U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 88—PART 3

MARCH 26, 1942, TO MAY 21, 1942
(PAGES 2959 TO 4452)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1942

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MAY 10 '43

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Rev. Gove G. Johnson, D. D., pastor, National Baptist Memorial Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father, in these troublous times when men are fainting from fear and for expectation of the things that are coming upon the inhabitants of the earth, as the Saviour foretold, we look to Thee for Thy grace and guidance in this crucial hour for our country and our Congress. We pray that peace may come again on earth and good will be among men.

"While for all mankind we pray, of every
clime and coast,
Hear us for our native land, the land we
love the most."

We ask Thy blessing in this hour, and that Thy fear be put into the hearts of the people and of our leaders, that we may not only be war conscious but God conscious, and that we may, above everything, obey Thy law, and seek Thy love eternal. Grant Thy blessing, we beseech of Thee, that national repentance and return to Thee may be granted, and then we need fear no foe.

Bless and guard, we pray Thee, the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and the Members of the Senate, that they may have grace and guidance, that there may be worthy transaction as well as discussion of all matters; and, in the light of Thy love and love of country, may Thy holy spirit lead and bring all to pass.

Hear our prayer; grant Thy gracious salvation to each one of us, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour, our Lord, and our coming King. In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. OVERTON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, March 25, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr CASE of South Dakota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5695) to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation technicians and mechanics, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a courtesy of the Senate in view of the limitation of time under the agreement which was entered into yesterday. The request is that we do not engage in the transaction of routine business this morning, and that I may be permitted to use the time for the purpose to which I have been assigned by the majority of the committee, and that is to present the views of the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for that purpose.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Caraway
Austin	Brooks	Chandler
Bailey	Brown	Chavez
Ball	Bulow	Clark, Idaho
Bankhead	Burton	Clark, Mo.
Barbour	Butler	Connally
Barkley	Byrd	Danaher
Bone	Capper	Davis
Doxey	McCarran	Shipstead
Ellender	McFarland	Smathers
George	McKellar	Smith
Gerry	McNary	Spencer
Gillette	Maloney	Stewart
Glass	Maybank	Taft
Green	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Murray	Tobey
Herring	Nye	Truman
Hill	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Holman	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Hughes	Overton	Vandenberg
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Van Nuys
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wagner
Kilgore	Reed	Walsh
La Follette	Reynolds	Wheeler
Langer	Rosier	White
Lee	Russell	Wiley
Lucas	Schwartz	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in Western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have asked Senators not to request that I yield for routine business this morning, in view of the fact that my time is very limited.

Mr. McCARRAN. I merely desired to present a report from a committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand, and there are many in the same situation. I regret that I cannot appear to be as generous as I really am, but in the performance of my duty I am obliged to conserve the time, if possible.

Mr. President I shall attempt to present the views of the committee, with respect to the law which has been so ably debated, in the following classifications

First. That this is not a case for expulsion to which article I, section 5, paragraph 2, of the Constitution applies; in other words, that this is not a case in which a two-thirds vote is required.

The second part of my discussion will relate to the challenge to the jurisdiction of the Senate to consider any case brought here by people of this country challenging the qualifications of a Senator-elect before he enters the door of the Senate. In other words, the second branch of what I have to say is directed to the point that this is not a case in which a State has violated article I, section 3, paragraph 3, by electing a person not eligible by reason of age, citizenship, or residence.

My concluding chapter relating to the legal issue is the simple proposition that this is a case for exclusion under article I, section 5, paragraph 1, of the Constitution.

Let us proceed to the claim which the committee makes and on which the committee divided, 13 to 3; namely, that the Senate, acting as a body, cannot expel a man who is not a Member of the Senate. It seems axiomatic, and as though it were not necessary to debate such a proposition, and that all that need be said is that the Senate cannot expel a man who is not a Member of the Senate.

The power of expulsion is limited by principle and policy and universal, unbroken practice to punishment of a man who is within the Senate and whose credentials and whose right to his seat in the Senate are above question. It presumes that he has passed the barrier which might be raised against him by his people and that the cause against him is one which arose by virtue of his act committed during his membership, or by virtue of his act committed outside his membership, but which takes effect during his membership, either by sudden discovery during his membership that he is unworthy to be a Senator, or that its consequences upon his public service first accrued during his membership as a Senator.

I have boldly asserted the equivalent of the claim that the Senator-elect here is not a Senator, that he is not a Member of the Senate, and I wish to dwell upon that thought for just a few moments. Indeed, I have to be brief in whatever I say, in view of the time limitation.

This case arose upon a petition by the people of North Dakota. This must be borne in mind in what we are doing, and we must remember that the issue was not initiated within the Senate of the United States. This is not an issue of law or fact between the Senate of the United States and WILLIAM LANGER; it is an issue between the people of North Dakota and WILLIAM LANGER. The Senate of the United States, the whole Senate, as a governmental organ and body, is the judge in the settlement of that issue.

Mr. LANGER comes here, and at the door he is challenged by a petition of his own people. No Senator raised the issue. The people of North Dakota said to the United States Senate, under the Constitution, "Stop this man. He is not entitled to a seat because he is not qualified morally to be a Senator." To be sure, Mr. President, they did say also that he was not legally elected a Senator because of irregularities in his election. But both causes were alleged, not by someone in the United States Senate, not by the Senate as a governmental organ, but by the people of the State of North Dakota.

By the way, Mr. President, let me not fail to point out that the people of North Dakota are citizens of the United States, and that as citizens of the United States they have rights also in addition to those which they have as citizens of the State of North Dakota, and among them is the right to have this organ of government, which belongs to them as citizens of the United States, judicially pass upon the issues they raise upon the evidence and according to the law, without fear and without favor, and with that high regard which is necessary for the moral strength of this Nation, of which they are members and through which they are united.

The people assembled in the Constitutional Convention after a futile effort to revive that unity which had been destroyed when they declared their independence of Britain. Previous to that time they had been united in the person of the King. The King's person was the device in government which united them, and upon the declaration of independence and the severance of that tie, they were scattered as seed corn. So they tried to replace that unifying medium by Articles of Confederation; they set up a Continental Congress, and they afterward set up a Congress under the Articles of Confederation. Did they create unity? On the contrary, they created the beginnings of anarchy.

In those days every State was a complete sovereign, and it sent to Congress delegates; it sent what I have heard two Senators in this debate claim the States now send to Congress, namely, ambassadors. Those two Senators are the distinguished statesmen who have made the fight to prevent the Senate from responding in the affirmative to the petition of the people of North Dakota. Therefore, Mr. President, I am forced to the conclusion that their position is due to a fundamental error, namely, that they still believe that the Government of the United States is a mere confederation, in which the Articles of Confederation provide that the States can take back their delegates; that those who appear here in that debating society called the United States Congress represent the States and have contempt for that Federal Government which should be the unifying characteristic of a great country such as ours.

We know that historically it is true that there was such competition among the States in that Confederation as to lead to economic collapse of the country; and, under the device of getting together the leaders of thought of the New World for the purpose of curing this economic difficulty, there occurred the meeting of probably the greatest galaxy of statesmen the world has ever seen together at one time.

What did they do? They supplied that which was missing from the Articles of Confederation and from the Confederacy; they supplied the unifying machinery, namely, a republic, a great republic, and everything that is contained in the Constitution of the United States which relates to that Republic—the creation of a government of the people of the United States; not a creation of the government of the people of 48 separate States—everything they put into that Constitution with respect to the officials of that Government, from the President down, and especially those officials who represented the people, namely, the Senators and the Representatives of the people of the United States—everything related to that unifying feature of our Federal system, the Republic, came from the people of the Nation, not from the people organized as the several States.

These officers became the officers of the people of the United States, not the officers of the people of the several States. No longer were Senators and Representatives to be called even ambassadors. It was truly provided by the Constitution, in which the people of this country agreed, as citizens of the United States, that Senators should be the Senators of the United States from these several States. So jealous were they of this unity of a great nation that throughout the framing of the Constitution they kept the firmest hands upon everything pertaining to the creation of the office of a Senator and the election of a man to be Senator, and the final decision of the qualifications of a Senator; and when they did delegate anything at all to a State, they hitched a rope to it.

Mr. President, I have heard Senators claim that there was something that the States reserved to themselves with respect to the qualifications of Senators. I so violently disagree with that assertion that it is difficult for me to discuss it calmly. A State may not reserve that which it never had, and there was not a State then, and there is not a State now, which has any authority or any power whatever over a Federal officer. The Federal Government, the great Republic, did not then exist.

This is not in conflict with the principle to which we all are devoted and for which we would fight to the bitter end, that in the beginning to the States alone belonged jurisdiction and authority over all affairs that were domestic and pertained to the government of the several States, and we probably did not need the tenth amendment to reserve in the States the great reservoir of power over all domestic affairs; but we did reserve expressly all those powers which were not expressly delegated to the Federal Government or which are necessarily implied from the delegations expressed. That does not conflict at all with that magnificent thing which was created by the Constitution—a union, a union not merely of indestructible States but a union that was indissoluble because it was a union of the people of the United States.

Let us not forget as we perform our humble duty here that we are the servants of the people of the United States, and their interest in our performance of that duty is great, whether they reside in the Green Mountains or whether they reside on the coast of the blue Pacific. The people of North Dakota initiated this proceeding of which we as the Senate,

an organ of this Republic created by the people of the United States, are the judge; but they are far from being the only people in the United States who will be affected by the judgment of this court. Are the practices of this court—I speak advisedly when I say "court"—to be regarded carelessly? I affirm that there has never absolutely never, been a case for expulsion tried and acted upon by the Senate of the United States in which there was not contained this ingredient, namely, that the act, the condition, the cause for expulsion occurred during the membership of the person acted upon.

Mr. President, the precedents to that effect are numerous; they are unbroken; there is not a single exception; but they have something more for sanction than the high regard which the people of the United States have always had for custom and precedent in judicial matters, namely, they have the sanction of reason.

Let us look at this question from the point of view of what we would do if we were members of that great Constitutional Convention and had before us the policy to determine. In order to expel a Member of this body there must be two-thirds agreement on the part of the Senate. It is a special provision; it is a severe provision. Why was it put there? The reason it was put there helps us to understand the difference between the process of acting upon a petition of the people back home and the process of acting upon a petition initiated in the Senate.

When a Senator, or any group of Senators in the United States Senate, comes forward and prefers a charge against a fellow Senator who occupies his seat unchallenged at the door, we would say as a matter of policy, just as our forefathers said, that in such a case there must be an extraordinary demand made of those who prefer such a charge after a Senator has come here with proper credentials, with good reputation, with no challenge from his own people, and has acquired his title, and has become established here. Then indeed there should be a severe test, and our forefathers said that in such case two-thirds should be required to expel him. In every other case, however, only a majority is required. This is for the reason that the people of the United States, interested in the character and quality of the Senate of the United States, should have a fair chance to raise the question at the door, and have it decided by a mere majority.

The people of the United States wrote into their charter the provision that even though a Senator-elect presents himself with prima facie good title, the Senate alone shall be the judge of his qualifications. The people on the outside should not be brought under the strict rule and heavy burden of a two-thirds vote, but the Senate should act, under its rules, by a majority vote. In other words, the distinction between the process for exclusion and the process for expulsion has been kept clean and clear-cut for 150 years without a single exception, always exactly the same, though statesmen have risen, as they have in this case, and tried to break it. The public—the people of the United States and the people of the several States—is given the opportunity to come to this court with a petition, submitting to this court the qualifications of the Senator-elect, with the right to a decision similar to judicial action in the courts of the land, on the basis of a majority. That is a part of the rights of the people of the United States, and it is our duty to guard and protect it. We have no choice.

It will be seen that I have made two propositions. One is the general rule that in the history of this Government no man has ever been expelled from the Senate or House of Representatives, and no attempt has been made to expel any man from the Senate or House, save for a cause which accrued during his membership. It may have occurred earlier, and before his election, but the cause of action, the cause of expulsion, is related to the performance of his office as a Senator of the United States, and the process can be initiated only after he has become such.

The other proposition is that this candidate has not become a Senator of the United States. At most, he is only a conditional Senator. It might be said, by the use of a word which is familiar with respect to some other things, that this condition is a putative one. He is a putative Senator. There is a certain imperfection. According to the practice of the Senate and according to the express condition and probation under which he was allowed to take his seat and his oath, he did so upon condition that after the hearing on the petition of his people which challenged him at the door, he might go out as if he had never taken his seat.

I make no point about the morals, the good manners, or the ethics of a man making such an agreement when he comes in here and forthwith repudiating it. It is not surprising, in view of the character shown by the evidence and pointed to in the report of the committee.

Mr. President, I come to the second point. This is not a case in which a State—meaning North Dakota—has violated article I, section 3, clause 3, by electing a person not eligible by reason of age, citizenship, or residence. I am a little surprised to find several distinguished lawyers here still arguing that old question, which has been decided so many times by both Houses of the Congress that one would think it was a closed incident, in the language of diplomacy. The section of the Constitution to which I refer reads:

> No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State from which he shall be chosen.

Observe that that is literally an imposition of a limitation upon the States. It says to the several States directly, expressly, and in unambiguous terms, "This is an officer of the United States. In choosing him there are certain prescribed disqualifications which you must observe. If you do not observe them, if there is one breach in the matter of disqualifications, the Senate of the United States, which is the sole judge of elections, ought to bar at the door the Senator-elect whom you have sent here."

Mr. President, those disqualifications were added to. If they were qualifications, what were the people of the United States doing by adding disqualifications to them? If they could be reversed and read affirmatively as qualifications, what earthly need was there for passing the fourteenth amendment? There had been no difficulty in dealing with innumerable cases relating to the same thing specified in the fourteenth amendment. It was not necessary to enact that particular provision unless we were dealing with an absolute and positive disqualification, because the Senate had already practiced the expulsion of a great number of Senators for being engaged in activities regarded as hostile and treasonable to the United States.

Again, if these are not what they appear to be, namely, disqualifications, why does the Constitution provide another thing which is called a disqualification, in another connection, namely, that a person may not hold any other office in the United States Government and still be a Senator? The Constitution prohibits that. In effect, it is a prohibition on the States.

We find that in article VI of the Constitution our fathers said to us, in effect, "The disqualifications which are spoken of are intended to proscribe the activities of the States." Hear what they said in article VI:

> The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

Observe the difference between an affirmative statement, which we find here, and that which we are primarily discussing, which is a negative, or prohibitive, statement. Here the Congress of the United States is being addressed. The Congress of the United States is being told what it must do. First, it must require of those who come here as Senators-elect that they take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States; and, second, the Congress of the United States is told that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for the office of Senator of the United States.

Mr. President, further, with regard to the conduct of our forefathers, which indicates clearly their purpose to keep unto the Federal Government, the Republic, control over the authority and qualifications of Federal officers, and particularly of Senators, we have article I, section 4, clause 1, of the Constitution, reading:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. President, what else? Was there anything else which the people in the

Constitutional Convention wished to have the Federal Government or Republic delegate to the States with respect to the election of Senators? If so, why is it not there written? In other words, applying the ordinary rule, that when a specific thing such as fixing the time of holding an election is delegated, we know by the rule of construction that all other things not mentioned are excluded from the delegation; nothing is delegated but that which is expressed.

Here the times, places, and manner are delegated, but even that limited delegation to the States of control over the election of Senators is kept strongly in hand by the National Government, which is the living soul of unity of the people of the United States—namely, that—

the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

It has been claimed here, in argument, that, since the disqualifications which are specified in this section of the Constitution are limited to three, and in the others of which I have spoken there are only two, making in all five, namely, age, citizenship, residence, participation in rebellion, and incompatible office, there are no other disqualifications. To my mind, that is an argument that works in reverse, and should be considered in connection with the affirmative section of the statute, to which I shall come shortly; namely, that the Senate shall be the judge of the qualifications of its Members; that is to say—

Each House shall be the judge of the * * * qualifications of its Members.

So, over and against this narrow limitation upon the power of the States to send Senators or Representatives here, we have an affirmative grant by the people of the United States to the Republic of the power and the duty to pass upon all other things relating to the qualifications of Senators and Representatives.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want to interrupt the Senator unless he is perfectly willing to have me do so. With reference to his statement that we are to judge, and his former statement that we set ourselves up as a judicial tribunal for that specific purpose—that is, to judge of the qualifications—let me ask if the position the Senator takes is that we are acting judicially in exercising that function?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not yet come to a discussion of that particular chapter. If the Senator will postpone his question temporarily, I should like to take it up in regular order in my discussion, instead of now.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall try to conclude the discussion of disqualifications.

I have so far attempted to discuss the reasons why our forefathers changed the substance as well as the form of the original draft of the Constitution. Now I desire to take up some of the precedents wherein this very question has been tried out.

In 1 Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, in the Brigham H. Roberts case, at page 528, we find this:

We desire at the very threshold of this discussion to lay down these general propositions, never to be forgotten and always to be kept clearly in mind:

First. That the House has never denied that it had the right to refuse to permit a Member-elect to be sworn in, although he had all of the three constitutional qualifications.

Second. That it has in many instances affirmatively declared that it had the right to thus refuse.

Third. That the right to so refuse is supported on principle and by the overwhelming weight of authority of constitutional writers and judicial opinions on analogous constitutional questions.

Mr. President, I was curious to find out how many cases have come to the United States Senate wherein the candidate was challenged by his own people, who either said that he had not been properly elected or that he did not have the qualifications. I may say that between the two there is quite a difference. I find that there have been, in all, 59 such cases. That is an imposing number, and they have been scattered throughout the history of the United States from the earliest times.

Among those 59 cases, there were 41 wherein the candidate was permitted to come in and take his oath and seat; but there was never broken the rule that his so taking his seat and taking his oath was probationary, upon condition, and subject to the result of the investigation of charges presented against him by his own people.

In 18 cases alone, the candidate was requested to stand aside, and did stand aside, and the investigation came first; but in all 59 cases we find that the Senate assumed the jurisdiction to decide, on the basis of a majority vote, the question presented by the petition of the public. There is not a single case that has sustained the claim which is now made here, and which has been made numerous times in our history, that the prohibitions, the disqualifications, constitute the only qualifications of the candidate who comes here and is challenged by his own people. Is not that an astounding fact? Has it not the weight and effect of absolute proof of what our forefathers intended and what the practical construction of both Houses of Congress is? What more is wanted? Mr. President, are we now going to adopt a resolution such as that of the Senator from Louisiana, and say that the Senate has no jurisdiction to test the moral character qualifications of a Senator-elect who at the door of the Senate is confronted by a petition from his own people challenging his moral qualifications? If now the Senate is going to declare its ineptitude, I think it will be a revolution that will affect the Senate until it reverses itself and gets back on the sound basis of truth, the sound basis of principle.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the Senator give us the name of one case in our entire history where a Senator who was allowed to take his seat was afterward excluded by a majority vote?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is it?

Mr. AUSTIN. There are a great many of them. I can give seven where the exclusion was for a similar cause as in this case. Although the gentlemen presenting themselves had credentials which were without flaw, yet they were excluded after they were allowed to come in here and take their seats on probation. I will read them. First, the John Niles case in 1843. That was a mental case. I think I can show just how long he had been here, for I have worked out a table which shows that he was a Senator from Connecticut from December 21, 1835, to March 3, 1839, and from May 16, 1844, to March 3, 1849. In that case the Senate assumed jurisdiction, heard the case, and found the facts against the petitioners. I read from the report of the committee:

The committee are satisfied his election, return, and qualifications are legal and sufficient, and that it remains to inquire into his capacity at this time to take the oath prescribed by the Constitution.

Mr. MURDOCK. In that case did the Senate exclude?

Mr. AUSTIN. It did not exclude, but it took jurisdiction.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not dispute that, but my question to the Senator is this: Is there any one case in our entire history where a Senator has been allowed to come in and take his seat as Senator LANGER has in this case, and on charges, not as to his election or not as to any constitutional disqualifications, as the Senator calls them, has thereafter been expelled or excluded by the Senate by a majority vote?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; there have been many. The case of Whittemore elected to Congress from North Carolina in 1870 is perhaps the most interesting and illuminating case in the history of Congress, so far as this question is concerned.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator that probably that case comes closest to being a precedent in point.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to put the list in the RECORD, because I think it may be well to keep the record straight, not that I am challenging the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want to appear for a moment as challenging the Senator. I merely want to get the matter straight in my own mind.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. As I understood, the Senator from Vermont, in his reply to the Senator from Utah, said that there were seven cases of exclusion for causes similar to those asserted and alleged in this case. Did the Senator make such a statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not mean exactly that. What I meant was for causes other than the three which I am discussing which are, as I claim, disqualifications and not qualifications.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, the Senator said, "I will name them," and he commenced to name them, and cited first the Niles case.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. That, of course, was a case where the applicant was not excluded by the Senate, but, quite the contrary; he was in the Senate from 1835, if I state correctly the dates given by the Senator, to 1839 and from 1844 to 1849.

Mr. AUSTIN. I see I have got to discuss each case fully in order to keep the record straight.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I was not questioning the Senator from Vermont in his citation of cases, nor do I require that he discuss each case, let me say. I thank him for his courteous forbearance with me at the moment, but I do wish to point out that the Whittemore case, for example, was the case of a Member of the House of Representatives and not a Senator; that the case of Niles was not a case of exclusion for causes similar to those alleged in this case, but, as the Senator has read, for exclusion because of inability to take an oath because of mental debility.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator means to say that such a cause is similar to that under the facts prevailing in this case. If he does, I should like him to say so; if he does not, I should like him not to have us understand that the seven cases to which he has referred, where exclusion was voted, were for causes similar to those asserted in this case. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will try to be more specific, and try to be as exact as in a plea of abatement.

Now, let me complete the list of cases which I think are responsive to the question. I see that I have not fully answered the question of the Senator from Utah. What I am undertaking to do is to give the names from this list of cases where the candidate was challenged for some other cause than the three disabilities or disqualifications I have mentioned. I think that is a correct statement, and I will try to adhere to that line, if I can. The names of those cases are John Niles, a mental case, 1843; Henry M. Rice, a case of fraud and corruption in the sale of the Fort Crawford Reservation, 1858; Senator-elect Thomas, a disloyalty case, 1867; Representative-elect Whittemore, the sale of appointments, 1870; Representative-elect Roberts, polygamy, 1899; Senator-elect Gould, bribery, 1926; Senator-designate Smith, acceptance of money while he was chairman of a public utility commission from corporations that came within the jurisdiction and rulings of the commission, 1926.

I think I have named seven of such cases, and they are spread over a period from 1843 to 1926.

Since 1926 there have been several cases, jurisdiction has been taken, the facts have been found against the petitioners, and the candidates have retained their seats not only after having come into the Senate and taken the oath, subject to hearing, but after the hearing and report they have continued to occupy their seats. Then there are 59 cases—I am speaking now of the Senate alone; there are, of course, many others in the House of Representatives—but there are 59 cases of exclusion, including those which came under the clause I am now debating, namely, the disqualification clause, as well as those which came under the other clause relating to the duty of the Senate to judge of the qualifications of its members.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator that there have been some cases where the Senate, at least in preliminary matters, assumed jurisdiction, but my question is: Is there one single case in the entire history of the Senate of a Senator who has been allowed to take the oath, as Senator LANGER has in this case, having been excluded by the Senate by a majority vote?

Mr. AUSTIN. Is the Senator now attempting to differentiate the construction placed on the Constitution by the House and that placed on it by the Senate?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am asking a simple question, I think.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not see the relevancy of it, Mr. President.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us even admit that it is not relevant; for my information and that of the Senate, has any such action ever been taken by the Senate; and if so, in what case?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in the very case in which reliance has been placed by the Senator from Utah, the Reed Smoot case, we find the Senate taking jurisdiction even though the petition was brought by people in his State. Some 4 years—4 years; think of it—after he had been here, the Senate took jurisdiction and decided that the question really came up on whether his attitude while a Senator, while he was still in this body as a Member of this body, was such that he should be expelled. The question really resolved itself to that, although they took an original motion for exclusion and modified it by parentheses, calling for the action by a two-thirds vote, which occurs only when the occasion calls for expulsion. Thereupon the Senate voted not to expel.

The point is not what the Senate finally did; and that is why I say the question is irrelevant. The result of the action means nothing. The point is the exercise of jurisdiction. That is what is challenged here. In the amendment presented by the Senator from Louisiana we have a question of jurisdiction. The amendment in effect says to the Senate of the United States, "You cannot act upon this petition which comes from North Dakota because you have no jurisdiction outside of these prohibitions or disqualifications. You cannot pass upon qualifications; you cannot, as the Constitution says you shall, be judge of the qualifications. You can be judge only of disqualifications."

That is the effect of the amendment. It is an amendment challenging the jurisdiction, and I say the answer to it is the unbroken practice of both Houses, in the protection of their integrity, of allowing a candidate to come in, and, nevertheless, trying the question raised by a petition brought by the people of the United States or the people of the several States. That is what is important.

In 41 cases, I have shown, the candidate has been allowed to take his seat, and thereafter the question presented by the petition of his own people was inquired into. In 18 cases he has been asked to stand aside, and the inquiry was made before he was allowed to take his seat. That is the practice which has probative force here, that is the only thing that is necessary to be inquired into, not what the effect of each of those trials was. In a great many of them the candidate has been allowed to take his seat because the finding was that the challenge was without foundation. It was not because any such action as that now requested was taken. Never in the history of the Senate, never in the history of the House of Representatives, has this challenge been granted. Many times has the question been raised and discussed. The cases are full of discussion, where the same claim has been argued time after time, but in every one of the cases to which I have referred, 56 of them, jurisdiction was taken; and that is the point.

It is the inherent and constitutional duty of the United States Senate to protect and scrupulously guard its integrity, if constitutional liberty is to survive in this Republic. (1 Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, p. 518.)

Brigham H. Roberts, at page 528:

"We desire at the very threshold of this discussion to lay down these general propositions, never to be forgotten and always to be kept clearly in mind:

"First. That the House has never denied that it had the right to refuse to permit a Member-elect to be sworn in, although he had all of the three constitutional qualifications.

"Second. That it has in many instances affirmatively declared that it had the right to thus refuse.

"Third. That the right to so refuse is supported on principle and by the overwhelming weight of authority of constitutional writers and judicial opinions on analogous constitutional questions."

At page 529:

"The provision seems to be worded designedly in the negative so as to prevent the suspicion that it was intended to be exclusive, and so as to prevent the application of the rule, 'the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another.'"

At page 530:

"We think that the civilized world would declare that it made itself ridiculous if it confessed its want of power to keep out from the councils of the Nation a man who was a confessed traitor."

On the question whether we should seat or not seat, we come to another issue, and that is the third chapter of my discussion. Our position about that is that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business. Observe that "a majority of each" is

hitched right onto the rest of the clause by a comma, it qualifies it, is a part of it, justifying the interpretation which has been made throughout history, that it is this organ of the Federal Government, this organ of the Republic, the Senate of the United States, that is the court which tries this justiciable question of the qualification of the member.

Mr. President, I was interrupted in my reading of the case of Whittemore, and I regard it important to read it in order for the RECORD to show the reasoning of the case, for I agree in that reasoning, especially as it was expressed by Gen. John A. Logan, who was a Member of the House at the time the Whittemore case was before them. He said:

It is said that the constituency had the right to elect such a Member as they may think proper. I say no. We cannot say that he shall be of a certain politics, or of a certain religion, or anything of that kind; but, sir, we have the right to say that he shall not be a man of infamous character. He is not merely a representative of the constituents who elected him, but his vote in the House is a vote for the whole country. It is a vote for the people of the whole country, and every district in the United States has the same interest in his vote that his own district has.

Hence, if Congress shall not have the power or authority, or shall not have the right to exclude a man of that kind, then the rights of the people of the whole country may be destroyed by a district sending a Representative who may be obtained to vote in a manner which may be destructive of the rights of the people. Are we to be told that Congress has no right to prevent anything of this kind because of the right of any constituents to send whomsoever they please? * * *

It is not that the people shall not be represented. Not at all. It is this: That the people of the country have no right to destroy their own liberty by filling Congress with men who, from their conduct, show themselves capable of the destruction of their Government. * * *

Congress, being the representative of the whole people, are entitled to say that the right of the whole country shall not be destroyed by one or more districts directing in here a man or set of men capable of their destruction; and they, having knowledge of the facts and the power to prevent the mischief by exercising the rights of exclusion, they having right to exercise that power and thereby protect the interest of the country and to preserve instead of destroy the right of representation.

In considering the Whittemore case and in weighing its value as a precedent it should be borne in mind that the charge complained of was an offense punishable by law but for which, under the Constitution, he was presumed to be innocent until proven guilty, and the offense was committed prior to the last election and the facts concerning the charge were known by the electorate prior to the election. It was not a case where the charges arose after the election nor after he had been sworn in. The Whittemore case is, therefore, a powerful precedent to establish the right of either House of Congress to reject a Member-elect.

I am very glad to have the admission of the Senator from Utah that that is a good case; but the case speaks for itself. Perhaps the best expression by text writers on constitutional law, so far as this question is concerned, is contained in Pomeroy's Constitutional Law, third edition, page 138, as follows:

The power given to the Senate and to the House of Representatives each to pass upon the validity of the elections of its own Members and upon their personal qualifications seems to be unbounded. But I am very strongly of the opinion that the two Houses together, as one House, cannot pass any statute containing a general rule by which the qualifications of Members as described in the Constitution are either added to or lessened.

Of course not, allow me to interpolate. The people of the United States imposed duties connected with determining or judging the qualifications of Members, imposed those duties upon the separate bodies, upon the Senate in the case of Senators, upon the House in the case of Representatives, and nobody else under the sun can exercise those duties. The Congress cannot exercise them. No State can exercise them

Holding the views I do about this principle of Federal strength and unity, which I would fight for, as I would fight for the independence of my State in respect to domestic affairs, it seems to me absurd to argue that it is left to the States to add to the qualifications, when there is no delegation in the Constitution to States save those which are expressly made with respect to the time, place, and manner of choosing Senators and Representatives, and even that delegation is kept within close bounds, subject to be changed at any time by Congress, excepting as to the place of choosing Senators.

The claim that we are only ambassadors of course expresses one real, underlying, fundamental error which makes men still claim that the Senate has not jurisdiction to pass upon the qualifications of its Members, and that the interpretation of "disqualifications" must be reversed, and it made to mean something else entirely, namely, qualifications.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I remind the Senator that in the case of an Ambassador, the country to which he is sent always has the right either to accept him or reject him.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Georgia, who certainly is an authority on foreign relations, having been chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and who is a very distinguished and learned international lawyer as well as constitutional lawyer. It is of some pleasure to me, Mr. President, to be associated in view with the Senator from Georgia on this important fundamental question which we are debating in the Senate. We are upon the verge of doing something terrible if we are to reverse the history of the United States, as we would do if we denied our jurisdiction for the cause stated in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. GEORGE. I may say on that point that I fully agree with the Senator from Vermont. The question here is not the right of any State; the question is the right and power and duty of this body, as a branch of the legislative body created by the Constitution, and I regard the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana as presenting a far more important question than whether Mr. LANGER shall keep his seat in this body at this time. If the Senate should agree to the amendment it would be a blow struck at the long and glorious history of the Senate of the United States, but it would be one, Mr. President, which, of course, no future Senate would regard or would be bound to regard, because under the Constitution each Senate, as and when organized, becomes the absolute judge of what it will do with respect to admission to membership or expulsion from the body after membership has commenced, subject only to the one restriction that expulsion must be by a two-thirds vote and not by a majority vote.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the thought of the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the amendment submitted by the able Senator from Louisiana does not raise the question of whether it takes two-thirds vote to expel or whether it can be done by a majority vote?

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana is a demurrer, it is a speaking demurrer, it is a demurrer to all that the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections has done, because it says in effect, "Regardless of what the evidence may have disclosed, if the provisions contained in the Constitution with respect to age, residence, and the other qualifications are met, the Senate has no further concern about the matter." It is a demurrer to the whole evidence. It is a denial of the power, of the right, and of the jurisdiction of the Senate to inquire beyond the mere prohibitive provisions contained in the Constitution.

Mr. McNARY. I regret to ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me of his time for just another inquiry.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. It had occurred to me that the proper course probably would be to insert after the language of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana that action should require two-thirds of the vote of the Senate. I assume the able Senator would not object to the presentation squarely before the Senate of the question whether action required a two-thirds vote or a majority vote.

Mr. GEORGE. That question is squarely presented in the first section of the committee's resolution, on which the chairman of the committee has asked for a vote.

Mr. McNARY. There is a question about that. I doubt if that provision is properly formed, if one wishes to be technical about it.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish further to take the time of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. McNARY. Is the interpretation which the Senator places on the amendment submitted by the able Senator from

Louisiana, that it is not a fair presentation of the question whether two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to expel?

Mr. GEORGE. It may be susceptible of that interpretation, but it goes far beyond that. It is a direct denial of the power of the Senate to entertain jurisdiction of any case respecting the right of a Member here to a seat, when the negative conditions set forth in the Constitution are not themselves directly involved.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield for a question. I cannot yield for a speech. My time runs out at 3:30.

Mr. BONE. I am impelled to ask about a particular aspect of the problem, because I have seen its parallel or its substantive parallel in some municipal operations. Suppose the Senate should repel Senator LANGER by whatever vote is decided to be a proper vote, and that the people of North Dakota should reelect him as Senator, and he should again present himself at the bar of the Senate. What sort of a legal problem would then confront us? I can conceive the possibility of that very thing happening, because it has in effect happened in the western section of the country on a number of occasions, when officials have been recalled by the people, and then have been triumphantly reelected to the same office. So I think we have to confront the possibility of such a thing occurring. If the people of North Dakota should feel that we have not treated the Senator fairly in repelling him, and were to reelect him, would not this whole problem again be dumped into our laps, and would we not be confronted with even a worse angle legally than that which now confronts us?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is not a relevant question. It cannot affect our decision as judges. That question has no force at all upon our decision today. The consequences of our decision are not important, excepting those consequences which affect the moral power of the Senate of the United States among the people and in the world. Those are the consequences which count. The question of what will happen to an individual, to a single citizen, is nothing by comparison with that. This is the kind of question that bears upon the reason for the rule which we assert: What would be the position of North Dakota or any other State in the Union if it could not challenge at the door a Senator-elect for having committed murder which had not been discovered at the time of his election? What would be the consequences if in that case the rule which is imposed upon the people for persuading the Senate of the United States were so sweeping that action must be taken by a two-thirds vote? Such a rule would be against all reason. It would be against the theory of our Government that we should demand of the people that they persuade us to that degree when they come here with their petition. That is why the framers said in the Constitution, "You, as an organ of this Republic, the Senate of the United States, you as a court and not as individuals, not by two-thirds vote, but by a majority vote of the Senate, shall judge not only of the election, but also of the qualifications of the Senator-elect." That is what we are called upon to do.

Mr. President, we are not confronted by a proceeding to expel or oust a man from the Senate who is a Member of it. We are confronted by a petition from the citizens of North Dakota to exclude, and I think it would be utterly absurd for us to answer in the affirmative the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana and say to the people of the United States for the first time in all our history that we are inept, that we do not have any authority, that we cannot pass upon any other qualifications than those set out in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I think we do have respect for the decisions of the Supreme Court—I do—and when I find myself making claims which are in line with the decisions of the Supreme Court I certainly feel much more persuaded to the thought I am trying to present than I would be otherwise. My persuasions became convictions. In the case entitled "In re Chapman, Petitioner," which will be found in One Hundred and Sixty-sixth United States Reports, page 661, I call attention to the following extracts. They are brief and in point:

> Under the Constitution the Senate of the United States has the power to try impeachments, to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members; to determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member; and it necessarily possesses the inherent power of self-protection.

Mr. President, that is a declaration of common sense. It is a declaration of principle that is a part of the civilization of Anglo-Saxon people. In all times since the twelfth century legislative bodies that claim to be free or semifree have had the inherent power, without any express delegation to them by the people in a constitution, to protect themselves from a murderer or any other criminal, or any man who so conducts himself in public office that he is a menace to law and order, that he is an encourager of insurrection or an inciter of strikes and riots.

We have the inherent power to protect the Senate of the United States, and we have the duty under the Constitution. We have been charged by the people of the United States to perform that duty.

The case from which I have read has other things in it which are applicable to our question. Those things relate to how the courts look upon transactions between a public officer and those against whose interest he should act, or is obliged under his oath to act. This question arose over a resolution which directed a committee of the Senate to inquire "whether any Senator had been, or is, speculating in what are known as sugar stocks during the consideration of the tariff bill now before the Senate." The Court said:

> What the Senate might or might not do upon the facts when ascertained, we cannot say, nor are we called upon to inquire whether such ventures might be defensible, as contended in argument, but it is plain that negative answers would have cleared that body of what the Senate regarded as offensive imputations, while affirmative answers might have led to further action on the part of the Senate within its constitutional powers.

In other words, within its constitutional powers it can act upon a case in which a public officer has gone into the market and dealt in the subject matter which is under consideration, which may be affected in value by the action which he take in this body.

> Nor will it do to hold that the Senate had no jurisdiction to pursue the particular inquiry because the preamble and resolution did not specify that the proceedings were taken for the purpose of censure or expulsion, if certain facts were disclosed by the investigation. The matter was within the range of the constitutional powers of the Senate. The resolutions adequately indicated that the transactions referred to were deemed by the Senate reprehensible and deserving of condemnation and punishment.

That is a bright light to have shine into the gloom of a great public body taking the attitude which has been taken here and treating the most remarkable history of misconduct in public office which I think the Senate has ever had before it as though it were a thing to be excused if any possible technicality can be found by which to wash our hands of the very odious job of passing judgment upon a fellow Member.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States as a body is on trial. What happens to us as individuals is nothing; but what happens to the Senate of the United States is of the greatest import at this time in the world's history.

On the question of moral turpitude this case also throws light:

> The right to expel extends to all cases where the offense is such as in the judgment of the Senate is inconsistent with the trust and duty of a Member.

Note the phrase "of a Member." That statement relates to the right to expel. The Court deals with some of our parliamentary history. It takes up the editorial discussion of this subject by Mr. Justice Story and points out that Mr. Sergeant commented upon the Blount case, to which the Senator from Ohio referred the other day. The Blount case was a case of expulsion, in which the offense was committed during membership. I am now reading from what the Supreme Court of the United States said:

> Commenting on this case, Mr. Sergeant says in his work on Constitutional Law, second edition, page 302: "In the resolution, the Senate declared him guilty of a high misdemeanor, though no presentment or indictment had been found against him, and no prosecution at law was ever commenced upon the case. And it seems no law existed, to authorize such prosecution."
>
> The two houses of Congress have several times acted upon this rule of law—

Reference is made to the rule of law that there is no limitation upon the power and duty of the Senate to pass upon the qualifications of Members. They are not obliged to wait until the man charged with murder has been tried and convicted, as some of the opponents of the report of the committee have asserted on the floor of the Senate during

this debate. They are not obliged to wait until State authorities or Federal authorities have brought an indictment and determined the criminal proceedings one way or the other. It is their duty to proceed when the challenge occurs and the facts appear. It is their duty to protect this organ of the Republic, indispensably required to be pure.

Mr. President, perfection alone is invulnerable. Nothing less than protection will keep the Senate invulnerable. Let us not forget it. We cannot afford to compromise, quibble, and fiddle when we have a duty presented to us as it has been presented in this case by a petition which is supported by the confession of the respondent. We cannot wash our hands by some clever device to sidestep the issue through legal questions. Such legal questions do not intervene. The duty of the Senate must be performed directly and promptly by the Senate.

I continue to read:

> The two Houses of Congress have several times acted upon this rule of law; and the cases may be found, together with debates on the general subject, in both Houses, of great value, in Smith's Digest of Decisions and Precedents, Senate Document No. 278, Fifty-third Congress, second session. The reasons for maintaining the right inviolate are eloquently presented in the report of the committee in the case of John Smith, accused in 1807 of participating in the imputed treason of Aaron Burr.

Let me read to the Senate the brief statement to which the Supreme Court of the United States refers.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I do not want a quorum call. I observe that 15 Senators are present. One can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry. I was only trying to help the Senator. I do not want to disturb the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. This is the statement to which the Supreme Court of the United States refers:

> The power of expelling a Member for misconduct results on the principles of common sense from the interest of the Nation that the high trust of legislation should be invested in pure hands. When the trust is elective it is not to be presumed that the constituent body will commit the deposit to the keeping of worthless characters. But when a man whom his fellow citizens have honored with their confidence on the pledge of his spotless reputation has degraded himself by the commission of infamous crimes which become suddenly and unexpectedly revealed to the world, defective indeed would be that institution which should be impotent to discard from its bosom the contagion of such a Member, which should have no remedy of amputation to apply until the poison had reached the heart. (Ibid. 937.)

With respect to what I have just read the Supreme Court said, in the case to which I have referred, at page 670:

> The reasons for maintaining the right inviolate are eloquently presented in the report of the committee in the case of John Smith—

That is the thing to which the Supreme Court refers.

In other words, on principle, by the unbroken practice, and by adjudication of the highest judicial authority in the world, the Senate of the United States has jurisdiction to pass upon the qualifications of its Members; and such an amendment as that offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], asserting that it does not have jurisdiction, ought to be turned down unanimously. In my opinion such a declaration would be the greatest confession of weakness, the lowest low in the admission of incapacity, that the Senate as an organ of government of the people of the United States ever reached.

Of course, the case would be ended were the answer in the affirmative. It would be a quick acting soap with which to wash our hands. We could not then pass on to the question of whether the petition of the people of North Dakota had been established by the evidence and by the confessions of the respondent. We would be helpless. We would say to the world, "Oh, we could not pass on those questions; we had to stop, because we did not have jurisdiction to pass on them. This man came here with three things certified: His age—all right; his residence—all right; his citizenship—all right." Then we could not act as judge of his qualifications, though the people of his own State stopped him at the door of the Senate, and presented a petition to us, and said, "Judge him. Here are the facts; judge him."

As stated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, with respect to the amendment, which amounts to a challenge to the jurisdiction of the Senate of the United States to protect the people in this very important organ of their Government, affirmative action on the amendment would be more devastating to the influence, the respect, the moral power of the United States Senate, than any decision which we could make upon the merits of this issue.

Mr. President, I have been rather abstruse, and have taken too much of the time of the Senate, but I have tried to clear the question, so that it would be apparent that the thing the Senate is about to do, the thing the Senate should do with the utmost care, is to judge of the qualifications of the Senator-elect as though he were now standing at the door of the Senate, and had been standing there since the time when the petition was presented by his people.

It may be of no probative force against him that he came here, not by a majority of the votes of his people, but out of a three-cornered fight in which he received a little more than one-third of all the votes cast in the election. It may be nothing whatever against him that that is so; but, on the other hand, it is not well that the Senate should admit that they cannot pass upon his qualifications with respect to moral turpitude because his people have passed on it. No! His people have not affirmed that he has the qualifications of a Senator, that he has the moral qualifications of a Senator.

I know that the Senate has suffered in listening this long while to the evidence of misconduct in public office; for nothing else was charged, nothing else was tried. The specific issues were drawn by the respondent himself, not by the committee. The complaint frequently made here, that the committee took into account misconduct in 1911, going back years in the history of this man, cannot be properly aimed at the committee. If Senators will examine the report, they will see that certain chapters of it deal only with the testimony of the respondent; they do not deal with any other matter at all. They are indexed by time as well as by page; the time begins in 1911 and continues through to his election; and the finger is pointed definitely to what the respondent said. We do not have to get the corroboration of any witness if we want absolutely to satisfy our own conscience that we have not done wrong in passing judgment on this matter. Stand only upon the testimony of the respondent himself, which, let me observe, Senators will find came originally either from his own initiative or by questions of his own counsel. He was guarded; he had numerous counsel right there with him all the time, he is not like a person who comes into the witness chair without knowledge of his obligations and of his rights. He is a lawyer, and he knows the legal consequences, he knows the probative effect, of his volunteering information. Apparently he wanted the committee to know the life story of BILL LANGER, and he gave it unblushingly, as if he regarded it as a thing to be proud of—laughing off a fist fight in court with a fellow lawyer; boasting of seizing a telephone exchange, armed with a gun and surrounded by others in masks, disguised; in fact, participating like a police officer when he was a prosecuting officer, an officer of the court whose duty and business it was to keep his hands out of that kind of a transaction and attend to the business of presenting to the court the evidence which police officers get, keeping himself free from the brimstone that comes from acts of that kind.

Thus, he told us of a lifetime in which he held many public offices, but never having held one without committing acts that showed the utmost disregard for law and order—searches without warrant, entering jails, removing prisoners. Think of the disregard for law that is expressed in the act of an attorney of the court having himself deputized for the purpose of opening a jail and removing from it a man who has committed an unbailable offense, a man charged with murder in the first degree, not entitled to bail, and yet his counsel, for the purpose of obstructing justice and preventing a witness—the sole eyewitness of the murder—from testifying against him, entered the jail, and not only removed the man from the jail, but took him out of the jurisdiction, where the peace officers of the State could not reach him. He could not be apprehended where Mr. LANGER took him; he took him beyond the boundaries of the State, to commit the act of obstruction to judicial process in a murder case—a man who has so little regard for the State which is

the institution which is absolutely necessary for the protection of the lives of its citizens from murder, a man who assisted a criminal by going out of his office as an attorney, to do two of the most unethical things ever heard of as being done by an officer of the court; and yet we wash our hands of responsibility to consider such matters.

I say, do not complain of the committee, do not complain that it considered testimony about a lifetime of misconduct. Such testimony was voluntarily given by him, and any reading of that testimony will reveal the most peculiar attitude toward it, as if such misconduct were perfectly all right, as if there were nothing wrong in it. Think of a man testifying about an affair in which he broke down the door to the office of the jail, and by assault on the jailer, obtained access to the desk drawer containing the key to the cell, after a fight with the jailor, overpowering him, he broke in and got the key and went to see his client. Oh, Senators, frontier life would not justify that. Even among men who are absolutely obliged to be alert all the time, there is this principle necessary, and this principle observed; that laws, rural though they may be, have always been found necessary, and a respect and regard for those laws was necessary for the safety of the whole community, and particularly is that true in the case of the administration of the criminal law.

Mr. President, you may take any block of years you want to from 1911 until Mr. LANGER was elected a United States Senator, and, from the testimony, you will not be able to escape the evidence of utter disregard for law and order in office. As State's attorney, attorney general, Governor, and commissioner passing upon the taxes and the valuation of property, every piece of that history has the same characteristics.

If you like best, as I do, to take those events which are nearest to his election as United States Senator, what do you see? They are knit together as an entire unit. The visit to the lawyer of the railroad company to sell something that was not salable: the deal with the broker who made $300,000 commission under Governor LANGER's administration, both were the product of what had occurred in 1934, 1935, 1936 1937, 1938, and 1939. They are related together according to the testimony. Mr. LANGER says, "Brunk helped me in the prosecution of the conspiracy case; Brunk helped finance me; Brunk came and visited me for a week afterward; Brunk did this and he did that"; and he told Brunk how hard up he was. He did undoubtedly become hard up from the effects of those prosecutions. That is the way they are connected with this transaction.

On the other horn of the dilemma was the lawyer representing a railroad company, Thomas V. Sullivan. Mr. LANGER said—I am dealing with the confessions of the Senator-elect—"Thomas Sullivan offered to act as attorney for me without pay in those prosecutions." They are all tied together. What do we find, without wearying the Senate except to refer to cases of the grossest misconduct? To begin with, the overt act of using his office as Governor to obtain subscriptions from State employees and also a few Federal employees. For what purpose? To build up the political party that would enable him to remain in power. Mr. President, if we do not regard that overt act as evidence of moral turpitude, causing us to take it into account seriously with all the other things, let us see how the court regarded it.

Remember, Mr. LANGER was convicted. To be sure, he said he had an unfair trial; but there were 12 men who found him guilty; and again there were 10 out of 12 who found him guilty on a retrial. In the meantime, however, between the two trials the circuit court of appeals had reversed the first trial. Did the court reverse the facts regarding the overt misconduct? No. The reversal is upon the proposition of conspiracy to impede the administration of the law of the United States, and the court held that a conspiracy which involved the employees of the State did not come within the jurisdiction of the Federal court. What, however, did they say further about the overt act? It is such things that show the character of the man; they are the things that bear upon the truth or falsity of the petition of the people of North Dakota.

I read from page 826 of Federal Reporter, second series, volume 76:

> Defendant LANGER in his testimony on the subject says—

The court also, it will be noted, stood on Senator LANGER's testimony, as I am doing—

> "The system of getting subscribers that I devised was this"—

This is from Mr. LANGER's testimony—

> "I felt that an employee who held a position under the State government owed, at least, sufficient duty to the administration to be willing to go out and assist the administration in securing a large circulation for a weekly newspaper I felt that if they sold newspapers or subscriptions to an amount of totaling 5 percent of their annual salary that that would not be asking anything too much of them, especially in view of the fact that the salaries of all of the State officials themselves—as distinguished from employees—had just been reduced 20 percent by the passage of a law."

That is the end of the quotation from which I wish to read.

Then I skip to the bottom of the column, where the following appears:

> It is not claimed that the overt acts charged in themselves constituted substantive offenses. Unless there was such a conspiracy, the conviction of appellants cannot be sustained. Whatever we may think of the ethics or propriety of the practice employed by appellants to secure funds for political purposes, it is not a matter of concern to the Federal Government, unless some lawful governmental function was thereby obstructed. In other words, a conspiracy or plan to assess State employees was not an act violative of any Federal statute, and hence, so far as the Federal court is concerned, not criminal. So far as the direct evidence of any plan or conspiracy for the collection of these funds is concerned, it was confined to the assessment of State employees. We have searched the records diligently for direct evidence of any plan beyond this, and counsel for the Government have called our attention to no such testimony.

In other words, the court obviously made its decision, not upon the overt act, but upon the question of whether that act itself was a violation of a Federal statute over which the court could take jurisdiction.

The court said further on page 827:

> Even participation in the offense which is the object of the conspiracy does not necessarily prove the participant guilty of conspiracy. The evidence must convince that the defendant did something other than participate in the offense which is the object of the conspiracy. There must, in addition thereto, be proof of the unlawful agreement and participation therein, with the knowledge of the agreement.

What is the effect of that decision in our consideration of this particular matter of misconduct in office? That decision wipes away the claim that the United States Circuit Court of Appeals had given some sort of an exoneration for the act. On the contrary, the court indirectly referred to it as an overt act of misconduct in office.

So, we see that all these acts are tied together. The employment of Leedom and Wyman is a part of the whole plan. One could not sit through the testimony of Mr. LANGER without getting the impression that he was in a tight place in that trial. I got the impression that the trial was about as tough a trial as any man ever had to undergo. I have no doubt whatever that the temptation upon Mr. LANGER and his friends to do what they did do as a consequence of it was very great; but it should not have been done, just the same, however great the temptation. Such a thing must not be done because it is a violation of law, to say nothing of ethics, and I am taking it only as Mr. LANGER himself looks at it. I am addressing myself to this thing on his view of the matter for the sake of argument. He says, "I had an unfair trial. They meddled and tampered with the jury. The judge himself was hostile to me." I am just assuming that in what I have to say. He said, "I would do it again. The respondent has a perfect right to protect himself in a trial of that kind by watching the jury." No; he has not. The court will protect him. He does not have to go and hire a man from out of the State who had formerly been a United States marshal and who is a friend of the trial judge, have him occupy a room just across the hall from the jury, and load him up with money.

Really, Mr. LANGER's description of how he was going to have this job done shows the most astounding attitude toward it. I do not need to read the testimony; Senators have probably read it themselves, about how he spoke of the money, and about how this man Leedom was a great actor, who could pretend he was drunk and nobody would know he was not drunk, how he could ingratiate himself with the boys and could do this job.

Let us assume that it was nothing more than the job of watching. Mr. President, that is an offense against the law, that is an obstruction to justice. It is not necessary even to let the jury know it. There does not have to be any effect of it getting to the jury, or

keeping anyone away from a jury, or anything of that kind. But for a litigant, particularly a respondent under a charge of conspiracy to obstruct the administration of the Federal laws, this employment of someone, even if he were a paragon of virtue, to watch the jury and to watch the marshal and the clerk of the court, is a stench in the nostrils. However great the temptation to do it, the respondent should go to the court with his claim that he is not getting protection. It would be ten times as effective as this idea of putting a watcher across the hall in the hotel to watch the door of the jury room. The court would protect him, and that jury would be placed where no one could get at it.

Do we need to be galvanized; do we need to have our consciences pricked, in order to react to this sort of conduct in office? Then let us consider what the court has said. I refer to the highest court of the land and in its decision in the case of Sinclair against the United States. All the claims we have heard made here about the Federal Government using spotters, spies, and detectives to watch juries were made in that case. The defense which is made here that it was conduct provoked, and conduct which should have been offset by similar conduct was made in that case, and the Court said this about it:

> The evidence does not disclose that any operative was instructed to approach, or did approach a juror, nor does it disclose that any juror actually knew that he was being shadowed. Some were suspicious. The court did not know, nor does it appear that Sinclair's counsel knew, the jury was being shadowed.
>
> Called as a witness, Day gave rather full account of himself from his youth up, including his Army service. He was not permitted to say that he had knowledge of a practice by United States attorneys to shadow juries in criminal cases after they were sworn.

That was in the recital of what appeared in the record in the lower court, as this highest court passed upon it. The Supreme Court said this about what the trial judge did:

> The trial judge held the petition stated a case upon which appellants might be adjudged guilty of contempt and the evidence showed their guilt. Among other things, he said: "I cannot escape the conviction therefor, that respondent Sinclair, respondent Day, Respondent Sherman Burns, and Respondent W. J. Burns have been, perhaps in different degrees, all involved—more or less directly involved—in the establishment of this surveillance, a surveillance which I have already announced in my opinion constituted an obstruction to the administration of justice by this court."

Again the Supreme Court said:

> After close of the evidence and arguments, and after the court had declared appellants were guilty of contempt, counsel announced that upon the question of mitigation they re-offered the evidence tendered but excluded during the main case as to the custom of the Department of Justice to place juries under surveillance. This was overruled.

The Court held:

> Under the doctrine so stated, we think the trial judge rightly held it unnecessary to allege or show actual contact between an operative of the detective agency and a juror, or that any juror had knowledge of being observed.

This is the point:

> The reasonable tendency of the acts done is the proper criterion. Neither actual effect produced upon the juror's mind nor his consciousness of extraneous influence was an essential element of the offense.

I skip now, and read again, at page 765:

> If those fit for juries understand that they may be freely subjected to treatment like that here disclosed, they will either shun the burdens of the service or perform it with disquiet and disgust. Trial by capable juries, in important cases, probably would become an impossibility.

As to the evidence offered for countervailing misconduct by the Government itself, the Court said:

> During the hearing and before conviction of guilt counsel proffered many witnesses by whom they proposed to show a practice of the Department of Justice to cause its officers to shadow jurors. This evidence was rightly excluded. That department is not a lawmaker and mistakes or violations of law by it give no license for wrongful conduct by others.

I leave that right there. The Senate is the judge.

Connected with this, and a part of this transaction with Brunk in which Mr. LANGER sold his land to the only person he could get to buy it in those times, and sold his Mexican stock to the counsel for the railroad company, as a matter connected by his narrative and by the circumstances, we find this connected also with these trials, the inciting to riot, and the declaration of independence of the State. What an amazing exhibition of disregard for law and order that is, he and his companions getting into a huddle and declaring the independence of the State of North Dakota, for the purpose of declaring martial law, then the subsequent declaration of martial law, but most of all the suspension of civil process. This is the Governor, this is misconduct of a man in his office. We may go anywhere throughout his life, from 1911 right by this period and up to the last before he came here, and we find the same characteristics. He makes no bones of it, he does not seem to think that is immoral. He does not seem to regard this as the most offensive kind of civil disobedience because it comes from the Governor of the State. Disobedience by the normal, ordinary citizen is bad enough, but when the Governor of a State flouts the law, and when he has an interest to protect himself against the service of civil process, that is, the process of ouster, then I say there is a circumstance which cannot be explained away, which cannot be colored, which cannot be washed off our hands, when the people of North Dakota come to us and say, "Judgment."

Mr. President, if an ordinary deputy sheriff abuses his process, the citizen has his remedy. If he exceeds the power of his writ the citizen always has a remedy. Can it be that the people of North Dakota have no remedy when a man comes to the Senate with a record shown by the petition presented by citizens of that State, and sustained by his confessions?

Mr. President, we do not have to go outside Mr. LANGER's testimony; we do not have to have testimony or proof beyond what he confesses. In our public service a man may not have two masters. A man, while governor, and head of a commission which has to pass upon the valuation of railway property in his State for purposes of taxation, cannot deal with the attorney of that railroad to any advantage at all for himself. We do not have to go further than Mr. LANGER himself went when he said that first he had had one talk, just one talk, with Thomas V. Sullivan about taxes, in which Sullivan wanted him to be sure to stick to the valuations of a certain year. He had that talk in March. Then in May we find Mr. LANGER in Chicago, in the office of this man. What for? For only one thing, as appears by his testimony. There Mr. LANGER makes the proposition of sale of his Mexican stock. I say we do not need to go any further than Mr. LANGER represented the State. Mr. testimony at 100 percent value and say that the stock was worth all he paid for it, yet Mr. LANGER has done this. His moral attitude is gone, absolutely gone. Morally he was vis-à-vis, this man Sullivan.

Mr. Sullivan represented an interest which was opposed to the State. Mr. LANGER could not serve both of those interests morally. He could serve only the State. The minute he took advantage of that relationship of opposing conflicting interests to find a market for that which he could not sell to anybody else, the deed was done that marked him, marked him in his office. That is the kind of man he is in office. We do not need to go beyond that.

Moreover, it was the same with the Brunk transaction. To whom could this land be sold? To anybody? Let us assume it was worth 100 cents on the dollar. Let us assume that it was sufficiently valuable to pay off its encumbrances of $28,000, its back taxes of $6,500, and the purchase price of $58,000, making a total of approximately $80,000—let us take it at that value, yet could he sell it? He testified that the depression of those days was such that there was no sale for land anywhere. Did he go to anyone else to sell it? No; he went to the man who was his vis-à-vis, the man whose interest was opposed to the interest that Governor LANGER represented, and he sold his land in that market, a market where he could not have sold it excepting that these interests were vis-à-vis.

The committee did go beyond that. The committee did make further findings, and I will testify that I think they were well grounded. But we do not need to go further than that. Those two transactions, coinciding in May 1938, show the character of the man to be exactly what the petitioners claim it is. We are dealing with the petition of inhabitants of North Dakota. While Governor of the State, Mr. LANGER availed himself of the opportunity afforded by being in a position to veto the business of Mr. Brunk. There is not any question about it.

I have heard arguments made in attempt to show that the Governor could not touch these county commissioners. Oh, pshaw! The Governor could and did touch them, and his touching of them

set an example for all county commissioners, which was, "Deal with Brunk if you want to get by with this kind of a transaction." Mr. Mueller, another broker, tried it, and the county commissioners were removed from office by the Governor because they had dealt with Mr. Mueller instead of going direct to the State institutions and marketing their bonds, as they had a right to do, and as all county commissioners had a right to do, and as they had a right to do in every one of those cases in which Mr. Brunk made his large commissions.

I am sure the Senate will excuse me for not picking up this testimony and reading it. There has been so much reading of the testimony already that Senators must be weary of it. So far as I am personally concerned I ought to disregard my feelings in the matter, because I am performing a duty which is extremely obnoxious to me. I do not place myself on a pedestal over my fellow men. I do not personally claim to be any holier, or purer, or nearer perfection than any other of my fellow men. It is not a personal thing to me. But as a member of the United States Senate I sat through every day of the taking of testimony here, holding my mind ever stable and open for acquittal of the charges presented in the petition. I think I never wrestled with myself more than I did—and I had to—throughout this case, trying to reconcile all the evidence, and every bit of the evidence, to such a theory that we could deny the petition of the people of North Dakota here and seat Mr. LANGER. To perform our duty we must envisage ourselves, each one, as the composite Senator. We must perceive our duty jointly as the Senate judging upon an issue raised by citizens of the United States and of the State of North Dakota.

Believe me, it is not a pleasant duty to perform, but I stayed in the committee meetings day after day, and my assiduity was due largely because of my sense of the deep, important questions that are involved here, because we have two of the most fundamental questions to decide. One is a question of fundamental law, which affects the status of the United States Senate and its ability to protect itself and the people it represents, the people of the United States, as well as the people of North Dakota. The other one is the moral question which is involved here. Those questions are so grave that no matter how disagreeable the task may be, no matter that the infallible man has not been born yet; yet I think every Senator should bravely face the responsibility and do his duty.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if, in the view he takes of the origin of the petition from petitioners in North Dakota, he would extend the same right of petition against this same applicant for a seat in the Senate in favor of the citizens of any other State?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not understand the question.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall reframe it. I tried to take into account all the elements the Senator had mentioned. Perhaps I thus encumbered the question. The Senator has discussed the matter of our duty to act upon a petition of protest filed by citizens of North Dakota against the seating of this applicant. I ask whether or not it would likewise be our duty to consider a protest against the seating of Senator LANGER if that protest emanated from the citizens of another State?

Mr. AUSTIN. That, of course, is an academic question. My own view, however, is that we would have that duty to perform. That is my view of the United States Senate. I consider that when we departed from the Confederacy and entered into a Union constituting, as Franklin characterized it, a Republic, the people of the United States created something which did not exist before. It did not come by delegation of any of the domestic powers of the several States or of their people. It sprang from the new union of all the people; and they created their own government.

So we now have a phenomenal thing, and that is two governments occupying the same geographical limits. It is a perfectly wonderful thing that the two governments can have jurisdiction within the same geography and never really conflict. To me the Constitution, in respect of its creation of the National Government, the Republic, is one of the most remarkable exhibits of statesmanship and lawgiving that the world has ever seen. There is nothing that equals it. The framers of our Constitution made it easy for this union of the people of the United States to keep that which held them together always strong, always indissoluble. Even though we have had war, we have kept it united, and we have given a vitality to it, not merely by the blood of our forefathers, but by countless acts, including our transactions in the Senate with respect to the qualifications of Senators.

We have given life to that provision of the Constitution which deals with the office of Senator. It is a United States office. We are not ambassadors. We are Senators of the United States. For years and years we have adhered to that principle, in spite of the attacks which have been made upon it in nearly every one of the 59 cases. It is a superb history. It is a glory to the Senate of the United States. It is of the essence of the moral life of the Nation, upon which we rely in the storms and stresses through which we are passing today.

To me it would be the saddest thing that could happen for the Senate now to agree to a proposal which challenges its jurisdiction. To me that would be the last thing to do. It would be a denial of the living soul of our Government, namely, the unity of the people of the United States, which is the most sacred thing we have to defend.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have the Senator's view upon this phase of the matter, because it has considerable bearing upon my point of view.

In the Senator's view of the situation, is there any point at which the people of North Dakota, by their votes, could wash away, so to speak, a moral turpitude which had been found by the Senate of the United States? In other words, granting for the sake of argument that moral turpitude exists, and assuming that the Senator from North Dakota were excluded and were reelected to the Senate, in the Senator's opinion what would be the situation which we should then confront?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not like to answer that question, but I shall do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it is not a fair question, I do not wish to submit it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, the question is fair; and yet it embarrasses me in this way: At one time early in the hearings in this case I felt that if the people of North Dakota had acted in the election of Mr. LANGER for Senator of the United States with full knowledge of the worst things—I am not talking about the lesser things, but, as I see it, there are five or six things in this case which are so important that they cannot be disregarded—I would not vote to exclude him.

That is rather a confession of weakness on my part, which relates to the heart more than it does to the head. When all the evidence in the green book came out in printed form, so that I could really study it, I made an examination of it to find out if the people had known the facts. I could not find anything. They knew a little—just enough to make it a good cause to elect him on the ground of martyrdom—but they did not know the whole story of the really immoral acts. They knew nothing about those acts which willfully endangered the security of the State.

Then I examined the newspapers which were offered as exhibits in the case. There were four newspapers, which I expected to have with me today. It is just as well that I do not have them, because, if I had them, I would take further time of the Senate. I examined them time after time to find out if the facts had been disclosed.

I could not find them, so I said to myself, "I may be wrong about it." I had two other persons go through the evidence, but they could not find anything.

When the committee met I said, "I am not going to decide this matter without knowing this fact. I have tried my best to find the evidence that the public acted at the polls with knowledge of the important facts." I named them. There were five of them. They are named in the report of the committee. I separated them so that Senators may know what they are. I said, "I want the help of the committee. Can any member of the committee point out any piece of evidence which would justify the claim that the people acted with knowledge?" It could not be done.

Mr. LANGER himself testified about knowledge. His statement appears on page 501 of the record. Perhaps I should turn to it so as to make no mistake in stating what he said. He was talking about a certain case brought for

slander, and the settlement and retraction by a newspaper of statements which it had made. The following occurs on page 501:

Senator LANGER. Then, I might mention the case against the Courier News, a daily newspaper in Fargo, N. Dak. When I ran for Governor, they commenced to write me up, and in this case, the paper had said that while I was a member of the board of equalization that I had dealt with the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. in reducing their taxes; that was one charge, and they had another charge——

Senator WILEY. That was when you ran for Governor in 1920?

Senator LANGER. They had another charge that I had refused to prosecute the Standard Oil Co.

I have before me a recent book which was given to me by its author, who is a friend of Senator LANGER. The author is John M. Holzworth. He was present throughout a good deal of the hearing. I think he was present throughout the taking of the evidence. I read from page 109 of the book entitled, "The Fighting Governor," published in 1938:

LANGER AND THE RAILROADS

The Courier-News had several times stated that Mr. LANGER was a corporation attorney working hand-in-hand with the railroads operating in North Dakota but investigation of this shows that he has been the greatest enemy of railroad control that the railroads have encountered in North Dakota.

As county attorney of Morton County, aided by the tax commission, he fought in the district and supreme courts to a successful conclusion the case of the Northern Pacific Railway Co. against Morton County and compelled the railroads operating in North Dakota to pay 6 years' back taxes on assessments aggregating $30,000,000, consisting of 2,038 licensed elevator sites, 1,000 lumber yards and their warehouse sites, and 260 oil tank station sites upon the right-of-way of the railroad companies within this State. The case is reported in volume 32 of the North Dakota reports, page 627.

After Mr. LANGER became attorney general the railroads endeavored to raise their freight rates 15 percent. He called into conference the railroad comissioners, and together with M. S. J. Aandahl, chairman of the board of railroad commissioners, and Mr. Little, the rate man, went to Washington. At Washington they found the railroads well organized and the States disorganized. The States were organized and Clifford H. Thorne, now attorney for the United States Grain Growers, and Professor Norton, of Yale University, an expert on the Adamson law were retained. Later Mr. LANGER and his assistant, Judge Bronson, personally spent 3 weeks in Washington assisting Mr. Thorne. He personally conducted part of the investigation before the Interstate Commerce Commission and took the testimony of various witnesses

The final result was that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not allow the increase in the freight rates in North Dakota although they were raised in some of the eastern States and based on the 1915 crop yield over $1,000,000 was saved to the farmers and producers of North Dakota grain alone.

Here is the retraction:

With these facts of record as they are, the Courier-News hereby retracts any statement made either directly or indirectly that WILLIAM LANGER is "a tool of the railroad interest," and states that there was no foundation for the charges thus made.

That was in 1920. The transaction with the attorney for the railroad company, in Chicago, in connection with the Mexican land business was in May 1937. Certainly, in 1920, the Courier-News was not publishing to the people of North Dakota anything at all about what happened in 1937; nevertheless, the testimony, if it were not checked, would give the impression that the people of North Dakota voted with information, through that retraction, of the misconduct of the Governor of North Dakota in selling his property to the counsel for the railroad company who had a pending lawsuit and who had a future issue to come before the commission of which the Governor was chairman, and in which he would have a deciding vote.

He said, "Then I might mention a case against the Courier-News," and so on. That was said when he was telling about all the matters that had been brought to the attention of the public of North Dakota, and all the different lawsuits, and the publicity given to them and the political discussions which grew out of them; all that was said in order to convince us—as he did convince me for the time being—that he was elected by the people with knowledge of those matters.

However, when I came to check up the papers that he held up—saying, "There are four newspapers that cover all these questions except the Gale Wyman one"—I found that they were not published at a proper time for that, as I pointed out in the report; and, on reading them, we found that they do not contain anything about those five charges.

So, in further answer to the Senator from Michigan, if I have not gone too far, I should say that there might be an effect upon the judgment of individual Senators—an effect which I think would be unfortunate, and yet one which the frailty of human nature permits; there might be the effect of giving to that vote the probative force of a finding of fact; but it is my opinion that, as a matter of law, it would have nothing whatever to do with our duty when the question is properly raised and becomes an issue between the people and the Senator-elect. No matter how many times he may have been elected with the same facts before them, no matter how much the people knew of the charges that were made against him, still the Senate is the judge of the charges contained in the petition, and must pass upon them when the petition comes to the Senate.

As I have said, these facts might have probative force in influencing us to decide the questions in a certain way, but that is a bridge we cannot cross and should not cross.

I desire to conclude.

I feel that on the questions raised by the petition we have two decisions to make, and that we should make them. The first one is that we have jurisdiction to try the qualifications of any Senator-elect who comes here, either to seat him or not seat him pending the hearing, to go through with the hearings to an end, and finally to decide upon the question of his qualifications. To my mind, such jurisdiction is important for the security of the State; and, therefore, our decision relative to it is a very grave act, with respect to which we must not do wrong; we must pass upon it correctly.

Then we come to the question—which will be decided by a majority vote if we have passed on the other question correctly—the question of whether in this case the facts alleged in the petition have been established, and the respondent should be excluded from the Senate by virtue of lawlessness charged in the petition, by virtue of his light regard for law governing his duties and their performance, defiance of lawful authority of the State, willfully endangering the security of the State upon which the rights of all citizens depend, and, finally, destroying the moral capital of the office of governor of the State—one of the States of this Union.

On that question every Senator will exercise his own judgment. As we know, 13 of the members of the committee found that the Senator-elect had, by his own response to the petition, in effect admitted the charges contained in the petition, and that he was not entitled to a seat in the Senate.

I want it understood that I do not ask, and I consider that it is not the duty of the committee to ask, any Senator to follow the committee. I am not undertaking to impose my views upon any Member of the Senate. I am trying to present the attitude of the committee, its regard for its duty, its devotion to the object of serving the people, and its effort to transact this very difficult and disagreeable business of acting as judge and, unfortunately, as advocate at the same time.

Some time, Mr. President, after this case is over, and when it cannot be affected by statements of what we may think about procedure, I shall have something to say about the question of procedure in such cases in the future. However, at present, I shall say no more. I leave the discussion of this matter at this time.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution by the City Council of Lorain, Ohio, protesting against the proposal for the Federal taxation of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A paper in the nature of a petition signed by The Merrills and postmarked at Glendale, March 16, 1942, praying that new and fully equipped airplanes be promptly dispatched to assist the armed forces, formerly under the immediate command of General MacArthur, at Corregidor, Province of Luzon in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the United Trades and Labor Council, of Pittsburg, Kans., signed by Ira Hall, financial secretary of the council, remonstrating against the adoption of any proposal to change the 40-hour workweek for labor as provided under existing law; to the Committee on Education and Labor

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States

and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS—ENLISTMENT FOR AIRCRAFT WARNING SERVICE—PETITION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a statement in the nature of a petition from a group of Philadelphia women at present working as volunteers with the United States Army Air Force Interceptor Command. I request that their petition be printed in the RECORD, without all the names attached thereto, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the statement or petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the names attached thereto, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 21, 1942.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, are at present working as volunteers with the United States Army Air Force Interceptor Command in Philadelphia, Pa. We would like to call to your attention certain phases of the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps bill. This bill has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate.

The portion of the bill in which we are interested is that section which applies to the enlistment of 12,000 women for the Aircraft Warning Service. As the bill now stands, there is a provision that enlistment in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps permits the Army to move an enlisted woman anywhere in or out of the United States.

A large majority of the undersigned workers of the Philadelphia interceptor command are married women with children (and certain home responsibilities), who, naturally, would be unable to enlist because of the above proviso.

We are trained workers who have been faithfully and patriotically giving regular service to the Philadelphia interceptor command since the inception of war. We wish to continue to do so. We would be most eager and willing to enlist in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for aircraft warning service, under the following changes:

1. That we be allowed to enlist and not to be transferred out of this service or out of our present localities without our consent.

2. That we be allowed to live in our own homes.

We feel privileged in making the above request both because of our loyalty and devotion to our country, and because, if this war is to be won, every citizen of the United States will have to help. We are trained to do a job, and we want a chance to continue it.

We trust that you, as our Senator, will give this letter your serious consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

The Volunteers of the Philadelphia Information Center: Mrs. Toby L. Sleif, 326 South Nineteenth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Gladys G. Kaufman, 1701 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Frances S. Perkins, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; and sundry other citizens of the Philadelphia area, Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath; without amendment (Rept. No. 1212);

H. R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain; without amendment (Rept. No. 1213);

H. R. 4625. A bill for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214); and

H. R. 5368. A bill for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2235. A bill for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216); and

S. 2278. A bill for the relief of Bob Sampley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217).

By Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1756. A bill for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1218).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2250. A bill to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1219)

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2285. A bill to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220);

S. 2286. A bill to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1221);

S. 2288. A bill to amend subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222);

S. 2327. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223);

S. 2381. A bill to provide that certain provisions of law relating to the Navy shall be held applicable to the personnel of the Coast Guard when that service is operating as a part of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224);

S. 2382. A bill to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1225); and

H. R. 4151. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1226).

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2399. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1227).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2409. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of certain lands adjacent to the Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2410. A bill for the relief of John Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 2411. A bill for the relief of William R. Laurence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2412. A bill to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5695) to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation technicians and mechanics was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, the Agriculture Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 79, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"Reimbursement of participants in cotton producers' pool: Not to exceed $4,320,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for the purpose of enabling such corporation to pay, and such corporation is authorized and directed to pay pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, to any holder of record, as of May 1, 1937, of a participation trust certificate (Agricultural Adjustment Administration Form C-5-I of the 1933 Cotton Producers Pool a sum equal to $2.40 per bale for each bale which such certificate evidenced that such holder held in such pool. Payments made under the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed to be in full and complete satisfaction of the claims of the payees against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts charged to them as carrying charges on the cotton which they held in such pool."

WOMEN IN WAR INDUSTRIES—ADDRESS BY MARY ANDERSON

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, entitled "Women's Jobs in War Industries," which appears in the Appendix.]

SYNTHETIC RUBBER PRODUCTION

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Chicago Sun of March 25, 1942, under the headline "Charge United States and industry blocked synthetic rubber," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MOST REVEREND FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York, on the radio program of the Fourth Degree Knights of

Columbus, March 22, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PROFITEERING—EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTIC CITY PRESS-UNION

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to war profiteering, published in the Atlantic City Press-Union of March 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. BUTLER obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	Nye	White
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have hesitated to inject myself into the long and tedious debate which has been in progress now for about 3 weeks on the floor of the Senate, and I can assure the Senate that my remarks shall be very brief; nevertheless, I feel that, as a member of the committee, it is proper, and perhaps required, that I should express myself to some extent.

Unfortunately for me, at least, I was made a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I say "unfortunately" because of my experience on the committee. Ordinarily I think there has been little work for the committee to do, and I hope, after this unpleasant incident is closed, that it will be a long time before the committee is again called upon to consider such a dispute.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections has had two rather difficult tasks: First, the settlement of the contest which arose in West Virginia, and then the question of seating the Senator from North Dakota.

My hesitancy to participate in the debate on either of these cases is due to my conviction that the discussions have been based largely on technical, legal interpretations. I am totaly unprepared to add anything to what has been contributed by the distinguished legal talent on each side of the case under consideration. However, when men of great legal talent are unable to agree or even to come close together on what to them appears to be the important legal phases involved in the case under consideration, I ask what are we to do who are not students of the law? Is there a place in the consideration of this case where something other than purely technical legal interpretations may be properly considered? My answer to the question is in the affirmative. There is properly a moral question involved, one that must be answered by the conscience of each Senator for himself.

It does not take a member of the bar to say in this case that the Senator from North Dakota is of legal age, that he has been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and was a qualified elector in the State at the time of his election and appearance before this body. Neither does it require a member of the bar to read the section of the Constitution of the United States which says:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

To me, as a layman, there can be no question of our right and our constitutional and moral duty to give consideration to the qualifications of any man who is met at the door of this body with a protest such as the one in this case. No member of the committee and no Member of the Senate had anything to do with the opening of this unfortunate situation. It was brought here by the people of North Dakota. Like other members of the committee, I listened to many weeks of testimony. At the beginning and all through the close of the hearings it was my intention to vote for the seating of Senator LANGER. Then it may be asked why did I sign, with 12 other members of the committee, the report which was submitted to the Senate? That is a proper question, and I am willing to give my answer.

I gave consideration to the "qualifications" clause of the Constitution. Suppose Mr. LANGER's name was before the Senate today for confirmation as a judge of the Federal Court for the District of North Dakota, rather than to become a United States Senator from North Dakota. In the light of all the undisputed testimony in this case, would the Senate confirm Mr. LANGER's appointment as Federal judge? I think not; I am almost certain he would be denied that great honor and position of responsibility.

Then, may I ask, in a spirit of sincerity to duty, how can we vote to seat a man as a Senator whose duty as a Senator is to pass on the qualifications of men selected for the Federal courts?

Mr. President, I have arrived at my own answer. To quote the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who has just spoken, my answer may be "more of the heart than of the head."

Mr. President, when it is difficult or impossible to arrive at a decision by the logic of law, the head route, then I say it is one's duty to use his common sense, his conscience, the heart route. I cannot escape living with my conscience.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	Nye	White
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I doubt that in the course of this debate there can be a more sincere and more earnest argument advancing the point of view of a Senator acting under his oath than that to which we have just listened, submitted to us by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I doubt that in the course of the long, gruelling consideration, under most trying circumstances, of this difficult case before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, there ever was a time when any member of the committee relaxed his vigilance, his sense of propriety, his sense of balance, or his judgment. I think every member of the committee who has considered the report which we have received from the committee has acted according to his oath and in good conscience in presenting to us the matter in the form in which we have found it.

It has seemed to me, from an examination of the original record of the executive session of the committee, wherein consideration of what was appropriate procedure in this case was first undertaken, that there existed an unusual degree of confusion both of thought and as to a course of action. Since that particular record was taken in executive session and appears before us only in a confidential print, I shall not refer to any of the observations made by Senators by name. Any of my colleagues may have access to the particular volume, from which and from the comments of the committee members, he will readily see the confusion of mind which existed in the approach of the committee itself to

a consideration of the problem confronting it. It is not to disparage the work of the committee, then, that I make reference to that point; quite the contrary. It is by way of having my colleagues here realize the unusual problem confronting the committee.

So far as I can perceive, there is no member of the committee who at any time in his service upon it ever had been called upon to consider a case of expulsion of a Senator for misconduct while a Member of this body; nor do I see that any member of the committee was ever called upon to consider a case of exclusion of a Senator from being permitted to take the oath as a Senator of the United States because of some alleged offense of which the applicant had not been earlier convicted. In short, Mr. President, such experience as the committee itself had had, through the learned lawyers and others of our colleagues who grace its membership, had been confined entirely to those cases of elections and returns in which frauds were involved, the very type of thing which, if established, vitiated an entire election, just as we all know that fraud vitiates every act it affects. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that there was no common understanding of just exactly what steps the committee should take in the premises.

An examination of the original petition which was filed by certain citizens of the State of North Dakota under date of December 21, 1940, which I hold in my hand, indicates that the petitioners felt "That WILLIAM LANGER, Senator-elect of the State of North Dakota, does not represent a majority of the electors of said State, and that he, by reason of his acts in North Dakota, is not qualified or entitled to be United States Senator. We do herewith petition the honorable Members of the United States Senate to refuse the said WILLIAM LANGER a seat in said body, and in support of said petition we submit the following facts:"

Whereupon there are narrated allegations to indicate that Mr. LANGER had received some 38 percent of the total vote cast in North Dakota—and still they do not dispute that that number was sufficient for his election; that he once had been convicted of conspiracy in a Federal court in North Dakota—but that conviction had been erased on appeal; that he had been, on suspicion, at least, so far as the allegations are concerned, involved in one matter or another in which it was claimed moral turpitude was revealed.

In short, Mr. President, there was no allegation whatever, in any form whatever, which would give the Senate jurisdiction to inquire into the "elections" or "returns" within the constitutional language, unless it were to be found in subparagraph (d), in which it appears—

> that at and during a State-wide meeting of the Republican State Central Committeemen at Devil's Lake, N. Dak., on or about July 19, 1940, Mr. LANGER promised one Thomas Whelan—

Whelan had been an opposition candidate at the general primary—

> that he would support him for the State chairmanship nd give to him or the committee one-half of the Federal patronage in North Dakota if Whelan and the committee would support him, LANGER, for the United States Senate in the fall campaign. This was agreed to.

I shall not read further, but if ever there was a case of what the law calls a nudum pactum, it lay in the assumption on the part of Mr. LANGER that if elected as a Republican Senator he was going to get any patronage, much less be able to give half of it to Mr. Whelan. [Laughter.]

In any event, Mr. President, abandoning all facetiousness, it becomes perfectly apparent that when the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], as he very properly did, permitted the applicant to take the oath "without prejudice"—and those were his words—he did it without prejudice to whatever rights the Senate had, and without prejudice to whatever rights the candidate had at that time. But when those rights which the Senate thus reserved in fact had been exhausted, when it developed, after hearings, that there no longer were any rights of inquiry as to elections and returns, as to which the Senate had a right to conduct further inquiry, it followed that whatever reservation previously had been made as to Mr. LANGER's right to take his seat had also been dissipated.

Consequently, the committee having found expressly, as it reports to us, that there was no irregularity in the election, that there was no fraud, that there was no question about the returns, it follows that the committee had exhausted whatever jurisdiction it then had, unless we can find that the committee had some right to pursue further an inquiry into the matter of what were the qualifications of the applicant.

Thus, Mr. President, we come squarely down to what is the only issue before us, whether or not there was any jurisdiction remaining in the Senate to inquire into some matter with respect to which rights were reserved when the Senator from Kentucky said that he would permit the applicant to take the oath without prejudice.

Mr. President, if anyone wishes to inquire into what the qualifications of the applicant were when he presented himself to take the oath, when he first came to the Senate, he must look to the Constitution itself primarily for a declaration of whatever disqualifications might exist. These disqualifications have been expressly listed by the Senator from Vermont and many others of the able Senators who have argued this question. The disqualifications need not be repeated. Long before an individual came to the Senate and offered himself, there arose the question of the existence of certain qualifications which were prescribed by the States themselves. As to such qualifications, whatever they were or whatever they are in any given case, we in the Senate have no voice whatever.

To illustrate the point, with reference to an alleged offense as to which there has been no conviction before a candidate comes to this body and presents himself, is it not singular that in all the years of our national existence we have no statute which would say that a man is ineligible by reason of his having committed a crime, no matter how infamous, to aspire to and to take a seat in this body? Never have we ever proclaimed any such doctrine.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I may be in error, but I recall from reading, particularly in reference to this and similar cases, that in 1866 Congress passed the test oath of loyalty, right after the Civil War, when feelings and emotions ran high. That test oath was called forth and attempted to be used in the case of Thomas, a Senator from Ohio, who was tried for sending his son into the Confederate Army, but it was abandoned because it was generally agreed it was adding to or attempting to superadd to the qualifications described in the Constitution. I think the Senator should bear that in mind. It only illustrates the futility of trying to do something we could not do.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution. Since the Senator has diverted my attention to that particular line of thought——

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I asked the same question of two Senators who spoke on the side of the majority of the committee, and I find that the situation was not exactly as it was stated to me by the Senators who answered my question, and, begging the pardon of the Senator from Oregon, not exactly as he stated it to the Senate.

In 1862 the Congress of the United States adopted a statute, such as the Senator from Oregon has described, and it remained upon the statute books for a matter of a few years. In 1866 it was evidently deemed by the Congress that such a statute was not within the power of Congress to enact. In other words, that the qualifications, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has stated, had been laid down in the Constitution, and could not be changed by anything other than a constitutional amendment. So a constitutional amendment was proposed, and finally adopted in 1866, which prevented men who had previously been Members of the Congress, either of the Senate or the House, from taking the oath if they had participated in the War between the States. That, I think, is an accurate historical statement of the situation, and is substantially the same as the Senator from Oregon has outlined it, but I think that something is added to the argument he makes by pointing out that Congress did enact such a statute in 1862, and subsequently supplemented it, or supplanted it rather, by a constitutional amendment, the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. And, Mr. President, let it be noted further that in the fourteenth amendment we even provided that the disqualification could be removed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator will find that the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, insofar as they were restrictions on rights, were definitely restrictions on the powers and rights of the States, and therefore that the State could not send a man here who, having previously taken an oath to the Constitution, had engaged in insurrection. Of course, it is agreed that the Congress of the United States cannot superadd any qualifications for a Senator or for a Member of the House, but for an altogether different reason, and one that goes to the very vitals of this question, because it is not a legislative power. Either House—not both Houses—is the sole judge of matters which pertain to the conduct or to the privilege of sitting as a Member of that House. Of course, Congress can pass no such law as that, because the particular House itself at the moment is the judge of the matters. Even if we should pass a law today, tomorrow it would have no effect whatsoever on another Congress which would assemble. That carries us to the bottom of the thing, if we want to face it, and that is that when we create a coordinate branch of the Government and vest in it legislative power, we give to that branch of the Government, necessarily, the power to control the conduct of its own membership, and the only single exception to it is when in the instrument creating the Congress or the House or the Senate, as the case may be, there are limitations placed upon that power. It is not a legislative power at all, and, of course, a law passed by the Seventy-third Congress would have no possible effect on the Senate or the House in judging of the qualifications or the election, for that matter, of a Member who came and demanded entrance into either House.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is a singular thing that when the Constitution was adopted—taking the view that has just been expressed by the Senator from Georgia for the present purpose—in section 2 of article I we provided—

That—

As to Members of the House—

the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

There was no reference then in any slightest particular to what qualifications must be had by the electors for Senators, the reason being, of course, that the Senators were chosen by the legislatures of the several States. The United States had nothing whatever to do with it, outside of the constitutional language. Whoever were to be chosen electors in a given State had the sole right under the laws and constitution of that State to select their own membership to their own State legislatures, who in turn selected anyone they chose to the United States Senate, only saying that he was not disqualified by the expressly stated constitutional disqualifications to which we have adverted.

Mr. President, that that may be the more apparent, let it be noted that it was not until the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution was passed, within our easy memory, that we ever adopted a provision to the effect—and I read—that—

The Senate of the United States——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair, at 3:30 p. m.). The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the fact that at this time the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on yesterday goes into effect, under which no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes on the pending resolution or any amendment or motion relative thereto.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair.

I read now from the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution.

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I beg the Senator from Connecticut's pardon. I did not hear the ruling made by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that at this time the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on yesterday goes into effect.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair, and I beg pardon of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, overlooking entirely the 2 minutes which the Chair and other Senators have taken from me, I shall proceed to read from the seventeenth amendment:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Never, Mr. President, until the seventeenth amendment became law, was there any stricture imposed upon, or any applicability in any way whatever of the Constitution of the United States to the choice of those representatives of the States chosen to be United States Senators, other than that they meet the matter of the testing disqualifications laid down in the Constitution itself.

Mr. President, let us historically think of another thing. In my own State we never even had a constitutional convention to write a State Constitution until 1818; we had no Federal Constitutional Convention, expressly so convened, to ratify the Constitution of the United States, nor even to pass on the various amendments to the Constitution of the United States, until it befell me, as secretary of the State for Connecticut in 1933, to organize such a convention that we might adopt the twenty-first article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States. As a matter of fact, it was not until 1939 that we even ratified the first ten amendments to the Constitution. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I mention such a thing to point up the inquiry, who between 1789 and 1818 was prescribing the basis for selecting the candidates for the United States Senate from Connecticut, and in accordance with what standards were they selected, and in accordance with what "qualifications"—and I use the word "qualifications" this time in quotes just as though I extracted from the Constitution? Obviously, we in Connecticut did it.

Let us turn to Rhode Island, Mr. President. Rhode Island did not have a constitutional convention until some time around 1842 or 1843; and then, Mr. President, over in Rhode Island, where there was still a Crown government in control, the people finally decided that they would have a constitutional convention of their own.

I see the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] present, and I will recall to him that it led to such a state of rebellion within the State itself that Dorr's Rebellion, as we have come to know it, led to President Tyler's being asked to send the United States Army in there to preserve order. Later a case arose which went to the United States Supreme Court for decision as to whether or not a plaintiff, an officer under one government, had a right of action in trespass against officers who had been elected under the other constituted government, and the United States Supreme Court held that it did not make any difference, in effect, what kind of government the State itself chose, only provided, as the Constitution required, that it be a republican form of government. It was a political question for the President to decide under our statute, not for the courts. It lay within the power of the State itself originally to decide even what kind of government it would have, so long as it was a republican government. And that is true today. If the people of the State of New York, for example, want to revise their whole form of government they may call a constitutional convention, and adopt a new form of government only so long as it be a republican form of government.

Mr. President, that same sort of thing was involved, as I recall it, when some lady in Missouri named Minor brought suit in 1874 seeking to be permitted to vote. She claimed that she was a citizen of the United States. She was. The Supreme Court decided that even women were citizens of the United States; but that did not mean that they had a right to vote under the law of Missouri. The Supreme Court said:

The United States has no voters in the States of its own creation. The elective officers of the United States are all elected directly or indirectly by State voters. The Members of the House of Representatives are to be chosen by the people of the States, and the electors in each State must have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted, all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of those constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is in the chair. I remember reading a few months ago an article by Jonathan

Daniels, who, I think, is now with the Office of Civilian Defense. He pointed out that under the law of the State of Virginia some 15 percent of the total population of the State is permitted to vote, while over the mountains in West Virginia, under West Virginia law, 76 percent of the voters had gone to the polls at the same election.

Standards of that kind are applied by the States. It has always been so. It has been so recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States. When the founders used the word "qualifications" and said that we were to be the judge of the qualifications of our own membership, in the absence of some statute which said that a man was ineligible, in the absence of some disqualification stated by the Constitution itself, or in the absence of a conviction for treason or felony anyone, no matter how infamous, was eligible. And I emphasize the word eligible to membership in this body.

There was a reason for all those things. The reason why persons were debarred by conviction of treason and felony, from being eligible to membership derived from the fact that under the law as it then stood both those offenses were punishable by death. They represented crimes against organized society, insofar as treason applied, and against organized mankind so far as felony was concerned. So it was, Mr. President, that conviction for either of those two offenses carried with it a conviction of outlawry. It was held that no person guilty of felony or of treason was capable of taking an oath.

That is why, when a man goes down the aisle and takes his oath at the Vice President's desk to qualify, he is being presented on the binding authority to which Washington, himself, adverted as the "knitting unit," upon which the whole structure of our society is based, namely, the sanctity of the oath. We find the oath as a fundamental factor running through every form of our activity in public life. We find it when a witness comes to the stand to take his oath in court. We find it when a grand jury is about to make a presentment or indictment against our citizens. We find it when a petit jury is sworn to make true deliverance of the prisoner at the bar. We find it with reference to the assumption of office by all officeholders, including Senators and Representatives when they come here.

So the question of qualifications was emphasized in the minds of the founders. There can be no cavil about it. They brought the test which they were applying without stint, and almost bodily, from Blackstone, the common law, and the law of Parliament in England, to the end that there should be retained in the States the matter of control over the qualifications of their own citizens, both to be electors and thereafter to be elected to the office of Senator of the United States. It might be worth recalling that the ninth and tenth amendments were insisted upon, particularly by the smaller States, which wished to be vouchsafed protection in their rights in that particular.

As a test of what the founders might have had in mind, I looked up Blackstone. In 1763, he wrote the following with respect to the qualifications of members of the House of Commons:

2. Qualification of members of House of Commons.—Next, as to the qualifications of persons to be elected members of the House of Commons. Some of these depend upon the law and custom of Parliament, declared by the House of Commons, others upon certain statutes. And from these it appears, 1. That they must not be aliens born, or minors. 2. That they must not be any of the 12 judges, because they sit in the lords' house, nor of the clergy, for they sit in the convocation, nor persons attainted of treason or felony, for they are unfit to sit anywhere. 3. That sheriffs of counties, and mayors and bailiffs of boroughs are not eligible in their respective jurisdictions, as being returning officers, but that sheriffs of one county are eligible to be knights of another. 4. That, in strictness, all members ought to have been inhabitants of the places for which they are chosen, but this having been long disregarded was at length entirely repealed by statute 14 George III, chapter 58. 5. That no persons concerned in the management of any duties or taxes created since 1692, except the commissioners of the treasury, nor any of the officers following, viz, commissioners of prizes, transports, sick and wounded, wine licenses, navy, and victualing; secretaries or receivers of prizes; comptrollers of the army accounts; agents for regiments; governors of plantations and their deputies; officers of Minorca or Gibraltar; officers of the excise and customs; clerks or deputies in the several offices of the treasury, exchequer, navy, victualing, admiralty, pay of the army or navy, secretaries of state, salt, stamps, appeals, wine licenses, hackney coaches, hawkers, and pedlers, nor any persons that hold any new offices under the Crown created since 1705, are capable of being elected or sitting as members. 6. That no person having a pension under the Crown during pleasure, or for any term of years, is capable of being elected or sitting.

We find the following express disqualification almost bodily in our own Constitution:

7. That if any member accepts an office under the Crown, except an officer in the army or navy accepting a new commission, his seat is void; but such member is capable of being reelected. 8. That all knights of the shire shall be actual knights—

And so forth.

But subject to these standing restrictions and disqualifications, every subject of the realm is eligible of common right, though there are instances wherein persons in particular circumstances have forfeited that common right, and have been declared ineligible for that Parliament by vote of the House of Commons, or forever by an act of the legislature. But it was an unconstitutional prohibition, which was grounded on an ordinance of the House of Lords.

Mr. President, to the end that there may be no repetition of that sort of thing in Congress the Constitution of the United States even inveighed against bills of attainder, which a few States previous to 1787 had already passed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The qualifications or disqualifications enumerated by the British Parliament are legislative. The British Parliament does not work under a limited written constitution delegating power to Parliament, as we are limited by constitutional qualifications.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Within those limitations the Senate has full power; but, like any other function or duty which the Senate must perform, it must be performed under our Constitution, within constitutional limitations.

It would appear that in the case which is before the Senate today the limitations are enumerated.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. The point I was seeking to make is that when the founders wrote our Constitution they knew that certain qualifications were stated for membership in Parliament, as well as in the several States. They knew that there were separate qualifications with reference to being elected as a member of the House of Commons, for obviously no peer could be a member of the House of Commons and, vice versa, no member of the House of Commons could be elected to the House of Lords.

Those things constituted a statement of qualifications; and when the founders used the term they knew full well that if Virginia chose to state her qualifications and Massachusetts chose to state hers, and we in Connecticut chose to prescribe ours, there would be left to the Senate the matter of testing whether or not a given aspirant in fact met the qualification stated. I have no question that this body could easily make inquiry as to whether or not a given individual meets the qualifications fixed in the State of Connecticut, for I have no doubt that this body can take judicial notice of what the law of Connecticut is in that particular; but that does not give us in the Senate any right whatever to add a statement of disqualification which is not known to the law, which is outside the Constitution, and which had never been prescribed by statute or otherwise.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is making a very able argument. I should like to draw attention to a hypothetical situation, as I did a few days ago when the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] was presenting his argument. As I understand the position of the Senator from Connecticut, he takes the same view as does the Senator from Utah with respect to qualifications. Once a man meets the constitutional qualifications there is nothing for the Senate to do but to admit him. Am I correct in my understanding of the Senator's view?

Mr. DANAHER. I think I have tried to go further than the limited statement by the Senator from Illinois. I have stated that not only must he meet the disqualifying tests set forth in our Constitution, but he must also meet the qualifications stated and fixed by law in the State of Connecticut, the State of North Dakota, or any other State.

Mr. LUCAS. I am dealing now only with the qualifications laid down by the Constitution of the United States. My question is limited to those qualifications. There are five of them, which I understand now appear in what is known as

the Overton amendment. If I correctly understand the Senator's position, if an individual is elected by the people of Connecticut and he comes here and can meet the five qualifications laid down in the Constitution of the United States, plus any qualifications which the State of Connecticut lays down, it is absolutely mandatory that the Senate admit that man to the United States Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Is the Senator stating what he understands?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am asking if that is the Senator's position. I want to be clear as to what the Senator's position is in connection with this very important matter.

Mr. DANAHER. To what the Senator has stated, I add that if a person shall have been convicted of treason or felony, or of a crime which would be disqualifying in and of itself, then such person is inadmissible. I add so much to those qualifications which are requisite.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator adds to those qualifications.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if an individual in Illinois were convicted of a crime in July, prior to the election in November, and in November, notwithstanding the fact that he has been convicted of a crime, the people should elect him to the United States Senate, and he were still out on bond, under those circumstances would the Senator deny him the right to come here and take the oath?

Mr. DANAHER. No; it does not follow that closely. I mean to say that we have the power to deny him a seat in the Senate, provided the type of offense of which he has been convicted is of such nature as to render him incapable of taking a valid oath. That is the reason for it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator now is drawing a very fine line regarding what might in the opinion of some Senator be prohibitive of an individual becoming a member of the Senate, and what other Senators might say was not of sufficient importance to prevent him from taking the oath.

The point I thought the Senator was making in his argument, and what I thought he was attempting to do in quoting a good deal of history in connection with this important matter and also in view of what he said with respect to the commission of crime, was that he was laying down a fundamental principle to the end that when an individual has met the qualifications laid down by the State of Connecticut and has met the five qualifications laid down by the Constitution of the United States—qualifications now included in the Overton amendment—it is absolutely mandatory that we admit such person into the Senate. I thought that was the point the Senator was attempting to make. What I was leading up to was the following hypothetical question: If in any State an individual is elected United States Senator in the November election, and if immediately following his election he commits murder, and thereafter is allowed to be out on bond, and if while out on bond he comes to the United States Senate, bringing with him all the credentials which are necessary, under those circumstances is it the position of the Senator that under the Constitution we are bound to admit such a man to the Senate and to permit him to take the oath, and then can expel him afterward if he is convicted of murder?

Mr. DANAHER. That case presents no difficulty to me, Mr. President. If the man had been convicted of murder, I should have voted that he stand aside. That is all there is to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not talking about a man who was convicted of murder.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. How much time have I? I desire to be as generous as possible to my colleagues.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining, on the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Have I 30 minutes on the resolution itself?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry on that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the clerk read the order previously entered relative to the limitation of time. Under the terms of the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I do not believe that any Senator has over 30 minutes upon the resolution or any amendment thereto.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, with reluctance I must say the Senator will not have the motion read in my time; I decline to yield further.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know the intent of the original motion as presented by the Senator from Oregon; and I say to the Senator from Connecticut that I shall be glad to have charged to me such time as may be necessary to discuss this parliamentary point, because it is important.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I understand that the Senator will have such time charged to him. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. It was my understanding in the beginning, I may say to the Chair, when the able Senator from Oregon presented his request for unanimous consent, that, following its adoption, only 30 minutes could be consumed by any Member of the Senate in discussing the resolution or any motion or amendment relative thereto. I may be wrong; but it was my understanding that any Senator could take only 30 minutes, and that would be the end of his time, whether he might speak upon the original resolution or upon an amendment.

I call upon the Senator from Oregon to state if that is not his understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The practice during the last several years has been that a Senator may conclude on an amendment and then take the same time on a motion.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in reply to the inquiry made to me by the able Senator from Illinois—I hope the time I shall take will not be charged against me or against the Senator from Connecticut—let me say that yesterday, when the matter came up, we were acting quite hurriedly. I informed the Parliamentarian that I desired to have a unanimous-consent agreement prepared; and he prepared it. At that time I intended that 30 minutes should comprise the length of time allowed for the debate of any Senator, whether on motions, amendments, or resolutions. The unanimous-consent request was stated in the usual form; and I did not detect, when it was read, that it dealt with this point. All the fault is my own in not making my intention clear. In my judgment, the order as entered does permit 30 minutes on the motion and 30 minutes on the amendment. If there is any disposition to criticise or find fault, let the fault be charged to my account.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in this position so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned. It was the definite understanding, as the able Senator from Oregon has said, that only 30 minutes would be allowed to any Member of the Senate to speak upon the original motion or upon any amendment or modification thereof. I shall not charge the Senator from Oregon with anything but the best intentions so far as the matter of limitation of debate is concerned; but I say that the Senator from Illinois is learning rather rapidly about parliamentary situations.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I take it that the last 10 minutes have not been charged against my time; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The last 5 minutes have not been charged against the time of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Apparently, I was proceeding, Mr. President, under the liberal construction rule. [Laughter.]

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois, with reference to his last comment previous to the interruptions, that I am not making this up; I am not giving the personal view of the Senator from Connecticut. I am giving the view which was established by the founders of the Constitution, by those collaborating with them, by those who construed it, by those who worked it out, by those who were on the Committee on Style, and others.

Mr. President, the other day I read to the Senate, as will appear at page 2752 of the RECORD, the view of Mr. Justice Swift, which was written in 1794. The two gentlemen, later United States Senators from my State who signed the Constitution and who assisted in its draftsmanship were among the first two Senators to come to Congress from Connecti-

cut. Mr. Justice Oliver Ellsworth was the third Chief Justice of the United States, and was one of the first United States Senators. He served in the Senate from 1789 to 1796. Mr. Justice Swift, from whom I quoted a few days ago, was later secretary to Oliver Ellsworth when he was Ambassador Plenipotentiary to France. Swift was his contemporary.

Mr. President, when Swift's System of Laws of the State of Connecticut was compiled, it was written and published under the patronage system then prevailing. I have in my hand a list of the subscribers to that work. Heading the list is the name of George Washington, President of the United States. His name is followed by the names of John Adams, Vice President of the United States; Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State; Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury; Charles Lee, Attorney General; John Davis, Comptroller; Tench Coxe, Commissioner of Revenue; and others—men coming from every State.

Mr. President, the subscribers and patrons under whose guidance and genius this particular work was compiled were the very ones who had compiled and written the Constitution of the United States. So it is pertinent that we see what they thought, as expressed by Swift, with reference to the "qualifications" of Members of this body:

If we have recourse to the common law—

Swift wrote—

we shall find that no crimes render a person ineligible but high treason and felony. A House of Representatives, being only one branch of the Legislature, can have no constitutional right to expel a Member for any act done previously to his election unless he is disqualified by the common law or by statute—

and there is no such Federal statute, and no similar bar is stated in the Constitution. But the State of Connecticut, or any state, has the right to prescribe a limitation by statute or in its constitution so as to inhibit the election to the Senate of any person who has been convicted of any offense deemed by that state to be of disqualifying nature. Indeed, under the Constitution of Connecticut, not only must an elector "sustain a good moral character", but the General Assembly has power "to restore the privileges of an elector to those who may have forfeited the same by a conviction of crime". Note the reference to a "conviction". It is not urged that any such limitation exists against this applicant's right to his seat.

No such disqualification is urged against the Senator whose qualifications are now under consideration. There is no disqualification at common law being asserted against this particular Senator at this time. Mr. President, when he came to this body without having been convicted of the offenses which it is alleged he committed in North Dakota, and prior to his election to this body, it follows that in the constitutional sense he is possessed of the qualifications fixed by his State and by the Congress and within the purview of the common law.

That being the case, the jurisdiction over the only qualifications into which the committee could have inquired and as to which no irregularities were found, has already been exhausted; and there being no jurisdiction remaining in the committee to go further on the record in this case, it follows that we come back to the precedent stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] this morning when he was reading from Hinds' Precedents. I invite the Senate's attention to page 10 of the report of the majority of the committee.

The report of the majority of the committee quotes Hinds' Precedents, at page 522, referring to the Brigham H. Roberts case:

1. Neither House of Congress has ever expelled a Member for acts unrelated to him as a Member or inconsistent with his public trust and duty as such.

2. Both Houses have many times refused to expel where the guilt of the Member was apparent; where the refusal to expel was put upon the ground that the House or the Senate, as the case might be, had no right to expel for an act unrelated to the Member as such, or because it was committed prior to his election.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, when we come back to consider the authority of a given State, and when we look to the language of the court of last resort for the authority upon which to base our opinion, we may properly review the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (88 U. S. 162), where the Supreme Court pointed out:

The guaranty is of a republican form of government. No particular government is designated as republican, neither is th exact form to be guaranteed in any manner especially designated.

The guaranty necessarily implies a duty on the part of the States themselves to provide such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. In all, the people participated to some extent, through their representatives selected in the manner specially provided. These governments the Constitution did not change. They were accepted precisely as they were, and it is, therefore, to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide. Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form, within the meaning of that term as employed in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate further. The case has been very ably argued, but I have sought to make a few points which it seemed to me had not been covered by anyone else and upon which I would wish it to appear that my vote in this matter would rest.

I feel it appropriate to point out an error, as I conceive it to be, in the argument submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] earlier in the day, when he talked about the Union that was being formed as the basis of the unity among the States. I believe that the view of the Senator from Vermont in that particular is not the view of the court of last resort in this country, and I think he will find in the case of United States against the Curtiss-Wright Corporation that Mr. Justice Sutherland expressly stated that the Constitution did no such thing as the Senator from Vermont would argue. Quite the contrary, when the Constitution expressly stated at the outset in the preamble that—

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, * * * do ordain—

and so forth, the founders were doing no more than building upon a structure which already existed. A Union had existed by virtue of the Articles of Confederation, which had welded the sovereignty comprised of the people of the individual States into a confederation which, while a union, Mr. President, was not the union which later was perfected under our present Constitution, and which may properly be described, as it was, as the "more perfect Union." I think it will be found expressly to have been so decided in the Supreme Court decision to which I have referred.

It was essential to the decision that the Court should so decide, for it was construing the effect of the exercise of power by our Chief Magistrate in the exercise of the external sovereignty of our country.

It is pertinent also, I feel, Mr. President, in order that the majesty and the sovereignty of the State of Connecticut may become apparent in the RECORD, that I inform the Senate that when the Declaration of Independence was adopted in 1776 and news thereof reached our grand little Constitution State, the general court was in session, and this, Mr. President, is what was done by the general court:

The people of this State, being in the providence of God free and independent, have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent State; and having from their ancestors derived a free and excellent constitution of government whereby the legislature depends on the free and annual election of the people, they have the best security for the preservation of their civil and religious rights and liberties. And forasmuch as the free fruition of such liberties and privileges as humanity, civility, and Christianity call for, as is due to every man in his place and proportion, without impeachment and infringement, hath ever been, and will be the tranquillity and stability of churches and Commonwealths; and the denial thereof, the disturbance, if not the ruin of both.

Be it enacted and declared by the Governor and council and house of representatives, in general court assembled, that the ancient form of civil government contained in the charter from Charles II, King of England, and adopted by the people of this State, shall be and remain the constitution of this State, under the sole authority of the people thereof, independent of any king or prince whatever. And that this Republic is, and shall forever be and remain, a free, sovereign, and independent State by the name of the State of Connecticut.

And be it further enacted and declared, That no man's life shall be taken away; no man's honour or good name shall be stained; no man's person shall be arrested, restrained, banished, dismembered, nor any ways punished; no man shall be deprived of his wife or children; no man's goods or estate shall be taken away from him, nor any ways indamaged under the colour of law, or countenance of authority; unless clearly warranted by the laws of this state.

That all the free inhabitants of this or any other of the United States of America, and foreigners in amity with this state, shall enjoy the same justice and law within this state, which is general for the state, in all cases proper for the cognizance of the civil authority and court of judicature within the same, and that without partiality or delay.

And that no man's person shall be restrained, or imprisoned, by any authority whatsoever, before the law hath sentenced him thereunto, if he can and will give sufficient security, bail, or mainprize for his appearance and good behaviour in the meantime, unless it be for capital crimes, contempt in open court, or in such cases wherein some express law doth allow of, or order the same.

Note that "no man's honour or good name" shall be stained except in accordance with law.

Thus, Connecticut preserved the ancient rights of its citizens, and they have ever been guaranteed to us. Thus, we in Connecticut feel singularly moved in the instant matter. We regard such protections as vital, moving items today as in 1776 when the General Court acted as I have shown. Our sacred privileges protected down through the centuries were old in 1789, and so, when Connecticut joined the Union, the "more perfect Union", it agreed, reserving its own rights, to be bound only in accordance with the supreme Law of the Land as set forth in the Constitution.

We knew our chosen Senator was not to be denied a seat in the Congress of the United States after our State had passed upon his qualifications, fixed by us, and had sent him here, always, of course, provided that he met the qualifications fixed by the Constitution itself. Consequently, Mr. President, if there be no barrier in law to the competency of a man taking an oath to perform his duties, to abide by the Constitution, and support and maintain it, then he will not be disqualified, and he is competent to a seat in this body as a matter of law.

That has nothing to do with the facts which extraneously were developed in this case; whatever those facts, or wherever they found the candidate in this case, he is left there; he is not exculpated; whatever conclusions some people seek to draw from the facts, such people are entitled to draw; but, under the Constitution, under our law, and as a matter of law, the candidate is entitled to the presumption of innocence until he shall have been convicted of the crimes as to which allegations have been made against him, and been convicted in accordance with law. It is not, Mr. President, in accordance with law when conviction must be said to rest upon what is done by some investigators in behalf of the committee which later makes a report to us based thereon, however sincere and earnest the members of the committee and their investigators may have been.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I feel that the qualifications of the candidate have affirmatively been ascertained insofar as the jurisdiction of this body applies; that the qualifications, in fact, have been ascertained to be in order and regular, and, on that ground, the applicant was entitled to take the oath, and he, therefore, did qualify as a Senator of the United States. Since, Mr. President, he cannot be expelled, nor has any Member of the Congress ever been expelled for alleged offenses committed prior to his election, particularly in the absence of conviction in a court of law, it follows, in my understanding of the case, that the candidate is entitled to his seat.

MANNER OF HEARING AND DETERMINING CASES UNDER EXPEDITING ACT OF FEBRUARY 11, 1903 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005) to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of Acts of Congress, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 3 In any action in a district court wherein the action of three judges is required for the hearing and determination of an application for interlocutory injunction and for the final hearing by reason of the provisions of section 266 of the Judicial Code, the Act of October 22, 1913, chapter 32, or the Act of August 24, 1937, chapter 754, section 3 (being, respectively, sections 380, 47 and 380a of title 28 United States Code), or the Act of February 11, 1903 (32 Stat. 823; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, section 28 and title 49, section 44), as amended by section 1 of this Act, any one of such three judges may perform all functions, conduct all proceedings, except the trial of such action, and enter all orders required or permitted by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States in effect at the time, provided such single judge shall not appoint, or order a reference to a master, or hear and determine any application for, or action of, an interlocutory injunction, or dismiss the action, or enter a summary or final judgment on all or any part of the action: *Provided, however,* That any action of a single judge hereby permitted shall be subject to review at any time prior to final hearing by the court as constituted for final hearing, on application of any party or by order of such court on its own motion."

And on page 2, lines 2 and 3, of the House engrossed bill, after "1903" strike out "(U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 49, sec. 44)" and insert "(32 Stat. 823; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, sec. 28 and title 49, sec. 44)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
TOM CONNALLY,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. MCLAUGHLIN,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE POLICE AND MUNICIPAL COURTS OF THE DISTRICT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5784) to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as "The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia," to create "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia," and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, be, and they are hereby, consolidated into a single court to be known as "The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia".

"THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"The court shall consist of ten judges appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated by the President as chief judge.

"The terms of the judges shall be in accordance with the following schedule: The first two appointments shall be for a term of ten years each; the second two appointments shall be for a term of eight years each; and the remaining six appointments shall be for a term of six years each. The judges of the Police and Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia holding office on the effective date of this Act shall, however, serve as judges of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia hereby created until the expiration of their respective commissions and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

"The Court shall adopt and have a seal, and shall be a court of record.

"SEC. 2. Subsequent appointments and reappointments to this court shall be for a term of ten years each. All judges shall continue in office until their successors shall be appointed and qualified. Each judge shall be subject to removal only in the manner and for the same causes as are now or hereafter provided for the removal of Federal judges. The salary of the chief judge shall be $8,500 per annum and the salary of each associate judge shall be $8,000 per annum. Each judge, when appointed, shall take the oath prescribed for judges of courts of the United States. No person other than a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia, and maintaining an actual place of abode therein for at least five years immediately prior to his appointment, or who shall have been a judge of one of the courts of the District of Columbia, shall be appointed a judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That not more than two nonresident persons may be appointed and serve as judges of the said Municipal Court at any one time. Further, all appointees shall have been actively engaged in the practice of the law in the District of Columbia for a period of at least five years immediately prior to their appointment. Service during the present emergency in the armed forces of the United States shall be included in the computation of the five-year requirements herein specified.

"SEC. 3. (a) The chief judge shall, from time to time and for such period or periods as he may determine, designate the judges to preside and attend at the various branches and sessions of the court. He shall have the power to determine the number and fix the time of the various sessions of the court, to arrange the business of the court, and to divide it and assign it among the judges. He shall also be charged with the general ad-

ministration and superintendence of the business of the court.

"(b) The chief judge shall give his attention to the discharge of the duties especially pertaining to his office, and to the performance of such additional judicial work as he may be able to perform.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the chief judge and the associate judges to meet together at least once in each month in each year, at such time as may be designated by the chief judge, for the consideration of such matters pertaining to the administration of justice in said court as may be brought before them.

"It shall be the duty of each associate judge to attend and serve at any branch or session of the court to which he is assigned. Each associate judge shall submit to the chief judge a monthly report in writing of the duties performed by him, which report shall specify the number of days attendance in court of such judge during said month, and the branch courts upon which he has attended, and the number of hours per day of such attendance, and such other data as may be required by the chief judge, and in such form as the chief judge shall require.

"The chief judge shall submit to the Attorney General of the United States and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a quarterly report in writing of the business of the court and of the duties performed by each of the judges of the court during the preceding three months. A copy of said report shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the court and shall be available and subject to public inspection during business hours.

"In the event of the absence, disability, or disqualification of the chief judge, his duties shall devolve upon and be performed by the other judges in the order of seniority of their commissions.

"Each judge shall be entitled to vacation, which shall not exceed thirty-six court days in any one calendar year, and which shall be taken at such times as may be determined by the chief judge.

"The court shall have authority to appoint and remove a clerk of the court, whose salary shall be fixed by the court in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the clerk so appointed shall have and exercise the powers and authority heretofore had or exercised by the clerk of the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the clerk of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia.

"The clerk of the court shall have authority, subject to the approval of the chief judge, to appoint and remove such deputy clerks and such other employees as he may deem necessary, and to have their compensation fixed by the chief judge in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall have supervision and direction over them, except clerks serving the respective judges, who shall be appointed and removed from office by the respective judges, their compensation to be fixed by the respective judges in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"The court shall have authority to appoint and remove a probation officer of the court, whose salary shall be fixed by the court in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the probation officer so appointed shall have and exercise the powers and authority heretofore had or exercised by the probation officer of the Police Court of the District of Columbia.

"The probation officer of the court, subject to the approval of the chief judge, shall have authority to appoint and remove such assistant probation officers and such other employees of the probation office as he may deem necessary, and to have their compensation fixed by the chief judge in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall have supervision and direction over them.

"All officials and employees of the Police Court of the District of Columbia and of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia holding office on the effective date of this Act shall continue in office unless and until they are removed therefrom; and all appropriations for the said Police Court or the said Municipal Court shall be available for the payment of the salaries and expenses of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia as hereby established.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, as established by this Act, shall consist of a criminal and a civil branch. The court and each judge thereof shall have and exercise the same powers and jurisdiction as were heretofore had or exercised by the Police Court of the District of Columbia or by the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia or the judges thereof on the effective date of this Act, and, in addition, the said court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions, including counterclaims and crossclaims, in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, exclusive of interest, attorneys' fees, protest fees, and costs, does not exceed the sum of $3,000 and, in addition, shall also have exclusive jurisdiction of such actions against executors, administrators, and other fiduciaries: *Provided, however,* That the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of counterclaims and closs-claims interposed in actions over which it has jurisdiction. The court shall also have jurisdiction over all cases properly pending in the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia or the Police Court of the District of Columbia on the effective date of this Act.

"(b) Service of process in the criminal division of the court shall be had as provided under existing law for the Police Court of the District of Columbia; service of process in the civil division of the court shall be had as provided under existing law for the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or in such other manner as may be prescribed by rules of court.

"(c) All judgments entered by The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on or after the effective date of this Act shall remain in force for six years and no longer, unless the same be docketed in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Upon payment of a fee of 50 cents, the clerk of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia shall prepare a copy of any judgment of the said court, whether heretofore rendered and in force and effective on the effective date of this Act, or hereafter rendered, and the same, upon being docketed with the clerk of said District Court shall have the same force and effect for all purposes as if it had been a judgment of said District Court. For the docketing of the same, the clerk of said District Court shall charge a fee of 50 cents.

"SEC. 5. (a) If, in any action, other than an action for equitable relief, pending on the effective date of this Act or thereafter commenced in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at any pretrial hearing thereof that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $1,000, the court may certify such action to The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for trial. The pleadings in such action, together with a copy of the docket entries and of any orders theretofore entered therein, shall be sent to the clerk of the said Municipal Court, together with the deposit for costs, and the case shall be called for trial in that court promptly thereafter; and shall thereafter be treated as though it had been filed originally in the said Municipal Court, except that the jurisdiction of that court shall extend to the amount claimed in such action, even though it exceed the sum of $3,000.

"(b) The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power and is hereby directed to prescribe, by rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings and motions, and practice and procedure in such court, to provide for the efficient administration of justice, and the same shall conform as nearly as may be practicable to the forms, practice, and procedure now obtaining under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Said rules shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify the substantive rights of any litigant. After their effective date all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force or effect: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to require any change in the existing rules, procedure, or practice now in effect in the small claims and conciliation branch of the presently constituted Municipal Court of the District of Columbia; nor shall this Act or any section thereof in any way repeal or modify the provisions of the Act of March 5, 1938 (52 Stat. 103, ch. 43), establishing said small claims and conciliation branch.

"(c) The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses from any part of the District of Columbia by attachment, and any judge thereof shall have the power to punish for disobedience of any order, or contempt committed in presence of the Court by a fine not exceeding $50 or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

"THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"SEC. 6. There is hereby established and created an intermediate appellate court for the District of Columbia to be known as "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia," for the hearing of appeals from judgments and orders of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia as established by this Act, and of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, as hereinafter provided.

"The court shall adopt and have a seal, and shall be a court of record.

"The said court shall consist of three judges appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, two of whom shall constitute a quorum, and one of whom shall be designated by the President as chief judge.

"No person other than a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia and maintaining an actual place of abode therein for at least five years immediately prior to his appointment, or who shall have been a judge of one of the courts of the District of Columbia, shall be appointed a judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Further, all appointees shall have been actively engaged in the practice of the law in the District of Columbia for a period of at least five years immediately prior to their appointment. Service during the present emergency in the armed forces of the United States shall be included in the computation of the five-year requirements herein specified.

"The chief judge shall be appointed for a term of ten years and the associate judges shall be appointed initially for terms of eight and six years each.

"Subsequent appointments and reappointments to this court shall be for a term of ten years each. All judges shall continue in office until their successors shall be appointed and qualified. Each judge shall be subject to removal only in the manner and for the same causes as are now or hereafter provided for the removal of Federal judges. The salary of the chief judge shall be $9,500 per annum and that of each associate judge shall be $9,000 per annum. Each judge, when appointed, shall take the oath prescribed for judges of courts of the United States. In the event of the absence, disability, or disqualification of any judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of any such judge,

the chief judge of said court may designate and assign any judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to act temporarily as a judge of said court. Likewise the chief judge, whenever he finds it in the public interest to do so, may designate and assign any judge of said Municipal Court of Appeals to act temporarily as a judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. In the event of the absence, disability, or disqualification of the chief judge of said court, his powers shall be exercised by that judge of said court next in seniority according to the date of commission.

"The said court shall appoint and remove a clerk who shall exercise the same powers and perform the same duties in regard to all matters within the jurisdiction of the court as are exercised and performed by the clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, so far as the same may be applicable, and his compensation shall be fixed by the court in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The clerk of the court, subject to the approval of the chief judge, shall have authority to appoint and remove such deputy clerks and such other employees as he may deem necessary, and to have their compensation fixed by the chief judge in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall have supervision and direction over them, except clerks serving the respective judges, who shall be appointed and removed from office by the respective judges, their compensation to be fixed by the respective judges in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"SEC. 7. (a) Any party aggrieved by any final order or judgment of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, as created by this Act, or of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, may appeal therefrom as of right to The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Appeals may also be taken to said court as of right from all interlocutory orders of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia whereby the possession of property is changed or affected such as orders dissolving writs of attachment and the like: *Provided, however,* That reviews of judgments of the small claims and conciliation branch of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, and reviews of judgments in the criminal branch of the court where the penalty imposed is less than $50, shall be by application for the allowance of an appeal, filed in said Municipal Court of Appeals. Said application shall be on a standard form, in simple language, prescribed by The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. When the appealing party is not represented by counsel, it shall be the duty of the clerk to prepare the application in his behalf. The application for appeal shall be filed in The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia within three days from the date of judgment. It shall be promptly presented by the clerk to the chief judge and to each of the associate judges for their consideration. If they or any one of them are of the opinion that the appeal should be allowed, the appeal shall be recorded as granted, and the case set down for hearing on appeal, and given a preferred status on the calendar, and heard in the same manner as other appeals in said court. If the chief judge and both associate judges shall be of the opinion that an appeal should be denied, such denial shall stand as an affirmance of the judgment of the trial court, from which there shall be no further appeal

"After the effective date of this Act, no writs of error or appeals, except in respect of judgments theretofore rendered, shall be granted by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to the said Municipal Court or to the said Juvenile Court.

"(b) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have the power to prescribe by rules what parts of the proceedings in the court below shall constitute the record on appeal, and to require that the original papers be sent to it instead of copies thereof, and generally to regulate all matters relating to appeals, whether in the court below or in said The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"(c) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not require the record or briefs on appeal to be printed, and if they are printed, the cost of printing shall not be taxed as costs in the case. Said court shall review the record on appeal and shall affirm, reverse, or modify the order or judgment in accordance with law. If the issues of fact shall have been tried by jury, The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall review the case only as to matters of law. If the case shall have been tried without a jury, The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have the power to review both as to the facts and the law, but in such case the judgment of the trial court shall not be set aside except for errors of law or unless it appears that the judgment is plainly wrong or without evidence to support it.

"(d) This section shall not apply to any judgments rendered prior to the effective date of this Act.

"SEC. 8. Any party aggrieved by any judgment of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia may seek a review thereof by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by petition for the allowance of an appeal. The petition shall be in writing and shall be filed with the clerk of said United States Court of Appeals within ten days after the entry of such judgment, the contents of the petition to conform to the requirements which said United States Court of Appeals may by rule prescribe. Said Court of Appeals may prescribe rules governing the practice and procedure on such applications, the preparation of and the time for filing the transcript of the record in such cases, and generally to regulate all matters relating to appeals in such cases. If said Court of Appeals shall allow an appeal, the court shall review the record on appeal and shall affirm, reverse, or modify the order or judgment in accordance with law.

"SEC. 9. (a) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have the power and is hereby directed to prescribe, by rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings and motions, and practice and procedure in such court, to provide for the efficient administration of justice, and the same shall conform as nearly as may be practicable to the forms, practice, and procedure now obtaining under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Said rules shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify the substantive rights of any litigant. After their effective date all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force or effect.

"Service of process shall be made by the United States Marshal for the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or any judge thereof, shall have the power to punish for disobedience of any order or contempt committed in the presence of the Court by a fine not exceeding $50, or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

"SEC. 10. The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia as established by this Act, shall have full power and authority to censure, suspend, or expel from practice, at their respective bars, any attorney for any crime involving moral turpitude, or professional misconduct, or any conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice. Before any such attorney is censured, suspended, or expelled, written charges under oath against him must be presented to the court, stating distinctly the grounds of complaint. The court may order the charges to be filed in the office of the clerk of the court and shall fix a time for hearing thereon. Thereupon a certified copy of the charges and order shall be served upon the attorney personally by the marshal or such other person as the court may designate, or in case it is established to the satisfaction of the court that personal service cannot be had, a certified copy of such charges and order shall be served upon him by mail, publication, or otherwise, as the court may direct. At any time after the filing of said written charges, the court shall have the power, pending the trial thereof, to suspend from practice at its bar the person charged.

"SEC. 11. (a) Any judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, any judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as established by this Act, or any judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, may hereafter retire after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating twenty years or more, whether continuously or not. Any judge who so retires shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge. In no event shall the sum received by any such judge hereunder be in excess of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in either the Police Court of the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous. The terms "retire" and "retirement" as used in this section shall mean and include retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent.

"(b) Any judge receiving retirement salary under the provisions of this Act may be called upon by the chief judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or the chief judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in either of said courts, or in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for more than ninety days in any calendar year after such retirement. In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such retired judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability.

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby; and if any provision hereof becomes inoperative, either by reason of failure of appropriations or otherwise, it shall not affect the legality or operative effect of any or all of the remaining features and provisions hereof.

"SEC. 13. The appropriations in the 1942 District of Columbia Appropriation Act, approved July 1, 1941, for the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, are hereby continued available for the purposes specified therein, and for the expenditures authorized by this Act. And there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be

necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 14. The provisions of this Act authorizing the appointment and salaries of the judges of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the clerk, deputy clerks, and other employees of said court, shall take effect one month after approval of this Act. The other provisions of this Act shall take effect three months after the date of its approval.

"The expression 'effective date of this Act,' as used in this Act, means three months after the approval of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
OREN HARRIS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

NINE-POINT PROGRAM FOR STREAMLINING ALL-OUT WAR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, yesterday the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think without exception, were moved by a report which was made to the committee by the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, telling of conditions with which he has personally been confronted in Manila, Corregidor, Bataan, and in the regions where the battle of the Pacific rages.

I come from a State which has already given to this war its first hero and the first recipient of the Congressional Medal, Capt. Colin P. Kelly and Lieutenant Nininger.

I read in the afternoon paper the statement by Prime Minister Churchill that the battle of the Atlantic is temporarily worse. I see in another afternoon paper a heartening address to the Australian people by General MacArthur, the headline of which in the Times-Herald is "MacArthur declares he'll win or die."

In the course of his remarks this indomitable soldier and crusader of liberty and freedom used these words:

> My faith in our ultimate victory is invincible. I bring to you tonight the unmistakable spirit of free men as opposed to perpetual slavery.
>
> We fight for the things that are right and condemn the things that are wrong. Under this banner the free men of the world are united to death. There will be no compromise. We shall win, or we shall die.

MacArthur pledged to Australia the full backing "of the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen."

Mr. President, I think it is only fair to examine whether or not in the Congress and in the country there is assurance that that heroic promise made by General MacArthur can be kept and faithfully performed. There is the greater doubt when from day to day the people of this country are confronted with such press releases as appeared, for example, in the Washington Post this morning, where it is said that "Two caulkers claim $160 each for 8 hours' work," as reported by the Associated Press, according to testimony received by the Naval Affairs Committee of the House.

I say especially is there some doubt about the sentiment in the country when one reads such evidence as was presented to the Committee on Naval Affairs yesterday, as reported in the Evening Star yesterday, that "sample companies with Navy contracts had increased tremendously in the period between 1934–41, the increases ranging from 22 to 1,331 percent."

Especially also is there doubt about such a sentiment for total mobilization in the country when we read reports such as that appearing in the August issue of Fortune magazine, which indicates the tie-up between certain industrial enterprises in the United States and state-controlled enterprises in Germany. I read now from a report made by Mr. Thurman Arnold, in which he quotes the article in Fortune magazine, as follows:

> Nazi interest in trade restraint is to hold back production outside Germany. Inside Germany they have optimum production, optimum expansion for the state. Nothing interests them less than maintaining "orderly markets." But by cleverly playing upon the profit motive (which is suppressed inside Germany) they have gulled businessmen in the democracies into limiting production of the very articles that the democracies were to need most urgently in their own defense. In this way Germany induced Europe's democracies to "stabilize" aluminum production—in their own self-interest—while German production shot forward at top speed. The consequences of this have since become all too plain.

Mr. Arnold adds:

> It is interesting to note that every single instance of the German influence which was cited in the article, to wit: Military optical instruments, tungsten carbide, aluminum, magnesium, beryllium, chemicals, and drugs, was uncovered by an antitrust investigation or prosecution.

The investigation also disclosed that there was an agreement between a German munitions company and the Remington Arms Co. as late as January 1941, whereby it was definitely agreed by this American company that they would not sell rifles or ammunition covered by the agreement to any country constituting a part of the British Empire.

It has also been disclosed by the antitrust investigation of the Department of Justice that in respect to pharmaceuticals there was a similar agreement—that is to say, an understanding—between the American company using German patents and the parent German companies, which are State owned, as to the division of the world market, the American company reserving to itself the right to charge any price it chose in the American market, and the German company being given a free hand in the other markets of the world.

It has also been made to appear by this investigation as to how the aluminum production increased in Germany from 1933 to 1938, and, indeed, to 1941, as compared with aluminum production in the so-called democratic countries, including our own. For instance, the comparison in production between France and Germany is shown by the following figures. In 1933, France produced 14,300 tons of aluminum, and in the same year Germany produced 18,900 tons.

In 1934, France produced 15,000 tons of aluminum in round figures, and Germany 37,000 tons.

In 1935, France produced 22,000 tons, and Germany 70,000 tons.

In 1936, France produced 26,000 tons, and Germany 97,000 tons.

In 1937, France produced 34,000 tons, and Germany 127,000 tons.

In 1938, France produced 40,000 tons, and Germany 175,000 tons.

In 1933 German production, as I have stated, amounted to 18,000 tons, while United States production amounted to 38,000 tons.

In 1934 German production amounted to 37,000 tons, the United States production to 33,000 tons.

In 1935 German production amounted to 70,000 tons, the United States production to 54,000 tons.

In 1936 German production amounted to 97,000 tons, the United States production to 102,000 tons.

In 1937 German production amounted to 127,000 tons, the United States production to 132,000 tons.

In 1938 German production amounted to 175,000 tons, the United States production to 130,000 tons.

The estimate by the Bureau of Mines is that in 1941 Germany produced more aluminum than the combined United Nations produced, that is to say, than all the Allies produced.

So, for the price of the American market, we helped Germany build the very planes which have been the messengers of death to our Allies and ourselves.

The investigation has disclosed another very interesting situation, involving the New Jersey Zinc Co., which is the owner of one of the two methods by which high-grade zinc is produced in the United States. The statement which I have before me, which comes from an authentic source, says:

> In the face of this situation, the New Jersey Zinc Co. has persistently refused to grant licenses for the use of its patented processes—the superiority of which seems to be generally recognized. New Jersey's refusal to license its patents is in the face of urgent pleas by such corporations as United States Steel, American Smelting & Refining, Anaconda Copper Co., and National Lead that New Jersey "let down the bars" if only, as one executive puts it, "out of a sense of patriotic duty."
>
> In this regard, it should be noted that New Jersey has granted only two licenses for the use of its process, and each of these has carried restrictions as regards the quantity and quality to be produced. One, to the American Smelting & Refining Co., limited this company to the right to make only 5,000 tons per year. As a concession to the emergency they were permitted to make 7,000 tons in 1941. The other, to the Grasselli Division of du Pont, limited the quality. Meanwhile, through a sale of its patent rights to European interests, both German and Italian producers are utilizing the very processes which are generally denied to American producers.

Mr. President, there is another instance of note, that of a case where one German company refused to allow the use of its patent process by an American company unless the American company would agree that it would not give advertising in the United States to any newspaper which was inimical to Germany in its views and editorial policy. Believe it or not, American companies

have, for profit purposes, entered into such combines as that.

So, Mr. President, I say it is not striking that the people of the United States today are very deeply stirred by the failure of their Congress to make adequate provision for the defense of their country and the total mobilization of their country's effort.

We all recall that since General MacArthur has been in Australia, the Australian Government, which is a labor government, has taken unto itself complete control and power over the people and the property of that great land, determined to live or die free men, and to resist the Japanese aggression, which is daily creeping with sinister cruelty closer and closer to their sacred homes.

I think it is therefore time for the Congress to reexamine what it has done, what it is now considering, and what it proposes to do, to see whether or not the country can feel that satisfaction which it should feel, that the Congress is making the utmost preparation to meet the greatest attack which has ever been hurled against this land in all its long history.

I regret very much to have to say, as a Member of this distinguished body, that, in my opinion, the American Congress stands lower in the estimation of the American people today, assuredly, than it has stood within my own memory, certainly within the brief period of my tenure here of something over 5 years.

In every part of this country men and women, not just those who are inimical to industry, not just those who are hostile to labor, not those who ordinarily lack confidence in public officials, but good men and good women, conscientious boys and sincere girls, are asking the question: "Is the American Congress fully alert to the danger which confronts our country today? Is the American Congress courageous enough to meet the menace, with the only methods by which it may be adequately resisted and at last thrown back?" I wonder whether or not our record of performance has given them assurance that we do possess the courage which they would like to see us indicate.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am venturing to propose a nine-point program to the Congress, to be by the Congress considered, and I hope approved, in furtherance of the great, Herculean leadership, which is being given to this country and to our kind of world by our incomparable President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I speak, Mr. President, only in aid of the mighty effort which he is exerting better to prepare and defend America, and to strike down the monsters of tyranny everywhere in the world.

First, I propose that Congress begin with self-examination; that the Congress streamline itself by the creation of a special joint war committee to correlate all congressional activities more closely with one another and with the President and his executive agents, so that the Congress may constantly keep the over-all war picture before it and most effectively provide for and contribute to the winning of the war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN NUYS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will allow me to continue until I shall have completed my statement, in view of the consent agreement which limits the time of each speaker. I am not sure that I will have time enough to say what I contemplate saying. When I shall have finished I shall gladly yield, and I hope there will be time enough to answer any questions the able Senator from Wyoming may ask.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall accommodate myself to the Senator's request.

Mr. PEPPER. I regret the necessity of resisting at this time the inquiry of my friend the Senator from Wyoming, because I should normally be glad to do anything he asks me to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the charges which the Senator makes against the Congress of the United States are so serious that I think they warrant a little discussion.

Mr. PEPPER. As soon as I shall have completed my remarks I shall gladly yield to any inquiry the Senator may make.

Mr. President, this first point is addressed in the first place to the inherent lost motion there is in the ordinary mechanism of the Congress, and I say this, as I say everything else which I propose to say in these remarks, with kindliness, certainly with great admiration and respect for my colleagues, with the consciousness that I am the least among them. What I shall say is intended purely in the spirit of offering suggestions which I hope might be of some help in the total mobilization of our country, and Congress' effort in that direction.

Mr. President, I started to advert to the fact, as is known to all of us, that in the last few days a great many congressional committees have been carrying on investigations. That means that day after day, and sometimes several times a day, men like Mr. Donald Nelson, and the leading figures in the administrative set-up of the defense program, have to trek up here on the Hill to appear before the various committees of Congress, each of which is acting certainly within its jurisdiction, and, of course, with justification, but nevertheless in a way that burdens those men and restricts the use of their time to their own duties, in which all of us, of course, are vitally interested.

Moreover our committee system, each committee looking through a single glass, as it were, or not more than through one window, does not give any committee, generally speaking, the opportunity to view the over-all defense picture to see whether there is anything that, out of a responsible source, might be suggested which could contribute something to the winning of the war. I thought therefore that if the leadership of the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, with the cooperation of the Speaker, and the President of the Senate, were to set up a joint committee composed of Members drawn from the Senate and House, which would be a sort of over-all war committee—and I am certainly not proposing myself for membership, Mr. President, and I should have nothing to do with appointing the personnel of that committee—I believe that such an over-all war committee, charged with no specific investigation, but with the general correlation of the Congress' activities on the subject of national defense, for general cooperation with the President and administrative agents, could very materially expedite the defense program, and very materially increase its tempo and effectiveness.

My second suggestion, Mr. President, is universal manpower mobilization, so that every citizen, every man and woman, may be best trained and placed to win the war in the shortest possible time and with the least loss of lives and money.

Mr. President, I think the time has come for us to decide—I am sure we shall have to decide it sooner or later—whether we mean total all-out mobilization of the strength and the resources of this country, or whether we do not; whether we are going to impose the burden of this war upon a few of our people, and let the rest be exempt; whether we are going to pick out a peculiar class and thrust the responsibility directly upon them, or whether, in the name of America's liberty, in furtherance of America's freedom, we as America's Congress are going to have the courage to challenge the whole American citizenry, men and women, boys and girls, to take their assigned places where they can serve best in the defense of their country, and gladly and enthusiastically perform their several duties.

I realize that that will apply to all ranks and classes of our people, and it is so intended. I mean by that to give the Government the power to assign labor where it might be necessary for labor to be assigned to carry on the defense program, for unless labor shall make it possible for democracy to survive in the earth, there never will be a decent life possible for any man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow.

Mr. President, that also contemplates the power in the Government to draft the brains, the management of the country. I see no reason why a man cannot be called from his factory to perform the functions of a governmental official necessary to his Nation's defense, and why he is not as amenable to the discipline of the defense effort as any man. By that statement I exempt no individual, I exempt no class, I exempt no sex. I say that the Government, by provisions which it should fairly and equitably and intelligently make, should have at its disposal the manpower and the womanpower of this whole great land.

Mr. President, I believe that there is not a Senator who has not seen enough of the sentiment of the country in the

last few weeks to know that what the country is clamoring for is for Congress to take a more courageous and stern policy, and a more definite and positive leadership.

Mr. President, I am afraid the people have gotten the impression that we are afraid to lead the country the way they in their hearts and in our hearts we know it ought to be led in the face of this great crisis which is growing daily more terrible upon our very horizon. I believe there is not even the prospect, Mr. President, that a single portion of our people who might so be called would fail to respond in the same patriotic way that the men who have been called in the draft have responded. There were some people who said that if we drafted men in this country before war has been declared there would be resistance. To the eternal glory of this country let it be said that there was hardly a discoverable case in all the great land, from coast to coast, and from our northern boundary to the Gulf of Mexico, and there will not be resistence, Mr. President, from the laboring men, or from factory managers, or from professional men, or from women, if they are fairly, equitably, and intelligently called.

Mr. President, I say the people of the country are begging for a chance to do something which they feel will help and will have a distinct and vital part in the defense program.

The third point is to abolish all legal restrictions of hours of labor during the war.

Mr. President, I am not saying that it is so bad to have a 40-hour week. I am not saying that perhaps it is not working out fairly well in experience, or that the average actually is not in excess of 40 hours per week; that it does not in some cases approximate even 50 hours. But what I am saying is that it is wrong in principle, in patriotism, in this time of crisis to have a law upon the books which limits the labor of any man in the defense of his country. It gives the wrong impression when a man gets time and a half pay. It gives the impression that he is doing something outside the scope of his duty when he works longer than 40 hours.

Mr. President, no citizen can satisfy his obligation to his land in a time of crisis by working any limited number of hours less than the total of his strength. This may be another case comparable to the one we had presented to us here a bit ago with respect to our own so-called pensions.

As a matter of fact, examined logically, intelligently, and dispassionately, the proposal was not anything like as bad as the newspapers of the country and our enemies tried to pretend it was. In my own case, being 41 years of age, I should have to pay 5 percent of my annual salary, or a total of $10,500, over a period of 21 years, before I ever become eligible for a penny of that retirement fund.

The country, however, never understood that we contributed anything toward the fund. The country thought it was a grab by the American Congress out of the public purse. In this time of crucial challenge to our national security, when our total effort, including our morale, must be mobilized, almost without objection the membership of this body reversed their position and repealed that law, to the obvious satisfaction of the American people. By doing so, by making frank confession of error, I believe, increased the respect in which Congress is held by the American people.

Mr. President, I say, therefore, that as it actually has worked out, the 40-hour-week work limit may not be impeding the program very materially, but if it is impeding it at all, even by one-half of 1 percent, or one-quarter of 1 percent; if it, by a single jota, holds up and handicaps the progress of that program, it is wrong, and it is contrary to the best interests of the people of America.

Mr. President, this has not been an easy decision for me to arrive at. I have been a friend of labor, and I am a friend of labor. I challenge any Senator to show a record of greater fidelity to the cause of labor than my own, as it appears from the records of the Congress. But, Mr. President, the people of this country are deeply stirred. In the past month I have been from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific. I have been from the northern boundary of this Nation to the southern boundary. I have been in my State and in the States of other Senators. The people are disturbed about this thing as I have never before seen them disturbed.

The feeling is not confined to those who are organized enemies of labor. It is not alone in the hearts of the labor baiters. It is not expressed exclusively by those who want to destroy labor unions at all events. It does not come alone from those who take advantage of the national crisis to wrap the flag around themselves and destroy humane efforts wherever they have been made to appear. On the contrary, the major part of these expressions come from the bleeding hearts of the men and women of this country.

I am not one of those who embrace the fallacy that only the sons of the rich are in the Army, and therefore that labor, by not doing all that could be done for the defense effort, is not giving all the support it could give to the sons of the rich who happen to be in our armed services.

On the contrary, Mr. President, I well know that 42 percent of the families of the United States have an annual income of less than $1,000; that 65 percent of the families of this country yearly earn a gross income of less than $1,500; that 87 percent each year enjoy less than $2,500; that 97 percent annually derive less than $5,000; and that only 1 percent of America's families receive $10,000 a year or more. So I know that most of the boys in the Army and Navy and in the air come from humble American homes. I know also that the fathers behind those boys are anxious—yea, willing and begging—for an opportunity to do their very best to make those boys, wherever they are, comfortable and well equipped as they approach the crucial struggle that may end their mortal lives. So I know the fathers of America who labor yield to none in their patriotism and purpose to help America's sons—their sons—win this war.

But, Mr. President, upon reflection, I believe all will agree that we should remove from the statute books of this Nation any legal impediment to the number of hours a week or a day which a man may work. I shall subsequently refer to a method whereby a reasonable restraint may be imposed and reasonable protection given to labor. None of us is foolish enough to think that we could gain in production by making a man work past the point of diminishing economic return, or more than his bodily efficiency is able to sustain.

The fourth point, Mr. President, is to establish a tribunal authorized to fix, during the war, hours of labor, wages, salaries, profits, prices, and bonuses, and to provide that such tribunal shall give consideration first to the effective prosecution of the war, and, secondly, to what is fair to individuals and groups in relation to other individuals and groups and in relation to the fighting forces and the national economy.

Mr. President, I think that what has occurred respecting labor has been a perfectly natural evolution. It has not been primarily the fault of either labor or industry, but of the American Government. When American industry was called upon by our Allies to provide equipment for them, to be paid for with the money of the Allies, the Government did not step in and fix the limit of its profits. Apparently the Government was willing for industry to make from our sorely pressed Allies abroad whatever profits it was able to make. Consequently the impression got abroad—and naturally reached the employees—that industry had a great opportunity to enrich itself out of the war that was going on on the other side of the world. Many—including some Senators—were saying that it was not our war anyway, that we now had a chance to make up for the hard days of the depression, and therefore we should charge such prices and make such profits as we were able to make. Consequently, high profit scales were established, high prices were put into effect and, obviously and naturally, high wage scales followed.

That condition continued until the time came when two valiant Senators rose in the Senate and offered an amendment authorizing the Government to take over any instrumentality which the Government might require and could not obtain by agreement with its owners. That indicated that the Government reserved the power to acquire those instrumentalities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN NUYS in the chair). The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that his time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. I will take time on the resolution.

When the war eventually came to our own shores by reason of the dastardly attack of the base Japanese, what policy did the Government then follow? Instead of at once calling upon the American people, as an act of patriotism, to

put their factories, fields, and farms, their sons, and their strength on the Nation's altar, again we started off on a program of profit for industry and enterprise. We even eliminated some of the price ceilings which previous laws had put upon the statute books. So again manufacturers came to Washington and started haggling over contracts with their Government—not all of them, but a great many of them. Cases have been brought to my personal attention in which as much as months were spent in dickering over the details of contracts, the price the manufacturer was to receive, and what the conditions of the order were to be. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I think time will disclose that in the long run we would have been far ahead if the responsible officials of the Government had called the representatives of American industry to Washington and said, "Gentlemen, your country is attacked and in danger. Today America expects every man to do his duty; and we know you will. You will be advised what you are expected to produce, and you will go home with the obligation of turning your factory into the production of that article or those articles."

If that had been done, when the employer got back to his factory and disclosed to his employees that he had patriotically put his factory at his country's disposal, I do not believe any labor union in America, or any substantial, responsible labor leader would have taken advantage of that kind of a manufacturer and tried to profit from the patriotism of such management.

But when labor saw the profits of the manufacturers soaring, when it saw exorbitant bonuses and outrageous salaries, some of them extending to more than 1,300 percent of what they were before the war began, was it not natural and inevitable that labor should say, "If that is the kind of a war we are going to fight, we are entitled to our just share of the national income?"

Another thing occurred quite naturally, Mr. President, and the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] gave eloquent expression to it on this floor. Finally agriculture came knocking at the door of the Government. It said, "Look at the wage scales; look at the scale of business profits, and compare the income of American agriculture with the profits of American business, and see how poorly the comparison stands for agriculture." Quite naturally agriculture started asking that it have a fair share in the distribution of the national income.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator at this point to say that the Senator has not correctly stated the effort which was made in connection with the price-control bill. I know that he has stated the information which was broadcast to the country; but the position of those who spoke for agriculture upon this floor was never that agriculture should be permitted to delve its hands into the Treasury. The position of those who spoke for agriculture was that agriculture should not be victimized when other elements were not being controlled.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. That is a much better statement of it than I could have made. That is what I intended to say.

What I have intended to infer, Mr. President, is that the high price structure which has gradually grown up and the inequalities which have crept into our economic life have quite naturally come into existence because the Government did not step in with sufficient foresight and force to see to it that each one obtained his or her or its just deserts.

If that had been done by an appropriate agency following an intelligent process and pursuant to a courageous sentiment, there would not have been the clamor from various groups to have a larger part of the profit of the war effort.

What I propose is the only effective way I know of to see to it that there is a fair balance in the whole economy and a fair distribution of the benefits and burdens among all the people. Consequently, I have proposed that Congress establish a tribunal authorized to fix, during the war, hours of labor. If 40, 45, 48, 50, or 60 hours a week are the hours which will produce the best results from the standpoint of production, those should be the hours. If hours should be lengthened in one industry and shortened in another, that is what ought to be done. If in one section there should be an increase and in another section a decrease by some tribunal acting only from patriotic motives, that is what ought to be done. That requires flexibility and judgment on the part of the directing tribunal and cannot be prescribed by law.

That is the reason why I have said the Congress should establish a tribunal with such power.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall have to decline to yield until I finish; I decline because of the limitation of time, and not because of anything else.

What I mean to say, Mr. President, is that such board should have power not only over hours of labor, but over wages. After all, what is time and time-and-a-half pay except wages? The extra pay is simply added to the pay envelope at the end of the week. If wages are not high enough in relation to industry's profits and in relation to agriculture's prices, they should be raised; but they should be raised by someone who has the public interest in view, and each group should be dealt with fairly in relation to the others and in relation to the national economy. That is the only way by which we shall ever prevent inflation.

I have included salaries. I see no reason why the same authority should not have the power to limit the salaries paid executives who are engaged in the manufacture of war commodities. Why should the president of a factory manufacturing airplanes receive $100,000 or $200,000 as his annual salary, and give a bonus of $25,000 a year to his girl secretary, and then complain because a carpenter makes a dollar an hour?

If we want to be fair, if we are to be effective, if we are to gain the confidence of the country, the whole economic picture must be considered by the proposed tribunal; and every individual, every class, every segment, and every section must be dealt with rightly and fairly with respect to one another and with respect to the total national economy and the country's defense effort.

I have therefore included the power to fix prices. Obviously, unless prices are fairly fixed, wages cannot be kept down, and profits cannot be controlled. So the board which is to deal with this subject must have the whole range of factors in its hands or it will not be able fairly and effectively to do the job. Its powers should be sufficiently comprehensive to extend to bonuses.

I have cited as a fifth proposal, Mr. President, prohibition of the payment or receipt of any entrance fees as a condition precedent to war work. Mr. President, imagine the spectacle of a man going to work on a defense facility and having to pay a labor union such a sum as $25 or $50—or in some cases $100 or more before he can use his hands and his skill to defend his country. Such a condition is an abomination against patriotism; and certainly the last to avail itself of such a policy should be the labor-union group, which stands tied forever to the citadel of freedom and liberalism in the world. Therefore, we cannot, when our homes are in danger, stand by and tolerate what in normal times is a fair privilege charge and initiation fee for membership, and allow that kind of toll to be levied—a practice which in some cases has innocently grown up, and in other cases has been willfully contrived for the purpose of taking advantage of the emergency.

I want to see labor unions continue, and I believe that the country is better off with its labor organized into responsible unions; but, Mr. President, in war we cannot put the dollar mark athwart the threshold of labor's door, and say that a man must pay for the privilege of associating himself with his fellow men, to better himself and to defend his country—at least, not more than to the extent of a nominal figure or contribution.

Sixth, authorize the President, for the duration of the war, to acquire or take control of any factory, mine, or facility, at compensation to be fixed by him.

To a very large extent the President has such power; but I desire to be sure that it has no limitations. I want it to be as complete as the power that the labor government in Australia has given to its government in order to hold back the marauding Japanese who are appearing at the very threshold of that country. Here in America we are closer to the enemy's assault than we know. It is not impossible that within 30 days, either upon the borders of this country or on this continent, there will be falling the deadly shells of a wicked enemy, shells that will be spilling not simply rivulets but rivers of blood, the lifeblood of our citizens.

Seventh. Empower the President to direct the use or kind of work to which any factory or facility shall be put to as-

sist in winning the war. If a man's factory is needed in order to do a certain kind of work, let some competent and fair tribunal have the power to say, "We need your factory; you must devote it to a certain kind of use," and then proceed to fix the profit that the owner will receive from its use. That is the only way I know by which we can ever live up to the promises that General MacArthur made to the stalwart people of Australia who are fighting today because they think they can depend upon aid from America; that is the only way they can ever hope to receive what he said would be the full resources and the complete effort of this country.

Eighth. Create two agencies, the heads of which shall be of Cabinet rank, one charged with the mobilization of manpower, and the other charged with the protection of the civilian life behind the lines, so that the American family shall best be served, as men and women are mobilized and communities dislocated by the necessities of war, and to provide prompt and just relief to those upon whom the burden of war has fallen with devastating severity.

Mr. President, I shall not have time, now being limited in time as I am, to discuss every aspect of this matter. I shall discuss just one phase of it. Some weeks ago the automobile industry was cut off from the production of automobiles; and the automobile dealers of the country were frozen, not out of business, but in business. The Ford dealer from Tampa, Fla., came here the other day and told me that under the present rationing plan it would take 10 years for him to dispose of the cars he had on his floor when the order went into effect. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has not even yet worked out a plan to finance the automobiles that are on the dealers' floors, so that they can keep their properties until the automobiles can be sold.

Mr. President, I call that bungling. The authorities have not yet provided means by which the mechanics and the facilities in the garages can be used in national defense. I call that bungling; and I call the whole dealing with that subject bungling. What I desire to see is some responsible agency that, backed by Congress, will be charged with the duty of foreseeing these things, anticipating such dislocations, and, when they do come at last, make effective provision, as best it can be made, to equalize the burdens upon the citizenry of this country, so that no one shall especially suffer more than is necessary.

Ninth. Direct the competent Federal agencies to make an immediate survey and the earliest practicable report upon the extent to which underprivileged and subnormal conditions exist in regard to health, education, and economic opportunity in the United States, and then Congress to resolve that it will make effective provision to remove those handicaps, so that we shall give not only our own people but the people of the world, by our own example, the best evidence of our faith in democracy and the dignity of man.

Mr. President, let me say with equal candor that various committees of the Congress in the interest of national economy have started an attack upon certain agencies which have been created by the Congress in the past. One of them is the National Youth Administration, one of them is the Civilian Conservation Corps, and one of them is the Farm Security Administration. There are many others that already have been attacked and will be attacked much more viciously in the days and months and years that lie ahead.

Mr. President, boys from America's humble homes are being called to the colors. This week I learned to my consternation that the Bureau of the Budget or some agency of the Government had already stopped the activities of the National Youth Administration under which they have in the past given work opportunities to needy boys and girls in the high schools and colleges of this country so they could attend school.

I am ashamed of a government which, when it is prattling and parading democracy to the people of the earth, will let a poor boy or girl who has not the wealth or the opportunity to get an education, go without it because he or she cannot even get a chance to work—and when the total amount involved is $24,000,000. That is what some people call economy. It all depends upon what kind of economy is talked about, Mr. President. Is it economy in human lives, economy in spiritual light, economy in wider horizons of opportunity, to save $24,000,000, and throw out of the high schools and colleges of America tens of thousands of worthy boys and girls?

That is an example of the perversion of patriotism which is going on in some spheres of this Congress.

So, Mr. President, I say we shall hear the worst attack upon the Farm Security Administration because it tried to make it possible for some of the citizenry—and white citizenry at that—of this country to exercise the privilege of sovereignty, and to vote. This agency has been denounced as a betrayer of the public trust in this country.

My God, Mr. President, we talk about saving the world for democracy, and we will not let a citizen vote because he does not have the money to pay for the privilege, and condemn the agency that lends the money to him.

If that is the example we are going to give at home in this crusade for democracy, all people are not going to believe us, Mr. President, and we shall find many people behaving the way people behaved in certain other areas—not seeing much advantage as between one master and another.

So I say, with no apology, let us go out into the highways and byways; let us go to the barren and eroded fields; let us go to the depleted forests; let us go to the rude mountain shacks, and lift these Americans up. Let us go where the humble boys and girls are, and not throw them out of schools, but bring them back with the welcome hand of their Government, saying, "God bless you; prepare yourselves better not only for the physical but the spiritual ordeal which lies ahead."

Let us go to all of our neglected people, and try to lift them up to a level where they will have a chance to enjoy the dignity of citizenship. Let us try to build greater opportunities for them in the sun of their national life. Then, when we have a nation which believes its own government really has its heart burning in the democratic cause, we will sense a new sentiment in this Nation, and we will find a throb of mighty power, greater than any force we have heretofore known.

Mr. President, you have generously borne with me while I have offered these suggestions for consideration by the Congress. I earnestly hope that what the Congress does will reflect a new sentiment in the Congress, a sentiment of vitality and spirit on the part of our membership which will make us pray that, as men are dying out in the remote places, and millions more are yet to die, the least we can do is to be worthy of them; that we shall at least risk our political fortunes at a time when they gladly and enthusiastically risk their very lives in the cold oceans or on the bloody fields of battle.

Mr. President, may I say, therefore, that we should lay down a simple standard for our conduct in the future: First, does it progress the cause of winning the war? Second, before God and our people, and with the memories of the dead and the prospects of the living in our consciences, is it right? If it is, without fear or favor we should do it. Let us so bravely live and labor, and we shall deserve to have it said by those who come after us that we kept our rendezvous with destiny; we were true to the race of man.

CONGRESS IS THE CITADEL OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Florida began his eloquent address, about three-quarters of an hour ago, and read the first of the nine proposals which he has now enunciated to the Senate, I asked the Senator to yield because I felt that he began this admirable and much-needed speech with what will be interpreted as an attack upon the Congress. My feeling is that the criticism which the Senator directs against the Government should not be directed to the Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interject, the last thought in my mind, the one most remote from my purpose, was to make an attack upon the Congress. I merely offered a suggestion, in which I hoped the Congress would find some merit, as to how the Congress might more militantly and effectively lead the Nation into total mobilization of its strength to win the war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate what the purpose of the Senator from Florida was, but I think it unfortunate that he used the words which he did employ, because inevitably they will go out from this Capitol to all sections of the country, and they will add to what I conceive to be one of the most unfortunate misconceptions of this crisis.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that the executive arm of a free government may be reduced by 90 percent, but democracy will still stand. The judicial power may be almost eliminated, but democracy will still stand while there remains a legislative body responsible to the people. The legislature is the citadel of democracy. So the most serious attack upon free government, here or anywhere in all the world, is that which is made upon the legislative body, and I say to the Senator from Florida, and to those who are gathered here, that when the people of the United States lose their confidence in the Congress, then indeed is democracy facing its greatest danger on the home front. When Congress goes, free government goes, for then all power is concentrated in the Executive. It is important, therefore, not lightly to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress.

I submit that the record of this Congress is not one to justify the charge made by the Senator from Florida, or at least the charge which may be properly inferred from his remarks. I was very glad to have him say that it was not his purpose to attack Congress. It is true that he said, however, that the Congress of the United States has today sunk to a lower level in public estimation than at any time in his memory.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not express that as my own opinion. I said that in my opinion it was the sentiment of the country that the Congress enjoyed its confidence less than it has within my memory. I was trying to report what I think I have seen in the sentiment of this country. I hope I am wrong; I am afraid I am not.

CONGRESS HAS FREQUENTLY TAKEN INITIATIVE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand exactly what the Senator said, and I do not wish to imply that I thought he desired to charge that Congress has failed or that it deserves the low opinion which he thinks the people have of it. I understand that he was reporting what he has heard and observed as he has gone around the country. I, too, hope that he was wrong in his report. I think he was wrong in his report, but I want to make it clear, by appealing to the records, that if anyone entertains that opinion, it is an opinion which is not justified by the facts. Congress has done everything it has been called upon to do to win the war. It has taken the initiative in many matters to improve our war effort. Indeed, Congress has been ahead of the Executive in its endeavor to solve many of the problems which are presented by the war. I am of the opinion, as the Senator might have expressed it with respect to the Government as a whole, rather than as to Congress only, that the people of the country are 6 months ahead of Washington. But the charge of failure to accomplish the result which the people of America want cannot be laid at the door of either House of Congress, and certainly not at the door of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Unhappily, Mr. President, I do not have any knowledge that we have taken the profits out of war, and that we have removed limitations on the hours of labor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me, I will show to him what I mean. The Senator has very properly and wisely said that the people of the United States would like to see the profits taken out of war. I stood on this floor more than a year ago declaring that the people of this country did not want any profits made out of the war. I was not alone. We wrote amendments into priority laws as long ago as 1940 to strengthen the war power of the Government. It was clear to many then, as it is clear to many now, that anyone who dreams there is any profit to be found in this war is just unaware of the nature of this conflict

When the price-control bill was before this body last January there were Senators who, like myself, called attention to the fact that the measure was not an all-out effort to prevent inflation. I well remember pointing out that the bill which was sent to this body with the blessing of the administration did not undertake to control wages, did not undertake to control profits, did not undertake to control fees or rents, except rents in defense areas. In other words, that price-control bill which was sent to the Senate and to the House was only a partial bill. I remember very well saying on this floor, during that debate:

> Is it not time we all realized that we should be through with half measures, that we should go to the very heart of this problem?

But every effort that was made to do more than go halfway was blocked. The policy of the Executive was to enact a selective rather than a complete price-control bill, and because we did not have a complete measure then, we have had continuous difficulty since over farm prices, wage rates, profits, fees, and charges of all kinds.

When the price control bill was under consideration in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, for example, in August last, and Mr. Leon Henderson, the Price Administrator, was testifying there with respect to the bill, he was asked over and over again by Members of the House whether the bill should not contain authority to control wages and profit, and his answer was invariably "No." Why blame the Congress. I remember reading the testimony. I could recite the questions which were asked by Members of the House, like Representative PATMAN. He addressed the inquiry to Mr. Henderson, "Is it not necessary, if we are to prevent inflation, to control wages as well as prices?" And the answer was a blunt "No."

Members of Congress, because they realized that we are in a great crisis, were unwilling to delay the enactment of the partial bill by making a fight for a more complete one for fear that inflation would get too great a start. We must recognize, if we recognize anything, that a war cannot be fought by a legislative body. A legislative body can only provide the sinews of war. The executive authority must take charge of warfare, and if Congress were to attempt to intrude itself into the strategy of war, the result would only be the creation of impediments to the successful operation of the war, rather than aiding in its assistance. The point is that there was a substantial body of opinion here months ago for taking all the profit out of war. Leadership decided that the time for that action had not arrived. Leadership may have been right. But Congress should not be required to carry the blame.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE

Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Florida has raised this question here today. It affords an opportunity to point to some things Congress has done. It is true, as we can point out, that it was the Congress of the United States, by, I think, a unanimous vote, which created the joint committee, executive and legislative, for the purpose of making a report as to the nondefense expenditures which should be eliminated.

It was the Senate that set up the Truman committee and instructed it to make investigations to make sure that there were as few errors as possible committed in the administration of the war.

It was the House of Representatives which has set up committees, like those presided over by Representatives TOLAN and FADDIS the purpose of which is to aid in the prosecution of the war.

It was the Congress which has made repeated efforts to find a place in the war effort for little business.

These committees have revealed many of the facts which, curiously enough, form the basis of the criticism of Congress in some instances.

With respect to the labor question, it must be remembered that the House of Representatives months ago passed a bill intended to solve that problem and secure full production. The bill may have been defective. It may have been unwise, but it was passed by the House and came over here to the Senate, and went to the Committee on Education and Labor, where it has since been.

On December first last the Judiciary Committee of the Senate passed the so-called Connally bill, intended to give the President the power to take over strike-affected factories, and to freeze labor conditions, so that production would not be impeded by any questions of closed shop, or open shop, or overtime pay, or any of the other issues that affect the labor question, but that bill is still upon the calendar of the Senate because leadership has believed it was premature. The point is that there has been action in Congress, not inaction as the public has been led to think. There was no agreement; but that is the democratic method. We must await agreement with the Executive.

Under the able chairmanship of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], an appropriation subcommittee last week called before it the heads of some of the departments to testify on this question. Miss Perkins, the head of the Department of Labor, filed a letter with the committee explaining why, in her opinion, that bill should not have been passed.

Mr. President, my point is not so much that either of these bills should have been passed. Perhaps they should not have

been passed. My point is that Congress cannot be condemned for failing to act upon this or other matters. Congress is ready to act. Congress cannot take the leadership. It has not failed to authorize any war program that has been laid before it.

Members of Congress feel—and I think very rightly—that the great danger that confronts this country is the same danger of internal disunity that overwhelmed so many of the countries of Europe. We must not waste our substance and our emotions in fighting among ourselves instead of joining to fight the enemy. It would be a tragic error for the people of the United States and the Congress now to tear themselves to pieces in a battle over the closed shop, or the open shop, or extra pay, or no pay. Questions of that kind can be settled satisfactorily only when it is generally comprehended that the proposed solution is not offered for the benefit of a particular group. The opportunity for bringing about such comprehension is here. All that is necessary to carry our people into the most enthusiastic, unified action to defend this country and to win the victory in this war is for the President of the United States to take the leadership. He was elected to be the leader. The Congress and the people will follow him in an all-out national policy of mutual trust.

The Senator from Florida indicated his belief—I took down a note of what he said—that Congress must take the leadership. Congress cannot take the leadership. That is the task of the Executive. The Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, new dealers and anti-new dealers, are ready to stand shoulder to shoulder to win the war. All that is necessary is that it shall be made eternally clear to the people of the United States that no attempt is to be made by any faction, by any group, by any party, to abandon the fundamental principles of democracy.

THE TASK IS NOT EASY

Mr. President, the task is not an easy one. It is difficult because in the very nature of the things that have transpired in the last 25 years there has been growing up a constant centralization of power—economic power in the first place and then political. The Senator from Florida has read here this afternoon some of the statements made by Mr. Arnold with respect to the agreements of great American corporations with great German corporations. That has all been in the record. Two or three years ago the story of the cartel system was told—told in the hearings of the Temporary National Economic Committee. It was a manifestation of centralism which has been the mark of our time. If we want to understand the steady expansion of the Government of Washington, we shall find it in the fact that these great business agencies have grown so great that they dominate the economic life of the whole country, and the people had nowhere to turn except to Washington for the protection of their interests. It is a manifestation of the same economic affliction that has produced the war. Class conflict is the principal enemy of democracy. The greatest unifying force imaginable among our people would be a rededication to the principles of free government without class distinctions.

We know that the people of the country are ready to make any sacrifices to win this war. I think no greater proof of the patriotism of any people was ever afforded at any time in history than that given by the people of this country in their response to the many demands for sacrifice in winning this war. The Senator from Florida refers to the automobile dealers. The automobile dealers in every State in the country, in every county, and in every village of the United States have seen their business taken away from them. They were ready to make that sacrifice. They made no complaint. They want to know only that the sacrifice is for the preservation of this country and not for any other purpose.

Mr. President, I know that at this hour Members of the Senate are not desirous of having this debate prolonged; but, having listened to what I regard as a much-needed speech by the Senator from Florida, and one which deals with fundamentals, I could not refrain from pointing out that the record demonstrates that the Congress of the United States has not failed. It has appropriated more money than any person could ever imagine, to enable the Army, the Navy, and the executive arm of the Government to function. We have provided the Army and the Navy with everything they could possibly need. We have asked only that they go out and do the job. There has been no hanging back here.

For example, with respect to the production of materials, month after month Members of this body have been begging the O. P. M. and the War Production Board to undertake an immediate campaign for the utilization of materials in the United States. The failure is not the failure of Congress. It is the failure of those to whom the authority has been given. When I say that, Mr. President, like the Senator from Florida, I do not say it in any critical sense, because I realize that the task with which they are confronted is a task of the utmost magnitude. It is a task which is almost beyond the imagination. The time has come when we must put aside and behind us, at least for the duration of this war, any thought of group advantage or group benefit. We cannot permit this to become a conflict of labor versus capital, capital versus labor, capital versus the farmer, or the farmer versus capital. All groups of the country must be brought together in one universal comprehension that unless the United States is speedily victorious the very foundations of democracy will be endangered.

While we are talking about this matter let us not forget that it is physically impossible for some of the gentlemen who, upon the radio and in the newspapers, undertake to pass judgment upon what is happening in Washington and in all the capitals of the world to keep themselves fully advised day after day. When I listen on the radio to some of the high-pitched and hectic declarations which are made by commentators upon what is transpiring here I cannot fail to remember that there is a Senate; there is a House; there are two-score standing committees, all working at the same time. It is physically impossible for any reporter daily to keep in constant contact with what transpires upon the floor of both Houses and in the various committees and also know all the secret plans of the warring nations.

Judgments and opinions so disseminated have none of the characteristics of infallibility. The task which confronts us is difficult enough at best; but no person in Washington, whether he be a member of the Government or not, can fail to know that most Members of Congress and of the Government are diligent in their tasks; that most Members of Congress are patriotic and are endeavoring to do what they can best do to preserve this country and to provide the sinews with which the President and the executive arm of the Government may carry on the war.

Our duty now is not to seek only for opportunities to criticize, but to think of constructive action. No bill ever came upon this floor, and no suggestion ever came from any person's mind with respect to any activity with respect to which it would not have been possible to say, "That is wrong; look at the mistake here, and look at the mistake there." The ether has been filled with criticism. It has been filled with the voices of those who are picking out the specks upon a really great achievement.

WE MUST SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

Let us not forget that it was on December 7 that the war came to us, and that now, a little more than 4 months afterward, we are already hearing about the activity of our men and our machines in distant lands. Let us not forget that American airplanes, made by American capital and labor, are now flying upon the Russian front. Let us not forget that while all this criticism was pouring our from Washington, undermining the confidence of the people in the Congress and the Government, MacArthur was escaping from the Philippine Islands and reaching Australia. I said "escaping." That is not the word.

He went there by the order of the Commander in Chief, to become the leader in Australia of the effort of the United Nations to defend the common cause.

Let it not be forgotten that when MacArthur reached Australia he was greeted there by American soldiers and sailors who had been transported across the Pacific Ocean without the loss of a single life. That was an achievement. It was an achievement for the Executive. It was an achievement for the Congress. It was an achievement which was ordered weeks before it was accomplished. During all the weeks while it was in process of accomplishment criticisms were being poured out, and the armchair strategists sitting by the radio were sending out their judgment about what should be done or what should not be done, all of it undermining confidence.

Mr. President, if this war is to be won speedily and efficiently, we must make up our minds to the fact that we have a leader who was chosen by the people of

the United States. He is the democratic leader. Not all of the people voted for him. Some may not like all he is doing; but he is the Nation's leader, and our duty now is to support the hands of the leader. But it is also the duty of the leader to lay down a definite program which will make it clear to all the country that we are standing foursquare to maintain democracy and all it means in the United States and to defend it throughout the world in this war.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to commend the type of speech which the distinguished Senator is making. In my humble opinion it is long over-due in the Senate. Instead of striking at one another in this great Chamber and further disuniting the American people in the greatest emergency we have experienced since Revolutionary days, it is high time that we start swearing a little more at Hitler, his scavenger, Mussolini, and the treacherous Japanese. If we do a little more of that, in my humble opinion, we can come nearer to uniting the American people than we can by criticizing one another here.

I wish to add this to what the Senator has said: It was on February 22 that President Roosevelt gave the order for MacArthur to leave the Philippines; and it was some time before he was able to turn over the command to Wainwright and his men and make the necessary final arrangements to get to Australia. During that time the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy was criticized time and time again for not doing something about MacArthur in the Philippines. My mail demonstrates it beyond the shadow of a doubt. It was even implied here on the floor of the Senate that the President of the United States was using politics in attempting to win the war, instead of listening to the admirals and generals in connection with the great task which lies before him.

In my humble opinion, there is not a man in the United States who is more patriotic, earnest, or sincere in attempting to save democracy than is Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He will listen to counsel, and he does listen to advice from the officers of the Army and Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I will take time on the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before I yield to the majority leader, let me say that I am very glad the Senator from Illinois has interrupted my remarks in order to make the comment he has made. I believe that when history is written it will recount the great achievement of our President. Many Members of the Senate and of the House and many people of the country may not agree with his policies or with what he has done; but, fundamentally, last November the people of the country demonstrated the fact they were devoted to his foreign policy, and their conviction that he was right in endeavoring to preserve the united front of the United Nations against aggressors. When the final story is written I think it will be seen that he has accomplished the great objective which the public saw possible in him; but it can be accomplished only by united action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it should be stated that not a single major action involving a question of major policy or strategy has been taken by the President of the United States without consultation with military and naval advisers. No such step has been taken except by the unanimous agreement of his advisers in the Army and Navy. The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He cannot escape that responsibility even if he desires to do so. Being the Commander in Chief by the terms of the Constitution, the decisions, of course, fundamentally must be made by him. However, I think it should be known, especially in view of the fact that intimations have been made a time or two that the President takes his own advice and does not consult others, that there has not been a single major action taken or policy adopted by the Commander in Chief except with the unanimous agreement of those who advise him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, so far as foreign policies are concerned, we can look back today upon the record the President has made, and we know that years ago he foresaw what was coming; we must pay him that tribute. However, that is not the question which now confronts the country. Today the country is upon the very verge of being split asunder over controversies involving domestic policy; and it would be a great tragedy if that should occur. I desire to say that I have no doubt whatsoever that 99 percent of all the organized labor in this country is ready to devote its complete effort, without restriction or restraint, to the winning of the war. They know, as we know, that the war must be won upon the assembly line and in the factory, as well as upon the front. The soldiers in the trenches, the soldiers in the air, upon the battle front, cannot stay there if they are not supported by the workers in the factory. The workers recognize that fact. The farmers, too, are ready to cooperate in every possible way—and I know that—likewise, the leaders of industry are ready to do so.

The great number of business executives who have come to Washington and have loyally contributed their time and their brains to the winning of the war, which is essentially a war of business organization, have demonstrated their good will, their patriotic intention. Of course, there are some who have not been adverse to taking advantage of the situation; and Navy contracts and Army contracts have been let—sometimes thoughtlessly—in such a manner as to enable great profits to be reaped.

This body recently passed the second war powers bill, which is now on the desk of the President, awaiting his signature. The bill contains the specific authority to the Chairman of the War Production Board to investigate the books of every war contractor. Congress again, I say to the Senator from Florida, has taken a stand and has given the power to take the profits out of war.

However, our great need now is to fuse all these elements in such manner as to give assurance to all of them that there is no intention upon the part of any person in responsible position, at the head of labor, or at the head of industry, or at the head of Government, or any of its bureaus, to take advantage—specific advantage, personal advantage, or political advantage—of the crisis in which the country is involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for an observation?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in line with what the Senator said a moment ago in reference to the willingness of labor to make sacrifices and to forego advantages and opportunities to make profits, it is noteworthy that in the morning newspapers in Washington, and, I presume in the newspapers throughout the country, there appeared an advertisement by the United Electrical Workers of the country, comprising about 400,000 men, offering to forego not only double time but time and a half on all work they do during the war period, provided that all the money they lose by so doing shall go into the Treasury of the United States instead of into the treasuries of the corporations for which they work, based upon the fact, as they stated, that contracts have already been entered into between their employers and the Government at prices which contemplate the payment of time and a half and double time under the 40-hour law. They are willing to forego the time and a half and double time provided that the Government of the United States which, in these contracts, must pay for it, gets the advantage of it, instead of their employers getting the advantage.

I thought that was a fine example of the willingness of labor to make sacrifices during these critical times.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I must say to the Senator that an offer of that kind is only a piece-meal offer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I realize that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It deals only with a segment of the case. What we need now is that which we discussed upon this floor last January when the price-control bill was under consideration. We need an executive, an administration program, if you please, laid down here, which will take all the profit out of war and afford opportunity to all classes to contribute to the war effort.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was merely seeking to confirm what the Senator had stated by pointing to this one instance, in which the laborers are willing to deny themselves the advantage of extra pay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand, and appreciate the Senator's contribution very much.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to call up a matter not related to that now being discussed, because I am forced to leave. It will take but a moment, I believe, if the Senator has not concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to add another word. The Senator from Washington asked me to yield to him, and if the Senator from Oregon will bear with me, I will answer the Senator from Washington, and will then conclude.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I merely wanted to make the observation that there is a strange historical parallel between what we are witnessing now and what this country has witnessed during other wars. If there be any critical students of the Civil War in this body they will recall that Lincoln was bedeviled and bewildered and bemused by fights which went on in Congress, and by bitter and unending complaints throughout the country about his conduct of the war. Congress ran like an engine without a governor, and the bitterness which existed between the Executive and Congress at times was a rather terrifying spectacle to the country. Yet the country was torn by a great war which threatened to dismember it.

We just have to be philosophical and realize that such things occur as those which have been mentioned. I know from many of the letters we receive that no two people seem to agree on anything. There is a hopeless confusion as to what should be done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator made the allusion to Lincoln. It brings to mind the fact that one of the bitter controversies of that time was the controversy over slavery, as, of course, all will remember, and many of the leaders of the Republican Party, which had elected Lincoln to the Presidency, were demanding immediate abolition before the President was ready to act. The Senator will recall that Horace Greeley, then editor of the New York Tribune, in issue after issue of his paper, denounced the President for his failure to act upon abolition, and one of the most eloquent writings to the credit of President Lincoln was his famous open letter to Horace Greeley. It is of importance now because, as the Senator will recall, President Lincoln said:

> What I do about slavery and the colored race I do because of its effect upon the Union. I must first save the Union.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that is the pattern for the answer which may be given now to every one of those demanding why Congress does not do this or that or the other thing; why we do not defend labor or punish labor; why we do not punish the farmer, or this or that. Our first duty is to win the war. For my own part, whatever I do by my vote about labor or any of the so-called social gains, I shall do because of my judgment as to the effect it will have upon the primary purpose of winning the war. What I do by my vote in respect to profits will be done with that in mind. So with every other problem which arises now in the legislative halls—the first, main, and principal objective is to win the war.

A few days ago I received a letter from a lady living in the northern part of my State, written in pen and ink upon two brief pages. In the letter she said, "The country now wants leadership, and it hopes that the President will get tough in that leadership."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. As an example of the intense bitterness which characterized the conduct of the Civil War by Abraham Lincoln, I recall one cartoon appearing in the New York Tribune after the terrible battle of Fredericksburg. On the front page of that paper was a cartoon, depicting Columbia with a flaming sword in her hand demanding that Lincoln avenge her 15,000 sons murdered at Fredericksburg.

That sort of bitterness has not yet crept into the present picture and been spread all over the country. We are developing enough of it as it is, and much of it is bitterness not founded on facts, but rather upon a series of assumptions of facts many of which have no existence.

I have seen charges of a strike in a certain industry slowing up the war effort. In that instance I know the strike was in the women's clothing industry, having no relation whatever to making bombers or guns or tanks. But the story goes out merely that so many man-hours are lost. A lawyer who tries to analyze evidence knows there is no relationship there that justifies bitterness. Perhaps the strike should never have been called, but to say that the Government lost a vessel or a bomber or a tank in a strike involving women's undergarments is stretching matters a little too much.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, doubt has been expressed that the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday reflected the intention of the sponsor or those who were present at the time. I entertain that doubt, as I indicated a few moments ago, and in order to clarify the unanimous-consent agreement, and to make certain that the length of time each Senator might take, as I tried to make clear, was to be 30 minutes on all amendments or any motion, and on the resolution proper, I submit a corrected copy and ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Ordered, by unanimous consent, that during the further consideration of the pending resolution (S. Res. 220) no Senator shall speak in the aggregate more than 30 minutes on the resolution and all amendments or motions relating thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Guy W. Ray, of Alabama, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, also to be a consul.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Monroe Kelly to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of November 1941;

Brig. Gen. John Marston to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 20th day of March 1942; and

Brig. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 20th day of March 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all nominations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY (as in legislative session). I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 27, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Floy A. Hill, Mountain Pine.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph W. Gorman, Upton.

OHIO

Bernice E. Hannahs, Alexandria.
Robert J. Goggin, Ashtabula.
Walter E. Waller, Cumberland.
Eldon R. Martin, Cygnet.

Howard C. Huhn, Hamden.
Kathryn M. Diederich, North Ridgeville.
Grace L. Skidmore, West Mansfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

Chauncey D. Everard, Wapwallopen.

TENNESSEE

Hollis M. Caldwell, Lookout Mountain.
Roy B. King, Madison College.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be a captain

Graham H. Benson

To be second lieutenants

Lowell S. Reeve	Cleland E. Early
Allen H. Anderson	James M. Robinson
Elkin S. Dew	William R. Burgoyne, Jr.
Roscoe M. Nelson	Louis H. Wilson, Jr.
Walter J. Meyer	Maurice J. Kelly
Frank E. Hollar	William L. Flake
Thomas J. Myers, Jr.	Thomas F. Cave, Jr.
Owen P. Lillie	Vincent J. Gottschalk
Evan E. Lips	George A. Gililland
James W. Love	Cliff A. Jones, Jr.
George F. McInturff III	William R. Adams
Guy W. Comer, Jr.	Bryan B. Mitchell
John R. Kerman	John P. Storm
Francis L. Fagan	Rodney V. Reighard
Lincoln N. Holdzkom	John B. Erickson
Charles R. Durfee	John N. McLaughlin
Thomas F. Mullahey, Jr.	Robert Mentzinger
William L. Culp	Charles E. Hinsdale
Charles F. Widdecke	Ralph Hornblower, Jr.
Valentine E. Diehl	William H. Enfield
John R. Lesick	James L. Denig
Richard Phillippi	John W. Bustard
Bruno J. Andruska	Maurice J. Coffey, Jr.
John G. Dibble	Joseph R. Clerou
William K. Crawford	Paul H. Groth

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord of lords and King of kings, we thank Thee that Thou dost come to us each day with light and life. Thy love is infinitely more than we can return and Thy revelation more than we can translate. Thou who looked with compassion upon a doomed city gray with the dust of silent centuries, show us the vision of Thy consecration and heroic purpose. Surrendering ourselves to Thy task may we with passionate ardor bow with penitent reverence before Thee, charting the journey of our souls from the cities of earth to the city of God. Bound and pressed by the tread of the thoughtless crowd, Oh bring us a message calling to higher states of power and blessing.

Thou, who didst come out of history's dawn, have mercy upon the multitude with its great heart, but with its greater ache. Let Thy holy word become flesh, O God, and dwell among us, living and working in deeds of Christian brotherhood. Like the fragrant springtime after a sore winter, heaven's light sheds calmness through starless skies. O Prince of Peace, come to the fallen ruins of our tragic world, transmuting them into forms of spiritual and intellectual might, beholding Thy glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. In the spirit of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2339. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the Allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5802. An act to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions; and

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the Committee on Appropriations

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a press release from the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on this afternoon at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HIGH DEFENSE PROFITS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just noticed in the morning paper that Gen. Robert C. Richardson says that "boys in the Army were 'burned up' by reports that stenographers had been paid $30,000 bonuses on defense jobs."

I think that the people of this country, especially the taxpayers who are going to have to pay the bill, as well as the fathers and mothers of the boys who are in the service, are pretty much disgusted to hear about the exorbitant profits that are being extorted by certain big defense contractors.

The company above mentioned, Jack & Heintz, Inc., who make airplane starters, and which company was also broke a year ago, paid its president $145,000 salary and bonus and paid his private secretary $39,300, and then distributed more than $900,000 among 1,300 other officers and employees. Last month Mr. Jack admitted that he received a $25,000 bonus. A dozen other big contractors, it has been discovered, received direct profits all the way from 40 to 75 percent on war contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not see how those in authority and who are charged with making such contracts would permit a thing like that to get by. No wonder those soldiers are "burned up." The people of this country who have to pay the bill are disgusted and discouraged. This sort of thing must be stopped, and it must be done right now. Every one of these outfits who have taken the money ought to be made to return every dollar of it, and they should be penalized accordingly. Such individuals ought to have their contracts taken away from them. The Government should remove them and operate their plants.

Mr. Speaker, such a thing is shameful and disgraceful. It should not be tolerated. People who will do that sort of thing in a time when our Nation is in the most serious crisis it has ever known are not worthy to be regarded as citizens.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article from the Washington Post of March 25.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AWARD OF THE CAMP GRUBER POWER CONTRACT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, referring to a statement made on the floor yesterday by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] in regard to the award of a contract for the transmission and sale of power to Camp Gruber, in Oklahoma, for the RECORD I merely want to state, on the authority of General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers, the bid of the Grand River Dam Authority was not 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, but 7.5; and General Reybold has informed me that the contract was awarded by the War Production Board to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. for the very good reason of a severe shortage of copper, and by the award to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric copper was conserved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6736, an act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman have in mind? Will the gentleman agree, if there is no objection, to bring back any item for a separate vote in the House which I may request a separate vote on?

Mr. SNYDER. I would prefer that the gentleman state what those items might be.

Mr. POWERS. I have not looked over all of the Senate amendments, but there are two items that the House definitely voted down: One was Bull Shoals and the other was Table Rock. I certainly want to get an agreement from the gentleman to get a separate vote on these two items.

Mr. SNYDER. I will agree with the gentleman to bring those two back for a separate vote.

Mr. POWERS. If there is any other item that I have not seen as yet that I think requires a separate vote, will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. SNYDER. There are only five amendments and they are all rather minor.

Mr. POWERS. Apparently the gentleman wants me to object; therefore, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include extracts from an article in the Saturday Evening Post; also from a bill, H. R. 6847.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASING DEBT LIMIT OF UNITED STATES AND FURTHER AMENDING THE SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JERE COOPER,
FRANK CROWTHER,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 2 of the House bill amended section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act by increasing the face amount of obligations issued under such act from $65,000,000,000 to $125,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The Senate amendment increased such amount to $130,000,000,000 and included in the aggregate of obligations outstanding at any one time the face amount of all obligations issued by any agency or instrumentality of the United States which are unconditionally guaranteed as to the principal and interest by the United States, except such guaranteed obligations which are owned by the Treasury Department. The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JERE COOPER,
FRANK CROWTHER,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, the Senate put in an amendment increasing the amount that we would be permitted to raise the national debt from $125,000,000,000 to $130,000,000,000, with the understanding that they would add all the obligations of our country to be included in those debts which we were supposed to pay. Now, if we cut this down to $125,000,000,000, will all the obligations of the United States, direct and indirect, be included in our national debt?

Mr. COOPER. There is a provision in the bill as it passed the House which the Committee on Ways and Means and the Treasury Department feel amply takes care of that situation. The bill passed the House authorizing a debt limit of $125,000,000,000. The Senate increased that to $130,000,000,000. In conference the Senate receded on the Senate amendment, so that the bill now comes back under the conference report just as it passed the House.

Mr. RICH. I would like to have this information, if I may. Will the indirect obligations of our Government, which I understood it was the intent and purpose of the increase of $5,000,000,000, be included in the Treasury statement when we reach our debt limit of $125,000,000,000?

Mr. COOPER. It is my understanding that it is the intention that the obligations as to which the interest and principal is guaranteed by the Government will be shown on the Treasury statement.

Mr. RICH. I think that was a wise provision that the Senate put in there, requiring that to be done.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request with reference to H. R. 6736, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill. I have had a conversation with the gentleman from New Jersey, and it may be that he will withdraw his objection on the basis of our conversation.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. So that we will have an absolute agreement, I understand the Bull Shoals and Table Rock and a $3,700,000 item are included in Senate amendment No. 2?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. May I ask the gentleman whether he will bring Senate amendment No. 2 back to the House for a separate vote?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That is agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I am not going to object as long as the gentleman agrees to bring those two items, Table Rock and Bull Shoals, for a separate vote.

Let it be known that the Senate report does not show the justification for reinstating the objectionable items committing the Government to a $87,500,000 project, nor does the debate in the Senate show it. The bill passed the Senate yesterday just as fast as the clerk could read the amendments. It did not take more than a column in the RECORD. There was no debate in the Senate, not a paragraph. Those who preach economy can save money by watching such proposals as these. We should have an opportunity to debate the question again and get a separate vote. As long as the gentleman says he will give us a separate vote, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I am going to insist on a roll call when the conference report comes back if it is necessary.

Mr. TERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, under this agreement there will be a separate vote on each of these two projects, Table Rock and Bull Shoals?

Mr. POWERS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand they are all in one amendment, Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, are we to understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we are going to have a vote on these two items at one time, or will we have a vote on them separately?

Mr. SNYDER. They will have to be brought back as one amendment.

Mr. RICH. Did the Senate consider the fact that these two projects have not been started and that additional funds must be found some place by the taxpayers of this country before they can be started?

Mr. TERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did not the Senate also find that the engineers had testified over there in the hearings that these projects are very essential for the production of electric power, which is needed in the war effort?

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Arkansas what year it was determined this power would be available?

Mr. TERRY. During the time the war will be going on, in all probability.

Mr. RICH. This war or the next war?

Mr. TERRY. The war in which we are now engaged, and which the gentleman evidently does not know about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SNYDER, TERRY, STARNES of Alabama, COLLINS, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE of South Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of entering a protest against the possibility of taking a recess or vacation at this time. I understand plans are under way for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I have made an investigation of some of the bills pending and I think we have a great many bills which deserve the immediate attention of the committees of the House and of the House itself. We on the Committee on Military Affairs have before us an investigation of the progress of the national defense program. The three subcommittees are working upon this investigation every day. The investigation is very important to the country at this time, and I think it should continue regardless. I hope the House of Representatives will not recess or take a holiday at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Senate proposes to investigate the causes of the tremendous upsurge of public sentiment against the continuation of union-labor abuses.

It seems passing strange that John Q. Public should be investigated because he writes to his Congressman.

John Q. Public thinks it would be more appropriate if the Senate would investigate why the antistrike bill that the House passed by a vote of 2 to 1 on December 3 has not been acted upon by the Senate.

But in order to help in the investigation of John Q. Public and to determine what makes him tick, I will be glad to submit to the committee the many thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received, and have personally read, protesting against present labor-union domination of our production efforts.

These letters come from mothers concerned for the safety of their boys in the fox holes of Bataan; they come from union members outraged at slow-down practices that retard our production; they come from free American workmen who are being charged today outrageous graft for the privilege of working on a defense job.

They come written on embossed stationery; they come written on postal cards; they come written in lead pencil on common paper.

They come from citizens in every walk of life who are firmly determined that our defense effort shall no longer be delayed and jeopardized to serve the interests of any special group.

If it is an offense for American citizens to write to their Congressmen and voice their complaints and dissatisfaction, I am glad to supply reams of evidence as to why they do so.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this suggestion that people who are insisting that Congress enact legislation removing certain burdens from the war effort be investigated, and to which the gentleman from Virginia has just made reference, is, to my mind, an insult to those who are feeding their offspring, flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone, into the greedy maw of war. It is talk which, if not stopped, will, in my judgment, result in the political hides of a lot of people being nailed to barnyard doors all over this country in the coming election this fall.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like the attention for a moment, if I may, of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who had something to say yesterday about the vicious influences behind these letters that are coming to Congressmen demanding a sound national labor policy. He noticed, undoubtedly, as I did, that a Member of the other body asserts that the Chamber of Commerce of America has been sending out some letters requesting that the people express their views to their Congressmen. In view of what was said yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] it seems that that should be investigated, too. I notice he is nodding his head in the affirmative, agreeing that the source behind those letters should be ascertained. Then I presume that as the chairman of the Committee on Rules he will support the resolution I have introduced for the appointment of a committee to do that very thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, delivered in New York on March 6, and an editorial of the Dallas Times-Herald commending that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall withhold that until the Chair gets ready to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a country banker in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HARMONY IN OUR WAR EFFORT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], in our effort to win the war, how we can have harmony in this country and furnish the necessary ammunition, guns, and ships to the armed forces if we do not all work to that end? If we permit radical labor leaders to call strikes, how can you make guns, ships, and airplanes for our armed forces in Hawaii, the Philippines, Australia, Africa, Iceland, and Ireland? We will not have harmony till the President and the Congress use our good offices to that end. That is our duty; that is our business; and we will not let up until we get such harmony. I want the harmony that will win the war. That is the harmony we need. That is the only harmony that will win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6845, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the Committee rose on yesterday, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] was pending. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 18, line 6, after the comma, strike out "$604,280" and insert "$595,384."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for a saving of less than $10,000, but it calls for a saving in a department of government where savings are highly desirable.

All of us this morning, I am sure, if we live in that direction, saw the new $600,000 building going up in the heart of Washington, providing for a central Department of Information. It seems to me that an expenditure of $600,000 for a temporary building and the appropriation for the Bureau of Information under Lowell Mellett, should be sufficient to supply all the information that every citizen of this country would require in the event he should visit the Nation's Capital.

Our country is calling on us to save on these nondefense appropriations. Here is a saving that is highly essential, and it is in line with hundreds of others relating to information agents in every department. I understood, when this Department under Lowell Mellett was established, that it was created to coordinate all of these agencies and to eliminate confusion here. Instead of fighting the enemy, so many of these fellows are fighting among themselves. I wonder if you observed, as I did, in a recent issue of a Washington paper, this item about a prominent citizen who came to Washington. Here it is:

It has taken me 6 weeks in this town to learn that when these people in Washington say the enemy, they do not mean the Axis; they mean the fellow in the office across the hall.

Let us take these people who are getting in each other's hair off the pay roll and put them to work really doing something worth while to help win the war. An expenditure like this is wholly unnecessary. Later today I will read some letters which have come to me, not from the United States Chamber of Commerce, but from Kiwanis Clubs, Rotary Clubs, farmers, and from people of all over Ohio, asking that we do something to stop these nondefense expenditures. Are you doing your best when you permit an appropriation like this to pass without a word of protest? I commend my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for his fine work of yesterday and today in offering these amendments. I wish the gentleman from Missouri, JACK COCHRAN, were hear, so that I could ask him how many Indians come to Washington in a year's time to ask questions of this information agency. It seems to me that Mr. Mellett has sufficient office and sufficient personnel to answer these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have not a great deal of confidence in political platforms. The last time the Republicans met, I caused to be presented to that organization a platform in regard to handling Indian claims, and I caused to be presented to the Democratic platform the same document. Both major parties of this country at the last election adopted a program in which both parties promised that they would settle these Indian claims, but so far in this Congress nothing has been done, and as long as you do not settle these Indian claims you will be called upon to feed the Indians; you will be called upon to take care of the Indians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Following what the gentleman has said, I appeared before the resolutions committee at the Democratic Convention in Chicago, where the platform was promulgated on which the Democrats would go before the country for the votes of the people, among them the Indians, and in that platform the Democratic Party pledged itself to determine as quickly as possible on the merits of the Indian claims before the Court of Claims, but up to date we have been unable to get a single bill passed by this House giving permission to the Court of Claims to determine a single claim of the Indians.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, the Republicans did the same thing, although I do not believe the Republicans meant what they said when they said it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Neither one of them meant what they said.

Mr. BURDICK. Just as long as that situation continues, we will have an Indian bill. My hope has always been that we could settle all these claims and get rid of the Indian Bureau itself, but as long as you are going to operate inch by inch, nothing can be accomplished. This committee has kept down the expenses of this bill just about as close as possible, to permit those Indians merely to live. Here is the place where you can save a lot of money, and the chance is good, because you can jump on a defenseless people and take $10,000 away from them, but the $3,000 or the $5,000 or whatever you take, will be taken away from the lives of these Indians. I know of thousands of them that do not have enough to eat. I know that in my reservation alone, where the death rate is very high, it is due to malnutrition. They do not get enough to eat, and all this committee has done is to try to arrange the matter to carry it along. If you want to eliminate expenses, you can do it by first settling and adjusting the claims of the Indians of the United States against the Government. We can then gradually turn the Indians' own business over to the Indians themselves and finally the Indian Bureau can be abolished.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I assume there has been a great deal of guesswork on this whole business of Indians. Frankly, I do not

pretend to be an expert, but I let the record speak for itself. There can be no particular quarrel with the record.

In 1930 we had, according to the census, 332,000 Indians in the country. Of that number approximately 105,000 were under 14 years of age, so that the number of adult Indians was somewhere around 225,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is there anything in the law that prohibits them from going to work and earning their living just like any other citizen?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not a thing that I know of. Now, just bear that figure in mind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not yet.

In that year we spent $17,000,000 on Indians. You can examine the appropriations. They are available to any Member of the House. Now, I find there are 394,000 Indians in 1942. That includes about 30,000 in Alaska, so that we have 364,000 in the United States. But while there has been about a 15-percent increase in the number of Indians and a larger increase in children than in adult Indians, yet the appropriation has gone up 100 percent, because last year it was around $35,000,000. Now it is $29,559,000. That does not make sense. Either we have been on bad ground before in our Indian policy or we are on bad ground now. I do not know what it is, but it seems to me there ought to be some realistic thinking on the subject.

Another thing, we have about 12,150 people looking after the Indians. Think of it. That is one person on the pay roll for every 31 Indians. That does not make sense. That excludes 626 who are in the Civilian Conservation Corps and 5 who are doing emergency relief work. You do not have to take my word for it. Look at the personnel table that Secretary Ickes inserted in the forepart of volume I of these hearings. There it is—12,150. So that you have one shepherd for every 31 Indians in the country. It seems to me there ought to be a complete reappraisal of policy.

I found the following statement on page 408 of Secretary Ickes' annual report for 1941. Listen to this language about the duty toward the Indians. It is a very engaging statement.

> The Indian problem grows out of the necessity for the Indians continuously to adjust their culture and ancient social forms to modern technology and to modern scientific programs of conservation, health, and education. It stems from the clash of primitive economies with the high-organization processes of production and distribution of their present-day society. It is irritated by the ever-impinging white culture threatening to uproot and cast out the concepts in centuries of habits, experience, and traditions.

What does it mean? I do not know whether they are trying to let the Indian follow out that basic, primitive nature of his or whether they are trying to make white men out of the Indians. If it is the latter, it is a mistaken premise, in my judgment. So I believe that sooner or later there must be a reappraisal of our Indian policy.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota, who is probably better informed on Indians than any Member of the House.

Mr. BURDICK. Are you in favor of keeping up this Bureau if you can get rid of the entire system?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I sort of like the premise that my good friend from North Dakota advanced yesterday when we were discussing this matter. I will not discuss here the things we were discussing privately, but it was genuinely persuasive.

Mr. BURDICK. You have my permission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I do like that approach. If we did that, it would be infinitely cheaper for the Government of the United States and far more satisfactory to the Indians.

Mr. BURDICK. May I have the support of the gentleman on the Court of Claims bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It depends on what is in the bill. If you are going to give away the United States and hand it back to the Indians, the answer is "No."

Mr. BURDICK. The Republicans may have promised that but they did not mean it. My question is, Will you go along with us on a bill providing for a claims commission to settle this whole affair and get rid of this Bureau?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say that I think that it is infinitely better than the constant controversy we have had on this floor concerning all these claims that have arisen over a period of years. Certainly if it is an equitable set-up, I think there is some virtue in it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. For the last 7 or 8 years we have claimed that we were trying to make the Indian self-sustaining, but each and every year our Indian population increases and our expense increases, and instead of them being self-sustaining we are only putting more Government employees in the Indian Service, and it is becoming more complicated and more top-heavy as each year progresses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the gentleman, in the language of the report, that is only the impinging of white culture on this problem, as the annual report of the Department would say.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any reduction of the amount mentioned in this bill for the relief or support of the Indians. If there is any one class of people in this country that has been robbed by the white man and by this Government, it is the Indians. I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first term I was in Congress, copy of a deed conveying the entire State of Pennsylvania to the Province of Pennsylvania from the Indians, for which the Indians received some articles of personal property, and part of the consideration was beer. That is what they got for that territory. Later on the Indian was gradually driven west, and as minerals and other valuable resources were discovered in those lands, the Government found a way of taking the land away from the Indians and giving it to railroad companies or somebody else. The Indian has been doomed, he has been robbed from the beginning of the Government down to the present time, and this Congress has never come to his full relief notwithstanding the fact that we who know the Indian problems have fought his battle from the time we entered Congress until the present day.

I call your attention to an article I put in the RECORD the other day regarding an Indian soldier. He was an Assiniboine Indian who had enlisted. His father was an Assiniboine and his mother was Cree. This soldier was decorated for daring in the Philippine Islands, for being one of the bravest soldiers MacArthur had. In the entombment of the Unknown Soldier great credit was given the Indians in the first World War.

Patriotism! When it comes to comparison to an Indian, Mr. Chairman, the white man does not look so good. There are more enlistees coming from the Indians, relatively speaking, than from any other class of the people in the United States today. They are the original Americans, and yet we find ourselves neglecting them. I want to give credit, however, to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I know that if he knew the Indian problem as we know it, if he would ever take time to come out to our State of Montana, and the other States where these Indians live, he would be just as great an advocate of the Indians' rights as any man in this House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I want to take care of all the people of this country. We are spending a tremendous amount of money for the Indians, and we know the Department is doing a great deal of work, but I have not yet been able to find out when we are going to get the Indians to be self-sustaining. The people handling their affairs do not want them to become self-sustaining; they want to have the Indians under subjection so we can keep this great organization that has been built up. I feel just as the gentleman from Montana does, but I think the people who live in the States where these Indians are ought to compel the Bureau of Indian Affairs to try to make these

Indians self-supporting by giving them aid and assistance.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are trying.

Mr. RICH. They should be made good, self-sustaining American citizens.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very fine statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Montana. He has always shown a very deep interest in the welfare of the American Indian. None of us, of course, take seriously the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois that the Indian Service should be abolished, if that is what he really meant. That suggestion has been made in the past. At one time in the history of this House, following heated debate, this body actually voted to abolish the Indian Service, but the next day the same House turned around and almost unanimously reversed itself. Let us not again do something as foolish.

If the gentleman from Illinois had his way, then who would administer the 88 or 90 Indian hospitals in the country? Who would administer the 200 Indian schools? Who would administer the many intricate details on the many Indian reservations in America? Who or what agency would administer the various Indian reclamation projects in many of the Western States? It is absurd on the face of it.

Oh, the gentleman from Illinois in offering his amendment says it has to do with so-called propaganda. That, of course, is a high-sounding word. It is being used a lot lately to prejudice Members against certain worth-while activities. When arguments and sound reason fail we hear that bad word "propaganda." This, of course, is not propaganda. This committee has already cut a number of thousand dollars from this salary item. The implication has been made that this item is entirely for press releases. Surely the gentleman knows better than that. Dozens of people come to the Indian Office every day asking for legitimate information; and I say to you the public is entitled to such information.

It would be an absurdity on the face of it to eliminate this small amount for information service.

Let me remind these gentlemen who have been so unduly critical of the Indian Service that this Bureau has already been cut $718,000, possibly the most drastic cut that has ever been made in the history of that service. This bill, let me remind Members once again, was reduced by the committee nearly $18,000,000 below the Budget estimate after the Secretary of the Interior had voluntarily cut his Department $10,000,000 below the original Budget estimate. Again I remind you, it is the first time in the history of the Republic, so far as I am able to find, that any Government official has ever voluntarily reduced his Budget estimate $10,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintaining law and order on Indian reservations, including pay of judges of Indian courts, pay of Indian police, and pay of employees engaged in the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, marihuana, and deleterious drugs among Indians, and including traveling expenses, supplies, and equipment, $264,660.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to inquire again as to the amount involved in this appropriation for power. Can the chairman of the subcommittee give me more definite information than he has given heretofore? When I asked him this same question yesterday, or the day before, he replied that it would amount to something like $50,000,000. Can the gentleman give me more definite information on this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will ask the gentleman from Washington who handled the matter and who is an authority on the subject to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. LEAVY. It is difficult to state it in exact figures because the power features of many of the reclamation projects also involve the reclamation of land itself. The money for power for Bonneville that we passed yesterday also is involved here. I would say a conservative statement would be $70,000,000 involved for power in one way or the other in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Seventy million dollars?

Mr. LEAVY. I am just making an estimate. I am trying to make a conservative one. It is difficult to segregate the power features from certain other features, both in the Indian Service and in the Reclamation Service as well as in Bonneville.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I see nothing in the hearings that gives us any specific information as to the amount that is to be expended for power or defense.

I think this is important, I believe there should be a break-down of the figures so as to show definitely what portion is to be expended for defense and what part for nondefense.

I fear there is room here in the way the appropriations are set up to spend a lot of money, in the guise of defense, we might well dispense with for the present. I do not wish to infer that it is the intention of anyone to take undue advantage of this situation. Nor do I wish to be understood as opposing any appropriations for defense. I want all power developed that is necessary.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. May I ask the gentleman in all fairness how he can take the position that $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 or $100,000,000 in times like these is too much to spend for electrical energy, for the securing of electrical energy needed, in the light of the fact we are spending billions and billions of dollars in the war effort, the primary feature of which is sufficient electrical energy, whether it be steam or hydro? Would the gentleman say that these great projects like Boulder, Central Valley, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee should either be closed up or should be given over to some private agency to operate?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I state to the gentleman from Washington that the gentleman from Ohio has not in any manner even intimated that a dime should be taken from the appropriations for the development of power.

Mr. LEAVY. I understood the gentleman to say he thought there was too much spent for power. I may have misunderstood him.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman misunderstood me. Let us allow $70,000,000 for power development. That still leaves about $92,600,000 in the appropriation for nondefense expenditures.

In 1931 the total expenditure of the Interior Department was $66,186,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman realizes, I am sure, however, that many activities have been transferred to it since that time. The gentleman knows that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The principal item that was transferred from the Interior Department was the Veterans' Administration.

But, I repeat, assuming that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is correct in his statement that about $70,000,000 of this proposed appropriation would be allocated to power development there would still be left roundly $92,600,000 for nondefense purposes. This is about $26,400,000 more than was spent by the Interior Department in 1931.

I earnestly feel a heavy reduction should be made in the appropriation for nondefense expenditures. Certainly a large portion of the amount carried in the bill for nondefense purposes is needed much more for war production.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the conferring upon General MacArthur of the highest honor that our Government can confer upon anyone, the Congressional Medal of Honor, by President Roosevelt is an act which receives the wholehearted response of our people.

It also recalls to our mind that while some in this body and others throughout the country were demanding General MacArthur's transfer from the Philippines, President Roosevelt had ordered his transfer on February 22. While some, for their own publicity, and for political reasons, were hollering "Bring MacArthur home," President Roosevelt was doing his thinking and his duty as Commander in Chief.

He knew that secrecy was necessary. He knew that the clamor started by some

of his bitter opponents was harmful to our country and detrimental to General MacArthur. He knew that Nazi Germany and the war-maddened leaders of Japan were aware of the fact that in democracies when public opinion, even when wrong, becomes aroused there must be some kind of recognition given by those in control of the Government. They knew this and welcomed this agitation for two reasons: First, it created division here, with resultant lack of confidence in President Roosevelt; and second, they knew that something might happen and they were watching for General MacArthur to leave the Philippines. This increased the danger to this brave general.

We know now that all the time that this important question was being given consideration by President Roosevelt and others, President Roosevelt and our military and naval leaders were giving serious consideration to the problem. We now know that despite the hollerings of the false prophets and the political demagogues the order was given by President Roosevelt on February 22. It was naturally considered long before the actual order was given.

Anyone with common sense ought to know that President Roosevelt, General Marshall, and the General Staff were thinking of General MacArthur day and night. Everyone ought to know that now they are thinking of General Wainwright and his brave men.

The lesson for the American people to learn from this is to do their own thinking, to use their God-given common sense, and not believe everything that some blind-minded Member of Congress might say on or off the floor of the House. Every speech on this floor that brings division and disunity means more graves for the men of our Army and Navy. The clamor to bring MacArthur home was nothing but a political move designed to embarrass President Roosevelt. The worst thing that could have been done on a matter of that kind was to give it the publicity it received. I do not blame the press as they carry news, but I do blame the agitators of such a move. How embarrassed they ought to feel when they now know that all the time those in responsible positions were thinking, and that action was taken at the proper time.

Those same Americans will now change their tactics with another line of sniping. Good Americans, as most of them are, they hate so much, or their partisan feelings are so intense—and I refer only to a few Members—that their reactions to such feelings becloud their love of America. I hope their consciences as American citizens will cause them to "stop, look and listen," and to realize the harm they are doing. In any event, their demagogic utterances on bringing MacArthur home, the worst thing a Member of Congress could have publicly agitated, ought to put the people of the country on guard against such persons so that they pay no heed in the future to what they say.

It is interesting to note that these few Members are on the floor practically every day with 1-minute speeches, knocking someone, criticizing all the time, never saying anything of a constructive nature. It is also interesting to note that those same Members opposed everything before December 7 recommended by President Roosevelt for the defense of our country.

Constructive criticism is one thing. The men I have in mind have yet to utter one constructive thought. Everything they say produces disunity and division. It is about time they stop it.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, waiving aside with just one brief sentence the observations that have just been made by the distinguished majority leader, I say that I hope it was not his intention to encourage a technique that has already been all too apparent, to infer that patriotism will not permit of any criticism and that criticism must be stifled if unity is to prevail.

A moment or two ago our distinguished friend from Montana made reference to the State of Pennsylvania. Whether he did it purposely or inadvertently, I cannot say, but it does seem to me that I, representing the State of Pennsylvania, cannot let the statement of the gentleman from Montana go unanswered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. In just a moment.

Apparently for the purpose of impressing the House with the idea that the Indians had not been treated fairly, he confined his observations to the agreement made between the Indians and William Penn. In a rather critical way—it may be that he meant it facetiously—he referred to the amount of the consideration, suggesting its inadequacy, and also referred to the type of the consideration, implying its impropriety.

It seems to me that the record of William Penn in his dealing with the Indians is well established. Whether the consideration was partly liquid or not, that should not concern us today. Dear knows, maybe some liquidity today might be of value in some of the deals that are being made. Instead of borrowing so much, if we had liquidity, there might be a benefit all around.

Those of us who come from Pennsylvania are proud of what William Penn did in his dealings with the Indians. If in all instances the equities and the justices had prevailed in the other arrangements with the Indians that were present in Pennsylvania, there would be little to criticize.

Now I yield to my friend. I hope it will be in the nature of an apologetic statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want the gentleman to know this. The reason I referred to the State of Pennsylvania is that I happen to know considerable about that State. It is one of the richest States and one of the richest territories in the United States. I think the finest farms I have ever seen I have seen in the gentleman's State of Pennsylvania. I might also add it is signally represented in this body.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman is uncertain as to the cause of that, may I say it is because of the industry, the frugality, the common sense of the Pennsylvania people. They have gone into the depths of the earth and brought out the minerals; they have taken the fields and have ploughed them, and they have used the resources of God rather than the bounties of a Government subsidy to provide wealth for themselves and the results have stood them in good stead at all times.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But I wanted to show the gentleman and the other Members of the House just how the American Indian was robbed by the American Government, by showing that what is now one of the richest States in the Union was taken away from the Indian by William Penn for the agreed price of $500, certain personal property, part of which——

Mr. DITTER. I do not yield further.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Part of which was in beer.

Mr. DITTER. I will not let that go unanswered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the truth.

Mr. DITTER. I shall not let that go unanswered. William Penn purloined nothing from the Indians. The memory of William Penn is revered and honored.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the record.

Mr. DITTER. During the days of colonization no finer record was written than that of William Penn in his treatment of the Indians. William Penn and his Quaker brethren left an unimpeachable record of fair dealing. Theirs was a relationship of friendliness with the Indians. Nothing was left undone to establish good will and understanding. Let it be remembered that Penn insisted that there should be accorded to the Indians "the same liberties to improve their grounds and to provide for the sustenance of their families as the planters." No finer example of friendliness and mutual understanding was evidenced in the colonization period than that which was established and which continued to exist in the settlement of Pennsylvania.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Crown owed a debt of many thousand pounds to the estate of Penn's father at the time the charter was granted to him and that Penn, with a burning zeal for freedom of worship, sought to establish a colony where persecuted Friends might find a sanctuary and a home. Could this be attributed to a spirit of meanness or greed or avarice? Are sharp dealers motivated by worthy purposes such as these? The Quaker heritage is above reproach.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I should not forego this opportunity to call the attention of the House to one feature of those days of colonization under Penn. I refer to the type of government that was established under him. We might well ponder today on a few of the precepts and principles advocated and adopted in the Quaker settlement. We might profit by a rereading of Penn's opinion when he wrote:

> I do not find a model in the world that time, place, and some singular emergencies have not necessarily altered, nor is it easy to frame a civil government that shall serve all places alike. I know what is said by the several admirers of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which are the rule of one, a

few, and many, and are the three common ideas of government when men discourse on that subject. But I choose to solve the controversy with this small distinction, and it belongs to all three—any government is free to the people under it (whatever be the frame) where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws; and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion.

That means a government of laws and not a government of men.

I appreciate the compliment paid by my friend from Montana to Pennsylvania when he said the Keystone State "is one of the richest States and one of the richest territories in the United States." Pennsylvania merits the compliment. It is a fact.

But I should like to emphasize the thought that her wealth is the result of work, the long, hard work of her sons and daughters. The wealth of Pennsylvania represents the industry, the thrift, the resourcefulness, and the frugality of a sturdy citizenry which set itself to the task of carving out not only a political independence but an economic independence as well. A planned economy, a regimented society, a Utopian dream contributed nothing to her wealth. For the most part, Pennsylvanians have always clung tenaciously to the convictions that private enterprise—a free economy—is fundamental to other freedoms; that the reward of industry is the right to a reasonable profit; that our frontiers are measured only by the horizons of our ambitions.

The wealth of Pennsylvania did not come into being as the result of any New Deal philosophy. It was not created by the bounties of any Federal bureaucracy. It did not spring from the largesses and benefactions of a profligate paternalism. We had no Sir Launfal at hand with a never-failing purse supplied by the taxpayers of the Nation. Pennsylvania does not owe its wealth to the spendthrifts, to the profligates, or to those who tried to impress upon the Nation a philosophy that the less we plant the more we reap and the more we waste the more we have.

The Quaker inheritance has stood us in good stead. Old copybook maxims such as "a penny saved is a penny earned" are still taught in many homes in Pennsylvania, and what is more, such precepts are in practice. The workshop, the home—yes, and the meeting house and the church—are a part of the life; in fact, they are the life of the Commonwealth established by Penn more than 250 years ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My friend from Pennsylvania, I yield to you for that statement you were going to make. I have 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, while I do appreciate the very gracious courtesy and kindness extended to me by my friend from Michigan, I feel that I have made complete answer to my friend from Montana, and that undoubtedly, in due course, he will repent the error of his way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And confess.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of organizing Indian chartered corporations, or other tribal organizations, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as supplemented and amended by the acts of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 378), May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, not to exceed $3,000 for printing and binding, and other necessary expenses, $45,000, of which not to exceed $13,800 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $3 per diem in lieu of subsistence may be allowed to Indians actually traveling away from their place of residence when assisting in organization work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure in that part of the State of New Mexico embraced in the Navajo Indian Reservation, and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for expenditure in said State: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to conduct elections in any reservation on any matter which has been previously voted upon there unless 2 years have elapsed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 19, line 13, strike out line 13 and the remainder of the page, and, on page 20, strike out the first eight lines.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment——

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have time reserved to me if the course of the debate indicates that it may be necessary for me to speak.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Chairman that we should not ask for the closing of debate immediately upon the presentation of an amendment, because I think it only hinders good legislation. I think we ought to let the debate run 5 or 10 minutes and then make the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further so that I may make one brief observation?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think the Members on both sides of the aisle know that an effort is being made by all of us to finish the consideration of this bill today. I am simply trying my utmost to speed up the consideration of the bill, and, if possible, finish before 5:30 o'clock this afternoon. I do not want to cut off anyone who wants to speak; but, again, I wonder if we could not agree, perhaps, on 20 minutes' debate on this item.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman wait until I get through before submitting the request? I would like to present the amendment and then we will see whether it is necessary to submit such a request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will cut out the expenses of 13.2 man-years in the field at a cost of $37,291, and in the office at Washington 8 man-years at $16,840, and temporary help in the field of $1,000 originally provided by the Bureau of the Budget. That is what was requested, and it has been cut down by the committee to $45,000. I do not know how the man-years will stand with that sort of cut.

This paragraph provides funds for organizing Indian tribes into corporations. Most of the work has been done with the major organizations, and I refer to page 8 of the committee report, where it says:

Additional reductions under the heading "General items" are largely attributable to the need for economy in nondefense activities. In connection with the reduction of $26,260 in the estimate of $71,260 for expenses of tribal organization, the committee wishes to point out that it has advised the Bureau on numerous occasions that it expects this item to disappear from the bill in a few years, as it does not regard the organizing of Indians under the Indian Reorganization Act as a continuing or permanent activity.

I call attention to page 44, part 2 of the hearings, showing how we felt about this item in another day. Originally the statute authorized the expenditures to a maximum amount of $250,000 a year for this purpose. That was when we were hunting for work to do, hunting to give men a chance to work for the Government, and to get them off the streets. Read the hearings on page 45, and you will see the statement as to the amount of expenditures made heretofore in other years for this service. Then on page 50 you will notice a question and answer by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] and Mr. Greenwood, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is what I have in mind. This committee has talked about it and has tried to discourage the promoting of these organizations. If the Indians voluntarily wish to do it, that is their business, but it does seem to this committee that it is not up to the Indian Service to go out to promote this kind of work.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think that pretty good evidence that we have not been engaging in promotion is the fact that out of 192 tribes that voted to accept the Indian Reorganization Act, there are still 106 tribes who have yet to organize; which means that only 86 tribes out of the 192 have actually adopted constitutions and bylaws.

On page 52 you will see what Mr. McCaskill reports, that most of the large groups have completed their organ zation. The committee thinks that this work should be curtailed. The difference between the committee and myself is that I think we should do it now, because it is not a necessary expenditure. It will not help get any more planes and guns and tanks to General MacArthur this year. I want to be able to go back home

when we finish this bill and say to the mothers whose sons are at the front, at Corregidor, the Philippines, and Australia, that I helped to do away with some of these nondefense expenditures and put the men employed in this type of nonessential work into production of machine tools and the production of equipment for guns and tanks and planes, so that they can help to protect these boys at the front. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the sentiment expressed by me, as read by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] at that time is the same sentiment that I have now, that this committee should curtail, and wind up this particular activity, within a few years, and that is exactly what the committee is doing. Despite the fact that the Indian Service wants more money for this particular activity, the committee has greatly reduced it, until it is now only $45,000. There are many tribes which are unorganized, and whether Members like it or not, many tribes of Indians are tremendously interested in this item. May I express the hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 34, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vehicles, Indian Service: Not to exceed $450,000 of applicable appropriations made herein for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation (including the exchange of necessary parts and accessories in part payment for new parts and accessories) of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of employees in the Indian field service, and the transportation of Indian school pupils, and not to exceed $225,000 of applicable appropriations may be used for the purchase and exchange of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such vehicles shall be used only for official service, including the transportation of Indian school pupils.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 20, line 9, after the word "exceed", strike out "$450,000" and insert "$350,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to this paragraph in the bill, "Vehicles, Indian Service." It provides that not to exceed $400,000 for automobiles and motor-propelled vehicles and for transportation shall be available, and so forth. Do you not think that we could cut that down? You are not going to be able to buy automobiles. They will have to do more horseback riding, as we did in the good old days. I only offer this amendment for your consideration because I think it can be cut down, and then if we cut that down, we could prohibit the expenditure of the money which is stipulated in line 17, $225,000, for the exchange and purchase of automobiles. I think that could be cut down without any injury to the Indian Bureau, without any injury to anyone, and we will get along this year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course the gentleman understands that this provides for the transportation of Indian school pupils and the gentleman is aware of the fact that many of the schools are now of the consolidated type, and that it is necessary to operate busses.

Mr. RICH. I am not here to interfere with those schools. I am just thinking of the great number of people in the last few years that have had automobiles in the Department. I do not want to cut these Indian schools or the transportation of these children, but I do want to cut out the needless running around with these Government cars. If they have to economize a little, the Indian Bureau will demand of every automobile driver that he should not use the car except when it is absolutely necessary. I think the gentleman from South Dakota will recognize the fact that if we cut this down some, that will be the result.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly am in favor of cutting down the travel of Indian Bureau employees, but I would like to know, as a matter of making a judgment on the gentleman's amendment, what amount was appropriated for this item last year?

Mr. RICH. I asked to cut this down $100,000. If you adopt that amendment, then I will offer an amendment, in line 17, to cut that down $100,000. That will not cut down the sum total, however. It will only take $100,000 off of this item.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this already represent a reduction from last year's figure?

Mr. RICH. Yes; a small reduction, not very large.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman give us the figure?

Mr. RICH. I do not just recall it. It is in the justification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is hard to tell how much to cut something that has already been cut.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. The Budget estimate was $495,000.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. LEAVY. And the committee cut $45,000 from that. On the Budget estimate of $495,000, we were asked to allow $303,000 for the transportation of Indian children to school. We reduced that sum to $200,000; and if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, you would leave the Indian Service with virtually half the money, and they could not render the service.

Mr. RICH. Let me say to my colleague, if you adopt this amendment, we will offer an amendment, on page 20, line 17, to cut that down $100,000, and that will take it out of "purchase of new automobiles." Then we will get along with that figure. That is what I am trying to do. I am trying to stop them from going out and getting new cars. Let us make these cars last a little longer. Service them a little more, and we can save that money.

Mr. LEAVY. We were told that they could not get new cars without the approval of the War Department and the Navy Department. We were told that they have already taken 200 army horses and are now using saddle horses to perform many of their duties. If you cut further, you cut to the point where they cannot render the service at all.

Mr. RICH. No. I differ with my colleague.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. According to the report, the appropriation for this purpose last year—supplies, purchases, and transportation—was $799,720. The Budget estimate was $800,000, and the amount appropriated, which includes this item and one or two others, was $799,000, or a cut of $720. So they are not going to be allowed these automobiles anyway. I think the gentleman is on the trail of something in suggesting that we cut this down, because there has not been any cut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am rather amazed at the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that there has not been any cut in this item. The committee made a reduction of $46,000, as shown by the bill, on this item alone.

Mr. TABER. Where does that show in the report? The report shows that on this transportation item the cut is $720. This is on page 21 of the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman, I am sure, knows that it does not show in the bill, because it is not an appropriation—that it is an authorization to use funds in the bill available for this purpose.

Mr. TABER. But it should show in the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure the gentleman does not contend that it would show in an authorization.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. This is an appropriation of $450,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman's insistence convinces me he has not studied the bill. I stand on the statement that it is merely an authorization. The gentleman surely knows that if he has made any real examination of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Alright, I am glad that is settled. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said he did not want to interfere with the schools, and I am assuming he is sincere in making that statement. Now here are the facts. There are 200 Indian schools which, if this amendment is adopted, will be seriously interfered with. Some of those schools are in widely scattered areas, 25 or 30 miles apart. I am sure the gentleman does not intend to do that, seriously cripple the hauling of Indian children to school.

For the benefit of those few on the minority side who are so fearful lest too much funds will be spent for cars, I will

read into the RECORD this part of the bill that has been mentioned several times before, so that there will be no further weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth about this item. Section 8, which appears on page 140 of the bill, reads as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for the purchase or exchange of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle if such purchase or exchange interferes with the priorities or quotas for military and naval purposes as determined, respectively, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

It is perfectly obvious that it will be impossible to spend money for this purpose unless it is certain it does not interfere with priorities established by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of lands, interest in lands, water rights and surface rights to lands, and for expenses incident to such acquisition (except salaries and expenses of employees), in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 985), $165,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 22, line 12, after "(48 Stat. 985)" strike out "$165,000" and insert "0."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is only for the purpose of prohibiting the Indian Bureau from going out and buying lands to the value of $165,000. You will notice in this paragraph that in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming we prohibit the Indian Bureau from going out and buying these lands because those States do not want them to buy any more.

The bill carries an item of $165,000 for the purchase of land. It is proposed to purchase this land in other States. A lot of people do not want this done. It is not necessary that it be done. Here is an opportunity to save $165,000 for the Treasury of the United States, if you do not want to take the bottom out of it, but I think it has dropped out already. They have got to find this $165,000 with which to purchase these lands. It is not right.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. In the first place, this $165,000 is not money belonging to the United States, it is money belonging to the Indians, and those who govern them feel it is a wise thing to spend it in the acquisition of land. Four States of the Union where there are Indian lands have said they do not want the lands purchased with tribal funds. The rest of the States do. It is not public money. The spending of this money would save the Government paying 4 percent interest on it. If you want to make a saving let them invest it in the land. It is their money.

Mr. RICH. The language of this paragraph does not say that it is money paid out of tribal funds. Even if it were I would advise against it because we have let them spend so many of their tribal funds that they are dependent on the Government when they ought to support themselves. They spend their funds and what do they do? They come back to us and we have to dig into our own Treasury to secure additional money. Five States have refused to permit them to buy land within their borders.

Mr. LEAVY. I want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I was in error on that, tribal funds are in the paragraph above.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Washington very seldom is in error, but there are a lot of fellows on that side of the House who are in error when they vote for the expenditure of all these moneys we do not have. Mr. Chairman, we can save this $165,000, let us save it now.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to observe to the gentleman that this is to buy pasture land for the flocks and herds of the Indians, a most essential thing, that they may produce and be self-supporting.

Mr. RICH. You know, we have been pasturing every Indian in the United States for a good many years. We have been pasturing most of the people of this country until now it has come to the point where the people should get out of pasture and work. We want people to work, we do not want to pasture them any longer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. From what is going on around here it looks as though we are having almost as much trouble withholding this country from the Indians as we had originally in taking it from them. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There may be food for thought in the gentleman's clever observation.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should make such a suggestion seriously to this House. The gentleman is one of the best businessmen in this body, whose word, I am sure, can be relied upon.

I am certain that if the gentleman made a contract he would carry it out in the spirit as well as to the letter of the contract, but now by this amendment he calls on Members of this House to repudiate and refuse to carry out a solemn contract made by the Congress of the United States. If Members will examine last year's law you will find it reads as follows:

Provided—

This is a contract authorization, an ironclad contract—

That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations and enter into contracts for the acquisition of additional land not exceeding a total of $325,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the acquisition of land pursuant to the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created.

If the gentleman wants to vote for his own amendment, he can accept the responsibility.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says everybody has got to work. The spending of this money will enable the Indians to do more work and produce more things.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Then the gentleman is simply repudiating his own statement that we ought to do more work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, if I may have the attentior of the membership of the House, including the author of this amendment, that anyone who fully understands the purpose of this particular appropriation will vote against the amendment. In the first place the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania was based upon a belief that certain States had asked not to have any of this money expended within their States. That is not the case. These States only sought to prevent expanding the boundaries of the reservations within those States. If you will read the proviso in the bill itself, it is stated:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within these States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming, outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

That limitation is not against spending some of this money in those States if it is within the boundaries of existing reservations, but only outside of those reservations.

In the second place, there seems to be a misunderstanding as to the purpose of this appropriation. It is not new cash; it is an item to pay contracts incurred under obligations authorized and contracted last year.

Within each Indian reservation you have an heirship land problem. When an Indian dies his land goes to probate. He may have many heirs. Then you have a very complicated problem. There

are estates in my district, for example, where there are several hundred heirs involved in a single quarter section of land. In an attempt to try to resolve that heirship land to a common denominator it has been sought to buy up certain tracts of land and get them so that the assets can be divided and the estates closed. You have instances where the lease fees, or the amount of lease fees going to an individual interest holder in some of these heirship lands amounts to only a fraction of a cent. It costs more to write a letter and write a check sending 2 or 3 cents to some of these heirship interest holders than is involved in the total amount of money itself. In one reservation over 30,000 acres of good land were idle a year ago simply because it cost more to divide and distribute the lease returns than they amounted to. This fund is used to buy up these fractional interests and make it possible to close these estates and put the land on a revenue basis.

Now then, with respect to this matter in the bill, last year there was a contract authorization for $325,000 for the purchase of this fractionated land. The funds here involved are to pay approximately one-half of that obligation. If you will turn to the hearings, page 64, you will find it clearly stated that "all" of the item carried in this bill "will be required to meet obligations incurred in accordance with the authority contained in last year's Interior bill. That bill carried $325,000 in cash and an equal amount in contract authorization." The Treasury impounded $160,000 of that $325,000 contract authorization. I repeat, there was cash $325,000 last year plus a contract authorization of $325,000. The Treasury impounded $160,000 of the $325,000 contract authorization, leaving $165,000 that could be contracted. Contracts for that land acquisition have been made. So, this appropriation is merely to provide the money to take care of the contracts made under the contract authorization last year which itself had been reduced one-half from the original authorization as approved by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Wherein was I mistaken?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman's words gave the House the impression that certain States would not have any money expended within the boundaries of those States. The language of the bill refers to the boundaries of existing reservations within those States. This money is available for settling this land problem within the boundaries of existing reservations in all States. The limitation is only against going outside the reservations in certain States.

Mr. RICH. We have had men from these States come to us and say that they did not want the Indians to buy any of this land.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They do not want the reservations expanded, but the gentleman will understand that within the boundaries of the reservations there are Indian lands, and there are also patented lands. The limitation and the objections are not against action within the reservations. This appropriation primarily is for the purpose of purchasing these Indian heirship lands already owned by Indians, but in such a complicated state of land ownership that it costs the Government more money to administer the heirship lands than it does to buy the land itself.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say as one of the Representatives of the State mentioned that the gentleman from South Dakota is making an extremely fine statement. He is well informed on the subject, and I subscribe to everything he says.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say as a Representative of the State of Arizona that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] occupying the Well of the House has stated the facts as they are in regard to this matter. I say this as a member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, for I have noted these conditions. Also, let me emphasize that such lands purchased in Arizona must be within the boundaries of existing reservations.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it more important now to the winning of the war to spend this $165,000 for an airplane for MacArthur in Australia or to go out and buy this land and take the money out of the Treasury for that purpose?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That issue is not involved at all. The gentleman knows that we are going to appropriate all the money we can spend to get airplanes to MacArthur. This item is to satisfy contract authorizations already legally made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase of land for the Indians of the Round Valley Reservation, Calif. (tribal funds): The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $10,000, contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, for the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Indians of the Round Valley Reservation, Calif., payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians, is hereby continued available until expended.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I add to that request that I want to speak out of order for only 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order. If there is objection, I will not pursue it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have made the statement that I would oppose anyone speaking out of order. I will not object in this instance, but I give notice now I certainly shall object in the future.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, we are endeavoring to finish this bill today. While I am not going to object to the gentleman's request to speak for 1 minute out of order, I shall be constrained to object to any further request to speak out of order that may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy shown to me by the gentlemen in charge of the pending legislation. I shall detain the Committee only a few moments. I rise at this time as a matter of personal pride and deserved recognition for the State in which I live.

Last night in Madison Square Garden, New York City, West Virginia University, participating in the finals of the national basketball tournament, defeated Western Kentucky State by a score of 47 to 45, thus winning this recognition for our State.

The coach of that great mountaineer team, Dyke Raese, of Davis, resides in my district. I pay tribute to those boys of the hills of West Virginia who defeated the splendid boys from the hills of Kentucky. The West Virginians, displaying their recognized fighting qualities, fought successfully against odds.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of developing agriculture and stock raising among the Indians, including necessary personnel, traveling and other expenses, and purchase of supplies and equipment, $693,180, of which not to exceed $10,000 may be used to conduct agricultural experiments and demonstrations on Indian school or agency farms and to maintain a supply of suitable plants or seed for issue to Indians, and not to exceed $30,000 may be used for the operation and maintenance of a sheep-breeding station on the Navajo Reservation, and not to exceed $5,000 may be used for defraying the expenses of Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 26, line 19, strike out all of line 19 and the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph relates to the Agriculture Department of the Interior Department. A few weeks ago we spent considerable time getting through the appropriations for the Agriculture Department. Generally the people had the belief that that would finish all the agricultural work, but here is a provision for an expenditure of $693,180 for agricultural work among the Indians in the Interior supply bill. In addition to what they get under this program, the Department of Agriculture supplements Interior Department work with soil-conservation payments. Apparently some of the work of that Department converges with the work of the Interior Department.

I questioned representatives of the Department about this subject and they

denied that there is any overlapping of the program. Even should there be no overlapping of the program, I think all the agricultural work ought to be in one place, and the place to have it is the Agricultural Department.

Let me call your attention to page 117 of the hearings, which shows some of the work that is being carried on by this branch:

Home-extension work.

For Indians, now, mind you.

Improved living and better homes in cooperative communities summarize the many activities in which home-extension agents and home aids help Indians to attain more satisfying home life. Increased membership in farm chapters and women's clubs has meant a spread of ideas of self-help and definite progress in farm and home betterment.

Think of it; this is with Indian people.

The variety of activities conducted in home-extension work includes child care, including feeding and development.

Remember, we have a department of Government for child care that takes care of this sort of thing, and the Indian Service is duplicating the work.

Food; nutrition, including storing, canning, drying, brining, and smoking of meats; food production; nutrition studies.

All of these things are covered in pamphlets of the Department of Agriculture, and this does not feed Indians. It pays the fat salaries and traveling expenses of Indian Service bureaucrats:

Food preparation and serving; clothing for adults and children; better bedding; home improvements; sanitation; household pest control—

This does not mean their putting Indians to bed. The bureaucrats for a fat salary are telling the Indians how to do it.

Listen to this, for an Indian:

Tentmaking.

Think of it! A program of tentmaking! You might as well have a program of getting umbrellas for fishes as show Indians how to make tents. Yet tentmaking appears on page 118 of the hearings.

I suggest that this is a wild-eyed, socialistic scheme for the Indians that we could just as well get along without; and in view of the fact that there is some work done by the Department of Agriculture among the Indians, this could all very handily and very well be done by the Department of Agriculture, so that when we finish with that appropriation and supply bill we will have done with it for good.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rose first to ask a question but I have stood here in rapt amazement, or something of that sort, listening to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in pathetic tones talk about doing some of these things for the In-Indians. He said:

Think of it, helping the Indians to have better homes. Think of it, helping the Indians to have child welfare and training in gardening and preservation of foods. Think of it, doing some of these other things for the Indians.

Why should this not be done for Indians if for the others you mention?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. Because we have a children's bureau in Washington, and they have pamphlets with beautiful pictures that show anybody how to do these things. Each Congressman sends them out to his constituents.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is exactly the answer I expected the gentleman to make. Can the gentleman cite a single one of those pamphlets that is written in Sioux or written in any other Indian language? Can he assure me that the Indians who need this help the most are able to read, even if these pamphlets were printed in those languages? Has the gentleman ever been on an Indian reservation in his life or visited an Indian home, with its dirt floor and leaking sod roof? Has he ever seen an Indian home in winter?

Did he ever see the kitchen in a ration Indian's home—a corner in a miserable room, a can for the few pounds of flour or beans that were to feed the family for a month? The family—three generations, perhaps, an old man or a woman on whose face time had written the tragedy of a race, a father and mother who were trying to master a white man's economy, children who were trying to learn how to work a white man's way, and had yet to learn the white man would deny them jobs?

Tents? Help in making tents? Has the gentleman ever seen little Indian children freezing in winter because they did not have a decent tent? Would the gentleman deny them that?

Has the gentleman ever visited an Indian reservation and seen Department of Agriculture officials attempting to help them? No; they have had to depend upon the Indian Bureau. I admit and I feel that the Indian Service spends a lot of time and money traveling, too much in fact, and it has too much bureaucratic authority, perhaps, yet God knows that justice calls for doing something for these Indians, whose lands we took away.

They are not getting aid from the Department of Agriculture. Were the funds that are available to the Farm Security Administration available for Indian loans a few years ago? No. The Comptroller General or somebody said they were not available. The Indian did not come under that program. So we provided a little aid for him, a little leadership, a little help in growing gardens, a little help in canning and preserving foods.

The gentleman cannot correct the situation he mentions by denying an Indian help from money in this bill. If he would go back and correct the basic legislation of Congress and say that the Department of Agriculture shall have the responsibility for taking care of these people and providing for them, that would be something else. But after you have passed the agricultural appropriation bill—and the funds were cut down there—then to come along, when the Indians are already denied funds and help from the Agriculture Department, and in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill to say, "We are going to cut this out of the Indian appropriations," is hardly fair.

I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio, for whose sincerity and for whose intelligence I have the utmost respect, if he were to visit an Indian reservation and see the Indians in actual life and see the conditions under which they live, would not talk this way. He might feel that we ought to have transferred some of the assistance in the agricultural bill, perhaps, and put it here, but he would not propose to deny this aid to the Indian people, people who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to be severe, I do not intend to be critical. But I have seen these people, the Indians. They get hungry. They grow cold. In a generation we have forced them to change from a hunter to a farmer, and a farmer on land that the white man did not want. Only those who live among them and have seen them in their homes and know the conditions can understand the importance of helping them to raise better livestock and better crops. Talk about economy, the best economy we can exercise in respect of Indian appropriations is to see that the Indians do have some help in raising better livestock and do have some help in raising more food so that it takes them off relief, so that it makes them independent and gives them a chance to be on their own. Do not deny the man who is down a chance to get on his own. That is what would be the effect of the pending amendment. And do not do it here just because you can and they are only Indians.

They are Indians. God made them Indians. The white conqueror made them what they are today. Let us give them a helping hand. We have no braver, truer fighters today than our Indian soldier boys.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Dakota for describing so graphically an Indian home in this country and describing the manner in which his lands have been taken away from him, and the manner in which he has been neglected by this Government. I want to say that the American people owe the gentleman from South Dakota a debt of gratitude for explaining to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] who has never seen an Indian home, what the conditions are.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for his very clear statement on the conditions of Indian life. This particular section of the bill deals with the development of Indian agriculture and is an extremely important section.

I desire to call the attention of this House to page 121 of the hearings on the Interior departmental appropriation bill, in which it is pointed out that the livestock on the Navajo Reservation, and elsewhere where this program has been in effect, have increased from 167,000 to 278,000 head. This Government and this Congress can be proud of the fact that the Indians have been improving in their economic status, that they are becoming self-sufficient, and that they are making physical progress at the same time.

I want to point out to you that at one of our Government ordnance depots, just constructed at Fort Wingate, N. Mex., near a Navajo reservation, 2,000 Navajos worked as common laborers on that job. Their labor brought forth the commendation of the contractors and the War Department.

I also want to say that when you can make a showing of this nature, where the race itself is increasing, where their herds of livestock are increasing, where they are becoming economically self-sufficient, you show democracy at work in the finest sense of the word, and you making a showing that appeals to the countries south of this Republic that have a large Indian population. The American Society of Indianists has approved of the work done under this program.

I do not want to take the time of the House, but I do want to commend the gentleman from South Dakota, and I do want to point out that the Government has officially recognized the value of this work which has produced an increase in the livestock of the Indians.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Coming from a neighboring State with a population of the largest portion of the 50,000 Navajo Indians, I can agree with the gentleman's statement concerning our Navajo Indians. I also want to commend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for his statement. I want to add just this word, if I may:

The Navajo Indians are increasing in number by leaps and bounds. They are the most prolific tribe of Indians in our country, I believe. We talk about the vanishing red man. However, the Navajo Indians occupy a region along the tributaries of the Colorado River, and if we do not help them conserve the soil we are going to lose one of the greatest works of man on this continent. I refer to Boulder Dam or Lake Mead, which is filling up with silt. So I much prefer to see the Navajos helped in conserving their soil and making good farmers of themselves than to see anything done that would bring destruction to one of our greatest irrigation projects.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and I assure this House that if the Members would visit the Navajo Reservation, would visit the Navajos in their homes, and see the progress that has taken place, they would be proud of the Congress, they would be proud of the Indian Service, and they would be proud of democracy at work. It is a fine thing in which we can all take pride.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that he is not the only one who has Indians in his district. We have Indians in my district, the Pottawatomies and the Ottawas, and the members of both tribes are taking care of themselves very nicely. They have not had very much from the Government. We have some Indians also in Cass County and in Van Buren County, in Michigan, and they are taking care of themselves. I know that every time we take up one of these Indian items, in which Members are interested, there is opposition to any cut, and I can appreciate that, but I try to go along and cut on everything that comes up that is not essential to the war effort, whether it affects my district or not. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish me to yield?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I may say, in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota, that it is a surprise to me, after hearing of the deplorable conditions among the Indians, that there were any here to meet our forefathers at Plymouth Rock. In the first place, this amendment strikes at a duplication of effort between the Agricultural Department and the Interior Department. In the second place, the gentleman talks about his Sioux not being able to read the child-care books that are being prepared in the Children's Bureau. I say to you that Nelson Rockefeller and his outfit have $18,000,000 in cash and contract authorizations of which a part is used to reprint into Spanish and Portuguese, for the Indians of South America, these Children's Bureau books. In God's name, if they have them for South America, what is the matter that they cannot get them to the Sioux in the same program? It is not my fault that the Sioux in the gentleman's State, and the Indians of the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from New Mexico get none of these pamphlets. It is not my fault; it is the fault of this administration, and I am not holding out by this appropriation any amount for the books that Mr. Rockefeller has that he could give to these people. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry that I cannot yield. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] has spent days and nights working on this bill. He has made every effort along the line of economy; he has tried and is trying to cut out unnecessary items; and yet when he proposes to do something Members are absent from the floor, not here to vote, or they oppose his efforts. Such conduct is no incentive to work. While you are trying to do something for the Indians, why not give a little effort toward supporting the committee members when they put in their time and devote their efforts to giving us information on the bill, and offer intelligent and money-saving amendments from the floor? I do not want to hurt the Indians—I do not want to hurt anybody—but I am asking the membership to remember their own Republican committeemen, who are trying to do something and turn some of this tide of wrath, which is arising against Congress, against the Members of this House, who do not deserve it, back where it belongs, to the body at the other end of the Capitol, and on the President's doorstep. That is where it belongs; that is where it should rest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, Mr. Chairman; I cannot.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the whole difficulty that has arisen here about this appropriation comes from the fact that there is not any duplication in the agricultural effort. This $693,180 for the purpose of farm improvements among the Indians, is a deserving item. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] may be right, but the difficulty is that we cannot get any help from the Agricultural Department. Practically all of these advantages go to the white people, and we are told, "these do not apply to the Indians at all." We had a most difficult time in North Dakota to permit the Indians to share in the sales tax, which is a relief measure, and although the Indians are paying the sales tax, it took about 4 months before we got an opinion that those Indians were entitled to any relief. They always say, "Go back to the Indian Bureau." I think it would be a mistake to cut out this section, because it is not a fact that is recognized in this country that the Agricultural Department has to take care of these Indians.

If we can help the Indians to get a start in livestock, good seed, gardens, and moisture conservation, we can, by so doing, prevent hungry Indian children, sick and emaciated adults, old and helpless Indians. Who is there who opposes this program? Those who oppose this provision certainly do not know the essential facts of the case.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 22, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Oh, let us try to have a quorum here. I think we should have at least 100 men on the floor. It seems

terrible to me that we should go ahead with a bill of this kind, when we are trying to save money for the Government and cannot get 100 men on the floor of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of irrigation systems, and for purchase or rental of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, and lands necessary for irrigation purposes for Indian reservations and allotments; for operation of irrigation systems or appurtenances thereto when no other funds are applicable or available for the purpose; for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods or loss of water rights, upon the Indian irrigation projects named below, $193,275, reimbursable, together with $44,500 operation and maintenance collections, from which latter amount expenditures for any one project shall not exceed the aggregate receipts from such project covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934:

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, much is being said here about our American Indians by people who apparently know very little about them or know very little about the present conditions of our Indian wards.

I wish to tell the Committee that I have the honor to represent many Indians who belong to the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Tribes. They live in the Third District of Nebraska—a district which I represent in this Congress. Long before coming to Washington I learned much about the Indians who live in Nebraska. For many years I have known many of the individual members of the Omaha and Winnebago Tribes. Some of these individuals are and have been officers of the tribal councils, and many of them have been and are today among the prominent and outstanding citizens of our State. Many of them have served in the Spanish-American War, the first World War, and some of them are in the service of our country today. It was from some of these individual friends among these Indian tribes that I learned much about their problems. I visited them many times before coming to Congress, and since becoming their Representative in Washington I have visited them personally many times. I want to tell the membership of this House that the Indians in my district are among the most patriotic citizens in our land, and I for one can never bring myself to the position to allow them to be treated in any way other than other American citizens. When we pass legislation dealing with any portion of our citizens, I feel that there should be no thought of race, creed, or color and that all should be treated alike. I know that the Indians in my district are not asking for any better or any worse treatment than is accorded to any other citizen. All they ask is for equality. But I know, and many of you know—if you will be fair in your judgment on some of the Indian legislation offered here from time to time—that the Indian citizen and Indian legislation do not get fair treatment and impartial consideration.

It is true that some of our older Indian men and women do not read or write the English language. There are not so many of these older Indians left in my district. Many have gone to join their ancestors. But a majority of those who are still with us are intelligent. They do understand the English language and they do read and write. Many of them are highly intelligent and are numbered among the brightest scholars attending our schools. Many of them have attained high places in the world of learning; high places in the field of athletics and sports; high places in the field of agriculture. All of them are interested in what we do here and all of them are anxious for progress and advancement for all free Americans.

I wish to tell my colleagues that the Indians of the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Tribes are aware of the crisis which our country faces today and they are and will continue to do their part in saving this Nation and bringing about a victory. I do hope that it is well understood here that the Indians of the Third District of Nebraska can be depended upon to play their part with all other Americans in shouldering their responsibilities at all times as highly patriotic American citizens.

I have spoken here many times about the treatment which has been accorded our Indians. I only need to tell you briefly the story of the Winnebagoes who were driven from their homes at the point of bayonets and shipped away like animals. It is well known how they were robbed of their lands and how they were exploited. This story I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many times. It need not be fully repeated here today. But I say these few words merely to refresh your memory that the white man has not always been fair to the Indian and that he has not treated him with the equality to which the Indian is entitled.

We are considering a very important bill here today. It makes the annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior. In it are the regular items to conduct the affairs of the Indian Service. Many items have been cut because it is generally conceded that we must cut nondefense items in order that we can concentrate on the main objective of today—that of winning this war in the shortest space of time possible and with the least number of casualties. Our Indian people are agreeable to that. The committee has already cut the bill many thousands of dollars. The committee made those cuts after careful consideration and after many days of hearings. But it is proposed here to cut more deeply on items which are highly important to the life of the Indian people. I am glad the membership has joined in defeating the further cut in the item of agriculture. The proposal to eliminate all rehabilitation for the Indian must also be defeated. There are many reasons why these cuts must not be made. One is because the Indians in my district depend entirely for their lives on agriculture. It is our only origin for our food and life. You people from the big cities and from the East must realize that our Indians are among the best farmers in our country and that the land on which they live must produce for them the food to feed their families and livestock. You have already made a deep cut in the item but we must not wipe it out entirely. There are many unemployables among our older men and older women on the Indian reservations. Would you take away from them and give to others only? I wish I could take you over the Indian country in my district and show you some of the homes in which these Indians are forced to live. Women and children in my Indian country have slept on the icy ground many a night when the mercury hovered far below zero because they had no better place to sleep. Of course, our Indians live in tents many times. They have been forced to do that many years because they were discriminated against. The hardships they have suffered are indescribable.

On behalf of the membership of the tribal councils of the Omaha and Winnebago tribes, I wish to thank the committee for allowing to remain in the bill the items for utility work on the Winnebago Reservation, the item for the continued maintenance of the hospital at Winnebago, and the item to allow the Omaha council to purchase some land to provide a farm for an Indian or two. But that is a mere pittance so far as the real needs that are required out there.

I hope that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will spread the appropriations contained in this bill so as to take care of the Indians on the Winnebago, Omaha, and Santee Reservations, in spite of the cuts made in the matter of road work and education. The road work has provided much work for our Indians, and certainly we must give our Indian children the same opportunity for education as is given the children of other Americans. The item of irrigation contained in this bill is of great interest to us. Many members of the Omaha Tribe home that someday we can have some of this work done on that reservation.

But temporarily, Mr. Chairman, I feel our Indians will forego some of the nonessentials in order that we can put all our strength into winning the war. But in making these decreases I hope there will be no discrimination against the Winnebagoes, Omahas, and the Santees when the time comes for the distribution of these funds. Our Indians have made many, many sacrifices in the past. They are willing to make more sacrifices in order that victory will come to us. The burden of this war must be shouldered by every American in an equal manner. The Indians of Nebraska—those of the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Tribes—have answered the call before. They are answering again today. They are great Americans. Give them equality.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eufaula, Okla.: For 140 pupils, $49,590; for pay of principal, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, $7,000; in all, $56,590.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask

unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, Carter Seminary at Ardmore, Jones Academy at Hartshorne, and Wheelock Academy at Millerton are all in my congressional district in Oklahoma. These are old and established schools of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians.

Our people in Oklahoma, and especially the Indians of the southeastern section of the State, are proud of each of these educational institutions.

I was amazed to learn that the Indian Service, as well as the Bureau of the Budget, favored closing of five Indian schools in the State. Wheelock Academy is one of those that has been definitely slated to go.

I congratulate the Committee in its far-sighted vision in retaining funds to continue Wheelock and the other schools involved. I merely rise now to plead again, as I did before the Committee, for the continuation of these Indian schools, and I wish to insert my recent statement before the subcommittee on appropriations, headed by my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. JED JOHNSON:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee is pleased now to hear Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, my personal friend for many years, and chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress. He is also chairman of the House Roads Committee, a true friend of the Indian, and an able and conscientious Member of Congress who is a credit to Oklahoma and the Nation.

Mr. LEAVY. I would like to add too that he is an intelligent and industrious member of this body who is always on guard, not only for the interests of his own State but of all the States.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And of all the roads in the country.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Gentlemen of the committee, I am flabbergasted by such a wonderful introduction. I wish I could measure up to the possibilities and responsibilities which you have dedicated to me. But this is not a mutual admiration society. I understand that word has been passed out that five Indian schools in Oklahoma must be abolished. I appear here in opposition to such proposed action.

I am especially interested in the retention of Wheelock Academy for Choctaw girls at Millerton, Okla., in the heart of the old Choctaw Nation.

The total enrollment of this school averages around 145 per year. The average attendance is 132, consisting of 84 full bloods, 48 of one-half or more, and all others one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood.

Since 1933 approximately 375 girls have been enrolled. Some of these entered the primary grade and remained until the course was finished. A small number was enrolled for a year only. The time for the others averages 5 years.

Preference is given to restricted Indian girls, to those from broken homes, to total orphans, to half orphans, and to those not within reach of public or Indian day schools.

Most of the children come from needy homes and need the Government care they get at the school. Think how the State would object if this number were added to the already heavy load for relief.

The Choctaw people are deeply interested in this school and are greatly distressed at the proposal to close it.

The word "economy" was brought up here awhile ago. I appreciate that and want to go along with the economy program wherever it is reasonable and possible. But I cannot recognize economy to the extent of saving a few dollars at the expense of the poorest orphans in the country in doing away with their schools.

Wheelock Academy was established a little over a hundred years ago, when the Choctaw Tribe was brought from Mississippi to the Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. It has 160 acres of good land and 18 buildings in good shape; 13 of the buildings belong to the Choctaw Tribe and 5 belong to the Federal Government.

The Choctaw people are poor and they need all the help they can get from the Government. They have practically no oil and what little wealth there is does not go to the tribe, as it does in the case of the Osages, because the Choctaw land has been alloted to individuals. The only tribal property they have consists of coal deposits and they have received nothing from them for many years.

So I am unalterably opposed to abolishing these schools, and particularly this one school in my district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand your statement, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, the Wheelock Academy is made up of students who are either orphans or from broken homes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And this school is more than 100 years old, and the Indians themselves are deeply interested in the school and are very much distressed about the proposal to close it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I also understand that the school has 160 acres, and that there is sufficient room for expansion of the school in case the Indian Service and the committee should ever be able to find funds to expand it. Is that correct?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is right. It is situated in the Choctaw Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is my understanding that probably the poorest Indians in the country, so far as we know, reside in eastern Oklahoma. And I understand that, while you favor economy, you do not favor it to the extent of economizing a few pennies, comparatively speaking, at the expense of the poorest orphan children of the country, who are unable to help themselves.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is right. And there are something over 130 orphan children there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Are there any further questions? If not, we thank you for your statement. I might add that I shall later propose some real economies that will enable the committee to provide funds to retain this and other schools proposed to be abandoned—in the name of economy.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general support and rehabilitation of needy Indians in the United States, $1,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals, and not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for administrative expenses incident thereto, including personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed $35,000) and elsewhere.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 53, line 4, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000."

In line 6, strike out "$45,000" and insert "$22,500."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to reduce the amount for needy Indians and Indian rehabilitation from $1,000,000 to $500,000. In the Budget for 1942 they had $1,150,000. That was scaled down $50,000 in the Budget estimates. Then the committee scaled it another $50,000, so that it is $150,000 below 1942.

You will notice on page 10 of the committee report this language:

The committee is of the opinion that war expenditures should open up means of obtaining employment to many Indians, and that this form of relief expenditure should be reduced to the minimum.

I think, in line with the general trend, that this item could well be reduced from $1,000,000 to $500,000, notwithstanding the representations that were made by those from the Indian Bureau who appeared before the subcommittee.

I was rather interested to see that they represented to the subcommittee that there were as many as 35,000 Indians on needy relief and that the equivalent of 25,000 of this number had to have on an average of 100 percent assistance. The singular thing about that is that on an examination of the census data you will find there are about 40,000 male Indians over the age of 35. So it would appear that if this amount is reduced and prorated over the heads of families, almost every male Indian over 35 in the United States is getting some kind of assistance. That is not very eloquent and persuasive testimony to the work that has been done in the Indian Bureau. It occurs to me that that item should be cut, because I honestly believe there must be abuse there somewhere if these figures stack up. You cannot make anything else out of it.

A portion of this money of course goes to rehabilitation funds. They originally estimated $425,000 for that purpose. Sewing and canning projects, water development, land development, buildings, barns, and chicken houses. They even built 41 garages and sheds out of that money in the last few years. That may be rehabilitation, but when you build a garage it presumes an automobile, and when you drive an automobile it certainly does not presume need.

Among other things, they set up five laundries in the last 4 or 5 years. They built 2,482 new houses. They repaired 4,540 other houses out of this rehabilitation fund. It is no difficult matter, I suppose, to get a bushel basket and fill it with a million dollars and just go about and broadcast this money, notwithstanding all the tearful appeals you have heard about Indian homes with dirt floors. I have been in some of them in the Osage capital and I have been in some of them in South Dakota when I used to sell books to the farmers to get enough money with which to go back to school. It seems to me if we are going to

be consistent in our attitude on this W. P. A. money, we will have to reduce the W. P. A. for the Indians as well. Take some of them off of the pay roll. When they tell us there are 35,000 who are on part-time relief and 25,000 on an average of 100 percent, it means that the equivalent of 50 or 60 or more percent of the male Indians over 35 years of age have been getting some kind of relief. How does that stack up with the recommendation in the report, about men who are going into the Army and finding their way into some productive industry? The committee recognizes that fact itself when they said in their report that they are of the opinion that war expenditures should open up means of obtaining employment to many Indians, and that this form of relief expenditure should be reduced to the minimum. If that means what I think it means, and in view of the fact that this appropriation does not become effective until July 1, 1943, you can well afford to support this amendment and reduce the amount from $1,000,000 to $500,000.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. I think it is proposed to cut the W. P. A. appropriations at least 50 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. JOHNS. And in addition to that it is proposed to cut out entirely the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. If we do that, then it would not be any more than fair that you should cut this down 50 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin takes a reasonable view of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This item of $1,000,000 is for two vital purposes. It is for relief and rehabilitation. The relief feature is to take care of people who are unemployable—the sick, the aged, the crippled. They cannot be employed. Another thing, your relief is going to become more intense among the Indians in the future than it has been in the past because the C. C. C. activities are sharply cut down. Likewise, the N. Y. A. and also the W. P. A., which furnished an avenue of work for some of these Indians, will now, in the main, be closed to them; consequently the relief factor will be higher, and, as I said a moment ago, more intense in the future than it has been in the past.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Is it not true that with Indian men having to go to war and other Indians having to go so far to get work in industry, it leaves a great many women on relief, and that nothing will take care of them except direct relief? These are the most needy people in the whole country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentlewoman because she is just 100 percent right. I want now to refer to the question of rehabilitation. In the Great Plains country thousands of Indians still live in tents and in crude houses almost totally devoid of shelter. During the long drought period we have gone through the Indians lost over 50,000 head of cattle. In the drought section of the western country, like Montana, the Dakotas, and Wyoming, the Indians were almost cleaned of cattle, and this rehabilitation amount, which is 40 percent of the million dollars, or only $400,000, is going to be used for the purpose of purchasing cattle, livestock, and equipment with which the Indians will be able to take care of themselves. This item, Mr. Chairman, should not be cut a dime, as a matter of fact, it is much below what it has been heretofore. In 1939 it was $1,240,000, in 1941 it was $1,600,000, and in 1942 it is only $723,000. So you can see it has been markedly cut down by the committee.

The chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee handling this bill is perhaps more familiar with Indian affairs than any man in this House. I refer to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. I think he has done an excellent job for the taxpayers of this country in cutting down this bill in every way in which it could be cut down. At the same time he and his committee have not overlooked the fact that we owe a duty to the Indian because he has involuntarily been subjected to the state of ward of the United States Government. He is our ward. You are not going to treat your wards in a different way than you would treat your neighbor across the street. The Government, if anything, owes these Indians something higher and beyond what we owe to each other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that this item has already been reduced from the $1,700,000 carried in the bill 2 years ago to $1,000,000 in this bill for the fiscal year 1943, the bill now under consideration. It has been cut $700,000, and the committee thought this was a pretty drastic reduction. There are still a lot of unemployed Indians, especially amongst the older Indians whose lands, in many instances, have been practically taken away from them by the Government of the United States when, several years ago, many incompetent Indians were given what was called force patents by this Government. That is one of the dark pages in American history. Then, of course, in most other instances the Government has to take the lands in trust for the Indians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct. In other words, most of the Indians do not own any land at all. The United States Government holds title to the land in trust for the Indians. The Indian has not anything. His reservations have been taken away from him, and in lieu of that the Government has given him a deed of trust; and in many instances, just as the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota pointed out, these people are living in direst and abject poverty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Instead of "$500,000", insert "$750,000." Instead of "$22,500", insert "$30,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this is a small item. My amendment recognizes the principle that savings should be made but is not quite so drastic as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I wonder if we cannot agree on a compromise between the committee figure and the gentleman's amendment, if we cannot meet the difference half way?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say that I personally would be agreeable to the compromise on condition that there is general agreement among the others that it is satisfactory. Otherwise I shall have to insist on a vote.

Mr. HULL. I think there are those on the floor who would object to either procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment very much in order, and the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois perfectly proper.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have talked this over with several Members. As I say, we recognize that there is considerable sentiment for making a substantial cut on this item. It is argued that some of the Indian boys who were formerly in the reservations are now in the armed forces and are getting some pay. In some places a few of the Indians have obtained work in defense projects. That is not a large number, but admittedly it bears on the problem when we are all putting the war first. Yet I feel the gentleman's amendment goes too far. I am hoping that agreement can be reached on the compromise.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean on this paragraph?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, we are all anxious to economize. I am anxious to economize. The difficulty is that we cannot all agree on just where economy ought to start. I happen to have a large band of Winnebago Indians in my district. They live only a few miles from my town, and I am quite familiar with their mode of life and with their very aggravated situation.

This tribe of Indians, had the white man kept his treaties with them, would

today own at least five counties in northeastern Iowa which were granted to them in perpetuity, over 100 years ago, "forever and ever"—the white man's usual language.

Today the remnants of that tribe are living on submarginal land about 5 miles from my city. They have a little settlement there of probably 300 people altogether, maybe more. Others are scattered throughout that section of Wisconsin. They have been deprived of everything that their ancestors had by the Federal agencies of our country. At one time there was established a trust fund for those Indians of $490,000. A number of years ago, more than 20 years, a law passed the Congress allowing division of that trust fund among those Indians. Agents went out from the Federal bureau and they squandered that money on every scheme that could be imagined, investing the funds in properties which soon were lost and leaving the Indians worse off than ever, leaving those Indians without a dollar.

Many of these Indians are now living in wigwams up there in cold Wisconsin, and it is especially cold there in the wintertime. We have a little school for them. This beneficent Government gives each school child a little bowl of soup, a half pint of milk, and a meager lunch, up in that great dairy country, every school day for 8 months of the year. That is a part of the relief funds which is proposed by this amendment to reduce.

Those people are sending their young men into this war. I happen to know of some of them. One is a marine down at Quantico and the other one is down in South Carolina. Still others are in other Army camps. They are making wonderful soldiers, just as they did in the World War. But at home are the old, the blind, the maimed, and the sick, and they are living under very destitute circumstances.

If you cut this amount down, what are you doing? You are going to compel some of those more destitute Indians to subsist more largely upon the taxpayers of our county, or else you are going to permit them to starve.

Let me call your attention to another angle of economy "as is." You people who want to save money in gobs instead of in driblets should realize that in a single 10 months our country sent to the people of Spain 200,000 tons of foodstuffs. We are sending thousands of tons of foodstuffs today to the French in Africa and to the French colonies in another part of Africa. Those nations are not our allies. In other words, we are feeding the poor and the needy in other sections of the world. Are you going to start economy in Federal expenditures by starving the poor Indian children and the poor old Indian folks out in the Middle West? I am not going to do that. This amendment should be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 47, noes 12.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as amended by the substitute.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois was amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota; so what we are voting on now, as I understand it, is to confirm or approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois as amended by the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 45, noes 11.

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reindeer service: For supervision of reindeer in Alaska and instruction in the care and management thereof, including salaries and travel expenses of employees, purchase, rental, erection, and repair of range cabins, purchase and maintenance of communication and other equipment, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses, $91,160, to be immediately available, and to remain available until June 30, 1944.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana has been recognized.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, are not committee members going to be entitled to recognition when they are on their feet asking for recognition? I make the point of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was on my feet before any member of the committee was on his feet.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet at the same time.

Mr. RICH. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman was sitting down when I was on my feet.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I was sitting here beside the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I want to assure the Chair that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet seeking recognition.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not at the time I got recognition.

Mr. CARTER. At the conclusion of the reading of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Montana, but the Chair thinks he should yield at this time. The Chair had recognized him.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], for whom I have the greatest admiration, I want to correct a statement I made before today.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is speaking out of order and has not received the permission of the Committee to speak out of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am speaking in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With reference to the amount that William Penn paid the Indians, I said this morning that he paid the Indians $250.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that I am in order.

Mr. CARTER. I ask that his amendment be reported.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The amendment was to strike out the last word.

Mr. COCHRAN. What is the last word?

Mr. O'CONNOR. About the reindeer.

Mr. CARTER. The last word is "1944."

Mr. O'CONNOR. It referred to the reindeer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order and confine his remarks to the paragraph.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In connection with the bill and in connection with the Indian problem, and in connection with the whole matter, I want to correct what I stated to the distinguished gentleman this morning as to the amount that William Penn paid to the Indians. I stated it was $250.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DITTER. I asked for the point of order so that if there is any confusion at the moment with reference to whatever my distinguished friend from Montana is saying, I hope the objection is withdrawn and that he is permitted every possible latitude to elaborate on the thought he had earlier in the day.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to waive any right I have to make the point of order, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is not waiving my right to make a point of order here in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. On page 5757 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1937, is a copy of the deed given by the Indians to William Penn, covering what is now the entire State of Pennsylvania, but no money is mentioned except 300 guilders, Dutch coins worth in our money about 41 cents each. Rum, beer, knives,

fishhooks, and so forth, and some clothing, were mentioned. The value of the articles set forth in the deed I do not find mentioned. I ask the gentleman to read that deed. It is a historic document.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I think it is very unfortunate that during the course of the consideration of this bill we should intrude this matter with reference to one single State. May I remind the gentleman, who is making a historical review, that William Penn was the one man who made a treaty with the Indians that was not under seal, that it was the only treaty that was never broken, and that Lord Chesterfield himself, in his letters to his son, commented particularly on the treatment accorded the Indians by William Penn. I do not care to detain the House any further on a subject that I know is so self-evident that it needs no elaboration.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I gladly admit that William Penn was the first in America in authority to recognize the ownership of land in the Indians. He recognized it when he bought this land from the Indians. But I repeat that they took the lands away from the Indians without any consideration whatever except a lot of inexpensive articles of personal property. I do not reflect at all upon the great State of Pennsylvania. The occasion is simply typical of how the Indians have been dealt with.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 53, line 17, change the period to a colon and insert: "*Provided*, That not less than $40,000 of said amount be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes."

Mr. RICH Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments prepared. One is to reduce this item of $91,160. However, after talking to the Delegate from Alaska, and in view of the evidence that was given in the committee to the effect that the handling of the reindeer situation in Alaska has been a failure, I wish to change the amendment. Just let me give you a few facts.

Several years ago, as you know, a bill was passed here to appropriate $2,500,000 to purchase the reindeer that were owned by certain corporations in Alaska. After a round-up and fighting this bill, the Interior Department did a good job. I congratulate them, because they bought all the reindeer in Alaska from these corporations for $720,000. As they figured, they got 84,000 reindeer for $720,000. Then we appropriated $91,000 to herd these reindeer.

Let me read from page 161 of the justifications:

There are now about 50,000 Government-owned reindeer in Alaska, including 6,000 due from native owners. These reindeer are worth $866,250 on the basis of the present wholesale price of 15½ cents per pound. As funds to finance an effective herding program have not been provided, 10,000 to 20,000 Government-owned reindeer have been killed by wolves, or died of starvation and exhaustion during the 12 months following purchase.

Now, does it not seem ridiculous for them to claim that 20,000 of these reindeer died during that one particular year, when that was the first year we ever spent $91,000 to look after them?

I want to make this further statement, and I believe I am correct when I say that all of the members of the committee feel that the purchase of these reindeer has been a failure. But whoever has charge of this matter is trying to herd these reindeer and keep the wolves and coyotes away from them. The only way you are ever going to provide an additional amount of reindeer meat in Alaska is to get rid of the wolves and coyotes, because they kill from 1 to 10 a night. So let us stop herding the reindeer, and kill the coyotes and wolves.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if these wolves and coyotes do not carry guns, or at least a lot of them.

Mr. RICH. Certainly, the hunters kill some. In my opinion, we are not handling this reindeer situation properly. If you adopt this amendment it will provide about $40,000 for getting rid of the coyotes and wolves, and this will do more to save the reindeer than to have a lot of people in that vast territory trying to herd them together.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. May I invite the attention of the gentleman to the fact that although $720,000 was appropriated to purchase the reindeer owned by others than natives of Alaska, only about $446,000 was actually used for that purpose, and the remaining amount of $274,000 was not paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. After the fight we had I want to give the Department of the Interior credit because they certainly did a good job in making that purchase. Mr. Ickes, Mr. Burlew, and others. I congratulate them upon that.

The Delegate from Alaska has seen fit to try to help exterminate these wolves, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] claims, if I understand him correctly, that they kill from 1 to 10 reindeer a night, and that is the best way to increase the number of reindeer. Therefore, if you adopt this policy the Department will then see that at least $40,000 of this money is spent for the extermination of the wolves and coyotes. So I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think he should include the hunters also?

Mr. RICH. If the hunters were brought there to kill the wolves and the coyotes that would help a great deal in extinguishing the wolves.

Mr. JENSEN. They are more apt to kill the reindeer than the wolves or the coyotes.

Mr. RICH. Let us kill both the wolves and the coyotes, and let each hunter have one reindeer, and we can increase our herd very rapidly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Members may recall that over a period of several years I opposed the proposal to purchase reindeer in Alaska, both before the Committee and on the floor of the House. It will also be recalled that at first it was proposed to spend $2,000,000 to buy the reindeer. The proposal was presented to the House on three separate occasions, and I opposed it each time it came up. I also opposed it actively in the committee. I remember the gentleman from New York opposed it very bitterly. Finally, there was a compromise worked out whereby a bill was passed authorizing $750,000 for the purchase of some 250,000 reindeer and equipment. When the reindeer were counted, it was discovered that there were only 84,000 for which the Interior Department paid only $450,000, and this sum included funds for the purchase of range improvements, and there were a lot of improvements of considerable value involved.

The Government now has invested $450,000, and there are now estimated to be 250,000 reindeer all told in Alaska. Reindeer meat is a primary food among the Eskimos and the Indians of Alaska. Its importance to the economic stability of Alaska cannot be overemphasized. If Congress, figuratively speaking, throws up its hands now and says, "We will have nothing further to do with it; it is a failure, and we are sorry about it, although we have $450,000 invested in Alaskan reindeer," then most of the reindeer will be exterminated by wolves or coyotes in the next year or two. I do not feel that it is the desire of Congress that situation be permitted to solve itself in any such fashion.

The question now is, What are we going to do about it? I am sure the Congress wants to handle the matter in the best way possible. I do not think Congress wants to eliminate the entire matter. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a suggestion that I made to the officials of the Department of the Interior when the matter came before the committee.

It will be recalled that I asked them in some detail about spending a goodly portion of this money for the trapping of coyotes and wolves, and the Department officials who happened to be there opposed it. Mr. Cooley, who has been in charge of agriculture for the Indians and has done a swell job, has now been placed in charge of the reindeer situation in Alaska, and he has consistently done a good job wherever he has gone. I do not pretend to say that a good job has been done in connection with this reindeer matter during the past year, but it does seem reasonable to suggest that

Mr. Cooley ought to be given an opportunity to build up this herd of reindeer in Alaska. We must do something about it. We cannot afford to permit this to be a failure. If it is necessary to spend additional funds for the trapping and killing coyotes and wolves, I shall not hesitate to urge that be done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Was it not stated in the committee that the greatest reason for the killing of these animals is because of the infestation of the country by wolves?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure that is one of the main reasons; there are others. I think they must have herders if we are going to protect the interests that we have in Alaska.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the opinion of the Delegate from Alaska in respect to this amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would be very glad to have the gentleman answer that question. The gentleman came before our committee, and his advice and counsel are always sought by our committee. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to abide by his suggestions in the matter.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The subject that is now under discussion is one which is not only of great concern to the people of Alaska, but if the people of the United States generally knew about it, it would be of almost equal concern to them, because it relates to the use of about 200,000 square miles of land in Alaska which is more suitable for reindeer pasture than for anything else. To get the picture it is necessary for me to recite briefly some of the history of bringing reindeer to Alaska and of their maintenance there. We started with a "seed crop" of only 1,280 reindeer. They were brought to Alaska in installments between 1892 and 1902. Over the years that number increased, and, for most of the time under careful and assiduous herding by the Eskimos, it reached the number estimated, according to testimony in the hearings, of 641,000.

The herds grew from 1,280 to 640,000 in something less than 40 years. Then, through a combination of circumstances not necessary to go into, because it would take a long time, herding was discontinued upon the invitation of the Government, and so the wolves and coyotes multiplied, and there was some other illicit killing, and thus the herds were seriously depleted. The result is, we are told now, that there are only 205,000 reindeer in Alaska. Much of the difficulty arose through the purchase of reindeer by the white men and the conflict between the interests of the Eskimos and the whites; and Congress, in my judgment, in a statesmanlike manner, attempted to solve that by buying out all of the white men's reindeer and providing that the Eskimos from that time on should have and use and own all of the live reindeer. That purchase was completed about a year and a half ago. In the meantime, since herding was discontinued, the wolves and the coyotes have increased to such large numbers that it has not been possible yet to kill enough of them off to prevent them from killing vast numbers of the reindeer. It would be a tragedy to discontinue this work of protecting and caring for the reindeer, and I hope that the House will not eliminate the appropriation altogether or reduce it to some insignificant sum like $11,000, as has been suggested, or reduce it at all. At the same time, I must admit that I believe that the first thing to be done by the Government is to kill the coyotes and wolves, for then the reindeer will multiply as they did between 1900 and 1930, and if that is done the time is not so many years distant when we will have a million reindeer in Alaska, and they will again be an important source of food and clothing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure that the members of the committee, and every Member of the House, have implicit confidence in the Delegate from Alaska and in his sincerity of purpose and desire to assist in this very important situation. I am wondering if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be willing to withdraw his first amendment.

Mr. RICH. Oh, the first amendment I asked to have withdrawn, and I am only asking that we allocate $40,000 of this to the killing of these wolves and coyotes. As the Delegate said, that is the best way to help the reindeer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment if the Delegate thinks that it is desirable. I am willing to do that, or if it should be determined any other way, then I am satisfied with that—say a division of 50–50.

Mr. RICH. We ask for only $40,000 for that purpose, and I think it would help the reindeer situation very much.

Mr. DIMOND. It is entirely feasible at moderate expense to so reduce the numbers of wolves and coyotes in the reindeer regions that the reindeer will be again able to thrive and multiply. While some of the reindeer live in timbered country which affords shelter to the wolves and other wild animals, by far the greater number of them, perhaps 90 percent, graze in open country and never enter the timber. Thousands upon thousands of square miles of the reindeer pastures contain no timber whatsoever. During the winter season, when snow is on the ground, both reindeer and wolves can be readily seen from the air. I have flown over a reindeer herd consisting of some thousands of animals, and at one side of the herd, perhaps a quarter of a mile away, were three wolves readily visible from the air. At that moment it occurred to me that the way of eliminating the wolves and coyotes in Alaska was to hunt them with the use of airplanes. It would be impossible for these predatory animals to escape. Many wolves have been killed by hunters in airplanes using only shotguns and rifles. One can readily see that by equipping a plane with a machine gun it would be possible in a year or two to kill practically all the wolves in the reindeer country.

Some of them would, of course, escape, but the numbers could be so reduced that their depredations upon the reindeer herds would be insignificant, as was the case between 1900 and 1925 when the reindeer increased from 1,280 to more than half a million in number. At that time, the number of wolves in Alaska was relatively insignificant because for most of that period the reindeer were herded continuously day and night, and the herders were able to kill practically all the wolves which approached their herds. In those former days, too, there were no coyotes in Alaska. They came in in the 1920's, but they have increased prodigiously in number and are now said to be as destructive as the wolves.

As has been suggested by a question asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] there has been some unlawful hunting and killing of reindeer, but the loss to the herds which occur in this manner has been of no material consequence.

The reindeer herds can be rebuilt not only to their former number but, in my judgment, to more than double that number. There is no reason in the world why Alaska cannot support in perpetuity a million reindeer unless it is considered the reindeer pasture is more valuable for other purposes. But in order to reestablish the herds and to so increase them, it is necessary, first, that the reindeer be herded as they were in the early days by the Eskimos, to some extent under Government supervision; that the tundra fires be prevented or kept under control because millions of acres of excellent reindeer pasture have already been destroyed by such fires; and, above and beyond all else, that the present enormous stock of wolves and coyotes in Alaska be hunted down and killed.

While it will never be possible to kill all the wolves and coyotes in Alaska, they can be kept under control so they will do comparatively little damage. In this connection, I suggest that a greater effort should be made to slaughter all the wolves and coyotes that can be found in Mount McKinley National Park. For many years they enjoyed in that area complete protection, and only in the last 3 or 4 years have orders been given to kill wolves in the park whenever they were encountered. It is my understanding that from three to seven wolves and coyotes have been killed each year in the park for several years past. A determined effort should be made to kill every wolf and every coyote in Mount McKinley National Park, as well as elsewhere in Alaska.

In this connection it is worthy of note that the Territorial government pays a bounty of $17.50 each on wolves and coyotes, and the hunters keep the pelts. This is a considerable drain on the Territorial treasury, but the Legislature of Alaska has thought it justified because without such a bounty the destruction of these predatory animals on the other wildlife

of Alaska would be even more appalling than it is. The Territory is really doing its part in paying this considerable bounty on wolves and coyotes.

The reindeer are really of more value than most people know. Not only is the meat truly excellent but the reindeer skins, with the hair left on, make the warmest garments of which I have any knowledge. They are invaluable for use as coats and parkas and particularly as sleeping bags, combining warmth with lightness.

The reindeer should be distributed more widely over Alaska, and particularly in the Aleutian Islands. From the hearings it will be seen that the reindeer now on St. Lawrence Island and Nunivak Island, some thousands in number, multiply and thrive because no wolf or coyote is to be found on either of those islands. The Reindeer Service should, at the earliest possible moment, also stock a number of other islands of Alaska, especially Unalaska Island and Umnak Island, the former, perhaps, 75 miles long and 20 miles wide, and the latter at least 50 miles long and 15 miles wide. These islands could easily support a great many thousands of reindeer and would be of immense benefit to the natives of that region. Many other areas in Alaska could be similarly so stocked, and they should be so stocked, with reindeer at the earliest possible moment. I realize that at the present time the serious lack of shipping for all purposes would prevent the transportation of reindeer by sea for any considerable distance.

As was suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], the United States Government has a distinct and substantial stake in the maintenance and protection of the Alaska reindeer. As was indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], $720,000 was appropriated by Congress for the purpose of buying the Alaska reindeer owned by others than the natives of Alaska in 1939. Of this sum, approximately $446,000 was used for the purchase of the reindeer and of reindeer range equipment, and the balance, amounting to about $274,000, was not used and remained in the Treasury. The history of this transaction was set forth by the late great Hon. Edward T. Taylor, then chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, in his remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 1, 1940. But even if the Government did not even have a cent invested in reindeer, it would still be the part of wisdom to protect and preserve the reindeer as a present and future food supply of Alaska, and in case of need of the Nation, and as the source of supply of clothing for military personnel and civilians for winter use in cold climates. To now abandon the reindeer would be short-sighted, indeed, because we know by past experience that under proper conditions Alaska can support so many hundreds of thousands of these valuable animals that they would constitute a real asset not only to Alaska but to the Nation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the gentleman's opinion as to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to allot $40,000 of this amount to the killing of the wolves and coyotes?

Mr. DIMOND. I hesitate to give a categorical answer to the gentleman, because I do not want to come into conflict with the Interior Department and with other people who are just as earnest and just as intelligent as I am, and just as desirous of saving the reindeer of Alaska. But if I were the administrator and had the disposal of the fund of $91,000 in the bill I think I would spend at least $40,000 of it to kill the coyotes and the wolves. I think, thereby, I would do the best possible thing to permit the reindeer to multiply and be thus sufficient to supply the needs of Alaska.

I do not want to be in the position of accepting this amendment or saying that I favor it, because I still believe that Mr. Cooley, of the Department of the Interior, mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], probably understands the condition just as well as I do, but he does not want to spend so much money for killing the wolves and the coyotes as I would. I should, on that account, desire to have this appropriation go through as written, but it would be better to adopt the amendment than to reduce the appropriation for care of the reindeer. At the same time I believe that the extermination of the wolves and coyotes is absolutely necessary to save the reindeer.

Let me tell you about the wolves and coyotes. They are more terrible than people realize. I talked with some Eskimos who at one time had a large reindeer herd in Alaska, in 1938. They told me that their herds had numbered a good many thousand and had finally been reduced to about 11,000. I asked the cause of it. They said the wolves killed them. I said, "Did the wolves eat all of those reindeer in the course of the winter?"

The Eskimo explained to me—he did not use this language, but he said, in effect, that the wolves are fussy about their diet—the wolves are epicures concerning their food. As long as they can get reindeer tongue they will eat nothing but the tongue. They will kill a reindeer and eat its tongue; then they will kill another reindeer and eat its tongue; and another one; and so on. The Eskimos in charge of this particular herd told me that they had lost more than 100 reindeer out of their herd in one night to one pair of wolves. So the wolves are an awful scourge to the reindeer, and unless the wolves and coyotes are controlled there is not much use appropriating money to the reindeer service. The wolves and coyotes can be controlled, if not exterminated. That job should be done without delay. Moreover, the reindeer must be herded; that, too, is indispensable. The tundra fires should be prevented. The reindeer should be distributed widely over Alaska and particularly on the islands. That is a sound program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, after hearing the statement of the Delegate from Alaska, as far as the committee is concerned, we will gladly accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and give the trappers an opportunity to show us what they can do. This Government has too much invested and reindeer meat is entirely too essential to the natives to permit our herds in Alaska to become extinct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am wondering what the chairman of the subcommittee is going to do about this? I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that we had an agreement earlier in the afternoon, and I am sure he was not on the floor at the time, in which I stated that, in conjunction with the chairman of the subcommittee, we would object to requests to speak out of order. We are endeavoring to finish this bill today. We are going to have to sit late in order to do it. It is a long bill. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his request at this time, because I stated on the floor some hours ago that we would have to confine the arguments this afternoon to the bill under consideration.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have only used 10 minutes' time on this bill in 2 days. I think I am going to address myself to something that is quite important. I have reduced it to writing so that I will not be wandering around and so that I can get it off with precision.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman always makes an interesting statement. Had I not made that statement I would be glad to cooperate.

Mr. NICHOLS. I hope the gentleman will not object. It was not necessary for me to ask to speak out of order. I could have just gone ahead and done it.

Mr. CARTER. I might ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he desires to set aside that rule and allow Members to speak out of order. If he does, I am not going to object to setting aside that rule, but I think we ought to preserve the integrity of that understanding for this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a liberal ruling will let the gentleman go ahead anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There was such an agreement earlier and I have asked other members who have spoken to me about it to wait until later in the day. I have said that if we are able to finish this bill by 5 o'clock, which

I think it would be possible to do and which we are making a strong effort to do, that I would then be glad to revise and modify that agreement. Of course, I cannot object to the gentleman. I never have done so.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would withhold his request for the present and renew it a little later.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman been granted any time at the present time?

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, the gentleman has been recognized, I understand.

Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my request and renew it at a later time, and will address myself to a different subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his request. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS Mr. Chairman, I understand that this morning one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], took the floor and questioned some of the statements I made on yesterday relative to a bid submitted by the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. for power to furnish Camp Gruber in my district. I understand that he said a bid of 5 mills per kilowatt-hour was not submitted by the Grand River Dam Authority, but that it was 7.2 mills. I am sure my friend was trying to straighten out what he thought was a misunderstanding, but my friend was incorrect.

The prime bid of the Grand River Dam Authority was 5 mills. What brought it to 7.2 mills was the line charge that would be made by the Grand River Dam Authority in delivering the power to Camp Gruber. I am not advised whether or not in the 10.8 mills bid by the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. the line charge was included, but for the sake of the argument let us agree that it was. There would still be a difference of 3.6 mills between the two bids. In this connection this morning I again called on the Army engineers and asked who it was in the War Production Board they talked to who advised them that they should give the bid to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. at the higher figure. A general in the Corps of Army Engineers advised me that it was a man by the name of Mr. Kahler. I called Mr. Kahler on the telephone. He said, "No; I never advised them. I never heard anything about it at all until this moment." I said, "Will you send me a letter to this effect?" He said, "I will"; and I presume that letter is now in the mails to reach my office this afternoon.

I was further advised that the reason the bid was given to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. was because it was said that if the bid were given to the Grand River Dam Authority, the Grand River Dam Authority would have to have priorities on material, so the bid was given to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.; and then, after the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. got the bid, they had to have, and did get, priorities on exactly the same materials that the Grand River Dam Authority would have had to have had the Grand River Dam Authority got the contract at the lower bid. I still say that there is a lot of funny business in it. I have never seen as much ball-passing in my life as there has been on this. Nobody will agree that he did anything. He just "passes the buck" to somebody.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last night's Evening Star carried an Associated Press dispatch which confirms what the gentleman from Oklahoma has said. In this article it states that General Manager Douglas Wright, of the Grand River Dam Authority, charges that the War Department consistently refuses to use this power for defense projects. The article goes on to quote him as saying:

> I have done my best to accomplish what the President wanted me to do; that was to make the Grand River power work for national defense. Apparently it cannot be done. It is impossible for me to get a contract with the Army.

I do not know anything about this or why the Army has taken this attitude, but I do know that the Army engineers are insisting that we commit ourselves to $87,500,000 for power projects in Arkansas and southwest Missouri. I refer to the Bull Shoals and Table Rock projects which you will have a chance to vote on tomorrow. What is the use of the Government putting up power projects if the Army is not going to use them for defense purposes? That is what the sponsors say they want them for. They have the Norfolk Dam that is being constructed now that will furnish power. Why have two additional ones in the neighborhood and commit this Government to the expenditure of $87,500,000 when the Army refuses to use the power? At least that is what the paper said and what the gentleman from Oklahoma said—the Army refuses to use it for national defense purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that constructive criticism? I think it is.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think it is constructive criticism.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do, too.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then what is the gentleman hollering about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not hollering, as the gentleman terms my remarks. I just want to get it in the RECORD that it is constructive, so we can use it on the Democrats when they yell that similar remarks made by Republicans are sniping.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman should be able to judge. He knows I am always constructive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am able to judge. What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] have just said is constructive. Unfortunately, whenever like statements are made by others they are accused of partisanship—of playing politics.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Wisconsin: Keshena, $78,525, including $25,000, of which not exceeding $5,000 shall be available for general relief purposes and not exceeding $20,000 for monthly allowances, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, to old and indigent members of the Menominee Tribe who reside with relatives or friends: *Provided*, That not to exceed $6,000 shall be available from the funds of the Menominee Indians for the payment of salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreters of the Menominee general council and members of the Menominee Advisory Council and tribal delegates when engaged on business of the tribe at rates to be determined by the Menominee general council and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 55, line 7, strike out "$78,525" and insert "$83,725." And in line 8, after the word "which" insert: "$5,200 shall be available for compensation and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys employed by the tribe under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior and".

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which increases the amount stipulated in this paragraph by the sum of $5,200, but it is an amendment that does not cost the Treasury of the United States one single penny. I hope I may have the attention of the Members, because I consider this to be a rather important amendment from the standpoint of these Indians.

This amendment relates to the right of the Menominee Tribe, in Wisconsin, to employ in the protection of its own business its own counsel, to be paid for out of its own funds. The Menominee Indian Tribe has over $1,500,000 to their credit at the present time in cash in the Treasury of the United States. They have over $5,000,000 worth of other assets, among which are their sawmills at Keshena, Wis., which employ hundreds of Indians, has a large annual pay roll, and is doing a very large business at the present time. This year it will show a net profit to the Indians of over $150,000.

Their interests are frequently adverse to those of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Their sawmill and all their logging operations are conducted under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I think it should be perfectly obvious to any honest man that there are times without number—and, without going into detail, I can say now that there are occasions when the interests of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior are absolutely adverse to the rights of the Indians. There is a dispute pending at the present time, for instance, over the management of this sawmill operation by the manager appointed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They have continually lost money, and the Indians claim that the sawmills should have made a large profit. They want their own counsel to handle their own affairs, to be paid out of their own funds. Why, in the name of conscience, the committee

should have stricken this item from the bill is beyond my wildest imagination.

This item was in the bill recommended by the President and by the Budget. The committee has stricken it out, and the only justification appearing in the report is that they have adopted a general attitude of refusing counsel to the Indians of their own choice throughout the entire country and are compelling the Indians to accept their legal advice from the attorneys of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior. So when a question arises as between this tribe, involving their own property and their own affairs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior, they have not a dollar of funds with which they can employ their own counsel to represent them, but must be represented by counsel for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If you can justify that sort of conduct, then it seems to me you are denying these wards of the Government, who are citizens of the United States, the inherent right that exists in every citizen that in matters involving his interest he has the right to be represented in litigation or in matters of business by attorneys of his own choosing.

Bear in mind we are not asking the Government for any money. We are simply asking to be permitted to spend our own funds in the sum of $5,200. The tribal council of the Menominee Tribe has engaged counsel, the same counsel that have represented them for a number of years very satisfactorily. They want to employ these attorneys and have unanimously voted in their tribal council for the appropriation of these funds. Why should they not be entitled to use their own money for this purpose? The contract which they enter into is subject to the approval of the Department of the Interior.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have checked into this matter. While these Indians are not in my district, I know a great many of them. They are splendid people, and they are doing a fine business. I have undertaken to advise them, and I have seen to it that they have had proper legal representation. They have accepted my advice. This is not a situation where some buccaneers are trying to steal the money of the Indians. The representation which they have is the very highest type of legal representation and the Indians want it.

Their attorneys, last year, spent 123 days working on the affairs of these Indians, besides handling a large number of personal injury actions, and a large number of workmen's compensation cases that have arisen through the operation of the sawmill on the Indian reservation.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. If this should be allowed and the amendment should carry, would it go to services claimed to have been performed or for services yet to be performed?

Mr. KEEFE. It will go for services to be performed under contract to be entered into by the tribal council and the attorney, to be approved by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The thought has arisen in my mind as follows: Suppose the counsel for the Indians clashes with the counsel for the Interior Department, which one prevails?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot say who prevails except that the Indians are entitled to representation. There are constantly matters arising as between these Indians. For instance, this committee has approved an item of over $6,000 to pay the expenses of the tribal representatives who come down here to Washington every year in the interest of this tribe and in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. My experience has been since I became a Member of Congress that those people immediately are represented and guided and directed by counsel for the Indian Bureau. They need their own counsel to advise them in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Let me call your attention to another thing. You observe in the report that the committee says:

> In connection with funds provided in the estimate for the employment of agents or attorneys for the purposes of rendering assistance to the tribes, the committee has recommended the elimination of all such requests, and it is the opinion of the committee that legal assistance and other aid should be available to the Indians from attorneys and other employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

At least the committee, in providing legal assistance to the three tribes in Oklahoma, apparently did not follow that policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is not an authorization in this bill for any contract attorney. That is an altogether different situation.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know anything about that, but I can say that in the bill there is provision for attorneys' fees, stenographers, and office expenses for attorneys for three tribes of Indians, the Choctaws, the Chickasaws, and the Osages, in the gentleman's State of Oklahoma. That is clearly in this bill. Anyone who can read can find it there. I submit that if anyone who has the bill in his hands will turn to that page, I

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not mean to tell the House that the Choctaws and the Chickasaws and the other Indians who employ their own Indian attorneys and have employed them for the last 25 years have attorneys who are in the same category as the contract attorneys who in many cases—possibly not in this case; I agree that it is not the same in this case—run down to the different tribes and say, "The Government of the United States owes you money. Just hire us and we will collect millions of dollars from the Government." That is what our committee was getting at.

Mr. KEEFE. If I thought for one moment that there was any such thing as that involved in this request I would not be here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as I am concerned, they are only asking to do the ordinary legal affairs for this tribe, the same as the attorneys are doing down in Oklahoma, and the same as they have done for years. I do not see how you can make fish of one and fowl of the other.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I take the floor of the House, especially to oppose the members of this committee, with whom I have worked and for whose judgment and integrity I have the highest respect. However, this is a matter that I think goes to fundamental principles. I may say to the House that I have no interest at all in these Indians. They are not in my district. I am not involved in any way. But I have come to know just what has been done in this matter for about 4 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is stating that he is not interested. The gentleman would like to have an attorney for some Indians in whom he is interested? Is that the idea?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Not in the least. I have no Indians in my district, and I do not care anything about who is appointed or anything of that sort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will be kind enough to yield again, let me say that there is a fundamental policy, and the committee believes that that policy should be carried out.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I believe that if the committee believes that policy should exist, it then owes a duty to this House to cut out the attorneys for the three tribes of Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. A situation like that has no connection at all with this.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am willing to submit to this House whether or not it has. Let us consider the facts about this tribe of Indians. The gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has stated the facts with reference to the Wisconsin tribe. I know the facts as to another tribe of Indians, in Oregon, in the district of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], the Klamath Tribe of Indians. Attorneys have represented them for 3 or 4 years. I am personally acquainted with the attorneys who represent them. They are high-class, fine, outstanding attorneys, and they have done a good job.

Last year the attorneys for the Klamath Tribe of Indians spent 150 days on the business of these Indians, and they get $4,500 a year. I talked to the Department to get the facts that I am stating. I talked to the assistant in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and he said that the Klamath Tribe of Indians owns in its own right $20,000,000 worth of property, and these Indians are doing $1,000,000 worth of business every year. They come to Washington with hundreds of problems. To show you what has been going on, this year they had $82,000 of claims filed against them. What they ask Congress to do is this: They say, "Permit us to take from our tribal funds the funds we earn ourselves, our own funds, and employ an attorney to defend us in these particular matters." What right has the Congress to say, "You cannot do it"?

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I believe the gentleman stated that the attorneys who represent the Klamath Indians spent 150 days in serving them?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. LEAVY. Does the gentleman know if any member of that firm in the last year was out on the Klamath Reservation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I happen to know that one of the members of the firm was out on the Klamath Reservation last year.

Mr. LEAVY. For how many days?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not know, but I know he was there. That is just a red herring to drag across the trail, and it does not mean anything, because you know and I know and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] knows, as a lawyer, that the work the attorneys for the Indians have to do is done right here in Washington. They are Washington lawyers. They did not go out and seek this job. The Indians came here. The attorneys who did this work saved the Indians, on these claims, $82,000 this year.

Now, why should these Indians, when it comes to a matter of policy or a matter involving legal questions or a matter involving claims, be required to go to the Department of the Interior and rely entirely on the Department's lawyer? Why should they be required to do that? Is there any reason for that? Why should they not have a right to say, "We want to take our funds and hire a man that we think can represent us"?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I have always opposed this type of expenditure, and it certainly cannot be because I want to do any injury to my own profession, the law, or the lawyers. I do not challenge the good faith or the standing of the lawyers who are thus retained but it is fundamentally wrong to spend the Indian trust funds in this manner.

I want you first to get this thought in mind. There are 200 Indian tribes in the United States, and it is a safe assertion that 75 percent of them have no funds of their own now held in trust by the United States. The 150 tribes, then, are just as much entitled to legal representation as the 50 tribes who do happen to have money, if it be sound in principle to employ private counsel to represent Indians who happen to have a cash credit in their trust account.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. No; I regret I cannot. I want to make my own statement.

I assert it is not sound in principle. Any American Indian, I do not care who he is, or where he is, can spend his money, when he wants to, for attorneys or doctors or anything else, but what they here seek to spend is not the money of any individual Indian; they are trust funds that are sought to be spent. These are funds that are put into the Treasury of the United States, and Uncle Sam, by act of Congress, is made the trustee for the Indian tribe—not the individual, but the tribe—and it is his duty, unless he breaks faith with his ward, to look after the ward's interest and not approve an action indicating on its face that Uncle Sam is not doing his part by spending tribal funds to employ additional counsel to go out and resist the things that the guardian is doing.

The Solicitor's Office in the Interior Department has dozens of lawyers. These are Government lawyers, and they are employed to represent these Indians in all trust matters just as much as where a court appoints a guardian for an incompetent and then authorizes the guardian to select an attorney and permits him to pay the attorney under the supervision of the court.

What would you think of the court if it told a ward, who is recognized, to begin with, as an incompetent, to go out and employ an attorney in addition to the one provided by the court and then that court would take out of that ward's estate the money to pay this second attorney, whose sole business it would be to do the work of the guardian and the attorney provided by him?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. LEAVY. I regret very much that I have not the time.

Mr. KEEFE. I will correct you.

Mr. LEAVY. These Indians that are mentioned here are not the only ones who happen to have some tribal funds. Six years ago there were only 2 cases where it was sought to spend money in this manner. This year it had grown to 10 tribes that seek to spend their trust funds in this manner.

The history is, and it is a sad history, that when the Indians exhaust their tribal trust funds, then they become gratuity Indians and we are asked to provide for them out of direct appropriations made from the Federal Treasury. I have Indian tribes in my district. They are also giving heed to the alluring suggestion, that if they seek counsel like other tribes, in addition to that provided by law, that great riches can be gotten for them.

Now if there is something wrong with the Indian Bureau, if there is something wrong with the management of these Indian trust funds, let us correct it by legislation, but let us not use this method of employing private attorneys simply because there is money in the fund that can be drawn upon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I do not have time to yield.

I want to make this further statement. Not a single attorney in the 6 years I have been on this committee has ever appeared before it and made a showing of anything except in one instance, and that was a typewritten page or two showing they had written some letters today and a letter written yesterday and another letter written a month ago.

None of these attorneys proposed to be employed represents the tribe on any pending legislation; none is retained to appear in an issue that is a justiciable issue, but they merely draw an annual salary, some of them as much as $7,500. I know of one instance where they were drawing $6,000 and they admitted they had never been near the Indian reservation, from which tribe they had been drawing money for year after year. I say if you adopt this amendment you do something that is fundamental, you adopt a policy that virtually says to every tribe, whether it be a pauper tribe or whether it be a tribe with $1,000,000. You are entitled to employ attorneys, not to handle pending litigation but merely to have them on an annual retainer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 3 additional minutes so he may yield for questions.

Mr. LEAVY. My time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE) there were—ayes 23, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads under the provisions of the acts of May 26, 1928 (25 U. S. C. 318a), as supplemented and amended, and September 5, 1940 (Public, No. 780), $1,148,000 to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000 of the foregoing amount may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*

further, That not to exceed $90,000 of this appropriation shall be available for lease, construction, or repair of structures for housing road materials, supplies, and equipment, and for quarters for road crews, but the cost of any structure erected hereunder shall not exceed $5,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 59, line 21, strike out "$1,148,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes in a discussion of this item. Here is an item for improvement, construction, and so forth, of roads in Indian reservations amounting to $1,148,000. I merely offer an opportunity to the committee to save $148,000. I hope the committee will agree with me and adopt the amendment. Certainly we can reserve this road building until after the war is won.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amount has been drastically cut. It has been cut $52,000 below the Budget estimate, and that is considerably below the amount expended last year. As stated in my opening statement with reference to this important road item, we have expended from year to year up to four or five million dollars. Only 2 or 3 years ago we spent $4,000,000 for this item. The chairman of the Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] is present in the Chamber, and will bear out the statement that for years we have kept around 10,000 to 12,000 unemployed Indians at work with this road item. The committee recognizing the fact that there are fewer unemployed Indians at this time than there were last year, has drastically reduced this item. I again remind the committee that this item has been reduced from $4,000,000 2 years ago to $1,148,000. It seems to me that the committee has gone a long way in offering to cooperate in the war efforts. The building of roads, after all, is an important factor in the national-defense program. I doubt whether any money to be expended in this bill would be of greater importance, in seeing to it that if necessary our troops could be transported over these roads. This money will put unemployed Indians to work, and will build roads that ought to have been built a long time ago. The committee has reduced drastically and has again reduced it, and it seems to me that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to take just a moment or two. It seems to me that the amount brought in by the Committee, $1,148,000 for roads and bridges for the Indians might be cut this additional $148,000, as suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It is again a question of whether to put steel in roads, remotely disconnected from strategic necessary highways, for the transportation of our troops, or to use this construction steel to make guns and tanks for the protection of our armed forces. True, $148,000 would not buy very much steel, but it will be a start in that direction, and I think that Congress would be much prouder of itself, of its work in this Interior Department appropriation bill, if it can say that every time it had a chance it spent money for steel for MacArthur's forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned a few moments ago that the Chairman of the House Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] is in the chamber, and now ask that gentleman this question. Is it not true that it is not proposed to spend any of this money for steel or concrete, and that this money will be used primarily for gravel roads?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is true. In fact, it is my understanding that this money will all be required for maintenance, and that no new construction can be undertaken with this greatly reduced appropriation. The funds will all be used to keep the existing Indian roads in serviceable condition and protect the investment of approximately $30,000,000 in them. This item does so much, and it is so little for the large number of Indians benefited and the important areas served in about 25 States that I am surprised that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] would even suggest that it be cut. Some of the Indian roads are the only access to strategic war materials, and some are used extensively for the transport of troops and military supplies. Some Indian reservations are in strategic areas, near military posts and international border lines.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean this amendment or this paragraph?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will be recognized within the 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this cut is only $148,000. It makes a cut below the Budget estimate of $200,000 out of $1,200,000. It is a very moderate cut. It is an item for regular construction and repair of bridges and roads, and there is absolutely no reason why they cannot get along with this amount. It is more in proportion than is allowed the Bureau of Roads for construction of general highways throughout the country. I think we ought to show common sense and adopt the amendment and cut out $148,000 at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize we do not seem to accomplish very much in attempting to cut these huge figures down. This item is for $1,148,000 and is for Indian reservation roads only. None of it outside Indian reservations. It should be cut deeper, but we are only asking that you agree to reduce it a little more than 10 percent. This is entirely separate and apart from the regular road program.

In order to tie this in to the war program they say some of these roads and trails might be used for military purposes, yet the chairman of the Roads Committee says that these roads will be gravel roads. These are not military roads at all. They are just roads and trails that have to do with these Indian reservations. These are not intended as regular military roads. You have a program that has to do with military roads separate and apart from this one.

But let us get down to brass tacks. You have got $1,148,000. Do we not have the courage to just trim this a little bit, just 10 percent, just 10 cents out of every dollar, and save $148,000? I agree the committee has done a fairly good job, but certainly you can go that much further. Does not $148,000 mean anything any more? We can afford to let the construction of some of these roads go a little while and get into fighting the war a little more, then take care of the Indian roads a little later on. You have got $1,000,000 to keep these roads in general repair. That is all you need, because you do not have the unemployment now that you had in the past. A great deal of this kind of road building was done in order to give these Indians employment. You do not have that acute unemployment problem now. Here is a chance to save a little money. Why not offer a little encouragement to the people of this country by showing a little additional economy?

As a matter of fact our citizens would be shocked if they knew this Congress was spending $1,148,000 for repairs and bridges on Indian trails when we need the funds so much for the prosecution of the war. I just hope you will have the courage to get up and support amendments to reduce items in this bill in line with our needs and not in line with the things we would like to have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman from Oklahoma, in charge of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In my statement I said it could be used to assist in the military situation in this country. Let me give you an example. At Fort Sill, Okla., there is a gravel road that goes right up to the fort, and it is over an Indian reservation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes, but how long is that part of the road that

may be used by the Army? Not much, and that part of the road is built. Certainly will not a very great part of a million dollars do that? Besides a big fund is provided for military roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There are several such instances where a gravel road is adjacent to the fort, and therefore it could be used for military purposes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Infinitesimal, and a very small part of these Indian trails and roads will be used for military purposes. In the light of the need of funds for airplanes and guns and supplies for our fighting forces, I trust you will go along and reduce this item $148,000. You ought to do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy, but this is the worst kind of economy, to me it is wasting and throwing away previous investments. We spent hundreds of millions of dollars to build these roads and now if we cannot keep them up we will let them go to pieces and will have to rebuild them again. We talk about them being Indian trails. In my section every one of these roads that goes through an Indian reservation is used by the mail route, by the school busses, and also by the general public. Wherever a road crosses an Indian reservation, whether it is a State or a Federal road, maintenance comes out of the money appropriated for the Indian Bureau. It will force counties or States to use their meager highway income to keep these roads passable to get the mail and the children to school. We have lost practically all of our Federal aid for highways. We have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in our roads. Now we are going to let them go to pieces so that they cannot be traveled. Is that economy? I think that is the worst kind of economy. Would it be economy to build a $15,000 home and then not spend any money to keep it in repair? We have been economizing on the rural mail routes, and I am swamped with letters, and so will the other rural Members be when the new year comes around. They are consolidating our rural routes, as much as 65 miles to one mail carrier. Our roads are going to pieces. Are not our rural people just as much entitled to service as the people in the cities? They have not foregone any of their service. The farmers out in the country can walk to town to get their mail, or they can go 2 or 3 miles to a mail box, because the mail routes have been consolidated. Where they had four or five out of one post office, now there are only one or two rural mail carriers, with routes as much as 65 miles long. That may be all right in certain sections of the country, but not in my country. With snowdrifts in winter, frost boils, and sink holes for months in spring no mail carrier can service a route over 35 miles long. That is economy, but the rural people are paying for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that many rural routes run through Indian reservations, but the roads are almost impassable?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Absolutely. They had crushers in there the last few years, and they have been graveled. Now, of course, if you cannot keep them up, they are bound to go to pieces—after all, $1,000,000 scattered over thousands of miles of roads on all the Indian reservations is so little that you cannot even run over them with a road grader once a year. How are you going to keep them up? I think it is a ridiculously small amount when you figure the territory we have got to cover with $1,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, Churchill just announces that the battle of the Atlantic is going against him, yet we are talking about appropriations for trails and roads.

I feel terribly sorry for those fellows up in Wisconsin. In my district there are five applications for every vacancy on a rural route. If one of those mail carriers does not like his job, there are five others who will take it.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry, I cannot.

Listen to this from page 2954 of yesterday's RECORD:

> Last night my own son (and the son is in the Army) was required to turn in two of the four cotton shirts issued by the Government because they did not have sufficient shirts to dress the boys in the line.

Now we are talking about building trails and roads. Down there in my own country of Allegan, Mich., they built trails along a trout stream so fishermen could get to the fish so they could be caught easier.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Who did?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That was the W. P. A., but you do the similar things up in the Indian district. I will tell you what else they did: They went out in an open field—you know these scrub-oak groves, cut-over pine land with oak openings where there are no trees—they went out there and—I will bring a picture of it over to you if you want to see it—a picture where they built brush piles for rabbits to crawl in. My God! When you cannot get shirts for the boys in the Army, what do you want to spend money to build trails and roads for? How can you justify it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not charge that to the Department of the Interior, does he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. That is just a sample of the waste. It seems to me we should draw the line some place when we do not have shirts for the boys who are doing the fighting, and when the battle of the Atlantic, as Churchill said, is going against us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that the committee has already reduced the item from $4,000,000 several years ago to $1,000,000 in this bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care if there is not one red cent left in it. I would rather that our soldier boys had shirts than to build roads and trails some place in the wildnerness, or any other place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman not know that the Congress has appropriated enough money for the Army to buy 10 years' supply of shirts and other clothing? If sufficient shirts have not been bought, it is not the fault of this Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to say it is the fault of the executive department or the gentleman would send that committee that is after the snipers, as he calls them, after me. I am glad when the gentleman, a Democrat, calls attention to the fact. You may have money enough for 10 years' supply of shirts, but the administration cannot or will not give the boys the four they need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know who is at fault, but I do know that sufficient funds have heretofore been allowed by our committee for clothing and materials to supply a mighty big army for a mighty long time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 47, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Winnebago, Nebr.: Improvements to utilities, $15,000;

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, and to proceed out of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I refer this to the majority side. I thought they wanted to get through with the bill today.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thought I had an agreement with the gentleman or I would not have asked for this time.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman had an agreement, then, so far as I am concerned, he may go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes, to proceed out of order.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, 1 year ago this month House Resolution 125 created a select committee to investigate air accidents. For 12 months this committee has been making an intensive study of the causes and contributing causes of air accidents to commercial aircraft. We have interviewed experts in every branch of aviation; we have, therefore, necessarily become familiar with the most im-

portant factors involved in the successful operation of all aircraft.

When my committee was appointed the Congress was aroused because of the death of Congressman Byron in an air crash in Atlanta. I think you again have every reason to be concerned. Since December 7, 1941, when Japan made its cowardly attack at Pearl Harbor, we have witnessed a tremendous increase in military aviation in the United States. This Congress has been called upon to appropriate billions of dollars toward the war effort. We have all voted without hesitation to increase the armed forces of the United States and particularly the aviation branch of the Army and Navy to an extent which no one of us could have dreamed possible 2 or 3 years ago. We have poured out the money of our citizens and will continue to pour out their money until Japan has been vanquished. I am sure that I bespeak the conviction of every Member of the House when I say that the Congress of the United States will see to it that the armed forces of America are provided with the financial sinews of war to defeat Hitler and the Mikado's horde of yellow rats who threaten the civilization of the world.

But, ladies and gentlemen, during the past year the members of my committee—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]—have learned something about aviation. We have not dilly-dallied with this question of safety. We have made an intensive study of the causes of air accidents. We know something about the subject, and it makes our blood run cold when every day over the radio or in the public press we learn of the wastage in life and property which is occurring in our armed forces before the boys have a chance to meet the enemy. We expect to lose planes in battle. We expect to lose some of our aviators in fighting the enemy, but it makes me sick when I see our boys killed and our aircraft destroyed through the utter foolishness and incompetence of unskilled Army personnel who apparently have but little appreciation for meteorology and who send men and machines, and who order pilots to fly machines in weather which civilian pilots with thousands of hours of flying experience would not think of attempting to negotiate. Just the other day the president of one of the air lines told our committee that recently, in one of the cities served by his air line, his company had four or five ships grounded because they were advised by their meteorologists that it was unsafe to fly due to icing conditions.

While these ships were grounded in that city an Army bomber flew over its airport bound for the east, and in a few minutes five members of the crew were forced to jump in their parachutes and a $100,000 bomber was completely destroyed. This is one of the few instances in which the crew lived to tell the story. In the last few days I know of a commercial airliner which left the city of Washington and went to Pittsburgh, where the air-line officers grounded it. A short time after that in the same vicinity five airplanes were sent into the air by the Army to face weather conditions which the air lines with their more experienced personnel would not attempt to navigate, and four of these pilots were needlessly killed and their planes destroyed. Recently it has been estimated by an expert in air accidents that better than $2,000,000 in military airplanes have been cracked up on the west coast alone. It is reported to me that there are 15 accidents a day to military aircraft on the west coast.

From my experience, and knowledge of air accidents, I say to you that the military leaders owe a duty to the people of the United States to protect our military airplanes until they have reached the battlefield, and that they owe a greater duty to the boys of our country who have volunteered as aviators to see that they have a chance to give their lives in battle rather than to be destroyed on a bleak mountainside.

Another thing that burns me up is the fact that we have an existing agency, to wit: the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is manned by experts who have devoted years to the study of the causes of air accidents and who are qualified to investigate and to determine the real causes of air accidents, and yet these men are not being utilized by the military authorities to assist them in investigating and eliminating the causes of the many tragedies which are occurring in our armed forces. If I were a father, and had a son in the aviation service, and he should be killed in combat fighting against the Japanese or Germans, I would take that loss with pride and some degree of satisfaction. But, if I had a son who had had only 300 to 500 hours of aviation experience and he was ordered to fly a bomber on a peacetime mission in weather which was so bad that the pilots of the air lines, having an average of 10,000 hours of flight experience, were either grounded or refused to fly; then I should want to know who the officer was that ordered my son to fly in such weather. I would also want to know why such an officer should be permitted to destroy the property of the Government and the life of my son before either of them were permitted to serve our country's cause.

On Sunday, March 15, my committee had before it representatives of 16 of the 18 air lines in the United States. This hearing started at 10:30 in the morning and ran until 5:45 p. m. Its purpose was to discuss with the air lines how they, as organizations, could best serve the military requirements. As a result of this hearing, my committee will tomorrow lay before the proper governmental agencies a plan charted, and in complete detail, containing an offer by the air lines and a suggestion by the committee, wherein the air lines propose to furnish their facilities for the advanced training of pilots, mechanics, radio operators, meteorologists, and other services to be rendered by them for the military, and all upon a no-profit basis. This is being done with a twofold purpose: First, so that they may continue to perform their basic function of providing transportation by air of both passengers and cargo; and second, to enable the Government to obtain from them the maximum amount of service for the war effort. There is one more thing which my committee would like to suggest to the military authorities: Study and experience of the past year have convinced us that the navigation of the air is a science which requires the united wisdom of many experts in different fields of human knowledge. No matter how skilled a pilot may be, it is nothing less than manslaughter for any person to order a pilot to undertake a routine flight in weather which skillful meteorological forecasters have predetermined as unsafe for flight.

Ladies and gentlemen, I propose that the War Department use the personnel of the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and have these experts inquire into the causes of these accidents, and if possible, find ways to eliminate them.

As I have said before, there are many capacities in which civilians can serve their country. There are thousands of men with special talents who stand ready, willing, and able to assist in the utter destruction of the Axis Powers. So, ladies and gentlemen, my committee asks your cooperation in assisting us to see that the armed forces utilize those agencies of our Government, those men of special training—such as the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board—to save the property which your appropriations have made possible, and the lives of our finest young men who are the potential heroes of our Republic.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations available for expenditure for the benefit of the natives of Alaska may be used for the payment of traveling expenses of new appointees from Seattle, Wash., and from any point within Alaska, to their posts of duty in Alaska, and of traveling expenses, packing, crating, and transportation (including drayage) or personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station within Alaska, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the outstanding newspapermen here in Washington is the author of a book that I believe should have the careful reading of every Member of the Congress. It should be read by every American. Mr. Carlyle Bergeron has written "Confusion on the Potomac." I think he should add a new chapter to this splendid work. I would suggest that the new chapter be titled "Confusion in the Interior Department."

I hold in my hand the Official Bulletin of the United States Travel Bureau, Department of the Interior. The cover page carries the picture of the distinguished Secretary of the Interior. That in itself gives it an air of officialdom that cannot be ignored. Secretary Ickes urges civilian travel for relaxation to aid health and morale. This booklet is dedicated to the Secretary's insistence that America must travel if it is to be fit. I would like the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to clear up for me a disturbing problem. How do you reconcile

this outburst of enthusiasm on the part of the Secretary of the Interior for a traveling America with his scare headlines on tires and gasoline? There seems to be some confusion. I understand that gasoline is now being rationed under order of the Secretary. I understand that all of the gas stations are closed certain hours of the day and on Sundays. And yet the Secretary in this pamphlet tells America to travel. As folks start to travel will they be able to get home? In one breath the Secretary calls for a traveling America and in the next breath he takes away the means to travel. Again I say, there is some confusion.

I see on the inside of this delightful brochure—and, remember, this is paid for by the taxpayers—the heading, "Nomads given the green light." That means that the gypsies, the rovers, the wanderers are given the go sign, the right-of-way in these days of difficulty, peril, and danger. That means that, despite the acute shortages in rubber, shortages that require rationing, and shortages in gasoline, the Secretary suggests roving for relaxation, wandering for morale. Again I say, there is some confusion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is there a date to that?

Mr. DITTER. I was hoping the gentleman would ask me that question. That is exactly why I brought this copy with me to the floor. The pamphlet speaks for itself as to date of issuance. It reached my desk on the 5th day of March 1942, and it is headed "January-February 1942." That means it is current. In other words, it is not a bit of antiquity that I have gone back into the files and pulled out. It is the latest word from the Department that I have found on morale building. It certainly appears to be up to date on its face. It is what the Secretary is presently advising, if we are to take any stock in what his publicity experts say. There may be another edition in preparation or on the press, in the minds of the propaganda specialists but, to the best of my knowledge, it has not been distributed up to this time. It may be that more confusion is coming.

I am concerned about the folks who follow the Secretary's suggestion to travel, how the nomads who are to be given the green light, how the gypsies from here, there, and elsewhere, under the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior, are to get gasoline and tires. One effusion from the Interior Department pushes America out on the highways and byways to relax, while the next outburst pulls us up peremptorily to a halt, where we are to be restricted rather than relaxed. The green light and the red light are flashed simultaneously. In one and the same breath we are told to march and told to halt. Again I say, there is some confusion.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it possible that the learned Secretary was thinking of the 500 gallons of gas in that tank that he is supposed to have had in storage when the gasoline shortage was on?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER Mr. Chairman, my regard for the Secretary of the Interior would not permit me to attribute to him any motives that were purely personal or selfish. Of course, I have no information as to what he may have at hand to minimize the confusion which he is creating.

The thing that concerns me is the confusion which is caused by this pathetic conflict—these go and stop commands.

Our people are worried over the threat made by Mr. Henderson that private tires are to be seized. He has said rubber requirements will not allow "a single pound of crude rubber for new tires or for recapping" of any of the 30,000,000 passenger cars in the United States. He urges a reduction in recreational driving. The situation is acute. It is a serious condition. Mr. Henderson, at least, considers it so. If our people are to have their tires seized from them, will they be seized while they are doing the nomad act around the country, or will the seizure be made when the automobile is in the garage? Shall we follow the suggestion of Mr. Ickes or heed the commands of Mr. Henderson? Confusion worse confounded.

What are we to believe? Are we to follow Mr. Ickes and travel or are we to heed Mr. Henderson and stay at home? Are we to conserve rubber and gasoline under Mr. Henderson's restrictions or are we to use rubber and gasoline under Mr. Ickes' relaxation? "To be or not to be, that is the question."

Mr. Henderson says a 25-percent cut in the civilian use of rubber for the United Nations has been put into immediate effect, and suggests the advisability of another 25-percent reduction. That is the Price Administrator's program. But Mr. Ickes counters with the urge, according to this current Department magazine, that relaxation and morale require us to indulge in travel, to become nomads, rovers, wanderers. "Consistency thou art a jewel."

It is high time that the Secretary of the Interior and the other bureaucratic chieftains bring a little order out of chaos, a bit of conformity in orders and regulations. Carlisle Bargeron, despite his entertaining style and informative ability, should not have the opportunity to add another chapter to "Confusion on the Potomac." We have had entirely too much confusion. It is time that we have some consistency and common sense in the executive branch of the Government. The confusion on the Potomac is not in Congress; it is in the bureaucracies that flourish here.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I would like to present the gentleman with a piece of rubber that has been made from rabbitbrush. I wish to ask the gentleman if that will do something to solve the problem.

Mr. DITTER. I know anything that the distinguished gentleman from Nevada presents me with has intrinsic value. I would prefer to have his opinion on its value as rubber rather than to venture an opinion of my own. I am not at all informed as to what rabbitbrush may mean in the manufacture of rubber. But one thing is crystal clear to me, and that is no matter how much rabbitbrush there may be at hand or how much rubber it will make, something more is needed to bring order out of chaos, to bring consistency out of inconsistency, to clear up the confusion on the Potomac. What we need and sorely need is a very generous supply of common sense, clear thinking, and genuine cooperation on the part of the bureaucrats here in Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

General investigations: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Planning Board, and the Federal Power Commission, $250,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 73, line 15, after the second comma strike out "$250,000" and insert "$150,000."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we appropriated $1,700,000 last year for investigations of reclamation projects in the Colorado fund, in the reclamation general fund, and in the reclamation fund itself. The results of the investigations to date may be found on page 325 of the hearings. On that page you will see completed and ready for construction projects in the total sum of $454,197,784. If it is our view that we need to have a backlog for postwar work, it seems to me that this presents enough of a backlog for that type of work.

We are in a struggle to win a war. We need to preserve all the manpower, all the technical engineers, all the help we can to assist the War Department and the Navy Department to win that war. Let us release some of these employees.

This amendment does not cut out all of the investigations. It is a moderate cut. It still permits them to go further and investigate the most necessary things for irrigation and for power for national defense. They still can do the most necessary things.

I have not asked to cut out the whole amount, although I believe that $454,197,000 worth of projects is enough to keep us busy after the war. I sincerely hope the members of this Committee will not be divided along partisan lines and can look at it from the standpoint of doing the most good for our country, and stand up in unison to release the personnel this amendment will release for the national defense effort. Why can we not cut $100,000 from this investigation under the reclamation fund and preserve it for guns and planes and tanks for MacArthur?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I trust that a substantial majority of the membership will support this amendment. I realize, as other Members do, that the expenditure of this money has value. I do think some of it is expended extravagantly, but I say again I think we must measure this thing in the light of the situation as we find it today.

Someone in defending this expenditure of $250,000 will suggest, of course, that this money will be returned because of rents that are received from Government land. But we will still get the rent even if we do not spend any of this particular item, as I see it. Just because there is some revenue from the use of this land is not an excuse for spending more money than you would otherwise. If such were the case, you would want to increase rather than decrease it. Such is not the case.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. I think this item ought to be cut deeper, but we ought to cut at least this much of it. The legislation says it is for making investigations, surveys, and studies. Reduce the item by $100,000 and you will still have $150,000 for that purpose.

On yesterday we tried to reduce an item of $600,000, and it was suggested then that all that money was needed for surveying and for investigation purposes, and that it was connected, of course, with our war effort. Now you have that $600,000 you said in your discussion was needed for surveying and making investigations. We go over to another portion of the bill and find an item of $250,000. A little later on there is another one for $500,000 for further investigations. I just wonder how much money is really needed for investigations.

This is just a moderate cut. I sincerely believe that this is one place where you can try to help save just a little share of these huge expenditures that are being made this afternoon. I hope the membership will use a little independent judgment this afternoon. Of course, we should listen to those who are spending this money, but that is not the entire reason why we should follow them every time. We have got to weigh this expenditure in the light of absolute need. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the individuals who may be employed by the use of this money could well be rendering their services in far more important places in the war effort.

This money is needed for the prosecution of the war, and part of the surveying and investigating could wait until this cruel war is brought to a close. It should be observed that this money is for proposed projects. Part of them can wait, especially in view of several hundred thousand dollars included in this bill, in addition to this item of $250,000.

But right now our country is in peril. In the light of that situation, this is one chance to save just a little money, only $100,000, which is not very much compared to the total amount of money being expended in this bill, but it will help a little, and it will at least show a turn in the minds of the Members of the House. It will indicate a definite determination to practice a little economy without injury to anyone. Do not forget this is not really a war measure. The people throughout the Nation are asking us right here and now to economize wherever we possibly can, and cut to the core. Let us join together for once, both sides of the aisle, and cut out this $100,000. I am so sure we ought to do it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has spent so much time and energy on this legislation.

Mr. JONES. It is not so much a question of whether we will get the money back—even a banker sometimes refuses to make loans, and in this case we are acting somewhat as a banker for these people who use the reclamation fund—it is a question of releasing the manpower to do the necessary things to win victory sooner.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and contribution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. May I ask the gentleman if any money is involved here at all? This money comes out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There it goes. That is the same old story. Just because there is some revenue in the way of rentals and income from the land owned by the Government, it is deemed proper to be a little more free with its expenditure. That is the difficulty of it. Certainly if we can get money out of the reclamation fund and save it, we should do it. Let us save this manpower and effort, and also save $100,000. As I said awhile ago, if spending more money on this item increases the income, the committee would not have cut it at all in the first instance.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is already cut down.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand; but why did you reduce it then? Why did you not make the item $350,000 instead of $250,000, if your reasoning is correct? I just do not believe you can show that the expenditure of this particular money will increase the revenues in the Federal Treasury, especially with all the other money you will have appropriated to use for this purpose. Let us save another $100,000 while we are at it.

I realize that Members who have reclamation projects in their districts have a deep interest in this matter and do not want to cut the items. They would like to keep the men on the job and have the surveys continued. I do not blame them for it. But I am talking to you about the situation as we find it this afternoon. In the light of that critical condition, I say that this is a chance to save $100,000 needed so badly for planes and guns and other war necessities. Let us get busy and strike out this $100,000 and save just that much money. If you have the courage of your convictions and nerve to do it, I feel you will support the amendment. I just do not believe your reasons against it are good, under the circumstances as they are this afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, hope that there will be no division down the aisle on this item. Let me give you the facts concerning it. The Budget approved an estimate of $500,000. The committee cut that half in two, reducing it to $250,000, and I believe even the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. RICH] thought that we had made an ample cut there. This money goes not only for general investigation, but the seven southwestern States entered into a solemn compact concerning the division of the waters of the Colorado River. A goodly amount of it must be used for this work. This involves an enormous amount of surveys and also investigational work that must be carried on.

The money, as has been pointed out, is not money coming out of the Federal Treasury never to return, because it comes from the reclamation fund, and is paid back into that fund from construction charges. My young friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] simply does not have a conception of what reclamation means, not to the West alone but to America as a whole. Our population increase has been 14 percent out there in the last 10 years, against something like a 7-percent increase in the Nation as a whole.

More than 1,000,000 soldiers are out there now. The West is going to be the place from which our armies must move. They must be fed, they must be clothed, and this must be done by food and fiber raised upon lands that are watered by the hand of man. This $250,000 leaves merely a skeleton organization to carry on a work that is the life of the western half of the United States. This amendment represents the worst sort of mistake and the most foolish type of economy that could be conceived. Some reference is made to the number of planes this so-called savings here would build. There is no shortage of battleships and planes, because we irrigate

lands in the West or because we produce crops on those lands or because we try to feed the Nation in part.

We are now in the western half of this country scarcely meeting 60 percent of our agricultural needs because of the limitation on the use of water. In the billion acres of land comprising the West we have only another 20,000,000 acres that can ever be brought into productivity by water. Yet you say you are going to cut this item so that the Reclamation Bureau can render no service or even care for the projects we have there.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 27, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $99,975.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I note with deep disappointment that the $5,000,000 item, so essential to the prompt completion of the transmission lines and steam stand-by plant for the Central Valley project have been omitted from this bill, although it was included in the Budget.

It seems strange to me that the California members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department should have permitted this appropriation to be cut out, particularly since the power to be derived from this project is so essential to the great shipbuilding and other essential war industries in the State.

The Central Valley project is an important power factor for the winning of this war. This House should not permit that appropriation to be eliminated. What is it going to profit the Nation if, in order to please the private power interests of California we lose the use of this power in this critical time?

True, if we fail to supply these facilities, the private power interests may, to their own private profit, force the Government to sell them the electric energy generated at these plants at a ruinously low price, a price which will not and cannot produce sufficient revenue to enable the Treasury to collect a sufficient amount to reimburse the Government for its outlay.

The two items which are eliminated from the appropriation on line 10 of page 78 of the bill—the steam plant and transmission lines—will make or break the financial success of the project. Without them the project's future is anyone's guess.

Conflicting evidence was presented to the committee—

Says page 12 of the committee report—

as to the necessity for the construction of a steam plant at Antioch, Calif., for which $5,000,000 was requested under an estimated total cost of $20,000,000.

That diffident little sentence is the committee's only explanation for its action. The real reason for the constant opposition to the project is to be found in the attitude of some selfish interests, concerned only with profit to themselves.

Now what was this conflicting evidence?

The committee says:

Evidence given by one witness was to the effect that an existing power agency in that area would be willing to purchase the entire supply of power generated at Shasta Dam at a fair profit to the Government, thus obviating the necessity of the Government constructing transmission lines or installing a steam plant.

This statement implies that the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation, the power monopoly of central California, would buy Shasta power and allow the Government, the people, us, a fair profit.

Would you call the $60,000,000 difference the steam plant will make to the project's revenue a fair profit? What of the profit to the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation on the transmission of power for irrigation pumping which the irrigation will have to pay if the Government turns Central Valley power over to this company.

I could speak all afternoon on the fight this very company put up against construction of the Central Valley project in the first place; on its assertions 10 years ago that it had idle plants, that no additional power was needed in the area. In its opposition to any power development but its own it would have deprived the Sacramento Valley of flood control; the San Francisco Bay area of water for irrigation and industry, and the farmers of San Joaquin Valley of sorely needed relief from heavy pumping costs and lowering water tables. The Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation's only concern has been and always will be its own pocket. That company has outdone itself today.

The committee failed to give due consideration to the facts, the clearcut evidence offered by the Government.

First, supporting this $5,000,000 item was the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted by the President of the United States.

Second, came the Commissioner of Reclamation who said:

It would be of substantial advantage to install the steam plant at Antioch.

Why did the President or Commissioner Page recommend these items? As I read Mr. Page's testimony on pages 450–451, he showed that the steam plant would be a financial advantage not only to the Government but to the water users and other beneficiaries of the Central Valley project. He showed that operation of the steam plant by the Bureau would yield net revenues of $549,000 annually in excess of the offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation. In 40 years, $61,960,000 could be applied to the construction costs of the project and unless this income was received, this huge amount would be borne by the taxpayers of the United States or by the water users of the San Joaquin Valley and Contra Costa area or other beneficiaries.

The third voice in favor of the steam plant was the War Production Board. It advised the committee that the Antioch steam plant was an essential part of the ultimate development of the Central Valley project. The War Production Board was unable to say "at this time when priorities could be made available for steam-station equipment to proceed with construction." Obviously the War Production Board could not commit itself on priorities in advance of an appropriation by the Congress for a steam plant or an application by the Bureau of Reclamation for the necessary rating. The War Production Board, or its predecessor, the O. P. M., gave Shasta Dam power plant a rating of A–1–E to assure equipment because of the need for power in northern California. That need for power today is even more urgent. It is unthinkable that an adequate rating for a steam plant would not be forthcoming.

And on top of this impartial evidence, in itself emphatic enough to make me marvel at the failure of the Appropriations Committee subcommittee to recommend the $5,000,000 needed, is the statement of the Federal Power Commission. It warns of the imminent shortage of power in northern California. On page 935 of the hearings Chairman Olds says of the proposed steam plant:

I think it is wise for the Government to build the steam plant.

On page 929 Director Tate, of the National Defense Power Division, also warns of critical power shortages in the Central Valley region. Despite the increases in capacity by Shasta and Keswick Dams, the shortages will be:

	Kilowatts
1943	285,000
1944	105,000
1945	215,000
1946	245,000

The Central Valley project was conceived and authorized as a means of improving navigation, providing flood protection, supplying supplemental irrigation water for hard-pressed farmers, municipal and industrial supplies, and "for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes." The Congress has appropriated $110,950,000 toward the construction of the project, estimated to cost $264,990,000.

The steam plant is essential to the economic operation of the project. Because of the fluctuating flow of the Sacramento River, stand-by facilities are necessary to make the output available at all times and more valuable. Transmission lines are required to carry the power to the Delta region for irrigation pumping as well as to load centers in the San Francisco Bay region. These transmission lines will have to be built to market this power. There is not sufficient transmission capacity now to carry the Shasta power. The only question is whether they should be built by and for the Pacific Gas & Electric, or by and for the people and their Government, who own the project.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation item is vitally necessary for the continuation of work on the Coachella branch of the All-American Canal in order to assure

the continued existence of Coachella Valley and to protect the millions which the United States has already invested in this canal and also to protect American water right in the Colorado River, which will be lost, so far as California is concerned, to Mexico or some other State unless they are put to beneficial use in the Coachella Valley.

This project is directly connected with vital war activities in that the 20,000 acres now under cultivation if assured a continuing supply of water will produce between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 of food products needed in the southern California defense industry areas. The project when completed will release 20,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity now being consumed annually in pumping 1,200 wells. In addition the canal will produce, at two power drops, 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. This 70,000,000 kilowatt-hours saved and produced is needed in the war industries of Los Angeles and San Diego areas. In addition the project will furnish 80,000 acres of land admirably suited in soil and climate to the growing of guayule, the rubber plant vitally necessary to supplying the natural crude rubber now cut off from the East Indies.

All of the foregoing finds ample support in the testimony of Commissioner Page, of the Reclamation Service, pages 388 to 392, Mr. Lee Anderson, Director of the Coachella Valley County Water District, pages 1026 to 1031; and Phil D. Swing, a former Member of the House, pages 1031 to 1037, before the House Appropriations Committee.

The early completion of this Canal has recently been urged by the California State Legislature, the Colorado River Board of California, and numerous other official and civic bodies.

(Mr. THOMAS F. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply taking this time for the explicit purpose of calling the gentleman's attention to page 110 of the hearing, a statement which is signed by Donald Nelson, who is in charge of the construction of all plants in the United States at this particular moment. I will ask the gentleman to read that statement, if he will, and reach his own conclusions as to why that particular provision was stricken from the bill.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 78, line 14, after the comma, following the name "Oklahoma", strike out "$99,975" and insert "$600,000".

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not offered for the purpose of spending the public funds but for the purpose of protecting the funds that you and I have invested in this project. This is the only irrigation and reclamation project in the State of Oklahoma. It is in my district. I know every foot of the ground, and in this connection I desire to quote from two letters just received day before yesterday and yesterday from the Department of the Interior and the United States Department of Agriculture.

I will now read these two letters:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, March 24, 1942.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: In response to your telephone call regarding the progress of construction of the Lugert-Altus Project in Oklahoma, you are advised that the appropriation of $99,975, contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, will provide for a very restricted program. Unless a larger amount is made available it will be necessary to reduce considerably the number of employees.

At the present time there are no war activities or industries in the immediate locality which would interfere with the labor supply. Construction is being performed by Government forces, and local labor is used.

The problem of obtaining priorities for critical materials would not be serious because the construction of the dam and canals will require only a small amount of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The purposes of the project are irrigation, domestic water supply, and flood control. Irrigation water will be supplied to 20,000 acres of land unsuccessfully dry farmed, and a partial water supply will be provided for 50,000 acres additional. In all, 500 to 700 farms will be benefited. The city of Altus will obtain a supplemental domestic water supply, and has contracted to repay a part of the project costs.

At present the project lands are sparsely settled and dry farmed. The soil is rich, and if an acute food shortage should develop, the land could be brought into use rapidly. I anticipate the project will be devoted almost wholly to dairying and livestock feeding.

Construction at the present rate of progress would require an appropriation of $600,000 in addition to the $180,000 for flood control to be furnished by the War Department.

Very truly yours,
JOHN C. PAGE, *Commissioner.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1942.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR VICTOR: I have been informed that there is some talk of not having sufficient funds to complete the Lugart irrigation project at this time. As you know, I still own and operate the farm west of Altus, where I was born and reared, and I am familiar with the entire farming area in Jackson and adjoining counties. While my farm is not located in the area to be serviced by the water from this project, I am interested in seeing this completed because there is a need for more diversified farming in the area than is practical to carry out without being assured of an adequate water supply during dry periods.

As you know, this project has been approved by a vote of the farmers and is to be self-liquidated by increased taxes. It would be very unjust to the farmers in the area to be serviced by this project if completion is delayed or suspended. A considerable amount of money has already been spent on the dirt fills which would be washed away by floodwaters if further construction is suspended. Most of the machinery and equipment is now on the ground, and there will be very little additional machinery or strategic material required, since this project is mainly of earthen construction, using very little concrete or steel.

There are 70,000 acres of very fertile land which requires no fertilizer and would be devoted largely to the production of food and feed crops. This land is well adapted to the production of fruit, vegetables, dairy products, and livestock which is needed in the food-for-freedom program. It would be very unjust for the farmers to pay the increased taxes for the amount of money already spent on this dam and then be deprived of the additional income from the crops which are needed in our war efforts.

On behalf of the farmers which will be served by this project, I urge you and the committee to do everything possible to secure the appropriation of $800,000 necessary to further this work.

Sincerely yours,
C. D. WALKER,
Assistant Director, Southern Division.

I did not ask for $800,000. I have asked for $600,000, which is a fair request. It will protect the funds already spent by the farmers, and also the funds that have been loaned to them by the Government, and also the $180,000 which the War Department is going to expend. If this is not constructed, it is like constructing a railway bridge half way across a stream, and then letting the engine run on that and run off into the creek.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman tell us where we are going to get the money?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The money is coming from my farmers.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean that the gentleman's farmers would loan that money to the Government to do this work before we start it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; but my farmers are buying defense bonds, and they are willing to pay this money back. I urge that the amendment be supported.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, this project, like many others, has much to recommend it, but it would be impossible for us to support this amendment at this time. I submit the proffered amendment to the House for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It is not my purpose to offer an amendment. If I were to offer an amendment at this time—the point has already been passed in the reading of the bill—it would be on page 78, line 5. There I notice an appropriation for the Gila project, $250,000. That is about one-fourth of what we have been appropriating for that project. I understand that the committee has cut every part of this bill to the bone, taking all facts into consideration, and I understand perfectly well their logic in so doing.

However, I feel I would be remiss in my duty as a Representative from the State of Arizona if I did not call attention

to some very important facts in connection with this Gila project. Let us look at this proposition for a moment, and I leave it to your serious calculation. We have now spent about $9,000,000 on this project.

It involves the Imperial Diversion Dam on the Colorado River and the Gila Canal, which is about 21 miles in length, and which brings the water from the Colorado under the Gila River through a syphon to the very edge of the desert which we intend to irrigate. At the former rate of progress, we, of course, will be several years in completing this great irrigation project, whereas even in peacetimes we should have speeded up the work, so as to minimize the loss of water rights to Mexico. The coming of the war situation has put another face on the matter. For war purposes, it could be made highly and vitally profitable almost immediately, though not as originally intended. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] said a moment ago that a certain proposition would be like building a bridge halfway across a river and not putting in the final span. We find ourselves now somewhat in this predicament regarding the Gila project. We have spent $9,000,000 in the past 7 years and today are at a point where an extra million dollars would enable the water to be placed on 70,000 acres upon this mesa, because the power plant is about finished, the necessary pumping plant is finished, the equipment already to install, and they are now putting in the distribution system upon the level desert mesa.

Someone may ask what would be the advantage if that could be done within a few months. Mr. Chairman, that land could produce vast quantities of food. Seventy thousand acres could be put under irrigation within a year's time. In a section where alfalfa grows 365 days in the year and where six cuttings are had annually, think what 70,000 acres could produce of food for our Army and Navy so near San Diego, Los Angeles, and other Pacific coast points.

But, perhaps, better still, there is in southern Arizona, the soil and climate and all the physical set-up suitable for the growing of the guayule plant for rubber production. Here is the most splendid opportunity of any place I know of for the war effort to be furthered, through the production of home-grown rubber. It would require but a small extra expenditure just at this point in its development.

I am not offering an amendment, but I do want to impress upon the House today that here is a small expenditure that would yield mightily in a short time in our war effort toward the winning of the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

General investigations: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Planning Board, and the Federal Power Commission, $500,000;

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 79, line 7, strike out line 7 and the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 18.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment on the desk proposes to strike out all funds for general investigations. I have another amendment to the second paragraph on that page to strike out the administrative expenses also. This would provide a saving of $950,000, but that $950,000 is quite infinitesimal compared to the potentialities of this paragraph.

You will note by a close reading of the language on page 79 that this money is for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal projects, those that are still in the future, and for extensions of existing projects and studies of water conservation and development plans, either independently or in conjunction with any other agency. It is a considerable chore to dig out all of these totals, but let me summarize this whole business for you.

At the present time there is authorized or under construction projects that total about $1,355,000,000. That includes $148,000,000 for Boulder Dam, $65,000,000 for the All-American Canal, $55,000,000 for the Big Thompson, $24,000,000 for the Palisades Dam, $23,000,000 for the Marshall Ford, $55,000,000 for the Valley Gravity Canal, $435,000,000 for Grand Coulee, and a number of smaller projects.

In the report to the subcommittee, as evidenced in the hearings, in addition to the $1,355,000,000 authorized or under construction, they have completed engineering surveys and data on still another 29 projects, including 8 steam plants and 8 hydroelectric plants that will cost $281,000,000, and the day that they throw the first shovel of earth on those various projects this Congress is committed to another $281,000,000.

But that is not the whole story. This particular language and the appropriation of $950,000 will be the beginning of new proposed Federal projects in the future. They have 285 projects at which they are going to look and on which they are making preliminary reconnaisance surveys. There are 9 in Arkansas, 5 in California, 13 in Colorado, 10 in Idaho, 6 in Kansas, and 11 in Texas, and so on.

When they first came before the Budget Bureau they asked for 388 persons for this particular activity, although that will be cut down somewhat because the committee reduced the funds. But the point is that if you leave this engineering and survey money in the bill, they will start in to find likely projects out of the 285 potential possibilities, and when they get through the $1,355,000,000 already authorized or under construction will be like so much chicken feed.

There is only one way to stop it, and that is to stop it now. They say that tall oaks from little acorns grow. I might paraphrase that and say that tall aches from little toe corns grow. This little toe corn from which the ache will grow will cost billions unless we stop these reconnaisance and survey items at this time when the Nation is at war.

I want to get this to the committee: The subcommittee struck out the steam plant and two transmission lines for the Central Valley, amounting to some $13,000,000. When the Central Valley was first presented to Congress by the California engineers they estimated the cost at $170,000,000. The Bureau of Reclamation revised that cost up to $234,000,000. They testified before JED JOHNSON'S subcommittee that the estimate now is $264,000,000. So they missed it by $94,000,000, or more than 55 percent. Some of the boys who are interested in the St. Lawrence waterway had better take that figure to heart, because if the engineers cannot do a better job getting close to an estimate, the $264,000,000 preliminary estimate will probably run up to five or six hundred million on the basis of the kind of guessing that the engineers did on the Central Valley in the first instance.

But here is $950,000 for investigations and surveys of proposed Federal projects. They state to the subcommittee that they number some 285. If you want to commit this Congress to an expenditure that will fairly imperil the Treasury, all you have to do is to let this money stay in the bill and the reclamation engineers will do the rest.

I commend to your good judgment this amendment and to strike out that authority and the money for these surveys in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement as to time on this paragraph. Would 30 minutes be sufficient?

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like 5 minutes myself.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The following gentlemen have indicated a desire to be recognized: Messrs. JOHNS, HINSHAW, CASE of South Dakota, WHITE, MURDOCK, JONES, CURTIS, and LEAVY, eight Members. Each will be recognized for 4 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Washington.

Does the gentleman from Idaho desire recognition?

Mr. WHITE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, for a gentleman who comes from the great State of Illinois, the gentleman who just addressed us did pretty well. My only regret is that he did not explain what he meant by "these projects."

What we need at this time, Mr. Chairman, is food. We need production from the existing irrigation districts. It is generally recognized that there is a shortage of water on these large irrigation districts of the West that are all equipped. The railroads are there, the facilities are there, the farms are there, the people are on the land, but the water fails along in the middle of the summer and production is curtailed. The only way this need can be supplied is for the Bureau of Reclamation, with its engineering force to go into the field and make investigation of the available water supply and plan new projects that will produce the supplemental water. This has been our trouble in the irrigation districts of the West, and particularly in the State of Idaho. The engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation, through their investigations, have found that there is available water that can be utilized by establishing supplemental projects—and do not forget that word "supplemental."

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Cannot this all be postponed until after the war?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, if we can postpone supplying our Army and Navy with food, sure, we can postpone it; but our job today is to supply the military forces of the United States with food from these irrigation districts; and, Mr. Chairman, do not forget that the theater of our military activities is going to be largely on the Pacific coast, and the source of supply of the Pacific coast is largely confined to these rich, fertile but semi-arid valleys where we must put water on the land; and the only means by which we can do so is to ferret out the supply of water in the several districts and to devise, engineer, and put in operation plans that will supply this supplemental water. These are not new projects, if you please. This does not have to be confined strictly t new projects. All we want is to utilize existing facilities, the railroads, the processing plants, the creameries, the dairies the packing houses and other utilities that are on these projects, utilize them to full capacity. The only way we can do this is to put water on the land by providing supplemental projects such as we have at Anderson Ranch where by storing up water that otherwise would escape to the sea and using it in the later months they increase very greatly the productivity of the land. I cannot understand this idea that we want to hamper and hamstring the policy and plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Government in supplying the food that is so vital to win this war, supplies for our Navy, Army, and military forces.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment at the desk not to strike out all of this fund, but just a portion. The gentleman from Illinois, however, has introduced an amendment to strike out the whole fund, and I think after you examine the bill itself you will find he is not far out of the way. I would like to have the attention now of every member of the committee who is on the floor, and there are not very many here at the present time. May I say to you that some of these seats that are temporarily vacated here now will be permanently vacated later on unless we pay more attention to these appropriation bills and what comes before the committee.

I call attention to the language on page 79:

> This general investigation is to enable the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extension of existing projects.

Let us turn back. We have just appropriated $250,000, and this is the language used on page 73, the exact language used on page 79:

> To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations.

I call your attention to page 74, to the Colorado River development fund:

> For continuation and extension of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of waters of the Colorado River system, $250,000.

Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity to strike out $950,000 without injuring anybody. There is no use of going out now and spending and investigating as to where we can spend it. We are going to have plenty to spend money for without going out and hunting some place to take the taxpayers' money at this time. Here is a place where we can save without injuring anybody because you have a fund here of $400,000 that, as I have pointed out to you, can be used for this purpose.

You will find as you go on reading the balance of this bill that a great deal of the amount that is to be appropriated is for investigations of some kind. It is not for anything that we actually need now for war or for anything that will relieve humanity, and in all the talk that we have had here this afternoon about these appropriations, nobody has said anything about where we are going to get not only the money but the people to carry out these projects. They are going into the war and the number are going to be reduced like the appropriations here should be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the question is often raised on the left side of this aisle, "Where are you going to get the money?" That was answered a moment ago, but I fear the answer was not heard by all.

In many cases this money comes out of a reclamation fund, which is a revolving fund set up 40 years ago by the Newlands Act of 1902. This fund is functioning in a most marvelous fashion in all the western reclamation States.

Here is a thing I want to call attention to in regard to this item. I am a little bit surprised at my friends on both sides of the aisle who are lawyers for not calling attention to it. I am not a lawyer. Time after time I hear men in this House say that we must regard the sanctity of contracts, with which I agree, and I recall, too, that there is a provision in the Constitution of the United States regarding the sanctity of contracts.

I call your attention to a thing here that seems to me to partake of the nature of a contract, in that part of the appropriation to provide engineering investigations in the Colorado River Basin.

As a member of the Reclamation Committee of this House, I recall that in the last Congress we passed a bill, which was a complicated bill, and we had considerable difficulty getting it through. It involved a readjustment of rates for power produced at Boulder Dam. Boulder Dam power is produced not by the Government but by private utilities. These private utilities were willing to sharpen their pencils and get right down and figure hard, cold mathematical facts. They agreed to certain power rates which they were willing to pay for the valuable privilege of getting power from falling water at Boulder Dam. That money was to go into the Treasury. I look upon this law as a binding contract. As a part of the consideration involved in that law, some of the money was to be spent for investigational purposes. As the money is paid into the fund some of it must be spent for that purpose along the Colorado River, and this is an agreement with the States of the Colorado River Basin, a binding contract, just as much so as a promissory note or a financial bond.

Part of that money was to be spent for investigational purposes. We did not say in the law that so much should be spent in any one particular year, but that is immaterial. I think we would break faith with the law that we passed here last Congress, I think we would break faith with the seven States of the Colorado Basin, if we did not continue this investigation as originally planned.

Of course, you may say this is not immediately needed. It is needed. I go on the assumption that it is imperatively needed, because I feel that all the marvelous work that has been done thus far is but a start of that which we ought to expect in years to come. Because we are in a war now and need food and raw materials, which are produced so abundantly on irrigated acres, is no reason why we should turn those acres back to the desert or confine to the desert those which are now in a desert condition. It is just as necessary to provide food and fiber for our war effort as to build ships, planes, and guns.

I want particularly to call the attention of my friends who are of the legal fraternity to the fact that the money

provided in the last three items for engineering investigations in the Colorado Basin has been virtually guaranteed out of private funds to the Colorado River States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, my amiable, able, and distinguished friend from Illinois, and my very good friend from Wisconsin also, probably has had the opportunity of going to the West where the arid countries are a great expanse of territory. I appreciate his desire and I go along with his desire to save the Government money, but I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the money he is discussing cutting out by his amendment is not Government money in the sense that it is appropriated from the general taxpayers. That money is being paid into a special fund in the Treasury by the water and power users and the real property taxpayers of the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, and several other cities in the metropolitan water district and elsewhere for the use of water and power. It is being paid under the terms of a contract or compact between them and the Colorado River Basin States.

We do not take a single dime from the Federal Government for this project as a gift. We have obtained a loan, for which we have signed our bond.

We are repaying that loan to the Federal Government with interest and a profit, which in turn, by agreement, is being allocated to certain of the States for investigation and development of their own areas by the use of water. Anyone who says that this is going to cost the Federal Government money is evidently incorrect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the gentleman referring to only one project of all of the 235 that are included?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am referring to any project which comes under the Colorado River Basin compact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This does not relate to the Colorado River Basin as a particular item at all, it relates to all the surveys of proposed projects in the future.

Mr. HINSHAW. I speak particularly of the Colorado River Basin, and some of the development funds referred to here come from those sources, I know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My colleague is under a misapprehension about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know the particulars of the other projects, but I do know that practically every reclamation project and every water-use project in the West is being paid for by the users of the water and of the power that arises therefrom. These are not gifts to us. We borrow the money, sign our bond, and repay the money with interest and sinking fund.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. One of the principal factors in the Colorado River project is the metropolitan water system.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. That is being carried by the taxpayers of that system.

Mr. HINSHAW. By the taxpayers and the water users and power users in that area. It has nothing to do with the United States except as a lender.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The United States does not have a cent invested in it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel that in view of the very great need that might arise in the future for additional production of food and for the additional production of power and all these other things, it may well be that these investigations are quite as important, for example, as the investigation to determine the location of minerals might be?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite possible. I do not know how far in advance we should go of the time when these projects are needed, and I am not willing to state whether or not this development fund is necessary for these purposes now, because it may be that we have enough things prepared in advance for the time being; but I would not be willing to have anyone carry the inference on the floor of this House that these funds are coming from the taxpayers of the United States. They are not. They are coming from the people who use the property and use the water and use the power.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Cannot some of this food we may need be raised on the good land of the country that the Government is now paying to have lie idle?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not in favor of allowing good, fertile lands to lie idle and meantime struggle and pay out huge sums in an attempt to successfully farm poor land that never should have been turned over. I do know that in our part of the country our fertile lands do not lie idle any more than we can help, because our population is very rapidly increasing and we need all the food we can raise. We import great quantities of corn and wheat and dairy products from the great Middle West to supplement our own production, while we export the surpluses of those foods which are peculiar to our soil and climate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is one which the friends of reclamation and those you designated as the enemies of reclamation can join in adopting. I say this because this paragraph provides for investigations of projects in the future. We have already a backlog of $454,000,000 worth of such projects.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I cannot yield.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no backlog whatever of new projects.

Mr. JONES. The statements in the hearings speak for themselves at page 325, and the gentleman can take opportunity to refer to them. I think my statement is correct.

Now, there has been the argument made that we need to have more projects investigated in order to get more food for the country. Out in that territory you have to have a half section of land in order to graze one cow, I am informed, and besides that, the Department of Agriculture and the A. A. A. have put 50,000,000 acres of productive land out of cultivation on a scarcity of production program. In addition to that, as the chairman of our subcommittee pointed out a few days ago, when we were considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, that many people were drawing $10,000 per farm in A. A. A. checks for not tilling the soil, on large farms in the South, and at the same time their unemployed tenants were migrating to the West. The A. A. A. has made the first American gypsies.

Now, you gentlemen from the West who are interested in reclamation claim a 14-percent increase in population as a reason for these projects, yet it is brought about by your agricultural program that is throwing those tenants out of work and putting them into Farm Security-operated communal camps. I reassert, and I ask you now to read the testimony of your own witness, Mr. Page: With all the funds that had been supplied for 1942 for reclamation projects only 50,000 acres were brought into production—50,000 acres which does not begin to compare with the fertile lands of Wisconsin, Ohio, Iowa, Illinois, or Indiana, where we can raise many bushels of grain to the acre instead of a few bushels to the acre on this semiarid land. This is the land your Agriculture Department is paying three-quarters of a billion dollars to take out of production in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. How many millions will you have to spend for investigation, and how many billion dollars' worth of projects will you have to construct in order to duplicate the production of the land that is put out of production by the Department of Agriculture, another branch of the same administration of the Federal Government?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I think if I were recommending a very much needed law so far as Members of Congress are concerned, it would be that no Member should be permitted to serve in this House, at least not a second term, until he has traveled over the United States to a certain degree, and, certainly, he should not be permitted to serve on the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations until he has gone out into the great West and has seen what it is.

My genial and capable colleague from Ohio talked about western irrigated lands stating 100 acres are required to support a single cow. Why, we have single acres out there that last year produced $160 worth of products. No irrigated area

that is not producing from $30 to $50 per acre in crop production annually in normal years can be considered a successful project.

Now, if I may use a slang expression; unfortunately, there seems to be a hangover from the feeling that existed in the Mississippi Valley States during the period of the depression in reference to bringing a competitor into the field of farm crops, and there developed then a sort of psychology or prejudice against western reclamation. There was a fear that we would be producing crops beyond those which the Nation needed and thus depress prices. I regret that my friends have not shifted positions a little and seen the change that has come into this Nation in the last 6 months.

We were told by the Secretary of Agriculture a short time ago that this year was a critical year in the production of every type of agricultural crops except wheat, and next year is going to be worse. We imported in the last 7 or 8 years crops that now we cannot import and we must now produce.

Coming now to the items in question here, this item came into this bill the first time last year and it was $1,000,000. It was submitted to us at $750,000 and we cut it to $500,000. I do not want in any way to mislead any Member of the House. Some of the Members on the left of the aisle here spoke for this and said that this comes from the reclamation revolving fund.

This is one place in the reclamation appropriation where there is a direct appropriation. This is a direct appropriation that is not repayable, but it is justified a thousandfold. It came first before us a year ago because we had the Case-Wheeler Act placing new duties upon the Bureau. We are making it possible for thousands and thousands of families along the one-hundredth meridian, and west thereof, in the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and those States, to get their projects engineered, and it likewise reaches all the rest of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has brought out two points that I wanted to touch on. Unfortunately, I was called away to answer a long-distance telephone call, or I would have taken my time on this provision in the bill.

This represents a cut of one-half of what the appropriation last year was and $250,000 below the estimates.

The other point is that this does not come from the Treasury, but on these water-conservation projects, under the Case-Wheeler Act, there is no money in this bill for those projects.

Mr. LEAVY. No; I did not mean to infer that, either; but some of this money goes to the engineering of those projects. Let me show you how important it is that the engineering work be done. These reclamation projects are necessarily giant projects. Some of them go to two or three hundred million dollars. They are not commenced until they are sound financially and engineeringly feasible. The Reclamation Bureau is perhaps one of the most thorough, most efficient, and capable agencies in the United States. We made an initial appropriation 3 years ago of two and a half million dollars for a project. The Reclamation Service stated that they had not completed the engineering detail on it. The next year they reported back that they had not spent any of the money; that it is a 30-million-dollar project, and that they would not undertake it until they had done the engineering. Now, the project is under way in another section of the State on the same river. The place selected as the first site proved to be one where failure was sure to follow construction. The amendment should be voted down, and it will be if we base our votes upon reason and the best interests of our Nation and not upon sectionalism or prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 26, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Page 79, line 18, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$350,000."

The CHAIRMAN. All debate upon this paragraph is exhausted. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman I make the point of order that this question has already been settled under the previous amendment, which was to strike out the entire amount.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment seeks to insert a different amount. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For administrative expenses on account of the above projects, including personal services (not to exceed $200,000) and other expenses in the District of Columbia and personal services and other expenses in the field, $450,000.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Page 79, line 23, strike out "$450,000" and insert "$350,000."

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the 5 minutes allotted to me. I realize that we have considerably more to read in the bill. I have already called attention to page 73 and page 74 where we have appropriations of $450,000 for this purpose, and if we cut down $100,000 in these expenses, and we ought to be able to cut down some, because many of these men will be called into service, then we can spend this amount of money on essential things. Here is an opportunity to cut out $100,000, and I hope the Democrats on my right will see to it that we do cut down this $100,000.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, general fund, construction, $70,317,970.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The total which has been just read on construction for the Reclamation Bureau in my judgment, if sound policy had been followed, would have been $86,140,000, so that it might have included two items for the Central Valley project in California, without which the beneficial effect of that project to the people of our State and its financial soundness, from the standpoint of the Federal Government, will be seriously impaired. One of these items should have been $10,723,000 for completion of a transmission line already started; the other should have been $5,000,000 for the starting of a steam plant to firm the power and make possible efficient operation of the project. On page 999 of the hearings there is a paragraph from the report of the Federal Power Commission in which they granted to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. permission to build two new power plants on the Feather River, in which they said that in their judgment it was necessary to grant these licenses, because this additional electrical capacity is vitally necessary, but in which they also said that the earliest possible completion of the Central Valley project, including a proposed steam plant at Antioch, was absolutely necessary if a serious power shortage is to be avoided.

The committee, however, struck from the bill not only the money for the steam plant, but also the money for the transmission line to carry the power from the dam to the markets where it can be used and where much of it must be used for war industries. As a matter of fact, at this very same time, because we are denied the opportunity to begin construction of a public steam plant, the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. has to build one of their own, yet one of the arguments advanced against the public steam plant was that they could not get priorities. Where is the P. G. & E. going to get theirs?

Another reason advanced for cutting out this item is that the P. G. & E. has made an offer to buy this power at the dam. I do not have any doubt of it in the world, for the one thing that this monopoly private power company of northern and central California wants to do is to protect that monopoly. The

main reason they have opposed this Central Valley project from the beginning, and the main reason they are willing to take the entire supply of this publicly generated power is because they are afraid the Central Valley will bring electricity to the people of that area at what it is worth and will make it possible for the farmers to have their water and the power connected with it, at a reasonable cost.

The city of Sacramento at this hour is attempting to establish a municipally owned plant. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. knows that if Central Valley has its own transmission line they can supply the city of Sacramento and save the people of that community many millions of dollars. It is no wonder P. G. & E. is willing to make an offer for this power. But that offer provides that Central Valley must deliver a certain number of kilowatt hours of electricity throughout the year. This will make it entirely uncertain whether the Central Valley project can operate effectively in supplying water for irrigation, for salinity control, and adequate flow of the river. For the terms of such contract would have to be fulfilled and delivery of the stipulated amount of power to P. G. & E. would take precedence over all other features of the project.

The War Production Board said that this project was needed; that the steam plant was needed. Mr. Page, of the Reclamation Bureau, said it was needed. The only testimony against it comes from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., so far as I know.

For my part, it seems to me it is poor economy to tie up the expenditure of $264,000,000 of the people's money in a situation where it can only find one market outlet, in a situation where there is not any transmission line to carry the power; where a private power company has to build a transmission line on its own account, and thus leave the people of California without the possibility of the benefits really coming to them, and the Federal Government in a position where it cannot economically or efficiently market this power to the direct consumers, as it should be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I think the gentleman's remarks are in accord, for the most part, with my own views, but I notice he made one statement which I think he should delete from his remarks. No matter who buys the power or where it is delivered, the water will flow down and wash out the salinity just the same.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, of course. Let me explain to the gentleman what I had in mind. I am glad the gentleman brought it to my attention. The point is that if you made a contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric for the delivery of a certain amount of electrical energy to them, and if you need, on a certain occasion, to use that water for some of the other purposes, you might be in a position where you could not do it. You might have to store water to be able to live up to your contract when the water was badly needed for irrigation, salinity control, or stream regulation. If Central Valley had its own steam plant such dangers would be completely avoided.

Mr. BUCK. But the water will generate the power at the source of the dam and then it will flow down and wash out the salinity, and you cannot overcome that, as a fact. I want to make your remarks correct. That is all. You can delete everything I have said, but correct yourself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not want to delete anything the gentleman has said.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is it not true that the State of California some years ago undertook to establish what is known as the State power and water authority?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And is it not true that the Pacific Gas & Electric, according to the State railroad commission, spent $500,000 to defeat that measure?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. And it bears out the point I made at the beginning of my speech. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would like to say further, in answer to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK], that it is true, if you are compelled to deliver a certain amount of power you may have to hold the water back when you should let it go down to meet other needs.

The committee, in the report, advises that it has eliminated from the bill the Budget estimate of $5,000,000 for the installation of the steam plant for the Central Valley project and $10,723,000 for the construction of transmission lines for the project.

From the wording of the report, there appears to be a disregard of the weight of evidence in favor of these two items which are the backbone of the financial stability of the Central Valley project and of the need for additional power for war industries in northern California. The report says:

> That conflicting evidence was presented to the committee as to the necessity for the construction of a steam plant at Antioch, Calif., for which $5,000,000 was requested under an estimated total cost of $20,000,000.

What is this conflicting evidence?

In support of its action in eliminating these vital items, the committee gives only this citation:

> Evidence given by one witness was to the effect that an existing power agency in that area would be willing to purchase the entire supply of power generated at Shasta Dam at a fair profit to the Government, thus obviating the necessity of the Government constructing transmission lines or installing a steam plant.

This reference is to a general suggestion by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which monopolizes the power market in northern California and would squelch all competition, public or private. I could speak all afternoon on the antagonistic attitude of this company to the construction of the Central Valley project; on its assertions 10 years ago that no additional power was needed in the area; that it had idle plants. In its opposition to public power development it would have deprived the Sacramento Valley of flood control; the Contra Costa of water for irrigation and industrial uses; and the irrigators of San Joaquin Valley of solely needed relief from heavy pumping costs and lowering water tables. I shall have more to say of its offer in a few minutes.

In any event this is the sole voice against the constructive proposals to assure an adequate supply of power for war industries through a steam plant.

The transmission system for which an initial appropriation has already been made will be necessary regardless of whether or not the steam plant is installed. Otherwise power from Shasta and Keswick Dams will be bottled up and subject only to the mercies of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The line is needed to carry power to the Delta region to pump water for irrigation to the San Joaquin Valley. It would be a serious matter if the Bureau of Reclamation were to have to depend on a hostile private utility to transmit power to operate the facilities of the Central Valley project itself.

But here is evidence without qualification that supports the proposed appropriation for the steam plant and the transmission lines, which it seems has been disregarded.

First, supporting these two items was the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted by the President of the United States.

Second came the Commissioner of Reclamation who said, "'It would be a substantial advantage to install the steam plant at Antioch."

Why did they recommend these items? Mr. Page's testimony, on pages 450–451, shows that the steam plant would be a financial advantage not only to the Government but to the water users and other beneficiaries of the Central Valley project. The operation of the steam plant by the Bureau would yield net revenues of $1,549,000 annually in excess of the offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. In 40 years it would mean that $61,960,000 could be applied to the construction costs of the project and unless this income was received, this huge amount would be borne by the taxpayers of the United States or by the water users of the San Joaquin Valley and Contra Costa area or other beneficiaries.

There was another voice supporting the steam plant. It was the War Production Board. It held that the Antioch steam plant was an essential part of the ultimate development of the Central Valley project. Although unable to say "at this time when priorities could be made available for steam-station equipment to proceed with construction," the War Production Board held the plant necessary. The War Production Board was, of course, unable to commit itself on priorities in advance of an appropriation by the Congress for a steam plant or an ap-

plication by the Bureau of Reclamation for the necessary rating. Previously Shasta Dam power plant was given a rating of A–1–E to assure equipment because of the need for power for war purposes in northern California. Today that need for power is even more urgent.

This evidence, in itself emphatic enough to make me marvel at the way the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has pulled the wool over our eyes, is given still more weight by the Federal Power Commission itself. The Commission warns of the imminent shortage of power in northern California. On page 935 of the hearings Chairman Olds says of the proposed steam plant:

I think it is wise for the Government to build the steam plant.

Director Tate, of the National Defense Power Division, on page 929, also warns of critical power shortages in the Central Valley region. Although he counts additions to capacities from Shasta and Keswick Dams, he shows the shortages will be:

	Kilowatts
1943	285,000
1944	105,000
1945	215,000
1946	245,000

You and I know that the Central Valley project was authorized as a means of improving navigation, providing flood protection, supplying supplemental irrigation water for hard-pressed farmers, municipal and industrial supplies, and—

For the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.

There has been appropriated $110,950,000 toward the construction of the project estimated to cost $264,990,000.

I emphasize that the steam plant is essential to the economic operation of the project. Because of the fluctuating flow of the Sacramento River stand-by facilities are necessary to make the output available at all times and more valuable.

This seems to be a last-ditch fight on the part of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to block the United States Government in the exercise of its rights to market the power of the Central Valley project as intended by the Congress when it reauthorized this project in 1937. The company has consistently opposed the Central Valley project when it threatened to invade its monopolistic domain in northern California. It has supported the project only with a string to any concessions it has made.

It now offers what is termed a fair profit to the Government on all of the power Shasta Dam will produce.

But from the statement of Commissioner Page, it would seem that the United States Government is being asked to hand over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. more than $60,000,000 over a period of 40 years. For that is the amount of additional revenue that will be derived by the project if the steam plant and power line are built. Not only that, but it does not say what its profit will be from transferring the Government's own power from Shasta Dam to the pumping system for the San Joaquin Valley.

For my part if there is to be any profit to anyone in the Central Valley power operations, I prefer that it should go to the United States Treasury and to relieve the hard-pressed farmers of the San Joaquin Valley of heavy water charges. Without the net revenue which will come from operation of the steam plant and transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation, the costs of the Central Valley project must be borne by the United States Treasury or by the water users and other beneficiaries.

The belated offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to give the Government a profit on Central Valley power is, in my judgment, prompted primarily by the company's desire to prevent the people of the city of Sacramento and other communities from operating their own electric distribution systems and using Shasta Dam power for this purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fort Peck project, Montana: For commencement of construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation for proper reception, handling, transmitting, and dispatching of electric energy produced at the Fort Peck project, as authorized by the act approved May 18, 1938, entitled "An act to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of the Fort Peck project for navigation, and for other purposes," (52 Stat. 403), $499,475, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed $10,000) and for all other objects of expenditure as specified hereinbefore in this act under the heading "Administrative provisions and limitations" appearing under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. This amount, as I understand it, is entirely for the purpose of keeping a contract authorization that was passed in the bill last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it the obligations are expected to be incurred before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Again the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. And it is not new money or a new project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the item just referred to makes provision for building and constructing transmission lines from Fort Peck Dam to as far east as Williston, N. Dak., and as far south as Glendive, Mont. The civil functions War Department bill recently passed by the Congress carried the sum of $1,300,000 for the purpose of building generators. The generators will, of course, serve no useful purpose without these transmission lines. It is now known that we have large deposits of strategic minerals, notable among them chromite, in the southern part of Montana. It is necessary that power be developed at Fort Peck just as quickly as possible to the end that these deposits may be made use of during this war period, and I am mighty grateful to the committee for including this amount in the bill.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. Let me say that the gentleman has faithfully, carefully, and conscientiously guarded the interests of the State of Montana and this particular item of the Fort Peck Dam and the transmission line, and he has brought it to the attention of the House so much, and I think we understand it so completely, that he need have no fear it is going to be defeated.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is not this Fort Peck Dam the one they had so much difficulty finishing because a part of it washed out?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. RICH. If they further increase the size of the dam and raise its height, what is the likelihood that some day another part of it will wash out, causing great destruction and loss of property?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is, of course, the largest dirt dam in the world; the longest, the highest, and the widest. There is always the possibility that anything might happen, but very little probability. It is just as likely that some other type of construction will go out. This is one of the best built dams in the world, and I believe there is no danger whatever.

Mr. RICH. It went out before, and they claim it is likely to go out again.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When it went out before it was under construction.

I have actively supported the requests for reclamation appropriations because I feel that only through increased use of western land resources by means of irrigation can the Western States be built into their just place in the national economy.

The contribution of our Western States to the war, in an agricultural sense, is largely dependent upon irrigation. In the matter of sugar beets alone, irrigated agriculture represents 75 percent of the total crop. Montana's sugar-beet acreage could be doubled with adequate irrigation water and with the necessary increase in refining facilities.

The program of developing western land and water resources must be continuously prosecuted in all stages, from the first preliminary investigation to fruition in the form of the projects ready for actual settlement.

Because I realize the significance of long-time planning for reclamation, I regret indeed that a reduction of $550,000 has been made in the Interior supply bill item covering investigative work of the Bureau of Reclamation. I know, for instance, how critical is the need for investigative work in my own State of Montana. The selection of storage sites that will provide dependable water supplies to irrigated lands, generate some power, and yet be feasible in an economic sense is a

complex job. It requires not only the physical scientist's skills in hydrology and engineering, but also the combination of these skills with the reasoning of economists and the experience of agriculturalists, if the project is to accomplish the objective of scund community building. Initial investigations are but the beginning of the job, and yet that beginning has been curtailed. How, I ask, is it proposed that the Bureau of Reclamation prepare itself for a full-scale program after the war, if we limit its authority for laying the groundwork now? We are going to need the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in post-war years. We will need it not only for the continued, progressive job it has been doing in building western agriculture and industry, but perhaps even more for the opportunity it will provide for a soundly conceived public-works program. A public-works program to fill dinner buckets, gentlemen.

Montana has not been particularly favored by the Federal Government in its reclamation work. In fact, we have some reason for a statement that we have been sadly overlooked. Fort Peck is the only Federal dam of any size in the State, and its purpose so far has been power production.

I should like to see irrigation pushed, just as far as the supplies of critical materials will let us go. We cannot abandon irrigated agriculture permanently for battleships, even in war. The battleships and planes must be manned, and men have to eat. Irrigated agriculture is an essential link in the chain of agricultural supplies, a link that must not be permitted to wear through if we are to win the war.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Labor and services of enemy aliens and of all American-born Japanese who are under the control of the War Department or other Federal agency may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior in the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under such regulations and conditions as the War Department or other Federal agency exercising said control may prescribe and in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider as read that portion of the bill beginning at the top of page 81 and ending with line 10 on page 104.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have never permitted, when I have been on the floor, an appropriation bill, or any part of it, to be considered as read.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are two items to which the committee agreed.

Mr. TABER. I have no doubt but that there will be no amendments, but I think we will get along faster to do it in the regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite (national defense): For all expenses necessary to the conduct of investigations and research on processes for production of alumina from siliceous bauxites, aluminum clays, and alunite, including all necessary laboratory research; maintenance and operation of small subcommercial plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; construction and equipment of a building to house testing and subcommercial plant units; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building and plant units; purchase of supplies and equipment; travel expenses; purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriters, adding and computing machines, professional and scientific books and publications; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for protection of employees engaged in their work, $93,925: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: Page 97, line 4, after the word "aluminum" insert the words "and alumina."

Line 7, after the word "alumina" insert the words "and aluminum."

Line 11, after the word "of" strike out the words "a building" and insert the word "buildings."

Line 22, after the word "work" strike out "$93,925" and insert "$743,925 to be immediately available."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because of the well-known and acknowledged shortage of aluminum for our national defense purposes. Some of our plants are only operating at about 35 to 50 percent capacity, due to the shortage of aluminum. We are at present dependent to a great extent for our aluminum supply on the bauxite of South America. We are all aware of the difficulty this country is experiencing now in getting that bauxite transported to our shores through the Caribbean waters.

The Bureau of Mines has requested that we increase this appropriation in order to explore all the possibilities of producing aluminum from low-grade ores, of which I am informed we have quite an abundance.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Did the Bureau of Mines approve this amendment the gentleman has offered?

Mr. WILSON. The Bureau absolutely has approved it and are recommending it. It has been recommended by members of the War Production Board, whom I cannot quote at this time because I have not been able to get in touch with them this afternoon in order to get permission to quote them.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman produce for the committee's enlightenment the communication from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I have it before me now.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This is a very important amendment and one which I think should be thoroughly considered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, upon reading this bill and noting the allowance in the bill for experimental work, and knowing of the aluminum shortage, I want to call to the attention of this body some large deposits of very rich aluminum ore. I know of an area of 78 square miles in my district which has been recommended by the Geological Survey as an area under which there is a vein of kaolin from 4 to 15 feet thick, and I have been informed by a reliable authority that this vein of kaolin will yield about 50 percent alumina. There is power available on the site for extracting the alumina from this ore.

We do not know how long we are going to be able to provide our defense plants with even a fair amount of aluminum, so I went to the Bureau of Mines and asked them if the amount of money provided in the bill was sufficient to carry on the necessary experimentation to explore these sources and develop the chemical processes and do the research work necessary to extract this aluminum, and the Bureau said, "Absolutely not."

Since I have had about 70 hours of science and have done a lot of research work, I know the amount of time and work required to carry on research. I also know that we may waste millions of dollars exploring raw-material sources and in producing defense materials by some inferior means, means that have not been thoroughly experimented with and developed. If we can foresee this thing and develop better processes and establish the most efficient chemical processes for extracting alumina from low-grade ores, we may be better able to arm our men and perhaps save our country millions of dollars.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We would have been grateful if the gentleman had come before the committee and offered this testimony so we could have included it in the bill, if it is essential.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry but I did not have an opportunity, since I did not know of it in time.

Mr. RICH. What has the gentleman from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. WILSON. I have a statement I could read, but I will not have time to read it.

Mr. RICH. Was it a recommendation from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. WILSON. It is a statement by the Bureau in answer to a letter which I addressed to them yesterday.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. I have been working on this proposition for a long time and I talked to the Bureau of Mines about it several times.

We have not enough high-grade bauxite in this country to last for 2 years and if the high-grade aluminum ore in South America were shut off today, we would soon find ourselves out of aluminum. It is a very serious situation.

We do have large deposits of low-grade bauxite and large deposits of aluminum-bearing clay. They all have to be worked by a different process from that now used in processing the high-grade bauxite in Arkansas. I took this matter up with the Bureau of Mines and introduced a bill providing for $100,000, but they came back and said that was not enough, that they would need a great deal more than that, that they would have to have pilot plants; probably two of them, one to extract alumina from clay and one for the low-grade bauxite. They have found those formulas and are now ready to use them.

We are having our vessels sunk today all around the coast of South America. What is called the Dragon's Mouth in between the West Indies islands and the coast of Venezuela has been virtually closed now. If the Windward Passage should become closed and then the Florida Strait, we might be entirely shut off from this bauxite supply in South America.

The Bureau of Mines is extremely anxious to have this increase. The reason I did not offer this amendment was that I thought it was too late, and we would have to get the item placed in the bill in the Senate. But I do hope the committee will accept this amendment. If I did not think it was necessary, and vitally necessary, I would not have risen to support it. The situation is serious, and the administration knows it is serious. This is our only chance to replenish our supply of alumina in case our supply in South America should be shut off. So I trust the committee will accept the amendment and that the House will adopt it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that the committee is sympathetic with his desire to furnish an additional source of alumina, but the customary method of handling appropriations is first to have an item recommended by the Bureau that will do the work, second, to have it presented to the Budget, which goes over the detail, and third, to send it to the committee, which carefully examines the pros and cons as to making the appropriation.

In this particular case, I suggest to the gentleman that he get a recommendation from the Bureau of Mines, which I believe he already has, then present it to the Budget, and then take it over to the Senate and have it incorporated in the bill during the Senate hearings. That is the orderly, systematic procedure. If we followed any other method, we would have more or less chaos and confusion by attempting to write an appropriation measure on the floor without having previous investigation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is a mining engineer and he was responsible for this provision being put in the appropriation bill in the first place; was he not?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. To a large degree.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. In the gentleman's opinion, should we carry on more research work and do it immediately to find out some efficient method for extracting this low-grade ore?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I am entirely sympathetic with the objective, and I think it will be done.

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman believe the amount in the bill is sufficient?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The amount in the bill is sufficient for the skilled personnel which is now available.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The Bureau of Mines says not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to and including line 10 on page 104.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, 1943 (H. R. 6845), had come to no resolution thereon.

PRODUCTION OF WINES, BRANDY, AND FRUIT SPIRITS

Mr. BUCK submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions.

CASES UNDER THE EXPEDITING ACT OF FEBRUARY 11, 1903

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6005) to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee handling the War Department civil functions appropriation bill have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that when we come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow we are going on with the consideration of the bill we have had under consideration today.

Mr. COCHRAN. Either that bill or the conference report on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article from the Reclamation Era.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief statement I made before the appropriations subcommittee and also to include a letter from Commissioner Page and a letter from Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] may be given an indefinite leave of absence on the advice of the physician at the Capitol, due to illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter I have addressed to Mr. Nelson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on today I have a special order to address the House for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business of the day has been transacted, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, in lieu of the special order I have for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a guest editorial by Ralph E. Ammon, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, appearing in the Wisconsin State Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table of profits of individual corporations for 1940 and 1941, showing the percentage of increase for 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business of the day and following any previous special order, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter to me from Maxey Jarman, president of the General Shoe Corporation, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial in the magazine The Cross and the Flag.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made a week ago yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, in each of which I ask unanimous consent to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JEWISH ARMY IN PALESTINE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in an apprehensive statement, Prime Minister Churchill told the united forces today that "we are likely to lose the war unless we use our combined overwhelming strength and use the multiplying opportunities that will present themselves to us." I want to call to the attention of the Prime Minister the fact that the Committee for a Jewish Army has pointed out repeatedly that there is in Palestine and other Middle East countries a manpower capable of supplying an army of approximately 200,000 Jews ready to fight with the valor that is characteristic of those who are defending their homelands. The immediate mobilization of these people must suggest itself as a wise course to all who want to see America win this war quickly. Many of our generals and our admirals tell us that such an army is essential to the protection of the Suez Canal. I do not know whether or not we are sending any men into that section of the globe now, but I venture to assert that it is only a question of a few weeks when American boys will be sent to Palestine to protect that region. Obviously there is an available army there now; a fierce army of traditional soldiers, for the Jewish people have, throughout the history of their existence, been a fighting people. Why not use it? The Jews were the first victims of Hitler. They want to fight. Why not let them fight, and in that way reserve our men for other important sections?

For some reason the United Nations have failed to take advantage of this ready manpower. Therefore I respectfully suggest that the President of the United States, at the earliest possible date, negotiate with the British Government in an effort to utilize this manpower. And I further suggest that he assign an American general to the task of effectively using this army, in the hope that military considerations will prevail and that we may drive on to victory and realize in the shortest possible time the complete destruction of the despotic forces that we are called upon to fight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield back the 10 minutes of the special order granted to me today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. STEPHEN RAUSHENBUSH

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests there are other special orders on the Calendar that must first be taken care of.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the attacks made yesterday on Mr. Raushenbush, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from him written to me today, and also a letter from Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, written to Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very interesting and informative article in yesterday's Washington Star relative to the pending measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the country is hearing a great deal from administration spokesmen these days about how production of war machines and munitions is being stepped up. There are also charges of slowdowns here and there. A grave danger—grave because it is insidious—confronts this country. It is time that it be pointed out. The technique of the bureaucrats, in those months when they should have had production and were not getting it, was to emphasize in all of their propaganda in the press, over the radio, through the motion pictures, and from the platform, the tremendous sums being appropriated and authorized.

The effort was made to convince the country that in some way appropriations and authorizations meant what only actual production could accomplish, and what was not being accomplished at the time.

We are now hearing much about production. If we are getting the production administration spokesmen say we are, the country can thank God for that. It still remains a fact, however, that reputable observers in Washington say it takes as much as 2 weeks in many cases for orders issued by the War Production Board to reach the governmental agencies which are to carry out those orders although, in many instances, the agencies are not two blocks away. That, however, is only a part of the grave danger which confronts this Nation. The rest of it is this:

Appropriations are only a preliminary step, necessary as they are. Authorizations are only a preliminary step, necessary as they are. Specifications are only a preliminary step, necessary as they are. Letting of contracts is only a preliminary step, necessary as that is. Production is the most important step in that succession of steps, but production is not the final step. The final, absolute, vital step which effectuates all of these previous steps is the delivery of these machines and munitions of war to our fighting men, and the fighting men of our allies, at the points where those machines and munitions are needed, and to get them there in time and in ample quantity.

If this final, vital step fails, if the machines and implements of war are not delivered to our fighting forces at the points needed in time and in sufficient quantities, all these previous steps of appropriations, authorizations, specifications, contracts, and production become ineffective and meaningless.

The evidence is accumulating in Washington that these machines and munitions are not being delivered at the points where they are needed by our fighting forces and our allied fighting forces in time and in sufficient quantities.

The administration has had all the money it has asked for. The Congress has appropriated billions piled upon billions. To date, Mr. Roosevelt has asked the American people, through Congress, for more than $160,000,000,000 to spend on this war. The President has been the recipient of powers piled upon powers. Twenty-two months have passed. The American people are demanding to know, and well may they demand to know, Where is the production? Why are the machines and munitions not being delivered to the points where they are needed, desperately needed, in time and in sufficient quantities?

America cannot defeat her enemies with words, propaganda, appropriations, authorizations, specifications, contracts, or production, so long as those machines and implements and munitions remain in warehouses in the United States. The people of America must demand with an insistence unending that the delivery of these machines and munitions be accomplished forthwith.

We have General MacArthur's warning that too little, too late, means betrayal and death for the boys in the fighting lines and defeat and enslavement for America.

America demands, and America will get, that delivery of enough in time, or they will know the reason why. The American people are now determined that no bureaucrat, that no partisan political consideration—nothing—shall stand between this Nation and its security, and between civilization and the threat of its extinction by brutal, ruthless, murderous marauders.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], I ask unanimous consent that he may be granted permission to extend his own remarks and include two newspaper articles and a letter addressed to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a table and a number of letters I have received from members of the Cabinet and chiefs of various governmental activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ECONOMY IN NONDEFENSE ITEMS A VITAL NECESSITY—NATION'S PRINTING BILL A GOOD PLACE TO START

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might present a progress repor on an effort I am trying to initiate to cut the enormous printing and binding costs of the United States Government. This is only one of innumerable places where the economy knife must be inserted deeply if we are to do our duty and carry out the wishes of the American people. But it is a good place to make a beginning.

A general, all-around reduction of nondefense expenditures has become not only a duty but a necessity. There is no use blinking at the facts and trying to convince ourselves that we can have all of the comforts and conveniences, the frills, and pet schemes and extravagances of peacetime and total war at the same time. They simply do not mix.

We are in a desperate war to preserve human freedom and the American way of life. Personally, I think it is going to be a long war. There is certainly nothing to indicate otherwise, with Japan entrenched in the Far East and Hitler in possession of Europe's "bread basket." As it continues it will draw more and more on America's vital resources. Our debt has mounted spectacularly until with existing commitments it is around $125,000,000,000. The last official estimates we have place the total wealth of the United States between $250,000,000,000 and $300,000,000,000. Since those estimates were made several years ago, our wealth has grown and the increase might now conceivably bring the total up to around $375,000,000,000. If in less than 4 months of war our national debt already amounts to one-third of the national wealth, what in Heaven's name will we be using for money to carry on the war 10 years from now?

CONGRESS NOT YET ECONOMY CONSCIOUS

As a Member of Congress trying to grasp the realism of the thing, I believe our national lawmaking body is not yet conscious of the cutting that will have to be done in our nondefense expenditures. I believe it has not yet even begun to be conscious of the drastic curtailments which are bound to come and which we will be compelled to put into effect in every kind and character of appropriation not associated with the war effort. I think that we in Congress will have to be shaken into a realization that we cannot have nondefense appropriations as usual and total war at the same time, and I believe the American people are about ready to do the shaking. My conclusion that the Congress is not aware of what it is up against in this respect is strengthened when I behold the numerous nondefense bills now pending to drain the United States Treasury of resources which must be conserved to carry on the war effort. Conspicuous among these is the rivers and harbors bill, carrying nearly a billion dollars, with a prospect that hundreds of millions more will be added to it if it ever reaches the stage of amendment in the House and Senate. This bill includes the indefensible St. Lawrence seaway scheme and the grandiose project to bisect the State of Florida with a ship canal, and various other ancient and fantastic measures to breach the Treasury. It is unthinkable to me that in the present state of our national finances and with the drain that war places on the Nation, such a squandering of money for nondefense, nonessential projects should even be considered for a moment, and yet we find it before us backed by a favorable committee report. When I see the big crop of nondefense Treasury tapping measures budding and flowering as usual and asking to be watered by American dollars, I wonder if we have really awakened to the fact that we are at war.

FIFTY-ONE UNOPENED GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

My purpose in arising, however, was not so much to call attention to the general picture of war financing and needed economies as to advise the Congress and the country of my inquiry into the cost of printing and binding by governmental departments and the savings which I hope may be effectuated in that particular line of economy. We are all familiar with the Gargantuan outpouring of Government documents of every imaginable variety and description, some modest and others ornate, printed on costly calendered paper and embellished with illustrations. Some of these publications have been printed in colors, which adds largely to their cost. One Government official, who is opposed to this waste, told me about an acquaintance of his, a businessman who, on examining the contents of a wastebasket in his office, found 51 Government publications, all in their original wrappers. At this point I desire to submit for printing in the RECORD a statement showing the amounts expended for printing and binding by the executive departments and agencies and Congress during the fiscal years 1939, 1940, 1941, and the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1942, as follows:

	1939	1940	1941	First 6 months 1942
Congress	$2,700,000.00	$2,987,378.23	$3,557,568.21	$2,110,867.99
The Federal Register	120,000.00	112,621.77	162,431.79	78,189.40
Code of Federal Regulations		88,147.05	125,283.45	
Private orders by Members of Congress:				
Documents, reports, bill, etc	20,338.23	12,815.12	26,621.07	5,751.04
Speeches	60,488.47	97,820.99	77,752.00	23,296.07
Other private orders	1,797.44	4,771.01	2,553.27	469.16
Superintendent of Documents	727,986.55	850,181.06	1,198,259.33	561,622.14
Library of Congress	468,536.23	542,168.15	580,885.07	286,174.70
Agriculture	1,447,208.19	1,950,909.85	2,433,426.86	900,792.12
Commerce	534,740.84	1,065,234.84	1,022,895.28	672,324.52
Interior	861,599.48	662,429.63	778,322.86	236,982.73
Justice	403,675.07	434,112.69	712,094.58	297,636.16
Labor	603,222.36	412,575.18	458,806.54	182,067.88
Navy	714,731.04	1,002,814.31	2,158,284.18	1,344,088.45
Post Office	1,881,791.91	2,046,122.52	2,213,324.68	1,074,878.85
State	215,092.82	204,219.23	269,048.55	102,183.58
Treasury	1,521,430.02	1,552,932.87	2,044,042.26	1,704,259.03
War	733,390.04	1,120,732.64	5,244,316.58	3,442,136.93
Administrative Office, Export Control				7,810.25
Administrative Office, U. S. Courts			34,858.43	29,481.01
Advisory Committee for Council of National Defense		326.92		
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	538,877.76	100,834.25	1,462.26	
Alien Property Custodian	(1)	(1)		
Alley Dwelling Authority	550.75	1,146.94	2,138.12	953.70
American Battle Monuments Commission	22,019.29	239.50	2,878.96	2,526.51
Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission		18.39		
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	2,584.16	1,092.52	1,328.36	3,422.82
Board of Investigation and Research				178.55
Board of Tax Appeals	30,383.63	31,218.00	36,607.20	18,983.30
Bureau of the Budget	38,277.04	44,946.31	50,901.93	2,611.65
Canal Zone Biological Laboratory				1.58
Central Statistical Board			1,468.63	147.15
Civil Aeronautics Authority	41,605.63	89,565.52	24,169.10	1,369.93
Civil Service Commission	128,732.36	155,315.91	353,364.70	181,557.73
Civilian Conservation Corps	40,030.18	9,565.47	2.28	
Commission of Fine Arts	406.20	351.43	197.86	247.51
Commodity Credit Corporation	59,531.05	19,712.52		
Coordinator of Information				6,099.43
Council of Personnel Administration		26.35		
Court of Claims	27,211.75	29,110.81	24,037.06	10,953.20
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	5,733.63	6,029.77	6,407.32	7,248.67
District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia	264.72			
District of Columbia government	83,900.54	78,394.76	75,959.63	27,849.42
Economic Defense Board				136.48
Electric Home and Farm Authority	587.04	2,482.33		
Employees' Compensation Commission	41,412.71	30,605.38	32,326.41	9,906.50
Export Control			3,874.27	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	308.18	263.06		
Farm Credit Administration	104,424.25	131,784.76	131,456.21	60,040.19
Farm Security Administration	158,536.49	161,373.46	195,275.00	107,265.52
Federal Alcohol Administration	12.00	12.00		
Federal Board for Vocational Education	(1)	(1)		
Federal Communications Commission	42,360.59	40,063.35	58,809.20	12,543.18
Federal Coordinator of Industrial Cooperation			11,836.99	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	8,942.77	8,786.90	8,945.49	2,608.92
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works	134,250.44	26,121.50		
Federal Emergency Relief Administration	50.70			
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	14,238.56	4,821.33		
Federal Housing Administration	306,389.47	87,235.38		
Federal Loan Agency		247,452.57	376,219.01	158,518.94
Federal Power Commission	39,563.14	75,720.92	58,494.33	13,123.68
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance	1,343.48	17.41		
Federal Security Agency		465,935.09	853,109.48	387,821.10
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation	16,784.90	10,684.94		
Federal Trade Commission	62,872.31	83,376.06	70,905.08	24,524.79
Federal Works Agency		411,021.94	450,505.04	215,910.71
General Accounting Office	101,002.96	103,108.88	110,895.34	67,340.65
Geographic Board	(2)	(2)		
George Washington Bicentennial Commission	13,103.42			
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	44,813.69	12,425.56		
Inland Waterways Corporation	18.50	497.29		
Interstate Commerce Commission	209,920.77	245,207.83	245,360.95	109,442.98
Maritime Labor Board	493.32	388.37	2,576.49	4.44
National Academy of Science	187.10	191.02	299.09	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	19,199.55	25,031.36	26,797.11	9,716.69
National Archives	12,476.92	19,395.05	13,100.69	5,222.86
National Bituminous Coal Commission	36,002.66	12,007.50	9,439.66	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	73.18	27.92	63.49	31.99
National Emergency Council	38,870.95	1,429.37		
National Forest Reservation Commission	797.03	696.03	680.00	52.51
National Gallery of Art	743.38	424.36	4,935.43	6,281.57
National Labor Relations Board	91,423.78	157,015.01	135,299.54	56,146.64
National Mediation Board	2,669.80	2,117.73	2,874.46	770.10
National Railroad Adjustment Board	36,117.73	380.16	1,108.07	50.05
National Resources Planning Board		2,984.10	19,157.55	9,038.42
National Unemployment Administration	23,193.14			
Northwest Territory Celebration Commission	4.25			
Office for Emergency Management			125,050.57	328,884.29
Office of Government Reports		20,010.82	43,760.49	20,220.26
Office of Production Management			78,331.66	108,357.11
Pan American Union	27,701.24	36,095.92	31,806.39	16,429.39
Panama Canal	6,679.82	14,096.44	20,524.33	9,570.64
Patent Office	789,740.72	873,767.22	908,171.25	343,361.75
Prison Industries Reorganization	45.09			
Public Buildings and Public Parks	(2)	(2)		
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration	2,900.65	2,850.36	501.87	177.68
Railroad Administration	33.51			
Railroad Retirement Board	27,751.88	113,210.09	100,464.40	53,279.73
Real Estate Commission, District of Columbia		14.34		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	160,374.24	76,234.43	16,535.30	
Resettlement Administration	.50			
Rural Electrification Administration	74,665.08	23,505.90	7.95	
Securities and Exchange Commission	100,930.90	135,415.36	131,103.56	56,906.96
Selective Service System			286,164.62	71,515.41
Shipping Board	(3)	(3)		

[1] In Justice. [2] In Interior. [3] In Commerce.

	1939	1940	1941	First 6 months 1942
Smithsonian Institution	$56,463.03	$58,576.79	$65,194.56	$37,832.02
Social Security Board	256,633.89	81,247.63	7,214.34	
Supreme Court, United States	10,949.56	6,357.92	8,290.29	6,147.94
Tennessee Valley Authority	57,775.70	45,587.25	44,991.27	19,197.29
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission	315.99	298.11		
United States Committee for the Celebration, 200th Anniversary, Birth of Thomas Jefferson				98.68
United States Commissioner Paris International Exposition				
United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission	1,428.03		5,435.00	
United States Coronado Exposition		32.52		
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia	1,754.27			
United States Customs Court		21.32		
United States Golden Gate International Exposition	953.94	197.46		
U. S. Housing Authority	39,895.06	10,226.96		
U. S. Maritime Commission	39,170.09	45,516.17	43,009.74	30,517.32
U. S. New York World's Fair Commission		1,569.26		
U. S. Tariff Commission	25,665.07	19,760.36	16,489.50	15,941.00
Veterans' Administration	131,967.54	143,504.77	155,741.58	60,837.43
War Finance Corporation		14.95		
White House	5,552.45	5,699.91	7,372.33	3,672.45
Works Progress Administration	817,902.04	240,176.32	2,787.62	
Commodore Perry Commission	114.00			
Grand total, printing, binding, and blank paper	18,238,045.10	20,150,203.72	28,593,638.71	15,864,603.65

OVER-ALL PRINTING COSTS

This table shows graphically how the cost of printing and binding has grown from $18,238,045.10 in 1939 to $28,593,638.71 in 1941, an increase of over $10,000,000 in 2 years, with a prospect of a further increase to about $32,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942.

But this does not begin to tell the story of the financial obligation on the Government incurred on account of printing and binding. The various documents that are printed have first to be written and edited and a large personnel is required in their preparation. This entails a cost equal to or greater than the cost of printing and binding. Then there is the amount of postage that is lost by reason of the fact that these documents are mailed free to the four corners of the earth. The amount of postage lost on penalty—departmental—mail in the fiscal year 1941 was $49,020,190.

That is to say, if postage on this matter had been collected at the usual rates, the amount would have been $49,020,190; but it is only fair to explain that the actual cost of handling the penalty mail, according to cost ascertainment figures, was $19,717,000 in that year. It is reasonable, I think, to assume that the cost of preparing and editing manuscripts intended for printing, the actual cost of the printing and binding and the cost of the handling of departmental and congressional printed matter under frank is in excess of $85,000,000 a year.

MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR FOR HEARINGS

It will surprise the general public and, I think, many Members of Congress to learn that the cost of printing and binding of congressional hearings is a million dollars a year. To be exact, the estimate of this item for the fiscal year 1942 is $1,055,000, and the actual cost for the fiscal year 1941 was $968,316.

This is the sheer printing and binding cost and does not include the pay of the stenographers who report the hearings or any other incidental charges. The cost of one hearing, that of the Civil Liberties Committee, was $296,000. Think of it. A vast amount of the testimony taken down by the official stenographers and printed in committee hearings is repetitious and inconsequential. How to reduce the cost of committee hearings is a problem. One suggestion is that competent clerks be employed to make a condensation or syllabus of important parts of the testimony and that such syllabus only be printed. But there the human factor enters, and what one person would regard as important enough to be printed another might omit altogether.

Another suggestion is that hearings be taken down by stenographers and transcripts of the testimony be placed on file with the committee and made accessible to everybody, but that the printing of the hearings be dispensed with. This would cut down the cost of congressional committee printing at least 90 percent, but it would do away with the general and widespread publicity of committee proceedings, which is believed to be in the public interest.

LETTER TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

On February 12 last, I sent to every member of the Cabinet and the head of every important United States Government activity the following letter:

DEAR MR. ———: As a member of the Appropriations Committee, still interested in economy notwithstanding the colossal overshadowing expenditures that are necessary for national defense, I am writing to invite your attention to a matter which, while seemingly of relative unimportance, bears possibilities, I believe, of substantial dividends in national morale, as well as in actual savings.

Everywhere the people are expressing a willingness to bow their backs to any tax impositions that may be necessary to win the war, but they are not only insisting but demanding that waste and extravagance in every conceivable form shall be eliminated from our national expenditures.

I am writing respectfully to request that you make a study of the paper and printing needs of your establishment to see if it will not be possible to effectuate worth-while savings in your paper and printing bill. One Government commission has been able to save thousands of dollars by changing its press releases from a daily to a weekly basis, printing on both sides of the paper and adopting other similar reforms to conserve paper and reduce printing costs.

If this example were followed generally throughout the Government, the saving in money would be substantial, but more important still would be the heartening effect on public morale. The people would construe this conservation effort as an indication that the practice of economy is not a lost art in Government operations and they would be cheered and encouraged.

I will be most appreciative if you will advise me whether it will be possible for you to make such a survey as I have suggested.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Mr. Speaker, the replies to this communication have been most gratifying. My suggestion that printing and binding costs be overhauled and that a critical study be made to ascertain how the same may be reduced has met instant and favorable reaction from all of those to whom the letter was sent. Without exception, sincere and complete cooperation is promised to bring down these costs. I believe that the spirit of cooperation which is being manifested should soon result in a saving of many millions of dollars a year to the taxpayers.

The replies I have received from heads of governmental activities and accompanying data in support of a real economy move to cut down the Nation's printing and binding bill would fill one whole issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Obviously I can submit only a small fraction of them for publication. The following communications are presented to show the fine spirit of cooperation manifested by the heads of all departments and agencies.

SECRETARY HULL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 18, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your letter of February 12, 1942, expressing your interest in the possibility of effecting worth-while savings in the Federal Government in expenditures for paper and printing.

In this connection you may be assured that I shall be very glad to cooperate with you in making a survey with a view to effecting economies wherever possible. In fact, I might add that such a survey with respect to the use of paper and other stationery supplies is now under way in the Department, and I expect within the next few days to inaugurate certain procedures which will aid materially in keeping expenditures for these items to a minimum.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

SECRETARY JONES

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 3, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We are in hearty accord with the suggestion contained in your letter that war economy and public morale demand a critical check of Government paper and printing needs. The economies suggested as well as additional curtailments were put in force throughout the Department some time ago.

The Department's publications committee, representative of each bureau, division, and other issuing agency, made a comprehensive study of all printing, processing, and use of paper, and other supplies. All publications not considered essential in the face of the present emergency are being eliminated. All production must conform to a rule of strict economy in the use of paper and other supplies and man-hours required. All distribution which has no bearing on the war effort is being eliminated, and all lists have been carefully checked. Consolidation and other savings are being effected as rapidly as possible. Last September we emphasized the saving of paper by use of both sides and single-spacing of the typing. All files have been checked and where not deemed of immediate or historic value were recommended to the Committee of Congress on Disposition of Executive Papers for disposal. This will not only conserve paper but release space.

Your interest and courtesy in writing are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

MR. KEYSERLING

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Washington, February 23, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: In reply to your letter of February 12, I wish to assure you that I am wholly in agreement with the thoughts expressed therein, and you are advised that a survey such as you suggest, looking toward worth-while savings in our paper and printing bill, will be made.

Since the beginning, economy has been and must of necessity be the watchword of the United States Housing Authority because it is constantly striving to reduce construction and operating costs, as well as administrative expenses, in carrying out its low-cost housing program.

Under what is known as our waste-control policy, we have been and are continually finding ways and means to eliminate administrative expense. For your information in this connection we are enclosing copies of memoranda issued during the past few years. This year, because of the emergency, we have established unusually tight budget controls over all administrative expenses with the object of eliminating every item of expense that is not absolutely essential to the efficient operation of the Authority.

Before any office memoranda, office forms, pamphlets, technical notes, office manuals, etc., are printed or reproduced for use or distribution, approval must first be obtained from our Budget and Planning Division, which takes into consideration such things as the purpose to be served, quantity to be ordered, method of reproduction used, distribution, present need, number of pages, and the possibility of combining two or more forms, for example, so as to reduce and improve upon the number of forms in use.

At present, wherever possible, we use both sides of the paper for printing. We have also reduced the number of editions of publications issued throughout the year. To cite one example, a publication issued as a weekly during the fiscal year 1941 was changed to a monthly and two special editions during the fiscal year 1942. As the year progressed, however, we have found it possible to reduce that number still further, so that only nine publications will be issued. The savings on that publication alone in paper, printing, and cost of distribution is approximately $7,000.

Because of our waste-control policy, under which we are constantly striving to eliminate waste and extravange, it is going to be somewhat difficult to effect very large savings; but you can count upon us to do our best to effect further savings in the survey which is being undertaken.

Very sincerely yours,

LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Acting Administrator.

PAUL V. M'NUTT

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, February 20, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LOUIE: I have your letter of February 12, 1942, asking my cooperation in making a survey to the end that economies may be effected in our paper and printing needs.

May I say at the outset that I am in complete agreement with the objectives you suggest, and for sometime past we have been trying to cut corners wherever possible. Specifically, we have established the policy of not only using both sides of the paper but also single spacing every duplicating job except, of course, in particular instances where this is not feasible. I have had established in my office for several months a central printing and duplicating committee whose responsibility it is to review each request for duplicating or printing service submitted by not only the constituent organizations of this Agency, but also the members of my immediate staff, with a view to determining whether or not the material is absolutely essential to the efficient operation of our business. Also, though it might seem a small item from a conservation standpoint, instructions have been issued to the entire staff that rewrites of letters are to be ordered only when absolutely necessary to insure clarity or correct misstatements, and in such cases only the originals are rewritten with changes made in ink on all carbon copies. In this connection, too, it has been ordered that the individual offices survey their correspondence procedures to the end that as many copies as are not absolutely necessary to the proper function of their office be eliminated.

Other than the above you no doubt are familiar with the fact that the Government Printing Office has recently asked the cooperation of the Federal departments and agencies in adopting several different sizes of letterheads, it being their idea that half-sized sheets be used for short letters, thus conserving the paper supply. I need not tell you that we are extending our every cooperation, and further than this we are also adopting similar-sized sheets for our interoffice correspondence.

As can be seen from this explanation, we are pursuing every effort to economize on this phase of our operation, but so far as showing an actual saving in dollars and cents, I am doubtful that this can be done at the present time on account of the fact that the war effort has considerably increased the load of our duplicating facilities. An economy actually does not exist by virtue of these measures we have adopted, although they might not be readily reflected in our appropriation figure for this function. Let me assure you that we are giving this matter very careful attention and those compiling our budget are keeping this uppermost in their minds.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Administrator.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL WARREN

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 19, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives, the Capitol.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter dated February 12 did not reach me until the 17th. I read it carefully and let me assure you I am wholly in accord with your position that economy should be observed in Government operation whenever and wherever possible.

Referring to our printing and paper expense, let me say that already we have moved to conserve paper in any way possible. We make only one carbon when that will suffice, and have instructed that one envelope carry more than one letter or document sent from one of our divisions to another division, whenever possible. We are located in 18 buildings and the necessity of sending papers from one building to another daily is very great. Also, I wish to emphasize the fact that the General Accounting Office has no daily, weekly, or any other kind of press releases. Not in the whole history of the Office has a penny been spent for that purpose, nor has the Office ever submitted an estimate for funds to be used for such a purpose.

With continued high regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SECRETARY PERKINS

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 14, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: This will acknowledge your letter of February 12, requesting a survey of the paper and printing needs of this Department with a view to effectuating "worth-while savings" in expenditures for these items. You may be assured that we shall be very glad to comply with this request.

* * * * *

With appreciation of this opportunity to cooperate with you, believe me,

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BIDDLE

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 12, 1942, relative to creating economies, particularly in our paper and printing bills.

I am pleased to advise you that the Department initiated a survey along these lines a short while ago. We have issued circulars to our divisional and bureau heads and to our field offices to make a survey of all supplies and equipment they have and to return any excess over their immediate needs to the Department with a view to conserving these supplies and distributing them in an economical manner. We have also requested that all obsolete forms be used for scrap paper and that both sides of paper be used wherever it is possible.

To create further savings, we are using, where suitable, a very small type for mimeograph work, which will permit us to have many more words on the page, thus conserving paper. To reduce our printing costs, we are using a varityper wherever possible, so that the far less expensive offset printing method may be used. We are also taking steps to reduce, if possible, printing costs for

briefs and records by the use of this special form of printing.

You may be interested to know that the Department does not issue daily press releases. In fact, the only information we issue is on matters of specific public interest, and then only when absolutely necessary.

You may be assured that the Department is exploring every possible means to conserve paper and reduce printing costs. Your suggestions and interest are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

SECRETARY STIMSON

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 4, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 12, 1942, relative to economy in the use of paper by the War Department, is acknowledged.

You are advised that various measures have been put into effect along these lines. War Department Circular No. 214, dated October 10, 1941, directed all concerned to exercise the strictest economy in the use of paper of all kinds by (1) utilization of both sides of mimeograph paper, if possible; (2) reduction of margins to a minimum; (3) economic arrangement of subject matter; and (4) strict adherence to brevity. Circular No. 253, of December 11, 1941, amplified the earlier circular by including measures such as the careful planning as to the minimum number of copies of orders and training schedules needed and the revision of mailing lists to eliminate those uninterested.

You are assured that a continued study will be given to this problem, and suggestions for further economy will receive immediate consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

SECRETARY KNOX

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 19, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At the present time a definite effort is being made in the Navy Department to effectuate a savings in paper and printed matter. In the Publications Division, Office of the Secretary of the Navy, a study is being made on standardization and consolidation of Navy Department forms and in this connection a definite attempt has been made to conform to standard sizes.

Furthermore, in an effort to eliminate waste and extravagance in paper and printing, a reduction in the use of rag-content paper has been made and the number of copies ordered has been curtailed. Material, insofar as it is advisable, is being printed on both sides of the paper.

You may be sure that the Navy Department will do everything possible to cooperate in the effort to conserve paper and reduce the cost of printing.

FRANK KNOX.

GEN. FRANK T. HINES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 20, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am in receipt of your communication of February 12, 1942, relative to effecting economies in expenditures for paper and printing needs of the Veterans' Administration.

Expenditures of this nature receive the continuous attention of this Administration, and as an example of what has been accomplished our cost of printing and binding during the fiscal year 1941 was approximately $149,000 as compared with $228,500 for the fiscal year 1923, notwithstanding the large increase in the activities of the Veterans' Administration during this period. Our appropriation for printing and binding for the current fiscal year is $144,250 and it may be well to state that our expenditures for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 are considerably above our normal requirements due to the costs involved in printing insurance applications, policies, and other forms required in connection with the new National Service Life Insurance.

Regarding the cost of press releases and other issues of this character, you are advised that we have a Press Relations Section, consisting of three employees. This section prepares a biweekly news bulletin and the total cost of stationery and supplies used for all purposes, including reference books and subscriptions, approximated $258 for the last fiscal year.

Your interest in effecting economies in operation is appreciated, and you may be assured of the continued cooperation of the Veterans' Administration in this important and necessary function.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

CHAIRMAN MILLIS

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I agree with you in your letter about the importance of conserving paper and money in restricting printing.

The Board does no promotional printing. It must finance its briefs, records, appendices, etc., in connection with litigation under the act. Similarly it is required by statute to issue an annual report. It must also issue its decisions so that they may be available to the public. The only other printing is that for elections, which consists of notices of elections, ballots, etc., and the usual miscellaneous items of stationery, forms, etc. These are all kept at a minimum.

I hope that this is fully explanatory, and know that if it is not, you will feel free to call upon me for further advices.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. MILLIS.

POSTMASTER GENERAL WALKER

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This will acknowledge your communication of February 12 concerning the study to be made of the paper and printing needs for the Post Office Department.

I am now having made an extensive study on these needs which will be completed within the next week. Upon completion of this survey, I will write you fully concerning the Post Office Department's needs.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Further reference is made to your communication of February 12, concerning the study to be made of the paper and printing needs of the Post Office Department and to my reply of February 23, wherein it was stated that such a study was being made and that you would be advised further on the completion of this study. I am now in a position to give you at length the results of this study.

Prior to January 20, when this Department appeared before the Committee on Appropriations with a deficiency request in the appropriation for printing and binding for the Post Office Department, I instructed the responsible officers to explain to the committee in detail the problems confronting us concerning this appropriation. After their return from the hearing I further instructed that a detailed complete investigation concerning this appropriation for the last 15 years be made and a report submitted. I am attaching herewith a copy of that report, with exhibits, and sufficient copies for distribution to all members of the committee if you see fit to so distribute them.

I believe that the report, with the exhibits, clearly sets forth the problems confronting the Post Office Department regarding this appropriation. In substance it discloses that the expenditures to a great extent are beyond the control of anyone in the Post Office Department, except as to the following:

1. Is the material ordered absolutely essential to the Postal Service?

With respect to this there is an itemized list submitted of every order and an investigation of this list will show that the material ordered is absolutely necessary to the conduct of the business of the Post Office Department.

2. Is proper check continually maintained on the quantity of forms used?

This subject is clearly covered in paragraph 3 on page 3 of the report. While you may have other ideas concerning this feature, I believe that we are now expending from other appropriation items all the money that should be spent to safeguard this feature. I am further of the opinion that the methods used are adequate and that we do not order or use more material than is absolutely necessary.

3. Is the absolute necessity for each form or other printed material ascertained?

With reference to this feature, on every occasion when a new form is ordered or a reprint of an old form is necessary, the unit ordering the form must submit an explanation as to its necessity, and before the form is printed it is passed on by a special committee on forms, attached to my office. This is covered in paragraph 4 on page 3 of the report.

4. Are the forms or other printed material made up in the most economical manner?

The committee on forms has always watched this very closely, and every known device is used to curtail expenses in the make-up of this material. A saving of $669,651 has been made during the last 8 years. This is covered in the continuing paragraph on the top of page 4 of the report.

I dislike very much for the Department to have to go before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee for deficiency appropriations, and have instructed all officers of the Department to submit their estimates with a view to eliminating the necessity for such requests. However, if you will read from paragraph 3 on page 5, through paragraph 6 on page 6 of the report, you will note that we have very little control over the necessity for such requests.

I am more than anxious to cooperate with the Appropriations Committee in every way possible, not only in this appropriation, but in all other appropriations of the Post Office Department. If, after reading the report of the investigation and this letter, you or the committee have any suggestions to offer I would be very glad to have them, and I assure you that such suggestions will receive my personal attention.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

CHAIRMAN HENDERSON

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
WASHINGTON, *February 18, 1942.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 12th, suggesting that a survey be made for the purpose of determining what savings could be made in our paper and printing needs, was brought to my attention today upon my return to the office after an absence of several days.

You may be assured that we shall be pleased to cause such a survey to be made promptly, which will include the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all affiliated agencies.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

LEON HENDERSON

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 4, 1942.*

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This will acknowledge your letter of February 20, 1942, relative to a definite plan for conservation of paper, as well as a reduction in our printing costs.

I was indeed glad to have your views on this matter because I share wholeheartedly your opinion that such savings are necessary, both from a standpoint of national resources, as well as one of public morale, and had already asked my staff to make the necessary surveys with that objective in mind. I am unable at this time to say just when there will be anything of significance to report, but a survey of the nature you suggest is, and has been, on our schedule and will be completed just as quickly as the present load of work will permit. At such time I will let you know the results of our findings.

May I assure you that I appreciate your concern in this matter and that I shall welcome any further suggestions you may wish to submit along this line.

Very truly yours,

LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator.

SECRETARY WICKARD

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 3, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 12 raises a question which has been undergoing careful consideration in this Department for some time. One phase of the printing and paper problem, namely the use of printed forms, was the subject of intensive study by our Administrative Council during the past year. Its study pointed in the same direction as did a recent circular issued by the Bureau of the Budget which directed all departments, in the interest of economy and efficiency, to review, eliminate where possible, and standardize its several types of printed forms. Consequently I issued on February 7, 1942, a memorandum (No. 976) instructing the several Administrators, Chiefs of Bureaus, and Directors of Offices to take proper steps to accomplish this purpose. I am enclosing a copy of that memorandum.

* * * * *

We are just now winding up a survey of all the printed and duplicated periodicals of the Department as a basis for cutting down the number of pages, frequency of issue, number of copies issued wherever possible, and in some cases for eliminating periodicals completely. There'll be considerable saving, we believe, in the printing of periodicals as a result of this survey and the following action.

However, much of our publication of periodicals and of single bulletins is more necessary in wartime than ever before since they carry information that farm people must have in order to produce the food and fiber that the Nation must have to carry on the war. Also, changes in the Department's programs help farmers get their wartime job done and necessitate considerable increase in the printing of forms, certificates, blanks, etc., as new activities are undertaken to meet the wartime needs. Our effort is to make sure that the printing funds that are available are put to purposes that will forward the Nation's war program.

I can assure you and your fellow committee members that we shall make strenuous efforts to meet the wartime necessities for the economical and effective use of our paper and printing resources.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

JAMES M. LANDIS

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C. March 1, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This Office is well aware of the national shortage of paper and the economies that can be effected by careful planning of all mimeographing and printing work.

One of the most fundamental duties of this Office is to give the general public through State and local defense councils the best possible advice in all matters relating to civilian defense. To that end we have had to reproduce more than 50 different items. Insofar as possible, we have utilized newsprint paper. Our mimeographing is always put on both sides of the sheet.

It may well be that further economies can be effected and to that end I have instructed the staff to be vigilant at all times.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. LANDIS,
Director.

JAMES G. ROBINSON

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C. March 4, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of February 20, requesting that we study our paper and printing needs with a view to effectuating worthwhile savings in our paper and printing bills, as part of the larger program of eliminating all waste and extravagance from our national expenditures, has been referred to this office.

We are continuously studying our paper and printing needs, prescribing ways and means of saving paper and printing, and enforcing adherence to standards and instructions. * * *

Our studies will be continued in this and other directions in order to effect such economies as are possible and practicable under existing conditions.

Your letter is very much appreciated and will serve as an aid to our efforts to effect further savings.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. ROBINSON,
Administrative Officer.

Mr. Speaker, among the many other governmental heads who have written to me, evincing a highly cooperative spirit, I would like to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to the following: E. K. Burlew, Acting Secretary of the Interior, who wrote that "the Department of the Interior takes very seriously the problem about which you wrote, and we are doing something effective about it"; Clyde B. Aitchison, Acting Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission; Harry B. Mitchell, president of the United States Civil Service Commission; W. N. Thompson, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury; C. J. Durr, Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Oscar B. Ryder, Acting Chairman, United States Tariff Commission; and Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Olds concludes his letter with the heartening assurance that "the Federal Power Commission shares your interest in these matters."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PACE for March 25 and 26, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 27, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, March 27, 1942, to hear Mr. Elliot E. Simpson, director of the Drexsage Rubber Co., of New York, in respect to rubber.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1534. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, with a view to modifying that part of the recommendation which provides that local interests shall defray all costs of the modification or rebuilding of bridges, bulkheads, and other structures and submarine crossings, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 1, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1535. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, U ited States Army, dated December 31, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Conewango Creek and Davis Brook in Chautauqua County and Cattaraugus County, N. Y., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 685); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5490. A bill for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5658. A bill for the relief of James Warren; with amendment (Rept. No. 1947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5854. A bill for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young; with amendment (Rept. No. 1948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5910. A bill for the relief of Randolph and Emma Treiber; with amendment (Rept. No. 1949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H R. 5966. A bill for the relief of Louis H. Deaver; without amendment (Rept. No. 1950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover; with amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Harry Tousey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 6858. A bill relating to the statues of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6859. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6860. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 6861. A bill relating to the voting rights of persons in the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 6867 (by request). A bill to amend title 39, United States Code; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 6862. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Thomas P. Prendergast; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6863. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 6865. A bill for the relief of Andrew Stenman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 6866. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2612. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the United States Senators from California and the Members of the House of Representatives from California to exert every effort to resist or modify the crippling effect of House bills 6617 and 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2613. By Mr. GILLETTE: A letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Dushore, Pa., favoring the elimination of certain nondefense governmental agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2614. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations between United States and Canada so that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and movement of persons and products facilitated for the purpose of promoting harmonious, efficient, and victorious prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2615. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Builders Exchange of San Francisco, Calif., adopted March 16, 1942, for the stepping up of war production; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose Providence doth always make provision for us, if not according to our fancied wants, yet according to our inmost needs: Quicken and quiet the spirit in us for worship and for praise, and, from the sanctuary of Thy holiness, do Thou compose our thoughts and renew our strength. Unclose our inward ear for hearing, and do Thou give to us the earnestness of soul that has no time to waste on anything that furthers not a sense of duty to God and Country, for the establishment of righteous dealing among men and the nations of the world.

We bless Thee for the lives of self-denial all about us, for the experiences which bring to us their lessons, leaving us chastened and tempered to a wiser spirit, and if there be in our heart today a song of thankfulness, and mingled with the song a prayer of upward aspiration, do Thou in Thy mercy receive the song and answer Thou the prayer according to the D'vine pleasure of Thy will; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 26, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Army was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in Western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 189)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, amounting to $50,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (S. DOC. NO. 190)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $3,500,000, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, amounting to $4,071,000 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year, for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for continuing the construction and equipment of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Philadelphia and vicinity, Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and to provide for the use of employees of the liquor business in the war industries, also to prohibit the sale of rubber tires or accessories to the liquor industry for liquor deliveries when such tires, etc., may be denied for the use of grocery deliveries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

The petition of members of the North Avenue United Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, Md., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Kansas State Federation of Labor, Coffeyville, Kans., signed by George A. Maiden, secretary, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2329, for the relief of civilian employees previously engaged in construction work at Wake and Guam Islands in the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A petition of members of the congregation of the Methodist Church of Vernon, Kans., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask consent at this time to present for the RECORD a petition from sundry citizens of Vergennes, Vt., headed by Katherine M. Waterman, with respect to Senate bill 860, generally known as the Sheppard bill, and praying for the enactment of that proposed legislation. I request that the petition may be appropriately disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Vermont will be received and lie on the table.

STATEMENT RELATIVE TO RESOLUTIONS OF LOYALTY BY AMERICANS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement containing references to certain resolutions pledging loyalty on the part of Italian-American people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF LOYALTY

Immediately after the dastardly attack upon Pearl Harbor numerous resolutions were adopted by fraternal and labor organizations whose membership is composed of Americans of Italian origin. These resolutions are splendid manifestations of the patriotism, loyalty, and wholehearted support of such organizations, as well as its members, to the President and the Government of the United States.

I wish to take this opportunity of summarizing a few of the very many resolutions which have been brought to my attention in these last few weeks, which I believe are of note to the members of this body:

Among the first, the order, Sons of Italy, through its supreme council meeting in extraordinary session in the city of Philadelphia, cradle of American liberty, recommended that each of its member lodges subscribe and pledge its available funds for the ultimate purchase of $10,000,000 worth of Defense bonds.

In a letter to President Roosevelt all of the executives, editors, administrative staff, and employees of the newspapers Il Progresso Italo-Americano, and Corriere D'America, edited by Generoso Pope, reaffirmed their loyalty and pledged their fortunes and lives to preserve and secure the United States. By the voluntary pay-roll allotment plan Mr. Pope's industrial and journalistic enterprises have already purchased $50,000 worth of Defense bonds.

In addition, all the other Italian-American newspapers are conducting an extensive campaign for the purchase of millions of dollars worth of additional bonds by the various Italian-American organizations throughout the United States.

On February 8 of this year the newspaper Il Progresso Italo-Americano already published the names of those social groups and clubs and industrial organizations, whose membership is composed of Americans of Italian origin, which had purchased a total of approximately one-half million dollars' worth of Defense bonds. This drive is still being conducted, and everywhere Americans of Italian extraction are unselfishly responding.

The spirit of loyalty of these people to the President and Government of the United States is proven beyond doubt in the following excerpts from some of the many resolutions adopted by their clubs and organizations:

The Alliance Clubs of North America at a regular meeting of the executive committee resolved that its 30,000 members "strongly stand ever ready for duty and call." Figli D'Italia, Santa Barbara, Calif., resolved, "We swear to offer ourselves, our organization, and our resources to the national defense." Italian Pharmaceutical Association of the State of New York resolved, "We have decided also to individually and collectively give our entire resources and our entire energies to bring about a quick and glorious victory to our Nation." Italian Union, Inc., resolved, "We place everything that we have at your disposal." Local 48, Italian Cloak, Suit, Reefer, and Shirt Makers Union, with a membership of 10,000, resolved, "We Americans of Italian origin are ready to fight against anyone to safeguard the integrity and the democracy of the United States of America." Italian Barbers Association resolved to "serve America" and "consecrate their sons" to the Nation. The Excavators and Building Laborers Union, Local 731, resolved to "cooperate with all their energies toward the national defense" and to buy the "greatest possible number" of Defense stamps and bonds. Logge Italo-Americane Dell'Ordine Operaio Internazionale resolved, "In this solemn hour" to "assume every duty and meet every sacrifice for the defense" of this country. "Death to nazi-ism and fascism. Long live the cause of democracy and independence."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 4869. A bill to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. J. Res 68. Joint resolution for the relief of the heirs of Fannie Ellis White; with amendments (Rept. No 1229).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr McKELLAR:

S. 2413. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2414. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BARBOUR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TERMINATION OF NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2295) to provide for the termination of the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

REVIEW OF REPORTS ON THE UMPQUA HARBOR AND RIVER, OREG.

Mr. BAILEY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated December 19, 1941, from the Chief of Army Engineers, together with papers and an illustration, on a review

of the reports on the Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg., with a view to the improvement of Winchester Bay, Oreg., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

LEADERSHIP IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, on March 20, 1942, there appeared in the Astorian-Budget, a newspaper published at Astoria, Oreg., an editorial entitled "Mr. President, Lead Us All," which so well expresses my own thought that I should like to have it incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Astorian Budget of March 20, 1942]

MR. PRESIDENT, LEAD US ALL

Mr. President, we are seeking the light, the light of guidance. We want to know what to believe, when to believe, how to believe.

We have been laboring under the deep conviction that our country stands at the crossroads and that the future of our Nation and of the world depends upon the route we choose and the way we travel it.

We believe you have pointed the true path to follow but we think many people are missing the path and many more will miss it through their own blindness or through bewilderment and confusion caused by others.

We believe the great need is a leadership that will dispel alike apathy and doubt, a stout and stern leadership, a clear and consistent leadership, a leadership with a clarion trumpet and a "terrible, swift sword" that will arouse all to a righteous wrath and unify them into a single-purposed army marching to its goal, heedless of all else.

Mr. President, the time has come when pointing the way will no longer suffice. We must be led along it.

We say this because we honestly feel that you have not yet brought yourself to give us that type of leadership in this greatest of all crises. When you hesitate and waver, it is inevitable that there will be many stragglers in the ranks.

Mr. President, we have just read where you are opposing any legislation that will in any way take away any of the gains made by labor during our previous administrations. We have read where your war-production chief, Donald Nelson, and your Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, have appeared before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee to oppose the bill which would suspend the 40-hour week for the duration of the war, which would outlaw the closed shop for the period and which would limit profits on war contracts to 6 percent.

We have just read where high Army, Navy, and maritime officials have unanimously agreed with you that restrictive labor laws are not needed now. They are reported as telling the committee that no serious labor situation exists now.

Mr. President, it doesn't make sense to us. It doesn't square with what you and these same men have told us before. There is inconsistency some place and that inconsistency leads to confusion and worse. It leads to a serious interference with the single-minded devotion to the all-out effort to win this war.

Mr. President, you have told us repeatedly that production will win this war, that we must turn our mills and factories from the manufacture of peacetime goods to the making of the implements of war. You have set goals for plane and tank and ship production of such proportions that will tax our manpower and our machines to the maximum limits, and you have urged greater and greater effort, more and more speed.

Mr. President, you have called upon us all to sacrifice, to give up our tires and cars, to forego many of the comforts to which we have been accustomed, to tune our standards of living to the one great purpose of victory. You have asked us to forget politics, to quit thinking in terms of selfish gain or group advantage. You have asked us to pay more and more taxes to provide all that must be provided if we are to win.

Mr. President, these exhortations do not coincide with what you now tell Congress, that there is no need for labor to sacrifice any of the gains it has made, that there is no need to suspend the 40-hour week.

Mr. President, it was only a few short days ago that Mr. Nelson, your chief of war production, made a Nation-wide appeal for vastly increased industrial output on a 24-hour, 7-day, 168-hour-a-week basis, the same Mr. Nelson who appeared for you before the congressional committee to oppose suspension of the 40-hour week.

Mr. President, Mr. Nelson is your appointee and so are the high-ranking Army, Navy, and maritime officials who testified that no serious labor situation exists, and yet from these same sources have come numerous protests against the interruption of production by strikes, of statements of the man-hours lost and their meaning in terms of ships, planes, and tanks.

Mr. President, we say again it doesn't make sense. It is not consistent. What and when are we who want to support your all-out program to believe?

You say and they say that there is no legislative restriction against working more than 40 hours, only that time and a half must be paid for overtime or double time in some instances. Where is the sacrifice in this? It is not imposed upon those who do this work but upon the taxpayers who must pay the excessive costs to which this contributes.

Mr. President, doesn't it disregard the fact that hundreds of thousands of young men, who once had well-paid jobs and who were protected by the Wages and Hours Act, have sacrificed those jobs and that security to go into the armed forces where there is a meager limitation upon pay but no limitation at all upon the hours of training or fighting? And these men must be ready to sacrifice their lives if need be. There is no 40-hour week or overtime pay at Bataan, and there will be none in Australia or on any of our other battle fronts.

Mr. President, the mighty effort to win this war of the world cannot be served by policies of gross inequity and discrimination, and neither can national unity be secured and preserved by such. Sacrifice cannot be for some and spared for others.

Mr. President, turn your eyes to England where long ago the gains of labor and of all other groups were sacrificed to the war of preservation. Turn your eyes to Australia, which has led the world in liberal legislation and where now workers and all others are conscripted for the prosecution of the life-and-death struggle.

Mr. President, you cannot travel two roads any more than you can serve two masters. You cannot pursue two great objectives at the same time and attain both. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too. Your great social program for the underprivileged was your shining target during your previous administrations. It was the product of peacetimes, which are no longer with us and when we have been led to believe and do believe that all else must be subordinated to the one great goal of victory. Mr. President, you are at the crossroads of your career and you must choose your route and lead forward.

Mr. President, we wonder why you hesitate. Is it possible that you still think the people would not be with you? Are you so poorly advised in Washington that you do not know that the great majority are ready and eager to follow you and support you on a course that calls for hardship and sacrifice for everyone? Why else do you think Congress repeatedly brings up these bills? They are but responding to the demands from home.

Mr. President, do you fear that labor will not follow you? Do you think that the working man and woman are less capable of willing sacrifice than others? You do not know them in their average if you doubt them. Their patriotic impulses are as strong as any others. They, too, have sons in uniform. They are Americans first and ready to share in the common effort and the common sacrifice. Make no mistake about that.

Are you not confusing, Mr. President, the average worker with the labor leaders who sit close to your office and who pretend to speak for many millions, those who would take advantage of a national crisis to entrench themselves, seeking selfish gains at the expense of the country? You do not have to fear them; if you rise to a flaming and trenchant leadership, your followers will leave them without following.

Mr. President, we appeal to you for such a leadership in a decision that will dissolve all doubts and misgivings, that will unify all citizens in the spirit of sacrifice for the prosecution of a mighty effort to a victory without which there will be no government, no democracy, no freedom, no civilization such as we have known and cherished.

LABOR AND THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR—ADDRESS BY DANIEL J. TOBIN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relative to labor and the conduct of the war delivered by Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, on March 23, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARMERS AND THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY M. W. THATCHER

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered during the National Farm and Home Hour by Mr. M. W. Thatcher, chairman of the National Farmers' Union legislative committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PROFITS AND WAGES—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1942, relative to war profits and wages, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND WAR PRODUCTION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles from PM for March 22, 1942, entitled "Nail That Lie About Labor," which appear in the Appendix.]

POLITICS AND THE SILVER MONTHS—ARTICLE BY VARDIS FISHER

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Idaho Sunday Statesman for March 22, 1942, by Vardis Fisher, entitled "Politics and the Silver Months," which appears in the Appendix.]

PATRIOTS ALL—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit Free Press entitled "Patriots All," which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005) to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, and Mr. HOLMES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6691) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I feel that I may be obtruding upon the time that is supposed to be allotted to the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], who desired to speak first this morning. I only speak at this time because of his absence. But in view of his detention before a committee, I shall speak within the allotted time. Perforce I must, and being somewhat responsible for the limitation on the time, I, of course, shall gracefully yield to the injunction of the order.

Mr. President, for a number of years I have been interested in the rules and precedents of the Senate and the Constitution, which have furnished the modes for its guidance and government. I have very definite views regarding the legal features of the case before us, and shall attempt to address myself only to the legal phases.

Not being a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I do not presume to be as familiar with the factual data as are the members of the committee. However, I have read the discussions in the briefs of the respondent and those filed by the committee, and also listened as attentively, probably, as any other Member of the Senate to the oral arguments which have been made during the last 3 weeks.

I have no personal interest in this case. I feel most impersonal about it, so far as the able Senator from North Dakota is concerned. I would assume this attitude if the same situation arose with respect to a Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle.

I may say at this juncture that some 16 years ago I was a member of a special committee in the Vare and Smith cases, and I was the only Republican on the committee who reported adversely to the position for which those men contended, namely, a seat in the United States Senate. At that time I showed no partisanship, and voted against my Republican colleague on the committee, and today I am found in the attitude of arguing, briefly, in defense of one who seeks to retain his seat in this body.

In this matter I am not influenced at all by personal feeling. In fact, I never knew the Senator whose seat is now challenged until he came to the Senate. My acquaintance is most casual, although he has conferred with me a few times on the matter of procedure, but I have not gone over with him the case as it is involved in the facts brought out before the committee or told to those who investigated the case.

Mr. President, it should seem very certain to all of us, I think, that we have not in this body the machinery, the equipment, or the tools to try a case of this kind. I do not censure the committee; I think, on the other hand, it has done its work as well as it could have been done; but we are handicapped by lack of those requisites which are essential in order fairly, completely, and adequately to try a case in which a criminal charge, or a semicriminal charge, or a quasi criminal charge is involved.

Investigators were sent into North Dakota to investigate the charges which were brought here on a petition. Some of the witnesses appeared before the committee, but no rules of evidence were involved. None has been since the case came before this body. I recall an experience I had a few years ago when we had on trial a district judge for impeachment. It is interesting to note that in matters of impeachment all the machinery necessary to obtain the facts, the real evidential facts, is provided for. The question of the admissibility and the competency of evidence is well regulated by the procedure. I recall that two lawyers appeared here in behalf of the judge, and two on behalf of the managers on the part of the House. If a question asked was considered incompetent, or was not passed upon by the Presiding Officer adequately or with fairness, an appeal could be made to the body of the Senate. In that way an impeachment proceeding was tried very much as a case in court is tried. Something must be done to assure a complete, fair, and total trial in a case similar to the one before us. We have done the best we could, but at the best it is a poor job.

I think I might recall to the Senate the attitude of the Senate of the United States in an early case—I think it was in 1795—when a similar situation arose in the Senate. This body at that time recognized the want of equipment properly to try a case, and rendered a verdict which I think should be the law and practice today. Probably this is the only case in which I shall produce a book to support my position, and I am very much pleased to review that case because of the philosophy involved and enunciated in the case.

Most of the cases which have come before the Senate have involved the legality of elections, and nearly all of them have been decided on that question. Very few of those whose cases have been acted upon by the Senate have been tried for crimes committed prior to the time the Senator has taken his seat. I recall only two exceptions. One is the case against Senator Thomas, of Maryland, in 1867; the other, a case much older, in 1805, brought against Senator Smith, of Ohio. In the latter case the charge was brought because of alleged conspiracy in connection with the Aaron Burr case. In the Thomas case the crime charged was assisting his son to join the military forces of the Confederacy. In both cases the Senate seized jurisdiction and tried the cases here, but the trials took place before the committees, and not before the Senate, and presented very simple questions of fact.

The case I have in mind which has come to us with almost uninterrupted authority is the case of Humphrey Marshall, found in the sixth volume of Compilation of Senate Election Cases by Hinds, page 168. In that case, Mr. Marshall was seated in the Senate and, after he had been seated some 18 months, a petition was presented to the Senate by the Governor of the State of Kentucky and by the legislature of that State, charging that during the time of a proceeding in chancery Marshall had committed a gross fraud and perjury. The matter was referred, as in the present case, to the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, and this was the finding, first of the committee, and then confirmed by the Senate, which I think should be the logic and procedure today. I read from page 171 a brief statement:

They think—

Referring to the report of the committee which was acted upon by the Senate—

that in a case of this kind no person can be held to answer for an infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, and that in all such prosecutions the accused ought to be tried by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed. If, in the present case, the party has been guilty in the manner suggested, no reason has been alleged by the memorialists why he has not long since been tried in the State and district where he committed the offense. Until he is legally convicted, the principles of the Constitution and of the common law concur in presuming that he is innocent. And the committee are compelled, by a sense of justice, to declare that in their opinion the presumption in favor of Mr. Marshall is not diminished by the recriminating publications, which manifest strong resentment against him.

And they are also of opinion that, as the Constitution does not give jurisdiction to the Senate, the consent of the party cannot give it; and that therefore the said memorial ought to be dismissed.

That was the report of the committee, and it was adopted overwhelmingly by the Senate. That rule has an almost unbroken record in the Senate.

Now here is this case today. It appears from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the

second petition filed by the attorneys for 11 citizens of North Dakota says:

> Petitioners further allege that for, to wit, the past 20 years, respondent's public and private life has been of such character that he has been repeatedly suspected and accused of conduct involving moral turpitude.

And then it sets forth the specifications which we have had presented here.

Mr. President, in spite of the rule to which I have referred, there has been no effort made by the good people of North Dakota, acting through their county prosecutors or through the grand juries, to indict or try Senator LANGER for any of these charges whatsoever. I think it is the manifest and plain obligation upon the part of the people of North Dakota, if they knew of these irregularities, and what some may be pleased to call crimes, either misdemeanors or felonies, to have tried Mr. LANGER in the district and the county where the crime was committed, and before a jury of his peers. Failing in that, refusing to assume that responsibility, they are indeed asking too much, after Senator LANGER has been successful at the polls, and, without being tried by a jury, without even an opportunity fairly to try the case, to attempt to impose that obligation upon the Senate.

Mr. President, there is no rule of law more fair, more logical, or that has the sanction of more years, than the one I invoke. It is found in the earliest jurisprudence which we find in the textbooks. It was codified in the early Gregorian and Justinian Codes. It is found in the common law of England and the statutory law of the United States. It is that a man who commits a crime or is accused of the commission of a crime, is entitled to be tried by his peers in the county or the district where the crime was committed. I cannot too strongly emphasize the obligation which rested upon those who do not like Senator LANGER and mistrust his honor to bring the charges they make in the county where the crimes were alleged to have been committed, and have them tried there—the charges which they now have brought here, and ask us to try, 20 years, 15 years, 10 years, 1 year after their commission.

Mr. President, if when this case had come here the philosophy of which I speak had been invoked, the case would not have been here occupying 3 weeks of our time in these stressful and distressing hours of the history of our country. I think it is the duty of the Senate in the future, when a Senator comes here under suspicion, under the charge of the commission of a series of acts which some are pleased to call criminal—some characterize them in milder words, as involving moral turpitude—to say to the people of his State, "Take this case back and try this gentleman as is provided for in the long line of precedents and in the theory of the common law of this country, and of England, and France, and the nations from which this wholesome rule has sprung."

I make one exception in this case in the greatest of fairness. We have seized jurisdiction of this case, and I am not complaining about it. It has been the practice for years, when a petition or a complaint has come to the Senate, to refer it to the committee having jurisdiction, and, perhaps, in this case the committee, without knowing and without considering the real philosophy we had followed for many years in almost unbroken practice, started to try this case as though the matters in question had taken place within our own jurisdiction.

I make some modification also in the spirit of the greatest of frankness. I am assuming that all the matters which are alleged by the petitioners in this instance, which have carried such weight before the committee, were known to the people of North Dakota.

There may be some conflict in the testimony on that point, but I am assuming that the matters were known to them, that the charges which we have been considering had been circulated and scattered through the State of North Dakota. There is some testimony to indicate that a few of them were not known. But the very statement made under oath by the petitioners would indicate that those matters were suspected and known for the past 20 years.

I would say that if a similar case should be brought to the Senate, and this rule should be applied, and later it should develop that the people did not know the facts with respect to the commission of an infamous crime, then it would be our duty, through our committee having jurisdiction, as well as the Senate itself, to try that issue. But how many issues of that kind are involved in this case? Scarcely any, if any.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few more words; time is fleeting, and I must proceed. I think the responsibility with respect to men who are sent to the Senate rests largely upon the people of the States who elect them, and if they are guilty of laches or indifference or negligence, the complainants should not come here, after they are unable to defeat a Senator at the polls, and ask us to right their wrong.

Mr. President—and I say a final word on that matter—Mr. LANGER has been Governor of his State on two occasions. He was elected to the Senate. He has been prosecutor of his State. In looking over the record a few days ago in the Library, I found that there is a very broad definition of crime, or any disobedience on the part of the Governor; and if these things were alleged against Mr. LANGER when he was Governor, a statute existed in North Dakota, the application of which would have resulted in bringing upon him dishonor and conviction if he had been guilty. There is no evidence here that any of the good people of North Dakota in any way complained to a district attorney or to a grand jury, or made any effort whatsoever to bring Senator LANGER within the toils of the law. Nothing was done until he was successfully elected to the Senate, and then 8 or 10 petitioners rushed here with a petition asking us to do something which they had failed to do. In view of the experience we have had, it is my opinion that in the future the Senate should not be again imposed upon in any such fashion.

I have given some thought to the question of what the Constitution prescribes in the matter of qualifications. I may say that it is a recent discovery on my part. Sixteen years ago, when the Smith case was before the Senate, I was one of the members of the special committee. I was one of two Republicans. My very good friend, the exceedingly able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] represented the Progressives, and there were two Democrats.

At that time I came to the conclusion that the Constitution prescribed fully, completely, and finally the qualifications which entitle one to a seat in this body. The question was discussed over and over again, and the committee brought in a verdict against seating Frank Smith, after he had been successful in the primary, because he had vitiated the election by reason of gross fraud when he was commissioner of utilities in the State of Illinois in accepting $125,000 from Mr. Insull, who had properties in that State worth in excess of half a billion dollars. He had also expended the sum of $450,000 in the campaign.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that a short time before that, in the Newberry case, with which most Senators are conversant, the Senate established a rule that the expenditure of $198,000 in a primary campaign was excessive and contrary to sound public policy. More than twice that amount was spent in Mr. Smith's campaign. Therefore, Frank Smith was not permitted to occupy a seat in this body because he did not qualify in the manner prescribed by the Constitution of the United States. Nearly all the cases which have been decided have turned on that point.

Mr. President, there are three constitutional provisions relating to this matter. They are all more or less interrelated and must be construed together. The first one is contained in article I, section 2 of the Constitution, which provides that—

> No person shall be a Senator who has not attained the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not when elected be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

That is section 2. Article I, section 3, provides:

> Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviors, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Article I, section 5, provides:

> Each House shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

As I understand, those who seek to remove Senator LANGER from the Senate claim that the qualifications of a Senator are not wholly specified by the Constitution, and that therefore he may be removed by a majority vote. I contend that in all parliamentary bodies a majority vote is sufficient for the body to function and express its authority unless there is some law to the contrary.

When a Senator-elect comes here under age, with not sufficient inhabitancy, or lacking the citizenship qualification, or if he has committed a fraud in the election, or has committed acts of treason to his country, by majority vote we can deny him a seat in the Senate by reason of that fact if it appears, as it

did appear in the Smith case. If he has all the constitutional qualifications and takes his seat he can be removed only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Upon that question I have no doubt. To that theory I find little opposition from the text writers, in the precedents of the Senate, or in the adjudicated cases.

The only exception I recall, when a Senator's seat was taken away from him by exclusion, was the Thomas case in 1866, when Thomas was excluded. That is the only exception of which I know. In that case Thomas was convicted of aiding, encouraging, and abetting his son in joining the military forces of the Confederacy.

At that time Mr. Edmunds, the great lawyer from Vermont, took the position that additional qualifications could be added to those prescribed by the Constitution. An additional qualification—namely, the test oath—had been on the statute books for 4 years. I referred to it briefly yesterday. The test oath went to the loyalty of the Senator who was taking the oath. As a result of that discussion, after argument by the great Reverdy Johnson, one of the greatest lawyers who ever sat in this body, Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, and Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, the test oath was abandoned as a qualification, and Thomas was thrown out on the general principle that he was a sympathizer with the South. That is the only case I find in which a Senator was excluded for a crime committed before he became a Member of the Senate.

There was another case. I refer to the case of Senator John Smith, from Ohio, who was accused of conspiracy with Aaron Burr. He was not expelled, though an effort was made to expel him. That case was an exception to the rule which I stated a few moments ago.

Mr. President, the reasons why a two-thirds majority is necessary to expel a Senator are very evident to me. If we read the great debates on the Constitution, we find that when the States joined the Confederacy they were jealous of their rights. They did not want to permit a Senator to be expelled by a mere majority. So it was plainly written in the Constitution that a two-thirds vote is necessary to expel.

The word "qualifications" is used twice in the Constitution. That is what those who are trying to exclude Senator LANGER rely upon. However, the word "qualifications," as used in connection with elections, is related to the definition which is given in the statute. As a rule of statutory construction, when a general word such as "qualifications" is used, and in some other place it is defined, the definition is exclusive, and no other can be added.

It is also said that if the crime had been committed before Senator LANGER's election, only a majority would be required to exclude him, whereas if it were committed after his election, while he was a Member, a two-thirds vote would be required. How ridiculous that is. Time is the only element in that theory. Those who advance the theory forget that the question is the commission of the crime. A criminal act is just as much a crime if it is committed before a man is a Senator as it is if committed after he becomes a Senator. I challenge anyone to produce any authority to support the theory which is advanced. Mr. Tayler, who was the attorney opposing Mr. Smoot, made that declaration but was denounced by the great lawyers of the Senate. It is like saying that if a man commits arson before he is married, a jury of 9 can convict him, but if he commits it after he is married a jury of 12 is required to convict him. There is no difference in the act itself. It is a crime in either event. The only difference is that of time; and time does not in any way define an act.

Mr. President, there is much that might be said, but I am the victim of my own proposal of yesterday. Perhaps I have had sufficient time to make clear my own views, though I had some other questions which I should like to have discussed more at length.

Senator LANGER comes here with all the presumptions of innocence in his favor. He is accused of a series of acts which are said to involve moral turpitude. If moral turpitude is a crime, and if he is guilty of moral turpitude, it was not committed before he became a Member. It is a continuing crime, as was said in the Smoot case. If moral turpitude is a crime, and he is guilty, he is a criminal today; he is in bad odor today. Turpitude means baseness of character. One guilty of moral turpitude is bereft of honor. The theory is that moral turpitude is a moral contagion which may be transmissible to those with whom he comes in contact in the Senate. If moral turpitude exists, it continues up to the present time.

Mr. President, I believe that my statement meets every contention of those who are opposing Senator LANGER at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to Senate Resolution No. 220.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I had understood that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] desired to address the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chandler	Holman
Andrews	Chavez	Hughes
Austin	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Connally	Kilgore
Bankhead	Danaher	La Follette
Barbour	Davis	Langer
Barkley	Doxey	Lee
Bone	Ellender	Lucas
Brewster	George	McCarran
Brooks	Gerry	McFarland
Brown	Glass	McKellar
Bulow	Green	McNary
Burton	Guffey	Maloney
Butler	Gurney	Maybank
Byrd	Hayden	Mead
Capper	Herring	Millikin
Caraway	Hill	Murdock
Murray	Russell	Truman
Nye	Schwartz	Tunnell
O'Daniel	Shipstead	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Smith	Vandenberg
Overton	Spencer	Van Nuys
Gillette	Stewart	Wagner
Pepper	Taft	Walsh
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	White
Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Rosier	Tobey	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, inasmuch as I have no intention of speaking on the main issue, I should like to use my time briefly to see if we can clarify the pending question. I am frank to say that I am one of those who wish to assert that a two-thirds vote is required to eliminate the Senator from North Dakota; but it seems to me that in the form in which the pending amendment is presented I shall also be required at least by implication to vote that the Senate has no jurisdiction over any qualifications except those named in the resolution. I should like, for my own information, to ask my able friend and colleague, the Senator from Oregon, what he has to say in respect to that interpretation of the Overton amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I always desire to be courteous and to give my best judgment on a matter of the kind, particularly when the question is propounded by the able Senator from Michigan. I did not like the resolution as proposed by the committee; I did not think that the first clause met the situation at all. It has been changed until I think it just about presents the question whether a two-thirds vote or a majority vote is required. I had in mind the form used in the Smoot case, which after the word "Resolved", inserted the words "two-thirds of the Senate concurring", thus raising the question without specification.

The objection I have to the Overton proposal is about the same as that which the Senator from Michigan has. It attempts to give a blueprint of what are the qualifications which must be possessed by a Senator-elect who comes here, and the possession of which entitles him to a seat. I do not think the Senate should foreclose itself in the event there should be future action by the States amending the Constitution or should specify the qualifications as of today. I stated very frankly to the able Senator from Louisiana that I thought there should be a modification of his amendment so that the vote would come directly on the question whether it takes a majority vote or a two-thirds vote, without any blueprint or specifications.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. Now I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether it is not possible to simplify the issue so that those of us who wish to record ourselves on that point can do so without any involvement or implication in any other phase of the question.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as I have understood the argument made in this case by those who are opposed to the pending resolution, insofar as that argu-

ment dealt with the constitutional authority of the Senate, it is this: That the Senate has the authority by a majority vote to exclude a Senator-elect if he has not been legally elected, or to exclude him by a majority vote if he does not meet the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution. That is the Senate's authority to act by majority vote. The amendment which I presented is all-embracing; it takes in all the qualifications which the Senate can consider and determine by a majority vote.

The other remedy is by an expulsion; and the applicable provision of the Constitution is:

> Each House may * * * with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

That is an unlimited authority.

Almost from the inception of the Senate's consideration of such cases, there has time and again arisen the question of what is the authority of the Senate in a case which involves in no way the qualifications or the election. I wanted by the amendment I propose to present a clear picture of my interpretation and, I think, the interpretation of the able Senator from Oregon, the able Senator from Utah, and many others of the question of what the Constitution authorizes us to do by a majority vote and what it authorizes us to do by a two-thirds vote.

If I were to withdraw my amendment, and if we should simply vote, as has been suggested, on the Green amendment to the resolution—which is that the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions of expulsion by a two-thirds vote—we should not be deciding anything; we should not be laying down any principle; we should simply be deciding that we are not going to expel WILLIAM LANGER by a two-thirds vote.

What I am interested in is to secure a proper interpretation by the Senate of the Constitution of the United States. I think that is transcendental and all-important, and it is not particularly a question of what we are going to do with respect to Mr. LANGER.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Michigan has the floor, but I shall be very glad to defer to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator maintain the view that, in passing upon a single case, regardless of whether it be by a majority vote or by a two-thirds vote, the Senate should lay down a rule by which all future Senates will be bound? Is it not better to leave each case to stand on its own bottom and its own merits, and to leave the Senate free to act on each case as it is presented, instead of undertaking, as if we were a supreme court, to interpret the Constitution not only with respect to this case but with respect to all future cases, so that the only consideration the Senate could give to any future case would be with respect to whether a Senator-elect was 30 years of age, whether he had been 9 years a citizen, and whether he had been duly elected?

Mr. OVERTON. By a majority vote?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. That is exactly my purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. My question presupposes on my part the belief that I do not think it is wise to undertake to bind future Senates on that issue. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." If the Senate desires by a majority vote or by a two-thirds vote to retain Senator LANGER, that is all we shall be passing on; that is all we are called upon to pass on, it seems to me. Other cases which may arise in the future will rest on their own merits and, it may be, a different set of circumstances.

I should hate to see the Senate go on record as stating that throughout all time hereafter the Senate cannot consider anything except a Senator-elect's age, the length of his residence, and his certificate of election.

Mr. OVERTON. By a majority vote, does the Senator mean?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, yes; by a majority vote, of course; because a Senator can be turned out of the Senate by a two-thirds vote without any cause whatever.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to give any reason; if there is a two-thirds vote, out he goes.

Mr. OVERTON. However, let me state—if the Senator from Michigan will pardon me—that my purpose is to set a precedent which will stop defeated minorities and disgruntled politicians from coming before the Senate and asking the Senate of the United States to pull their chestnuts out of the fire and to step beyond the constitutional provisions and exclude a man from the Senate on some ground extraneous to the Constitution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will permit me in that connection, it seems to me that the infrequency of cases of this sort in over 150 years proves that the right to investigate these matters has not been abused by the Senate. I do not think it has been abused. I do not think the Senate is open to the charge that it has permitted disgruntled politicians and disappointed office seekers to clutter up the records with contests involving the right of a man to a seat. In the most recent cases there cannot be any charge made that the matters were brought to the Senate by disgruntled politicians or disappointed office seekers, because the facts which resulted in the denial of a seat in the Senate to two men were brought out of the initiative of the Senate itself which had previously appointed a committee, not to look into their cases particularly, but into all cases. So I doubt very much whether the right of the Senate to review these matters has been abused because of the importunities of unsuccessful candidates or political parties.

Mr. OVERTON. There have been many cases.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I, just for a moment, reclaim the floor?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I applaud the objective to which the able Senator from Louisiana has directed what is a very worthy effort, but it seems to me, from my viewpoint, that if we settle the William Langer case today that is about all we need try to settle. I think we will have difficulty enough in settling that. I know I have had difficulty enough in coming to any conclusion in respect to it, without attempting to write a charter for the future. Unfortunately, perhaps, the view which the Senator from Louisiana presents in respect to the fundamental law is disagreed to by other able constitutional lawyers in the Senate. I merely should like to be relieved of the necessity of passing upon a controversy which is not necessary, it seems to me. There is enough controversy when we pass upon the Langer case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Along the line suggested by the Senator from Michigan, the Langer case, in the future, will be judged, of course, in the light of the debate and what has transpired here. Whether we use the language the Senator from Louisiana advances or do not do it, will certainly in effect be a precedent in conformity with what he undertakes to do without making a formal declaration in so many words.

So our action here will be judged by what the debates have shown and by the result. Whether we vote against the resolution and refuse to expel Mr. LANGER on the grounds that have been advanced or vote to the contrary, it seems to me that probably the purpose the Senator has in mind will, in effect, be subserved, and yet Senators such as the Senator from Michigan will be relieved from any embarrassment about choosing as between different amendments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And choosing with respect to a subject that has not been adequately debated and is not a part of the case at bar.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In the event I withdraw my amendment, and if no other amendment to the Green amendment shall be agreed to, the vote will be on the Green amendment, which is that the William Langer case does not fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion by a two-thirds vote. If, on the other hand, the Green amendment should be voted down, then would not the necessary implication be that it would require a two-thirds vote of the Senators?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; or we could strike out the word "not" in the Green amendment and have an affirmative vote produce the same result, but the roll call would be confined to the issue at bar.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not going to take the position that the case of WILLIAM LANGER does fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion, because I am not going to take the position that WILLIAM LANGER is subject to expulsion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that the Senator from Louisiana would reach every purpose he wishes to reach with respect to the Langer case by a vote either "yea" or "nay" on the very simple proposition submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island, and at the same time I would be permitted to vote the way I want to vote by confining the issue as indicated. Why must we complicate it?

Mr. OVERTON. Would there be any objection to my modifying my amendment by striking out a part of it and letting it read in this way:

That said WILLIAM LANGER cannot, except by a two-thirds vote, be deprived of a seat in the United States Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a suggestion, that is precisely what the first part of the committee amendment does.

Mr. OVERTON. I think not.

Mr. BARKLEY. It passes upon that question.

Mr. OVERTON. No; the committee amendment states that it is not a matter of expulsion at all. I want to take the position that expulsion is the only remedy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is where the Senator, it seems to me, is undertaking to bind future Senates.

Mr. OVERTON. My proposal, then, would merely say—

That the said WILLIAM LANGER cannot, except by a two-thirds vote, be deprived of his seat in the United States Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Michigan, but, by analogy, it would mean that no other Senator who comes here in the future, provided he is old enough and has lived long enough in the United States and has a certificate, could not only not be expelled but could not even be excluded when he knocks on the doors of the Senate except by a two-thirds vote. I do not think the Senator would harm the Langer case by permitting a vote of the Senate on the committee proposal, because whether a Senator votes "yes" or votes "nay" on the question that it does or does not come within the two-thirds-vote rule, the Senate will pass upon that question as it applies to this case, and will leave the Senate in the future to pass upon the same question in regard to any other case that may arise.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I have not the floor. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. I desire to speak later.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am thoroughly in agreement with the Senator from Louisiana that his amendment is a proper one, and I should like to see a precedent established; but I am inclined to the view today that, inasmuch as the seat of the Senator from North Dakota is questioned, it would be better and fairer to all Senators who may vote on the question to confine the issue, as nearly as we can, to the Langer case.

In talking with the minority leader he advises me that he intended to offer, if he had not been precluded under the Senate rule, an amendment identical with the resolution in the Smoot case as a substitute for the Green resolution. I should like to see the Senate vote on that question just as it did in the Smoot case. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana, agreeing with him thoroughly on the principle involved in this question, I should like to request him very respectfully to withdraw his amendment and let the minority leader or the Senator from Louisiana, if he so desires, or some other Senator, offer as a substitute a resolution similar to the one offered in the Smoot case, which would permit a vote on the question of whether we can exclude by a majority vote or can expel, if expel at all, by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator restate the language used in the Smoot resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. If the language in the Smoot case were used, the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would read as follows:

Resolved (*two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein*), That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

The only words substituted for words in the resolution in the Smoot case are the name "WILLIAM LANGER" instead of "Reed Smoot" and "North Dakota" instead of "Utah."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, obviously this question cannot be satisfactorily concluded in my brief time on the floor. I have achieved the purpose I wanted to achieve: I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I am hopeful that there can be some sort of an agreement upon terminology before we finally have to vote, so that those of us who know what we think about the two-thirds problem can vote upon that question without having it involved with anything else.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. While the Senator was talking, and since this discussion has arisen, I have conferred with the able Senator from Oregon, the minority leader, and he and I have agreed to ascertain whether it would be satisfactory if I should withdraw the amendment I have offered and either the Senator from Oregon or I offer this amendment in lieu thereof:

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion by a two-thirds vote, if cause therefor exists.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no objection to that, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment without any consent being given.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana modifies his amendment, and the clerk will report the modification.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote, if cause therefor exists.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not asking anyone to agree with me, but I want to say now that I definitely disagree with the Senator from Oregon when he takes the position that moral turpitude is necessarily a continuing offense. I have too much experience with the grace of God ever to subscribe to that kind of a doctrine, and I would not today vote to expel Senator LANGER from the Senate, because not a single, solitary word has ever been offered in the evidence or brought to the attention of the committee of any misconduct whatever upon his part since he became a Member of the Senate.

I interrupted the Senator from Michigan to say merely that the first branch of the resolution, upon which the chairman of the committee has already asked for a separate vote, directly and definitely raises the very issue which he wishes to raise, that is—

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote.

If that should be approved by the Senate, it would mean that Mr. LANGER would not have to be expelled by a two-thirds vote, or, putting it in the affirmative, it would mean that in his case, if the committee's contention is correct, a majority vote for exclusion only is involved.

This resolution, if adopted by the Senate, would mean, of course, that a majority vote would be sufficient. If it were rejected by the Senate, it would mean definitely that WILLIAM LANGER would be entitled to his seat here unless by a two-thirds vote he were expelled.

I say frankly that would be the end of the case, so far as I am concerned, because if this provision should be rejected, then we would be faced with the simple proposition of expulsion, and there is no evidence here on which a conscientious man could vote for expulsion, unless he is blessed with a very fertile imagination; is one who can think that things which occurred long in the past and a condition which once existed are bound to continue all the way through into the future; and I disclaim that kind of imagination.

This case is made in the record. The record itself shows that nothing is involved which has occurred since Mr. LANGER came to the Senate. The record shows that the only thing raised is the question of qualifications, and the evidence upon that point all relates to transactions and to incidents which occurred before he came to the Senate, some of them long before. So if the first branch of the resolution should be rejected, it would mean exactly what the Senator from Louisiana hopes to accomplish by his amendment, so far as this particular case is concerned.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. While the able Senator from Georgia will not agree with the Senator from Oregon, I agree with the Senator from Georgia in one particular, except that I think the point could be raised by the Green proposal, as amended.

If I may add a word, I do not believe we are trying Senator LANGER upon some little things which happened, but upon a charge of present baseness of character by reason of the things which have been alleged.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am content to have clarified the situation a bit by the action which has been taken.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] shall be submitted, a vote one way or the other on that amendment would be decisive of a number of important questions in the case. So I propound the parliamentary inquiry, If this amendment should be submitted a bare majority voting against the amendment, would be sufficient to kill the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly it would kill the amendment. If a majority did not vote for the amendment, the amendment would be rejected.

Mr. BONE. That would simply leave the question, then, to be determined by a majority vote of the Senate, would it not? I want to get the parliamentary situation clear in my mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly, so far as the amendment is concerned it would be determined by a majority vote.

Mr. BONE. This amendment is so phrased that it really determines the legal questions in the case, as I understand, because the amendment provides that Senator LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion by a two-thirds vote. Therefore, if by a majority the Senate votes down this amendment, the Senate then declares the law of the case and, thereafter, it is obvious, a majority vote would have to decide the main question. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. BONE. Let me restate the situation; it appears that the Senator from Louisiana does not understand it as I do.

If the Senate, by a bare majority vote, should vote adversely on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], that would settle the law of the case. Am I correct up to that point?

Mr. OVERTON. It would settle the law of the case, and would require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. BONE. This amendment says that the case of Senator LANGER does not fall within the provisions for a two-thirds expulsion vote. All I am seeking is to get the matter straight. Perhaps I am twisted in my understanding of it, but there has been so much confusing argument on this question that I want to get it straight.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senate does declare that the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the expulsion provisions, then a majority vote would decide the question, but if we vote down the Green amendment, or if we vote for my substitute amendment, a two-thirds vote would then be required.

Mr. BONE. I understand. My principal reason for making the inquiry is that that vote would be decisive one way or the other. If we vote the amendment down, then I assume a two-thirds vote would be necessary. If the other way, the opposite would be true.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct, except that it is much more obvious that if we vote for the amendment I have offered, we meet the issue fairly and squarely; that is, that the case of WILLIAM LANGER does fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion by a two-thirds vote; and I have added "if cause therefor exists." That meets the issue fairly and squarely, and we vote it up or down, and make a precedent.

Mr. BONE. The explanation by the able Senator from Louisiana is probably much clearer than my own cumbersome attempt to determine the law in the case. The point I am getting at is that the vote would be decisive.

Mr. OVERTON. The vote on my amendment would be decisive.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me call to the attention of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana the fact that if by a majority vote we adopt the first branch of the Green amendment, we merely state that the Langer case does not fall within the expulsion clause of the Constitution, but we do not say under what clause it does fall, if any. So that we would accomplish nothing by the adoption of the first branch of the Green amendment, except to say that the case does not fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion. Whereas if the substitute, or the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] were adopted, we would affirmatively say the case does fall within the expulsion clause of the Constitution, and then, when we vote on the second branch of the Green amendment, we know then, affirmatively, and by vote of the Senate, that it takes a two-thirds vote rather than a majority.

Mr. BONE. I know I am not the only one who is confused about the matter, because that is made evident by the questions which have been asked, and by the attempts made to clarify the issue. My only reason for propounding the question arises out of the fact that a majority vote on the amendment, one way or the other, will determine the question whether or not later on a two-thirds vote shall be required. So that a bare majority vote becomes decisive of the necessity or the lack of necessity for a two-thirds vote. We therefore confront the possibility of a majority of the Senate finally deciding a question which must be ultimately decided by two-thirds. The thing presents utterly impossible facets.

I confess I cannot understand a majority of the Senate voting and by a majority vote controlling what two-thirds must later have to do. A bare majority vote would invoke, not one of our own rules, but a constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds vote. Our own rules make no reference to a two-thirds vote. Some confusion arises among Members because of that fact, if it be a fact.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is in error, because the procedure of the Senate is always determined by a majority vote, and cannot be determined otherwise.

Mr. BONE. Then the majority vote in one case must, in legal effect, control a two-thirds vote later on because of the constitutional provision and not our own rules.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly; necessarily must control.

Mr. BONE. Let us have that understood.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has taken all his time. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BONE. I have yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been called from the Chamber. What is the latest edition of the proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] as further modified.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much further has it been modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment as now proposed.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote, if cause therefor exists.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator's amendment is contradictory to itself and to the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution does not require that any cause be given by the Senate for expulsion, provided it is done by two-thirds vote. The Senate can expel a Member for any reason, or without any reason whatever. We do not have to assign any reason for expelling a Member by a two-thirds vote. A moral duty rests upon the Senate, I assume, to give a reason for its action, but, so far as the Constitution itself is concerned, we do not have to assign any reason. A Senator could move to expel me now, and if on that motion he should obtain a two-thirds vote I would have to go out of the door of the Senate. Such action could be taken without the Senator making the motion assigning any reason. There might be good reason for taking such

action, but it would not be necessary to assign it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The phrase "if cause therefor exists" does not mean that a constitutional cause exists. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the Senate can expel a Member for cause or without assigning any reason.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate can vote to expel a Member because it does not like him, and no one can do anything about it.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. But if the Senator has not made up his mind one way or the other as to whether the Langer case falls within the expulsion power of the Senate, there would be no objection to a provision being adopted which states that it falls within that power in the event some ground existed therefor. That is all I have in mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Louisiana, even under his modified amendment, is seeking to establish a policy in this case which will bind future United States Senates.

Mr. President, I wish merely to state briefly my views with respect to this situation. They have nothing to do with the merits of the case. I shall not discuss the merits of the Langer case at all. The Senate will do what it wishes about the case. I do not know how any Senator is going to vote, except those Senators who have spoken. I have not asked any Senator how he is going to vote, I do not intend to ask any Senator how he is going to vote, and I have not in any way attempted to influence any Senator's vote on this matter. It is not a partisan matter. It is not in any sense an administration matter. I have frequently been asked privately if the administration has taken any hand in this matter, and my reply has been universally "No." I have never discussed the case with anyone outside the Senate, and personally I am not concerned about what the Senate does with the Langer case.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that nothing ought to be done here that undertakes to bind future Senates, and I am more concerned about that question than I am about whether the Senator from North Dakota is seated or unseated. I do not think we ought to do anything here that undertakes to bind, or, in effect, would bind, future Senates in such a way that they would be handicapped in dealing on its own merits with any situation which might arise under different circumstances from those involved in the Langer case.

I happen to be one of those who believe that if the Senate can, by a majority vote, exclude a man when he comes here, because of things that have happened prior to his effort to be admitted, the Senate can deal with the matter ab initio as if he were now knocking at the door of the Senate, instead of having served for more than a year. My judgment in that respect may be somewhat clouded by what happened at the time the Senator from North Dakota came seeking admission to the Senate. Yet I am not in any way prejudiced. I have no prejudice one way or the other with regard to the Senator from North Dakota. Personally, I like him. He has been very agreeable and very courteous to me, and I have not the slightest prejudice whatever against him as a human being. If he is retained in the Senate I shall, I am sure, get along with him as I have up to now as a Member of this body, and I think he will show me the same courtesy and consideration which I think has been shown him during the last year and 2 months.

Mr. President, I lay down the proposition, however, that when the Senator came here with a certificate from the authorities of North Dakota, with a cloud upon his title in the form of charges which were filed with me by reason of the position I happen to hold, and those charges were laid before the Senate he could have been excluded by a majority vote until the committee investigated his right to a seat. In taking the position I did on the first day of the session when the Senator presented his credentials, I did take it as a matter of whim. I took that position after consulting not only the parliamentarian as to precedents in such cases, but after consulting the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and after consulting the acting minority leader, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], in the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who was ill. Having consulted the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and having consulted the acting minority leader, and having consulted the parliamentarian and the Vice President as to the effect of permitting the Senator from North Dakota to take the oath without prejudice, which meant without prejudice to him and to the Senate, I felt that we were observing the right of the Senate ab initio to investigate and pass upon his right to his seat.

Under the statement I made here on that day, the Senator was permitted to take the oath without prejudice, and every Senator was in his seat, except those who were detained by illness or other reasons, for that was the day when the new Congress began. There was a fuller attendance that day, I should say, than there has been any day since, except probably the days when we declared war on Japan and on Germany and Italy. It was made perfectly plain on that day that there were charges filed, involving the right of the Senator to his seat. Every Senator understood that. I made that statement on the floor, and I made the statement that the charges were serious.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. I do not think anyone will dispute the fact that they were serious charges, which if true would affect, in my judgment, and what seemed to be the judgment of the Senate at that time, Senator LANGER's right to his seat here.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MCNARY. Does the able Senator believe that his gracious and kindly admonition to the Senate that the action proposed to be taken would be without prejudice, in any way changed the constitutional rights of the Senator from North Dakota or of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that would involve a question I cannot indulge in discussing in the time which is at my disposal, but I will say that no Senator protested my statement at the time. No one on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota protested at the time that by admission tentatively to a seat here without prejudice the Senate would be deprived of its right to pass upon his right of admission to the Senate. That was not simply my action; it was the action of the Senate. I asked that the Senator be allowed to take the oath without prejudice. It was agreed to unanimously by the Senate. No one objected. The Senator from North Dakota came in under those circumstances and took the oath under those circumstances.

Any Senator could have raised the point and prevented the unanimous agreement. The only Senator who rose to make inquiry was the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who did so in his capacity as acting minority leader. I had consulted him previously, as I had consulted other Senators, including the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. If any Senator had disputed the wisdom of the proposed action he could have arisen and said, "The Senate is not bound, and I will not be bound by such a unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator from North Dakota may be allowed to take his seat provided the Senate reserves its right to pass ab initio on his right to come here in the first instance as a Senator."

Mr. MCNARY and Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment, Mr. President. The action then taken may not constitute law. I do not mean to say that we can abrogate any well-defined constitutional provision even if the United States Senate by its own unanimous consent permits a Senator to come here under those circumstances. Certainly no one objected on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota to that procedure, which any Senator had the right to do. If any Senator had objected, then the question would have come up on a motion to exclude the Senator, and a majority vote would have excluded him, and he would have been hitched on the outside of the Senate until the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections had made its investigation and the Senate had passed upon the committee's report and determined whether he was entitled to enter the Senate at all.

My feeling about it is this: The Senate may now repudiate its unanimous-consent action on that day if it wishes to do so. It has the power to do it. It may now say that, although we sat here silently in our seats and agreed that he be admitted without prejudice in spite of the charges, we may now repudiate that action. The agreement was understood to mean that the Senate could investigate the charges and decide, as though it had originally decided the question, whether he was entitled to a seat in the Senate, and that his status quo would be preserved. That agreement

was entered into unanimously. Everyone thought that that was what was done, and no one disputed it. If the Senate now desires to repudiate its own action in that regard it has the power to do so. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to vote to do it. I say that because I took part in the proceedings. I thought I understood the mood and intention of the Senate at the time. I admit that that does not constitute any constitutional law on the subject.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator believe that we did something that had not been done years and years before? Let me add, representing the minority, that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] asked particularly if the agreement would have any effect upon the necessary two-thirds vote to expel a Senator. The reply was "No."

Mr. BARKLEY. The reply was that only a majority vote would be necessary.

Mr. McNARY. No; the reply was that a majority vote would test his qualifications only.

Mr. BARKLEY. This fight is over his qualifications.

Mr. McNARY. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely. When the Chair announced, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Vermont as to whether admitting him at that time under the circumstances would later require a two-thirds vote or a majority vote to exclude, the Vice President announced that only a majority vote would be required later. Nobody disputed that statement at the time. If any Senator had disputed it, a motion would have been in order to exclude him, and such a motion could have been carried by a majority vote. It is not contended that the Senate cannot, by a majority vote, decline to allow a Senator-elect who presents himself here to take the oath of office.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under the circumstances, I have remained silent. My question, asked under a reservation of the right to object, was this:

> Does this procedure waive any requirement of a two-thirds vote?

I think that was an unfinished question, in fact. It should have been made complete by the addition of a phrase which would show that we were contemplating the preservation of all rights—the rights of the Senate and the rights of the respondent. That was the sole purpose of my question. It was not well conceived. I did not intend to obtain a ruling upon the question of whether one sort of vote or another should obtain. However, what happened, following that, was this:

> The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it does not.

That answers the question in one way, but is not the full answer. Thereupon followed this:

> If this agreement is entered into, only a majority of the Senate will be required to pass on the qualifications of the Senator-elect.

I must say, in all candor, that notwithstanding my views about this case—and that is the only thing we are called upon to judge—I did not intend to foreclose the issue, but rather intended by my question to keep the issue open for the Senate and for the respondent, so that, notwithstanding our agreement, if he wanted to raise the question of a two-thirds vote, he could still do so. I make that statement so that there may be no misunderstanding.

Mr. McNARY. I think that is a very fair interpretation of the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a very fair statement. I think the record, as it is disclosed, in no way committed the Senator from Vermont on the question whether a two-thirds vote or a majority vote would be required later.

I think this question is important so far as the future of the Senate is concerned. It may not be of any importance at all in regard to the Langer case, because, frankly, I think that if there are votes enough to decide that a two-thirds vote is necessary to expel the Senator from North Dakota, there are votes enough to seat him. I do not think the vote would be very much different on the question of seating him than on the question of determining whether a two-thirds vote or a majority vote is required. For that reason I have suggested—although it seemed like putting the cart before the horse—that we vote first on whether the Senator is entitled to a seat; and if a majority should decide that he is entitled to a seat we should not have to pass on the question of a two-thirds or a majority vote.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator implied that every Senator present on the opening day agreed to what took place. I sat here as a Senator-elect and heard the proposal made; but I was not a Senator until I took the oath.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want the majority leader to imply that there might be any bad faith on my part.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not implying bad faith on the part of anybody. Only a third of the Senators were new, or had been reelected; and while we were far down the list on that day in swearing in Senators, there were still some who had not yet been sworn in.

Mr. MURDOCK. I had not been reached.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, my remarks do not apply to those Senators.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is all I wished to clear up.

Mr. BARKLEY. On that day the question was raised as to whether the Senator from North Dakota should be admitted tentatively. No Senator objected to his being admitted tentatively, with the understanding that we should consider this case ab initio, as we lawyers say, which means from the beginning, without the Senate being bound by a two-thirds rule. It was the understanding that we could consider his title to the seat whenever the committee investigated the case, as though we were passing upon it on the opening day. On that day, if we had had all the facts before us, we might have excluded him by a majority vote.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator does not contend, does he, that even by a unanimous-consent agreement the Senate can wipe out or eradicate a constitutional right?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not so contend. However, I think it is passing strange that, with all the constitutional lawyers in the Senate, when the question was raised on the opening day no Senator objected to the fact that Senator LANGER was coming in under those conditions. No Senator objected on his behalf that he was coming in under those conditions.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In that connection I think it would be well to point out that the petition upon which we acted, and which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, questioned the validity of the election of WILLIAM LANGER.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it did.

Mr. OVERTON. A majority vote can determine that question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that on that day we could have decided by a majority vote whether he should be permitted to take his seat. However, I do not think that the Senate ought to reach the conclusion that when it permits a man on whose title there is a cloud—which question the Senate has the constitutional power to investigate—to take his seat as a matter of courtesy, or otherwise, pending the investigation, the Senate is then bound by a two-thirds rule which did not exist or which did not bind it on the day when the Senator-elect presented himself for admission to the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. In defense of my colleague's statement, made on the opening day, when I was present, it was suggested to my colleague that Senator LANGER stand aside and not come into the Senate. On that occasion my colleague stated:

> However, the better practice in such cases seems to have been to allow the Senator-elect to take the oath without prejudice, which means without prejudice to him and without prejudice to the Senate. In the future, after an investigation of these charges—which I do not propose to read or to repeat—the Senate would have a right to determine by a majority vote his fitness and his qualifications to become a Member of the Senate.

That statement was made by my colleague on the opening day, in the presence of Senators who had a right to object, and none objected. Let me say to my colleague that in the future I do not think it will be possible to have the Committee on Privileges and Elections investigate the fitness or qualifications of a Senator-elect under similar circumstances if as little consideration is given to it, after the Senate has directed it to do what this committee has done, as is being given in this case.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the 3d of January 1941 I asked that the Senator from North Dakota be permitted to take the oath without prejudice. If any Senator had objected to that request it would have been in order to move that the Senator-elect be permitted to take the oath without prejudice. Such a motion could have been carried by a majority vote. It would also have been in order to have moved that the Senator-elect be excluded until the Committee on Privileges and Elections had examined his right to a seat; and that motion could have been carried by a majority vote, because it would not have involved expulsion.

We cannot expel a man unless he is a Member of this body. The question which seems to me to be important is this: If, when we have the right by majority vote to exclude him from taking the oath, we permit him to do so tentatively, with the understanding that the Senate shall lose none of its rights, and after he has taken the oath it is contended that we cannot then exclude him except by a two-thirds vote, the result in the future is bound to be that when a Senator-elect presents himself with a cloud on his title the Senate cannot afford to do otherwise than compel him to remain outside the Senate until the Senate has examined his right to a seat. In a case of that sort the State would be deprived of its representation here.

There is one thing which concerns me, and about which I am anxious, but not on account of the Senator from North Dakota, for I have taken no hand in the fight for or against him, as every Senator knows. There is not a Senator who will testify that I have lobbied with him or electioneered with him or asked him how he would vote, or tried to influence his vote; I have not done it. I am interested in the Senate as a body and in its future; and if the Senate is going to vote that, under the circumstances which surrounded the admission of the Senator from North Dakota into this body, thereafter a two-thirds vote will be required to expel him or to exclude him, the result must be that in the future no Senator-elect who knocks at our doors with any cloud upon his title can be admitted; and the Senate has the right at the time to exclude him by a majority vote. I say that, as I said it in the beginning, without the slightest prejudice one way or the other about this case.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure, as the Senator says, that he has no prejudice whatever about this matter. It seems to me that the confusion which exists in the minds of some Senators is due to the fact that on the one hand the question which is involved in some cases is one of fraud in the election itself, and on the other hand the question which is involved in the pending case is one of moral turpitude. If a Senator-elect comes to the Senate of the United States with proper credentials he is entitled to be sworn in; there cannot be any question about that. He could demand that he be sworn in. Mr. LANGER came here with proper credentials. In the petition, as I understand, a question was raised as to whether he secured his election by fraud. If such had been the case, if fraud had occurred, I say that a majority vote could have put him out under the circumstances mentioned by the Senator. However, when the question is one of moral turpitude, I think a different rule prevails, and I think that the Constitution would be so construed by any court in the land.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question whether he secured his election by fraud, if that question were raised in the charges, would be merely an incidental charge. The Committee on Privileges and Elections did not go into that matter at all.

Mr. WHEELER. No evidence was presented on that question.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the report of the committee is not based upon that at all.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; such a charge was contained in the petition, but it was dismissed by the committee. It is my understanding that the committee considered but dismissed that charge.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not one of those who believe that the only things which qualify a Senator-elect for membership here are his age, his residence, and his certificate. I think the Senate has the right to go into the question of a man's qualifications. "Qualifications" is an elastic term; but I do not think that the term "qualifications" should be limited to meaning that a man is 30 years of age, has been 9 years a resident of the United States, and has a certificate from a governor or from an election board; because, otherwise, if a Senator-elect came here and had served a term in the penitentiary, and his citizenship had not been restored, we could not pass on the question whether he was entitled to membership.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; he has to be a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. He may have been a citizen for 9 years before he came here; the Constitution does not say that his citizenship must be continuing.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; he has to be a citizen of the United States when he applies to the Senate for admission. In the illustration the Senator from Kentucky gives, if the Senator-elect had been convicted and had lost his citizenship, he would not be a citizen.

Mr. BARKLEY. He might have been convicted of a Federal offense, and his citizenship might not have been restored by the President of the United States, or he might have been convicted under a State law and his citizenship might not have been restored by the Governor of the State in which he lived.

Mr. WHEELER. It would not make any difference; he would not be a citizen of the United States if he had been convicted, had lost his citizenship, and his citizenship had not been restored.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree—and I do not suppose the Senator from Montana agrees with me—that we are compelled to limit ourselves to the technical constitutional provision requiring that he must be 30 years of age, must have been 9 years a citizen, and must come here with a certificate.

Mr. WHEELER. I do disagree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If it should be agreed that, under the Constitution, a two-thirds vote is required in order to seat Senator LANGER, would not such a decision mean that in the future, when an individual is elected to the United States Senate and a protest is made by various citizens of his State—a protest similar to that which was filed in the pending case or similar to those which have been made in many other cases, it would be the duty of the United States Senate under such circumstances to refuse to let the Senator-elect take the oath, in the first instance, and thereafter to investigate the charges?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I just stated. If it is to be decided by the Senate in the pending case that, notwithstanding the circumstances under which a Senator-elect came to the Senate and was permitted to take the oath—a privilege which he might have been denied by a majority vote—a two-thirds vote is required to exclude him, then in the future I think the Senate will be required in self-defense to say to any Senator-elect who comes here with a cloud upon his title "You cannot be admitted; you must stand aside until the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any other appropriate committee, investigates your right to be a Senator."

Mr. LUCAS. And that would mean that each State whose Senator-elect was compelled to stand aside would be devoid of representation in the Senate, insofar as that one Senator was concerned. I undertake to say, Mr. President, that, if we were to insist that under such circumstances a Senator-elect stand aside, such a practice would be provocative of contests, one after another. In other words, the flimsiest kind of a pretext would be found by some political enemy or some other individual in the State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my time has expired. I conclude by saying that under such a rule the Senate would be required to protect itself against a two-thirds-vote requirement by excluding a Senator-elect at the very beginning by a majority vote, which the Senate would have a right to do.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the present case we find ourselves dealing with a great constitutional question. After listening to the arguments yesterday, I felt I had to say something very briefly today.

When Isaac Newton looked at the falling apple, he looked twice, and he gave to the world his discovery of the law of gravitation. For millions of years befuddled human brains had seen apples and other fruit fall, but it had made no impression on them. Newton looked twice, and he beheld a great law.

For millions of years the lightning had flashed across the skies and electricity

had manifested itself to humanity, but it took an Edison to utilize it to light the world. Edison looked twice.

After the Revolution, our founding fathers saw the demon of disunity threatening the peace and liberties of the Thirteen Colonies, and in order to form a more perfect union than they had under the Confederation and in order to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity, they ordained and established the Constitution of the United States.

Paraphrasing Job, one can say of these fathers that "the spirit of God had made them, the breath of the Almighty had given them life," and they created an indissoluble union, a government by and for the people.

Mr. President, a few years passed and the demon of disunity again raised its head, and a man named John Marshall looked at the Constitution He did not breathe life into it. Life was there, and he interpreted it to a people just coming into their own. He did not question the validity of it or the power of it. He interpreted it, the breath of life that was in it, the spirit of unity—one nation indivisible. And this growing Nation with its new experiment of free government, of a free people, went forward demonstrating the living power of a great, growing and strenuous Nation. But disunity raised its ugly head and a Jackson slapped it down. The years sped on. The Nation grew in power, but disunity would not down, and on to the stage of action came a giant Daniel Webster. How he loved the Constitution How he interpreted it to this people. He knew that with it this Nation would possess "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

Mr. President, Webster understood and exemplified the dignity and the power of the Senate. As I have many times quoted, he said the Senate was "a body not yet moved from its propriety, not lost to a just sense of its own dignity and its own high responsibility" Never once did he question the plenary power of the Senate. Yes, he saw the Republic as one Nation—one and inseparable He saw the Senate as a body to which the country could "look with confidence for wise, moderate, patriotic, and healing counsel."

Then came the Civil War—

testing whether this Nation—

As Lincoln said—

or any other nation so conceived * * * could long endure.

Lincoln did not believe in disunity. Listen to what he said in his first inaugural address:

I hold that in the contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied if not expressed in the fundamental law of all national governments. * * * Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Yes; Lincoln looked twice at the Constitution. He saw the strength and the vitality of the Union, and he said, "No State upon its own motion can lawfully get out of the Union."

Yesterday we heard a great argument by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. There was no political heresy in what he said.

Mr. President, when I came to the Senate 3 years ago "Borah of the United States," was here. Every argument we have heard on the floor of the Senate in favor of something that would devitalize the Constitution, this great statesman answered. It has been argued here that this great body under the Constitution, created with plenary power, has no control of its Members except to expel them. It has been argued here that the States alone have the right to fix the qualifications of the men who constitute this great body. One would think we were still operating under the Articles of Confederation. One would think that were still a chain composed of 48 links. No; Mr. President, we are one people, one Nation, indivisible under God.

I said that Senator Borah answered all these unconstitutional arguments advanced by those who would limit the power and the right and the authority of the Senate of the United States. To those who are interested in knowing what Senator Borah and another great statesman, Senator Walsh, of Montana, thought about the legal phases involved in this debate, I recommend that they get volume 68 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read beginning with page 39 thereof. Senator Borah's remarks appear in volume 69, part I, beginning with page 155.

I say to Senators, if they want to seat Governor LANGER, seat him on the facts. Do not camouflage the issue and deal a dagger's thrust into the Constitution and into the authority and the power of this great body.

Mr President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the argument presented by my distinguished friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. He advanced a new argument. He suggested to the Senate that it did not have jurisdiction. One might just as well advance the argument to the Supreme Court of the United States, after it takes jurisdiction in a case, that it has not jurisdiction. When the Constitution of the United States said that the Senate "shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members," there is no body, no individual, or power on earth that can take that power away from the Senate except the Senate of the United States.

My distinguished friend and colleague spent some time on the subject of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention. Time will not permit me to answer in detail what was said by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

At this point I wish to read what I regard as a complete answer to what he said, which appears in a brief by Hon. Price Wickersham, which was presented by Mr. Reed, of Missouri, on December 6, 1927, and was printed as Document No. 4, Seventieth Congress, first session. I read the first five pages of the document:

THE RIGHT OF THE SENATE TO DETERMINE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ITS MEMBERS

(Price Wickersham, of the Kansas City, Mo., bar)

HAS THE UNITED STATES SENATE PLENARY POWER TO REJECT A SENATOR ELECT?

I. Consideration of the Constitution

1. Pertinent clauses.

2. The language is in the negative; in preliminary drafts of the Constitution the language was in the affirmative.

3. The requirements of age, citizenship, and residence are not qualifications but disqualifications.

Section 2, Article I, of the United States Constitution provides:

"No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of 25 years, and been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

Section 3, Article I, provides that Senators shall be chosen by the legislature of each State, and that—

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Section 5, Article I, provides:

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members. * * *"

And further:

"Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member."

The above are all of the pertinent provisions of the Federal Constitution.

It will be noted that section 5, Article I, is a grant of power without limitation in the section itself, and unless section 3 can be construed as a limitation of the grant of power, then it follows that the grant of power contained in section 5 is unlimited in the Constitution.

It will be noted that the language of section 3 is in the negative. This is an important fact. In the original drafts of the Constitution the language of this section was in the affirmative and was purposely changed to the negative. Congressman Taylor, of Ohio, on January 23, 1900 (CONG. REC., p. 1075), in discussing this very issue said:

"It is a notable fact that in the first draft of this constitutional provision which provided for qualification of Representatives in Congress the language was affirmative and positive, and that when it was finally presented for adoption it appeared in the form in which we now find it.

"The slight contemporaneous discussion in the Constitutional Convention was upon the provision in the affirmative form. Why was it changed to the negative? Surely not for the sake of euphony. And certainly not to make it more explicitly exclusive.

"In the report of the committee on detail, submitting the first draft of the Constitution, this section read in the affirmative as follows:

"'Every Member of the House of Representatives shall be of the age of 25 years at least, shall have been a citizen of the United States for at least 3 years before his election, and shall be at the time of his election a resident of the State in which he shall be chosen.'

"In the discussion, Mr. Dickinson opposed the section altogether, expressly because it would be held exclusive, saying he was—

"'Against any recitals of qualifications in the Constitution. It was impossible to make a complete one, and a partial one would, by implication, tie up the hands of the legislature from supplying omissions.'

"Mr. Wilson took the same view, saying:

" 'Besides, a partial enumeration of cases will disable the Legislature from disqualifying odious and dangerous characters.' "

The requirements of section 3 as to age, citizenship, and residence are not qualifications; they are disqualifications. This very question was discussed by John Randolph in Congress in 1807, and he said:

"If the Constitution had meant (as was contended) to have settled the qualification of Members, its words would have naturally ran thus: 'Every person who has attained the age of 25 years and been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State from which he shall be chosen, shall be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives.'

"But so far from fixing the qualifications of Members of that House, the Constitution merely enumerated a few disqualifications with which the States were left to act."

The same view was taken by Mr. Quincy and Mr. Key in the famous Maryland contested-election case reported in the Annual of Congress, volume 1808, at page 908.

Sections 5 and 3, taken together and properly paraphrased to get the true meaning, would read:

"The Senate shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, but no person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years and has not been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

This construction of "negative" clauses is upheld by the courts. The case of *Darrow* v. *The People* (8 Colo. 417) is in point. A statute of Colorado made the payment of taxes a necessary qualification for membership in a board of aldermen. There was a provision of the Colorado constitution that "no person except a qualified elector shall be elected or appointed to any civil or military office in the State." The court said:

"It is argued that this provision by implication inhibits the legislature from adding the property qualifications under consideration. There is nothing in the constitution which expressly designates the qualifications of councilmen in a city or town, and this section contains the only language that can possibly be construed as applicable thereto. But it will be observed that the language used is negative in form—that it simply prohibits the election or appointment to office of one not a qualified elector. There is no conflict between it and the statute."

There is no conflict between section 5 which is a full grant of power to the Senate and section 3 which simply prohibits the seating of a person who has not the three requisites of age, citizenship, and residence.

II. Consideration of proceedings of Constitutional Convention

1. Pertinent features of Randolph, Pinckney, and Hamilton plans.

2. Proceedings in Committee of the Whole August 10, 1787.

It is submitted that the above analysis of the language of the Constitution itself is determinative of the question under discussion. However, a brief survey of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention may serve to make plain the intent of the framers of the Constitution, and this requires a brief analysis of the three major plans for a Federal Constitution that were under consideration. It is necessary to know these plans, so far as this issue is concerned, in order to understand the proceedings which occurred when the clauses in question were under consideration. It is evident to the student of constitutional government that the Constitutional Convention used the structure of Parliament as a guide, insofar as this particular subject is concerned; it is likewise clear that the practice and proceedings of the House of Commons were, to say the least, a guide. Burdick, in his excellent work The Law of the American Constitution, page 168, says:

"In confining to the Houses of Congress the right to judge the elections and qualifications of their own Members the framers of the Constitution were following the practice of the English House of Commons."

The three plans were submitted by Edmund Randolph, Alexander Hamilton, and Charles Pinckney, which plans will be discussed in their reverse order because Randolph's plan was the one that was in the main followed.

Charles Pinckney's plan:

"ART. 5. Each State shall prescribe the time and manner of holding elections by the people for the House of Delegates, and the House of Delegates shall be the judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their Members."

Under Pinckney's plan the Senate was to be elected by the House of Delegates. Pinckney was unqualifiedly in favor of removing the election of the Senators as far as possible from the people.

Hamilton's plan:

The Convention met on May 11, 1787, and concluded its deliberations September 17 following. About 2 weeks prior to the close of the Convention Hamilton prepared his plan and furnished it to Mr. Madison, frankly saying that he did not expect that his plan would be adopted but that he had prepared it in order that it might serve as an ideal toward which the United States might eventually work. His plan provided:

"ART. 2. The Assembly shall consist of persons called Representatives, who shall be chosen, except in the first instance, by the free male citizens and inhabitants of the several States comprehended in the Union, all of whom of the age of 21 years and upward shall be entitled to an equal vote."

The plan also provided that the Senate was to be chosen by electors elected by citizens of the several States, who shall have certain property qualifications, and also:

"The Senate shall choose its President and other officers; shall be judge of the qualifications and elections of its Members, etc."

No qualifications of any kind were prescribed in his plan for Senators and the only qualification for Members of the House of Delegates was that as to age above quoted in article 2.

It will be noted that the Senate, under Hamilton's plan, was given the power to "judge of the qualifications" of its Members without limitation as to any qualifications in the plan itself. Hamilton had sat all through the Convention and heard all of the arguments that were advanced upon this subject, and it is significant that in the plan which he prepared toward the very close of the Convention he in no manner limited the right of the Senate to judge of the qualifications of its Members.

Randolph's plan:

Article 2 provided for a House of Delegates and Senate; article 4 provided that—

"The Senate shall be elected and chosen by the House of Delegates."

Article 7 provided that the Senate shall have the sole and exclusive power to declare war. This article and the one providing for the election of the Senate by the House of Delegates is cited to show that Randolph intended that the Senate should have extraordinary powers and that it should be far removed from the people themselves.

Article 5 provided:

"And the House of Delegates shall be the judges of the election, returns, and qualifications of their Members."

When the question under his plan as to whether the House of Delegates should be chosen by the people direct was first voted on it carried by a vote of 5 to 2, two States being divided. There was much discussion during the Convention as to the "qualification" or "prerequisites" as to age, citizenship, and residence in the several States, but there is very little reported as to the debate concerning the question at issue. It appears that shortly prior to August 10 the Convention had directed the committee on detail to prepare a draft of a provision concerning property qualifications of Members of the legislature, and accordingly, the committee reported the following draft:

"SEC. 2. The Legislature of the United States shall have authority to establish such uniform qualifications of the Members of each House with regard to property as to the said legislature shall seem expedient.

"SEC. 4. Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members."

On Friday, August 10, the following debate took place:

"Mr. PINCKNEY. The committee, as he had considered, were instructed to report the proper qualifications of property for the Members of the National Legislature, instead of which they have referred the task to the National Legislature itself."

He thereupon argued for a property qualification.

Mr. Rutledge seconded the motion. Upon a viva voce vote the proposition was overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. Madison then argued against the section.

Mr. Ellsworth agreed that the power given by the section was exceptional, but contended that it was not dangerous.

Thereupon Mr. Morris moved to strike out the words "with regard to property," in order to leave the legislature entirely at large.

"Mr. WILLIAMSON. This would surely never be admitted should a majority of the Legislature be composed of any particular description of men—of lawyers, for example, which is no improbable supposition—the future election might be secured to their own body."

On motion to strike out "with regard to property," the vote was ayes 4, noes 7, Delaware not voting.

Mr. Rutledge opposed leaving the power to the legislature, arguing that the qualifications for the Senate should be similar to qualifications for the State legislatures.

Mr. Wilson thought—

"It would be best, on the whole, to let the section go out. A uniform rule would probably never be fixed by the legislature, and this particular power would constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications."

On agreeing to article VI, section 2, the vote was ayes 3, noes 7, Delaware not voting.

The above quotations are taken from Madison's report of the debates and are very illuminating. It will be noted that the convention, according to Mr. Pinckney, had directed that the committee prepare a clause prescribing the property qualifications in the Constitution itself, but that the committee had left such power to the legislature; that Mr. Pinckney's motion for a property qualification in the Constitution was defeated overwhelmingly; that the motion to strike out the words "with regard to property" was defeated 7 to 4; that when Mr Wilson pointed out that if the clause "with regard to property" was left in the Constitution that such clause would "constructively exclude every other power of regulating qualifications."

It was evidently the intention and opinion of the Convention that the power should not be so limited. The Constitution already had a provision in it that "each House shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," and it is evident that the Convention thought that such clause was sufficient to give to each House plenary power to judge qualifications, and consequently when a vote was taken as to

whether section 2 of article 6 should remain in the Constitution it was voted down 7 to 3.

It appears that nothing further was said on this subject during the Convention.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague also spent some time speaking about the provisions of State constitutions prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution. I thought at one time he was going to make the point that Connecticut was not in the Union, but he veered off from that angle. I cannot discuss or attempt to answer his arguments in detail, but I desire to read at this time the matter contained under heading three of the brief by Price Wickersham, "Provisions of State constitutions prior to adoption of Federal Constitution," on pages 5, 6, and 7:

III. Provisions of State constitutions prior to adoption of Federal Constitution

1. Origin of "judge * * * qualifications" clause.

2. Case of John Breckenridge, of Virginia.

It will be noted that Randolph, Pinckney, and Hamilton in their plans submitted to the convention all used the phrase "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," or words of the same import. The coincidence of the use of the phrase by the three is indicative of the fact that it was not original with any one of them. What is the origin of the clause? It, of course, did not originate in England, because they had no written constitutions. We, therefore, must examine the constitutions of the States prior to 1789.

The Virginia constitution of 1776 provided for a house of delegates and a senate. The house of delegates was to be composed of—

"Such men as actually resided in and are freeholders of the same, and are qualified according to law."

And the senate requirements were the same as those of the house, except that members of the senate must be "upward of 25 years of age." The constitution further provided:

"And each house shall choose its own speakers, appoint its own officers, settle its own rules of procedure, and direct writs of election for the supply of intermediate vacancies."

And—

"Officeholders or ministers of the gospel of every denomination being incapable of being elected members of either house."

The above are the only pertinent provisions of the Virginia Constitution. Nothing is said about the right of the house to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

An interesting case arose in 1780. John Breckenridge, a youth of 19, was elected to the house of delegates, which refused him admission upon the ground that he was too young to be entrusted with a decision of matters which were thought to be of such gravity to the State; thereupon his constituents reelected him to the house; the house again refused him admission upon the same ground; thereupon he was elected the third time and the house permitted him to sit In analyzing this case it is clear that the constitution itself did not prescribe any qualifications except residence and freeholdership. There was no provision in the Virginia Constitution specifically giving the house the right to judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its members.

A search of the records of the Virginia Historical Society fails to reveal the preservation of any debates upon this subject, but it is evident that the house of delegates assumed that it had the inherent power to judge of the qualifications of its members, regardless of the absence of a constitutional provision giving it such power. There were precedents for its action in the history of the English House of Commons and particularly in the case of Henry Downs which arose in the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1742, which is hereinafter commented upon.

The Constitution of North Carolina of 1776 contains no such provision.

The first draft for a constitution for Massachusetts was defeated on March 4, 1778, and a second draft was submitted and adopted in 1780, which, so far as its senate is concerned, required a residence of 5 years and certain property qualifications—but no religious qualifications—and further provided—

"The senate shall be final judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their members, as pointed out in this constitution."

The Constitution of New Hampshire of 1784 provided for a residence, property, and religious qualification, and contained the same words as above quoted from the Massachusetts Constitution.

The Georgia constitutions of 1777 and of 1789 and 1798 contained provisions that—

"Each house shall be the final judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their members."

It will be noted that the Georgia constitutions did not incorporate the words "as pointed out in this constitution" contained in the Massachusetts and New Hampshire constitutions.

It will thus be seen that the first written constitution which contained the clause in question was the Georgia Constitution of 1777. It is clear that the members of the Constitutional Convention were familiar with the constitutions of Georgia, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire The Convention, and particularly the committee on detail, had the choice of adopting the language of the Massachusetts Constitution or the language of the Georgia Constitution, and they chose the language of the Georgia Constitution, which contained no limitation of the grant of power. This fact is important in view of the contention made by Mr. Beck in his book The Vanishing Rights of the States, that the John Wilkes case, hereinafter discussed, was "the great constitutional landmark of the eighteenth century and determined for all time the right of Englishmen to be represented in Parliament by members of their own choice." If the Colonies, or later the States, or the Constitutional Convention placed any interpretation upon the Wilkes case, as contended for by Mr. Beck, it is truly remarkable that Georgia should have conferred upon each house of its legislature the right to be "the final judges of elections, returns, and qualifications of their members" without any limitation of the power whatsoever, and it is equally remarkable that the Federal Convention should have done likewise.

Mr. President, on the subject which was referred to by my distinguished colleague relating to the right of the Colonies prior to 1776 to reject or expel. I submit and ask to have printed in the RECORD the matter contained under heading four, "The Colonies prior to 1776 considered the right of rejection and expulsion an inherent power of legislative bodies," as shown on pages 7 and 8 in the brief of Price Wickersham.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IV. The Colonies, prior to 1776 considered the right of rejection and expulsion an inherent power of legislative bodies

Case of Henry Downs, Virginia House of Burgesses, 1742

Of course, there were no constitutions of the Colonies which contained clauses similar to the one under discussion. Some of the Colonies were proprietary, and some of the charters of the Colonies contained provisions for the functioning of their legislative bodies, and little information is available as to the exercise of the right by such legislative bodies to reject or expel their members. However, an interesting case arose in Virginia in 1742 in the house of burgesses. The journals of the house of burgesses (assembly, 1742–1747) contain the following account of the case of Henry Downs (p. 11):

"Mr. Conway, from the committee of privileges and elections, reported that they had—

"Had under their consideration the information against Mr. Henry Downs, a sitting member, to them referred; and had examined the matter thereof, and heard the said Mr. Downs; whereupon, it appeared to the committee from the transcript of a record of the court of Prince Georges County, in Maryland, produced to the committee, duly attested by the clerk, and certified under the public seal of the said county, that at a county court of the right honorable the lord proprietary of that Province, held at Marlborough Town, in and for the county aforesaid, on the 27th day of June 1721, Henry Downs, together with Edward Brown and James Jones, all of the said county, were indicted of felony, in stealing one sheep, of a white color, of the price of 10 shillings, the property of a certain person unknown, on the 29th day of August then last past, at a place called the Chapel, in that county; and that the said Downs, upon his arraignment, the same 27th day of June aforesaid, did confess himself guilty of the felony and theft, so as aforesaid laid to his charge, and put himself upon the grace and mercy of the court. And thereupon it was considered by that court that the same Henry Downs, by the sheriff of that county, from the bar to the whipping post should be taken, and there being stripped naked from the waist upward, receive on his bare back 15 lashes well laid on by the sheriff aforesaid, so that the blood appear; and that after the whipping aforesaid, the said Henry Downs, by the sheriff aforesaid, be put on the pillory for and during the space of half an hour. And afterwards the said Henry Downs, the same 27th day of June aforesaid, was, with the consent of one Jacob Henderson, clerk (his master), sold by the court aforesaid, for 1 year and 9 months, to one John Middleton, planter, to discharge the fees of the conviction aforesaid. But the said Henry Downs, the sitting member, denied before the committee that he was the same Henry Downs mentioned in the said record But it appeared to the committee from the testimony of several gentlemen, members of this house, that the said Henry Downs, the sitting member, had lately confessed himself to be the same Henry Downs mentioned in the record aforesaid. Thereupon, upon the whole, the committee had come to several resolutions, which he read in his place and afterwards delivered in at the table, where the same were read.

"And the said Mr. Henry Downs was heard in his place and withdrew.

"Then the resolutions of the said committee were again read, and agreed to by the house, nemine contradicente, as follows:

"'*Resolved*, that the said Henry Downs, having been convicted of felony and theft, and punished, as aforesaid, is unworthy to sit as a member in this house;

"'*Resolved*, That the said Henry Downs, for the causes aforesaid, be expelled this house;

"'*Resolved*, That the said Henry Downs be disabled to sit and vote as a member of this house during this present general assembly.'

"Mr. Downs was thereupon expelled the house."

It will be noted that the felony complained of was committed 21 years before Downs was elected, and that there was then no constitution of Virginia giving the right to the house of burgesses to judge of the qualifications of its members. Such right was assumed by the house to be an inherent power of legislative bodies.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I call attention, though I shall not read it, to heading 5 of the brief of Price Wickersham, in which he shows the growth and development of power of judging qualifications in England.

Yesterday, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], demonstrated clearly that the uniform practice established through the years definitely established the right of the Senate to exercise its discretion as to whether it would seat a Senator before investigation, or investigate before seating.

Mr. President, I now read further from the Wickersham brief, commencing with heading 8 on page 19, to the end of the brief:

VIII. Opinions of authorities on constitutional law

The authorities on constitutional law have not devoted much space in their text to a discussion of this question. It seems to be taken for granted that the House and Senate possess such power as an inherent prerogative of legislative bodies, the courts having no power to pass upon the action of the House or Senate in such matters.

That a legislature has the power to enact statutes increasing the qualifications for office holding prescribed in a constitution is admitted. Throop, on public offices, section 78, says:

"The general rule is that the legislature has full power to prescribe qualifications for holding office in addition to those prescribed in the Constitution; provided, that they are reasonable and not opposed to the constitutional provisions or to the spirit of the Constitution."

Perhaps the best expression by an authority on constitutional law, so far as this question is concerned, is contained in Pomeroy's Constitutional Law, third edition, page 138, to wit:

"The power given to the Senate and to the House of Representatives each to pass upon the validity of the elections of its own Members and upon their personal qualifications seems to be unbounded. But I am very strongly of the opinion that the two Houses together, as one House, cannot pass any statute containing a general rule by which the qualifications of Members as described in the Constitution are either added to or lessened.

"Such a statute would not seem to be a judgment of each House upon the qualifications of its own Members, but a judgment upon the qualifications of the Members of the other branch. The power is sufficiently broad as it stands. Indeed, there is absolutely no restraint upon its exercise except the responsibility of the Representatives to their constituents."

Also see reasoning of Judge Story in point IX following:

IX. The right of the Senate to judge qualifications of its Members is not in derogation of any inherent or retained power of the States

It was contended in the debate upon the motion to reject Roberts in 1900 that a Senator or Congressman was "a representative of the State"—a sort of ambassador to represent the State in the Legislature of the Union—and that the right of the State or district to name and select whomsoever it chose was one of the rights retained by the States when they entered the Union, and articles IX and X of the Constitution were cited, to wit:

"ART. IX. Rights retained by the people. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"ART. X. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Article X was construed in the case of *Collector v. Day* (11 Wall. 124), in which the Court said:

"This clause does not contain a new grant of power to the States or people, but is simply declaratory of a preexisting condition."

Judge Story, in his memorable work, On the Constitution, volume 1, section 627, says:

"The truth is that the States can exercise no powers whatsoever, which exclusively spring out of the existence of the National Government, which the Constitution does not delegate to them. They have just as much right, and no more, to prescribe new qualifications for a Representative as they have for a President. Each is an officer of the Union, deriving his powers and qualifications from the Constitution, and neither created by, dependent upon, nor controllable by the States. It is no original prerogative of States' power to appoint a Representative, a Senator, or President for the Union.

"These officers owe their existence and functions to the united voice of the whole, not a portion, of the people. Before a State can assert the right it must show that the Constitution has delegated and recognized it. No State can say that it has reserved what it never possessed."

The title of Mr. Beck's book "The Vanishing Rights of the States," is thus seen to be a misnomer. No right of a State can "vanish" that never existed.

X. Conclusion—The Constitution expressly confers the power without limitation upon the Senate, the intent of the framers of the Constitution is plain; history supports the power, the practice of Colonies, States, and Congress upholds the power, and the best governmental policy demands that the Senate exercise the power

We have seen that the Constitution expressly confers the power to "judge qualifications of its own Members" without limitation; that the debates in the Constitutional Convention show that such was the plain intent of the framers of the Constitution; that the authors of the plans submitted to the Constitutional Convention all agreed that such powers should be conferred without limitation; that Georgia first conferred this unlimited power upon its senate in 1777; that the House of Delegates of the State of Virginia in 1780 exercised this power without any constitutional provision and assumed that it was an inherent legislative power; that the Colony of Virginia in 1742 recognized and exercised this right as an inherent legislative power; that the House of Commons and the House of Lords recognized and exercised this right 25 times in the Wilkes case, and that such power was the growth of hundreds of years; that since the adoption of our Federal Constitution Congress has repeatedly exercised such power; that the profoundest students and authorities upon constitutional law declare that the power is absolute.

If there were no precedents to guide this Government, if there was no constitutional provision upon the subject, if the matter were to arise now for the first time, what would be the best governmental policy? Would the delegation of such a power to the Senate be fraught with danger to the Republic? It must be remembered that Senators are officials of the United States Government and not of the States. They legislate not for the States alone but for all the people of the Union. The vote of a Senator affects every State of the Union as much as it does the one from which he is elected. His vote may mean peace or war for the Union. Should not the Union have the right to protect itself against corruption in one of its parts? Should the whole suffer from the dereliction of a part? If it be said that one political party may corruptly and wrongfully decline to seat a Senator-elect of another party, it must be admitted that such a contingency might arise, but it would not destroy the right of the State to representation; another could be elected in his place. Other possibilities readily suggest themselves. For instance, the President might be a Republican and the Senate Republican and the House Democratic, and the House might refuse to pass any appropriation legislation in order to embarrass the administration. This is a contingency that might arise, but what sensible American believes it probable?

Exaggerated illustrations mean nothing; they are futile. As Senator David Reed, of Pennsylvania, in discussing this question in the Senate last spring, said:

"Illustrations can be drawn that make both sides of this question seem silly. We must be guided by reason and not by fancy."

Under our Constitution momentous questions are submitted to the decision of nine Supreme Court judges appointed by the President and not elected by the people. Generally speaking, these judges come from one class—those identified with large interests—and not from the masses; yet the people recognize that ours is a constitutional government and that such procedure is in accordance with law. There is no real danger in submitting to 96 Senators elected by the people the question whether a particular Senator-elect possesses sufficient moral or intellectual qualifications to sit in the greatest deliberative body in the world. We submit to the decision of the Supreme Court when it decides some vital matter by a vote of 5 to 4. May we not intrust the decision of the qualifications of a Senator-elect to the judgment of a majority of 95 Senators elected by the people and responsible to them for their acts? Never in the past has a Senator or Congressman been denied a seat unjustly. History has proven the wisdom of the Constitution in conferring this power upon the Senate.

I might say, Mr. President, that this brief reaches the conclusion—"The Constitution expressly confers the power without limitation upon the Senate; the intent of the framers of the Constitution is plain; history supports the power, the practice of colonies, States, and Congress upholds the power, and the best governmental policy demands that the Senate exercise the power."

Let us look twice. Well might we bear in mind in this critical period the prayer of one who said, "Open Thou mine eyes to behold wondrous things out of Thy law." The seeker referred to the law of the spirit.

Well might we ask that our eyes be not closed in order that we might behold the wondrous glory of the Constitution. Without it we would be nothing—a group of discordant States, a replica of Europe. With it, we are cemented together in one great bond of unity. Without it we would be weak. With it we are strong—one Nation indivisible under the Stars and Stripes.

Do not let a spirit of disunity again manifest itself. Let us not permit ourselves to take any step that would weaken the authority of this great body; weaken the Constitution in one place, and we open the door to weaken it in other places. I repeat, if you want to seat Governor LANGER, seat him on the facts, but do not be carried away by any arguments that would once more give power to the demon of disunity.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to Senate Resolution No. 220.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to Senate Resolution 220. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it. The noes have it, and the amendment is rejected.

The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island. [Putting the question.]

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McNARY. On what question was the vote taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, to the so-called Green amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Was the amendment agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McNARY. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider the vote by which the Senate rejected the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Overton amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I was called out of the Senate for a few minutes. Am I to understand that this question was disposed of on a viva voce vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. OVERTON. I regret that I was absent. I was gone only for several minutes. I thought the Senator from Georgia and one or two other Senators were to speak. So I thought I could absent myself for a period of a few minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; I shall be glad to yield, but I was making a parliamentary inquiry, and, at the proper time, I should like to present the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to say to the Senator that I think there was much confusion in the minds of Members of the Senate—certainly there was in my own—at the time the vote was taken. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it places squarely before the Senate the question of whether Senator LANGER can be expelled by a two-thirds vote or by a majority vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized to state his point of order.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senate is operating under a strict limitation of time, and argument of this character on a point of order or argument on the merits of the motion is out of order. I make that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order of the Senator from Georgia is well taken.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am not making any argument. All I am doing is to try to clarify in my own mind—and I am answering the Senator's point of order, I am not making any argument on the merits or demerits—what is before the Senate. What I am trying to ascertain, and to clarify for the Senate, is what is the question now before the Senate; and I am asking the Senator from Louisiana if his amendment does not bring before the Senate the question of whether Mr. LANGER can be expelled by a majority vote, or whether it takes two-thirds vote. Is that argument, or asking a simple parliamentary question?

Mr. OVERTON. Have I the floor? If so, I shall address myself to the amendment.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand it——

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely ask for information. Is a motion to reconsider debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the pending question and is debatable.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the chair.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I shall again read to the Senate the amendment I have proposed as a substitute for the Green amendment. The amendment I propose reads:

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote, if cause therefor exists.

I should like to modify the amendment by striking out the words "if cause therefor" exists. I modify my amendment by striking out the words "if cause therefor exists."

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OVERTON. I have a right to modify my own amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not until the motion to reconsider has been adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator cannot modify an amendment on a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment has already been passed on.

Mr. OVERTON. I was doing it merely in compliance with the suggestion made by the majority leader, because I always like to follow the majority leader whenever I can. He made the suggestion that the words "if cause therefor exists" should be eliminated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I always appreciate a compliment from the Senator from Louisiana, but I never suggested to him that during the consideration of a motion to reconsider the vote by which an amendment has already been passed on he could modify the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. It is correct the Senator from Kentucky did not make that suggestion, but a while ago he did suggest that it would be very well to eliminate the words "if cause therefor exists."

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have been proper for the Senator to modify his amendment before it was voted on.

Mr. OVERTON. I intended to do that, but, as I undertook to explain a few minutes ago, during a temporary absence from the Chamber, the amendment was voted upon by a viva voce vote.

The amendment I have offered is in answer to the amendment proposed originally by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which declared, in effect—I have not the amendment before me—that the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote, and undertook to assign reasons therefor, the reason being, in effect, that since WILLIAM LANGER has been a Member of the Senate, he has not done any act which would be a ground for expulsion.

Then the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I assume after consultation with the majority of the members of the committee, offered an amendment to the committee's own amendment, wherein it is proposed that the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote, omitting the reason why it does not so fall.

Let me say to the proponents of the resolution who are objecting to the amendment I offer by way of substitute, that it is the Committee on Privileges and Elections which has raised this constitutional question; and I think it is properly raised. I do not think we can intelligently vote upon this question until we do determine whether the case comes within the constitutional provisions relating to expulsion, or whether we can oust the Senator from North Dakota by a bare majority vote.

When I offer the substitute, I bring before the Senate perhaps more clearly than does the Green amendment the question at issue, because the Green amendment expresses the proposition in the negative, whereas my amendment expresses the proposition in the affirmative.

Mr. President, I do not expect to go through the argument I have already made in support of my view and interpretation of the Constitution. It is perhaps sufficient for me to point out briefly that the framers of the Constitution provided, first, that the legislatures of the various States should select Senators. That is provided in the first paragraph of section 3 of article I of the Constitution. That, standing alone in the Constitution, gave to the legislatures of the different States an uncontrolled and unlimited power to select whom they pleased.

Then the Constitution provides that the legislature can exercise that authority only within certain constitutional limitations, namely, that while they may send anyone here whom they choose as a Senator to represent their State, the Senator must have attained a certain age, been for a certain time a citizen, and be an inhabitant of the State from which he is elected.

When a Senator presents himself here who has been sent by the people of a State under the provisions of the Constitution, he can be ousted by a majority vote only if he fails to meet those qualifications prescribed by the Constitution, or if his election is called into question and it is determined that the election was not valid, or if, under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, it is shown that he has been guilty of disloyalty, as phrased in the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. President, the amendment I am offering, if adopted, will place the Senate on record, insofar as the Langer case is concerned, as believing that a two-thirds vote is necessary for his exclusion. There is no question at all about the qualifications of Senator LANGER, there is no question at all about his election; there is no question about his loyalty to the Government, there is no question that he holds any other office. Therefore, the only remedy left to the Senate of the United States to protect themselves in their dignity, in their integrity, in their honor, is to invoke the power of expulsion against Senator LANGER, if there be any cause therefor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution of the committee, as amended, presents two propositions. One of them is that it does not require a two-thirds vote, and the other is that the Senator from North Dakota is not entitled to his seat. Those are separable propositions, and a separate vote can be obtained on each. The vote would come first, of course, as has been asked by the committee, upon the first part of the resolution. Why is it that the Senator from Louisiana is not willing to have the Senate pass upon the first part of the resolution, upon the determination of which we will then know whether it takes two-thirds or a majority in this case, unless he is seeking to bind future Senates in any similar case, or any possible case, outside of the technical qualifications set up in the Constitution?

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. Why should he object to a vote upon the affirmative proposition, that the case falls within the expulsion power of the Senate, instead of voting on the negative proposition that it does not so fall?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to either method, but we can reach the result by striking out the word "not" in the resolution of the committee so that we would vote affirmatively.

Mr. OVERTON. That is an excellent suggestion, and I did strike out the word "not"; that is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I read the Senator's modified amendment, it is a substitute for the first part of the committee resolution.

Mr. OVERTON. It reads exactly as the Green amendment reads, with the word "not" omitted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why vote on a separate amendment when we can vote on the first part of the committee resolution and get the same result? If the Senate votes down the first part of the committee resolution, then it takes two-thirds to oust the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. OVERTON. It is because I think we should present the proposition affirmatively, and not in a negative way. Why beat about the bush, say it does not do this and does not do that? Why not say it does so and so? I think that is the way to meet the issue, meet it face to face, squarely, and not say it does not do this and does not do that. Let us say it does fall within the power of expulsion, and trust the Senate thereafter to take the proper action.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Suppose we should adopt the first branch of the Green resolution. All we would do would be to say that the case does not fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion, but we would not say where it does fall. So that even after voting for the first branch of the Green resolution, it still could be contended, if a majority vote is to unseat Senator LANGER, that he had been unseated, whereas if we vote for the Overton amendment and affirmatively say that this case falls within the constitutional provision for expulsion, then we shall have eliminated any question whatever on that score.

Mr. OVERTON. In other words, we leave it like Mohammed's coffin, suspended in the air.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are only two baskets in which this head can fall; one of them is the two-thirds vote basket, and the other is the majority vote basket. If we refuse to put the head in the basket that means a two-thirds vote, automatically it comes in that of the majority vote.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from Kentucky can give me one good, valid reason why he does not wish to vote upon this proposition affirmatively, I shall be very glad to consider it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure no reason I can give would satisfy the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I can tell the Senator why I do not want to vote on it negatively.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the simplest and most direct way is to vote on the resolution as it has been presented by the committee, upon which a separate vote

is, of course, possible, and has already been asked. It could not be denied, as I view it. Instead of offering amendments in the nature of substitutes for the committee resolution, I think it is simpler to vote on the resolution brought in by the committee, the result of which will be the same as a vote on the other proposal.

Mr. OVERTON. I regret that in this particular instance I cannot agree with the able Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume the vote would be the same in either case.

Mr. OVERTON. I assume so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Kentucky gives us the illustration that there are only two baskets into which this matter can fall; but what the Overton amendment does is to avoid having it fall out of both of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. No——

Mr. MURDOCK. The Overton amendment places the matter 'n the expulsion basket. All the Green amendment does is to say that the question does not go into the expulsion basket; it does not put it over into the other basket.

Mr. BARKLEY If it does not go into the expulsion basket, it is bound to go into the exclusion basket, because there cannot be any other basket. A Member cannot be ousted from the Senate except by either a two-thirds vote or a majority vote.

Mr. MURDOCK. We want it to go into the expulsion basket.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no doubt as to which basket the Senator wants to put it in, and the Senator has the privilege of putting it there if he can do so, but if it does not go into that basket, it goes into the other basket.

Mr. MURDOCK. What I want to be sure of is that it goes into a basket, and is not suspended between the two of them.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think from the standpoint of the Senator from Kentucky the decision of the question is between Tweedledee and Tweedledum, but from our standpoint it is decidedly different, because we state positively and unequivocally, to use the illustration given by the Senator from Kentucky, as amplified by the Senator from Utah, that we wish to know exactly where the head does fall, and we want it to tumble within the provision of the Constitution relating to expulsion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to address myself very briefly to the motion to reconsider, and I do so only for the purpose of pointing out the parliamentary situation, which seems to have become somewhat confused. I happened to have been temporarily in the chair at the time this situation arose. It was a matter of general opinion or knowledge in the Senate that two or three Senators probably desired to speak upon this matter. When I relieved the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the chair, I was advised that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] desired to be recognized. At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], no Senator rose to claim recognition. I sent a page to two of the Senators who had been reputed to desire the floor, to ask them if they desired to be recognized, and they said no. In that situation there was nothing for the Chair to do except to put the pending question, which was on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, which the Chair did. At that point the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] suggested the absence of a quorum, and a roll call was had, at the conclusion of which, a quorum being developed, the Chair again put the question on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified. On a viva voce vote only one Senator, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], voted in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. A considerable number of Senators voted in the negative. The Chair said, "The noes seem to have it; the noes have it, and the amendment is lost."

No Senator demanded a division or the yeas and nays.

It is perfectly obvious, from what has transpired since, Mr. President, that the Senate, being in some confusion, did not properly understand the action that was being taken, and on a matter of this importance, involving not only the right of a Senator to his seat, but involving also a very large question of public policy in future senatorial proceedings, it seems to me that the Senate ought to act with a full knowledge of what it is doing, and act on the question, the very important question, which was presented by the Senator from Louisiana Therefore it seems to me, Mr. President, that, whatever may be the difference among Senators in their view as to the Overton amendment, unanimous consent should be given for a reconsideration of the vote with respect to it, upon the theory that the Senate is entitled to act with full knowledge of what it is doing.

Mr. President, if I am in order I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana was defeated be reconsidered, and I say in that connection that, of course, if the vote shall not be reconsidered, the same purpose could be served by the Senator from Louisiana slightly modifying his amendment and offering it in a somewhat different form, but it seems to me that as a matter of fairness such action ought not to be necessary

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator to yield, because if I interpose an objection I wish to explain why I do so. I have already made such explanation to the Senate, but I do not think the Senator from Missouri was present when I made it. I do not think this is a case for expulsion. This is a case for exclusion or it is nothing at all. That is the position I have taken. I therefore would be compelled to object, if the Senator from Missouri asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator is going to object, it is useless to ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to explain my position, because identically the same question arises on the committee's amendment. One question is put in the affirmative and the other is put in the negative, so that no one's rights are lost or jeopardized. The first branch of the committee resolution is—

> *Resolved*, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion * * * by two-thirds vote.

That remains to be voted on, and is the next question. A separate vote will be taken on that question and the same rights of Mr. LANGER are preserved thereby as if the vote came on the other question.

If the Senator from Missouri urges his unanimous-consent request I shall have to object to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, there is no point in making the unanimous-consent request if the Senate already has notice that the Senator from Georgia intends to object, which he has a perfect right to do. Therefore I withdraw my request.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr President, I interposed the motion to reconsider because of the temporary absence of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. Personally I should like to have him withdraw the motion, or permit me to withdraw it, so that we may act on the resolution offered by the committee, for I think it raises the same proposition. One branch of the resolution calls for an affirmative vote and one for a negative. It is just as easy for me to say "No" as it is "Yes," so long as I follow my conscience and my views. Inasmuch as I made the motion, unless I thereby offend the able Senator I shall withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have already been ordered, and the order cannot be rescinded except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MCNARY. If the yeas and nays were ordered they were ordered very hastily when I was trying to obtain the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the order based on the motion I made, be vacated. Since I made the motion I think I am entitled to that courtesy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. OVERTON. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make a statement. I am a good soldier, and when both the majority and minority leaders combine and want me to withdraw my amendment, when both the proponents and the opponents of the resolution desire me to withdraw my amendment, I am going to do so. Therefore I hope unanimous consent will be granted to permit me to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I make the observation for the benefit of the Senate. It was absolutely necessary for the committee, in view of the position it took, to bring in the type of resolution it did, in the negative.

Mr. McNARY. I agree to that.

Mr. President, I now renew my unanimous-consent request that the order for the yeas and nays be vacated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McNARY. Now, Mr. President, I withdraw my motion for a reconsideration of the vote by which the Overton amendment was rejected, so that the question may stand upon the two proposals made by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oregon is agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. If it be in order I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has already been rejected. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to this motion. It narrows the issue which I wish to discuss.

The pending question is:

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provision for expulsion by two-thirds vote.

That is the sole issue now before the Senate.

I have already stated to the Senate, and I repeat, that so far as I have heard as a member of the committee or read in the record, there is nothing in this case relating to any act of misconduct on the part of WILLIAM LANGER which is even alleged to have occurred since his election to the Senate. That seems to me to dispose of this case, because if the first branch of the resolution should be voted down I do not think that the case here presented would be one for expulsion. The case made in the evidence is not one for expulsion, and the case does not proceed upon that theory.

That, of course, raises the larger question involved in this case, whether or not expulsion on the basis of acts which occurred prior to the election can be urged as a reason for the exclusion of the Senator from North Dakota from this body.

I admit that the Senate is not obliged to give any reason for expelling a Member. While we may proceed blindly and frankly on a basis of prejudice, and say that we propose to expel A or B from the Senate, nevertheless, the Senate, as a responsible legislative body, is obliged to give its reason upon such an important issue. When the reason on which the expulsion is based relates entirely to matters which occurred prior to election, in my opinion, it cannot be sustained.

The contrary view is that there can be no exclusion upon the basis of any qualification or disqualification other than the disqualifications which are enumerated in the Constitution. That view has been submitted by the able Senator from Oregon, the minority leader [Mr. MCNARY], today. It has also been submitted by the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and other Senators.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the language of the Constitution. If we stay by the Constitution there will not be much difficulty. If we did not try to indulge in reasoning of our own there would not be much difficulty.

First, what is the expulsion provision in the Constitution? I read it:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members—

Not Members-elect; not Members-designate—

for disorderly behavior and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member

I am aware of the fact that the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made a very learned argument, but the real effect of his argument is that we may expel a man before he ever becomes a Member of this body. Neither in logic nor under the Constitution can such a position be maintained.

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings—

Relating absolutely to its internal organization, and not reaching outside of it for a moment for any purpose—

punish its Members for disorderly behavior—

Not a Member-designate or Member-elect, but only a person who has come to this body, taken the oath, and qualified without reservations and without any question of his right to a seat under the qualification clause of the Constitution—

and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Only in that instance is a two-thirds vote required. This case does not fall within it, and there is no way to make it fall within it if we wish to face the one big issue which is raised in this case.

Mr. President, I read another provision of the Constitution:

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business.

That is a clear declaration that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members, followed by the express provision "and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business."

Not even a majority of the Senate is required to exclude one who comes here, because a bare majority is declared to be sufficient to constitute a quorum of the Senate.

Only in one other particular is the two-thirds rule prescribed in the Constitution, and that is when the Senate sits as a court of impeachment. Then the verdict of guilty can be rendered only by a two-thirds vote. I shall not go into all the facts, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to one particular provision in the Constitution. It is said that nothing but the qualifications prescribed in the Constitution can be looked into by the Senate. Is that the rule? Suppose Al Capone were to be appointed to the Senate. Could not the Senate stop him at the door? Could it not at any time raise the question that he is not entitled to a seat here?

The argument is made that the only qualifications of which the Senate has a right to judge are the qualifications stated in the Constitution. I read from the provision of the Constitution which affects impeachment:

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Is that one of the enumerated disqualifications? Not at all. Look at the Constitution. Remember that the Senate is a sovereign body exercising sovereign powers, with the right to determine these important questions affecting its own integrity.

Bear in mind, also, that judgment in cases of impeachment need not necessarily extend through all future time to disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States Suppose A has been elected to the Senate or appointed by the Governor in the case of a vacancy, and suppose that when he comes here to take his oath someone raises the question that A is really X, and that X has been impeached and cannot hold an office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States. Would we not have the power to look into the question? Would we not exercise the power? Would we say that that would be a case only for expulsion? Would we give to that kind of a man the benefit of a two-thirds vote? Would we give him any benefit? Suppose he came here under his right name but that in the State to which he had moved it had been forgotten that he had ever been impeached and debarred from holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States. Suppose the people of his State knew nothing about it, but that he had made no misrepresentation. Would not the Senate have the power to protect its own integrity?

Suppose a man known to be of infamous character should come here, or suppose the Governor of a State should appoint such a man as Frank Smith. The single fact known about Frank Smith when he came here under the appointment of the Governor was that in a primary campaign he had accepted a large donation from a utility interest which came within his jurisdiction as chairman of the Commerce Commission of the State of Illinois. The special investigating committee hurriedly made its report to the Senate. The credentials were presented on the floor, and by a definite vote of the Senate the credentials were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, there to lie until the Privileges and Elections Committee reported upon the case.

The last case to come before the Senate involving a question similar to the ques-

tion involved in this case was the case of Gould, a case from Maine. That case, as I recall, came before the Senate in December 1926. Mr. Gould had been elected from Maine. When he presented his credentials upon this floor the distinguished Senator, Tom Walsh, from Montana, who died soon after being appointed Attorney General by the President of the United States, and who was one of the best lawyers ever to occupy a seat in this body, rose and made the single solitary objection to Senator Gould's seating, that 14 years before his election he had been guilty of bribery, a fact which was admittedly known to the people of Maine and was discussed in the campaign.

The Senate considered the question whether to take jurisdiction. The Senate took jurisdiction, even in a case of that character, where there had been one single overt act, occurring 14 years before the election. When the committee investigated the case—and I was a member of the committee—we simply found that Senator Gould was not guilty, or that one view of the evidence exculpated him from all guilt of the charge, and therefore no other ruling was made. However, the Senate took jurisdiction of the case, permitted Senator Gould to be sworn in without prejudice—as in this case—went into the case, and looked into the facts of the case. That was the only fact involved in the case.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I have such a short time that I must beg the Senator's pardon and decline to yield at this time. If I can finish before my time has expired, I shall be glad to yield.

The Constitution does not undertake to prescribe all the qualifications of a Member of this body. By way of negative statement, which is the case wherever a power is denied to a State in the Constitution, it is said that no person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to 30 years of age, been a citizen of the United States for a prescribed time, and an inhabitant of the State at the time of his election. That is a negative statement, a statement which directly proscribes the sending by a State of anyone to the Senate who does not meet such qualifications. Conviction for impeachment is not stated in the Constitution as a disqualification. Even under the fourteenth amendment, which provides that no person shall be a Member of the Senate or of the House who, having previously taken an oath to support the Constitution, shall have engaged in an act of rebellion, the Senate itself is given the power to waive that disqualification. The Senate may, by the vote prescribed in the Constitution, permit the seating of the Senator-elect even though he had taken an oath to support the Constitution and had subsequently engaged in a treasonable act or had given aid and comfort to the enemy. Why? Because the Constitution left to the Senate the absolute power to say who should sit here and who should not sit here—the power to say what disqualifications it would prescribe. Even when the so-called war amendments were adopted they provided that the power should remain inviolate except that the Senate would be required to take a vote before the seating of a Senator-elect who had taken an oath to support the Constitution and who subsequently had engaged in an act of disloyalty against the Government.

In the section of the Constitution from which I have read there is not stated a single disqualification which the Senate is obliged to observe. That section constitutes a clear limitation on the power of the State itself. Mr. President, why is that so? It is so for this reason: When its framers wrote the Constitution and when the people of the United States adopted it, they knew very well what a parliamentary body was; they knew very well what the House of Commons and the House of Lords were. They had derived their jurisprudence from England. They were thoroughly familiar with what the House of Commons, the legislative branch of the English Government, could do. It has been the rule since time immemorial that the House of Commons could inquire into the qualifications, or the election returns, of any member who came to that body. That power was clearly and definitely reviewed and reasserted in the Wilkes case. It was known to those who framed our Constitution. What happened? The legislative power of this Government was vested in the Congress of the United States, and then the Congress was created, consisting of two Houses. To the Congress was given specially delegated powers and all other powers that arise by necessary implication from the powers granted; and the moment that a government, a sovereign government, is set up, is called into existence, and the legislative power of that sovereign is vested alone in a legislative branch of that government, under a constitution, there is no limitation on either House of that Congress with respect to its own members, save the limitations and restrictions which are written into that constitution; because in the case of absolute sovereignty the sovereign had a right not only to make the laws but to execute the laws and to interpret the laws. Under the English system, the power to make the laws was vested in a parliamentary body. The framers of our Constitution followed the pattern, created a parliamentary body, and gave it full sovereign power over everything placed within its jurisdiction, save as limited in the Constitution.

Oh, I know very well that, in theory, at least, the Federal Government is not an absolute sovereign. It exercises within the field of legislation only such powers as are expressly delegated or by necessary implication are implied from the powers granted; but with respect to the legislative powers granted, whatever they were, whether to control interstate commerce or to do any other thing which the Congress has from the beginning done, the Congress stands as a sovereign legislative body with the full power of the sovereign to say who shall sit here, and to meet at the door everyone who comes to it demanding a seat. After a Senator-elect has been seated, with no charges of substance against him relating to things which occurred long prior to the time before he became a Member of the Congress, then, of course, the Constitution does provide for expulsion by two-thirds vote. It does not matter when the motion is made to exclude a Senator; it does not matter whether it is made when the Senator-elect presents himself or thereafter. In the orderly course of things, it might well be made when the Senator-elect presents himself; but to make such a requirement would be to do violence to another constitutional provision of great and perhaps higher dignity; that is, to deny to the State equal representation by having two Members in the Senate at all times—a right of which a State cannot be deprived, save by its own consent.

So the practice has grown up of permitting a Senator-elect or a Senator-designate to come into this body if he has credentials, regular on their face, and to take his seat without prejudice, if there are then pending objections to his qualifications, and to permit the qualifications to be examined later. It is simply a rule of expediency, simply a practical determination of a question, but having due consideration to the right of every State to have two representatives in this body.

The same thing is true when a Senator-elect comes here with credentials regular on their face and is met by a contestant. The contestant files his contest. The contestee, the Senator-elect, or Senator-designate, always is permitted, so far as I know, to take his seat.

He may sit here for 6 months or a year before the contest is finally decided. Everything he does is done of right as a de facto Senator, at least. Nothing that he does by his own single vote as a majority of one can be questioned anywhere, because he is a Senator sitting here. If later it should be determined that he was not in fact duly elected at the time of the election, although he may have been here 1 year or 2 years, or if it should appear that either as a result of accident, fraud, or mistake, he was not duly elected, of course he would then go out; and the contestant himself would come in and would be seated in his stead. So the logical question arises there.

The sole question in this case—and it is the question in every case—is not in what form the motion arises, not at what time the motion arises, but what is the substance of the motion. If the motion questions the qualifications or the election or the returns of a Senator-elect, it is a motion to exclude him, and on that motion only a majority vote of the Senate is necessary. If it relates to anything done after his election, anything occuring after the time he becomes a Member of this body, then the motion is to expel him, although the act complained of may be of a character exactly similar, one of a kind, to the act which was committed perhaps 2 years before the election on which a motion is made to exclude.

It may be said that after one is elected the Senate has jurisdiction of him. I deny it. There is no reason for saying that it has jurisdiction of him. So far as expelling him is concerned, it may have some kinds of jurisdiction, but, until one is elected or appointed and comes here to take the oath of office, he

may decline the office; he may give it up at the last minute; he may not come when his term commences; he may remain away from here; and, if he does, the only rightful power of the Senate is to declare his office vacant and to proceed to have it filled up as the Constitution prescribes.

When he comes and elects to take the office and takes the oath and takes his seat, if there is not raised then or thereafter the question of his election or his qualifications, he can be deprived of his membership in this body only by expulsion, which requires a two-thirds vote. If his election is involved, if fraud, accident, or mistake can be shown to account for his presence here, although nobody raises the question for months and months after he comes into this body, it can be raised whenever the fact is known or when any one desires to raise it. That, however, does not involve this case.

When Mr. LANGER came here he was met with objections to his qualifications; long petitions were on the desk; the majority leader, perhaps after conference with some of the friends of Senator LANGER—I do not know—permitted him to be sworn in without prejudice to his right to insist upon all his rights, and without prejudice to the Senate to take whatever action thereafter appeared proper in his case.

So, Mr. President, I think that resolution No. 1 should be voted in the affirmative, and I so think regardless of what may be done in the further resolution as to permitting Senator LANGER to retain his seat. I think it infinitely more important that the Senate not publish to mankind that it lacks either the courage or the wisdom to meet an issue head on, face to face, and that it protect its integrity by excluding from this body not only those who are not 30 years of age, who have not been citizens 9 years, who were not inhabitants of the State from which they were elected; not only those who have been convicted of treason and deprived of the right to hold office; not only those who hold other offices of trust under the Constitution of the United States; not only those who, having taken an oath to support the Constitution have levied war against the Government of the United States, but for any other reason which can injure the integrity of the Senate itself. Do not do that, gentlemen. Whether you seat Senator LANGER is another question. It is infinitely more important that the Senate of the United States retain its power and assert its power.

Someone has been worried about the lack of power in the Congress of the United States to prescribe any other disqualifications. Why worry about that? Certainly there is no power in the Congress of the United States to prescribe any other disqualification, because not the Congress of the United States, not the President of the United States, not the Supreme Court of the United States, but each House of the Congress is the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members. Nobody can encroach upon that power; but the way to lose it is to be timorous in asserting it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] always makes able and well-considered addresses; I admire his great legal ability, and were this case to be decided upon our respective merits, I should not dare to draw my sword.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the Senate of the United States ought to retain whatever power it possesses with respect to the admission to and the expulsion of Members from this body, but I do not agree to the theory that the Senate has the authority to treat with indifference the distinction between exclusion and expulsion.

Mr. President, we are faced here today with four parties to this proceeding: The Senate of the United States, the Senator from North Dakota, who is the prisoner, as it were, at the bar, the State which elected him, and the Constitution of the United States. I hope in the very few minutes I shall devote to this matter to undertake to harmonize and give to each of the respective parties the proper jurisdiction which they possess.

Mr. President, my view of this matter is that when a candidate for the Senate approaches the door of the Senate with an abstract of title from his constituency, covering all the requirements as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, the Senate may not reject him, but must expel him if there is any cause for his not remaining in this Chamber.

What is the issue here today? The issue is not a matter of punishment; the Senate is not a court to inflict punishment upon Senator LANGER for what he did 20 years ago; but the Senate is sitting here to protect itself alone. The courts are the proper tribunal to inflict punishment. We have no right to say that we are going to punish Senator LANGER. We can only put him out of this body, on the theory that he was corrupt 20 years ago and he is still corrupt, and, being corrupt now at this moment, he is in danger of corrupting the Senate of the United States, or of depreciating the dignity of the Senate of the United States. If he has been cleansed, if he has been forgiven, if he has been given a bath of immunity, and is now pure, why should we exclude him?

The Senator from Georgia referred to the case of Al Capone. If Al Capone should be legally elected a Member of the United States Senate, and possessed the qualifications, we could expel him the moment he came through that door; but, suppose Al Capone had become purified, that he had become a Christian, and the Senator from Georgia knew that he was pure, that he was honorable, that he intended to do the right thing—there is no power on earth that would sanction his exclusion on the ground that he committed an offense 25 years ago.

Mr. President, Senator LANGER appears here. What does the Constitution say as to the title he shall have? The Constitution of the United States uses negative language; and I think there was a reason for the use of negative language. The Constitution of the United States says that no State shall send a Senator here unless he has been 9 years a citizen of the United States; unless he is an inhabitant of the State from which he comes, and unless he is 30 years of age. Those are prohibitions or limitations. By inference it clearly appears, to my mind, at least, that the States may send whomever they please, but whoever they send must, at least possess those qualifications. It cannot be said that the Constitution makers did not think about that subject.

Let us see what is the background of the Constitution of the United States. First there was the Continental Congress, to which each colony sent whomever it pleased, without any restrictions whatever upon its right by the central body. Then, under the Articles of Confederation—and I hold them in my hand—each State had a right to send such delegates as it might determine and select. There was no restriction, no limitation; they were recognizing the freedom of the States. But when they got into the Constitutional Convention, with this sort of a background, and knowing that the States and the Colonies had a right to send whom they might please, there were those who said, "Wait a moment. We want to protect against those not native-born, not 9 years citizens, and not inhabitants of the State. We want no rotten boroughs," and they laid down these qualifications.

There are those who say the qualifications are not exclusive. Why are they not exclusive? We are now meeting in the constitutional convention, let us say, in this Chamber, and some Senator proposes the qualifications which are now set forth in the Constitution. Can it be supposed that if this body wanted any other qualifications some Senator would not arise and say, "Mr. President, wait a minute. I am going to offer an amendment." We have many amendments here. Amendments were offered in the convention. If the framers of the Constitution had intended that the Senate on the one hand or the Congress on the other had the power to say that there should be other qualifications, why did they not say, "or such other qualifications as either House may prescribe," or, "such other qualifications as the Congress may prescribe"? All through the Constitution we find that kind of provision. They laid down certain things and then added, "or as may be provided by law," or "as one House may determine."

It did occur to the members of the Convention to add other qualifications. Mr. Pinckney, of South Carolina, who had originally offered a complete draft of the Constitution, proposed that another qualification be added. The original draft of the Constitution provided that—

> The legislature of the United States shall have authority to establish such uniform qualifications of the Members of each House, with regard to property, as to the said legislature shall seem expedient.

Senators now say that, though that was rejected in the Constitutional Convention, if the Senate desires we can exclude a Member because he does not possess a sufficient amount of property. That is their theory, that we can add anything we desire. But what happened to the proposal in the Convention?

Mr. Gouverneur Morris, who was politically more or less of an aristocrat, who held the Tory view of things political, proposed to go beyond that. He wanted to strike out "with regard to property," in order to leave the legislature entirely free to act. In other words, Mr. Gouverneur Morris proposed in the Convention itself that, in addition to the grounds we now have in the Constitution, the legislature might be entirely free to prescribe other qualifications. That is what those opposed to Mr. LANGER say we have the power to do. Yet when it came to the test, old James Madison, who knew more about the making of the Constitution than any other man there—and I glory in him; he came from the same Commonwealth now represented in part by the distinguished Senator on my right, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]—James Madison opposed these amendments, and he said:

MR. MADISON. The qualifications of elector and elected were fundamental articles in a republican government and ought to be fixed by the Constitution. If the legislature could regulate those of either, it can by degrees subvert the Constitution.

In other words, Madison said, "If you let the Senate determine any qualifications it may see fit, it may subvert the Constitution of the United States. If you permit the House to determine in the first instance the qualifications of its Members," Mr. Madison said, "you may subvert the Constitution of the United States."

I submit these sayings of wise men, men sitting in the Convention, men breathing its spirit, surrounded with the patriotism and the determination of the other leaders to make a government, to preserve democracy, to secure the rights of the States; I set those opinions against some of those we have heard uttered on this floor in recent days.

Mr. President, after hearing Madison, after hearing Pinckney, after hearing Gouverneur Morris, the Convention voted to refuse the Senate the right to add property qualifications. When they refused to permit the Senate to add that qualification they voted down the power to add any other kind of a qualification, and they thereby denied to this body and to the House of Representatives the right to impose any additional qualifications, save those set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Has the Congress of the United States recognized that principle? Senators will recall that in the fourteenth amendment, which was a constitutional act, the qualifications as to membership in this body were further amended by the provision that no one who had ever participated in rebellion or armed resistance to the Government could serve as a Member of the Senate save by a two-thirds vote of immunity.

If we could have accomplished that without the Constitution being amended, why was it not done? If the legislature could have done that by statute, why did they not do it? They said, "No; we cannot exclude members from this body because they participated in rebellion, save by amending the Constitution of the United States itself." When they adopted that amendment they thereby by inference excluded every other specification, save alone that of participation in rebellion.

My fellow Senators, these are elemental truths, according to my mind. We do not have to read a great number of lawbooks. We have brains, we have minds. We are the ones to be guided by the Constitution in this instance. We have a right to judge what this language means and what the precedents mean.

Mr. President, what is the philosophy behind all this? I think there is a philosophy which some Senators have overlooked. Why have two routes for getting Members out of this body? One is exclusion at the door, exclusion at any time. It does not make any difference whether one takes the oath or not; according to my view, it does not change the situation at all that he takes the oath. A year after he has been in the Senate, if we should decide that he was never legally elected, he goes out, because he never was a Senator de jure to start with. That was the situation in the Smith and Vare cases. Those cases are not comparable with the instant case. We decided in the Smith and Vare cases that neither of those men was ever legally elected, because he polluted the stream, he corrupted the ballot, and the poison permeated the whole election, vitiated it all, and he never was a Senator at all, he never acquired title, he did not come here with an abstract of title, he came here with grimy and corrupt hands, freshly stained with corruption upon them, and that corruption was responsible for his apparent election. The Senate said, "You never were a Senator. You were not a Senator when you stood at the door." If I am correct, that is the theory of the Senator from Oregon. That is what those cases decided.

But in the case of Senator LANGER, not a voice is lifted to say that he was not legally elected. Oh, it is true that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] yesterday said that while he was elected, we had a petition here from the people of North Dakota. How many of the people of North Dakota? Is a nondescript minority the people of North Dakota? If the people of North Dakota have any complaint in this case, their forum is the ballot box, and not the Senate of the United States.

North Dakota is a sovereign State. It may control the qualifications of its electors. It may control the election of and the conduct of its candidates. If crime is committed in North Dakota, it has the sovereign power to punish the criminal through the courts. The people of North Dakota, in the most solemn referendum free government knows, went to the ballot box and elected this man Senator, it elected him twice before that as Governor, it elected him twice before that as attorney general, and it does not lie in the mouths of a handful of disappointed and vanquished antagonists to come here now and say, "We cannot convince the people of North Dakota, who know, him, the people of North Dakota, who are familiar with his life, the people of North Dakota, who have mulled over his political record and the charges against him for 25 years. We cannot trust them to pass on his morality. We want a committee of Congress, the members of which have not attended the sessions, we want the Senate, half the Members of which do not hear the debate, to pass on this case, and give us the Senator we want. True, we were licked in the election. It is true that the charges were broadcast on every stump in North Dakota, and it is true that Mr. Lempke went about the State discussing the bond transaction and the land transaction. Every voter in North Dakota who could read or hear knew about it. But we want the Senate, in its purity and its wisdom, to rewrite the verdict, and give us a Senator we want."

What is that old reference about those English characters, the tailors of Tooley Street? Three tailors met in Tooley Street in London on one occasion and solemnly drew a petition to be presented to Parliament, which began, "We, the people of England." We find here a handful of complainants, who do not represent the people of North Dakota. And while I am on the subject of North Dakota, let me say that it has courts, it has Governors, it has a Governor now who is an enemy of the Senator from North Dakota. The present Governor of that State was elected on a platform pledging, "If you will elect me I will clean up this bond transaction, I will ferret out LANGER, and I will have him prosecuted and have him punished. I will appoint an investigator who will go to the bottom, one Mr. Duffy, and we will drag forth into the clear light of heaven all these impurities and these crimes."

Has there been a single indictment? Not even in a justice of the peace court. Has there been an indictment in the district court? Not one. Has there been a legislative committee which has ferreted these things out and condemned the Senator from North Dakota?

Why do not the people of North Dakota, of whom the Senator from Vermont speaks, assemble in North Dakota, instead of in Washington, and have the grand jury convene and act upon these charges? Why did they not sit down on the steps of the mansion of this Governor, who during election is strong for purity and after election gets cold feet because he fears he cannot deliver? Why do not the people of North Dakota get the North Dakota authorities to act? They want the Senate of the United States to act. I suppose they think we have played everybody else's game here and that we might as well play theirs. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, my contention is that there is bound to be some reason for these two philosophies as to expulsion and rejection. The men who framed the Constitution were not engaged in playing battledore and shuttlecock; they were engaged in endeavoring to foresee difficulties and to provide methods of dealing with them. So they provided two methods in respect to this difficulty. They are bound to have different bases, but if we were to follow the majority we would not need to have provision for expulsion of some person, except after he had come here; then he might be

expelled. Their theory is that if a person committed a crime last August the Senate can punish him for it. They call it punishment, but it is not punishment at all. We are not engaged in punishment. It is punishment enough for the poor victim, but for the rest of us it is not punishment. It is said we can punish a man for a crime committed last August by a majority vote.

After he comes into the Senate it is contended that the man can commit the same crime right here on the very altars of the Senate—it ought to be a greater offense to commit the crime in the Senate than to do so before he came here and he may have repented before he came here—but if he commits a crime after he comes into the Senate then they say, "Oh, it takes a two-thirds vote to act." "Why did you not throw another man out last month for committing a crime last August, the same crime?" "Yes." "Well, this fellow committed the same crime in the Senate. He shook his fist in the face of the Vice President and said, 'To hell with the Senate, I will do as I please,' and he committed a crime. He hit a man over the head with a stick; he assaulted him." But the majority say, "Now, wait a minute, we are trying to preserve the purity of the Senate. You cannot throw him out except by a two-thirds vote."

Mr. President, my contention is that if the issue involves any one of the four points, whether the man is a resident of the State, whether he has been a citizen for 9 years, whether he has borne arms against the Republic, or the other qualifications, it is an issue of fact. Those qualification are plainly set down. We have a right to determine those questions by a majority vote just like we determine every other question by a majority vote. If he is an objectionable character, if he is currupt, if he is a criminal, of course, we can throw him out. We can throw him out the first day he comes here. But we would have to throw him out by the process of expulsion. There is a reason for that provision. In the other case, where it is purely a finding of fact, it requires only a majority vote. But in the case of expulsion it contains more than simply a question of fact.

The Senate cannot probe into a man's heart. It involves the question of discretion, whether we will expel him or not. Being a question purely of discretion and of will, the makers of the Constitution said:

> We will require in such a case a two-thirds vote. We do not want a narrow partisan majority of one to expel a man from the Senate of the United States.

It is true the Senate may expel him for anything. The Members of the Senate may expel him because they do not like him. They may expel him because he is not a new dealer. They may expel him because he is a new dealer. They may expel him because he does not have the right kind of a mustache. They may expel him on any ground they want to, and they can expel LANGER right now on any ground they want to, but it must be done by a two-thirds vote.

The framers of the Constitution felt that action involving the free and unhampered will of the Senate must have some bridle placed upon it; that it must have some limitation placed upon it; that it shall not be the plaything of the passion of an hour, or the impulse, or prejudice of Senators who might act tonight, and change their minds tomorrow. Therefore they said, "We will not permit the Senate to expel a man except by a two-thirds vote." Is not that a sound principle?

Mr. President, I have only 5 minutes left; I have a monitor who pulls my coat and tells me I have only 5 minutes left. I can but briefly refer to the other matters. The only reason the Senate can expel this man or put him out of here now is because he is corrupt right now. If he was a cattle thief 20 years ago Senators must believe he is a cattle thief now, and if they do they can throw him out by a two-thirds vote. If they believe he was a bribe taker 20 years ago they must believe he is a bribe taker now, and therefore is apt to corrupt the Senate. But when they do, they must throw him out by a two-thirds vote. The crime committed is a continuing one. If he was corrupt 20 years ago Senators must believe he has been corrupt all the intervening time, and that he comes into the Senate now corrupt, and being corrupt, the Senate has a right to put him out. Is there no period of forgiveness? Can the Senate not act as He acted in dealing with the accusation against the woman in the Bible, and sent her away and said, "Sin no more"? Oh, no, Mr. President, the Medes and the Persians say that principle cannot be invoked. They say that because Mr. LANGER stole a drug store as was charged in North Dakota, the Senate should stop him at the door by a majority vote.

We may expel for any cause. The Constitution does not add "or such other qualifications as either House may provide." The Constitution was founded upon the theory of the Confederation and the Continental Congress. The framers tried to carry forward into the new Constitution the fundamentals of the theories of those bodies. The Convention was called, not for the purpose of making a new Constitution, but to modify and to amend the Articles of Confederation. These negative limitations, to my mind, excluded every other limitation except those which were named, and Madison made it clear that as finally drafted the Constitution says just what we contend it says—only that the States, when they do elect, must elect one having these qualifications.

I now wish to speak of the issue of fact. Senators remember the Albert Gallatin case, which came up on the question as to whether he had been 9 years a citizen of the United States. The Senate tried that case. It was tried on an issue of fact. Senators remember the Holt case. In that case it was contended that Holt was not 30 years of age when his term began. We had a right to pass on that case by a majority vote, because in that case it was not a question of expelling him. We were trying him on the question of one of the links in his abstract of title, and not on the ground that he was corrupt.

If the power of adding to the qualification was to be given to any body by the Constitution, why did not the Constitution so provide? In another place it said that the Senate shall be the judge of its Members' qualifications. The framers of the Constitution could very easily have said right there, if they had wanted to, that "The Senate shall add to the qualifications here set out." But they did not do so. The Constitution provides that the Senate can judge of the qualifications of our Members. The Constitution says, "judge." It does not say that we can create new qualifications. If the framers of the Constitution had meant to say that we can create new qualifications, I think Mr. Madison knew enough about the English language to have said, "create qualifications." But the language of the Constitution is "to judge." What do Senators think of a judge who tries to make laws? A judge does not create any law, he does not enact any statutes. He judges the facts that are brought to him. He passes judgment on what is already laid down in the books. And when the Senate judges, it judges the fact whether a man has been 9 years a citizen, or whether he is 30 years of age, or whether he has borne arms against the Government. When the Senate judges it simply finds that the man is 30 years old, as we did in the Holt case, as the Senate did in the Gallatin case when it passed on the question as to whether he was 9 years a citizen of the United States.

When it comes to this larger question of expulsion, that is an act of self-defense, that is a saving clause which the makers of the Constitution inserted in the document, giving us the widest latitude, the widest possible power, but bridling that power, arresting that power, clothing it with caution, giving something of patience, by providing that though you can expel him for anything on earth, you can only expel him by a two-thirds vote. That is the case here. You have a perfect right—I would not say "right"—but a perfect power to expel the Senator from North Dakota because he wears a blue suit, if you want to, but when you do, you have got to do it by a two-thirds vote. You cannot expel him at the door because he wears a blue suit, because the Constitution does not require him to wear a blue suit, and it does not deny him the right to wear a blue suit. It simply says that if he is a resident of his State, if he has been legally and honestly elected, and if he has been 9 years a citizen, and is 30 years of age, he is a Senator-elect, and there is no power on God's green earth that can make him anything but a Senator, except this body, by expulsion. I do not think there is anything in the doctrine that we have to wait until after he comes in the door. I think if he committed a crime a week before he came here, the power of the

Senate is absolute and we could expel him.

In closing, let me say that, in my opinion, the facts in this case do not meet any judicial test. Senator LANGER is clothed with the cloak of innocence. He wears the badge of innocence until the presumption of innocence is overcome. I challenge any Senator to read the record and find convincing evidence which would convict Senator LANGER of any of these charges were we to pass upon the charges themselves.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, when this case came to the Senate the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. He reported to the Senate a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Senate. That resolution instructed the Committee on Privileges and Elections to examine into certain charges filed, not by the committee or by any other Member of the Senate, but by the people of North Dakota, questioning the right of Senator LANGER to a seat in the Senate.

Pursuant to that resolution the committee, for a year and 3 months, has undertaken to do what the Senate authorized and instructed it by resolution to do. During the discussion of the preliminary phases of the question, before it had been definitely determined what course the committee should pursue, the Senator from Texas said to the committee:

> I think that we have the naked power to exclude anybody just because we do not like the color of his eyes; but I think under the precedents we would not have any authority to go further than the issues that affect his character.

So far as I know and have been informed, no charge has been made against the character or conduct of Senator LANGER since he became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator repeat the statement which he read? I did not quite catch it all.

Mr. CHANDLER. The chairman of the committee said:

> I do not quite agree with Senator HATCH. I think that we have the naked power to exclude anybody just because we do not like the color of his eyes; but I think under the precedents we would not have any authority to go further than the issues that affect his character.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the chairman of the committee was the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois knew that when he heard the statement first read.

Mr. CHANDLER. In answer to a question by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] the chairman said:

> The CHAIRMAN. Awhile ago I said that I thought it was our duty to investigate the charges. I did not mean by that that if we thought that the charges were frivolous or were not worthy of considering that we had to go into those facts. We can just disregard them, but as to such charges as we should find raise an issue that goes to the title of the Senator, we will have to go into, regardless.

It has been said here by some members of the committee and by other Members of the Senate that the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections undertook to punish Senator LANGER, and that we went out of our way to get up charges against him. During the first few days of debate I thought the committee, and not the Senator from North Dakota, was on trial. On the opening day of the session when the Senator from North Dakota presented himself the statement was made by the majority leader, and not objected to by any Senator, that by a majority vote we could say to the Senator from North Dakota, "You stop at the door." That was the substance of it. However, he said:

> The better practice in such cases seems to have been to allow the Senator-elect to take the oath without prejudice, which means without prejudice to him and without prejudice to the Senate.

Then a discussion ensued between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Vice President said that the Parliamentarian had advised him that if the Senator should come in and take his seat, then the question of his qualifications could be determined by a majority vote of the Members of the Senate present at the time the vote was taken.

Mr. President, I have not tried this case on technicalities. I have tried it on the record; and on the record it is my opinion that no Senator can justify to his people, if the issue is raised in his State, a vote to condone the conduct charged—and in my opinion proved—in this case.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I decline to yield. My time is limited. The Senator from Utah consumed a week. I do not wish to engage in a discussion with him. I wish to finish my own remarks.

I tried the case on the record—not on any technicality, but on the facts presented to the members of the committee—as to whether Senator LANGER was guilty of the serious charges made against him by the people of North Dakota.

It has been said that the people of North Dakota knew about the charges and passed on them, because they were issues in the election in North Dakota. If the people of North Dakota did pass on them as issues, they decided those issues adversely to the Senator from North Dakota, because in a three-cornered race Senator LANGER received 100,000 votes; Lemke received 92,000; and a third candidate received 69,000. Together the other two candidates received 161,000 votes, and Senator LANGER received 100,000. He was elected by a minority of the voters of North Dakota in that election.

Let us see briefly what the charges are. When I undertook the case I had nothing against the Senator from North Dakota. I have nothing against him now. I wish I could have been saved service on the committee, or having to vote. I can never be persuaded to vote on another such case if it is conducted in the way in which this one has been conducted. If in the future a Senator-elect comes to the Senate with charges brought against him by the people of his own State, my opinion is that we will not get the Committee on Privileges and Elections, under a resolution of the Senate, to investigate the charges if the Senate is to say later that it has no jurisdiction and that the investigation should not have been made.

Let us see what happened. The committee voted 14 to 2 to assume jurisdiction. If I am not incorrectly informed, the Senator from Texas voted, along with 13 other members, that we had jurisdiction over this case and that we ought to proceed to investigate and reach a decision. Then the committee voted 14 to 2 that the case must be considered by the Senate under its constitutional and inherent obligation to examine the qualifications of its Members; and if I am not incorrectly informed the Senator from Texas voted for that proposition.

Finally, the committee divided 13 to 3 on the resolution—

> *Resolved*, That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

I wish to give my reason for the decision which I have reached. I dislike to vote on the question whether one of my fellow Senators has the right to sit in the Senate. Personally I have no objection to him. If I had my wish in the matter I would wish that the charges were never brought, and that he did not have to answer. So far he has not answered to the Senate, and his explanations before the committee were not satisfactory.

What are the charges? The first charge is that he and his associates tried to bribe or buy a Federal judge. To my mind that is a most serious charge. It is said that he did not do it; but he paid the money. It is said that he did not buy the judge; but he tried to do so. He and his agents tried to influence the judge to direct a verdict in a case in which he was charged with conspiracy in his own State. There is a rule of law that even if he did not do it himself, if he did it through his agents he was responsible. The Latin maxim is, "Qui facit per alium facit per se." What a man does through his agents or representatives he does himself. He did pay money to the judge's son, who was a weakling. It is said that the son did not try to influence his father. I do not know whether he did or not, but he talked about it. Then he said, "I do not think I can do much about the fixing business. I do not think, from a physical standpoint, it is a possibility that I can fix the old man." To the old man's credit, I do not think he did, but he tried; and we must either believe that $525 was paid in an attempt to bribe the judge, or we must be foolish enough to believe that Mr. LANGER'S agents paid the judge's son $525 to go to his father and tell him that a banquet was to be held in his honor when he came to North Dakota. Senators may believe that if they wish to do so. I do not believe it.

Senator LANGER took $2,000 from a widow to obtain a pardon for her son, who was in the penitentiary. He never believed that he could obtain the pardon, and never tried to obtain it; but when she sued to try to recover the money, the prisoner in the penitentiary was punished until his mother was persuaded to withdraw the suit. That is another charge which is unexplained. I cannot account for it.

It is said that the people of North Dakota are responsible for Senator LANGER. They are; but if I should vote for him I should get in the same bed with him, and accept my responsibility for him from now on. I am not willing to do it.

It is said that he sold stock to a railroad lawyer by the name of Sullivan. Sullivan is a distinguished, brilliant, and successful business man. He speculates and deals in securities and stocks; but the record shows that he bought $25,000 worth of stock without receiving the stock. So far as I know he never asked for it. It was worthless. Senator LANGER never turned the stock over to him. Nobody knows where it is now. Mr. LANGER was asked, "Where is it, Senator?" He replied, "I do not know. I wish I knew." It was not delivered. It was not transferred. It was of no value; yet Sullivan, the representative of the Great Northern Railroad, paid the Governor of North Dakota, who was chairman of the commission which supervised the rates of assessment of that railroad company in North Dakota, $25,000 for nothing. Mr LANGER got the money. Sullivan got nothing. Sullivan has been highly successful in business, but not by conducting his business in that way. No man ever made money by conducting his business the way Sullivan conducted this transaction. The railroad company's assessment was decreased the first year, and the second year it was increased $3,000,000. The contract for the stock was entered into on the 27th day of May 1937; and just before the board met to consider the assessment of the railroad company Mr. LANGER demanded and got the balance of the money—some twelve thousand dollars—from Sullivan on the worthless stock.

Let us see what he did with the money. He owed the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. on loans on his insurance. He did not put the check into the bank. He endorsed it and sent it to the insurance company, to pay his debt, and asked the insurance company to send him the balance, which it did. The balance was $4,000.

Then he sold land to Brunk. I do not know when my friend the junior Senator from Utah changed his mind, but he changed it at some time, because when we were talking about that transaction he said, "This is an irrational deal; this is an irresponsible sort of proposition." Brunk said, in reply, "Yes, sir; it is." He said, "If my good Scotch wife did not understand why I paid $56,800 for land which the appraisers said was worth $5,600, I cannot expect Senators to understand it."

The junior Senator from Utah did not understand it then. No one else understood it. Fifty-six thousand and eight hundred dollars was paid for land which, according to the appraisers, was worth $5,600; and Mr. LANGER got the money. What did Brunk and Brewer get? They were bond dealers living in Iowa. They were friends of Mr. LANGER. Brewer did not like the transaction, but Brunk wanted to help Mr. LANGER. He helped him unwisely, and not so well. He admitted wanting to contribute to him in some way. Mr. LANGER got this money.

Let us see what the bond brokers got. In 1937 and 1938 they took some $297,000 from the little counties in North Dakota, from the hard-working Scandinavian farmers in North Dakota. The Bank of North Dakota financed the transactions, and the counties could not do business except with the bond syndicate, because the Governor had the power to veto transactions. In 1937 and 1938, according to the books of Brewer and Brunk, they collected on county bonds bought from the North Dakota counties, and they were the only ones who could deal with the counties, because if anyone else tried to do so the Governor could put him out of office; and in one case he did put such a person out of office because he attempted to deal with someone else.

According to the books, they got some $297,000 from those North Dakota counties, from the poor, hard-working Swedes, Poles, Icelanders, Norwegians, and Danes. I have known some of them for 22 years. I have played baseball with them. They are frugal, thrifty, and hard working; but they could not sell their bonds except at a discount. The bank of North Dakota financed the transactions for the Governor, and Brunk and Brewer collected the money. The only thing that we can see in that transaction is that Brunk and Brewer were "kicking back" to the Governor of North Dakota $56,800.

In my opinion, it is impossible for a Governor to deal with a lobbyist for a railroad company and with bond dealers, collect $25,000 for worthless stock, collect $56,800 for land of the value of $5,600, and still be conducting the affairs of his State according to decent, honest administration. In my opinion that is impossible.

I have disregarded the fact that he "took a drug store." He did take a drug store; he took it, and took the house with it, and locked all of it up. It is said that he did not "take the jail." He did; he broke into the jail, got the keys, and scuffled with the deputy sheriff. He did all those things. He called out the militia. As the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] said, he hid in a shanty in the woods in order to evade process servers after he had called out the militia and declared martial law when he was ousted as Governor.

It is not contended that he has committed any such acts since he became a Senator; but it is contended that he performed the acts as a public official. No justification or excuse for such acts has been shown by him or by anyone who appeared for him or who testified for him.

It is not contended that they constituted decent, honest conduct of the affairs of the people of North Dakota.

The responsibility of voting for him is the Senate's. On the record I cannot vote for him. I have reached the decision which I have reached on the record, not on any technicality. I do not believe that he has any more right to a seat in the Senate than he had on the day when he appeared at the door of the Senate and we said, through the majority leader of the Senate, "Come in and sit down without prejudice to you, and without prejudice to the Senate, and we shall examine the charges." My colleague, the majority leader, said, "The charges are serious, but we shall examine them."

The Senate adopted a resolution instructing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to examine the charges; the Senate told us that we could examine them ourselves, by a subcommittee, or through investigators. We chose the latter course, because we did not want to send Senators to North Dakota on a junket, to stir up the people there. We handled the matter in the best way we could, without prejudice to Mr. LANGER. We had the investigators go quietly to the State of North Dakota and ask the people there for the truth about the whole thing. The people were surprised at some of the transactions, because they had not known about them before.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I ask the Senator to yield for just a moment; I do not want to encroach on his time.

A moment ago the Senator spoke about Senator LANGER receiving $25,000 from Brunk, in a deal for land which Brunk never had seen. The junior Senator from Kentucky said there was a mortgage on the land. I believe the record shows that there was a mortgage of $25,000 on the land. The amount of outstanding unpaid taxes and the amount of the mortgage were to be deducted from the $56,800. The whole amount was paid Senator LANGER, and he, in turn, was to pay the mortgage and the taxes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know whether the mortgage and the taxes have in fact been paid?

Mr. CHANDLER. So far as I know, they have never been paid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know anything about the mortgage; but the testimony specifically shows that when the hearings were being held, after we appointed the appraisers, one being a title examiner from Minneapolis, Minn., with 14 years' experience in the examination of titles, not a single dime of taxes had ever been paid upon a single acre of the land which was bought by Brunk during 1936 and 1937. When the title examiner made his investigation, the taxes alone on that

land were more than what the appraisers found to be the equitable value in the land.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator's statement is accurate.

I desire to conclude by saying that it is a serious matter to be called upon to vote against the right of a fellow-citizen to occupy a seat in the Senate. I wish I had not been placed in this position, and I wish I had not been a member of the committee. I hope I shall not have to be a member of such a committee in the future when cases of this sort are considered. The task is highly distasteful. However, a member of the committee has an obligation to do what the Senate directs the committee to do. We were directed to find out whether the charges were true. In this case, in my opinion, the charges against the Governor of North Dakota have been proved. If the Senate wants to keep him here in spite of the charges, I am powerless. If we could have kept him out on the opening day by a majority vote, I think it is foolish to let him come in and then require a two-thirds vote in order to get him out. The Senate will be confronted with such situations as long as its legislative life continues.

My opinion is that, for the reasons stated, we cannot justify allowing Mr. LANGER to retain a seat in the Senate. His supporters have stayed away from the record. That is not unusual for lawyers who try cases. If the facts are with them, they stick to the facts; if the law is with them, they stick to the law; and if neither is with them they tell funny stories. [Laughter.]

It has been stated that the Senate should not attempt to conduct a trial. I admit that there are better things than a Senate trial; but under the Constitution of the United States the Senate is the judge of the qualifications of its own Members. I do not think that means that the Senate shall consider only now old a Senator-elect is, what State he lives in, how long he has been a resident of the State, and whether he is a citizen of the United States. I do not think the Constitutional provision means only that. If it does, the Senate does not need a Committee on Privileges and Elections; each election year the Senate can appoint a special committee to find out whether a Senator-elect is a citizen of the United States, whether he is old enough to be in the Senate, and whether he has been living in his State long enough to qualify.

The statement has been made that when charges similar to those made against Senator LANGER—which I think it is admitted have been proved—are made against a Senator-elect, the Senate may refuse to admit him by a majority vote, but that if he is allowed to take his seat pending investigation he may thereafter be excluded only by a two-thirds majority. I do not believe that is the law of the United States. I am not willing to dodge by such a technicality the issues presented by the charges which have been made in the pending case. On the record and the facts which have been presented by the people of North Dakota, and not on the basis of any technicality, in my opinion, these serious charges have been proved against the Senator from North Dakota so fairly that I think, under the circumstances, he is not entitled to a seat in the Senate.

It has been said, "Send him back to North Dakota, and the people will elect him again." I have no objection to that; but the Senate has the responsibility of passing on the charges which have been presented; and if on this record the Senator is allowed to retain his seat, the Senate will be called upon to justify its vote.

Mr. President, faced with that responsibility I must vote with the majority of the committee, and say that under the circumstances the Senator from North Dakota is not entitled to retain his seat.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to discuss the pending question, and I should not do so now except for certain remarks made toward the conclusion of the address by the junior Senator from Kentucky, to the effect that some of the supporters of Senator LANGER have not come to his defense.

Some time ago I took it upon myself to make some inquiries of persons who I thought would be impartial in the matter of passing judgment on the character of Senator LANGER. I did not write to persons in political life; I did not write to businessmen who might have some axes to grind. I took it upon myself to write to some clergymen in the State of North Dakota whom I did not know but who, I thought, possibly could give me some information that would assist me at least in passing judgment on the character of the Senator from North Dakota, without having my judgment interfered with by the information or testimony of someone who might have an ax to grind on matters of politics. I wrote to the Reverend C. F. Strutz, of the North Dakota Conference of the Evangelical Church. He answered as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA CONFERENCE
OF THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH,
January 6, 1942.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Member, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your inquiry regarding the personal character of Senator WILLIAM A. LANGER at hand, and in response would say: (1) That I am not now and never have been in politics except as any public-spirited citizen is interested in clean politics and public welfare; (2) that I have not always favored the policies of Senator LANGER and have even opposed him at times, sharply criticizing some of his actions; especially did I disapprove of some of his associates who have now turned against him.

I think I can honestly say, therefore, that I am not prejudiced in his favor, but having said this, I want to add that I have known Mr. LANGER since the spring of 1918, when I came to Bismarck, and have had dealings with him at different times in various ways since then and have always found him fair, honest, courteous, and helpful.

He has always been the friend and champion of the downtrodden and oppressed. He has many faults, but I am speaking my honest convictions when I say that I believe he stands much higher in moral character than many of his political foes who desire to bring about his expulsion. He has many fine personal qualities of character, and I know that his family life is beautifully affectionate.

I believe it would not only be a disgrace to expel him but a tragedy as well, for I honestly think he would represent our State ably and effectively if given a fair chance.

I have confidence that our Senate will rise above the petty politics of small politicians and give the Senator and the people of North Dakota a square deal by voting to seat their chosen representative.

Very truly yours,

C. F. STRUTZ.

Mr. President, along the same line a clergyman by the name of Seibel, in answer to a letter, wrote me from Bowdon, N. Dak., as follows:

BOWDON, N. DAK., *January 5, 1942.*

Mr. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. Senator CHAVEZ: I just received your very important letter and now I have opportunity to write to some honest soul in the Senate concerning the pending case against Senator WILLIAM LANGER

I shall answer this letter as though I were standing before the courts of the most high for men will have to give account for every word they speak.

I am acquainted with Senator LANGER personally for a good many years. Prior to our acquaintance I heard many questionable stories about Mr. LANGER, so that my opinion of him was of inferior quality. But how different I have found him to be.

I first met Mr. LANGER when he was attorney general of North Dakota. In later years he became Governor of this State, and he proved to me that he was the poor people's friend and sympathetic feeling toward the aged, crippled, orphans, and widows. His favoritism toward these unfortunate ones gave him many enemies among the capitalists In spite of the fact that a great deal of money is spent to impeach Senator LANGER; the people who voted for Mr. LANGER into this honorable position are hoping they will not succeed in doing this.

During the years 1937 and 1938 it was my privilege to become more closely associated with Mr. LANGER as Governor of this State, while I served as a member on the State Pardon Board. Here I had the opportunity to work with him. I observed him closely and found him to be a gentleman in every way. During his term of office he saved the farmers millions of dollars by placing an embargo on grain and a moratorium on real estate and personal property. Many poor people's homes were saved in this way and the wealthy fear that he will continue to favor the poor while serving as Senator. The people still have the same confidence in him that they had when they voted for him. Should he be impeached and sent home, I feel sure that he will again return to the Senate by the vote of the common people.

Hoping that the Almighty will guide in this so important matter is the wishes of your humble servant. I remain,

Sincerely yours,

J. H. SEIBEL.

I have a letter from a former justice of the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, who, I believe, would be most anxious to punish anyone who was guilty. His letter is as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 28, 1942.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It will not be denied that North Dakota is entitled to be represented in the United States Senate. I desire to say a favorable word for WILLIAM LANGER,

our United States Senator from North Dakota.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Elections and Privileges seeks to disqualify our Senator from North Dakota upon the ground, generally speaking, that he is not morally fit to hold the office.

This action, if exercised, will have the effect of removing Senator LANGER from his office as United States Senator, and virtually will amount to his impeachment by the United States Senate without trial, and without those usual rights being accorded to a Senator which are recognized as fundamental in any criminal trial of a defendant for committing any crime.

Senator LANGER already has been our Senator from North Dakota with a recognized seat in your body now for over 1 year. He is not charged with the commission of any crime, and is not on trial before the United States Senate for treason, bribery, or any other high misdemeanor as specified in our Constitution providing for removal of civil officers of the United States. Already Senator LANGER has heretofore had his trial in North Dakota before our Federal court for the commission of a Federal offense, and after trial in the ordinary course of law, he has been found innocent, so that his record before your body is that of a man who is innocent of a Federal offense upon which he was charged and tried before our Federal court in our State.

I have known Senator LANGER practically since his boyhood. This dates from the time when, as a student, he took law from me when I was instructor on real property at the University Law School of North Dakota.

I know personal charges have ofttimes been hurled at Senator LANGER in his campaigns, but in spite of such political charges the voters have repeatedly elected him to offices such as attorney general for two terms, and as Governor of our State for two terms.

Senator LANGER and his outstanding family have been a credit and honor to our State, and I do not think there is any question that the moral conduct of Senator LANGER has been anything but most exemplary.

In 1917 and 1918 the undersigned was first assistant attorney general, serving as such in the office of the attorney general at Bismarck, N. Dak. In 1918 the undersigned was elected as associate justice of our supreme court, and later became chief justice of our supreme court, from which office he voluntarily retired in the year 1924 to engage in the practice of law at Grand Forks, N. Dak. At this time he is now president of the State Bar Association of North Dakota for the ensuing year.

During all the years that I have been acquainted with Senator LANGER I have been impressed with his sincerity of purpose and with the high native ability he possesses. There are many times when I have disagreed with his policies. There can be little question but that Senator LANGER possesses the personal ability to serve well as representative from North Dakota in the United States Senate. Personally, I know that for a great many years Senator LANGER has been a great friend of the poor and distressed. He believes in a fair deal for everyone.

In the first World War he made a fine record in support of our Government. It is my belief that in the existing war emergency now confronting us, Senator LANGER will become a strong supporter of our Government and its activities, as we all must be, and should be, in order that this present war be won and our democracy preserved for us.

I simply request your careful consideration of the subject matter of qualifications of our Senator WILLIAM LANGER to continue as our Senator from North Dakota. I have faith in the fairness and justice of the United States Senate which you, as a Member, do honor.

I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

HARRISON A. BRONSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to the first resolving clause of Senate Resolution 220.

Mr. MURDOCK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senate votes down the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to the original resolution, which, as I understand, would indicate that a majority of the Senators favor expulsion by two-thirds rather than exclusion by a majority, would we not then be in the same position in which we were before the amendment was voted on at all, and would we not then be called upon to vote on the original resolution as now drafted, which again presents the very same question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the first provision of it because heretofore, upon request of the Senator from Rhode Island, the two branches of the resolution were separated.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that, but my question is, if we vote down the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], which of course would indicate that the Senate insists on a two-thirds vote to expel Senator LANGER would we not then be called upon to vote on the question again under the original resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the first provision of it; yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am wondering, Mr. President, why we could not by unanimous consent substitute the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] under the first resolve in the resolution, so that after the one vote on that the matter of the two-thirds vote would be settled.

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. If we vote in favor of the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], then a majority vote may exclude the Senator from North Dakota. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. If, upon the other hand, we vote down the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, it will then require a two-thirds vote to unseat Mr. LANGER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that case, the vote would recur on the provision of the original resolution.

Mr. OVERTON. And that would require a two-thirds vote to unseat.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it seems to me that the effect of voting down the Green amendment would be to restore lines 1 to 5 of the original resolution, which comes back to the same thing as the Green amendment. I agree with the Senator from Utah that the proper procedure is to get unanimous consent for the Senator from Rhode Island in effect to amend the first branch of the resolution before we vote on it, and get that in the form in which he wants it to be, then let us vote on that, the first paragraph, then divide the question and vote on the second paragraph.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have thought all along, and have so expressed myself privately, that there was no need in the beginning to have these two resolutions yoked up together as one. The simplest plan would be to vote on the Green proposition as an independent motion, not simply as a substitute for some language in the committee resolution, because the object of voting on two propositions which are separate is in order that there may not have to be a vote on either one of them again. When we vote on one, by that vote we settle the question. In order to do that, it would be necessary to strike out the first part of the committee resolution altogether, and vote on the amendment as an independent motion, which would settle the question of two-thirds or a majority, and then, based upon that determination, we would vote on the question of exclusion or expulsion. That could only be done by offering this amendment as an independent proposal, and not simply as a substitute for the first part of the resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The purpose the Senator wants to achieve is exactly the same as mine. Once we vote on the question of a majority or two-thirds, it will be settled, and we will not again have to recur to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not see any need of voting twice on the question whether it is to be a majority or a two-thirds vote. If we adopt the Green amendment, we simply substitute it for the first part of the committee resolution, and then we have to vote on the committee resolution as a whole, and we will again be voting on the question of two-thirds or a majority hooked up with the question whether Mr. LANGER shall be seated. It is entirely conceivable that Senators may vote for or against seating the Senator who would vote the other way on this particular proposition, and the two should not be tied together.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Could not the Senator from Kentucky obviate that difficulty by a unanimous-consent agreement that the Green amendment shall be accepted as to section 1, and that then the Senate shall take a separate vote?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that could be done; in other words, by unanimous consent we could eliminate the first part of

the committee resolution and substitute the proposed amendment for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. And then vote separately on this proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. But there must be a severance if we are to vote separately.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. While I do not think the Green amendment, if adopted, would be efficacious, it is certainly designed to determine the question of the vote on the second part of the resolution—that WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to his seat. In other words, if the Green amendment should be adopted, it would then be claimed that that is determinative of the question whether the second resolve requires a majority or two-thirds vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. Of course, that is what we are trying to settle now—whether, in voting on the second part of the resolution, the Senate shall decide the question by two-thirds or a majority. These two proposals could have been brought in by the committee as separate resolutions. It was not necessary to join them. They could have been offered separately.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that thoroughly, but they were joined together because the committee thought they would make themselves stronger.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now they are trying to separate them because they do not think it makes them stronger.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee was following a precedent in a previous case in joining the two parts.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the question has already been decided, and is not now at issue. It seems to me that assuming that the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island on March 23 represents the majority view of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, we could resolve this parliamentary complication by the Senator from Rhode Island asking unanimous consent to modify the committee's resolution, in the first resolve, in the terms of his amendment offered on March 23. Then, under the provision for a division, we would vote on the modified resolution first.

Mr. BARKLEY. That can be done, but the point was raised that even after passing on the first part of the resolution, determining whether a majority or two-thirds was required, we would have a vote on the last resolution, which would in effect be voting again on that part of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No decision having yet been arrived at, the Senator from Rhode Island has the right, on behalf of the committee, to modify the resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as I made the report for the committee, there were two parts to the resolution. First, I offered an amendment in the form of a substitute for the original resolution, and asked that the two parts of it be voted on separately. The latter request was forthwith agreed to, so it is already agreed that the two parts shall be voted on separately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to modify the first provision?

Mr. GREEN. I am perfectly willing to, if that will make it easier. I understood that had already been done.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit, I suggest that he has the right to modify his original resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would simplify it merely to strike out of the original resolution all down to and including line 5, and substitute the three lines in his amended resolution for that part, and that would be what we would have a separate vote on.

Mr. GREEN. That was my original proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator offered it in the form of an amendment.

Mr. GREEN. I ask unanimous consent to make the modification myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to ask unanimous consent; he has the right to make the modification.

Mr. GREEN. I do make that modification, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that case, the question is on the first provision as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], as modified, in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 220, will be withdrawn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Kentucky that it is with the distinct understanding that we have a right to ask for a division.

Mr. BARKLEY. That has already been granted.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr McNARY. I had worked that out with the aid of the Parliamentarian in what I thought was a simpler form, but I shall not propose it, inasmuch as there has been so much controversy, and now, accepting the present proposal, do I understand that it reads—

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote?

That would be the first vote, and a vote in favor of requiring a two-thirds vote should be "No." Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is inquiring as to whether a majority vote would determine?

Mr. McNARY. I am asking if a majority should vote "no" on the pending motion, would a two-thirds vote then be required to expel the Senator from North Dakota? Is that the interpretation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would prefer to submit that question to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me it is obvious that the Senator's inquiry must be answered in the affirmative. If we vote down a resolution which says the case does not fall within the two-thirds provision, then, of course, that vote automatically results in the fact that it does require two-thirds. So a vote "nay" on this resolution is a vote for two-thirds. A vote "yea" is a vote to determine the matter by a majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That seems obvious.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the resolution upon which we are now about to vote may be stated by the reading clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, renewing my inquiry, and finally, I put it this way, if in my opinion it requires more than a majority vote, my vote will be "no"?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, from private conversation with a number of Senators I have come to the conclusion that there is still confusion with regard to the effect of this vote, and therefore I propound the following parliamentary inquiry: If a majority of the Senate should vote in the affirmative upon the pending question, would it then require a majority vote only to exclude Senator LANGER from his seat?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. An affirmative vote means that a majority vote may exclude.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And if a majority of the Senate votes in the negative on the pending question, it then follows that a two-thirds vote will be required to exclude the Senator from North Dakota; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This question, of course, is evidently complicated and has confused a number of Senators. I wish to know if the question could not be put straight before the Senate by a resolution providing that Senator LANGER is entitled to his seat in the Senate as a Senator from North Dakota. If so, it would simplify the situation. It would then not be divided into the two questions, whether we shall vote under a two-thirds rule or a majority rule, but it would give the Senate the opportunity to determine in an affirmative way, if the majority feels that way, that Senator LANGER is entitled to his seat, and would negative the proposal for a two-thirds vote. It would settle both questions in one vote. If I can get unanimous consent, I should like to have it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama has requested unanimous consent——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Do I need unanimous consent? Would not a substitute be in order to the effect that Senator LANGER is entitled to his seat?

Mr. LUCAS. I am constrained to object, because we have gone all over the parliamentary situation, and I believe everyone understands it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and vote. I vote "yea." I am not informed how the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Maryland would vote if present.

Mr. KILGORE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who, I am informed, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. NORRIS' name was called). I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that the Senator from New York is willing that I be released from that pair on this vote. Therefore, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who is still ill and confined to the hospital. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay", and if the Senator from New Hampshire were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been called to his home State on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea", and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—37

Andrews	George	Murray
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Ball	Glass	Pepper
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Bulow	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Hughes	Truman
Butler	Kilgore	Tunnell
Byrd	Lee	Van Nuys
Caraway	Lucas	Wiley
Chandler	Maybank	
Doxey	Mead	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Herring	Reynolds
Bailey	Hill	Rosier
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brown	La Follette	Spencer
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tobey
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	Overton	Willis

NOT VOTING—14

Bilbo	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Lodge	Tydings
Bunker	Norris	Wagner
Downey	Nye	Wallgren
Hatch	Smathers	

So the first branch of the committee resolution was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the second branch of the resolution, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH. Is a two-thirds vote necessary on this question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution as it reads is merely:

Resolved, That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. As I understand, Senators who are of the view that Senator LANGER is entitled to a seat should vote "nay"?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, as I understood the Senator from Kentucky, he held that, if we should adopt the first part of the resolution, automatically the judgment would be rendered.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I said that if the first part of the resolution were agreed to, then automatically that would result in a majority vote only being necessary; but if it were defeated, automatically a two-thirds vote would be required on the second part of the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move as an amendment to Senate resolution 220, in line 6, to strike out the word "not."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that changes the nature of the vote. The answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon is now reversed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Senators who desire to seat Senator LANGER should now vote "yea," and those who desire not to seat him should vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, my amendment has been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been disposed of. The Senator from Kentucky is merely clearing the minds of Senators with regard to the statement made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri was agreed to be reconsidered. It seems to me that this is a resolution to expel, which requires a two-thirds vote; and if we turn it around and declare that he is entitled to a seat, how are we to know what percentage of the vote will be required? It seems to me that the language of the resolution to expel must be in accordance with the Constitution. That is why I move that the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I agree with the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio. I shall vote for the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment

offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. As I understand, the answer to my inquiry is now the same as that originally given by the Chair, that is, that those who desire that Senator LANGER be seated should now vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; those who desire that Senator LANGER be seated should vote "nay."

The question now is on the second branch of the resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I am not advised how he would vote if he were present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and will vote. I vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from Maryland would vote if he were present.

Mr. KILGORE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] who, I am informed, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who, if he were present, would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. Referring to my former statement concerning the absence of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in Western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been called to his home State on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—30

Andrews	Barkley	Caraway
Austin	Burton	Chandler
Ball	Butler	Doxey
Barbour	Byrd	George
Glass	Lucas	Reed
Green	Maloney	Stewart
Guffey	Maybank	Truman
Gurney	Mead	Tunnell
Kilgore	Murray	Vandenberg
Lee	O'Mahoney	Wiley

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Bailey	Herring	Rosier
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	La Follette	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Walsh
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	
Gillette	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—14

Bilbo	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Lodge	Tydings
Bunker	Norris	Wagner
Downey	Nye	Wallgren
Hatch	Smathers	

So the second branch of the resolution—Senate Resolution 220—was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the resolution was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was rejected.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROVISION OF HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "without the specific approval of the Secretary of War"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 2.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The Vice President laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 27, 1942.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment numbered 2, now in disagreement, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the appropriation carries the item for the Soo Locks.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The conference report is on the War Department civil-functions bill. The House and Senate have reached an agreement with respect to all amendments except one, which is in disagreement, and the Senate has just ordred it referred to a further conference.

Mr. BROWN. What item is in disagreement?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment known as number 2, which covers, I think, six items. However, the item in which the Senator from Michigan is interested has been agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

MRS. EDDIE A. SCHNEIDER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$5,000" insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ESTATE OF MRS. EDNA B. CROOK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of the estate of Mrs Edna B. Crook, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
LLOYD SPENCER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

STRIKES IN WAR PRODUCTION PLANTS AND FREEZING OF LABOR CONDITIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as soon as I can secure a favorable opportunity, it is my purpose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054, a bill introduced by me, reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and now on the calendar, relating to strikes and the freezing of labor conditions.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting several nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Clifford E. Van Hook to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of November 1941.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy W. Ray to be consul.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Franklin Bogenrief to be postmaster at Hinton, Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anastatia E. Walsh to be postmaster at Larchwood, Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Monroe Kelly to be rear admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Marston to be major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander A. Vandegrift to be major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ARMY NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs a number of nominations in the Army. I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader, and there is no objection to immediate consideration, and I therefore ask that the nominations be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to immediate consideration? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower to be major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Troy Handy to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of St. Clair Streett to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Morris Hoge to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Bowditch Hunter to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur Bee McDaniel to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 30, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Thomas Troy Handy (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. St. Clair Streett (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Morris Hoge (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. George Bowditch Hunter, Cavalry.

Col. Arthur Bee McDaniel (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Guy W Ray to be a consul of the United States of America.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Dwight David Eisenhower

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Thomas Troy Handy
St. Clair Streett
William Morris Hoge
George Bowditch Hunter
Arthur Bee McDaniel

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY

Monroe Kelly to be rear admiral for temporary service.

MARINE CORPS

To be major generals for temporary service from March 20, 1942

John Marston
Alexander A. Vandegrift

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

R. Franklin Bogenrief, Hinton
Anastatia E. Walsh, Larchwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we lift up our hearts to Thee; hear our prayer in Thy dwelling place, and when Thou hearest, forgive. Back of the call of the human soul is the King of Glory who came from the heights of an infinite throne to the crimson depths of the cross that He might put into our breasts the rhythm of unearthly peace. Enable us to touch even the rim of that other worldliness that breaks through the spirit of a narrow vision and gathers up our motives and endeavors and bears them to the throne of grace.

Oh, that the quiet, solemn influence of these days might inspire men to lay their ambitions, their opportunities, and the needs of their souls at the footstool of divine sovereignty. His profound grief burst from His lips as He looked tearfully upon the city that would soon be prostrated in the dust of the oppressor. O Thou who art clothed with the royalty of the eternities and waiting with matchless patience, lift us into the upper spaces of spiritual aspiration. At Thine altar may we rededicate ourselves to the loyal service of the Master who came to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to open the prison to them that are bound. O Thou chosen Son of the living God, fling Thy light across the soul of this sick world that it may turn to Thee, live like Thee, and work with Thee. In our blessed Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5784. An act to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of A Surgeon's Prayer in Wartime, by Col. John J. Moorehead, of the Army Medical Corps, written by him on Christmas night at the Tripler General Hospital in Honolulu.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: To revise and extend my remarks and to include some letters with reference to farm labor, and to extend my remarks with reference to the charging of fees by unions, and to include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a circular letter written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. I desire to submit two requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two resolutions by the Indianapolis Newspaper Guild; and, second, to extend my remarks and include a telegram from Katharine Hepburn, the movie actress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHERE IS THE MONEY GOING?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in checking the record I find that in the first 263 days of the fiscal year 1941, up to March 20, the administration has spent $19,000,000,000, or an average of more than $70,000,000 per day, $2,916,666 per hour, $48,611 per minute. On March 20, 1942, expenditures were $138,000,000 per day, $5,149,200 per hour, $85,820 per minute.

If this money is for national defense and is spent wisely, the people will bear the burden without a murmur. But is it being spent wisely? Let us look at the record.

First. Excess profits on war contracts. Mr. W. S. Jack, president of Jack & Heintz, Inc., of Bedford, Ohio, makers of airplane parts, testified under oath that his company had paid out $600,000 in bonuses during last year. Adeline Bowman, secretary to the president of this company, testified that she had received in bonuses $18,295 for the first 10 weeks of this year. And all the money came from the Government.

Second. Nonessential expenditures: The records show that the Office of Civilian Defense has 69 sports coordinators to teach the people badminton, archery, billiards, code ball, miniature golf, marbles, bowling, bag punching, canoeing, and weight lifting.

In behalf of the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio, I raise my voice in criticism and protest against this wasteful expenditure of money. Let us find out who is responsible for this waste and see that it is stopped immediately.

[Here the gavel fell.]

USE OF COPPER BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1942, Special Committee No. 3 of the House Committee on Military Affairs published a report of its investigations regarding the R. E. A. and copper. This report raised somewhat of a storm of criticism at that time, but I rise now to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Nelson has banned copper to the R. E. A. for the duration of the war, and has cut 3,200 tons from the allocated supplies. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the judgment of the committee has been vindicated in this respect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. 1976) which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the bill.

TO INCREASE FLYING HOURS OF AIR PILOTS

The SPEAKFR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6799) to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it that the gentleman will make an explanation of the bill. There are a few suggestions that I would like to make in connection with it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to make an explanation.

The facts are these. There are a number of pilots on the civil aviation lines and the War Department is desirous of having these pilots or some of them for ferrying planes and for other purposes; therefore in order to do that without detriment to the service, the number of flying hours is increased from 85 to 100 a month. That will release, I think, about 240 pilots.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, because I think this bill should be adopted; but I would like to say to the membership, as the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, this bill seeks the amendment of section 401, subsections (1) (l) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act incorporated by reference the so-called Decision 83 of the National Labor Board rendered in 1934. The issue involved was in an action by the air-line pilots over wages.

In making this decision the Labor Board found that the maximum number of hours to be flown by a commercial airline pilot in any 1 month should be 85, and it is that limitation which the bill seeks to change. It will release a number of pilots for military service. At this point, in order that the House may understand it, I want to say that the limitation of 85 hours was to prevent technological unemployment rather than to prevent unsafe conditions of operation on the air lines, and in support of that I read from the decision:

> The industry is on the threshold of technological improvements which will greatly accelerate the speed of airplane travel and which may result in some technological unemployment. The increase of speed will either greatly increase the mileage covered by the pilots or materially reduce their monthly hours of employment.

There is no question but what the Army needs trained flyers and it should have them if the interest of safety will not be adversely affected. I think it is clear that the interests of safety will not be affected.

At no time has any Government agency found that the 85-hour limitation is necessary in the interest of safety. The civil air regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board provide 100 hours as the monthly maximum for pilots.

Just one thing more. When the representative of the Air Line Pilots Association was before the committee he said he did not have definite authority to make any commitments for his organization, but that the matter had been discussed, and it was not contemplated that the pilots would ask for anything other than straight time for the additional 15 hours of flying time that would be granted under the maximum that will be provided in this bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the bill is all right, and it is proper for the civilian pilots who are in the Reserve Corps to serve in this emergency. There is only one observation I care to make, however. I understand that a few of these civilian pilots, who are Reserve officers in the Army, have already been called into active service. Some of them have been called without giving adequate notice. In other words, I understand that in a few instances they were notified to report within 3 days.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is a matter which should be taken up with the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to briefly make a statement about this legislation.

The provisions of this bill, H. R. 6799, are temporary in character and operative concurrently with the prosecution of the present war. The bill does not amend any of the provisions of existing law, but it does suspend for the duration of the war the limitation contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, under which the maximum number of flying hours of air pilots is fixed at 85 hours per month.

This standard requirement of 85 flying hours per month for air pilots was fixed through a decision of the National Labor Board under date of May 10, 1934, which is identified as decision No. 83, of the National Labor Board. The provisions and terms of that decision as they affect air-line pilots were carried into statutory law by enactment of paragraph (1) of subsection (l) of section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which reads:

> Every air carrier shall maintain rates of compensation, maximum hours, and other working conditions and relations of all of its pilots and copilots who are engaged in interstate air transportation within the continental United States (not including Alaska) so as to conform with decision numbered 83 made by the National Labor Board on May 10, 1934, notwithstanding any limitation therein as to the period of its effectiveness.

This bill results from the voluntary offer of the pilot members of the Air Line Pilots Association, as their contribution to the Nation's war effort, to waive this provision of law relating to monthly maximum number of flying hours and consent to flying 15 additional hours per month, or a maximum of 100 flying hours per month, under regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

During the hearings on this bill before the committee, Mr. David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, stated on behalf of the pilot members of that association—

> The pilots feel they want to do what they can for their country in its hour of dire need, we are willing to defer the effects of the 85-hour limitation and to fly with no limitation on flights that are purely for military purposes for the duration of the war.

Brig. Gen. Donald H. Connolly, Military Director of Civil Aviation, has stated:

> The pilots are making a patriotic gesture by volunteering to work these extra hours.

Mr. Charles I. Stanton, Acting Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, has stated publicly that—

> Behncke didn't act on his own but consulted the pilots' unit representatives. The pilots approved it. Verbally and in writing we have received promises of their fullest cooperation, and I am sure that we can count upon it.

The bill provides for certain flexibility with regard to the extra 15 flying hours which the pilots agree to work. Authority is given to the Civil Aeronautics Board by regulations: First, to fix the maximum number of flying hours at less than the 100 hours provided for by the bill if the Board, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy finds that, as to 1 or more air carriers, the flying of 100 hours is not required for military needs of the armed forces; and second, to authorize the flying beyond the maximum of 100 hours to such extent as may be found necessary to complete a particular flight for military purposes.

No opposition to the bill was expressed during the hearings before the committee. Unanimity of support has been expressed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Army air forces, the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy, and the Bureau of the Budget.

The early enactment of the bill is of emergency importance to the prosecution of our war efforts. The committee recommends its prompt passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the maximum flying hours in interstate air transportation prescribed by paragraph (1) of section 401 (l) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, shall be 100 hours of flying per month: *Provided*, That, to the extent the Civil Aeronautics Board finds, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy or their designated representatives, that the maximum hereinabove prescribed is not required by reasons of the military needs of the armed forces of the United States, the Board may fix, from time to time, by regulation applicable to 1 or more air carriers, the maximum flying hours at less than 100 hours: *Provided further*, That the Board, in accordance with such procedure as it may prescribe, may authorize the maximum flying hours hereinabove provided for to be exceeded to the extent necessary to complete a particular flight for military purposes.

SEC. 2. Every air carrier shall comply with the regulations fixed by the Board hereunder. The powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to the enforcement of the Civil Aeronautics Act shall be available to it in the enforcement of this act, and the penalties prescribed in section 902 (a) of that act shall be applicable to violations of this act or any regulation issued thereunder.

SEC. 3. This act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "(1)" and insert "(l)."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "with", insert "the provisions of this act and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the removal of the monthly 85-hour limitation for air-line-pilot flying and the substitution of 100 hours therefor subject to further discretionary relaxation, as provided by H. R. 6799, will very substantially increase the manpower hours of air-line pilots. The merits of this bill are self-evident.

No one is able to state the exact number of hours of increased service that will result from this change in the law. The estimate that the increased service will equal that of three or four hundred air-line pilots, as now in operation, is dependent upon the increased number of such pilots who will be engaged in flying either in the regular air-line service or in the additional war service in which these pilots will engage.

In any event, the change of the law will make a very useful and a very substantial contribution to transport service both by the air lines and in support of our country's war effort.

This is perhaps the first instance during this war in which an organized group of employees has voluntarily come forward and in the interest of national defense supported a change in the law to authorize additional hours of service and that without any hourly increase or overtime pay. This is a commendable action that deserves recognition. It can be said, also, that the air-line carriers and the pilots and copilots have voluntarily heretofore agreed upon terms of employment more favorable to the operating pilots than that required by law.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. LANHAM, BELL, and HOLMES.

CASES UNDER THE EXPEDITING ACT OF FEBRUARY 11, 1903

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6005) to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005) entitled "An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

SEC. 3. In any action in a district court wherein the action of three judges is required for the hearing and determination of an application for interlocutory injunction and for the final hearing by reason of the provisions of section 266 of the Judicial Code, the Act of October 22, 1913, chapter 32, or the Act of August 24, 1937, chapter 754, section 3 (being, respectively, sections 380, 47 and 380a of title 28 United States Code), or the Act of February 11, 1903 (32 Stat. 823; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, section 28 and title 49, section 44), as amended by section 1 of this Act, any one of such three judges may perform all functions, conduct all proceedings, except the trial of such action, and enter all orders required or permitted by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States in effect at the time, provided such single judge shall not appoint, or order a reference to a master, or hear and determine any application for, or vacation of, an interlocutory injunction, or dismiss the action, or enter a summary or final judgment on all or any part of the action: *Provided, however*, That any action of a single judge hereby permitted shall be subject to review at any time prior to final hearing by the court as constituted for final hearing, on application of any party or by order of such court on its own motion."

And on page 2, lines 2 and 3, of the House engrossed bill, after "1903" strike out "(U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 49, sec. 44)" and insert "(32 Stat. 823; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, section 28 and title 49, section 44)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. MCLAUGHLIN,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
TOM CONNALLY,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005) entitled "An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the bill adds a new section to H. R. 6005. This new section is retained, in substance, in the amendment agreed to by the conferees. Such new section added by the Senate amendment was substantially the provisions of H. R. 4812 which passed the House on February 2, 1942, which pertained to other three-judge courts, the purpose of which bill was to authorize a single judge to handle preliminary matters. Section 1 of H. R. 6005 relates to the composition of the expediting court. The Senate undertook to include the expediting court authorized by the act of February 11, 1903, as such a three-judge court where a single judge might also be authorized to handle preliminary matters. The language used, however, referred back to section 1 of the bill (relating only to expediting courts under the act of February 11, 1903, as one would have defeated the purpose of H. R. 4812 by limiting to that type of three-judge court the authority for a single judge to dispose of preliminary matters whereas H. R. 4812 was intended to apply to the various other three-judge courts. The amendment agreed to by the conferees would include expediting courts under the act of February 11, 1903 as one of the several three-judge courts where a single judge may handle preliminary matters.

The conferees retained language of the Senate amendment making it clear that a single judge of a three-judge court should not conduct the actual trial. It is believed that H. R. 4812 as it passed the House would not have permitted a single judge to conduct the trial, but in order to make it clear of any doubt, the conferees retained the Senate language providing that a single judge may not actually conduct the trial.

The conferees have agreed to a clarification in the bill of a citation to the United States Code.

The Senate amendment to the title is appropriate to the action agreed upon in conference and the House recedes from its disagreement thereto.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. MCLAUGHLIN,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The bill (H. R. 6005) is a bill to provide that in cases arising under what is known as the Expediting Act, which up to this time have required the action of a court composed of three judges of the circuit court of appeals, the court henceforth may be composed of three judges only one of whom shall be required to be a member of the circuit court of appeals. This will relieve the circuit court of appeals by permitting the use of district judges in three-judge court cases under the Expediting Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous conference report?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is a unanimous conference report.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It was.

Mr. MICHENER. It is somewhat technical, but it will be a very effective law and will expedite the trial of cases and possibly obviate the necessity of having additional judges.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is entirely correct.

I may say for the purpose of the record, not to consume any extraordinary length of time but to make definite the statement, that this bill, H. R. 6005, is in effect a combination of H. R. 6005 and H. R. 4812, both of which bills passed the House after a unanimous report by the Committee on the Judiciary. They were passed as independent bills in the House. In the Senate they were

combined in one bill. The House conferees took the position that the combination bill was drawn in such a way that it did not accomplish the intended purpose. The members of the Committee of Conference on the part of the House pointed this out in the conference. The Senate accepted our version and the Senate adopted the conference report. The bill comes before us now in what we consider to be proper form as unanimously agreed to by the conferees of both the House and the Senate.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, from my distinguished colleague, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary after a very careful consideration of the measure. If this bill is finally passed and becomes a law, it will relieve the tension very materially as far as judges of the circuit court of appeals are concerned with regard to actions of the character mentioned. It will make possible the use of two district Federal judges to sit with one circuit court judge. This measure is needed, and it will expedite the procedure materially.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Indiana, a very valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary has stated the situation correctly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short radio speeches on the sale of Defense bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram which is similar to a number of others protesting against the curtailment of rural mail routes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on the capital-gains tax bill made by a former Member of the House, Mr. Pettengill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA SALES TAX

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I again want to answer my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] in connection with his bill to prevent the State of California from collecting its 3-percent sales tax. This gentleman says this bill "will not take away from California one right that it has had," but in the same sentence he says, "But it will prevent the State of California from levying taxes on money that is being spent by the Government through contractors, subcontractors, and material men." And right below he states that by the enactment of his bill $40,000,000 will be taken away from California.

I think we in California know more about the financial structure of that State than does the gentleman from Missouri, and we know that this bill will wreck the State of California. About the only real effect this bill would have would be to place in the pockets of the contractors, subcontractors, and material men far more profits. These will not be passed on to the Government. If the discussion of some of these profits as disclosed by the gentleman from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, is any criterion, you may see how the United States Government is going to come off.

Why should the gentleman from Missouri or the Federal Government at any time tell the State of California what it can or cannot tax? This is an absolute violation of the sovereignty of the State of California and its State's rights, and is an attempt on the part of the Federal Government to tell California what it can do with respect to taxes. So far as I am concerned, the Federal Government will never step its foot over the State line of California to violate that sovereignty, and I hope the Members of this House will kill the Cochran bill if it ever comes before this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF THE 40-HOUR WORKWEEK

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable argument over the air and through the press as to where our protests for the suspension of the 40-hour workweek are coming from.

This morning I took occasion to carefully analyze and classify the first delivery of my morning mail. I give you the results:

For suspension: Organizations, 8; wholesale company, 1; insurance company, 1; Housewives, 9; mining company, 1, petitions, 2; threats, 1; farmers, 8; businessmen, 15; laborers, 5; professional men, 2; officeholders, 3.

Against any change: 1 petition, 4 names; 2 wires, labor organizations; 1 letter, labor organization.

This makes a total of 56 in favor of suspending the 40-hour workweek and 4 against any change in labor legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions passed by certain mass meetings held in the Sixth Congressional District of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a recent article by Frank Kent in which he defends Mr. Jesse Jones against criticism of being in any way responsible for the rubber situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CHEHALIS, WASH., IS ON THE ALERT

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have many fine patriotic com-

munities in my district and I am particularly proud of the progressive city of Chehalis in Lewis County.

According to a telegram I have just received from my friend and prominent civic leader, Mr. Clarence Ellington, Chehalis, with a population of 5,000, has oversubscribed its campaign to raise $55,000 for the purchase of a P–40 pursuit plane in 9 days of the 2 weeks. Continuing the campaign the surplus raised is to be used for specialized equipment for the plane. This is a basis of $9.16 per capita.

A still better record is the total sale of war bonds in Chehalis. To this date bonds amounting to $360,000 have been sold, which is $72 per capita.

Chehalis, which is one of the first communities which the Japanese are likely to invade, according to Homer Lea and the military experts, if they attempt an invasion of the Pacific coast, challenges any other community in the United States to excel this record and invites Tokyo to take notice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SALES TAX IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand it is being discussed to recess for 2 weeks; so my purpose is to enter a protest against taking an Easter recess.

I have heard it said, "I want to go home and see how my people feel toward certain national problems." Well, for me, I can definitely say I know; that the majority of my people have listened, they have thought, they have drawn their conclusions, they demand less speeches, more action, and with fervent prayers they are asking we gear our industries to operate 24 hours a day and at the same time eliminate all nondefense spending.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MONOPOLISTIC CORPORATIONS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, synthetic rubber, we now learn, could not be developed here because of an agreement between Standard Oil of New Jersey and the German Dye Trust. Already we have been told how expansion of metals has been interfered with for the same kind of reasons. In my judgment, the worst bottleneck we have, so far as increasing American war production is concerned, is the shortage of certain metals, and other necessary products due to opposition on the part of some monopoly corporations which, as Thurman Arnold yesterday said, even went to the extent of agreements between those monopoly corporations and some German corporations. I point out that it is monopoly which strikes hardest at the vitals of any democratic action, and any democratic economic order. For monopoly means restriction of production and only the most ingenious action can break its hold. I am not one to apologize for things that may be wrong in the ranks of labor or any other group, nor do I say that we should not correct them, but I do say that the serious, effective bottleneck is not in labor but is here in these restrictions that have existed and in some respects still exist, and I commend the action of Mr. Arnold and his associates for bringing it so forcibly to the attention of the country. If we are to have full production 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, there cannot be tolerated any attempts on the part of monopolies to preserve their monopoly position at the expense of the fullest expansion of production that our war production requires.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and resolution from the American Legion of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I obtained consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Louis M. Lyon. It has been called to my attention that it exceeds three pages and would cost $105 more. I ask unanimous consent that the article be included, nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6736, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "without the specific approval of the Secretary of War"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 2.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $66,802,500 for rivers and harbors, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $57,502,500, as proposed by the House, the increase of $9,300,000 applying entirely to the construction of lock and auxiliary works at Sault Ste. Marie on the St. Marys River, Mich., for which a Budget estimate has been presented (H. Doc. 658).

Amendment No. 3: Changes the effective date of the provision with respect to preliminary examinations and surveys conducted, pursuant to law, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Amends the provision with respect to the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles by Federal agencies, other than the Executive Office and the Military and Naval Establishments, so as to make all purchases or exchanges subject to the specific approval of the Secretary of War.

Amendment in disagreement

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendment of the Senate:

Amendment No. 2, relating to flood control, general.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, there is 1 hour allowed on the conference report, is there not?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to use it.

Mr. POWERS. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to use it. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. As I understand it, there is 1 hour of debate, if we so desire, on the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. SNYDER. That is correct.

Mr. POWERS. It is not my intention to take very much time on the report itself. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. There is also 1 hour of debate on Senate amendment No. 2. Is that correct?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. POWERS. Assuming that we do not use the hour on the conference report, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me one-half of his hour on Senate amendment No. 2?

Mr. SNYDER. I will yield the gentleman as much time as we consume on this side. I do not think it is customary to yield time en bloc to the other side on a conference report.

Mr. POWERS. If you have 1 hour, you say you will yield to me as much time as you use?

Mr. SNYDER. I will yield to individuals on your side as much time as we use.

Mr. POWERS. We want a half an hour on this side. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The rule is to divide the time between the proponents and opponents, regardless of their political affiliations.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The rule is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will have control of all the time.

Mr. SNYDER. I will yield as much time to the proponents as I do the opponents.

Mr. POWERS. Then you will yield half an hour to the opponents and a half an hour to the proponents?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That is satisfactory.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not suppose very many are interested in this, but if you will listen to this statement perhaps we will not require much debate. We had a great deal of debate on the controversial questions when this bill was considered in the House. I do not see any reason why we should have a great deal of debate after this statement.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate placed four amendments on the bill. The statement just read by the Clerk explains the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees on amendments 1, 3, and 4.

The remaining amendment, No. 2, is returned in disagreement. This accords with the arrangement entered into on yesterday when we agreed to the conference asked by the Senate.

I should like to say a word about this amendment No. 2.

It relates solely to the total amount to be appropriated for flood control, general.

The House approved a total of $128,273,700.

The Senate increased that amount by $23,789,000.

That increase applies to six projects, and I think the House should know what they are:

First. The Bull Shoals Reservoir project, in Arkansas, $16,700,000.

Second. The Table Rock Reservoir project, in Missouri, $2,016,000.

Third. The Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla., flood-control project, $213,000.

Fourth. Clearing and snagging work, Salt and Gila Rivers, Ariz., $50,000.

Fifth. Mermentau and Vermillion Rivers, La., flood-control project, $970,000.

Sixth. Readying authorized flood-control projects for building up a reservoir of work available for immediate prosecution to cushion post-war adjustment, $3,750,000.

The House considered the Bull Shoals and Table Rock Reservoir projects and rejected them.

The House did not have the Oklahoma, Arizona, or Louisiana projects before it. They are all authorized projects, but are not supported by Budget estimates, and, of course, the House provided for projects—three projects, without Budget estimates. The Oklahoma project has a munitions defense plant protection justification. The Arizona and Louisiana projects are urged for giving protection from floods to agricultural areas.

For building up a backlog of worthwhile post-war projects, the House provided $1,000,000.

I want the membership to have this information before it is called upon to act upon the amendment in disagreement, which is the next step after the conference report shall have been adopted.

The Senate increase involves all of the projects I have named.

At the proper time I shall move to insist upon our disagreement to the amendment of the Senate. I shall do so because of the parliamentary situation. I favor the Bull Shoals project; I think there is much merit in the Oklahoma project, and I should like immensely to vote for the project designed to ease the post-war readjustment. Next to winning the war, I can conceive of nothing of greater importance. It will be a hollow victory, indeed, if we are not ready to make the most of it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman tell us on which of these six items that are included in this proposition, the Senate held hearings?

Mr. SNYDER. All of them.

Mr. TABER. All of them?

Mr. SNYDER. They so stated in their hearings that they had.

Mr. TABER. Does it refer to all of these items?

Mr. SNYDER. It does, sir.

Mr. TABER. As to the Oklahoma item, is it not true that an appropriation was made for this current fiscal year for that item and that the funds therefor have been impounded by the President and the Treasury, and the work has not been allowed to go on?

Mr. SNYDER. My impression is that there was an appropriation of $300,000 made for that as of the past fiscal year, and that it was impounded, and that this is merely asking for $213,000 more, making a total of $513,000 which it was stated in the hearings—at least, it was stated before the conference committee, would do the job.

Mr. TABER. When the President and the Budget thought that the project had so little merit that they have impounded the funds that have already been appropriated for the project?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I am not here to make specific argument for that project, but it is my duty to state that in the conference the gentleman who was advocating this said that a number of Army factories had sprung up along here that needed this protection. That is what they gave to the conference committee. It was a report similar to what we have done at Louisville, Ky. The funds were impounded there last year, but the Army moved in and built a lot of plants right down along the river and, as a protection, we allowed that money so that they could build whatever was necessary at the river to protect those plants. It was stated to us in conference that this was a similar situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice that the amount of money allocated for the construction of the extra lock at Soo, Mich., has been increased by $1,300,000?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DONDERO. No figure has ever been presented to the Rivers and Harbors Committee in excess of $8,000,000. I wondered what that extra $1,300,000 was for.

Mr. SNYDER. As we understood there was a situation up there that made it very essential that the work be done and be done right away. It required this amount of money to do it.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it for some item outside of that extra lock at the Soo?

Mr. SNYDER. No; no item outside of general project.

Mr. DONDERO. What I am wondering is where the increase comes in above the $8,000,000 that was presented to the

Rivers and Harbors Committee as the cost of that extra lock.

Mr. SNYDER. I cannot give the gentleman details, only to say that it must be looked at from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. DONDERO. This is the first time I have seen the figure $9,300,000 mentioned in connection with the item.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. I understand the extra amount is for auxiliary work in connection with the lock.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. It was my understanding that all work in connection with the lock was not to exceed $8,000,000. That was the testimony before the House committee; and I am wondering what the additional amount is for.

Mr. TERRY. The estimate is $9,300,000, including that extra work, as I understand it.

Mr. DONDERO. Some other work outside the lock?

Mr. TERRY. Yes; auxiliary work.

Mr. SNYDER. No.

Mr. DONDERO. I would like to know what that work is.

Mr. SNYDER. I cannot give the details.

Mr. TERRY. It is in connection with this work, as I understand, and was approved by the Director of the Budget when they sent the estimate up here.

Mr. DONDERO. There seems to be some confusion about this additional amount. I do not want in any way to disclose any defense matters, but I would like to know and I believe the House would like to know why the extra $1,300,000 is necessary.

Mr. SNYDER. I believe the gentleman will find that in the Senate hearings. The gentleman understands this was put in by the Senate.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that to be so.

Mr. SNYDER. As members of the House committee, therefore, we would not know the details of this.

Mr. POWERS. Before the gentleman moves the previous question, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and I also would like to have some time.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be pleased to yield to these gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, as this bill comes back to us from the Senate we find they have added $33,089,000. It is certainly pretty tough to see the bill treated in this manner, especially when we in the House of Representatives are trying to cut down on nonessential Government expenditures, to have the other body try to force us to spend for items that are not essential to the winning of the war. I refer particularly to the item in disagreement which will be considered after we have disposed of the conference report, $16,700,000 for Bull Shoals, and $2,106,000 for Table Rock in Arkansas and Missouri. These two items will cost us eventually $87,000,000 and not by the wildest stretch of the imagination can they be considered war functions. In the first place it will take between 3 and 4 years to complete.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Not now.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman should be fair in his statement.

Mr. RICH. If I have made a misstatement, the gentleman from Arkansas may correct it. I am stating the situation as I see it. And I am not making a misstatement.

The House of Representatives is now asked to obligate the Treasury for $18,000,000 or $19,000,000, the expectation being to come back later for further appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is about time that either we in the House of Representatives woke up or that the people back home woke up to the things we are trying to do. Personally, I believe the people back home are waking up.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. Is it not true that when these projects were considered in the House they were turned down?

Mr. RICH. That is right; exactly so. They were turned down at one time. We are now faced with this situation again, and it is up to us in the House of Representatives to turn them down again.

Mr. HAINES. Is my colleague certain that these projects are necessary or will contribute to national defense?

Mr. RICH. In 1945 or 1946 they may get some power out there, but in my thinking it seems to me there are so many things of greater importance facing us now that we should not even consider these. We shall have up for consideration before the day is finished another bill calling for the appropriation of $18,000,000,000. You heard it reported this morning. We have already appropriated for war over $90,000,000,000, almost all the money we can possibly spend during the whole year 1942, working 24 hours a day making things that are vital to the welfare of this Nation and the winning of this war. That is our first duty, our first obligation. Win the war; that is our first duty and our first obligation.

Mr. HAINES. Is there anything in the hearings that indicates a real need that this money be appropriated at this time?

Mr. RICH. May I say that you and I, as hard as we try to work, cannot do anything. We have worked hard for the last few weeks. I had to go to bed at 8:30 last night in order to be in the office at 9 o'clock this morning. We did not get these hearings until about 15 or 20 minutes ago. How can we look through them? We have to go to appropriation committee at 11 o'clock and pass on an appropriation bill for $18,000,000,000. It is humanly impossible to do these things. Work as hard as you can from 8 o'clock in the morning till 11 o'clock at night.

Mr. HAINES. I want to commend my colleague for his splendid work. May I say I am in entire accord with the statement he makes.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Because these items are to be spent in the district of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], and because he is working day and night to have this passed, I am forced to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to know what time the gentleman had to go to bed last night to get here today?

Mr. RICH. I had to go to bed at 8:30 last night because I have been working for 4 weeks long, long hours. I am about played out and I cannot take it much longer. I am going to tell you, some of you gentlemen have got to work a little longer or we are going to wreck this Nation. We want more work and less play. More work or less pay.

Mr. TERRY. More work and less talk.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the same old story. The Appropriations Committee of the House and the House tried to do a job in cutting down nondefense expenditures. Then the bill goes to another body and is raised, as usual In my 10 years' experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee I do not recall having received a bill back in the House from the other body that had not been raised. This is just another glaring example of what is happening on the other side of the Capitol. Where in the world this economy bloc was when the bill passed the Senate is beyond me.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the gentleman aware of the fact there is a report in the Power Division of the War Production Board that the Government's power program by 1944 will result in a 70-percent power surplus over all of the domestic and war needs of the Government as those war needs have been furnished to the War Production Board?

Mr. POWERS. I was not aware of that fact. That is a very interesting contribution the gentleman has made.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that information has also come to me, in addition to the information just stated, that these two particular projects, Bull Shoals and Table Rock, will add a needless part of that surplus power. It is also reported that there is absolutely no war need for these projects in that particular territory of the country today. Further, I think it is important for the Members of the House to know that there has been an attempt to suppress this report until the bill we are now considering can be passed by the Congress I think that borders on being scandalous.

The Senate has put these two projects back in, and by putting them back in they are reestablishing appropriations in excess of $87,000,000, the ultimate expense involved in the construction of these two dams; this, after the House has cut them out of the bill.

I am hopeful that the House will repeat its action of a few days ago and strike from the report of the conference committee Senate amendment No. 2 which includes these particular projects that I have just mentioned.

Mr. POWERS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to take some time, through the kindness of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, on Senate amendment No. 2. When the House votes on Senate amendment No. 2 it is voting a commitment of $100,000,000. One hundred million dollars is the commitment that we are going to vote on in a very, very short time. I shall reserve further remarks until I obtain my time on Senate amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 7, line 5, strike out "$128,273,700" and insert "$152,062,700."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TERRY moves to recede and concur in the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The amendment is not in order at this time. If an amendment of this kind is to be offered to recede and concur with an amendment, it must be after the House has voted to recede.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recede and concur takes precedence at this point.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated very well by the chairman of the subcommittee, when this bill went to the Senate that body put in four items in addition to the Bull Shoals and Table Rock items, which were up for discussion in the House when the bill was before this body.

Much has been said about Table Rock and Bull Shoals not being completed for several years. It was stated in the House that these projects would not be in operation until too late to serve in this war, yet the engineers have told you that Bull Shoals will be in operation in the latter part of 1944 and that the Table Rock hydro will be in operation in the spring of 1945.

Mr. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in a letter which was read in the House, states this:

These projects are essential parts of a program of power supply for the war effort in the region which comprises the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, most of Oklahoma and Texas, part of Missouri, and the westerly portion of Mississippi. This program includes existing generating facilities, new steam-electric units on order by the utilities, new generating capacity on order to serve aluminum and magnesium loads, and existing and other proposed hydroelectric projects.

A summation of the existing assured capacity, after allowance for minimum reserves, in this region, including new steam-electric units on order by utilities for installation this year and the new industrial generating capacity on order for installation in 1942 and future years, is 269,000 kilowatts less than the estimated power requirements in 1943, 322,000 kilowatts less in 1944, 419,000 kilowatts less in 1945 and 483,000 kilowatts less than estimated requirements in 1946. These deficiencies must be made up by a combination of additional steam-electric and hydroelectric generating capacity.

As you know, the limitations on the manufacturers to produce land turbines have become increasingly serious on account of the necessity of pushing, to the fullest extent, the naval and maritime ship program. The same manufacturing capacity is utilized for the production of land and marine turbine equipment. For this reason it is especially desirable to install, in areas where the possibilities for the development of hydroelectric power exists, all of the hydro equipment that can be obtained, subject to the limitations of manufacture. By following this procedure, manufacturing capacity for the production of land turbine equipment can be utilized for areas where the possibilities for the production of hydro power do not exist.

This power is needed by the country at this time in the development of the war program. There is no doubt about it. We know the war will not be over this year, but we do not know whether the war will be over even in 1944 or 1945.

Some of the Members of this House who are now criticizing the development of power which is needed at this time by the Government, when the War Department program came on the floor for the 5,500 airplane program 3 years ago, in June 1939, fought that program at that time, because, they said, "You cannot tell us we are going to have a war." They further said, "The President of the United States is a warmonger and is using the foreign war propaganda to conceal and divert attention from domestic problems."

Yet within 3 months after they were trying to defeat the expansion of the airplane program, we had a war in Europe. From that day on, it has been conclusively demonstrated that more and more airplanes are necessary; that we cannot win battles on land or sea without air superiority.

The President of the United States has asked you for these dams. The President had a supplemental Budget estimate sent down to include the Table Rock and Bull Shoals projects as being necessary for the production of power for the war program. I do not see how gentlemen can get up on this floor and say, "We would vote for these projects if they were necessary for power for war production, but we do not know when the war will be over. These dams may be in operation too late for the war." You do not know when the war will be over, and I do not know it. The President of the United States does not know it. Nobody knows.

I ask you to agree to my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Baldwin	Gifford	O'Day
Barry	Gillette	Osmers
Beam	Gore	O'Toole
Bender	Harris, Va.	Pace
Bennett	Healey	Patrick
Bishop	Hébert	Patton
Boehne	Holmes	Pfeifer,
Bolton	Hook	Joseph L.
Brooks	Houston	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Jarrett	Richards
Buck	Johnson,	Robertson,
Buckler, Minn.	Lyndon B.	N. Dak.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kelly, Ill.	Romjue
Burch	Kennedy,	Sacks
Burdick	Martin J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Byron	Kennedy,	Schulte
Cannon, Fla.	Michael J.	Shannon
Capozzoli	Keogh	Sheridan
Celler	Kilburn	Short
Clark	Kleberg	Smith, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Klein	Stratton
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Kramer	Tolan
Delaney	Lambertson	Vreeland
Dies	Lewis	Wadsworth
Domengeaux	McGranery	Walter
Douglas	McKeough	Weiss
Eliot, Mass.	Maciejewski	Welch
Flannagan	Magnuson	Wilson
Gale	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gavagan	Mitchell	Worley
Gearhart	Mundt	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are items in here involving $22,000,000. The first one relates to Bull Shoals Reservoir, the second one to Table Rock Reservoir, both of which were thrown out by the House about 10 days ago, when we had the War Department bill up.

These reservoirs are designed, alleged, to promote flood control on the White River in Arkansas, and are power projects in disguise, but they are power projects that cannot be put on an efficient basis. In other words, the engineer testified that the cost of producing power at the plant would be 3.2 mills, as against an average coal cost, which is generally known in regions that are supplied plentifully with coal, of about 2 mills. This means that the power is high-priced power and that if it is going to compete and be transmitted, it is going to be expensive power.

There is a coal plant of considerable size under construction at the present time, which will come out quite a little ahead of this plant, and these two plants cannot possibly be completed before early 1945 or 1946. Both of them are opposed by the Conservation Commission of Missouri. It seems to me it is a waste of money for us to go ahead at this time

with an enormous program of $22,000,000 when Mr. Churchill tells us that the tide is turning against us in the Atlantic. This was his announcement yesterday. Is it not time for us to wake up and quit monkeying around and get right down to the war effort and quit going into things we cannot possibly have done in time to be of use in our war effort?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Are these dams to be used in a series of dams any of which are now operating?

Mr. TABER. They are new dams and the authorization is $49,000,000 and the cost of the two dams will be $90,000,000, or about double the authorization.

Mr. MICHENER. What I am getting at is whether they are to be used in connection with a series of dams, where the same water goes over more than one dam, thereby producing additional power without additional cost.

Mr. TABER. There may be other dams on the river. I cannot tell the gentleman about that. I will leave that to the members on the subcommittee; but these two dams are supposed to a certain extent to go together, although there was no Budget estimate for the Table Rock proposition.

There are four other items in here, including the Tulsa, Okla., item, where there was previously an appropriation of $300,000, which has been impounded by the President and the Director of the Budget and the Treasury, and is not to be used.

Why should we put any more money into that proposition? There was an item for clearing and snagging the Salt and Gila Rivers, on which there were no hearings, and no one can tell anything about it. There was an item for Louisiana, and the engineers were not called in or asked to give testimony, and that amounted to $970,000. Then there was an item of $3,750,000 for planning, and after hearings the subcommittee only allowed $1,000,000. They did that when they knew what they were talking about. If we have our engineers chasing all over the country trying to get up new projects when there are millions and millions of projects already surveyed, we are going to interfere with the war effort and cloud our efforts to get things done so that we can support the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will reject the motion to recede and concur.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was before the Flood Control Committee I appeared before that committee in opposition to both dams. When the flood-control bill was brought in I spoke in opposition to both projects. When this bill was before the House I spoke in opposition to the projects. I merely mention this to show that I have been consistent in my opposition to the Bull Shoals and Table Rock Dams. The House refused to include the projects in the bill before it went to the Senate. Read the Senate hearings and see if you find any justification in favor of restoring the projects. Read the Senate report and see if you find one word in justification of these projects.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I will not. Answer in your own time; I need mine.

Read the debate in the Senate. You cannot, for you will find there was no debate on this proposition in the Senate; not a word. The bill was passed in the Senate as fast as the clerk could read the amendments, and yet the Senate put two projects in the bill which the engineers of the Army say will cost $87,500,000. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] says this will cost $100,000,000. You have a power dam on the White River, the Norfork Dam, now being constructed, but it will not be completed in 1944 or 1945. It is going to provide power. Yesterday it was shown on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] that the engineers of the Army are not even using the power already available at the Grand River project. Are they going to use the power at Norfork? Table Rock and Bull Shoals would provide an excess of power, which is not needed. If it were a national defense project, I would support it. I would turn around and go the other way, if we needed it, but it is not a national defense project.

You will hear in a few moments, if he is consistent, from the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS], who will tell you that anyone who opposes this represents the Power Trust. Before he ever saw Washington, I was here fighting the Power Trust. I fought it on Boulder Dam, and on the holding-company bill, and on every public project that was advocated here. Too many to mention. Look at my record. The gentleman from Arkansas has filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with statements, given articles to the press, in which he says anybody that disagrees with him is, according to him, a representative of the Power Trust. If there is one charge from which I can be exonerated, it is that of being a representative of the Power Trust. My action all through my public life has been just the opposite. I am just as much opposed to the Power Trust as is the gentleman from Arkansas, and I have done just as much for rural electrification as he has, and I suggest to him that he might curb his words a little in accusing Members of this House of being representatives of the Power Trust. I am in favor of private utilities when properly conducted, but not when they are operated against the public interest.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refuse to yield. The gentleman has been allotted time. Here is a chance to save $87,500,000. True, the authorization is only for $49,000,000, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] knows that the Chair has ruled time and time again, if a project is in progress, regardless of how much is contained in the authorization, an amendment is in order as an additional appropriation, even though above the authorization. You can appropriate $200,000,000 on these projects if once you start them. These projects are not necessary. One of them is in my own State, and the other is in the State of Arkansas.

Norfork does not depend on these projects to generate power. Let us have Norfork. I am willing to have that power, and then if you need more in that section, come back and convince Congress you do.

There is only one national defense project down there, and it is an aluminum plant. Read the House hearings, and you will see that the aluminum plant is going to have its own power plant. It is not going to take the power from Norfork, or from Grand River, or from any other public dam down there. It is constructing its own power plant right now.

These projects are unnecessary; it is a waste of public funds at this time. The motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to recede and concur should be defeated. If you want to defeat these projects, if you want to save this money and spend it for vessels, tanks, and planes, and ammunition, vote "no" on the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas. I hope by an overwhelming vote that the House will vote it down.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ].

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to make a brief explanation of one item which is included in the amendment. I refer to the item for the Mermentau and Vermilion Rivers project, amounting to $970,000. This particular item was not presented to the Committee on Appropriations at the time this particular bill was under consideration, because we were not prepared at that time to make a proper presentation. Since 1856 this section of south Louisiana, between the Vermilion and Mermentau Rivers has been suffering from floods, which have progressively grown worse, until 1940, when, due to a tropical storm and precipitation of about 24 inches in 24 hours, the entire section, encompassing about 900,000 acres, was flooded, and resulting in as much as 6 and 7 feet of water in some of the communities. This particular flood, and that experienced in 1941, is due to the silting of the mouths of these two rivers, which makes it impossible for the rain water to flow into the Gulf.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I am sympathetic toward the gentleman's project, but there is no Budget estimate for this.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. No; there is no Budget estimate. It was inserted by the Senate.

Mr. POWERS. And it means that this project is taken out of hundreds of others and placed in this appropriation bill without estimates, and is preferred over the others.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. It is an approved project.

Mr. POWERS. It is an approved project.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. It was only completed just a few weeks ago by the engineering department. But I just wanted to make

an explanation of this item in order to show that there is some connection with this project and national defense.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that there were 2,500,000 bushels of rice lost by the flood of 1940. Forty-two percent of all the rice grown in continental United States is grown in that immediate territory. At the present time the oriental supply is cut off. Cuba, Puerto Rico and South American countries depending on rice as their basic food are unable to obtain it from any other section except Louisiana.

There were 240,000 tons of cane destroyed by the flood of 1940, 750,000 bushels of sweetpotatoes, 800,000 bushels of corn, 1,950 acres of peppers, 2,300 acres of truck, 42,000 bales of cotton, 25,150 head of cattle, 13,300 head of hogs, 4,000 head of sheep, 1,680 horses and mules, and 44,000 poultry.

In addition to this, there are something like 33 oil fields in that immediate territory producing more than 85,000 barrels of oil a day. During the flood it was necessary to close down every one of those oil fields and stop production for several weeks.

Another item which has not been called to the attention of the Congress is that during the 1940 flood the main line of the Southern Pacific from the Gulf coast to the Pacific coast was tied up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BULWINKLE). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to recede and concur in this amendment.

The facts are there is no power shortage in this particular area of the United States. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] himself stated it would be 1944 before one section of this project could be completed and 1945 before the other could be completed.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. It has been stated by the Federal Power Commission that there is a shortage in this area we are talking about.

Mr. WINTER. Well, I differ with the gentleman's interpretation of what the Federal Power Commission has said about it, and what actually exists.

About a year ago, the Government started to build an aluminum plant at Lake Catherine, Ark. At that time the Defense Plant Corporation and Government organizations in charge asked the power companies to form a power pool to furnish the additional power necessary to operate this aluminum plant. The power companies got together and formed this pool and agreed to furnish power of over 100,000 kilowatts. In the interim the Defense Plant Corporation decided to build its own power plant of 120,000-kilowatt capacity. That plant is now in process of construction. The Government asked these power companies to have 100,000 kilowatts of power ready in March 1942, and that is this month. The aluminum plant is not ready to go. The power companies have their 100,000 kilowatts of power ready. The interconnections have been made. The power is there. There is 1,500,000 kilowatts of power in this particular area right now. There is an excess of over 200,000 kilowatts, not counting the 120,000 capacity that the Government is building in the aluminum plant itself.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Suppose we put in these two dams and the war ends, where will they have a market for any of it, either that which is there now or that which will be produced in the future?

Mr. WINTER. They will not have any market. With the dam at Norfolk and with the dams owned by private industry on my side of the line over in Kansas, which have now been interconnected and made a part of this pool, there is all the power that they need. They only have one defense plant down there, and that is the aluminum plant.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. If the gentleman will examine page 76 of the hearings he will see that Colonel Reber testified that Bull Shoals would be completed by April 30, 1945, and start delivering power in 1944. Table Rock would be completed June 30, 1946, and would start delivering power in 1945.

Mr. WINTER. If that statement is true, and I assume it is, how on earth can electric power produced in 1945 and 1946 do the defense program any good at this time?

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. For the truth of the gentleman's statement we need only refer to the action taken this morning by Donald Nelson with regard to not furnishing any more copper for the R. E. A.

Mr. WINTER. That is exactly correct. There is no use getting excited about this situation. It may be a fine thing. I do not blame these gentlemen for wanting these dams built in their areas, but as I understand it, the people of Missouri, particularly a great portion of them, except in the part that this particular dam at Table Rock is located, are against this program. I do not know anything about what the situation is in Arkansas, but I do know you are going to expend in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 under the guise of bringing electric power into an area that is supposed to have a shortage of power, when with these interconnections they now have over 200,000 kilowatts more power than they need.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The people in the southeastern part of Missouri and the northeastern part of Arkansas are tremendously interested in the development of these dams, because that is the only source of power which they have in that great section of the country that is waiting for development. We do want it and need it badly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the speech made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]. Most surprising was the statement that they had a million kilowatts of electricity in that area and 200,000 more than was necessary.

Let me say in advance that some day the people are going to send Members to Congress from that section who will help develop the natural resources of the West and the Middle West. The power companies are using the Mississippi River as a Hindenburg line to keep us from going beyond it in the development of the water power resources of this country.

The administration is for both of these projects. It will not take a single dollar away from any other national defense project; besides these projects will pay for themselves. Gentlemen who are living in the tallow-candle age stand up and tell an intelligent Congress that we shall have no market for this power. Do you know what it reminds me of? I heard the same argument made by the predecessors of these gentlemen against the development of Muscle Shoals. They said we had a surplus of power At that time the country was using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year we used 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. There is a shortage now. Next year it will take more than 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and the time is not far distant when the American people will use a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Whenever you get to where you use electricity for the purposes for which it was intended you will never have a surplus of power.

How do you know that none of the plants along the Atlantic or Pacific coast are not going to be knocked out? How do you know how long this war will last? How do you know how long we are going to be involved in this great struggle? We are going to need all the power we can develop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN Is it not rather inconsistent on the part of these gentlemen to argue against these projects because the plants will not be completed until 1944, 1945, or 1946, yet you never hear a word from them against the construction of a battleship that will take equally long to complete

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Why, certainly. Of all the men in this House who could gracefully drop out of this fight they are the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and your humble servant now addressing you, because our districts are electrified with power generated on the Tennessee River, and it is being retailed to the people at less than half the rates the people in Missouri,

Kansas, Arkansas, and a large number of other States that are affected have to pay. There is not any reason on earth for thus turning back and resisting modern progress, necessary progress, under the flimsy pretext that this money is needed for something else when it does not take a single dime away from national defense. If it did the President would not be for it.

You may do as you please, but if you defeat these projects you are turning back the wheels of progress. When you vote this motion down you are not only crippling national defense if this war should last for 5 or 10 years, but you are shutting the door of hope in the faces of the people of Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, and of every other section within the distribution radius of one of these dams. The gentleman from Kansas talks about the immediate area The Army engineers told us in the Muscle Shoals report that the distribution radius was 350 miles, which would reach the city of St. Louis. You are not voting on local propositions, these are national projects.

I hope the motion will be sustained.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, how, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, anyone can say this does not take something away from the prosecution of the war effort is beyond my comprehension. I simply cannot follow such a statement as that just made. The situation is simply this: These dams they are talking of constructing—the Bull Shoals Reservoir on the Arkansas and the Table Rock Reservoir—will take $19,000,000 to start. But to complete these and the other projects we are now debating will in the end cost $100,000,000.

What is happening here to the Congress? In the last 4 days we have had before us the Interior Department Appropriation bill carrying $162,000,000. This is a bill in which every Member of Congress is vitally interested We have so far spent 4 days on it. Even in that bill there are a lot of items that were not only cut to the bone by the committee before the bill was reported but further cuts were made by the Committee of the Whole.

Here come the same things, a Budget estimate for $23,000,000, which will cost $100,000,000. Now, you are going to spend that much by putting these two items in the bill. Does not that seem ridiculous?

Let me give you a statement to reflect on a little bit, and this refers to what was said by the gentleman who preceded me. He said it would not take anything away from our war effort. Let me call attention to the fact that you passed the fourth supplemental appropriation for airplanes, providing $12,000,000,000 on the 23d of January. On the 26th of January there was reported the Navy Department appropriation bill, and by the time the Senate got through with it there was provided in the bill $26,500,000,000. You have had the fifth supplemental defense bill for the Army, providing $32,762,000,000. This afternoon when you finish the Interior Department appropriation bill you will have the sixth supplemental national defense bill for $18,302,187,148. That makes a total for the four bills for war of over $90,000,000,000, and you have appropriated all that in 62 days.

Now you come in here and want to build dams that are not going to be for the national defense. If there is any, you will not get it until 1945 at the shortest time.

If you agree to the pending motion the people of this country will say that you have wheels in your head. The people of this country will not have any confidence whatever in you. All they can say is that Congress is trying and will wreck our financial stability.

Where are you going to get this money? How are you going to get this money? You have to go back to the people of this country and you are going to bow their backs for 100 years or 500 years in order to pay these debts. The people of America cannot stand it, this Nation cannot stand it, and if you have any love for your country for goodness' sake vote against the motion that has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], and do not agree to the amendments that were placed in this bill by the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol.

The Senate said at the beginning of the year that we ought to take a billion, yes, $2,000,000,000 away from the spending in civil functions of our Government. It made that statement early in January. Now it comes in here and tries to shove down the throats of the American people and you legislators who are elected by those people, the sum of $23,000,000 for several projects which will ultimately cost $100,000,000 and it will not be for national defense. Defeat the motion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, I would like to go on a little later. There are about 25 minutes of debate left.

Mr. SNYDER. I only have the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] on this side. Does the gentleman want to be last?

Mr. POWERS. As a member of the committee I think it is my privilege to be last.

Mr. SNYDER. No; not necessarily.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman states he has only one other speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS]?

Mr. SNYDER. That is is all.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman wants me to take my 5 minutes now?

Mr. SNYDER. This gentleman here says that he was to have some time.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman had a few minutes on the conference report. He has had no time on Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman want him to have time?

Mr. POWERS. Yes. If the gentleman has extra time, yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to say there are some people in the State of Missouri who are most sincerely interested in the development of these projects. I say that in spite of the fact that I am very much opposed to them. Their chief interest centers around a future hope of industrial development of that region of the Ozarks, not a war development but a future industrial development which time would not permit to be pertinent in any fashion whatsoever to our war effort. Their support of these projects is admirable. I have no quarrel with these proponents.

These dams were originally proposed, as I understand it, as flood-control measures. Early last fall I brought to the city of Washington and to the War Department a man who is thoroughly acquainted with that entire region. I wanted a careful survey on which to form an opinion. He has made quite a study of the flood-control problems of that entire Ozark region. He spent almost 2 weeks interviewing engineers in the War Department who had anything to do with studying the problem of flood control in this region. After he had completed that survey of the various features and plans of the engineers in the War Department, he returned to me and told me that if it had not been for the insistence of certain individuals in the administration to go ahead with these projects because of their ultimate use as power projects, they could not find any earthly reason to justify them as flood-control projects. As a matter of fact, the opinion prevailed that they were going at the flood-control problem exactly in reverse; that it could better be solved by little dams controlling the upstream water instead of dams on the major rivers, as in the case of the White River.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Not just now. The gentleman had time before and refused to yield to me. If I can spare a minute at the end, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to our attention—and I am repeating this—that the experts on power in the War Production Board have completed a survey which is being withheld for the time being, until the Congress disposes of this bill, which will bring forward the fact that the projects already under way and now in use will by the completion of the year 1944 produce a surplus of 70 percent in all of the power needed to carry on not only the war industries but all the civil use of power which might be expected between now and the close of 1944.

While we see an ultimate expenditure of some ninety million dollars to one hundred million dollars in these two projects, I think it is only reasonable to assume that ultimately, as in many, many other projects, they might well cost two or three times that amount. The history of the past bears that out, and my time does not permit me to give specific examples.

There are power facilities that have been completed in years past in this

area that are not used to their full capacity this very day.

It has been implied that the people of Missouri in opposition to these dams are against progress.

I think I could justly say for the people of the State of Missouri that we are not against progress. Goodness knows it does not take the State of Mississippi to show us, the people of Missouri, progress. We are not against progress. Power development went ahead out in that region, far ahead of some of the power development you have been talking about today. I for one am not opposed to the development of our natural resources for power, even public power, but I am bitterly opposed to the inconsistency here of loading on the backs of the taxpayers every dollar of tax burden they can possibly stand and then wasting that money instead of spending it for direct and immediate war purposes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, so that we shall know exactly what we are doing, I am going to state this proposition bluntly and honestly. We are going to have a vote very shortly on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 2. If this motion prevails, it will mean that the taxpayers of this Nation will have another $100,000,000 thrown down the old proverbial rathole.

Senate amendment No. 2 will obligate the Congress of the United States to spend approximately $90,000,000 on Bull Shoals and Table Rock. The other four projects in Senate amendment No. 2 probably amount to about $8,000,000, so there is about $100,000,000 in all.

I am going to devote these few moments to a discussion of Table Rock and Bull Shoals. If you will recall, on March 11 I spoke against these two projects and the House voted both of them out of the bill. I asked you at that time if you really knew in terms of income tax what $90,000,000 was, and this is what I said on March 11:

> I wonder if every Member of this House knows what $90,000,000 means? It would take the entire income tax paid by all Members of the House and Senate—at the rate of $1,000 or more per year per Congressman—for a period of 45 years to pay out $90,000,000.
>
> I wonder also what the average taxpayer understands by $90,000,000 in terms of his own income tax? Assuming an average tax of $50 a year, under the present rate, for taxpayers earning $2,500 a year it would take the total income tax from 20,000 of these taxpayers over a period of 90 years to equal $90,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, these two projects, providing the rainfall is great enough, will come in as power projects in 1945 and 1946. These two projects will come into production of power in 1945 and 1946 providing priorities are given and they can be built. We know the priority situation today, and those of us who are thinking in terms of priorities feel that priorities will not be granted for these projects and they will not even be completed by 1950.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same old story of the House voting out of a bill certain items and the Senate putting them back in without a word of justification, without a word of debate, merely putting the items back in the bill. If these two projects are national defense projects, Heaven help us. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas is voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A1183 two letters from Jesse Jones and Donald Nelson denying a synthetic rubber plant to the Arkansas area because of power shortage. The gentlemen who say there is no power shortage in that area do not know what they are talking about. We have a desperate and drastic power shortage there. That is the reason the Defense Plant Corporation is having to build a 120,000-kilowatt steam-power plant out there to supply its aluminum plant. There is no power available elsewhere.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said that Table Rock did not have a Budget estimate. It did, of $6,500,000, and the Senate cut it to $2,106,000.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] said there were no hearings held in the Senate on these projects. There were. I for one was there and testified before the committee. Here are the hearings. The Army engineers were present and testified.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, because there ought to be a correction made there?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Army engineers testified only on those two projects; they did not testify on the other four.

Mr. ELLIS. I say they did, and I have the hearings here.

Mr. TABER. I have them here, too.

Mr. ELLIS. I have just finished reading the testimony.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] stated that the power companies were ready to supply a great amount of power out there to the Aluminum Co. That is not correct. The gentleman is wrong. The shortage still prevails in that area, even though we have the manganese, the bauxite, the lead, the zinc, and the mercury lying idle and undeveloped there, mostly because we do not have sufficient power.

It is most unfortunate that the parliamentary situation was such that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] had to agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], who objected, that the House conferees would bring this amendment back in disagreement in order to get a conference at all. Actually, a majority of the committee favors this Senate amendment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] has said he is for the Bull Shoals project, and that he asks the House to disagree only because of the parliamentary situation.

The Senate wisely wrote back into this bill $16,700,000 to start Bull Shoals Dam and $2,106,000 to start Table Rock Dam. The amount is still $3,394,000 below the Budget request; $3,394,000 below the request of President Roosevelt, the War Department, the Army engineers, and the Federal Power Commission.

These two great dams, to cost $50,000,000 and $37,000,000, will be self-liquidating and will ultimately cost the people nothing. They will produce 880,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power annually in an area where a shortage of power already exists, from the standpoint of war production. They can be almost completed in half the time it will take to construct some of the new battleships we are starting.

Again I would call to your attention the letter which Chairman Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, wrote to the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, saying these dams are necessary to alleviate the power situation for national defense in the States of Mississippi, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Missouri—and that since the same capacity is required to produce generators for ships as for steam, either generators for ships or for steam power must suffer, whereas generators for hydro can be obtained. And we have got to almost double the country's power capacity to meet war demands.

Again I would remind you of the Budget statement that these dams are necessary for the war effort.

I need not remind you that the corrupt Power Trust is still blitzkrieging the Congress against these dams.

Some will vote against them because the Power Trust does not want them; some will vote against them because President Roosevelt wants them; some will vote against them to save some money. I hold in my hand a copy of last night's Star, in which you, no doubt, read that yesterday the president of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $10,000 for corrupting the elections and certain public officials of Missouri, and the company itself was fined $80,000. A vote against the substitute motion is a vote for this and other corrupt power companies of those States.

A vote against these dams because Mr. Roosevelt has asked for them is to shoot politics instead of bullets and bombs at the Japs.

You have already cut more than $3,000,000 from this item. To cut them out is to shoot economy at the Japs.

A vote against this substitute motion to recede and concur is a vote for Hitler and the Japs and against our boys at the front.

Our chosen leaders in this crisis tell us these dams are necessary. They are best in position to know. Who, then, will vote for our own defeat?

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. It seems to me that every argument that has been made here today is almost identical with the argument that was made against Bonneville and Coulee and the other big dams down

in the T. V. A. Yet, today, it is admitted by all of us that they are a godsend in time of need.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TERRY) there were—ayes 37, noes 97.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 117, nays 202, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—117

Allen, La.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Green	Pierce
	Gregory	Pittenger
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Plauché
Beckworth	Harrington	Poage
Boggs	Harris, Ark.	Priest
Boland	Hébert	Rabaut
Boykin	Hendricks	Ramsay
Bradley, Pa.	Hill, Wash.	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hull	Rankin, Miss.
Brown, Ga.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Buck	Jackson	Rogers, Okla.
Cannon, Mo.	Jacobsen	Sanders
Cartwright	Jarman	Sauthoff
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Okla.	Scrugham
Coffee, Wash.	Kefauver	Shanley
Collins	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Wash.
Colmer	Kerr	Snyder
Cooper	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Costello	Lane	South
Courtney	Larrabee	Sparkman
Cox	Lea	Sutphin
Cravens	Leavy	Tarver
Creal	Lesinski	Tenerowicz
Culkin	McCormack	Terry
Dingell	McMillan	Thom
Disney	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Eberharter	Manasco	Traynor
Elliott, Calif.	Marcantonio	Vincent, Ky.
Ellis	Mills, Ark.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fitzgerald	Mills, La.	Weaver
Fitzpatrick	Murdock	Whelchel
Flaherty	Myers, Pa.	White
Ford, Miss.	Nichols	Whitten
Ford, Thomas F.	Norrell	Whittington
Fulmer	Norton	Wickersham
Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Gehrmann	Oliver	Zimmerman
Gossett	Pace	
Granger	Patton	

NAYS—202

Allen, Ill.	Carlson	Downs
Andersen, H. Carl	Carter	Duncan
	Case, S. Dak.	Durham
Anderson, Calif.	Chapman	Dworshak
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Eaton
	Chiperfield	Edmiston
Andrews	Clason	Elston
Angell	Claypool	Engel
Arends	Clevenger	Englebright
Arnold	Cluett	Faddis
Barden	Cochran	Fellows
Barnes	Coffee, Nebr.	Fenton
Bates, Mass.	Cole, N. Y.	Fish
Baumhart	Cooley	Fogarty
Beiter	Copeland	Folger
Blackney	Crawford	Forand
Bland	Crosser	Ford, Leland M.
Bloom	Crowther	Gamble
Bonner	Cunningham	Gerlach
Boren	Curtis	Gibson
Bryson	D'Alesandro	Gilchrist
Bulwinkle	Davis, Ohio	Gillie
Burdick	Dewey	Graham
Burgin	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.
Butler	Ditter	Guyer
Camp	Dondero	Gwynne
Canfield	Doughton	Haines
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maciora	Sasscer
	Martin, Iowa	Satterfield
Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.	Scanlon
	Mason	Schuetz
Halleck	May	Scott
Hancock	Meyer, Md.	Secrest
Harness	Michener	Shafer, Mich.
Harter	Mitchell	Sheppard
Heidinger	Monroney	Sikes
Hess	Moser	Simpson
Hill, Colo.	Murray	Smith, Maine
Hinshaw	Nelson	Smith, Ohio
Hobbs	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Hoffman	O'Connor	Smith, W. Va.
Holbrock	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Hope	O'Leary	Spence
Hunter	O'Neal	Springer
Imhoff	O'Toole	Stearns, N. H.
Jenkins, Ohio	Paddock	Stefan
Jennings	Pearson	Stevenson
Jensen	Pheiffer, William T.	Sullivan
Johns		Sweeney
Johnson, Calif.	Ploeser	Taber
Johnson, Ill.	Plumley	Talbot
Johnson, Ind.	Powers	Talle
Johnson, W. Va.	Randolph	Thill
Jones	Rankin, Mont.	Tibbott
Jonkman	Reece, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Kean	Reed, Ill.	Vorys, Ohio
Kee	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Keefe	Rees, Kans.	Ward
Kilday	Rich	Wasielewski
Kinzer	Rizley	West
Knutson	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wigglesworth
Kunkel		Williams
Landis	Robertson, Va.	Winter
Lanham	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott
LeCompte	Rockefeller	Woodruff, Mich.
McGehee	Rockwell	Woodrum, Va.
McGregor	Rodgers, Pa.	Young
McIntyre	Rogers, Mass.	Youngdahl
McLaughlin	Rolph.	
Maas	Russell	

NOT VOTING—112

Baldwin	Hart	O'Day
Barry	Hartley	Osmers
Beam	Healey	Patman
Bell	Heffernan	Patrick
Bender	Holmes	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett	Hook	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bishop	Houston	
Boehne	Howell	Richards
Bolton	Jarrett	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Jenks, N. H.	Romjue
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Luther A.	Sabath
Buckler, Minn.		Sacks
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schaefer, Ill.
Burch		Schulte
Byrne	Kelly, Ill.	Shannon
Byron	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.		Short
Capozzoli	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Pa.
Celler		Starnes, Ala.
Clark	Keogh	Steagall
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Stratton
Cullen	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Kleberg	Sumners, Tex.
Day	Klein	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney	Kocialkowski	Thomason
Dickstein	Kramer	Tinkham
Dies	Lambertson	Tolan
Domengeaux	Lewis	Treadway
Douglas	Ludlow	Vinson, Ga.
Drewry	Lynch	Vreeland
Eliot, Mass.	McGranery	Walter
Flannagan	McKeough	Weiss
Gale	McLean	Welch
Gavagan	Maciejewski	Wene
Gearhart	Magnuson	Wheat
Gifford	Mansfield	Wilson
Gillette	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gore	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
Harris, Va.	Mundt	Worley

So the motion was rejected.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Thomason against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Day.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Short.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Richards with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Mott.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Houston with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Capozzoli.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Hook.

Mr. Bean with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy.

Mr. Kramer with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Healey.

Mr. Schulte with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Lewis with Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts.

Mr. Klein with Mr. McKeough.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr Maciejewski.

Mr. Worley with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Merritt.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Wene.

Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. Sacks with Mr. Magnuson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6845, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read down to the national parks, page 104, line 11.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I propose to offer amendments reducing the amounts of the maintenance charge for each individual park 10 percent. I would much prefer to offer one amendment covering the whole picture than to offer individual amendments. I am wondering if, when we get to the first item, it would be agreeable to the committee that unanimous consent be granted for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I think that that will be perfectly agreeable. However, I wish it to be plain that the committee does not agree to any such proposed deduction.

Mr. TABER. I am asking only as to procedure; I am not asking the gentleman to commit himself as to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that procedure will expedite the consideration of the bill, and that will be perfectly agreeable. I remind the gentleman, however, that the Park Service has been cut more than 60 percent now. It has been cut more than any one of the 26 agencies. Our Republican friends on the committee played a major role in writing the bill, as far as the Parks Service is concerned, and if our friends across the aisle wish to turn on their own handiwork it is welcome to do so.

Mr. TABER. I think it will appear perfectly fair that the cut to the maintenance and administration of the individual parks will be of benefit not only to the Park Service but to the public.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

How much does the 10-percent cut the gentleman is suggesting amount to in the aggregate?

Mr. TABER. About $300,000.

Mr. LEAVY. And that applies to a single activity in the Park Service?

Mr. TABER. It applies only to the items with reference to the maintenance of individual parks.

Mr. LEAVY. I think it is highly desirable in the interest of saving time and would accomplish whatever we would if we considered them separately. I am not in accord with the gentleman's views about making the cut.

Mr. TABER. That is a matter for discussion. What I am talking about is the matter of procedure.

Mr. LEAVY. I think it is desirable.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If we should take up the individual items, we would have quite a good deal of amendments, and it would take a long time, and if we are permitted to make this one item, I think it will be the sense of the House that we could cut down 10 percent on the Park Service without injury to the Service whatever. It would be a good thing for the taxpayers and for the Service. I hope the amendment to be offered by the gentleman will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, we have agreed to the procedure, but if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others keep discussing the matter, we might be tempted to withdraw our agreement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the House and the country is very much concerned with a bill pending before the Naval Affairs Committee, which deals with very important subject matters, namely, the limitation of profits, the question of the 40-hour-week suspension, and the question of the closed shop. For the last 10 days the Naval Affairs Committee has been conducting hearings from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon. A great many witnesses have already testified and there are requests from a great many other witnesses to be heard. For instance, just a few moments ago I had a communication from a shipbuilder on the Pacific coast, who is anxious to appear before the committee. The committee is doing everything humanly possible to expedite the matter, but at the same time the importance of the legislation requires a most careful study and investigation. I find that it will probably not be possible for the committee to present a bill to the House dealing with this subject matter or dealing with any phase of it between now and the 13th day of April. By that time I am hoping that on that date the Naval Affairs Committee may be in a position to lay before the House a bill dealing with these matters that I have briefly spoken about. I make this statement, Mr. Chairman, so that Members of the House and the country may be advised with reference to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acadia National Park, Maine: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including $3,000 for George B. Dorr as superintendent without regard to the requirements of the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 22, 1920 (5 U. S. C. 691-693, 697-731), as amended, $3,000 for temporary clerical services for investigation of titles and preparation of abstracts thereof of lands donated to the United States for inclusion in the Acadia National Park, and not exceeding $1,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, $51,215.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at this time to offer an amendment relating to the items beginning on page 105, line 19, and extending through and including the item on page 112, line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. TABER. The purpose is to offer an amendment which will reduce each of these items 10 percent; offer it as one amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is just a horizontal reduction?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

Page 106, line 6, strike out "$51,215" and insert "$45,715."

Page 106, line 16, strike out "$20,385" and insert "$18,380."

Page 106, line 18, strike out "$105,260" and insert "$94,760."

Page 106, line 24, strike out "$88,870" and insert "$80,000."

Page 107, line 9, strike out "$198,480" and insert "$179,000."

Page 107, line 15, strike out "$126,535" and insert "$115,700."

Page 107, line 25, strike out "$31,420" and insert "$28,200."

Page 108, line 6, strike out "$114,130" and insert "$102,700."

Page 108, line 12, strike out "$64,070" and insert "$57,600."

Page 108, line 18, strike out "$75,150" and insert "$67,900."

Page 108, line 20, strike out "$28,520" and insert "$25,850."

Page 108, line 25, strike out "$37,555" and insert "$33,750."

Page 109, line 8, strike out "$57,990" and insert "$49,200."

Page 109, line 13, strike out "$80,900" and insert "$72,900."

Page 109, line 19, strike out "$64,570" and insert "$58,160."

Page 109, line 25, strike out "$27,610" and insert "$24,900."

Page 110, line 6, strike out "$146,275" and insert "$131,850."

Page 110, line 12, strike out "$62,290" and insert "$56,090."

Page 110, line 18, strike out "$20,225" and insert "$18,220."

Page 110, line 24, strike out "$105,665" and insert "$95,165."

Page 111, line 8, strike out "$133,780" and insert "$120,480."

Page 111, line 14, strike out "$101,405" and insert "$91,105."

Page 111, line 20, strike out "$23,600" and insert "$21,300."

Page 112, line 5, strike out "$449,530" and insert "$404,600."

Page 112, line 17, strike out "$317,690" and insert "$286,000."

Page 112, line 23, strike out "$44,090" and insert "$39,600."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of cutting down the amounts required for administration, maintenance, and improvement of the national parks. With the exception of the Acadia Park, which I think is the first one, the cuts by the committee have been very small. The cuts over last year's bill have ranged from 2 to as high as 13 or 14 percent. The average would be about 3 or 4 percent, the way I remember it. I have not touched any of the monuments; I have simply covered the parks. The situation is just this: Last year 8,000,000

people visited the parks. This year down to the time the automobile restrictions went on the park attendance was about the same as last year to a comparable date—perhaps a little increase. It is perfectly apparent to all of us when we come to consider that people are not going to have automobiles to run around with that the attendance at these parks will be divided by 4; it probably will be way below that. We probably would be justified if we came here and asked for a 25-percent cut in the maintenance and operation of these parks. I am saying this not as one who is particularly critical of these parks, because I believe they are great institutions, but because of the reduced requirements resulting from much smaller attendance it will not be necessary to have so much help around looking after the visitors. I feel that this is a very modest request and one clearly in accord with sound administrative policy. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and save approximately $300,000. I think this is as much as one need say on the subject. Frankly, I do not see how anyone who takes a position in favor of sound administration can criticize my stand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think there is much in what the gentleman said about the reduction of travel, but I am wondering if this amendment should carry—whether further legislation would be necessary to permit the park employees to be reassigned to other duties? I have in mind the fact that the Classification Act fixes the type of work certain employees may do, and it seems to me that to apply a reduction of this sort to the National Park Service may require some further action by Congress to overcome limitations.

Mr. TABER. There will be fewer employees, resulting from the draft and because some of them will seek other employment. We have here, for instance, the Hawaiian park, which I put in the same category with the others. This is a fine park, but practically all of it has been taken over by the Army.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No doubt they will lose many employees, but the question is whether the reduced personnel can be reassigned to certain duties without some change of the Classification Act.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; I do not believe there is any question about that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will this in any way affect the ability of the Government to keep up the parks or to administer them?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, about half the park employees have been required to look after visitors and to take care of them during the peak of the season. The volume of tourist travel is going to drop off and this in itself will release quite a number of employees to carry on maintenance and administration. I do not believe it will interfere with the protection and upkeep of the parks at all.

Mr. DONDERO. And the upkeep of the parks will be that much less.

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The following gentlemen have asked for recognition on this amendment: Messrs. ANDERSON of New Mexico, MCINTYRE, JONES, LEAVY, SCRUGHAM, and RICH. Each gentleman will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that attendance at the national parks has been increasing, that up to the 1st of March of the present year the increase over a similar period of last year has been 4.29 percent, and more than 9 months of this has been since the tire-rationing order went into effect. Let me point out further and emphasize the fact that the park system is being extensively used to give to the service men facilities for recreation and rest. Three hundred and thirty-eight service men visited the parks in the last 8 months and this number will probably increase. Almost all of the parks are located near some military camp.

The next important thing about this proposed cut is that the maintenance force in the parks has already been cut to the bone. If you will read the list commencing on page 39 of the report, you will find that with few exceptions each and every park has received a more or less drastic cut, depending somewhat on the location. The Park Service altogether has been reduced from some $14,000,000 last year to some $5,000,000 as a total for the next fiscal year.

The additional cut as proposed will seriously injure our national park system for the reason that the crews they have now for maintenance and supervision are necessary, primarily for fire protection and for protection against vandalism. Any cut such as proposed by the gentleman from New York will, in my opinion, seriously injure the efficiency of the park service system. In justice to this splendid and efficient organization, I ask the Members to vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and desire to point out to the Members of the House that the Carlsbad Caverns, included in this appropriation, took in last year $352,000 as against an appropriation of $110,000, a net profit to the Government for its park system of $242,000, in connection with a park which was given to the Government by the State of New Mexico after that State had acquired it through appropriations. If you cut this appropriation still further, you merely increase the profit to the United States Government.

I call your attention also to the fact that this park is located in a portion of the United States where there are a tremendous number of military camps. A great many soldiers are quartered in Texas and in New Mexico. Those boys have been making use of the park facilities this year as they have never been used before.

This appropriation has already been reduced at a time when more people are coming to the park. I submit it is not fair to the State and to the people who gave this park to the United States Government, if you try to make more of a money maker out of it when it is already producing a quarter of a million dollars of net revenue every year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, these items may well be cut by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], because these Budget estimates were made before the Pearl Harbor debacle was fully realized. Since that time we have learned of the restrictions—one, the curtailment of the production of automobiles; two, the freezing of tires, due to the fall of the Dutch East Indies. This is very acute.

All of this means that fewer people will go to the parks. Look at the personnel provided for each one of these individual parks. There are 45 on the pay roll in the Carlsbad Caverns Park. Cut 10 percent off the manpower in that park, and will it close up? You will still have enough people there to run the park and to entertain the soldiers. Go down through every one of them.

Here is the park at Crater Lake, Oreg., in which there are 22 positions, involving an expenditure of $48,247. Will 10 percent close that park?

Let us take Glacier National Park, 61 positions, total of $126,000. Will a cut of 10 percent close that park? Can they not still entertain, with the restricted travel and the restricted rubber supply, the number of people who will come to these parks?

I submit also that in the over-all administration of the parks there has not been enough of a cut in Washington in comparison with the cuts that have been made throughout the bill. These items could stand a cut in addition to what the gentleman's amendment provides.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, these 10-percent cuts will release a number of men for productive work to help deliver enough goods soon enough to the boys who bare their breasts for their country. It is later than you think.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, certainly we can make cuts in the National Park Service without interfering at all with the handling of the affairs of the national parks. They will go on just the same and without any difficulty or impairment in service to the public.

You have heard gentlemen on this side of the aisle speak about the cut we have made in the appropriations for the national parks. Let me show you what we cut. Out of the total appropriation we cut off $9,287,410 from last year. Here is what we cut out of it: Roads and trails, $2,820,150; Blue Ridge Parkway, $5,735,765; physical improvements, $293,740; Travel Bureau, $65,180; and monuments, $23,800; and I have not given them all to you. This makes a total of $8,914,000. Deduct that from the total cut of $9,287,410, and you will see that we have only cut all the other items in the bill, and I did not include all the cuts, $273,375.

We have not cut this bill nearly enough. We ought to cut these items 20 percent instead of 10 percent, as provided by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House what harm there would be in closing these parks altogether for the duration?

Mr. RICH. I am not in favor of closing the parks. I think we ought to keep them up, but look at the money we have appropriated here. As I just said, instead of cutting them down 10 percent, we ought to cut them 20 percent. We are hoping that we will get enough Members here to put a little efficiency into the operation of these parks. We just want to cut out the waste and extravagance; that is all we are trying to do now. We ought to do more.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Would not the people have a little more money to buy defense bonds?

Mr. RICH. Certainly they would.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I suppose the gentleman heard the testimony that was given before the committee. Was any evidence given to indicate that the number of those who visited the parks would have anything to do with the maintenance of the parks?

Mr. RICH. Yes; you get revenues from the parks but your expenses are greater than your revenues. I want to economize in the operation and by economy we can keep from raising that much more revenue. It is an efficiency amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yellowstone National Park is the oldest national park in the United States. It takes in almost as much as is paid out. It has an acreage of approximately two and a quarter million acres, covered by the finest growth of timber, pines, and so forth, you have ever seen. If any cut is made in the item for operation and maintenance and looking after that park, that is what may happen. During the hot, dry months of July, August, September, and October fires may break out—and this may be a good year for them to be started in some underhanded way—and they may destroy this entire area.

Mr. LEAVY. I may say to the gentleman generally that I am very much opposed to this cut, and I propose, if I can in the limited time I have, to show how disastrous it would be not alone to the park to which the gentleman refers but to all the 26 national parks

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I say has application also to Glacier National Park. It would be a horrible mistake to cut down the operating expenses of those parks, particularly this year.

Mr. LEAVY. It applies to all the parks.

May I state that in the first instance I was favorable to this type of amendment, because it is a great time saver, but like all blanket amendments, you can never know that you are doing the right thing or that you are not doing the wrong thing by either supporting or opposing it.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman tell us some particular instance where he is sure we would be doing the wrong thing?

Mr. LEAVY. I propose to do that.

This budget was made up by the Park Service prior to Pearl Harbor. After Pearl Harbor, they made further reductions. If you will turn to page 607 of the hearings, you will find that they state they have curtailed every regular maintenance and operation activity to a minimum, and that this reduction will require postponement of all road work, parkway work, and all trail construction work. They further say:

> In recognition of our responsibility in the war effort, the National Park Service plans to save $302,295 in its current appropriations by curtailment of expenditures.

Then they discuss the 26 parks. I am not going to refer to all of them because my time is limited, but you will find that without exception, including the elimination of roads and parkways, every park was cut from 5 to 20 percent.

Then you find that if we were to make another 10-percent cut, such cut could readily be the difference between the total destruction of a park or the saving of it.

I am surprised that any Member of Congress would even think of suggesting that we close the parks. The parks represent assets running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Last year 21,050,000 American citizens went into these parks and came out of them better men and women and better Americans. This year there may be some reduction in the number of persons who go into the parks, but there will still be a large number of visitors to the parks.

Many of the Army camps are now being placed in the West so that they can make use of the parks.

The fire hazard in the parks just as in the forests this year will be greater than it has ever been. Can we think for a moment of taking $340,000 or $350,000 out of this bill and thereby probably destroying in whole or in part one of the greatest assets we have, the national parks, an asset recognized by every nature lover and, I think, even by those who do not love nature? America without its magnificent national parks, would have lost one of its greatest charms.

The gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER] has been active in the 6 years I have been here in Congress in the matter of reducing appropriations and saving money. In this particular amendment he would not effect an economy, but might destroy these parks. He left out all the monuments. If he had proposed to cut 10 percent off the appropriations for all the monuments then, of course, he would have gone into practically every congressional district in the country and his amendment would have had no chance at all.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that we are going to offer an amendment as to the monuments.

Mr. LEAVY. Many of these parks are actually money makers. Mammoth Cave National Park produces considerably more in revenue than the whole item for that park. The same is true with Carlsbad, Yellowstone, and a number of others. It would be a calamity to have this amendment prevail, because none of you believe that we ought to destroy a great national asset.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 48, noes 51.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 62, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> National monuments: For administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and preservation of national monuments, including not exceeding $3,000 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the custodians and employees in connection with general monument work, $334,625.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 113, line 5, strike out "$334,625" and insert "$301,263."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is to cut 10 percent off of the funds for the operation of the national monuments. We just had an amendment a few moments ago to knock off 10 percent from the national parks. All the Republicans, I think, voted for that economy, four or five Democrats voted with us, but we went down to defeat. It was not an ignominious defeat, it was a glorious defeat, because it showed that practically all of the Republicans are for economizing in the operation of the Government. I would like to know how the Democrats are all going back home and show their peo-

ple how they tried to economize. If each one of you Democrats is going to say that he was one of the three or four who voted for that economy, you are going to get all mixed up and you are going to have a terrible time to explain. I charge this administration as being the most extravagant in the history of our country.

Mr. Chairman, they do not like it on the Democratic side and the country will not like it, either. You will find today that the country is not going to like the fact that all of you voted to keep in the amount recommended for the operation of these parks. The people of this country are going to be compelled to work and work and work, and they are not going to have an opportunity to go to these parks. When you keep all the men at work in these parks you are going to have to account to your constituents for the amount of your expenditures on them.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. While the gentleman is lecturing, let him call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that all of this money to operate these pleasure parks must be borrowed and the Government must issue bonds and go into debt for every dollar appropriated. These parks are fine and should be developed when we can afford it. This expenditure is not essential at this time. It may be desirable in peacetime, but the committee well knows that these parks will have very few visitors next year. The operating personnel will be needed in the grim business of war. It seems unthinkable that the committee is insisting on the country borrowing money and selling bonds to pay the employees in these parks who will not be needed next year.

Mr. RICH If this were for the operation of the Government or for an essential activity, that would be one thing, but every one of these parks has had a great deal of deadwood around, men who did not really have anything to do or enough to do to keep them busy. Yet we are maintaining this year almost the same schedule that we had last year and the year before. It is just too much; it costs too much; and I know a lot of you on that side of the aisle are looking at me with an expression of rage, but that does not make any difference. I do not care what you may say about this matter; it is time for you to stop spending money and it is time for you to economize. Now I am giving you a chance. You can say all you want about me. If the people of my district do not want me to economize, then I do not want them to send me back here, because I am going to continue to fight for economy in Government operation, and I ask you again, where are you going to get the money? Only by severe taxes on your people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given us another lecture on economy and, as usual, his is a masterful oration. But once again he speaks in glittering generalities. I am sure that all Members enjoy hearing him. If I wanted to be a trifle facetious, however, I might be tempted to say that we could save some money by having less talking done on this floor and a little more action in and by the committee. I am sure the gentleman knows what I mean. The record shows I demanded and consistently supported every possible economy in the committee. If the gentleman makes any more economy speeches, I might be tempted to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania about the only increase in the pending bill above Budget estimates is the $2,800,000 in three reclamation items. These rather marked increases were placed in the bill because the gentleman joined in raising the bill that amount above the Budget estimate.

Mr. RICH. Name the item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Surely the gentleman remembers. Surely his memory has not suddenly failed him. Does the gentleman deny that he helped "up" this bill to the tune of $2,800,000?

Mr. RICH. I ask the gentleman to name the item that I helped to increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, well, if the gentleman insists on forcing me to show that he talks economy here and votes for items to the tune of $2,800,000 without a sign of a Budget estimate, I can sure call his hand.

Mr. RICH. Just name one. The gentleman cannot do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, since the gentleman asks for it, here goes. If the gentleman will forget his economy lecture for a moment and turn to the hearings he will recall, I am sure, some very splendid reclamation projects in the West. One of such projects is the All-American Canal. I am not criticizing the gentleman for joining in the move to raise that one item a cool million dollars. I am simply calling the gentleman's hand, or should I say "bluff"?

On the other hand, in my own State, where there is only one reclamation project—the Altus-Lugart project—I did not demand extra funds for that worthy project. It had about $600,000 last year. This year the Budget reduced the item to $100,000. Certain members of the committee hinted that they might give my State a little mite above the Budget estimate. Well, no additional funds for Oklahoma are in this bill. I did not assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude. I did not say, "Give me mine, war or no war." My skirts are clean. Is that not correct? Does the gentleman deny that? Have I called the gentleman's hand? Just who is really for economy, anyway? Does the gentleman wish for me to give him further details? I wait for the gentleman to enter his denial or make his confession.

Now, as to the appropriation for national monuments, the Bureau of the Budget cut this item $23,800 below what they had last year, a sizable reduction

And then the committee cut it $10,755 below the Budget estimate. Again I remind gentlemen that the Park Service was reduced more than any other of the 26 agencies in the entire bill. This deep cut was made on an implied promise, at least, of some real cooperation from the other side of the aisle. If the kind of sniping we have had at the bill is the gentleman's idea of cooperation, then we have no complaint, except to insist the gentleman save his lectures on cruel economy for some future time and to someone else. I might add that neither the gentleman nor his party has a corner on honesty, intelligence, or patriotism.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I was very much amused to hear the gentleman on the other side pretending that we ought to turn this Department of the Interior over to the Republicans. The last time we did that we lost Teapot Dome, and it took us years to recover it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. I rise to correct one statement that has been made, and that is that all of this money for Park Service operation has got to be borrowed. That is not correct. The fact is that about 50 percent of these appropriations are earned by the several parks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; the Park Service alone turned in last year several times the amount of money involved here. In fact, the exact figures are $2,179,119.

Mr. NORRELL. And in conclusion Hot Springs National Park comes nearer being self-sustaining than any other park in the country. This year it is greater than any other time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And may I call attention to the fact that the Yellowstone Park brings in almost as much money every year as it takes to run the park.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true. There are two of the parks that turn in considerably more each year than the entire amount to operate them. I refer to Carlsbad and Mammoth Cave.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not true that Carlsbad turns in $300,000, and that it costs only $100,000 to operate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; a mighty fine record.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was really surprised to hear my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] inject politics into this debate. I know that it is awfully hard, as long as this aisle runs through the middle of the Chamber, to keep political discussion off the floor, but I also know that it is the consensus of opinion in this House that at this time politics should be kept to a glimmer, a very dim glimmer. Then for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to get up and state in the RECORD that nobody but Republicans wanted to vote for economy is cheap politics—very cheap politics. Such politics should not be practiced at this time on the floor of this House. I would not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield to me in my patriotism and love for this country, and I would not ask the Republicans to yield to the Democrats in that respect, in these days, but I do not think that either the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the Republicans of the House should ask that of the Democrats. This is a far bigger issue than the success of a party and the success of the elections next fall. It is all

right to make your individual record and let the collective individual records speak for themselves. A few days ago on a division vote, when I was a bit angry, I took the floor and said that there were only a certain number of Republicans that voted for a particular amendment.

The majority leader took me to task for that, and he was right. I should not have done it. Neither should we here on either side take unto ourselves all of the credit for economy or anything else.

I could say something about the type of amendments that have been introduced to this bill and to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill that was considered a few days ago, where blanket, ill-advised cuts, straight down the line, were offered. But I do not think it is necessary to charge anybody with bad faith for that. I did not vote to cut out this appropriation for the national parks, and I do not have one in my district. I am just not going to support amendments, the basis of which is to cut 10 percent or 20 percent or 50 percent—some arbitrary percentage picked out of the air, just so that I can go to my people and holler, "I am a great economist." I hope I am an economist, but I hope I will temper my desire for economy with good judgment. That is what I want to do. There is such a thing as false economy. As far as I as a Democrat am concerned, I am not ashamed of the fact that a majority of the men on the right side of this aisle voted this afternoon against an amendment which would take an arbitrary cut of an arbitrary percentage straight down the line out of any appropriation. If it were necessary, I would be perfectly happy to go to the hustings of this country with the record of the Democrats against the record of the Republicans for economy or good government at any time; but I do not think we ought to be fighting that now on the floor of this House when we have a war to win.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a limitation of this debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will be recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like 2 minutes to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

WE NEED SOME COMMON-SENSE APPROACH TO LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting to note the efforts of our colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT JONES, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable ROBERT F. RICH, and others, in their effort to reduce the nonmilitary expenditures in this Interior Department bill. The majority may talk economy, but they do not seem to relish it when it is offered, and they therefore must accept the responsibility of continuing unnecessary expenditures. What they do not try to cloak under the pretext of military needs they make a feeble effort to justify on the grounds of necessity. Where are the exponents of economy who made themselves so effectively vocal when the agricultural appropriation bill was up last week?

The people in general are desirous of obtaining a reduction in or a termination of nonmilitary expenditures. The people want to win this war. They are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to do so. They can see no more excuse for "certain Government agencies as usual" than they see a reason for "business as usual." The public thinks that certain Government employees should be compelled to accept other employment, if they are engaged in nonmilitary work, just as employees in private industry are compelled by the thousands to go out and find other jobs.

Millions upon millions of dollars could be saved in these bills, and still we could help the war effort instead of retard it. Why all these expenditures for operating the national parks, when people are not going to get any tires to go to the parks?

Take the appropriation for surveying new irrigation projects, as an example. There may be some excuse to complete the irrigation projects already started, but why, in the name of common sense, should we be appropriating money at this time for someone to run around and investigate an opportunity to find new lands to put under irrigation? Why should we appropriate thousands upon thousands of dollars of our grandchildren's earnings to try and find new lands to irrigate when we have millions of acres of land now under cultivation that will not be efficiently worked this year because of lack of labor to crop the land already available for production? This does not make sense.

It appears that many Members, sitting here year after year, have become so accustomed to tossing the millions and billions of somebody else's money around that they cannot cease to do so. They continue to toss the taxpayers' money out the window, even when we are faced with the greatest war in history. It is not any wonder that people are getting sick and tired of the kind of legislation we pass. It is not any wonder that the press criticizes the kind of legislation that we do pass.

Let us quit this waste and extravagance and unwarranted procedure and, at least, once and for all, get down to some common-sense legislation. I repeat, the people have the will to win this war. They do not want to waste time, money, and labor on a lot of programs that were questionable in peacetime and indefensible in wartime.

If you spenders keep on "rolling out the barrel," you will find that someone else will be having a "barrel of fun" instead of the wasters of the public funds. The people are tired of hearing about politics. They do not like to be reminded that the New Deal is more dynamic than fascism and more revolutionary than communism. They do not want to hear about the New Deal or the old deal. They want to win this war and they know that the first step to win it is to curtail all unnecessary expenditures and put all crackpot legislation in cold storage and leave it there. We must realize that an enlightened and aroused public opinion is essential to the best war effort, and necessary for the welfare of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]. I do not think it makes any difference about the political side of these problems as far as Democrats and Republicans are concerned, but I do think it might be a good idea if those on the majority side of the aisle they just would not try quite so hard to defend the bill because the committee adopted in this form, but be a little more realistic about this thing. I say that to the Republican side of the aisle also. Nobody, of course, wants to injure this program. I suppose it will be like water on a duck's back to insist on a small reduction of 10 percent on this big item here for more than $300,000.

I do not think, according to the hearings as I have read them, that the $10,000 cut that was mentioned was particularly scientific, as far as that goes, but here is one part of the program that does not connect very closely with our war program. If we use a little independent judgment and save 10 cents out of every dollar on this item of more than $300,000, we would save $30,000. That is a lot of money out in my part of the United States. Of course, we will have some travel. People who have money will travel around some, but we must bend our energies now to win this war. We have 2,000,000 men in the service and we are going to put 2,000,000 more in before long. Our consideration will be given to something else than traveling and vacationing this summer, that is most of us. We can maintain these monuments and keep them in shape at least for this year and you can trim these salaries and cut out some of the help, because you will not need so much of it. Many of these men will be in the service. If not in the service, they will be needed somewhere else far more necessary right now than in this kind of employment.

All you have to do is to take 10 percent of the whole thing. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] suggested that this straight cut did not mean anything. It will mean a saving of $30,000 to the taxpayers of this country. That is what it will mean. The chairman of the subcommittee is not going to take the floor and tell you there has been any so-called scientific cutting in this measure. The reduction of $10,000 made by the committee does not appear to be scientific. If so, the hearings do not disclose it.

Let us be realistic now and appreciate the fact that we need this money for our war program and for guns and tanks and

airplanes far more than for activities of this kind right now. We are not asking you to eliminate even a major part of the expenditure; just 10 percent. It may have been all right to approve this item in full a few months ago, but it is not right now. It ought to be reduced more. I just do not see how or why Members on both sides of the aisle would not be glad to support the amendment. I will prophesy one thing: If this kind of legislation comes to the House a year from now, it will be a lot less than it is today. It will be reduced much more than 10 percent. We just will not have the money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the suggestion has been made that the Republican Members had agreed to this bill when it came to the floor. I served notice on the last day when we marked up the bill that there were many items I disagreed on. If the Chairman will remember on numerous occasions as we went down through the bill I said: "Let us go back to the 1932 appropriations." On numerous items that were cut down we said: "We will take so much out of travel, so much out of communications; we will make an over-all cut leaving it to the Clerk to suggest where these cuts should be made."

I call attention to another thing. Before Pearl Harbor the Secretary of the Interior asked for $349,756,568. After Pearl Harbor, that near disaster, the Bureau of the Budget cut it $50,000,000 below last year's bill. And then the Secretary of the Interior said: "You are pikers, I can find another $10,000,000 in here you can cut out." Since that time the Dutch Navy has suffered considerable losses.

Since that time the Dutch East Indies have fallen; Singapore has fallen; Bataan stands by the grace of God, General MacArthur, General Wainwright, and gallant American and Philippine troops. Boys from my district share in that honor. Every day we face new sacrifices. The American people will have to reappraise the luxuries they have had. The Secretary of the Interior has been first and foremost in calling upon the American people to do without gasoline. He urged this upon them long before there was a legitimate shortage. Every hour that we fail to gain some territory in the Pacific—yes; in the four corners of the world where our troops are stationed—we are going to have to reappraise our position on these appropriations and see if we cannot cut more; see if we cannot place more men into the war-production jobs for our armed forces. I think that indicates how this subcommittee did a $17,000,000 better job than Mr. Ickes and the Bureau of the Budget. Today I still want to cut nondefense items below the subcommittee figures.

A lot of amendments have been turned down, but next year, I promise you, we will come in here and scrape more from these items.

I want to call one other thing to your attention—that in 1941 the Interior supply bill was $155,000,000. This bill is $162,000,000 already, and the deficiency bill that will come up tomorrow carries a deficiency appropriation for the Interior Department for 1942; so I suggest we go through this bill now with a fine-tooth comb.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio always makes an inspiring address. The fact is he almost had me convinced until I remembered how he and some of his Republican colleagues voted in the committee to raise the bill $2,800,000 above the Budget estimate. Where was his economy then? It is quite true the gentleman did make several splendid lectures to the committee, that he did give notice there were certain items in the bill in which he reserved the right to offer amendments to cut. Nevertheless, the gentleman was one of the prime movers in adding $2,800,000 to the bill. I desire to make it plain that I am not criticising him for doing it because as I said a moment ago I believe the projects he voted for are desirable just like there are many other desirable and worth-while projects in the country. I am not saying that a dollar of that $2,800,000 will be wasted; I do not think so. I am not criticising him for it at all but merely calling attention to the fact that he is making mountains where there are not even any molehills.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 36, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boulder Dam National Recreational Area, Ariz. and Nev.: For administration, protection, improvement, and maintenance of the recreational activities of the Boulder Dam National Recreational Area and any lands that may be added thereto by Presidential or other authority, including not exceeding $800 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles, $91,375.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A CHALLENGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, with threats of civil strife if Congress persists in making it possible for every American citizen, by his work here at home, to support the men in the fighting line, Philip Murray and William Green, presidents of the C. I. O. and the A. F. L., have challenged the courage and the patriotism of every Member of Congress.

That is a challenge which we should not delay in accepting. Hitlerism, whether it be practiced in Germany by Hitler or here in America by labor dictators, is equally unthinkable. Hitler compels men and women to work when and where he wills. Murray and Green tell us that no man or woman shall work without becoming members of their organizations and paying into their treasuries the sums they demand.

Let us for the moment forget pay and a half, double pay, the 40-hour week, and get down to the basic issue—the closed shop.

The closed shop smacks of Hitlerism. The President told us he never would force it upon the American worker. Nevertheless, through an arbitration board, with Steelman acting as his representative, he did that thing less than 20 days later.

Today 15,000 free-born, liberty-loving American citizens, if they would work here at home in support of our fighting men, are being forced to bow to the will of, and pay the price exacted by, the American Federation of Labor, or forego the jobs which are offered and which they can perform at Camp Pickett, Va. That charge is made by Governor Darden, of Virginia. It is substantiated by the investigation of State Labor Commissioner John H. Hall. We learn from his report that initiation fees and monthly dues charged to individual members of the various unions employed at Camp Pickett are as follows:

Carpenters and joiners, $30, $2; operating engineers, $30.45, $4; painters and decorators, $25, $2; teamsters and truck drivers, $10, $2.25; electrical workers, $25, $5; sheet-metal workers, $50, $2.50; glaziers, $25, $2; plumbers and steamfitters, $55, $2.50; asbestos workers, $100, $3; elevator constructors, $200, $2.50; iron workers, $12.75, $4.50; metal lathers, $50, $2.50; cement finishers, $100, $2; laborers, $6, $1.50.

Yesterday it was that Green and Murray, presidents of the A. F. L. and the C. I. O., according to the press, told the American people that, if they insisted upon exercising their God-given, their constitutional right to assist in the defense of their country without meeting the demands of these two unions, civil strife would come to this land of ours.

Here are two men, spokesmen for two organizations—two organizations which insist that only their members shall be gainfully employed—threatening to start a civil war here at home, while the Nation is sending hundreds of thousands of its finest young men to fight and die on every continent, on every sea, the world over.

Yes, cowards and lacking in patriotism are we, if we fail to meet this challenge without further delay.

Philip Murray, testifying before the House Naval Affairs Committee in opposition to labor legislation, said:

That the committee had the responsibility of correcting misinformation that has been sponsored and fostered by antilabor groups * * * and of rebuking once and for all those in public life and in private life who are attempting to disrupt and divide our Nation into groups.

The only individuals, the only groups, whose activities disrupt and divide our Nation on this question are Mr. Murray and Mr. Green and those who with them

contend that their organizations shall have a monopoly of defense work.

Said William Green on the same occasion, and I quote:

> I charge that the sponsors and supporters of this bill are now waging an undeclared war against President Roosevelt and against the workers of America who believe in the policies of his administration.

How absurd is that statement in view of the record of these two labor organizations.

Who was it who, in 1937, invaded the State of Michigan and with armed goon squads beat into submission the workers of General Motors at Flint, Mich.? Who was it who took possession of some of the cities of Michigan and by force maintained possession for weeks—yes, for months? Who was it who carried on that undeclared war against civil authority? It was the C. I. O., of which Murray is the head

Who is it who today is carrying on, in the city of New York, an undeclared war, civil strife, by means of which its members stop the trucks of honest farmers seeking to carry food and produce to the inhabitants of New York City; hold them up and by force and violence rob them before permitting them to use the highways and streets of that city? None other than the Teamster's Union affiliated with the A. F. of L., of which Mr. William Green is the president.

Talk about war! For weeks, for months—yes, for years—these two organizations, with the approval of their presidents—for they have not stopped the practice—have been carrying on an undeclared war, a war of violence, a war of beatings, of killings of defenseless, unprotected, law-abiding citizens. They have practiced extortion. They have practiced what one Justice of the United States Supreme Court characterized as highway robbery—not on one occasion, but day after day, month after month, and year after year.

And now, brazenly, while the country is fighting for its life, after we have suffered almost irreparable losses in the Pacific, while Churchill says we are losing the Battle of the Atlantic through the sinkings by submarines, these two men, claiming to be patriotic, loyal American citizens, have the effrontery to declare that, unless they and their organizations are permitted to continue the practice of extortion, of graft, which they have been carrying on, no man, no woman, can work here at home in support of MacArthur and his armed forces; in support of our Air Corps, of our Navy.

All who oppose their demands for a monopoly over all workers, they charge, are creating discontent and but little veiled is their threat that, unless the Federal Government yields to their unlawful, their exorbitant, their un-American and their unjust demands, they will bring about civil strife.

If that be their attitude, then we should challenge them to bring on that strife without further delay and before, through their acts in weakening our national defense, Hitler and Hirohito have reached our shores.

Said William Green:

> We cannot afford in the Nation's crisis to take time out to fight another and undeclared war among ourselves here in America.

His acts show that the alternative is a submission by our people and our Government to his rule, to his demands.

As just stated, the record of the past shows who, with blackjack, with lead pipe, with bludgeon, with stones, brickbats, and guns, has made war upon American workingmen, American workingwomen.

Let Murray and Green, or either of them, name one individual who is supporting the present proposed labor legislation who has, by word or act, advocated or committed any act of violence against any laboring man.

Those who have gone forth to beat, to maim, and to kill, to destroy property and deprive workers of their jobs, have been pickets and the goon squads of these two labor organizations.

Overlong has the American Federation of Labor harbored convicted racketeers and criminals. Overlong has the C. I. O. placed in positions of power and in control of vast sums of money known Communists and advocates of the overthrow of our Government by force.

For years, farmers, tillers of the soil, driving, in their own motor vehicles, their produce to the markets in our cities, have, by force and violence and threats of force and violence, been compelled to stand and deliver a part of their hard-earned money to the agents of the American Federation of Labor.

Now, when the fate of our Nation is at stake, these men declare that if we throw open the gates of our factories, of our mills, and our mines, throw open the gates of the yards which surround our cantonments, so that law-abiding, loyal, patriotic American citizens, with sons and brothers and relatives in the armed forces, can go into those places of employment and work to preserve the life of the Nation, there will be civil strife.

They ask more than does Hitler, Hirohito, or Mussolini. For the present at least all those three enemies of our country are asking is that we get out and stay out of the lands adjacent to their territories. These two men go further than they and tell us that we cannot work in our own industries, in our own cantonments; that we cannot make the shells, the guns, the tanks, and the planes which are vitally necessary if we are to win this war, until they have collected all sums which they consider they need or desire; until we have signed on the dotted line and acknowledged their rule.

Hitlerism at least is some distance away and the war with him is in the open, as it is with Japan. These men announce that we shall have war here at home and that challenge of theirs, uttered yesterday, should be accepted and answered in the characteristic American way. They should be told that Americans who fight for freedom on all the seven seas and on every continent will fight for freedom here at home.

If this Congress has courage and patriotism, it will at the earliest possible moment accept this challenge by legislation which will protect the American worker, who, after all, is patriotic and who does not by any means subscribe to the doctrine of these two who so misrepresent patriotic American labor as to demand that the American brother and the American father cannot, without their permission, support the brother or son who is offering up his life in the defense of all.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Travel Bureau: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to encourage travel in the United States and for other purposes", approved July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 773-774), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses incident to participation by the Travel Bureau in international expositions and conferences dealing with travel; printing and binding; books, newspapers, and periodicals, $9,820.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 119, line 8, strike out all of lines 8 to 16, inclusive.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike from the bill an item of $9,820 for a Travel Bureau. I realize it seems to be more or less a matter of formality to offer amendments for a reduction of any of these items. The inference I gathered a few minutes ago was to the effect that since the committee saw fit to bring in these figures, it was not up to the Members of the House to raise very much question as to whether the item should or should not be allowed. Of course, if we are expected to abide entirely by the decision of the committee, admitting they are very competent, when they bring the bill to the floor of the House, what is the use of debating the bill at all? Why not vote "yea" or "nay" and let it go at that, or why not take the recommendation of the committee and not even have a vote, if that is the attitude we are expected to take?

Let me call your attention to this item for the Travel Bureau. Somebody got a bright idea about a year ago and thought we ought to have a Travel Bureau, so this Congress agreed to spend about $75,000 to encourage travel in the United States through a new streamlined bureau. A fine new establishment was set up in Washington, together with some branch offices.

As I understand it, the thing did not go over big. They spent about $45,000, and there is still $30,000 unexpended. That ought to be put back in the Treasury or they will spend that. Even the Bureau of the Budget saw fit to reduce the amount to $20,000. Then the committee thought it had better not destroy the whole thing, so they made it $9,820. They just did not have the courage to eliminate it. Looks as though they, or someone, thought some fine day they might want to revive it. So we have an office down here, and we have to employ somebody to keep it open, pay

them a salary, and also the salary of a secretary, probably. They put out a little bit of literature. Goodness alive, the thing was only conceived a year ago. We certainly don't need it now.

We do not want to spend any money on travel this year, and especially the Federal Government. Why, on the face of the very thing, it is bad. Let us cut it out and if next year or some time after this war, when and if it is over, you want to establish this kind of a thing and think you can afford to and you believe the taxpayers of this country want it, all right, but let us shut it up before it spends any more of the taxpayers' money that they don't have. Since this Bureau can't be defended on need for war effort, it will probably be suggested that we should have it to connect with a "good neighbor" policy. That is an excuse. We are spending millions of dollars for that purpose in other respects. This $9,820 will not help much in that regard. It will just pay the salary of two people, that's all.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman, of course, knows that the day is not far off when the Government may have to ration travel because of lack of equipment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Why, sure. Our people are being told they should not travel any more than necessary. We must save the cars, the tires, and the gasoline. Train travel is about to be discouraged to give way to those who must go. The first thing we know, there will be a bureau set up at the expense of the Government advising the public not to travel. The very idea of the existence of such a thing as a Travel Bureau, at a cost of approximately $10,000 is not good.

This is one time when we ought to forget there is an aisle down through the middle of the House and vote for this amendment. It is only $9,820 but it will buy an airplane. I do not think many Members even knew we had a Travel Bureau until they read this bill. I do not think anybody can get up here and defend the use our people had out of that Bureau during the year we had it, and which has cost the taxpayers of this country $45,000 already. I wish someone would tell us just where the $45,000 was spent and what for. It would be interesting to know, especially before we spend any more money on it.

There are two things involved here. One is to save the money and the other is the very principle of the thing. Let us just cut this out. Let us show we are willing to cut one thing out that does not have anything to do with national defense. Furthermore, in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, I do not see how you can vote against my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Was this Bureau created for the purpose of encouraging travel in the United States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is as I understand it and that is what the hearings tell us.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the policy of the Government now was to discourage travel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman agrees with me. I think that is correct, and that is the reason we ought to cut this particular item out. This is not an old, established Bureau. This is just what somebody thought of a year ago and it was put in here. I do not know why it came in here in the first place. The hearings do not even disclose what services were rendered from the $45,000 that has already been spent. It should also be noted that the Department of the Interior, through other bureaus, is spending thousands of dollars in publicizing and advertising the many attractive places that come within its jurisdiction. Here is a chance to vote out $10,000 and save that much money.

I hope the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations will agree to my amendment and not try to defend this kind of an item. It just does not look good on the face of it. Of course, somebody is going to lose a rather fat salary for a rather easy job. A stenographer or secretary will have to get another job. That will not be difficult. They will probably tell you they want to encourage the South Americans to come up here and travel around. Those people are going to be too busy to spend much in travel during the next year. I do not think $9,820 spent for a couple of employees in a Washington office will go very far for a purpose of that kind. We need to save the $9,820. The spending of it will not do the taxpayers of this country much good. It should be used for better purposes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have 5 of those minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I want 5 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] wants 5 minutes, but I shall be glad to split my time.

Mr. DITTER. I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma will agree with me that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have used very little time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman, and I also agree that whenever the gentleman speaks he is always listened to with a great deal of interest.

Mr. DITTER. That is a very gracious compliment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is one of the most effective speakers on the floor of the House, and I shall not ask him to cut any of his time. I shall give the gentleman from California 4 of my minutes, and close in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I should first like to have the RECORD show that with few exceptions the majority has opposed every effort that has been made by the minority to bring about economies in the administration of the Department of the Interior. A very determined demand is evidenced throughout the country for economy in government. The people are demanding economy and efficiency. These teller votes and the aye and no votes do not give the full record. It should be of record that the minority has made efforts to economize but that every one of these efforts has been met with the almost solid opposition of the majority. Spending has become a fixed habit with the majority.

As to the amendment before us, my distinguished friend from Oklahoma will remember that this is the item having to do with the pamphlet, the pamphlet of confusion, to which I directed the attention of the House yesterday. It is the activity that urges us to travel, to become nomads, wanderers, and rovers, when we have no gasoline and no rubber. What possible objection could there be to the elimination of the activity in its entirety? That is what this amendment seeks to do. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from New York—and I know that the Department of the Interior is close to his heart—and to my friend from Oklahoma, who has been most zealous for the interests of the Secretary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I believe and the majority party believes in sound economy, but I do not believe in political economy, which you on the minority side are practicing.

Mr. DITTER. My friend fails to answer. There is no such thing as economy in the New Deal. My question is this. What harm could there be in the elimination of this activity in its entirety? Does the gentleman approve of the publication of pamphlets telling America to travel, when we have neither the gasoline nor the rubber to do it? In other words, would it not be wise to eliminate conflict between Mr. Henderson on the one hand and Mr. Ickes on the other? I should like my very able and distinguished friend from New York to answer that question. What harm could there be? What loss would there be?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming the gentleman went into the national parks to visit, would he not like to receive a pamphlet issued by the Park Service giving him information which would enable him to see the beauties of that particular park?

Mr. DITTER. My understanding is that such publications are not provided for by this $10,000. This $10,000 provides for the confusions which I believe the gentleman from New York was willing to admit yesterday were foolish. That is what this $10,000 is for, to publish the contradictions and confusions of the New Deal—pure waste.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has spent probably more than $195 in talking about this item, and that is what these pamphlets cost about which

the gentleman raises his voice so vociferously at this time. At the same time, I point out that when it comes to real funds, everything is silent, silent as the grave. The gentleman is talking about $195, when this committee has already reduced this travel bureau item from $75,000 to less than $10,000.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman will not take all my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thought I was taking a little more time than the gentleman wanted me to take.

Mr. DITTER. I have this to say in answer to the gentleman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be using $195 worth of printing in connection with the opposition that is presently being made by him, but I believe $195,000 and more might well be saved if a few more on the other side of the aisle would be articulate and active in their opposition to the extravagances of this administration. I regret, and it is to be deplored that the gentleman from Oklahoma can find no better justification than that to which he has resorted. My question has not been answered. To attempt to turn the subject on to the costs of the debates here in the House is a confession of weakness. The truth of the matter is—there is no answer—no reason why the activity as a whole could not be cut from the people, and no one would mourn the loss other than the pay rollers who get the benefit.

The question involved here is not the saving of $195. It goes much deeper than that. The problem here is the elimination of an activity that has no useful function to perform at this time—to make a start at house cleaning here in Washington—to get rid of the parasites that have fastened themselves on the public pay roll and who are extremely reluctant to let go. The problem can be solved in one way—to set about the job of separating these agencies which have no present excuse for existence from the public purse. Instead of coddling them by hunting for some excuse for their existence, close them up and save men and money and materials. It can be done if there is a will to do it.

I confess that I do not know what my friends mean by the phrase "political economy," as contrasted with what they term "sound economy." I am familiar as a result of my experience here in the House during the last 8 years with political profligacy, with political spending, with political bounties, but I have seen little or nothing which impresses me as a genuine effort to save money—to economize—to make $1 do the work of two—to save if an excuse could be found to spend. The best evidence at hand to substantiate this assertion is an examination of the public debt at the beginning of this administration and at the close of the second term. That may represent "sound economy" to some men, but to me it is the indication of an unsound, an unwise, and a loose fiscal policy—a wasting of a national substance in riotous living.

I shall not dwell at length on the reference to the costs entailed in carrying on debates in the House. Suffice it to say that as long as I am a Member of the House I shall not be intimidated by a suggestion that free and full debate on controversial subjects must be measured on a dollar basis—that the merits or demerits of a proposal dare not be discussed because of the cost of reporting the debates. Rubber stamps may be less expensive in the costs of recording the proceedings of this body, but my conviction is that we would be a wealthier people today had we had fewer rubber stamps in days gone by.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I believe the opposition to the Travel Bureau is shortsighted. The 21 republics of North and South America have united in organizing an Inter-American Travel Conference that is engaged in promoting understanding and better political and business relations between North and South America. Each of these countries has an agency similar to our Travel Bureau. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] was a delegate to that conference at Mexico City last year. He speaks in the highest terms of the work and associations of that conference as beneficial to our country. Another conference is set to meet in the capital of Argentina in September of this year. The gentleman from North Carolina states that men of the highest type in the 21 republics—and this year including Canada—are going to engage in that conference.

These other American countries are all contributing to the support of agencies established by their governments to carry on such work as is done by our Travel Bureau. Many nations of the world have engaged in such activities for years. Canada has raised its appropriation this year for this purpose from $350,000 to $500,000. The United States has an annual travel bill of $7,000,000,000. Would it not be poor judgment to force representatives of our Government when they go to Argentina to engage in this conference to admit that the United States is the only 1 of the 21 republics of North and South America that fails to cooperate in its relation to the travel problem? That travel must have so much to do with promoting understanding and business relations with our sister republics.

The appropriation has already been reduced from $75,000 to less than $10,000. Fifty-five thousand dollars of that was reduced by voluntary action of the Department as a concession to war conditions. The committee itself further reduced it to about $10,000. I think that was a mistake to reduce it so much. But if we considered it only from the standpoint of the domestic situation in promoting travel, it would be important to preserve at least a skeleton organization. In the last 25 years I have traveled into every State in the Union, sometimes for business, sometimes for pleasure, and always for my benefit. From my experience in traveling I am satisfied the Travel Bureau can do and is doing a useful work.

The work of the Bureau is mainly in coordinating information for the benefit of the traveler. It has little to do with producing printed material and expenses of that kind, but it serves a good purpose in supplying useful travel information from original sources without publication by it. It is particularly useful in contacting and coordinating travel information between our States and the other American countries. It is a promoter of understanding, good will, and better business relations.

I see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is here and I would like to have him speak further within the time allotted to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will not cut this appropriation. Practically nine-tenths of this amount of $9,820 will go to pay the expenses of our attending and participating in international expositions in the western republics.

Just listen to me a minute. We have neglected these countries for years and years, until the business was taken away from us and until there arose among the people of the western republics a real antipathy and dislike toward the United States. This statement is undoubtedly true, and I think every man in this House realizes this. We are now attempting to overcome whatever feeling of neglect there is on our part toward our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere by cultivating these people and by stimulating spiritual, commercial, and friendly relations and by promoting unity between us all, a unity which will vouchsafe the political safety and welfare of all the western republics. This is one of the finest things we can possibly do and most of this item goes for these purposes alone. The money is not used for pamphlets or for advertisements or for papers, but to pay the expenses of representatives of this country to a congress that meets and considers the beneficial relationships which should exist between all the people of this great Western Hemisphere. We should have begun to cultivate such a relationship 50 or 100 years ago, and this Nation would be better off today if we had done this, as well as all other republics of the New World. I trust that the good sense of this committee will not allow this item to be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim that this Committee is infallible.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Not now.

It has made mistakes, but I call attention to the fact that every administrative item in this bill has been cut and reduced drastically. Some of them have been cut as much as 75 percent. It held hearings for 1 month, every day, including Saturdays, and I am sure the committee was in agreement on this item that we reduced more than 75 percent. So it just occurs to me, inasmuch as this item has already been reduced from $75,000 to below $10,000, inasmuch as every travel item in the bill has been reduced, and remembering, too, that we have cut the park service

$9,000,000, that the present figure should stand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 41, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Food habits of birds and animals: For investigating the food habits and economic value of North American birds and animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including methods of conserving beneficial and controlling injurious birds and animals, $50,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 124, line 21, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out the item which provides for an expenditure of $50,000 which is contained in this bill for investigating the food habits of birds. The item is captioned "Food habits of birds and animals."

I believe that the time has come when the American people are no longer willing to tolerate an expenditure of this kind. I am not in favor of permitting an agency of the Government to go on a wild-goose chase or on a snipe hunt. I wonder if the Department is trying to find out who killed Cock Robin or if it is endeavoring to ascertain how much wood would a woodchuch chuck if a woodchuck would chuck wood.

This is just an absurd expenditure of public funds. The idea of spending $50,000 to investigate the food habits of birds. How can Members of Congress stand before the country in this emergency and defend an expenditure of Federal funds for such a purpose?

I was very much surprised, upon an examination of the record, to find that the Department spent $80,000 last year investigating the habits of birds.

The report indicates that "extensive records of the economic relationships of foreign birds and animals are maintained to guide in the determination of departmental action with respect to proposed importation of foreign species." The record clearly fails to disclose a justification for this item. If the Department has not been able to find out all that they want to find out about the food habits of birds with the tremendous appropriations which have already been provided, then I suggest that they call in some farm boy from down in North Carolina to give them full information regarding the subject What Birds Feed On.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman said that they appropriated $80,000 for this particular thing last year.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Did it ever occur to the gentleman from North Carolina that they set up a fund to carry on some of these experiments, and that they never do arrive at any conclusion. It is like Tennyson's brook, it runs on and on forever. It will gather this information year in and year out, and still they need the money to make an experiment.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I call your attention to a news article which appeared in today's Washington Daily News, written by E. A. Evans, regarding the Interior Department contribution to war effort. I read excerpts from Mr. Evans' article:

European butterfish lay their eggs in empty oystershells.

Old male Pacific walruses weigh from 2,000 to 3,000 pounds.

These items were taken by Mr. Evans from Current Conservation, published monthly by the Interior Department and described by the Interior Department as "A clip sheet of current news about the Federal Government's wartime conservation activities in mobilizing the Nation's natural resources for victory." In this grand publication we find the following:

The thresher shark kills its prey with its tail. The elf owl is the tiniest owl in North America, being no larger than a sparrow. The tongue of a woodpecker is longer than the bird's head. The little jumping mouse can sometimes leap as much as 10 feet in one bound. The catfish of the African swamps is the only fish which it is definitely known will swim upside down. Woodpeckers are the only birds in the United States that can dig holes in solid trees. After being A. W. O. L. for a year, a pair of Canada geese recently returned to George Washington National Monument.

The time has come to stop this foolish expenditure of public funds for these scientific articles, circulars, leaflets, and bulletins. Who cares about how long a woodpecker's tongue is or how much wood a woodpecker can peck, or how far a little mouse can jump?

I urge the adoption of my amendment which will strike from the bill this foolish and absurd item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is very easy to laugh these things off. It is so easy to be facetious and resort to ridicule. That method of debate is too often indulged in when one does not have sound argument. In my judgment the wording of the paragraph under discussion is unfortunate, but if the gentleman will investigate he will find that this activity is of considerable importance, and I may say to the gentleman that I have received telegrams and letters from some of the leading sportsmen of the country criticizing the committee and demanding that this and other items for the Fish and Wildlife Service be increased. The members of the Izaak Walton League and many other sports organizations of the country feel that this committee cut this and several other items in this bill pertaining to fish and wildlife entirely too much. This item now is $30,700 below what was spent last year for this purpose, and then the committee cut $21,550 below the Budget estimate. I do not believe the item should be further reduced.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman tell the Committee how much money is contained in this bill for birds? Here you have one item for predatory birds, $700,000; and then for the protection of migratory birds, $342,000; and then there is another item of $10,000——

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, the gentleman knows that there are several other items in this bill for fish and wildlife, but he also knows it has been drastically cut. Is it his wish to destroy that service? What does the gentleman desire? The Congress of the United States in its wisdom established the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is one of the most popular services in the United States, and if he thinks the people of this country are not behind it he is mistaken. The committee has already cut this and three or four other items in this bill far below the figure that any evidence would justify. Practically every item in the bill has been slashed.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is much more than a mere matter of humor, and it can be neither laughed off nor killed by ridicule. If it were entirely a matter of investigating the life and habits of a bird or some birds, it would be quite different, but this is an activity that has been carried on for years and covers all birds and animals.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Not at the moment. Ten years ago they had over $100,000 in this item, and it does not cover merely investigating the habits of birds, but this is for investigating food habits, and the economic value of North American birds and animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including methods of conserving beneficial and controlling injurious birds and animals. Aside from the interest of American sportsmen in the wildlife of the Nation, the birds and the animals of this Nation fall into two categories, those that are beneficial and those that are destructive to agriculture, forestry, and horticulture.

It is naturally a subject that will never come to a conclusion. It should not, because the mysteries and habits of the animal kingdom can never be fully solved. But we have now invested, rightly or wrongly, millions and millions of dollars in refuges for our wildlife. I think it a wise action.

American sportsmen are contributing millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury, much more than this entire appropriation. You may as well say that because we have two dozen or three dozen fish hatcheries and we are stocking the streams that we ought to completely eliminate that activity. Now, there is a limit to that which is economy, and when you leave economy and go into destruction——

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman referred to injurious birds in one paragraph. That is the one I am trying to strike out. In the next page you refer to predatory birds, animals, and so forth. That carries an appropriation of $700,000.

Mr. LEAVY. Let me say to my friend that the Fish and Wildlife Service is collecting both from commercial and American sporting interests who are interested in game and wild birds, and food fish and food animals are contributing far more than we are proposing to appropriate here. Every State in the Union maintains a very large and capable fish and game department. These activities just fit into that service and coordinate their activities with the various States.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman claim that this work should go on and on forever?

Mr. LEAVY. It should go on so long as it justifies itself, and the gentleman has not shown that it is not justified.

Mr. COOLEY. I can show by the record that it has not justified itself.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the gentleman recognize that scientific men have agreed that insects are the greatest foe of the human family and that birds are the greatest protectors of the human race? Our feathered friends may save us from our enemies.

Mr. LEAVY. There is no question about it at all.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder if the gentleman would give us the amount of the unexpended balance in this item? In other words, as we were discussing this travel item a moment ago, the record showed a very substantial unexpended balance. In line with the amendment offered by the gentleman a moment ago, it would seem to me that we should know how much the unexpended balance is at the present time before the gentleman from Washington can justify the appropriation that he now endorses.

Mr. LEAVY. I cannot, on a single item like this, say what the unexpended balance is.

Mr. DITTER. Well, it is relevant, is it not?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; it is relevant. If you contend there will be an unexpended balance at the end of the year, the burden should be upon you to show what there will be. Presumptively we only appropriated enough last year to run through this fiscal year. Now we have cut that amount down about one-third for the next fiscal year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me read this for the gentleman's information. It is found in the last paragraph on page 743 of the hearings:

> Of this sum $42,832 has been allocated for the purchase of refuge land, and $4,500 for investigation of migratory birds.

Mr. LEAVY. I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman suppose that any of the superfluous employees of this Bureau would have to go to work if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. LEAVY. No. I presume those that they have are all working, and are necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of not wanting it to appear that I want to laugh this $50,000 off. Not for a moment. I do not think anyone wants to appear to laugh off the item of $50,000. This is a serious matter. I think that this expenditure would do some little good. Of course, it would. It is not just for nothing at all, but is it worth it in the light of our other needs at this crucial hour? Is it worth it in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury? Is it worth it considering the demands being made on the taxpayers of this country? Had we not better use this money to feed the soldiers rather than just use it to study the food habits of birds? What do you really think about it?

I realize these sportsmen who have just been mentioned are highly patriotic citizens. If this were all the money you are spending for birds, that would make the situation somewhat different.

There are hundreds of thousands of dollars in this bill to be expended for birds.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the author of this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. The section that I offered to strike out makes no reference whatever to game birds or to sportsmen, but I think that the language is fallacious, because it tries to connect the food habit of birds with horticulture or agriculture or forestry.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. I think the question the gentleman asked a moment ago about the destruction of insects and things like that with relation to birds has nothing at all to do with this particular item.

Here is one item of expense that does not add up in any direction with the defense program. It has nothing to do with the war effort. You cannot sustain it in that respect by any stretch of the imagination. Let us strike out this $50,000 and save that much money for far more important uses. There is still thousands of dollars in this bill being spent for birds. I know we are not going to have any roll call on this amendment, but let us use our good, common horse sense and save this $50,000. I know the country will feel a little better if they know there is some little gesture being made toward economy in this bill. I hope you will sustain the gentleman who has offered this amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Member from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the present bill larger or smaller than last year's appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, the entire bill is for more than last year, but this particular item has been cut down to some extent.

It seems rather strange reasoning to say that because the committee cuts an item that is the reason why we ought not to cut it further. As I said a moment ago, it does seem to me that it is only fair that the members of the Committee of the Whole should have the right to give consideration to these cuts without having it suggested to them that just because the committee brings in a bill with a few cuts we should not reduce it some more. Let us not vote for any item unless we convince ourselves that it is a wise expenditure. And do it in the light of the need of the hour.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not feel that while perhaps the committee cut the bill but not as much as the gentleman himself wolud have cut it, yet the committee has spent a considerable amount of its time listening to the opinion of people who have been justifying these appropriations? I am wondering if the gentleman has read the hearings to the extent that he feels he is justified in making the argument he does?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I have read the hearings, and I certainly don't find anything in this evidence that convinces me that we should spend $50,000 to study food of birds.

I know the committee did not listen to anyone else than those sustaining the expenditures. That is the trouble. Why do you not ask someone to come in and be heard on the opposite side?

Mr. LEAVY. Did the gentleman ask to appear before the committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly not. But the gentleman is hardly fair. How could I know when the committee would give consideration to these particular items? I realize, as the gentleman stated, about the only ones that are heard, are those interested in these items of expenditures and in favor of them, but I am talking about John Q. Public, who does not have a chance to be present except possibly through his representative here in Congress and that is what I am trying in my humble way to do this afternoon. I do not say the committee did not exercise its best judgment, but I am saying that all of the witnesses heard justifying this expenditure are those who will benefit from the funds and those who want the activity carried on. This is a place where we can save $50,000. It will injure no one. Those who get their salaries from this fund can be employed in far more important jobs right now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman did not appear before the committee and make such request did he?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no; certainly not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There were 30 Members of Congress who did

appear before the committee, including several Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle, and not one made a suggestion to cut a single item but asked for increase of items. Had the committee been guided by their suggestions we would have added several millions of dollars more than the Budget estimate, whereas we bring the bill to the House $17,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In the first place I felt the chairman of the committee would see to it that reductions would be made where it could possibly be done. His committee did cut what is known as estimates, by a little less than 10 percent. The chairman well knows and should appreciate that it is not only the right of any Member to offer amendments to these measures when they are presented to the membership of the House. It is also his duty to do so. The inference that because a Member did not appear before the committee regarding any of these items is not justified, in my opinion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Page 124, line 25, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes but merely enough time to state, in view of what has been argued, that this is an essential service. My amendment would provide for the maintenance of at least a skeleton organization and would preserve some of the things that have been accomplished during the past few years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman point out one good thing that has been accomplished by this expenditure up to this good hour?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman will find it set forth in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. The record fails to make any such disclosure.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly much good has been done by a greater knowledge of the food habits of birds and of the food habits of animals as they affect agriculture and forestry. I know that this is the experience in the Western States where our contacts with the Department of the Interior are close. We feel the work has been of value.

Mr. COOLEY. They have issued a lot of bulletins.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. How else would they spread the knowledge of what discoveries they have made? If it is insisted that a cut must be made in this item, I maintain it should not be stricken out entirely, but enough should be left to provide for a skeleton organization.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to call attention to the fact that this money does go for publications, articles, circulars, leaflets, and bulletins on the life and habits of birds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just to ask the gentleman if he does not feel it is more essential at this time that we study the food necessities of migratory soldiers rather than the food habits of migratory birds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the soldiers are going to be fed, and fed well. As far as I am concerned, while the committee is not in a position to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico—and I am opposed to it—I certainly would favor it over the original amendment to eliminate the item altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEAVY) there were—ayes 61, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying into effect the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act by providing funds for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory-bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds, for developing and administering such areas, for the protection of certain migratory birds, for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1934, as amended by an act entitled "An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, and certain other acts relating to game and other wildlife, administered by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 718–718h), an amount equal to the sum received during the fiscal year 1943 from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly; and in addition thereto an amount equal to the unobligated balance on June 30, 1942, of the total of the proceeds received from the sale of stamps prior to July 1, 1942.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to this paragraph covering the migratory bird conservation fund, I want to call the attention of the committee to what is going on in the Migratory Conservation Commission, which was created by an act of Congress. The chairman of that committee is the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes. Our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is a member of that Commission and two or three United States Senators are also on the Commission. These are the gentlemen who go about the country selecting and buying land for bird sanctuaries. In view of what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said awhile ago as to the importance at this time of thinking about arming, feeding, supporting, and maintaining an army in this awful war in which we are engaged, we are somewhat surprised to find the gentlemen who are administering this program more interested in certain species of ducks and in finding a place where they may light and rest, than in making available every possible dollar for the prosecution of this war. Down in the district which I have the honor to represent, this Commission is instituting proceedings to purchase and take out of cultivation some 33,000 acres of agricultural land at a cost of approximately $400,000, to be converted into one of these bird sanctuaries and covered with water for a place where ducks may swim and rest for a few weeks or months during the year.

The people of those counties do not want this land taken out of cultivation because it will mean the removal of several hundred families from the land on which they now live and are supporting themselves at this time. These lands will be covered with water, converted into a malarial breeding ground, and will not produce one dollar of revenue. On the other hand, these lands will be taken off the tax rolls for purposes of taxation, and will make the tax burden of the people of those counties more difficult to bear.

I take this opportunity to let you know what is going on at a time when we are taxing ourselves to the limit to get funds to prosecute this war. If we were at peace it might be different, but at a time like this it seems sheer nonsense to remove a hundred or two hundred families from these lands and force them to go elsewhere to find homes for the sole purpose of providing a place where birds may rest. I may say that within 10 miles of this proposed sanctuary we have a 6,000-acre Government-owned lake which will provide an ideal resting place for all the birds that will ever come to that part of the country.

To show you how high-handed this commission is, one of my constituents called upon my friend and colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] for some information in regard to this proposed sanctuary that they propose to create down there in this section and it is very interesting to hear what they had to say in reply to that request. You have heard about the tail wagging the dog. Well, we have some commissions in this country now that almost wag the Government and there is little we can do about it. It is a case where the creature has become greater and stronger than the creator.

This letter of reply is from the Secretary of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and is addressed to the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute in order to read this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This letter reads as follows:

Your letter of February 8, accompanied by Mr. R. B. Oliver, Jr.'s, communication to you of February 7, is received. A copy of the letter has been made and the original is enclosed.

I regret to advise that the records of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission are not public, consequently much of the information desired by Mr Oliver cannot be made available. However, I expect to be in Missouri very shortly in connection with field investigations of the Mingo project, and it is my plan to call on Mr. Oliver and others to discuss this matter.

It is my hope that I will also be able to obtain more complete information regarding the point of view of those who are opposing the project at present.

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH DIEFFENBACH,
Secretary, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

I make these remarks today in order that you gentlemen may know how some people insist on spending money at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Speaker of the House did appoint me a member of this commission. I have attended every meeting of the commission since my appointment. I made some suggestions to the commission in reference to getting additional information before land was purchased. For instance, I requested information about the tax value of the land, and so forth, so that we might know that we were going in the right direction, and all this without suggestion from anyone.

At the last meeting of the commission when the proposal was up to purchase this land that my colleague speaks of, nearly $400,000 are involved, and in all 33,000 acres, including acreage that is not in the gentleman's district but in an adjoining district, I wanted to know when the survey had been made. I was informed that it was made in 1935.

I called attention to the fact that since that survey was made a flood-control dam had been constructed down there in the gentleman's district. I also stated it was my understanding that dam had protected that section of the country and it was unfair now to buy that land upon a survey made in 1935. I insisted upon another survey being made. After considerable arguing, they agreed to make a second survey and they sent some men down there to make the survey.

When I received that letter from the secretary of the commission, it was the first time I knew the records of that commission were not available to the public. I wish to assure the membership of the House that if it is within my power, at the next meeting of the commission, those records are going to be made available to the public. Nobody has a right to spend public funds and say that nobody else may look into the manner in which the funds are being spent. I know I am not going to be a party to that. I am not going to remain on a commission that maintains secret records and will not let the general public know what it is doing with the public money.

This money is not appropriated, it comes from the migratory bird conservation fund, which is raised by the sale of duck stamps; but regardless of how it gets there, it should be spent properly. It should not be wasted. I already have the assurance of the Secretary of the Interior, who is chairman of the Commission, that at the next meeting of the Commission the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], in whose district this proposed refuge is located, will have an opportunity to be heard. I am not convinced that this property should be purchased, in view of the fact that the Wappapello Dam has been constructed and that the land down there is no longer subject to overflow as it was prior to the time the dam was constructed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman inform the House if the goose that laid the golden egg is a migratory bird?

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the gentleman will have to ask the gander as to that. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure every Member of the House appreciates the fine and unselfish service the gentleman, as a member of this important Commission, is rendering. As I understand, there are two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate on this Commission, and they review the activities of this agency. I would like to have the names of those gentlemen placed in the RECORD. I can say that the House feels that this Commission will review every item and see that no money is wasted or foolishly expended.

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope the Members of the House and the Senate who are members of this commission will stand together and not approve the purchase of any land that they feel should not be purchased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That expresses my opinion exactly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CCCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman feel that at this time we ought not to go down there and condemn land upon which people are now living and supporting themselves, turn it into a bog or lake, and force those people to go elsewhere and reestablish themselves, when we are trying to produce all the food we can?

Mr. COCHRAN. My answer to the gentleman is that without any suggestion from anybody I have stopped the purchase of this land. That shows my attitude on it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I commend the gentleman for taking this attitude.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of the Governor and employees incident to the execution of the acts of March 3, 1917 (48 U. S. C. 1391), and June 22, 1936 (48 U. S. C. 1405v), traveling expenses of officers and employees, necessary janitor service, care of Federal grounds, repair and preservation of Federal buildings and furniture, purchase of equipment, stationery, lights, water, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for purchase, including exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $4,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, fuel, ice, and electricity necessary in the operation of Government House at St. Thomas and Government House at St. Croix, $147,980.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 136, line 15, after "Saint Croix", strike out "$147,980" and insert "$32,980."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am just like the average American citizen; I am sick and tired of paying deficits. You will find that the American citizens are going to be more sick as the days go by of paying our own deficits, but I hate to think that we have to pay the deficit each year of the Virgin Islands. And why do we have to pay it? Because the management over there is poor.

One of our former associates—Guy Swope, who comes from Harrisburg, Pa., and is a mighty good fellow—heads the office here in the District that has charge of the Virgin Islands. I talked with him yesterday on the telephone. I said, "Guy, we have to do something to stop these deficits in the Virgin Islands." He said, "You are right." I said, "Let us look at what happened in the operation of those islands last year and the year before. Last year we had a deficit of $105,000."

Someone figures that we are going to have a deficit of $115,000 there, and that is why I want to strike out of this item the amount that it is figured will be the deficit next year. Guy Swope is going to see that we do not have a deficit. He is going to do some work over there, and say to the Governor and those in charge of the islands, "We are going to have some real efficiency in the operation of that government and try our best to balance the budget." If we do not balance the Budget of America, we are at least going to balance the budget over in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Government has any air bases in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. RICH. Yes; we do; and they are building some more.

Let me show you another reason why we have these deficits. We started the Virgin Islands Company. We paid for that Virgin Islands Company up to 1934, $2,546,404.50. Then we gave to that company as operating capital from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration $200,000; from the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, $150,000; from the Emer-

gency Relief Administration, $168,813.27; from the Farm Security Administration—Rural Rehabilitation—$257,531.32; from the Work Projects Administration, 1940, $48,000, and from the Work Projects Administration, 1941, $35,000—making a total of $859,344.59.

Add these two totals together and you have a grand total expenditure of $3,405,749 for the Virgin Islands Company.

We capitalized that at $30, and we manufactured rum and sugar. Last year in the operation of that rum plant we lost $60,456.30. If we get a good administration of the Virgin Islands Company, we shall eliminate that $60,000 loss right off the bat. Then we have only half of it raised.

What did they do last year in the harvesting of sugar? There was a lot of sugarcane they did not harvest because they took too long to get it in and it spoiled in the field, or perhaps the Department of Agriculture might not have permitted them to harvest it, because you know we manufacture rum over in Puerto Rico and there were 250,000 tons of cane they did not take in there because the Department of Agriculture said they should not harvest it. They paid them for not harvesting that sugarcane. If they had put the amount that they put into rum into using that sugarcane, let me show you how much sugar we would have saved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. I am sorry we did not raise more sugar and less rum. We would have been helping the country right now if we had done that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I shall not delay the House more than a moment. The situation in the Virgin Islands is really a pitiable one. It is unfortunate we have so many poor people down there. I wish this were not so. I wish economic conditions there were better than they are, but somehow, I just cannot understand why the gentleman would want to interfere seriously with the government there. I might call attention to some of the testimony of the Governor. He tells about the low salaries paid there. He reminded us that some capable men with families are working in his office for as low as $55 per month. The lowest salaries, so I am advised, paid anywhere in this Government are paid in the Virgin Islands, and the Governor pleaded for some additional funds to raise some of these low salaries and to permit him to employ some additional help. The conditions he told us about are nothing to brag about. Some of his remarks were off the record. The sanitary conditions at St. Croix are absolutely deplorable. They are worse than any place, perhaps, on the face of the earth. The Governor begged for additional help in order to clean up that situation. They have a leper colony nearby. Without going into details, I sincerely hope that members of the committee will not cut this item when I say to you that instead of providing additional funds for this activity we have cut it $21,305 below last year's appropriation, and we have also made a cut of $570 in travel pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much of the time of the House at this time of the day, but there are some things here that ought to be considered. There is first the question of salaries. If you will look on page 811 of the hearings you will find, if I am not mistaken, that they increased those salaries about 25 percent. The interesting thing about that is that you increased the higher salaries more than you did the lower salaries. I mention that because of the plea made by the distinguished chairman of the committee. It seems to me if we need to spend money down there in the Virgin Islands to help these poor people we may as well grant the money to them rather than spend thousands of dollars on a rum plant. I understand we spent $60,000 on that, and that certainly is not helping the poor people of the Virgin Islands or of this country.

My understanding is that one of the reasons you have a big deficit here is because you do not tax these big sugar operators down there. These big sugar plantations are not paying their fair share of the taxes. This is the main reason you are losing money. If you could get proper taxes out of them, you would get along all right.

The views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be sustained. For years the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a gallant fight against this use of the taxpayers' money. The United States Government should not be in the business of manufacturing rum. Just think of it. You had better give them twice that much money than let it be used for making liquor. I wish I had the time to discuss this whole problem. Right now we are in this war and we need the sugar. You are going to ration the sugar on the family table and yet the Government right now allows big manufacturers to use the sugar down there to make liquor and then have it sold in this country. We are producing more liquor than we ever have before. Last year the amount that was produced was increased and the amount is higher for the first 3 months of this year. Thousands of gallons of this stuff is imported here every year. We ought to sustain the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It will be said this money or appropriation is not for rum. No; but it is to take up a deficit caused by the use of Federal funds that are used to subsidize the rum business to the extent of $60,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that, so far as I am personally concerned, I agree with him with reference to his views on the rum issue; but that has nothing whatever to do with this appropriation. There is not a dollar in this appropriation for the rum business.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The Virgin Islands have gone into the red $60,000 each year and the deficit comes from this rum company. What are you going to do when you are paying off these deficits?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is not a dollar in this bill for the company to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the trouble is this, that you would not have a deficit if you did not spend the money for making rum, and that is all there is to it. You just cannot get around that. The Federal Treasury is short $60,000 because the Government is in the rum business. It would at least be more commendable if the product were used for alcohol, so much needed in the making of war materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do not say that I make it. I do not make it; I am not responsible for it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly he does not make it. I refer to him only as being in charge of this legislation. The Government is the one that is in the business. As the chairman of this subcommittee, I know the gentleman from Oklahoma pretty well. As a matter of fact, I do not think he favors the Government being in the rum business any more than I do.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 27, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Appropriations herein made shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of vehicles generally known as quarter-ton or half-ton pick-up trucks and as station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger-carrying vehicles and without the cost of purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair being included in the limitation in the various appropriation items for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 138, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for these purposes, namely:

"1. Publications not required by law;
"2. Press service;
"3. Radio broadcasting;
"4. Group contacts;
"5. Exhibits;
"6. Motion pictures;
"7. Lantern slides and lecture material;
"8. Photography;
"9. Individual contacts;
"10. Posters.

"And the amounts submitted by the Department of the Interior, Division of Information, for these purposes shall not be available therefor, and shall be recovered into the Treasury."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the committee to describe this amendment. I discussed it in the early part of the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. The

total amount for the Office of Information in the Department of the Interior is $2,430,770, as reported by the Division of Information of that Department. The correspondence of the Department of the Interior is $216,713 of the total of $2,430,770. The rest is for publications, group contacts—whatever they are—individual contacts, motion pictures, radio programs, photography, lantern slides, and lecture material. All of these things could be cut out since Pearl Harbor. I submit that with the enormous expenditure in the Office of Government Reports, with the enormous expenditure in the Office of Facts and Figures—and it might be referred to as facts and fiction—under the direction of Mr. MacLeish that we do not need to have propaganda agencies in all of the departments, including this one.

There has been steadily growing in Washington a large army of men and women on full-time and part-time compensation to glamorize the activities of the bureaus they represent. Many bureaus that have nothing to do with defense try to get their noses under the tent. So many nondefense bureaus have asked for increased appropriations that their pleas of national defense are commonly referred to as the national prayer.

When we became a united people on December 7 the chairmen of both great political parties sounded a welcome note to the ears of the American people. It was generally headlined throughout the country, "No politics during the duration." But ladies and gentlemen, there was another group that never laid down their pens—2,995 of them working full time and 34,513 working part time. In many instances their only function appears to be to demand appropriations in order to keep themselves in jobs. They represent a political philosophy which is not in tune with either the Republican or Democratic Parties. I have read many of their pamphlets. I have seen duplication after duplication. News reporters have shown me the stuff that they throw in their wastebasket, and have told me they do it day after day. Virtually tons of it are poured out, not only in Washington, but in the field offices throughout the country.

So that you may have some idea of the extent of the activity of the propaganda agencies, I will tell you there are 3,096 counties in the United States. If you eliminate the counties in the solid South, which have no Republican organization and virtually only one party, you could give to every Republican or Democratic county committeeman in the United States a salary for writing political material every day in the year. You could give every Republican or Democratic district committeeman in the United States a salary to send out his political material every day in the year. In addition to that you could give every Republican or Democratic State central committeewoman a salary for sending out political material every day in the year. You could hire 10 more Republican or Democratic central committeemen in each county for part-time work and then pay the whole lot a pay roll of $27,700,000 a year and give them $2,500,000 worth of paper and $49,000,000 worth of postage. Then you would have an idea of what political activity and propaganda at Government expense means to the taxpayer of this Nation.

We have modestly cut the Information Service in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. We have cut the publication of the Yearbook for the farmers. Let us make the same record on the Interior Department. So far we have only cut $100,000 out of this $2,400,000 monstrosity. I contend that it is bad and indefensible for you gentlemen on the other side, again asking for an adjournment of politics, to vote for this propaganda service, paid for by every man who labors, toils, and sweats to buy bonds and arm our men in blue and khaki. Why keep 115 men on the pay roll for full time and 1,918 for part time, to spread propaganda for the administration at public expense?

Mr. STEFAN. Are any of these items tied up with national defense?

Mr. JONES. There definitely is not an item that will help a soldier or a sailor to protect himself from the enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, if the membership will just note the territory embraced in this proposed amendment, and give a second thought to it, they will see that it would actually destroy the usefulness of the whole Interior Department.

As I said at the time we began consideration of this bill, when we began the reading of it, Secretary Ickes, the head of the Interior Department, is an outstanding man. I go further now and state he will go down in history, when the history of this stormy period is impartially written, as one of the great men of his time. Some men disagree with him, and other men are ardent supporters of him. That he is an honest, capable, efficient public servant has never been questioned by anyone. Some persons dislike him and some groups dislike him. I respect him for the enemies he has made. He has made an exceptional fight insofar as the West is concerned to see to it that the resources of the marvelous western country are preserved and utilized, and that includes the territory of Alaska, for the benefit of all the people. He has been a bitter opponent of the exploitation of that region for the benefit of a few. To carry on that type of fight, of necessity engenders opposition and it engenders opposition that is powerful, opposition that is going to make itself felt and heard everywhere.

I would be the last person in the world to charge any Member of this House as opposing the Secretary of the Interior because of opposition from the outside, but I do state that many Members are misled by statements made as facts, that are only biased utterances of individuals, who have felt the righteous wrath of the Secretary, when they sought advantage or special privilege. These statements are given in the press, on the radio, and elsewhere concerning the Department of the Interior, and they are accepted as true by some Members, and then they fight from that position and they argue from that point. Harold L. Ickes does not need to be defended. His public career has been a just and righteous one and speaks far more eloquently than the words of any man.

Now, coming to the amendment in question, I am sure that those on the left side of the aisle just as well as those on the right side, do not believe for a moment that this Government, in a period even when we would practice economy to the extreme, can function without an active, energetic, wide-awake Interior Department. Now, if you believe that, you certainly cannot support this amendment. If you want to destroy that Department or so weaken it as to make it useless, then this is the type of amendment that will do just that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to approve 100 percent what the gentleman has said about Secretary Ickes. I lived in the West since 1904. I know that Secretary Ickes is the best friend of the western country that has ever occupied the position of Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LEAVY. I know he is the type of man who fights to the last ditch a course of conduct that has been exposed in the last 48 hours with reference to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and their dealings with the German dye works. He has had that same battle and fought it for us in connection with aluminum and magnesium where they had a similar arrangement in reference to those metals with the same German dye works. His heroic battle for the people against special privilege in the electric power field is common knowledge.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JONES. Is not the head Oil Coordinator under Mr. Ickes one of the officials of the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Mr. LEAVY. That may be. I do not say—neither does the gentleman from Ohio—that everybody who is an official of the Standard Oil Co. is necessarily dishonest or crooked or a traitor to the cause of this country at this critical time, any more than I would say that they were in other monopolistic activities. I do say no one can, in good conscience, defend the makers of material, or producers of it, who will barter away the rights of the Nation to its enemies, as recent revelations have disclosed as to octane gas, rubber, aluminum, and magnesium.

This amendment ought to be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder who there is in this Hall who thinks that it is a necessity to send out propaganda picture books to maintain the De-

partment of the Interior? When you get down to that point you are down to the point where you recognize and admit that there is no merit in much of its operations.

I have here one picture book of 300 pages. Another picture book that comes out every month, of about 20 pages. That is just a minor factor in the propaganda that is put out by the Department of the Interior. Are we ever going to get to the point where we are honest with the people back home and are ready to cut out the foolish expenditure of the people's money?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true also that the Government Printing Office is overtaxed now with matters pertaining to defense and the necessary functions of Government?

Mr. TABER. To the extent that the Government Printing Office is sending out questionnaires to every private printer all over the country, peddling orders all over. That means it is absolutely ridiculous at this time for us to be spending two and a half million dollars on propaganda in the Department of the Interior.

Now, do not vote on this because somebody wants you to. Vote on it because you want to do the right thing by the people back home. I have heard people on the floor state that we must cut out these nondefense expenditures. This is worse than nondefense. It is absolutely nonsensical and ridiculous and it is absolutely a breach of faith with our people for us to sit here and consent that two and a half million dollars of the people's money be spent on propaganda and printing and all kinds of foolish literature that is not necessary to maintain the problems of the Government.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted by a unanimous vote. It is an amendment that the committee ought to accept instead of talking against.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is no news to this House that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has no particular love for the Secretary of the Interior. He has demonstrated that on many previous occasions. These pamphlets that he talks so vociferously about, or similar ones, have been held up here many times in the past. We had a thousand-dollar speech a while ago on a $195 pamphlet. The gentleman from New York and others will continue to talk about pamphlets until they can rake up some other excuse to snipe at this bill. No one knows better than the gentleman from New York just how far reaching the pending amendment is.

For example, the first item mentioned in that amendment would prohibit the printing of any kind of publications not actually and specifically authorized. That, of course, is an absurdity on the face of it. What he really wants to do is to destroy the office of the Secretary of the Interior. This committee reduced the appropriation for printing in the Department $62,000. We did not just talk to the galleries or for home consumption. We did business.

Now, they talk about radio, as if the Department were buying a lot of radio time. Surely the gentlemen know better. The Department, of course, is not buying radio time. It is not necessary to do so. Their programs are so fine, so patriotic, so educational, and constructive that many of the large radio stations have requested the Department of the Interior for some of their programs. That means, of course, that the public likes and demands more of such programs. Not a dollar is in this bill for the Interior Department for radio time, yet you would think from some of these statements that most of this money went for radio time. And so it is quite obvious that about 99 percent of the opposition to this bill is directed actually against an honest, fearless, and capable Government official, the Secretary of the Interior.

Again I call your attention to the fact that not one of the gentlemen who have criticized the Secretary of the Interior have commended him for voluntarily cutting his own budget $10,000,000 below the original Budget estimate. That is a record on which I challenge my Republican friends, a great many of whom evidently get up an hour early every morning to hate President Roosevelt and his great far-sighted Secretary of Interior. I challenge them to go back to any Republican administration of misrule since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary and point out one example of a Republican official, high or low, who ever asked to have his own budget cut $1. Call the roll; there are no black satchels or Teapot Domes in our political closets.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 49, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Appropriations under the Department of the Interior available for travel shall be available for expenses of the transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 73c-1), and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to certain matters and ask for clarification of them in order that I might know before final passage of this bill whether these figures are correct. As I understand the total request of this Department of the Budget was for $349,756,568, as shown by the hearings on page 40. How much did the Budget finally allow? What was the total Budget estimate for this agency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The total Budget estimate, I may say to my good friend from Wisconsin, was $180,317,266, as shown on page 47 of the report.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that the Secretary of the Interior voluntarily cut his request by $10,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct; he voluntarily cut his Department's estimate $10,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. So that when the matter came before the gentleman's subcommittee for consideration it was how much?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I misunderstood the gentleman. The original Budget estimate as submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by the Budget Bureau was about $10,000,000 in excess of the present estimate—it would have been $190,317,266 without the reduction recommended by the Secretary.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; and how much has the committee cut it in all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee brought the bill back here at $162,634,845; and there have been some considerable cuts which will make it something above $18,000,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman give me a figure showing the total cut on this bill below the Budget estimate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The total committee cut is $17,682,421 below the Budget estimate and that, of course, was after the Secretary had taken his voluntary ten-million-odd cut the day after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention and also that of the Members that we have spent a number of days here, as we frequently do on appropriation bills, worrying about items, arguing and debating, trying to achieve some reductions in governmental expenditures. The committees always try to come in to show they have reduced the bill below the Budget estimate. This is a very laudable ambition. Let me call your attention to a fact, which you will find true in reference to almost every appropriation bill that comes before this Congress. I know it is true of those bills that are reported by the subcommittees of which I have the honor to be a member. I know it is true in this case as shown on page 34 of the hearings. This agency, in the current fiscal year, has received funds transferred to it from emergency funds heretofore given the President, totaling $19,677,035. It received funds transferred from other agencies to this Department of about $2,500,000 more.

Do not worry too much about these little cuts you are making. Do not think you are going to cripple this agency because you cut $50,000 from some wildlife project, or some travel item or printing bill. You have made available in other appropriations millions upon millions of dollars of funds subject to the direction and control of the President. These agencies make a practice, when they have been cut by the Congress, and after we have fought for days and days trying to effect savings of going up to the Budget or to the President and requesting funds out of these so-called emergency funds. I dare say that if this agency is not different than the others, you will find there are deficit items for this agency already before the deficiency subcommittee. I find that in those appropriations being requested for the next

fiscal year for the labor and social-security agencies that they already tell us they have deficiency items before the deficiency subcommittee. To illustrate the point I am making I call attention to one agency for which the House appropriated $1,080,000 last year, but which is actually spending $1,980,000. Where did they get the money? Did the Congress pass upon that $900,000 of additional money? Did the Appropriations Committee pass on that additional $900,000 or the necessity for the additional personnel? No, we did not. They received those funds from "emergency funds." Let us not mislead ourselves. We are trying to save a few million dollars, and every effort should be made to continue the fight for economy However, I want you to know, that under the despicable system of blank-check appropriations, a subservient Congress has so often resorted to, you open the way for the Executive to replace in the departmental funds every dollar we cut off. You know this practice is going on all of the time. If you want real, effective economy take back the power of Congress to control appropriations and put an end to the policy of blank-check appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, this is a recital, and I trust you will not be critical of the language I may use. I will promise you only one thing. If I begin to get sick, I will not say I am feeling "badly" unless the trouble develops in the ends of my fingers.

Some nights ago I was listening to the radio and heard one of the commentators say that it was being circulated around New York, and maybe somewhere else, that our Republican friends were letting it ooze around that they expected in 1944 to nominate General MacArthur for President of the United States. The thing disturbed me right smart.

The next morning when I came down the street I ran into one near the Capitol here whom I knew, and I was complaining somewhat about it. I said to him, "Since when did we understand that General MacArthur is a Republican? Why would he be born in Arkansas if he was ever going to be a Republican?" Now, there is Kansas and Vermont, maybe another State, but I cannot think of the name of it right now. "Oh," said my friend, "do not be disturbed about that. They are not going to try to take your man away from you."

"Well," I said, "let me remind you of a few things, my friend. Do you not remember when Woodrow Wilson went out and found Mr. Hoover, brought him into Washington, bought him a brand-new linen or duck suit, put it on him, combed his hair nice, bought him a beautiful sailor hat, and we thought he was ours and continued to think so until 1928? Then we looked around for him, and, bless your soul, our Republican friends had gotten him and gone away with him—suit, hat, and all."

"There was nothing we could do about it. So they kept him through 1932," I told my friend, "and we did not raise any row about that. We did not even ask them to give us the hat back."

Then it came along to 1936 and in that year they behaved nice. They went over to Kansas and got their own candidate and nominated him. I was listening to the radio and heard the annoucement and I thought, "Well, they are going to behave nice now; they have decided that a man cannot very well ride a horse sitting on him backward, nor operate an automobile to much advantage in reverse all the time, and we will not be bothered any more."

But I reminded my friend that I still had some grounds for my fears, because in 1940, lo and behold, they run over on our side and snatched Mr. Willkie before we could say a word about it.

My friend said, "You do not understand very well. You are not a man of much foresight. Do you know they are not going to nominate General MacArthur in 1944? That report is 1942 congressional campaign strategy they are putting on now."

I said that I had not thought of that, and asked him, "Are you a suspicious man or a prophet? I know one thing, you are like a great many women and a whole lot of men I know, you will have the last word; so, just go on and have it your way. I am gone."

And, too, I was reminded that General MacArthur has been in military life since he was 18 years old to date.

And as I went away, he was mumbling something. I looked back and listened to him, but I could not hear exactly what he was saying. It might have been something about Willkie.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the committee there is a saving made in this appropriation of $17,600,000 over the 1943 Budget estimate. Of course, any one who knows the inner workings of the bureaucrats knows that figures such as we see here are of little or no value, so far as getting at the facts is concerned.

There is also shown here a reduction of roundly $75,400,000 under the 1942 Budget estimate.

The 1942 Budget estimate was something like $188,300,000. That was the original 1942 Budget estimate.

It will be noted in the report that the estimate is stated as being $238,101,280. Since the original Budget estimate there have been something like five or six supplemental appropriations. There is pending now another supplemental appropriation bill for the 1942 Budget. Therefore, the savings as shown in this report have absolutely no significance whatsoever.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for the purchase or exchange of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle if such purchase or exchange interferes with the priorities or quotas for military and naval purposes as determined, respectively, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 141, after line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions carried in this bill for printing and binding the total amount to be expended for printing, binding, duplicating, mimeographing lithographing, or reproduction in any other form or by any other device, and including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles published in periodicals and journals shall not exceed for every such purpose included in this bill the sum of $450,000, and that the amounts estimated therefor and not expended within this limitation shall be recovered into the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma kindly invite the attention of the Chair to the legislation included in the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not sure I heard the exact wording of the amendment, but as I heard it, it stated "notwithstanding any other provisions carried in this bill," which would clearly indicate that it proposes to change the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Although, as indicated by the gentleman from Oklahoma, it does provide, "notwithstanding any other provisions carried in this bill," it relates to appropriations in the pending bill. The Chair is of the opinion that it is a limitation and is in order. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the printing and binding item is not all that is spent by the Department of the Interior for printing. I have a report that the amount of the investment in printing equipment in the Department of the Interior is as follows: Total replacement value of printing and duplicating equipment owned by the reporting unit—the Department of the Interior—$836,213.45.

It seems to me there is a fundamental principle involved here. We should not go through the sham of voting an amount for printing and binding and then, without its being read as a separate item, know full well an expenditure of $503,000 for this multigraphing and duplicating plant is hidden in this bill. If my colleagues on the subcommittee will look at page 47 of the committee print they will find a report of these duplicating expenses.

I hope the committee will adopt my amendment in the interest of honesty of government, because this expenditure will not help any soldier or sailor on any of the fronts throughout the world to protect himself. If we adopt this amend-

ment we shall be in much better shape to say, at least by the limitations expressed in here as to amounts, that we have saved that much manpower to protect the sons of the friends and neighbors we go back to face in our districts, and have done that much toward the winning of the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this further than to say that this Committee has voted on this same thing or a very similar item three or four times within the past couple of days. As I stated on the floor of the House yesterday, our friends across the aisle played a major role on this particular item of printing and binding. They practically wrote their ticket. Now, it seems they are dissatisfied with their own work and record. It will be recalled that I had to come to their rescue yesterday when they were wanting to disown and turn down their own handiwork. Again I beg Members on this side of the aisle to cross their fingers and give the O. K. to the fine work done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and our other colleagues over there in reducing to a minimum this important item for printing and binding.

Mr. Chairman, we have about finished this bill. Why the unnecessary delay? Why stall and play to the galleries? They are about empty now anyway. It has been a long, tedious battle. I have no complaints. Our lines have held except on two or three items. I feel that we have done a pretty good job. Of course, the Senate will review every item, and I am sure will make material changes. Let us finish the job and go home for the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 141, line 3, insert a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) Not more than 50 per centum of the appropriations herein made for nondefense purposes shall be expended."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the temper of our people correctly, there is in this hour of intensifying peril an ominously growing concern among them over the failure of Congress to resist the selfish demands of the bureaucracy and other pressure groups and to put a stop to unconscionable, nonessential, nondefense expenditures.

This attitude of mind is not altogether a reaction of the war. It had been welling up for a long time before that. Naturally and justifiably the war has intensified this feeling. It appears the public is now becoming agitated over this matter to the point of demanding that we take effective action.

Indeed, we are blind if we cannot see this. Here we are in Congress asking every conceivable sacrifice of the public in order that we may win the war. Yet we fail utterly to stop the bureaucracy in its orgy of grabbing and spending—in its consumption and dissipation of resources sorely needed to stop the enemy.

Under these circumstances the people have a perfect right to complain that we are dilatory in our duty. We should not be surprised if their resentment against our continuing these huge appropriations for nonessential, nondefense expenditures should break out into angry demand that we stop them.

The bill before us calls for an appropriation to the Department of the Interior of roundly $162,600,000 for 1943. The report shows this to be a reduction of approximately $17,600,000 from the Budget estimates of 1943. This, of course, can mean nothing to anyone who understands the inner workings of the bureaucracy in setting up these estimates.

The report on this bill also shows a reduction of roundly $75,400,000 from the appropriations for 1942 which can be misleading. The report shows the appropriation for 1942 to have been roundly $238,100,000. The regular appropriation for the Interior Department for 1942 was about $188,300,000. Something like six supplemental appropriations were made to this Department, bringing the figure up to $238,100,000. Another supplemental appropriation for 1942, the amount of which I do not know, is now pending. From this it will be seen that the $75,400,000 savings claimed in the report over the 1942 appropriations also has no meaning.

For the fourth day now I have been on this floor almost every minute listening attentively to the debates on this appropriation measure. A sincere effort has been made by certain members of the subcommittee to reduce nonessential, nondefense items with practically no success. A very few and almost insignificant piddling reductions have been made. We have seen practiced in the consideration of this bill the technique that is the normal mode of those who consistently resist reductions of all nonessential, nondefense appropriations. Formerly those people justified every appropriation in the name of recovery. Now they do so in the name of defense. In my opinion there is more boondoggling going on under the cloak of defense than there was under that of recovery.

Under the war conditions it is not enough to justify any appropriation merely on the basis that it is to be expended on a worthy project. The cardinal question in every proposed expenditure for carrying on normal nondefense activities is whether in wartime those activities can be dispensed with and the funds used more appropriately for war purposes. This one big question I am asking in respect to the appropriation before us, and I think every Congressman should do likewise. It is the real problem before us.

This bill, as stated, calls for an appropriation of, roundly, $162,600,000. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], a member of the subcommittee, and I believe reputedly as well informed as any Member of Congress on this appropriation measure, stated, in answer to a question asked by myself, that in the neighborhood of $70,000,000 of this appropriation will be required for power and defense measures. That would leave approximately $92,600,000 for nondefense purposes. In the light of past Interior Department expenditures, plus the urgent prior needs for funds to carry on the war, I am convinced of the necessity of making a huge reduction in the nondefense portion of this appropriation.

In 1931, before the orgy of spending began, the cost of operation of the Interior Department was, roundly, $66,100,000. That was for all purposes. It should be realized that the $70,000,000 which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] stated should be considered as needed for power development will not all be expended for this one purpose. Much of it will go for improving and expanding irrigation and other nondefense projects. So that the $70,000,000 will be used in a large measure for the same purposes as the $66,100,000 was used in 1931.

Possibly Mr. LEAVY'S estimate of the amount required for power development is too low, but that is not likely. But whatever may be the required amount in this appropriation for the development of power and other defense measures, it is my judgment the remainder of the appropriation which is to go for nondefense expenditures could be and should be reduced 50 percent. If this were done on the basis of $70,000,000 being required for power development, it would mean a saving for war purposes of more than $46,000,000. I am sure the amount of this reduction is needed more urgently for war production than it is for the purposes specified in the bill, however worthy they may be.

Then it should not be overlooked that most of the funds appropriated for nondefense expenditures are borrowed.

Drastic, shocking, I can hear many of you say, to propose such a reduction as my amendment calls for.

But is it any more drastic than depriving farmers, workingmen, and others of their automobiles; destroying small businesses by the tens of thousands; rationing of sugar, gas, and so forth, which is being extended to include more and more of the necessities; rationing even of razor blades—one a week per beard—so that the male of the genus homo in this land may soon also be looking like a Bolshevik?

Oh, yes; let the people bear all these burdens and sacrifices, but touch not anything that pertains to the bureaucracy. It must have its pound of flesh, war or no war.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country are losing patience with Congress because they are not sure that it knows we are in war. They know we are at war and the reports they are receiving on its progress makes them fear it is at

present going against us, and I submit to you that it is time, and high time, for this Congress to take hold of this situation and let the people of this country know that we, too, are aware that our country is at war.

My amendment is proper and should be adopted. The people want nonessential, nondefense appropriations drastically reduced and I am sure they would approve of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have two more amendments. Would this close debate on those amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the Chair to understand that they would be offered as new sections?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the limitation would apply to them.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the gentleman is not too serious in offering an amendment of this kind and I shall not take the time to answer the gentleman. A day or two ago the same distinguished gentleman took several minutes to try to convince the House that the Budget estimate was only $71,000,000. We finally, after much effort, convinced him, I think, he was in error then.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Sorry but I only have 2 minutes.

I made the statement in my opening remarks that the Interior Department is now engaged in by far the greatest war program of any other department of Government save the Army and the Navy. A few moments ago the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] referred to some of the so-called nondefense activities in this bill and gave a figure of $19,000,000. On page 34 of the hearings you will find what that $19,000,000 actually is or represents.

No. 1 is the emergency fund for the President, every bit of which is for national defense.

Then No. 2 is the Office of Petroleum Coordinator, every dollar of which is for defense. Then there is Office of Solid Fuels Coordination, every dollar for defense; Geological Survey, practically every dollar for defense. The Bureau of Mines has also now virtually become a war set-up. Way down toward the bottom of the list appears the appropriation for the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. This might not be called actual national defense, but surely the Members would not want to eliminate that item at this time. I am sure my friend would not want to let the people of the Philippine Islands down right now. So it will be seen how utterly impractical such an amendment would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 5, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 141, line 3, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 8–A. Not more than 75 percent of the appropriations herein made for nondefense purposes shall be expended."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment was voted down. That amendment would have effected a saving of more than $46,000,000. If it had passed there would have been that much more money to buy bombers and tanks and guns for MacArthur and his gallant fighters. There would have been that much less for the bureaucracy to waste and spend.

If that amendment had passed the people of this country would have been encouraged to believe that Congress has at last awakened to a realization that its responsibility in this crisis is something more and different than voting huge appropriations and catering to selfish pressure groups.

My second amendment would effect a saving of only about $23,000,000. Should it pass the hopes of the people might be raised a little. For their sake and our own I hope it passes.

I want to answer the gentleman from Oklahoma who made the statement that I said the original estimate of the 1943 Budget was only $71,000,000. If the gentleman will read the record he will see that the gentleman from Ohio merely asked to have some figures reconciled. I did not make any such statement as he has attributed to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; I cannot yield just now.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said he would not dignify my amendment by opposing it. I am not concerned whether he dignifies my amendment or not. I am now concerned only with what I believe the public wants done about the spending of so much money for nondefense purposes.

The gentleman from Oklahoma also said he was surprised that any Member should propose closing the national parks. Such a proposal should not be so surprising in view of the present rubber situation.

Mr. Chairman, there is talk of passing a law to limit the speed of automobiles to 40 miles an hour to save tires. When the tires now on the automobiles are worn out, there may be no more automobiles running. Certainly until we can see more daylight in the rubber situation than we see at present there will not be many automobiles running after they have worn out their present tires. I am not sure but that the proper thing to do would be to close those parks for the duration. If we want to save rubber here is an opportunity to do so. Therefore, it is not a joking matter when we consider it from this standpoint.

I know there is a lot of ridicule and derision of the attempts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to bring about some economy here in these expenditures, but I say to you that people will be reading that man's economy record long after the record of the men who are deriding him has been forgotten. Vote for my amendment and give the people some hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 14, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 141, after line 3, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 8 a. Not more than 90 percent of the appropriations herein made for nondefense purposes shall be expended."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. TABER. This amendment is a very modest one. It cuts only 10 percent of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not the bill, only the nondefense expenditure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. How is the time to be allotted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, and 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that debate upon the bill close in 8 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my other two amendments having failed, I am offering a third. This one calls for a reduction of nondefense appropriations of only 10 percent, amounting to the piddling sum of $9,000,000. I am fully aware that nothing short of a miracle can bring its passage, for I fear it will take a miracle to break the strong addiction to spending that afflicts this body. It seems that neither a public debt that promises to reach as high as any ever did, nor taxes that promise to be as burdensome as any ever laid on the backs of men not outright slaves, nor even the sound of tramp, tramp, tramp of our mortal enemy approaching our threshold can awaken this Congress to a realization of our responsibility in this crucial hour.

The chairman of the subcommittee stated he could not believe I am sincere in offering these amendments. Let me

assure him, if that be possible, that I am sincere.

I think the time is near at hand when the American people are going to effectively demand that we put an end to the spree of nondefense spending, that we check the greed of the bureaucrats, that we stop catering to pressure groups, that we quit our shilly-shallying, and get down to the hard business of winning this war.

I cannot believe this Congress fully realizes the gravity of our present situation, or we would not be piddling and fiddling as we are.

Nor can I blame the public for having the feeling toward Congress it has.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 37, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts for 3 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take advantage of this time to make inquiry from the majority leader. I understand he could tell us now the legislative program we may expect for the next few days.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, tomorrow we will consider the deficiency appropriation bill. After that there is nothing on the program for the next week and I know of nothing for the week after that. The only thing that might occur, but there is nothing on the program, is, in case it is ready, the conference report in connection with the civil functions of the War Department, but I assume that that will be disposed of without necessity of coming back here. Also the conference report on the housing law in connection with the District of Columbia, which went to conference today, provided that could be taken up without controversy. But there is nothing on the program for the next 2 weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There has been a great deal of interest in the Smith-Vinson bill. When will it be ready for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], stated on the floor today that a large number of requests have been made by witnesses to appear and that a bill could not be reported out before April 13 if a bill were reported out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then any Member who went home during this period when there will be no legislative program ready would not be neglecting his duty as far as that bill is concerned? He could not help any in getting it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely not.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am very much opposed to any recess until some action is taken by the House on the suspension of the 40-hour law, the limitation of profits by war contractors, and other features of the Smith-Vinson bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is not a recess.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Well, it is a moratorium on action.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I would not say that. It is simply that the House has caught up with all of its legislation. Certainly at Easter time we take some recess out of respect to the holy days.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am one of those who wants the House to act at the very earliest possible moment upon the Smith-Vinson bill. I think it is imperative that we pass now legislation to speed up production in war industries and curtail enormous profits by some of these contractors. Of course, I realize that the House cannot consider that bill until the committee reports a bill. Do I understand that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. VINSON, which committee is considering the bill, has unequivocally stated that a bill cannot be reported to the House before April 13?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. That is the earliest date, if the committee reports a bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I have talked to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and urged the earliest possible action, and I believe the people have a right to expect Congress to act without any delay, and the safety of America demands it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder whether the gentleman from Texas, who has just expressed his concern about a possible recess, was prompted by reading the advertisements and literature that came to the desk of most of us within the last day or so?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to emphasize and concur in the statements of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. The people are aroused and rightly so, and the importance of early action suspending the 40-hour week and preventing excess profits cannot be exaggerated. There is positively on doubt in the mind of any informed person that the overwhelming majority of the people, especially the people of the South, want immediate action on this 40-hour week and excess-profits matter. For many days I have been appealing for action without a delay and without a recess. Is there anything that we can now do to speed up action on that matter prior to the 13th of April?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, I would have to refer that to your own leadership.

Mr. MAHON. I would like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to answer that.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; there is nothing at all until the bill comes out of committee. There is no bill out of committee yet.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct totals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPATRIATION OF AMERICANS ENLISTED IN SERVICE OF UNITED STATES ALLIED FORCES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers table the bill [S. 2339] to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. This bill, S. 2339, just passed by the other body, is a bill to permit approximately 20,000 American soldiers serving in the Army of Great Britain or her allies, who thereby gave up their American citizenship, to reclaim their American citizenship and join American forces now abroad.

We want to bring these men back. We can only bring them back by congressional action on a bill restoring their citizenship to them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why bring them back when we are sending troops overseas?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to answer the question?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The intent is not to bring them back to this country but simply to repatriate these former American citizens who expatriated themselves by joining the armed forces of foreign nations, mostly Canadian and English. They are to be allowed to recover their American citizenship by taking the oath of allegiance before the proper consular officer and joining the American forces immediately available. It is just a question of letting them fight under our own flag rather than under the flag of some allied nation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then it does not mean necessarily bringing them back to this country?

Mr. MASON. It does not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think this is extremely good legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 323 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149), entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," is hereby amended to read as follow:

"SEC. 323. A person who, while a citizen of the United States and during the first or second World War, entered the military or naval service of any country at war with a country with which the United States was or is at war, who has lost citizenship of the United States by reason of any oath or obligation taken for the purpose of entering such service, or by reason of entering or serving in such armed forces, and who intends to reside permanently in the United States, may be naturalized by taking before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301, the oaths prescribed by section 335. Any such person who has lost citizenship of the United States during the second World War may, if he so desires, be naturalized by taking, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335. For the purposes of this section, the second World War shall be deemed to have commenced on September 1, 1939, and shall continue until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war. Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 6717) were laid on the table.

CONTINUANCE OF 40-HOUR WEEK

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the letter I am about to read I received this morning from a soldier in the South, in camp there. He says:

Last night, after listening to a broadcast by Elmer Davis over the CBS network, I realized that we in the Army, and everyone in the South particularly, were being subjected to a merciless bombardment from every source against the continuance of the 40-hour week.

It started me thinking, too, and the reason for this letter is just a word of encouragement, since many in the Army resent being dragged into the arguments of those who would discontinue labor's opportunity to share equally in the results of the present expansion, and this expansion has been made possible through governmental expenditures.

It is a hell of a note to think that a great deal of their argument is based on patriotism since real patriotism should also consist in preserving a worker's advantages, though he may be in the Army. For victory will bring demobilization, and it would be an empty victory indeed if it meant a return to a civil life where there were only jobs with long hours and low pay.

I have received other letters—equally as expressive, and equally indignant—that the men in the Army are made to appear to have their brothers who are at the machines, supplying them with the tools of war.

These men who are now on the battlefields and in the camps, preparing for the day when they take their places before the enemy, all realize that they must return to civil life when this war shall have finished. They want to come back to the America they knew, not to a land of serfdom and overlords. They are depending on those who remain behind to keep faith with them. They want the progressive social legislation kept on our statute books. They had it put there in their demands for a square deal. They have received that square deal, and they are now fighting and dying to preserve that square deal. They do not want it wiped out while their backs are turned to home and their faces are turned toward the would-be destroyers of their homes.

They realize also, just as every sane person realizes, that these constant attacks are attacks on the men who are working for them, working to give them the most of the best equipment that can be produced, and give it to them in less time than the enemy can provide for its armies. They know that men who toil at the machines cannot be inspired by ridicule or the use of the bull whip. Those men at the machines have to realize that they are fighting for their America—for something worth while. They cannot feel that when they are being told hourly that the country is determined to wipe out everything they have—every last vestige of social progress that has made their lives decent and respectable.

These men on the construction jobs—in the factories and in the shops—realize far more than we who stand here and preach, what this war is all about. At Wake Island these same men took up guns and hammers and anything else available the moment the emergency confronted them. They did not wait for authorizations, or reassignments, or appropriations. They did the job that had to be done. Many of them died. Many of them now languish in prison camps. Is their reward and congratulation to consist of this frenzied endeavor to cripple their futures by divesting them of the right to be acknowledged equals in the industrial life of the country to which they hope to return?

Men in and out of Congress rant and shout for the abolition of the 40-hour week, because it hampers production, yet every single one of them knows that it does not slow down production; that it is merely a standard, and that, in fact, almost without exception, war industries are working more than 40 hours per week—every week. The statement is heard over and over again—the people of the country want labor curtailed. Are not the men in the factories the people of the country? Are there a chosen few who are to be considered the people of the country? Then who are we who do the heavy work? Are not our conditions worthy of consideration? Those who perpetuate this clamor are doing no good. They are discouraging the efforts of the men at the tools, and they are serving the purpose of our enemies by stirring up class prejudice upon which they thrive, and which will some day return to haunt them. Keep it up and you may have the momentary feeling of victory, if your plans succeed, but you will later have these same men whom you now would cast down returning to mock you. They will tell you that their sons and their brothers fought in the trenches—that they did their jobs without all the clamor, and you will have nothing but the ashes of the great fire of enthusiasm that followed Pearl Harbor to guide you back to the days of oppression and sweatshops that some apparently pine for.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and to include therein a newspaper and also excerpts from a letter written by Mr. Donald Nelson of the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain schedules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CANCELATION OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order I had to address the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order I had to address the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FOLGER, Mr. JONKMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein certain schedules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a portion of an editorial from the news service of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from PM by its editor, Mr. Ingersoll.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech broadcast by Elmer Davis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Tulsa (Okla.) World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the Memphis Press-Scimitar, of Memphis, Tenn., entitled "The Ides of March—Not Gone."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I have written.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received from a member of Parliament of Canada

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ELLIOTT of California, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. PACE, for 1 day, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1536. A letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting a list of papers for disposal by him of certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1537. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Navy Personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Report No. 1956. Sixth supplemental report to accompany H. R. 6868. A bill making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1957. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1958. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1959. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. House Joint Resolution 291. Joint resolution to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6869. A bill to provide for the decentralized settlement and payment of damage claims arising from activities of the Army, other than in foreign countries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6870. A bill authorizing the appointment of special clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 6871. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, with respect to corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6872. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce

against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to aid and expedite the prosecution of the war effort by raising revenue through the sale of war-participation tickets, to be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 300. Resolution authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to rename 20 thoroughfares for the Pan-American Republics; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to suspend the 40-hour work-week for duration of national emergency; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ANGELL introduced a bill (H. R. 6873) for the relief of Maude Leach, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2616. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Kiwanis Club, adopted March 16, 1942, for the guarding and protection of facilities essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2617. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 13 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and members of the Ladies' Auxiliary, No. 1044, National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the passage of House bill 6486, to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2618. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. Lena Martin, chairman of Local 3007, Corsicana, Tex., opposing Secretary Morgenthau's proposed legislation for tax on pension trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2619. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, urging the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake careful studies of economic problems arising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2620. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Bayside, N. Y., that the new time recently enacted to speed war production, commonly called by the sinister expression "war time," be renamed "victory time"; and if further change is made during the summer months, to call that period "victory summer time"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2621. Also, resolution of 300 independent tire dealers of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, that they implore relief from financial disaster under existing rubber regulations, and offer for consideration the fact that tire manufacturers, mass distributors, and petroleum outlets do not need their small share of new tire and recapping business in order to exist; conversely, the independent tire dealers of the Nation must receive all of the available new tire business and recapping tire service to continue in business; and that failure to direct the small amount of this business exclusively through the independent dealer will unquestionably result in the mortality of approximately 60,000 independent tire dealers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2622. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Clerk read the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1942.

I hereby designate the Honorable JERE COOPER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art high and exalted, who hast promised to dwell with those who are of humble and penitent heart, we entreat Thee that we may be drawn to Thee by love and not by fear. Grant that we may be so consecrated to Thy service in mind and disposition, that the eyes of our hearts may behold Thy purity and the wonder of Thy creative power. The heart that knows Thy love is a sacred temple and all the babble of earth's confusion of voices is soon hushed into silence.

We praise Thee for the Christ, whose indomitable love and courage constrained Him to give His life for the redemption of the world. While the storms of rage and the thunders of hate were crashing over His head, His deepest promise was given: "My peace I leave with you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you." We pray that every throng may feel Thy presence, every cot of pain, the touch of Thy hand, and every endeavor realize in common life the brotherhood of man. Send forth Thy benediction, illuminating the minds of men, quieting their fears and hatreds and bringing them back to sanity and peace, confidence and faith in Thee. Almighty God, Oh bless America and may America bless God and most humbly realize that she will never be fit to rule until she is fit to serve. Do Thou help our President and all his counselors in their world-wide responsibilities, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6483) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment No. 2 to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on said amendment in disagreement, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House, of the following titles:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook; and

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider.

THE LATE RENÉ L. DEROUEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ].

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce the death of my personal friend and immediate predecessor, the Honorable René L. DeRouen. Mr. DeRouen died suddenly yesterday morning in the city of Baton Rouge, La.

Mr. René, as he was affectionately known by thousands of people in the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, served in the House of Representatives with honor and distinction for about 14 years, voluntarily retiring at the expiration of his term last year.

At the time of his retirement he was chairman of the Public Lands Committee and a ranking member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

His able and conscientious services to the Nation, especially as a member of these two very important committees, are universally recognized and appreciated.

Mr. DeRouen was of a quiet and undemonstrative temperament. In his quiet way he had a great influence on his country and his fellowme..

When I came to Washington as his successor, I found that all those who knew him, not only recognized his ability, sincerity, and earnestness, but were all proud to claim him as a personal friend.

Mr. DeRouen was a person of great devotion to his wife and his children. The State of Louisiana and particularly the Seventh District has lost a respected and beloved citizen, one who could ill be spared, especially in times like these.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, sometime yesterday morning in the city of Baton Rouge, La., René DeRouen passed into the Great Beyond. The end came

as he slept, without pain and without anticipation.

Until the day of his death he always retained a most active interest in his fellow man and a most sympathetic interest in the problems of humanity. During the last 16 years of his life he served as Representative from the Seventh District of Louisiana in the House of Representatives, retiring because of ill health at the end of the last session of Congress.

Those of us who have served in the past remember the familiar figure of our friend as he presided over the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives. We remember him as he quietly moved among us, working always with some useful goal in view. His especial interest was devoted to reclamation and irrigation projects of such vital interest to the struggling masses of the people of the western part of the United States. Unselfishly he toiled, without hope of reward, save that of "duty well done," but the millions of our people out there in the great open spaces of the far West know that the life of René DeRouen was not in vain and they thank God that he was permitted to be with us.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana and the Nation has lost a tireless, useful, and beloved leader, and we have lost a friend. Our deep sympathy goes out to his devoted widow and four children, all of whom survive him.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. On behalf of the Mississippi delegation, I wish to join the Louisiana delegation in mourning the death of Dr. DeRouen, one of the noblest characters who ever served in this House. Personally I can say that he was my friend. All I can add is—

> Farewell! if ever fondest prayer
> For other's weal avail'd on high,
> Mine will not all be lost in air,
> But waft thy name beyond the sky.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I should like to pay my tribute to Mr. DeRouen. I served on the Committee on the Public Lands for several years during the time he was chairman. I thought he was one of the most honorable, honest, and conscientious chairmen of a committee I have ever had the privilege of serving under while I have been a Member of this House. He was likeable, and energetic in trying to do what he thought was for the best interest of this country I know of no one with whom I have been associated in the House of Representatives whose friendship and companionship I have appreciated more than that of Mr. DeRouen. He was a wonderful character, a fine man, and a real fine American citizen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I knew Mr. René L. DeRouen before I came to Congress. After I came to Congress I was thrown with him a great deal. He was the dean of our Louisiana delegation and was more than a dean to us. He was almost like a father to us. He was the grand old man of our delegation. We went to him for counsel. He not only had had many years' legislative experience but he had broad business experience which qualified him to correctly appraise most questions coming up. He and I had apartments at the same hotel. We saw each other every day. It is natural, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I grew to have a very fond affection for this grand old man. The news of his passing, therefore, saddens me very much. We House Members who were so closely associated with him shall miss him. The people of Louisiana will miss him. We all deeply mourn his passing.

A striking feature of the life of Mr. DeRouen was his spirituality. He was deeply spiritual. He had an abiding faith in the God of all the earth. His quiet Christian spirit endeared him to all who knew him. I am sure that the realization of this fact is a comfort to his devoted companion, fine children, and host of friends. Our friend has gone from us, but the memory of his exemplary life, his deeds, his kindly acts will remain as a monument. He has left the heritage of a life well spent. In such a life there can be no regrets.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As one who lives in a neighboring State and who served with the distinguished former Member, Mr. DeRouen, I concur in the beautiful tribute that his colleague from Louisiana has just paid him. No one could know him without loving and respecting him.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In behalf of the Louisiana delegation, I thank the gentleman from Texas for that tribute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of René DeRouen. I had the pleasure of serving with him in previous Congresses. He was a distinguished citizen of Louisiana, an able public servant. He represented his people in the Congress with energy, with ability, and with distinction. He was a man of singular poise of temperament, calm, not easily disturbed. He made friends easily and retained them. I was happy to call him my friend and am proud to have had the distinction of serving with him. I join with those who have expressed to his family the sympathy we all feel for them in this hour of their bereavement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress a little more than 9 years ago, one of my first assignments was on the Public Lands Committee. At that time I became acquainted with the gentleman from Louisiana, René L. DeRouen. I was immediately impressed with his keen insight and thorough knowledge of public affairs, especially those which had to do with the public land questions. I was also greatly impressed with the kindly disposition of this unusual character. Since that time and up until the time that he voluntarily withdrew from Congress, I was closely and intimately acquainted with him, and on his retirement I had the honor of assuming the position of chairman of the Public Lands Committee, which he so successfully held for a number of years.

My close association with him confirmed my first impressions, and I came to honor and respect him for his untiring efforts in behalf of his constituents and his splendid ability as a legislator. Due to his energy and hard work in this body, he has passed on to the Great Beyond many years sooner than he otherwise would. However, he has left with us and with the citizens of Louisiana and with the people of this entire Nation a splendid example of patriotism, of energy, and of fidelity to the cause which he espoused. A great man has gone to his just reward. We missed him when he left this House of Representatives. The people of Louisiana have lost a faithful servant, and this Nation has lost a useful, distinguished and courageous patriot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow I read in the paper this morning of the passing of my former chairman of the Public Lands Committee, René DeRouen. For 8 years I served on that committee. He was such a splendid chairman, such a fine gentleman, such a genial friend, always courteous to the members of the committee, always courteous to the witnesses who appeared before the committee. He was efficient because he had for years studied public lands. He was fair because that was his innate nature. My good friend DeRouen met the summons yesterday morning in the spirit expressed by William Cullen Bryant in the beautiful poem called Thanatopsis:

> So live that when thy summons comes
> To join the innumerable caravan
> That moves to that mysterious realm
> Where each shall take his chamber
> In the silent halls of death,
> Thou go, not like a quarry slave, at night
> Scourged to his dungeon,
> But sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust.
> Approach thy grave as one who wraps the draperies
> Of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

So our good friend René has gone to his last sleep in that spirit. We will miss him here in the House and his friends in Louisiana and in the Nation will also miss him. We will all miss his smiling face, his genial greeting, his friendly handclasp.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned on entering the Chamber today that my good friend, one of God's noblemen, former chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House, had passed away. I

refer to our noble friend, former Chairman DeRouen, of our Public Lands Committee.

I am one of the younger Members of the Congress. I was impressed deeply during my first 4 years here with the fact that Mr. DeRouen was always kindly in his presiding over the Public Lands Committee, always considerate, and always governed by intelligence and justice. As one who comes from the far West, I want to say right here that no man from any part of our country was better informed or more considerate of all parts of the country than Chairman DeRouen in his leadership of the Public Lands Committee of this House. I cannot adequately indicate our obligation to him.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEAVY. I concur fully in what the able gentleman says in the way of tribute to the memory of the late Mr. DeRouen, and what my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] has said. I do not believe that with all the great men the West has ever produced and sent to this House it had a better friend than it found in Mr. DeRouen. The work he did for that great region will stand as a perpetual monument for all time. He was truly a great friend of the West. We knew him as our friend and appreciated him sincerely. We feel his passing is our loss, just as it is the loss of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is correct.

As younger Members, my friend from Washington and I, as well as the rest of us, feel that in the National Capital, in the membership of this House, we may now properly apply to Chairman DeRouen the words of the poet:

> Green be the turf above thee,
> Friend of my better days!
> None knew thee but to love thee,
> Nor named thee but to praise.

CONCESSIONS AND SACRIFICES BY ALL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the 40-hour week, benefits, and subsidies, direct and indirect, came by law, and they can only be suspended by law. Voluntary action has never replaced selfishness and never will. Laborers, farmers, manufacturers, merchants, all groups, and all blocs must make concessions. Depression agencies must be abolished; nonessential appropriations must be eliminated; nondefense expenditures should be reduced so as not to cripple or destroy essential governmental functions. Experiments must not be repeated. The taxpayer foots the bill, and he knows it. All-out production means sacrifices by all citizens.

If benefits to labor are to be suspended, benefits to farmers, manufacturers, and industrialists should also be suspended. The labor profiteer and the war profiteer must go. For my part I am ready to call the roll.

JOINT INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have filed my protest as heretofore and always opposed to the proposed provision in the new tax bill requiring joint return by husband and wife.

As one admittedly somewhat familiar with the administration of tax laws, I insist that the provision to which I refer is violative of constitutional rights, destructive of domestic relations and felicity, and possibly prohibitive of those contemplated.

Practically and really it is an indefensible attempt to raise revenue through and by means of what is actually an attack on the home life of our people, though probably not so intended theoretically.

The zeal of revenue raisers and tax gatherers to get more money somewhere has led them astray and made them almost blind to the consequences, for certainly this provision of the bill will defeat itself, fall of its own weight, will not accomplish that which is sought as a revenue producer, but will do more damage than good.

The end does not justify the means.

ALLENE RUHLMAN AND JOHN P. RUHLMAN

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5473) entitled "An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$2,721" insert "$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$1,185" insert "$2,185"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as it passed the House provided for the payment to Allene Ruhlman the sum of $5,221, and to John P. Ruhlman the sum of $3,185, for personal injuries and property damage sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an ambulance of the Civilian Conservation Corps on September 6, 1940, on the Harrisburg Pike, near Carlisle, Pa. The Senate amended the bill by reducing the amount payable to Allene Ruhlman from $5,221 to $2,721, and reducing the amount payable to John P. Ruhlman from $3,185 to $1,185.

At the conference a compromise of $4,000 was agreed upon for Allene Ruhlman, and a compromise of $2,185 was agreed upon for John P. Ruhlman.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 5473.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDNA B. CROOK

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4557) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
LLOYD SPENCER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as passed by the House provided for the payment of $2,500 to the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook for personal injuries resulting in her death on May 6, 1940, when she was struck by a United States Army truck in Forest, Miss. The Senate reduced the

amount to be paid to the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook from $2,500 to $470.

At the conference it was agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDDIE A. SCHNEIDER

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5290) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do ecommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "$5,000" insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of $10,000 for personal injuries resulting in the death of her husband, Eddie A. Schneider, when the airplane in which he was flying was struck by an airplane piloted by a student pilot of the Navy. The Senate reduced the amount to be paid to Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider from $10,000 to $5,000.

At the conference a compromise of $7,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCGEHEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the regular business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a write-up by a friend of former Gov. Phil La Follette entitled "That's Phil La Follette."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "For Greater Unity," from the Washington Post this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent and an editorial from the Kansas City Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Judge F. L. Henderson, of Bryan, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Herald regarding the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with several of my Texas colleagues and

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4665) entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Kahn," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$2,500" insert "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4665) for the relief of Harry Kahn, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as it passed the House provided for the payment to Harry Kahn of the sum of $5,000 for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle near the entrance to Fort Humphreys in the State of Virginia, on April 16, 1931. The Senate reduced the amount from $5,000 to $2,500.

At the conference, a compromise of $3,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY KAHN

other Members of the House, I agree that this is no time for the Congress to cease to be in session. The people of Texas and many sections of our Nation are demanding that both bodies of Congress immediately establish legislative policies with reference to excess profits and certain reprehensible acts of some industries, the 40-hour week, and delays occasioned by causes of any type. As one who has supported every measure designed to speed up our war effort, I am anxious that the Congress lose no time in acting on legislation pertaining to the problems mentioned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. Oberholser, editor of the Red Oak Express, of Red Oak, Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], who just said that we should remain in session and adopt some labor policy; but if the majority party and the administration will not permit us to consider any legislation to that effect, why stay here? I, for one, if they refuse to let us bring out any legislation, intend to go home and tell all of the folks I can see why it is that we are not doing anything to remedy the trouble and who is responsible for it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram I received from R. C. Middleton, secretary of the trade council, of Baton Rouge, La., together with my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, some Members clamor for a recess so they can go home and find out what the people are thinking.

They can find that out by reading their mail; the people mean what they are saying.

When these Members go home they will find a rising tide of righteous indignation at the racketeering and profiteering now disrupting the country and slowing down our defense efforts.

If a Member is not willing to vote to amend or repeal laws that have virtually wiped out the Bill of Rights and that are now causing trouble throughout the country then he had just as well stay on here until his time expires—next January.

The highest right a man has in this life is the right to work for his daily bread—without having to pay tribute. That right has been taken away by these laws of which the people now complain.

Patriotic Americans are not going to let this country go the way of France.

Remember the House passed the bill to correct this situation on December 3—4 days before the Pearl Harbor disaster.

It is still pending in the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PATRIOTISM OF THE BASQUES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the House passed a bill authorizing the Attorney General to cancel deportation proceedings against 60 Basque aliens. At that time much interest was manifested by Members of the House in that particular nationality.

Yesterday I received a letter from a constituent at Twin Falls, Idaho, advising me that a group of 19 Basques in that community had sent a draft for $780 to the War Department as a voluntary contribution for the purchase of war materials. These Basques are in no way related to those whose names were contained in that bill, but I am happy to call this incident to the attention of the House as an exemplification of the highest type of citizenship, and to give you a better understanding of the Basque people, who come from a province in northern Spain. They are numbered among the most patriotic citizens of my district, and are loyally supporting our Government in the prosecution of our war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would become jealous of one of my colleagues. I so express that jealousy now. Here is an editorial from one of my home papers. It is part of a letter from a soldier from my district now stationed in the far South, in an army camp.

Representative RANKIN, who is from Mississippi, the State which has taken legal steps to stop interference with any man's right to work at a lawful vocation, shows his resentment at such attempts to discredit protests to Washington by attacking their source and gives the proper answer to them. Declaring that he is tired of insinuations that letters to Congressmen on labor matters are inspired by ulterior motives, RANKIN insists that the American people have a right to be heard and that among those who have been writing are "patriotic Americans whose boys are bleeding and dying because of lack of materials."

Then he goes on to say:

The soldier thinks Congressman RICH might be interested in seeking enactment of a similar law by Congress.

I want to say that the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, will not go farther than that boy's own Congressman to enact legislation to stop strikes in defense industries, and I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, will keep it up so that Congress and the President will get an inspiration here and we will adopt such legislation, and do it now. Now is the time to do it. We should not put it off any longer than is absolutely necessary. We must furnish ships, guns, ammunition, airplanes, and all other items of warfare to aid and assist our soldiers to win the war, and we must not permit anything to stop production. It is imperative and necessary to the winning of this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COAL MINERS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the county in which I live, there are approximately 25,000 coal miners who work in or about the coal mines. A good percent of them are Poles, Slovaks, Hungarians, Czechs, and Italians whose fathers and grandfathers came to this country between 1890 and 1910. They are among our most stable citizens. Many of them and practically all of their children have completed a high-school course.

Several thousand of these young men from this county enlisted in the Army,

Navy, or marines long before selective service went into effect. No groups in all the country are more loyal and more patriotic to our institutions and to our way of life than these men who work in the mines.

Speaking of cooperating with the Government, the coal miners in my district really cooperate. They obey the rules and regulations; yes, even the suggestions relative to the war program. When the Government asked them to conserve tires, they organized. These miners have to drive 2, 5, or 10 miles, and some of them 30 or 40 miles to work every day. They got together and made arrangements so that four or five or six would go in Joe's car today, in Jim's car tomorrow, and Mike's the next day, and so forth, in order to save oil, rubber, gas, and so forth.

This is an example that thousands of Government employees here in Washington should follow. If you will observe the traffic on the streets in the morning between 7:30 and 9, you will find that three out of every four cars have just one person in them.

You will find the coal miners in my district living up to the laws and suggestions of the President, Donald Nelson, and others who are in authority to issue suggestions in behalf of our war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on taxes and loans and the war functions by Prof. Walter A. Morton, of the University of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one gentleman who preceded me spoke about the importance of getting at profiteering and racketeering. I think we could well focus major attention on these two things, and I think we ought to act about them without delay. There are some other problems that are also pressing and I want to point out one of them in particular.

Out in my State there is a group of men working for a shipbuilding company who have signed a petition, some thousand strong, asking to be permitted to work on Sundays without pay to themselves at all, provided only that their wages will be credited to them and paid by the company to the Government of the United States. Mr. Speaker, Members should think about this a little, because it has a lot to do with this question of the so-called 40-hour week, which really is a wage question and a question of who will get the benefit of the wages labor might lose, whether it is to be the companies or the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from a boy in my district. It is one of the most exceptional letters I have ever received and it is the first letter I have inserted in the RECORD in 14 years. It has appealed to me to that extent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6868 making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Report No. 1956); and pending that I would like to reach an agreement as to time with the gentleman from New York. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman from New York if we had an hour on each side?

Mr. TABER. I believe we ought to have just a little more than that. I think if we had two hours and a half equally divided that it would take care of requests for time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate be limited to two hours and a half to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. There are some members of the Appropriations Committee who will have to attend sessions of the committee during the consideration of this bill. Would it be possible for such a Member to file with the Clerk objections to certain sections of the bill on the ground they are not germane? And, if not, would it be possible to leave a motion to strike certain provisions from the bill and have that motion taken up in order regardless of whether the proponent were present or not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Answering the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry the Chair will state that to present a motion the Member making it would have to be on the floor in person.

Mr. HARE. That is, he could not prepare his motion and leave it with the Clerk for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Nothing in the rules of the House permits that type of procedure.

The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours and a half, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6868, the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1942, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the preservation of democratic government rests not merely on an intelligent electorate but upon an informed electorate. A people must be not only capable of self-government, but they must also be accurately informed.

Never has the Government labored under a heavier burden of misinformation and misapprehension than today—misapprehension as to the efficiency with which the war is being conducted, misapprehension as to the extent and success of our program of production, misapprehension as to the character and integrity of the service of the officials of the Government and of the Members of Congress in particular.

Under a barrage of propaganda the people are encouraged to believe that waste and needless spending are rampant and that fumbling inefficiency and abysmal stupidity are losing he war.

It is true that we are suffering heavy reverses—and will continue to suffer heavy reverses for some time to come—but that is to be expected. It is the result of conditions which should be apparent to everybody. We are attacked unexpectedly by two of the greatest military powers the world has ever seen. Under generations of compulsory military training they are inured to warfare and under carefully matured plans of conquest have accumulated through the last decade vast supplies of mechanized equipment while we have been lulled to sleep by dependence on international law and the assumption of continued peace. It would be absurd to expect instantaneous victories under such circumstances and yet there is in some quarters a national egotism which has always assumed that our untrained forces could spring overnight to arms which require years to manufacture and in 3 weeks subdue any nation which might challenge us. Now that the house of cards has fallen, partisans and professional sensationalists catering to the disillusioned resentment in these quarters have sedulously emphasized minor deficiencies and overlooked the notable accomplishments of the program until there is a widespread impression that the war is being mismanaged.

Of course, there have been mistakes and, of course, there has been profiteering. There always has been in time of

war and always will be. That is inevitable. We are spending the largest sum of money ever available in the history of the world. It is being administered by personnel aggregating hundreds of thousands. It is being dispensed in countless enterprises of gigantic dimensions and in activities which embrace every clime and touch every shore. Would anyone be so unreasonable as to expect 100 percent of accuracy and efficiency under such circumstances? Never before in any period of American history have there been so few errors and such integrity of administration in comparison with the magnitude of the task involved as there have been in the provision of men, money, and munitions for this war.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am glad the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is making the very excellent statement he is making. I believe the question I propose to ask him will lead right into his present position. The public does not seem to understand first that we were confronted with the task of converting a peace-loving nation from peacetime production to wartime production of all kinds of equipment. That is No. 1.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And in a very brief space of time.

Mr. MAY. Yes; in a very brief space of time. No. 2 is that this war has spread all over the world. Our supply lines are on an average of eight to ten thousand miles in length. The task is stupendous.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And one never before attempted on this gigantic scale by any people.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, following up his very excellent remarks, that in the first World War, although the United States sent approximately 3,000,000 men overseas, those men used almost altogether equipment, ammunition, and weapons which were made by other countries, including airplanes, whereas today the United States is called upon to supply not only our own armed forces but those of many other nations she is fighting with. So that our task is of tremendously greater consequence now than it was then.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman anticipates what I am just about to say and I am glad to have him emphasize it.

It is not a matter of any great concern, at least not of primary concern, that these indictments are being brought against those in charge of the war; but it is a matter of serious concern that the people of the country should be so far misled as to fail to understand the remarkable progress being made in the war program. Let me repeat that no legitimate criticism can be made of the manner in which money, men, and munitions are being provided for the prosecution of the war.

First, as to money, it should be a matter of gratification to every Member of the House and the Congress that we have provided every dollar required or which could be advantageously used.

Congress has provided every dollar required. Let any man rise in his place and point out a single estimate the denial of which has delayed or obstructed the program. There has been determined opposition—especially to the lease-lend appropriations which enabled us to get a 2 years' start in the development of production facilities. But be it said to the credit of all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle—the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] in particular—that the entire committee rallied at all times to the support of these crucial appropriations without which the Nation would today find itself in a tragic state of unpreparedness.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. May I offer this suggestion to the gentleman from Missouri: On the policy of lend-lease, there was, as he has stated, a great deal of controversy. But once that question was decided by a majority vote of the Congress, the gentleman is in error when he says that there was any particular controversy in regard to the appropriations to implement the lend-lease policy. I can remember of no controversy in that regard to speak of on either side of the aisle.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Throughout the country the policy was assailed even after it was approved. There was controversy on nearly every lease-lend appropriation that we presented to the House. Invariably amendments were offered to reduce the amounts in a way that would have seriously crippled the policy. But I repeat that the support of these crucial appropriation bills by all members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle, especially as viewed in the light of recent events, evinces the highest quality of statesmanship. Yet in all the flood of malodorous criticism sweeping the country today you find no mention of it.

Let us now consider the effectiveness with which these funds are being expended, first in the production of ordnance. When we went into the World War we were wholly lacking in high-powered artillery. And in all the 21 months we were in that war, we were never able to get any heavy artillery to the front. We had to depend throughout those 2 years upon the 75-millimeter guns supplied us by the French.

Let us contrast that with the situation today. Today our artillery is second to none in the field. And now in the fourth month of the war, as compared with the twenty-first month of the last war, we are turning out 90-millimeter and 105-millimeter guns at a rate and of a precision and efficiency that is gratifying to every man who is familiar with the situation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I observe that even after we came out of the first World War, due to the clamor for peace, we demobilized our Army to the point where we had only about 165,000 men and officers in our Regular Establishment, with no military training, and when we entered upon this program we were confronted with the situation that we had no trained manpower in this country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Today, the rapidity with which we are training personnel and the remarkable efficiency of our program of mobilization, late as it is in getting started, is in marked contrast and is a high tribute to those charged with its administration, not excepting the Members of Congress who made it possible.

Now as to tanks. In World War No. 1, notwithstanding an ambitious program for tank production, not a single American tank reached the front. Today modern tanks of the latest design are rumbling off the assembly lines in widely distributed centers of production by the thousand. While exact figures must be withheld, the War Production Board reports amazing increases in production and the President announces that the goal for tank production has been doubled. Donald Nelson, after witnessing exhaustive tests of both guns and tanks, expressed the opinion that they were the best in the world. That appraisal is more than borne out by the magnificent performance of these tanks in their baptism of fire upon the Libyan Desert.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is one of the greatest utterances we have had since I have been in Congress. I was about to ask the gentleman if he would object to my suggesting the absence of a quorum. I think every Member of Congress ought to hear this speech.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his cooperation, but time is of the essence this afternoon, and we have here the men who are to pass on this bill, and that is the essential consideration.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina that this is indeed a great address. I only regret that the Nation cannot hear the report the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is making.

I hope he will take occasion to take some of this information to the Nation in a Nation-wide broadcast of the facts that are being given here today.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee appreciates the gentleman's cooperation as we have appreciated his cooperation throughout the session, because he and every other Member of this House have had their indispensable part in this program of production.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has correctly said that there are many things that we members of the Committee on

Appropriations who make these appropriations cannot say as far as numerical statements are concerned, but I wish the gentleman would include in his remarks as he goes along the statement that the amount of fighting planes we are producing today will send the fear of God into the hearts of our enemies.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to comply with the gentleman's suggestion as far as the military situation permits. Notwithstanding the charges that through inexcusable delay and parliamentary quibbling here in the House we are losing the war, as a matter of fact we are making a record in the production of all war equipment, and of planes in particular, that borders on the miraculous.

In the last World War, although we were already engaged in the manufacture of war planes for the Allies when we entered the war, with the exception of a few token machines, practically no American-built planes reached the front. In the twenty-first month of the war we were producing less than 2,000 planes a month, although the planes at that time were mere kites compared with the intricate mechanism which constitutes a plane today.

In the month of January, the second month of this war, in contrast with that record, we were producing vastly in excess of that rate, and production is rising at a rapidly accelerated speed.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Does not the gentleman, who is now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, think that he should advise the House and the public that by reason of his position and by reason of the position of other members of the Committee on Appropriations he has been afforded an opportunity to obtain information from the military experts of the War Department that is not generally given to the country, and it is upon this information that he is today making general authoritative statements?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman himself is a member of this committee, a member who has rendered invaluable service in the development of the war program. As the gentleman has stated, very little of the testimony submitted to our committee could be printed. The hearings which we publish and which are released today are a bare skeleton. All statistical data necessarily have been taken out in order to avoid communication of confidential military information.

Eighty-seven of the 90 General Motors plants, all of the Ford and Chrysler plants, all Packard, Studebaker, Buick, Nash, Hudson, and Willys-Overland are now engaged in war production. Assembly lines have been adapted to mass production, and the number of planes produced borders on the miraculous. At full capacity 3 of the largest companies will be producing two and a half times the dollar value they did in the peak month of 1941. Day and night, from these rapidly moving assembly lines, we are turning out an ever-swelling stream of aircraft destined to win the war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows very well that members of the Appropriations Committee and of the House Military Affairs Committee go down to the War Department every 2 weeks and get inside information and the graphs that are shown there show a gain in percentage of more than 100 percent in at least two-thirds of the items required to be produced as against 6 months ago.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman has said, it is a very impressive showing. It is to be regretted that every Member of the Congress and every patriotic citizen of the country cannot have an opportunity to really understand the extent of the marvelous production which is being achieved through the efficiency, the hard work, the attention to duty, and the patriotism of officials in charge of the work, including Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, in both House and Senate, notwithstanding the calumnies daily uttered against us.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. I was very much interested in the very heartening statement the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made in regard to the increase in production of our war munitions as reflected in the confidential communications made to the Appropriations Committee last week by the statistical officer of the War Department. I wish the people of the country generally could read the speech of the gentleman from Missouri, because I feel that the people of our country do not realize how the production program is increasing and gaining from day to day and month to month.

I feel, if they could hear the gentleman's statement, they would not have the jitters to the same extent they now seem to have them in regard to lack of production. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to a pencil memorandum I found in my files in reference to the plane production of the other major countries of the world, which was given us at the time of the military hearings in the summer of 1937. We were asking the intelligence office of the War Department to give us, in round numbers, the number of planes the other nations had. According to this pencil memorandum, they told us that Great Britain had 5,633 planes, Russia 4,155, Italy 4,162, Germany 3,167, France 2,364, and Japan 2,292. This was in 1937.

Mr. MAY. Five years ago.

Mr. TERRY. When we speak now about 30,000 planes, and 60,000 planes, and 120,000 planes, the objective which we are trying to attain and which we will attain, it makes those figures of 4 or 5 years ago fade into insignificance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman has cited comparative statistics on American and foreign production. It may be of interest to note that the latest Japanese budget is one-tenth of our Budget for comparable expenditures, and that from information which we consider accurate, Germany's production of aircraft and ordnance has declined 15 percent. They have dropped to a production of 85 percent of capacity, due to matériel and personnel difficulties, whereas we are accelerating every day the production of war matériel of every character.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, your illuminating discussion of the productivity of this Nation as compared with other countries, from the standpoint of placing fighting craft in the air, brings to my mind a very interesting observation. I have talked within the last week to General Wong, who for many years has been a leader of the fighting air forces in China. He told me the disturbing news that China, as of today has only a few hundred fighting planes, whereas Japan, when it entered the conflict against the United States with an attack on Pearl Harbor, had approximately 6,000 fighting planes of all types. He made the further observation that had the Chinese Government possessed a few hundred additional fighting planes during these past few years, they could have more than held their own with the Japanese forces. Twelve to one was too great a ratio to overcome. The Chinese pilots are superior to Jap airmen and they could have won battle after battle in the skies even though they had but 1 plane against 4 for the enemy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of our first objectives is to supply our Allies with equipment. That is half the battle and, fortunately, our early provision of lend-lease facilities is contributing measurably to that end.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Briefly, if the gentleman will permit, as my time is limited.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the splendid output the gentleman is speaking of, this would not have been possible, would it, without the splendid cooperation of labor?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. It requires the cooperation of every group and every class. Every American citizen has his part in this common cause, and to the extent that any citizen does not attain 100-percent personal efficiency, to that extent we are failing to attain 100-percent national efficiency, and to that extent we are delaying the successful conclusion of the war. We must have 100 percent from industry, from labor, from agriculture, and from every group and individual in America.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I personally appreciate the splendid address the gentleman is making, and having supported all these appropriation bills and other bills for our defense program,

and believing that we are making splendid progress, and at the same time realizing there is a disturbing condition in the country which has been created by some effort, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how they have given out the idea that our defense program is not moving along as it should.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is very simple. Undue emphasis is being placed on comparatively insignificant details, and no attention given of the magnificent progress that we are making in every line of war endeavor.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Is not the misinterpretation of the situation in the country by the people due very largely to the fact that this country has always lived upon the idea that we have never lost a war, and that we will not lose this war, and in the face of the fact we have been losing all of the battles so far, it has a tendency to create in the minds of the people a sort of hysteria which brings about the very thing with its flood of letters and telegrams?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is disillusioning to the average citizen who has been taught American omnipotence from the kindergarten up, to wake up to the realization that we cannot go out and lick the world in a couple of days. There are those who have capitalized that disillusioned resentment by fostering an impression of general failure and inefficiency not justified by the facts. All we have to do is to let the people know what is actually being done.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I join the gentleman from Missouri in giving deserved tribute to loyal labor, and to responsible unionism in this country. We have found these conditions in the aircraft industry and in other defense factories. I do feel, however, that we cannot escape the factual history of our aircraft production in this country during recent months. Although we want to look forward to a stepped-up industry, yet we must realize and recognize that at one time within the past year, one-fifth of our aircraft production was at a standstill, because of disastrous strikes. We must face that responsibility as Members of this body. Shame on those persons in management and labor who failed to cooperate for necessary production in our hour of need.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. NELSON. And may I just say that in my opinion this is one of the most heartening and helpful addresses that I have heard in this House. Reference has been made to the necessity for material, and I believe my colleague will agree with me that what we need today is to conserve all of our scrap for the use of our men on the fighting front, and to direct all of our scrapping against the common foe.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No better advice could be offered at this time. I trust the country will take it to heart.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that shipping is one of the bottlenecks, that it is useless to produce materials unless we can deliver them. I am happy to say that in the construction of ships we are more than keeping pace with the program. The merchant-ship tonnage program calls for the production of 8,000,000 deadweight tons in calendar 1942, and a minimum of 10,000,000 dead weight tons in calendar 1943, and I hope we can exceed that. The Navy is far ahead of its schedule in the construction of destroyers and all fighting craft, and materially in advance of the program laid down at the beginning of the war. The Maritime Commission is extending its program for the production of all cargo ships, and especially of oil tankers.

In every line of endeavor we are producing proficiently and expeditiously the mechanism of war and simultaneously we are training the men who are to use it.

Contrast the mobilization in the Spanish-American War, when we assembled a comparatively small number of men, and the huge hospital list of recruits in our home camps and the failure to provide fundamental necessities, with that of today, when we are nearing our objective of an army of 3,600,000 men in this calendar year, drawing young men suddenly from civil life and bringing them into new surroundings and strange conditions. There has not been one single justified criticism as to the ration, as to the clothing, as to the housing, or as to the training of this vast army of men so unexpectedly brought under arms. The mobilization of this great number of men, under difficult conditions, is proceeding with a smoothness and with a rapidity that is gratifying to every patriotic citizen.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I would like to pay tribute to General Somervell, who is an Arkansas man, who has charge of the distribution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I certainly join in the gentleman's commendation of General Somervell. In his line and station he is doing as great a work as General MacArthur in his line.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I appreciate the information the gentleman has brought to the House. He was speaking of the number of men who have been brought into training and under arms. Would the gentleman be divulging a military secret that he ought not to divulge if I should inquire the number of men that we now have in training in the various armed forces of the country, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. About 2,000,000 men.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman feel we will reach our objective of 3,600,000 in training in the Army during the present year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The program is proceeding on schedule, and will be completed this calendar year.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The President a few months ago laid out in the Budget estimates a very ambitious and splendid program as to the number of planes, tanks, bombers, and so forth, that he had in mind to produce. Are we moving along so that we can reasonably hope that that schedule will be reached?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are not only moving along according to schedule but we are raising our sights. The President has just announced that he has increased his program by doubling the number of tanks which we expect to produce in a stated length of time. We are increasing the magnitude of our program, and every day we are making material progress toward its realization

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The country is tremendously interested in our program for planes and bombers. Is that moving along satisfactorily?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The statistics, if they could be made public, would satisfy anyone who has any doubt whatsoever as to the progress being made in the production of all types of aircraft.

Now, notwithstanding this magnificent record of unbroken success and progress, there is a spirit of criticism abroad in the land which is expressed by a letter I have received and which I will read. I am glad to say it is not from my district, and not from my State. It illustrates a state of mind found in the country, due entirely, I think, to misinformation. Here it is:

> DEAR SIR: We are getting a little tired of the shallow thinking and boondoggling inaction of some of you "saps" in Congress. Politics is controlling the Army and Navy. Selfish groups are sabotaging industry. Production is bogging down. In short, you are losing the war.
>
> We are paying out taxes, registering for defense duties, sending our boys to camp, and doing it cheerfully, but we would like to feel that we have leadership in Congress from honest men and not a bunch of cheap petty grafters who are taking advantage of the times to feather their own nests and dissipate the Nation's resources.

In answer to an all-too-prevalent frame of mind, of which this letter is an expression, I want to call attention to incontrovertible evidence of the integrity and self-abnegation of Members of Congress.

For more than 150 years congressional salaries have been exempt from State taxation. They would have remained so indefinitely had not Congress, of its own motion, without pressure from any source, voluntarily rescinded that exemption and subjected every Member of this House to taxation by his State.

Every Member of this House paid a vastly increased tax this year when he paid his State income tax, and it was done voluntarily. Yet, in face of that indubitable fact they charge that Members of Congress want to feather their own nests at the expense of the country.

Let me call your attention to another instance just as conclusive. Since the

establishment of this Government, at every census period, in order to prevent any State from losing representation and to save any Member of the House from having to run at large, Congress fixed the apportionment at a point where no State would lose Representatives. That has been going on ever since the establishment of the Government. There has only been one instance—in 1840—where they failed to increase the size of the House. We have at the present time only 435 Members in the House, whereas the British House of Commons, representing a much smaller constituency, has over 600 members. We could have gone along as usual amply justified in increasing the membership in order to protect the Members from expense and inconvenience at loss of seat.

The decision to reduce the membership and to increase the apportionment means financial loss and inconvenience to every Member and yet the vote on the change was practically unanimous. Oh, they say a Member will stoop to any venality; will sacrifice any principle in order to hold his seat in Congress. Why, this Congress patriotically, of its own volition, refused for the first time in a hundred years to increase the membership; and still we are charged with a desire to profit at public expense.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the fine address the gentleman is making. I think it is something that should have been said by many of us perhaps before now. With reference to State taxes paid by Members of Congress, I think it has been the gentleman's experience, as it has been mine, that the people back home frequently think that Members of Congress are exempt from paying the Federal income tax. I think it should appear in the gentleman's remarks at this point that we also pay the Federal income tax.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And the amount of the Federal income tax paid by Members of Congress is considerably more than that paid by the average person with like income. Not only do we pay the income tax but we are allowed less exemption than any other citizen of the United States. Others are allowed to deduct legitimate expenses, but a Member of Congress cannot deduct the legitimate expenses of his service or his election.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Commander VAN ZANDT.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that members of State legislatures are permitted to deduct for income tax purposes the cost of living in the capital city of their State whereas we Members of Congress are not accorded the same privilege in regard to the cost of living in Washington.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. Members of Congress have constantly denied themselves special privilege, and especially in connection with financial gain.

Then, when the legislative appropriation bill came up, the bill that pays our household expenses for the legislative establishment, we voluntarily and with no suggestion from the executive branch reduced the amount by $2,000,000, as against comparable amounts of the current year. We are not only economical with everybody else but we have been especially economical with ourselves.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am afraid the gentleman's remarks that we reduced household expenses may be subject to misinterpretation by uninformed people. The gentleman has reference to the expenses of the legislative branch, not our own personal households.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman differentiates. There is a widespread belief that Members of Congress charge many items to the Public Treasury. We are supposed to get free service in the barber shops, free service in the restaurants, and many other emoluments, when, as a matter of fact, we pay for this service in full and at current rates.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is appropriately discussing the subject of membership responsibility in this House. There are mistaken ideas which are prevalent in our districts as to certain expenses the Government pays for us. I find in my district a great many persons believe that Members of Congress can take the phone and call back to their constituents 200 miles away, or 2,000 miles away, and that the toll charges are paid for by the Federal Government. Every such call that goes beyond the confines of the Nation's Capital is paid for by the Member himself, even though such call be on strictly governmental business.

I do not wish to make an unfair comparison, but I do feel that it is appropriate and important to state that thousands of appointive officers of the Government here in Washington and back in our districts freely use the phone in transaction of Federal business.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point is well raised by the gentleman. You may call up anybody over long distance, but at the end of the month it will be on your bill and there will not only be the charge for the telephone call but you will pay in addition the Government tax on the call. As a further evidence of the economical attitude of Congress, I call attention to the retrenchment in nondefense expenditures effected in this session.

You would think from reading some of the mail that Members of Congress take delight in spending money on the least provocation or on no provocation at all when, as a matter of fact, we have decreased this year a number of these funds.

The reductions in 1942 nondefense appropriations on the basis of the regular annual bills as passed by the House so far this session, including the Interior bill as reported to the House, is approximately $600,000,000. In addition the sums to be advanced by the R. F. C. for loans for F. S. A., R. E. A., and Farm Tenancy are decreased by $165,000,000.

On the basis of the reductions submitted by the President in the 1943 Budget, which have not yet been considered by Congress, the decrease on nondefense appropriations (exclusive of statutory public debt and retirement fund requirements) will exceed $1,250,000,000.

The House at this session, on all appropriation bills (defense and nondefense), including the Interior bill and the Sixth Supplemental National Defense as reported, has reduced the Budget estimates by approximately $500,000,000. In addition to this sum there has been effected a decrease of $20,000,000 in the amount of the Budget estimates for funds to be advanced by the R. F. C. for loans.

In this connection, I want to read a paragraph from one of the many syndicated columns which go out every week, in which this statement is made:

> For a manifestation of the wholesome effect of this beat-some-sense-into-your-Congressmen campaign had, you need look no further than the RECORD of the House of Representatives in considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Here is a complete misrepresentation of the action of the House on the bill. The reason for the cuts in this bill have been persistently ignored and overlooked or misrepresented in every report that has gone out from Washington. The fact is that the cuts made in the agricultural appropriation bill were made on the recommendation and demand of the agricultural organizations themselves. There was not a single cut in that huge bill that was not recommended and insisted upon by the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. And on the other hand, there was not an item in that bill which they recommended be kept there that was not kept there in toto. That retrenchment was not in response to any beat-some-sense-into-your-Congressman campaign. It was done because the farmers of this country, with highest patriotism announced to us that they were satisfied with bare parity, and insisted upon the cutting of nonessential items in the bill.

And last, because my time is about to expire, let me call attention to the fact that the irregularities, errors of judgment, and instances of profiteering featured in the charges against Congress have without exception been uncovered by Congress itself acting through its committees of investigation. Instances of this character are unavoidable but Congress itself is taking every precaution to bring them to light and punish and eliminate them.

We are confronted by a prodigious job. It is everybody's job. We must have the cooperation of all to win. But let us take heart. The way is long and dark but it leads to victory—to enduring peace—the greatest heritage we can leave to those yet to come.

The bill before us falls into three categories, and is submitted in three titles,

one making provision for the Army, one for the Navy, and the other for general appropriations.

Under the naval title little may be said publicly. The total is $825,924,000, including $125,000,000 of contractual authority, the latter all being for ordnance purposes. Of the direct appropriations, the bulk of the money falls under the ordnance and aviation heads. Ordnance comprises many different projects, all of a material nature. The larger part of the aviation money falls under two projects, namely, radio equipment and the expansion of production facilities.

The military portion of the bill is explained in such detail as circumstances warrant, commencing on page 5 of the report.

The estimates amount to $17,579,311,258.

The need may be said to be responsive to five major factors, namely, personnel, aviation, maintenance and operation, storage and shipping facilities, defense aid.

The build-up has already begun of the enlisted strength The present objective is roundly 3,600,000 men by the end of the calendar year. That is about double the present number. By July it is hoped to have half of the increase in the service. That means additional amounts for pay, subsistence, transportation, and training to the end of the fiscal year, and it means provision to have housing available for the whole number as and when they enter the service. The cost for all is approximately $2,050,000,000.

You will recall that we provided for outfitting and implementing the larger force just a few weeks ago in the fifth supplemental defense bill.

On the aviation side, the estimates call for the second increment of planes looking to a peak production rate of 125,000 airplanes during the calendar year 1943. We provided for the first increment of 33,000 airplanes in the fourth supplemental defense bill. The next and final increment will come along in the regular 1943 bill.

This growing aviation program means a large organization expansion, additional ground facilities, more pilots, and hence more training facilities, and more mechanics and radiomen. It is a tremendous program. It means an outlay of around $10,670,000,000. The airplane part is $6,990,000,000.

For maintenance and operation incident to actual war participation and otherwise, including a number of miscellaneous projects, the allocation is approximately $2,050,000,000.

For storage and shipping facilities, and both are becoming increasingly difficult problems, the estimates call for $450,000,000.

Lastly, for Defense Aid, the allocation is $2,220,000,000. Seventeen billion two hundred and fifty million dollars has been made available heretofore for the transfer of defense articles, information, and services chargeable against War Department appropriations.

You will note on page 5 of the report that we have gone along with the estimates, insofar as money is concerned, in all but 4 instances. On page 5 we list the changes, and, commencing on page 7, we state the reasons I shall not dwell upon them. I might tell you, though, that the Army Specialist Corps is a new venture. It has not been authorized by law. The President has sanctioned its creation, but it needs funds in order to function. It was described to us as a corps of civilian specialists, from artisans and nontechnical specialists to scientists and professional men, who would serve at home and abroad in special fields as civilians. They would be provided with a distinctive uniform, or, at least, required to wear one. It would be a quasi-military group. The number might ultimately reach 150,000. The pay would range from $2,300 to $8,000.

We have eliminated provision for this corps. In the first place, we do not have jurisdiction. In the second place, the idea of a quasi-military outfit did not have much appeal. If they need such character of service, we felt that they should get it either by taking men possessing the qualifications required into the Army in the manner provided by law or by employing such persons as civilians, by contract or otherwise.

The truth is, this sort of a proposition should have been presented to the military legislative committee.

That covers, I should say, the salient features of the War Department title.

I should like to stress this point, Mr. Chairman. We had rather exhaustive testimony on and off the record. That part on the record has been painstakingly edited. Practically all of the meat is gone. We have a bare skeleton left. So, we must be careful about using publicly facts and figures which we may think are in the record, but which, for military reasons, the Department's agents have removed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is now just a little over 3 weeks since the Appropriations Committee has had pending a bill for the appropriating of funds for national defense. That is a little longer than the usual period—perhaps it is a little longer than we can expect in days to come—because the United States is engaged in a struggle, the like of which we have never known, and I hope we will never know again—a struggle for our very existence.

I appreciate the things that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has said about me and about the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. May I say that the gentleman from Missouri and many of those who have assisted him on his own side of the aisle have stood for all needed appropriations for national defense all along. There has been no partisanship in that matter; there has been nothing but a sincere feeling on the part of all of us that we must do those things which would protect the United States of America, and this we have felt impelled to do many times, regardless of what the political repercussions might be.

Before Pearl Harbor, however, there were three or four groups in this country: There were those who wanted to amend the Neutrality Act; there were those who wanted to pass the Lease-Lend Act and say to our people that those things would keep us out of war; there were those who felt that the passing of those two types of bills were bound to get us into war and that we should not tell the people something that we did not believe ourselves; there were those, on the other hand, who felt that it was possible to keep the country out of this war. Frankly, I belonged to that second group. I did not feel that it was possible to keep this country out of the war. I knew that the passage of those bills would not keep us out, and I never told my people that I thought we could be kept out of the war, because I did not believe it myself. I blame nobody for our being in. It took some people back home a little while to get out of their heads the idea that we were going to be kept out of the war, but now I think the whole United States is aroused to the necessity of prosecuting this war to the utmost.

I do think that there is a feeling on the part of a very large number of people that there should be better cooperation on the part of those in authority—on the part of the President of the United States himself—with the defense program. There are many people who feel that the retention of Madam Perkins in the office of Secretary of Labor is against the interests of national defense, and these people include members of the labor unions, as well as others. There are many who believe that some of the operations of the N. L. R. B. and the wage-hour outfit are against the interests of national defense. There are many people who believe that the tribute that is levied upon those who work in defense plants and on Government work, where they are obliged to pay a tribute of from $75 to $1,000 in many cases for the privilege of joining a union before they are permitted to work, is against the interests of national defense.

I am going to recite an instance that, to my mind, is absolutely against the interest of national defense, an instance that is typical of many of those that exist throughout the country, one of those that, to my mind, must absolutely be corrected.

A week ago Monday the Navy Department desired to ship from a place in Rhode Island to one of the embarkation points along the coast a very considerable distance, calling for travel through New York City, some very heavy things. There was a strike on that prevented the obtaining of a truck to handle the material. The Government finally commandeered a truck and loaded it with all this material to carry down to the embarkation point. They put a man on to drive, and accompanied him with uniformed men of the Marine Corps.

These men got down to the borders of New York City, and the union there would not let them pass through the city. They were obliged to unload that truck and put the material on another one before they were permitted to go on. As a result, hours and hours of the men of

the Navy were lost, and it was with the utmost difficulty that this material was delivered to the port of embarkation on time.

If those who represent labor unions think they are helping to clear up this situation and promote national unity by the promotion of such performances and such operations, it is time they wake up and begin to realize that the people of America want cooperation with the national defense program. Our production is better than it was; yes, but I wish that that production were double what it is today. I wish we could have the cooperation of industry and labor wholeheartedly and devotedly. The members of many committees of the Congress have been working for months and months many hours beyond what might normally be expected to be spent. I wish this spirit could permeate the whole of America and that we could rise to the point where we were supplying every tank and every plane and every ship that is needed for the prosecution of this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I hope the President of the United States, this Congress, and those in authority will cooperate to get that situation in shape, so that we shall not have to hang our heads.

Regardless of how well we are going, regardless of what we are doing, we are confronted with the announcement of Prime Minister Churchill the day before yesterday that the battle of the Atlantic is not going as good as it ought to. What does this mean? It means that we must spur every bit of effort that is going on, we must drive it to the point where it is producing results and America is able to win the ultimate victory.

I am not going to spend much time on this bill. The deficiency committee, with reference to the deficiency items in the bill, has brought in here cuts that in almost every instance are deep enough to satisfy me, and that is going awfully strong. I have no excuse for coming out here and offering amendments to cut down these items. The committee did a good job on the bill.

As to the military and naval items, it was found necessary to cut out some of the recommendations for things that are not needed for national defense, like moving-picture cameras to put on shows for the civilian population. The civilian population does not need to have frills and extras to keep up their morale. They will do that by themselves. The committee was unanimous in cutting out such items.

With reference to the Army, it was estimating what we thought to be too large a figure on some of the post construction. We had estimates from the Coast Guard for about $1,000 a man on some of this post construction, and from the Army for $1,250 at the same time, and we thought there was a little inconsistency there. As a result, we made some trimmings on things of that kind, which I do not believe will hurt the Army but will improve their operations and construction.

No items have been cut that in my opinion militate against the successful development and prosecution of the war.

God knows there will be waste, there will be terrible waste in this thing; there will be waste, no matter what anybody does. There is no way to stop it. The figures are absolutely staggering, but what we are up against in the world is absolutely staggering.

The situation confronting America today is the most desperate in her history. We have to go down the line; we have to supply what is needed. I, for my part, propose to continue, as I have in the past, to supply the sinews of war for the boys who are fighting our battles, to see that they are not left to go into battle without the very best we are able to give them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, when the war powers bill was being considered by this body a few days ago an amendment to that measure was offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the effect of which was to modify the 40-hour provision of the labor laws for the duration of the present emergency so as to permit an employee to work over 40 hours a week, if he desired to do so, without charging any more per hour for the time he works above 40 hours than he charges for his services per hour under 40 hours.

As the law now stands, no laborer can do this without violating the law and making himself subject to the penalties provided for such violation of the law.

I was dumfounded when only 62 Members of this body voted for this amendment.

I am surprised that our President does not favor it.

At the time I stated that this vote of the majority in defeating this amendment did not reflect the sentiment of the majority of American labor or the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the American people. I am even stronger now in that conviction.

The issue involved in this proposal is clear and elementary. And before we go any further with our war activities it should be definitely determined as to the course Congress, the President, and our country are going to adopt on this issue for the duration of the emergency.

This should be done in justice to our boys whom we, Congress and the President, are forcing, through compulsory military conscription laws, to fight and die on far-flung battlefields scattered throughout the four corners of the earth. It should be done in justice to the mothers and fathers, from whom we, Congress and the President, have not asked but demanded, through stern Federal compulsory military conscription laws, the gift of their most precious possessions, the crown jewels of their homes, their young sons, even before they have tasted the sweet fruits of mature manhood, to give their lives not for 40 hours a week but for every hour of every day of every year so long as the war lasts. To many thousands this demand will mean broken bodies and crippled limbs for the remainder of their lives. To many thousands more this demand will mean their lives not for the duration only but for eternity. To these the fruits of the war will mean nothing. The Members of this Congress and the President will have demanded that they die in order that we may live.

These boys are dying and fighting and serving because the majority of the Members of this body have by Federal compulsory military conscription laws, adopted by us, demanded that they die and fight and serve. A large portion of these boys could not even vote. They were not organized. They were innocent of the pressure practices of politics. Most of them are not old enough to even have any mature idea of the meaning of our complex form of government or the underlying economic issues which have brought on this dreadful war. And it is a dreadful war primarily because these boys are being killed and wounded.

If these boys had been as strongly organized as the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. and if they had a John L. Lewis and a William Green as well as millions of dollars at their command and could have defended themselves against compulsory military service legislation as forcefully as organized labor is defending itself against modification of the 40-hour week and the other special privileges and benefits it is now enjoying during this grave period of national emergency I wonder how many of us would have voted for the Compulsory Military Service Act. I am wondering also what the attitude of the President of the United States would have been toward this legislation.

We likewise adopted the 40-hour law making it a crime for a man to work for more than 40 hours a week without receiving special compensation for such additional service. And the President approved it. We passed this law in order to help give jobs and comfort to American laborers and American families. We passed it to relieve unemployment, because there were more laborers than there were jobs. We passed it to remedy an economic condition that does not now exist and at a time when there was no great national emergency or grave threat to the very life of our Nation.

Now we are demanding of our American boys that they give their lives in military service. At the same time we are refusing to even permit, much less demand, American laborers to voluntarily give up any of the special privileges and benefits which we gave them in time of their need even though the necessity for such special privileges does not now exist. And from newspaper reports the President of the United States, who with us has decreed that our boys must if needs be die for their country, seems to strongly oppose any legislation which would merely permit laborers to voluntarily work for their country.

Mr. Chairman, how can Congress and the President justify before man and God this attitude?

I know that the arguments about profits of capital and huge salaries and private greed enter into the picture, but they are in this instance largely weapons of selfish groups to becloud the real issue.

Congress and the President did not bring forth these arguments when we

ordained through compulsory military service that our boys fight and die. And certainly the life of a young boy is as dear and as sacred to him as the 40-hour week is to the man laboring in industry.

Profit, greed, and avarice have always existed. They always will. There is plenty of time to pass laws dealing with these matters and I understand that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House is now holding hearings on legislation that does deal with these problems. I hope the Naval Affairs Committee will give us a bill that will remedy these undesirable conditions and include in their bill modification of the 40-hour-labor law for the period of the emergency.

The real issue, as I have stated, is plain and elementary.

Shall Congress and the President of the United States continue to demand compulsory military service of the youth of this country and at the same time continue to make it a crime for a man not in military service to voluntarily labor for over 40 hours per week without receiving special favors and benefits at the hands of the Government?

The membership of this body know what we should do. The truth is that we know our duty but it seems that some of us are afraid to do our duty. We know this law should be modified.

Suppose that the majority of our boys in the armed forces displayed the same degree of fear in meeting the enemy as we are displaying in meeting this issue?

Is our war effort a puny effort of cowardice? If so can we expect any more of the American boys who are fighting our battles?

This issue has been clearly presented in legislation now pending before the Judiciary Committee of this House of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] who is also an outstanding American citizen, is chairman. It is simple legislation and can be easily and speedily acted upon by that committee and brought before this body. This should be done without delay. And every Member of this body should have courage to go on record on this issue. Let your constituency know how you stand. Let the American people know how you stand. And let the boys who you voted to conscript and who even now are dying on battlefields in foreign lands because of your vote know how you stand. The American people are demanding action and we should act without delay.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, the final outcome of this war hinges upon our ability to produce and deliver to our fighting forces with the utmost speed and in enormous quantities implements, machines, and munitions of war. The duty to produce and deliver such equipment rests upon all of us and is one in the performance of which industry and labor share equal responsibility. To attain this goal without sacrifices on the part of every man and woman in this country is impossible. The job to be done is a monumental one, involving the creation of something like $150,000,000,000 of matériel, and one which must be completed during the next 18 months. Both war production and the supply of civilian necessities must be maintained. They add up to a volume of industrial production that has never before been approached.

To achieve this objective is more than a problem of creative technology; it is a matter of achieving unprecedented productivity with the men and machines we have on hand—

According to a recent study in the March 1942 issue of Fortune magazine.

The present program for war industry calls for production of something like $65,000,000,000 of matériel during the 18 months between January 1942 and July 1943. Translating this into man-hours, according to the common formula of $1 of production for each man-hour of work, this means United States industrial labor will be required to supply in this period 65,000,000,000 man-hours of work for the war effort. Making a very liberal estimate of all industrial labor now available, both in and out of jobs, we have 20,000,000 workers. If these were all to work 50 hours a week, 50 weeks a year, they could work only 75,000,000,000 man-hours in 18 months, which is only 10,000,000,000 in excess of the theoretical war-industry requirement, without taking care of any civilian industrial necessities. Actually, our labor force could not work that much in war industry for the period as a whole, because the change-over to new jobs now in progress is necessarily a slow and gradual job. To meet the war program, plus supplying civilian needs at the lowest level of the last depression, we must increase our industrial productivity by at least 50 percent. That is, we must achieve a man-hour that turns out $1.50 in goods instead of our present $1 man-hour.

In other words, with 20,000,000 men working, our production must be one and one-half times as great as it is in normal times. That is impossible under the 40-hour workweek; it is equally impossible under a much longer week if strikes are allowed to continue. The House of Representatives passed the antistrike bill early in December 1941 and sent it to the Senate, where it still remains. I wish that body would act on it, for now, more than ever before, we need and must have definite assurance that there will and can be no more delays in the production of articles and implements of war.

A few days ago some of us undertook to amend the 40-hour-week laws so as to suspend their operation in war industries during this critical time of national danger. Basic wage rates for normal working time were not involved in the amendment—only hours, days, and weeks, and the amendment applied simply to defense industries. When the vote was announced, however, we were able to secure only 62 votes in favor of this proposal, while the opposition received 226. All of us know the situation confronting the American people; we know that it is utterly impossible for us to secure the needed production unless men work longer hours. Naturally, I am disappointed that our proposal to permit the increase of man-hours so absolutely essential to secure such production failed of enactment. My only son is a corporal in the United States Army, drawing a small salary each month; my ony son-in-law is likewise in the Army. Each of them, like the sons of countless thousands of our citizens, will be expected to work unlimited periods of time and they will gladly do so—without complaint and without thought of normal working weeks. It seems to me that men engaged in the production of weapons and munitions of war, a job of equal importance with the work done by our armed forces, should not be unwilling—and I cannot believe they are—also, to make sacrifices by working longer periods than 40 hours a week, especially since they are well paid for their labor and do not have to face the dangers and horrors of battle.

Basically, the 40-hour-week laws were passed so as to divide and distribute work in a time of economic depression, to make it possible for normal production to be done by a greater number of workers. The need for that is past. There is more work now than can be done, and for our success each individual worker is obliged to produce more than heretofore. Of course, men are not expected to work 24 hours per day each day in the week. The impossible is not asked; nor are factory workers asked to work so long as to endanger their health or reduce their efficiency. Continuous production each day in the week for an unreasonable number of hours each day would put foremen, supervisors, and workers under a dangerous strain. We cannot, however, falter in our duty to make the maximum use of each hour in each day for as many hours and days as yield advantageous and profitable productivity.

I am confident that every worker would be more than willing to work longer hours and to make every necessary sacrifice if he knew that victory depended upon greater efforts by him. The difficulties lie in the necessity for management to pay overtime after the 40 hours maximum have been worked each week. Labor can, if it wishes, hold out for better pay and larger pay envelopes; it can strike or slacken work, but it must not forget that fatter pay envelopes and slackened work will eventually yield poor returns. With the cost of labor high, the cost of fabricated articles will increase. With consumer goods scarce, prices will be pushed still higher. Standards of living necessarily will be reduced and in the end workers will not have been the gainers.

I was talking this week to a very dear friend—a friend I have known since his childhood; a flyer who, along with his brother, another flyer, has indelibly written his name in the history of aviation; they are extraordinary men, humble, brave, glorious—who has been fighting in a flying fortress nearly 50 hours a week almost from the beginning of this war, in Java, Bali, Celebes, the Straits of Macassar, and other Pacific waters. The first thing that this man said to me was, "Please send us more planes." He was not complaining of long hours nor of danger; all he wanted was the tools with which to work, tools that must be supplied by industrial workers in quantities sufficient to enable him and his brothers in arms to fight their best for us upon the field of battle. I assured him I would do my best to grant his wish, and I shall do my best. But we must not fool ourselves; we cannot secure maximum production until the workers in the factory give longer hours to the fabrication of the weapons that are needed. I am

not against labor. I have always been the friend of labor, and I am still the friend of labor; I want every man who works to secure a good wage, and I want him to work under good conditions, but I do believe that in times like these all of us should make every possible effort to bring into existence and deliver the ships, the weapons, the munitions, and the host of other articles that our boys in the field so sorely need in their fight to protect and preserve this Nation.

I believe, first, that every man within given age limits should be treated exactly alike, the well circumstanced married and the unmarried; of course, a man in an industry necessary to war production or to the support of the war effort should not be molested; and second, that no one should be deferred from armed service unless his occupation is one that is essential to war production, and there is no one to take his place on the production line. We have had several Members of Congress between the ages of 30 and 40 years who have relinquished the high position they occupied to take their places in the armed forces of the country, because they felt that men of their ages were needed there.

Hon. FRANCES E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

Hon. EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington.

Hon. ALBERT VREELAND, of New Jersey.

Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, of New Jersey.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas

A grateful people will always honor them.

We cannot win this war, and work, and live, and carry on our lives as usual. Self-sacrifice is necessary, and labor and industry alike must make it. Our boys in Ireland, Australia, the Philippines, and elsewhere, who are fighting and dying for this Nation, are depending upon us at home to give and deliver them the weapons, the munitions, and the equipment necessary for them to carry on. They are not bemoaning their fate nor bewailing the fact they are on the firing line, facing guns and superior forces of the enemy; they are not worrying about their standards of living; they do not strike; they are humbly, bravely making the sacrifices of the soldier. It certainly does not help their morale to know that there are those who are holding up production for bigger and more fabulous profits, and others striking for higher wages or protesting against an increase in working hours. It is high time that both labor and business give up some of their gains.

Congress too, must do its share. Our Constitution imposes upon Congress the responsibility of providing an army and a navy, and armies and navies that are not effective are worthless. Now of all times, Congress should have its own corps of independent experts to acquaint it fully with our military and naval necessities. Public opinion should force both House and Senate to provide themselves continuously with learned and capable men in the fields of science, industry, and military affairs to advise them upon questions of weapons, technique, and policy. Congress should know the military and naval weapons that should be produced in quantity and supplied to our sons in the field of action and do its part in seeing that they are produced and delivered.

We are at war—the greatest war of all time—a war of such scope and such proportions that no man can comprehend fully its final implications; a World War to which our War between the States and World War No. 1 were mere preliminary skirmishes paving the way for this limitless conflict—a war that will take the whole time and effort of every citizen to win—a war which I fear will be fraught with many discouraging reverses on many fronts before we shall be able to bring our full industrial might to bear and crush those powers who have challenged the right of democratic peoples to live their own lives in their own way.

Victory with no unavoidable delay is what we should strive for, strive to the utmost, because I know you fear, as I do, not that we shall not be victorious, but that if this war continues many years our victory may be a hollow one with little left to salvage; with nothing much on earth but human misery and chaos. Our battle front is both at home and abroad; in every factory, in every office, in every home there is work to be done, sacrifices to be made by all of us. I am sure that the American people will rise to the occasion, cheerfully, courageously, wholeheartedly, that as surely as our brave men now fighting for us in the air, on the ground, and on and under the seas will eventually triumph on the battle lines, so we too shall fight and win the battle of the production lines.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total of $18,302,000,000, of which $145,000,000 is in contract authorizations. It compares with Budget estimates of $18,537,000,000, of which $150,000,000 is in contract authorizations, or a reduction over-all, as compared with Budget estimates, of about $236,000,000.

Of the total, about $17,376,000,000 is for the Army, about $821,000,000 for the Navy, and about $105,000,000 for other agencies.

This is the fourteenth appropriation bill to be considered by this House since December 4 last, those bills aggregating, including the present one, about $93,571,000,000.

The bill forms part of the picture which you will find on page 4 of the committee report. The table on that page indicates that for the 3 fiscal years commencing July 1, 1940, as of March 23, 1942, appropriations, contract authorizations, and pending recommendations for war purposes alone amount to the stupendous over-all total of over $160,889,000,000, exclusive of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman would not get permission to put that table, which is on page 4 of the report, in the RECORD.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I shall be very glad, under leave to extend my remarks, to insert the table at this point in the RECORD:

The following table includes the amounts in this bill on the basis of the Budget estimates submitted therefor. However, the reductions effected in the Budget estimates for the bill by the committee do not equal an amount which would bring the round total below $160,000,000,000.

Appropriations, contract authorizations, and recommendations for national defense fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 (as of Mar. 23, 1942)

	Army	Navy (including Coast Guard)	Other agencies (including Lend-Lease)	Total
Fiscal year 1941:				
Appropriations enacted	$8,483,708,958	$3,620,233,790	$8,33[illegible],531,908	$20,451,474,656
Contract authorizations enacted	5,006,589,651	871,769,817	389,000,000	6,267,359,468
Subtotal	13,490,298,609	4,501,003,607	8,727,531,908	26,718,834,124
Deduct appropriations included above to liquidate contract authorizations [1]	352,093,444	86,647,100	221,500,000	660,240,544
Net total, 1941	13,138,205,165	4,414,356,507	8,506,031,908	26,058,593,580
Fiscal year 1942:				
Appropriations enacted	58,033,709,528	16,726,202,466	16,360,557,082	91,120,469,076
Contract authorizations enacted	183,145,695	687,818,894	3,791,000,000	4,661,964,589
Supplemental items:				
Appropriations	17,579,311,253	700,974,000	36,185,457	18,316,470,710
Contract authorizations		25,000,000	25,400,000	50,400,000
Subtotal [2]	75,796,166,476	18,139,995,360	20,213,142,539	114,149,304,375
Deduct appropriations included above to liquidate contract authorizations [3]	4,276,580,695	615,453,690	354,111,226	5,246,145,611
Net total 1942	71,519,585,781	17,524,541,670	19,859,031,313	108,903,158,764
Fiscal year 1943:				
Appropriations recommended in 1943 Budget	[5] 5,468,091,747	[4] 14,047,891,674	[5] 1,323,161,955	20,839,145,376
Contract authorizations recommended in 1943 Budget		[4] 500,000,000	90,000,000	590,000,000
Supplemental items: Appropriations			2,913,417	2,913,417
Subtotal	5,468,091,747	14,547,891,674	1,416,075,372	21,432,058,793

[1] Includes liquidations of 1940 and prior contract authorizations, as follows: Army, $156,921,988; Navy, $58,087,100 other agencies—Maritime Commission, $144,500,000.

[2] Includes liquidation of 1940 contract authorizations for Army of $12,382,500, and for Maritime Commission, $95,981,258.

[3] Exclusive of $920,000,000 originally recommended in Budget for 1943 appropriation, now appropriated in Public Law 474 as 1942 to liquidate 1941 and 1942 contract authorizations.

[4] 1943 Naval Appropriation Act, Public Law 441.

[5] Includes items in 1943 independent offices, Department of Justice, State, Commerce, and War Department (civil functions) Appropriation Acts as passed the House.

Appropriations, contract authorizations, and recommendations for national defense fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 (as of Mar. 23, 1942)—Continued

	Army	Navy (including Coast Guard)	Other agencies (including Lend-Lease)	Total
Deduct appropriations included above to liquidate contract authorizations	[2] $730,365,695	$825,575,021	$1,085,177,184	$2,641,117,900
Net total, 1943	4,737,726,052	13,722,316,653	330,893,198	18,790,940,893
Net total, 1941, 1942, and 1943	89,395,516,998	35,661,214,830	28,695,961,409	153,752,693,237
Estimated appropriations required beyond 1943 to complete construction of the expanded Navy				7,137,021,018
Total				160,889,714,255

[2] Exclusive of $920,000,000 originally recommended in Budget for 1943 appropriation, now appropriated in Public Law 474 as 1942 to liquidate 1941 and 1942 contract authorizations.

The Members will note that the over-all total of over $160,889,000,000 shows about $89,395,000,000 for the Army, about $42,798,000,000 for the Navy, and about $28,695,000,000 for other defense agencies.

I want to call attention also, Mr. Chairman, to a table appearing at page 49 of the latest lease-lend report of the President dated March 11, 1942, showing all appropriations made for lease-lend or defense aid purposes. Under leave to extend my remarks I also include this table at this point in the record.

RECAPITULATION

The amount of lend-lease aid that may be provided under the various acts is summarized in the following table:

Lend-lease appropriations to the President

First Lend-Lease Appropriation Act	$7,000,000,000
Second Lend-Lease Appropriation Act	5,985,000,000
Third Lend-Lease Appropriation (fifth supplemental)	5,425,000,000
	18,410,000,000

Value of goods that can be transferred

War Department:	
Third supplemental	$2,000,000,000
Fourth supplemental	4,000,000,000
Fifth supplemental	11,250,000,000
Navy Department:	
Naval Appropriation Act (ships)	3,900,000,000
Naval Appropriation Act (articles)	2,500,000,000
Maritime Commission:	
First supplemental	1,296,650,000
Fifth supplemental (appropriation funds)	1,500,000,000
Fifth supplemental (contract authorizations)	2,350,000,000
Other departments: Third supplemental	800,000,000
Total	29,596,650,000
Maximum amount of aid that can be provided	48,006,650,000

The Members will note that the table shows a total of $48,006,650,000 available for lend-lease purposes. This bill raises that figure by $2,238,000,000, giving a total over-all of about $50,244,650,000. The over-all total constitutes what may be called a ceiling for lease-lend purposes. Any or all of it may be used, of course, either for the purposes of our Allies or for our own purposes, according as we may determine from time to time.

Actual appropriations for war purposes, Mr. Chairman, as the committee report points out, must run far ahead of actual expenditure. It is hard to know just how far ahead they should run. I should suppose that at present they are running about 12 or 18 months ahead of anticipated expenditure. Actual expenditure for the fiscal year 1941 was about $6,000,000,000, estimated expenditure for the fiscal year 1942 is about $24,000,000,000, estimated expenditure for 1943 is about $53,000,000,000, a total of $83,000,000,000.

We have the assurance from the War Department, the Navy Department, and other war or defense agencies that with the exception of certain long-time items, all commodities requested to date may be expected to be turned into finished goods not later than the end of the calendar year 1943.

The bill is in three titles. The first provides for the Army about $17,376,000,000, a decrease as compared with the Budget estimate of over $203,351,000. The second provides for the Navy about $820,751,000, a decrease of about $5,172,000, as compared with the Budget estimate. The third provides for various other agencies about $105,236,000, 67 percent of which, the report states, is connected with the war effort, or about $27,680,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Like the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am reasonably satisfied with the cuts which have been made by the committee in charge of this bill. I have not the time to go into the individual items. The principal items are admirably covered, it seems to me, by the report prepared by Mark Sheild and John Pugh, our able clerks for the Appropriations Committee. I have time only to make two or three comments on matters which have developed in connection with the hearings.

First, I want to refer to the matter of unit costs. We all know what has been developed through the Truman committee and through the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the House in terms of gross waste in the construction of cantonments, for instance, in terms of enormous excess profits and other matters.

We know that to date, generally speaking, unit costs have failed to come down.

I call attention in this connection to the testimony of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, pages 338 to 352, part I, of the committee hearings, page 19 of the committee report. There you will find an item of $1,200,000 representing solely increases in cost of materials, equipment, and supplies, increases all the way from 22 percent to 126 percent, increases apparently due solely to competition between this and that Government agency. In the absence of explanation these exorbitant increases just do not make sense.

We are told that contractors and subcontractors are being asked to furnish explanation in the matter. It must be gone into thoroughly. Profiteering must cease. Unit costs must come down.

I want to refer also to the matter of training for war or defense purposes. You will find two items in the bill for training courses. I understand that there are no less than 11 different Government agencies operating in this field at the moment.

If I am correctly advised there is the Department of Labor program, there is the Office of Education with five programs, there is the W. P. A. with two programs, there is the N. Y. A. with two programs, there is the C. C. C. with its program, there are the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, and the C. A. A. programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is the War Production Board with two programs; there are, I am told, two programs under the public vocational schools.

We have seen, Mr. Chairman, in the past no less than 8 different agencies operating in the field of priorities, and the enormous confusion that resulted. We have seen some 12 different agencies in the field of defense housing. The hearings indicate that some effort has been made to coordinate this training picture through the War Production Board. I submit, however, that some committee of the House, probably the subcommittee in charge of labor and social-security appropriations, should go into this picture thoroughly with a view to eliminating any of those programs which do not justify themselves, and to assuring coordination of the entire picture.

During the past 9 years we have seen the creation of an unlimited number of commissions, boards, and other Federal agencies. Recently the demand has become insistent for the elimination of all nonessential expenditure. Yet to date, we have seen almost no indication of the elimination or suspension for the period of the war of any of the agencies referred to. Attention is called in this connection to the testimony of the Public Buildings Administration showing that the Federal Government in Washington alone today owns office space to the extent of 19,790,000 square feet and rents additional space to the extent of 5,975,000 square feet as compared with a year ago when the owned space amounted to 17,316,000 square feet and the rented space to 4,842,000 square feet, the space for both years being apparently far in excess of the peak during World War No. 1.

Many Members were much concerned recently by the action of the Social Security Board in taking over, under doubtful legal authority, the employ-

ment offices in several States; a step apparently preliminary to the subsequent step contemplating complete federalization of the unemployment compensation work throughout the Nation, recently defeated by the Ways and Means Committee after the almost unanimous protest of the Governors of all the States. Attention is directed to the fact that the request of the Social Security Board included $1,500,000 as a result of the taking over of the employment offices.

My time is very short and I can only speak briefly.

This bill allows 99 percent of the Army requests and 99½ percent of the Navy requests. It slashes the total for other requests by about 20 percent. It sets a good example and indicates the road that we must follow.

The situation confronting us demands 100 percent cooperation in everything contributing to the war effort, in order that victory may be achieved at the earliest possible moment. It demands also 100 percent opposition to every force, whether inside or outside of Government, prejudicing that result.

One destructive force is the force represented by waste, by extravagance, by nonessential expenditure. That force must be eliminated.

I have an editorial, Mr. Chairman, sent me by a friend, appearing in an unnamed Massachusetts paper. It reads, in part, as follows:

THIS IS THE KIND OF CONGRESS WE NEED NOW

By tradition Congress is a deliberative body. In ordinary times that is what we need. But these are not ordinary times.

These times demand, not a deliberative Congress, but an enraged, determined, fighting Congress which will forget votes, forget parties, forget elections, forget social experiments, and slap down everyone who blocks the war program for even 15 minutes.

We need a Congress which will see red when an American boy is killed or wounded because a ship, or a plane, or a bit of war material reached him too late on account of some delay at home, whether that delay was caused by a strike or by someone's incompetence.

We need a Congress with guts enough to say to everyone: "Either you are for winning this war or you are against winning the war. There is no halfway position."

We need a Congress which will stop pussyfooting, stop trading the lives of American soldiers and sailors for the feelings of some incompetent but politically powerful Government official.

We need a Congress which isn't afraid of man nor devil, a Congress that is hell-bent for victory, a Congress that will make history instead of letting history write its epitaph.

We need a Congress of aggressive leadership. We need it badly.

I offer the editorial as evidence of what public opinion expects of us.

Public opinion throughout the country has become aroused, Mr. Chairman. Personally I thank God that it has at last become aroused. Personally I think it is a tragedy that it did not become aroused years ago.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has emphasized the fact that production is improving. That is true. I do not believe, however, that he would state that he is satisfied with production today. I know that I am far from satisfied. I do not believe the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, or anybody else primarily responsible for production is satisfied today. We must have maximum production at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing, in my judgment, that can contribute more to maximum production, to legislation essential in the interest of victory, to the elimination of all forces impairing an all-out national effort than an intelligent and aroused public opinion through the length and breadth of this Nation of ours. I welcome it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman familiar with the lend-lease funds now appropriated?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The total appropriated to date is $48,006,650,000, of which, according to the last lend-lease report by the President dated March 11, 1942, about $12,272,000,000 has been allocated, about $8,459,000,000 obligated, and about $1,411,000,000 actually transferred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if my figures are approximately correct. I have here figures indicating that the lend-lease amount, including the amount in this bill, would be something like $50,206,000,000; that on February 28, of this amount, $2,560,000,000 has been actually spent. Of that, $1,100,000,000 has been transferred; also of this $1,100,000,000, 25 percent was for war materials, or actual defense materials. Are those figures comparatively correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think they are not far out of line. Including this bill, the figures I have show total appropriations of about $50,244,000,000. According to the President's report of March 11, 1942, the amount obligated as of February 28 was about $8,459,000,000; the amount transferred was about $2,570,000,000, including articles in process, and about $1,411,000,000, excluding articles in process.

Mr. STEFAN. Then my figures are substantially correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think so.

Mr. STEFAN. That is, as of February 28.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, if it is true that only 25 percent of this amount is for war materials, what became of the other 71 percent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A large part of it was for agricultural commodities and other expenditures. I think the gentleman will find the details in the report referred to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in accord with much that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], said at an earlier hour today. With some of his statements, however, I must take issue.

It is to be regretted that he left the impression that either the press or the radio is not living up to the best traditions as molders of public opinion. I believe the press is trying to do an honest and a fearless job. I believe the radio is being used in an effective way. I believe any effort to stifle either the press or the radio would be a dangerous move today.

I am not unaware of the fact that in wartime much must be withheld, much must be left unsaid that can very properly be said in times of peace. But, on the other hand, there is considerable danger if any effort is put forth by those in authority to establish themselves, as Felix Morley has well said:

The keepers of the national conscience and the moralistic arbiters of our destiny.

So I plead today for a public opinion, an informed public opinion, an intelligent public opinion. I plead for a freedom of speech and a freedom of the press which will make possible the formation of an intelligent opinion. I object to any suggestions which might mean suppression of the means at hand for the dissemination of information and the formation of honest opinions and the reaching of reasoned judgments. I think some answer should be made to what I interpreted on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri as an optimism. I think there is danger in a false optimism. I think there is considerable to be said in favor of Mr. Churchill's forthrightness and frankness when a day or two ago he told the people what the conditions were. I am delighted that progress has been made in production, but I am extremely concerned lest we assume a false optimism, which might contribute to our undoing. France was lulled into a sense of security by an optimism. This must not happen here.

The record of the hearings discloses from the lips of one of the naval officers what I have in mind, Admiral Towers, under examination, admitted that we were under the estimates as they had been projected, in plane production. He was honest and forthright. The job to be done is a big one, a gigantic undertaking. Nothing less than our utmost will complete the task.

Let us cease fooling the American people. Let us avoid misleading the American people by an optimism that may prove disastrous. Words will not win this war. An optimism, illusory hopes, idle dreams will not win this war. We must work more and harder to win.

My distinguished friend from Missouri took occasion to draw a comparison between the conduct of this war and all other wars in our history He dwelt at some length on the competency with which this war is being managed and that which prevailed during the course of other wars. I shall make little comment

about that. I am not in hearty accord with the blanket whitewash that my friend attempted. I will let the record speak for itself and what the future will disclose time alone will tell.

From unimpeachable sources we have the records at hand which indicate that all is not well on the Potomac. There is little advantage to be gained by wrapping ourselves in any cloak of contentment, if this war is to be won. Irregularities have been shown. Favoritism should and must be eliminated. Let us make the record by deeds rather than writing it in words.

The gentleman referred to the information that should be available to our people. I am in hearty accord with the statement he made. But my suggestion is that that information should be uncolored and undistorted. Let this information be honest and factual, free of the pressure of propaganda purposes, and free of political persuasiveness. Let both of those conditions be attached to the dissemination of information. Let it be broadcast, the information at hand. It must not disclose military secrets. It must not disturb our military successes. It must not discourage our forces. But, oh, let it be information that does not have the pressure of propaganda or political advantage behind it. Give the people the cold, unvarnished truth, unadorned by the efforts of skillful publicists in the Government employ or by the deft touches of propaganda specialists. An honestly informed people is our surest security

One thing disturbs me greatly. I have seen entirely too much evidence of a stubborn and unyielding unwillingness to admit mistakes; a refusal to admit that there could be any possible fallibility. God knows this is a human effort. God knows the frailties of human nature. Let us cast aside this mask of omnipotence, of infallibility. If there are mistakes, instead of being stubborn and unyielding let us be willing to admit them and try to correct them. Unfortunately, this same spirit of stubbornness prevails, as honest men, as well-intentioned men, as patriotic men, devoted loyally to their country, attempt to direct constructive criticism as to the means or the ways of conducting the war. In my humble judgment the road to progress, the road to improvement, has always been the road where constructive criticism is not only permitted but where it is invited. Retrogression comes where the barriers are placed against those who may make calculating, constructive criticisms and honest appraisals. This war is to be won. It will be won. To win it there must be a singleness of purpose not only on the part of the people throughout the country, but a singleness of purpose here in Washington—yes, in this Congress. This singleness of purpose must be divorced from any plan to protect political power or to perpetuate a political philosophy. This war will be won by permitting the light of noonday to get into every nook and corner of public life. It will be won by a fearless forthrightness which will challenge the devotion of a free and a courageous people. America is not afraid. America knows no fear. But one thing can defeat us, disunity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today an appropriation bill carrying the sum of $18,157,187,148. An enormous sum of money, and I do not know where we will get all the money we are spending. We received this bill in the Committee on Appropriations yesterday morning about 11:15. At 12 o'clock the committee reported it out of the full committee for your consideration. This appropriation is in addition to those already made at this session, which began the 5th day of January. On January 22 we passed the fourth supplemental appropriation bill amounting to $12,566,000,000 for airplanes. On the 26th of January we passed the Naval Department appropriation bill carrying $26,500,000,000. Then we had the fifth supplemental deficiency bill amounting to $32,762,739,900 for the Army. With this bill the total exceeds $90,130,922,000. Since the 22d day of January, including this bill, we will have appropriated, so far as the House is concerned, for this country's participation in the war one of the most tremendous sums the Nation has ever appropriated in such a short time. No country in the world has ever done more to win a war.

Our first duty as American citizens is to win this war, because this Nation will not be fit to live in if we do not, and it behooves each and every one of us to do everything we can to bring about the ultimate end of a successful conclusion and winning of the war. In our zeal to make appropriations for national defense, however, we should also be careful that we do not permit powers that belong to Congress to pass out of the hands of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. We have our responsibilities to the people, we have our responsibilities to the country, and we should see that our form of government is maintained and that our financial structure is secure in granting these powers under this bill.

I tried to find who wrote the bill, but all I could ascertain was a statement by the chairman of the committee that it was sent here by the Chief Executive and the Army; that they made the suggestions. Our Subcommittee on War held hearings for 3 days. The fact of the matter is that we are furnishing money to the Chief Executive and the Army so fast we are beginning to hear stories that do not sound so good about the kind of contracts that have been made, where contractors have made 200 and 300 percent profit. This is wrong. I realize that income and excess-profits taxes are going to level them to a greater or lesser degree depending on the bracket in which the income falls, but that is not sufficient; we should not permit contracts of this kind to be let in the first place. No contract should bear a greater profit than 10 percent.

It makes no difference what it is for or to whom the contract might go. That is your responsibility and mine, and it seems to me that when we are passing out this money so fast that greater waste and greater extravagance will certainly follow the wake of these rapid appropriations. I am not in sympathy with such speed that leads to waste.

If we give the power to the Army and Navy and to Government officials to let these contracts, certainly they must be more responsible for looking after every detail of these contracts. They must investigate and find out what it costs to manufacture a certain article, then they will have a better idea of how to award a contract so that they will not yield such great profits to any manufacturer. That responsibility is yours and mine to see that they do not; I want to assume it; do you?

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to page 29 of this bill which provides a deficiency appropriation for the Interior Department and to this proviso:

Provided, That for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property persons may be employed for periods of less than 60 days and be paid salaries or wages from this appropriation without regard to citizenship and without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, that is wrong; it seems to me that when we bring in a bill here so rapidly that it permits a proviso of that kind to remain in it, there is something wrong with our Americanism, there is something wrong with our citizenship, and as far as I am concerned personally, when this proviso "without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government" appears in here, I will not support it. I am going to make a point of order against that particular section of the bill. It must be struck out.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield? I will explain that because it seems to me the gentleman will not take that position if he understands it.

Mr. RICH. Let me finish my statement. If you will turn to page 36 of the bill you will see the proviso that we have placed in practically every appropriation bill we have passed:

Provided further, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

That is the proviso that we write in every appropriation bill, and it is a good proviso. When we permit this other proviso I read on page 29 to remain in the bill, one is diametrically opposed to the other.

I know what the gentleman has in mind. They are going to take these

people that are placed in concentration camps and use them for fighting forest fires and things of that kind. We should put anyone who advocates overthrow of our Government behind the bars and keep him locked up, and I do not care who he is, where he comes from, or what his name is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. When a fire starts in a forest, the Forestry Department immediately secures as many helpers as it can to put out the fire. There may be 50 in one village, 5 over here, and others over there. This provision that the gentleman is seeking to strike out is put in here so that they will not have to ask these people who are asked to fight the fire to file citizenship papers showing that they are citizens, or to take an oath and to go through all the necessary things that they must go through, to put a man on the pay roll. Would it not be ridiculous, if you had to stop, while a fire is burning, to make a man prove the fact that he is a citizen, take an oath that he is not a Communist, and go through all the minutiae they now have to go through before they get on the pay roll? This waives those provisions in case of fire so that they will not have to go through all of these details in order to put a man to work putting out a fire.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman that at a time like this, when there is a fire, you have not all these opportunities to take affidavits, but I do not want to put anything in this bill that is going to permit any man who advocates the overthrow of this Government of ours to work any place. Why, he would do more damage because he would do everything to start fires if he had the opportunity. I say, put that fellow in prison and do it now.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman understand that you could not take on perhaps 200 people when the fire started, because you would have to stop and make them all take an oath? You would have to investigate all of them, you would have to have all of them present their citizenship papers and other details. The gentleman wants the fire stopped, but he seemingly does not want to have anybody fight the fire.

Mr. RICH. No; that is not the case at all. I do not want to agree to let any person be at large who would overthrow the United States of America. I am willing to give my life for my country and I will not permit any person at large who would overthrow our Government.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman does not understand it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us calls for $18,302,187,148, and the President, the War and Navy Departments say that this appropriation is necessary for our national defense, and have asked Congress to appropriate this sum. I am supporting the bill. I assume that if there is a roll call that every Member of the House will be recorded for it. There is no opposition.

Our Nation is now engaged in its longest, costliest, and bloodiest war. The one great desire of all loyal Americans is to win this war at the earliest date possible. I am sure that every loyal American is willing to do whatever he or she can that is necessary to bring success to American arms.

The report of the Appropriations Committee filed with this bill shows that this brings the grand total voted by Congress at the request of the President, the War and Navy Departments, to the amount of nearly $161,000,000,000 since July 1, 1940. This does not include many, many billions voted for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan to various industries and agencies to aid in our war efforts. I think it can be truthfully said that the total amount voted by Congress since July 1, 1940, for war purposes alone exceeds $164,000,000,000. This vast sum is more than one-half of the estimated national wealth of the country and is more than six times the direct and total cost of the first World War of $25,729,000,000 from April 6, 1917, to July 2, 1921, when that war officially closed. This sum does not include the $10,000,000,000 loaned to the Allies in the first World War. This $161,000,000,000 is four times the assessed value of all the farm lands, the improvements, livestock and poultry thereon in the United States, according to the Federal census of 1940.

The leaders of labor and the heads of industrial plants generally, throughout the Nation, have been working wholeheartedly to prevent strikes or stoppage of work in our defense plants. I regret, however, that there are some workers in some of our defense plants who have obstructed production, and then there are some of those engaged in industry who, according to their own statements, have been receiving unconscionable profits. Such individuals or groups render themselves a great disservice. The American people will not tolerate such conduct.

I wish to commend the high purpose and patriotism of those workers and their leaders and those in industry who place the welfare of their country above their own personal interest and welfare. Let us not hastily condemn all of labor or all of industry because of the selfish acts of a few. When the American people see their money honestly expended for our national defense and see that our production and our war efforts are commensurate with the money expended and they can see that their country is being defended, I am sure that the American people will willingly buy bonds and saving stamps and pay their taxes. With these tremendous sums of money being spent the American people have a right to expect results.

Congress has voted to the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, extraordinary powers. These great sums of money and these powers voted by Congress because of the demand on the part of the President, the Navy, and War Departments that they were necessary for the defense of our country and to enable us to win the war, and therefore it can be truthfully said that Congress has provided the money and the power to carry on this war successfully. There may be ground for just criticism that Congress has been too liberal in granting funds and power, but every other Member of Congress, like myself, would not want it said that we had obstructed in any way our war production or our war efforts. We desired only to see our heroic men thoroughly equipped and armed to defend our country and bring victory to the Nation.

The plans of the administration are to train, arm, and equip at least 10,000,000 men for the Army, Navy, and Air Service. In a short time Congress will pass another tax bill. The Government will then collect from the people annually thirty billion in taxes. Our armies, Navy, and Air Forces are now in every land and on every sea. The American people must begin to realize what a stupendous task is before them. I believe the patriotic American people are willing to make the sacrifices and for the Government to spend every dollar that is necessary to insure victory, but they have the right to demand that their bond money and their tax money be judiciously and honestly expended and their bond and tax money must not be squandered and wasted for fan-dancing, boondoggling, profiteering, to carry on rackets or racketeering, or to promote the interest of any selfish group or individual. They demand that this money be translated quickly into ships, planes, bombers, tanks, guns, and other war materials and supplies, and in such quantities as will mean victory. The dangers to our country are such that they have a right to demand that there be no strikes or stoppage of work in our defense plants by either capital or labor.

UNITY AND VICTORY

We have heard much about V standing for victory. The letter U precedes the letter V and stands for unity. In order to make sure of victory, there must be unity of the American people.

This war cannot be won by capital, by labor, by the farmer, by the Congress, by the administration, by the Army, Navy, or by the air force, or with money, or by one political party; it can only be won through the unselfish, patriotic efforts of all of our people and all of our agencies and resources.

This great war will tax to the utmost the manpower, the industrial, economic, mental, and spiritual resources of the whole Nation. It will finally reach the pocketbooks of the rich and the poor, and every heart and home in this broad land of ours.

There is considerable discord in the Nation; one group is claiming another group is promoting its own selfish purposes. In order to have unity Congress and the administration must see to it that justice is done to our defenders, to those who produce on the farms, to those who toil on the railroads, and in the factories, shops, and mines, and those engaged in industry. All these groups must contribute their share of the sacrifices, but each one of them is entitled to fair and just treatment.

Many bills have been introduced in the House and Senate relating to the question of labor and profits. The Naval Affairs Committee of the House is holding hearings, and will continue these hearings for some days yet. This committee will then report a bill to the House about the middle of April. No one knows in what form the bill will be presented or what provisions it will contain. Consideration of this bill should be approached by the Congress in a spirit of justice and fairness, keeping constantly in mind that the first and greatest task of our people now is to give to our defenders the weapons and equipment with which they can make an heroic and successful defense of our Nation.

As millions of American boys are, and will, offer their lives for their country, no Member of Congress should hesitate to take such action and cast such vote as he honestly believes will promote unity, expedite production of our war equipment, and give the greatest assurance of victory.

After all, if we should be defeated because of action taken or votes which we honestly believed were to the best interests of our country, it could mean little compared to what our defenders give, or the sacrifices that will be made by the mothers and fathers, the wives and children of these defenders.

I did not agree with the foreign policy of the President in the repeal of the neutrality laws, or in providing guns, planes, bombers, ships for other countries. I sincerely believed such a policy would involve us in the European and Asiatic wars, and I knew our country was unprepared. I believed that we should keep some of this equipment for the defense of our own country and the Western Hemisphere, and I believed it was our duty to build up first the greatest air force, the best mechanized army, and the best two-ocean navy in the world, primarily to defend our own country and the Western Hemisphere, and then give such aid as we could to other countries. That was the policy that was then being followed, and is now being followed, by Britain and Russia.

When we pass this bill today, Congress will have voted over fifty billions that the President and his administration can use under the so-called lend-lease policy. Of course, since we have entered the war, we must all hang together or hang separately, but our administration should insist that these other nations, with which we are united in this war, do what they reasonably can to help win the victory.

We are now in the war, and however, sincere or right one side or the other may have been, we must, for the period of the war, forget the things that are behind us, and unite together to bring success to our American forces, even though Mr. Flynn, the National Democratic chairman, calls upon the people to elect only Democrats, and the President intimates his desire that only New Dealers be elected, and Democratic newspapers are urging that Democrats or New Dealers be elected. Neither the Democrats nor the New Dealers alone can win this war. We must have the united effort of all of our people.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the average Member of the House has many questions in his mind when a bill like this comes in, because the hearings of necessity are censored. The printed hearings occupy 205 pages. However, throughout these 205 pages you will find frequent lines that read:

Here was a discussion off the record.

If my memory serves me right, there was considerably more said off the record than on the record during the time we were working on this bill. I feel, however, that in spite of the censorings and the omissions, Members will find considerable information in the printed hearings. It is my purpose merely to give you a few references to some points that I think will be of interest to you. First, may I call your attention to the item in the bill that provides funds for the Army to guard and protect enemy aliens. This is not to be confused with the evacuation problem.

The President by Executive order recently established a new work corps for the handling of some of the people of alien descent being evacuated from the west coast. That phase of the problem is not covered in this bill. The other problem deals with prisoners of war and enemy aliens covered by international agreement and funds in this bill go to that purpose.

It was of interest to members of the subcommittee to learn that the obligation on the part of belligerents to look after officers and persons of equivalent status who are prisoners of war is the subject of a multilateral convention which was entered into in 1929, ratified by the United States, and also ratified by Germany and Italy. Japan also was a signatory and we were told that as far as is known Japan as well as Italy and Germany are abiding by this convention.

This convention is reproduced in full text on page 47 of the hearings. You will find information on the same subject on pages 32 and 33. I think reading it will help you to answer some questions that Members will be asked back home.

Another subject that is under considerable discussion at the present time is the payment of time and a half for work after Friday night and double time on Sundays. In response to a question by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], we were advised that, regardless of whether a man had worked 40 hours prior to Friday night or not, pay on Saturday would be time and a half and pay on Sunday would be double time.

The testimony on this follows:

Mr. COLLINS. You do put in all of your contracts a provision that from 5 o'clock Friday afternoon until 7 o'clock Monday morning every man who works is paid overtime, even though that is the only time he does work?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir (p. 19).

Mr. CASE. Referring to the question which Mr. Collins asked you relative to the clause in the contracts which requires payment of overtime or double time for work between Friday night and Monday morning: Where is the responsibility for that clause being in the contract?

General SOMERVELL. The act of Congress, which requires us to pay overtime and the rate of time and a half.

Mr. CASE. It is the responsibility of Congress, if it requires a change in the act.

General SOMERVELL. That is in the law (p. 32).

So this places squarely before Congress the question of whether or not that provision with respect to time and a half or double time should be changed.

In this same connection I think it will be of interest to the Members to know that of the forty-six-million-and-odd dollars carried in this bill for pay of civilian field employees of the air forces, over $19,000,000 in this particular bill is to pay time and a half by reason of the fact that they are instituting a 48-hour week in the field. Under the law employees of the Government, civilian field employees of the War Department, have a 40-hour week. By instituting a 48-hour week in the field it will require for the period covered by this supplemental bill an additional appropriation of $19,273,292.

You might say the committee might have denied these funds if they did not want to pay this. On the other hand, under the ruling that has been applied to the Ramspeck Act by the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office, with that being the law, the employees would have a cause of action and a just claim against the Government if the funds were not provided in the appropriation bill. So the committee included that $19,000,000 for overtime on the 8 hours added. It is mandatory under existing law.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does the gentleman mean to say that all the employees of the War Department get time and a half for overtime?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not mean to say that all of them get it. It depends, of course, on whether or not that time is reported and accounted for. In the justifications on this bill an item of $19,273,292 was specifically included to take care of overtime for field employees of the Air Corps under the act of June 3, 1941.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingencies of the Army, including necessary personal services and the purchase of lawbooks, professional books of reference and subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and such other expenses as may be necessary, and payments from this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes, $1,578,180.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, to what paragraph does this request refer?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph ending in line 5, on page 2. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to mention that on June 15, 1941, I made a speech advocating doubling of the base pay of every soldier and sailor in the armed forces of the United States. It has been my great satisfaction to see that action taken in another body and also to see the very provisions of the Hall bill now before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and, according to information which I have, it will soon be brought to the floor for our consideration.

I need not say it is particularly gratifying to me to see such action taken. I feel that the day is way past due when we should consider, in view of the other benefits that have been paid to other groups of this great war effort, benefits to the soldiers and the sailors who are keeping the enemy at bay in the Pacific and throughout the world.

I want to express my satisfaction today that before very long this subject will come up. I regret that in this bill there is not an opportunity to take such action today to increase the pay of the soldiers and sailors, but I want to express the desire and the hope that such action will be taken immediately.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the gentleman from New York for preparing and presenting to this body such legislation. It seems to me that every excess in the operation of Government here at home lessens by just that much what we give to our soldiers at the fighting front. There is certainly much merit in the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his observations. I also want to thank the members of the committee for the consideration they have given me at various times when I have presented this amendment.

Another proposal which I made long ago and which will be remembered was to give free transportation home to members of the armed forces on furlough.

Some of the Members felt that such action was not necessary, but on the other hand I have received letters from many boys in the training camps, and they have stated flatly that they have been unable to take advantage of the furloughs that have been granted because they did not have the funds sufficient and heir families did not have the funds sufficient to make the trip home. This, in many instances involved traveling a long distance. Although it is out of order in this bill to offer amendments for pay increases to soldiers and sailors, nevertheless I hope that such a thought can be injected into this debate and action taken as the result of it. At this time I think it only fair to mention the subject of insurance and benefits to the families of the men in the service. This subject has also received wide consideration. It is with all sincerity that I stand before the House today and advocate that not only the base pay be doubled for every man in the armed forces and furloughs granted him when he is able to go home, but also provision should be made for insurance and benefits to those members who may be among the casualty list in the great battles for freedom which are to come. We must all be prepared to strip our essential needs to the bone. Yet I am sure there is not a member of the committee or a citizen of the United States who will not agree with me when I say that there is nothing too good for the men who are fighting the battles to preserve this great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Signal Service of the Army, $748,149,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is present.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. I had anticipated, as I saw the gentleman making notes during the course of my own address to the House, that he would have something to say and therefore I felt in duty bound to be on hand to listen to the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's powers of deduction are keen, and they are correct. I have taken the floor to compliment my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania upon the constructive speech he made this afternoon in his plea for unity. It is one of the finest speeches that I have ever heard, and I was very much moved by it. Every one of us agrees with him in his statement that criticism should not be destructive, but should be constructive. Particularly in these trying days should the very able and constructive suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania be carried out, that all of us should discipline ourselves to the extent that we should not make any utterances that would not serve the Nation's benefit. That applies not only to ourselves but to the great agencies that exist in the country that create public opinion. During his remarks the gentleman said in substance that no effort should be made to stifle the press or radio, that such an effort would be a dangerous move. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in that respect. I think everyone else agrees with the gentleman, and I think my friend will agree with my observation that the press with its constitutional freedom, and the radio with its privilege should do everything in their power to make their criticism and observations constructive. We want constructive criticism. It is through constructive criticism that human frailties which result in errors will be corrected, and my friend from Pennsylvania ably referred to the human frailties of which we are all victims. It is constructive criticism that will correct those errors and which will prevent those errors from occurring in the future.

However, I am inclined to think that my friend from Pennsylvania unintentionally misinterpreted the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], because certainly there is no one in this country who will fight more to preserve the freedom of the press or the privilege of the radio than our distinguished friend from Missouri, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I feel also sure that every one of us, without regard to party and those little things that move us, as we look at the broader implications of our way of life, in which we believe, and which we see threatened, must have a feeling of consolation that our Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, our President, is a man who is an intense lover of our form of life and an intense believer in preserving the freedom of the press. I refer only to one act on his part. We are at war and yet once a week, sometimes twice a week, he holds his press conference. These men who represent the papers, the special columnists, are men of great capacity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we all admire the correspondents who represent the various papers and news services in the House gallery and in the Senate gallery. I do not mean to flatter them, because I do not curry flattery. I do not like to receive it and I do not hand it out, but, to give credit where credit is due, the men and women who represent the journalistic profession are men and women of great capacity. Yet in war we see the President of the United States, the only country in the world where it has happened, still holding his press conferences. Not so many years ago, because of the ability of the members of the press to ask disturbing questions, we have had Presidents refuse to answer questions, but insisted that the members of the press submit their questions in writing a week ahead, and then the Chief Executive would select such questions to answer. I cannot criticize those Presidents, but, on the other hand, we have the spectacle of our President today holding his press conferences, meeting the galaxy of brains, subjecting himself to the questions that are suddenly shot at him. That is freedom of the press at its greatest height. So long as we have President Roosevelt and men of his type we need not worry about the great principle of freedom of the press being preserved, and as long as we have men of the outstanding ability of my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

But I also had another reason for rising in addition to expressing the profound effect that the thrilling utterances of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] made upon me.

Few realize the tremendous difficulties our Army and Navy have faced in their operations in this war.

In this first phase, garrisons have been sent to guard our outlying bases and

strategic islands along our line of communications. Each of these garrisons has presented a different problem. Few have gone to places where the size of the garrison was not so great that the local utilities were entirely inadequate. Many garrisons have gone to localities where local utilities are nonexistent. The air forces, the Infantry, and the Artillery have to be supported by utility operating organizations called service troops—few of which existed, except on paper, before the emergency. The American forces in Iceland, for example, took with them 25 different types of service units, among which were:

An ordnance medium maintenance unit for repair of weapons. Such a unit cannot only repair weapons but can even manufacture complicated parts in its mobile machine shop.

A quartermaster refrigeration unit, which operates a portable refrigeration installation, so that fresh meat and vegetables which are shipped in can be preserved.

A medical battalion, which constantly watches over sanitation and health, and which provides immediate medical care to the sick and wounded. After initial treatment, the medical battalion arranges for transportation to the rear for complete and continued care in hospitals.

Other types of service units included a signal construction unit, an air-field construction unit, a field baking unit, a field laundry unit, and even a mobile shoe and textile repair unit.

An added complication in garrisoning islands not already heavily populated has been the lack of unloading facilities. Here cargo must be discharged with the ship's own cargo-handling equipment, frequently onto wharves which have no facilities for removing or storing the cargo as it is unloaded—sometimes into lighters, from which it must be removed by hand.

Unusual equipment and supplies required in unusual places vary all the way from salt-water stills, for providing drinking water from sea water, to typhus and cholera vaccines—which are seldom used in the continental United States.

The great bottleneck in the American effort is lack of shipping. The problem of transporting troops and their supplies has increased greatly since the World War. Distances are so great that only the bombers can fly and other types of aircraft must be shipped by water. Many divisions are armored or motorized. Even in the Infantry divisions most of the supplies and equipment are carried in trucks. This is because, in order to provide protection against modern mechanized units, it has become necessary to increase the weight and caliber of many of our guns and automatic weapons. This change has increased the amount and weight of ammunition requirements, and also requires motor vehicles and fuel to move these weapons to meet rapidly changing tactical situations. As a result, whereas in the World War the pounds of supplies required per man per day averaged 34, they now average 45; and whereas the cubic feet required per ton were 57, they are now 80. The combination of the two have reduced to one-half the number of men which can be supplied by any given amount of shipping. A second factor of one-half must be inserted, because, whereas in the World War we secured more than half our supplies from Britain and France, delivered in France, we now have to use much of our shipping assisting our Allies. Finally, the distance from our west coast to Australia is well over twice the distance from our east coast to France, which doubles the time required for each complete voyage. The product of these three factors, each of one-half, indicates that the amount of shipping which could have supported eight divisions in France in 1918 will support only one division in Australia in 1942.

In spite of these difficulties, much has been accomplished. Within the continental United States the railroads moved 1,904,000 troops between December 7 and March 15. This does not include thousands of soldiers who went home on furloughs. The troop movements were required partially in moving troops to our shores for protection against raids, partially in moving troops to our ports for movement overseas. All were made without confusion or delay.

From our ports, since December 7, millions of ship tons of cargo have been transported to foreign destinations; thousands of troops have sailed overseas. These movements, too, have been made without confusion, and with such secrecy and under such vigilant protection from the Navy that not one transport loaded with troops has been lost.

I think this information is important to the American people as a means of assisting them in understanding more clearly the trying problems tha confront our naval and military leaders. I think that more information of that kind should be given to the American people because, with the information given to them that the military exigencies will permit, we in the long run can rely upon the sound judgment of the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I shall not detain the Committee but for a moment.

I would be remiss were I to fail to acknowledge—and very gratefully acknowledge—the kind words of my distinguished friend the able majority leader. Suffice it to say that, in my opinion, he has rendered today a splendid service for that liberalism without which free institutions cannot hope to live.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, the testimony of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold before the Truman committee relative to the withholding by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey of patent rights in the manufacture of synthetic rubber and gasoline indicates that some corrective legislation should immediately be passed.

At the time the first and second war powers bills were considered by the Committee on the Judiciary inquiry was made into the question of whether the Government had a right to take over and use during the period of the war patents held by citizens or corporations of the United States for the purpose of prosecuting the war effort. It has been generally understood that this right existed, and therefore titles were not included in either of the war powers bills dealing with this question. Title 35, section 68, of the United States Code provides for the payment of compensation to a person or company whose patent is used by the Government of the United States. This section also fixes the method for arriving at just compensation. It was assumed that by dealing with the matter of compensation the Government, for its security and protection, had a right to use patents owned by citizens of the United States. Since there seems to be some doubt about the matter I have filed a bill affirmatively giving the Government this right and invite your earnest consideration to this proposal. I hope the bill may be passed without delay. The Government certainly must not be curtailed in manufacturing the sinews of war. The Government must, for war purposes, be able to use any patent, whether foreign or domestically owned. It would be well for us to have affirmative legislation on the subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I modify the request and make it 10 minutes. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARTER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know how much this section includes? Where does the section end?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I should have said paragraph, Mr. Chairman; we are reading the bill by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph ends on page 5, line 18.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that my remarks are not to be interpreted as in disagreement with what our majority leader just said. I want it clearly understood that I have no intention to deprecate or take anything away from the acclaim that his remarks merit. I, too, as much as any-

one in the Congress, believe in complete unity in advancing our war effort; but when I picked up the morning paper and learned from the press that the leadership had decided—notwithstanding that in my judgment Congress has plenty of work to do—not to do any work for about 2 weeks. I felt that there were grounds for disunity in that plan itself. I certainly cannot condone that program. I am not in accord with that plan. I do not care if the leadership or who it is that does not approve of what I have to say in opposition to a recess. I rose here about a year ago and objected to a recess of the Congress because I felt that then was the proper time for us to enact legislation to curb labor practices, especially strikes, that were hampering our war effort. We still need to act on that and other problems.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I say on my part in discussing this, that no matter what my friend's views are I have a profound feeling of respect for him. The gentleman and I seldom disagree, but even in disagreement I respect his views.

Mr. BOREN. I regret if from what I have said any inference of criticism of our distinguished majority leader is drawn. I have no such intention. I only want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am in full accord with everything we can do for unity, which means unity of work toward the winning of the war; but I am opposed to anything that might even tend to slow up our war work.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The House passed the Smith amendments that would prohibit strikes. It now lies dormant in the other body.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but we have other work that needs to be done, and I feel that we ought to be expeditiously about our country's business.

This is no time for a recess. We cannot afford any lost motion. Delay, dilatory tactics, interference by racketeering such as exacting exorbitant fees as a condition of employment or exorbitant profits on war contracts are throwing our war effort out of gear. These evils must be dealt with now. Now is the time to stop the sabotage of our war efforts.

There will be no better opportunity 2 weeks from now than the opportunity that exists today.

The pendulum of the clock swings on and with every stroke it chimes a clarion warning now, now. Two weeks of wasted time may be the margin of difference to change that "now, now" to "too late, too late," my colleagues. Do you not remember that Bible story of old that stands as a monument of challenge to people everywhere—that story of him who lost his life when he said, "Go thy way, and when I have a more convenient season I will call thee unto me"?

My colleagues, there will be no more convenient season than today. It was only a matter of hours that the Austrian coup was effected. Czechoslovakia was crushed in a few days. Poland did not have weeks to wait. Two weeks would have meant a great deal to Singapore, to the Dutch Indies, and even now to Australia. Japan will not wait 2 weeks.

How can any citizen of the Nation that has experienced Pearl Harbor, Wake, Guam, and Manila close shop for 2 weeks?

Mr. Chairman, America is the last lighthouse in the surge of the world's storms, and I, for one, cannot sleep with things undone that should be done, that must be done, that can be done, even in 2 weeks.

It is not possible for me to be on all the battle fronts of the world at this hour, but I want every soldier on Bataan, in Iceland, in Australia, on the high seas, and at every point of conflict to know every minute, every hour, every day, I am dedicating my every energy toward the work that must be done to keep the life lines to them intact and thus insure the liberties of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I must say frankly from an earnest and anxious heart that I am bitterly opposed to any recess, formal or informal. Uncle Sam can use these 2 weeks of our endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to call the attention of the House to what I think is an historic, a significant action by our Appropriations Committee on this bill, one which will soon be ratified by this body. I think this is the first time since Pearl Harbor that there has been any reduction of an appropriation for military purposes.

We are told there is a reduction of about 1 percent in the Army and Navy portion of this bill, and a reduction of 20 percent in the nondefense activities. Let me point out that the 1-percent reduction in war appropriations represents a cash reduction in appropriations of about $208,000,000, while the 20-percent reduction in nondefense activities represents a cash reduction of about $22,000,000. It is not my purpose to discuss the wisdom of either of these reductions. The nature of the reductions have been described. What I wish to point out is that here is an instance where, in my judgment, the Congress is ahead of public opinion. Public opinion is talking about the reduction of nondefense expenditures. Congress knows that the important thing, if we are to make any substantial reduction in expenditures, is to watch our war expenditures. We should make all possible reductions in our nondefense spending, but the total so saved will not amount to much, compared to the volume of our war spending, and we can make great savings in our war spending without hampering our war effort. The Committee on Appropriations must be practically the sole judge on the question of military expenditures because much of the testimony is in secret, and the rest of the House must rely almost exclusively upon their judgment. The Appropriations Committee, in going through the defense-offense expenditures—the war expenditures—which we should make, is, we hope, holding those down as best it may. I believe they should investigate the astounding failure to reduce the unit cost of arms as production rises. This reversal of the whole trend of American production just does not make sense. Only a small reduction in the war expenditures will far exceed any possible reduction that could be made in nondefense expenditures. As I say, the significant thing is that while there is no disposition here to retard or hamper our war effort on the part of this committee, and while I understand that part of these expenditures in which the $203,000,000 is involved have been postponed, or are to be further considered; the reduction shows that the Congress is attempting to hold down as much as it can with efficiency and propriety the defense-offense—the war expenditures. These are, for the 3 years covered in this report, 1941, 1942, 1943, more than 10 times the nondefense expenditures. So that if we were to wipe out all of our nondefense expenditures it would only amount to a reduction of 10 percent in our total expenditures. I hope that this is a sign that the Congress, acting through its Appropriations Committee, will attempt to preserve proper control over the amount that we pour out for our war effort, and that this sign, no bigger than a man's hand at this time, a 1-percent proposition, may give promise of what is to be done from now on. This will need to be done if we are to make bearable the money burden, and money is here only a measuring stick for human effort—the human effort for carrying through our war effort to a successful conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Air Corps, Army, $8,515,861,251.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, according to this section that has just been read, something over $8,000,000,000 is being appropriated for the Air Corps of the Army and I understand the bill also carries some money for the C. A. A. I am glad to see this expansion in our air program, I am for it, and I think it is long overdue. Airplane production is rapidly moving forward. We will soon obtain mass production of planes. The experience of many other nations would indicate that we need about 50 men well trained in the different and various branches of aviation for each plane, hence an air force of about 50,000 planes calls for a force of manpower of two and a half million trained men.

I have taken this time that I might inquire of the committee just briefly something about what is contemplated in the way of expansion in our air force, and I direct my questions to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I would like to know what this bill provides by way of more flying schools? Does it anticipate the establishment of more of them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These amounts cannot be segregated, but the bill provides for the establishment of

very many more schools and for extension of existing schools for this purpose throughout the country. For reasons which are obvious, the site and location of the schools cannot be designated, but provision is made to insure the training of sufficient men to handle the equipment as rapidly as fabricated.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman know something of the type of these schools? Are they additions to our basic flying schools of the Army?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is the usual flying school, up to the advanced course stage, similar to those already in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the program call for in the way of schools for airplane mechanics?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are making ample provision for the training of mechanics and ground men. We are providing facilities for additional technical schools and for the instruction of about 10,000 men in private schools in addition to those under instruction at this time. I am speaking of aviation mechanics only. We also are providing for the radio side of it.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, I do not want the chairman to divulge anything that should not be stated. I am sure we are all agreed upon that. I wonder if any plans are under way to extend any type of aviation training to students in high schools?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no provision in this bill for anything of that sort.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The aviation schools for the young men are very largely under the control of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. There is a very considerable expansion there, more expansion than heretofore. The Army itself can hardly go into the question of taking boys in high schools and training them. They would have to be handled by the civil units.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make that 4 o'clock in order to give me 2 minutes?

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think it is highly appropriate that the gentleman call attention to the need for mechanics and technicians to maintain our flying aircraft as well as our civilian planes. May I say at this point for the RECORD that earlier this week the House unanimously passed an amendment to the Civil Pilot Training Act to include mechanics and technicians. I trust the Senate will give speedy consideration to the bill and pass it at an early date.

Mr. CURTIS. I recall that bill and I appreciate the gentleman's activity in connection with it.

May I say in regard to high-school students in connection with our aviation program that I realize the impracticability of the Army doing this, but it seems to me if we are going to win the war, we will have to have supremacy of the air, and we are going to have to have it in a large way. We have countless thousands of American high-school boys who will be great aviators, but they have never had a chance to even ride in a plane. Something ought to be done to harness that ability early so that it can be developed. Where we have heretofore trained 50,000 pilots, we must train 500,000. We need more fields, more mechanics, more schools, and more of everything. I think we should start this training in our high schools.

What does this bill provide in the way of increasing our Army fields in addition to the schools that may be provided?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say this, that it provides for expanding personnel instruction in complete harmony with the airplane program, but I regret that I am not in a position to disclose to the gentleman the exact information.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that.

Mr HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Missouri just mentioned that 10,000 additional mechanics might be required. I may say to the gentleman that if we are to have a 50,000-airplane program, since the Army requires not less than 20 mechanics and technicians for each airplane, this means a total of 1,000,000. In order to supply this very large number, we shall have to use every available training facility in the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I rise a second time to say that what the gentleman observes about the need for training in aviation for high-school students is very important. Here in the District of Columbia we have started this year courses, optional to be sure, for high-school students. I think that should be done all over the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CURTIS. In order to obtain mastery of the air we must expand our air program and do it now. We must think in terms of millions of pilots, not thousands. This program should be carried to our high-school boys.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military posts: For construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, $4,358,118,283.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER: On page 6, line 13, strike out "$4,358,118,283" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,341,701,283, no part of which shall be used for increasing the facilities or area of Stewart Field, West Point, N. Y., including outlying areas."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 21 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to delete from the total sum of this item of military posts some $16,400,000 for the development of Stewart Field, adjacent to West Point, N. Y., which is included in the item with the view to undertaking voluntary flight training at the Military Academy and qualifying cadets as pilots prior to graduation.

Let me preface my remarks by saying there is no one in the House, I believe, who is more fully conscious than I of the value of military air power and the necessity for this Nation to acquire supremacy in the air in the several theaters of war in which we may be engaged, but the inclusion of this amount of money in this deficiency appropriation bill comes without any specific legislative authorization whatever. This matter has not been laid before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives to determine the policy and the advisability of making this change, a most radical one from the present curriculum of the academy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER. I am not ready to yield right now. My time is very limited.

Under this provision, as I understand from the reading of the hearings relative to this particular item, the present plans are to have the flying training given to the cadets who volunteer for that training during the last 2 years of their course.

We must understand that at the time the Government will have a great investment in all those young men in the Military Academy, who will have completed 2 years of their training before volunteering for this flight training.

What is the situation with reference to weather conditions in and around West Point? All of us know that that territory is subject to a great deal of fog and cloudiness. The terrain is mountainous and rolling. It seems to me we should give consideration to the safety of these young men. After years of experience in building up a very substantial air force, we have found that certain localities in the Southwest and South and west coast areas furnish the best climatic conditions under which Air Corps pilots can

be trained. Now we are going to take the cream of these cadets and subject them to flying training in a part of the country most unsuited for such operations.

It will be argued that we must have a larger air force, we must have more pilots. What proportion do these West Point cadets constitute of the total number of men we are going to have as pilots? We are training pilots at the rate of nearly 30,000 a year now. We expect to raise that number to 50,000 a year before this year is over. Yet the men in West Point at the present time number 1,831. If half of that number elected to take the pilot training, you would have about 400 in the upper two classes at the academy taking this particular training. In other words, you would graduate about 200 cadets each year from the Military Academy who had pilot training.

This is a radical departure from our system of training heretofore. It appears to me that it is far more democratic to follow the system that is in existence at the present time of graduating these men from the Point, then letting them go to the Air Corps training centers, where they are infiltrated among the young men who come from the schools, colleges, and the universities. The number of graduates from the Military Academy is small, but the advantage of them mingling with the youths from civil life after their 4 years of military training, I believe, is of great value to both groups. You must have a leavening of cadets in each of these classes so that they may get the spirit of the young men who come from the colleges and universities in order that we may have to the fullest extent a really democratic Air Corps.

The Military Affairs Committee has been completely bypassed in the consideration of this legislation. Why have legislative or policy-making committees if they are to be ignored by the War Department and the Appropriation Committee?

The reading of the hearings upon this item leaves one more confused than ever. Are these men to be sent to civilian schools for their primary training, as are all other aviation cadets, or are we going to set up a special primary school at West Point for these cadets alone?

At one point in the hearings a Colonel Weikert, on page 160, says:

> During his first stage he is living with aviation cadets and should draw the same pay, because we have to pay for his board and quarters at that place.

This would indicate the primary training would be with other aviation trainees and at a place other than West Point. No details are available as to the type and extent of the facilities at Stewart Field which the sixteen million plus is to provide.

It may be that a full and careful inquiry will show the Army correct in its request for these funds for such training at the Military Academy, but Congress and the people, even under present conditions, are entitled to have these matters properly and fully considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for eliminating over $16,000,000 from this bill. If you read through the hearings, all you will find on this subject is that $16,000,000 is included to construct buildings on an air field some 12 miles or more north of West Point. There is no explanation of the character of the buildings or the necessity for the construction of $16,000,000 rather than $10,000,000 worth of buildings, or any other amount. For $16,000,000 you can build one of the largest Air Corps flying bases in the country. March Field in California or Maxwell Field in Alabama originally did not cost over $10,000,000, yet to train approximately 200 or 300 pilots a year out of West Point you are going to spend $16,000,000.

What effect, I ask you, is that going to have on the regular training course at the academy? You are going to take the students there out in the morning by bus and run them out to this flying field and have them fly. Some will be there one day and some another. How this is going to affect the course of studies at the academy was not directly inquired into. You are establishing a new policy of making every cadet at West Point go through a very definite and a very elaborate program of training in aviation, far more comprehensive than the present course in aviation which he is already receiving, far more than you give him regarding infantry, cavalry, or coast artillery. The program at West Point provides for a general course and right now they are getting flying training. Whether it is necessary to provide for 2 years of training in which they go out and fly every day has not been looked into. The advisability of this program is certainly subject to question. Moreover, what is the weather condition up there? You are putting this field in a long, narrow valley, 20 miles wide, with rolling mountains and hills on all sides of it. It is a very dangerous country and yet you are proposing to put a flying field there, to train young inexperienced cadets. The wisdom of this program has not been considered. The justification of the $16,000,000 cost has not been made.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] for 2 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Army upon its very early realization, after what has been going on in Europe, Asia, and the Far East in air warfare, of the advisability of establishing a flying school for cadets at West Point. We have men there who are learning to be artillery officers, infantry officers, cavalry officers, and engineer officers. By the same token we should develop some of these men as flyers. It is contemplated that the flying course will be the last 2 years of the 4-year West Point course. For the first 2 years the students will be given observation training and after 2 years those boys who wish to take the course in flying may do so.

They have at West Point or near there Stewart Field. It was originally a municipal field that was owned by a city in that neighborhood. This has been turned over to West Point as a landing field, and one million and a half of W. P. A. money has been spent on it. They contemplate acquiring 100 additional acres of land there to extend the flying field, and this acreage will cost $150 an acre, or $150,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I am sorry, but I only have 2 minutes.

In addition to that, there will be $16,000,000 for the flying facilities there—the garages, the administration building, the runways, and other extensive equipment and facilities that have all been figured out by the West Point authorities. This flying program for West Point is urgently asked for by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, and by General Arnold, the head of the Air Corps. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the inclusion of this item is an effort to modernize our Army. Unless officers are trained to fly, and unless they know how, they are no good to the Army of the future. If you are going to abolish West Point and move it somewhere else, that is one program; but unless you are going to establish this flying field up there, you have no hope of modernizing your Army and having the men who are going to head our Army in the future be of any use to us in organizing it and perfecting it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is merit in this proposal to have some aviation activities at West Point. I think the course there is a little outmoded and ought to be brought down to date, but the thing I do not like about this is the way you are trying to do it. I am a member of the Board of Visitors to West Point and much interested in its success. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] whom all regard as one of the strongest and sanest men in this House, probably knows more about aviation than anyone in the House, because he has made a special study of it. This House is always safe in following his leadership. It seems strikingly peculiar to me that this matter should be tacked onto an appropriation bill with $16,000,000 to provide one of the biggest air fields in the Nation without hearings before the legislative committee.

I am beginning to wonder what is the use of having legislative committees such as the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Military Affairs, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], has had hearings on many matters of national defense for months. Yet this

item has never been presented to the committee. Now some of the Members are talking about recessing for 2 weeks, to which I am opposed, because there are plenty of matters with respect to national defense just like this one that could be considered. The Committee on Military Affairs will meet next Tuesday, and the subcommittees of that committee are in almost daily session. A matter of this sort could be considered by that committee and reported out after reasonable and proper hearing and then brought to the floor of this House for fair and just action by the House. This is no time for adjourning or recessing, and I am opposed to either. The Committee on Naval Affairs should report out their 40-hour bill and let us vote on it. We will send it to the Senate whether they act on it or not. We will at least have done our duty.

Randolph Field is called the West Point of the Air, and then there is March Field, in California, and Maxwell Field, in Alabama. These different schools are turning out 30,000 pilots a year. Now overnight they say they need a great air school at West Point. The United States Military Academy is the greatest school of its kind in the world. I am its friend, and I want to see aviation there. But I do say the Committee on Military Affairs is entitled to some courtesy and consideration in the matter. We ought to appoint some more cadets to West Point. We ought to fill up the vacancies there. The school could accommodate 550 more boys by putting 3 in a room. I am going to sponsor and urge some legislation on the subject.

Mr. COSTELLO. And the cadets at West Point are now getting aviation training at Mitchel Field each year.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, and they are getting it at all the fields. We must do everything possible for aviation. I have for years urged such a program. This war will likely be won or lost in the air. I want us to have the finest planes of any nation in the world, and more of them. This means we must have pilots who are qualified and well trained. Any such program will have my active support. I am only objecting to the way you are doing it and not in keeping with the rules of the House.

Mr. POWERS. Mr Chairman, very seldom do I find myself in disagreement with the able membership of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, but let us be frank and honest and mean it. The War Department should have gone to the legislative committee, and the War Department should have justified this expenditure, or at least this change of policy, at West Point, and then have asked to have the money put into the bill, but the money is in the bill now, and it has been urgently requested by General Marshall, and urgently requested by General Arnold, and also it has been justified by General Wilby, the Superintendent of the academy. This is what it does It is not a mandatory proposition. It is a proposition to allow any cadet in the academy to take this air course. If that is allowed, and this amendment is defeated—and I hope it is—it will mean that every year infiltrating into our air force will be a certain number of graduates of the Military Academy. It will mean that every year a certain number of these men will go directly into the air force, who have a basically rounded military career, a basically rounded knowledge of field artillery, of infantry, of cavalry, of every other branch of the Army.

Mr. TERRY. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. TERRY. It has been stated by those in favor of this amendment that there were no hearings on this subject. There are 10 pages of hearings.

Mr POWERS. Yes; there are 10 pages of hearings, and it has been testified that it is the greatest forward step taken by West Point in 100 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reference has been made by the gentleman from New Jersey, and also by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to this being earnestly requested by Generals Arnold and Marshall. I have read the hearings and I do not find where either one appeared before the committee in connection with it, and while everything that the gentleman says may be true, yet these are matters that ought to have been passed upon by the legislative committee.

Mr. POWERS. Oh, I cannot argue that with the gentleman. General Wilby, of the Military Academy, justified it, and General Arnold spoke to every member of the committee, with the exception of myself; General Marshall called the committee while it was in session, and General Marshall is a non-West Point man.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. MAY. As chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I say if given the opportunity I will call the committee next Tuesday morning, and it will pass this legislation out, if it is required, but I do object to any such proposition as this.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, that is a matter about which I cannot argue with the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. Was any reason given by the Committee on Appropriations as to why they should not go before the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. POWERS. The question was asked, "Is not this a change of policy?" And the answer was "Yes."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, no longer than this week we tabled a bill that the Committee on Appropriations should have handled, in order to give them a chance to do so.

Mr. POWERS. I cannot argue that fact with the gentleman. I want to be fair and truthful, and I am telling you that General Marshall and General Arnold urgently requested the appropriation, and I hope that the Harter amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. HARTER. I do not know whether the gentleman was in attendance at the hearings of his committee or not.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman was there every day and well into every night.

Mr. HARTER. One of the members of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], made the suggestion on page 163 of the hearings—and I read from the hearings:

> Mr. STARNES. That is going to bring about additional cost. I am afraid you are embarking on something here that ought to be considered by the military legislative committee of the House and discussed very fully.
>
> Colonel WILBY. What we are trying to do, really, is to bring the Air Corps closer to the Army than it would be if we do not do this, Mr. STARNES; that is what it will bring to the Army; because we are going to get well-rounded cadets in the Air Corps, which this large expansion of the Air Corps today has prevented.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] just said. There is no question but what this should have been brought before the Military Affairs Committee, so we will not talk about that any more. We agree with you 100 percent. But things have changed in the past few months since Pearl Harbor. I do not think, if we had not had Pearl Harbor, that this would be in this bill at all. I am sure it would not be.

How many have been to West Point and have been up to Stewart Field? It is about a 15 minutes' ride above West Point. There is a small airfield there now—so small that you could not get down on it with a modern bomber.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Did you develop in the hearings how long it would take to construct this field—to get it ready to train at West Point?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. How long?

Mr. SNYDER. Just let me come to it, will you, please? The only logical place adjacent to West Point where an expansion could be made for an airfield is at Stewart Field. They can and will within the next 8 or 9 months, if they get the money, have this field sufficiently completed for pilot training.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Not just now, if you please. The inference I got from the previous discussion was that the boys at West Point would not continue to get the same type of training that they are getting now. This is all extra. They will get the same course, academically speaking, that they are getting now. The flight training will be entirely extra.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Not just now. I told you I would not question the right of you men to get mad about the matter of jurisdiction. I want to say that General Arnold called me up about this proposi-

tion and said this was one thing he was interested in, above all. This is the first time General Marshall ever called me about any pending proposition. He called me personally during our hearings and he said:

If there is one thing that is of vital importance, it is that pilot training matter at West Point.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. HARTER. Does the gentleman remember the statement he made in the hearings at page 132 in reply to General Robins:

It just makes me sick to look at these figures. What type of construction, as a general rule, is contemplated at all of these places?

You were talking about this expansion at Stewart Field. What disturbed you over the figures that morning? What did you not like about them that made you sick?

Mr. SNYDER. At Stewart Field?

Mr. HARTER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I was referring to the whole construction matter, not to any specific project.

Mr. HARTER. I do not see any explanation here about the buildings except $16,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that at innumerable places throughout the United States we are spending more than $16,000,000 on construction projects?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. And is it not true that we were told this would be the most forward-looking step adopted by our Army in a hundred years?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that those who are looking toward the future security of this Nation should think twice before voting to eliminate air training from West Point?

Mr. SNYDER. I agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARTER) there were—ayes 39, noes 56.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN [after counting]. Fifteen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number. Tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and repair of hospitals: For construction and repair of hospitals, $775,000. In all, $5,306,163,883.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. COOLEY. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we now have under consideration a national-defense measure. Upon the passage of the pending bill many of us are looking forward with pleasure to a brief visit home. We are going home to face criticism, criticism which is generated by a general unrest which exists in the country today. All of us have received numerous communications all of which indicate the great unrest which exists in America today. I am conscious of this situation and I am quite sure that you are. I have today listened with great interest to many very fine speeches which have been made by able and distinguished Members of this House during the general debate on the pending measure. Many speakers have referred to the paramount importance of an all-out war effort and many of them have referred to the deplorable situation which exists in the world today. I know that I need not tell you that we are living in an unhappy world and that a belligerent spirit and a reckless and rapacious tide of violence is sweeping across the earth, crushing out the ancient institutions of freedom. I know that I need not tell you about the intriguing schemes and imperialistic ambitions which have caused men and women in other parts of the world to renounce their belief in the soundness of democratic government and to lose their faith in the ability of men and women by their own good judgment to govern themselves. The revelations of each hour and of each day and of each night give rise to solemn and disturbing thoughts and reflections.

I know that you understand the complexities of our present situation, but I rise for the purpose of propounding certain questions to the membership of this House.

Is any Member of this House conscious of anything that this House of Representatives has done which has resulted in impeding the progress of the war effort? Is any Member of this House conscious of anything that this body could have done which has not already been done? I pause for an answer.

I know and you know, and it is time for the membership of this House to let the country know, that every bill which has been reported by the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and, for that matter, every other committee of the House, which had for its purpose the building of a war machine sufficient to crush the Axis forces, has been appropriately considered and very promptly passed by this body. If there is anyone present who challenges the accuracy of this statement, I pause for the purpose of permitting the Member to stand in his place and point out wherein the membership of this House has failed.

I know—and I want the country to know—that this Congress is earnestly anxious to do everything within its power to expedite the all-out war effort, yet the country seems to feel that Congress has been guilty of dereliction and on account of a lack of information a general and unjust indictment has been leveled at us. We appreciate just as much as some of our critics appreciate the fact that the time for dynamic action is at hand and that the national defense program is of great and paramount importance. We appreciate the fact that upon a prompt and proper solution of the great problems of production will depend the ultimate success of our war effort, and upon the success of our war effort will depend the survival and the perpetuity of our system of government. We likewise appreciate the fact that this is no time for selfish gain. This is no time for racketeering or profiteering, and this is no time for strife and strikes in vital industries.

Eighteen months before Pearl Harbor the House passed and sent to the Senate amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. This bill died a natural death in a pigeonhole in that body.

On December 3, four days before Pearl Harbor, we passed and sent to the Senate the Smith bill which was a bold effort on the part of the House to solve some of the problems growing out of labor disputes. This bill has been pending in the other body since December 8 but for some reason, no action thereon has been taken.

The House Naval Affairs Committee is now considering another bill dealing with the subject of labor disputes and controversies but we are advised by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that this bill will not be reported to the House before April 13.

The laboring men of America must be inspired by a patriotic zeal and they must furnish the tanks and guns, the battleships and bombers, and all of the other instrumentalities of defense and death which are needed by the fighting men of America and our gallant allies. It is neither the force of law nor the fear of punishment that causes the sons of America to fight and to bleed and to die in the cause of freedom. It is their love of their country and their country's cause that inspires them to heroic deeds. We cannot by the mere enactment of laws win the conflict in which we are now engaged. The laws we here enact will not in themselves bring victory to those who are dying in the ranks of freedom on the ramparts of the world. It will take the all-out effort of every union, bloc, and group in this country to bring the present conflict to a glorious consummation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY and Mr. KEEFE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] a member of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly impressed by the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who just left the floor.

We are about to pass a bill which involves over $18,000,000,000 and will bring the total appropriations and authorizations for national defense up to over $160,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal of the criticism directed by the people of this country toward the Congress and the administration is justified. A great deal of the uncertainty in the minds of businessmen and others arises, however, not as a result of actions of Members of Congress but from the administration and disbursement of these funds. I want to call your attention to a situation that is developing throughout this country that ought to command the immediate attention of those in charge of the expenditure of these funds.

I will give you an illustration of what I have in mind: One concern operating in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area has firm contracts today to build items for the Navy amounting to $140,000,000. In figuring a wage scale applicable to the units involved in the production the Navy did not take the wage scale that prevailed in that area but took the wage scale prevailing in naval establishments in Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Washington, D. C. The result is that that concern is receiving a unit price for its product which enables them to pay wages that amount today to $1.28 an hour for night work and $1.16 for day work when the prevailing wage rates through that midwestern area is perhaps 75 to 90 cents an hour for the same class of work.

They are offering a contract of employment that will permit their employees to work on a basis of 75 hours a week, the employees receiving 92½ hours' pay or $118.40 per week for night work and $107.30 for day work. On a 50-week year this is $5,920 per year for semiskilled labor for night work and $5,365 per year for day work. Many of the men working in this plant are permitted to work as high as 84 hours a week and up to 92 hours a week, all receiving overtime over 40 hours. What is the result? The firms engaged in the war effort in my territory have secured their business as a result of competitive bids and they have been required to figure labor in their unit cost at the prevailing wage rate stipulated under the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act.

The result is that these concerns up in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area are siphoning away the skilled labor from down in our area, and attracting that labor up to the St. Paul-Minneapolis area where they are able to offer these attractive wage rates.

Mr. Chairman, that situation is growing up all over the country, and I have before me now confirming evidence from one of the manufacturing plants in my city that is devoted 100 percent to war work, making marine motors for the Navy, in which it is stated that if they lose a few more of their men they will have to shut down their plant. What is the Government doing about it? They have negotiated a stabilization of wage rates in the shipyards industry, but we have this situation going on in many other industries. In the Minneapolis area we find that the International Harvester Co. is seeking 2,500 additional men, the Minneapolis Moline Co. wants to hire 4,000 additional men, the Minneapolis Ordnance Plant, 18,000 additional men, and the Northern Pump Co., the company I just referred to in these remarks, is jumping their employees from 600 to 6,500.

This problem should attract the attention of those who are letting these contracts and not destroy the effort in the communities that are compelled to pay the prevailing wage rate. The head of one concern clearly put the problem before me in the following language, and I quote:

> In other words, if this situation is allowed to continue; in fact, if the present situation is not corrected, it apparently will become necessary for business to pay wages of five to six thousand dollars a year for semiskilled labor, and up to and over $9,000 a year for skilled labor and departmental foremen. In my opinion, that is no longer a start toward inflation—it is just about the peak.
>
> What the solution is I don't know. But, among others, it might be advisable to restrict all defense manufacturers to employ all of their labor through the United States employment bureaus throughout the country. If this were done some control over pirating could be put into effect.
>
> Personally, I wish that all prices would be frozen, not only material prices, but salaries, wages, profits, farm prices as well, right down the line. If this can be done, still leaving room for some bonus or incentive for increased production, such as a certain percentage of profit on all war business regardless of the volume, the bonus for salaried employees and wage earners for increased production, plus a cost-of-living bonus as the cost of living increases, I think we would solve a great deal of our problems.

Mr. Chairman, pious expressions of hope and intentions from the contracting officers of the Army and Navy will not correct this evil—determined, offensive action is necessary on this front if we are to achieve necessary production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, but for the fact I was precluded from addressing the Committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], which proposed to strike out the $16,000,000 appropriation for the Steward Field near West Point, I would not have asked for this time to speak to the Committee.

May I say that for more than 2 years before the Congress declared war, the House Military Affairs Committee had anticipated the needs of this country and had started programs of legislation on its own accord, as illustrated by the strategic raw materials bill and other bills, which the War Department did not sponsor. In the 2½ years that have passed, there has never been a time when the War Department asked for legislation that it did not get it promptly.

While I am not here to throw rocks at my colleagues or to take issue with the Appropriations Committee, I do intend to say that I resent the acts of the Appropriations Committee and the War Department in completely ignoring the House Military Affairs Committee, in view of the fact that no later than last week, when we were notified that the Appropriations Committee had decided not to appropriate money for the purchase of any further real estate other than that absolutely essential, we tabled a bill that proposed to buy real estate to go along with the House Appropriations Committee. Notwithstanding the fact that we passed legislation 2 years ago to authorize the construction of an Army medical library and museum, where there are $30,000,000 worth of the most valuable books in the world, and notwithstanding the fact that there had been appropriated only $150,000 for engineering and architectural work, they disallowed that item this time and would not appropriate it. We made no complaint, although the Budget had authorized $500,000 for the purchase of the real estate. I think in good conscience the Appropriations Committee ought not to put this legislative committee in the attitude of having to come up here and oppose something that the War Department through the back door asked for.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am not in sympathy with items of this character, and have always opposed carrying them in appropriation bills; only the exigencies of the situation and the insistence of the Department that this was an emergency matter prevailed upon us to include this paragraph in the bill.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman has stated his position correctly.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. If that is the attitude of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure it is, and I accept it at its full worth, and if the Committee on Military Affairs is an important legislative committee, does not the chairman of that committee who now addresses the House feel that the War Department, through its proper officials, owes the legislative committee the courtesy of presenting these matters to the legislative committee in order that full and adequate hearings looking to authorization may be had?

Mr. MAY. I agree absolutely with my colleague, who is my right hand or right arm on the committee, a very wise leader; I would not be surprised, however, if the War Department does not have some hearings on this proposal next Tuesday, notwithstanding the action of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, may I ask the gentleman if his committee has not promptly considered and reported to the House every national de-

fense measure that has been recommended by the administration, and if the House has not appropriately considered and very promptly passed every bill which the gentleman's committee has reported?

Mr. MAY. Every word the gentleman has stated is the truth, and, in addition to that, may I say that no later than last week the War Department found itself haltered, hobbled, and string-tied for a little piece of legislation that had been reported by my committee. I came to the floor of the House, got it passed by unanimous consent, had it messaged to the Senate, followed it over there, and insisted it be passed the same day, and it was passed. In the face of all that has been done, the responsible officials of the War Department, whoever they were, that bypassed the Military Affairs Committee on this matter, ought to have an awakening of conscience, and I hope the high ranking military gentlemen in the gallery go down and tell their superiors every word I have said, and if they do not, the gentlemen can read the RECORD

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the question which we have been discussing is whether or not we shall provide money for Air Corps training at the United States Military Academy at West Point. Of course, for years we have provided for Air Corps training in a limited way for the men after they graduate from the Academy. We have trained the cadets in the arts of cavalry, engineering, and other subjects but not aviation. Our enemies must have smiled at the failure of this great Nation to incorporate aviation training in the basic course at West Point years ago.

I quote the following from the testimony of General Wilby, superintendent of the Academy, as shown on page 165 of the hearings:

Mr. MAHON. When was West Point established?

General WILBY. In 1802.

Mr. MAHON. And the methods of warfare have changed considerably since that time?

General WILBY. Methods change with the weapons.

Mr. MAHON. If West Point is going to keep pace with modern warfare it has got to be tops in the air?

General WILBY. Yes; it has.

Mr. MAHON. And if West Point graduates are going to have a dominant part in running the Army some of them have to be in the air and be Air Corps officers?

General WILBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. And the best way to get them in the air is to train them at West Point while they are going through their regular training?

General WILBY. That is what I believe.

Mr. MAHON. You think this is one of the greatest forward steps proposed to be taken in a number of years?

General WILBY. For 100 years.

Mr. MAHON. I think you are right.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of the subcommittee which originally considered this item about which the gentleman from Kentucky has been speaking may I say that I agree with him somewhat in his statement that the item should preferably have been first considered by the Military Affairs Committee; but we were not confronted with a theory in procedure, we were up against a proposition which required action. We were authoritatively told that this would be one of the most forward-looking steps taken in a hundred years by the War Department, and that immediate action was absolutely required. Therefore, we brought in the item and, under the circumstances, I think the gentlemen are justified in some of their criticism, but, on the other hand, I think the Appropriations Committee is justified in the position it took under the circumstances. And the House of Representatives is to be commended for its position in trying to get West Point out of the "horse and buggy" days, so to speak, and into the field of modern warfare where victories are won.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who I think has rendered the country a distinguished service today. He pointed out a short time ago that the testimony of Mr. Thurman Arnold has revealed the fact that there is some doubt whether or not the President of the United States and the Government have the unquestioned right to make use of any patents that may be in existence today, to break the hold of those patents, and to see to it that such processes can be used any place, at any time, and to any extent for the production of the necessary war materials.

The gentleman from Tennessee has introduced a special bill which, if passed, would clear the situation once and for all, and decisively. I just wanted to say that I believe he has rendered a real service and indicated a kind of leadership on matters of this type that is very good and constructive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

For ordnance service and supplies, Army, $543,721,283.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to point out to the Members of the House the fact that the subcommittee on military expenditures oftentimes adds to the amount the War Department is allowed by the Director of the Budget to ask for. I was interested in this particular item because it totals $543,000,000 for the weapons with which we are supposed to win the war, while the cost of construction in the United States of buildings and other installations is about 10 times that amount, or more than $5,000,000,000.

Sometimes Members of Congress are chided on the fact that they have cut appropriations which have to do with either naval or military expenditures, but I think the Members of the Committee would be interested in knowing that back in 1938 the situation was exactly the opposite. The War Department needed money with which to manufacture Garand rifles. At that time the total amount of money that had been appropriated and which would be expended up to October 1, 1938, slightly over 3 years ago, for Garand rifles would produce only 7,500 of those semiautomatic rifles; yet early in 1938 the Army was told by the Budget that the amount they could have was only a certain limited amount, less than it had asked for through the Bureau of the Budget. As a result, because these weapons were in the fourth priority, as the records show, it was necessary to cut the production of these semiautomatic rifles to 2,500 a year, and that would have been all that would have been produced of those rifles between July 1, 1938, and July 1, 1939, 2 months before this great war broke out.

As a result, I went before this subcommittee, and I am interested in telling the Committee here today that that committee unanimously, laying aside all questions of partisan politics or whether a person was a member of the Republican or the Democratic Party, said that they would see to it that funds were available to increase the amount for rifles by 400 percent, and would provide $1,800,000 for new tools, dies, and equipment to make the Springfield Armory, where these rifles are manufactured, a first-class, modern institution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a new Member in that Congress, I recall that on February 18, 1938, I was in the committee room at the same hearing, having gone there to present two other matters pertaining to preparedness. I compliment the gentleman now in the Well of the House on making one of the best presentations I have heard since becoming a Member, in favor of this new semiautomatic rifle. Not being a military man, I knew little about it then, but I was convinced that day, and almost forgot the items I came to speak for in my enthusiasm to support his request. I can confirm what the gentleman is saying about the attitude and action and the apparently unanimous consent his eloquence at that time brought forth in the committee in regard to the need for this remarkable new rifle.

If I may go a bit further, I have been glad to be informed by the highest military authorities that that rifle has long been in mass production and it has played a very important part recently, especially in the Philippine Islands in recent days. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has had a remarkable part in bringing about that impetus in production which has led to such fine results.

Mr. CLASON. I thank the gentleman for his very gracious statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. May I point out also that as late as October 1, 1938, only 7,500 of these rifles had been built in a period of years, yet today they are manufacturing that entire amount in a single week at Springfield. This shows what was accomplished by reason of the subcommittee on military expenditures seeing to it that funds were made available to carry on the work which was then being advanced.

Even as far back as May of 1938 that rifle was on maneuvers in small numbers. A commander of a battalion on maneuvers reported to Major General Tschappat, then Chief of Ordnance, that some of these rifles on maneuvers fell overboard in a stream, were clogged with sand and, although the men had hardly any way of cleaning them, they were yet serviceable and were used throughout the maneuvers without apparent damage. Of course, I was particularly pleased when General MacArthur brought out the fact that while they are being used in the fox holes in the Philippines they often go more than a week without lubrication and render excellent service

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I propounded a question to the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. ANDREW J. MAY, and I should like very much now to propound a similar question to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I think the entire membership would be interested in the answer to the question, since it appears that there is a likelihood that some of us will go home this afternoon.

May I ask the distinguished gentleman if his committee has not promptly considered and reported to the House every bill that has been recommended to the Congress by the Commander in Chief of the armed forces?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, I desire to advise the House that the Committee on Naval Affairs has promptly considered and made recommendation on every bill before the committee, except a bill I introduced today, and one yesterday, and we will take those up just as soon as we get to a committee meeting.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like further to ask, Mr. Chairman, if the measures reported by the gentleman's committee have not received prompt consideration and passage at the hands of the membership of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The House has cooperated 100 percent in the speedy enactment of every naval-affairs bill that has been brought before it.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask one other question of both the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and of the entire membership of the House. Do any of you know of any one thing that any one Member of Congress or any group of this House or even a majority of this House can do at this moment which would expedite the war effort?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. COOLEY. I pause a moment for an answer and not receiving an answer, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say in answer to the query of the gentleman from North Carolina that I do not know of any single item of legislation that has been presented either by the House Military Affairs Committee or by the House Naval Affairs Committee that has not been considered very promptly and passed by the House.

Furthermore, I make this statement, subject to the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and that is that as to the legislation that is now pending for hearing before his committee, the gentleman and myself have made an agreement that in order to expedite the early disposition of such matters we would consider the hearings of one committee—namely, the House Committee on Naval Affairs—without the necessity of duplicating them before the House Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Kentucky is correct. May I say that there can be no valid criticism against the House of Representatives with reference to any legislation relating to the speedy and successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], of course, is too modest to admit it and much too modest even to say so, but the fact is, however, that so far as the naval program of the United States is concerned, the gentleman from Georgia began that program in the Naval Affairs Committee long before he ever had any requests from the Navy Department or even the Commander in Chief. Some of the most valuable naval legislation that has been reported out of that committee was over the protest of the Navy Department itself. This is naval history. So, instead of being behind, the gentleman from Georgia is years ahead even of the Navy in the work of our Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I approve heartily of all this "back patting" that has been going on here, because, as one Member of the House, I think I have taken about as much criticism as anybody else has in the last 60 days.

I went home last week and spent 6 days down in my district and made six speeches and talked to a lot of people. I do not agree with my friends who oppose a recess. I would vote tonight for a resolution requiring every Member of this House to spend 1 month out of each 4 months in his district every year in order that he might counsel with the people he represents and find out what they want to know and tell them the truth, because they are not getting the truth anywhere else. All of this talk about what the House has done in the way of expediting legislation is fine, and it is true, but the people are not hearing about it. All they are hearing is when they are sitting there with one ear glued to the radio listening to Mr. Kaltenborn say that the industries of this country are only working half time. What he meant, of course, is that they are only working 12 hours a day, but what my people thought he meant was that they were working only 4 hours a day, and they were very much upset about it.

I found out another very interesting thing. When I referred to that broadcast, a lady rose in the audience and said to me, "Why, Mr. RAMSPECK, you have a censor up there who passes on everything that is said over the radio and everything that is printed in the newspapers. I understood that because it was censored it had to be true." Of course, you and I know that they are not censoring anything that is said over the radio or anything written in the newspapers. Certain rules have been made as to what is considered military secrets, but no one passes on the matter in advance So I want to make the suggestion to you gentlemen who are going home that you have the courage to meet your people face to face and tell them the truth.

Tell them only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the seven and a half million people in war industries have been out of employment due to labor disputes since Pearl Harbor; tell them that you have three times as many people at work now as a year ago producing war equipment, and take with you that wonderful address made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] today, and give them some encouragement. They need it. They are discouraged, they are despondent, and they do not know the facts, because they are not getting them from the critics, who are day by day misleading the people of this country about the conduct of this war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am scheduled to make an Army Day address in my district on the 6th day of April, and I propose to tell the people the truth from the ground up, and I am going to tell them what Congress has done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I hope every other Member who goes home will do that. I am not concerned about whether or not the people in my district have lost faith in me, as an individual, but I say to you that if they have lost faith in the Congress, as a coordinate branch of the Gov-

ernment, that is a serious matter, and you know that some people in this country are trying to destroy the faith of the people in their Congress. They are also trying to destroy the faith of the people in the President of the United States. I am not talking now about the individual, but I am talking about the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. He is your elected leader until January 1945, and whether you like him or not, you ought to stand behind him and defend him and help him, and we ought to give our people the truth about this situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, $166,000: *Provided*, That all funds heretofore and herein appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 under the titles "Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga.," " Instruction in Cavalry activities," "Instruction in Field Artillery activities," and "Coast Artillery School, Fort Monroe, Va.," shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund under the title "Special service schools."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, our colleague from Florida, the Honorable LEX GREEN, has a record of achievement which is worthy of our commendation. The value of a Member of Congress rests largely in his understanding of the needs of his people and of the Nation; his vision to foresee the needs of the future and to meet these needs by appropriate action. His value is tested not by the number of bills introduced but by the importance, directly and indirectly, of such bills, and their bearing upon legislation finally enacted.

His more than 17 years of service here have given him power and influence. He has most efficiently served as assistant Democratic whip for more than 12 years. I, as chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, know the value of his seniority here and his worth to the country as a whole. I feel that our administration here in Washington owes him a debt of gratitude for his splendid work and outstanding achievements.

During his services in Congress, Mr. GREEN has sponsored many bills. Of great importance among these measures are the following:

NAVAL AIR BASE FOR JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

On March 25, 1938, Congressman LEX GREEN introduced H. R. 10031, which provided for the construction of an air base at Jacksonville, Fla. In 1938, pursuant to special legislation, Secretary of the Navy Swanson appointed a sites inspection board, composed of Rear Admiral A. J. Hepburn, Rear Admiral E. J. Marquart, Capt. J. S. Woods, Capt. A. L. Bristol, Jr., Capt. Ralph Whitman, and Commander W. E. Hilbert. Upon the urgent request of Congressman GREEN, close inspection was made of the Jacksonville, Fla., area.

On January 3, 1939, this board reported to the Congress its recommendations, among which was that we would have a southeastern air base and that it would be located at Camp Foster, Jacksonville, Fla., together with carrier piers at the mouth of the St. Johns River and auxiliary base at Banana River. On January 4, 1939, Congressman GREEN introduced H. R. 1654, to carry out the Hepburn board's recommendations insofar as a southeastern air base was concerned.

My committee made two official inspection trips of the proposals offered in the Southeast including places in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. Hearings were held by the committee and due consideration given to the various sites available in the Southeast. On March 28, 1939, my committee by a vote of 15 to 7 designated Jacksonville as the place for the air base. This bill was promptly passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President.

In this connection let me say that in my opinion the citizens of Jacksonville, Duval County, and as a matter of fact the entire State of Florida are under lasting obligation to their able and distinguished Congressman, Hon. LEX GREEN, for the valuable aid and assistance he rendered, not only to the committee but the Hepburn board in the selection of the site.

I measure my words when I say that during my 28 years service in the House, I have never seen efforts more diligent or successful as Congressman GREEN's efforts in behalf of this establishment. The then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Lewis Compton, strongly praised him for his diligence in the location and establishment of this station when he said in part, as follows:

You knew as well as we did that it was the proper strategic location and you were determined that Jacksonville would not lose this large Federal establishment. You represented Jacksonville with great credit and you assisted the Navy in carrying out its recommendations.

We are confident that this base will be a great pride to Jacksonville and the surrounding counties as well as Florida and the Nation. I want to thank you for your valuable assistance in helping the Navy locate another line in its defense of the Panama Canal and the southeastern United States.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this, the Southeastern Naval Air Station at Jacksonville, Fla., is one of the finest war establishments in the country, and it stands out as a lasting tribute to Mr. GREEN's outstanding accomplishments to our war effort.

OTHER NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN FLORIDA

The Navy Department has made great expansion in its establishments and its development in Florida. Many auxiliary fields in connection with the air station at Jacksonville, the largest of which is at Banana River, Key West, Pensacola, Miami, and other places, are developing in a strong ring of naval defense around the entire State of Florida.

The War Department has greatly augmented its defense facilities in the State of Florida through several establishments. Fort Barrancas, Eglin Field, Appalachicola, air field at Marianna, Tallahassee, Orlando, MacDill Field (Tampa), Miami, and Camp Blanding are among those of greater magnitude. Mr. GREEN has been most active and aggressive in his efforts for national defense and in support of the war effort. It is noteworthy that the largest of these military establishments is situated in his district at Camp Blanding. He conferred with War Department officials; they inspected possibilities at Camp Blanding and found it to be a most suitable location. It was constructed with speed, and within a few months after decision by the War Department to establish Camp Blanding some 50,000 men were in training there. In this connection and in connection with our defense program, the following letter from the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is significant:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1942.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: Further reference is made to my conference with you concerning H. R. 6243, a bill introduced by you to authorize the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., deceased. I have referred the matter to the Secretary of War for his recommendation. I appreciate your diligence in this cause so worthy.

I desire to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation for your full cooperation with the House Military Affairs Committee in the passage by the Congress of our national defense legislation. You have supported and voted for all defense and war measures reported by my committee since, and before, Pearl Harbor.

The military establishment at Camp Blanding best demonstrates your successful interest in our war effort. This is one of the greatest military establishments in our country and will go down in history as a lasting tribute to your outstanding achievements in connection with our war effort.

Your long experience and seniority has enabled you to serve effectively, and I hope the people of Florida will contribute to our war effort by returning you to Congress.

With very kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. J. MAY,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee.

RIVERS AND HARBORS IMPROVEMENTS

Owing to our colleague's seniority, he is now chairman of the Territories Committee, a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, and of the Committee on Flood Control, and stands near the top of the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee. The Rivers and Harbors Committee assignment is of tremendous interest to all States, but particularly to Florida, which has some 1,300 miles of seacoast and numerous navigable rivers. He has been most active and successful in bringing about approval of such outstanding projects as the harbors of Fernandina, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, Cedar Keys, Port St. Joe, Pensacola, Okeechobee flood control, and many others. On April 13, 1936, he introduced H. R. 12253, which is a bill to provide for Federal cooperation to prevent erosion and destruction of beaches and water fronts throughout the country. This problem is gaining the consideration of the Congress.

SOLDIERS' HOME—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

On April 15, 1929, Mr. GREEN introduced a bill for the establishment of a national home for disabled soldiers in the State of Florida. This bill was passed and actually led to the establishment, not only of the home in St. Petersburg (Bay Pines), Fla., but of similar

institutions in Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. It was one of the most important pieces of soldiers' relief legislation ever passed.

Mr. GREEN has been instrumental in obtaining numerous appropriations for the enlargement of United States veterans' facility in Lake City, and the one at Bay Pines, Fla.

On December 1, 1930, he introduced a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to return to Florida the silver service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the Florida people. The legislation was passed.

H. R. 1440, introduced by him, is now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This bill would give disability pensions to all disabled World War veterans for 10 percent, $12 per month; 25 percent, $20 per month; 50 percent, $30 per month; 75 percent, $40 per month; total permanent disability, $60 per month. This bill would also give automatic increase of 10 percent in service-connected compensation.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1936, roll call No. 3, shows he voted to pass the bonus bill, and the RECORD shows on January 24, 1926, roll call No. 11, he voted to pass the bonus bill over the veto of the President.

He has been a consistent supporter of legislation for the benefit of veterans and their dependents and was in 1933 given the Legion distinguished service award of the American Legion post of his home county.

After a Member has served here for several years, the question is sometimes asked: What has he done? This is very easy to answer in the case of our colleague from Florida, Mr GREEN.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. GREEN has been a consistent supporter of farm relief measures, including electrical current for farms. On March 10, 1933, he introduced a bill providing for extension of time on Federal land bank loans, and for other purposes. This bill gave impetus to the administration's legislation extending time on loans and permitting additional loans by the Federal land banks throughout the country. On January 3, 1935, he introduced H. R. 3020, providing for funds for the control of screwworms in livestock and for the continuance of the tick-eradication program. Funds for both of these necessary farm causes were provided in the 1935 appropriation bill.

He supported and voted for legislation which was passed to guarantee and insure the bank deposits throughout the country.

In 1937 he introduced a bill to refund to tobacco growers taxes paid under the Kerr-Smith Act. Legislation for this purpose became a law and claims were refunded to the growers.

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY CLAIMS

In 1930 Mr. GREEN was the first to introduce a bill looking toward survey of fruitfly eradication damages in Florida and for payments therefor. His efforts and those of his other Florida colleagues have been so persistent in this cause until recently the House Claims Committee reported a bill looking toward the appropriation of $10,000,000 for refund of these damages. On March 23, 1942, he addressed the House at length on this subject and urged prompt passage of H. R. 5950 for payment of claimants.

UNLIMITED SUGARCANE PRODUCTION IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN has opposed the continental United States sugar-quota laws insofar as they applied to sugarcane production. He has appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and also addressed the House on numercus occasions in an effort to bring about unlimited cane-sugar production, particularly in the Florida Everglades area. On February 5, 1942, he introduced H. R. 6541, which is a bill to suspend sugarcane restriction quota laws within the United States. On February 5, 1942, he addressed the House on this subject, calling for unlimited and continuous sugarcane production in Florida, and pointing out the eminent need for more sugar in our country, particularly during the war period.

TURPENTINE EXPERIMENT STATION

On December 21, 1929, he introduced a bill directing the establishment of a naval-stores experiment and demonstration station on the Osceola National Forest in Florida. The legislation was approved and the station established at Olustee, Fla., and is giving untold benefits to the naval stores and pine tree industries. It benefits not only Florida but the entire South.

FEDERAL AID FOR ROADS

He has supported all legislation for Federal aid to roads, including the national defense highway program. His district and his State have shared most liberally in the general construction program of roads, Federal buildings, and other Federal establishments.

PENSIONS

Mr. GREEN has been a consistent supporter of pensions for the aged and has frequently addressed the House, contending that the matter of security for the aged was a Federal responsibility and that straight Federal pensions should be paid to the aged without the required State matching as now under the social-security law. He has voted for liberalization of civil-service laws for all Federal workers except Congressmen and Senators. He did not vote for retirement (pensions) for Congressmen and Senators, neither did he participate under it, and on February 24, 1942, on roll call, he voted for the repeal of the law which gave possibility of so-called pensions for Congressmen and Senators. He voted for pensions or retirement bills for railroad employees, and has a most liberal and progressive record in this respect.

ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATIONS

He is the author of H. R. 4454, upon which hearings have been held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. This bill would provide Federal assistance for the establishment of engineering experiment stations in each State in the Union. It is a constructive measure and in all probability, will receive the attention of the Congress after the war.

WAR CRISIS

Mr. Chairman, our Nation now faces its most grave crisis. The emergency of the situation challenges America's best leadership. Men who are tried and true should now guide the destiny of our Nation. This is no time to experiment with high public office. Experience is essential to best results in our war effort. Mr. GREEN is experienced; he has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting. He is a man of high character and is dependable. He possesses the required leadership.

Appreciation of his character, service, and ability is expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable PATRICK J. BOLAND, Democratic whip, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY WHIP,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D. C. March 18, 1942.

Hon. R. A. (LEX) GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: I wish to extend to you my sincere thanks, as my assistant whip, for the splendid and effective cooperation you gave me during the past 10 years.

At such times when it was impossible for me to be on the floor of the House, I knew that you would perform the duty of assistant whip with such diplomacy and efficiency that desired results would be forthcoming. I feel that our administration here in Washington owes you a debt of gratitude for your splendid work, and I wish at this time personally to express my thanks for your cooperation.

Your long experience here has given you strength and power in the councils of our great Democratic Party. Your aggressiveness, high character, and fair dealings have enabled you to accomplish things of importance for your district and for the country as a whole. Men of the courage and character of your type are needed in the Congress during the critical period now racing our country. I hope that the voters of your district will continue your services as a Member of Congress.

With very kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. BOLAND.

The Congressional Directory reveals the following: LEX GREEN was born in Bradford County, Fla.; graduated from Lake Butler High School and University of Florida; taught school; studied law, Yale University; admitted to the bar, Florida, and United States Supreme Court. Married Miss Lucile Harris of Gainesville; has two children, Lex, Jr., and Lucile. Member Florida Legislature; speaker pro tempore; county judge, Bradford County. Representative in Congress from Second Congressional District, Florida, for past 17 years. This long service in the Congress has given him seniority and experience. There is no substitute for experience.

It is a generally known fact that those districts which have retained their Representatives in Congress for the longest continuous terms have received the best services and the greatest recognition. The chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, Judge A. J. SABATH, of Illinois, has been in Congress for 34 years and is dean of the House of Representa-

tives. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. R. L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, has been in Congress for 32 years. The present Speaker of the House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has been in Congress for 30 years. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. HATTON W SUMNERS, has been in office for 30 years, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, has been in Congress for 20 years. The majority floor leader, Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has been in Congress for 15 years. The longer the successive tenure of office, the greater the service and usefulness of the Representatives. Why should a constituency exchange experience and efficiency for inexperience?

In reviewing the record of my colleague [Mr. GREEN], I am reminded of an address made on March 16, 1916, by former Speaker Champ Clark at the Washington Press Club reception, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 17, 1916, as follows:

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph, of Roanoke, in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate and General Jackson sent him to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the top-notchers.

Let us take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served I cannot name all, but will cite a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for length of service in the House in our entire history In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker 8 years, only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, is sixteenth; Mr Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth; Mr. Stephens, chairman of Indian Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Slayden, chairman of the Library, his twentieth; Mr. Henry, chairman of Rules; his twentieth; Mr. Lever, chairman of Agriculture, his sixteenth; Mr Padgett, chairman of the Navy, his sixteenth; Mr Lloyd, chairman of Accounts, his twentieth; and Mr. Sparkman, chairman of Rivers and Harbors, his twenty-second. There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that, as a rule, the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are oldtimers. The same thing holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillette and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth year, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairman thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probability, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

New England and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have understood the value of long service all along, and, having elected a fairly good man to Congress, they keep him in the harness

The Member of longest consecutive service is called "the father of the House." Five Philadelphians in immediate succession bore that honorable title—Randall, Kelley, O'Neill, Harmer, and Bingham Then it went to Mr Dalzell, of Pittsburgh. When General Bingham announced the death of General Harmer, his immediate predecessor as "father of the House," he stated that the five Philadelphia "fathers of the House" had served a total of 147 years, and he served 8 or 10 years after making that interesting statement.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the Speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth. These four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country.

The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them.

The speech of Speaker Champ Clark is deserving of the thoughtful study of every voter of the country.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. GREEN'S ANNOUNCEMENT FOR CONGRESS

My record is an open book; upon it I stand. There is nothing hidden, and your examination of it is invited. During the past 17 years as your Congressman I have done all within my power to bring to you every possible protection and assistance from our Federal Government. Possibly mistakes have been made, because we all make mistakes, and probably none is without fault. I shall be satisfied, however, if, upon examination of my record, you will give careful consideration to each vote cast and official acts which I have performed, place the good on one side of the scales and the errors on the other side of the scales, and vote for the side that weighs heavier. I have no fear of the outcome of such a ballot, because I feel certain that you will find in my record more merit and perfection than demerit and imperfection.

I have printed at my own expense and I am mailing to you this record in order that you may have the correct information concerning my record and my efforts as a Member of Congress. I trust also that you may see fit to request some of the Government publications as indicated on the enclosed list. These publications give the best obtainable information on the various subjects indicated. They are printed by the Government in an effort to be helpful to the citizens of our country They are your bulletins because you are a part of the Government and the Government belongs also to you. I am sending the list to you in an effort to be helpful in this connection.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and these Government publications are mailed without postage. When the Congress was created, it established the right for the Government to transact its official business postage free. This was a wise provision because if Congressmen, Senators, and Government officials had to pay postage on the Government's publications, then this service would be open to millionaires only because the average man would not be financially able to pay postage on the large volume of Government business required of such official. These publications, in most instances, were printed and ready for distribution before the war; therefore, you should order promptly if you desire any of them because we are endeavoring to cut out every possible Government expense which is not of direct necessity for the prosecution of the war. Many of these publications may not be reprinted until after the war, even if then

I favor the elimination of every possible Federal expenditure which is not directly needed for the success of the war effort. Newspapers and publications are given special privileges of mailing, the first zone being mailed postage free and the other zones with relatively small charge If the publications in the country were to pay the same rate of postage you or I pay on private or business mail, the Government would receive, it has been estimated, as much as $150,000,000 annually in postage fees. I am reliably advised that it actually costs the Government each year $83,000,000 to handle this mail of newspapers and other publications. I am satisfied that it costs the Government more to deliver your big daily newspaper in the home county of this daily newspaper than it does to carry the mail of the average Congressman for a whole year. The mailing privileges were given newspapers by the Congress to encourage the free press and it is especially helpful to the small county newspaper which is not financially able to pay the regular business postal rates.

TO THE CITIZENS OF THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

I bring back to you the high office of Congressman of your district without stain and without tarnish. I have endeavored since you first elected me in 1924 to be of all possible helpfulness to you. You have responded most nobly and have cooperated fully with me over this long period of time. You have helped me in all efforts for the benefit and advancement of our district and our State and our Nation. You have trusted me and have been kind and good to me in every way.

You have refused to heed the whisperings of the common enemy and you have stood with me on every occasion. For this confidence, trust and goodness on your part, I am profoundly grateful. I hope that my services and conduct have merited your faith and I assure you that if I am now elected as Congressman at Large, I shall continue to do everything in my power for you and for the entire State of Florida, extending from the Perdido River on the west to the Florida straits on the south. I shall depend upon you as my strength to carry our cause to all parts of Florida.

During my long period of service, thousands of you have sent me letters and other communications of inspiration and encouragement. The following one is of particular interest:

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT,
ALACHUA COUNTY,
Gainesville, Fla., March 9, 1942.

Hon. R. A. (LEX) GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: The county commissioners wish to thank you for the splendid attention you have given to the need for additional facilities at the Alachua County Hospital.

Hospital services have been and are badly needed by the wives and children of the military personnel at Camp Blanding, the defense workers and their families, and the civilian population and all of us are very grateful to secure this grant in the amount of $159,000 to augment the $100,000 furnished by Alachua County.

Your record in Washington conclusively proves that your actions have back of them one thought, to give service for the best interests of our country, the military personnel and their families, and all others. We heartily commend you for this.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,
W. J. WHITEHURST,
Chairman,
CLAUDE BRANDON,
J. P. AMEROSE,
O. M. TILLMAN,
THOMAS D. ROLAND,
Board of County Commissioners,
Alachua County Fla.,
GEORGE E. EVANS,
Clerk of Court.

My decision to ask the people of our State to elect me as Member of Congress from the State of Florida at large was prompted by the sincere hope that, owing to my experience here as a Member of Congress, I may, during this grave war crisis, be of greater service to our entire State and to the Nation. A true servant of the people should at all times do his best, but during a war period the best is imperative.

About a year ago, we were able to pass in the Congress a bill to reapportion the representation in the Congress of the various States. Florida's increase in population gave us one additional Congressman. At the last session of the Florida Legislature, our State was not redistricted into new congressional districts. On this account, the sixth Member of Congress from Florida is to be elected from the State at large. I am asking for this office because it is, in fact, a promotion. I feel that it is appropriate for me to ask for this advancement and broader scope of service. I have served longer in the House than any other of the present Congressmen and Senators from Florida. If reelected to the Congress as from the State at large, I will retain my seniority, also my committee assignments, and my strength and usefulness will be increased. The duties of Congressmen have over the past several years increased and during the grave war crisis they have been multiplied. In the effort to perform these duties, congressional experience is indeed helpful.

TO THE PEOPLE OF ALL FLORIDA

I have during the past 17 years at all times endeavored to represent here the best interests of my district and of our State and Nation. Uppermost in my mind has been the greatest good for the greatest number of people represented. The vote cast by me in the various committees and on the floor of the House has by me been considered as the vote of my people, and not as the vote of any individual.

Many things of helpfulness, I hope, have transpired as a result of these efforts. I served here during a portion of the Coolidge administration; all of President Hoover's administration; and for the past 10 years, under President Roosevelt's administrations. I served through trying times of financial chaos from 1929 to 1934.

Along in 1932 business and industry was at its lowest ebb since the beginning of the depression. Agriculture was in the depths of despair; ten or twelve million idle men and women were walking the highways and streets in increasing numbers looking for jobs. By the 1st of March 1933 a banking holiday had been declared in many States of the Union. The people had almost lost confidence in the ability of their Government to bring about a recovery. Economic chaos threatened the country to a more alarming extent than in the darkest days of the preceding years. Wheat had sold as low as 18 and 25 cents per bushel; cotton 5 to 6 cents per pound; and corn as low as 10 or 12 cents per bushel; in fact, some of the corn growers of the Middle West were burning their corn for fuel, while the coal miners were without food and in need of this very corn for food for themselves and families. There was an abundance of wheat, corn, cotton, wool, and meats, yet millions of people hungry for the want of these foodstuffs and cold from lack of cotton and woolen garments. Granaries and warehouses were filled to capacity, yet railroad cars stood idle and rusting out in the railroad yards, and idle freight boats rode at anchor throughout the harbors of our country. Industry was paralyzed; credit was destroyed. In fact, local credit was almost nonexistent. The old custom of 150 years ago of trade and barter and exchange was in common use. One individual would trade and barter products or commodities for some other needed product or commodity in order to obtain cloth, food, fuel, and necessities of the body. Agriculture was on the very brink of bankruptcy. Money had either gone into hiding or was locked up in bank vaults.

The then remaining banks in the country were closing in alarming numbers, carrying with them the life savings of honest American citizens Church and charity funds and the trust funds of orphans were not even spared. But what was even worse than all of this, there were forces of doubt, suspicion, and destruction at work in our midst which threatened our social and civic institutions and the very foundation of our Government itself.

The Congress endeavored through legislative act to meet this situation and to enact helpful laws. Out of this chaos came legislation for the guaranteeing of bank deposits; an act to supervise through the Federal Trade Commission interstate traffic in investment securities; large appropriations for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; a gigantic public-buildings program; and many other measures of helpfulness. I supported these measures as an attempt to meet the then economic emergencies. Some of these measures were of lasting benefit, while perhaps some were experiments which were in error. I believe, however, that if you had been in the Congress at that time you would have voted for these measures with the hope that help to the American people would come. It is my hope that probably 75 percent of these measures were good, and if such is the case, it was a good batting average.

Along in this depression period we saw the total income of the American people drop to about $38,000,000,000. We have seen since then and prior to Pearl Harbor the total American income amount to almost $100,000,000,000. Along with this increase in income, of course, came increased bank deposits, and almost every avenue of business grew brighter. Florida during this building program obtained post-office and other Federal buildings; contributions of millions toward road, bridge, and overpass construction; contributions for school, courthouse, hospital, and countless other permanent and needed public facilities. This economic battle has in part been won but not before a battle more grim and grave appeared on the horizon. We are now in war, and it is therefore essential that all possible funds be further mobilized for war production and that every nonessential Federal expenditure be stopped. In both of this, I expect to do my full part.

AGAINST PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS

I have voted for every liberalization law and every new bill for increase of benefits to war veterans; also for the Railroad Retirement Act and many constructive economic reform measures. I voted for the Social Security Act, but, before it was passed, joined with other southern colleagues in voting for amendments to give straight Federal pensions to the aged without State matching. I voted then to give $4 from the Federal Treasury and $1 from the State, then $3 and $1, then $2 and $1. All of these amendments were voted down, and the best we could get was a 50–50 matching proposition. In States where Federal funds are fully matched by State funds, the aged of our land are now drawing $40 per month because $20 per month is available from the Federal Treasury for every needy person in our country above 65 years of age, provided the State matches same with 20 additional dollars. I shall continue my efforts for straight Federal pension for the aged, without State matching.

I voted for the postal employees' longevity bill and for other bills helpful to the Federal employees.

I did not vote for the act which gave civil-service retirement possibilities (pensions) to Congressmen and Senators. I did not participate under this law during the few days which it existed, and I voted for the repeal of this law on a roll call in the House of Representatives on February 24, 1942. I am definitely opposed to pensions for elected Federal officials and believe that if they are dissatisfied with the salaries paid them, they should quit. There is no one related to me by blood or marriage on my pay roll.

SUGAR PRODUCTION IN FLORIDA

I have labored vigorously for unrestricted cane sugar production in Florida and shall keep up this effort because it is in the best interest of the prosecution of this war and it is just. Also, in this connection, the damages sustained by the Florida fruit and vegetable growers through eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly should be paid by the Congress and I shall continue my sincere and vigorous efforts for this.

CRITICISMS AND WHISPERINGS

During tragic and critical times, the enemy never sleeps. Whisperings and misrepresentations go on in the darkness of the night. Although I am here at my post of duty, 800 miles from Florida, these statements are brought to me by friendly lips. I hope you will not be misled by these whisperings into voting against me. I have stood by the masses and in the interest of the rank and file. This I shall do as long as I live. I cannot forget my own handicaps and struggles in trying to obtain an honest education. I picked cotton at the age of 4; plowed at the age of 8; hoed, dug ditches, chipped pine trees, dipped pine gum, and cut cross ties. I could do it again, if necessary. I believe in

the dignity of labor and in the majesty of toil. There is no aristocracy except that of honor and no rabble save that of crime I honor the man who earns his living by the sweat of his honest brow I do not light my candle and place it under a bushel.

Of all times in the history of our great Republic, Americans only should be placed on guard. The maximum work capacity of all Americans is the chief hope to win this tragic war. It is time for the full mobilization of the maximum work capacity of all Americans In work there is honor and through work there is victory Every victory I have won and every worth-while accomplishment has been made possible only through the work of my loyal friends. The bright hope now for a prompt American victory is work and cooperation

WAR EFFORT COMES FIRST

There are many legislative matters of signal interest to Florida in which I, with you, am deeply interested, but which I fully realize may not be hoped for until after this war is won. You can best judge the future by a review of the past and you may depend upon me to exercise my best judgment in response to your needs and representations made to me.

JACKSONVILLE NAVAL AIR STATION—CAMP BLANDING

My efforts have been unabating for national defense measures for many years. I have worked sincerely and voted for all national defense measures prior to and since Pearl Harbor The American Legion has for several years sponsored a defense program which has had my full support It happens that in my present congressional district, we have been able to locate two of the largest new war establishments in the United States The naval air station for the Southeast, stationed at Jacksonville, and the Army training establishment at Camp Blanding, I believe warrant the good pride of every American. It is true that the Second Congressional District has shared most liberally in the expenditures of Federal moneys during the past several years and it is true, I believe, that it has received more new national defense money than any other district in the country It is true, however that all Florida has been and is now being converted into a comprehensive fortress of defense.

I have given my full support to all of these war efforts and establishments, among the larger of which are Pensacola, Eglin Field, Marianna, Apalachicola, Tallahassee, Jacksonville, Camp Blanding, McDill Field, Orlando, Banana River, Miami, Key West, Sebring, and many others. I have encouraged the utilization of Florida's shipbuilding facilities. The Government is now embarking upon a huge shipbuilding activity at Jacksonville and Tampa and will in the near future go into other of Florida's splendid harbors. All of this program has had my active support I have voted for the huge billions for the prosecution of the war

If elected as Congressman from the entire State, as I have endeavored to do unto the people of the Second District and for the Second District, I shall endeavor to do unto the entire State of Florida I deplore sectionalism, especially State sectionalism; I was born and reared and have lived all of my life in Bradford County It is practically the center of the State. That which is helpful to Starke is likewise helpful to Key West. An injury to Fort Myers is an injury to Marianna Money spent in Miami and Tampa reflects economic benefit to Pensacola and Tallahassee The State is one and its cause is one, and I shall look with equal responsibility and duty of service to every portion of our great State and its interest and security.

NO TIME FOR POLITICS

Ever since Pearl Harbor I have worked at my desk and in the committees and on the House floor an average of 98 hours a week. This has been done in an effort to do what I could as my part in the prosecution of this war I have not had time to visit with you and will not be able to spend much time in Florida in the near future. However, I do not believe that you are thinking in political terms during this war crisis. I feel that you prefer that I be at my post of duty when needed This seems to be the general feeling in our great State. I was greatly impressed by news release on the occasion of the meeting of the Florida State Democratic Executive Committee in Jacksonville last February There was made, according to news reports, by the State's chief executive, Governor Holland, a statement, the substance of which was the hope that there would be no bitterness in Florida political campaigns and that unity and harmony may prevail

It is also most significant that a recent news release indicates that in Osceola County all incumbents were nominated without opposition. It is indeed significant that President Roosevelt was quoted, under date of February 6, 1942, in the press, as follows: "President Roosevelt told a press conference today that when the country is at war we want Congressmen who, regardless of party, will back up the United States Government and have a record of backing it up."

I would like to continue my services here in the Congress during this crisis I ask that you exercise the same judgment in this matter as you do in your own private affairs. If you had a house almost completed, I do not believe you would change carpenters without good cause. If you were seriously ill, I do not believe you would change doctors if your doctor was faithful and honest and sincere. If you had a faithful and experienced employee in your own business, I do not believe you would replace him with one without trial and experience There is no substitute for experience. Do not swap horses in the middle of the stream. The war crisis grows more grave daily Civilization is at the very cross roads Freedom faces its supreme test The occasion demands a united America and the best efforts of all

My platform is: I shall vote, regardless of personal and political consequences, for every measure I believe in the interest of winning this war

Individual ambitions and interests must be submerged The cause of our country comes first. I pledge you that I will keep faith and do all within my power for victory in this war and victory in peace.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 104. This title may be cited as "Title VI, Military Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have asked for this time just now to call the attention of the committee to some matters that have been eliminated from the appropriations for the Army and also to try to point out some of the inconsistencies that the Committee on Appropriations have argued here this afternoon, with particular reference to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] I think it should be made clear that those of us who voted for that amendment were not necessarily voting against that particular improvement, but we were voting against its inclusion in this bill at this time, until it had been adequately heard by the committee which had been set up under the rules of this House for the purpose of hearing testimony with reference to policies.

There were two items asked for by the War Department, and I remember hearing they were urgent. I think the exigency—some one used that word as justifying the inclusion of Steward Field in the bill before us, stating that the matter was a great exigency—I think the exigencies of the matter were nothing as great in the matter of the improvement of Steward Field as they were in some other cases. At the best all that they can get from Steward Field is 200 pilots in 1 year out of 60,000. That is one-third of 1 percent. Yet they argue that the matter is so urgent that they could not go before the legislative committee.

I call attention to pages 7 and 8 of the report of the committee: The War Department did not ask for the establishment of an Army specialist corps, because the President under the powers he had set up that corps and asked the committee to make funds available. The committee refused to do so, and gave this as the reason:

> The committee went into the matter rather exhaustively (hearings, pp. 182–204, pt. 2) and has not given its approval to the matter, primarily because the submission itself suggests the need of specific legislative sanction for disbursing funds for such activity, which, if true, removes the matter from the committee's jurisdiction.

They refused to appropriate money there, where the President and the War Department had asked for it. The War Department had been before our committee in regard to that particular activity and said it was urgent and that they needed it. The committee refused to appropriate the money for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and I think they properly did so, but I call your attention to this statement by the witness for the War Department:

> We wanted to start it immediately and not have to delay until estimates were processed and appropriations obtained. We hope that we shall require no more supplemental estimates this fiscal year

Now the committee boasts of the fact that it omitted those items from this appropriation and the reason for it was because legislative sanction had not been given to those particular matters.

Mr. MAY Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY It was said by the chairman of the subcommittee for civil functions of the War Department that it would take 8 months to build Stewart Field. Does the gentleman have any idea that the delay in getting legislative authority would have held up that program?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We could have gotten a bill out of committee and passed it and sent it to the Senate before the Senate could possibly act on this particular appropriation. The only point I want to make is this: That Congress intended, when it set up the various legislative committees that those committees should be respected in their rights and prerogatives. It is not fair, it is not right for the Appropriations Committee of the House to take unto itself those rights and those prerogatives. I do want to plead in all earnestness that at least the Appropriations Committee be consistent in the arguments that it advances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Ships: The appropriations under this head for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for repairs, conversions, and restorations on nonnaval vessels operated for naval requirements; and for the accomplishment of the purposes authorized by Public Law 286, approved October 24, 1941, amended by Public Law 446, approved February 10, 1942.

Mr. KEEFE Mr Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE I yield

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with gentlemen on the minority side, I desire to submit a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAY Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest also, if it is proper to do it and within the parliamentary power of the gentleman, that we eliminate further reading of the bill, with the right to amend it, and save time that way.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is impossible to dispense with the reading of the bill, but we can close debate on it at 5:30 o'clock.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment on page 29. I want to make a point of order or offer an amendment. I take it that I will be given the privilege of doing that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will have that right under the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to propose on page 18, and I would like at least 3 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I merely ask that debate close at 5:30. There will be no limitation on amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOBBS. Reserving the right to object, I do not believe we should be cut off this way. There are some amendments that are to be offered that are absolutely worthless and useless unless we have a chance to explain them. I think probably they will be, anyway, in the light of the fate of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I assure the gentleman the committee will take no time at all.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I want to know that when we place these amendments on there, we are going to have at least 2 minutes to discuss them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I couple with my request, Mr. Chairman, the further provision that Members have 2 minutes on bona fide amendments.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, suppose there are more amendments than could be considered with 2 minutes to each amendment? What are you going to do with the surplus?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I understood the chairman to add to his original request that each person offering a bona fide amendment would have at least 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] desires to make some comments about the travel allowance. It would be necessary for him to move to strike out the last word. That is an important amendment. I would also like 2 minutes. I would like to know if that would be included?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask further that the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] be granted 2 minutes each.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I expect to make a point of order and I expect to argue it not too long, but I want the membership to understand that if we close debate, probably the gentleman would prefer to confine the debate to 20 minutes instead of to a given time.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that his point of order will be conceded by the committee. It has already been talked over by the chairman of the committee and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be derelict in the duty I owe to the people I represent did I not call to your attention another fact that I have recently observed in connection with the expenditure of public funds out of the appropriations that we have heretofore made and are now making.

We all know the problem that small business in this country has to secure defense orders. We know the problems that are confronting those businesses that have not had a call to engage in the direct production of arms and munitions.

Let me illustrate the case of a large chair manufacturing company in my district. This is one of the largest manufacturers of chairs in the United States and has been in business for a great many years. This company is tooled and equipped, and its factory designed for the production of chairs. Now an invitation for bids comes out from a department for prices on furniture. The bid specifications call for not only chairs, but for tables, for dining room furniture, for bedroom furniture, and so forth. These items are all included within one specification. This company is unable to bid under those specifications because their production is limited to chairs. A furniture manufacturing company in my district making tables and bedroom furniture is not able to bid because their production is limited to those specific items. What happens? The thing that inevitably happens is that some intermediary slips into the picture. He is given the specifications, and he goes to these parties, collects their bids. He then submits a bid to the Government and although he has perhaps nothing more by way of investment than a desk here in Washington or in the city of New York, he gets the business. Why cannot these departments, in the name of common sense, split these specifications up so that the chair factories in my district and in yours will have an opportunity to bid, to furnish chairs? Why do they not split them up so that the table manufacturers can bid to supply tables and the Government receive a much better product at a great saving to the taxpayers of this Nation? Why is it necessary to have these intermediaries drawing their profit out of the deal? Why does not the Government deal direct?

I have before me right now an invitation to a manufacturer in my district to participate in the manufacture of 18,000,000 tent stakes. Did it come from the Government? Did that invitation come from the War Department, the Department for which we are appropriating funds this afternoon? No; the invitation came from a concern up in Philadelphia that is listed in Dunn & Bradstreet's but that has no financial rating. Did the Government come to the manufacturer in my district and ask him to submit a bid to the Government for a part of these stakes? No, it did not. They were asked to submit a bid to a concern up in Philadelphia with whom the Government is dealing as intermediary. Why does not the Government deal directly with these concerns that have the capacity and the ability to manufacture tent stakes rather than to call in this intermediary and pay him a profit when perhaps he has no manufacturing facilities and is totally unable to bid on the 18,000,000 tent stakes without the supporting bids of real manufacturers?

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that such criticism is constructive, and that if the agencies in charge of the expenditure of this money will pay some attention to what I have said they will relieve some of the distress of the small manufacturers, and give them a chance to participate in the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 201. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense he may authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense articles procured from funds appropriated in this title, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11): *Provided*, That the total value of articles disposed of under this authority shall not exceed $18,000,000: *Provided further*, That the term "defense article" as used herein shall be deemed to include defense information and services, and the expenses in connection with the procurement or supplying of defense articles, information, and services: *Provided further*, That the limitation of $2,500,000,000 established in sec-

tion 301 of the act of February 7, 1942 (Public Law 441), shall apply to all appropriations made to the Navy Department since March 11, 1941.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at a later stage of the bill I shall offer an amendment and take but a moment now to read it to you. It is the insertion of a new section to read as follows.

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as final payment until the contractor shall have filed with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be.

This suggested limitation grows out of the recent Bethlehem decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in which the Court held that if excessive profits were made in the prosecution of a contract, once having made final settlement and paid the contractor the Government cannot recover.

In other words, the Court has held that we must lock the barn before the horse is taken. We must have an agreement for renegotiation of the contract and reduction of the costs or reimbursement if an audit of costs shows the price to be excessive. And this must be done before final settlement is made.

I have discussed this approach to the problem in hearings on two different bills recently: First, with General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, in the hearings on the civil-functions War Department bill, and with Colonel Kutz, representing the ordnance branch, on the bill now before us. You will find the testimony of Colonel Kutz on page 147 of the hearings.

I read this portion of the testimony:

Mr. CASE. In connection with this problem of costs, at a previous hearing of this committee I suggested to General Reybold, of the Engineers Department, the possibility of a provision that that portion of the payments designated as the "final payment" in any contract should not be made until the contractor has furnished the War Department with a satisfactory certificate of costs and a satisfactory renegotiations agreement, as a matter of protection of the Government. Have you given any consideration to that method of making it possible to recapture excessive payments, or protect the Government?

Colonel KUTZ. Not exactly, sir. However, in a number of our contracts we have provided for the renegotiation of the costs based on a percentage run, say, of 25 percent production under the order, after which time an audit shall be made of the actual costs, and the renegotiated price to be based upon those actual costs.

For example, in the case of machine guns, the initial estimated price, after having been renegotiated on the basis of the actual experience on production of 25 percent of the total order, was reduced by more than 50 percent, and the price as renegotiated was made effective over the entire contract.

Mr. CASE. I do not want to prolong this discussion, but I am just going to make this observation: I fear it will be impossible for Congress to control that by simply passing a law saying that profits shall not exceed a certain percent; that there must be some method, in the light of the Bethlehem decision, for the Government to protect itself by getting a renegotiation agreement that will permit it to take advantage of any discovered excessive costs. And that, of course, will have to be done before final settlement is made.

Colonel KUTZ. That is correct, sir.

This experience of the Ordnance officers would indicate that such a procedure as I have proposed is workable.

All of us have been appalled by the recent testimony that has come out as to the excessive profits being made under certain contracts. Profits so big they had to have shovels to handle them; profits of 100 and 200 percent in some extreme cases. Under the court's holding in the Bethlehem case, it would appear that the only way that we can get at these cases is to have a provision in the contract providing that before final settlement is made a certificate of costs shall be filed with an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement for excessive profits. I hope when the amendment is offered it will have your support.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to store valued documents of the House of Representatives in The National Archives Building and such documents shall continue under his control and jurisdiction and shall be consulted or removed only on his written order. The Archivist shall assign suitable space and provide adequate protective custody for such documents.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this last paragraph on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to States for old-age assistance: For an additional amount for grants to States for old-age assistance, subject to the conditions specified under this heading in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, $30,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 18, line 4, strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the appropriation of $30,000,000 for social security to $100,000,000. This bill carries a total appropriation of $18,000,000,000 for all purposes. I am for the bill, and will vote for it.

My amendment will provide an additional $70,000,000 with which to take care of the aged in need and crippled people of this country, those who may be in such a condition that they are unable to secure employment—or work if they could get it. We have taken it upon ourselves to establish freedom from want in every country in the world. I think we had better begin by trying to establish freedom from want in our own country. You may find want in every State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I ask in the name of the people who are in need, who are sick, who are old, who are crippled in this country—many of whom are living in abject and dire poverty—that this sum be increased from $30,000,000 to $100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Access roads: Authority is hereby granted, in addition to the authority granted for the same purpose under this heading in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, to enter into contracts in the amount of $20,000,000 for the construction and improvement of access roads and for replacing existing highways and highway connections as described in and in accordance with section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (Public Law 295), such authority to continue during the existence of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 22, line 17, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$25,400,000."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply restore the amount of the contract authorization to the Budget estimate. This bill authorizes contracts up to $20,000,000. The Budget calls for $25,400,000. There were $150,000,000 authorized by the appropriate legislative committee of this House and $25,400,000 is the unallocated balance of that authorization.

I want to read you the reason given by the Appropriations Committee for this reduction, and I read from the report, page 18:

In making the decrease of $5,400,000 in the requested contract authorization, the committee has been advised—

It does not say by whom—

that some projects—

It does not say how many what, or where—

constructed under this program are more elaborate than the circumstances of the access needs warrant and that lesser appropriations will suffice if the projects are planned on a strict utility basis of war need.

I submit, in all frankness, candor, and sweetness, though fully appreciating the outstanding ability of the great Appropriations Committee, I would rather have the opinion of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the Army engineers than that of the Appropriations Committee.

Our Appropriations Committee says that it has been advised that some projects are too elaborate. Two separate groups of experts, as well qualified and patriotic as any living men, have approved every one of the access road projects in this program as being necessary to our Nation's war effort, and have prepared the plans and specifications for each with that care and skill for which they are justly famous. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy has certified each as important to national

defense. The Budget has asked Congress to authorize contracts for $25,400,000 worth of them. Instead of doing so, our committee says "No." We are advised that some projects are too elaborate, so we will cut $5,000,000 off the amount certified as being needed for war purposes after your best, studied estimate. This seems to many of us both arbitrary and capricious. There is no showing of facts to justify the committee's guess based upon the advice of the unknown man.

We had better be safe than sorry. Let us have no more of the "too little, too late" preparedness.

This item is not an appropriation of money. It is merely a contract authorization. If it be true that some projects have been too elaborate, it does not follow that these, for which contract authorization is now sought, are.

I beseech you to follow the advice of the experts of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Army engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and take no chance of blocking projects certified as being necessary to help win the war.

I am satisfied that quite a few members of the Appropriations Committee themselves agree with me on this proposition. Let us adopt my amendment and restore the Budget estimate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency): For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies or individuals, to intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures in critical areas on Federal, State county, municipal, or private lands, including the purchase (not to exceed $5,000), operation and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $15,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, $2,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That sections 2 and 3 of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, or similar provisions in this Act or in the act making appropriations for said Department for the fiscal year 1943 shall not apply to persons employed hereunder for less than 60 days on sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, as the House has agreed to close debate on amendments at as nearly 5:30 p. m. as possible, there will be no opportunity to obtain an adequate hearing on the question of emergency forest-fire-control appropriations. The Forestry Service asked $18,100,000 of the Bureau of the Budget for this important purpose but in its wisdom the Bureau cut that to $5,000,000 in making its recommendation to the Appropriations Committee. Then that great committee cut the $5,000,000 to $2,000,000, which is the amount recommended in this bill. That amount is entirely inadequate for the purpose of protecting the national forests from sabotage fires in southern California alone.

I have talked with other Members of the House from the three Pacific States who know what this means for us and we have decided that owing to the lateness of the hour, the restlessness of the Members present, and the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations that it would now be an inopportune time to offer an amendment restoring this item even to the amount recommended by the Bureau. We have decided to let the matter rest in the House and to take it up in the other body where we may be able to accomplish our need.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of March 5, 1942 (Public Law 473), and in accordance with the provisions thereof, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere (including alien labor); printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and periodicals; the purchase (not to exceed $13,000), operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; the exchange of passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, tractors, and other equipment and parts or accessories thereof, in whole or in part payment for similar equipment; the erection of necessary buildings; the procurement of medical supplies and services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, $4,200,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That any proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales resulting from operations under such act of March 5, 1942, shall be covered into the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts": *Provided further*, That the allocations of $884,000 and $750,000 for these purposes from the emergency fund for the President in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, made by letter No. 42-75, dated February 6, 1942, and letter No. 42-89, dated March 10, 1942, respectively, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, and immediately thereafter an amount equal to such allocation shall be repaid to said emergency fund for the President (Pub. Law 473, 77th Cong.).

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unfortunate that a bill of this importance, carrying military appropriations, has to be a catch-all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman offered a bona fide amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the agreement, the gentleman cannot be recognized unless he offers a bona fide amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. It was my understanding that specific provision was made for me to be recognized for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The agreement was that the gentleman from Oklahoma would be recognized for 2 minutes and the gentleman from Texas for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is indeed unfortunate that an important military measure has to be a catch-all in some degree for appropriations that do not go through the regular channel. In regard to the travel in respect to guayule, I call your attention to an article appearing in the El Paso Herald of March 16, 1942. It reads as follows:

HOW TRAVEL MONEY GOES—THREE UNITED STATES AGENTS RIDE TO EL PASO ON GUAYULE

A phase of the United States Department of Agriculture's contemplated Pullman farming program has come to El Paso County.

Four agricultural agents, three of them on the United States Agricultural Department's pay roll, came to El Paso last Friday to arrange for planting of guayule in two 1-acre plots.

County Agricultural Agent Foster, whose $3,443.20 annual salary is paid by the Federal Government, the State, and the county, could have handled most of the arrangements, saving Uncle Sam the traveling expenses of the three agents.

J. T. Presley of the Arizona experiment station, came by train all the way from California at Government expense. S. E. Wolf, of the Soil Conservation Service, and C. H. Muller, of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture subsidiaries, came by automobile with A. R. Templin, of the Texas experiment station, from San Antonio. Mr. Templin is a State employee.

Arrangements for planting of an acre of guayule on the Ord Gary farm in the Upper Valley and an acre on the Lower Valley experiment farm to determine its growth for future rubber production could have been arranged through his office, Mr. Foster said.

"We arranged things so the agents could find out about planting guayule here, and I suppose we could have handled the actual signing of agreements," Mr. Foster said. "These men, however, are setting up a special office in San Antonio to get the guayule program started. Mr. Presley has had experience in growing it."

The county agent explained that his office had no control over the functions of other Department of Agriculture agents.

Mr. Foster will have nothing to do with the guayule experiments unless he is called upon to aid the San Antonio office, he said.

One of these agents came from California to El Paso and three came from San Antonio to El Paso to plant these 2 acres.

I am taking the time of the House today to tell the men who will spend this $4,200,000 on this most useful war program that the House will not tolerate this as a boondoggle. We mean business and we are going to watch every one of their expenses. We do not want this money spent on offices; we do not want it spent on regional inspectors; we want it spent on the planting of guayule rubber. This is not just an ordinary peacetime expenditure. The House Appropriations Committee, I know, intends to watch it.

Going back once more to dumping these items into these vital War Department bills, may I say that in the item just before this there is an appropriation for controlling the white-winged moth, and in that there is a travel account amounting to $117,860. I think these departments should come down and put their total appropriations in the agricultural bill, and not come in under a big bill that is of such vital importance to defense

and expect the House to miss those items in its consideration of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with all the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said. I think he has rendered a very distinct service to the House and to the country in calling attention to the waste of money in traveling expenses. I have supported every amendment he has offered along that line and shall continue to do so. I am for cutting all items to the bone that are not absolutely necessary in the prosecution of the war.

May I say in connection with the statement the gentleman has just made and the article he read that I am tremendously interested in the guayule program. I see the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is present. When he had his bill before the House some 2 months ago to purchase the seed of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. at Salinas, Calif., I was very happy to support it.

The guayule plant is a proven thing in my part of the country, especially in the Big Bend. There was once a splendid factory in the town of Marathon, Tex. There are literally thousands of young unmatured plants there now. Only last week I had a conference with Doctor Walton, the president of Texas A. & M. College, who is much interested in the development of guayule in Texas. The able representative from the district in which the college is located is Mr. LUTHER JOHNSON, who has been cooperating with me in the matter. Mr. JOHNSON and I talked to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Mr. Grover Hill, of Texas, and urged that the Texas A. & M. College, through its county agents, have a part in this program. There is no greater college of its kind in America than Texas A. & M. and we were promised cooperation.

In my judgment, it is unnecessary to be spending a lot of money in these experimental 1-acre tracts to develop guayule. It is certainly not necessary to spend any excessive amount in the way of traveling expenses. There are literally thousands, perhaps millions, of plants in old Mexico now and many of them fully matured. Under the new bill that has been passed by Congress, there is authority to build factories in the United States to process the guayule that is brought out of Mexico. These guayule plants take 3 or 4 years to mature, but there is a great lot of guayule now in Mexico that could be processed in this country now if we had the factories and I want to see one in Texas.

What I want to see done is to have the great agricultural schools along the Mexican border like Texas A. & M. cooperate in this program through the county agents, and thus you will not need all this travel expense. I want to see everything possible done to develop the guayule industry in west Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California. It has a great future and do not forget the rubber supply is getting short and the situation more serious every day.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For all necessary expenses to enable the Department of the Interior independently or in cooperation with other appropriate agencies to initiate and intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures on critical forest, brush, and grass areas under the administration of the Department of the Interior, including not to exceed $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed $6,000), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment; and purchase in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," fiscal year 1942, $324,800, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property, persons may be employed for periods of less than 60 days and be paid salaries or wages from this appropriation without regard to citizenship and without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if I offer an amendment to this section and the amendment is not adopted, can I then make a point of order against the section?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has to be made against the section before the amendment is offered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman will confine his point of order to lines 10 and 11 on page 29?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order against this, but I would like just to change the wording of the section because I have talked to a number of the members of the Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit the amendment for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Without prejudice to any point of order, I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr RICH: On page 29, line 9, after "without", strike out "regard to citizenship and without regard to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government," and insert "the necessity of inquiring into their citizenship or membership in any organization."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. I am against anyone now and immediately who advocates the overthrow of this Government, and I want to put him behind the bars and I do not want him to have any chance to do any damage, and that is the reason I offer the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402 No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk, and which I have previously explained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 36, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 402–A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as 'final payment' until the contractor shall have filed with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as the case may be."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that under the guise of a limitation the amendment would require executive action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 36, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 402–A No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments designated as 'final payment' to any contractor who fails to file with the procuring agency a certificate of cost and an agreement for renegotiation of contract and reimbursement of profits in excess of 6 percent."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 70, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. Section 302 (c) of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1942, and section 302 (c) of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1943, are hereby repealed; and the limitation of $750 specified in section 302 (a) of each of such acts and any similar limitation of the same or a lesser sum specified in any other appropriation act for such fiscal years may be exceeded by such amount as the Secretary of War, in the case of the War Department, the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of the Navy Department, and the Director of Procurement, in the case of other essential governmental needs, may determine necessary to obtain satisfactory motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles of the lightweight, low-priced class, but in no event shall the price so paid for any such vehicle exceed $900 free on board factory.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 37, line 13, after the word "exceed", strike out "$900" and insert "$860.50."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, that accounts for the 15 percent that they allow dealers. There is no reason why they should permit the Army to pay more than the price that Mr. Henderson fixed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 405. This act may be cited as the "Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 7, strike out "$45,650" and insert "$59,847."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6868), making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] have permission to revise and extend his remarks made today and include therein excerpts, letters, and editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on this bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. ROWLAND K. ADAMS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to learn of the appointment of Judge Rowland K. Adams, of the supreme bench of Baltimore, as regional director of the Office of Civilian Defense for the area comprising Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and I am sure that under his guidance the Office of Civilian Defense will be conducted in a very efficient and intelligent manner.

Judge Adams' performance in the State attorney's office and on the supreme bench of Baltimore will guarantee to the people of the Third Corps Area the leadership which is needed at this time.

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 28, 1942]

OUR OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE AREA OBTAINS A GOOD REGIONAL DIRECTOR

The appointment of Judge Rowland K. Adams, of the supreme bench of Baltimore, as regional director of the Office of Civilian Defense for the Third Corps Area will be welcomed by the people of Maryland and by those outside the State who know him. Judge Adams' modesty has not hidden the fact that he is a sound and intelligent man capable in his quiet way of thinking complicated problems through and acting on them decisively.

The Third Corps Area includes Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The touchy civilian defense problems here will arise in part from the fact that the defense area overlaps the respective jurisdictions of a series of local governments, each of which could mistakenly seek to think first of its own pride despite the far more important general need.

The man selected to approach these touchy matters must be tactful and at the same time forceful if he is to be successful. Judge Adams has both these qualities. The Office of Civilian Defense is fortunate in obtaining his services and so are the civilians of the area affected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include two tables and an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Federated Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks for every day that the House is in session during the next 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Judge Michael A. Musmanno, on the subject of Saint Patrick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include therein a brief excerpt from the hearings on the War Department appropriation item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein excerpts from letters received from constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] be allowed to extend his own remarks and include an article from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial and a news item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include therein a certain letter from a constituent and an article from the Washington Post of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to bring to your attention an article that appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, March 28 1942:

MARYLAND BRICKLAYERS REFUSE PAY BOOST

BALTIMORE, March 27.—The business representative of the Bricklayers and Masons Union No. 1, American Federation of Labor, announced today the members had rejected a dollar a day pay increase due to start April 10.

The agent, J Raymond Ward, said the union surveyed the situation and decided it was not the proper thing at this time to increase wages, because the United States is at war "We want to do our part as well as any other soldier."

To understand the labor front in America it is necessary to survey the entire picture. It is a fatal mistake to generalize from isolated instances.

But strange as it seems we listen to Members of Congress, day in and day out, walk down in the Well of this House and proclaim to the world that it is necessary to curb labor in order to increase the production of war materials that are essential today to win this war.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and several well-known leaders of the opposition forces of organized labor, nine times out of ten only give to you and to me and to all the world isolated cases of strikes in our defense industry. By citing the above notice in the Washington Post I do not attempt to say that every local in the country is doing the same thing, but being honest and aboveboard I am willing to admit that this is an isolated case, and by the very same token I make the charge that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Virginia when they make the charges that they do day in and day out are without question making them without foundation and only in isolated cases.

Mr. Speaker, it amuses me to listen to these labor haters day after day hark back to the days of industrial strife such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] did yesterday when he said:

Who was it who, in 1937, invaded the State of Michigan and with armed goon squads beat into submission the workers of General Motors at Flint, Mich.? Who was it who took possession of some of the cities of Michigan and by force maintained possession for weeks; yes, for months? Who was it who carried on that undeclared war against civil authority? It was the Congress of Industrial Organizations of which Murray is the head.

Well, I say in answer to the gentleman from Michigan that these very same companies that he speaks of are the very same ones that organized a strong-arm squad its leader stated:

To put the fear of God not only in any union outsider who might appear but also in any employee with a sympathetic attitude toward union activities.

They were supplied with blackjacks which were manufactured in the plant; later, as their work progressed they acquired whips, lengths of hose, and similar weapons. They were stationed at different vantage points throughout the city, were given free use of company cars, and were afforded free access to the plant at all hours.

Mr. Speaker, one man was murdered by mistake by this group—they wanted his brother—and I have heard of another who was tarred and feathered, his eye gouged out, and left to die (this was also a mistake: he was a union organizer, but in another type of industry). The conditions here that I have described are not presented in any attempt to show that labor is always right and its employers are always a group of exploiters. But the silence of our press on these matters does reveal its leanings and its biased and partisan treatment of labor relations, and the sniping at the labor laws by those in and out of Congress who delight in condemning those of us who are affiliated with organized labor and in reality they portray the faults of labor and the virtues of capital.

Oh, yes; Mr. Speaker, it makes my blood boil when I sit here in the House and listen to the gentleman from Michigan and others proclaim that unity does not prevail, when in reality they, by their remarks and insinuations, are the ones who are creating disunity in our ranks, coupled with the help of the press, the all-too-wise radio commentators, the chamber of commerce, the dollar-a-year men, the manufacturers, and all others who disagree with our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States; Mr. Nelson, the Navy Department, the Army Department, in fact those who are responsible for carrying out our war effort are all wrong if we were to listen to these prophets of today who are telling us how to win this war and yet by their past votes if they had their way we would now probably be under the thumb of the Axis Powers.

The gentleman from Michigan also brought to the attention of the House the initiation fees that are charged workers at Camp Pickett, Va. All I can say in answer to that is, brother, those fees are cheap at half the price. When I joined the Bricklayers Union of Providence, R. I., I paid $107.15, and was damned glad to get in at that price.

When I think of those days when men labored 12 and 14 hours a day for a dollar a day, and because of labor being organized when I joined the union I received $12 a day for 8 hours' work, brother, I considered that a very good investment.

The initiation fees charged and collected from new members go into the local union treasury and that the new member, through the payment of his initiation fee, acquires an equity in the funds belonging to the local union. Not one single penny of the initiation fees collected goes to the national treasury. All of it is held by the local, belongs to the local, is deposited in the local union's treasury, protected and safeguarded by local union officers who are required to furnish adequate bond. Thus new members who join the union become beneficiaries in that the funds thus accumulated in the local treasury are used for the purpose of paying sick, death, and accident benefits and unemployment benefits.

In other words when a new member joins he rates the same benefits as those that have been paying dues for 30 or 40 years which to my mind is some investment worth while and particularly when they are about to receive a wage that is just about twice the wage if they were to work for some unorganized outfit.

Mr. Speaker, no one can tell me that all this poppycock and propaganda about getting rid of the 40-hour week and time-and-one-half for overtime originated from the people of this country. No; I maintain that the huge corporations are using their fantastic war profits to finance the drive as well as to reduce income taxes.

And I further believe that these same interests are more interested in winning their war against Roosevelt and unions than against Hitler and Hirohito.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of changing any of our labor laws and I will vote against any amendment and any bill that would take away any of the gains that labor has gained, and in closing I would like to include a letter that I received from a constituent of mine, which is as follows:

We know that your sympathies are with the workingman, but that, unfortunately, many of your colleagues do not share your point of view.

We've been reading and hearing all about letters being sent to Congress by the people wanting abolishment of the 40-hour week and overtime pay. It seems inconceivable that working people would write such letters, and a little hard to believe

Here's a letter to the contrary, and I believe it represents not only us but thousands more like us. The favor we ask of you is to read it and if you think it presents our case well enough give its contents to the poor thinkers who are trying to push this bill that will surely sabotage the war production effort

If a man is making a dollar or more per hour, straight time, maybe he can stand to have his overtime pay taken away; I wouldn't know; but what of the man whose base rate is only 62 cents an hour? Take my husband, for instance:

He works 60 hours a week, one Saturday afternoon off a month. He's up at 5:30 a. m., to work at 7 o'clock; stands on his feet steady all day, eyes glued to his work, to the point of strain at times, breathing iron dust into his lungs all day, finding many tasks more than tedious, bosses temperamental, quitting at 6 p. m., "all in" from the tension, gets home at 7 p. m., muscles aching, feet burning, too tired to eat or go anywhere for recreation from one end of the week to the other, nerves frayed All this, Monday through Saturday, in—about—the largest defense plant in this State. Many's the morning he is more tired than when he went to bed, but he feels his country depends on the workingman as well as the soldier, and so he puts his feelings behind him and goes

right on to his work. He needs more nutrition to keep going, extra vitamins, extra tonics.

Is $37.50 a week going to make it all up to him? To his wife and children on whom all this reflects? He is proud of his lapel button with the E for efficiency and the pretty diploma with his name on it, also awarded for efficiency by the Navy. Is this to become a mockery?

There is a lot of shouting about union trouble. It seems to me that labor trouble, in defense industry, is pretty thinly scattered today. The union and nonunion are working side by side, here, in harmony; forgetting their differences in their all-out effort. They're all working far over the 40 hours, without complaint; even though many feel now that they are underpaid they are willing to forget it.

Is the passage of this bill to be their reward? We know many defense workers from various plants, union and nonunion, you can bet they won't take it lying down. Where all is smooth now all will be havoc, if not revolution entirely, and who could blame them? Unpatriotic? They are not!

How would the Congressmen like it if they did the work these men are doing and some one passed a bill whereby they were told they couldn't have what they earned? That's no better than Gestapo agents in Europe going around and taking the people's money away from them.

Who started this anyway; the South? Through their jealousy over northern industry?

Why should we kick when the soldier is only getting $21 a month, they say. God bless the soldiers, we appreciate them and pray for them, our hearts are with them. But the $21-a-month soldier is not, in most cases, the head of a family, coping with living costs at home, supporting a family. The soldier's board is free. We certainly can't all be in the war, and you certainly can't dispute the fact that we, on the home front, are using our pay checks to the best of our ability in aiding the war effort. If they pass this bill who is going to buy Defense or war bonds, how can we pay income taxes? Many of us incurred bills in good faith on the strength of our wages. The creditors will attach the wages and the men will lose their jobs in many cases. I don't mean we've done any excessive buying. One or two things necessary to living, that's all, but we all have our bills to pay. Where will we be? I believe these Congressmen so anxious to pass the bill should be investigated as fifth columnists.

Mr. FOGARTY, we are asking you to visit us in our home, over Easter. We understand the Congressmen are going to do this among the voters. We are typical of the average, honest, upright Americans. We'll show you a home, a budget, and many other things that will prove that we are not going to perdition on any exorbitant defense pay.

Hoping the defense worker isn't going to get this awful wallop below the belt by some very unpatriotic Congressmen, and that you will honor us with a real down-to-earth visit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter I have received requesting me to place an editorial in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no obection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from the Salley Grocery Co., of Bernice, La., dealing with employee participation in the buying of defense bonds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Helena (Ark.) World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH DURING NEXT 2 WEEKS

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask unanimous consent that during the next 2 weeks business in order, under the rules of the House on any of the calendar days, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 30, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers' table and referred as follows:

1538. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the naticnal interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

1539. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6874. A bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 6875. A bill to protect owners of businesses from increased rents while such owners are in active service in the land or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6876. A bill to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, and for other purposes, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding a tota' of $150,000; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6877. A bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6878. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, so as to authorize the President to permit unlicensed use of inventions in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the activities of Col. Harry F. Besosa, acting adjutant general of the State Guard of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PETERSON of Florida introduced a bill (H. R. 6879) for the relief of Oliver W. Williams, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2623. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island Truck Owners Association of Providence, R. I., memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to defeat proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating oil taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2624. By Mr KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles Industrial Union Council, Chemists and Technicians, Chapter 205, expressing their disapproval of the Smith bills and urging the Representatives in Congress to vote against these and any similar bills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2625. Also, petition of the Aeronautical Mechanics Lodge. No. 727, Burbank, Calif., bitterly opposing the Smith labor bills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2626. Also, petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, opposing the Ways and Means Committee proposal to enact the joint income tax on Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2627. Also, petition of the Pacific Coast Transportation Advisory Board, in session at Los Angeles, Calif., urging the President of the United States and Members of Congress, through appropriate legislation, to modify the present 40-hour week, in order to expedite the various phases of the national defense program; to the Committee on Labor

2628. Also, petition of Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the adoption of House bills 6525 and 6638, and fully endorsing the principles of each bill, if they should be contained in another bill of similar nature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2629. Also, petition of the reclamation board of the State of California, thanking the House of Representatives, and in particular the Members of the California delegation for their support in the passage of House bill 6736, which appropriated to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for expenditure of the Sacramento flood-control project, the sum of $3,210,000, and they ask the support of the House of Representatives in securing the passage of the same measure in the Senate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2630. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Hon. Flora J. Coutts and some 16 other residents of Newport, Vt., for all-out production, stoppage of strikes, elimination of overtime and double Sunday pay, an efficiency program and immediate action; to the Committee on Labor

2631. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Round Table, requesting that national expenditures for nondefense purposes be kept at a minimum; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2632. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Texas Chiropractic Research Society, Inc., asking the establishment of department of warrant officers in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs

2633. By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Petition of B. F. Parker and citizens and residents of Russellville, Logan County, Ky., urging the passage of laws at this time to speed up the war effort; to stop strikes; to change the 40-hour workweek to the number of hours necessary to meet the emergency, allowing no extra pay for Sundays or holidays; and to change any needed industry from nonessential to war production, placing those refusing under Government supervision, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2634. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1942

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Merciful Father, who hast promised to the meek in heart the blessings of the life that now is and the sure hope of an eternal inheritance: Grant that in this Holy Week we may capture more and more the spirit of true meekness as it is revealed in the person of Thine own dear Son, who floods the simplest acts of life with an unearthly light, making them gracious and beautiful symbols of some pure and holy mystery by means of which each human thought and word is clothed with a radiance divine. Help us each day and hour to take His yoke upon us and to learn of Him, that we may take suffering and pain into our souls not as a tedious interlude but as the very melody and march of life itself, touched perhaps for a moment by a mordant note, only to resolve itself into the perfect harmony of life triumphant.

Inspire in us a deeper consecration to Thy service as we strive to do Thy will; make us ever more responsive to the call of duty, whatever its demands, willing, if need be, to yield up life itself, and do Thou lure us by the sweet compulsion of the Saviour, whose gentle tyranny is always exercised in perfect love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 27, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EMPLOYEES OF BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE—STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Vice President, on the basis of information which he had received the afternoon of Sunday, March 29, from friends as to a letter written him by Representative DIES, put out a statement over the telephone to the press. The Vice President has not yet received from Mr. DIES the courtesy of the letter which Mr. DIES gave to the press on Sunday to be printed Monday morning. I have here a copy of the Vice President's statement which was telephoned to the press last evening and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

I have been informed of an open letter written me by Mr MARTIN DIES regarding certain employees of the Board of Economic Warfare. If Mr. DIES were genuinely interested in helping our war effort, he would have discussed this matter with me as soon as it came to his attention. He did not. Rather, he is seeking to inflame the public mind by a malicious distortion of facts which he did not want to check with me. If we were at peace, these tactics could be overlooked as the product of a witchcraft mind. We are not at peace, however. We are at war, and the doubts and anger which this and similar statements of Mr DIES tend to arouse in the public mind might as well come from Goebbels himself as far as their practical effect is concerned. As a matter of fact, the effect on our morale would be less damaging if Mr. DIES were on the Hitler pay roll.

Obviously, I stand ready at all times to have any and every fact regarding our employees thoroughly investigated. This is being done daily by the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are eternally vigilant about it. The current charges will be investigated at once by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If that investigation proves that these men are unsuited for work with the Board of Economic Warfare, they will be dismissed promptly as others have been in the past. If it does not, I expect a public apology to the men whose reputations Mr. DIES has publicly smeared without giving them a chance to be heard.

Over half of Mr. DIES' "letter" is given to charges against Mr. Maurice Parmelee. I never heard of the gentleman until last Saturday morning. Since then I have been informed that he was employed because of responsible work he did in London on blockade control for the United States War Trade Board during the last war. Subsequent to that, in 1920, he was named as special assistant to the Secretary of State. He is not now doing post-war work.

Notwithstanding Mr DIES' statement, less than half a dozen people are engaged in post-war planning for the Board of Economic Warfare. The majority of our employees are engaged in work on over 8,000 export-license applications which are analyzed and cleared every day. Mr. DIES' reason for distorting the emphasis on post-war work was because of the chance it gave him to draw utterly false inferences from a book Mr. Parmelee wrote 11 years ago on nudism.

This book was first published in 1931 by Alfred Knopf, one of the established publishing houses in this country. Some years later a libel suit in connection with an English edition was filed in the Federal district court here. Mr. DIES quotes extracts from that lower court decision. He would keep the American people in ignorance of an appeal in the case. Such an appeal was taken to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the lower court decision was reversed. In a decision handed down by Justice Miller on May 14, 1940, the court held that the entire text of the book was inoffensive and that only a few of the illustrations were questionable.

The court held further that "it is obvious that the latter do not furnish the dominant note of the publication * * * In the present case, as in the Ulysses case, the book as a whole is not obscene * * * The author has been known for many years as a well-qualified writer in the field of sociology. His textbooks have been long known and used in the colleges and universities of this country."

Mr. Parmelee's case has been passed on by the courts of the land as provided for by our form of government. Not one person in a hundred thousand in this country is interested in nudism. Mr. DIES has twisted a few isolated facts in an effort to create the impression that the Board of Economic Warfare is planning a nudist post-war world for the United States. In calmer times this would make him the laughingstock of the country. In these days of crisis and tension, however, we cannot tolerate deliberate and dishonest efforts to confuse the public.

These are the most critical times in our history. Everything we treasure is at stake. It is the solemn duty of all patriotic citizens to fight the enemy within our gates who hides under many cloaks, the most insidious of which is a false patriotism. Any man who seeks to undermine faith in our Government by a malicious misuse of facts is a greater danger to our national safety than thousands of Axis soldiers within our borders. Hitler and the Japs know that better than anyone else. We Americans must face this ugly truth.

I trust that Mr. DIES and others of his kind, with an intense itch for publicity, will use their talents to help the United Nations win this war rather than stir up discord among patriotic Americans.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

MARCH 29, 1942.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Herring	Schwartz
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Hughes	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Walsh
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	Wiley
Doxey	Nye	Willis
Ellender	O'Daniel	
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in Western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EILEO], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 27, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1669. An act for the relief of James Franklin Smith;

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Bessie Walden;

S. 1762. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to release the claim of the United States to certain land within Coconino County, Ariz;

S. 2063. An act to authorize certain officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States to accept, emblems, medals, orders, and decorations that have been tendered them by governments of the Western Hemisphere;

S. 2198. An act to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2208. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war (signed 3 p. m., eastern wartime).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2339) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn; and

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6709. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war;

H. R. 6845. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn;

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider;

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman;

H. R. 5784. An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, to create the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, and further to define the powers of a district judge in certain suits.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (S. Doc. No. 192)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Selective Service System amounting to $3,770,000 for the fiscal year 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY AND NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 193)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, amounting to $809,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 194)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1941, for the District of Columbia, in the amount of $1,409.18 and supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $527,110; in all, $528,519.18 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel in the land forces under the provisions of existing law at a specified time; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO PREVENTING PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Patents.

CHARTER OF THE U. S. COMMERCIAL COMPANY

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate (Edwin A. Halsey), stating that, pursuant to the provisions of law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has filed with him, as Secretary of the Senate, two certified copies of the charter of the U. S. Commercial Company (with accompanying papers); ordered to be placed on file.

THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Scout Executive of the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Thirty-second Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America, and certain appended related reports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of Post Office (4) and Agriculture (4), the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and The National Archives, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Doughton bill, House bill 6750, providing for exemption from the payment of sales taxes by contractors working upon defense contracts, and also House bill 5180, requiring political subdivisions in the United States to pay 25 percent of the cost of access roads to defense plants; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Jasper County, assembled at Ridgeland, in the State of South Carolina, favoring the stoppage of all nonessential money spending; the prohibition of all strikes in war industries; the suspension of political ambitions for the duration of the war; and the appropriate control of labor and any pressure groups which may seek any undue advantage in the war situation; the termination of all jobs which are not necessary to the successful prosecution of the war, and also favoring the devotion of all necessary efforts of the people and all available money to the sole purpose of winning the war and assuring victory to the Republic; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

[Translation]

Senate Resolution 10

Whereas there has been published in the press a report that affirms that Col. Harry F. Besosa, acting adjutant general of the State Guard of Puerto Rico and director of the Selective Service in the island, has expressed his opposition to the appointment of Samuel R. Quiñones, speaker of the house, as captain and judge advocate of the State Guard because, as is quoted in the press, from the document alleged to be signed by Harry F. Besosa, "Mr. Quiñones cannot be considered for the position of judge advocate of the State Guard with the rank of captain because his political ideas incapacitate him for forming part of the armed forces of the United States";

Whereas although the party of which Mr. Quiñones is a member does not have in issue, nor does it represent an electoral mandate in favor of, any political finality, it is, nevertheless, the inalienable right of American citizens in Puerto Rico to have absolute liberty in their convictions in regard of what should be the future of Puerto Rico, whether in the form of statehood, independence, or other form of government organization;

Whereas if the words and ideas attributed to Harry F. Besosa prove to be true, such attitude implies treason to the principles for which this war is being fought and to the principles contained in the Atlantic Charter and to the need of the Government of the United States to show with midday and undoubted sincerity that the fight that is being waged in the world is the fight for the liberty of conscience and of man;

Whereas the attitude attributed to Harry F. Besosa would be, if true, treason to the cause of democracy because it would establish odious distinctions in connection with the consciences of men, declaring certain men incapacitated to assume fully their responsibilities in this war, the same as in Germany the Jews are declared incapacitated for fully assuming their responsibilities in the life of Germany;

Whereas the attitude attributed to Harry F. Besosa, if true, could be due only to absolute irresponsibility at the historic moment, or to a total lack of understanding of the significance of the United States in this struggle, or to a desire, contemptible and sinister, to play a partisan political game or the capitalistic game;

Whereas the attitude attributed to Harry F. Besosa, if true, would be equivalent to establishing an opprobrious condemnation not only against many Puerto Ricans devoted body and soul to national defense but also against the heroic Philippine defenders of the American Nation who are fighting heart to heart together with the heroic General MacArthur in Bataan;

Whereas the attitude attributed to Harry F. Besosa, if true, would tend to create the greatest confusion and the greatest perplexity in Puerto Rico and outside of Puerto Rico as to the war objectives, as to the cause that moves millions of men throughout the world to offer their lives in its defense, as to the significance of the Atlantic conference and of the deepest and most sacred meanings of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, as it is hereby resolved, by this Senate of Puerto Rico:

1. That the Governor be requested to ratify or to rectify the information published in the press in connection with the said attitude of Harry F. Besosa.

2. That, if the Governor considers this information confidential and privileged and believes it should not be furnished to this legislature or to the people of Puerto Rico, the Governor be respectfully requested to send said document to the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for such use as President Roosevelt may consider pertinent.

3. That if the attitude attributed to Harry F. Besosa in the press is true, this senate expresser its emphatic censure of such attitude, considering it treason to the fundamentals of the cause for which the free men of the world are struggling; a vile and irresponsible attempt to confound the people of Puerto Rico in its attitude toward the war; a vile and irresponsible attack on thousands of Puerto Ricans in all political parties; a vile and irresponsible attack on the heroic Philippine soldiers who are fighting together with the heroic General MacArthur in Bataan; vile and irresponsible treason to the purposes enunciated by President Roosevelt in the Atlantic charter; a vile and irresponsible attempt to place in doubt the democratic sincerity of President Roosevelt and of the American Nation toward Puerto Rico, toward Latin-America, toward the entire democratic world.

4. That this senate, if the attitude attributed to Harry F. Besosa is true, expresses to the Puerto Rican soldiers, to the Puerto Rican people in general, to the people of Latin America, to the freemen of the world, its absolute conviction that such attitude does not in any wise represent either the attitude of the Government of the United States or of the democratic powers of the world; that not for a moment should a single Puerto Rican soldier, a single American citizen of Puerto Rico fail to render, on account of the mere fact of such attitude, if it should be true, his most decided cooperation, or to be willing to make the greatest of sacrifices in defense of the Nation and of the democratic cause; that the complete and unlimited cooperation of each Puerto Rican in the great cause directed by President Roosevelt and which is headed by the American Nation should continue to be rendered fully, to the last atom of sacrifice, even though the attitude of Harry F. Besosa proves to be true and he should continue in the position which, in that case, he would occupy in a morally improper manner.

5. That copies of this resolution be sent, if the attitude attributed to the said Harry F. Besosa is verified, to the President of the United States, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, to the Secretary of War of the United States, to the Chief of the Selective Service of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of the United States, and to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Murdock, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2406) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1230) thereon.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WALSH introduced a bill (S. 2415) to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 6845. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NINETEENTH ANNUAL DINNER OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND CIVICS OF THE ORANGES AND MAPLEWOOD, N. J., ADDRESS BY DR. HU SHIH

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the proceedings of the nineteenth annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, N. J., together with the address of Dr. Hu Shih, Chinese Ambassador to the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER IN HAWAII TO HIS BROTHER

[Mr. BARKLEY, on behalf of Mr. DOWNEY, asked and obtained leave to have printed in

the RECORD a letter from William Morrell Hale, Jr., stationed in Hawaii, to his brother, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO CLASS WARFARE—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of March 27, 1942, entitled "No Class Warfare," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CASE AGAINST THE JEW—ANSWER BY RALPH INGERSOLL

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from PM magazine entitled "An Editorial Answer to the Saturday Evening Post," and an article giving the background and history of Milton Mayer, which appear in the Appendix.]

SHOULD AMERICANS STRIKE?—STATEMENT BY LOWELL L. WALKER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Lowell L. Walker, chairman of the Americanism committee, Department of Nebraska, American Legion, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW MODEL WAR BABY—EDITORIAL FROM NEBRASKA STATE JOURNAL

[Mr BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Nebraska State Journal under the headline "New model war baby," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 4-H CLUBS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the week of April 5–11 has been proclaimed National 4–H Mobilization Week. Its purpose is to enlist a half a million or more new members, and secure new leaders to further the 4–H victory program.

President Roosevelt has written a very fine statement in support of the National 4–H Mobilization Week program, which I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 11, 1942.

To the 4–H Club Members of the United States:

In an hour when our Nation needs the active support of every group of its people, it is gratifying to learn that the 4–H Clubs will hold a National Mobilization Week, to rally the million and a half members and spur them to greater efforts in the cause of freedom. It is to be hoped that the National 4–H Mobilization Week also will bring more rural young people into active participation in the useful work in which 4–H Club members engage.

Your activities in producing, preserving, and preparing food; in making clothing; and your other practical experiences in farming and homemaking have prepared you for many tasks important in peacetime and indispensable in wartime. No other group of rural young people anywhere else in the world has so much worth defending, or is better prepared to help defend what it has.

Your 4–H Club pledge embodies the obligation which rests upon every club member as a young citizen. Repeat it, study it, make it part of your very being. Let your head, heart, hands, and health truly be dedicated to your country, which needs them now as never before.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. CAPPER. Let me say further, Mr. President, that the future of our Nation is in its boys and girls. They are going to have to retrieve the mistakes we have made. They are going to have to pay the bills we are contracting while trying to find the way out of the morass into which we have stumbled through misunderstanding the application of economic laws.

The 4–H Club boys and girls from the farms and rural communities of 48 States, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii, are as well prepared, are getting as close to the right training and experience to handle the world of tomorrow, as any group I know of in this increasingly complex society that has developed unevenly during the transition from peace to a war basis.

Mr. President, I think I know these boys and girls. Since 1914 the 4–H Clubs for rural boys and girls have been a part of the organized work of the Extension Division of the Department of Agriculture, Dr. M. L. Wilson, Director, cooperating with the land-grant colleges, and nearly 3,000 counties over the United States.

During 1940 the 4–H Club enrollment reached a new all-time high, with 1,420,000 boys and girls enrolled in 80,000 local 4–H clubs. The total members and past members of 4–H Clubs is 8,000,000. Six and one-half million alumni of the 4–H Clubs are carrying on, most of them on farms and in rural communities, but many of them in our cities. Wherever these 4–H Club graduates are they will be found engaged in community work, furnishing leadership.

The 4–H boys and girls learn to do by doing. Each member raises a pig, or has a cow and a calf, or plants a garden, or learns to sew—acquires firsthand a farm and home project which entails both work and management. They also are required to take part in some community project or projects. This year 4–H Club members are undertaking to plant 1,000,000 war gardens.

The 4–H Club emblem is a four-leafed clover, with the letter H on each leaflet. The four H's stand for head, heart, hands, and health. Think what it means to this Nation to have millions of young rural people pledged to develop head, heart, hands, and health for club, community, and country. This is quite a contrast to the pledge German youth, who consecrate themselves to Hitler and take an oath to die for him.

Mr. President, I am convinced that we must give more attention in this country to youth training—the sort of training provided by the 4–H Clubs. Our young people must know how to work, grow their food, make their clothes, and build their homes. As the war tightens its grip on us and as our standard of living is reduced, we must again become pioneers. Our young people will accept this pioneering adventure with zest if they know how to work. That is one of the reasons I have always advocated an expansion of the 4–H Club program so that a larger percentage of our 12,500,000 rural young people from 10 to 21 years of age could take advantage of this practical training.

One closing thought, Mr. President: One day this war will be over. If and when we are privileged to sit at the peace table as victors, we will still face serious major problems. One is that the present generation of entire totalitarian states has been trained to be subservient to the state. They have been trained to hate, to kill, and to die. And they number millions. If we are to solve the problem of antagonistic populations, one of our first demands at the peace table should be that the conquered nations must institute and maintain a youth-training program based on democratic and Christian principles. That must be done if we are to look forward to permanent world peace. And that is why we need to strengthen our own youth-training program and the 4–H Clubs during this first national 4–H Mobilization Week.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] desires to address the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed at the conclusion of the routine morning business, and that at the conclusion of his address the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there are no objections?

Mr. McNARY. The RECORD indicates that the last call of the calendar was on the 7th of March.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to ask that we begin with Calendar No. 1190.

Mr. McNARY That is all right. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The routine morning business is concluded.

LABOR RACKETEERING IN CONSTRUCTION FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on March 12, I introduced a bill which took the title of S. 2365. This is an attempt to declare a national policy with regard to restrictions as to employment paid for wholly by the taxpayers' money from the Public Treasury, on work directly for the Government or under contract, where the work performed is wholly for the Government.

In recent weeks I have obtained some information of value regarding the closed-shop policy applied to the construction program which has been under way for about 2 years. The figures I shall present, and the compilations and estimates from those figures are confined entirely to work performed under the jurisdiction of the Office of Chief of Engineers, War Department. There has been extensive construction by, or on behalf of the Government, handled through the Navy Department, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Defense Housing Corporation, and many Government agencies other than the Office of Chief of Engineers, War Department. None of these are included in anything considered or presented herein.

In order that any reader may have the complete record available for consideration, I ask that the text of Senate bill 2365 be included in my remarks at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that all qualified persons who are citizens of the United States, or who have declared their intention to become such citizens, are entitled to equal opportunities with respect to employment in the service of the United States and employment resulting from expenditures made by the United States; that it is contrary to sound public policy to permit religious, civic, political, fraternal, or labor organizations to control opportunities for such employment; and that no person should be required to be a member of any religious, civic, political, fraternal, or labor organization in order to obtain employment in the service of his Government or employment resulting from expenditures made by his Government.

SEC. 2. (a) That provisions of this section shall apply to any position in the employ of the United States or any agency thereof, and to any position in the employ of any person having a contract with the United States or any agency thereof if the duties of such position consist wholly of work performed in fulfilling such contract.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to require membership in a religious, civic, political, fraternal, or labor organization as a condition of employment in any position to which this section applies, or to discriminate against any other person in connection with the terms or conditions of employment in any position to which this section applies because such other person is not a member of such an organization. It shall be unlawful for any person to induce or attempt to induce another person to violate the provisions of this subsection. It shall be unlawful to enter into or comply with any arrangement, agreement, or contract to perform any act which would be in violation of this subsection; and any such contract or agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into is hereby declared to be contrary to public policy and shall be null and void. No person shall be subject to any penalty or forfeiture, or liable for any damages, on account of any act done or omitted to be done in compliance with the requirements of this section.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "person" includes any individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any religious, civic, political, fraternal, labor, or other organization.

(d) Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not more than 1 year or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the scandals described in some detail hereafter began to come to life almost precisely 1 year ago. The New York Times of March 22, 1941, contained the first story that came to my office dealing with these things. It was followed by the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Providence Bulletin, Washington, D. C., papers and others. So far as the papers named are concerned, their reporters conferred with officers of the War Department in Washington and at the various construction projects before writing their stories. Being a newspaperman myself, and knowing the earnest effort all good newspapermen make to ascertain facts and write the truth about them, I give full credence to the efforts of the newspapers named and their reporters.

There was so much agitation about this matter a year or so ago that even that stanch champion of organized labor, our beloved and respected colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] addressed a letter to William Green, president of the A. F. of L., and to Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., which appeared in the Washington Post of March 23, 1941. From that letter I quote:

I know many of these reports are exaggerated, and some of them are entirely untrue, of course, but the general public is getting the idea that laboring men have to pay exorbitant fees to join a union, and that these fees are taken out of their salary as they work. I have investigated some of these cases, and some of them are true. I have taken it up with several labor leaders, some of them in my own State, and I want to say to their credit that I have never talked with a single one but what he has condemned this practice, although all of them admit to me it is in vogue in a great many places in the country, and that local unions are taking advantage of the situation and of their own fellow laborers to charge them admission fees to the union—fees which are frequently perfectly outrageous.

It must have been a sad awakening for the Senator from Nebraska, whose honesty, integrity, and devotion to the public interests, and especially to labor and the common man, has never been questioned, to find that his letter to Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, was not answered by Mr. Green, and that the reports which had disturbed him understated rather than exaggerated the facts.

As my colleagues know, I was released from Walter Reed Hospital about a year ago with instructions, which were emphasized by the Capitol attending physician, to return home for a rest. I proceeded to my home in Parsons, Kans.

Soon after my arrival at Parsons announcement was made of the construction of a shell-loading plant, to be known as the Kansas ordnance plant, just outside my home city. In August 1941 headquarters were set up in Parsons by officers of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, then in charge of construction; the prime contractors, the Johns-Manville Co.; and the constructing contractors, Kiewit, Condon & Paschen. I had contact with all these parties and with numerous other people interested, including individuals, labor groups, and committees composed of laboring men and officials of organized labor locals. On July 14 I received a letter from E. W. Latchem, of Coffeyville, Kans., special representative of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, Local No. 193, of Coffeyville, Kans. The letter was dated July 10, 1941. This particular union is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and will be referred to frequently later. Mr. Latchem's letter, in part, contained the following:

We wish to call your attention to a very disagreeable situation existing in Kansas on defense projects. Kansas City, Mo., still has a few remnants of the old Pendergast machine, under which regime labor unions fell into the hands of labor racketeers. Now that Kansas City has been cleaned up to a certain extent, these racketeer elements have moved into Kansas. They dominated defense work at Fort Riley and Manhattan to the disgust of all fair-minded unionists in Kansas and we are determined to avoid any such tactics being repeated on other defense work in Kansas.

In order to forestall anything of this sort on defense work in the Tri-State Area—

I may explain that "Tri-State Area" is the designation of the area in which I live, and similar areas in the two adjoining States, where the three States of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma come together—

representatives of local unions chartered by the Hodcarriers, Building and Common Laborers International Union, in the Tri-State District met last January and took steps to form a district council. Apparently our international union officials acted on information, the source of which we do not know and turned our application down without giving us any information as to reasons.

Instead we find a former business agent from Kansas City, during Pendergast's racketeer ays, installing a charter with miscellaneous Work Projects Administration workers and other nontradesmen as signers to the application for charter. None of the long-established locals in this district were consulted as to this matter, but were told in true Pendergast manner that this man had set up a local and would handle matters. Thus it appears that local unions, who have held charters since the International Union of Hodcarriers was organized, could not be trusted or consulted in matters of vital concern to their trade, but that a bunch of Work Projects Administration workers of miscellaneous backgrounds, under control of a Kansas City business agent acting as financial secretary, could be trusted. The usual and proper method when installing a new charter for a local union is for the members to select all officials from their own number, but that would not suit any racketeering elements, as they always have to get their hands on the money.

A local union composed of new members who are not familiar with union business methods and who have been tricked into accepting an outside racketeer as business agent and financial secretary-treasurer can be nothing more than camouflage for whatever subversive interests are being served. An outsider with no local interests or concern would be inclined to give preference to outside labor and leave local labor in the district to be taken care of by the various relief agencies while outside labor does the work. Besides, outside labor is more easily handled by racketeers as they have no local connections. Therefore, we ask you—

—This letter is addressed to me—

to assist in getting rid of all subversive labor elements, by bringing this matter to the direct attention of the union officers concerned.

Mr. President, I read a paragraph from the letter of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to Mr. Green. I read four paragraphs from a four-page letter from Mr. Latchem. I shall read two paragraphs from the next letter to which I shall refer. I want to avoid any possible charge from any source that I have put into this RECORD only selected paragraphs and that the reading of the full letter would show a different result. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, the complete letters to which I have heretofore referred and from which I have read extracts, and letters from which I subsequently read paragraphs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letters appear at the conclusion of Mr. REED's remarks.)

Mr. REED. I also ask unanimous consent that following these letters there may be inserted in the RECORD certain newspaper articles which are given as a basis for the statements with respect to certain charges collected as union fees and dues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The articles appear at the conclusion of Mr. REED'S remarks.)

Mr. REED. I desire to do this in order that the record may be complete.

I now read from a letter dated August 20, 1941, and received by me on August 22, 1941, from Henry Allai, president of district 14, United Mine Workers of America, with headquarters at Pittsburg, Kans. Mr. Allai is head of what is, perhaps, the largest organized labor union in Kansas, and is among the ranking officials of organized labor in the State of Kansas. From Mr. Allai's letter, I read:

Since the Government decided to build some defense industries in southeastern Kansas, certain craft organizations, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, have been selling union membership cards. However, these cards are just sold to certain people whom they like, and then these people are given preferential employment throughout the entire United States. Hundreds of people have had to pay from $25 up in order to secure employment on Government projects. These craft organizations are now busy in our part of the State, selling union cards to men, leading them to believe that they have to buy these cards, at an exorbitant price from their organization. A certain amount is paid down and the rest paid when they secure employment. This, we claim, is unreasonable.

We believe that every man should have the right to secure employment from the contractor on his own merits and then, as a free American citizen, should select whatever labor organization he may want to join.

I believe that the Government should make an investigation into this entire matter. People should be given the right to secure employment on their merits and join whatever labor union they want to join. At least they should be free American citizens to do as they please under the Constitution of the United States. I hope that you—

Mr. Allai addressed this letter to me—

will be successful in getting the Government to straighten out these conditions, which have been imposed upon the people of this country—especially their having to pay exorbitant fees for joining a union and then having to pay unreasonable dues each month so that a man may be able to make an honest living. I think if an investigation was made that all of these injustices mentioned above could be remedied.

Thanking you for your past cooperation, I am—

No Harvard law professor drafted for Government service could more clearly state sound principles of democratic government and correct labor policy than was done by Mr. Allai in the letter from which I have just read.

The general line of the letter from Local 193 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborer's Union of America of Coffeyville, Kans., the same international—not the local—being a notorious racketeering organization and among the numerous racketeering organizations affiliated with the A. F. of L., and the letter of Mr. Allai, president of District 14, United Mine Workers of America, a C. I. O. organization, was followed by a subsequent letter dated September 29, and received by me on October 6, 1941, from Mirle Beeson of Coffeyville, Kans., who, in explanation of his letter, stated:

The above is being carried out as a part of the instructions of the officers and executive board of Local 315, United Construction Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Coffeyville, Kans.

From Mr. Beeson's letter I read:

Labor has been granted the right to join a union of its own choosing, and, insofar as we are able to ascertain, neither the spirit nor the letter of the law provides that if an individual does not join the American Federation of Labor he should be barred from working on a Government defense project. Yet the fact remains that the members of the United Construction Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, are being and have been repeatedly refused employment or any consideration for employment on any and all defense projects in this area.

Due to the fact that there are thousands of unemployed men in southeastern Kansas unable to pay an exorbitant initiation fee and at the same time there are thousands of members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations who, in all honesty of purpose and in compliance with the Federal law, joined a union of their own choosing, yet they are being discriminated against through some combination of circumstances and individuals, and we feel that some steps should be taken, either through a senatorial investigation of other legal means to ascertain why any governmental agency or department would be a party to a violation of Federal law.

That ends the quotation from Mr. Beeson's letter. I shall recur to that letter shortly. I emphasize that this is a letter from an organized-labor official asking and suggesting a senatorial investigation.

In the course of my correspondence with various organized labor officials, of both affiliates of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. unions, I had occasion to refer to the president of the A. F. of L. of Kansas, and a statement he had made to me. His name is Clem Blangers.

Mr. Latchem, whose organized labor connection has already been stated, in a letter dated September 7, 1941, which letter is being offered for insertion in the RECORD, said:

Of course, Mr. Blangers could mean that the question of local racketeering has been so camouflaged as to be acceptable to the international unions, and that racketeering rules have been made to appear as labor union rules. If this is what he refers to I will have to admit that he is correct. As evidence I only need to mention that recently about 20 men were given cards in the local laborers' union in Parsons, and then discharged after working 1 day.

As to matters being adjusted, they are as far from it as at the time I wrote my former letter. You are at liberty to use this letter in any manner you see fit if it will help adjust matters. With best wishes, I am yours.

(The letter referred to appears in full at the conclusion of Mr. REED'S remarks.)

I read further from another letter from Mr. Beeson, president of the United Construction Workers Local No. 315, in which he said:

In view of the senatorial investigation into the general labor policy of the administration and the Office of Production Management, according to the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator, Tuesday night, it seems as though a great number of Senators are asking a pertinent question. By what authority does the Office of Production Management, or any other Government department, specify the union to be recognized on any defense project?

Once again we request that some steps be taken to find out by what authority the War Department can issue such discriminatory instructions, for, frankly, we challenge the validity of such action by any governmental agency.

(The letter referred to appears in full at the conclusion of Mr. REED'S remarks.)

Finally, without quoting therefrom, I offer for insertion in the RECORD a letter from Roy A. Brady, of Coffeyville, Kans., general organizer for the United Construction Workers, C. I. O.

(The letter referred to appears in full at the conclusion of Mr. REED'S remarks.)

Mr. President, in a long public life I have never had so many visits from laboring men of all classes, including officials of unions affiliated with both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. as I had in August, September, October, and November of 1941, during which time I was at my home town of Parsons, Kans. The ordnance plant known as the Kansas Ordnance Plant was under construction, and men were being hired by the hundreds and thousands. The maximum employment at this plant, as nearly as I can ascertain the figure, was somewhat in excess of 11,000 at the peak of employment in February 1942.

Numerous complaints were lodged with me personally, and, when the time and facilities permitted, I made a personal investigation.

I was informed—and investigation showed the information to be correct—that the so-called International Hod Carriers' Union was profiteering off common labor, the lowest-paid labor on the job. No local of that organization had existed in Parsons before this construction began. Locals then existed at Coffeyville, some 30 miles distant, and other places in that territory. Those locals formed a district council, as stated by Mr. Latchem, for the purpose of handling the Parsons job. They were not permitted to do so. The "gravy" was too rich to let honest country boys pour it, so outsiders were sent in. It was charged by officers of the locals existing in this territory that those sent in were remnants of labor racketeering which had been common in Kansas City, Mo., during the Pendergast regime. I had neither the time nor facilities to investigate this particular phase, but the charge sounds reasonable. Conditions in Kansas City during that period were notorious. The International Hod Carriers' Union is not only notorious, but is obnoxious and offensive, and smells to high Heaven. I shall refer to it later.

No man could obtain a job as a common laborer on the Kansas Ordnance Plant unless he held a membership card in the local union of the hod carriers' racket, newly organized from outside. That would cost him $12. His dues thereafter would be $2 a month while he remained a member, and he had to remain a member to hold his job. The personnel division of the constructing contractor informed me that when construction got under way an average of about 4,000 common laborers would be used. That number would be exceeded at the peak of construction. In answer to a further question, I was informed that probably the number of men of this classification hired during the construction period would be 10,000 or more. This figure, of course, would include the average of those employed and the labor turn-over.

The figure of an average of 4,000 or more given me last fall is borne out by a recent item from the local newspaper, which reads:

Members of Laborers' Union, No. 550, are sponsoring a dance and social meeting scheduled for 9 o'clock Saturday night in the grandstand building at Marvel Park. A large crowd is expected to be on hand for the affair, since the organization now has a membership of approximately 4,000, according to Carl Masters, head of the union.

In the absence of detailed information, I assume that the estimate of the total number of men to be hired during the construction period, as given me by the personnel department of the contractor, is reasonably accurate. It is the best information I have.

If a $12 membership fee were collected from each of the 10,000 men estimated to be employed during the construction period, which has not yet ended, the total collected would be $120,000. If $2 a month has been, and is being, collected from each of 4,000 men employed on the project, an average of $8,000 a month is being taken from the men. In a construction period of 12 months this item would amount to $96,000. The sum of these two amounts would be $216,000. No claim is made that this estimate is absolutely accurate. It is based on the best information available to me.

It must be considered that in this case, as in every other case of a construction project, the wage to be paid each and every classification of labor was fixed by the Department of Labor, and was not subject to any negotiation between the local contractor or the War Department with any labor union, local, national, or international. The same is true of hours and working conditions, including overtime payments.

In other words, on these projects there was no service of the kind usually performed as to wages and working conditions negotiated by labor unions. Wages, hours, conditions, and so forth were fixed by law and by official order under governmental authority. The hod carriers' union has taken money from these men without rendering any possible equivalent service.

Membership fees collected by the racketeering hod-carriers' organization, were the lowest collected by any labor organization. For a truck drivers membership $25 was charged. For a carpenter already a member of the carpenters' union $25 additional was charged for a local card. I was told that $50 was the charge for a membership card if the applicant was not already a member of the carpenters' union.

The scale differed for various crafts, with the highest membership-card cost being $150 for the electricians' union. The plumbers, steamfitters, bricklayers, and the other crafts paid a membership fee between the high and low limits stated. What I have just said, relates to the Kansas ordnance plant near my home town of Parsons, Kans., and is based on my personal investigation. I shall now refer to the general situation.

On my return to Washington I began to seek information from the Office of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, and to check with that office the construction activities which had been carried on beginning in 1940.

The general situation was outlined in a letter addressed to me from the office of the Chief of Engineers dated March 21, 1942, and accompanied by a table entitled, "Number of Jobs, Estimated Cost, and Employment Military Construction Program Under the Jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers July 1, 1940, Through February 29, 1942." I do not care to read this letter and the accompanying table in full, but shall refer to them, and I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 21, 1942.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: In acknowledgment of your letter of March 19 addressed to General Reybold and marked to my attention, there is furnished a tabulation setting forth statistics on the scope of the military construction program under the control of this office.

Please note that this tabulation covers the period since the inception of the emergency program, July 1, 1940, through February 28, 1942, and that the employment figures included are as of February 28, 1942. Employment on the program was not then at its peak. This was reached in September 1941, when there were 529,000 individuals employed. Their distribution was approximately as follows:

Air Corps projects	116,000
Troop facilities projects	136,000
Ordnance projects	229,000
Other projects	48,000
Total	529,000

From December 7, 1941, until February 28, 1942, construction on newly authorized projects was instituted by this office at the rate of about $200,000,000 per week. From the period March 1 to March 15, 1942, newly authorized construction averaged approximately $250,000,000 per week, a 25-percent increase in volume. There can be no accurate forecast of future volume of construction, but the recent further acceleration of the program is incontrovertible evidence that there will be increasingly heavy demand for material and labor. There is strong probability that labor demand will exceed the peak (529,000) of September 1941.

In summation, it is interesting to note that the military construction program under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, including completed and active projects and all types of work, is made up of over 1,000 jobs at more than 500 different locations and costing approximately four and seven-tenths billion dollars. Of these, more than 500 jobs, costing almost $2,000,000,000 were completed as of February 28, 1942.

It is a pleasure to be able to make this information available to you, and I trust that it will suit your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Engineers.

Number of jobs, estimated cost, and employment, military construction program, under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers July 1, 1941, through Feb. 28, 1942

Item	Number of jobs	Estimated cost (000,000 omitted)	Employment as of Feb. 28 1942
All types, total	1,064	$4,653	
Not started	193	767	
Under construction	321	1,922	421,000
Completed	550	1,964	
Troop housing facilities, total	473	1,553	
Not started	62	181	
Under construction	[1]88	510	93,000
Completed	323	862	
Ordnance manufacturing and storage facilities, total	157	1,769	
Not started	42	347	
Under construction	[2]62	681	200,000
Completed	53	741	
Air Corps facilities, total	262	916	
Not started	36	152	
Under construction	132	482	75,000
Completed	94	282	
Other facilities (general hospitals and special branch (other than ordnance depots), total	172	$415	
Not started	53	87	
Under construction	39	249	53,000
Completed	80	79	

[1] Includes 24 jobs providing facilities for more than 10,000 troops.
[2] Includes 33 ordnance jobs costing more than $5,000,000

Mr. REED. I desire to call attention to the statement contained in General Robins' letter above referred to, that at the peak of construction employment in September 1941, 529,000 individuals were employed. I also call attention to the further statement in that letter that the program of future construction contains a "strong probability that the labor demand will exceed the peak (529,000) of September 1941."

I also ask that there be included in the RECORD at this point, two tables entitled, "Rates Paid and Employment Cantonment Construction," hereinafter referred to and identified in the RECORD as table XX, and "Rates paid and employment other than cantonment construction," hereinafter referred to and identified in the RECORD as table X.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XX.—*Rates paid and employment—cantonment construction*

NEW CANTONMENT PROJECTS UNDERWAY

Project name and location	Amount of construction (000 omitted)	Type of contract	Date work started	Percent completed as of Feb. 28, 1942	Hourly rates paid					Average number employed, week ending Feb. 21, 1942											
										Total all mechanics and laborers		Straight time employment									
												Carpenter		Laborer		Electrician		Plumber		Operator, shovel	
					Carpenter	Laborer	Electrician	Plumber	Operator, shovel	Straight time	Overtime	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CampButner, Durham, N. C.	$22,800	Lump sum	Feb. 18, 1942	13.0	$0.90	$0.30	$1.00	$1.25	$1.25	143	62			79	55.2						
Camp Carson, Colorado Springs, Colo.	30,368	do	Jan. 19, 1942	1.0	1.25	.625	1.50	1.50	1.50	49	6	9	18.4	16	32.7						
Camp Gruber, Muskogee, Okla.	35,000	do	Jan. 14, 1942	1.0	1.25	.50	1.50	1.50	1.25	125	58	35	28.0	73	58.4	3	2.4	6	4.8		
Camp Pickett, Blackstone, Va.	37,653	do	Feb. 30, 1941	6.0	1.125	.40	1.50	1.50	1.50	4,111	4,111	347	8.4	2,865	69.7	28	.7	287	7.0	2.2	0.5
Camp Rucker, Ozark-Enterprise, Ala.	27,790	do	Jan. 21, 1942	14.0	1.00	.40	1.375	1.25	1.25	5,497	5,082	1,630	29.7	2,751	50.0	34	.6	41	.7	12	.2
Camp Swift, Bastrop, Tex.	22,612	do	Jan. 9, 1942	3.0	1.125	.40	1.50	1.50	1.25	2,013	435	617	30.7	1,022	50.8	3	.2				
Camp White, Medford, Oreg.	22,800	do	Feb. 20, 1942	1.0	1.30	.875	1.625	1.625	1.45	1,407	296	408	29.0	307	21.8	8	.6	4	.3	11	.8

CANTONMENT PROJECTS NOT STARTED

(Rates shown are rates authorized)

Camp Atterbury, Columbus, Ind.	$34,500	Lump sum			$1.30	$0.75	$1.50	$1.50	$1.50												
Camp Campbell, Hopkinsville, Ky.	25,000	do			1.15	.45	1.375	1.50	1.50												
Corvallis Triangular Division Camp, Oregon.	22,800	Not available			1.125	.75	1.50	1.50	1.45												
Camp Hood, Killeen, Tex.	22,000	do			1.125	.40	1.50	1.50	1.375												
Marysville Triangular Division Camp, California.	25,345	do			1.25	.85	1.50	1.5625	1.60												
Camp McCoy, Sparta, Wis.	30,000	do			1.15	.75	1.25	1.30	1.50												
Morganfield Triangular Division Camp, Kentucky.	30,000	do			1.25	.70	1.50	1.375	1.50												
Paris Triangular Division Camp, Texas.	30,000	do			1.125	.40	1.50	1.50	1.25												

CANTONMENT PROJECTS PRACTICALLY COMPLETED

(The data shown are for the peak month of employment)

Camp Chaffee, Ark.	$22,026	Lump sum	Sept. 12, 1941	69.0	$1.25	$0.50	$1.50	$1.50	$1.50	5,341	2,053	1,563	29.3	2,293	42.9	110	2.1	106	2.0	12	0.2
Camp Cook, Santa Maria, Lompoc, Calif.	21,304	do	Sept 10, 1941	92.0	1.175	.75	1.50	1.425	1.625	4,612	4,171	1,692	36.7	1,384	30.0	76	1.6	256	5.6	9	.2
Camp Crowder, Neosho, Mo.	24,270	Fixed fee	Sept. 1, 1941	93.0	1.00	.55	1.375	1.50	1.35	17,906	10,039	6,150	34.4	7,260	40.6	298	1.7	284	1.6	112	.6
Camp Gordon, Augusta, Ga.	16,286	do	Aug. 11, 1941	97.0	1.00	.30	1.00	1.50	1.25	12,713	12,284	6,024	47.4	3,890	30.6	130	1.0	58	.5	13	.1
Camp Tyson, Tenn.	11,866	do	Sept. 10, 1941	93.0	1.25	.45	1.375	1.50	1.25	7,375	7,368	2,150	29.2	3,482	47.2	108	1.5	191	2.6		

CANTONMENT PROJECTS STARTED IN 1940 AND COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 1941

(Data given as of April 1941)

Camp Barkeley, Tex.	$7,408	Fixed fee	Dec. 20, 1940	100.0	$1.125	$0.40	$1.50	$1.50	$1.375	104	(1)	13	12.5	49	47.1	2	1.9	3	2.9		
Camp Forrest, Tenn.	22,880	do	Oct. 3, 1940	100.0	1.25	.45	1.25	1.50	1.25	1,497	(1)	167	11.2	600	40.1	31	2.1	5	.3	1	0.1
Fort G. G. Mead, Md.	21,802	do	Sept. 30, 1940	100.0	1.25	.625	1.50	1.375	1.625	1,319	(1)	71	5.4	600	45.5	41	3.1	36	2.7		
Camp Roberts, Calif.	16,253	do	Nov. 18, 1940	100.0	1.125	.75	1.50	1.50	1.50	3,362	(1)	785	23.4	999	29.7	314	9.3	180	5.4	3	.1
Camp Wheeler, Ga.	10,197	do	Dec. 12, 1940	100.0	1.00	.30	1.00	1.50	1.25	324	(1)	8	2.5	138	42.6	12	3.7	15	4.6	1	.3
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.	37,123	do	Nov. 28, 1940	100.0	1.00	.55	1.25	1.25	1.35	13,513	(1)	4,745	35.1	5,386	39.9	48	.4	261	1.9		

[1] Not available.

TABLE X.—*Rates paid and employment other than cantonment construction*

ORDNANCE

Project name and location	Amount of construction (000 omitted)	Type of contract	Date work started	Percent completed as of Feb. 28, 1942	Hourly rates paid					Total over-all employment	Peak employment		Average number employed, week ending Feb. 21, 1942									
													Total all mechanics and laborers		Straight time employment							
															Carpenter		Laborer		Electrician		Plumber		Operator—shovel	
					Carpenter	Laborer	Electrician	Plumber	Operator—shovel		Number	Month	Straight time	Overtime	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alabama ordnance, Sylacauga, Ala.	$44,902	Fixed fee	Apr. 22, 1941	86.0	$1.125	$0.50	$1.50	$1.50	$1.50	37,636	21,298	Oct. 1941	9,979	790	1,630	16.3	2,790	28.0	455	4.6	167	1.7	7	0.1
	17,913	do	Sept. 10, 1941	28.0																				
Elwood ordnance plant, Joliet, Ill.	33,077	do	Nov 18, 1940	98.0	1.50	.90	1.501	.70	1.55	8,000	6,920	June 1941	3,176	2,909	393	12.4	1,521	47.9	277	8.7	14	.4	16	.5
	8,878	do	July 15, 1940	93.0																				
Morgantown ordnance works, Morgantown, W. Va.	13,881	do	Dec. 13, 1940	98.0	1.25	.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	11,182	4,427	Aug. 1941	1,774	1,523	116	6.5	339	19.1	96	5.4	76	4.3		
	7,226	do	July 29, 1941	42.0																				
St. Louis ordnance plant, St. Louis, Mo.	36,644	do	Jan. 11, 1941	99.0	1.50	.875	1.675	1.625	2.00	26,872	15,024	Sept. 1941	5,966	5,028	250	4.2	1,172	19.7	728	12.2	247	4.1	21	.4
	42,098	do	July 17, 1941	85.0																				
Seneca ordnance plant, Kendia, N. Y.	16,070	do	July 9, 1941	89.0	1.25	.70	1.25	1.375	1.75	17,747	7,054	Oct. 1941	394		35	8.9	200	50.8						

TABLE X.—*Rates paid and employment other than cantonment construction*—Continued

STORAGE

Project name and location	Amount of construction (000 omitted)	Type of contract	Date work started	Percent completed as of Feb. 28, 1942	Hourly rates paid					Total over-all employment	Peak employment		Average number employed, week ending Feb. 21, 1942									
													Total all mechanics and laborers		Straight time employment							
															Carpenter		Laborer		Electrician		Plumber		Operator shovel	
					Carpenter	Laborer	Electrician	Plumber	Operator-shovel		Number	Month	Straight time	Overtime	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alexandria Quartermaster Depot, Alexandria, Va.	$3,680	Fixed fee	Sept. 1, 1941	66.0	$1.625	$0.85	$1.80	$1.75	$2.00	2,434	1,147	Dec. 1941	608	144	75	12.3	387	63.7	----	----	----	----	1	0.2
New Orleans General Depot, New Orleans, La.	1,587	do	Aug. 1, 1941	76.0	1.25	.55	1.50	1.50	1.375	6,162	443	do	157	43	24	15.3	92	58.6	----	----	----	----	----	----
Oakland Port and General Depot, Oakland, Calif.	8,857	do	June 18, 1941	99.0	1.375	.875	1.50	1.50	1.75	3,035	2,359	Nov. 1941	1,022	218	114	11.2	394	38.6	23	2.3	18	1.8	17	1.7
	20,500	do	Dec. 15, 1941	8.0	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
San Antonio General Depot, San Antonio, Tex.	2,223	do	July 31, 1941	72.0	1.125	.50	1.50	1.50	1.25	2,794	1,418	Feb. 1942	1,418	321	174	12.3	873	61.6	----	----	5	.4	2	.1
Utah General Depot, Ogden, Utah.	5,791	Lump sum	Dec. 6, 1940	97.0	1.25	.75	1.25	1.375	1.50	7,452	1,188	Sept. 1941	519	43	105	20.2	202	38.9	4	.8	1	.2	4	.8

AIR CORPS

Fort Crook aircraft assembly plant, Nebr.	$12,159	Fixed fee	Mar. 3, 1941	99.0	$1.25	$0.55	$1.375	$1.375	$1.50	(1)	(1)	(1)	222	80	14	6.3	58	26.1	16	7.2	4	1.8	1	0.5
Mobile Air Depot (Brookley Field), Ala.	14,376	Lump sum	Aug. 6, 1940	61.0	1.125	.50	1.25	1.50	1.50	3,550	(1)	(1)	1,116	305	65	5.8	545	48.8	35	3.1	17	1.5	----	----
Hammer Field, Calif.	3,058	do	Mar. 24, 1941	57.0	1.25	.75	1.50	1.50	1.75	(1)	(1)	(1)	71	4	2	2.8	17	23.9	----	----	----	----	2	2.8
Tulsa aircraft assembly plant, Tulsa, Okla.	21,237	Fixed fee	May 7, 1941	84.0	1.25	.50	1.50	1.50	1.25	8,709	(1)	(1)	3,112	1,763	74	2.4	1,207	38.8	198	6.4	125	4.0	3	.1
Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass.	3,213	Lump sum	Mar. 1, 1941	86.0	1.25	.65	1.375	1.50	1.50	2,715	(1)	(1)	166	67	51	30.7	51	30.7	5	3.0	1	.6	3	1.8

[1]Not available.

Mr. REED. From the letter from General Robins, to which I have referred and which has been offered for insertion in the RECORD, and from the tables XX and X, computations have been made covering matters which I shall presently discuss.

To avoid repetition and shorten the RECORD, when I hereafter refer to the War Department, I have in mind the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

In my endeavor to obtain information I found that the War Department could, would, and did furnish information regarding the total employment of February 28, 1942 (See table accompanying letter from General Robins.) The total amount of money estimated as the cost of various types of construction, including projects completed, projects now under construction, and projects planned but only barely started or not yet started, aggregates $4,653,000,000. Employment as of February 28, 1942, is stated as 421,000 individuals.

I now come to a discussion of the amount of money required to be paid for the privilege of working on any of the projects being constructed by the War Department under authority of the United States for war purposes. It is hardly necessary to say that these projects are being paid for, and will be paid for, by succeeding generations, out of taxpayers' money. These plants, with possible negligible exceptions, are being operated on a closed-shop basis. That term is so frequently used that only brief explanation is necessary. The term "closed shop" means that before any citizen of the United States may work on a job where he applies he must belong to a labor organization having exclusive jurisdiction over employment on the project or in the shop where he seeks to work. These privileges are not extended as a courtesy.

The labor union controlling employment charges for them. How much the charges are will be discussed. What becomes of the money so collected nobody knows except the collecting labor union, and it does not tell anyone, not even its own members.

The War Department could give me much information as it concerned the financial and physical characteristics of its construction program. This information is largely contained in the letters and tables to which I have referred and which I have asked to have made a part of the RECORD.

The War Department could not give me information as to the membership fees or monthly or other periodical dues collected by the labor unions. All it could do was inform me that virtually all these projects were operated on a closed-shop basis; that as a matter of general knowledge, the Department knew union fees and dues were being collected; how much was collected from how many individuals the Department did not know.

I was told that possibly the contractors might furnish that information, but I had neither the time nor the facilities to contact the contractors on the projects. It is a task beyond my capacity as an individual Senator. However, I desire to inform the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, its chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the subcommittee appointed to consider Senate bill 2365, and its chairman, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], that all the material I have collected will be placed at their disposal; but I have only scratched the surface. I have no doubt that the subcommittee will make a diligent and thorough inquiry and will bring out information of tremendous importance and far-reaching consequence to the Nation.

I want now to discuss as briefly as I can some information that can be checked and verified from the letter and

printed tables provided for me by the War Department. From that letter and tables I have made some careful calculations, with rather startling results. The calculations and computations are mathematically correct. The extensive computations and calculations, being made from a partial showing of employment, are, of course, subject to some margin of error. All I claim for them is that they are fairly made and correctly computed on the best basis available.

Before proceeding to use the War Department figures as a basis of calculation, I want to insert some additional information regarding fees and dues alleged to have been collected from men in different classifications of employment and different crafts. The statements I have made about the Kansas Ordnance plant near Parsons were obtained by me personally by contact with the contractor and members of the various organizations. My personal knowledge does not extend beyond the Kansas plant. The War Department could not help me on this phase. Therefore, I have depended upon newspaper reports for information as to what has been done elsewhere.

In the special dispatch to the New York Times from Fort George G. Meade, Md., dated March 21, 1941, Byron Darnton stated that applicants for employment as carpenters were required to pay $57.50, and applicants for employment as laborers were required to pay $25. It was stated that payment could be made in installments.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 9, 1941, stated that a membership fee of $56.50 was charged for initial employment as a laborer on the plants being constructed in the vicinity of St. Louis, and an additional grab of $25 was made to insure steady employment.

The Philadelphia Inquirer of April 6, 1941, stated that applicants for employment as a carpenter were required to pay $50 at Indiantown Gap, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer of April 7, 1941, stated that $80 was required as an initial fee at Fort Dix, N. J., and that a local charge of $30 was also made.

The Providence Bulletin of April 9, 1941, stated that a charge of $75 was made as a prerequisite for employment as a carpenter and $25 for employment as a laborer at Camp Edwards, Mass.

In order that there may be no question about these allegations, I am asking that the newspaper articles from which this information was obtained be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I am desirous that the Senate and the public of the United States shall know the source of my information and the basis upon which the calculations to which I refer have been made.

(The articles referred to appear at the conclusion of Mr. REED'S remarks.)

THE BASIS OF CALCULATION

In making computations and calculations as to the amount of money collected by the several labor organizations from employees of the contractors on the construction projects as a prerequisite to employment I start with the figure of maximum total employment given in the War Department's letter of March 21, wherein it is stated as 259,000 individuals actually working in September 1941. Membership fees, however, were charged from all people employed, regardless of the length of employment. It is therefore necessary to determine the turn-over of employment. I therefore proceed to table X and compare figures shown in the column entitled "Total Over-all Employment" as against those shown in the adjoining column, "Peak of employment." The result shows a turn-over of 92.9 percent. In other words, the total number of people hired is 192.9 percent of the peak employment at any time. For the purpose of this computation, a turn-over of 90 percent was assumed to be fair. It is impossible for me to break down the turnover figures as between classifications of employment, and I am not undertaking to do so, as I have no basis from which to calculate. I have used 90 percent as an average.

I have no doubt that this figure is not equally applicable to all classifications. I would assume, without being able to verify the assumption, that the turnover is higher for common laborers, carpenters, and truck drivers, than it was for other classifications, but 90 percent has been used for all. This factor is used only on membership fees, and not on dues. Calculation as to the amount of dues collected is confined to the average actual employment, disregarding the labor turnover reflected in the difference between the columns. For the purpose of calculating membership fees, I use the figure of $25 per individual for common laborers; $25 for truck drivers; $50 for carpenters; $100 for electricians; and $100 for plumbers.

At my request, the Office of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, made a break-down of employment by classification, as shown in tables X and XX. Also shown in these two tables are figures relative to 41 different construction jobs. I had no part in the selection of the jobs. They were selected after a conference with the Chief of Engineers' Office, and based upon my request that representative plants be selected.

I ascertained that the percentage of employment shown in different classifications, computed from the figures shown in the tables, are as follows:

	Percent
Common labor	38.7
Carpenters	18.2
Truck drivers	11.9
Electricians	2.8
Plumbers	2.6

The Office of the Chief of Engineers did not give me the data regarding the number of truck drivers. That figure is taken from a break-down by classification of the Kansas ordnance plant near Parsons, where the truck drivers were 11.9 percent of the total number of persons employed by contractors on February 17, 1942. I think this percentage is, perhaps, below the average. Only a further detailed investigation could disclose the facts. I realize the margin of error possible in making calculations from a narrow basis such as is used in this instance.

I applied these percentages to the total number of people hired in order to ascertain the collection of membership fees.

I then proceeded to compute the dues collected. For this purpose, I used a figure based upon the average construction period, which is approximately 12 months. Usually this period is exceeded, with employment below the peak at the beginning and at the end.

Using the method described, I reached these results: Taking the basis of 529,000 individuals given by the War Department as being employed in September 1941, and extended by 90 percent to cover turn-over, I find that 1,005,100 individuals were hired in the plants subject to the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, War Department. On this basis was calculated the membership fees, using the sums heretofore stated.

Coming, now, to the number of people from whom dues were collected, or could have been collected, for the construction period, for which 12 months is used, I found employment in the several classifications to be as follows:

Laborers	264,723
Carpenters	96,278
Truck drivers	62,951
Electricians	15,312
Plumbers	13,754
Total	393,018

Against this number of employees, I calculated collections that were made, or could have been made, on the basis outlined herein. I do not know how much was actually collected. Nobody knows but the labor union officers, and they do not tell anyone, not even the members of their unions. They do not have to report to anyone, and the only way to disclose the exact amount would be through a thorough and exhaustive investigation, which I have had neither the time nor facilities to make.

Coming now to the amounts involved, I find that in membership fees and in dues for a 12-month period, the following amounts were collected or could have been collected:

Hod carriers, building, and common laborers' union	$14,637,697
Carpenters	7,124,575
Truck drivers	4,820,703
Electricians	2,082,432
Plumbers	1,705,496
Total	30,370,903

Again I desire to take precaution against being misunderstood. I do not know how much was collected. I do know that at the Kansas ordnance plant being constructed near my home town of Parsons, Kans., no man falling within the classifications named, or in other classifications where employment is controlled by a labor organization, was permitted to go to work unless he was in good standing in the union controlling employment in that particular classification, nor was he permitted to continue employment unless he kept his dues paid up.

There have been frequent charges that men were hired and shortly fired after a few days' work in order to collect dues from other men to be hired in their places. Rumors to that effect were numerous during the time I was at home, and several men came to see me and told me personally that this had been their experience. How general this practice, I do not know. I do know that I have been told of numerous instances where this outrageous practice was followed. Some of these statements were made by men who claimed personal knowledge of the fact. I was told of a practice in effect in a plant in Louisiana where a charge of $25 was made as a local fee where a man was already a member of the carpenters' union. A charge of $50 was made on men who were not members of the union. Most of the latter class of men were really not carpenters, but farm hands, laborers, or clerks. Waiting lists of both experienced and inexperienced men were kept. Preference was given in hiring to the inexperienced list because of the higher fee involved. There is basis for a belief that this practice was quite generally followed in many different classifications. My direct information on this point covers laborers, truck drivers, and carpenters.

The calculations I have made are based upon the best information obtainable. The results show the potential collections. How nearly the labor unions came to reaching 100 percent of the potential in their actual collections, I would not undertake to say. These figures on the surface appear fantastic, but the whole labor scheme of employment in these plants was fantastic. This is Government work, paid for with taxpayers' money out of the Public Treasury. Waste, extravagance, slowdowns, overtime, and inefficiency were rife in virtually all plant construction. Calculations from information available on tables X and XX show that 44.5 percent of all employees received overtime payments. The labor policy adopted was undemocratic and not in keeping with the tradition of this country.

There never was the slightest reason for using the 100-percent closed-shop method on common labor. This is the lowest-paid class of people employed. Taking from this low-paid labor, whose wages and working conditions were already fixed by the Department of Labor, substantial sums as a prerequisite for employment, and collecting substantial monthly dues, is an outrage upon decency and fairness. Men who prate of their devotion to the laboring men, and of their loyalty to their Government, and of their patriotism, should be ashamed to be guilty of such practices, or to defend such practices. Organized labor universally expresses objection to a general sales tax. Any thinking man can easily appreciate the reason for this attitude. A general sales tax does impose a disproportionate burden upon the lower income classes of citizens, but the total that would be taken from this class of citizen by any reasonable tax would be less than is being taken from the same people by unnecessary and parasitic labor unions.

The Kansas Ordnance Plant near Parsons is operated as a closed-shop plant, with the exception of clerical employees, guards, watchmen, and so forth. Notwithstanding that it is a Government project, closed-shop restrictions are tighter than in private industry as a whole. The closed shop is forbidden by law on railroads—see Railway Labor Act of 1934, as amended. The general Printing Office of the Government in Washington, the largest printing office in the world, is operated entirely on the open-shop principle. I am informed by the Department of Labor that there is practically no closed shop in the great steel industry; that the aircraft industry is only 15-percent closed shop; that the automobile industry is only 25-percent closed shop; the shipbuilding industry, only 60 percent. Only in coal mining is there substantially 100-percent closed shop. The term "closed shop" here includes agreements for a union shop, and the Department of Labor informs me that its figures are based upon the working agreements now in operation covering closed shops and union shops. My convictions on this basic policy are expressed in the provisions of S. 2365 which is now in the Senate Committee on Judiciary.

To the attention of that committee and the subcommittee which it has appointed, I earnestly commend these figures as a basis for their investigation. I do not claim that it is more than a basis. I do claim that it is a basis.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the fact that these laboring people, the lowest paid class of men engaged in work on these tremendous construction projects, were handled 100 percent upon the closed-shop basis, whereas in industry, as a whole, on the railroads, a closed shop is forbidden by statute; it hardly obtains at all, according to the Department of Labor, in the steel industry; it is only 15 percent in the aircraft industry and 25 percent in the automobile industry. Yet these Government construction projects, by some distortion of principle and by some fantastic conception of somebody somewhere, God only knows, I do not know, were operated 100 percent on a closed-shop basis. This is the way men get a job near my home town: A contractor wanted 50 or 100 or 200 common laborers. He telephoned to the employment office, which was normally a State employment office, but virtually it was a part of the Federal employment service. The employment office telephoned to the hod-carriers' union, and sent to the contractor only the names certified from the hod-carriers' union to the employment office as being members in good standing of that racketeering union, and the contractor employed only such men whose names were sent to him in that way. If there has ever been an outrage committed upon the people of the United States, and particularly upon the working people of the United States, that is it.

I desire to hurry on. The majority leader and the minority leader were kind enough to give me right-of-way against a call of the calendar, and I shall conclude in a few moments. I wish, however, to say to my fellow Senators that there has been no more important subject discussed on this floor in the 3 years and a little more of my service here than I am bringing to the attention of the Senate this morning.

Mr. President, obtaining these figures and the computations and calculations necessary has been a heavy task. I have performed it in what I consider to be the public interest. It is proper to call attention to the fact that the classifications used to determine the number of individuals employed represents only 74.2 percent of the total employment. The remaining 25.8 percent included many skilled craftsmen who were required to be members of their craft organizations before they could be employed. The percentage of omitted employment also may include "white-collar" workers in clerical service, watchmen, guards, and so forth, who probably were not members of any labor organization and did not, therefore, have to pay for their employment.

The total collected as stated above is not a total potential collection. Such a total would include the craftsmen who were members of labor organizations. Nonorganized membership should, of course, not be considered.

I desire to offer an illustration of effects of these practices upon the taxpayer. I think this illustration will be of especial interest to my fellow citizens of Kansas. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, the citizens and corporations of the State of Kansas paid to the Federal Government the sum of $28,414,647.13. I obtained from the Bureau of Internal Revenue a break-down of Federal taxes paid by citizens of Kansas for that year. I ask permission to have this table inserted as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Federal tax collections for the State of Kansas, fiscal year 1941

Income:	
Individual	$5,074,989.80
Corporation	6,598,503.98
Excess profits	229,215.00
Unjust enrichment	408,815.63
Capital-stocks tax	836,613.38
Estate taxes	1,257,556.36
Gift taxes	$99,365.58
Distilled spirits	134,182.45
Tobacco (excise)	17,678.53
Oleomargarine	104,259.48
Narcotic	6,051.00
Marijuana	4.00
Stamp taxes (documents, cards, etc.)	96,979.24
Manufacturers' excise taxes	5,375,901.68
Amusement taxes	216,839.74
Club dues and initiation	25,252.41
Social-security taxes	7,701,362.00
Bituminous-coal taxes	29,431.70
Sugar-processing taxes	92,017.39
Telegraph-telephone taxes	52,017.00
Leased-wires taxes	116.00
Pipe-line taxes	47,447.00
Safe-deposit taxes	20,435.00
Total	28,414,647.13

Mr. REED. My fellow citizens will, I think, be greatly interested in the fact

that the collection of labor organizations for permission to work on a Government project, paid for by taxpayers' money, exceeded the total Federal tax payments of the citizens of Kansas for the fiscal year named. This will come as a rude surprise to the people of Kansas, and other States, but is a fair illustration of the effect of one form of extortion on the taxpayer.

I wish to discuss briefly some of the characteristics of the labor organization which I have shown collected, or could have collected, the largest amount for the privilege to work on Government projects paid for with taxpayers' money. I refer to the racketeering organization named the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America. I offer for the record, to be printed at the close of my remarks, four articles by Westbrook Pegler, and published in the Washington Post on January 27, 29, 30, and 31 1941.

(The articles referred to appear at the conclusion of Mr REED's remarks.)

Mr. President, I realize that it might be said Mr. Pegler is an extremist on this question. In Mr. Pegler's behalf it should be said that he has performed a distinct public service in his exposé of racketeering practices by this and other racketeering organizations and racketeers. But to support Mr. Pegler in what he has written about this obnoxious organization, I bring a witness whose fairness and impartiality nobody will question.

Mr. Pegler charged that the International Hod Carriers' organization had not held a convention for 30 years, the last convention being in 1911. Mr. Pegler also charged that the present president was selected by the executive committee in 1926, without any vote by the membership, and he had retained his office, without any affirmative action by the membership, up until the time Mr. Pegler's articles were written, a period of some 15 years.

I quote now from Louis Stark, a reporter on the New York Times. Mr. Stark is widely known in newspaper circles and among labor organizations as the foremost newspaper reporter handling labor topics and as a specialist in that particular field of reporting. From St. Louis on September 15, 1941, Mr. Stark sent a message to the New York Times which was printed on the following day. He opens his dispatch with this language:

> The International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America opened its first convention in 30 years here today.

Apparently there are some honest men in this organization. Mr. Stark sent dispatches from St. Louis about an insurgent group. Apparently about 60 locals were included in this group. This group, according to Mr. Stark, appealed to William Green, the weak president of the American Federation of Labor, to support them in their effort to bring honesty into the management of this union Mr. Stark wrote:

> After a private session at his hotel with delegates who said that they represented 60 locals, at which he said that he could not take sides and support their antiracketeering resolution, Mr. Green addressed the 1,200 delegates in their first convention in 30 years.

Of this address, Mr. Stark wrote on September 16, 1941:

> William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appeared before a turbulent session of the convention of the International Hod Carriers, Building, and Common Laborers Union today and warmly praised the top union officials, who had just been accused by antiadministration delegates of "railroading" the adoption of a set of rules in undemocratic fashion.

In a later dispatch from St. Louis, dated September 19, in the New York Times, Mr. Stark wrote:

> The International Hod Carriers, Building, and Common Laborers Union of America adopted a resolution today condemning racketeers, but the convention refused to go on record as barring from office those found guilty of racketeering, embezzlement, or larceny of funds.

Mr. President, it is unbelievable that a convention would adopt a resolution condemning racketeering and yet refuse to exclude embezzlers and thieves from holding office.

In the New York Times of December 1, 1941, some months after the convention at St. Louis, appeared this language. I quote:

> William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, was asked yesterday by leaders of the union of sand hogs here to restrain the International Hod Carriers Building, and Common Laborers Union from proceeding with an expulsion action against the local group, which has been in the forefront of a movement to oust racketeers from positions of influence in the parent union
>
> After 2 days of secret hearings, before a trial board in Washington, Charles Moore, president of the group of sand hogs, and Brian Feeney, the local business representative, called upon Mr Green to "stop this scandalous reprisal against the sand hogs because of their fight to purge their ranks of racketeer influence.

I declare that the International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers Union is a stench in the nostrils of honest men, whether they belong to labor organizations or not. It is the nearest complete grafting organization of any within my knowledge. Its management and practices are shot through with fraud on common laborers, the lowest-paid men belonging to any of the building trades organizations.

The subcommittee investigating will get valuable information from the district, State, and Federal prosecuting officers in New York, St Louis, and other places about the racketeering, embezzling, and larcenous methods followed by officers of the Hod Carriers' organization, who have been indicted by grand juries in various places, and who are held up as horrible examples of the worst that can happen in labor organizations.

This rotten international is not the only one affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Along with other men who try to be fair, I think that the vast majority of members of organizations within the American Federation of Labor are honest and patriotic citizens. It is a shame that the great national federation of labor organizations should permit racketeering and racketeers to the extent that it does permit them. Honest, courageous leadership would demand a house cleaning. Unfortunately, the American Federation of Labor does not now possess such leadership.

From some sources will come the cry that what I have said comes from an antilabor Senator. On that subject, I want to make a brief statement. All my life I have not only defended, but advocated the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. I have gone so far as to constantly uphold the right of men to strike for the purpose of improving their wages and working conditions. I have no sympathy with jurisdictional strikes and think they should be discontinued by the rules of labor organizations themselves. Surely jurisdictional questions can be settled by conflicting organizations under a formula which even a modest amount of ability in labor leadership could form.

It is unfortunate for labor and labor organizations that they have not done this. I accept the "closed shop" policy where it is adopted by agreement in privately operated business. In my private publishing business, I have maintained a "closed shop" contract with the Typographical Union for 35 years. The "closed shop" is debatable in principle and can be used as a weapon of extortion and oppression. It is being so used in many cases. It is not a matter for sweeping generalization.

One of the official publications of the United Mine Workers of America, the District 50 News, printed a story on March 15, 1942, that the break of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America with President Roosevelt came because of the failure of the Roosevelt administration to pass a mine-inspection bill as promptly as it should have been passed. On that point, I desire to call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1940, on pages 766 to 778, inclusive, where will be found the debate in the Senate on Senate bill 2420, known as the mine-inspection bill. That bill was favorably reported by the Mines and Mining Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member. In that committee it had been carefully rewritten. The principal part of the rewriting was done by the late Senator Logan, of Kentucky, chairman of the committee, and myself. I offer the debate preceding passage of the bill, of which I carried a major part, against any charge of unfriendliness to organized labor.

When H. R. 4139, the Smith bill, passed the House of Representatives on December 3, 1941, labor officials immediately descended upon Washington to oppose the passage of that bill in the Senate. I received numerous letters and telegrams from labor organizations in Kansas asking me to oppose it. I first carefully examined the so-called Smith bill and wrote or wired all inquirers that I

would oppose it as it passed the House. I reached this conclusion for two reasons:

First. That the bill was defective within itself and was a horrible example of what can happen, and what did happen in this instance, when an important bill is extensively amended or rewritten from the floor.

Second. The bill, even if perfected, was, in my judgment, too drastic and imposed too many restrictions upon labor organizations.

I have not examined and, consequently, am not familiar with the present bills now pending in the House of Representatives known as the Smith or Smith-Vinson bills, and therefore have not arrived at any conclusion regarding them. If they should pass the House of Representatives, I will, of course, give them my most careful study and be guided by my best judgment as to action thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking the Senator to yield merely because there is a unanimous-consent agreement in effect, and if the Senator does not yield to me before he finishes, we will be on the calendar. I desire to say a few words before the Senator reaches his concluding paragraph, if he will be good enough to yield.

Mr. REED. I do not like to be discourteous; I wish I could yield to the Senator from Wyoming, but I was granted the courtesy, by the majority leader and the minority leader, of having the consideration of the calendar postponed in order to enable me to make this address. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming would not want me to do anything which would seem to be in bad faith with the majority and minority leaders. I wish I could yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am willing to impose restrictions upon some labor practices, but I want to preserve fair and honest labor organizations in full health and vigor so that they may protect the interests of their members which, I think, is in the general public interest.

We all labor in one way or another. A substantial portion of men who labor belong to labor organizations. So long as the policies of these organizations do not conflict with the general public interest, I have favored them. With me, the public interest has always come first, and will always come first. It is only when such a conflict arises that labor loses my support. It will always be so. Whenever I am unable to support my country first and subordinate any minority group to the general welfare, I will retire from public life.

If this can be deemed a statement of a man unfavorable to labor, I can only regret it. Whenever labor loses the support of men holding the views I have outlined above, it will be on the road to losing many of the gains that have been accomplished only by the support of this class of men.

Number of jobs, estimated cost, and employment, military construction program, under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers July 1, 1941, through Feb. 28, 1942

Item	Number of jobs	Estimated cost	Employment as of Feb. 28, 1942
All types (total)	1,064	$4,653,000,000	-------
Not started	193	767,000,000	-------
Under construction	321	1,922,000,000	421,000
Completed	550	1,964,000,000	-------
Troop housing facilities (total)	473	1,553,000,000	-------
Not started	62	181,000,000	-------
Under construction	[1]88	510,000,000	93,000
Completed	323	862,000,000	-------
Ordnance manufacturing and storage facilities (total)	157	1,769,000,000	-------
Not started	42	347,000,000	-------
Under construction	[2]62	681,000,000	200,000
Completed	53	741,000,000	-------
Air Corps facilities (total)	262	916,000,000	-------
Not started	36	152,000,000	-------
Under construction	132	482,000,000	75,000
Completed	94	282,000,000	-------
Other facilities (general hospitals and special branch (other than ordnance) depots) (total)	172	415,000,000	-------
Not started	53	87,000,000	-------
Under construction	39	249,000,000	53,000
Completed	80	79,000,000	-------

[1] Includes 24 jobs providing facilities for more than 10,000 troops.

[2] Includes 33 ordnance jobs, costing more than $5,000,000.

[From the Washington Post of March 23, 1941]

NORRIS' LETTER ON UNION FEES

This is the text of Senator NORRIS' letter to William Green concerning the practice of collecting what he called "perfectly outrageous" fees from defense workers. It is slightly different from a letter he sent to Philip Murray and includes all that he wrote to the Congress for Industrial Organizations president.

DEAR MR. GREEN: I am continually getting reports from laboring men who are seeking jobs on Government projects. These reports are to the effect that in order to get the job they have to join the union, and that when they join the union, they have to pay admission fees running as high as $250. Usually the admission fee is much less than this but I have two letters on my desk now, just received, and in one case the applicant had to pay, it is said, $150. In another case, he had to pay $50.

I know many of these reports are exaggerated, and some of them are entirely untrue, of course, but the general public is getting the idea that laboring men have to pay exorbitant fees to join a union, and that these fees are taken out of their salary, as they work. I have investigated some of these cases and some of them are true. I have taken it up with several labor leaders, some of them in my own State, and I want to say to their credit that I have never talked with a single one but what he has condemned this practice, although all of them admit to me it is in vogue in a great many places in the country, and that local unions are taking advantage of the situation and of their own fellow laborers to charge them admission fees to the union, fees which are frequently perfectly outrageous.

COMPLAINTS CONTINUE

My understanding is that the local union controls this matter. I am firmly of the belief that the general impression has gone out over the country that advantage is being taken by the unions to charge exorbitant fees to join unions, in order to get jobs.

Complaints are continually coming in. Some of them are not well founded and are based entirely upon hearsay, but the thing that worries me is that the general public is getting an erroneous idea of this situation but an idea nevertheless which has many instances of well-founded cases where laboring men have been held up by the labor unions themselves.

Of course it is not necessary for me to tell you what effect this will have on the general situation, if the country as a whole is going to get this idea. The pendulum will swing the other way, if it has not already gone quite a distance in that direction, until the general public will have the idea that labor unions themselves are holding up the laboring man. If this idea becomes general, cranks, crooks, and dishonorable men will take advantage of it, and it will do the laboring man a great injustice, in my opinion.

CONGRESS MAY ACT

I am wondering if you, as head of the American Federation of Labor, cannot take some action which will stop this erroneous opinion, and which will also stop the practice wherever it is applied. I am writing you as one who has always believed in the labor movement. I do not want Congress to have to pass legislation in regard to this which may be injurious to labor's cause, but if this continues, and the rumor continues to spread and to grow, I am satisfied Congress is going to be called on to take action in regard to it. I fear that action will not be what I think or what I believe you think ought to be done.

When I was at home in Nebraska, I had a conversation with the head of an electrical union and I told him of the reports I had received in regard to his own union. He admitted frankly to me that it had occurred. He said, however, he condemned it just as much as anybody could. He thought it was wrong; that it was doing the labor movement a great deal of harm, and he would like to see it stopped. However, I gathered from him that he had no authority to do so, because the local unions controlled it entirely.

Mr. Roy M. Brewer, of Grand Island, Nebr., a president of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor, is a man with whom I have been acquainted for a great many years. I have worked with him on many occasions. I have formed a very high opinion of him. Our work together has been mutually satisfactory, and I think these facts worried him considerably.

It seems to be conceded there are grounds for this rumor. The public looks at it in its exaggerated form, however. It is bad enough if there is even one instance where this occurs. But it will be much worse if the general public is given to understand that such a practice is universal.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. NORRIS.

INTERNATIONAL HOD CARRIERS' BUILDING AND COMMON LABORERS' UNION OF AMERICA—LOCAL NO. 193,
Coffeyville, Kansas, July 10, 1941.

Hon. CLYDE REED,
Care of Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to call your attention to a very disagreeable situation existing in Kansas on Defense Projects. Kansas City, Missouri still has a few remnants of the old Pendergast machine, under which regime Labor Unions fell into the hands of Labor rackateers. Now that Kansas City has been cleaned up to a certain extent, these rackateer elements have moved into Kansas. They dominated defense work at Fort Riley and Manhattan to the disgust of all fair-minded unionists in Kansas and we are

determined to avoid any such tactics being repeated on other Defense work in Kansas.

The short time between now and the start of the work on the New Shell Loading plant at Parsons, Kansas, make it imperative that immediate and vigorous protests from all parties concerned should be filed with all International Union Officers, requesting that all Kansas City elements be kept out of the picture and let local unions in this District work out their programs direct and in co-operation with their own International Unions. This method will re-establish confidence of local unions in their own Union Officials and get far better results than to attempt to follow the unsavory methods of former Pendergast henchmen no matter how clean, on the surface, their own actions may appear to be.

As ample evidence of serious danger from the above source, we need only mention that at Fort Riley, men were forced line-up in a manner similar to the old "bread lines" and pay a $2.00 fee to even get a chance to find out if there was a job available for them. Some crafts had to pay a slightly larger fee in order to get an examining board to act on them, and then would be put to work for a few days, and if another bunch of "suckers" were on hand, the ones alread at work would be given a bunch of blue-prints and told to do a certain job which was impossible for him unless per chance he had a college education, and then this "sucker" workman would be discharged if he failed.

Very few experienced mechanics are "blue print" men as that is the Foreman's work, and this alone proves that something was seriously wrong at Fort Riley and Manhattan.

In order to forestall anything of this sort on Defense work in the Tri-State Area, representative of local unions chartered by the Hodcarriers, Building and Common Laborers International Union, in the Tri-State District met last January and took steps to form a District Council. Apparently our International Union Officials, acted on information, the source of which we do not know and turned our application down without giving us any information as to reasons.

Instead we find a former Business agent from Kansas City, during Pendergast's rackateer days, installing a charter with miscellaneous WPA workers and other non-tradesmen as signers to the application for charter. None of the long established locals in this district were consulted as to this matter, but were told in true Pendergast manner that this man had set up a local and would handle matters. Thus it appears that local Unions, who have held charters since the International Union of Hodcarriers was organized, could not be trusted or consulted in matters of vital concern to their trade, but that a bunch of WPA workers of miscellaneous backgrounds, under control of a Kansas City Business Agent acting as financial secretary could be trusted. The usual and proper method when installing a new charter for a local union is for the members to select all officials from their own number, but that would not suit any racketeering elements as they always have to get their hands on the money

Recently, a local union of Truck drivers received a visit from a Kansas City individual claiming to have authority from the International Union which he could not show, and with him was a Kansas City man, which he tryed to install as Business Agent of the local union.

Another happening which tends to show that subversive elements are at work locally in an attempt to undermine the faith of the local labor unions in their own International Union Officers is the recent experience of the Retail Clerk local union. This union, with approval of an International Union Official and in co-operation with the Coffeyville Central Labor attempted to adjust certain labor difficulties with a well known "chain store" and were forced to place a picket on same. Most of the local stores had already signed up with the local union but this "chain store" wanted "special consideration" and refused to sign the same contract as accepted by the other stores. Then, to the surprise and amazement of all concerned, the local union received instructions from their International Union Officers to immediately remove this store from the unfair list, etc. We hear a good bit about co-operation from the Clerks Union as well as others but seldom do we find anyone getting such a deliberate and vicious slap in the face from those who received the co-operation asked for. Truly, something must be wrong somewhere or all of these happenings would not be taking place at about the same time.

Such methods destroy faith and efficiency of the individual worker in the same manner that corrupt politics destroys faith in our Democratic form of Government Furthermore, such methods are seldom adopted except by selfish and unprincipaled leaders, who would willingly sacrifice the interests of those they pretend to represent as well as the best interests of the Country by delaying Defense work should it happen to be to their own personal benefit to do so

Ordinarily, these matters could be aired and adjusted through regular channels as provided by the Labor Union, but in this case the time is too short to permit this and the matters at issue are of too much importance to all parties concerned to permit of any delay in taking adequate action to get matters adjusted. Apparently, the International Union Officers concerned took it for granted that all others are just as honest as they are, and being extremely busy have ignored all protests.

Therefore, we believe that we are in order when we ask you to file vigorous protests with the International Unions concerned, as it appears that someone is making a concerted, subversive and deliberately intended move to cause dissension and distrust in local labor circles and between the various local unions and their own International Union Officers and thus prevent if possible, the full fledged co-operation on Defense Work which has been promised by the American Federation of Labor and which we wish to carry out in the true Democratic manner which is our countries heritage We also feel confident that all Internationals, if they know the true facts would co-operate with their own local unions to work out their problems locally where ever possible If the present policies as above mentioned are continued, serious difficulties are certain to develop in connection with Defense work in this District and we would very much like to have this ironed out prior to the start of this work.

We are anxious to co-operate with both our own International Union Officers, and the American Federation of Labor in adjusting all matters pertaining to Defense work, but cannot do so effectively unless those who have been placed high in Positions of trust in our Unions will work with us. We welcome all assistance and co-operation possible from our own International Union Officers, but cannot accept the dictorial methods of Kansas City racketeers as co-operation. Furthermore we are certain that all Business and Political elements in the District are behind us in this.

A local union composed of new members who are not familiar with union Business methods, and who have been tricked into accepting an outside racketeer as business agent and Financial-Secretary-Treasurer, can be nothing more than camouflage for whatever subversive interests are being served. An outsider with no local interests or concern would be inclined to give preference to outside labor and leave local labor in the District to be taken care of by the various Relief agencies while outside labor does the work. Besides, outside labor is more easily handled by racketeers as they have no local connections. Therefore we ask you to assist in getting rid of all subversive labor elements, by bringing this matter to the direct attention of the Union Officers concerned.

Until such time as Officials of International Unions concerned can lay before us undisputed evidence that officials and members of long standing local unions are incompetent or dishonest, we are within our rights in demanding the full control of matters concerning our trade to which our membership entitles us We are just as much entitled to a District Council Charter in order to handle our Business as are the 30 or more districts who have Charters already established. This we believe to be the best method of handling the business which will necessarily come before our various local unions in this District and at the same time will make it impossible for labor racketeers to secure a foothold.

Thanking you in Advance for any assistance we remain Fraternally yours.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
PITTSBURG, KANS., *August 20, 1941.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: Since the government decided to build some defense industried in Southeastern Kansas, certain craft organization, affiliated with the A. F. of L., have been selling union membership cards. However, these cards are just sold to certain people whom they like, and then these people are given preferential employment throughout the entire United States. Hundreds of people have had to pay from $25.00 up in order to secure employment on government projects. These craft organizations are now busy in our part of the State, selling union cards to men, leading them to believe that they have to buy these cards, at an exhorbitant price, from their organization. A certain amount is paid down and the rest paid when they secure employment. This, we claim, is unreasonable

As has been the past history of government projects, men would have to secure one of these cards in order to secure employment. Our organization does not believe that this Government should stand for such methods of hi-jacking in order that men may secure employment, especially on these government projects.

We have hundreds of men here in Southeastern Kansas who are members of the United Mine Workers of America and other C. I. O. affiliate organizations. If conditions are put into effect here in Kansas, which conditions have existed in other government projects, these hundreds of men who are taxpayers here in this territory will be unable to secure employment on government projects in this field. During the past few months the A. F. of L. craft organizations have had men running around this territory selling membership into the Union. They have picked the men to whom they sell this membership. Along with other members of my organization, I do not believe that this is fair. We believe that every man should have the right to secure employment from the contractor on his own merits and then, as a free American citizen, should select whatever labor organization he may want to join. As stated above, through the methods employed by these craft organizations, hundreds of ablebodied men are kept out of employment

It is rumored that the Kansas City organization (A. F. of L.) is going to have jurisdic-

tion over the plant at Parsons. If so, men will be sent into this territory from Kansas City to take employment which should belong to men who live here.

Then, on the other project—ammonium plant—which is going to be in and around Crestline, the Joplin, Missouri, A. F. of L. organization claims jurisdiction over and probably men from Missouri will be sent into Kansas—through the pretense of having membership in the A. F. of L. organization and our people will still be left without any employment.

I believe that the Government should make an investigation into this entire matter. People should be given the right to secure employment on their merits and join whatever labor union they want to join. At least, they should be free American citizens to do as they please under the Constitution of the United States. I hope that you will be successful in getting the Government to straighten out these conditions, which have been imposed upon the people of this country—especially their having to pay exhorbitant fees for joining a union and then having to pay unreasonable dues each month so that a man may be able to make an honest living. I think if an investigation was made that all of these injustices mentioned above could be remedied.

Thanking you for your past cooperation, I am

Yours very truly,

HENRY ALLAI,
President, District 14.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS.,
September 29, 1941.

Hon. CLYDE REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to call your attention to a situation now existing in southeastern Kansas relative to employment on all defense projects wherein the provisions of the Wagner Labor Act are being violated either through collusion between certain Governmental departments and the American Federation of Labor or through a misapprehension as to the intent and purpose of the Federal statutes.

Labor has been granted the right to join a Union of its own choosing and in so far as we are able to ascertain, neither the spirit nor the letter of the law provides that if an individual does not join the American Federation of Labor, he should be barred from working on a Government defense project. Yet the fact remains that the members of the United Construction Workers, CIO, are being and have been repeatedly refused employment or any consideration for employment on any and all defense projects in this area.

This is true on the Shell Loading Plant at Parsons and now it seems as though it might be true on the Ammonia Nitrate Plant located near Baxter Springs, as we have been informed on rather reliable authority that all contractors are receiving instructions from the War Department to employ nothing but AFofL labor on these projects.

We have a letter signed by Mr. Sidney Hillman, Mabor Director of the OPM, to the effect that the individual contractor shall be the sole judge as to which Union he prefers on the construction of such projects. Yet, notwithstanding this ruling by the OPM and notwithstanding another ruling by the War Department wherein common labor on the defense projects in this area shall be open shop, the AFofL is continuing to charge exorbant initiation fees and refusing to accept any CIO members for employment.

Due to the fact that there are thousands of unemployed men in southeastern Kansas unable to pay an exorbitant initiation fee and at the same time there are thousands of members of the CIO, who, in all honesty of purpose and in compliance with the Federal law, joined a Union of their own choosing, yet they are being discriminated against through some combination of circumstances and individuals, and we feel that some steps should be taken, either through a senatorial investigation, or other legal means to ascertain why any Governmeutal agency or department would be a party to a violation of a Federal law.

Since the American Federation of Labor has been granted sole jurisdiction over the Shell Loading Plant at Parsons and now has the thing in a muddle to where hundreds of individuals have paid anywhere from $12.50 to $125, and wherein a man that puts his individual truck to work must surrender the title to same after it has earned a certain appraised value Very few of them have as yet obtained employment, and dozens upon dozens are sitting around Parsons slowly starving to death.

The CIO United Construction Workers charges a maximum fee of $5, which includes one month's dues and thereafter the monthly dues is a total of $2 In addition, we operate as one unit on any construction job, and we feel like since we have the required personnel to handle any project, that our of pure simple justice to the thousands of unemployed in this district, both skilled and unskilled, that the CIO should be granted sole jurisdiction over the Ammonia Nitrate Plant at Baxter Springs, and if it is true that the War Department has issued behind-the-scenes instructions to contractors to employ nothing but AFofL, that this be changed.

Please investigate this matter and advise. The above is being carried out as part of the instructions of the officers and executive board of local 315 United Construction Workers, CIO, Coffeyville, Kansas.

Yours truly,

Local 315,
By MIRLE BEESON
President.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS. *Sept. 7, 1941.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Senator, Parsons, Kansas.

HONORABLE SIR: Your letter of Sept. 5th to hand and I note that you have taken the subject matter of my letter of July 10th up with Mr. Hugh Pearson of Parsons. Also I note that you "have a letter from Mr. Clem Blangers, President of the Kansas State Federation of Labor, saying that matters have been adjusted in accordance with the rules with the proper international organization". I am sorry to state that Mr. Blangers is seriously in error in this matter if he refers to honest legitimate union affairs.

Of course, Mr. Blangers could mean that the question of local racketeering has been so camouflaged as to be acceptable to the International Unions, and that racketeering rules have been made to appear as labor union rules. If this is what he refers to I will have to admit that he is correct. As evidence I only need to mention that recently about 20 men were given cards in the local laborers union in Parsons, and then discharged after working one day.

As to Mr. Blangers, I might mention that George A. Naiden, Secretary of the Kansas State Federation of Labor, is authority for information that Mr. Blangers never worked even one day at Laborers work, but was attached to the Kansas City, Mo. Laborers local during Pendergast's racketeer days, because there was no place else to place him and those in control of the local union had to take him. In other words he was a racketeer "political baby" and had to be nursed by someone. Furthermore the same source informed me that the Kansas City, Mo., representatives dare not visit Kansas City Kansas Laborers because of honest business agents being in control. Of course, I doubt very much if Mr. Naiden would publicly verify any of this as it would not appear very well for him to be officially connected with known racketeer elements.

As to matters being adjusted, they are as far from it as at the time I wrote my former letter. You are at liberty to use this letter in any manner you see fit if it will help adjust matters. With best wishes I am yours,

E. W. LATCHEM.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS., *October 16, 1941.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator,
Parsons, Kans.

DEAR SIR: In view of the Senatorial investigation into the general labor policy of the Administration and the OPM according to the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator, Tuesday night, it seems as though a great number of Senators are asking a pertinent question. By what authority does the OPM or any other Governmental Department specify the Union to be recognized on any defense project.

We are therefore requesting your friendly cooperation in obtaining our equitable share of employment and since the AFofL has succeeded in gaining at least a semblance of jurisdiction over the Parsons project, we are asking why, since Mr. Kenneth Spencer, the prime contractor on the Ammonia Nitrate Plant at Baxter, personally has stated that he preferred to deal with the CIO, however, that he had received orders from the War Department to employ nothing but AFofL labor. You may verify this fact through Mr. Joe Yromeck, Secretary of District 14, United Mine Workers of America, Pittsburg, Kansas.

Once again we request that some steps be taken to find out by what authority the War Department can issue such discriminatory instruction, for frankly, we challenge the validity of such action by any Governmental agency.

We wish you would use your good offices in sounding out Kenneth Spencer's personal preference and since the contractor at Parsons is having serious difficulties in finding competent or qualified drivers for his insulars and dumsters, and since we are able to furnish qualified personnel for any part of the job, just why will he persist in getting along with inefficient help when by the simple expedient of granting us employment, his problems will be solved.

Also, please understand that there are no exorbitant initiation fees in our organization, as $5 is the maximum and any employee can switch from one division of the job to another at any time without any additional costs to the individual involved, and we can assure the contractor that there will be no labor troubles if dealing with the CIO. Please advise.

Yours truly,

LOCAL UNION NO. 315, CIO,
MIRLE B. BEESON, *President.*

AUGUST 7, 1941.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: It seems there is a consensus of opinion, especially in this area, that there is some "hokus-pokus" or provisions where members of the United Construction Workers affiliated with the C. I. O. are barred from employment on all defense projects and that all construction must be carried through alliance of the building trades of the American Federation of Labor. Since there is a law of the land, viz., the Waggoner Labor Act, an individual may join a union of his own choice. We felt that unfair discrimination is being shown on some defense projects in this area, both on the Parsons Shell Loading and on the Ammonia-Nitrate.

We have a district organization of the United Construction Workers, C. I. O., which has many skilled workers of all kinds, and that it is mutually advantageous to the contractor, government, and the public if an industrial union handles all personnel on the

job rather than a dozen or more different craft organizations involved. We wish to call your attention to the fact that the United Construction Workers is truly a democratic organization free from any strife or controversy, and that we do not use racketeering methods by charging enormous initiations fees to the poor, individual workers we can employ on the project by charging anywhere from $50 to $200 as a maximum initiation fee. In our organization on any defense project, a fee of $5 is charged which covers initiation and one month's dues.

Please advise as to your reaction in this matter and if there is any red-tape where C. I. O. members are barred. We wish you would use your influence with O. P. M. to remove same and grant us our equitable of defense projects.

Yours very truly,

ROY A. BRADY,
General Organizer.

[From the New York Times of March 22, 1941]

UNION'S "TAKE" IS $400,000 IN JOB FEES AT FORT MEADE—ORDINARY WORKMEN IN HUGE CANTONMENT HOUNDED BY DUES COLLECTORS AND BY SWARM OF RACKETEERS

(By Byron Darnton)

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD., March 21.—Three Army officials sat down with this correspondent today and told the full story of what the ordinary workman had to face to get and hold a job in the construction of this vast cantonment, where 30,000 soldiers will be in training July 1.

It involves, also, activities which were wholly legal. In these activities, the "take" for two unions alone, carpenters and common laborers, was estimated by the Army men as $400,000, and the estimate was declared, in proper Army fashion, to be "as conservative as hell."

Meade is 91 percent completed. The original estimate of its cost, plus supplementals later authorized, totals $18,882,128. The ultimate cost will be around $23,000,000. Overtime to date totals $1,808,320.

At the peak of the building operation, 30 percent of the money spent for labor "didn't drive a nail." That is, it was premium payment for overtime—in the case of carpenters, double rate for everything over 40 hours a week. The total labor cost to date is $12,215,205—more than half the ultimate cost of the camp.

A CLOSED-SHOP PROJECT

Meade is a closed-shop job. Most of the workers are carpenters and common laborers. In theory they were supplied by locals of the two unions in Baltimore, but in practice the men simply came to the camp and asked to be put to work, and then were required to join—and pay an initiation fee to—the union having jurisdiction.

The carpenters' union actually supplied about 200 of its regular members, but at the peak 2,113 carpenters were working here. The laborers' union had only 800 members before this job started; at the peak 11,800 laborers were working here.

Thus it was impossible for the unions to supply the men. As a result, great numbers of what are called Sears, Roebuck carpenters got jobs. (They are called that because they get a Sears, Roebuck outfit of tools for $5 and instantly become carpenters.) Army officials, emphasizing that they were making only a guess, put labor efficiency in the building job at somewhere between 50 and 65 percent. As one officer expressed it, "We got the floaters and klucks."

The labor story at Camp Meade is worth getting on the record for the reason that the defense construction program is far from complete, and the difficulties encountered at Meade may possibly be averted elsewhere.

In Congress there is strong sentiment for drastic regulation of labor unions. That sentiment is being fed not merely by strikes that delay building and production but also by thousands of letters that reach Members of Congress from workers in all parts of the country who feel that they have been unfairly treated on defense jobs. This correspondent has read stacks of such letters in the files of various Members, and over and over again the principal complaint was:

"Why do I have to pay any union before I can go to work for Uncle Sam?"

Some of the strongest fighters for unions talk privately of the necessity of reform from within to avoid too drastic regulation by Congress. They cite, in particular, the record of the unions in the numerous cantonment jobs.

The record is not blackest at Meade, and so this camp provides a fair example for analysis. According to Thurman Arnold, Assistant United States Attorney General, union glaziers at one camp quoted their initiation fee at $1,500, and, as no worker could pay that, permitted 170 nonunion men to set glass so long as each one paid the union $2 a day. There has been nothing as excessive as that at Meade. The record here is average.

OFFICERS PERMITTED TO TALK

The Meade job has been in charge of Maj. J. A. Noxon, assisted by his executive officer, Capt. Charles Meyers, Brig. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, chief of the construction division of the Quartermaster Corps, gave permission for Major Noxon and Captain Meyers to talk frankly to the New York Times about their experience here. Present at the interview was James Mitchell, a civilian, who serves as labor adviser to General Somervell.

Major Noxon explained that the principal contract had been awarded by the War Department to the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore, an organization that has done considerable building in this area and has for years operated on the closed-shop principle. Thus labor relations were primarily the concern of the contractor and the unions. Because such great numbers of men were needed, the unions could not supply them.

Q. Did the men apply to the unions for jobs or to the contractor?

A. The contractor hired the men. There was an employment shack for carpenters and another one for laborers. The men hired went to work for 8 days, a probationary period, and then they had to get their union cards. As soon as the union spotted men in the field without cards, those men were fired. Some of them lasted several months before they were spotted, but that was the way it was supposed to work.

Q. Were the incompetents actually weeded out in 8 days?

A. That all depended on the pushers and the foremen. Pushers were in control of gangs of 25 men and foremen had four to six gangs. The foreman had to depend on his pushers for information about the men. And frequently the pusher did not know much more about the job than the men themselves.

When we sent a gang of new men out on a building we would pick a guy who looked as though he could read a blueprint and say to him, "Hey, you're the pusher." Men with proper supervisory training simply were not available, and we had to take what we could get.

SAYS UNIONS GAVE NO HELP

Q. By union closed-shop contracts the union undertakes to supply the employer with competent men. A sure supply of competent men, who will work at an agreed rate for the duration of the contract, is one of the factors that impel employers to sign such contracts. Did the unions perform that service on this job?

A. They performed the normal service, except in the case of the carpenters and laborers. And those two unions did not do a thing that we could not have done ourselves with our employment shacks. We got no help from them—not a damned bit. They were supposed to provide us with workmen and they did not do it.

But they did handle grievances. It's my belief that we would have had fewer headaches if there had been no grievance committee, if we had handled that question ourselves. Ninety-nine percent of the men who worked here had no use for the unions. The contractor was in no position to do anything about it. He has civilian business, and so he could not get in a scrap here or they would strike him on his private business.

Q. Were there any strikes at Meade?

A. Two. One involved the carpenters, the other the roofers. The roofers' strike was over a jurisdictional matter and it lasted only 1 day. We lost 3 days' work because of the carpenters' strike—October 18, 19, and 20. It concerned rates for overtime. We did not have authorization to pay more than time and a half for overtime, and the carpenters said that in Baltimore they got double time.

We had a conference and explained our position, said that we had referred the question to Washington and that if the decision was for double time it would be retroactive. All the other unions, except the carpenters, said O. K., and stayed on the job. About 2,000 carpenters struck—that was before we were at the peak of operations. They finally went back to work and thereafter the decision for double time came through from Washington.

MANY INSTANCES OF SHAKE-DOWNS

Q. Do you know of any instances of shake-downs?

A. Yes. Before Christmas there was a plan to buy a present for an official. So we put out a placard saying nobody had any right to collect funds. It was a racket. There were plenty instances of shake-downs. Every gunman from Washington and Baltimore was here. Until we stopped it, all sorts of people were collecting dues; of course, that was not a union activity, that was the work of smart fellows taking advantage of the system.

Q. If a man was declared not in good standing by the union, was he discharged without inquiry or a chance to protest?

A. He was discharged at once. He might protest, but that rested with the man himself. At first, the union people just told the timekeeper to take the man's name off the pay roll, but we stopped that and made them go to the contractor's office.

Q. Did the carpenter's union make any effort to bring in trained men?

A. No, they couldn't. There was a shortage all over the country.

Q. Did many men turn up for carpenters' jobs with brand new lunchboxes and tools?

A. The Sears Roebuck carpenters? We got millions of them. Taxicab drivers drove in from Washington in their own cabs and went to work as carpenters. We had all sorts of people.

Q. Did they have tools?

A. Yes; they had new hammers, saws, squares, hatchets, levels, and brace and bit sets. They did not know whether they had rip saws or crosscut, but they had 'em.

TROUBLE WITH DUES COLLECTORS

Q. There are green placards all over camp that say, among other things, that union delegates may not collect dues from men during working hours. Such collections had been made?

A. All sorts of people were attempting to collect dues. And there were six or eight official collectors. We had to run them all off with the M. P.'s [military police]. Some individual racketeers would go up to ignorant men, often Negroes, collect money from them and hand them a scrap of paper saying that so-and-so had paid his dues.

Q. Were there any fights or disturbances growing out of union arguments?

A. There were plenty. Only last week a group of men threw rocks and mud at a

union organizer. Many of the men made down payments on their union cards and then did not meet the installments, and they had no love for the union delegates.

Q. Can you make any guess as to the efficiency of labor on the job—carpenters and common labor?

A. That is pretty difficult, but maybe somewhere from 50 to 65 percent. A report to us by the contractor estimated that at the peak, when we had 8,113 carpenters, 10 percent of them were finished carpenters, 55 percent were rough carpenters, and 35 percent were not fully qualified. Of course, on this kind of job you did not need a lot of finished carpenters. The 10 percent was enough. The 35 percent at the bottom could nail a floor or saw a board—but not a proper sawing. Most of them probably held up the more competent men in their gang.

JOB TURN-OVER IS TREMENDOUS

Q. Was there a big turn-over?

A. Yes. On the whole job the social-security cards total more than 35,000—that is, all kinds of workmen. Our top pay roll was around 20,000. But that doesn't show the whole picture. Probably 50,000 to 60,000 would be the total of hires.

Lots of men came on as carpenters, for instance, and were not any good, so they were hired again as common laborers. Only one social-security card would be made out in such a case. We had 10,500 carpenters go to work to get a peak total of 8,113.

Q. What did carpenters and laborers have to pay to get into their respective unions?

A. Carpenters $57.50 and laborers $25, in installments.

Q. What do you estimate was the total "take" for these two unions from that source?

A. Not all the men completed their payments. Figured on a conservative basis, it would be about $400,000—and that's as conservative as hell.

Q. What were the men paid?

A. Carpenters got $1.25 an hour and double time for overtime. Laborers got 62½ cents an hour, time and a half for Saturday afternoon, and double time for Sunday.

Q. Did you work nights?

A. We never got enough men to man one full shift of carpenters, let alone two or three.

Q. Supposedly every man hired as a carpenter received an oral test; compiled by the contractor, which would indicate whether he knew his business. Was that test actually given?

A. It was given, but not to every carpenter. We were having 1,000 men lined up in the morning to get jobs. During the rush period it was impossible to apply the test. But when the work simmered down, it was given—after we had reached the peak.

Q. Have you received any complaints from men who said they had been victimized?

A. Lots of them. You can get them from the files.

EXCERPTS FROM COMPLAINT FILE

Following are typical excerpts, with names deleted, from the complaint file:

FEBRUARY 18, 1941.

Was hired on Armistice Day (Monday). Was put to work on following Tuesday and worked through that week through Friday. Was then told that there would be no more work. However, I came down on Saturday on my own accord to file my own saws, and it was then that ——— (carpenter pusher) said I might as well do some work, but that it would cost me a quart of liquor every other week.

I brought the liquor as was told to do and my partner, ———, was also to bring a quart every other week. I cut this down to a pint and then cut it down to nothing. Was then laid off.

There were six carpenters and four pushers that worked the first Saturday. There were carpenters that were kept on who had come in five weeks after I did. ———, one of the men in the gang, gave donations of money, but I don't know how much it was. He told me he too was laid off because he didn't live up to his agreement. It seems that everyone who donated money but didn't live up to it was laid off. There was one fellow in the gang who said he was asked to donate $3.50 a week.

——— ———.

JANUARY 24, 1941.

I have recently returned to New York after working in Fort Meade, Md., for 9 weeks. I worked there as a plumber.

I left the job of my own accord because the working conditions were not to my liking. I know of many occasions where partiality and discrimination were openly employed by the supervision. The results of these practices were a let-down on production all around, unnecessary waste, and consequent loss of time and money for the Government.

With my assistant, another plumber from New York also, I've finished fitting one barrack building with water pipes in slightly more than 2 days. The other plumbers with the same facilities and the same type of work took from 3½ to 5 days to complete their jobs. The same thing happened in the case of the cast-iron installation. It took us 2½ days and it took them 4 to 5 days. We were only working at a normal pace. Evidently the others were stalling for time, with the foremen in full approval.

——— ———.

CAMP QUARTERMASTER'S REPORT

The following is a report made on an investigation conducted by the office of the camp quartermaster:

1. Section 4, unit 3, December 12, 1940: Three men came to job at 10 a. m. and tried to take all men who had not paid up off job and down to union office. They stated that all men who had not paid up could not work Saturday and Sunday. Speeches made on job, workman cursed by steward, job delayed 1½ hours.

2. Section 6: Talked with ———, superintendent; ———, materials checker; and ———, labor pusher; ———, steward; ———, head steward; and one other (name to be given as soon as possible).

Union representatives come to job on various occasions, lay hands on nonunion or delinquent men, curse them publicly with obscene and insulting language, take them to timekeepers and order their immediate dismissal. Timekeepers evidently take orders from stewards and discharge men without consultation with Consolidated. Materials checker states men are becoming so disgusted with situation they are losing desire to produce. The men cannot understand why United States permits such action on defense projects by men who in two cases speak broken English. Union and nonunion men place defense work above racketeering union practices.

Checker states violence is possible if union stewards continue present practices. Men have been jerked off job while holding rafters and have endangered safety of others by having to drop lumber without concern for men below them. It was also mentioned that if laborer's steward appears more often on job, murder was not improbable.

Section 3. Laborers' union has been reported interrupting men's work at various times but has been warned by Government checkers.

TRY TO STOP RACKETEERING

Harold Dreher, project manager for the Consolidated Engineering Co., agreed that the notice to field workers which was posted on the job in the form of a large green placard had been put up in an effort to stop racketeering and the collection of union dues by foremen and other unauthorized persons.

Emphasizing that relations with both the carpenters' and laborers' unions in private work in and around Baltimore had been good, Mr. Dreher said that at Meade those unions had been unable to perform the services they perform in private jobs—that is, the supplying and disciplining of stable and competent labor. The company's contract with the carpenters' union, he said, required the union to supply trained men who had been through the usual apprenticeship.

Officials of both the carpenters and laborers' unions hold that their organizations are fully entitled to collect initiation fees from nonunion men who go to wohk on Meade or other Government projects within their jurisdictions.

Nelson Ford, financial secretary of Local 101, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, is the spokesman for his union. He declined to say how much money had been obtained by the organization from the Camp Meade job.

"It's nobody's business," Mr. Ford said.

He said that before the defense work started, Local 101, which is in Baltimore, had 1,200 members and that the present total is 5,000. The new membership, he explained, came not solely from Meade but from other defense works in the area—the proving grounds at Aberdeen, the Edgewood Arsenal, the quartermaster depot at Holabird, and the new Glenn Martin airplane plant.

SAYS COLLECTIONS ARE EXAGGERATED

Mr. Ford said that Army officers at Meade who estimated that new and only partly paid initiation fees had netted the carpenters' union about $250,000 exaggerated the situation.

"They let 3,000 to 4,000 men work down there who never paid a dime into this organization," said Mr. Ford. "We told the contractor that we could not supply the men he needed and he was to get them where he saw fit on a 3-day probation basis, and if they suited him we would take them into the organization. If they did not, we wanted nothing to do with them.

"But we have protested to the contractor that this job was not kept closed shop because a lot of those men never did join. Even when a notice was put in their pay envelopes saying they had to be union members they did not come in.

The money received by the union from Meade went into the general fund, Mr. Ford explained. The local pays 75 cents per man per month to the international office, which is in Indianapolis.

In reply to workers who have complained about the necessity of paying a union initiation fee before going on a defense job, Mr. Ford said:

"The men clearly understood that Consolidated was a closed shop. If a man does not want to work for a union contractor, let him go somewhere else. If he does, he has to obey the rules.

"The amount that they paid to the union was insignificant in comparison with what they made. Who would not pay $57.50 to make $90 to $120 a week for 3 months? It's a damned good investment."

FOUR HUNDRED NOW ATTEND MEETINGS

Before the new members came into the union, Mr. Ford said, the average union meeting was attended by 100 to 150 men; now the attendance runs around 400.

But even though the new members outnumber the old, there is practically no possibility of their taking over control of the organization. That is because the local is operated by the general office in Indianapolis.

"About 10 years ago, Mr. Ford explained, "the organization got into such condition that the local voted for the general organization to come in and take full charge. There was an investigation and we have worked under the general organization ever since. The president of the local is Henry W. Blumenberg. He has had the job the last 5 years. He is from New York and was sent from the general office to act as president."

The new members have a voice in what goes on at meetings, Mr. Ford said. But even if they wished to gain control they would have to go through a difficult procedure.

"It would take a unanimous vote of the whole membership," he explained, "to revoke the action taken 10 years ago. We would have to hire a big hall so that all the members could attend the meeting.

"A vote of 100 percent of those present would make it possible to revoke the resolution that brought the general office into control. But the general president would have to approve that vote. They would have to show cause why the action of 10 years ago should be revoked, and the general president would be the judge as to whether that cause was sufficient."

DATES $57.50 FEE BACK TO 1918

The general office, Mr. Ford said, "knows to a penny" what the local got from Meade and what the money has been used for. There is a financial statement to the general office each month, and with it goes a copy of every voucher the local has issued.

Mr. Ford said that a proclamation by President Roosevelt at the beginning of the defense program stated that there were to be no changes in labor conditions, and that therefore it was only just that the closed-shop contract with the Consolidated Co. should cover Fort Meade just as it did the contractor's private work. The $57.50 initiation fee had been in effect since 1918, he asserted, and dues had been unchanged at $2 a month since 1935.

The common laborers at Camp Meade came under the jurisdiction of the Hod Carriers and Common Laborers International Union of Baltimore. J. M. Buzby, president of the district council, and E. H. Lewis, recording secretary, asserted that they were proud of their union's record at Camp Meade.

On September 1, 1940, the rate for unskilled labor in Baltimore went from 56¼ to 62½ cents. This increase, Mr. Buzby said, had been negotiated in the summer "before we knew anything about the fact that the defense program would bring about a strong demand for labor." As a matter of fact, however, the defense program had been widely discussed and was partly under way last summer.

"Our initiation fee, which started 7 years ago, when the union was founded, at $1, was raised gradually until, 2 years ago, it became $25," said Mr. Buzby.

"When this defense work came along we cut the down payment from $10 to $5 and gave the men a chance to make a pay before they had to give us anything.

"Right now the Baltimore rate for nonunion labor is 45 cents. Our men at Meade get 62½ cents. Our union spread the banquet, and nobody can expect to eat free of cost."

Asked how much the union had obtained from men on the Meade job, Mr. Lewis said it was impossible to tell, as the figures are not segregated. But he gave these statistics, covering membership increases from all defense jobs:

On October 1, 1940, the union was worth $2,590.99, and on March 1, 1941, it was worth $8,485.03. Membership, he said, had increased from 800 to 2,600.

There would appear to be some discrepancy in those figures. An increase of 1,600 members, at $25 apiece, would bring in $40,000. If new and old members have paid dues at $1.50 a month since October 1, the dues total would be $19,500, or an aggregate income of $59,500. The union pays to various groups within the American Federation of Labor 64 cents a member a month, a total since October of $8,320, making a net income of $51,180. Yet the net worth of the union has increased since October 1 by $86,893.04. And that does not account for salaries, taxes, and expenses of all sorts.

According to the union spokesmen, attendance at meetings has dropped from an average of 150 before the defense step-up to 60 now.

"The men are working and contented, and so they don't come to meetings to complain," said Mr. Buzby.

Mr. Buzby, however, had a complaint to make against the Fort Meade contractor.

"They broke down a prevailing practice in this area," he said, "because they did not let our agents check the men on the job to see if they were all members."

On the question of why men should be forced to pay an initiation fee to a union before working on a Government project, Mr. Buzby said:

"The contractor is 100 percent union. We did not ask anybody to work on the job. Any man who did, and reaped the benefits, had to pay. Why, it would have been representation without taxation any other way."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 6, 1941]

HUGE FEES COLLECTED BY INDIANTOWN UNIONS; COERCION IS CHARGED

(Because of conflicting reports concerning labor conditions during operations enlarging Army camps, the Inquirer, with the full cooperation of the Construction Division, Quartermaster Corps, U. S. Army, made an exhaustive inquiry. The first article, covering Indiantown Gap, is published herewith. The second article, on Fort Dix, will appear in the Inquirer tomorrow.)

(By Charles H. Ellis, Jr.)

INDIANTOWN GAP, PA., April 5.—Despite the fact that construction of the huge $14,500,000 military training camp here has been conducted on an open-shop basis, workmen have paid from $25,000 to $100,000 to unions in fees.

Coercion on the part of union foremen to compel nonunion workmen to pay $50 in initiation fees was reported to officers of the Construction Division, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, which is supervising the job.

The estimate of $25,000 is rock bottom, as the president of the carpenters' union local said approximately 500 new members were recruited at $50 each. How many nonunion workmen in other trades were required to pay similar fees is not known, but indications here are that there were many.

Maj. William L. Kay, of the Construction Division, who is overseeing the construction work, asserted, however, that the work was not materially delayed by labor difficulties beyond those expected on such a rush job.

TWELVE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY MEN AT PEAK

At the peak of construction last January, he said, 12,690 men were employed, 4,407 of this number being carpenters.

Major Kay estimated that the laborers were not more than 40 percent organized at the time of the greatest activity. The carpenters, he said, probably were 60 percent unionized.

ESTIMATES 85 PERCENT

H. T. Klingensmith, assistant project manager for the three contractors doing the bulk of the work, set his estimate at 85 percent for the carpenters, and he preferred not to record an estimate for the rest.

Although it was an open shop, and no union in the vicinity had enough laborers or carpenters to meet the needs of the job, there was intensive organizing activity on the part of the unions, at $50 a head for the carpenters and $15 for the laborers. There was also the matter of monthly dues of $1.75 for the carpenters and $1 for the laborers.

LOCAL GROWS TO 1,200

Charles M. Kitzmiller, president of Local 287 of the Carpenters' and Joiners' Union in Harrisburg, is authority for the figure of at least 500 new members recruited at Indiantown Gap. He said his union had from 600 to 700 members, and grew to about 1,200 during the construction period.

The union head, incidentally, was much more vehement than either the contractor or the Army officers in criticizing the abilities of some of the workmen. He said that 65 percent of them were worthless; the others declared that they met only the amount of incompetence expected in a rush job.

COMPLAINTS BY WORKERS

An official of the Construction Quartermasters' Corps in Washington arranged for the interview on labor conditions at the camp, insofar as the Army was involved.

Complaints filed with the Army by some of the workmen indicated that the unions were active in high-pressure organizing, in some cases telling farmers and others from the vicinity that they had to join the union to keep their jobs.

COERCION CHARGED

While there was no evidence of violence in the attempts to organize, workers on the job did testify that they were victims of coercion.

Union foremen, they said, threatened them with jobs "out in the mud"—working on forms for concrete—unless they joined up.

Here is one affidavit taken from the official Army files at Indiantown Gap. Names, of course, are omitted.

"WOULD GET DIRTY WORK

"About 10:30 or 10:45 on December 17," said the carpenter, "Mr. —— came to me and told me if I didn't join the union I would be sent down on the forms in the mud, and that I would get all the dirty work there was until I joined the union.

"They would expect at least $10 a week until the initiation fee was paid. The foreman, Mr. ——, said to keep himself straight with the union, the union expected him to do this.

"HAVE BEEN BOTHERING ME

"I started on this job November 13 of this year, and they have been bothering me ever since to join.

"Wednesday, December 11, Mr. ——, another carpenter foreman, did the same thing. He sent us out into the mud, but we went to —— and he put us on the inside working again. Now they got to us again. The foreman, Mr. ——, said my work was satisfactory, and he liked me personally, but he had to do this."

TELLS OF TRANSFER

Another workman, who had been working on the inside, testified:

"The foreman, Mr. ——, came to me while I was laying the floor, and he called me to one side and said he had to transfer me down through to 1-A to set forms up. He said 'It is not my doings, but I must do as they told me. I like your work, it is satisfactory to me.'

"December 11 the steward came to me and asked me what I would do. I said, 'I can't do anything. I need money right now. I have my wife in the hospital and I must pay my hospital bill.'

"WE GAVE YOU JOB"

"He said to me: 'Doesn't your job mean anything to you?' I said, 'My job means something, but my wife means a lot more to me than that.'

"He said, 'We gave you the job, didn't we?'

"I said, 'No; I got my own job here.'

"He then walked away."

When the job first opened last October the carpenters and the laborers' unions had shacks on the reservation.

OFFICES CHANGED

That was changed, and now they have shacks a few miles away on the road to Harrisburg, where organizers set up offices and carried on their business.

Kitzmiller frankly discussed and defended the $50 fees, and said that, in his opinion, they ought to be three times as high

"What do you do with all the money?" he was asked.

"Need it for running the organization," the union official replied.

$300 DEATH BENEFITS

"We have death benefits of $300 for members, and a little less than that for their wives. We pay up to $7 a week for sick benefits. We pay the union dues of our men who are drafted."

He displayed a labor newspaper photograph of a home for aged carpenters at Lakeland, Fla., and said that part of the money goes for the support of the institution.

"Don't forget," he said, "that the fees have been in effect for years, many years."

DEFENDS UNION FEES

"Do you think you're right in collecting fees at this time," he was asked, "particularly in view of the need for swift construction?"

"Yes," was the reply. "My belief is that they should be triple what they are, and I'll tell you why. These men misrepresent themselves to a great extent. I'd say that 65 percent of the employees on that job are worthless.

SAYS TOOLS ARE STOLEN

"Some of them didn't have tools when they came out to work, and would steal a tool here and a tool there until they had a set, and could look like carpenters. You could call them wood butchers, only that has the word 'wood' in it."

Asked if the 500 or so who had come from neighboring farms and villages to get temporary jobs, and had paid initiation fees, would continue as union members, and hence be apt to share in the benefits, Kitzmiller said he didn't know.

$50 FOR $1,000

"They get 4 or 5 months' work at $1 an hour, and pay $50 for it. I think it's a good deal. I'd pay $50 for $1,000 anytime."

The other union representatives could not be reached, but both contractors and Army officials agreed that they too had been active in trying to organize the men, with some success.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 7, 1941]

UNION "INITIATION FEE" FOR FORT DIX CARPENTER EXCEEDS INDIANTOWN'S

(Because of conflicting reports concerning labor conditions during operations enlarging Army camps, the Inquirer, with the full cooperation of the Construction Division, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, made an exhaustive inquiry. The first article, covering Indiantown Gap, was published in yesterday's Sunday Inquirer. The second article, on Fort Dix, is published herewith.)

(By Charles H Ellis, Jr.)

FORT DIX, N. J., April 6.—Although separated from Pennsylvania's big training camp at Indiantown Gap by only a few hundred miles, carpenters employed on the construction of the camp here must pay 60 percent more as an initiation fee

Contrary to the frank justification of the $50 fee required of carpenters working at the open-shop Indiantown Gap project and ready discussion of it, union representatives here are openly hostile in refusing any discussion.

AIDED BY ARMY UNIT

As in the case of Indiantown, inquiry into conditions here was made with the consent and cooperation of the Construction Division, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, which is supervising construction of the sprawling $18,000,000 camp.

As in the case of Indiantown, Army officers asserted that labor difficulties, in the main, have not hindered the work and have not been greater than was anticipated. It was pointed out that the union question is not a concern of the Construction Division.

UNION AGENT CONTACTED

In an attempt to verify or disprove the report that the initiation fee had been raised just before the construction work began, the business agent of Local 1489 was sought out. He was found in a shack just off the reservation, near Wrightstown, which bore the union's name and that of its business agent, J. McCarthy.

"Mr McCarthy, it has been said that your fee is $80 How long has it been at that figure?" he was asked.

"Who told you that?" McCarthy demanded.

OUTBURST OF PROFANITY

"All the main contractors on the job and some workmen," he was told.

McCarthy's answer was a burst of profanity. "I don't like your damned paper or anything about it, and that includes you," he said, angrily.

When the reporter attempted to point out that he was merely trying to get the union side of the story, McCarthy flared up.

ORDERED TO GET OUT

"I won't tell you a damned thing," he shouted; "and if you know what's healthy for you, you'll get out of my district damned quick." He went over to the door and opened it. The interview appeared to be ended.

Workmen around the shack were being told at the time that there were men who had failed to get their April working permits, showing them paid up on dues and initiation fees, and who would be "knocked off tonight." That meant only, it was explained by one, that they would be taken off the job.

Fort Dix is 90-percent complete. It differs from Indiantown Gap in two respects: there is a closed shop, and contractors accepted the job on a lump-sum arrangement and are alone responsible for labor costs within their total bids.

Col. Oliver Cromwell, construction quartermaster at Fort Dix, said there was no hold-up on account of the union or the workmen, other than the sort of happening on any large job.

MET LITTLE DIFFICULTY

The three main contractors, too, agreed that they had no great difficulty with the union, although there had been incidents which slowed them down for a day or so.

As for the fees, the contractors reported the $80 fee was obtained for carpenters. Men coming from other locals which had lower fees had to pay the difference, usually $30. Total fees or the differential could be paid, said the contractors, on installments.

PLUMBERS COMPLAIN

During the investigation a foreman of one of the gangs came in and reported that some of the plumbers were complaining they had to pay 5 cents an hour, or $1.75 a week, for working permits Most of them were already members of the union, said the foreman.

In other trades, the contractors agreed, the unions had sufficient members to furnish all the workmen needed at Fort Dix.

Colonel Cromwell said he had about 50 inspectors on the job. Their duty is to see that work is up to specifications, and that it is proceeding without undue delay. As for labor relations, they are entirely up to the contractors.

DELAYED BY LACK OF MEN

Under the Walsh-Healey Act prevailing wages for the locality are paid. Carpenters receive $1.37½ an hour; laborers from 60 to 80 cents; plumbers $1.75 an hour; and electricians $2 an hour.

James Daly, secretary-treasurer of the L. C. A. Construction Co., which has $1,713,000 worth of the work, said that the stringing of electric wires was delayed somewhat by the refusal of the electricians' union to employ more men.

BAN TEMPORARY HELP

The United Brotherhood of Electricians, he said, was able to furnish only 100 men, and at one point in the operation more were needed. The union, said the contractor, would not permit men to be employed temporarily, and that resulted in a delay.

Asked about the type of workmen furnished by the union, Daly said that some of them were not competent, but added that "you expect that when there is such a terrific demand."

THINGS SATISFACTORY

"Generally," he said, "things have been satisfactory o the job."

John A. Johnson, head of the construction company bearing his name, which is working on a $1,828,000 contract, said the men were "not quite so skillful as they might have been" but he also attributed that to the rush of the work.

"Out of a clear sky we had to hire 3,000 men," he said. "That just can't be done overnight, and it took a few days. We got some who weren't so good, but that was to be expected.

"You have to give them a little time. Things weren't too bad, considering the type of work.

"The men," he said, "were permitted to pay their fees at the rate of $5 to $10 a week. Some of them got in one week's work and reneged on the balance of their dues."

UNUSUAL CONDITIONS

Collection of fees and dues, however, did not interfere with the work, Johnson declared. "You couldn't get top production," he said. "Nobody could."

An official of another contracting firm on the job said the turnover on the job was probably higher than normal, but attributed that to the unusual conditions.

Johnson said that at present the painters are refusing to permit the use of sprayers on the exteriors of the buildings, because that reduced the number of men at work.

PAINTING DONE BY HAND

Consequently, the painting of the 625 combination barracks and mess halls, 460 barracks, 165 mess halls, and 680 other buildings, is being done by hand.

At Indiantown Gap, where painting is to get under way in earnest this week, sprayers are permitted.

"I can't say that there has been anything too serious, though," Johnson concluded.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 9, 1941]

CAMP EDWARDS "TAKE" PUT AT $250,000 FOR CARPENTER UNION ALONE—ARMY OFFICIALS, DECLINING ESTIMATES, SAY FEES BY OTHER LABOR UNITS RAN INTO "LOT OF MONEY"

(By George E. Pelletier)

CAMP EDWARDS, MASS., April 9.—Amid the roar of big guns at firing practice on the range of this greatest of all New England camps are the ringing silver echoes of hundreds of thousands of dollars of "small change" that went into unions' coffers as the $20,000,000 boom-town rose in 6 months out of the sandy, stub-timbered hillocks of Bourne, Sandwich, and Falmouth.

Just how much the unions' take was in joining fees and dues is a matter of conjecture, but Army officials are satisfied that the carpenters' union benefited to the tune of $250,000 to $260,000 and that other unions

gained in proportion to the size of their initiation fees.

TEN THOUSAND CARPENTERS

At one time, they point out, there were 10,000 carpenters on the job out of a total of nearly 19,000 construction employees. The carpenters' joining fee was $75 a head. Thousands paid it in full, while others made a down payment and added $5 to $10 a week while they worked.

At peak there were 5,000 common laborers and their initiation fee was $25 each. Again, everybody didn't pay in full, but most of them did. Some of the money found its way into the treasury of the Providence union, among others.

Capt. Fred Robbins, constructing quartermaster; Capt. O B Brown, who formerly was superintendent of construction and is now operations officer; and Capt. A. E. Perkins, executive officer—all of the constructing quartermaster's office—agreed to the $260,000 figure, which already has gone into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DIDN'T INCREASE COST

They would give no estimates on totals received by other unions, but agreed the total "must have run into a lot of money."

At the same time, they pointed out, it must be made clear that "these fees did not increase the cost of the project."

"The money the unions got came out of the workers' pay and of course it is none of our business what they do with their money after they get it." Captain Robbins pointed out

All three officers were emphatic in declaring that so far as they had seen there had been no "pressure" put on anyone to collect these dues, and that they had had no complaints or racketeering such as has been reported at other camp projects.

Captain Robbins and the other officers said they knew of no single instance of workers being victimized by fake union collectors, or of shakedowns by minor bosses and foremen.

TOTAL COST BOOSTED

Yet, while the dues did not come directly out of the Government, there seems to have been some relation between union activity and the rising cost of construction at Edwards.

For one thing, in the case of the carpenters, their rates were upped from $1 an hour to $1.175 during the course of construction. This increase, together with others in other trades, engaged at Edwards, lifted the total cost of the project by $1,416,000, according to official figures given recently to Congress.

The matter of overtime—the pay that, in the words of another Army officer, "doesn't drive a single nail"—cost $1,087,470 at Edwards, according to another report given to Congress. This was based upon only those payments in excess of regular rates—time and a half on Saturdays and double time on Sundays, the report to Congress said.

Captain Brown and Captain Perkins said that, as they computed it, overtime had run to exactly the figure given to Congress, as of January 21 of this year, but that the figure should not be misunderstood.

"The $1,087,470 figure really represents total payment made on days when overtime rates were in effect. It does not merely represent the excess. It would be truer to say that between one-third and one-half that figure represents the true cost of overtime—that is, that amount paid over and above regular rates because the work was done on Saturdays or Sundays." they explained

WEEDING-OUT PROCESS

The process of hiring and weeding out incompetents at Edwards was described by the three officers as follows:

"The Army had nothing to do with the hiring. Men wanting work applied directly to the contractor, usually attended by a union steward. The process of being put on the payroll of the contractor and on the union books was done at the same time.

"I believe they only hired union men, but that is something that Mr. Dugan (Walsh Co. representative) could answer much better."

Dugan, the contractor's representative, when seen later, said "the company never specified that a man had to be a union member to go to work.

"It was one of those things which was generally understood. There was no difficulty on this score at any time," he said.

He explained that "whenever a man was hired, the union agent was right next to him and we both did business at the same time, so there was never any question of hiring nonunion men."

NO COMPLAINTS

Both Dugan and the Army officers said they had never received complaints from any worker who said he was forced to join the union.

Q. What was the competence of the men who came to work?

A. The competence was what you might expect on a hurry-up job such as this. No questions were asked of the men except whether they could do the work. If they said they could they got the job. If we found out later they could not do the work, they were weeded out

Q. How much supervision was there to determine as rapidly as possible the competence of these men?

A. There were foremen for every dozen or 20 workers and it didn't take long to find out the workers and the fakirs.

Q. Did some of the carpenters show signs of having become carpenters overnight—that is, did they have new tools, apparently purchased for the occasion?

A. Some of them had new tools, but it is an unwarranted conclusion to argue that because of that they did not know their work. Everybody has a few tools at home, and some men who do odd jobs at home are pretty good workers. Coming to a job like this, they would naturally buy a few new tools. We think it is all wrong to draw conclusions as to efficiency on the basis of the newness of their tools.

MASS PRODUCTION

The Army men pointed out that the camp's 1,303 buildings were erected on a mass-production basis as close to an assembly line process as it is possible to make construction work, so that whole gangs were doing certain things all together and it was easy for the experienced workers to help the less experienced become really effective.

Certain gangs laid cement foundations, others followed and nailed down floors, still others hoisted uprights, and more boarded up the sides of buildings. Then came roofers, plumbers, heating installation workers, etc. There were no hitches. The principal problem was proper distribution of materials to keep all these gangs going at the same time.

Dugan was emphatic that at no time had notices to workers been posted at Edwards telling them that only union labor was being employed, and that failure to remain in good standing would result in dismissal.

He was asked whether the union, particularly the carpenters' union, was able to assure the contractor a sufficient number of trained men

TRIAL AND ERROR

"They did the best they could and we hired everybody who came along in the peak period. We were hiring up to 1,000 a day then, and it wasn't very practical to test them except by the trial and error method. The foremen could get wise in less than a day to any fellow who didn't know his job or who was trying to stall," he said.

The Army men were asked about strikes, if any, at Edwards during the construction period.

There was not a single strike during the whole period the construction was under way by contract, from the first breaking of ground last September 12, to March 7 of this year, when the contractor's job was completed, they said.

Captain Robbins said there had been a 2-hour strike on March 10, over some dissatisfaction among a group of painters.

"It was due to a misunderstanding and it was settled the same afternoon that it started," he said.

DEMIES REPORT

At the offices of the carpenters' union in New Bedford, which handled the bulk of new memberships, Thomas Roy, financial secretary, said that "there's no truth at all" to reports that the New Bedford union collected $250,000 to 260,000 as the result of the Edwards job

He substantiated, in effect, however, reports that the union's membership had gone from a few hundred to around 2,500.

"I wouldn't say it was quite that high. My books are at the auditors' so I can't give you exact figures," he said.

"Would you say the membership was around 2,000?

"It might be—I wouldn't be sure without the books."

With respect to initiation fees, Roy was asked what the total figure might be, if it wasn't $250,000.

"It wasn't anywhere near that. We didn't collect all the money. We let the fellows join any union they wanted near their own homes. Some of them even joined in Providence, in Boston, Worcester, Hartford, and other places," he said.

"Would you say your union collected $100,000?" he was asked.

"It might be around that figure, but not any more."

BUSINESS AGENT SILENT

Joseph Gibeault, union business agent, referred all financial queries to Mr Roy. All he would say was that the union's "relations with both the Army and the contractor were 100 percent all the time."

Roy said that "most" of the carpenters who joined the New Bedford union "paid the $75 in full," the principal exceptions being apprentices under 21 and veterans over 60.

"We charged them only $10 to come in. We thought that was only fair," he said.

"Some of the other fellows couldn't pay on the spot and we always considered their circumstances. Sometimes they'd put only $5 down, or $10, and we'd get the rest later. But I think I can say most of them paid in full."

On the basis of 2,000 fully paid $75 fees out of the total membership of around 2,500, the union would have collected $150,000, it was pointed out. But Roy said "it (the total) didn't run that high."

BOUGHT NEW BUILDING

That the union benefited greatly, however, is indicated physically by the fact that it was able to buy the old Odd Fellows building on North Sixth Street in the rear of the New Bedford post office, and is now in the process of having it remodeled from top to bottom.

Outside the building bright new shiny cars which come and go, bringing members to pay their dues, testify also to the new prosperity.

While most of the membership has now been withdrawn from the Edwards job, there is prospect of further work at the camp soon. The Army plans to erect 12 to 14 chapels at Edwards, and "that ought to give some of our men work," one union man pointed out.

Reportedly, before the Camp Edwards job was in sight the New Bedford union's initiation fee was $30 and it was jumped to $75 when the flood of applicants began to mount. Mr. Roy would not confirm this. He said the local recognized cards held in any Massachu-

setts or other unions in neighboring States, where initiating fees ranged from $25 to $57.

Altogether he wasn't too talkative as he pored over a ledger nearly 6 inches thick and men came in to pay their dues and have them properly receipted. These things, together with the remodeling and the painting of the new building, seemed to come nearer to telling the story.

There's no doubt that the New Bedford Carpenters' Union is "in the dough" and that other unions have benefited proportionately.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 9, 1941]

HOD CARRIERS PAID ADDITIONAL $25 FOR "STEADY" JOB—FEE WAS COLLECTED FROM 30 MEN, ALONG WITH $56.50 WORK PERMITS, MORRIS REPORTS—POSSIBLE FEDERAL ACTION INDICATED—SECOND SUM MAY INVOLVE VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES ANTIRACKETEERING STATUTE, IT IS SAID

Disclosure that some officer of the American Federal of Labor Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union, Local 42, exacted payments of $25 from new members to insure "steady" employment was made last night by Acting Circuit Attorney Henry G. Morris.

Morris said about 30 such cases had been reported to him in the course of his investigation of the union's tangled financial affairs.

The $25 payment was in addition to the $56.50 work-permit fee, or initiation fee, which was charged new members, but which Morris has found was entered in the union's cash journals as only $21.50, when it was recorded at all. The $25 payment assured the new members that he would not be laid off several weeks after paying the initiation fee, either in one lump or on the installment plan, Morris said. It has been found that hundreds of members were laid off after paying their $56.50 fees and new members were given jobs in their places.

POSSIBLE FEDERAL ACTION

This new development, Morris said, indicated the possibility that the Federal Government might become actively interested in the case, as the $25 payments might constitute violation of the Federal Antiracketeering Act. United States District Attorney Harry C. Blanton, it has been learned, has been watching developments of the investigation and reporting to Washington daily. Blanton has requested Morris to be on the alert for any possible Federal violations.

Complete investigation of all phases of the new development has been hampered by failure of some informants to give their names when reporting "shake-downs" verbally or signing their names to letters, and Morris repeated a promise that the names of all persons aiding in the investigation would be kept secret.

Many of the complaints about the $25 payments came originally from wives, mothers, or friends of members of the union, who were too afraid of reprisals to report the details personally, but investigation substantiated the information when members were confronted with the facts.

In some of the complaints made by letter information was not complete, and Morris is having a staff of eight detectives, headed by Detective Sgt. Curtis Brostron, inquire into each case.

Many of the complaints urged Morris to investigate the methods used by some union agents to obtain work for their members at the $100,000,000 small-arms ammunition plant at Goodfellow Boulevard and Bircher Street, which, they said, constituted "an open and public scandal."

SHORTAGE MAY BE LARGER

The grand jury, which has heard more than 120 witnesses in its inquiry beginning 4 weeks ago, will resume its investigation Thursday when the final results of an audit of the union books will be given to them. A provable shortage of $102,000 has already been found, but Morris said last night indications were that the shortage would be greater.

Four of the Hodcarriers' officers, Edward Hill, president; Orville Golden, secretary-treasurer; and Paul Halahan and Earl Jenkins, business agents are at liberty under $10,000 bonds following their arrest on charges of embezzlement of union funds.

[From the Washington Post of January 29, 1941]

FAIR ENOUGH—AN ARGUMENT OVER FUNDS

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The Hod Carriers' and Common Laborers' Union, a racket which has been extorting vast amounts of money from American day laborers on defense projects and other works, is involved in an interesting civil action filed in Albany, demanding an accounting of funds of a big tunnel workers' local, known as No. 17. The defendants are Samuel Nuzzo, of Newburgh, N. Y., a labor politician and tavern keeper, and other officers of the local.

The plaintiffs are dissident members who charge that, whereas there should be at least $400,000 in the treasury, Mr. Nuzzo, who rules the organization with dictatorial powers, recently said there was only $2,000 or $20,000 on hand. Total collections during the last 4 or 5 years should have been around $600,000, according to the rebellious workmen, who are willing to concede that as much as $200,000 of this money could have been spent for legislative purposes, including per capita taxes to the international, which formerly had headquarters at Quincy, Mass., but moved to Washington last April.

The local was formed in 1936 to embrace workers employed on the construction of the 400-mile Delaware aqueduct in the span of three New York counties—Orange, Ulster, and Sullivan.

Newburgh, the seat of Orange County and the headquarters of Mr. Nuzzo, is also the official headquarters of Henry Hirschberger, the district attorney, or prosecutor, of Orange County, who bobs up in this case in the strange role of counsel for a defendant who, conceivably, could be accused of felony if the civil action were successful.

Mr. Hirschberger, however, says there is nothing questionable in his conduct as counsel for a man who might be charged with a crime in the same case. He explains that the position of prosecutor is a part-time job in Orange County, and that there have been cases in which he found it necessary to present clients of his private civil practice to the grand jury. Should criminal proceedings develop out of the present case he would merely ask the attorney general of New York to supersede him.

Mr. Hirschberger is an inveterate and versatile politician in a community in which the Nuzzo group is an influential factor. He has been elected repeatedly to his present office, both as a Republican, which is his present faith, and as a Democrat, and is now a member of the Republican State committee.

Frederick Dusing, one of the plaintiffs, filed an affidavit charging that Nuzzo and others had threatened to beat up any member who opposed their rule of the local, which has 6,000 members, and that some who have had the courage to protest have lost their jobs.

Moreover, the rebellious men have been summoned for a union trial before the executive committee on charges of disloyalty to the union and its officers, including Nuzzo, none of whom ever was elected by the members.

Nuzzo got his job by appointment from Joseph V. Moreschi, the international president, who never was elected himself, but rose to the presidency by some obscure and unconventional process in 1926 following the death of Dominick Allesandro. However, the last convention of the international was held in 1911, so it will be seen that the affairs of the present union are not commonly entrusted to the paying members.

In Albany Justice William H. Murray, of the supreme court, issued a temporary injunction forbidding acts of terrorism against the plaintiffs and impounding the books. Further arguments will be held in Kingston, N. Y., on February 7, when Mr. Hirschberger will represent that Nuzzo is merely a subordinate of Moreschi who appointed him, and that the local is under the direct supervision of the international, which never holds conventions. This international is the same which in Chicago handed out a sheaf of local charters to a notorious racketeer named Mike Carozzo, recently deceased, whose union graft had made him one of the richest men, in cash position, in the city of Chicago.

Briefly, the plaintiffs want to know what happened to their $600,000 over a period of 4 or 5 years, demand an election of officers, and, of course, seek any retributive justice that may be indicated by the facts concerning the disposition of their money. They pay initiation fees of from $33 to $76 and dues of $2 or $2.50 a month, plus assessments, of which, the petition says, eight have been levied in the last 6 months.

There will be more of this.

[From the Washington Post of January 30, 1941]

FAIR ENOUGH—JUST A SWEET GRAFT

(By Westbrook Pegler)

I am going to tell you some more about the union racket which is shaking down the poor pick-and-shovel stiffs in the great national effort to spread freedom everywhere, on which President Roosevelt vowed that nobody would be allowed to profiteer. The pick-and-shovel shake-down is the hod-carriers' and common laborers' union, and it is the sweetest graft of all, because the boys just go along quietly and mysteriously, never holding elections or conventions but always collecting the money, and whenever you try to get in touch with them they are away. It is like trying to nail a plank on a cloud of smoke to investigate the hod-carriers' and common laborers' racket. You know it is there, but when you try to touch it, it ain't.

This union now claims 250,000 members. That much I did get from the woman who answered the phone in Washington, where the headquarters were established last April after many years in Quincy, Mass.

Joe Moreschi, the boss, or international president, explained to the local chamber of commerce in Quincy that he was moving the business to Washington to be closer to the public pulse—obviously a misprint for "purse," inasmuch as his boys have been extorting from $25 to $50 per head from American citizens desiring to turn a few spades of soil in the building of cantonments, powder plants, and the like.

The boss, however, is not in Washington, and neither is the secretary, Achilles Persio. They are out of town, and will be gone for a month.

Guess where they are. Out in the snow heartening their loyal followers as they chip the frozen soil with picks to earn a few eating bucks for their families? You know better than that? Mr. Moreschi and Mr. Persion are down in Miami, the hibernating place of the criminal scum and the racketeers of the American Federation of Labor, to confer with themselves on solemn affairs of labor, with a capital "L," in a series of deliberations which will include an accredited representative of the Chicago underworld.

You would think that a big international union of the American Federation of Labor would leave some imprint, if only a scar, on a city the size of Quincy after twenty-odd years of official residence there. The teamsters and carpenters are pretty important in Indianapolis, for instance, but in Quincy, Mass., the

pick-and-shovel racket was very aloof. Mr. Moreschi was generally "out" or "away," and the local people know little about him or his union, except that the union did build a three-story edifice for its headquarters.

He became president after the death of Dominick D'Allesandro in 1926, and "became president" is about as good a term as can be used to describe the process. The rank and file were not consulted, nor has their opinion been asked on any question since the last convention, in 1911. Moreschi "became president," and president he remains, and nowadays, according to the claim of his own office in Washington, his central treasury draws tribute from 250,000 American workmen—some of them willing suckers, of course, but others victims of plain extortion.

At the rate of 35 cents a month per member, which was the same graft that was extorted from the building-service workers by George Scalise, that would yield $1,050,000 a year to the international treasury, and we don't know how many years this graft has been rolling in or what has been done with any of it beyond paying the salaries of about 20 office hands at headquarters and a miserable little death benefit ranging from $50 to $200.

This union is so rotten that even the gorillas of the movie employees' racket may look with envy and admiration on the larcenous effrontery of the racketeers who run both the international and the dirty little shake-down locals which carry the message of organized labor down to the pick-and-shovel stiffs. But the other American Federation of Labor construction unions, which collaborate with it and give it aid and comfort by their standing agreements to strike jobs struck by the common laborers, are only a little less guilty.

[From the Washington Post of January 31, 1941]

FAIR ENOUGH—LICENSE TO GRAFT

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The great pick-and-shovel shakedown department of the American Federation of Labor, which at present is extorting some vast sums from horny-handed American toilers of the poorest bracket, is governed by an exclusive, self-perpetuating group of labor racketeers who never confide in the rank-and-file members, or slaves. Joe Moreschi, the president of the racket, known officially as the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers Union, just eased into the presidency by vote or conspiracy of the executive board on the death of Dominick D'Allessandro, in 1929, and since the time of the last international convention of the shake, 31 years ago, no vacancy in any international office has been filled by popular vote. The bosses just get together and decide whom to cut in on the racket without saying aye, yes, or no to members.

Possibly no such decision was submitted to the members or any elected representatives of the members for some years before that. But a span of 31 years without elections, conventions, or reports to the membership surely is enough to prove the character of the racket which controls 250,000 stiffs in all parts of the country and bleeds out of their small and intermittent earnings upward of $6,000,000 a year.

Of this enormous shake the international gets a little over $1,000,000 a year in per capita taxes at the rate of 35 cents per head per month, plus $5 out of each initiation fee—provided, of course, that the gangsters who have charge of some of the locals don't forget to kick in.

It is unlikely that the hoodlums would be so foolish as to hold out, however, because the boys in charge of the international may easily cancel the charter of an unethical gorilla, which, after all, is a valuable license to graft from employers and extort from workers.

This year, with the locals shaking down former members of the Work Projects Administration force, farmers, and casual laborers for permission to work on cantonments and other rearmament projects, the international should collect at least $50,000 and perhaps twice that many $5 dividends on the initiation fees. So the total receipts of Moreschi's office should run well over $1,250,000.

They just do not bother to tell the rank and file what they do with all this money. They do not like to worry the poor, dumb rank and file with big figures. But they do pay a modest office expense including the cost of charters, or racketeering licenses, for enterprising gorillas starting new locals, and there is a theory that they sometimes pay a death benefit of from $50 to $200, although in Chicago, when that subject was mentioned to members of the mob, they offered no book figures, but just smiled.

Some of the locals have a theoretical $5-a-week accident benefit for members injured on the job, but, again referring to Chicago, the 25 local unions were all held in the single ownership of an old-time gunman of the south-side prostitution trade named Mike Carrozzo, and he was bashful about his generosities.

Incidentally, although $200 is the maximum theoretical death benefit, after a man passes his sixtieth birthday, though he may have been a member all his working life, the maximum drops to $50. As death becomes more probable the racket, with its vast take from the earnings of the sucker, shies away from him.

Of course, it will be discovered that William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, has been utterly unaware of the nature of this racket all this time, Mr Green being a man who likes to think good thoughts of his associates in the cause of labor with an upper-case L.

But in May 1931, Mr. Green was one of those invited to a testimonial dinner in Boston in honor of Moreschi as that great crusader for the rights, and dues, of the pick-and-shovel stiff prepared to shove off for Bristol, England, as a fraternal delegate of the American Federation of Labor to the British Trades Union Congress. Mr. Green did not attend, but Frank H. McCarthy, New England organizer of the American Federation of Labor, officially represented him at a feast adorned by the presence of Army and Navy officers, the Italian Consul, and other persons of rank and note.

Mr Moreschi was praised as "a man and leader of men," and sailed away for England to view the quaintly scrupulous financial and electoral customs of unionism there, bearing in his pocket "a substantial check" from his devoted followers.

"Mr. Moreschi" said a news story of the following morning, "has been similarly feted by members of unions of his organization throughout the country in recognition of his services and of the honor paid him by the American Federation of Labor in selecting him as its delegate."

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1941]

FAIR ENOUGH—INITIATION FEES

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Some months ago I remarked that the American people were so far gone in such vices as graft and deceit by public men, so comfortably adjusted to profiteering on public office by relatives of high officials, that, in words of one syllable, they just don't give a damn. Some of my fellow citizens were wounded sore by that observation, but not as much, I think, by the fact itself as by the open recognition of it.

You call a "con" man a speculator or a cafe trollop a glamour girl and nobody's feelings are hurt, but they are what they are just the same, as well we know and they, too. And, similarly if you just sort of gold-plate our national popular immorality in civic affairs as an amiable frivolity people don't mind. On the contrary, they think it rather cute or mischievous, although we know it all amounts to a terrible burden of graft that comes out of the work and earnings of the citizens and a cynical condonation and encouragement of wrong.

This sales talk is by way of introducing a discussion of a condition that could not exist in any land whose people were not too sloppy in their morals to care. I refer to the extortion of millions of dollars from American citizens by labor unions, mostly unions of the American Federation of Labor, in return for permission to work on camps, arsenals, and other works having to do with the national defense.

At the base we have the fact that workers are allowed to organize for collective bargaining, which is an honest enactment in that respect But these American Federation of Labor unions have been forcing men to join up at extortionate rates, and the American people and the Congress, which know their minds, are so tired of studying out things, so discouraged in the matter of insisting on their rights and protesting, that nobody is doing anything about it. So a few private and, in some cases, very exclusive organizations are carting off tons of money which the people pay into the Treasury as taxes and the Treasury pays out to the workmen as wages.

The so-called Hod Carriers' Union is a spectacular example, although, of course, the carpenters and electricians and all are getting theirs, too

The hod-carriers' is the common laborers' union. It has not held a national convention in 30 years, but it has been charging common pick-and-shovel workers $50 initiation fee plus dues. If we assume for a figure—and not an extravagant figure, by any means—that 50,000 such men have been put to work that would mean a rakeoff of $2,500,000 for that union alone, without reckoning in the dues at all.

Whose right of collective bargaining is this, anyway? Was it intended to protect the workmen or to provide a graft for a private organization? The workmen don't want to join. They don't rally 'round the union collector and implore him to be their bargaining agent. Personally, they would much prefer to part his hair with a spade and save that $50 per head plus dues, which would buy considerable shoe mileage for their kids or gin for their innards come Saturday night.

But they have to give up to this stranger who shows up on work of the United States Government, and if the contractor puts them to work without the give-up this stranger will jerk his head at the strangers representing the carpenters' and electricians' union and they jerk the job, and the soldiers can sleep under the stars.

This common laborers' union is one of our pretties. Over in Pennsylvania it bestrode the big high-speed highway job and took first cut at the pay of the poor, horny-handed side-hill dodgers of the farms and mines, many of them just getting off relief or public doin'-around jobs, who had muscle to sell and, by happy chance, a place to sell it.

But in Chicago it issued a sheaf of charters like a deck of cards to a dirty blackhander and gunman of the Colosimo-Capone civilization named Mike Carrozzo who was such a low and notorious gorilla that even in Chicago he couldn't get naturalized until his third attempt, when obviously some crook must have put in the fix with some other crook.

The locals, be it remembered, get most of the graft, paying only a small divvy to the international, and the local may be one hoodlum, as in the case of Carrozzo, who was

in himself about 30 locals, accountable to nobody, and one of the richest men in town in ready cash.

But what's the use? The Americans don't mind. It is the quaint, corrupt American way.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into provided that the calendar of unobjected-to bills should be called immediately at the conclusion of the speech by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand that during the calling of the calendar the 5-minute rule is in operation, but I do not wish to take 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the first order of business on the calendar under the unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator from Wyoming will be recognized to speak on that bill.

PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ENTERING MILITARY OR NAVAL FORCES

The bill (H. R. 6023) to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States was announced as first in order.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT ON ECONOMIC DISORDER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the address just concluded by the Senator from Kansas [Mr REED], together with numerous articles and speeches which are being made throughout the country, suggest to my mind that this is the appropriate time to call the attention of the Senate, and to such extent as may be possible the attention of the country also, to some phases of the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. This report was filed in the Senate by the chairman of the committee on March 31, 1941. It contains recommendations of a joint legislative and executive committee, which for 2 years and 9 months had been studying economic problems that have beset the world.

Speeches which are now being made, editorials which are now being written, radio broadcasts which are now being given nightly deal with various aspects of the study this committee made. The subject matter of the committee's report is the very substance of the conflict now raging on every continent and every sea.

Everyone, I think, must recognize that our first objective must be to win the war. We cannot safely permit ourselves to become involved in civil disunion over the solution of economic problems, because no solution can be made stable without victory But it is most important that we should understand that the war is essentially an economic conflict. The study of the T. N. E. C. was an attempt to analyze in a calm and dispassionate manner the economic problems which have upset the world. Its report was an attempt to remedy economic disorder and its recommendations point the way for the restoration of peace on a democratic basis. I am going to ask that some parts of this report may be published in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, let me say that too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that this war began and the United States became involved in it only because the statesmen of the world, the business leaders of the world, the labor leaders of the world, have not as yet discovered how to adjust the individual to the complicated organized economy of our time. Until that adjustment is made there will be no hope of a permanent settlement.

The conflict that is going on is a conflict between socialism and democracy. That is the heart and soul of world disorder, socialism upon the one hand, either of the Nazi or of the Communist variety, and democracy upon the other.

I read one portion of the report on page 26. as follows:

Socialism, whether it be of the Nazi or Communist variety, is the negation of the concept of private property. The concept of fascism preserves the system of private property, but for only a part of the community, and that part much the smaller.

Under the Fascist concept, the preponderant part of the community is confirmed in its dependence upon the small group in whose hands private ownership of large segments of property has been concentrated. Under neither scheme is there any hope for the masses to enjoy a free and stable opportunity to use their own property to sustain their economic existence. On the contrary, they are condemned to be the pawns of the state.

The central principle of socialism is that the group is supreme. The central principle of democracy is that the individual is supreme. The difficulties during the past 50 years, here in America and throughout the world, have arisen from the failure to protect the rights of the individual as against the growing power of groups. No one knows better than those of us who are Members of Congress what pressure groups mean. Yet they are only the normal and natural expression of the attempt of individuals to preserve from attack by other groups what they conceive to be the essential of their economic life.

The revelations made in the last few days with respect to the manner in which great corporations have used patents for their own advantage, even though the entire people suffered; the agitation which centers around the activities of labor organizations and farm organizations; the criticism which proceeds from the revelation of huge profits earned by some war contractors, are all manifestations of the central problem, the relation of the individual to the huge organizations which dominate our economic life.

This report of the T. N. E. C. points out that during the last decade the tendency toward collective government has appeared even here. Congress has passed bills which take on the characteristics, in some instances, of the Fascist theory, and in other instances of the Communist theory of government. The fundamental need of our time is to preserve the democratic principle, concerning which this report uses the following sentence:

The democratic concept preserves the institution of private property and guarantees to the masses a free and stable opportunity to labor and to possess the fruits of their toil.

This is fundamental Americanism. This is the recognition of the rights of the individual. This is a restatement of the principle enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, which, as everyone knows, was written to proclaim to all the world that personal rights of individual man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were the rights for the defense of which this Government was established.

We shall not begin to understand the cause of the war or the object for which we are fighting, and certainly we shall not be able to preserve democracy, unless we realize that individual personal rights in this very war are being threatened by the expansion of group power.

The gist of the recommendations made by the Temporary National Economic Committee is simply this, that all economic organizations which affect the national economy, whether they be organizations of capital or organizations of labor, or organizations of farmers—all national economic organizations which affect the national welfare should receive their authority from the National Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the following extracts from the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. First, the material beginning on page 24 and ending at the bottom of page 29, entitled "National Standards for National Corporations and Economic Organizations."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR NATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS

If the democracies of the world are to organize the peace and freedom for which they are fighting and this organization is to be accomplished without disorder, they must first decide what kind of organization they want and how it is to function. It will not do merely to drift, as unfortunately we have been drifting, nor to putter around with patchwork remedies intended to restore an economic structure that is already dead. If we are to have a democratic order in the New World instead of an order fashioned on the philosophy of a Hitler or a Lenin, it must be an order which is adjusted to the social and economic mechanisms of the twenty-first century instead of to those of the nineteenth.

The upheaval in which this generation is caught proceeds from the failure of leadership, here and throughout the world, to comprehend that the nineteenth century is as completely an era of the past as the eighteenth. Efforts to solve our problems of unemployment and underinvestment by the means and methods of the past were foredoomed to collapse, not because the principles on which leaders acted were wrong, but because the methods were not suited to the times.

It is generally agreed, for example, that competition must be maintained as the principle of our economy, for everyone seems to acknowledge that the alternative to competition is some form of concentrated government authority which might easily destroy

democracy. But the sort of competition of which most observers seem to think when they are considering the chaotic conditions which enmesh us is the competition of individuals, using the tools and working within the limitations of the last century. The record of this committee is full of comment by some of the wisest observers who came before us, in which the personal pronouns "he" and "him" were used to designate the units of modern competition, although, as a matter of fact, the economic behavior of individual competitors is no part of our problem. What we are concerned with is the behavior of the huge collective groups which use the tools of the twentieth century and are not hampered by any of the limitations of the nineteenth century which retained the business of that era within local boundaries and to the jurisdiction of local government.

It is lack of comprehension of this simple fact that is destroying democracy—destroying it here in America as well as in Europe. Democracy, which surely comprehends economic as well as political freedom for the natural person, cannot endure when the natural person cannot shape the policies and the activities of the collective agencies which control all the materials of his economic life. The American ideal of living has not changed, but the forms of our economic life have changed and most radically. The new forms of industrial organization are such that competition has become a vastly more difficult status to maintain, and the American ideal of free living for people is not nearly so easy of achievement as before organizations superseded men in the economy.

The new aspect of competition in our era and the much more insecure position of the natural person may be illustrated by the story of aluminum in the present defense effort. Production of aluminum, controlled for more than a quarter of a century by a single huge unit, was restricted, not by the capacity of people to use aluminum nor even their need for it, but by the will of the organization which produced and sold it. That will was swayed, not by any public judgment of what output or price should be, but solely by the private judgment of the rulers of the organization which produced and sold it. The absolute control of this organization could not be disturbed by any natural person, because no natural person acting by himself could produce aluminum in competition with the monopoly. Aluminum is not the product of individual enterprise. It is the product of modern collective enterprise. It can be produced only by machines and capital that the individual cannot command.

But no group of individuals would institute competition on their own resources either, although plenty of raw material was available. The obstacle here was the unwillingness of the owners of private capital to venture their own money in industrial competition with entrenched monopoly. Too much was at stake to warrant the risk of loss.

This was the situation when it became clear that the successful defense of democracy imperatively required an increased supply of aluminum. The increase is being obtained, not by the free private enterprise we all want to defend and perpetuate, but by government, that ogre before which business and freemen tremble. The Congress of the United States appropriates $32,000,000 out of an empty Treasury to build a new Tennessee Valley Authority dam to produce electric power for the monopoly to expand its output. Another agency of the Government advances $20,000,000 of nonexistent public money to loan to another large organization, which, thus backed by public credit, is willing to compete with the monopoly. But to make this competition effective, the new organization must also rely on public electric power, and so Congress is called upon to appropriate additional funds to expand the Bonneville public power project so that competition between organizations may be brought about to produce aluminum to save democracy and preserve to men their right to individual freedom.

The workers who will man the new plants and furnish the labor to operate the machines that will be used to produce the aluminum necessary to keep men free will be recruited from the four corners of the land for temporary jobs in a new environment, but with no certainty of employment when peace and democracy have been saved and the war demand for aluminum subsidies; no certainty unless, indeed, democracy finally awakens to the fact that the central problem of our time is how to adjust the economic organizations the modern world must have to the American ideal of living which we have cherished since the founding of the Nation.

This is a task for statesmen, statesmen in business and in government, who are capable of giving form and substance to the new organization for democracy—the democracy of the future. Unless such an organization is formulated now, the jibes of Hitler at the futile plutodemocracies will echo and re-echo from the ruins of London Bridge across a world in which the irreligious, authoritarian state is supreme and from which human liberty shall have been banished by arbitrary power.

Ours is the era of organization in the field of industry and commerce. And ours is the responsibility of determining the form and nature of the organizations with which the generations of the future must work. Already in our own country, by our own legislation, there have been erected organizations which are the prototypes of those developed by the so-called alien philosophies of Europe, and if we wish to avoid the danger of Nazi, Communist, or Fascist trends, we shall do well to identify the characteristics of those orders and wherein they differ from democracy.

Socialism, whether it be of the Nazi or communistic variety, is the negation of the concept of private property. The concept of fascism preserves the system of private property, but for only a part of the community, and that part much the smaller.

Under the Fascist concept, the preponderant part of the community is confirmed in its dependence upon the small group in whose hands private ownership of large segments of property has been concentrated. Under neither scheme is there any hope for the masses to enjoy a free and stable opportunity to use their own property to sustain their economic existence. On the contrary, they are condemned to be the pawns of the state.

The democratic concept preserves the institution of private property and guarantees to the masses a free and stable oportunity to labor and to possess the fruits of their toil.

The germs of each of these systems are apparent in our own economy.

The Bituminous Coal Act, for example, has set up an order in that industry which is not without its resemblance to the Fascist order. The deposits of coal are privately owned by small groups who are by law released from the burdens of competition. They are given the right, through the decisions of a Government bureau, to exact from the general public prices sufficient to maintain the industry. The workers must be content with wages secured to them by the efforts of a single big union which is Nation-wide in its operation.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is not without some aspects of socialism. A vast plant, built by public funds, employing thousands, and affecting the lives and welfare of millions, it is managed by a small board without responsibility to agencies like the Civil Service Commission or the General Accounting Office which supervise ordinary political bureaus. It is an example of a public corporation which is not subject to the control of the persons most directly affected by its operations except remotely through the power of the Congress to alter the law. The Board is in complete authority, and appropriations are sought from Congress only for plant expansion, not at all for operation.

Recently a measure was introduced in Congress to set up another such public corporation to administer the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, an organization which would establish in the States a function which would intimately affect the economic life of the people of the States in which operating and even that of adjacent States in which it had no plant.

The public corporation of this type is no new experiment. The device was used effectively during the World War to build a new merchant marine, to handle the grain and sugar problems, and to finance private enterprise. The War Finance Corporation which financed many essential industries through the war and protected many an agricultural producer during the depression that followed the war was the model for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation produced by the depression of 1929.

In every instance they were organizations formed for the public good, successful and unsuccessful in their operation, but often engaging in business of the type once regarded as solely the function of private enterprise. The alteration of our economy was such, however, that private enterprise was not equal to the task and the new organizations had to be set up. Disregarding their success or failure, the efficiency or inefficiency of their operation, we face the fact that they are collective institutions, and they are managed for but not by the persons whose interests are affected.

Similarly, the private industrial corporation, as already pointed out, is frequently a huge collective enterprise affecting the entire national community, owned by a few, managed by still fewer and bound together with other similar enterprises and financial institutions by a variety of devices in an industrial and commercial empire which does not possess the characteristics we call democratic. This development, in turn, has led to the establishment of Government bureaucracy, the maze of which defies explanation.

The task of democracy is to preserve the freedom and independence of the individual in this economic and political complexity and the obvious first step is to differentiate between the economic organizations which are essentially national in scope and those which are essentially local and at the same time definitely and clearly to fix their powers, responsibilities, and duties. The simple way to do this is to provide a national rule for the national corporations that carry on national commerce. The suggestion has been made over and over again by the statesmen of the last 50 years. It has been rejected because of an inherent fear that it would lead to political domination of the States by the Federal Government.

Some of those who have opposed the proposal have pointed out that the respective States have a complete legal right to regulate the activity within their borders of corporations created by other States. The right exists but has seldom been exercised. Indeed, in the nature of things it cannot be successfully exercised because so much business is essentially national in scope and the economic power of the corporations which carry it on is so great that individual States fear to place themselves at a possible disadvantage by imposing requirements which other States would not lay down. The result has been that we have witnessed in America the steady progress of centralism—centralism in business, centralism in labor, centralism in agriculture, centralism in government. The very consequence which it was feared would follow from a system of Federal charters or licenses for corporations

engaged in interstate and foreign commerce has proceeded from the failure to adopt that formula, and simultaneously, with the development of centralism the economic impotence of the States and of local communities has become more and more striking.

The principal instrument of the concentration of economic power and wealth has been the corporate charter with unlimited powers—charters which afforded a detour around every principle of fiduciary responsibility; charters which permitted promoters and managers to use the property of others for their own enrichment to the detriment of the real owners; charters which made possible the violation of law without personal liability; charters which omitted every safeguard of individual and public welfare which common sense and experience alike have taught are necessary

Among those to suffer the worst effects of the failure to require national standards for national corporations are, it is almost possible to say, the businessmen of the Nation who have been taught to fear a national charter law. Because the local corporation and the small corporation have no protection against the unfair and improper activity of the large corporation, little business has seen a constantly increasing portion of the Nation's business pass into the hands of big business.

Throughout the 50-year period during which the Government establishment at Washington has steadily grown little businessmen have always been told by the opponents of a charter system that they, the little ones, would be the victims of Government interference and control, if a national charter system were adopted. The system was not adopted and the little business man finds himself compelled to deal with both the bureaucrat and the monopolist

A national law which would prohibit interlocking directorships would eliminate one of the principal causes of concentration and would injure no local or small corporation.

A national law which would make corporation directors trustees in fact as well as in law would protect investors big and little and would injure no local or small corporation

A national law which would raise a barrier to business dealings by corporation officers and directors for their own personal profit with the corporations they manage would protect investors and all honest business enterprise.

A national law which would make corporation officers and directors civilly liable personally for violations of the antitrust laws which they themselves conceived and directed would protect all business

A national law which would clearly define the scope of subsidiary corporations and one which would standardize intercorporate financing would remove two of the causes of concentration

These and other necessary reforms could be effected by a national charter law without in the slightest degree impairing State sovereignty. Indeed, such provisions would have the very opposite effect because they would abolish the principal means by which the concentration which has undermined local economic sovereignty has been effected

So long as those who want to voyage at will upon the seas of interstate and foreign commerce without responsibility to the public may obtain unlimited charters from the States, there is no efficient means of safeguarding the general welfare, for even the regulatory powers of agencies like the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission are not sufficient to prevent the evils which arise from loose State charters.

If it be desirable to foster small business and encourage independent economic development in the States, if it be desirable to improve the fiduciary standards of the modern business corporation and protect investors, the simple way is to strike at the cause and prevent the practices that are condemned instead of trying vainly to correct and punish wrongs after they have been committed.

National standards such as are suggested here would require no expanding bureaucracy to administer. They would clothe no Government employee with discretionary power They would have the simple effect of raising the corporate standards of the entire business world and thereby would liberate business from the dangers of arbitrary power whether exercised by monopoly or Government.

In the absence of legislation of this kind, it will be quite impossible to escape the continued multiplication of Government boards and commissions. Free independent enterprise will continue to be condemned to wage an unequal battle with concentrated power and the progress of concentration will make inevitable the development of more discretionary Government tribunals to protect the masses. We must either keep business organizations within bounds or accept some form of concentrated government.

The Temporary National Economic Committee, therefore, endorses the principle of national standards for national corporations and recommends that Congress enact legislation to that effect

[Approved. Dissenting: Sumners, Reece, O'Connel, and Pike.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed immediately following that, the personal statement by the Chairman of the T. N. E. C., which appears on pages 47 and 48 of the final report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, ON A NATIONAL CONFERENCE TO DEVELOP NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR NATIONAL ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS

It is a fundamental rule of democratic society, as already pointed out in this report, that authority over the society proceeds from the whole and not from any part of it. It follows from this that the organizations which affect the whole should be amenable to the whole and should derive their authority from the whole Organizations, which from their very nature must of necessity influence the political or economic life of a democracy, must be of a character to reflect the will of the members rather than the will of the leaders.

Democratic society is willing to permit the individual to exercise the utmost freedom because no individual acting alone can so injure the entire community (except in the case of crime) as to justify the withdrawal of individual liberty. This is not the case, however, when organizations become so large and powerful that by weight of numbers, by wealth or power they threaten or affect the public welfare. In such instances the public has the right to define the nature and the form of the organization, not for the purpose of "regimenting" it but for the sole purpose of making certain that the organization shall operate in the public interest.

For this reason, since it appears that as a result of economic concentration there are not only huge corporate business and industrial organizations which intimately affect the entire national economy, but also trade associations, agricultural associations, consumers' organizations and labor unions, as well as pressure groups of various kinds, all of which are beyond the jurisdiction of local political subdivisions, I am personally of the opinion that the Congress, which represents all the people, should, by legislation, lay down definite standards of organization and activity for all such groups. This would be no easy task, but it seems to be preeminently a necessary one, for if the people of America in order to make the defense of democracy effective have found themselves obliged to coordinate all their forces and resources for the purposes of war, it seems clear that a similar coordination must be made effective if we are to establish the coming peace upon an unassailably democratic basis.

The mark of our economy has been largely one of restricting production for the purpose of maintaining price. That policy is to be found everywhere, but the defense crisis teaches us that stimulated production, not restricted production, is our great need. If, under the impetus of war, we are eliminating all restriction on production surely the demonstrated economic needs of millions teach us that we should have the same policy in peace. Only thus can we hope to distribute equitably among all the people the abundance Nature provides

The termination of the war effort, putting to an end, as it may very suddenly, the industrial activity now gaining tremendous momentum, will bring with it problems more critical and more fraught with danger than those which followed the collapse of 1929. Unless the democratic society of America shall have prepared in advance for this hour there will be no alternative except Government action, which will necessarily be as inconclusive as the action which has heretofore been taken The unsolved problems of post-war depression will be heaped upon the unsolved problems of pre-war depression and it is difficult to say how, in these circumstances, democracy can survive unless democracy prepares for peace now.

Therefore I recommend that the Congress by an appropriate statute call a national conference of the various organizations representative of business, labor, agriculture, and consumers, which have for years been working on the diverse phases of the economic problem The duties of such a conference would be twofold. First, to define the nature and democratic responsibility of such organizations—business, labor, agriculture, and all—and, second, to define a formula for stimulated production under the impetus of peace rather than war.

Mr O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, following the other two extracts, the material on patent laws, beginning on page 36 and ending on the bottom of page 37.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. PATENT LAWS

No one can read the testimony developed before this committee on patents without coming to a realization that in many important segments of our economy the privilege accorded by the patent monopoly has been shamefully abused. It is there revealed in striking fashion that the privilege given has not been used, as was intended by the framers of the Constitution and by the Congress, "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts," but rather for purposes completely at variance with that high ideal It has been used as a device to control whole industries, to suppress competition, to restrict output, to enhance prices, to suppress inventions, and to discourage inventiveness.

We have certain specific recommendations to make which, in our judgment, are clearly called for by the record before us. It should be emphasized, however, that if the pattern of control which has been achieved through the patent monopoly continues in spite of the changes we suggest, and it is entirely possible that it will, a complete reexamination of

our patent laws should be made with a view to determining whether, under present-day conditions, they are calculated to achieve their avowed purposes.

Indicated changes in the patent laws divide naturally into two general classes—procedural and substantive In its preliminary report to the Congress, dated July 17, 1939, the committee made certain recommendations with respect to the patent laws. Some of the procedural changes recommended have since become law. Subsequent examination of the problem has confirmed our belief that substantial changes are needed, including some in addition to those already recommended.

(a) Licensing of patents: In order to eliminate the use of patents in ways inimical to the public policy inherent in the patent laws, as well as that of the antitrust laws, we recommend that the Congress enact legislation which will require that any future patent is to be available for use by anyone who may desire its use and who is willing to pay a fair price for the privilege. Machinery, either judicial or administrative, should be set up to determine whether the royalty demanded by the patentee may fairly be said to represent reasonable compensation or is intended to set a prohibitive price for such use

This proposal is intended to prevent the suppression of patents as well as to provide for their availability for use in an equitable manner in any industry where they are a major factor.

[Approved. Dissenting: Sumners and Taylor.]

(b) Unrestricted licenses: We recommend that the owner of any patent be required to grant only unrestricted licenses, and that he not be permitted to impose restrictions upon the buyer in sales of patented articles. In other words, the holder of a patent should not be permitted to restrict a licensee in respect of the amount of any article he may produce, the price at which he may sell, the purpose for which or the manner in which he may use the patent or any article produced thereunder, or the geographical area within which he may produce or sell such article There should be a further prohibition against any other restriction which would tend substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly, unless such restriction is necessary to promote the progress of science and the useful arts.

[Approved without objection.]

(c) Recording of transfers and agreements: We recommend that any sale, license, assignment, or other disposition of any patent be evidenced by an instrument in writing and that the same be required of any condition, agreement, or understanding relating to any sale or disposition of any such patent, and that in any such case a copy of such written instrument be filed with the Federal Trade Commission within 30 days after execution. There should, of course, be a substantial monetary penalty for failure to file as required

[Approved without objection.]

(d) Limitation on suits for infringement: In order to prevent the use of litigation as a weapon of business aggression rather than as an instrument for adjudicating honest disputes, we recommend legislation which will provide that no action, based upon a charge of infringement of any patent, whether for damages, for an injunction, or for any other relief, shall be permitted against any licensee under a patent or against any purchaser or licensee or any article unless the plaintiff has previously secured a judgment against the grantor of the license or the manufacturer of the article for infringement in connection with the granting of such license or the sale of such article.

[Approved without objection.]

(e) Forfeiture of patent for violation: If any person who owns any interest in or right under a patent violates any of the prohibitions described in paragraphs (a) and (b) above, his interest therein should be forfeited, such forfeiture to be brought about in a civil action against such person by the United States. Any patent or interest therein so forfeited should become a part of the public domain.

[Approved. Dissenting: Taylor.]

(f) Single Court of Patent Appeals: In order to improve the existing mechanism for the issuance of patents and the determination of disputes relating thereto, we recommend the creation of a single Court of Patent Appeals with jurisdiction coextensive with the United States and its Territories. Such a court would replace the present 11 different and independent jurisdictions and should do much to assure uniform treatment of patents and to reduce the time and cost of patent litigation.

[Approved without objection.]

(g) Limitation on period of patent monopoly: The life of a patent should be so limited that it will expire not more than 20 years from the date of the filing of the application, thus obviating the possibility of prolonging the patent monopoly by keeping an application pending in the Patent Office a long time. This would mean that if an application were kept pending in the Patent Office for more than 3 years the 17-year term of the patent granted would be to that extent decreased.

[Approved without objection.]

PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ENTERING MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6023?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6023) to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECREATION BOARD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to revert to order of business 1151, House bill 5075.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator state the nature of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is House bill 5075, to create a recreation board for the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5075) to create a recreation board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That there is hereby created in and for the District of Columbia a Recreation Board hereinafter referred to as "the Board."

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE RECREATION BOARD

SECTION 1. The Board shall consist of seven members as follows: A representative of the Board of Commissioners selected by that Board; a representative of the Board of Education selected by that Board; the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks ex officio; and four members, who shall have been for 5 years immediately preceding their selection bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years each, except the original appointments which shall be for terms of 1, 2, 3, and 4 years, respectively. The appointment of the four citizens shall be without regard to race, sex, or creed, and shall take judicious account of the various parent, civic, and other organizations through which residents of the District voice their civic wishes and advance the common welfare The two members of the Board representing the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education shall be designated annually by their respective agencies.

SEC. 2. The members of the Board shall not be personally liable in damages for any official action of the said Board performed in good faith, nor shall any member of said Board be liable for any costs that may be taxed against them or the Board on account of any such official action; but such costs shall be charged to the District of Columbia and paid as other costs are paid in suits brought against the municipality; nor shall the said Board or any of its members be required to give any supersedeas bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatever.

SEC. 3. Vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term by the agency which made the original selection.

SEC. 4. The members of the Board shall serve without compensation for such service.

SEC. 5. The Board shall select from among its citizen membership its chairman and its secretary and is hereby authorized and empowered to adopt all necessary rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

SEC 6. The Board shall hold stated meetings and such additional meetings as they may from time to time deem necessary. All meetings of the Board shall be open to the public.

ARTICLE II. FUNCTIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD

SECTION 1. The Board shall determine all questions of general policy relating to public recreation in and for the District of Columbia, and shall supervise and direct expenditure of all appropriations and/or other funds made available to the Board.

SEC. 2. The Board is hereby authorized to appoint a Superintendent of Recreation, which position is hereby authorized and created, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board but not a member thereof, and shall be charged with the general organization, administration, and supervision of the program of public recreation contemplated and provided for by this Act. The Superintendent shall be a person of such training, experience, and capacity as will especially qualify him to discharge the duties of the office He shall possess those qualifications of education, training, and experience in recreation work as well as executive and administrative experience which will assure a thorough knowledge of current theory and practice in public recreation and give promise of the administrative ability necessary to administer a program of public recreation in and for the Nation's Capital

The Board, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, is empowered to appoint, promote demote and terminate the employment of such personnel as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Superintendent may suspend for cause for a period not exceeding 30 days any employee of the Board.

All present personnel of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department whose services have heretofore been rated satisfac-

tory shall be retained by the Board with the understanding that this provision does not contemplate the continued employment of individuals whose service is inefficient, and such personnel shall continue to function under existing rules and regulations until such time as classification and civil-service requirements have been effected.

The Superintendent and all other regular annual personnel of the Recreation Board shall be employees of the District of Columbia. Their salaries and positions shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, without regard to race, sex, or creed, and the civil-service requirements as agreed upon between the Civil Service Commission and the District Commissioners or any existing agreement between them relative to the selection and change of status of District of Columbia employees.

Upon recommendation of the Superintendent, the Board is authorized to employ, on a part-time basis, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, and without reference to civil-service requirements, and without regard to the prohibition against double salaries provided by section 1763, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. Annotated, title 5, sec. 58), such teachers, custodial, and other employees of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education, upon approval by the present employer, as may be necessary to keep in operation and to conduct therein appropriate phases of the recreation program authorized by this act.

The respective facilities of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education shall by the agreement of the respective agencies of the Government having control of such facilities, be made available to the Board under the terms of this act.

The Superintendent is authorized to employ for a 90-day period as full- or part-time employees, such referees, umpires, swimming-pool guards and attendants, gymnasium and playground supervisors, and other similar special employees as may be necessary to carry out the recreation program authorized by this act, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to civil-service requirements, and without regard to the prohibition against double salaries provided by section 1763, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. Annotated, title 5, sec. 58): *Provided*, That the retention in the District service of any such employees for a period longer than 90 days shall be subject to the approval of the Board.

The Board is authorized to accept upon recommendation of the Superintendent the gratis services of such persons as may volunteer to aid in the conduct of any of its activities.

SEC. 3. The Board shall have power and authority to adopt, conduct, direct, or cause to be conducted or directed, under its supervision, a comprehensive program of public recreation which shall include the operation and direction of games, sports, arts and crafts, hobby shops, music, drama, speech, nursery play, dancing, lectures, forum for informal discussion, and such other physical, social, mental, and creative opportunities for leisure-time participation as the Board shall deem advisable to offer in major recreation centers, playfields, athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, beaches, golf courses, community centers, and social centers in schools, parks, or other publicly owned buildings, as well as other recreational facilities which may be agreed upon between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities. The public properties utilized by the Board for the above purposes shall include those designated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in accordance with a comprehensive plan, as suitable and desirable units of the District of Columbia recreation system.

Nothing in this act contained shall be construed as affecting any rights under any existing lease or leases lawfully entered into by any agency mentioned or affected by this act, nor shall anything in this act contained be construed as affecting the right of any such agency in the future lawfully to enter into leases of land or premises under its control for recreational purposes.

SEC. 4. The Board is hereby authorized to create a trust fund similar to that now operated by the Community Center and Playgrounds Department in which shall be deposited all fees and receipts from those activities which the Board may deem it advisable to conduct on a fee basis or any other basis, the moneys in such trust fund to be available to the Board to defray in whole or in part the expense of conducting its activities, the fund to be audited quarterly by the auditor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. The Board shall prepare and submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an annual budget itemizing the appropriations necessary for the performance of its functions and duties under this act, including appropriations necessary for the purchase of books, literature, newspapers, periodicals, technical reference material, trophies, and medals, and as provided in article III, section 4, of this act, the Board's share of the cost of improvement, maintenance, and upkeep of the buildings and grounds used by the Board and which are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education, the Board of Commissioners, or the National Park Service.

SEC. 6. The Board shall submit to the Commissioners an annual report of its activities, together with recommendations for further activities and development, or curtailment.

ARTICLE III. RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD TO OTHER AGENCIES

SECTION 1. All the functions of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department now under the joint control of the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education are hereby transferred to and shall, after the effective date of this act, be vested in the said Recreation Board. The transfer of all such functions shall include transfer of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department, any unexpended balance in trust funds, and the salary of the coordinator now carried in the appropriation of the National Capital Parks.

SEC. 2. The control of all land, buildings, and other facilities used by the Board shall be in accordance with agreements reached between the Board and the governmental agencies having jurisdiction over such properties.

SEC. 3. No power or authority conferred by this act shall be construed to abridge the powers of the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or the National Park Service to refuse the use of any ground, building, or facility under their individual or collective control whenever the use of any such ground, building, or facility for recreational purposes would interfere with the use or purpose for which such ground, building, or facility was acquired or created, and nothing herein expressed or implied shall be construed to abrogate any powers vested in the Board of Education by the organic act of 1906 insofar as the control of public education and all necessary facilities and personnel is concerned.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and improvement of all playgrounds and recreation areas and facilities now under the control of the Board of Education, or of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or of the National Park Service, or which may hereafter be acqured by any of said agencies for said purpose, may be provided for by agreement between the Board and the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the National Park Service, respectively. The Board is hereby authorized to transfer to the said agencies such funds, equipment, and personnel as may be necessary to carry said agreements into effect.

SEC. 5. The Board is authorized to arrange with other governmental agencies for services on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 6. All equipment, machinery, supplies, and materials of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department shall, on the effective date of this act, be transferred to the Board.

SEC. 7. The plan or system for the administration, operation, and conduct of recreation facilities in use by the Community Center and Playgrounds Department of the District of Columbia at the time of the passage and approval of this act is hereby adopted and made the permanent policy for the administration, operation, and conduct of all recreation facilities placed by this act under the jurisdiction of the Board. The Board shall continue to recognize coordinate authority of white and colored personnel in the administration, operation, and conduct of the respective programs to be adopted, conducted, directed, and supervised by the Board under the terms of this act.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its approval.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, beginning with line 16 and ending with line 3, on page 18, it is proposed to strike out all of section 7 of article III.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I offer a further amendment, and may explain that it merely provides for renumbering sections 8 and 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 8" and insert "Sec. 7", and on page 18, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 9" and insert "Sec. 8."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barbour	Bunker
Andrews	Barkley	Burton
Austin	Bone	Butler
Bailey	Brooks	Byrd
Ball	Brown	Capper
Bankhead	Bulow	Caraway

Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Schwartz
Clark, Idaho	La Follette	Shipstead
Clark, Mo.	Lee	Smathers
Connally	Lucas	Smith
Danaher	McCarran	Spencer
Davis	McFarland	Stewart
Doxey	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
George	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	Millikin	Truman
Gillette	Murdock	Tunnell
Glass	Murray	Tydings
Green	Nye	Vandenberg
Guffey	O'Daniel	Van Nuys
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Walsh
Herring	Pepper	Wheeler
Hill	Radcliffe	Wiley
Holman	Reed	Willis
Hughes	Reynolds	
Johnson, Calif.	Rosier	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' RELIEF ACT OF 1940—RECOMMITTAL

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert for a moment to Calendar 1147, Senate bill 1842.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None is heard.

The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1842) to extend certain benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, my purpose in reverting to this bill is to say that additional information has come to me since the Military Affairs Committee considered the bill. I have conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee and with the chairman of the committee, and they agree with me that the bill should go back to the committee for further consideration. I therefore move that it be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN LOSSES OF DISTILLED SPIRITS IN BONDED WAREHOUSES

The bill (H. R. 6273) to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEASING OF UNDEVELOPED COAL DEPOSITS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS, OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1542) to authorize the leasing of the undeveloped coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease any of the unsold segregated coal deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Leases shall be for indeterminate periods upon condition of diligent development and continued operation of the mine or mines, except when such operation shall be interrupted by strikes, the elements, or casualties not attributable to the lessee, and upon further condition that at the end of each 20-year period succeeding the date of approval of the lease such readjustment of terms and conditions may be made as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, unless otherwise provided by law at the time of the expiration of such periods: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may permit suspension of operation under a lease for not to exceed 1 year at any one time when market conditions are such that the lease cannot be operated except at a loss.

SEC. 2. The rate of royalty in coal leases made under this act shall not be less than 8 cents per ton on all coal mined, including what is commonly known as slack: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe minimum annual tonnage requirements and advance annual rental payments for each lease. If the minimum annual tonnage specified in a lease is not mined, the lessee shall pay royalty thereon the same as if the coal had actually been mined. The advance rental paid for any year shall be credited on the royalty becoming due on coal mined during the year for which the said advance rental has been paid but shall not be credited on royalty on coal mined in any previous or subsequent year.

SEC. 3. Any act, or acts, or part of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title, as proposed to be amended by the committee, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the leasing of the undeveloped coal deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the title as proposed to be amended, I offer an amendment to strike out the word "undeveloped" and insert in lieu thereof the word "segregated."

The amendment to the amendment to the title was agreed to.

The title as amended was agreed to.

ONIE MARTIN AND BETTY MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 4099) for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FOR OVERPAYMENTS

The bill (H. R. 5652) to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD L. MILLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5887) for the relief of Howard L. Miller, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$2,360" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FLOYD P. MORITZKY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. WILLIAM MEISTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1991) for the relief of Mrs. William Meister, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$2,000"; and in line 9, after the figures "1938", to strike out "when struck and hurled into an excavation being operated by the Works Progress Administration on West Holden Avenue, Lemay, Mo.," and insert "when she fell on West Holden Avenue, Lemay, Mo., as the result of stepping upon a small stone permitted to roll in the roadway by employees of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000." So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. William Meister, of Lemay, Mo., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. William Meister on June 21, 1938, when she fell on West Holden Avenue, Lemay, Mo., as the result of stepping upon a small stone permitted to roll in the roadway by employees of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAX MILLER AND VERA CAROLINE MILLER, AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1732) for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on

page 1, line 7, after the words "sums of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000"; in line 9, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000"; and in line 10, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, parents of Lucile Alice Miller, deceased, the sum of $3,000; to Elizabeth Frances Chapman, mother of John Frederick Chapman, deceased, the sum of $3,000; and to Gladys Estella Reid, mother of Caryol Norrine Reid, deceased, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for the deaths of Lucille Alice Miller, John Frederick Chapman, and Caryol Norrine Reid, respectively, who died as a result of injuries received in an automobile accident between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck driven by Private James Duncan at the intersection of Illinois State Route 22 and U. S. Route 45 at Half Day, so-called, on March 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

L. H. GOODMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1044) for the relief of L. H. Goodman, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000", and insert "$1,500"; and on page 2, after the name "Tennessee;", to insert "*Provided*, That payment under this act shall be conditioned upon the filing by L. H. Goodman of a discharge and satisfaction of the judgment against Wallace Welsh", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to L. H. Goodman, of Monteagle, Grundy County, Tenn., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Harleth Goodman, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him on November 9, 1939, when he was struck by a truck of the Works Progress Administration on United States Highway No. 41, between Pelham, Tenn., and Monteagle, Tenn.: *Provided*, That payment under this act shall be conditioned upon the filing by L. H. Goodman of a discharge and satisfaction of the judgment against Wallace Welsh: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHAVER FORWARDING CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1648) for the relief of the Shaver Forwarding Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, notwithstanding the lapse of time, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg., for alleged damages for loss of revenues from its transportation business during the period November 1, 1935, through December 31, 1938, resulting from the closing to navigation of the Columbia River during the construction of the Bonneville Dam: *Provided*, That such suit shall be brought within 1 year of the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3488) to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFEICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], who reported the bill, is temporarily absent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the bill be temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

MURFREESBORO, TENN., WATER-PUMPING STATION AND PIPE LINE

The bill (S. 2356) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant easements to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line, in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn, described as follows:

PIPE LINE

Beginning at a point in the southern boundary of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., in the center of Compton Road, said point being three thousand and eighty-eight feet east of the intersection of the center line of Compton Road with the center line of Lebanon-Murfreesboro Pike at the southwest corner of the Veterans' Administration facility; thence north one degree thirty-two minutes west four thousand and thirty-four feet more or less to a point on the south bank of Stones River.

PUMP-HOUSE SITE

Beginning at a point in the above-described pipe line twelve feet south of the south bank of Stones River; thence south eighty-eight degrees twenty-eight minutes west eleven feet; thence north one degree thirty-two minutes west thirty-five feet; thence north eighty-eight degrees twenty-eight minutes east twenty-two feet; thence south one degree thirty-two minutes east thirty-five feet; thence south eighty-eight degrees twenty-eight minutes west eleven feet to the point of beginning.

ACCESS ROAD

A strip of land twelve feet wide running in an easterly direction eight hundred feet more or less along the south bank of Stones River from the pump-house site to the easterly boundary of the Veterans' Administration Facility.

SEC. 2. The easements authorized by this act shall be conditioned on the erection by the city of Murfreesboro, without expense to the United States, of a fence, enclosing the pump-house site, satisfactory to the Veterans' Administration, and no other portion of the lands described in this act will be fenced; the depth of the cover over the pipe line shall be sufficient so that no interference will result in the use of the land for farming activities; no electric transmission line of any kind shall be erected on the facility lands by the city of Murfreesboro under the easements granted pursuant to this act, and no pole for the support of electric wires shall be located at any point on the facility outside of the pump-house site; all of the lands covered by the easements, with the exception of the fenced pump-house site, shall remain available for Veterans' Administration activities not incompatible with the purpose of the easements and the existing dam and reservoir in Stones River shall be maintained by the city of Murfreesboro and available as an emergency water supply for the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 3. The easements herein authorized to be granted shall be limited to the period of time the aforesaid lands are required and actually used by the city of Murfreesboro for the construction and maintenance of a water-pumping station, and when no longer so required and used, all interests herein authorized to be conveyed in said lands shall cease and determine.

OVERPAYMENTS ON TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTS

The bill (S. 2305) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no disbursing or certifying officer of the United States shall be held liable for overpayments made for transportation furnished on Government bills of lading or transportation requests when said overpayments are due to the use of improper transportation rates, classifications, or the failure to deduct the

proper amount under land-grant laws or equalization and other agreements.

PAYMENT OF DEPOSITS AND INTEREST THEREON OF ENLISTED MEN

The bill (S. 2353) to amend sections 1305 and 1306 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against payment of deposits, and interest thereon, of enlisted men until final discharge, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 1305, Revised Statutes, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended to read as follows: "Any amount heretofore or hereafter so deposited shall be held during such period of his service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War; shall be accounted for in the same manner as other public funds; shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and kept as a separate fund, known as pay of the Army deposit fund, repayment of which to the enlisted man, or to his heirs or representatives, shall be made out of the fund created by said deposits; shall not be subject to forfeiture by sentence of court martial, but shall be forfeited by desertion; and shall be exempt from liability for such soldier's debts: *Provided*, That the Government shall be liable for the amount deposited to the person so depositing the same."

SEC. 2. Section 1306, Revised Statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows: "For any sums not less than $5 so deposited for the period of 6 months, or longer, the soldier, on his final discharge or at such time as times prior thereto as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, shall be paid interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum."

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I send to the desk a routine amendment to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection if the Senator from New Jersey wishes to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be received, and objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

RENEWAL OF LEASE OF OLD NAVAL HOSPITAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6440) to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIN HOY

The bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of Chin Hoy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I should like to know what was the alleged failure of cooperation or what were the damages which were caused by failure to comply with the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Connecticut that the bill was reported by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], who is temporarily absent; accordingly, the bill will be temporarily passed over.

MARTIN J. PRICE

The bill (H. R. 3091) for the relief of Martin J. Price, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAZEL M. LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 716) for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "$5,738.85" and insert "$1,798.85", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Hazel M. Lewis, of Powers, Oreg., the sum of $1,798.85, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for damages as a result of personal injuries sustained by Hazel M. Lewis when assaulted by Richard T. Foster, an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps assigned to Camp China Flats F-105, Fifty-four Hundred and Forty-third Company, on September 5, 1938, at Powers, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. WILLIAM STEWART WALKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2048) for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to First Lt. William Stewart Walker the sum of $115.87, out of any funds available for pay and travel of the Army, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for pay, allowances, and mileage, which claim was disallowed by the General Accounting Office on May 26, 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK S. MATHIAS AND ELSIE MATHIAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2116) for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, to strike out "$781.60", and insert "$731.60", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank S. Mathias, of Essex, Baltimore County, Md., the sum of $731.60, and to Elsie Mathias, his wife, the sum of $514.35, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, on Eastern Avenue about 150 feet west of Umber Street, Baltimore, Md., on August 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

QUIMBY-RYAN ENGINEERING SALES CO., INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2069) for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, to strike out "$1,268.03" and insert "$962.48", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc., of New York, N. Y., the sum of $962.48, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the payment of amounts heretofore withheld from said company as liquidated damages for delay in delivery of pumps furnished to the Treasury Department and the Works Progress Administration under several contracts entered into in March 1939; such delay having occurred without fault on the part of said company and because of circumstances beyond its control, and having resulted in no actual damage or inconvenience to the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. L. FREEMAN

The bill (H. R. 5576) for the relief of A. L. Freeman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF HUNTSVILLE, TEX.

The bill (S. 2309) for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.,

was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First National Bank, Huntsville, Tex., the sum of $105.61, in full settlement of the claim of the said bank on account of two checks numbered 4120725 and 5455048, dated November 1, 1940, in the amounts of $27.66 and $77.95, respectively, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, over symbol No. 894-404, in favor of Jesse Cooper Hickman, and cashed by the said bank on the endorsement of Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman as temporary guardian, such checks thereafter being erroneously canceled by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and the amounts thereof included in a new check issued to Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to relieve the said Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman from any liability to the United States on account of any amounts improperly received by her: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MR. AND MRS. R. F. CLAUD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1227) for the relief of Mr and Mrs. R. F. Claud, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$541", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud, of Clinton, Ky., the sum of $541, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered on December 19, 1939, at about 6:30 p. m., when the car in which they were riding ran into a ditch which had been cut across the road by employees of the Work Projects Administration, and which at the time of the accident was without any warning signs or lights: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY FAMIGLIETTI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1334) for the relief of Anthony Famiglietti, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anthony Famiglietti, of Providence, R. I., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages for personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage sustained by him when he was struck by a truck owned by the United States Government and operated by A. A. McGrath, an employee of Work Projects Administration, in the village of Chepachet, in the town of Glocester, R. I., on March 22, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPORT ON TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION AND PLANS

The resolution (S. Res. 228) calling on the Civil Aeronautics Authority for a report on transport aircraft production since 1938 and plans for future development of the air-transport industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I intend to ask that the resolution go over for the reason that the subject matter of the resolution is not properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Jurisdiction of this subject matter has always been held in this body by the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the resolution will be passed over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I made inquiry, and was told that the resolution should go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and it was sent there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The subject matter of the resolution has always been handled by the Committee on Commerce, at least, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. It is merely a resolution calling for information.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Committee on Commerce has always held jurisdiction over the whole subject matter of civil aviation.

Mr. GEORGE. I simply acted on the advice I received. It is a resolution which I myself asked to go to the committee; the resolution merely asks for information.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know anything about the resolution, but I do not propose to have established in another committee jurisdiction over a subject which always has been held under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution without reference to the committee which considered it. The resolution merely asks the Civil Aeronautics Board for information, and only information the disclosure of which is compatible with the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Civil Aeronautics Board be requested, if not inconsistent with the public interest, to report to the Senate of the United States at the earliest possible date what, if any, steps it has taken since 1938 to see that a great many more transport aircraft were built and in service, whether the air-transport industry has been, since that date, and is financially able to undertake expansion far beyond its present extent, and what steps the Board contemplates taking to see to it that the air-transport industry is able to and will develop in the future at the maximum possible rate.

The preamble was rejected.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 975) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by amending certain provisions of part II of said act, otherwise known as the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. The bill proposes by legislation to redefine the word "farm," so as to include other vocations than those we primarily think about when the word "farm" is used. It is proposed to have it include nurseries, ranges, and things of that sort, and certain industrial occupations, such as corn farmer or wheat farmer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the bill go over until I have an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT, 1930

The bill (H. R. 6366) to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUALIZATION OF PAY RATES OF ARMY, PHILIPPINE SCOUTS, AND PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH ARMY

The bill (S. 2387) to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of the second paragraph of section 36 of the act of February 2, 1901 (31 Stat. 757), as amended by the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 496), be, and the same is hereby, further amended to read as follows: "The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the personnel of the Philippine Scouts, and members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army while in the service of the armed forces of the United States, shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for the personnel of the Regular Army in corresponding grades."

SUSPENSION OF PROHIBITIONS AGAINST MARRIAGE OF OFFICERS OF LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2380) to suspend for the duration of the present war all prohibitions against the marriage of officers of the land and naval forces of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "engaged", to insert "or 6 months thereafter", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or regulation, no officer of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard shall be discharged, have his commission revoked, or be otherwise discriminated against because he was married at any time during any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged or 6 months thereafter, regardless of the length of time such officer has held his commission at the time of marriage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CREDITING OF MILITARY SERVICE UNDER THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (H. R. 6387) to extend the crediting of military service under the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, AND SETTLEMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask to revert to Calendar No. 1178, House bill 6328, and that it be now considered. The last time we considered the calendar this particular bill was passed over because of some objection. I desire to state that the bill is a departmental bill, the purpose of which is to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to adjust accounts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana to consider, out of order, House bill 6328, Calendar No. 1178?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6328) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS SAMUEL WURIU

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1944) for the relief of Thomas Samuel Wuriu, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Thomas Samuel Wuriu as of August 30, 1925, the date on which he entered the United States, provided he is admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACQUES HAILPERN AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1541) for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment, on page 1, in line 9, after the period, to strike out "Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct three numbers from the Rumanian quota of the first year that the said Rumanian quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ALBERT EDWARD WHITESIDE

The bill (H. R. 2922) for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUSTMENT AND JURISDICTION OF TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2221) to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this act, the term—

"Federal agency" includes the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States, and corporations whose primary function is to act as and while acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, whether or not authorized to sue and be sued in their own names: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to include any contractor with the United States.

"Employee of the Government" includes officers or employees of any Federal agency, members of the military or naval forces of the United States, and persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in an official capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States, whether with or without compensation.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT OF TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 201. Subject to the limitations of this act, authority is hereby conferred upon the head of each Federal agency, or his designee for the purpose, acting on behalf of the United States, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle any claim against the United States for money only, accruing after the approval of this act, on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death, where the total amount of the claim does not exceed $1,000, caused by the negligence of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death, in accordance with the law of the place where the negligence occurred. Subject to the provisions of title III of this act, any such award or determination shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government except when procured by means of fraud, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. Any award made to any claimant pursuant to this section, and any award, compromise, or settlement of any claim cognizable under this act made by the Attorney General pursuant to section 304, shall be paid by the head of the Federal agency concerned out of appropriations that may be made therefor, which appropriations are hereby authorized. The acceptance by the claimant of any such award, compromise, or settlement shall be final and conclusive on the claimant, and shall constitute a complete release by the claimant of any claim against the United States and against the employee of the Government whose negligence gave rise to the claim, by reason of the same subject matter.

SEC. 202. The head of each Federal agency shall annually make a report to the Congress of all claims presented to such Federal agency under this title. Such report shall include the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, or other disposition made in each instance, and a brief description of the claim.

TITLE III—SUITS ON TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 301. Subject to the provisions of this act, the United States district court for the district wherein the act or omission complained of occurred, including the United States district courts for the Territories and possessions of the United States, sitting as a court of claims without a jury, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on any claim against the United States, for money only, in any amount not exceeding the sum of $10,000, accruing after the date of approval of this act, on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death caused by the negligence of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death in accordance with the law of the place where the negligence occurred. Subject to the provisions of this act, the United States shall be liable in respect of such claims to the same claimants, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances, except that the United States shall not be liable for punitive damages, or interest, or costs. The judgment in such an action shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant, by reason of the same subject matter, against the employee of the Government whose negligence gave rise to the claim. No suit shall be instituted pursuant to this section upon a claim presented to any Federal agency pursuant to title II of this act unless such Federal agency has made final disposition of the claim: *Provided*, That the claimant may, upon 15 days' notice given in writing, withdraw the claim from consideration of the Federal agency and commence suit thereon pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That as to any claim so disposed of or so withdrawn, no suit shall be instituted pursuant to this section for any sum in excess of the

amount of the claim presented to the Federal agency, except where the increased amount of the claim is shown to be based upon newly discovered evidence not reasonably discoverable at the time of presentation of the claim to the Federal agency or upon evidence of intervening facts, relating to the amount of the claim. Disposition of any claim made pursuant to title II of this act shall not be competent evidence of liability or amount of damages in proceedings on such claim pursuant to this section. Judgments against the United States under this title shall be paid in the same manner as judgments rendered under section 24 (20) of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C., sec. 41 (20)): *Provided*, That if the judgment be based on the act or omission of a corporate Federal agency or of an officer or employee thereof, the judgment shall so declare, and the amount thereof shall be charged against funds available to said agency.

SEC. 302. In actions under this title, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure, shall be in accordance with the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (ch. 651, 48 Stat. 1064), and the same provisions for counterclaim and set-off shall be applicable as in cases brought in the United States district courts under the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. 505).

SEC. 303. Final judgments in the district courts in cases under this title shall be subject to review in the circuit courts of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as other judgments of the district courts; and sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended, shall apply to such cases in the circuit courts of appeals as to other cases therein.

SEC. 304. With a view to doing substantial justice, the Attorney General is authorized to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim cognizable under this title, after the institution of any suit thereon.

SEC. 305. The provisions of this title shall not apply to any claim arising out of the activities of the military or naval forces, or the Coast Guard during time of war.

TITLE IV—PROVISIONS COMMON TO TITLE II AND TITLE III

SEC. 401. Every claim against the United States cognizable under this act shall be forever barred, unless within a year after such claim accrued it is presented in writing to the Federal agency out of whose activities it arises, if such claim is for a sum not exceeding $1,000; or unless within 1 year after such claim accrued an action is begun pursuant to title III of this act. In the event that a claim for a sum not exceeding $1,000 is presented to a Federal agency as aforesaid, the time to institute a suit pursuant to title III of this act shall be extended for a period of 6 months from the date of mailing of notice to the claimant by such Federal agency by registered mail to the address last given by the claimant as to the final disposition of the claim or from the date of withdrawal of the claim from such Federal agency pursuant to section 301 of this act, if it would otherwise expire before the end of such period.

SEC. 402. The provisions of this act shall not apply to—

(1) Any claims based upon—

(a) the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused; or

(b) an act or omission of an employee of the Government, exercising due care, whether or not alleged to be wrongful, in the execution of a program, project, statute, or regulation, valid or invalid.

(2) Any claim arising out of the loss, miscarriage, or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter.

(3) Any claim arising in respect of the assessment or collection of any tax or customs duty, or the detention of any goods or merchandise by any officer of customs or excise or any other law-enforcement officer.

(4) Any claim for which a remedy is provided by the act of March 9, 1920 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 741-752, inclusive), or the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781-790, inclusive), relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States.

(5) Any claim arising out of an act or omission of any employee of the Government in administering the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

(6) Any claim for damages caused by the imposition or establishment of a quarantine by the United States.

(7) Any claim arising from injury to vessels, or to the cargo, crew, or passengers of vessels, while passing through the locks of the Panama Canal or while in Canal Zone waters.

(8) Any claim for which compensation is provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, or by the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended.

(9) Any claim arising out of assault, battery, false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or interference with contract rights, or a nuisance not involving negligence.

(10) Any claim for damages caused by the fiscal operations of the Treasury or by the regulations of the monetary system.

(11) Any claim arising in a foreign country.

SEC. 403. If the damage, loss, injury, or death with respect to which a claim is made pursuant to this act is caused under circumstances creating a legal liability on the part of some person other than an employee of the Government to pay damages therefor, jointly or severally with the United States, the award or judgment against the United States shall be only for the pro rata share of the damages in proportion to the number of parties so jointly or severally liable.

SEC. 404. The court rendering a judgment for the plaintiff pursuant to title III of this act, or the head of the Federal agency or his designee making an award pursuant to title II of this act, or the Attorney General making a disposition pursuant to section 304 of this act, as the case may be, shall, in each case where the claimant has been represented by attorney, as a part of the judgment, award, or settlement, determine and allow reasonable attorneys' fees, to be paid out of but not in addition to the amount of judgment, award, or settlement recovered, to the attorneys representing the claimant. If the recovery is $500 or more, the attorneys' fees thus determined and allowed shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered under title II or 20 percent of the amount recovered under title III. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 405. From and after the date of approval of this act, the authority of any Federal agency to sue and be sued in its own name shall not be construed to authorize suits against such Federal agency on claims which are cognizable under title III of this act, and the remedies provided by this act in such cases shall be exclusive.

SEC. 406. (a) All provisions of law authorizing any Federal agencies to consider, ascertain, adjust, or determine claims on account of damage to or loss of property, or on account of personal injury or death, caused by the negligence of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, are hereby repealed in respect to claims cognizable under title II of this act and accruing after the date of approval of this act, including, but without limitation, the provisions granting such authorization now contained in the following laws:

Public Law No. 375, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved December 28, 1922 (ch. 17, 42 Stat. 1066; 31 U. S. C., secs. 215-217).

Public Law No. 163, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 28, 1937 (ch. 383, 50 Stat. 321; 16 U. S. C., sec. 584o).

Public Law No. 267, Sixty-sixth Congress, approved June 5, 1920 (ch. 256, 41 Stat. 1054; 33 U. S. C., sec. 853).

Public Law No. 481, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 20, 1936 (ch. 159, 49 Stat. 1184; 5 U. S. C., sec. 300 (b)).

Section 4 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 25, 1910, as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1015; 33 U. S. C., sec. 564).

Public Law No. 338, Sixty-second Congress, approved August 24, 1912 (ch. 391, sec. 1, 37 Stat. 586; 5 U. S. C., sec. 208).

Public Law No. 182, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved July 1, 1918 (ch. 114, 40 Stat. 705; 34 U. S. C., sec. 600).

Section 4 of Public Law No. 18, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved June 16, 1921 (ch. 231, 42 Stat. 63), as amended by Public Law No. 456, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 22, 1934 (ch. 717, 48 Stat. 1207; 5 U. S. C., sec. 392).

(b) Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to repeal any provision of law authorizing any Federal agency to consider, ascertain, adjust, settle, determine, or pay any claim on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death, in cases in which such damage, loss, injury, or death was not caused by any negligence of an employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, or any other claim not cognizable under title II of this act.

SEC. 407. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMMETT ARMSTRONG

The bill (H. R. 5452) for the relief of Emmett Armstrong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CITY OF ATLANTA, GA.

The bill (H. R. 5866) for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARROL D. WARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2192) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

IDA BAIRD

The bill (H. R. 3732) for the relief of Ida Baird was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEOFFREY ORME

The bill (H. R. 4955) for the relief of Geoffrey Orme was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE GARCAVY

The bill (H. R. 5049) for the relief of George Garcavy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF CHARLES L. CLARK

The bill (H. R 5500) for the relief of the estate of Charles L. Clark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. J. ABNEY

The bill (H. R. 5504) for the relief of H. J. Abney was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEWIS J. AND MARY BLACK

The bill (H. R. 5686) for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM HORSMAN

The bill (H. R. 5559) for the relief of William Horsman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. F. WILDER TEMPLE

The bill (H. R. 5977) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

E. P. CORLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,250" and insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EDD NEVINS

The bill (H. R. 639) for the relief of Edd Nevins, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY J. McCLOSKEY

The bill (H. R. 4464) for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL ELLIOTT AND HELEN ELLIOTT

The bill (H. R. 6714) for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTIN N. MAYRATH

The bill (H. R. 710) for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COL. S. W. McILWAIN

The bill (H. R. 3724) for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KARL K. WILKES

The bill (H. R. 4625) for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHNSTON-HALL HOSPITAL AND DR. Z. V. JOHNSTON

The bill (H. R. 5363) for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIETT BOSWELL, GUARDIAN OF BETTY FISHER

The bill (S. 2235) for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harriett Boswell, of Paducah, Ky., guardian of Betty Fisher, the sum of $1,266.50, in full settlement of any claim of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher, against the United States for personal injuries caused Betty Fisher on January 21, 1937, by the negligent operation of a truck owned by the United States Government and driven by one of the employees in the Soil Conservation Service, which was at the time using said truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BOB SAMPLEY

The bill (S. 2278) for the relief of Bob Sampley was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bob Sampley, of Forrest City, Ark. the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and for reimbursement of medical expenses incurred as the result of having been struck by a tin bucket thrown from an Army troop train near Madison, Ark., on June 18, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FRANKLIN BENJAMIN McNEW

The Senate proceeed to consider the bill (S. 1756) for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000 to Franklin Benjamin McNew, of Oklahoma City, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the permanent loss of sight in one of his eyes as the result of an injury sustained by him on June 1, 1937, while on an institutional assignment as an inmate of the United States penitentiary, Leavenworth Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION

The bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I believe that bill should have full consideration on the floor of the Senate, and, therefore, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, that is a very important bill, and I should like to have a time fixed when it may be taken up for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be taken up immediately following the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 2288) to amend subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes" (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon followed by the words: "*Provided further*, That for the purposes of this subsection the length of total commissioned service of an officer, commissioned as an extra number in the Coast Guard from the former Lighthouse Service, shall be considered to be the same as that of the officer in a regular number in line of promotion next above him on the seniority list."

RETIREMENT WITH ADVANCED RANK OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank of certain officers of the Navy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as the commander of a fleet or subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list: *Provided*, That no increase in retired pay shall accrue as the result of such advanced rank on the retired list: *Provided further*, That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may in his discretion extend the privilege herein granted to such officers as have heretofore been retired and who satisfy the foregoing conditions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri subsequently said:

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I inquire what became of Calendar No. 1260, Senate bill 2285?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed without objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to return to that bill for the purpose of asking the Senator from Massachusetts, who has come into the Chamber since the bill was passed, to explain it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide that any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as a commander of a fleet or subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list.

Officers who command fleets or subdivisions of fleets at sea with a temporary rank of admiral or vice admiral who occupy positions equivalent to those who are now given this right do not enjoy the same benefits. Under the present law certain officers, who by reason of the office they hold, receive, a higher rank, then, when they return to a lower rank can be retired at the higher rank, without additional pay. This clarifies that provision and provides that officers with the fleet who may have a higher rank temporarily when they retire may retire with such higher rank without additional pay.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, I may ask the Senator from Massachusetts what is a subdivision of a fleet? One ship is a subdivision of a fleet, is it not? A regiment is certainly a subdivision of an army; a platoon is a subdivision of a company, and a squad is a subdivision of a platoon.

Mr. WALSH. A subdivision may be a squadron of submarines, for instance.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When the Navy Department begins to operate under this bill it will be able to retire at an advance in grade any officer who has been in command of a ship or a portion of a ship. It will be strange if any officer in the Navy is not entitled to a step.

Mr. WALSH. No; they must be officers who are in charge of a——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of a subdivision of a fleet.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not a ship a subdivision of a fleet? A squad is certainly a subdivision of an army.

Mr. WALSH. A ship is not recognized as a subdivision of a fleet.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection to that being done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the motion to reconsider is entered, and the bill will be passed over for the present.

PAY OF COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

The bill (S. 2286) to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective from September 8, 1939, for the purpose of determining both active duty and retired pay of commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, including such officers advanced in rank pursuant to the provisions of the act approved June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793), the phrase "with creditable records on the active list" appearing in section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1922, as amended (45 Stat. 1187), shall be construed to include, as service on the active list, service on active duty heretofore or hereafter performed subsequent to retirement.

MILEAGE ACCOUNTS AND TRAVEL ALLOWANCE OF ENLISTED MEN OF NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The bill (S. 2327) to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, regular and reserve, shall be made in accordance with distances and deductions computed over routes established and published in mileage tables prepared pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 12, 1906 (34 Stat. 246), as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 870).

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of April 1, 1941.

APPLICABILITY TO COAST GUARD OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO NAVY

The bill (S. 2381) to provide that certain provisions of law relating to the Navy shall be held applicable to the personnel of the Coast Guard when that service is operating as a part of the Navy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy the provisions of section 1563 of the Revised Statutes, of section 13 of the act approved February 16, 1909 (35 Stat. 622), of the act approved March 3, 1909, relative to discharged naval prisoners (35 Stat. 756), of the act approved March 4, 1917, relative to advances to officers (39 Stat. 1181), of section 10 of the act approved March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274), and of the act approved May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 712), shall be considered applicable to personnel of the Coast Guard.

DESIGNATION OF NAVAL AVIATION PILOTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2382) to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith, so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes," which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraphs 1 and 2 of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 766, 767; 34 U. S. C. 735), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1. That hereafter when the term 'naval aviator' is used in this act or any other act it shall mean any commissioned officer or warrant line officer in the Navy or Marine Corps who has successfully completed the course prescribed by competent authority for naval aviators and who has been or may hereafter be designated or appointed a naval aviator by competent authority and who has flown alone in a, or as first pilot of a dual-control, heavier-than-air craft not less than 75 hours and who has flown in heavier-than-air craft a total of not less than 200 hours, or who has been in the air, under training, in airships not less than 150 hours and successfully completed the course prescribed by competent authority.

"PAR. 2. That hereafter when the term 'aviation pilot' is used in this act or any other act it shall mean any enlisted man in the Navy or Marine Corps who has successfully completed the course prescribed for aviation pilots and who has been or may hereafter be designated or appointed an aviation pilot by competent authority and who has flown alone in a, or as first pilot of a dual-control, heavier-than-air craft not less than 75 hours and who has flown in heavier-than-air craft a total of not less than 200 hours or who has been in the air, under training, in airships not less than 150 hours and who has flown in lighter-than-air craft a total of not less than 200 hours.

"The term 'pilot' shall be construed to mean a naval aviator or an aviation pilot."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that bill, please.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot—airship.

The Secretary of Navy on December 18, 1941, approved the second partial report of the Board appointed to recommend organization and personnel requirements for nonrigid-airship program. This report stated that, in the opinion of the board, an item of outstanding importance in the correction and clarification of the lighter-than-air personnel situation is the creation of the designation of naval aviation pilot—airship.

In a word, the purpose is to provide for pilots who operate lighter-than-air ships a different designation than that applied to pilots who operate airships of a different category in the naval service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS, NAVAL AIR STATION, LAKEHURST, N. J.

The bill (H. R. 4151) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGISTRATION OF PERSONS DISSEMINATING PROPAGANDA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2399) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, about the 18th of December, as I recall, the Senate passed a bill requiring the registration in this country of agents of foreign principals who were defined in the bill. The bill also defined an agent. The act was so far reaching in its impact that, after it passed the House, sometime in January, and reached the President's desk it was believed that it would militate against effective conversations with people representing South American countries, for example, and agents of those countries with which we are united in the war effort. It was felt there might be embarrassment arising from having all their agents, all their activities, and all their efforts in this country heralded far and wide because of the disclosure required in the registration statements prescribed in the original measure. The President vetoed the bill, and sent it back, expressing disapproval on that ground. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that, in order to meet the objections the President had voiced in his veto message, we have simply taken the original bill and added a new subsection which is to be found on page 17, commencing in line 20, known as subsection (f) of section 3, which will broaden the class of persons to be exempted in certain particulars, for limited purposes, and for a limited time. The original measure is otherwise unchanged.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the pending bill meet the objection on which the President vetoed the previous bill?

Mr. DANAHER. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631, U. S. C., title 22, sec. 233 (a) to sec. 233 (g)), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes", as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"It is hereby declared to be the policy and purpose of this act to protect the national defense, internal security, and foreign relations of the United States by requiring public disclosure by persons engaging in propaganda activities and other activities for or on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals so that the Government and the people of the United States may be informed of the identity of such persons and may appraise their statements and actions in the light of their associations and activities.

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. As used in and for the purposes of this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals;

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) an individual affiliated or associated with, or supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of this section 1 (b);

"(3) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and is a citizen of and domiciled within the United States or that such person is not an individual, is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and has its principal place of business within the United States. Nothing in this clause (3) shall limit the operation of clause (5) of this section 1 (b);

"(4) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(5) a domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, subsidized directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (3), or (4) of this section 1 (b);

"(c) Except as provided in section 1 (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' includes—

"(1) any person who acts or agrees to act, within the United States, as, or who is or holds himself out to be whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, servant, agent, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal;

"(2) any person who within the United States collects information for reports information to a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits or accepts compensation, contributions, or loans, directly or indirectly, from a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits, disburses, dispenses, or collects compensation, contributions, loans, money, or anything of value, directly or indirectly, for a foreign principal; who within the United States acts at the order, request, or under the direction of a foreign principal;

"(3) any person who assumes or purports to act within the United States as an agent of a foreign principal in any of the respects set forth in clauses (1) and (2) of this section 1 (c); and

"(4) any person who is an officer or member of the active or reserve military, naval, or other armed forces of any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of section 1 (b) hereof, or who is an officer of or employed by any such foreign principal; and proof of any affiliation or employment, specified in this clause (4), of any person within a period of 5 years previous to the effective date of this act shall create a rebuttable presumption that such person is an agent of a foreign principal;

"(d) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' does not include any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the Postmaster General a sworn statement in compliance with section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 553), as amended, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication, is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined to clause (1), (2), or (4) of section 1 (b) hereof, or by any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this act;

"(e) The term 'government of a foreign country' includes any person or group of persons exercising sovereign de facto or de jure political jurisdiction over any country, other than the United States, or over any part of such country, and includes any subdivision of any such group and any group or agency to which such sovereign de facto or de jure authority or functions are directly or indirectly delegated. Such term shall include any faction or body of insurgents within a country assuming to exercise governmental authority whether such faction or body of insurgents has or has not been recognized by the United States;

"(f) The term 'foreign political party' includes any organization or any other combination of individuals in a country other than the United States, or any unit or branch thereof, having for an aim or purpose, or which is engaged in any activity devoted in whole or in part to, the establishment, administration, control, or acquisition of administration or control, of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof, or the furtherance or influencing of the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof;

"(g) The term 'public-relations counse' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in informing, advising, or in any way representing a principal in any matter pertaining to political or public interests, policies, or relations;

"(h) The term 'publicity agent' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in the publication or dissemination of oral, visual, graphic written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including publication by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or otherwise;

"(i) The term 'information-service employee includes any person who is engaged in furnishing, disseminating, or publishing accounts, descriptions, information, or data with respect to the political, industrial, employment, economic, social, cultural, or other

benefits, advantages, facts, or conditions of any country other than the United States or of any government of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or of a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(j) The term 'political propaganda' includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person (1) which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissensions, or (2) which advocates, advises, instigates, or promotes any racial, social, political, or religious disorder, civil riot, or other conflict involving the use of force or violence in any other American republic or the overthrow of any government or political subdivision of any other American republic by any means involving the use of force or violence. As used in this section 1 (j) the term 'disseminating' includes transmitting or causing to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or offering or causing to be offered in the United States mails;

"(k) The term 'registration statement' means the registration statement required to be filed with the Attorney General under section 2 (a) hereof, and any supplements thereto required to be filed under section 2 (b) hereof, and includes all documents and papers required to be filed therewith or amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, whether attached thereto or incorporated therein by reference;

"(l) The term 'American republic' includes any of the states which were signatory to the Final Act of the Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics at Habana, Cuba, July 30, 1940;

"(m) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States;

"(n) The term 'prints' means newspapers and periodicals, books, pamphlets, sheet music, visiting cards, address cards, printing proofs, engravings, photographs, pictures, drawings, plans, maps, patterns to be cut out, catalogs, prospectuses, advertisements, and printed, engraved, lithographed, or autographed notices of various kinds, and, in general, all impressions or reproductions obtained on paper or other material assimilable to paper, on parchment or on cardboard, by means of printing, engraving, lithography, autography, or any other easily recognizable mechanical process, with the exception of the copying press, stamps with movable or immovable type, and the typewriter.

"REGISTRATION

"SEC. 2. (a) No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplements thereto as required by this section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) hereof or unless he is exempt from registration under the provisions of this act. Except as hereinafter provided, every person who is an agent of a foreign principal on the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter and every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal after the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, of which one copy shall be transmitted promptly by the Attorney General to the Secretary of State for such comment, if any, as the Secretary of State may desire to make from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this act. The registration statement shall include the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this act:

"(1) Registrant's name, principal business address, and all other business addresses in the United States or elsewhere, and all residence addresses, if any;

"(2) Status of the registrant; if an individual, nationality; if a partnership, name, residence addresses, and nationality of each partner and a true and complete copy of its articles of copartnership; if an association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals, the name, residence addresses, and nationality of each director and officer and of each person performing the functions of a director or officer and a true and complete copy of its charter, articles of incorporation, association, constitution, and bylaws, and amendments thereto; a copy of every other instrument or document and a statement of the terms and conditions of every oral agreement relating to its organization, powers, and purposes; and a statement of its ownership and control;

"(3) A comprehensive statement of the nature of registrant's business; a complete list of registrant's employees and a statement of the nature of the work of each, unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General; the name and address of every foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act; the character of the business or other activities of every such foreign principal, and, if any such foreign principal be other than a natural person, a statement of the ownership and control of each; and the extent, if any, to which each such foreign principal is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party;

"(4) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is an agent of a foreign principal; a comprehensive statement of the nature and method of performance of each such contract, and of the existing and proposed activity or activities engaged in or to be engaged in by the registrant as agent of a foreign principal for each such foreign principal;

"(5) The nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received within the preceding 60 days from each such foreign principal, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;

"(6) A detailed statement of every activity which the registrant is performing or is assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or any other person other than a foreign principal and which requires his registration hereunder;

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and, if an individual, the nationality, of any person who has within the preceding 60 days contributed or paid money or anything of value to the registrant in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this section 2 (a) and the amount or value of the same;

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding 60 days in furtherance of or in any way in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person;

"(9) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is performing or assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or for a foreign principal or for any person other than a foreign principal any activities which require his registration hereunder;

"(10) Such other statements, information, or documents pertinent to the purposes of this act as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may from time to time require;

"(11) Such further statements and such further copies of documents as are necessary to make the statements made in the registration statement and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(b) Every agent of a foreign principal who has filed a registration statement required by section 2 (a) hereof shall, within 30 days after the expiration of each period of 6 months succeeding such filing, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth with respect to such preceding 6 months' period such facts as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may deem necessary to make the information required under section 2 hereof accurate, complete, and current with respect to such period. In connection with the information furnished under clauses (3), (4), (6), and (9), of section 2 (a) hereof, the registrant shall give notice to the Attorney General of any changes therein within 10 days after such changes occur. If the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, he may, in any particular case, require supplements to the registration statement to be filed at more frequent intervals in respect to all or particular items of information to be furnished.

"(c) The registration statement and supplements thereto shall be executed under oath as follows: If the registrant is an individual, by him; if the registrant is a partnership, by a majority of the members thereof; if the registrant is a person other than an individual or a partnership, by a majority of the officers thereof or persons performing the functions of officers or by a majority of the board of directors thereof or persons performing the functions of directors, if any.

"(d) The fact that a registration statement or supplement thereto has been filed shall not necessarily be deemed a full compliance with this act and the regulations thereunder on the part of the registrant; nor shall it indicate that the Attorney General has in any way passed upon the merits of such registration statement or supplement thereto; nor shall it preclude prosecution, as provided for in this act, for willful failure to file a registration statement or supplement thereto when due or for a willful false statement of a material fact therein or the willful omission of a material fact required to be stated therein or the willful omission of a material fact or copy of a material document necessary to make the statements made in a registration statement and supplements thereto,

and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading

"(e) If any agent of a foreign principal, required to register under the provisions of this act, has previously thereto registered with the Attorney General under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201), the Attorney General, in order to eliminate inappropriate duplication, may permit the incorporation by reference in the registration statement or supplements thereto filed hereunder of any information or documents previously filed by such agent of a foreign principal under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201).

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 3. The requirements of section 2 (a) hereof shall not apply to the following agents of foreign principals:

"(a) A duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such officer;

"(b) Any official of a foreign government, if such government is recognized by the United States, who is not a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, or a citizen of the United States, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such official are of public record in the Department of State, while said official is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such official;

"(c) Any member of the staff of, or any person employed by, a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, other than a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, or information-service employee, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such member or employee are of public record in the Department of State, while said member or employee is engaged exclusively in the performance of activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such member or employee;

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 48), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;

"(e) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or of the fine arts;

"(f) Any person, or employee of such person, whose foreign principal is a government of a foreign country the defense of which the President deems vital to the defense of the United States while, (1) such person or employee engages only in activities which are in furtherance of the policies, public interest, or national defense both of such government and of the Government of the United States, and are not intended to conflict with any of the domestic or foreign policies of the Government of the United States, (2) each communication or expression by such person or employee which he intends to, or has reason to believe will, be published, disseminated, or circulated among any section of the public, or portion thereof, within the United States, is a part of such activities and is believed by such person to be truthful and accurate and the identity of such person as an agent of such foreign principal is disclosed therein, and (3) such government of a foreign country furnishes to the Secretary of State for transmittal to, and retention for the duration of this act by, the Attorney General such information as to the identity and activities of such person or employee at such times as the Attorney General may require. Upon notice to the Government of which such person is an agent or to such person or employee, the Attorney General, having due regard for the public interest and national defense, may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, and shall, at the request of the Secretary of State, terminate in whole or in part the exemption herein of any such person or employee.

"FILING AND LABELING OF POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

"SEC. 4. (a) Every person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act and who transmits or causes to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons shall, not later than 48 hours after the beginning of the transmittal thereof, send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act to transmit or cause to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons, unless such political propaganda is conspicuously marked at its beginning with, or prefaced or accompanied by, a true and accurate statement, in the language or languages used in such political propaganda, setting forth that the person transmitting such political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted is registered under this act with the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., as an agent of a foreign principal together with the name and address of such agent of a foreign principal and of each of his foreign principals; that, as required by this act, his registration statement is available for inspection at, and copies of such political propaganda are being filed with, the Department of Justice; and that registration of agents of foreign principals required by the act does not indicate approval by the United States Government of the contents of their political propaganda. The Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe the language or languages and the manner and form in which such statement shall be made and require the inclusion of such other information contained in the registration statement identifying such agent of a foreign principal and such political propaganda and its sources as may be appropriate.

"(c) The copies of political propaganda required by this act to be sent to the Librarian of Congress shall be available for public inspection under such regulations as he may prescribe.

"(d) For purposes of the Library of Congress, other than for public distribution, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are authorized, upon the request of the Librarian of Congress, to forward to the Library of Congress 50 copies, or as many fewer thereof as are available, of all foreign prints determined to be prohibited entry under the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of all foreign prints excluded from the mails under authority of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230).

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to permit the entry and the Postmaster General is authorized to permit the transmittal in the mails of foreign prints imported for governmental purposes by authority or for the use of the United States or for the use of the Library of Congress.

"BOOKS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 5. Every agent of a foreign principal registered under this act shall keep and preserve while he is an agent of a foreign principal such books of account and other records with respect to all his activities, the disclosure of which is required under the provisions of this act, as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and shall preserve the same for a period of 3 years following the termination of such status. Until regulations are in effect under this section every agent of a foreign principal shall keep books of account and shall preserve all written records with respect to his activities. Such books and records shall be open at all reasonable times to the inspection of any official charged with the enforcement of this act. It shall be unlawful for any person willfully to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to attempt to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to cause to be concealed, destroyed, obliterated, mutilated, or falsified, any books or records required to be kept under the provisions of this section.

"PUBLIC EXAMINATION OF OFFICIAL RECORDS

"SEC. 6. The Attorney General shall retain in permanent form one copy of all registration statements and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda furnished under this act, and the same shall be public records and open to public examination and inspection at such reasonable hours under such regulations, as the Attorney General may prescribe, and copies of the same shall be furnished to every applicant at such reasonable fee as the Attorney General may prescribe. The Attorney General may withdraw from public examination the registration statement and other statements of any agent of a foreign principal whose activities have ceased to be of a character which requires registration under the provisions of this act.

"LIABILITY OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 7. Each officer, or person performing the functions of an officer, and each director, or person performing the functions of a director, of an agent of a foreign principal which is not an individual shall be under obligation to cause such agent to execute and file a registration statement and supplements thereto as and when such filing is required under sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) hereof and shall also be under obligation to cause such agent to comply with all the requirements of sections 4 (a), 4 (b), and 5 and all other requirements of this act. In case of failure

of any such agent of a foreign principal to comply with any of the requirements of this act, each of its officers, or persons performing the functions of officers, and each of its directors, or persons performing the functions of directors, shall be subject to prosecution therefor.

"ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person who—

"(1) Willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder, or

"(2) In any registration statement or supplement thereto or in any statement under section 4 (a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda or in any other document filed with or furnished to the Attorney General under the provisions of this act willfully makes a false statement of a material fact or willfully omits any material fact required to be stated therein or willfully omits a material fact or a copy of a material document necessary to make the statements therein and the copies of documents furnished therewith not misleading, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) In any proceeding under this act in which it is charged that a person is an agent of a foreign principal with respect to a foreign principal outside of the United States, proof of the specific identity of the foreign principal shall be permissible but not necessary.

"(c) Any alien who shall be convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate, any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder shall be subject to deportation in the manner provided by sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890), as amended.

"(d) The Postmaster General may declare to be nonmailable any communication or expression falling within clause (2) of section 1 (j) hereof in the form of prints or in any other form reasonably adapted to, or reasonably appearing to be intended for, dissemination or circulation among two or more persons, which is offered or caused to be offered for transmittal in the United States mails to any person or persons in any other American republic by any agent of a foreign principal, if the Postmaster General is informed in writing by the Secretary of State that the duly accredited diplomatic representative of such American republic has made written representation to the Department of State that the admission or circulation of such communication or expression in such American republic is prohibited by the laws thereof and has requested in writing that its transmittal thereto be stopped.

"APPLICABILITY OF ACT

"SEC. 9. This act shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 10. The Attorney General may at any time make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

"SEC. 11. The Attorney General shall, from time to time, make a report to the Congress concerning the administration of this act, including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 13. This act is in addition to and not in substitution for any other existing statute.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended'."

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Upon the effective date of this act, all powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of State under the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631), as amended, shall be transferred to and become vested in the Attorney General, together with all property, books, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations used by or available to the Secretary of State for carrying out the functions devolving on him under the above-cited act. All rules, regulations, and forms which have been issued by the Secretary of State pursuant to the provisions of said act, and which are in effect, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, revoked, or repealed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the sixteenth day after the date of its approval, except that prior to such sixteenth day the Attorney General may make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

LONGEVITY CREDIT FOR ENLISTED MEN OF NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4869) to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was in section 1, page 1, line 4, after the words "Marine Corps Reserve" to insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the same line after the word "Guard" to strike out "and the Army Reserves" and insert "of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts explain this bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve receive full-time longevity credit for all commissioned service in the Reserve since June 30, 1925, whether active or inactive, whereas warrant officers and enlisted men receive no credit for inactive service or for active service for training. The purpose is to equalize the provision for longevity service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why is it that the naval officers and officers of the Naval Reserve receive full longevity pay for their service in the Naval Reserve, while officers in the National Guard and in the Reserve Corps of the Army receive only half longevity pay? Does the Senator see any rhyme or reason in such a distinction as that? I realize that the subject is not within the jurisdiction of the Senator's committee.

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado, who may be able to answer the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In answer to the Senator's question, we will have a pay bill before us shortly, in a few minutes, I hope, which will correct that whole situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much in sympathy with the bill to which the Senator from Colorado is referring, and I certainly have no objection to the bill of the Senator from Massachusetts, but it has long seemed to me that it was an absolute outrage that naval and marine officers receive full longevity pay in the Reserves, while Army officers, either in the National Guard or in the Organized Reserves, receive only one-half longevity pay.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator's observation seems to be sound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 7, after the word "service", to insert "since June 30, 1925."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Naval", to strike out "Reserve or" and insert "Reserve."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Reserve", to insert "and the National Guard: *Provided*, That warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States shall not be credited for this purpose with time served in the inactive National Guard not in the active Federal service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes."

HEIRS OF FANNIE ELLIS WHITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68) for the relief of the heirs of Fannie Ellis White, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Special Disbursing Agent of the Five Civilized Tribes Agency, Muskogee, Okla., for credit in the individual trust-fund accounts of the various Indians or their heirs, the sum of $12,201.60, representing interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the following official checks from the dates of their issuance until the dates on which the proceeds thereof were credited to their respective individual accounts on the books of the Five Civilized Tribes Agency, viz:

Check Nos.	Dates of checks	Names of payees	Amounts of checks	Dates deposited	Interes due
202503	Feb. 12, 1923	Jackson Colbert	$12.78	Nov. 18, 1940	$13.62
282875	May 26, 1923	Jackson Colbert	1,677.32	Nov. 18, 1940	1,758.94
282892	May 26, 1923	Jackson Colbert	2,202.81	Nov. 18, 1940	2,309.98
282205	May 24, 1923	Heirs of Fannie White (nee Ellis)	3,312.61	Nov. 14, 1940	3,472.72
544742	Mar. 7, 1925	Julius Fouts	49.06	June 29, 1940	45.06
275902	May 16, 1923	Ladee Fulsom	877.39	Nov. 18, 1940	921.54
238817	Mar. 26, 1923	Mahala Leader	1,221.82	June 29, 1940	1,265.18
316701	Aug. 17, 1923	Estate of Bony Randall	812.07	Nov. 18, 1940	840.62
255504	Apr. 16, 1923	Russell Thompson	1,356.18	Dec. 14, 1940	1,437.10
255505	Apr 16, 1923	Sam Willie	129.11	Dec. 16, 1940	136.84
		Total interest			12,201.60

Payment of the above specified sums shall be in full satisfaction of the claims of the respective payees or their heirs against the United States of the payment of interest on the amounts of the above listed refund checks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Whereas J. L. Summers, disbursing clerk of the Treasury Department, on various dates during the calendar years of 1923 and 1925 issued 10 official checks to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, or their heirs, as refunds of income taxes which had theretofore been unlawfully collected from the said Indians or their heirs; and

Whereas these refund checks were not delivered to the payees, but were delivered to the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, Muskogee, Okla., and, after having been held in the office of the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes for many years, were submitted to the General Accounting Office on January 27, 1940, and lieu checks issued during 1940, thus depriving payees of the use of their money for an extended period.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1224, Senate bill 2025, the Army pay bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2025), to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on September 8 last year the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] sponsored Senate Resolution 162, which called upon the War Department to make an arrangement for an interdepartmental committee to make a study of military pay. The last pay measure along that line was the act of June 10, 1922, enacted 20 years ago. Additions and amendments to the pay law had crept in, until the pay of personnel of the military services was becoming confused.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which the able and distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman, which subcommittee considered, prepared, and recommended the pay bill for the armed forces, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the resolution which I introduced on September 8 last directing the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, or a subcommittee thereof, to make a study and investigation of the situation and to bring in legislation providing increases in the pay of our armed forces.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 162) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the existing laws relating to the pay of all enlisted personnel of the military and naval services of the United States, including persons inducted for training and service into the land or naval forces under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, members of Reserve components of the Army of the United States in or subject to active military service, and the United States Coast Guard, with a view to determining what adjustments and increases in the pay of such personnel are necessary or desirable in the interests of the national defense. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when the Senate adopted Resolution 162, just inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Alabama, providing for a study, the Secretary of War called upon all the other military branches, and a committee was appointed to work on this subject. It is a very involved question, and very intricate, as all those who have studied the question of military pay know.

After considerable time and long study, a bill was agreed upon which I had the honor to introduce in the Senate, and which is known as Senate bill 2025. I was appointed chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to consider the bill, and the subcommittee spent much time on it. We held extensive hearings, where everyone concerned with the measure was invited to testify, and many did appear and testify.

The bill was endorsed by the Military Order of the World War, the American Legion, the Regular Veterans' Association, the Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., the National Association of Regulars, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Our subcommittee consulted and conferred with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and he was very helpful to us in our study of the bill. We spent about 6 months in preparing the bill. We have gone into the subject very thoroughly; we have suggested many amendments to the bill as originally prepared; and we have brought forth a measure which is quite moderate in the increases in Army pay.

The original bill prepared by the interdepartmental committee provided increases in pay for all commissioned officers. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and many of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs did not believe that kind of pay raise was justified; so we eliminated all commissioned officers, with the exception of second lieutenants and ensigns, who are given an increase of $25 a month. We raised the limitation of a brigadier general from $7,500 to $8,000. We did make certain moderate increases in the subsistence allowances for the other commissioned officers. The increases in the bill go almost entirely to the enlisted men.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senator referred to enlisted men. Did he mean just that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I meant to include the entire personnel below commissioned rank.

Mr. BROWN. All those brought in under the Selective Service Act, as well as enlisted men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and those in the National Guard. It applies to everyone in the Army "Enlisted men" is a classification for the first rate of pay. They are raised from $21 to $42, and that is the most pronounced raise that occurs in the bill. The rest of the raises are very moderate.

Mr. BROWN. I want to assure the Senator of my support of this bill, which I think is most meritorious. I am glad to know that a greater measure of justice is being done to the men in the service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the bill applies to the naval as well as the military service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It applies to all the military and allied branches; it applies to the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, it does not raise the pay of officers with rank above that of second lieutenant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, with the single exception of the brigadier general, whose limitation is raised.

Mr. BARKLEY. The limitation of a brigadier general is raised $500?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. His limitation is raised, but that does not mean he will get the increase.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, men who are enlisted in the Army or who are drafted draw $21 a month, up to the time they are 4 months in the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then they go to $30?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the pending bill the $21 is raised to $42?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the $30 man goes to $42?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The $36 man goes to $48?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The $54 man goes to $66?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the total estimated cost, based, we will say, upon an army of 4,000,000 men? I do not know that that is the basis figured on in the report, but in order that we may have some understanding about the cost involved, assuming we had an Army of 4,000,000 men, how much would the increase in the pay amount to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, as the Senator knows, the size of the Army is a military secret. The Army and the Navy and the interdepartmental committee estimated that with a military force such as we had on January 1, 1942, the increased cost as the result of the passage of the bill would be $282,412,221. That is more or less of an estimate. It is based on the size of the Army on January 1, 1942.

Mr. BARKLEY. The total cost, then, would depend on the increase in the Army from that date?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that during the first World War we increased the pay of the Army from $15, which it had been up to that time, to $30, I think it was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We made provisions for allotments out of the pay of the enlisted men in part, and in part by a contribution of the Government, to the dependents of the men in the Army during the first World War. By this combination of allotments and contributions presumably the dependents of the enlisted men were fairly well taken care of. What is the contemplation at this time with respect to matters of allotment and contribution by the Government to take care of dependents, if there are dependents?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that sort of provision does not belong in a fundamental pay bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It will follow.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no provision in the pending bill for allotments or assignments of any kind out of the pay of the men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. None whatever, but it is expected that as soon as this bill shall have been passed, a bill providing for what the Senator mentions will be brought up, and that liberal provision will be made for the dependents of the men in the armed forces.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not suppose we can anticipate the terms of that legislation, but I was wondering whether the Senator, or the committees—either the Naval Affairs Committee or Military Affairs Committee—have gone into it far enough to visualize whether out of this increased pay there will be an allotment provided for to be contributed to by the Government, so as to make fairly adequate compensation to the dependents of those who may be called into the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A short time ago the plan was to match whatever the person in the military service gave to his dependents, by an equal amount on the part of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. I imagine that contribution by the enlisted personnel would have to be fixed by law. In other words, it could not be left to the whim of some man as to how much he would give to his family, and the Government would match that. Is that a correct assumption?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that would be a part of the dependents' bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we cannot deal with that matter in the proposed legislation now under discussion, but looking to the whole picture and comparing it with what was done in the last war, I was wondering what is in contemplation by the committee in the way of legislation of that sort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is a bill to follow dealing with the subject the Senator is now discussing, as soon as the present bill is enacted. But the War Department thought it best that the present bill be passed first.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that probably we cannot combine the two into one bill of this sort.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BONE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I realize that it is beside the question on this particular bill, but since the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has raised that question, and since the Senator from Colorado is a very able and distinguished Member, and is the senior Member on the Military Affairs Committee, I should like to suggest to them both, that it is by no means fair to establish a provision merely that the Government match what a soldier may make as an allotment to his family. In the last war it happened repeatedly that soldiers who had wives and families were urged by the responsible regimental and company officers, at the direct order of the Government itself, to subscribe to Liberty Bonds; they were all certainly urged to take out insurance for themselves, and, in some cases, a man did not have as much as a dollar a month left for his own personal expenses.

Mr. President, I wish to say what I think the Government should do in this connection, and I merely mention it because I know the Senator from Colorado is interested in the whole subject. When we act upon this sort of legislation we ought to make a flat allowance for the wife and a flat allowance for each dependent child, and then, if necessary, make a flat requirement that the soldier shall allot so much of his pay, instead of merely saying that the Government will match whatever a soldier himself chooses to put up. I think we ought to require that. I think we owe an obligation to the wives and children of these men, and we ought not to leave it up to a man who does not perform his full duty.

Mr. President, since I am on my feet I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado one or two other questions. As I understand, this is a bill for a flat pay increase?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It provides for an increase.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, it is a flat increase, is it not? I mean up and down the line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it is an increase.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not provide for any limitation of the hours of service of these men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. None whatever.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Or for any extra pay, no matter how long they may serve? If they are on duty day and night for a week or 10 days, they do not get any extra pay, do they?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator. As I have said before, I am very much in favor of the bill on its merits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think we all appreciate the contribution made to the consideration of the dependents' bill that will probably follow this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to observe, in line with the discussion opened up by the Senator from Kentucky, that, while there is no provision for increasing the pay of officers, the advances in rank and the promotion are so rapid in the Army and the Navy that, as a matter of fact, the officers are all receiving increases. I think that ought to be observed. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is very true.

Mr. WALSH. That situation does not apply to the selected men, or the

draftees, or the enlisted men, because there is no rapidity of promotion in connection with them, but the Army and Navy officers are advancing so rapidly, so exceedingly rapidly—either the Senator from Colorado or myself are at liberty to say so surprisingly rapidly—that any officer who is efficient and capable is likely to advance rapidly one or two ranks.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask a question in that connection. I am not as familiar as I ought to be with the military regulations concerning promotions. I happen to know of officers in the lower ranks, second and first lieutenants, who have had no promotions, though they have been in the service for a year and a half, and I have been told that there is some rule of law which prevents promotion during a shorter period of service than 3 years. Is there any such law limiting promotions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. None whatever.

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I I have not had time to look into the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The regular automatic-promotion bill requires 3 years of service as an ensign or a second lieutenant before he becomes a first lieutenant, but that is in peacetime.

Mr. BARKLEY. It applies to second lieutenants and ensigns?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And in peacetime?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. A bill has recently been passed giving authority to both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make temporary promotions as they see fit. Am I correct in that statement, I will ask the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; with Senate confirmation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a statement on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A nomination came to the Senate the other day for the promotion of a major in the Regular Establishment to the position of brigadier general temporarily. He happened to be an officer that most Members of the Senate know very well, Major Clay. I always thought it was really incongruous to have men holding the rank of captain come before Senate committees habitually representing the Corps of Engineers in all matters dealing with rivers and harbors and flood-control bills, and I am certain that he will make a very excellent brigadier general. Nevertheless, he holds the permanent rank of major in the Regular Army, but his name was sent to the Senate the other day, and speedily confirmed by the Senate, as a brigadier general in the temporary establishment. Such things go on every day when we consider the Executive Calendar. We see that lieutenant colonels are promoted to be colonels and brigadier generals. The other day, as I recall, a lieutenant colonel was promoted to be major general in the temporary establishment. A subaltern moves up in a slower degree, but nevertheless moves up automatically if he qualifies as an efficient officer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I happen to know Major Clay. He is a very competent officer. I recall the circumstance of his promotion during the emergency. Of course, he is still permanently a major, but he enjoys the rank of brigadier general.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned I believe he would be an excellent general either in wartime or peacetime.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I agree with the Senator from Missouri, because I know the quality of Major Clay, and his service to the Government of the United States. I was not thinking so much about majors and lieutenant colonels and brigadier generals, as I was about these lower ranking officers, the ensigns and second lieutenants, and even first lieutenants, who may or may not deserve to be promoted as rapidly as the higher officers. At the same time I happen to have had my attention called to some of them who have received no promotions at all in a year and a half, and I am wondering whether there is some automatic deterrent which prevents their consideration as compared to officers of higher rank.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator again permit me to interpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that promotions in the Army and Navy are a good deal like a mule chute, which gets narrower and narrower as it gets up to the top. In other words they cannot promote a second lieutenant unless they have a vacancy as first lieutenant, or they cannot promote a first lieutenant unless they have a vacancy as captain. The further they go the narrower the field becomes, and, of course, it is broader in the case of the subalterns. There is no way by which you can establish an automatic rule that men will be promoted in a certain length of time. If we do we will have more generals than privates when we get through.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize that, but in view of the rapid increase of the size of the Army I am wondering whether these automatic rules which deter deserved promotions in the lower ranks ought to be strictly adhered to, because irevitably there are bound to be more vacancies in captains and majors, as the Army expands, than there would be if we were on a peacetime basis. I think consideration ought to be given to that question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, we had a situation a year or 2 ago of having more lieutenant colonels than we had captains in the Army. I think the Senator from Colorado will bear me out in that statement. I received my information from the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose we all have a common experience here with respect to men who want to render service to their country, who think they can render better service if they have commissions than they could otherwise do. We all have that experience, and frequently it is a correct position to take, but if we appoint every one a commissioned officer at the beginning there will not be any one in the ranks at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Most of those really think they would be better colonels than second lieutenants also.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I agree.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. My understanding of the existing law relating to this subject is that these jumps from one grade to another two or three grades higher, and perhaps to a still higher grade, are not made under the promotion law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true.

Mr. AUSTIN. But are made under the appointment law which Congress passed not long ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. And the appointments are not based upon age or grade or anything of that kind. They are based upon selection, and they are made for the special purpose of improving the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator state what the bill provides in regard to overseas service, and whether for such service there is an addition to the pay raise just referred to by the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill repeats almost word for word the so-called Clark amendment which was recently passed, except that it extends the benefit of the Clark amendment to the Coast and Geodetic Survey and to the Public Health Service. I think those two services were perhaps left out at the time the Clark amendment was adopted. The Clark amendment provided for an increased pay of 20 percent for enlisted men and 10 percent for officers serving overseas.

Mr. BURTON. That schedule would apply to the new increased base rates, would it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would apply to the new base rates.

Mr. President, I did not mean to take the Senator from Massachusetts from the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is nothing further to say except that, so far as I have been able to make a study of the work of the Committee on Military Affairs and of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Colorado is chairman, I am in hearty accord with the recommendation. I appreciate the fact that the Committee on Naval Affairs was consulted and that the proposed pay increases are equalized with respect to both the Army and Navy, insofar as they can be equalized when applied to like services rendered in the Navy and Army Establishments.

I am in hearty accord with the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Going through the bill, does the same rule apply to various ranks in regard to rental and other allowances as applies to increases in pay? As I understand, there is no increase in rental allowance above the rank of second lieutenant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are some increases, but there are also limitations. For example, a colonel and a lieutenant colonel are limited. A colonel is limited to $7,200 a year. We might increase his allowances ever so much, but it would not do him any good, because of the limitation which keeps him from receiving the benefit of any additional subsistence allowance. That is also true of a lieutenant colonel and a major. Under the terms of the bill a first lieutenant and a captain would receive some very moderate increases. They are very modest.

Mr. BARKLEY. On page 9 of the report, under the head "Rental allowances," under No. 1, where the present allowance is $40, I notice that it is increased to $60; and where the present allowance under No. 2 is $60, it is increased to $75. However, the statement does not show the ranks of the officers entitled to the increases.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. 1 refers to second lieutenant, No. 2 to first liutenant, No. 3 is to captain, No. 4 to major, No. 5 to lieutenant colonel, and No. 6 to colonel.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, from the rank of second lieutenant up to the rank of colonel there is an increase in the rental allowances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is an increase in the rental allowances; but a colonel, a lieutenant colonel, and a major do not receive the allowance, because there is another provision in the law which limits the over-all amount which they may receive.

Mr. BARKLEY. Lieutenant-colonels and colonels come under Nos. 5 and 6. As I understand, they receive no increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. They come under Nos. 5 and 6, and they receive no increase whatever in subsistence allowances.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As stated by the Senator a little while ago, the bill provides for full longevity pay; that is, a longevity allowance for all the time which has actually been served by National Guard and Reserve officers; is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, heretofore National Guard and Reserve officers—that is, anybody outside the Regular Establishment in any category—received only half the allowance for longevity received by officers in the regular service. The bill would correct that situation and put them all in the same status in which the Navy and Marine Corps have heretofore been, so that they would receive full longevity allowance for all their service. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The Senator will find that on page 7, lines 6 to 9.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is a long-needed reform. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is for their active service. I wish to make one point in connection with longevity pay. Heretofore commissioned officers have had a different formula for longevity pay than the enlisted men have had. An enlisted man served 4 years, after which he received 10 percent. Then he had to serve another 4 years to receive an additional 5 percent; but he had a limitation of 25 percent. That was not true of the officers. Every 3 years they received an increase of 5 percent in longevity pay. We have applied the same formula to enlisted men. That is a very important matter, and I think a very constructive thing to have done, because, as we all know, today the Army is full of specialists and mechanics. Today nearly every man in the Army must be a mechanic, to some degree at least; and those men should have more money. I am speaking now of a mechanized division. I think the bill does a very good job, insofar as making possible a career in the Army is concerned, by increasing the pay.

Everything this Nation is or hopes to be, today more than ever before in our history, depends upon the strength of our armed forces. Anything which builds that strength adds to our security. In my opinion, Senate bill 2025 adds to the strength of our armed forces and for that reason, among others, I urge its passage.

Our Army today is of a highly specialized and mechanized character. We must have skilled mechanics and well-trained engineers and technicians and men of learning and intelligence in our Army for exactly the same reasons that we must have them in civilian life. Today every man in our armed forces on the land, in the air, beneath the sea, and on the sea must be a mechanic to some degree, and many of them must be highly skilled. The old concept of depending upon minutemen, rookies, and recruits to carry the brunt of battle is gone forever. We can no longer gather an Army one day and throw it into battle the next unless we fully expect them to be destroyed. It takes time to build a modern army of skilled men, each with a highly specialized task and with complete coordination throughout. Coordination requires years of thorough training. Not only must there be coordination between the Army, Navy, and the Air Corps, but there must be coordination within the Army between all branches of the service. Coordination is the most important military requisite today. It is absolutely indispensable.

America has always depended upon a citizen's Army to fight her wars. America has tried to keep away from a career Army, but science, and mechanization, and the machine age have driven us to it. Modern machinery of war cannot be mastered over night. It takes time to get a modern army under way. In these unhappy days of the blitzkrieg, a million Paul Reveres could not assemble a formidable force quickly enough to be effective. We must have a career Army; and the first requisite of a career Army is to make military service attractive. Skilled men have every right to receive adequate pay for the effort they have made to become proficient.

Mr. President, the increases in this bill are very moderate; but I am quite surprised to find that Australia is still a couple of jumps ahead of us. I do not know that they are kangaroo jumps [laughter], but they are jumps, nevertheless. For example, at the present time, whereas we pay our privates $21 and $30, Australia pays hers $62.10. Our corporals receive $54. Australia pays hers $94.20. The other noncommissioned officers in the Australian Army receive pay along the same lines—$102 for a sergeant, $110.10 for a staff sergeant, $117.30 for a top sergeant, and $141.60 for a master sergeant. Their specialists' total pay runs from $113.70 to $130.20 a month. So we still do not have the highest-paid Army in the world.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator have information in regard to the English Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have information with regard to Canada. Canada pays her recruits $35; first-class privates, $41; corporals, $46; sergeants, $60; staff sergeants, $75; top sergeants, $85; and master sergeants, $106. In addition there are specialists' ratings which add from $6.60 to $21.30. I wish to make it clear that under the terms of the new pay bill we shall no longer have specialists' ratings. At the present time we have specialists' ratings, but those will be eliminated. So the amounts to which I have referred will be the maximum pay which men in the various categories can receive.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Of course, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this consideration being given to the question of raising the pay of the boys who are out in front doing the fighting. I am wholeheartedly in favor of raising their pay, and I think it should have been done long ago, and that it should be raised more than this bill provides.

I was interested in the questions which were asked by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] with reference to whether or not the 40-hour week and time-and-a-half for overtime applied to the boys doing the fighting; but the Senator from Missouri did not go quite as far as I should like to go. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether or not the boys who are doing the fighting will have to pay any racketeering fee to labor leader racketeers in order to get the job

after the pay is increased. In other words, I wish to make sure that labor leader racketeers who are not in the Army do not establish a closed shop in the Army.

Of course, I know that the boys in the service are working day and night when necessary and not asking for a limit of 40 hours per week or for double pay on holidays and they will keep on doing that, but it seems to me that Congress should do something to curb the labor-leader racketeers who are not in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the boys in the Army are conscripted. Many of them are in the Army not because they have selected military life but because they have been selected by us. Quite naturally they do not have to pay anybody to get into the Army.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that I know that he and his committee and the Senate are anxious to vote on this important measure. I agree that the Senator and the committee have done a fine job. I do not care at this time to inject myself into this debate to make a statement which I have upon the subject, but I ask unanimous consent to have it incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not interpose any objection to the request made by the Senator from Mississippi, but I wish to make the observation that recently there has been growing up the practice of inserting remarks in the RECORD and having them printed as though they had actually been delivered on the floor of the Senate. I know that it is the practice in the House of Representatives to insert matter by way of extension of remarks; but I think it is an unfortunate thing to have such a practice develop in the Senate. In order that no personal equation may be involved, I serve notice now that in the future, at any time when I shall happen to be present in the Chamber, I shall feel constrained to object to any requests for extension of remarks to be printed in the RECORD as though they had been delivered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask the Senator not to do so, because purposely I avoided making any objection to his request.

Mr. DOXEY. In view of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, I wish to withdraw the request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator will not feel that way about it, because I purposely wished to make my statement apply only so far as the future is concerned. I do not want to object to the Senator's request, because other Senators have made similar requests recently. However, I think it is a bad practice, and I wish to serve notice that in the future I intend to object. I certainly hope the Senator from Mississippi will stand upon his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DOXEY. I will say to the Senate and to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that I have heard similar requests made. I withdraw my request. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, in a very few days I hope to present a report of certain salaries, approved by the Defense Plant Corporation and paid out of Government funds to officials of defense contracting companies, ranging from $9,000 to $36,000 a year. Contrast these figures to the small compensation given the boys who are fighting for our country. I had begun to believe that the soldier was the forgotten man in this conflict. I am happy that the Senator from Colorado has brought up his bill today. I will support it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the Committee on Military Affairs and the Senator from Colorado, as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this subject, have done a constructive piece of work in the presentation of the pending bill.

Of course, we all understand, and we have always understood from the beginning of our history, that service in the Army and Navy cannot be placed upon a strictly mercenary basis.

There is no way by which we can measure in terms of money the value of a soldier's service or the value of the service of a sailor or a marine. Sometimes we are reminded of a comparison that, on the surface, seems unfair: The men in the Army and in the Navy draw what everyone regards as modest pay, so far as money is concerned, as compared with the pay drawn by men in private life during a war; but, fundamentally, we cannot really make comparison between what is paid in the Army and the Navy and what is received by men in professional or business or industrial life—in private life. There are many equations which enter into such a comparison; but I think that at this time we may well give favorable consideration to the proposed increase, which seems to me to be a modest increase in the pay of our men in all the services. The pay of Army or Naval officers or enlisted men can never be raised high enough to compensate them in money for what they do for their country. We have all read about mercenary soldiers in the Revolution, and from that time until now we have thought about them with contempt—that a man had to be paid in order to serve his country; and, yet, the man who serves his country is entitled not only to respectable and decent pay for his own service and for his loss of time, but for a sufficient amount that will enable him to make a substantial contribution to the support of his family and his dependents, if he has dependents.

So far in this war we have undertaken to be as light as possible upon those with wives and children, but no one can tell how long it will be until we shall be required to draw upon the manpower of our people, upon those who have dependents—wives and children—to serve their country—men within certain ages. That time may come sooner than we can anticipate; and when it comes we certainly must make provision for the support of the wives and children of those who are being drawn into any of the branches of our services, for the benefit of their country and in order to win the war. I think the proposed increase is a modest one. In the aggregate it sounds like a good deal of money—$282,000,000, based upon the Army of January 1—but when we compare that sum to the other costs of the war, the various items which are going into and must go into the expense of winning the war and preserving our institutions, it seems to me that this is a modest increase in the pay of our enlisted men and the lower-rank officers, although the increase will be expanded as we expand the Army and the Navy of the United States.

Personally, I am glad the committee has brought in the bill, and I am happy to support it. I believe it will go a long way toward mollifying or assuaging the feeling that we have not up to now done justice to our Army and Navy in regard to the pay our soldiers and sailors receive, as compared to the pay received in other vocations and other walks of life. Although I grant that we never can equalize such matters from the standpoint of financial contributions, the pending bill is a step in the right direction, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I quite understand how it is impossible properly to pay soldiers in the armed services, particularly in time of war, and I think it would be rather foolish to attempt to give them proper compensation. I was called from the Chamber and probably the Senator has already referred t the matter I am about to mention, but I am wondering—if the Senator has not already referred to it—how he justifies the increase in pay for officers having the rank of lieutenant or ensign. What is the justification?

Mr. BARKLEY. The increase applies only to second lieutenants and ensigns.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not apply to higher ranking officers, except in the one case of brigadier generals, for whom I believe an increase of $500 is proposed.

Mr. MALONEY. What is the purpose of attempting to increase the pay of ensigns and second lieutenants?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has already explained that, I think, and I should not attempt to discuss it.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry; I was out of the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should prefer to have the Senator from Colorado answer the Senator's question, although, frankly, I think we have not gone too far in increasing the pay of ensigns and second lieutenants. Ensigns are those who have enlisted, and in certain instances those who have come out of the Naval Academy as ensigns, and, for a certain length of time, remain as ensigns. I, myself, do not feel that we have increased their pay beyond their merits.

Mr. MALONEY. If the pay of ensigns and second lieutenants is desired to be used as a yardstick, we should increase

the pay of privates and ordinary seamen, as well as the pay of second lieutenants and ensigns. I cannot see any justification for increasing the pay of ensigns and second lieutenants.

Mr. BARKLEY. Although in the past we have to some extent increased pay according to rank, there may be good reason for providing that during his first 4 months of service a private shall receive the same amount that he will receive commencing the day after he has served 4 months. At the present time, he received $21 a month for the first 4 months of his service, and thereafter his pay increases to $30 a month. There may be some reason for increasing all pay according to rank; but I, myself, do not feel that there is any particular injustice in modestly raising the pay of a second lieutenant or an ensign, although the raise may be a little more than the increase granted to a private. At the present time, the low-ranking privates receive $21 a month. Under the terms of the bill, that amount would be increased to $42 a month; and those who have been in the service longer than 4 months, and who now are receiving $30 a month, would have their pay increased to $42. So we tend to equalize the pay of those who have been in the service for less than 4 months and the pay of those who have served for a longer period.

If the scheme or schedule should be carried further, it might be said to justify an increase in the pay of privates to a degree equal to the increase of pay of ensigns and second lieutenants; but inasmuch as we have always gaged our pay according to rank and length of service, I do not see that there is any particular injustice in the suggested increase of pay for second lieutenants and ensigns.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that there is never an injustice when we increase the pay; the injustice comes when we decrease it.

If I am not trespassing upon the Senator's time, I should like to ask the able Senator from Colorado to tell us why it is proposed to increase the pay of ensigns and second lieutenants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We propose to increase the pay of ensigns and second lieutenants by $25 a month. Heretofore, their salary has been $1,500 a year. Under the terms of the bill it will be increased to $1,800 a year, which, it seemed to the committee, would be a very moderate increase. Such men have considerable expenses. They have to dress well, and their clothes cost them a considerable amount of money. They have to be neat and clean, and their appearance counts for a great deal. Their responsibilities are very great, and we simply thought that they are entitled to an increase of $25 a month.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question at that point: If I correctly understand the matter, such officers are required to purchase their own uniforms, are they not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. To what extent are privates—both those who have been in the service less than 4 months and those who have served for a longer time—or even corporals or sergeants, required to purchase their own uniforms?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Their uniforms are furnished them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean that for all men below the rank of ensign and second lieutenant the Government furnishes the uniforms?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. When a man becomes a second lieutenant or an ensign he must purchase his own uniform out of his pay?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. He receives no allowance for it, I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He receives no allowance for it.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, that is not a very good argument, if I may interrupt at this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be if the cost of uniforms has increased.

Mr. MALONEY. The cost has not increased in proportion to the proposed increase of $300 a year in base pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may have, depending on how many uniforms an officer has to buy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The salary of $1,500 is too low, and it should be increased.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I was about to suggest that $1,500 is too little pay for a second lieutenant. It is hardly enough for a good stenographer in the city of Washington. Scarcely anyone working in the Government service today is making less than $150 a month.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if we attempt to pay officers and enlisted men what they are worth, there will not be enough money in the land, or enough printing presses in the land, to make that much money. I think it is a mistake to attempt to pay them what they are worth.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me again, let me say that I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that we cannot pay them what they are worth, but at least we can attempt to pay them a decent or a living wage; and I do not think anyone feels that $150 a month is too much pay for a second lieutenant. Many of the second lieutenants are married and have children and dependents.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I congratulate my distinguished colleague on his work in getting the bill out of committee and onto the floor for consideration, and for giving us a chance to vote on it. I hope the vote will be favorable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank my colleague.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I simply wish to say in connection with consideration of the pending bill that there is now pending before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs a bill which provides that $10,000 of insurance, which is considered a reasonable amount for our soldiers, shall be provided for at the expense of the Government; and the bill likewise provides that our soldiers shall be allowed to vote, and shall not be required to pay any poll tax. I mention those matters as potential benefits which may yet be enjoyed by the soldiers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. I am frequently comparing the present situation to that of the first World War. I happened to have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives during the last World War which committee had jurisdiction of the bill which was passed creating the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. That Bureau was created prior to our entry into the war for the purpose of providing insurance for shipping, cargoes, and vessels, which were required to navigate the seas and undergo the dangers and hazards without any facilities for private insurance. We passed a bill providing insurance under the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and, then, when we got into the war, we amended that act by providing for Government insurance for soldiers. What progress has been made so far toward the consideration of legislation providing for insurance for our enlisted personnel and officers who assume the hazards of war and who, under the circumstances, cannot obtain private insurance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are several bills pending I may say to the Senator on that subject. I do not know of any bill that is similar to that passed during the World War.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think the present draft act and other laws provide that all the men who are now in the military service shall be subject to the compensation and all the beneficial laws administered by the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that that legislation is broad enough to cover the type of insurance we gave to our men ir the service during the first World War.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are covered up to $5,000, are they not?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that any man called into service after the day of the passage of the draft act in November 1940, as I recall, under the present law has been automatically covered to a minimum of $5,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. And the period has been lengthened in which the insurence can be taken. I think the Senator will find that is true as to the enlisted men.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall, in the first World War we provided insurance up to $10,000.

Mr. GEORGE. A maximum of $10,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. A maximum of $10,000.

Mr. GEORGE. The provision now is for a minimum of $5,000, and payments are made a charge against the pay of the soldier.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the present law provides an opportunity for

every soldier to have life insurance up to $10,000, and to have the premiums deducted from his pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. My recollection was that it provided only up to $5,000, but it seems that $5,000 is the minimum and $10,000 is the maximum. So that completely covers the situation as it was covered in the last World War.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with regard to what he just said about insurance. I understood a short time ago from the War Department, and, particularly, I think, from the Veterans' Bureau, that the insurance benefits available to soldiers of this war were not equivalent in advantage to those available to soldiers of the first World War. Can the Senator inform me as to the correctness of that statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot. I have never made a comparison of the two laws. I had the law called to my attention as it stands now, as it was passed in the Senate at the present session. I know that a soldier may have $10,000 of life insurance by paying for it, and that the policy of the War Department is to encourage his taking it. To a certain extent it is compulsory; in other words, a soldier must have a certain amount of insurance, but I have not the law before me.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will examine into it, I think he will find that in what is called the National Insurance Corporation, or under the national insurance arrangement, the provisions are not the equivalent of the war-risk insurance which was available during the first World War.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, and disability provisions at the present time are not so liberal as they were during the World War.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, in section 1, page 2, line 3, after the words "second period", to strike out "$2,100" and insert "$2,000"; in line 4, after the words "third period", to strike out "$2,700" and insert "$2,400"; in line 5, after the words "fourth period", to strike out "$3,300" and insert "$3,000"; in the same line, after the words "fifth period," to strike out "$3,800" and insert "$3,500", and in line 6, after the words "sixth period", to strike out "$4,200" and insert "$4,000"; in line 12, after the words "thirty years' ", to strike out "service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army" and insert "service"; in line 25, after the words "seventeen years' ", to strike out "service, except those whose promotion is limited by law to this grade and who are not entitled under existing law to the pay and allowances of a higher grade" and insert "service"; on page 3, line 25, after the words "thirty years", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the base pay plus pay for length of service of no officer below the grade of colonel of the Army, captain of the Navy, or corresponding grade, shall be at a rate in excess of $479.17 per month."; on page 4, line 9, after the name "President", to insert "and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, Seventy-seventh Congress)"; in line 25, after the words "provided by", to strike out "law: *Provided*, That in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer who was appointed to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy, after August 24, 1912, the time spent at such academy shall not be counted" and insert "law", so as to make the section read:

That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the surgeon general, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

The first period, $1,800; the second period, $2,000; the third period, $2,400; the fourth period, $3,000; the fifth period, $3,500; and the sixth period, $4,000.

The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard, who have completed 30 years' service.

The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed 23 years' service.

The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed 17 years' service.

The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed 10 years' service

The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed 5 years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service up to 30 years: *Provided*, That the base pay plus pay for length of service of no officer below the grade of colonel of the Army, captain of the Navy, or corresponding grade, shall be at a rate in excess of $479.17 per month.

For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 percent of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this act or as may otherwise be provided by law.

The provisions of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 14, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. No commissioned officer while on field or sea duty shall receive any increase of his pay or compensation by reason of such duty.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 percent, and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be increased by 10 percent, for any period of service while on sea duty, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the percent increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect 12 months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, at the top of page 10, to insert:

When the total of base pay, pay for length of service, and allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, authorized in this act for any officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, shall exceed the rate of $600 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such officer is entitled

shall be reduced by the amount of the excess above $600.

On page 10, after line 1, to strike out:

No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor while an officer with or without dependents is assigned quarters at his permanent station which, in the judgment of competent superior authority of the service concerned, are adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents: *Provided*, That such officer, although furnished with such quarters, shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer, although furnished with quarters, shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay, shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month.

To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be $90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be $105 per month.

When the total of base pay, pay for length of service, and allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, authorized in this act for any officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, shall exceed the rate of $600 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such officer is entitled shall be reduced by the amount of the excess above $600.

No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 11, line 9, after the word "Army", to strike out "and of" and insert "or"; in line 10, after the word "Navy", to insert a comma and "the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey,"; in line 12, after the word "the", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "Engineering" and insert "Engineer in"; in line 13, after the word "Navy", to insert a comma and "an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey,"; in line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "the" and insert "an"; in line 15, after the words "shall be", to strike out "$7,250" and insert "$6,000"; in line 16, after the word "Army", to strike out "and of" and insert "or"; in line 18, after the words "of the", to strike out "Navy" and insert "Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; in line 19, after the words "shall be", to strike out "$8,400" and insert "$8,000"; in line 22, after the words "sixth period", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That when the total of base pay, subsistence, and rental allowances exceeds the rate of $666.67 per month for officers serving in the grade of brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an Assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and the rate of $808.33 per month for those serving in the grade of major general of the Army or the Marine Corps, and rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the amount of the allowances to which such officers are entitled shall be reduced by the amount of the excess above $666.67 or $808.33, respectively"; on page 12, line 20, after the word "Operations", to strike out "the" and insert "officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be $8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period: *Provided*, That when the total of base pay, subsistence, and rental allowances exceeds the rate of $666.67 per month for officers serving in the grade of brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and the rate of $808.33 per month for those serving in the grade of major general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the amount of the allowances to which such officers are entitled shall be reduced by the amount of the excess above $666.67 or $808.33, respectively.

Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this act serving in corresponding grades shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this act serving in corresponding grades shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 13, line 17, after the word "except", to strike out "chief warrant officers of" and insert "masters in"; in line 19, after the words "Planter Service", to strike out "chief engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service,"; in line 22, after the word "receive", to strike out "the base pay of the second period as established by section 1 of this act" and insert "base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum"; on page 15, line 8, after the words "Shall be" and the colon, to strike out "Active" and insert "active"; in line 10, before the word "components", to strike out "Reserve" and insert "reserve"; in line 15, before the word "with", to insert "only"; in line 17, before the word "components", to strike out "Reserve" and insert "reserve"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,500 a year" and insert "the rate of $458.33 per month"; and in line 23, after the words "amount above", to strike out "$5,500" and insert "$458.33", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall recive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service

and commissioned warrant officers with less than 10 years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, 77th Cong.).

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after 10 years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after 20 years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this act, and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service, not exceeding 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including commissioned service in the reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $458.33.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 16, line 4, after the word "grade", to strike out "$60" and insert "$66"; in line 15, after the words "years of", to strike out "service, not exceeding" and insert "service up to"; and in line 20, after the words "District of", to strike out "Columbia," and insert "Columbia:" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $138; enlisted men of the second grade, $114; enlisted men of the third grade, $96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $48; and enlisted men of the seventh grade $42. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $126.

For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

Every enlisted man paid under the provision of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, page 17, line 3, after the words "per day", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe"; in line 12, after the words "Coast Guard", to strike out "Service" and insert "service"; in line 19, after the word "kind", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him"; on page 18, after line 19, to insert: "Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong.).

Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the provision in lines 19 to 23, on page 17, which reads:

Provided, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The purpose of this proviso is to enable an enlisted man having dependents to draw a rental allowance for both himself and his dependents if he is assigned to a post of duty where his dependents cannot accompany him and the Government is unable to furnish quarters for either him or his dependents. For example a master sergeant who has a wife and child in the United States to whom quarters are not furnished would be entitled to draw a double rental allowance if he should be sent to Newfoundland or Trinidad and the Government did not furnish him quarters at the station to which he is sent. Under the provisions of law now in effect the Comptroller General has held that such an enlisted man is limited to drawing one rental allowance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, page 19, line 7, after the word "pay", to strike out "and the allowances" and insert "of enlisted men"; in line 9, after the word "pay", to strike out "and one-half the allowances"; and in line 10, after the word "corresponding", to strike out "ratings" and insert "grades", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 12, page 22, line 24, after the word "available", to insert "as may be determined by the head of the department concerned"; in line 2, after the word "services" to strike out "entitled to pay under the provisions" and insert "mentioned in the title"; in line 9, after the word "costs", to insert "for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished", and after line 12, to strike out:

The words "permanent change of station" as used in this section shall include the home of an officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man to which he is ordered in connection with retirement.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

The words "permanent change of station" as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including retired personnel and members of the reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a reserve component.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $6 per day.

Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance, shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term "permanent station" as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

The words "permanent change of station" as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including retired personnel and members of the reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a reserve component.

Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 15, page 27, line 11, after the word "nurses", to strike out "and enlisted men" and insert "enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve"; in line 17, after the word "retirement", to insert "or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve"; in line 23, after the word "in", to strike out "this" and insert "the"; on page 28, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "allowances," and insert "allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty"; after line 10, to strike out:

In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage increases in their retired pay: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 percent of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½ or 3 percent of the active-duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½ or 3 percent for each year of active duty and a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay as authorized by existing law.

And on page 19, after line 8, to insert:

The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 percent of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue prior to the enactment of this act as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this act, retired officers, warrant officers, nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act, which pay shall include increases for all

active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the act of June 4, 1920.

In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½ or 3 percent of the active-duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½ or 3 percent for each year of active duty and a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay as authorized by existing law.

The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 percent of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue prior to the enactment of this act as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 17, page 30, line 1, after the words "per annum", to strike out "to subsistence at the rate of 75 cents per diem which may be commuted, to mileage at 5 cents per mile while proceeding under instructions from competent authority from their homes to their respective academies for the purpose of entrance therein, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders after such entrance" and insert "and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $780 per annum and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 18, page 30, line 25, after the name "President", to insert "Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned."; after line 17, to strike out:

Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 percent thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay at the rate of $100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of $50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 19, page 32, after line 2, to strike out:

Those portions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, 77th Cong.), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, the act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941), and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That acts or parts of acts incorporating, directly or by implication, the provisions of the act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this act except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

The act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, 77th Cong.), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That acts or parts of acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this act except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this act.

The act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, 77th Cong.), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That acts or parts of acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this act except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 20, page 33, line 19, after the words "act of", to strike out "1941" and insert "1942", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 20. This act may be cited as the "Pay Readjustment Act of 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments of the committee. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Doxey	Nye
Andrews	Ellender	O'Daniel
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Guffey	Rosier
Barkley	Gurney	Schwartz
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Brown	Hill	Spencer
Bulow	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Byrd	La Follette	Tydings
Capper	Lee	Vandenberg
Caraway	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chandler	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wiley
Connally	Maloney	Willis
Danaher	Millikin	
Davis	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

On the question of the passage of the bill the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SCHWARTZ (when Mr. O'MAHONEY's name was called). A few minutes ago the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was called from the Senate on public business. He authorized me to say that if present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business. I am authorized to say that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BURTON. On behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is temporarily absent, I am asked to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS. My colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHAVEZ. My colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], are necessarily absent. If present and voting, I am advised that these Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. If present he would vote "yea," the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent. If present, all these Senators would vote "yea." The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is detained in a conference. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—73

Aiken	Doxey	Nye
Andrews	Ellender	O'Daniel
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Guffey	Rosier
Barkley	Gurney	Schwartz
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Brown	Hill	Spencer
Bulow	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Byrd	La Follette	Tydings
Capper	Lee	Vandenberg
Caraway	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chandler	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wiley
Connally	Maloney	Willis
Danaher	Millikin	
Davis	Murray	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—23

Bilbo	Lodge	Smathers
Brewster	Maybank	Stewart
Bridges	Mead	Taft
Downey	Murdock	Tobey
Glass	Norris	Truman
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Kilgore	Radcliffe	White
Langer	Russell	

So the bill (S. 2025) was passed.

Mr. STEWART subsequently said: Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber this afternoon when a vote was had on the so-called soldiers' pay-increase bill, Senate bill 2025. I was present this morning, and left about 1 o'clock to go to one of the departments. I happened to be absent when the roll was called on the bill, which I understand was passed unanimously. Since the RECORD shows my presence here this morning, I wish to state that I am in full sympathy with the bill, and would have voted for it had I been present. If I had the right to ask unanimous consent to be placed on record as voting in favor of the bill, I should do so; but I understand that such a request would be out of order.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2250, Calendar No. 1258, with a view to having it made the unfinished business; but I do not desire to press for immediate consideration of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what is the motion?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2250 in order that it may be made the unfinished business. I understand we shall have a session tomorrow, and I wish to have the bill considered at the earliest possible time in view of the vital importance of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas made every effort to obtain recognition. He approached the Vice President before the calendar was called and was assured that he would be recognized immediately after the calendar was called, but he could not get recognition. It is his purpose to move that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of Senate bill 2054, the so-called anti-strike bill. He realizes that there are currents of opposition to giving the Senator from Texas a chance to have a vote taken on this bill, but he does not propose to be sideswiped and bypassed.

Let me ask the Senator from Montana, How long does he expect his bill will take?

Mr. MURRAY. I merely ask that it be made the unfinished business, and that it be taken up for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. How long does the Senator expect the consideration of the bill will take?

Mr. MURRAY. It will probably take no more than an hour. I do not think there will be any opposition to it on either side of the Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does not the Senator ask that the bill be considered now?

Mr. MURRAY. There are a number of Senators who are very much interested in the measure who are not here at the present moment. They will be here tomorrow and, in view of the fact that they participated in working out the measure, I dislike very much to take it up in their absence.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator, I do not know what absent Senators he is talking about, but there are more Senators present right now than have been present in a week. Why does not the Senator from Montana wait until tomorrow, and let me make my motion now; then he can be entirely happy tomorrow, for he will have the absent Senators here.

Mr. MURRAY. I made my motion. I do not know that there is any parliamentary objection to taking up my measure, having it made the unfinished business, and then laying it aside for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the Senator can use an hour and a half at least until 5 o'clock, when we usually adjourn. I think the Senate ought to be doing something during the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. MURRAY. I am willing to have the bill taken up at the present time. As I said, I do not like to present it at this moment because several members of the Special Committee on Small Business, who had a very important part in the preparation of this measure, are not here at the present time. It is not my bill alone. It is the bill of the seven members of the committee. I believe in courtesy to them I should permit them to be here when the bill is being considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I can secure any assurance that on the completion of consideration of the Senator's bill I can obtain the floor, for the purpose of making a motion——

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Texas will have my support in securing recognition.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator agrees, but no other Senator seems to agree.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure the Senator will have no difficulty.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator is sure, then I may say he is surer than I am.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure the Senator will have my support. In view of the purpose of the Senator's bill, and in view of the great love and affection we all have for him, he should know that we will all be anxious to see that he is given first consideration after I get through with my bill

Mr. CONNALLY. I see the Senator knows how to handle little business. [Laughter] Let me ask the Senator, would he object to being permitted to make his measure the unfinished business, and then temporarily lay it aside, and let me make my motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what was that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought I would get a reaction from that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The remark which the Senator made——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not saying it publicly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would just as soon the Senator would say it publicly as privately.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, I did, if the Senator wants to be angry about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not angry; but the Senator from Texas made some side remark which I did not think was complimentary to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said I would get some reaction, and I got it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Texas knows and every Senator knows, that the bill which he proposes to take up cannot be disposed of between now and tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not want my bill to be displaced, because I think it of vital importance to the people of this country that the measure be passed without delay. The bill has been worked out with great care, after lengthy hearings, and it seems to me it should be considered promptly. It has the approval of the War Production Board, and is regarded as a solution of the problem of utilizing small business in war production.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to have a vote on the Senator's bill today. Why does he not go ahead and explain it, and take up as much time as is necessary this afternoon, so we can dispose of it as early as possible? There is no use to adjourn at 3:30 simply in order to——

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, as I said a moment ago, that if I can get some assurance that I will have some chance, after the bill of the Senator from Montana is out of the way, to make my motion, I will agree to the motion of the Senator from Montana, but I have a right to obtain the floor to make my motion. My bill has been pending since December, I think it was, with a favorable report from the Committee on the Judiciary, by a vote of 12 to 2, and I have a right to have it considered. The bill of the Senator from Montana is a new, fresh bill. It has been here only for a short time. All I want is a chance for my white alley.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from Texas and I have conferred frequently and privately about his measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I have assured the Senator that I have no desire to shut him off from making a motion. I do have some very settled opinions about the wisdom of attempting to bring it up at this time, but that does not influence the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator——

Mr. BARKLEY. When he brings his bill up, if he does, the Senator knows that the whole question of the labor situation is before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Any amendment is in order to his bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Amendments with respect to the 40-hour week, antistrike, time and a half for overtime, and double time will be in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are all in order on the bill of the Senator from Montana also.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is true. They are in order on any bill except a regular appropriation bill, to which those amendments cannot be offered, but they have not been offered to any other bill, and probably would not be offered to the bill of the Senator from Montana. Inasmuch as the bill of the Senator from Texas deals with the subject, amendments of that nature would be in order on his bill.

Mr. President, I am not going to argue the matter now. Whenever the Senator wants to make his motion he can make it, so far as I am concerned. When the motion is made if I see fit to make some remarks about the wisdom of undertaking to deal with the matter at this time I shall do so, and they will not influence anyone I am sure, because if there is anyone in the Senate who has no influence with it on this subject, I think the Senator from Kentucky is the Member. But, nevertheless, I will, if I see fit to do so, undertake to discuss the wisdom of bringing this matter up at this time, when everyone in the Government, and as I understand, in labor, is trying to work out the solution of this matter.

I do not think the Senate has the last word on it. I do not think any Member of the Senate has the last word on it or knows the answer to this question. The Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Military Affairs have been holding hearings. The House passed the Smith bill months ago. The House has now taken a recess, with the alibi that it has passed the bill and that the Senate will not act upon it. It is an alibi; that is all it is. The House is still holding hearings on another Smith bill, on the Vinson bill, and on various other bills. So the House itself has not yet expressed its own judgment about the legislation which should be enacted. The House has taken a 2-week recess, to which I have no objection; but I do not think it is quite fair to the Senate or to individual Members of the Senate for Members of the House from various States to go back home and, as an alibi, tell their people that they have passed a bill which solves the question, which is now on the doorstep of the Senate, and that the only trouble is that the Senate will not pass it.

This is a serious question. The whole labor situation is a serious matter. We have already been threatened. I have been threatened. In my State a Republican newspaper has been picking up copy from some Oklahoma newspaper and carrying on its front page editorials and little box pledges to be signed by its readers, to the effect that—

> I hereby pledge that I will never vote for another Senator or Representative in Congress unless he votes to repeal or suspend the 40-hour week, or votes for some antistrike legislation.

People have a perfect right to sign those "canned" threats to Members of Congress if they want to do so; but a threat to defeat a man never was an argument for or against any bill, and never will be. So far as I am concerned I have served notice on the people of my State who have sent me these threats that I do not propose to be influenced by threats of defeat to vote for or against any measure which may be pending here. There are some things in life which are more precious to me than a seat in the Senate. More precious to me than any honor I hold at the hands of the Senate is my own self-respect. I do not propose to be swept off my feet. I do not propose to hunt a brush pile every time I hear a dog yelp in order to insure my reelection to this or any other body.

I know that this thing flares up every now and then, because somebody gets out some propaganda. This time it

started out in Oklahoma. It was said to be a grass-root proposition. A certain radio commentator announced that it was sweeping over this country like a pairie fire, to which he had set a match. It got into my State. I have probably a bushel basketful of threats that if I do not vote a certain way I will be defeated.

I regard a seat in the Senate as a great honor. I cherish the respect of my fellow Members and of my people in Kentucky; but in my judgment, they do not know me, and they do not know the Members of the Senate if they think that they can influence me or them to vote for or against any proposition merely because of a threat of political defeat. I would rather go back to my home defeated than to be intimidated, browbeaten, or insulted into voting for or against anything.

The labor question is not a one-way street. There are many sides to it. Many questions are entitled to consideration, and we ought to consider them on their merits.

I have great respect for the opinions of the men who are charged with the responsibility of production, including Mr. Donald Nelson, Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Patterson, and Mr. Forrestal, who are in charge of production for the Army and the Navy. They are not Democrats. They are not new dealers. They have no axes to grind. They are not running for any office; but they are charged with the responsibility of conducting this war and of bringing about production. As between their judgment and experience and that of those who are trying to intimidate me by "canned" letters clipped out of newspapers, by which they threaten to defeat me the next time I run for office. I accept the judgment of those who are charged with responsibility in this great crisis.

I have not said anything about the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our Army and our Navy. As I said the other day, he could not escape that responsibility if he desired to do so. It is placed upon him by the Constitution of the United States. I think that he and Mr. Nelson, Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Patterson, and Mr. Forrestal know more about what they are doing day by day, across the table from industry and labor, than do those who are seeking to frighten us in some way to vote for or against something.

All these things have to be considered. I do not believe the Senate is prepared to consider them. I do not believe the Senate has made up its own mind. I do not think it has the answer to this question. The Senator from Texas has been impatient with me because, as he has probably thought, I have "stalled" on this thing and postponed it——

Mr. CONNALLY. I tried to be respectful to the Senator, and have not approached him in the spirit of dictation.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. The Senator has approached me in the proper spirit, and we have discussed the matter frankly. I have tried, in conversations not only with him but with others, to convey the impression that in this state of public furor, excitement, and panic, I think we ought not further to disunite and divide our country by bringing up a matter which I believe is being worked out fairly and successfully. I shall not go into that question; but I will go into it when the time is ripe and the occasion is proper.

I am not now going into the matter of strikes, the 40-hour week, time and a half, and so forth. I think the Senate must go into those questions in dealing with this whole subject. I have felt, and I now feel, that we are not yet ready, in view of the fact that no committee has passed upon legislation dealing with the 40-hour week, or with antistrike legislation.

It is true that the Senator's bill merely authorizes the President to take over factories. He already has that authority. The bill which the Senator is sponsoring may vary that authority somewhat, but the President already has authority to take over factories which are stopped by reason of strikes or lock-outs. There may be some provision in the Senator's bill with reference to freezing wages and contracts which is not now in the law; but substantially the Senator's bill does not deal with the 40-hour week or with compulsory antistrike legislation, by which I mean punishment for strikes or violation of the law. It deals only with the power of the President to take over factories under certain conditions, which he can already do. Of course, the Senator knows that when he brings up his bill, any Senator may offer the Smith bill, the Vinson bill, or a bill of his own dealing with the 40-hour week, time and a half, or antistrike legislation as an amendment; and then we shall be precipitated into the very midst of consideration of the question upon which no committee of the Senate has passed.

For those reasons, in view of our desire to try to bring about unity, or at least preserve unity, and in view of the success of the board established by the President, the success of Donald Nelson, Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Patterson, and all the rest, in dealing with this matter and working out a voluntary agreement and program, which I believe will be infinitely more workable than any compulsory law we might enact, I do not believe we are ready to have that subject precipitated into the Senate without a committee report, and without the advice of those who have looked into it. I may be mistaken, but that is my belief.

We talk about wanting unity. The Lord knows, I want it. I should like to have it here in the Senate. If we could get it here in the Senate we could make much progress. If we could quit talking about one another and quit bickering and quarreling among ourselves over things which we may not be able to solve by compulsion, we might set an example for unity throughout the country. I may be mistaken, but that is what I think.

For that reason, and, with the greatest deference to my friend from Texas—for he knows that I have for him the greatest respect and affection—I have sought to delay this thing until we could get the matter concretely before us.

It is no use to say that the Committee on Education and Labor has deliberately delayed consideration of this matter. It has held hearings. Hearings are now being held from time to time on the subject. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has been on the griddle, and I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma on his courage and intelligence in dealing with the question. He called a number of Government officials before the Committee on Appropriations, and they made unequivocal statements to his subcommittee on the subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Unanimously.

Mr. BARKLEY. Unanimously. At his own expense the Senator from Oklahoma had all the testimony printed and has sent it to his constituents in Oklahoma in order that they might see both sides of the question. The Senator from Oklahoma has not been swept off his feet by a panic. In this instance, as always happens, the Senator from Oklahoma has given the subject the statesmanlike consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. A great amount of furor and animosity has been created by radio commentators and newspaper columnists, and in many cases by those who are seeking to take advantage of this war to undo nearly everything we have done in the past 8 years. Of course, I exonerate the Senator from Texas from this charge. I am talking about some of those who have inspired the present movement. We ought not to be precipitated into a hasty consideration of a matter which is of the utmost importance in preserving unity and the faith of our people in themselves. I think it is about time for us to quit fighting among ourselves and go to fighting Hitler a little harder. We cannot put into effect our entire force—moral, industrial, physical, or otherwise—if we are quarreling among ourselves and creating suspicion among others by the passage of resolutions condemning the President of the United States and writing insulting letters to him because he has not pursued a course which meets with the approval of some who were never very much in favor of anything he did from the beginning.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Kentucky yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, let me ask my colleague if it is not a fact that there are approximately seven and one-half million workers employed in the defense industries of the country, and that the records show that about three one-hundredths of 1 percent of them have been out of work because of labor disputes since Pearl Harbor?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; the Senator is correct.

In order to show the effort to misrepresent matters, let me point out that in Harlan County, in our State, where the chief production is coal, so much

coal has been mined that it has been piled up on the ground outside the mines, and the miners are working only 2 days a week; and yet, because the miners are idle 4 days of the week, they are charged with being on strike and with preventing production during the emergency of war, when, as a matter of fact, the coal which they have already mined cannot be sold, and is piled up on the ground outside the mines.

That is only an instance of the unfairness of some of the people of the country. When some people see a man not working, they think he is on a strike and is holding up production. The instance I have mentioned is only one of many.

The other day I called attention to the fact that 400,000 of the United Electrical Workers of the United States, in a full-page advertisement in the Washington Post, agreed that they would give up not only double-time pay for work done on Sundays and holidays, but also time-and-a-half pay for overtime, provided that the pay which they would otherwise receive should go into the Treasury of the United States, instead of into the pockets of their employers.

It so happens that the Government had already entered into contracts with Westinghouse and General Electric and others in which the price was based on payment of time and a half for overtime. So if the workers were to agree to forego time-and-a-half pay, what would be saved would go into the pockets of those employing them. The 400,000 electrical workers have agreed that during the war they shall receive ordinary pay instead of time and a half for overtime, provided that what they would otherwise receive should go into the Treasury of the United States. No one has said whether the employers have agreed to the suggestion, but it was an offer on the part of 400,000 workers in the United States. That certainly indicates a willingness on their part to yield to the American people what they would receive as time-and-a-half pay for overtime, provided it should not go into the pockets of the men employing them. Can anyone disagree with such an attitude?

All such instances convince me, Mr. President, that it is not wise, or in the interest of war production, or in the interest of harmony or unity in this country, to stir up our people over an issue which is being settled through voluntary negotiation, by men who are responsible for production sitting down at a table with those responsible for working, and working out the matter according to what may be justice and equity.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield. I have already taken more time than I intended to take, but I did want to take sufficient time to express the basis of my views on these matters.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall not protract the Senator's remarks, but I should like to ask him a question. Does not what the very able Senator has said this afternoon—I think with the approval of nearly all of us—indicate the necessity of Congress, through some special or standing committee, some group which the leaders might designate, through some group working cooperatively, or in some way or another, approaching the whole problem and doing what needs to be done with respect to any phase of it, so that there will not be an injustice to any group by simply jumping on them and leaving the others unaffected? Does not what the Senator has so ably said indicate the necessity of approaching the whole problem? Most of us have felt from the beginning that labor was willing to do its fair share, but if we leave the matter without any approach to the whole problem, is it not possible that we shall not act fairly to our people?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know specifically and concretely what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. Profits, excess bonuses, wages, the 40-hour-week law, and all such factors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. In my judgment, we cannot deal with those problems on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Nor in mine. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we have to collect information. As I said awhile ago, the whole subject is not a one-way street; there are two sides to it. The trouble is that many people in the country are not willing to recognize the fact that there is any side except their side, whereas there are two sides to the problem.

I had hoped that we might, by mutual conferences, without regard to politics, work out some plan. I had spoken to the minority leader [Mr. McNARY] the Senator from Texas, and to other Senators about it, to see if we could not during this week get together and informally discuss the matter and see what the best course might be. I do not think we are prepared overnight to pass on a problem of this sort or to act wisely with reference to it. We may act according to our prejudices or our preconceived notions; but we cannot act wisely if we so act. We must consider the whole subject as a whole. We must consider the experience of those who are working with the subject day by day, who are trying to work it out, and who are working it out. I am one of those who believe that we can accomplish infinitely more by voluntary cooperation and adjustment than by compulsion.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe it, and I want to believe it. I believe we should have the benefit of the views and experience of those who are trying to adjust such matters on the basis of cooperation and adjustment.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me say that what the Senator has said is undoubtedly true in the majority of cases; and yet we have the instance of the bonus scandal which the Secretary of the Navy disclosed, the case of a secretary receiving a bonus of $25,000, which is coming out of the cost of airplane construction. One House Member showed that excess profits have gone up 13 percent in some cases. Such instances are just as obnoxious, just as irritating, just as wrong, and, indeed, just as unpatriotic as some of the things which the workers do.

Is it not our duty to make an approach to the whole problem, wherever it occurs?

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly the Senator is correct. What has been developed in regard to the highjacking firm out in Cleveland—and I say that was highjacking—is a disgrace and a scandal; it is a dishonest and unscrupulous performance on their part. No one can condone such actions; and yet I doubt whether we should condemn all business and industry and pass a law to affect everyone because we have found a bunch of little crooks out in Cleveland.

For that very reason it takes patience and some forbearance to look into all these matters and to find out what the facts are.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the existence of the "chiseling" class in every group make it impossible to achieve a solution of the whole problem merely by voluntary effort?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter on which I think there may be honest difference of opinion. It may be that it is impossible. We talk about undertaking to curb profits. There are two schools of thought on that question. One is that we can pass a law limiting profits to 6 percent, or some other percentage, which involves the necessity of the Government standing by every day and keeping the books of the concerns, in order to see that no more than 6 percent is made as a profit.

On the other hand, there are those who believe that we can tax that profit and get it back into the Treasury of the United States, and do it more successfully than we can by attempting to regulate the percentage of profits made by any concern.

That raises the question whether we can pass an over-all law that will affect every industry in the United States, so as to guarantee that no one will make more than a certain percentage of profit—all of which must be studied and argued out. It may be necessary in the tax bill which is coming forward to be more drastic than we have ever before been in a tax bill, in order to catch cases of that sort.

However, the point I am making is that the matter cannot be wisely solved or disposed of on the floor of the Senate without the advice and judgment of a committee which has meticulously and exhaustively looked into the matter and studied it. I do not see how anyone can quarrel with that theory.

Mr. President, I have already said more than I desired to say. I apologize to the Senate, and especially to my good friend the Senator from Texas, for taking up so much time. The Senate is at liberty to do as it wishes about the whole subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2250, and make it the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have to renew his motion. Does the Senator desire that the bill be considered now?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I desire to have its consideration go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is before the Senate and is debatable.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Kentucky felt irritated at the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas did not intend to irritate. He made a little side remark to one of his colleagues, entirely in good humor, when the Senator from Kentucky arose. The Senator from Texas made no criticism.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky very frankly stated that he is against considering my bill. That is all right; but other Senators who favor it have as much right to express their views by a vote in this Chamber as he has by a speech.

My bill is not the result of the recent agitation and hurrah. It has been pending on the calendar since the 1st day of December 1941, with a report from the Committee on the Judiciary. Senators talk about having bills receive committee support. The Committee on the Judiciary is a rather sound, conservative, and fair committee. The Senate is willing to trust it in other important matters. That committee reported the bill favorably by a vote of 12 to 2. It is said that Mr. Forrestal is against this bill and Mr. Patterson is against this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, I did not attempt to quote Mr. Forrestal or Mr. Patterson on this bill. I was quoting them on a general program of legislation dealing with the question of a 40-hour week, antistrike proposals, time and a half, and so forth. I have understood that when the Senator's bill was before the Judiciary Committee Mr. Patterson and Mr. Forrestal expressed themselves as not in opposition to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is right. I do not want to be unfair to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted to make it clear that in their recent statements they were talking about the general situation that has brought this matter before the Congress and before the whole country.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says if this bill comes up any kind of labor amendment can be offered. Of course, it can. Any kind of labor amendment can be offered to the bill of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] when it comes up tomorrow. Is that any reason why we should not proceed to take it up if we want to take it up? Is the Senate afraid to consider a measure because it is afraid it might lead to something else? We talk about courage here. It seems to me that the Senate ought to have courage enough to face some of these issues by a vote.

I am not insisting on any radical measure. This is not a radical measure at all. I am no labor hater; I am no labormonger. I have voted labor measures on the floor of the Senate over the years, and I am sure that labor will rate my record very high in their private cause, but in this emergency I do not think anyone is exempt from his duty to his Government. I do not propose to create any aristocracy of a few labor czars. I believe that most of the laboring men want to help the Government; I believe most of them want to work; but they are highjacked by a few labor czars who order them around. I do not believe that this is any time for the Government of the United States to tolerate that kind of conduct. Of course, other amendments may be offered, but will they be offered? Has not the Senate the right to express itself? Are we afraid to express ourselves on any question that may come before the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In view of the range the debate has taken, I should like simply to ask the Senator what bill he is talking about getting up? Is he talking about getting up the bill passed by the House of Representatives, known as the first Smith bill, or another bill which was before the House known as the second Smith bill, or is he talking about the Connally bill which was approved by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and has been on the calendar for 4 months?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am trying to get up Senate bill 2054, Calendar No. 878, reported without amendment under authority of order of the Senate of December 1, 1941, by Mr. HATCH.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator a further question: Something has been said here as to the attitude expressed by Under Secretary Patterson and Under Secretary Forrestal and Mr. Nelson and Admiral Land. What was their attitude in regard to the Connally bill? I am not now speaking of the Smith bill, but of the Connally bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Kentucky was evidently referring to the statements made by Mr. Forrestal and Judge Patterson on the 40-hour-week proposition. My bill does not deal with that question at all. I understand they appeared before some committee and said they did not favor amending the 40-Hour Week Act, and many people sought to construe that to the effect that they were not for any sort of labor legislation. I have before me what Judge Patterson said when he was before the committee and he has not retracted it. I quote from the hearings before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee last November. This is not a result of all the tempest which has arisen within the last few days. This was on November 21. I cannot quote all his testimony, but in referring to this bill, Judge Patterson said:

> It seems to me to be a sensible and rational way of dealing with an evil with which we are now faced: The existence of stoppages in production in vital plants, plants vitally needed, that is, for the furtherance of the national defense program. It is fair. I do not see how the interests of either the employer or employee are prejudiced.
>
> It is practicable in that it provides for a resumption of work, the resumption of production in a plant, the output of which may be indispensable to the arming and equipping of the Army and Navy at a time when interruptions cannot be afforded by the Nation.
>
> Now, we have, heretofore, on behalf of the Army, pursuant to Presidential order, taken over the production of two plants, and I believe the Navy has of one.

Then he goes on at considerable length to approve the bill without amendment. He says it is what the Army needs.

Then, we had Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal before us, and, in effect, he testified along the same line. He said that he advocated the passage of the bill without amendment.

What does the bill do? It will be remembered that the Senate, when the original draft bill was before it, adopted the Overton-Russell amendment. That amendment provided that whenever an employer or the owner of a plant refused to produce at reasonable rates and on conditions which were satisfactory to the Government the President should take over the plant.

The Senator from Kentucky says that the law now provides for the President taking over a plant. He can do so under those conditions, and under those conditions alone, when the employer or the owner refuses to give the Government an advantageous or fair contract. This bill provides merely for the other branch of the question. It provides that when production in national defense plants is slowed up, or hindered, or delayed by strike, or by labor controversies, or by any other cause, the President, through the appropriate agency of Government, may take the plant over and conduct it and keep it going and keep the wheels turning and keep it producing.

How does the bill deal with the men who work in the plant? It does not regiment them; it does not command them as to what they shall do, except to say, "If the Government takes this plant over, the labor relations which existed before the strike shall not be disturbed by a strike." In other words, "If you have an open-shop plant, you cannot strike demanding a closed shop; if you have a closed shop, you cannot strike demanding an open shop; if you have controversy between various unions, you cannot strike on questions of jurisdiction or other trivial matters of that kind. You can either work or you can quit; but when you quit you must not bother the men who want to work. You have no right to stand at the gate with a club and fight off men who want to work." That is what it does with respect to labor.

In an effort, however, to be fair to labor, it sets up an impartial governmental board for fixing fair wages, taking into view the possible enhancement of the cost of living. A tribunal is provided so that when the workers vote to submit a wage matter it goes before that board in order to assure them a fair wage.

How can that hurt labor? The labor unions say there will not be any strikes. If there are going to be no strikes, this bill will not hurt them, it will not touch them; but if there is a strike, it is a gun behind the door to make sure that the factory shall continue to produce national-defense articles.

Mr. President, we are not bringing this bill forward because we are frightened; we are bringing it forward because it was right last December; we are bringing it forward because the Committee on the Judiciary in calmness, when there was no

tempest raging, when there was no storm frightening us and making us tremble in our boots, thought it right in December, and it has been on this calendar ever since.

One reason it has not been taken up here is that we were depending on voluntary agreements around the table. That is fine, but sometimes there is someone under the table instead of around the table, and it is not possible to get agreements that stick.

The country has been flooded with statements that the House has passed the Smith bill and other bills, and the House has sent them over to the Senate, and the reason there has not been any legislation of any kind is the Senate of the United States. There is the record. But we did act. On the 12th of June 1941, the Senate passed the bill which I now offer, except that it then did not contain the provision with respect to "freezing" labor relations. It adopted the provision authorizing the President to take over strike-bound plants.

The bill in the form of an amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 67 to 7, and it went to the other House, but the House conferees would not let the Members of the House vote on it. The House had no chance to vote on it. It was smothered in conference; it was choked to death. It was left on someone's doorstep, and the House conferees ran off and left it. The House dared not vote on it, and did not pass it. So the House is in no position to point their trembling finger at the Senate of the United States and say that we are to blame for this situation. They voted down the wage-hour suspension by what was it—two hundred and some odd votes to sixty or so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They voted it down by 3 to 1.

Mr. CONNALLY. They voted it down by 3 or 4 to 1. That is what this present agitation is about—the 40-hour week. My bill does not deal with that subject, but of course if it comes up, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, if any Senator wishes to offer an amendment about the 40-hour week, it is perfectly true, he can offer it, and he can offer as well to the bill of the Senator from Montana. Let me say to all Senators, if they have any labor amendments to present, offer them to the bill of the Senator from Montana, and they will get them up promptly, and clear the ground, and everything will be nice and sweet when I bring up my bill following action on the bill of the Senator from Montana. Of course Senators are not going to do that. They are not going to interfere with the Senator from Montana. He has his bill; and I am sure it is a good bill. I have not read it, but the less we read of some of these bills the better they seem to be. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not desire to cause anyone any trouble, but I thought that when a committee of the Senate by a vote of 12 to 2 reported a bill favorably, the Senate was entitled to vote on it.

Now, Mr. President, I do not want any side-bar remarks. The Senator from Kentucky objected to something I said awhile ago, and he is whispering over to the Senator from Oregon in a very deprecating and disparaging manner. I do not know what he said, but I looked at his face, and it was not kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I wore one of the most benign smiles on my countenance I have had in a month.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly; "benign" is when they "get" you. [Laughter.] But this is all in good nature. I know the Senator was just being humorous.

Mr. President, I am not criticising the leadership, but it looks to me as if the leadership should stand by the committees when they act, and certainly when we have a committee voting 12 to 2. Talk about nonpartisanship; it was a nonpartisan vote. There was not any politics. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], wearing the robes of traditional New England Republicanism, voted for the bill in the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have frequently tried to stand by the majorities of committees in the Senate when I did not have the cooperation of my good friend from Texas; last week, for instance. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. But the Senator from Texas is not leader. I am talking about leaders. When one gets to be a leader, then he is freed from all the little, petty quibblings of other men in the ranks. I am an enlisted man; I do not wear the shoulder straps.

I do not know what the Senator is referring to when he says something about last week.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Langer case.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have "langered" so long, I am willing not to "langer" longer, but to talk about something else.

Mr. BARKLEY. The rule to which the Senator refers is one which I have observed all the time, and I am sure the Senator would be consistent by helping me when I stand by committees. I do think it is the duty of the majority leader, any majority leader, to uphold the majorities of committees whenever he can do so consistently; but I do not think he is always required to yield his own personal convictions in order to do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct; I do not differ. The Senator from Kentucky says that the Senator from Texas should support him. I think the Senator from Kentucky leaves an inference in that statement to the effect that the Senator from Texas is not supporting him. I have not supported him 100 percent. The cases when I did not support him fell in the last category the Senator mentioned.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has stated that I, as majority leader, should always support the majorities of committees.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say always.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not make any exception. In the main, I do, and in the main the Senator from Texas cooperates with me in supporting the majorities of committees. So that in the main we are both right. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. In the main the Senator from Kentucky supports the committees, and in the main I cooperate with him, but here I am in the main——

Mr. BARKLEY. In the main the Senator thinks I am wrong now.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the main I have 12 committeemen in my favor, and there are two for the Senator from Kentucky, so in the main it looks to me as if 12 to 2 is a majority.

Mr. President, I am not trying to quibble over this. I recognize the right of a leader to say "No" when he does not think something is right. God bless him, I think it would be good to practice it a little more often. I am not speaking of the Senator from Kentucky now, but of many other leaders.

Talk about a one-way street, this is no one-way street. Of course, there are two sides to these questions. You want unity, but you are not going to get unity by hiding yourself in a hole and saying, "Oh, my God, this cannot be done. Do not bring up that thing here." Someone is going to bring it up if you do not, and they are going to bring it up in another forum, another forum which you call the ballot box.

I am not threatening anyone. I am not a candidate this year. I am trying to save some of those who are candidates. We have to face this thing sooner or later. Why not face it now? The war is going on. The war is not waiting on these things. The war is not being postponed until next week, when we can confer. There is no armistice in the Southwest Pacific. The soldiers are acting now. We have to face these things, and why do we not face them? Let us face them now. It is no one-way street. Bring out your propositions and let us vote on them.

We want harmony; yes, we want harmony. All of us have to dodge together at the same time. [Laughter.] Are we going to have unity by everybody here hiding, saying, "For God's sake, do not bring the question up"? You are not going to get anywhere acting like that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a moment ago I thought the Senator from Texas was about to conclude, and I want the floor for about 3 or 4 minutes to defend the right of petition.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry; the Senator has not been in the Senate long, or he would have known the Senator from Texas was not through.

Mr. REED. I acknowledge my newness, and my mistake in assuming that the Senator was through.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am always glad to hear the Senator from Kansas. I heard him speak today.

Mr. REED. May I take 3 minutes out of the Senator's time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I wish to say just a few words on behalf of the right of petition. I had not intended to make this statement, but the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the distinguished major-

ity leader, seemed to be displeased because the people of this country had exercised that inalienable right, given them by the Constitution.

I was tremendously disappointed in the Senator from Utah a few days ago when he built up a straw man which he made out of the United States Chamber of Commerce so that he could knock it down. I take it, from the criticism voiced by the Senator from Utah, that he does not think much of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Nor do I. I do not know whether the Senator from Utah holds it in as low esteem as I do or not. I do not regard it as conclusive that a thing is wrong because the United States Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers is for it. but at least with me it is prima facie evidence that something is wrong, and I have to wrestle with myself to remove the presumption.

When anyone undertakes to say that the flood of letters we have been receiving, all of us, come from an inspired source like the United States Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers, he merely displays an ignorance of the contents of the letters, and of the people who have written them. In a long public life I have never seen a wave of sentiment sweep over the country, such as that manifested by the letters we have received, that I have thought as genuine, as spontaneous, as earnest, as that indicated by the letters we are now receiving. Those people are perfectly entitled to write to us, whether they write in the tone we like or whether they do not.

The truth is—and I am sorry it is so—the letters we are receiving have in them more of an element of bitterness than any letters I have ever had in my public life, and that element of bitterness I think arises out of the fact that a vast majority of the people of this Nation are tired and impatient with the way things are being handled, with regard to war production, work stoppages, strikes, and inefficiency, and writing their representatives here is the only way they have of manifesting their feeling.

We talk of unity. You are not going to improve our chances of unity in this country by casting a reflection upon the good faith, the sincerity, and the intelligence of millions of people like those who write these letters. They are expressing a very earnest conviction, Mr. President, and they are taking the only means open to them of conveying that impression to their Representatives in Congress, Members of both Houses. That is the only way they have of registering their desires, and I stand here to defend their right to give voice to their earnestness, their intelligence, their sincerity, their good faith, their desire to sustain the President in all the proper steps he may take to carry on the war. I think that these people who, by the thousands and tens of thousands, are writing these letters, are impatient, and wish that Congress would take some action along the lines of improving war production. They have a perfect right to do what they are doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Nothing I said a moment ago in any remotest degree contradicted the right of the people to write letters. In all my service in the two Houses of Congress there never was a moment when I did not welcome an expression of the views of the people with respect to legislation, or any other matter, giving their reasons for their opinions. What I had reference to, and the thing that I do not think expresses any intelligent opinion, is for people to take a newspaper and clip out a printed pledge and sign it, by which they say that unless you vote a certain way we will defeat you the next time you run for office. That is not a petition. That never was or will be an argument in favor of or against anything. It is that sort of automatic subversion to the opinion of others, without giving any reason for it, without giving any facts in support of it, that I condemn. That does not involve even remotely the right of petition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, something has been said about Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal's position. He testified some days ago about the 40-hour week, but he did not retract his support of this bill. I hold in my hand the printed hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in which Mr. Forrestal strongly advocates the passage of my bill, without any amendment whatever. He says the Navy needs the measure in order to forward its construction work.

Something has been said about Admiral Land. Admiral Land not only appeared before the subcommittee and said that his organization wanted the bill, but that three words in the bill, "freezing labor relations," would meet the difficulty. He advocated the passage of the bill without any amendment whatever.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the report show to what extent strikes were prevailing in the country at the time of those hearings?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it does not. We did not go into that matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is familiar with the improved conditions with respect to strikes that exist now, in contrast to last year?

Mr. CONNALLY. If there are any strikes at all, they are too many. That is my answer to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean there should not be any at all?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree if such were possible, but does the Senator think we can entirely prevent strikes by legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know, but we come nearer to it than we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my opinion that we cannot entirely stop strikes by legislation. We will be confronted with labor disputes and strikes so long as the Government does not choose to put labor and management under its supervision and control to the same extent as now prevails with respect to the Army and Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator; and now reverting to strike conditions, I think the record will show, as was pointed out on the floor of this Senate sometime ago, that in January 1941, with 1,500,000 men employed in defense work, there were lost 147,000 man-days. A year later, after Pearl Harbor, with almost 8,000,000 men employed—an increase of 553 percent more persons employed—we had a loss of only 7,100 man-days, or a decrease of 95 percent in man-days lost. I think that is almost as near perfection as we can possibly attain. We are told that good progress is now being made on our production lines, and I ask, why disturb that situation? Speaking for myself, I stand ready and willing to vote for any measure, no matter where the chips fall, that will increase our production.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Of course, after Pearl Harbor naturally there would be a decrease. The impact of the attack would stir men enough to go ahead and work and give up some of their grievances. That is true. I do not dispute that. How long will it take some of them to get over that?

Mr. ELLENDER. As the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] pointed out a few minutes ago, there is some kind of an understanding now existing between management and labor, with the Government sitting in, not to strike, but to increase production. The War Labor Board has been created, and I really think it is performing a good service. As was demonstrated a few days ago by Senator THOMAS, chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the Senate, hundreds of disputes are being adjusted each month, without strikes or stoppages of any kind. I honestly believe that if that Board is permitted to function it will stop strikes more quickly than we can by enacting drastic legislation. I desire to state now that if we cannot get management and labor to cooperate on a voluntary basis, we may have to resort to force, but woe unto us when we do. Our difficulties will be multiplied, and I am convinced that our war production will be decreased rather than improved. Let us maintain free labor and free management as long as they cooperate, and I have confidence that a flood of implements of war will be made available for our fighting forces. Let us punish labor racketeers and unscrupulous businessmen, who impede our war effort, rather than indict patriotic groups that are doing their all to maintain our freedom.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I would much prefer there would not be any strikes and then we would not have this bill before us or any other bill. The Senator will recall that last fall the labor leaders, Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, got together and said, "We

are not going to have any more strikes. Everything is settled." But we have had strikes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has not been a strike since that in a defense industry which has been organized by the organizations represented by Mr. Green or Mr. Murray.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has not been a strike which has not been condemned by them. A few days ago Mr. Green announced that he would withdraw and cancel the charter of any labor organization a part of the A. F. of L. which went on strike or which authorized a strike during the war emergency on any defense work. They cannot help it if some wildcat, woods colt of an organization goes out on a strike which is not a member of either set-up and of which they have no control. But even those have been diminished to a minimum, until in February, out of 8,000,000 men working in defense industries, less than 7,000 were on strike, and they were wildcat, unauthorized strikes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I realize that Mr. Green has said he condemned these strikes, but they have not stopped. What has he condemned if he has not condemned strikes that occur? The trouble with the American Federation of Labor is that its central organization has no power to regulate local unions, and he so testified before our committee. They can do as they please. The only remedy he has for it is to suspend their charter. Well, he does not suspend their charter because he is afraid they will walk across the street and join the C. I. O.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know that both organizations represented by Mr. Murray and Mr. Green have agreed not to undertake to electioneer for membership among units which go out of either organization?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be, but still that does not change the fact that they do not like to suspend anybody. Nobody likes to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senate does not either.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know it. The Senate does not. If the Senate has cause to do so, it will. If it does not have cause to, I hope it never will. Let somebody start a strike around here and we will see what the Senate will do.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to say to the Senator from Texas, and in support of his contention, that, in my opinion, there is a fallacy in the statement which was made in an effort to controvert his argument that the percentage of men engaged on strike is small compared to the number employed. The mainspring of my watch is only a very small percent of the bulk of the watch, but the watch without the mainspring would be a very poor timepiece. I happen to know that in one case there were two carloads of airplane propellers and that each propeller would complete an airplane, but the strike masters ordered a picket line around the two carloads of propellers and the propellers were not then available to put into as many airplanes as there were propellers in the two carloads.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. His contribution is very much in point. Of course, everyone knows that with any intricate machine composed of thousands of parts, if one part is not there, or is defective, the whole machine is ineffective. In a great complex machine any one little link that is missing destroys the utility of the machine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I may add, because I think it is vitally important, that we should not be misled by encouraging statistics into believing that the strike problem has all been happily settled and determined and put behind us. According to the State Mediation Board of Michigan, between the date of the attack on Pearl Harbor and February 25 there were in the Detroit arsenal area 269,416 man-hours of labor lost by strikes. There is no way of estimating how much is being lost by this new, insidious method——

Mr. CONNALLY. Of slow-downs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; of slow-downs in dealing with defense productions. There still is a problem. I concede that the problem is becoming of such a nature that perhaps the only way it can be settled is by voluntary action, because I do not know how we can reach the slow-down factor by legislation. Nevertheless, to proceed on the theory that all of this trouble is behind us is simply blind and wrong.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Of course, to proceed on the theory of simply letting everything alone and problems will settle themselves is wrong. The only excuse the Senate has for existing is to meet troubles and solve them, or try to solve them. In a moving world we must act this year, and change our action next year because of changing conditions. The only reason for our existence is to undertake to make conditions workable.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I think I am one of those who voted for the amendment which the Senator discussed a while ago, to the Selective Service Act, which was passed in 1941. What is disturbing me at the present time is whether there is any necessity for the Senator's bill. When production at the plant of the Vultee Aircraft Co. in California was stopped, the President, under his powers as Commander in Chief, in order to maintain the military production, took over the plant. When a strike of similar natur was threatened in New Jersey, some time in October or November of last year, as I recall, though it may have been later than that, the President took over the plant and the Government operated it through the military authorities. I have been of the opinion that the President could do everything that is proposed in the Connally bill except possibly fixing the wage rate, which I notice is included in the Senator's bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Freezing the labor relations.

Mr. BROWN. Freezing the wage rate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Freezing the labor relations.

Mr. BROWN. I believe the Commander in Chief could do everything now that the Senator proposed to do by his bill. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I will say that I rather agree with the views of the majority leader, with the position he takes, that if the Senator's bill, which I think is unnecessary at the present time, is made the pending business of the Senate, there will undoubtedly be attempts made upon the floor, without adequate consideration, to determine the question of the 40-hour week, which is an important matter, to determine the question of overtime wages, which is an important matter—matters which I think some committee, whether it be the Committee on Education and Labor or the Committee on the Judiciary, should carefully consider.

I grant that they ought to give some time to the administrative authorities to try to get results, and perhaps they have. I do not know whether sufficient time has been afforded the administrative authorities up to the present. I think the committees should give opportunity to the administrative authorities to do that job. I think I should be compelled to vote against the consideration of the Senator's bill for the reason briefly, first, that I think it is unnecessary, for I think the Commander in Chief now has all the power the bill would grant; and, second, because I want the entire labor situation gone into, and I want the advice of the Senators who have labored with that problem for many years.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I am not pressing him to vote for my bill. I am pressing to get a vote for its consideration. If the Senator wants to vote against it he has a perfect right to do so.

I wish to point out to the Senator, who was not in the Chamber a while ago, that the President now has power to take over a plant when the owner is recalcitrant, but he does not have any power to take it over if it is bound up by a strike. My bill provides that if production is delayed or hindered by strike or labor relations the President then shall have a right to take over the plant.

Even if the statement which the Senator makes be true, the most important thing in this bill which was not in the other bill is that upon taking over a plant the labor relations—not the wages—are frozen as they existed before the strike. That means that there can be no jurisdictional strikes. It means that there can be no strike over the closed-shop issue. Admiral Land stated when he was before the committee that with the three words to which reference

has been made, he could absolutely control the situation in the shipbuilding plants.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator is in error in stating that the trouble in California was with the ownership of the plants. I think the trouble was the strike. It was labor's action, and not the action of the owners, against which the President's order was directed.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be so; but I am talking about the law. I think this is what happened, the way the situation was construed: Government officials went to the owner and said, "We want you to produce these things." He said, "I cannot." The Government officials said, "If you cannot or will not, we will take over the plant." The law allows the President to take over a plant only when the owner refuses to make a contract for production under reasonable terms. It says nothing about strikes. If the President already has the authority to which reference has been made, it would do no harm to give it to him again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The reason the owners could not produce was because the men would not work. That was the only excuse the owners gave. Of course, there was a strike. There was a condition brought about by the employees and not by any recalcitrance on the part of the employers.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was the reason which was given to justify the action; but if we look at the law it does not say anything about that. If what the Senator says be true, why are we afraid to say so?

When this bill was before the subcommittee we examined Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. We brought him before us last November, not in any period of excitement. He did not receive any telegrams from home. He was not agitated every time he opened a letter by seeing a voter making faces at him. He came before us in November. He was trying to build ships and put them on the ocean to carry supplies, men, and arms to win this war. What did he say?

Admiral LAND. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I have no written statement. I have a very brief oral statement, as follows:

* * * I have read S. 2054—

That is this bill—

very carefully, and have read the testimony of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson. Both the bill and the testimony meet with my hearty approval—

Was there any doubt about what he meant by that? Was he dodging? Was he equivocating? Was he afraid something else would be brought up?

—and in my best judgment they will go far to accomplish the purpose you have in mind, namely, production in these United States, an all-out production effort for national defense. It seems to me that the bill is simple, concise, and direct. In my judgment it would accomplish the result of all-out production, without cessation of work. If stoppage occurs, then the Government has the right to go in until the thing is properly adjudicated, and the bill itself contains provisions that when it is adjudicated it will be returned to its owners.

He testified for about 4 or 5 pages. I shall not read all his testimony.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] referred to the California case. That was a classic example of what this bill would do There was a strike, and an airplane factory was tied up. What did the Government do? Whether it had the legal right to do so or not, it took charge of the plant. The plant was picketed; and about the second time a picket raised a roughhouse some "roughneck" rammed a bayonet into the most prominent portion of his body. What happened? The strike collapsed, and within 2 weeks the property was handed back to its owners, who resumed production.

What happened in New Jersey? There was another strike in New Jersey, and a plant was tied up and could not produce. The Government took charge. Within a very few days the difficulty was composed, and the plant was turned back to the owners, who continued to manufacture airplanes. That is what Admiral Land said he wanted in connection with shipbuilding. He told our committee:

"The welders on the Pacific Coast do not belong to the Congress of Industrial Organizations or to the American Federation of Labor. They are an outlaw union. If we had a little clause in the law about freezing relationships in taking over these plants we could stop the welders' strike and produce ships."

This bill would not hurt any laboring man. We are asked not to pass any anti-labor legislation. This bill would not hurt labor. It says that labor must not strike in a national defense plant. It does not tell a man he may not quit. Of course, he may quit if he so desires; but when he quits he must take his hat with him and stay away from the plant until he wants to go back to work. If wages are not high enough, there is a board to fix them higher. All the bill says is, "Before this strike you were willing to work on the basis of certain relationships. Why should you seize upon the hour of the country's peril to extort from the Government and from your employer more favorable relationships than you previously enjoyed? If you want to work under the same relationships under which you worked 24 hours ago, which relationships you assumed voluntarily, and under which you have worked for many months, go ahead and work; but if because you think the Government is in peril you are going to demand a closed shop, or organize a jurisdictional strike so that no ore but your little group can do a piece of work, we will not tolerate it. If you are not getting enough wages we will give you higher wages. There is the board."

Mr. President, that is all the bill does. Mr. Green says that there will be no strikes in his organization. If that is so, the bill will not touch him. Mr. Murray says that there will be no strikes in his organization. If there are to be no strikes in his organization he ought to want the bill, so that if Mr. Green has strikes it will catch Mr. Green and not him. If there are to be no strikes in either of those organizations, this bill will not hurt them.

Mr. President, I do not know of any way to proceed except to try to get a vote on this bill. I expect to renew my motion. I shall not offer my motion as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I do not want to be discourteous to the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is better than I at obtaining recognition and seeing the right person before he rises. I saw someone, but the one whom I saw is not present, and that does not help me a bit. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to assure the Senator that I had no idea that he had obtained a promise of recognition. I did not speak to anyone before I made my motion for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then the Senator has a better "wave length" than I have. [Laughter.] I am not angry with the Senator. Let him go ahead and obtain consideration for his bill.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator seems to feel that I am in competition with him as to who is the most popular Senator. I have always regarded him as one of the most agreeable Members of this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no disposition to change the Senator's opinion on that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert—

That in addition to the powers and duties of the Chairman of the War Production Board defined by Executive Order No. 9024 of January 16, 1942, and by Executive Order No. 9040 of January 24, 1942, it shall be the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he is hereby empowered, through a deputy to be appointed by him, to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns, and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized to augment war production.

SEC. 2. The Chairman of the War Production Board shall have power, whenever and to the extent that he determines such action to be necessary—

(1) to make, or arrange with the Bureau of the Census or such other governmental agency as may be possessed of the necessary personnel and facilities for the making of, a complete inventory of all productive facilities in the United States which may be used for war production;

(2) to direct the attention of officers of the Government having procurement powers to the potential productive capacity of plants operated by small business concerns;

(3) to obtain information with respect to the extent and the terms upon which prime contractors with the Government have let subcontracts, and to take such action as he may deem appropriate to bring about the

letting by such prime contractors of subcontracts upon fair and equitable terms and in the greatest volume practicable;

(4) to take such action as will result in the granting of such Government contracts to business concerns operating small plants as will provide them with a sufficient incentive to engage in war production and to make such conversion of their plants as may be necessary to engage in war production;

(5) to certify to the Smaller War Plants Corporation established under section 4 of this act, and to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries, the amount of funds necessary for the conversion to war production of any small plant or other plant interested in obtaining from the Smaller War Plants Corporation, or from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any such subsidiary, the capital necessary to provide for such conversion;

(6) to certify to Government procurement officers with respect to the competency, as to capacity and credit, of any small business concern or group of such concerns to perform a specific Government procurement contract;

(7) to obtain from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any subsidiary thereof, and any other Federal department, establishment, or agency engaged in war procurement or in the financing of war procurement or production, such reports concerning the letting of contacts and subcontracts and making of loans to business concerns as he may deem pertinent in carrying out his functions under this act; and

(8) to make studies with respect to the means by which small business concerns may be supplied with essential raw materials and receive fair and reasonable treatment from all Government departments and agencies without interfering with the efficiency of the war-production program.

SEC. 3. In any case in which a small business concern or group of such concerns has been certified by or under the authority of the chairman of the War Production Board to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit as to a specific Government procurement contract, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, and all other officers of the Government having procurement powers are directed to accept such certification as conclusive, and are authorized to let such Government procurement contract to such concern or group of concerns without requiring it to meet any other requirements with respect to capacity and credit.

SEC. 4 (a) There is hereby created a body corporate under the name "Smaller War Plants Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"). The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Corporation may establish such branch offices in other places in the United States as may be determined by the board of directors.

(b) The Corporation shall have capital stock of $100,000,000, subscribed for by the United States through the Secretary of the Treasury, and payment for which shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the board of directors of the corporation. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock when payment is called by the board of directors. Receipts for payments by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of the stock ownership by the United States.

(c) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of five directors to be appointed by the chairman of the War Production Board. The board of directors shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among the members of the board.

(d) The Corporation shall not have succession beyond July 1, 1945, except for purposes of liquidation, unless its life is extended beyond such date pursuant to an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to make contracts; to lease such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalties thereof; and to prescribe, amend, and rpeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed. The board of directors of the Corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. The Corporation, with the consent of any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(e) All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act.

(f) The Corporation is empowered (1) to make loans or advances, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as it may determine, to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials, or to supply such concerns with working capital, to be used in the manufacture of essential articles, equipment, supplies, or materials; and such loans or advances may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise; (2) to purchase or lease such land, to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants, and to purchase or produce such equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies, as may be needed to enable the Corporation to provide small business concerns with such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as such concerns may require to engage in the production of essential articles, equipment, supplies, or materials; (3) to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of to any small business concern any such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies; (4) to enter into contracts with the United States Government and any department, agency, or officer thereof having procurement powers obligating the Corporation to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government; and (5) to arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or parts thereof, or servicing or processing in connection therewith. Such subcontracts may be let upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may deem appropriate in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

SEC. 5. The Chairman of the War Production Board shall make a report every 60 days of his operations under this act to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include the names of the business concerns to whom contracts are let, and for whom financing is arranged, by the Corporation, together with the amounts involved, and such report shall include such other information, and such comments and recommendations, with respect to the relation of small business concerns to the war effort, as the Chairman may deem appropriate.

SEC. 6. Whenever the Smaller War Plants Corporation has completed any transaction under clause (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (f) of section 4 of this act, it shall transfer the loan, advance, plant, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, supplies, leases, or other property resulting from such transaction to the Defense Plants Corporation, and the Defense Plants Corporation shall service and administer such loan, advance, or property, as the agent of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, remitting to the Smaller War Plants Corporation any interest, principal, or other proceeds or collections, after deducting its actual expense of service and administration.

SEC. 7. Subparagraph (2) of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) To make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise, including, when requested by the Secretary of Commerce, subscription to the capital stock thereof, for any purpose deemed by the Corporation to be advantageous to the national defense. Such loans, purchases, or subscriptions shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine. The War Department and the Navy Department are hereby authorized to participate in or to guarantee any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to this provision, and, in connection therewith, they may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment."

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify or limit in any manner (1) the authority vested in the Chairman of the War Production Board by Executive Order No. 9024 of January 16, 1942, or Executive Order No. 9040 of January 24, 1942, or vested in him by any other Executive order or act of Congress; or (2) the authority vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries by any Executive order or act of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator does not desire to go on at this hour with his bill.

Mr. MURRAY. No.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSIER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Several retired captains for promotion on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Theodore Wanerus, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo. (reappointment);

William G. Johnson, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Cheyenne, Wyo. (reappointment);

Ellis Purlee, of California, to be register of the land office at Sacramento, Calif (reappointment); and

Thomas F. Corbally, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Great Falls, Mont. (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifford E. Van Hook to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from November 28, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 31, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, March 30, 1942:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. William Henry Anderson, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Robert Walter Stika, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1941.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Lt. Col. Howard Burdette Nurse, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from October 4, 1941.

First Lt. Carl Morton Sciple, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from August 1, 1935.

First Lt. Charles Murray Henley, Infantry (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from July 3, 1940

First Lt. Daniel Allen Richards, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Alden Pugh Taber, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. William Russell Huber, Field Artillery (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from August 1, 1935.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. Willard Stewart Paul, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Burton Curtis Andrus, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from April 4, 1942

Maj. Guy Lewis McNeil, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Landon Johnson Lockett, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Columbus Bierce Lenow, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Charles Henry Calais, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. William Thomas Johnson, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Clarence Prescott Talbot, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Charles Deans Calley, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Alfred Liljevalch Jewett, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Loyd Daniel Bunting, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Elam LaFayette Stewart, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Louie Clifford Mallory, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Bob Childs, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Lewis Selwyn Webster, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Virgil Grover Allen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. William Edward Smith, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. William Andrew Smith, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Roy William Camblin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Ray Eric Cavenee, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Wade Darragh Killen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Andrew Jackson Schriver, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Frank James Lawrence, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Dorrance Scott Roysdon, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Hyatt Floyd Newell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. John Easton McCammon, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from April 18, 1942

Maj. Jules Verne Sims, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from April 19, 1942

Maj. Charles Carlton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Frederick Clay Weekley, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from April 4, 1942.

First Lt. George N. Schuhmann, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from April 30, 1942.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Elbert LaFayette Fenske, Dental Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from April 18, 1942.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Capt. Ralph William Mohri, Veterinary Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from April 23, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Albert W. Darby, Florence.

CONNECTICUT

Thomas P. Smith, Brooklyn.
Samuel M. Bella, Centerbrook.

GEORGIA

Homer Roy Cobb, Ball Ground.
Luther P. Goolsby, Carlton.
Paul C. Sewell, Cave Spring.
Fannie M. Vaughn, Jeffersonville.
Dewey G. Burnette, Rockmart.
Clarence B. Cooley, Sandersville.
Alice V. Ethridge, Sparks.
Bertha L. Boyd, Union Point.
Robert B. Bryan, Wrightsville.

INDIANA

Jane Agnes Quinlan, Holy Cross.
Theodore V. Koontz, Monticello.

KANSAS

Clarence E. Yockey, Erie.
Elizabeth Brackman, Scranton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Robert H. Leavy, Granville.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY

Clifford E. Van Hook to be a rear admiral, for temporary service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Consider our frailties, O Lord; we entreat Thee to hear our prayer. Remembering that unfaithfulness will surely be punished and fidelity rewarded, we pray that we may be in a searching mood with a somber thought. With eyes that see, with hearts that feel, and with hands that work, we beseech Thee to possess us with pure minds and holy wills, desiring that the good in us may become better, ever yearning to attain the best. Walking with Thee through these days of Thy passion, unveil to us Thy redeeming grace, making it everlastingly new, yet as old as the heart of God.

O Christ, Thou who art the way, who hast the power to make life a psalm and fill it with a triumphant song, again ride abroad redressing human wrongs and cleansing the temples of our sinning souls. Multitudes of Thy mourning children, sick for home, are toiling in tears in alien lands; as the fires of hate cannot melt the golden chain of Thy mercy nor distance break the bonds of our Saviour's compassion, open Thy hand with the tokens of divine love, bringing surcease of imposed pain. Awaken in us the high privilege of sharing the heartaches of others with that courageous devotion which can endure with dignity and without fear. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 28, 1942, was read and approved.

LT. GEN. JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I took occasion here on the floor to say that when and if the circumstances demanded in this war effort we would find that we had many generals and admirals in our armed forces that would meet the situation in a way that all red-blooded Americans would be proud of them.

I personally know more than 200 of our Army officers, colonels, and generals. I have met them across the table at hearings and in conferences or I visited and saw them in action at their posts of duty in the States, in Alaska, in Panama, in Puerto Rico, and in Hawaii.

I remember distinctly the first time I saw a long, lean, lanky, then colonel, with his Cavalry unit in action. Everything was spick and span. The men were tidy. The equipment and munitions were in first-class shape. Action and precision were manifested in every move.

I later visited this officer on several occasions at his post. Mrs. Snyder and I were guests in his home. He has a charming family. The elements are so mixed in this gentlemen that he has the courage of his convictions. He is possessed with much initiative and vision. His friends, as well as the men he commands, admire and respect him. They take pride in carrying out his orders.

Yes; Lt. Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright is a worthy successor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as commander of our forces in the Philippines.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by printing a radio address he delivered on the 29th and also that he may have permission to print in tomorrow's RECORD an address that he will deliver today in his district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two other unanimous-consent requests, one that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by David Lawrence; and I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

MAURICE PARMELEE AND HIS NUDISM IN MODERN LIFE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I make the unusual request for me to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to Maurice Parmelee, economist for the Board of Economic Warfare, under Vice President WALLACE, at a salary of $5,600 per year.

I have scanned Parmelee's book, Nudism in Modern Life. In this book Parmelee advocates the general practice of nudism in the homes, business establishments, industrial establishments, and offices of the Nation. A critic of the book, however, calls attention to the fact that if nudism becomes generally practiced, we may need restrictions against overcrowding in elevators, streetcars, and similar places. Parmelee warns we can expect the opposition of the churches of the Nation.

The only comment I want to make is: Only crackpots would select crackpots to help plan our war program or our post-war program.

MAURICE PARMELEE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have a very affectionate regard for our Vice President. He is one of the cleanest, finest men I have ever known; but I do regret his rather bitter attack upon our colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES].

I hope that the Vice President will not be jockeyed into the position of defending Mr. Parmelee. I hold in my hand two of Mr. Parmelee's books, and if I have ever seen in print and picture anything that is filthy and dirty, it is in these books.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks copy of Mr. DIES' letter to the Vice President, and in this connection may I say that I am not taking any part in the controversy and certainly I have nothing of criticism of others whose names are given in the Dies' letter, but I do assert that, insofar as Mr. Parmelee is concerned, the statement of Mr. DIES is amply supported.

In view of what has been said on the floor this morning, using the name of the Vice President, I think in fairness to Mr. WALLACE his statement should be placed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed immediately following the letter of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

MARCH 28, 1942.

The Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE,
Chairman, Board of Economic Warfare,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: By Executive Order No. 8982, of December 17, 1941, the President established the Board of Economic Warfare and named you as its chairman. For that reason, Mr. Vice President, I am addressing you to apprise you of some of the results of my investigation of the situation which exists with respect to the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare. I note especially that the Board numbers among its functions and duties the consideration of measures dealing with post-war economic reconstruction.

An initial check which I have made shows that at least 35 high Government officials employed by the Board of Economic Warfare have public records which show affiliation with front organizations of the Communist Party.

Outstanding among these officials of the Board of Economic Warfare is the case of Maurice Parmelee who is employed as principal economist for the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of $5,600.

Mr. Parmelee was born in Constantinople, and throughout his life has traveled extensively. Furthermore, Mr. Parmelee has been a prolific author, and consequently his views are matters of public record.

Among Mr. Parmelee's books—all of which are revolutionary in viewpoint—is one entitled "Nudism in Modern Life." This volume was published in 1931 after the author according to his own declaration, had spent several years in nudist camps in Europe.

Nudism in Modern Life is a book of 300 pages with 35 photographs taken in nudist camps, all of which are obscene. That the book is an attack upon the moral structure of our society and upon the church and religion is apparent from even a casual reading. Mr. Parmelee advocates the widespread practice of nudism in this country. He does not offer it in the form of an experiment

or an occasional diversion or a fad but quite seriously declares that it should "be practiced whenever feasible in office, workshop, and factory." The author professes to believe that nudism has the greatest advantages for the home and for society generally.

In the nudist society which Parmelee envisages, "convent and monastery, harem and military barrack, clubs and schools exclusively for each sex will disappear, and the sexes will live a more normal and happier life together."

Parmelee foresees some hesitancy on the part of rural folk in adopting nudism because, "The church and its clergy are usually strongly intrenched in the country, and exercise a powerful sway over its inhabitants."

Parmelee ties his philosophy of nudism up with his ideas of economics on which he has written extensively in other volumes. In the present volume he explains the relationship between his philosophy of nudism and his economics, as follows: "While gymnosophists (nudists) are not necessarily socialists or communists, these colonies furnish excellent opportunities for experiments along communistic lines, some of which may be successful. To say the least, these colonies would be democratic in their character. Customary nudity is impossible under the existing undemocratic social, economic, and political organization."

Surely, Mr. Vice President, there is no place in a post-war planning agency for a person who advocates such a crackpot and immoral plan. When I consider that this man is the principal economist of the agency which you head, I, like many others, wonder how it is possible that a person with Mr. Parmelee's background and views can secure such an important post when there are so many competent persons who are able and willing to fill this post, persons whose outlook on life is wholesomely American and not embellished with crackpot ideas of nudism, technocracy, communism, or any other brand of revolution. It cannot be said, Mr. Vice President, that the Government did not have notice of Mr Parmelee's background for as early as 1934 he was tried in the District of Columbia for bringing obscene matter into the United States. I should like to quote here what Chief Justice Wheat had to say concerning Mr Parmelee's book: "The illustrations which are asserted to be obscene apparently have no relevancy to the written text at the place in which each of said photographic illustrations is set in the book. The said photographs or illustrations, upon examination, are obscene and within the condemnation of the statute under the authority of which seizure was made and the libel filed." In stating his conclusions of law, Chief Justice Wheat declared: "The said books contain obscene matter and are therefore properly subject to libel under section 305 of title 111 of the Tariff Act of June 17, 1930, title 19, United States Code, section 1305, and should be destroyed.

Wholly apart from the final disposition of the case of Mr. Parmelee's book in the courts, I am obliged to state that the volume is obviously the work of a warped and unhealthy mind. I find it significant that Mr. Parmelee did not list the title of this book on his application for Government employment. The question which I raise is not one of freedom of speech and press but of qualification for an important Government position.

I call your special attention, Mr. Vice President, to two other volumes from the pen of Mr Parmelee. One is entitled "Farewell to Poverty" and the other "Bolshevism, Fascism, and the Liberal-Democratic State." These volumes have nothing of the objectivity of the scholar but are, on the contrary, propaganda treatises for communism. Together these volumes fill some 900 pages. Any one of thousands of passages could be cited from these volumes to show the Communist viewpoint of the author, but I must be content to quote only the following: "The high technological development in the United States renders it feasible to introduce a planned social economy much more rapidly than has been the case in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The superficial paraphernalia of capitalism can be dispensed with more quickly than in the Soviet Union."

I may point out that the name of Maurice Parmelee appeared on the membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy which our committee published 2½ years ago. At that time, Parmelee was employed in the Department of Agriculture. There will hardly be any disagreement at this date over the fact that the American League for Peace and Democracy was one of the fronts of the Communist Party.

Other employees of the Board of Economic Warfare were likewise affiliated with the Communist-controlled American League for Peace and Democracy. I cite the following records:

C. Hartley Grattan, economic analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $5,600, wrote an article for Fight magazine which was the official publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

T A. Bisson, principal economic analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $5,600, was a sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Kendall Foss, principal analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $5,600, was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Sigmund Timberg, principal analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $5,600, was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

David Vaughn, head administrative officer of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $6,500, was a sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Abe M. Drainer, assistant intelligence analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $2,600, was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Eugene Staley, consultant of the Board of Economic Warfare, was a sponsor of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Nathaniel Weyl, senior economic analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare, at a salary of $4,600, was a member of the national committee of the Communist-controlled student congress against war, which was in turn one of the forerunners of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

I do not intend to go fully into the records of these employees of the Board of Economic Warfare at this time, Mr. Vice President, but I do wish to point out a few additional affiliations with Communist organizations which the records of our committee reveal.

In addition to his affiliation with the American League for Peace and Democracy which I have already cited, Mr. C. Hartley Grattan was both a contributor and an advisory editor of the magazine Champion. This periodical was an official organ of the Young Communist League and included among its editors such well-known and publicly avowed Communists as Angelo Herndon. Grattan was also a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, an organization which was an auxiliary of the Communist Party. Like Mr. Parmelee, Mr. Grattan has been a prolific author. In his book entitled "Preface to Chaos," Mr. Grattan predicts world-wide communism after the second World War. He then cites H. G. Wells as holding a contrary view and asks the following rhetorical question: "As between Wells and Marx, what worth-while man will hesitate in his choice?"

In September 1939, which will be remembered as the month following Soviet Russia's pact with Hitler, the Communist magazine Soviet Russia Today published a manifesto which was described as "On open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union." Some 400 prominent Communists and fellow travelers signed this document. It should be kept in mind that this document appeared at a time when the line of the Communist Party was in sharp conflict with the interests of the United States. Among the 400 signers of the document were T A Bisson, whom I have already mentioned as a sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy, and George B. Cressey, consultant of the Board of Economic Warfare on a $25 per diem.

T. A. Bisson has also contributed several articles to the Communist magazine Soviet Russia Today. Bisson was also a speaker at the fourth national convention of the American Student Union, one of the fronts of the Communist Party

There will be no debate, Mr. Vice President, on the desirability of our having an agency to consider the grave problems of post-war planning and economic reconstruction. On the other hand, I am sure that the American people will be concerned to know whether or not such an agency is to have on its staff a large number of persons—or even one person for that matter—whose records indicate that they reject the American way of life in favor of this or that scheme for revolution.

Recently it became my duty to expose the Communist record of one Malcolm Cowley, who was employed in the Office of Facts and Figures. After my exposure Mr. Cowley resigned his post. I believe that the American people will now welcome numerous resignations, or dismissals, from the staff of the Board of Economic Warfare. I am sure that you will unhesitatingly agree that the interests of national unity would be furthered thereby. At least, there is no place in such an agency for an outstanding advocate of nudism.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES,
Member of Congress.

The statement of the Vice President is as follows:

WALLACE'S STATEMENT

Vice President WALLACE'S statement, in full, follows:

"I have been informed of an open letter written me by MARTIN DIES regarding certain employees of the Board of Economic Warfare. If Mr. DIES were genuinely interested in helping our war effort, he would have discussed this matter with me as soon as it came to his attention. He did not. Rather, he is seeking to inflame the public mind by a malicious distortion of facts which he did not want to check with me. If we were at peace, these tactics might be overlooked as the product of a witchcraft mind. We are not at peace, however. We are at war, and the doubts and anger which this and similar statements of Mr. DIES tend to arouse in the public mind might as well come from Goebbels himself so far as their practical effect is concerned. As a matter of fact the effect on our morale would be less damaging if Mr. DIES were on the Hitler pay roll

"Obviously I stand ready at all times to have any and every fact regarding our employees thoroughly investigated. This is being done daily by the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are eternally vigilant about it. The current charges will be investigated at once by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If that investigation proves that these men are unsuited for work with the Board of Economic Warfare they will be dismissed promptly, as others have been in the past. If it does not, I expect a public apology to the men whose reputations Mr DIES has smeared without giving them a chance to be heard.

"One-half of Mr. DIES' letter is given to charges against Mr. Maurice Parmelee. I

never heard of the gentleman until last Saturday morning. Since then I have been informed that he was employed because of responsible work which he did in London on blockade control for the United States War Trade Board during the last war. Subsequently to that, in 1920, he was named special assistant to the Secretary of State. He is not now doing post-war work.

"Notwithstanding Mr. DIES' statement, less than half a dozen people are engaged in post-war planning for the Board of Economic Warfare. The majority of our employees are engaged in work on over 8,000 export-license applications which are analyzed and cleared every day. Mr. DIES' reason for distorting the emphasis on post-war work was because of the chance it gave him to draw utterly false inferences from a book Mr. Parmelee wrote 11 years ago on nudism.

"This book was first published in 1931 by Alfred Knopf, one of the established publishing houses in this country. Eight years later a libel suit in connection with an English edition was filed in the Federal district court here. Mr. DIES quotes extracts from that lower court decision. He would keep the American people in ignorance of an appeal in the case. Such an appeal was taken to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, however, and the lower court decision was reversed. In the decision for the higher court, handed down by Justice Miller on May 14, 1940, the court held that the entire text of the book was inoffensive and that only a few of the 23 illustrations were questionable. The court held that it is obvious that the latter do not furnish the dominant note of the publication. In the present case, as in the Ulysses case, the book as a whole is not obscene. The author has been known for many years as a well-qualified writer in the field of sociology. His textbooks have been long known and used in the colleges and universities of this country.

"Mr. Parmelee's case has been passed on by the courts of the land as provided for by our form of government. Not one person in 100,000 in this country is interested in nudism.

CHARGES "FACT TWISTING"

"Mr. DIES has twisted a few isolated facts in an effort to create the impression that the Board of Economic Warfare is planning a nudist post-war world for the United States. In calmer times this would make him the laughing stock of the country. In these days of crisis and tension, however, we cannot tolerate deliberate and dishonest efforts to confuse the public. These are the most critical times in our history. Everything we treasure is at stake.

"It is the solemn duty of all patriotic citizens to fight the enemy within our gates who hides under many cloaks, the most insidious of which is a false patriotism. Any man who seeks to undermine faith in our Government by a malicious misuse of isolated facts is a greater danger to our national safety than thousands of Axis soldiers within our borders. Hitler and the Japs know that better than anyone else. We Americans must face the implications of this ugly truth.

"I trust that Mr. DIES and others of his kind with an intense itch for publicity will use their great talents to help the United Nations to win this war, rather than stir up discord among patriotic Americans."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, after disposition of whatever business is on the Speaker's desk today, and at the conclusion of any other special orders previously entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], addresses the House for 10 minutes today, I may speak for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests—first, that after the regular business of the day has been disposed of and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The other is that I may proceed for 1 minute now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I rise to call attention to a bill I have just introduced that provides for a limitation of profits in war industries. I think it is a disgrace to our country, that certain corporations and individuals would take advantage of the Government under which they live, and whose protection they seek by taking unconscionable profits.

Recent investigations have disclosed, for example, that the Todd Shipyards, upon which the Government has depended for providing sinews of war—received profits to the extent of 75 percent and 80 percent on some of its big contracts. We have the example of the New York firm, with an investment of less than $50,000 that made a profit of about $200,000 during the year. Then, we have the amazing example of the Jack & Heintz Co., engaged in the manufacture of airplane starters, that paid its president $145,000 salary, and its secretary $39,000, besides dividing almost a million dollars among its other officers in order to evade income-tax payments.

Mr. Speaker, these cases are exceptions to the rule—but I am inclined to believe there are some more like them. In any event, it is a problem that should be promptly safeguarded. This is no time to permit war profiteers to become multimillionaires at the expense of the taxpayers who already have a burden that is pretty difficult to bear. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that legislative measures are necessary to protect this country from such unpatriotic and disgraceful acts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Lawrence Journal-World, and also to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Progressive Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and following any special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly denounce with all the vehemence within me the Saturday Evening Post for publishing an article in its current issue called the Case Against the Jew, by one Milton Mayer. It is anti-Semitic to the core. The Saturday Evening Post has indeed sunk pretty low. What is its sinister purpose? It plays with pitch and is defiled. The article might well have been written by Joseph Goebbels. It is like a typical effusion from Social Justice or Scribner's Commentator.

This is, indeed, no time to arouse racial and religious hatreds. Why the case against the Jews? Why not the case against the Quakers, the Lutherans, or the Catholics? Why pick on the Jews? Their loyalty, patriotism, and devotion to the war effort are unassailable. Their sacrifices are as great as those of any other group. Their sons have joined the colors as enthusiastically and proportionately in as great numbers as any other group. They have proportionately purchased as many bonds as any race or sect.

This filthy statement was written by a guttersnipe—unfortunately a Jew. He is a traitor to his race, a betrayer of his people—a Judas, indeed.

Many strong epithets fit him, but the proprieties forbid mentioning them.

However, the dung and bilgewater of such an article can only come from a mud lark.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RIGHT OF THE MEN SERVING IN OUR ARMED FORCES OF OUR NATION TO VOTE IN THE COMING ELECTIONS

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this morning to call to the attention of the House a joint resolution that I have filed upon which I hope Congress will take speedy action. That is, the right of the men serving in the armed

forces of our Nation to vote in the coming elections. By November, it is estimated that there will be more than 3,000,000 such men serving in all parts of the world.

These men are the cream of the manhood of our great country. These men are the ones who are fighting our battles to preserve our rights and liberties and who to my opinion have a better appreciation and fuller realization of our rights and liberties than any other single group in our Nation. I know of no group who are more entitled to exercise the right and privilege of voting than this group. Our forefathers fought hard to obtain this right. These men are now giving their all to retain the same and still a great many may be disfranchised because of the fact that they are serving their country away from home.

I realize that this is primarily a State affair and that the Congress, by itself, cannot remedy the situation. Nevertheless, this resolution calls upon the governors and legislatures of the respective States to take cognizance of this situation so that prompt and aggressive steps and actions be taken to provide our men in the armed forces with the right to vote.

During the Civil War, this question first arose and remedial legislation was passed by many States permitting the men in the North to vote. During the first World War, special statutes were passed by most of the States giving this right. Today, many technicalities are in the laws of the various States, which if strictly enforced would disfranchise these boys who are fighting our battles.

In my own State of Illinois, there is a law that requires the personal registration of an individual before he is entitled to vote. If that law were strictly enforced, it would practically disfranchise all members of our armed forces within the State of Illinois from voting. A public-spirited citizen of the city of Chicago and a former attorney for the election commission and a service man of the last war, Mr. Urban A. Lavery, filed a mandamus suit to permit men actually in the armed forces to vote without personal registration. This was granted. In regard to down-State Illinois, a similar registration statute will apply in November and unless similar proceedings are taken or unless the Governor and the Legislature of the State of Illinois amend this act, the overwhelming majority of the men now serving in the armed forces of my State will be disfranchised from the right to vote.

I hope that speedy action can be had upon this resolution to call to the attention of the various officials of all the States of the Union to carefully examine their election laws and take whatever steps are necessary to entitle the youth of our Nation, who are giving their all for our country, to have the right to vote in the coming election.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions adopted by county officials representing 30 States, meeting in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GERMAN-AMERICAN BUND

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of satisfaction and give commendation to the Attorney General, who is at last going after the members of the German-American Bund and is going to cancel their citizenship.

On May 24, 1940, I executed an affidavit against one Fritz Julius Kuhn, former head of this bund, asking that his citizenship be canceled and giving the grounds upon which it should be canceled. In addition to this, on February 3, 1941, I entered House Resolution 94, asking the Attorney General to appear before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives and tell the committee what proceedings were being taken to revoke Kuhn's citizenship.

I gave this whole history, together with the references, to the Attorney General. I have continually been after this Department since pushing this matter.

There is no question in my mind but every one of those in this bund who have done the things set forth in my affidavit should have their citizenship canceled. I have pounded on this matter ever since May 1940, and, of course, I am gratified to see this action, as I presume that the same charges will be filed against Fritz Julius Kuhn as are being filed against the others. I have stated many times on this floor that people of this class should certainly be taken out of circulation and placed where they could not damage this country

I am including in my remarks copy of House Resolution 94 and my affidavit, above mentioned:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

LELAND M. FORD, being duly sworn, on his oath says that Fritz Julius Kuhn was naturalized a citizen of the United States by the judge of the United States District Court at Detroit, Mich., on the 3d day of December 1934 by fraudulently pretending to comply with the naturalization laws, and as evidence of such citizenship conferred, received certificate of naturalization No. 3845908, dated December 3, 1934; and

That the fraud imposed upon the court and upon the naturalization laws of the United States consisted, in part, in deliberately claiming and asserting under oath, in his petition for citizenship filed in the said United States district court on June 28, 1934, that he was, without any mental reservation made known therein, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States;

That, upon such fraudulent representation, and at the hearing of the said petition, the said Fritz Julius Kuhn did then and there in open court give false and perjurious testimony in support of such claim; in that the said Fritz Julius Kuhn, with deliberate intent fraudulently to deceive the court, and before the court granted his said petition, did solemnly declare and swear falsely on oath in open court, and in the presence of the court, that he would support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and that he did absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every prince, potentate, State, and sovereignty, and particularly by name to the foreign state and sovereignty of which he was at that time a citizen or subject; that he would support, defend, and bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that he took this obligation freely, and without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; whereupon the judge of said court did thereupon grant the said petition, and confer United States citizenship upon the said Fritz Julius Kuhn;

That the said Fritz Julius Kuhn did not, in fact, renounce his allegiance to the state of Germany, which he swore it was his intention so to do in his said petition for citizenship hereinbefore referred to, and which in open court he swore then to be doing in fact at the hearing upon his said petition;

That, by the sworn testimony of himself and other witnesses before the Special Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States on un-American Activities, as stated in their Report No. 1476, of January 3, 1940, the said Fritz Julius Kuhn has been unequivocally shown not to have renounced his allegiance to the State of Germany which he swore in his said petition for citizenship hereinbefore referred to it was his intention to do, and which, in open court at the hearing upon his said petition, he swore he was then in fact renouncing;

That the said report No. 1476 establishes among other things, that the said Fritz Julius Kuhn, referred to therein as Fritz Kuhn, is the fuehrer or directing head of an alien organization in the United States known as the German-American Bund, and that this said bund receives its inspiration, program, and direction from the Government of Germany through the various propaganda organizations which have been set up in the United States by the Government of Germany, and which function under the control and supervision of the Nazi Ministry of Propaganda and Enlightenment of the German Government, as more fully set forth in testimony before the said special committee, and thereby conclusively established; that the said bund is widespread in the United States, and that it has taken its orders from the said Fritz Julius Kuhn as its national fuehrer; that his said activities have been against the good order and happiness of the United States, and against the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and against the Constitution of the United States to which the said Fritz Julius Kuhn did fraudulently swear in open court he would bear true faith and allegiance, and would support and defend against all enemies foreign and domestic of the United States.

That more and fuller details of the fraudulents acts of the said Fritz Julius Kuhn against the laws and good order of the United States are set forth in the said report No. 1476, and it is believed that more amplified testimony is in the files of the said special committee more fully showing by the acts of the said Fritz Julius Kuhn that he is, in fact, and always has been, an enemy of the United States; and

That for the reasons set forth herein there is shown good cause for the appropriate United States district attorney to perform the duty imposed upon him by the naturalization law to institute proceedings to set aside the judgment of admission to citizenship fraudulently obtained by the said Fritz Julius Kuhn and to cancel the said certificate of citizenship issued to the said Fritz Julius Kuhn in the court having jurisdiction to naturalize aliens in the judicial district in which the said Fritz Julius Kuhn is now residing; and

That the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly ruled that the naturalization laws must be construed strictly and in favor of the United States as against the alien.

LELAND M. FORD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of May 1940.

———— ————.

———

[H. Res. 94. In the House of Representatives, February 3, 1941. Mr. LELAND M. FORD submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization]

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas in an affidavit signed by Representative LELAND M. FORD, of California, filed with the United States district attorney for the northern district of New York facts are set forth showing that the citizenship of Fritz Kuhn was obtained upon fraudulent testimony; and

"Whereas there is in the files of the Department of Justice much correspondence in connection with this matter; and

"Whereas despite such affidavit no action has been taken to institute proceedings for the revocation of the citizenship of the said Fritz Kuhn: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Attorney General is hereby requested to appear before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives with all the correspondence in the files of the Department of Justice in connection with the affidavit signed by Representative LELAND M. FORD, of California, and filed with the United States district attorney for the northern district of New York relating to the citizenship of Fritz Kuhn, and to state to such committee what proceedings, if any, are contemplated to revoke such citizenship."

THE LATE FRANK M. RAMEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to announce the passing of a former Member of this House. It was not my pleasure to have the acquaintance of this Member, although I had known of his activities of recent years. This morning I received this clipping from a newspaper:

HILLSBORO, ILL., March 27.—Frank M. Ramey, 61, former Congressman from the Twenty-first District and Montgomery County Republican leader, died in a hospital today after a week's illness.

He was elected to one term in Congress in 1928. He recently was appointed an examiner for the Illinois Commerce Commission, but illness prevented him from performing any duties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Evening Star of March 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL WAR EFFORT

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I was interested this morning to receive in my mail a letter from a hardware company. Being in the hardware business myself, the letter interested me. It reads as follows:

THE SALT LAKE HARDWARE CO.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 26, 1942.

Hon. WM. S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regardless of the press reports quoting statements made yesterday on the Senate floor that most of the letters of protest reaching Congress are chamber-of-commerce inspired, this one is not. Personally I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to class them as a bunch of nit-wits who have no mind of their own and to even infer that we have to be told by brass hats in marble halls what to say.

The facts are that the rank and file of the common people, of which I am proud to be one, are justifiably alarmed over the trend of the national war effort. The destiny of America lies largely in the hands of our duly elected Senators and Representatives in Congress, who, by their acts or their failure to act, will win or lose this war, depending on whether they pursue a policy of intelligent action or continue to respond to the political pressure of selfish groups.

In our own organization, consisting of 300 men and women, the deep-seated alarm and the daily questions exchanged show clearly how these folks feel about the delays that have already occurred in our war-production plants. It is a temper of righteous indignation and the result of the "gimme" attitude by both management and labor, which is definitely retarding our war-production program and thereby unnecessarily endangering the lives of our loved ones at the front who are being let down.

This is no indictment against all management and, certainly, not against all labor for, by far and large, both are cooperating, but this brings into bold relief the few who are putting their own selfish interests above the welfare of their country.

This is no time to quibble over profits by management or overtime by workers. My own firm will gladly forego all profits for the duration, as a contribution to the war effort; likewise, workers should thank God that they live in a country where they are able to earn a living wage: and, so long as our sons, husbands, fathers, and sweethearts are giving up good jobs and all the home ties in order to give their all to the military service of our country on a $21-per-month basis, our workers, both direct defense and civilian, should welcome the opportunity to serve our country by working as many hours each week as the urgency of the job requires, and without any thought whatsoever of overtime. In cases where wages are subnormal, these, of course, should be adjusted in the American way, but not through work stoppages.

In writing you I am expressing the conviction of thousands of our farmers, stockmen, industrial workers, clerks, truckers, railroad men, retail merchants, and, in fact, all others except racketeers and profiteers.

This letter is not written as a criticism of what is past, for that is already too late; but, in Heaven's name, let us all have the intestinal fortitude to demand and fight to the finish for no politics and more action, so we won't wake up too late.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES L. WHEELER,
President and General Manager,
the Salt Lake Hardware Co.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include this letter in full.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD twice and to include in each extension an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of the Dies committee, and I hope some other matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram from the carpenters' union of Baton Rouge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Worcester Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak in behalf of the thousands of retail automobile dealers in the country. They have a great many automobiles they are forced to keep in storage and are forbidden to sell. Many of them have not the facilities to keep these cars in dry places. They are rapidly deteriorating and the time will come when they will have faded upholstery, dead batteries, rusty motors, tire deterioration, and crystallization of parts. This is going to be too much of a burden for them to overcome.

Many of these dealers have not made a retail delivery during the year 1942. In my State of Massachusetts, less than 5 percent of the total allotment has been delivered. If these conditions continue to obtain, they will practically bankrupt

every automobile dealer within the next 6 months.

I have taken this matter up with the Automobile Rationing Board. They said that they drew up strict regulations upon the theory that it would be better to be strict at the beginning and to relax later on. When these regulations went out to the 8,000 different rationing boards, the board here in Washington was surprised at the strictness with which these local boards interpreted the regulations. This may be the answer to the fact that less than 5 percent of the total allotment has been delivered. I have been given to understand by the Board here in Washington that they are going to relax their regulations and are going to ask the local boards to be less strict in their interpretation of the regulations.

I suggested that wherever the entire quota of automobiles has not been sold within a given period of time that the board allow the dealers to sell the cars to the general public.

It is unthinkable that we should allow this deplorable situation to drift from bad to worse without doing something about it. I intend to press for action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MILK IN THE GUTTERS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time I have been worried about the dairy farmer and what he would do with his milk this spring—in spite of the fact that we could use every drop of milk they could produce, in spite of the fact that the farmers have certainly done their share in producing not only as much milk as they were requested to produce, they have exceeded that amount. While I am not going to take the 15 minutes allotted to me, I am going to ask for time sometime later to enlarge on this matter; but I want in a short statement to show who is to blame for this situation and why we have not processing plants that will take care of the milk that is being produced by the loyal, patriotic farmers. In order to do this I had to prepare a written statement, because I might step on the toes of some fellows here, and I want to be sure that I am not misquoted. Therefore I am going to read my prepared statement, and it is entitled "Milk in the Gutters."

I predict that milk will soon flow in the gutters of Wisconsin and other milk-producing States in the Union. Milk—the same precious commodity called for in vastly increased amounts in the Secretary of Agriculture's food-for-victory program.

Soon the flush season will be here and the new flood of milk—for which there is so serious a need—will be dumped on the ground and fed to livestock because there will be no facilities to process it.

Why? Because of the bungling of a vital part of the war program by the Food Section of the Dairy Division of the War Production Board.

The blame must be shouldered by the man directing the Division. In fairness to his splendid chief, Donald Nelson, and to the Nation, Clyde E. Beardslee, head of the Section, should submit his resignation at once.

When the Secretary of Agriculture announced his plans for the ambitious program of producing food for our Allies at war, the Department did a thorough and splendid job of convincing the farmer that he must increase his milk production at any cost—increasing feeding—increasing herds. The farmers' patriotic response was instant and complete. The plans called for dried separated milk, cheese, and evaporated milk in great quantities. Goals were set at 88,000,000 cases of evaporated milk where we had produced 61,000,000 in 1941. We wanted 619,000,000 pounds of dried separated milk in 1942. Last year we processed 389,000,000. The Surplus Marketing Administration was to purchase this food for export. Now we find the program bogged down. Why?

Perhaps Mr. Beardslee can best explain this. His section knew that plant facilities would have to be rapidly increased. We had to have new evaporating plants and milk-drying equipment. Surplus Marketing Administration, with lease-lend funds, was ready to finance this program. The Agricultural Defense Committee had approved applications by the industries for machinery and the critical materials for the equipment had been allocated.

Why didn't the Food Section, under Mr. Beardslee, see to it that the priorities applications were approved? Was it because so large a share of the applications were from farmers' cooperatives?

Here was one great chance for existing farmer cooperatives to make their plants flexible and open new markets, insuring their existence. Whom was Mr. Beardslee representing in this matter—our Nation, in a great war effort—or the lecherous monopolistic group represented by his firm, the Borden Co., which lists him as vice president?

This is the same Mr. Beardslee indicted by the grand jurors, impaneled, in the District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, at the December 1941 term of the said court, which was continued to March of this year. He was indicted as an individual officer of the Borden Co.

The indictment, among other things, recites that the defendants, by means of purchases from others and by manufacture in their own factories, handled approximately 553,000,000 pounds, or 90 percent of the total United States production of American cheese. The grand jury found that the defendants had entered into a conspiracy to unlawfully restrain trade and commerce among the several States of the United States, against the peace and dignity of the United States.

The Big Four—National Dairy Products, Swift's, Armour's and Borden's—engineered the conspiracy to force the small producers to accept the prices for cheese fixed by the defendants. This is a sample of Mr. Beardslee's thinking and philosophy.

Trust-Buster Thurman Arnold, who has been doing a remarkably fine job, stated that in order to have a political democracy, we must have an industrial democracy, and that in order to have the latter, we must have a free market. I believe that Mr. Arnold's contention is a sound one—I believe that the monopolies and cartels, whose treasonable actions have been brought to light since the advent of the second World War, must be smashed. They are merely an insidious form of thievery, operating under the pious guise of big business.

But to return to our recital of the impending plight of our dairy farmer. When the Big Four, who are engaged in building up complete control of the evaporated milk industry, heard of the plans to expand facilities, they immediately scuttled the program of expansion, regardless of whether or not it was an integral part of our war effort.

Taking an optimistic position, we guess that with what increase of facilities was made, we will be able to produce 525,000,000 pounds of dried separated milk. This is 100,000,000 pounds short of our goal. It is true that facilities have been made available through priority ratings which would increase the production of dried skim 63,000,000 pounds, but none of these with the exception of one plant, will be in production this year. The crew of obstructionists has been successful in holding up the diversion program for almost a half year.

It is interesting to note that as a forerunner of my prediction the Secretary of Agriculture has already had to increase butter prices in order to attract milk from the evaporating plants to the creameries, because such plants have reached the saturation point as far as capacity is concerned.

The point of all this is that the farmer, in good faith, has changed his economic position to his peril. He relied upon the integrity of the men directing our production efforts. I wish that the culpable persons could properly assume the burden of responsibility for this catastrophe, but they cannot. The serious impact upon our agricultural economy and upon the morale of the farmer is not to be lightly reckoned with. I do not know whether Mr. Beardslee is a dollar-a-year man or not. In any event, he is being paid too much. Again we are forced to admit the soundness of the old axiom "One cannot serve two masters"—certainly not two ideals.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will agree with me that bringing to light these monopolies was the result of the action of this House through its Appropriations Committee which made possible funds to be used by the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice for the very purpose of investigating the monopolies. The hearings in the subcommittee on appropriations making

appropriations for Mr. Arnold's division are filled with demands on the part of the membership of the House here to bring to light some of these monopolies and eliminate them.

The gentleman will also agree with me that in bringing to light these monopolies the committee and the gentleman himself and others in this House, on both sides of the aisle, felt that doing things like this would bring to the attention of the public the fact that the farmer himself does not receive the price against which many consumers are complaining today, and that the effort on the part of the membership of this House, on both sides of the aisle, was through such action it was thought we could provide a better system of distribution of the farmer's product and, eventually, get for him the cost of production to which he is entitled.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I certainly agree with the gentleman and that is why I supported an amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], to increase the appropriation for Mr. Arnold's trust division $200,000.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSON. I am very much interested in what my colleague has said, his State and mine being among the leading dairy States of the Union. This morning, and in fact for several days I have been working on a proposition for one of my cooperative milk-producing organizations in Missouri, by which we are attempting to get equipment somewhat along the lines referred to. On Saturday afternoon I was told that until a more complete statement as to need had been supplied nothing could be done. Just before I left my office the some authority called me and said the equipment had been supplied and was there. I am now trying to get the facts in the case and have wired to know what the real situation is. I feel we are indebted to our colleague for calling attention to this important matter.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Thanks, Mr. NELSON, you always have the best interest of the actual farmer at heart. I have worked, of course, in respect of my own section to get more milk-drying plants. I have probably as many creameries as any other section of the State of Wisconsin and that separated milk should be converted into milk powder, but the cooperatives evidently are not given much consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Mr. H. E. Trulock, secretary of the Jefferson County Farm Bureau, of Pine Bluff, Ark., under date of March 16, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects, and in one subject to include an article by A. C. Gauld and in the other subject matter to include an article by Dan West, of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] for 10 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of March this year this House passed, by a vote of 331 to 46, a resolution continuing what is commonly known as the Dies committee. From its inception, with but one exception, I opposed the continuation of this committee. I voted for the continuation of this committee the last time. I was 1 of the 331. Under the present happenings, I regret that I cast my vote as I did. If you can believe anything that appears in the newspapers—and sometimes I wonder about it—this House cannot overlook what appeared in the press within the past 24 hours. This House has a responsibility; it has a responsibility that every one of us must bear. We have created a committee that is presumably for the purpose of assisting this country in trying to do just one job, and that is the job that we are up against—that is the job of winning this war.

God knows that I did everything I could in my power to keep us out of the hellish mess that we are in, but we are in it, and our boys are being slaughtered on the seven seas. They are meeting death, and if there is any one thing in this country that we have to have, it is unity of purpose and action, and we cannot have unity when some of our people, with the sanction of this Congress, if you please, are going around over the country and attacking people who are fighting our fight by our side, to whom we are giving arms and money. There is no doubt but that the Dies committee has uncovered a lot of valuable information, and that was one reason why I voted for its continuance, but there is a way of using to advantage information instead of handing it to the public when it is going to hurt rather than help, and that is to hand it to the proper officers to be used at the proper time, instead of putting it broadcast in the newspapers.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not the time at present. I should be glad to yield later if the gentleman can get me further time.

Another reason why I voted for the continuance of this committee is that I have faith in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] himself, but I have also a great deal of faith in the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and when he made the statement which I shall quote, it was the controlling factor in my voting for the continuation of the committee. He said at that time:

> In my judgment, the future of the committee should be devoted primarily and with every bit of major emphasis at its command to the doing of a job of exposing and combating the work of people who attempt to create confusion in our country and to build up sympathy with the Nazi philosophy of government.

In addition the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] disclosed some good work the committee had done against Nazi fifth-column work.

That is why I voted for it. What are we doing? The committee is now engaged in ferreting out who are Communists. That is all right; I am no more in sympathy with the communistic philosophy of government than is any Member of this House. I know of only one "ism" which is in my mind and in my heart, and that is Americanism. Remember this, the Communists are fighting our fight today, and they seem to be the only ones who are winning. They are stopping our common enemy, Hitler, and they are the only ones who are stopping him and they are doing it on the field of bloody battle. Of course, we have Communists in this country; they run openly for office as such. Now, are we to deny them the right to live in this country and particularly during these times? I do not like obscene literature or pictures which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] referred to, any more than he does; but what have they got to do with winning the war? Is this the time and is this the place to bring that situation up? I do not criticize the distinguished gentleman who occupies the position as Speaker pro tempore for saying what he did. He has the right to do it—that is free speech—and I have the right to say what I say.

When we attack communism and when we attack Communists in this country we are really attacking the people that are helping to hold up our right hand and fighting back of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In just a moment. I think it is up to the leadership of this House to take cognizance of what is going on. That committee is a committee of this House. It is not alone Mr. Dies. It is a committee of this House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say to the gentleman that I pro-

pose to discuss these matters a little later on today. I have been granted time to do it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope the gentleman does. I quoted the gentleman a while ago and I will say to the gentleman right now that there is no Member of this House that I have more faith in or respect for than the gentleman from California. It was because of the statement the gentleman made to this House that he would see what that committee did, that I voted for its continuance, together with the fact that it has assembled a lot of valuable information. But there is a way of using information. If you are going to use it to the point of scuttling the thing we are trying to save, then it not only becomes useless but dangerous. We are trying to save this country. There are boys from my State who have enlisted and have been drafted, both Indians and white boys, who are being sunk to the bottom of the ocean today, in the seven seas, if you please. They come from all over America. I have a grandson who has enlisted in the Army Air Corps. We must protect those boys. You cannot protect them by fighting an element of people that is helping us, whether you agree with their philosophy or not. We cannot protect our boys by fighting a country that is fighting by our side. We have a responsibility here. I think there are 40 or 50 Members of this House who have the courage to go ahead and act, if action cannot otherwise be had.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Our colleague from Montana is making a valuable contribution to a most important subject. Is it not a fact that the resolution appropriating funds for the Dies committee has not as yet come before the House? We merely passed a resolution to continue the committee, but the Committee on Accounts has not as yet presented to the House a resolution to provide funds.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is true. I will tell you right now if the business of this committee is carried on as is shown by the press today, if we can believe it, a resolution for funds will not receive my support. I do not fully agree with Vice President WALLACE in saying all he did in the press regarding this Dies matter. In order to save this country we must work in harmony with those people who are fighting for our side, whether we like them or not.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman is thoroughly patriotic and I want to congratulate him on his vote for the continuation of the Dies committee. I think he voted properly. The Dies committee is doing everything it can to try to preserve Americanism in this country. We do not want to stir up any fight or any friction in our joint efforts with Russia to crush the common enemy. Nevertheless, we have the job of preserving Americanism in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am glad the gentleman brought that out. As usual, the gentleman is nearly right. The gentleman and I agree on a lot of things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, some of us seem to forget that we are not at war with Russia. Russia is our ally, and it is incumbent upon us to do just as we are doing, that is, to lend them every aid to help defeat a common enemy, Germany and Japan.

The situation that prevailed before we became a party to this war must not and cannot be taken as a situation prevailing now. At this time and until the final peace is had, we must distinguish between our friends and foes. After the war is over, none of us can predict what the situation will be, but all of us will be just as determined to preserve the American way and the American system then as we are to die for it now.

The Dies committee could render the country an inestimable service by helping track down the friends of Germany and Japan who are within our borders at this time. That is what I thought they were going to do when I supported the resolution. Otherwise, I would never have voted for it.

I will sacrifice every life in this country to protect this country, but by the gods, at the present time we have but one job to do, and that is to lick Japan and to lick Germany.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I have great admiration for the gentleman from Montana. We all know he is highly patriotic. But would the gentleman state specifically what objection he has to a continuation of the Dies committee?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no objection at all to the continuation of it if they will go on and do their job. The exposé of Teapot Dome would never have occurred if it had not been for Walsh's congressional committee. Harry Daugherty would never have been driven out of President Harding's Cabinet if it had not been for BURT WHEELER's congressional committee that exposed his rottenness. Congressional committees can do a world of good if they will confine themselves to what they are supposed to do. There is no argument about that; but when they do more harm than good—then, I balk.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman will recall that when this resolution came before the House I was one of the 331 who voted the same way the gentleman from Montana voted. It was following the presentation of the exposé of Japanese subversive and fifth-column activities in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. And we were given to understand that the committee would continue that investigation, in which our people in the West are vitally interested.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. In view of that fact, the members of the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest States met, and the gentleman was present, I believe, and we adopted a resolution expressing the desire and the hope that the Dies committee, in collaboration with the military authorities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and other responsible law-enforcement agencies of the Government, would continue that investigation of Nazi and Axis activities in this country. I was a member of the committee which drafted the resolution in line with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], as quoted by the gentleman from Montana, we had every reason to expect that the conduct of the Dies committee would be judicious and cooperative.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; the gentleman from Washington is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the American people, including ourselves, are too readily inclined to accept an indictment as a conviction. Thurman Arnold is a very able and energetic trust buster. We all admire him for the outspokenness of his statements, even when he may be wrong, but there are occasions when Thurman Arnold does not tell the whole truth, doubtless because he does not know it; that is, he makes a misstatement because he knows only half of the truth. Last week he made two statements, one concerning labor and the other accusing the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey of certain practices, including that of selling high-octane gasoline to foreign air lines in South America. It is not my place to defend the Standard Oil Co.—they can do that themselves—but I have a passion for truth.

As a member of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents, and having gone with that committee to South America to investigate aviation there, I know something of the truth concerning that last statement of Mr. Arnold's.

It is perfectly true that a subsidiary, perhaps two or three subsidiaries, of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey in the Latin American countries did sell high-octane gasoline to foreign air lines in

South America within a few months prior to the declaration of war, but that is only half of the story. It is also true that those companies are incorporated under the laws of the country in which they are domiciled, and they must carry out the dictates of the governments of those countries. One of those dictates has been that their connection by air with Europe via the Lati, an Italian air line, must be maintained. That was their only connection by air with Europe until, I believe, November of 1941. Therefore the oil companies were required to continue furnishing Lati with aviation gasoline.

The committee in the course of its investigations had the same idea that everyone else here has: Why could not the oil companies just stop that Italian airline by refusing to sell it gasoline? I am quite confident from the discussion the committee had with persons there that the oil companies would liked to have done just that, but the governments in South America desired to maintain the connection until it was replaced by an American air line covering the same routes, or similar routes, to Europe. So the oil companies therefore had to continue selling the gas. It was the major oil companies' subsidiaries in South America, however, who discovered the fact that the Italian and Nazi dominated air lines in Latin America had been collecting huge supplies of aviation gasoline far and beyond any normal quantities which were necessary for the ordinary operation of those air lines. They brought this matter to the attention of the several governments concerned, and in cooperation with those governments they made it necessary for those stocks of gasoline to be reduced to such a point as could be considered adequate for the current use of those lines; and it was through the cooperation of those four oil companies more or less jointly and their subsidiaries in Latin America that the Italian air line Lati was finally grounded by refusal to sell them any more oil or gasoline. I, myself, with the members of the committee, saw one of the Lati line airplanes which had come from Europe by the way of Dakar, Natal, and Rio de Janeiro, grounded at Porto Allegre, Brazil, en route to Buenos Aires, because they could not get any of the local people to sell them gasoline. That was early in October of 1941. Where they finally got the gasoline to go on to Buenos Aires I do not know. It had been habitual on the part of the Lati line to take off from a place such as Rio de Janeiro with enough gasoline to go to Buenos Aires nonstop, then come in several hours overdue. It is assumed, although it cannot of course be known, that in that interval of 4 or 5 hours they were out to sea spotting ships and radioing their location, perhaps to submarines. The Standard and other oil companies did a pretty neat job of aiding our own Government in putting a stop to Nazi and Italian air line operation in South America, I can assure you. Thurman Arnold was only half right, and thereby convicted by indictment, without hearing witnesses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the deplorable situation with respect to the sale and use of intoxicating liquors in and near our training camps is becoming a national disgrace. When legislation was demanded several months ago to protect our service men against the use of intoxicating liquors of all kinds we were told no legislation was necessary. It was said it would be so much more practical for the administration to handle the problem. Unfortunately, little has been done to control the use and sale of liquor around our camps and to the men in uniform. Alcoholic beverages flow freely in and near the great majority of our training camps. Cases have been cited where beer of high alcoholic content was served free to men on certain occasions.

Mr. Speaker, we are using every effort to build and equip the finest and best-trained army in all the world. We have the kind of men with which to do it. The most important factor in such training is that these men are physically and mentally alert. This is so essential because modern warfare requires, for the most part, men who are highly skilled in the use of technical instruments and equipment. Men who use these instruments, these weapons, must be as mentally and physically trained as can be done. These boys are being trained to do a job where they will risk their lives and the lives of others in a most cruel combat at arms.

No one will contend, I am sure, that the use of alcoholic beverages contributes to the mental alertness or the physical well-being of the young men who are training for service. You and I well know even our outstanding athletic coaches of the country require their athletes to refrain from the use of liquor.

Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary for me to discuss the effect of excessive use of intoxicating liquor on the morale, as well as the morale, of our men, nor the complications to which excessive drinking leads. Furthermore, the adjustment from home life and environment to military rules is not an easy one. It will be said that only comparatively few yield to excessive use of liquor. I grant they are far in the minority, still there are too many of them. Whatever the number, there can be no excuse for permitting it.

There is an economic side that should not be overlooked. Spending for liquor leads to the use of money for other worthless purposes.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have the best trained and best equipped forces our country can provide, it is essential that they have the proper food and care, as well as the highest type of training. Certainly, alcohol does not fit in that picture.

Mr. Speaker, the boys are entitled to protection against the sale and use of intoxicants. Their parents and their families are entitled to it. Their country is not only entitled to it but should have it.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced in this House H. R. 3371. This measure would prohibit the sale or use of liquors of all kinds to men in uniform and in or near training camps, except for medicinal uses. The bill authorizes the President to make proper rules and regulations to carry out its terms.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an experiment. It is not new. It is the reenactment of legislation that was put into effect during World War No. 1. It was effective then. We need it now.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote just two of several eminent authorities. They are not reformers or preachers or temperance advocates, but soldiers and statesmen who have seen the effect of liquor on armed forces in time of war.

During the first World War Theodore Roosevelt wrote:

> My sons who are now in the Army in France, wrote me most strongly (just as General Pershing has published his public opinion unstintingly) as to the harm done to the men of the Army by permitting the sale of liquor to them, stating they believed in absolute prohibition for the Army in war time.

During the first World War, General Pershing had this to say:

> Banish the entire liquor industry from the United States; close every saloon and brewery; suppress drinking by severe punishment to the drinker * * * and the Nation will find itself amazed at its efficiency. * * * I shall not go slow on prohibition, for I know what is the greatest foe to my men—greater even than the bullets of the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, you do not even have to be sentimental, although it would be difficult to keep from it, to support this legislation. The passage of this bill will, in a big measure, contribute to our war effort. It will help protect the physical and moral well-being of thousands of our young men who will soon be on their way to the battle front, and to many more who are being called every day. This bill, I think, should have the united support of the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss another phase of this problem for just a few minutes. The correct and sensible thing to do is to stop the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic liquor, except for medical uses, at least for the duration of the war. Do you know that the American people last year spent four and a half billion dollars for liquors of all kinds? It is almost as much as the national deficit for last year. It is an average of $34 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It would have far more than paid the salaries of our soldiers last year. Think of the Defense bonds and the bombers and airplanes and guns and supplies it would have purchased, or the hungry people it might have fed. Here is something I regret to mention: The retail cost of liquor in the city of Washington last year was approximately $50,000,000. That is $10,000,000 more than the District spent for general government

expenses, protection of life, property, health, sanitation, public welfare, and education.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about conserving food. Last year the manufacture of all kinds of liquor required 1,996,000 tons of food grain. Think how far that would go in feeding the Allied armies. Talk about a sugar shortage. Last year 135,000,000 pounds of sugar and sirup were consumed by the liquor business. I am informed they are now to be rationed to some extent. It hardly makes sense that sugar should be used in this way and then ration it on the family table.

We are advised the manufacture will be cut 50 percent for hard liquors. That they will make industrial alcohol for war industries. We are also informed there is a 5 or 6 years' supply of hard liquor on hand. Why not take that supply over immediately and convert it into munitions so much needed, and not sell it to the boys in training camps, who are better without it, or the public who could use the money to buy bonds.

Mr. Speaker, a government that can ration automobiles, typewriters, razor blades, clothing, sugar, and other foods, can, if it wants to do so, take over the liquor supplies and convert them into industrial alcohol, smokeless powder, and other munitions. Then stop the use of food products for making liquor for the duration.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not believe the patriotic citizens of this country should object to this plan. Certainly, mighty few will contend that saloons, cocktail lounges, or beer parlors contribute to national defense or to the prosecution of the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH], is recognized for 7 minutes.

MONETARY REFORM

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is Monday of Holy Week and that day of His last week on which our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ cleansed the Temple at Jerusalem and drove out the money changers. It is frequently referred to by Bible commentators as "The Day of Authority" and the words of denunciation uttered by Jesus are still ringing down the centuries: "Is it not written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations'? but ye have made it a den of thieves."

This is, therefore, an appropriate day and occasion on which to invite the attention of the House and the country to the need of monetary reform in our own country and throughout the world. This is a subject which I have studied for many years and I believe I have read most of the books dealing with it. I have recently come across a small volume written by the late Vincent C. Vickers, governor of the Bank of England from 1910 to 1919 and director of the Vickers-Armstrong armament firm for 22 years. A few months before his death in 1939 he wrote a little book entitled "Economic Tribulation," which is probably the clearest and most concise exposition of the evils of the world's present monetary system which has ever been written. I intend to quote and read some of the most striking statements made by this late distinguished former governor of the Bank of England, which apply with equal force to our own monetary system and which express the views which I have held for many years, and which I have previously stated on the floor of this House.

Speaking of the present monetary system, he says:

> It is actively harmful to the State, creates poverty and unemployment, and is the root cause of war.
>
> The experts have hopelessly failed.
>
> We need a complete change in the relationship between the supply of money and the supply of goods.
>
> "Sound finance" means nothing at all, merely a banker's slogan adopted to disguise the injustices of the credit system.
>
> The system entails that there should exist at all times a demand for credit and currency which normally exceeds the supply, and prescribes that there should be no reform and no legislation which might deprive the money industry of the natural and interested advantage of its monopoly or of its existing policy.
>
> The exchange broker lives, not upon exchange, but upon movements and alterations of exchange.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to say that I appreciate very much what the gentleman is saying. I agree with his contention, and I want to ask him this question: Will not the gentleman agree that truly sound finance and a truly sound monetary system would be one in which the monetary supply of the country put into circulation without an interest burden on the people is kept at a level commensurate with the flow of real goods into the markets of the Nation?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I agree with the gentleman from California that the formula he suggests would provide us with a scientific, sound monetary system, which is certainly what we do not have at the present time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And which you can never get on the basis of gold or an interest-bearing debt?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Mr. Vickers agrees with both of us, and I shall continue to quote him. I quote:

> Mankind is capable of producing far more than mankind can consume.
>
> We are confronted with the undeniable fact that the chaotic state of the world's ability to produce, that the health and welfare of the individual, the happiness of the community, the contentment of the nation, and the peace of the world, are mainly, if not entirely, a monetary problem.
>
> The money supply and the management of the money system are almost entirely outside the control of the Government and are operated by an outside individual section of the community, working for profit, and possessing a virtual monopoly of lending credit to the community at high interest—a credit based on the community's own money—this, indeed, being the only means, under the existing system, of distributing such credit as may be available, so that goods may continue to change hands and so that those in need of money can borrow the use of it provided they are credit-worthy borrowers. Above and beyond this, we discover that, in the progress of time and through our own base carelessness and ignorance, we have permitted the money industry, by the very virtue of its business, gradually to attain a political and economic influence so wide and powerful that it has actually undermined the authority of the State and usurped the power of democratic government.
>
> Unless we can contrive an improved financial system which is the first essential toward a new and better economy, no satisfactory outcome of the war is possible. Are we now fighting to uphold freedom and democracy, or are we fighting to uphold and strengthen the dictatorship of international finance? * * * The object and existence of money is to facilitate the exchange of goods and services. A sack of gold on a desert island is not worth as much as the sack that holds it; and to allow the supply of money to regulate the production and consumption of goods is as if we allowed strawberry baskets to regulate the supply of strawberries, and yet those who have developed the business of letting out strawberry baskets on hire now control the production and consumption of strawberries. If an economist from Mars or a little child of ordinary intellect were told of the present position they would rock with laughter at the blind stupidity of mankind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I would like to comment on the speech made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] by saying that it seems to me no needed manpower, no needed equipment, no needed manufacturing facilities should be devoted to the manufacture of liquor today if they can be devoted to any other need in connection with furnishing war materials or basic civilian needs.

I requested this time to talk about the Dies committee. When the committee's life was extended a short time ago I made a speech in which I pointed out that the committee, in my judgment, had accumulated a great deal of very important information. I contended that the committee should be continued and in my speech I stated that today America is at war and the duty of the committee is to focus its attention upon the agents of the nations with which America is at war, and to go hammer and tongs after that work. I also said, not in my little 2-minute speech when the resolution was being considered but in two previous speeches, that, in my opinion, the committee should have as its regular basis of procedure the following rules:

It should hold regular meetings at specific times; at those meetings important matters concerning reports or statements by the committee should be discussed; members of the committee should have opportunity to bring up any questions that have been brought to their attention or to make any suggestions with regard

to investigations and that all matters of committee policy, and especially of committee publicity, should be discussed and decided on at those times.

It is perfectly true that on many occasions when meetings of the committee have been called the members have not attended as they should have. I am not willing to make a confession of personal negligence in reference to that matter because I think I have been very faithful. But what I say is generally true. My point has always been that if there were a stated regular time for the meetings, then if the members did not come and if action was taken, it was the members' own fault for not being there.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Referring to the necessity for calling meetings, as the gentleman just stated, was there any meeting of the committee that discussed this release which was given by Mr. DIES to the press concerning certain persons engaged in certain matters?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The main purpose of my asking for this time is to discuss that very matter and I would like to do it in an orderly way.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; there was not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That answers the question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the second thing I said was that in my opinion there ought to be approval by at least a majority of the members of the committee before public statements are issued, particularly in times like the present. I know what the answer to that is. I make statements myself, and I do not ask other members of the Dies committee to O. K. them, and anyone else has the right to do the same thing. Yes; I would agree to that except in matters which are directly connected with the investigation of the committee and in matters where the situation presented is a matter that comes directly out of the committee's work, and for which inevitably members of the committee, like myself, will be held in part responsible.

I have taken my share of the responsibility for the official reports and the official statements of the committee, and I have no apology to offer for them. I have received criticism from both sides about my work on this committee, I may say. I have been designated in Communist papers as the worst member of the committee, and I have been accused falsely by some other people of trying to hamper the work of the committee, which has not been true.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. May I say that, in my opinion, the gentleman is doing a splended job and neither of those accusations is true.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

In the third place, I say that the committee needs at this time to engage for itself certain additional people for its staff, people who would concentrate on the job of investigation of Nazi and Fascist activities. I believe this is going to be done; I have confidence it is going to be done. It has not been done as yet, but I have confidence it will be. Our first job is to win the war and the No. 1 classification of un-American activities consists of those carried on for the benefit of the nations which now seek the destruction of the United States.

On the other two matters that I mentioned a minute ago, I feel in duty bound to speak today.

This morning's paper carries an account of an exchange of correspondence between the chairman of the committee and the Vice President of the United States. I want to make my comment on this matter as constructive as I know how. The chairman's letter includes a list of names. A couple of days ago one of the people on the committee staff showed me some books and cards and things having to do with two or three or maybe four people. I expressed concern about some of that material and said that I thought an effort should be made to bring any such evidence that the committee might have to the attention of the people who are in responsible positions in the Board of Economic Warfare in order that thorough investigation might be made of the matter, and that I was of the opinion that action would be taken if there were anything substantial that could be shown.

The next thing I knew was that I was called on the telephone by a newspaper reporter connected with one particular paper and not a press service, who said that some of this material had been read to him on the telephone and he wanted me to tell to whom it applied.

My first point is that I do not believe matters should be given to the newspapers out of the Dies committee office until the members of the committee know what is going on.

In the second place, the next thing I knew was the account in this morning's paper.

I happen to believe that the American institution of constitutional democracy and the preservation of freedom of economic enterprise are important, and that they are going to be difficult to keep in the future. I think their preservation depends primarily on the solution of certain economic problems like unemployment, monopoly, and some others, more than on any other thing. But because I believe those things I am anxious, I am deeply anxious, that anyone committed to any other philosophy of government should not be employed by the United States Government. My record is absolutely consistent on that point. But here we have a situation where a comparatively long list of names is put into a letter, where about 9 or 10 names in the body of the letter are surrounded on both ends by quite lurid material about some other individuals, and where the whole thing is made public, as far as I know, before it has even been received by the person to whom it is addressed; let alone by members of the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman tell, if he knows, who released that to the press?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know who released it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. On page 4 of the Washington Post of this morning we find this:

> JASPER, TEX., March 29.—"WALLACE can't take it."
>
> That was the recreation of Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat), of Texas, tonight, when informed the Vice President of the United States had expressed bitter resentment of DIES' statement today criticizing certain members of the Economic Warfare Board's staff.
>
> Representative DIES, resting at his ranch in Jasper, broke into laughter as he commented: "Now doesn't that sound exactly like WALLACE? He just can't take it. I mean he can't take the truth about the birds that fly around his roost."

Does not that show that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] must have known about the release of that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I assume that the chairman knew about the release of it, but my answer to the gentleman's question is true; I do not know about the circumstances of its release, from personal knowledge.

I would like to be allowed to proceed now until I finish my statement.

It seems to me it is perfectly obvious that the effort of a committee of this kind should be to correct things and not to try cases in the press, at least until it has failed to secure correction that in the judgment of the whole committee is needed. I want to give you one example, because one of the men whose names appeared on that list called me up today. I do not know him. I never heard of him before. But I think it is only fair to say what I am told about this man.

He is a Kentuckian by birth. He came to Washington, I am told, directly from the Irving Trust Co., of No. 1 Wall Street, New York, to become the head administrative officer of the Board of Economic Warfare. He is an active member of the Methodist Church. He is a member of the Society for the Advancement of Management, more popularly known as the Taylor Society, which consists of 1,200 manufacturing, merchandising, industrial, and mechanical engineers, and contains such members as Mr. Walter Fuller, the publisher, and a number of other people. He is also a member of the Society for Personnel Administration. He denies absolutely that he ever had anything to do with the League for Peace and Democracy.

All I need to say is that before a thing like this was done, if there was any reason the committee had to suspect this man, he should have been called before the committee, along with everybody else, and there should have been a hearing on the matter to determine what was basically true, instead of an ex parte trial, because it is a trial in times like these.

After that hearing was held, I think there should have been a check with the

F. B. I. and the Civil Service Commission to find out whether they had already made an investigation. After that had been done, I think there should have been a report to the head of the agency. If the committee had found that there was substantial evidence against anybody and the agency then refused to act, then I as a member of the committee, along with the rest of the members of the committee, would be quite willing to take some public stand about the matter; but not until those things had been done. I have been contending for these things for a long time. So far it has not made much difference, and I want to say further that because a man is a progressive in his views we cannot condemn him or else we have lost all that America has stood for through the years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have voted consistently for the creation and the continuance of the so-called Dies committee. I do feel, however, as the gentleman feels, that the work of this committee will be nullified if proper procedure is not carried out in the future.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

The name of the man I have been speaking about is David Vaughn. I should say that in justice to him. There is another man on that list by the name of Sigmund Timberg, who I personally am certain is not a Communist at all. I do not know whether or not he had anything to do with the League for Peace and Democracy, but I do know that by the very definition of an organization being defined as a Communist-front organization, one of the purposes of it is to involve in it people who are not Communists. Until you have investigated a man individually and found out what the truth is about him, I do not think you have the right to make public accusations.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I was not here when the gentleman began his remarks, but do I understand that this letter which was written to the Vice President was sent without the knowledge of other members of the committee or without previous consultation among the members of the committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. Not only that, but after I personally had said I believed anything about this matter should be put in usable form so an attempt could be made to bring it to the attention of the head of the department or organization with a view to finding out the facts and getting whatever action was called for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Is the letter which was written in this case simply based upon a report which some investigator for the committee may have made to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; that is substantially correct. It is not even, necessarily, the work of any investigator. It is a comparison of a list of people who are working for a certain Government agency with a list of people who belong to a certain organization which organization was found—after considerable investigation by the committee—to be an organization that was under the domination of Communists. But I may say that there were in every case of such an organization a great many people who were not only not Communists, but enemies of Communists who were sucked into it. Just as was the case with certain organizations whose work played directly into the hands of the Nazis but where the average person who attended its meetings was only anxious to keep America out of war or something like that. I do not know about the particular case but I do say it is not fair to make an accusation until the facts are determined. As a member of the committee I want to have something to say about such things.

Mr. HOPE. I want to say that I am certainly in entire accord with the gentleman's position, and I hope his attitude and viewpoint will prevail in any further activities of the committee.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. I would like to give a personal illustration. A short time ago it was brought to my attention that Mr. George Deatheredge was working on a naval contract in a rather high position down here at Norfolk, Va. Mr. Deatheredge had been before the Dies committee and had given testimony which indicated his extreme sympathy with fascism and with Hitler and the things he was trying to do. Even in that case, although from my own standpoint there was a situation that certainly ought not to be allowed to continue, I preferred instead of getting up on the floor sometime and making a big speech about it, to call up Naval Intelligence and the committee and have them go into it and find out what the situation was first. The result finally was that the Navy Department required his dismissal from that job. I do not care whether anybody knows that JERRY VOORHIS had anything to do with it or not, the important thing is that we attempt sincerely to make corrections where correction is called for in our Government or anywhere else and to do it in the most orderly way we can and not to cause a misconception on the part of the people of the United States about what the real, substantial situation is with regard to our Government.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to say to the gentleman that David Vaughn—I presume one of the parties that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has mentioned—married a girl in my home town. In connection with the statement that the gentleman makes, the point I cannot understand is that, if there is anything wrong with a man in the beginning, why the departments employ him and then expect the Dies committee or some other committee to come along and report on his character and then they, of course, will discharge him. Why is it not done in the first instance? I have implicit confidence in Mr. Vaughn, and I do not have reference to him, but I cannot understand why they do not make sufficient investigation in the beginning.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would say that I think the department should make a very thorough investigation, and I would say further that my understanding is that the F. B. I. at present is making a complete investigation of the whole Government personnel. Inevitably, it is going to be brought forth from time to time that in every institution of the human race you are going to have somebody that is not going to be just what he ought to be. I mean, for example, you have businesses where you have people in positions in America who are favorable to fascism or nazi-ism. Sometimes there are people in the labor movement who do not belong there. You have people everywhere who do not belong there, perhaps, from the standpoint of some of the rest of us. But let me say that right now the biggest question is this: Is a man for or against the United States in this war? At the moment that is the all-important question.

Mr. NORRELL. I do see little possibility of doubt with reference to this man Parmelee, because it is well known he did write a book on nudism, and we saw it on the floor of the House here.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it is almost tragic—regardless of other factors in the situation—that we must now go through a long period when people are going to think their Government is full of nudists. I would say that I do not think any agency of government should leave itself open to such a thing. I would like to make it plain here that I am talking about the procedure by which these matters ought to be handled. I think they ought to be handled in the way I have spoken about here today, and I do not think a situation ought to occur where it is not true that every member of this committee is informed as to just why a certain statement is made and what all the evidence in regard to it is, so that instead of a member being in the position in which I find myself, he would in all cases have had opportunity to pass upon the evidence and could therefore take a portion of the responsibility.

Mr. NORRELL. I think the gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, here is the point: Supposing this House votes the appropriation which the Dies committee asks, which it has not yet done

up to date. The gentleman, of course, is complaining, and rightfully so, and I fully realize and appreciate the gentleman's position, but the gentleman, after all, is a member of this committee. We are going to spend $300,000 of the taxpayers' money. Some of the members of this committee will object to the procedure that has been followed. They have objected to it, but we want more than mere objection in fact. My thought is this, that the gentleman as a member of the committee owes the House this obligation, that if that committee does not carry on in the manner in which it should carry on, according to the judgment of the gentleman, that it is the gentleman's duty to bring a resolution before the House reciting the fact and making a recommendation and let the House find out what the situation is. I think the gentleman ought to do that in justness and fairness to the House, if that appropriation is voted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In answer to the gentleman I will say that I will do the best I can, as I have tried to do heretofore.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. Does the gentleman as a member of this committee know whether there is any cooperation between the several investigative divisions of the Government that have to do with the employment of Government employees, such as the civil service, the investigative department of the Treasury, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question. One of the reasons why I spoke in favor of the Dies committee resolution, when it came on the floor, was because I am informed that these other agencies are constantly making use of the material the Dies committee has in connection with their work.

I am frank to say that I do not think there has ever been as much cooperation as there ought to be, and I have tried my best to encourage better cooperation. I do not know that there is any particular lack of cooperation, except that I have at times felt that there was some tendency on the part of different agencies to be rather anxious to be the ones most in the public eye, perhaps.

Mr. DEWEY. If a man is to be employed, and his name is certified to the Civil Service Commission, is there no requirement on the part of the Commission to ascertain if any doubt exists as to a man's integrity in the Treasury or the F. B. I. about the desirability of the man being employed?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Congress, as I understand it, has written into the law in most appropriation bills a requirement to that effect.

Mr. DEWEY. I think it would be worth-while to investigate that, because during the hearings on the price-control bill, when there were certain questions in respect to certain employees, I investigated the matter personally, and I found there was no cooperation between the investigative department of the Treasury, the Civil Service Commission, and the F. B. I.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think there ought to be, and I think anybody in the position of hiring Government people to work in any of these agencies should be scrupulously careful about this matter in the first place.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. The testimony before the Committee on Appropriations has been that at the present time there is a very careful investigation of everyone.

Mr VOORHIS of California. That has been my understanding. I thank the gentleman very much for that contribution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has pointed out that which I think we all recognize, that it is not proper procedure if matters are as stated by the gentleman from California. The gentleman is a member of the committee. The committee always functions through a majority. This same matter about giving out publicity without consent of the committee has been discussed by the House and in the committee and was up before the Rules Committee before this extension was reported favorably. I am wondering if the gentleman from California has done anything in committee about having the committee function as he thinks it should function?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that when the committee was continued 2 years ago the gentleman offered a motion to have those rules applied, and the motion was voted down.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I am getting at. Has a resolution been offered in the committee by a member of the committee to the committee, outlining the procedure by which the committee is to be governed and releases announced?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman the committee has not met since it has been continued this last time, so there has been no opportunity. But I certainly propose to offer such a resolution as soon as the committee meets for the purpose of organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent opportunity and an excellent place in the RECORD for a few words with reference to the appropriation for the Dies committee. I think the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] mentioned $300,000 this morning as the proposed appropriation.

When the House extended the life of the Dies committee, as is the usual policy of the Committee on Accounts, I endeavored to contact the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. For 2 days I could get no information as to his whereabouts. On the third day I was advised the gentleman had gone to Texas. I left word that it was the policy of the Accounts Committee to require the chairman to appear before the committee and make an accounting of his stewardship with reference to the expenditure of funds that had been at his disposal, and I felt obligated to carry out that procedure in the future. I asked that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] be so advised and that I be informed when he was coming back. I have not heard from the gentleman from Texas, and I have not called a meeting of the committee. I did call a meeting of the committee for the Wednesday following the passage of that resolution; and when I found out that the gentleman from Texas was not in the city, I called the meeting off. I did not send the letters out. If the gentleman from Texas is not coming back, I feel he should notify the Committee on Accounts and detail such members of his committee as he desires to appear before the Committee on Accounts with reference to the appropriation.

I have repeatedly kept the Dies committee advised as to the amount that was to its credit. The last time I advised Mr. Dies there was $6,000 to the credit of the committee. I am frank to say if they are spending money at the rate they have previously spent it, that money is not going to be sufficient to pay the March salaries, let alone the expense vouchers which have not as yet come through for a number of weeks. So they must be piling up.

Newspapermen are continually calling me over the telephone wanting to know how much money they are going to get and when they are going to get it. Therefore I want the RECORD to show now, as there seems to be a gentlemen's agreement that we will not have any important business transacted for the next 2 weeks, it is my purpose to call a meeting of the Committee on Accounts 2 weeks from tomorrow. By that time I feel the Members will all be here and we can have a hearing and come to some conclusion as to the amount to be appropriated. If the committee orders a report I will bring the resolution to the floor April 15.

The life of the committee, of course, expires next January. As far as I am concerned, no set amount has been agreed upon. The committee will determine the amount. We always try to hold the appropriations down.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman said I was giving away $300,000. Is it not a fact that this committee asked for $300,000 in the resolution, or did they not ask the Congress for $300,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. They never asked the Committee on Accounts for any $300,000. No such resolution is before the Accounts Committee at this time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not generally known that they wanted $300,000, but that you cut it down to $100,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. They did not ask me for any $300,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But is that not generally known?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not believe all the rumors I hear.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the gentleman knows that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know it. I read in the papers on one occasion where a million dollars was suggested.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say, particularly in view of the speech I just made, that it is my understanding the reason the chairman is absent from the city is because of the illness of his mother. I feel that should be understood.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am very glad the gentleman tells me that. Certainly that is justification for any Member to be absent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn;

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider;

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman;

H. R. 5784. An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, to create The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, and further to define the powers of a district judge in certain suits.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn;

H. R. 5290 An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider;

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman;

H. R. 5784. An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, to create he Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, and further to define the powers of a district judge in certain suits.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 31, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on the following bills on Thursday, April 2, 1942, at 10 a. m., room 346 House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes;

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; and

H. R. 6702, to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1540. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Thirty-second Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America (H. Doc. No. 517); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1541. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the Unitied States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1542. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on the Knife River Harbor, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 4, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 686); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 6880. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6881. A bill amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to include provisions relating to inflationary wage and salary increases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6882. A bill limiting the profits which may be derived from contracts with the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6883. A bill to provide that World War veterans serving in the land or naval forces during the present war shall be given the highest rank, grade, or rating held by them during the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 6884. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARNES:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution for the right of men in service to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2635. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor of Ridgeland and a mass meeting of Jasper County, S. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to all-out war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2636. Also, petition of the Norfolk Council of the American Legion, Norfolk, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a continental defense force for the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, whose devoted children we are, continue, we pray, Thy long enduring, Thy striving with us, till at length, ceasing to be Thy burden, we become Thy rest and joy. Give to us faith in the greatness of man; faith in the things that are within, of which Thou art the source and the center; faith in the eternal kingdom of justice and love, that we may cherish those instincts of heart that constrain us to prayer, that speak of a hidden world with a light beyond and constantly avouch a Fatherhood divine.

And now we bless Thee for the power of goodness that still remaineth in us, for the Spirit from above that ceaseth not to strive against our flesh; we bless Thee for the men whose quiet thought and effort do gradually prevail o'er the noisy clamor of the crowd, and for the hearts that burn with holy zeal while

multitudes sit down to eat and drink and play. Do Thou grant us that wisdom acquired from the humiliation of defeat, the resolution always to be true by refusing to entertain in our minds any unworthy or distracting thoughts that may seek entrance there, that we in all things may worthily magnify Thy holy Name, through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 30, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a judicial nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2339) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the Allied Forces of the United States during the first or second World War, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brooks	Hughes	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bunker	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
George	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I anncunce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House Resolution 38

"Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to suspend 40-hour week for duration of national emergency

"Whereas the totalitarian powers, with a decided purpose to destroy democracy through the world in order to establish a regime of violence and oppression, have extended their devastating war to the American hemisphere; and

"Whereas after the brutal and ruthless attack on the naval base of Pearl Harbor and the Philippine Islands the Congress of the United States declared the existence of a state of war with totalitarian powers; and

"Whereas in the present conflict, which at this time already includes all the nations of the earth, the fate of democracy in the world is involved, and all free nations being bound in common effort to insure its subsistence in order to save with it the conquests of civilization, the spiritual values of humanity, and the right of man to liberty, security, and peace; and

"Whereas the people of America are ready to make the utmost contribution of men and effort and to suffer whatever sacrifices may be necessary in order to defeat totalitarian powers definitely and permanently; and

"Whereas the youth of America, comprising our armed forces now engaged in life and death struggle with the enemy, are in desperate need of the arms and munitions of war with which to bring about our complete victory; and

"Whereas the 40-hour workweek is impeding the manufacture of such arms and munitions necessary for our armed forces to defend our country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, That we urge the Congress of the United States to take immediate and vigorous action to suspend present 40-hour-week law for the duration of national emergency; that no extra rate of pay be made for overtime work, and by limiting the profits of all national defense industries to 6 percent: *Provided, further,* That on all negotiated contracts for construction of camps, cantonments, and other defense projects that profits of not more than 1 percent shall be paid to those who are awarded the contracts; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States Congress and to the President of the United States."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A telegram embodying resolutions adopted by the Crawford County Medical Society, Pittsburg, Kans., favoring full and prompt mass production of all war materials and the elimination of all barriers, whether individual or group, which may interfere with the maximum production of such materials for the war effort; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the alleged destruction by governmental order of 2,000,000 acres of wheat in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Dickinson County, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation which may propose to restrict the sale of beer around military camps, stations, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—MEMORIALS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask consent to present sundry memorials signed by numerous citizens of Wisconsin. I ask that the body of one of the memorials, all of which are identical, may be printed in the RECORD, and that the memorials be appropriately disposed of.

There being no objection, the memorials were ordered to lie on the table and the body of one of the memorials, without the signatures attached thereto, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas certain bills (notably S. 860 and H. R. 4000) have been introduced into Congress, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; and

Whereas military authorities now possess all necessary power to control the sale of alcoholic beverages to members of the land and naval forces; and

Whereas certain sections of these bills are, we believe, unconstitutional; and

Whereas the control of alcoholic beverages and the control of prostitution are unrelated, and therefore ought not to be combined in one piece of legislation; and

Whereas we believe the enactment of these bills into law would establish an unwise and dangerous precedent, and would be opposed to the general welfare of citizens of the several States and obstructive to the common defense of the United States:

We the undersigned, citizens of Wisconsin, respectfully request that these bills be reported unfavorably.

NECESSITY OF SUPREME EFFORT IN WAR PRODUCTION—VIEWS OF CRAWFORD COUNTY (KANS.) MEDICAL SOCIETY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Crawford County Medical Society, Pittsburg, Kans. I desire to read the telegram and afterward to comment on it briefly. The telegram is as follows:

MARCH 27, 1942.

HON. CLYDE REED,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

The Crawford County Medical Society, Pittsburg, Kans., in regular meeting, with a membership of 53 doctors, and 100 percent of the doctors in Crawford County, Kans., wish to express to you our views and opinions relative to the effort necessary for prompt mass production of war materials.

We think we can justly expect you, by reason of your official position, to aid in providing laws to prevent excessive profit to

manufacturers engaged in producing war materials, whose greed and avarice excel their patriotic duties.

We think you should aid in legislation to insure labor a fair wage and working conditions, but should also include in such legislation penalty for suspensions, strikes, and "slow ups" in defense industries; and since the wage-hour law was a peacetime measure and we are now at war, this law should be suspended during the emergency.

We think a union card should not be necessary for employment in any defense industry; this is war; such practice in peacetime may be permissible; in preparation for war it is detrimental A union card has not been deemed necessary to procure admission to the Army or Navy.

We think Government officials or officers who negotiate contracts with industry, permitting excessive profit, should be punished by law and punished now.

We think all social and economic gains sought or attained in time of peace are of secondary importance, if such gains are incompatible with all-out mass production, and that no one individual or group of persons should be permitted to interfere with maximum production.

We think the above views expressed are those felt by the great majority of persons in this particular section of the State, and that these opinions have been formed by us and others from official reports, military and civil, from reading, and from mediation, and that they have not been influenced in any way by any chamber of commerce, organized labor, manufacturers' associations, or political affiliations.

CRAWFORD COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY OF KANSAS,
C. D. BELL, M. D., *Secretary.*

I offer this for the RECORD, Mr. President, because of what has been said about the thousands of letters and telegrams which are coming to all Members of the Senate being instigated by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, or some other organization of the kind. This telegram presents the clearest statement I have had from any source. I think it reflects fairly the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the people in my section of the United States toward the necessity of full speed ahead in war production.

These people are exercising their right of petition. They are impatient; there is a bitter feeling running through much of the correspondence we receive. But, after all, these writers are expressing their earnest desire that we proceed with all-out production without regard to any minority group, whether it be of capital or whether it be of labor. The tone of their telegrams and letters is not, perhaps, always one of patience, but, again, they are not only within their rights but are rendering a needed public service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5962. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 1231); and

H. R. 6166. A bill to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1603. A bill to provide for the extension of banking facilities at military reservations and at navy yards and stations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2416. A bill providing for the transfer to the reclamation fund, and waiving of interest upon, Government-owned bonds, notes, and other obligations of drainage, irrigation, and reclamation districts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 2417. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2418. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on Indian lands, and for other purposes; and

S. 2419. A bill relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2420. A bill for the relief of Isabelle Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2421. A bill relating to the military status of the members of a certain company of the Florida State troops during the War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2422. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy; and

S. 2423. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2424. A bill for the relief of Dr. B. M. Chambers and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2425. A bill to provide for suspending the operation of provisions of law designating or recognizing any day to be a holiday, except insofar as such provisions apply to the day known and celebrated as Christmas Day, until the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced Senate bill 2426, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a bill (H. R. 6641) to amend the act entiled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937, is pending before the Committee on Commerce. A similar Senate bill is pending before the Committee on Naval Affairs, in fact, a hearing has been held on the bill by the Committee on Naval Affairs. I ask that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made.

PREFERENCE RATINGS FOR DELIVERIES OF MATERIALS FOR MINING ENTERPRISES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, on March 25, legislative day of March 5, Senate Resolution 232 was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This resolution was originally introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. After consulting with him this morning we agreed that it should be referred to the Special Silver Committee, which was created on August 16, 1935. At the present time three of the original members of that committee are still in the Senate. I ask that the Committee on Mines and Mining be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Senate Special Silver Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made.

DEVELOPMENT OF MEANS TO INCREASE AIR-MINDEDNESS OF AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, yesterday I directed a letter of inquiry to Hon. Arthur Cutts Willard, the president of the University of Illinois; also letters to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce, to get their views as to the possibility of developing at our State university not only an air field but a research laboratory to utilize the facilities, the students and the inquiring genius of the staff to develop information and train student pilots.

Everywhere in our country today we are darkening the windows under penalty in order to provide against raids from the air by enemy planes. In every office, every elevator, every room in the Government buildings of this great Capital, there is a warning and a direction sign as to what we shall do when the air raid comes.

The lessons of this war have taught us that aviation is a leading and vital element in every war maneuver. The disaster of Pearl Harbor was a demonstration of sudden deadly attack from the air. In this morning's newspaper we saw pictures vividly portraying the demolished hospital at Corregidor, pictures of the demolished house in which General MacArthur lived, pictures of the demolished officers' quarters on Corregidor, the devastated streets and the burning harbor at the Cavite Naval Base during the raid on Manila. The scenes of our sunken or burning battleships and our great bombing and pursuit planes destroyed on the ground at Pearl Harbor present a devastating reminder of the power of attack from the air.

America has finally awakened to the reality and the necessity of fast-moving, mechanized forces on land, on the sea, and in the air. We are undertaking to transform an automobile industry into an aviation industry five to six times as large as the automobile industry that preceded it, and this is to be done by denying our people automobiles in the future, or tire and parts for those they now possess.

We are moving with rapid speed to the production lines of tanks, and from a nation that built practically no ships we are undertaking the job of building more ships than any country in the world.

This war may be the longest war in history—certainly it is the most difficult for the United States to conduct of any war in which we have ever engaged. The lines of supply to Iceland, Ireland, Africa, South America, Australia, Alaska reach in every direction from two to eight thousand miles. We must develop and maintain those supply lines, but certainly we know that our ships are not safe in the presence nor within the reach of land based airplanes at the end of the journey.

Our battleships are not effective, our transports are insecure unless the sky above them is protected and dominated. And equally important, our troops cannot proceed without the overwhelming command of the sky above them, flying ahead of them on these foreign shores spreading to the far corners of the earth.

That means one thing. It means young and courageous and intelligent and educated men to man these ships, these tanks and these planes in the sky.

Our leading industrialists are already developing the greatest production and assembly lines ever known to mankind to turn out the finest planes in record time.

Surely we have learned the bitter lesson, that the finest planes on earth are no good if they are destroyed on the ground. I propose that the Senate create a special committee to investigate and to advocate methods of elementary training to be conducted and made available in every high school in the land, additional educational facilities to be provided in the cities and communities of the Nation, and through which every great university be requested and encouraged to develop a research staff for the development and encouragement of aviation and pilots.

The American boys have an advantage. Millions of them knew how to drive automobiles. Hundreds of thousands were experienced veterans in the plowing of the fields and the harvesting of the grain with huge and powerful tractors, and every boy that has plowed a field, climbed a hill, crossed a valley with a tractor is a partially educated boy for the mechanized machinery of war that travels on the ground. Every normal boy can handle that kind of a machine, but it takes the finest of eyesight and hearing, steady nerves, and sturdy bodies to pilot a ship 400 miles an hour through the air. It is like putting a young man inside a steel jacketed bullet and sending him to travel at a speed unheard of before.

The experience of every aviation school in eliminating vast numbers who are less capable has proven that the bottleneck tomorrow will be the lack of experienced, trained pilots. We can talk about training pilots in a few months, but for the master ships it takes 2 years of intensive training thoroughly to equip men to fly to victory against an armed flying enemy in the varied atmospheric and climatic conditions throughout the world. Information, advance study, preliminary opportunity should be made available in every educational institution in the country, for aviation will be not only a leading essential element in winning this war, but aviation will determine the future of the world.

Instead of training our boys to goosestep on the ground, let us train them to fly like the eagles in the sky, flying for American liberty. Now is the time—not tomorrow, not next year—but now is the time for the Senate of the United States to take the lead in encouraging this essential training of the youth of our country before they reach the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

Our whole national course was changed by the sinking of our ships and the sinking of our dominance of the Pacific at Pearl Harbor. While we black out our windows and hide in the darkness in our cities of this land of free men, let us know at least that we are doing everything that it is possible to do to encourage, to educate, to develop the finest flyers in the world, to clear the sky not only over our homes but over the soldiers and the sailors that represent America at the future far-flung battle lines of this war.

The Panama Canal and the Sault Ste. Marie Canal are not safe unless we control the sky above them. The great cities of our country, the great railroad centers, the great railroad bridges, the great airplane factories, the great tank and munitions factories are not safe in America unless we can control the sky above them. Our tankers and our sailors burning in oil within sight of our shore furnish tragic evidence of our lack of protection and detection in the air. Whether it is for war or the future leadership of the peace of the world, aviation will either darken or lighten the sky above free men.

We have heard much talk about erecting a great building for the dissemination of figures and facts about our Government. We had better devote a large portion of that building, with the cooperation of every existing department of our vast Government, to developing air education and dissemination of information and facts so that the dream of every boy to be a pilot, a flyer, a guardian of the skies of liberty may have the advanced aid of his Government. Let us air mind the youth of America, and aid the youth of America to clear the skies, rather than to order our citizens to hide in darkness.

I emphasize again, this immediate education and development of it in every school and community in the land should be encouraged with the greatest possible speed and dispatch.

We owe it to the youth of our country. We owe it to ourselves.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution for the appointment of a special committee and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate, and that it be immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 233), as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete inquiry and study with respect to (1) the adequacy of the facilities available for the training of air pilots, ground crews, and other necessary personnel to operate, maintain, and service aircraft for the military and naval forces of the United States, (2) the adequacy of the present program for the training of such air pilots, ground crews, and other necessary personnel, (3) any action which might be taken by the legislative or the executive branches of the Government in the interest of facilitating the training of an adequate number of air pilots, ground crews, and other necessary personnel to operate, maintain, and service the aircraft now being produced and to be produced for the military and naval forces of the United States, and (4) the extent to which the facilities of the colleges, universities, and other institutions of learning in the United States are being used, and might be used, for the purpose of training such air pilots, ground crews, and other necessary personnel. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its inquiry and study together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings in open or executive sessions, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has asked for immediate consideration of his resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity even to hear the text of the resolution. It seems to me that a resolution of such length ought not to be considered without reference to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BROWN

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the Langer case, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOTTO: REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR!—UNIQUE MONEY-RAISING PLAN FROM EWING, TEX., TO HELP UNCLE SAM

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of Senators for just a moment to the beautiful hand-made motto hanging on the wall of the Senate Chamber, which reads "Remember Pearl Harbor!" This motto was sent to me by some of the good people in Texas who have originated a unique plan for raising money to help Uncle Sam. I believe I can best explain the idea by

reading the letter which came with the motto.

The letter comes from Hans Weber, store manager of the Angelina Hardwood Co., at Ewing, Tex., and reads as follows:

EWING, TEX., *March 18, 1942.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed with this letter is a money order for $45, which is to be used as a donation for national defense. The money was collected by a method which I think should be used as a Nation-wide campaign. For this reason I am also sending to you the board, etc., which will give you the complete information as to how and when the money was collected. For your information, I should like to give you some details.

I am store manager for the Angelina Hardwood Co. at Ewing, Tex.

The board, with marked holes, was placed on our counter, and within 4 days the tacks were sold for 10 and 25 cents each. About 75 percent of the town population responded cheerfully.

I discussed this matter with Mr. E. L. Kurth, president of the Angelina Hardwood Co., and he, too, was of the opinion that the idea should be adopted as a Nation-wide campaign, with a national organization acting as sponsor.

Similar signs, with varied national slogans, could be placed in all schools, colleges, and other public places. Also the donations could be varied from 5 cents up to $5 a tack or more. After a sign is finished, the money could be collected through sponsoring organizations, and the sign becomes the property of the school or the business place as a memorial for years to come.

To protect this method against mishandling, each sign should have a mark of approval on it, and each giver should register in a book attached to the sign the amount he or she has donated.

Again, I should like to inform you that, according to the response at my little home town, Ewing, this idea will continually bring in donations from all parts of the country. I should like to quote you a little slogan of my own which could possibly be used to advertise and encourage the people, especially boys and girls in schools and colleges:

"The way to help our fighting men is to give some money to Uncle Sam; deny yourself some pleasures and funs in order to help our fighting sons."

As a citizen of Angelina County and of the State of Texas, I will appreciate it very much if you will present and outline the whole matter to our honorable President in order to make this Nation-wide campaign come true.

According to my opinion, the American Legion should be the best-fitted organization to sponsor the drive.

I will be very glad to devote my entire time to help put this program over, if necessary.

After you have looked into the matter thoroughly, I would appreciate it very much if you will return the sign to me.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

HANS WEBER,
Store Manager, Angelina Hardwood Co.

Mr. President, with this letter is a money order for $45, made payable to me. I have endorsed it to the Treasurer of the United States. This may be a small amount, but, nevertheless, it is cash money, and comes from a small town—a town of perhaps 50 population. If the idea were spread over the entire Nation it would bring in a large amount of money. It is not money with which to buy Defense bonds. It is money which the citizens of that small town have donated to Uncle Sam to go into the Treasury to help take care of the enormous expense the Government is incurring in the prosecution of the war.

I brought this motto with me today in order that Senators might see it and become acquainted with the idea, in case they have any means of transmitting the plan to the people in other sections of the country. It might prove to be a very good thing.

REPORT ON TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION AND PLANS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, yesterday during the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there was no objection, Senate Resolution 228 was agreed to. I was absent from the Chamber in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations at the time. I had intended to offer to the resolution an amendment which was satisfactory to the author of the measure. I therefore ask that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY What is the resolution to which the Senator refers?

Mr. McCARRAN. A resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] providing for an investigation with reference to certain activities of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I now offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 10, after the word "rate", it is proposed to insert "(including the steps the Board contemplates taking with respect to the issuance under section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, of certificates to air carriers who were not engaged in air transportation on the date of enactment of such act)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EQUALIZATION OF PAY RATES OF ARMY, NAVY, PHILIPPINE SCOUTS, AND PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH ARMY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill (S. 2387) to authorize the Secretary of War to equalize the rates of pay of the personnel of the Philippine Scouts, the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes. The authority given in the bill to the Secretary of War is desired by the Secretary of the Navy in cases where there can be a readjustment of the pay of citizens of the Philippine Islands who are in the Navy. Under the present law they are paid only one-half as much as is paid persons who are American citizens doing corresponding work in the Navy.

I ask that the vote by which the bill was read the third time and passed be reconsidered. Then I will ask that the amendment I have sent to the desk be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reconsideration of the vote whereby the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I now submit the amendment which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The first sentence of paragraph 3 of section 10 of the act approved June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 630; 37 U. S. C. 16), is hereby amended by adding the following proviso at the end thereof: "*Provided*, That in time of war the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to increase such rates of pay not to exceed those prescribed in paragraph 1 of section 10 of said act for enlisted men in corresponding ratings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Navy, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes."

CAPITOL CITY LODGE, NO. 354, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS—CONTRIBUTION TO WAR EFFORT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, under date of March 28 I received a letter from Mr. Peter Tracy, of Hartford, Conn., who is secretary of the Capitol City Lodge of the International Association of Machinists. It is a most interesting letter, it seems to me, and, since it reflects something of the poignancy and the ambitions and the thinking of defense workers in the serious crisis confronting the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in full in the RECORD. I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
CAPITOL CITY LODGE, NO. 354,
Hartford, Conn., March 28, 1942.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Eleven months ago, upon the request of our employers, we increased our working hours from 40 per week to 50 per week. Three months ago, upon the plea that more working hours were necessary to win the war, we decided to work 9 hours on Saturdays. This brought us up to a 59-hour week.

We are paid time and one-half for all over 8 hours per day and for all time worked on Saturdays. This gives us an extra hour's pay for each 10-hour day and 4½ hours' extra pay for working on Saturdays—a little better than a 16-percent bonus for whatever we have taken out of ourselves and put into our job.

Something does come out of us. From July 1, 1941, up to March 21, 1942, 53 members of our group reporting unemployment because of sickness lost 1,559 days. May God grant that will be their only loss; that they will regain their health and return to their jobs in defense of home and country.

This is not a new experience for us. Nearly all of our group were at it 25 years ago—some right here on the war-production line, and

a great many others "over there" in the depth of humanity's wasted purgatory.

We pledge our all that the present effort shall not be wasted, that our country shall win this war, and that brotherhood, not greed, shall rule.

We hope and pray that the Congress will spare us the added burden of fighting some selfish employers, who are seeking achievement of their own special gains and inspiration to such ends through the repeal of humane labor laws.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PETER TRACY, *Secretary.*

THE EARLY OPENING OF GREAT LAKES TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a matter which should be of great interest to all. We hear much criticism today that certain people and organizations fail to contribute their energy and activity to the war effort, so that when I learn of a fine task accomplished by cooperation of private business and Government, as has happened in the Great Lakes region recently in iron-ore transportation, I feel impelled to refer to it briefly.

The Great Lakes are closed by heavy ice from 3 to 4 months of the year. The Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. steamer *Sheadle* broke through the ice jam this year about 2 weeks earlier than was ever done before in this century. That means that we will bring down from two to five million tons more of iron ore than we would with an average opening date. This means that the bombers and the bombs, the ships, and munitions, whose construction and manufacture are dependent upon this ore transportation, will be completed that much earlier.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., one of the old historic companies of the Lakes; I wish to congratulate Captain Hayward, of Detroit, and his valiant crew in thus opening up the transportation of this vital artery so much earlier this year than usual; and also I commend the Lake Carriers Association. I want to thank the Coast Guard, the Michigan State Highway Department, which loaned its great ice crusher, the steamer *St. Marie*, and her Capt. Paddy Brown and his crew. All contributed to this result.

Mr. President, we in the Senate have little conception of the importance of this great artery of trade, and I take this opportunity of thus calling to the attention of the Senate the earliest opening of Great Lakes trade in the last 40 years.

UNITY IN THE WAR PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have a high respect for the leader of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], but I emphatically disagree with him in the statements which he made on the floor of the Senate yesterday to the effect that a full and frank discussion of the labor situation, as affecting our national preparedness program, would disturb our national unity. To the contrary, I believe that a national labor policy adopted by Congress would do much to unite the people of America in the common effort and the common sacrifice which we must make to win this war. We should frankly face the fact that today there exists in America, in this very critical hour, more disunity as to the progress of our military preparedness, more conflicting opinions, and a greater criticism of all branches of our Government than has heretofore existed since perhaps the very formation of our Republic. We are united, thank God, in our determination to win the war regardless of the cost. Our very existence as free people depends upon our victory. After all, this is a democracy, and we are fighting to preserve our democratic institutions of government, our freedom of speech, and freedom of expression. There exists today throughout the length and breadth of America, in the mountains and in the valleys, on the seashores and on the plains, an aroused and militant demand that this Nation shall be stripped for action and victory, and that every single obstacle to the attainment of victory shall be eliminated from our public and private lives. This sentiment, which comes from the very grass roots of our Nation, is to me one of the most hopeful signs that the people back home are aroused to our perils and are demanding that we in Washington do what may be necessary to place this country on a 100 percent war basis. Any effort to suppress a free discussion of these vital matters, or any effort on the part of the Senate to prevent full consideration of the measures which the people back home believe essential to our victory, would merely add to the disunity which now exists and to the criticism of governmental actions or lack of action by those back home. I do not make this statement in connection with our distinguished leader, who has never endeavored to suppress any discussion in the Senate.

After all, it is the people back home who will fight and win this war. Washington may lose the war, but those who will fight and die to preserve the liberty of America will come from every section of our great country and from every class of our population.

When the people back home hear that they have been branded as sixth columnists because of their efforts to increase the production of vital war materials and remove any and all barriers which exist to winning the war, such statements merely add to the disunity and to the criticism. As I understand, a sixth columnist is interpreted to mean one who aids the fifth columnists. Certainly, those in America who want to win this war and who want a more successful and vigorous prosecution of the war than has heretofore been the case cannot be classified as giving aid and encouragement to the fifth columnists, which is a term applied to those who are disloyal to this country, and who are aiding the enemy.

Full-page advertisements are being published headed, "Beware the sixth column"; and by implication, if not by direct statement, the body of the advertisement charges that those who are pursuing their constitutional right to advocate changes in our laws are sixth columnists. These advertisements are being paid for by one of the Nation's largest labor unions. On the same day that the talk of sixth columnists started in Washington, the greatest modern American hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, said in Australia:

> One cannot wage war under present conditions without the support of public opinion, which is tremendously molded by the press and other propaganda forces. Men will not fight and die without knowing what they are fighting and dying for. The care with which the enemy keeps the truth from his people and tries to incline their minds toward certain channels and to implant certain ideas shows the weight he lays upon it. In the democracies it is essential that the public should know the truth.

The sooner we in Washington, the representatives of the people, appreciate the firm determination of those we represent to remove any and all obstacles to an early victory the sooner the disunity about which we have heard so much will disappear.

The people back home are not asking a great deal of Congress. They are merely asking that if the 40-hour week interferes with production it be repealed; that if the constant bickerings between capital and labor interfere with production, they be stopped. They are saying that strikes in defense industries, even for 1 day, will not be tolerated; they are demanding that extortionate profits by those who have war contracts not be permitted; that all the frills and activities not essential to the war be dropped for the period of the emergency.

The people of America were shocked at the tragic reverses in the Pacific, and now are aware of the fact that the reverses were, in large part, at least, occasioned by lack of adequate preparedness; by the failure in the months preceding Pearl Harbor to do the things necessary to our national defense; to prevent strikes in defense industries; the failure to appoint a single head of our war production effort; and to end the fantastic confusion which existed in Washington after the fall of France, which tragic event was a warning in unmistakable terms that this Nation must be prepared to defend its liberties.

The Nation was amazed by the recent speech made by Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, who said that we are now operating on only a 50-percent war production basis, when, on practically the same day, Sir Stafford Cripps said in England that after more than 2½ years of war, when millions of their able-bodied men were engaged in war, Germany had reached the highest level of its war production.

Instead of condemning those back home who have exercised their constitutional privilege of communicating with their elected representatives in the effort to remove any and all obstacles to the successful prosecution of the war, I think that those citizens deserve the commendation and the approval of all America. At least, they have shown that they are not complacent; that they are not living in a fool's paradise, as has so often been stated by officials of our Government. This is a healthy sign, and shows that the people are deeply concerned. It shows that they want to win this war; it shows that they are willing to make the sacrifices to do so; it shows that they

intend to control their own Government and to lead it along the path of a more vigorous and successful prosecution of the war, which is possible only by tremendously increasing our present production of military equipment.

Of course, I know that there have been some misunderstandings and misinformation on both sides. There are those who contend that our present war effort is adequate, and those who contend that it is not; but the American people, with that clear vision which preserves great democracies in an hour of desperate peril, know that everything is not right in our war-production program, that we have not and are not going forward in that program as rapidly as we should, that the obstacles must be removed. Such action they are demanding of those in authority. The American people believe that there is only one great task before our Republic today, and that is to win the war. Our people believe that every activity of the people and of the Government must be subordinated to that one purpose.

Mr. President, I think it is the duty of Congress to meet these issues squarely and to take the best action possible—action dictated by the sole and single purpose of winning the war. I firmly believe that it is the duty of Congress to adopt a definite labor policy, and that the adoption of such a policy by Congress is the only way to stop the constant bickerings and jealousies that exist between capital and labor.

I think that we should proceed with the consideration of the Connally bill. As the majority leader of the Senate said yesterday, the bill would be open to amendments covering all phases of the labor situation; and such amendments could be discussed on their merits, and a proper conclusion arrived at.

The fact that important labor measures passed by the House of Representatives have been suppressed in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has not made a wholesome impression upon the American people. The Senate should have the right to pass on such House bills one way or the other. Instead of adding to the unity of the country, the fact that effort is being made to prevent consideration of the Connally bill is adding to disunity.

I think, too, that it is the duty of Congress to pass legislation to prohibit exorbitant profits on war contracts; and that matter can be considered in connection with the Connally bill.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator intend to make a speech?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Of course, I wholeheartedly concur in everything the Senator from Virginia said in the splendid speech he has just made. I do so because I know the sentiment of the people of Texas. The effort being made by the people of Texas is not an organized one; it is an entirely spontaneous expression from the hearts of the people of their desire to have something done by Congress to speed up war production.

I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether he has any ideas as to how we might be able to get some labor bill on the floor of the Senate for consideration.

Mr. BYRD. I should much prefer that the bills which come before the Senate should first be considered by the appropriate committees; but if the Senate Committee on Education and Labor refuses, as it has in the past, to report important bills passed by the House, then it seems to me that the only way to get such measures before the Senate is to offer them as amendments to other pending bills. I think the questions involved are of such vital importance that they should receive committee consideration; but, in view of the attitude of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, whereby they have suppressed for weeks and months vital and important labor legislation passed by the House of Representatives, there is no other alternative, as I view the situation, except to offer amendments on the floor to other bills.

Mr. O'DANIEL. In my State of Texas, Mr. President, the citizens attempted to hold a peaceful meeting at which to discuss this subject, but the meeting was interrupted and almost broken up by some of the representatives of the labor-leader racketeers. The citizens of Texas have almost reached the limit of human endurance. My worthy colleague the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is fully familiar with the urge that is coming from our State for some action to be taken by the Senate; and yesterday he made a valiant and powerful effort to try to bring his bill, or any other bill dealing with the labor situation, to the floor of the Senate, but his effort was unsuccessful.

However, I did hear from the majority leader on this question——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to proceed to discuss the pending bill at this time. I think I have yielded for almost an hour; and if the interruptions are to continue any longer I think we should postpone consideration of the bill until next week.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana decline to yield further?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I merely desired to ask a question of the Senator from Montana bearing on his bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator has said quite enough on the subject he is discussing. I think in the very bill now pending before the Senate I can dispose of the argument the Senator has been making this morning. Thus far today all the time has been taken up with a discussion of the proposition that the country should devote itself to bringing about 100-percent war production. I think that the method the Senators who have just been speaking are following is not the true course to follow. They are merely drawing a red herring across the trail.

The only way to bring about complete production in this country is to organize the small business plants of the United States so that they may engage in the production of war materials.

The idea of attacking labor at this time is absolutely absurd. There are no strikes in the country. If there were any disturbance of production as a result of strikes or labor disputes of any kind, there might be some merit in the Senator's contention; but the real cause of lack of production in the country is the fact that the big corporations of the country have obtained all the contracts, and the small concerns of the country, which during the past 6 months or more have been endeavoring to get into war production, have been left entirely out of the picture.

We have in our country approximately 184,000 small concerns which for the last 6 months or more have been struggling to get contracts for the production of war materials, but they have been unable to do so.

A few moments ago the Senator from Virginia stated that about 49 percent of the productive capacity of the United States is not being utilized at the present time. The purpose of the bill now pending is to bring about complete production in the country. If the Senators who have been engaging in debate today will listen for a few moments to a presentation of the purposes of the pending bill, I think they will agree that it provides the proper way to meet the present problem of production, and not by raising an issue which has little merit, if any; for as I have said, at the present time I find in the country no disturbance of production as a result of labor troubles. Labor has entered into an agreement with industry whereby it has pledged itself to continue production without any disturbance from strikes. There are to be no strikes, and all labor disputes are to be settled by the War Labor Board which is made up of representatives of labor, of industry, and of the public. It seems to me that the Board should be given an opportunity to work out its program of cooperation, and that the country should be allowed to get down to a basis whereby full production can really be brought about in this country.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. In view of the fact that the work of the committees has been mentioned in the debate, I merely wish to point out that the pending bill comes before the Senate with the unanimous report of the Committee on Small Business, and with the favorable report of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Before those committees appeared the men responsible for production, and they favor the bill. We discussed and

conferred regarding its provisions with the men responsible for war production and for essential peace production.

I desire to say for the Committee on Education and Labor, in the absence of its chairman, that we consulted with the self-same men who are responsible for our essential peacetime production and for our essential wartime production. We conferred with all of them, with the Department of Labor, with the Secretary of War, with the Secretary of the Navy, with the head of the Maritime Commission, and with Donald Nelson and his associates. They told us, on the one hand, that the pending bill would be very helpful and, on the other hand, that there was no need for our committee to report antilabor legislation at this time. We are to a great degree relying upon the views of the men who have the sole responsibility for the country's production; and, in addition, we are considering their recommendations before our committees. In the debate relative to the pending bill we are considering their recommendations. We had the advice and counsel of those men. We have confidence in them, and we are endeavoring to augment their labors by giving them further support.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from New York is absolutely correct, and I desire to thank him for his very fine contribution.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. In discussing the bill of the Senator from Montana, Senate bill 2250, I may say that I feel very favorably inclined toward his bill; I think it is a good bill, and I intend to support it. The only reason I rose a while ago, when I was interrupted and taken off the floor, was to endeavor to find out if there was any possibility of getting some labor legislation onto the floor of the Senate without the necessity of adding it as an amendment to the pending bill. I should dislike very much to mix the two subjects in one bill, but I have been here some time and have been unable, so far, to get any labor legislation out of the committee room for consideration by the Senate. As I understand it this is a representative form of democracy. I am here representing the citizens of the State of Texas, and there is almost unanimous clamor there for some action on the labor situation, and unless I can get some promise or assurance that there will come before the Senate promptly a bill which will deal adequately with this subject, I shall be obliged to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I say that this bill will be open to amendment, and if any Senator wants to attempt to emasculate this bill by any improper amendment of the character the Senator proposes, it is his responsibility. I can understand there may be a desire upon the part of some people in this country to destroy this effort on the part of small business to have their facilities utilized in war production.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to suggest, on behalf of the Committee on Education and Labor, that, while I do not think they have reported the bills they should have reported, they have reported two labor bills that have been on the calendar of the Senate for over 2 months, and all that is required, if any Senator wants to take them up, is a motion to consider them. We can take up the Connally bill or the Ball bill tomorrow, or we could lay aside the pending bill and take either of them up now, if we wanted to do that.

The Ball bill "freezes" the closed shop—that is one of the important features of the Ball bill—and prescribes the proper method of negotiation and arbitration. The Connally bill "freezes" all labor relations if a plant is taken over. I do not think that is the best method of "freezing" them, but, nevertheless, those are bills which can be taken up by the Senate by a majority vote. I hope very much the Committee on Education and Labor will report some additional legislation, but, at least, we cannot blame the committee for not reporting any labor bills, for there are two before the Senate today.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to relieve the mind of the Senator from Montana by stating that there is no desire on my part to emasculate his bill. As I previously stated, I favor his bill; I think it is a good bill, I have no desire to emasculate it, and want to support it in every way; but, at the same time, I am pressed by my folks in Texas to secure consideration of labor legislation by the Senate; and, if there is no other way to do it, I may offer my amendments to his bill.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. In the section of the country represented by the able Senator from Montana and myself there are vast deposits of alunite and magnesite, which are both highly valuable metals in this critical period. I have been trying, along with other Senators, to secure the development of those vast deposits which lie throughout the West, in Utah and other States, and particularly in my State, where we literally have mountains of alunite and magnesite. From magnesite can be made magnesium which is, in my judgment, a superior metal to aluminum in many respects, and is being widely used now by Germany in increasing amounts.

In our endeavors to have the necessary plants built, we ran into delay after delay, occasioned by the squabbles of big business holding certain patent rights. The result has been that the factories turning out airplanes have not been able to produce the number of planes which could have been built if there had been the proper supply of the raw material we call aluminum or magnesium, and, because there has been delay in some of the big plants, there has been a bitter outcry on the part of members of the public who are not apprised of the controversy going on under the surface by holders of the patent rights. Labor has been criticized and management has been criticized for this, but these great plants stand ready to turn out the planes if they can get the big fellows to quit squabbling over their patent rights. It is time there should be a clearing of the atmosphere about this matter, and I hope some of the investigations and committee inquiries that are under way will have a very healthy tendency to relieve this picture. Complaint has been made of the Boeing Plant in Seattle but its employees are not to be charged with delays in the production of fighting airplanes, when the raw material is not available, although mountains of it lie in the ground in the Northwest and could have been developed so as to open some of these bottlenecks. It has not been the fault of either management or labor and to charge them with the failure to go ahead and utilize these patents for the defense of which our boys will lay down their lives is to put the cart before the horse, and to so distort the picture that it is twisted out of any semblance to anything rational and decent.

So I think the time has come when Congress has got to determine whether we have to have the all-out effort which has been referred to, and whether we are to use our natural resources which lie so abundantly at our very doors, and thus eliminate some of the conditions which have bedeviled all of us. A factory cannot turn out its product when it cannot get the raw material and when the men in the factory have to stand around not able to work full time. The management is bedeviled by that sort of condition.

There is a reason for it. I sat in a conference here and saw businessmen squabble over whether or not patents would be available for the manufacture of certain kinds of aluminum from alunite. I am looking at the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]; I imagine that he, too, has heard some controversy about that. He nods his head, and says, "yes." Then, in the name of reason why should there be a controversy over the right to use any patent in this country when the lives of our boys are now to be used by us to defend the right of a man to have a patent and exercise his rights to a patent which is a monopoly granted to him by the United States Government?

I say that condition has a bad odor; it is not right; it is a reflection on all of us; and the time has come to clear the decks of this whole patent business, and determine whether a man's patent rights are more important than the welfare of the Government and the lives of our boys.

I am hopeful that even out of the bill of the Senator from Montana will grow some clarification, some more evident direction. The little business man has been shoved to one side in this country and a few great firms have had most of

the business. I can understand the impulse on the part of Army officials and Navy officials, growing out of long years of experience in contracting, to give the large contracts to the bigger business concerns, because, I suppose, they figure that they get more prompt action on the contract; but we do face the necessity here and now of deciding whether the little business man is to go out of the picture. If we are going to turn machine power to war production—and we are advised that 85 percent of our machine potential must be geared exclusively to war production—we may fail in our efforts. There is only one way to accomplish the result, and that is to bring the little business man into the orbit of this war operation. I see no better proposal than that suggested by the Senator from Montana; I wish him well in his effort, and I hope that he may be successful in doing what he seeks to accomplish.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Washington. He is absolutely correct. The most serious problem affecting this country is not the labor problem but the problem of saving small business enterprise. Big business has moved in and practically crowded out the little fellows all along the line. That is what has been happening in the War Production Board. The Senator from Washington has very well stated the situation. I have before me a report of the hearings before the Truman committee where Mr. Thurman Arnold appeared a short time ago and made a statement with reference to the cartel agreement made between the Standard Oil Co. and an organization in Nazi Germany. In that hearing it was also pointed out that certain practices existed in connection with the war procurement procedure of the country which must be ended. Mr. Arnold, before that committee, told a very interesting story with reference to the way in which big business was able to finagle and freeze out the small concerns that are seeking to get contracts and that are competent and capable of producing war materials in this country. I have reference to the testimony of Mr. Arnold in which he reported before the committee a few days ago some interesting facts.

The Arnold report includes several pieces of correspondence between executives of the Standard Alcohol Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil, and makers of synthetic toluol, an indispensable ingredient of TNT. The letters and memo disclose that Standard Alcohol refused to make toluol available to one munitions company but did sell it to Du Pont.

In other words, the small plant had an opportunity to get a contract from the Government, but needed toluol, which is manufactured by the Standard Alcohol Co. They went to the Standard Alcohol Co. and asked for a price and for terms on a shipment of the toluol. Before answering the representative of the company which was seeking the contract, the representative of the Standard Alcohol Co. immediately took the matter up with his superiors, and letters passed between the subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. and the Standard Oil Co. itself.

I wish to read the letters. The first is dated May 15, 1940, to H. W. Fisher, from James G. Park, both of the Standard subsidary, and it reads in part as follows:

DEAR BUD: Dr. W. O. Snelling, of the Trojan Powder Co., Allentown, Pa., called yesterday and stated that he understood we were considerably ahead of other oil companies in producing synthetic toluol, and he wanted us to quote him on it and give specifications.

We immediately got in touch with Douglas Stewart (of Du Pont) and got his advice as to how the matter should be handled and he, in turn, talked to Major Harris.

Major Harris is one of the procurement officers.

It developed that Major Harris had sent the Trojan Powder Co. a bid and had told Dr. Snelling that we were preparing 20,000 gallons of synthetic toluol.

After Stewart talked with Major Harris, Harris again talked with Dr. Snelling and told him that it was a more or less private arrangement and asked him to withdraw the bid.

Mr. Stewart advised us of this situation and then suggested, as a courtesy, that we call Dr. Snelling, but to tell him nothing, as Dr. Snelling would probably withdraw the bid.

I called Dr. Snelling yesterday in reply to his inquiry, and he confirmed the fact that he understood that we had 20,000 gallons of synthetic toluol and wanted to know at what price we would sell it. I told him that as a matter of fact we did not have 1 gallon of synthetic toluol made, and even if he bid $100 a gallon, we could not supply it at this time. I stated that we had done some work in producing synthetic toluol, but as yet had found no interest, and he seemed satisfied and stated that when he was in New York again he would drop in to see us.

STATEMENT CALLED UNWISE

Arnold's report says that attached to this letter was a memorandum marked "personal" to Fisher, the writer, and signed by R. P. Russell. The memo said:

Mr. Sadler has asked me to tell you he felt it was a bad mistake to make the statement contained in the last paragraph of the attached letter to Park. He feels it is much better to say nothing than to say something that we know isn't true.

I felt about the same.

A previous letter, dated May 3, 1940, and addressed to Fisher again, was not signed in the Arnold report. It said:

Major Harris, who is stationed at Wilmington and who is cooperating very closely with the du Pont Co. and who has worked with our people, will send out competitive bids shortly for TNT, which must be made with synthetic toluol. The du Pont Co. expects that they will get the bid; therefore, du Pont will buy synthetic toluol from us.

DU PONT GOT IT

A final letter shows that Standard Alcohol sold their toluol to the du Pont Co. It is addressed to an O. V. Tracy and signed by Standard's Park:

We have received an order from the du Pont Co. calling for two tank cars of synthetic toluol (10,000 gallons each) to meet Army specifications 50-11-38 A to be shipped to Barksdale, Wis.

The Arnold report commenting upon the letters says:

The unfortunate results of this type of close relationship between American companies on essential war production can be shown by [this] one example, and I only give this example because it is imperative that this committee appreciate the ramifications.

That is the situation in which small business finds itself. The purpose of the bill is to change that situation and provide small business with a forum in the War Production Board to which it may go, and be enabled to get contracts for war production.

The bill is sponsored by the entire Small Business Committee, made up of myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The committee reported the bill unanimously. It is probably the most nonpartisan legislative proposal ever submitted to the Senate. Every one of the members of the committee took an active part in the studies made, and participated in the preparation of the bill. The committee held extensive hearings, had before it numerous representatives of small business from all over the United States, and I am confident that the bill as worked out by the committee, when enacted, will make it possible to utilize small business to a high degree in the war production program.

Section 1 of the reported bill confers additional authority upon the Chairman of the War Production Board and makes it his duty, through a deputy to be appointed by him, to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns, and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized to augment war production.

The bill contains a number of provisions describing the duties of the deputy to be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board with a view of aiding in bringing into the war production the small business concerns of the country.

Section 2 authorizes the Chairman of the War Production Board, whenever and to the extent that he determines such action to be necessary, to provide in various ways for getting information about and utilizing for war production plants operated by small business concerns. These include the making of inventories of productive facilities, directing attention of Government officials to the productive capacity of such plants, providing for the letting of subcontracts by prime contractors, encouraging through Government contracts the conversion of such plants to war production, certifying to the Smaller War Plants Corporation established by section 4 and to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries the amount of funds necessary for such conversion.

In addition to the efforts of the War Production Board through the deputy who is to be appointed, the bill also provides for the creation of a Smaller War Plants Corporation, with a capital stock of $100,000,000. The Smaller War Plants Corporation, which will be staffed by experts, engineers, and men capable of understanding the problems of war production, will make a study of the small

plants of the country with a view of bringing them in and enabling them to get contracts to speed up the production of war materials which are so essential in the war effort.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Is it the purpose to have the new corporation do any manufacturing itself, or is it merely to function through subcontractors?

Mr. MURRAY. The Smaller War Plants Corporation will merely take prime contracts, and deal them out in subcontracts to smaller concerns. As I have said, it will be staffed by men who will understand what work small plants may be able to do in connection with the war program. It will operate in connection with the War Production Board, and when the Army or the Navy is in need of certain commodities or materials necessary in the war effort, the Smaller War Plants Corporation will notify the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, that it will take certain contracts and be responsible for the production of the material. It will then sublet the contracts to the smaller plants which will thus be able to contribute to the war production program.

Mr. MEAD. As I understand, the Corporation will not only act in the capacity of a prime contractor, subletting portions of the prime contracts to small businessmen but it will also fit up small business concerns so that they themselves may in some instances become prime contractors.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to be created not only for the purpose of making a study of the small plants of the country, and undertaking to utilize them in the war production effort, but it will also undertake to finance them. If they are in need of certain additional machinery or some expansion of plant, it will be empowered to finance the small concerns so they may secure the needed machinery or accomplish the necessary expansion of their plants.

The bill as first originated in the committee provided that the financing feature of the program should be carried out through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The bill was studied and thoroughly analyzed by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it was finally decided that it would be more effective to have the financing powers included in the Smaller War Plants Corporation, so that when it investigated a plant and determined that it had the capacity to participate in the war program, it could at the same time determine what financing it might need, and provide such financing so as to speed up the plant's action in entering upon war production. It seemed to me and to the members of the Small Business Committee that that was the practical way to handle the matter, and the Senate Small Business Committee was unanimous in agreeing upon it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Another reason for having the $100,000,000 handled by the Smaller War Plants Corporation is that it has power not only to make the loans, but it has power to purchase materials, supplies, and additional land, and to pay for plant expansion, and if in each instance the Corporation must go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or some other financing agency, there would be a loss of time which would slow up production. So, in view of the fact that this Corporation has the right to buy materials, supplies, machinery, and lands, and to expand plant facilities, it was thought that if that Corporation handled the money there would be no delay in accumulating the highest possible degree of war productivity.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct. His explanation, of course, is accurate. I am sure all Senators who have studied this will agree with his conclusions.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. So that we may have clearly in mind the method of operation and make sure that it does not duplicate existing machinery, I understand that the Smaller War Plants Corporation would help to finance small business, but once it has made that arrangement with the small concern it then turns over the loan and the financial transactions to our existing Defense Plants Corporation, and goes ahead and looks for more business to promote small business again.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true; the idea being that the Defense Plants Corporation, which is already set up in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has the machinery for servicing and collecting these loans.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. It would avoid the necessity of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for which we are providing, setting up a complete duplication. The collecting agency of the Corporation is already in existence. It seems to me that was a wise provision to place in the bill, because the R. F. C. has, of course, extended experience in servicing and collecting loans, and when these loans are made, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, they will be turned over for servicing and collection to the Defense Plants Corporation which is already set up in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. President, in addition to the powers of that Corporation to help small plants to convert to military production, and to get necessary material, and to expand, it is also designed to aid other small business concerns which wish to convert their plants into essential civilian production. There are many plants which, as the result of the shortage of material in the country, are unable to continue their operations. There are a number of corporations that have representatives in Washington at this very moment, who are in danger of being closed out in a very short time, because of failure to obtain essential raw materials needed in their operations.

This bill undertakes to aid those concerns so far as possible. Many of them, of course, will not be able to convert into war production, but so far as possible this bill undertakes to aid any corporation engaged in nonessential civilian production to convert its plant into essential civilian production, or into war production, whichever is most appropriate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think my colleague is making a very valuable point, and one which should guide the Corporation after the bill becomes law. When the Senator makes the point that this measure does not deal solely with war productivity, but that it also deals with essential civilian productivity, I think he makes a very good point, and one that should carry weight with those who shall have in hand the enforcement of the proposed legislation. If we convert small business engaged in nonessential work into essential civilian peacetime productivity, we, of course leave other business enterprises free to produce for our military needs, and when we consider that this year we shall produce $60,000,000,000 worth of essential peacetime goods, we find it to be essential to relieve existing plants in order that they may devote more of their time to war productivity. One way of doing that is to convert industry not now engaged in essential peacetime work, so that it will be able to do its share in that particular field. In a word, the bill deals with military productivity and also with essential civilian productivity.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. One of the main purposes which the committee had in mind was saving the small business concerns of the country. Something had to be done, because all over the Nation they were going bankrupt. As the result of the lack of essential materials necessary in civilian production they had to close down. They were unable to get contracts from the War Department or the Navy Department, and therefore were being closed out entirely. Many of these corporations were entirely competent to take war contracts. Numbers of them sent their representatives to Washington, who went before the procurement officers and showed them that they could participate in war production.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Montana has been very much interested in, and has performed a very useful and helpful work for, the small business people of the country. I happen to know also that he has been very much interested in trying to assist those who have been engaged in one branch or the other of the automobile industry. I should like to ask the Senator if under the bill there would be some possibility of helping those who are engaged in the distribution or repair of automobiles, either by converting, where it is possible, the organization or business into a war-producing machine, or converting it into a producer of some necessary civilian products or articles?

Mr. MURRAY. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the committee has given very serious consideration to the matters he has just mentioned. The special committee has already reported two bills designed to aid the automobile dealers and the tire dealers of the country. Those two bills are now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill before us will itself no doubt enable some automobile dealers, by joining a number of their plants together, to secure war contracts. The two bills to which I have referred, which were reported by the special committee and are now before the Banking and Currency Committee, are directed to aiding those who are not going to be able to participate in war production, and are being curtailed as the result of the rationing orders, so they may survive the conditions which have been brought upon them as the result of the curtailment or stoppage of production of automobiles and the rationing of cars.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator's statement because I know he has given a great deal of time and attention to the matter, and has been of invaluable service to those engaged in the automobile business in all lines throughout the country. The Senator perhaps knows better than any other Senator on the floor the distressing condition in which the distributors and repairers of automobiles, and handlers of tires in the country, find themselves at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I can assure the Senator that the two bills our committee has reported, and which are now pending in the Banking and Currency Committee, have been very carefully worked out with the best expert counsel we could obtain. They were studied very carefully by our committee members, many of whom are able lawyers. They were the result of the unanimous agreement of our committee. The two Republican Senators sitting on the committee contributed very ably in working out these problems, both with respect to the bill which is now before the Senate and the two other bills to which I have referred. Every member of the committee, I wish to say, religiously attended the meetings we held, and participated actively in all our efforts to solve these problems.

I am sure that the problem of small business in the Nation is the most serious problem affecting the country, because if we permit small business to be destroyed we shall destroy the American way of life. Our democratic system was founded upon small business enterprise, and if it shall be wiped out, and if the whole field of business endeavor shall be taken over by the big monopolistic concerns of the Nation, then we shall have a totalitarian system, we shall have communism or fascism.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if Senators who are so much agitated over the labor problem would sit down for a little while and study this problem they would make up their minds that by this means they can save our country, rather than by wasting their time discussing the labor situation. There are no strikes in labor. Labor has agreed with industry not to have any strikes during the progress of the war.

There is no need whatever for the labor legislation which is being advanced at the present time, but there is a vital need for the kind of legislation represented by the bill now pending before the Senate. If the measure is not passed, I am convinced that the Congress of the United States will be guilty of one of the greatest mistakes it ever made, and such failure to act will contribute to the complete destruction of free-competitive enterprise in this country. That is very well shown, I think, by the testimony brought out by Mr. Arnold before the Truman committee. He brought out the danger of the complete swallowing up of small business enterprises in the United States by the activities of the monopolistic institutions of the country.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BUNKER. What the Senator from Montana says about small business being important is very true. My State is very largely made up of small business. I should like to ask a question. I make this statement as a background: A friend of mine who is an automobile dealer has some $200,000 tied up in new cars. Is it not true that the bills which are now pending before the committee would definitely deal with this question?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. BUNKER. And also with the situation of tire dealers, who have tire stocks tied up?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. BUNKER. The committee has performed a very valuable service to the country; and if it should succeed in solving this problem—and I have every reason to believe it will—it would solve one of the most perplexing problems of the day.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I do not want to add to the able presentation which the Senator from Montana has made as to the need for legislation such as is proposed; but I wish to compliment him and the committee on the admirable way in which they have planned at least a partial solution of the problem which faces the Nation. I should like to give one illustration, taken from my own State of Rhode Island, of the help which the bill would render, as an illustration of the aid which it would afford to all small businesses throughout our great country.

Rhode Island is the most highly industrialized State in the Union. In my own city of Providence, as an illustration of what I mean—I could use other illustrations—I cite the jewelry business. It is not a wartime business. Normally there are about 21,000 employees in the jewelry factories of Providence. They represent a very large part of the jewelry industry in the United States. In the neighboring State of Massachusetts there are some 5,600 employees in this industry; and in the State of New Jersey only some 1,700. In Providence the employees of the jewelry industry constitute almost one-third of the total number of employees of manufacturing industries in the city.

Most of such industries are small. From the very start they have patriotically endeavored to convert their factories to the production of wartime goods. They have very consistently and patriotically refused to ask for any help which could be shown to interfere with our war-production effort. Some of them have been able to convert their factories, machinery, and organization to wartime purposes, but most of them are faced with two difficulties.

The first difficulty is that of obtaining contracts from the Government. In the second place, there is the difficulty of obtaining the means to operate, because of the reconstruction of their machinery or the new equipment which would be necessary to change the industry over. If the pending bill is passed—and I sincerely trust it may be—it will help to solve both those difficulties which stand in the way.

I have mentioned only one illustration, though many could be cited. Rhode Island is a small State which illustrates the situation in the whole United States. Small industries cannot be ignored because individually they are small in comparison with the great corporations with which they compete. In the aggregate they form a large reservoir of labor, skilled and unskilled, of machinery, and other facilities which can be used both for war production and for necessary civilian production.

As the Senator from Montana has ably said, it is necessary for the economic welfare of this country not only at the present time, during the war, but in preparation for the post-war period, that these industries be preserved. I congratulate him and the committee on this excellent effort to meet the problem.

Mr. MURRAY I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. The committee has had considerable contact with small manufacturers from Rhode Island, and we understand the plight of his State, which is not different from that of almost every other State in the Union. The great difficulty has been in securing war contracts. As I said some time ago, witnesses came before our committee from all parts of the country and told the story of how they had made an effort to get into war production. One concern in Minneapolis, for example, has made a desperate effort. It could not remain in civilian production, and it spent thousands of dollars preparing plans for the manufacture of mess kits. Its representative came to Washington with plans and specifications of its products, as well as photographs of it, went before the procurement officers and showed them how mess kits could be made out of steel and some plastic material, thereby saving aluminum. The procurement officers told him that that was fine—that was exactly what they were looking for. The representative left the plans and specifications with the procurement officers and went away. He came back in a short

time and found that in the meantime the Department had let a large number of contracts to big corporations, using the ideas and methods which the small manufacturer had proposed.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Let me add to what the Senator says that my recollection of the testimony is that the representative of the small manufacturer left with the procurement officers not only pictures and plans, but also samples. The company had manufactured a number of samples to show how well the product looked and how well it served the purpose. The articles were much cheaper than similar articles made of aluminum. Apparently the procurement officers used the samples furnished by the small manufacturer to make contracts with large corporations.

Mr. MURRAY. They used the idea which the small manufacturer had worked out.

Mr. HUGHES. And the small manufacturer received no consideration.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly true.

As I say, many witnesses explained the difficulty of obtaining contracts They showed that their plants were completely equipped to take war contracts; yet small concerns have spent a large amount of time in Washington seeking contracts, but have nearly always been unable to accomplish anything.

From all the testimony which we received we finally concluded that there is only one way in which this condition can be surmounted, and that is by setting up an agency in the War Production Board which is familiar with what the Army and the Navy needs, and capable of determining what plants can participate in the manufacture of such war materials, and then spreading out this work through subcontracts to the smaller concerns. Probably many small concerns would be able to take prime contracts; and, of course, whenever that is possible they should be given prime contracts.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to refer to the testimony which was taken before the committee, but I could refer to a great many cases of small manufacturers who are well equipped to do this work, who have engineers, experts, and technicians among their personnel. They are competent and capable of taking war contracts, but they have been totally unable to secure them because of the policies and practices of the procurement officers of the Army and Navy.

This bill is not only the unanimous action of our committee, but also has the endorsement and approval of Mr. Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board, and his advisers. He feels that this may be a solution to the problem of bringing small concerns into war production. He appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and gave testimony in approval of the proposed legislation. It seems to me that it is sound from every standpoint. It would not only enable us to bring about complete utilization of the productive capacity of the United States in the war effort, but at the same time it would save the small business concerns of the country from bankruptcy and preserve our system of competitive enterprise. We must do either one thing or the other; we must either get new war production for these small concerns or they will be forced to the wall.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to know if the committee had the report submitted relative to the British treatment of the small business problem, which, I may say, I have not had an opportunity to examine.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The committee did have the report?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; the committee had the report before them; and it was explained by an expert, Mr. Nash, who was in charge of the financial section of the War Production Board.

Mr. GEORGE. Has not the British Government subsidized small business?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; it has. It has utilized its small plants in war production to a very high degree.

Mr. GEORGE. Did it not do so because it recognized the fact that small business is the backbone of the whole free-enterprise system?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. And that it was necessary to subsidize small business during war conditions such as the British people have experienced, and such as we are now undergoing?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. That is very true.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to take this occasion to compliment the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on the presentation of the pending measure, and to compliment the committee itself on the concept which is worked out in the proposed legislation, because it is apparent to me that it is a very definite, practical, sensible approach to the most pressing problem we have before us, so far as our domestic affairs are concerned, and likewise so far as a large part of our productivity for war purposes is concerned.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator very much. I dislike to stand here and appear to take credit for the work of the committee, because I am not entitled to it. Of course, more than a year ago I conceived the idea of bringing about such legislation, because I noticed the rapid dwindling of small business in the United States; but I desire to say here and now that the members of the committee are more responsible for the proposed legislation than I am. I think they have had vast experience in the study of the problem before us. Many of them had already been working on other bills relative to the financing of small business. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who was a member of the committee, and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who has spoken today and has shown his thorough knowledge of the subject, both were very able and helpful in working out the proposed legislation.

I wish to say that I do not think I could have been able to bring in this bill in its present excellent form without the splendid aid which I received from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. The Senator from Ohio especially was very helpful to me, and I desire to acknowledge the obligation I owe to him for his valuable assistance.

As I said some time ago, I do not think there ever was a measure brought before the Senate that was so free from partisanship as is the pending bill. Our committee was unanimous at every step. We had no difficulty in having the committee meet, because all members were earnestly interested in the work.

We also feel that we are entitled to recognize the splendid cooperation which we received from the War Production Board. Mr. Nelson, Chairman of the Board, recognized the subject matter of the bill as one of the great problems of the Nation, and he has assured us that, if the measure is enacted, he will make a wholehearted effort to put it into successful operation.

Every member of the committee, as I have said, took an active part in the work on the measure. The junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has conducted some of the meetings for me, in my absence attending other committee meetings on one or two occasions, and has been very helpful in all our proceedings. I must say the same for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who gave his full cooperation.

I do not think there is a member of the committee who has not actually worked on the bill. I want to say the same with reference to the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], who was the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, sat with us daily, for several days, and aided in every respect in the effort to bring about this legislation. In fact, the bill is the result of the continuous efforts of both the special committee and the Banking and Currency Committee. As finally worked out, I think the bill is a really constructive effort to solve the problem of the full utilization of small business.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I notice that the bill provides for the authorization of an appropriation of $100,000,000 to be subscribed for the capital stock of the corporation. Will the Senator comment on the adequacy or the inadequacy of that amount for carrying out the purposes of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, it might not be adequate, but the recent Executive order of the President would be supplemental to the legislation. A few days ago, the President issued an Executive order in which he authorized the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to make loans and discounts, advances and commitments, in order to expedite and aid in bringing about complete utilization of

small business. The President invited three members of our committee to the White House at the time when he was signing the Executive order; this acknowledged the efforts of our committee to solve the problem. My understanding is that the Executive order will greatly aid in achieving the objects we have sought to accomplish through our efforts in connection with the bill.

Mr. BURTON. It is clear, therefore, that without legislation in addition to that proposed, the aid to small business will not be limited to $100,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. The aid will not necessarily be limited to $100,000,000; no. In fact, small business may also continue to receive aid from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, so far as possible, and from private financial circles. The bill authorizes the banking concerns of the country to participate in financing the small concerns, and I have no doubt there will be considerable financing of them through banking institutions.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that, in addition to what the Senator has said, the $100,000,000 is also a revolving fund; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. As the loans are serviced and collected, and as sums are paid in, they go back into the revolving fund; do they?

Mr. MURRAY. That is true—so that the fund becomes a continuing fund.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to call the attention of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to section 7 of the bill, which was suggested by Mr. Jones, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is a section which very materially would change the rules which heretofore have bound the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with reference to loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been bound by language substantially to the effect that a loan must be reasonably certain of being repaid.

Under section 7 of the bill, we would amend the appropriate section of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to read as follows:

> To make loans and to purchase the obligations of any business enterprise, including, when requested by the Secretary of Commerce, subscription to the capital stock thereof, for any purpose deemed by the Corporation to be advantageous to the national defense.

Heretofore the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been bound by a rather strict rule; that is, the necessity of being reasonably assured of repayment.

Under section 7 of the pending bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation might loan, under any circumstances in which it found that the making of such loans might be advantageous to the national defense—a basis of loans very different from that which heretofore has existed, and I think that the section making that provision is a very material part of the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. In addition to what the Senator from Michigan has said, section 7 also provides for participation in or guaranty by the War Department or Navy Department of any such loans—a provision also desired by Mr. Jones, and needed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, because it would permit those departments to guarantee or participate in the loans.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I am in entire accord with what the Senator proposes to accomplish, but I am bothered by section 4, which gives to the Corporation the power "to purchase or lease such land, to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants." I was wondering if it would be wise to give to this Corporation the right to build new plants. I have understood that the present difficulty lies in there being perhaps too many small business operations and plants, and I was wondering whether we should give to the Corporation the right to build, to own, and to operate new plants.

If the Senator will examine the report explaining section 4, he will find that the report states:

> The Corporation may also purchase or lease land—
>
> The Corporation itself—
>
> purchase, lease, build, or expand plants, and purchase or produce equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies to enable small business concerns to engage in essential production

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, that is intended merely to enable a small plant having some special qualifications to participate in war work to expand its plant so as to make it possible for it to participate in the war effort.

Mr. BYRD. I am not talking about the expansion of the plant. There may be some justification for that. I am talking about the construction of new plants.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, I think the proposed construction of new plants would be absolutely nothing other than what is now being done for every large business in the country. Although it could not be done very extensively, because the amount involved is small, it is exactly what the Government is doing today; the Government is building plants and is leasing them to this company or that company, but in every case to a large corporation. We saw no reason why it might not be desirable for small corporations to have the same privilege.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the purpose of the bill to increase the number of plants in the country?

Mr. TAFT. It might well be that a small plant would be fully equipped for certain purposes, but could not be effectively used unless an addition were built to it.

Mr. BYRD. I am not talking about additions; the bill gives corporations the right to build new plants.

Mr. MURRAY. The bill does not say "new plants."

Mr. BYRD. The bill says that the Corporation shall have the right "to purchase or lease such land, to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants."

Mr. TAFT. I do not see how a line can be drawn between the expansion of a plant owned by the Government, and which is leased, and a new plant.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio think that the small business man, in the situation in which he finds himself, will be benefited by the building of new plants? There are too many plants now, and many of them are not being operated at full capacity.

Mr. TAFT. There might be such an instance that three plants could be found to make three essential parts of a machine, but not the fourth part, and it might be found desirable to build a fourth plant.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection to adding to an existing plant, but it seems to me to be an unwise thing to permit a Government Corporation to buy land and build new plants.

Mr. TAFT. The Defense Plants Corporation is doing exactly that thing for practically every big company in the United States. Then why it should not be done for the small companies, if it is an effective thing to do, I cannot see.

Mr. BYRD. They have a right to do it for small plants as well as big plants, have they not? This bill is for the relief, as I understand, of small business men.

Mr. TAFT. No; it is primarily for the production of additional war material.

Mr. MURRAY. Production is the main purpose sought to be achieved by the bill. It is not a question of the relief of small corporations, but it is to bring them into war production. Of course, the operation of the Corporation set up by the bill will be under the direction of Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and it is assumed that he will undertake to expand a plant only upon the basis that is essential in connection with the war program.

Mr. BYRD. I thought the Senator from Montana had been working on a plan for some time to relieve the distressing situation that now confronts the small business men of the country. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BYRD. I thought the Senator from Montana had been working very ably and diligently to relieve the distressing situation with which small business is confronted. Is that situation going to be improved by building new plants to compete with the present small business plants?

Mr. MURRAY. If it is necessary in connection with the war program that a small plant may be utilized in the war effort, and it is essential that the plant

should be expanded or a new plant built for it to enable it to take part in the war program, of course I think it ought to be built.

Mr. BYRD. But are there not facilities for that now?

Mr. MURRAY. Apparently not.

Mr. BYRD. The Government is building plants all over the country.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, they have built enormous plants for the manufacture of airplanes, but they have found that production is slowed up because of the lack of necessary parts and materials to keep the production lines moving. It may be necessary to build some new plants in order to turn out materials necessary to keep in operation the production lines in the big plants which have already been constructed.

Mr. BYRD. But should not the question of the expansion of plants be handled by the same agency that now handles it, whether they are big plants or little plants? I do not think there should be a duplication by having another Corporation designed simply to build plants for small industry.

Mr. MURRAY. The trouble we found was that various subdivisions of the War Production Board were under the control or domination of representatives of big business. The officers of the Army and Navy also have been accustomed to dealing with big business, and the result has been that the War Production Board has been paying no attention to small business whatever, but has been allowing the War and Navy Departments to give contracts to big concerns and allowing them to expand their plants enormously, indeed, to such an extent that some of the plants cover enormous areas. After the war is over many of these plants, of course, will become obsolete and worthless.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I suggest also, if the Senator will pardon me, that it might become necessary to build new plants for small business, particularly if there was being brought about a consolidation of facilities or equipment. There might be two or three more plants that might have some equipment, some facilities, some machinery that could be used.

Mr. MURRAY. That was suggested with reference to the facilities of automobile dealers.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly; and it might become necessary to build a new plant outright in order to enable the consolidation to take place and the small business to enter the field of production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, during our discussion of the pending bill before our committee, one of the main reasons for proposing the formation of a Corporation was not only to create an agency to lend money but to allow the Corporation itself to enter into contracts with the Covernment for the production of various articles of war, and to permit the Corporation then to sublet portions of the work to smaller business. In carrying out this idea, of course, it might become necessary, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio pointed out, to build, perhaps, an addition or even a new plant to furnish parts which small business could not at this time furnish.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I should not want the Senator from Virginia to feel that the viewpoint he has just expressed was not presented to the Banking and Currency Committee. I, with several others in the minority—the committee stood, I think, approximately 11 to 7 or 8—was defeated in an attempt to confine the operations of the War Production Board to the operations which the Senator from Louisiana has just referred, that is, the matter of taking contracts from the Government and leaving the financing to the R. F. C. and the Defense Plants Corporation, and others, on directions from the W. P. B. I was defeated on my motion to bring that result about, and, in the interest of unity and a desire to get together, I decided not to make any fight or trouble about it on the floor of the Senate, but to go along with the majority of the committee; but many of us believe as the Senator from Virginia does.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to point out, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, that, on page 13 of the bill, section 4, paragraph (f), clause (4), among the powers given to this Corporation are the following:

(4) To enter into contracts with the United States Government and any department, agency, or officer thereof having procurement powers obligating the Corporation to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government; and

And (5):

(5) To arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or parts thereof, or servicing or processing in connection therewith. Such subcontracts may be let upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may deem appropriate in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

That language, in a nutshell, outlines the main reasons for the creation of the proposed Corporation.

All of us know that one of the main reasons why small business cannot get any of the contracts for war articles is that usually such contracts are so large that small establishments cannot handle them. Hence the creation of the Corporation provided by the bill which could enter directly into contracts with Government agencies and thereafter subcontract with small business.

Mr. President, the Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, has held extensive hearings on the proposition of how best to aid small business. Small business has been severely handicapped during these trying times and I hope that we can afford it some relief by the enactment of the pending measure. I know of no opposition to the measure and I do hope that the Senate votes unaminously on the proposition now before us.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, the necessity for this provision of the bill very largely arises out of the fact that, as it seems to me, the War Department and R. F. C. have not wanted to do this particular work. In other words, it is easier for an Army officer to make a contract with one person. He would rather make a contract with a big company than to make contracts with a number of little companies. The War Department is not in the least interested in the survival of the small companies.

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I regret very much to say that that situation seems to have finally come to exist in the R. F. C., although previously it did not exist there. As I understand, the Senator's committee has reported this bill with the idea that it will obviate the objections which have been raised by the War Department and the R. F. C. in particular cases to putting small business concerns in the position to participate in the war-production effort. In other words, the R. F. C. has been very technical; the War Department has been extremely technical. They told thousands of small business concerns, "No; you cannot bid on this contract because you are not financed to do it until you get an approval by the R. F. C."

The R. F. C. says, "Well, we have no assurance that you will have a contract, and, therefore, under our rules, we cannot put you in a position to fulfill a contract. So there has been a vicious circle."

Let me say that I have been as much opposed to the creation of new agencies as has any other member of this body; but it seems to me that the proposition here is by the creation of an additional agency to meet the objections which have heretofore been made by the War Department, the Navy Department, the procurement services, as well as the R. F. C., to cut that vicious circle and provide an agency which can meet the objections of all concerned. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has stated it very clearly. That was one of the main topics of discussion in our committee, and in the Committee on Banking and Currency, namely, the failure of the procurement officers of the Army or Navy to take any interest whatever in bringing the small corporations into war production.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no desire whatever to criticize the War Department, because each official in the Department is anxious to get all the production possible, and that is true of the war production effort in the other agencies. On the other hand, the R. F. C. has certain very technical rules which they have set up.

It seems to me that they have come to the point now where it is just as easy to get money from a bank as from the R. F. C. Nevertheless, the pending bill is designed to cut all these circuitous routes, and to establish an agency which will be able to say to little businesses, "All right, no matter what the R. F. C.

may say or what the War Department may require, we will enable you to contribute your maximum to the maximum production of the country."

Mr. MURRAY. And it is absolutely necessary that they should, in order to bring about the necessary production for the war effort.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is also necessary that we set up this new agency in order that we may not have to stop production while we make a complete investigation to determine who may be at fault in all these other agencies. It is essential to set up a new agency over all, which will have authority to take care of that situation. It seems to me it will mean a saving of time.

Mr. MURRAY I know it will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And will prevent duplication of effort, still enabling the little businesses to live, and to contribute their maximum to the defense effort.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is correct in his statement that the proposed agency is to be set up in order to save time, to cut red tape, and to get the business to the small business man so that he can do his job, and make his contribution to the war effort.

The committee found that the R. F. C. was motivated by commercial banking practices, and we were anxious to put working capital on a war-production basis. So we had to provide for cutting red tape, and making some money available.

We recognize the fact that the procurement officers of the military branches of the Government had their responsibility, which was to get the contracts clear of their desks, to get them out into the going industries of the country. We recognize the fact that the W. P. B. was concerned with allocations and priorities, and that the working of priorities atrophied small business, eliminated small business. So the proposed Corporation is to be created to take over the job, to organize small business, to get the money, the contracts, the materials, and the supplies together, so that the small businesses can come in and make their contributions.

We had a very definite problem, caused by the practices which had been built up in the past, and to cut clear across those practices this new agency is really necessary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to refer briefly to what the Senator from New York has said. Any of us who have served in the Congress for as much as a year are very familiar with the fact that whenever an abuse grows up, either in the matter of failure to perform a function, such as the failure to make the maximum effort in the war production, or a general failure in any regard, where as many as two governmental agencies are involved, the tendency is inevitably to pass the buck. The War Department says, "It is not our fault; it is the fault of the War Production Board." The War Production Board will say, "It is not our fault; it is the fault of the R. F. C." Thus the responsibility is passed around the circle.

The Senate had that precise situation in mind when it created the committee headed by the Senator from Montana, a committee which has made such exhaustive investigation into the subject committed to it. It is for the very purpose of taking a short cut in this buck passing between various governmental departments, which I think is inevitable in the case of departments, and I am not, therefore, criticizing—it is for the very purpose of devising a short cut in this general system of buck passing and going around the vicious circle that the Small Business Committee of the Senate was created. As I understand, that has been the principal object of the committee in presenting its report to the Senate advocating the proposed legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct. Of course, the present war is the first totalitarian war we have ever fought, and the Navy and the Army heretofore have been in the habit of dealing only with big business plants. They have not found it necessary to go to small plants. They can get their contracts off their desks by dealing them out to big concerns. The result is that the material is not coming fast enough. We need more production. We need more of our productive capacity brought into the picture, and that is what we are seeking to do through the pending bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me a moment further, I heard the Senator speak a little while ago of the matter of toluol in connection with the du Pont Co.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a member of the Senate Committee on Munitions, I have read that the du Pont Co. was advised by the Intelligence units of the Army and the Navy that it would be preferable for the du Pont Co. to sell its secrets to prospective opponents of the United States, in one case Japan, in the other case Russia, than in any way to restrict their own production. That has been the tendency and the policy of both the War Department and the Navy Department, and I am not presently criticizing either of them for it, because they wanted to have easy access to supplies. But it seems to me that a great deal more than that is involved in the present consideration. First, there is the necessity for maximum production of all of our war necessities; and second, the necessity to keep in existence, so far as may be possible, and with every desire on the part of the Government to keep them alive, these little business concerns, which may be very useful.

I am informed that in Japan and Germany it has been found that a great deal of war production has been brought about in the homes.

Mr. MURRAY. And on the farms.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And on the farms, in the homes in the small towns, where some little factory may have been able to fabricate some particular part of a machine which will enable partial production by individuals on the farms and in the homes in those countries. It seems to me we will not arrive at our maximum production until we have permitted every small industry, as well as every large industry, to produce everything it can possibly produce to enter into the war production, either as parts, or as raw material.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator. That situation was very ably described by Mr. Nash before the Committee on Banking and Currency during the progress of the hearings. Mr. Nash is with the War Production Board, in charge of the financial section, and he described in great detail the German method of handling this problem. He is very much in favor of our bill, and has the feeling that this is the way to approach the problem in this country.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am one of those who believe in the proposed legislation and that the times demand it, and I desire to pay tribute to the men who pioneered along these lines. First, I refer to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who over a year ago came before our committee and presented a bill to aid small business men, which was not adopted, but his efforts were very clean-cut, and deserved a larger measure of success than they received. I refer next to the Senator who now has the floor, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who has carried on so earnestly and sincerely and indefatigably to bring this proposal on the floor of the Senate, as chairman of the Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I also pay tribute to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], than whom no man has done more effective work, shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Montana. These three men, in my estimation, deserve real recognition and praise for the arduous work they have accomplished and the result now before us in the form of the finished bill.

To amplify what has been said in the debate in my hearing—I have not heard it all—I now wish to read what I call exhibit A, which may have already been used in the debate, presented by Mr. Bradley Nash, Chief of the Bureau of Finance, War Production Board, who has just been referred to by the Senator from Montana, and who in his testimony told of an illustration in connection with the Navy's need for pumps in submarines which is graphic. Mr. Nash said:

> We know there are many other cases which we help, but which do not get money, and some are very dramatic. It happens that our representative in New York State is here today—I remember when he joined us, last November 1—at that time he was not sure whether he would work for the New York section or for us, but about an hour after he came the Navy called up and said they had some submarines they could not launch because a manufacturer of pumps did not have enough working capital to order adequate supplies. It took Mr. Rankin until about 8 days before Pearl Harbor—

That was December 7—

to get the financing to get the pumps, in order to put the submarines into the water. And there may be many other cases.

Mr. BROWN. The attack on Pearl Harbor occurred December 7.

Mr. TOBEY Yes; and December 1 was 7 days before, the analogy being that it took 30 days, or 1 month of the calendar year, to get the financing authorized, to insure the pumps' being delivered, to put them in the submarines, and to get the submarines to work fighting the Japanese. That is an incongruity, and we are trying to correct it in the proposed legislation before us. It took 8 weeks for them to get the pumps. The disbursements, after the loan was granted, took 8 weeks. That could not happen under the proposed law. Red tape will be cut; we will get prompt service. The proposal, I may say, is approved by no less a person than Mr. Donald M. Nelson.

If I may have one moment more, I point out also further testimony of Mr. Nash, in speaking of what the Senator from Missouri referred to, Germany's effort; and we certainly can take a leaf out of Germany's book. In spite of the old Biblical query—by way of analogy—"Can any good come out of Nazareth?" some lessons may come out of Germany, because it is admitted they have been efficient in production of war materials. Mr. Nash said:

Traveling throughout Germany and Europe are thousands of instructors who are teaching smaller artisans how to work.

They go around representing the Nazi government of Germany, and pass this work out stimulating and working for production in an effort to obtain sufficient goods to defeat the democracies.

Mr. Nash further said:

Perhaps I should clarify what I suggest, which is that whenever the Services or the War Production Board feel that production of any goods by any concern is essential, the credit record of that concern shall not be the guiding factor but that urgency shall be the guiding factor.

Mr. President, we have enunciated that principle all the way through. For instance, in the production of copper, in which there are low-cost mines, such as the Anaconda Copper Co. and the Kennecott Co., the high-cost mines of northern Michigan are given a bonus of 5 cents a pound, the objective being to get quantity production and win the war.

Mr. President, I say we should not vote for this bill solely along economic lines. There are some very worth-while social implications and by-products which will result when we pass this bill. Throughout the Nation there are literally tens of thousands of small business men. Senators have many of them as constituents and friends, and know what they speak for, and yearn for, and cry out for today.

Many of those men believe they are the "forgotten men." Give them this legislation, implement this board of five, give them $100,000,000, put the servicing of the legislation in the hands of the subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and what will you do? You will tell these small business men that somebody cares for them, and the name of these small business men is "legion." Let us evidence to them that the Congress of the United States cares for them, and for the great objective of all-out production to win the war at all costs.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, as the result of the statement I have made, and the discussion which has taken place here, I think it has been pretty well established that the bill is a worthy one, and that it is really essential for the purpose of bringing small business into the picture. As the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] stated a short time ago, there seems to be a psychology on the part of the procurement officers of the country that they can only deal with big business. That same situation is found to exist even in the War Production Board, and in O. P. M. before Mr. Donald Nelson became the Chairman of the War Production Board.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement which was made by Arthur C. White, who is connected with the War Production Board.

At Atlantic City just a few days ago he said that small business should close up shop and stop wasting the economic strength of the Nation. He is a big business representative, and he thinks that small business is simply in the way, and that we can get along without it. That that psychology does exist in the War Production Board to some degree has been shown by the testimony given before the Truman committee, and in other ways. It was shown by the testimony of the small business men who came before our committee and told how impossible it was for them to make any headway in obtaining contracts for war production.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In a recent investigation of manufacture in aircraft plants, conducted by a subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, there was brought out the complaint that contracts had been piled up at the top, but no effort was made to bring into the picture the small men who can make the parts for the assembly plants, that the stoppage occuring, the slow-down being complained of, resulted from the fact that nothing was being done to finance the small business man down at the bottom who was making the rivet or screw or some small assembly part.

One airplane manufacturer stated that he dealt with 4,000 subassembly manufacturers, small manufacturers in the United States, any one of whom could slow up his plant, and frequently did, and his hope was that the Government would step into the picture and help build up this subassembly by the small manufacturers to meet the needs of the assembly line. I thought the Senator would want to know that.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his able contribution to the presentation being made today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to trespass on the time of the Senator, but I should like to say that I have received complaints from Missouri along this line, that frequently when officials of the War Department have let contracts the contracts have included fields entirely outside the contractors' possible ability to perform. I received one complaint from a woodworking concern with respect to certain articles which had nothing whatever to do with the steel industry, not in any remote degree, but this concern, the oldest woodworking concern in the eastern section of Missouri, one of the oldest and most solid in the whole United States, was asked to make a sub bid by a concern to which a contract had been let by the War Department, which concern was itself a steel producing concern, and which showed in its specifications and price limit an absolute, a complete ignorance of the lumber producing trade, which was necessary to furnish the subcontractor's requirements. In other words when the question of subcontracts comes up, there seems to me to have been a great deal of the sort of business going on, of having some of our purchasing agents simply let large contracts to certain concerns in the country which were not able to or not entitled to take all the contracts, a part of which they were supposed to let out to subcontractors, and in connection with which the contractors did not know anything whatever about the trade conditions of the subcontractors to whom they would have to let subcontracts.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana whether the small business concerns and plants to which he is referring include concerns and plants which deal with mining?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And with concerns which are appurtenant to mining plants?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; it does. It applies to any small business. For instance, we have many small mining corporations in the country which produce some of our critical materials. Out in my State of Montana we have a small corporation which has been engaged in the production of manganese for a great many years. If that plant needed any assistance to expand its operations, in connection with that very essential critical material, of course it would be covered by this bill. The same is true with respect to copper or any of the other strategic minerals.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For the sake of the RECORD may I ask if that is the opinion not only of the distinguished Senator, as the chairman of the committee, but also the opinion of the members of the committee?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; it is.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe I have covered the matter substan-

tially, and if other Senators now desire to speak, I will yield the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it has been apparent to me for many months that the full force of our production has been handicapped because subcontracting has been neglected. Small business firms have not been able to negotiate prime contracts and have been ignored in the field in which subcontracting would have helped. This situation must be and can be improved.

I heartily approve of Senate bill 2250, which will make possible a more effective use of existing Government agencies now working for all-out production and will also establish the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The task before us is to locate small plants and gear them to action. In my judgment, the big job of production now at hand is to take the contracts to the machines, rather than expect every employer in the United States to run to Washington for an expensive and oftentime futile trip.

We are fortunate in Pennsylvania to have one of the most effective production organizations in the country which has made itself favorably known as the York plan. This plan is nothing more than a demonstration of what can be accomplished through cooperation between large and small industries when facilities are well developed and skilled labor is available and willing to work. My hat is off to the men who have done this effective work of subcontracting in York County.

We must remember that necessary civilian production as well as war production will be sustained under the provisions of the pending bill. I regard the bill as absolutely necessary to the maintenance of free enterprise and the successful conduct of the war.

MAN-HOURS AND PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS LOST THROUGH FIRES AND EXPLOSIONS

Mr. President, we are generally agreed that this war must be won by man-hours of labor and production of essential war materials. I should like, therefore, to call attention to a most important aspect of our war emergency program, which, in my opinion, is not receiving proper attention. I refer to the protection from loss by fires and explosions of both raw and finished war materials.

At the present time man-hours and production of essential war materials are being lost through preventable fires and explosions.

In looking into and reviewing reports of explosions and fires during the war emergency period, these questions immediately arise:

First. Are the American people fire conscious?

Second. Are we disposed toward ways and means of preventing and stopping explosions and fires?

To win the war we must be interested in the productivity of labor, and especially in the loss of man-hours either through accident to the laborer himself or to the materials with which he works. It is therefore vitally important to plan and organize for the complete nonimpairment of our total war effort.

Every fire or explosion cuts down man-hours and production.

Every fire requires replacement materials, the fabrication of which takes man-hours from the production of needed war materials.

An unusually large number of explosions and fires have occurred in war industries since the beginning of the emergency. Investigations by competent authorities have shown that up to the present time sabotage has not been evident, and that many of these disasters are due principally to accidental causes connected with operating processes, production under pressure, new workmen, and other causes associated with expanding war production. These fires and explosions are therefore preventable, and all possible steps should be taken to prevent their occurrence.

FIRES IN NATIONAL DEFENSE PLANTS

During the year 1941 the National Fire Protection Association, through its department of fire record, received reports of 48 fires in the United States and Canada, each of which involved a loss estimated at $250,000 or more. The total loss was approximately $33,000,000. These fires destroyed badly needed supplies of war materials.

This represents an increase of 10 fires over the number reported for 1940, 28 more than for 1939, and 12 more than the average for the past 5 years. Twenty of these fires in 1941, in which vital war materials were destroyed, caused individual losses of not less than $500,000, including 13 which resulted in losses of more than $1,000,000 each.

The largest fire in 1941, and the greatest single industrial loss in any 1 year in our entire history, was the fire which destroyed the rubber products plant at Fall River, Mass., on October 11. That fire alone destroyed approximately 14,000 tons of rubber—at a time when we could not afford the loss—and resulted in a property loss of $11,000,000, exclusive of indirect losses.

I hold in my hand an illustrated booklet entitled "National Defense Fires," issued on March 2, 1942, by the National Fire Protection Association, whose executive offices are at 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass. This booklet, which shows pictures of 21 disastrous fires and explosions, contains the following important foreword:

> The fires pictured on the following pages are typical examples of recent spectacular fires that have been and are hampering production. Thousands of other fires of smaller proportions have an equally serious aggregate effect on this Nation's war program. These fire losses, though measured in dollars, mean far more than the money value, for even though they may be fully covered by insurance, just so much needed war production is lost.
>
> The responsibility for these fires usually cannot be assigned to any one place. They are usually due to a combination of different factors, such as lack of proper planning on the part of the management, apparent acts of carelessness on the part of employees, lack of adequate fire-fighting facilities, and a variety of other factors, no one of which can be blamed exclusively on any individual fire.
>
> But underlying all the faults of omission and commission is the fundamental lack of the appreciation of the importance of fire safety. Of all the measures of fire protection, the most important and the one most commonly neglected is that of subdividing combustible materials so as to minimize the total possible destruction of any individual fire.
>
> In many plants fire protection has been a paramount consideration of planning, but in all too many others fire safety has been mistakenly sacrificed to quick production.
>
> An increase in the number of fires is to be expected during a period of increased war production. Most fires can be prevented but some may occur despite all precautions, and what is most important is to avoid any conditions which will permit a small fire, whatever its cause, from assuming disastrous proportions. No fire department, however efficient, can prevent serious loss after fire has once reached major proportions in a large area of combustible material.
>
> Sabotage is a fire cause commonly neglected in ordinary times which must now receive special attention. However, there is danger in concentrating all attention upon prevention of sabotage to the exclusion of adequate thought to ordinary fire causes. And fire is equally destructive whether caused by an act of sabotage or a carelessly discarded cigarette.
>
> The measures of fire prevention and fire protection that should be employed to prevent these disastrous losses are well known. They are clearly outlined in the well-established standards of the National Fire Protection Association and information on the important features of construction, protection, and organization for fire safety can be obtained for the asking from fire-protection authorities throughout the country.

Many cases of disastrous losses of war materials by recent fires and explosions can be cited, but here are a few typical examples:

First. The fire of October 11, 1941, at the rubber-products plant at Fall River, Mass., destroyed 14,000 tons of rubber, enough to make 2,000,000 automobile and truck tires, and resulted in a loss of $11,000,000, exclusive of indirect losses. The fire started in an unsprinklered process drier. The loss of manufacturing sections curtailed vital war production.

Second. Grain-dust explosions and resulting fires at the Great Northern Grain Elevator X at Superior, Wis., on January 10, 1942, caused an estimated property loss of more than $1,350,000 and destroyed a large grain supply which would have provided bread rations for an army of 700,000 men for an entire year, and resulted in the loss of vital storage and shipping facilities at that important port at the head of the Lakes.

Third. An explosion and fire of magnesium dust at a plant in Newark, N. J., on October 16, 1941, vitally affected production of badly needed war materials. The plant, with one-third of the national production capacity of this valuable war material, was making magnesium powder for bombs and tracer bullets.

Fourth. A fire on March 6, 1942, in Boston involved 1,500,000 pounds of wool, one of the Nation's largest storages of wool, destroyed a large quantity of wool, and caused property damage estimated at $250,000. This is a critical time to lose such a large quantity of strategic war materials.

Fifth. In Baltimore, Md., on September 17, 1940, 10,000 tons of cork, stored in anticipation of stoppage of shipments from Europe, were destroyed in a million-dollar fire. Four hundred and fifty

Baltimore firemen with 60 pieces of fire apparatus, summoned on 15 alarms, were unable to stop this fire.

Sixth. In Philadelphia on May 15, 1941, a disastrous fire in a lumber yard caused a loss of $900,000 and destroyed four and one-half acres of lumber needed for wartime construction. The fire department saved a large adjoining shipbuilding plant—very vital to the war shipbuilding program—but no fire department in the world could control a fire in such a mass of burning lumber.

FIRE AND EXPLOSION PROTECTION NECESSARY

These disastrous fires and explosions which are vitally affecting the production of needed war materials emphasize very definitely the importance of utilizing available technical explosion and fire-prevention experts in the war production program.

The experience of the Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering has shown in a striking manner that dust explosion and fire losses in industrial plants can be prevented by the application of the methods which have been developed in the Department of Agriculture, and which have involved extensive research work.

The determination of the causes of fires and explosions involving dusts, gases, vapors, solvents, and other inflammable chemical materials requires specialized technical qualifications and experience. The investigator assigned to the case must have sufficient expert knowledge of general manufacturing processes and be fully acquainted with the fundamental characteristics of explosions and resulting fires of this kind in order definitely to determine the cause. It is therefore a highly specialized technical service.

The present activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the War and Navy Departments, as well as other associated agencies, are well organized, and splendid work is being done to provide protection against sabotage, espionage, and subversive activities. In my opinion, however, adequate provision has not yet been made in our war emergency program for the full utilization of available technical knowledge which can be put to use in an action program which will result in the prevention of fires and explosions in our vital war-production industries.

In normal times perhaps we can rest in the security that the insurance companies will pay the losses, which of course, is true; but engaged as we are in a critical war, the losses from fires and explosions are just as comforting to the enemy as are well-planned and executed cases of sabotage. The effects are the same.

The present activities, therefore, concerned with the production, storage, and shipment of war materials, should be supplemented immediately, in the approprate Federal agency, with a staff of technical explosion and fire-prevention experts to recommend procedure, equipment, and methods for the prevention of fires and explosions. With the continual change of availability of materials, corresponding changes in procedure and equipment will be necessary.

The purpose of this undertaking would be concerned only with the technical phases of fires and explosions, the prevention of fires due to carelessness, accidental causes, and industrial hazards, and would have no relation whatever to cases of sabotage, espionage, or subversive activities. On the other hand, it would perform a function which perhaps the Federal Bureau of Investigation would not claim to encompass, but which could be conducted by the properly qualified Federal agency.

It would provide also for the development of a plan for acquainting existing plant-inspection forces with the technical explosion hazards and characteristics of dusts, gases, vapors, and explosive and inflammable materials inherent in industrial plant and war-production industries.

It would further provide for the development of practical and effective plans and methods for properly informing plant officials, workmen, and operating personnel with fire and explosion hazards and with methods of control and prevention.

In the execution of this program the Secretary of Agriculture would utilize the services of and cooperate with existing Federal agencies and with recognized fire-prevention and safety organizations, such as the National Fire Protection Association, National Board of Fire Underwriters, Associated Factory Mutual Insurance Companies, Western Actuarial Bureau, State fire marshals and insurance commissions, National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters, National Fire Waste Council, International Association of Fire Chiefs, International Association of Fire Fighters, National Safety Council, International Association of Government Labor Officials, International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Society of Grain Elevator Superitnendents of North America, Fire Protection and Insurance Section of Association of American Railroads, and Terminal Grain Elevator Merchants Association.

The investigations of explosives and fires in war-material-producing industries would be conducted by members of the technical staff in cooperation with the inspection forces of the above-named agencies and others interested; and plans for plant inspection, educational work, and similar activities involving the development and application of methods for fire and explosion prevention would be worked out in conjunction with both Federal and private agencies.

We cannot continue to have these losses of man-hours and vital war materials by fires in war-production industries. We must make provision for the application of technical knowledge on fire and explosion prevention.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order that the Nation can expend every effort to save our valuable war materials for the prosecution of this war to a victorious conclusion, I submit an amendment to House bill 6709, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately organize a staff of technical explosion-and-fire-prevention experts to develop and recommend procedure, equipment, and methods for the prevention of fires and explosions due to accidental causes, industrial hazards and operating processes, and other plant causes, exclusive of sabotage, espionage, and subversive activities.

I ask unanimous consent to submit the amendment to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and that it be printed in the usual form, also printed at this point of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks; and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DAVIS to House bill 6709 was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with Federal, State, and private agencies, to organize a staff of technical explosion and fire-prevention experts to determine the causes of fires and explosions in the production, storage, and transportation of war materials made from agricultural products and other sources, and to develop and recommend procedure, equipment, and methods for the prevention of fires and explosions due to accidental causes, industrial hazards, operating processes, and other plant causes, exclusive of sabotage, espionage, and subversive activities, $250,000, of which $100,000 will be immediately available."

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I take the floor at this time only to express my unqualified support of the pending measure, Senate bill 2250, for the assistance and maintenance of small industrial plants, for two purposes: First, to increase the production for war purposes; second, to keep alive the small industries so that after the war there still may be a place in our national economy for the small, independent businessman and some small, independent business concerns.

The objectives and mechanics of Senate bill 2250 have already been well explained by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee which presented the original measure and am in accord with the changes made in that draft by the Banking and Currency Committee. I hope the Senate passes the bill, and that it receives early and favorable consideration in the House. Its early enactment into law, as I see it, is imperative.

As has been already explained to the Senate, the bill proposes to set up a Smaller War Plants Corporation, with a capital of $100,000,000, the stock to be subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury. This Corporation will be managed by five directors, named by the Chairman of the War Production Board, so that at all times its operations will be synchronized with the war efforts of the War Production Board. It will be in no sense a competing agency, nor will it divert anything from the all-out prosecution of the war.

The proposed Smaller War Plants Corporation will be authorized to make loans or advances to small business concerns, to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion for the purpose of manufacturing essential articles, equipment, supplies, and materials. It will be authorized to provide working capital for such production. The Corporation also might purchase or lease land, or lease, build, or expand plants to enable small business concerns to engage in the manufacturing of essentials.

Another function of the Corporation will be to take Government contracts as a prime contractor, and subcontract to small business concerns that otherwise could not get Government contracts, either prime contracts or subcontracts.

The measure does not directly deal with the equally serious problems of the distributors, with some 3,000,000 wholesale and retail firms and dealers threatened with obliteration if the war effort is not directed with due regard for the future welfare of the internal economy of the Nation. But I agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that every small manufacturing plant enabled to stay in business and manufacture essentials for civilian use, will mean that the distributors have just that much more of a chance to keep alive.

Mr. President, industry faces two big jobs. The first, of course, is to produce sixty or seventy billion dollars worth, or even more, of necessary war materials. The second—and it also is important—is to continue production of things essential to the civilian population.

As I pointed out to the Senate recently when I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the final report of Mr. Floyd Odlum as Director of the Division of Contract Distribution in the O. P. M.—the Division has since been abolished, and Mr. Odlum retired to a position as consultant—undoubtedly there is pressing need for the Government itself to help preserve the small industries and the small businesses of the Nation.

It is decidedly to the interest of the Government, and of vital interest to the people of the Nation, and I believe also in the interest of winning what promises to be a long and tough war, that as much business as possible be kept going. I am not making a plea for business as usual, but I am urging that the war effort does not necessitate the destruction of small business in this Nation. If for no other reason than for tax-revenue purposes, we should keep in mind the fact that every business concern destroyed means also the destruction of a taxpayer—perhaps of many taxpayers.

I believe I appreciate fully some of the possibilities in the President's Executive order taking off the restraints on lending by Government, by R. F. C., by banks, and by other lending agencies, so that working capital may be provided wherever necessary, appropriate, or convenient to the war effort. I appreciate the fact that some of the Government-underwritten loans will be made to small industries, but under that order there is no one, no agency, no responsibility for seeing that the small concerns get any of its benefits.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation proposed in the pending bill will be in position, will have the responsibility (under control of the War Production Board, so that it will not do anything to hamper war production) to utilize the very broad powers created by the President's Executive order allowing unlimited lending for war production.

Mr. President, there are some 184,000 manufacturing plants in this Nation. Fewer than 10,000 of them have obtained either prime contracts or subcontracts. The bulk of the contracts have gone to fewer than 100 big concerns. Thousands of the smaller plants already have folded up. Tens of thousands more will go to the wall unless something is done to keep them open. As Mr. Odlum pointed out in his report, all the small plants, if kept going at capacity, would not be sufficient to supply the absolutely necessary civilian needs; and, after all, if the armed forces are to be kept supplied with what they need, if the war program is to be financed, articles to supply civilian needs must be produced, and the financing must be done by the civilian population.

I am not under any illusions that this bill of itself will solve the problems of small business in the United States during the war effort; but it promises to be of real, perhaps of great assistance along that line. I urge the Senate to pass the bill, and to get at work at the earliest possible moment the machinery it provides.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending bill has two purposes. Its first purpose is to mobilize all the productive facilities of the United States, a great part of which are in so-called small business enterprises. The second purpose is to preserve small business throughout the war so that it may exist in future times.

I do not suppose anyone could hear the testimony which was elicited before the committee without becoming convinced that small business is being given a very small part in the war, and that it faces a serious crisis, if not complete destruction, if deliberate and thoughtful action is not taken.

I do not think it is necessary to argue the advisability of retaining small business. I cannot go into a single county seat in Ohio which is not largely kept alive and supported and its independence maintained by one or more small manufacturing plants. If we rely entirely on big business we shall practically wipe out a large number of the smaller towns of Ohio.

I do not think I need elaborate on the fact that there is a tremendous capacity for production in various kinds of small plants. I was interested in a recent survey completed by the president of Willys-Overland Motors, in Toledo, with regard to the productive facilities existing merely in the automobile repair shops of the United States.

They took a cross section of the country and found among these various shops, nearly all of which will be put out of business so far as automobiles are concerned, a perfectly incredible amount of all kinds of machinery. The estimate made indicates that there are in those shops alone 18,000 lathes; 15,000 grinding machines; 1,400 shapers; 16,000 drilling machines; 52,000 welding units, and a countless amount of additional machinery. The area of floor space in those shops is more than 250,000,000 square feet. The machinery and equipment is valued at more than a half billion dollars. That is only one phase of the kind of facilities which are not being used.

The testimony shows that in Germany practically every cross-roads shop has been set up as a machine shop to help make parts for the war production. Many farmers are given machine tools of a certain type to enable them during the winter to work in the production program. Certainly there are not only small plants, but there are a countless number of intermediate plants that can be mobilized if someone can do it; and that is the purpose of this bill.

When we approached the bill we found the difficulty was that the heads of the three departments having to do with production were concerned primarily with big industry. That is not their fault. They had to get results in a hurry; they had to get millions of articles manufactured with the utmost speed, without waiting to try to work out the best possible method of doing it, and, naturally, they turned to big business. The procurement officers of the Army and Navy find it much easier to let 1 big contract than to let 10 small contracts; that is human nature; but their whole energy is taken up in negotiating large contracts.

The War Production Board set up a small business division, but it was not backed up or given effective support. The War Production Board, necessarily, has been trying to mobilize all the big industries of the country. They have had the whole automobile industry and many different kinds of large manufacturing concerns to convert. They simply could not have the time and have not had the time or the energy to go on to the infinitely more difficult job of trying to coordinate all the small industries of the country.

When it comes to the lending agency, the R. F. C., the same condition is found to exist. The Defense Plants Corporation have available to loan to war industries nearly $10,000,000,000. They are lending it in large amounts. They are necessarily interested; their time is taken up in negotiating contracts with concerns that can borrow as much as a hundred million dollars at a time, and, naturally, in a much shorter time, they can accomplish more in that way. So we started out to set up a separate organization in the War Production Board, which shall not be concerned with big business in any way but shall simply be concerned with mobilizing small industry to work out the problems of small industry. We have provided for such an organization in this bill. In order to implement that effort, and to make it more effective, the bill also creates the Smaller War Plants Corporation. We have a Defense Plants Corporation which can do anything that the new corporation can, but its whole energy must be taken up with doing the big job. We want somebody who has not anything to do except

to mobilize small industry. That is the purpose of this bill.

After we started, it was suggested, why not have this thing all done at one place instead of three? Why have a procurement officer who is trying to distribute contracts to small business and the War Production Board trying to organize it, and the R. F. C. trying to finance it? Why not put it all in one place? That seemed to be common sense. So we provided for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, but we only gave it a hundred million dollars, which is only 1 percent of what the R. F. C. has. If the plan is a success, the Corporation will be back for more, but this is a trial to do a job which is not an easy one to do. Somebody will have to be something of a genius to work it out.

According to the terms of the bill the Smaller War Plants Corporation can go to the War and Navy Departments, if those Departments propose to let a contract for a few tanks, and say, "We can handle for small business a hundred of those tanks; give us a contract for a hundred of them and you will not need to worry; we will get a certain concern to manufacture one part, another concern to manufacture another part, a third concern to manufacture a third part, and a fourth concern to assemble the whole into a tank.

So the bill gives the Corporation the power to be the prime contractor, and then to sublet the contracts so that the article may be produced. The Army will have the same control; the Army inspectors will be able to give the same inspection; the Army will let the contracts; the goods must come up to specification; but the job of trying to divide the work among subcontractors is to be given to this Corporation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Ohio is making a very able presentation of the case before the Senate. I am sure that he will recall the testimony which was developed before the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the bill in which it was shown how difficult it was for an individual corporation to get a contract. I remember the testimony of Mr. Glassgold, representing the Allied Automatic Machines, Inc., of Chicago, and small plants generally, who said that they had the very finest equipment and were competent of taking contracts for the most complicated kind of materials, but they failed absolutely to secure any consideration. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the bill, as it is drawn and as it has been explained, will bring about such a situation that the facilities of small concerns scattered over the country can be utilized in war production.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that there is any question that it is a job that can be done.

When it came to financing, we decided that this Corporation might as well do the financing. If they have to mobilize small industry they ought to be able to say, "If you can make this article in your plant or if you can make this particular part and you need so much money, we will lend you money for that purpose." It seems to me that will avoid complications. The small concerns will not have to sell their whole proposition, first, to the War and Navy and procurement officer, then to the War Production Board, and, finally, to the financing corporation. They will not have to begin at the beginning each time and explain their story, but they can get it all done in one place, in one production board, the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

I am confident that the plan will work. It will take real skill; it will take a careful and methodical approach; it will take energy, initiative, and imagination to put it across; but I believe it can be done.

We are only giving the Corporation, as I have said, 1 percent of what the R. F. C. has. I do not think a great deal of money will be required, but some money will be needed; and I can see no reason why the Government should not do for the small plants exactly what it has done for nearly every large company in the United States, either lend them money or build the plant for them and lease it to them, or take some other action which will enable the company to participate in the war effort and enable the Government to add just that much production to what would otherwise be available in the big plants. There is no interference with the development of the manufacture of the large plants; this is a supplemental program and a program which only adds and cannot detract from the total war effort of the United States.

I might refer to one feature of small industry in general. We may find that it is better to turn as much as possible of the large industry into war production, and then mobilize the small industry to take care of the civilian supply, or parts of the civilian supply which the larger companies have been handling but which now they must abandon in order to give their full attention to war production. There is pending another bill suggesting that idea, but there is nothing to prevent the corporation provided for in the bill from financing the development of essential manufacture; and if it is desirable to take a large plant which is manufacturing something perhaps essential for civilian supply and turn that whole plant into war production, and then mobilize the smaller industries to take care of the civilian supply which the larger plant has given up, that can be done by the Corporation provided for in this bill.

So I feel very confident, Mr. President, that the bill can only be of assistance in the program. I have confidence that, if administered with ability, it can be made of the greatest assistance to the American war-production effort.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Ohio for the very clear explanation he has made of the purposes of the bill. I wish to acknowledge again the very able part the Senator from Ohio played in the formulation of the measure. He contributed, I think, more than any other member of the committee in drafting the provisions of the bill. I wish to make that acknowledgment publicly.

He was active and interested from the very commencement of our hearings and proceedings, and contributed greatly to the final result.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able speeches and explanations which have been made today on the floor of the Senate in favor of Senate bill 2250. I, too, am heartily in favor of the bill, because I feel that it will be of great benefit to small business and small industries. The title of the bill is, "To mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

I know the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and his committee have labored long and hard, and, as has been said by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I feel that if the proposed law shall be properly administered it will bring untold good, and serve a pressing need and help business and those engaged in small business pursuits.

The bill has been explained and considered, and it will not be my purpose to take time to discuss Senate bill 2250, but my purpose in asking recognition is to express the hope that the Senate will make the Connally bill, Senate bill 2054, the next order of business in this body. Yesterday a strenuous effort was made to bring up the Connally bill and secure some consideration of labor legislation by the Senate, but the effort failed. However, we are going to do our best to get some labor legislation considered by this Senate as soon as possible. Some of us have been working along this line for quite some time, but up to now we have not been able to have considered on the floor of the Senate any measure dealing with the present labor situation.

Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, appointed to conduct hearings on Senate bill 2054, known as the Connally bill, a measure relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, I desire to say that the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings, and we had before us many distinguished personages, such as Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; and Hon. James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Land, and other notable individuals. We had before us also representatives of various groups and organizations.

Senate bill 2054 provides for the freezing of the status of employers and employees in case of a strike in a defense industry, thus avoiding delay and the impeding of production in our all-out war efforts.

Mr. President, I no longer use the term "national defense efforts." I now propose to use the more realistic and aggressive term of "national offense efforts." We cannot win the war if this country still possesses the psychology of "national defense." We must realize that from now until final victory the slogan must henceforth be "national offense efforts."

I know there is a movement on foot to bring about a tacit truce on demands for wartime labor legislation, at least

until after the Easter holidays, with the thought that this so-called cooling-off period would give the Members of the Congress time to go home and ascertain the true facts about what the people really wanted.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to say to the Senate that I do not have to return to my State to know the hearts and minds of the God-fearing and intensely patriotic citizens of Mississippi, and here and now I raise my voice in support of the earnest effort of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in his attempt to get Senate action on his antistrike bill, calling for Government seizure of plants and freezing all labor and conditions where disputes threaten war production. I certainly am not against labor when I take this stand. I believe that all patriotic Americans are fully convinced that strikes retarding our all-out war efforts must cease.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Mississippi, now addressing the Senate, is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of the subcommittee that considered and reported my bill, and worked very diligently and very attentively on Senate bill 2054 from the very time he was made a member of the subcommittee. I wish personally to thank him for the contribution he made. With his usual ability and diligence he contributed very materially, and his approach to the question is a broad, patriotic one. I am very happy indeed to know that at this time he is supporting my measure and expects to vote for its immediate consideration. The people of Mississippi can well be proud of the Senator for his contribution while he is still a very new Member of the Senate.

Mr. DOXEY. I deeply appreciate the kind and generous remarks of the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the senior Senator from Texas, and I thank him profoundly.

Mr. President, I believe, as was stated by Judge Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, when he was testifying before our committee:

> In my opinion, the enactment of this measure—
>
> S. 2054, known as the Connally bill—
>
> will be in furtherance of the national defense program and consequently of the public interests.

Mr. President, this was the considered judgment of the distinguished Under Secretary of War, before we were so foully stabbed in the back on December 7, 1941. How much more compelling is the enactment of this salutary measure at this time, whe we have stopped talking about national defense efforts and have gotten down to brass tasks and only speak of our national offense efforts. If we ever expect to win the war, we must be definitely on the offensive. I said on the floor of the Senate on March 10, 1942:

> Huge war profits must cease, red tape must be dispensed with, and everyone, from the highest to the lowest, must realize that we are now fighting for our very existence and act accordingly. Congress must act. Legislation should be immediately enacted to remedy this regrettable and serious situation. I am ready to vote and do all I can to achieve this result now. No time should be lost; nothing should deter us. First things must come first. We must win this war and preserve our democratic way of life.

I also said:

> We cannot all do the same things, but we must all contribute our part; that we must all work or fight.

Those among us, if there be any, who are not willing to work or fight, must be dealt with summarily. We are in a life and death struggle, and I am fully conscious of this awful fact, and am doing my dead-level best to meet the issues of the hour fairly and squarely. I further said in the same speech before the Senate, March 10:

> Let us cross the Rubicon and take our stand beside the boys in the trenches, on the high seas, and in the air, and say to those who would stop or retard our all-out defense efforts, "This glorious Republic is not poor and beaten France. We must all work or fight; we cannot do more; we dare not do less."

Mr. President, I truly mean just that. We must quit thinking in terms of less work for more money. We also have to get away from the outrage of a $35,000 investment with a profit of $210,000; or double time for Sunday or holiday work; or time and a half until we have worked at least a full 48-hour week. How are we going to win this war if we follow the footsteps of fallen France? I am proud to personally back Senator CONNALLY in this tragic hour—for I firmly believe that if we pass the Connally bill and modify the 40-hour-week provision, and pass the pending measures limiting the unreasonable profits in the manufacturing of all instruments of war—even, if necessary, commandeering capital and labor, treating all alike, then we will have made great progress in remedying this situation and securing all out war production. I am ready to do just that.

I plead with the Senate to get down to brass tacks and meet the issues of the hour. I well know that if this is done our representative Government will stand eternally vindicated. I do solemnly declare that unless we here and now measure up to this high standard of statesmanship, in this critical hour of National peril, I am fearful of the ultimate consequences. I definitely differ with the school of thought which would place theories of "social gains" above the bald fact that up to this good day we are being defeated in this World War; that we can work only 40 hours regular time, and receive time-and-a-half pay after 40 hours, and double time for Sundays and holidays, with our boys fighting and dying on land, in the air, and on and under the high seas, and sufficiently sustain the morale of our entire Nation to bring us victory. To win this war we must get away from this deadly philosophy which brought France to slavery and utter defeat. If we, the Congress, will exercise that degree of leadership, so prayerfully hoped for by the great majority of the American people, and put a stop to unconscionable profits by both industry and labor, and so regulate prices as to keep down ruinous inflation, then, Mr. President, it will mean that we are determined to bring about national stability, so that when our brave fighting forces, well knowing that we mean business, victoriously return to the land of the free and the home of the brave, they will not find this glorious country burdened down with an unpayable debt, and absolutely threatened with national bankruptcy. If we continue on our present course, I fear we are going to rue the day when we did not stop, look, and act.

I well know that those of us in the Senate who are working and fighting for the curtailment of many unnecessary governmental expenditures, the consolidation of the overlapping agencies of our National Government, and the elimination of useless and expensive activities are strongly opposed by some of those in authority. But I have the determination to face the crisis of this fateful hour, and I here and now call upon my colleagues of the Senate and appeal to them to forego any further postponement concerning enactment of those salutary measures of which I have spoken, and which are certainly designed to prove to the world that we realize the extreme seriousness of this day. Let us, in the name of freedom, with a high regard for our sacred duty to our families and firesides, and our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines now fighting and dying so gloriously and destroying the treacherous enemy, I say, let us become altogether united and unselfish, and thereby meet the full measure of that terrible responsibility which destiny has placed upon the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as one who is very deeply interested in the problems of small business, as one who, as far back as 1936, introduced a bill to set up a system of guaranteed loans for small business, I wish to make a few observations concerning the measure which is now before the Senate for consideration. The bill, like the President's order, seeks to put working capital, financing, on a war basis, and seeks to eliminate peacetime restrictions on banks and other credit agencies, so that we may cut away the red tape and expedite the war-production program.

Necessarily the R. F. C. has been reluctant to grant loans in the cases which will come within the purveiw of the pending measure. That is because of the legislation governing the functioning of that agency and because of its policy, with which I have no fault to find.

Mr. President, the present bill authorizes the creation of a corporation to aid small business in the production of both military and essential civilian supplies. I wish to emphasize that fact. It may be misunderstood. It may be thought by

some that the proposed legislation is for the sole purpose of augmenting military production. As I read the bill, and as I recall the discussion before the committee in connection with the bill, it is for the dual purpose of aiding in the production of both military and essential civilian supplies.

Mr. President, we can readily agree that that is very necessary when we understand that this year there will be spent in the United States upwards of $60,000,000,000 for essential civilian supplies. One of the purposes of the proposed legislation is to relieve big plants now manufacturing military supplies in one part of the plant and civilian supplies in the other, and also to distribute some of the work among the smaller plants of the country.

A second purpose is to supplement the work done by the big plants by permitting the smaller plants to participate in the military production. So the bill, if enacted, will enable small business to participate both in the essential civilian productivity and in the very necessary and vital military production.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the bill provides the method whereby the goal set by the President of the United States for the construction of planes and tanks and military equipment, can be reached. By the enactment of the proposed legislation and by the enthusiastic mobilization of small plants into war and essential peace production we shall attain the goal set before us by the President, and I believe in some cases we shall exceed that goal.

In my judgment, the pending bill presents the very best medium whereby we can speed and accelerate and expand war production. There are in the United States 184,000 manufacturing plants, of which, according to figures furnished to our committee and to the Congress, a very small percentage is participating in the contracts which have been awarded to date.

I believe it is reasonable to assume, based upon the record, that eventually some 50,000 plants, which are now closed or partly closed, or which will shortly be closed as the result of priorities, will, by the proposed legislation, be brought into the military productivity we so vitally need.

Mr. President, I estimate that approximately 5,000 of these plants are located in the State of New York, and that a substantial number of those which are idle, partly idle, or destined shortly to be idle, are located in the western part of New York.

The proposed legislation, as I see it, authorizing as it does a deputy to be appointed by Mr. Nelson to mobilize and to organize small plants, will result in furnishing loans, material, supplies, machinery, equipment, and additional land and additional plants in order to organize small business. The Corporation created by the bill will be able to furnish engineering and other similar services in order to enable small business to cope with the requirements contained in the contracts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am quite interested in what the Senator has stated as to what is possible under the provisions of the bill. I should like to ask him whether it would be possible under the provisions of the bill for a small mine to borrow money for milling purposes or for the production of ores? Would it be possible for such a mine to borrow money under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that the Corporation which is authorized to be formed by the bill, if given the money necessary to do the job, can loan money for such purposes. I believe the particular question with reference to the possibility of mining facilities participating in loans can be answered in the affirmative. I would say that the Corporation can organize the small mines of the country, particularly those which can make a contribution to national defense. I believe that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee—in fact, I heard him make a similar observation during the debate today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very glad to hear the Senator make that statement because, at the present time under existing laws and under the regulations governing the R. F. C., it is almost impossible for a mine to borrow any money unless it can absolutely prove ore in place sufficient to repay the loan.

I notice that the repayment requirements under this measure are very much more liberal than those of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. If it seems to be in the interest of national defense, a loan for such a proposal should be authorized, even though it be not absolutely certain that all the money loaned will be repaid. I may say that there is now a very great shortage in production of certain vital strategic and critical minerals, and we have in the West great opportunities to increase the production of such minerals of which we are so short. It is seemingly impossible, however, to borrow any money from the Federal Government for the production of those minerals in the Western States, by reason of the strict rules and regulations and red tape and other difficulties, unless the concerns making application for the loans are very large ones. So I am more than pleased to hear the Senator from New York say that, in his opinion, the provisions of the bill could be applied to small mining industries.

Mr. MEAD. Yes, Mr. President; in my opinion, the defense requirements will obviate the necessity of the plants conforming to the normal banking requirements which have heretofore motivated the agencies of Government. It is my opinion that, under the provisions of the bill, any small mining operation can be organized and be provided with loans and with engineering facilities, if that is necessary.

Mr. President, I will say that our committee made a study of this very problem, which confronted other countries of the United Nations. We also studied the methods which were used in Germany as well as in other countries. We feel that this method of approach presents not only the quickest but the very best method whereby small industry in the country can be mobilized and brought into the war effort. It must be remembered that not only war contracts but priorities have served to render idle thousands of the smaller plants of the country.

The proposed legislation contemplates the restoration of those plants either to essential civilian productivity or to productivity for the military effort.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In my opinion, the senior Senator from Colorado has raised a very important question in connection with the bill—certainly important to the intermountain region from which he and I come. As the Senator knows, the bill was before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member. Had there been the slightest doubt in my mind as a member of that committee that small mining operations come within the purview of the bill I certainly should have offered an amendment during the discussion of the bill before the committee to take care of that situation; but I was so sure of my position, which is now, I think, supported by the Senator from New York, that small mining operations do come within the provisions of the bill, that I thought it wholly unnecessary to offer any such amendment during the consideration of the bill before the committee.

I know that many small mining operations in the West have been handicapped by reason of the laws controlling the lending of money to mines by the R. F. C. and I am hopeful, as is the Senator from Colorado, that many small mining operations in the West capable of adding much to the production of copper, lead, and zinc will find in the provisions of the bill what they have been seeking for a long time, and that we shall see many of those operations come back into activity.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to have my distinguished colleague's contribution at this point. I shall conclude by summarizing in brief what I believe the bill would accomplish.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I note with much interest that in writing the bill the committee has given particular emphasis to subcontracts. I presume the committee had in mind the importance of subcontracts and the importance of using smaller concerns in every way possible in the matter of subcontracts. Is that not true?

Mr. MEAD. That is true.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the committee had in mind the importance of endeavoring to impress upon the War Production Board and everyone else connected with the war-production program that it is the intent of the Congress that subcontracts be awarded whenever possible to expedite the production program, and

also that small business be given its part and place in the war-production program.

Mr MEAD That is true.

Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, the proposed legislation would authorize the appointment of a deputy to Donald Nelson, whose job it would be to organize small business. The bill would create a Corporation of five members, which would be clothed with authority to make loans, extend plants, buy land, and furnish supplies, materials, equipment, engineering resources, and other facilities, so nothing would stop the job from being accomplished.

The proposed legislation would enable the Corporation to act in the capacity of a prime contractor which could bid for work, just as any other big prime contractor now bids for work, and then sublet the work to the various small manufacturing plants throughout the United States. I believe that the bill would authorize the Corporation to utilize an existing prime contractor who is perhaps suffering from a backlog of contracts which he would be unable to complete for the next 2 or 3 years. It would authorize the utilization of such a prime contractor in a contract which would permit him to subcontract 100 percent of any contracts he might have.

The bill would do the job. It would eliminate the difficulties which have beset the various procurement agencies of the Government, because the proposed corporation would be clothed with an authority as complete as the problem requires. I believe that from now on the military and essential civilian production of our country will rise rapidly and that before the middle of the year rolls around we shall realize the mighty contribution we shall have made in the enactment of this legislation, for it would make sure the attainment of the goal mapped out for us by the President of the United States.

I congratulate the chairman of our committee for his persistence, energy, and leadership in bringing the bill to its preeminent position. I congratulate and commend the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, its chairman, my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], who made a magnificent contribution to the expeditious consideration of the legislation.

The same praise is due my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and an active and enthusiastic advocate of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate will set an example in the consideration and passage of this measure today. I hope that example will be followed by the House, so that the President may have the privilege of signing the bill in the very near future.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate has been more concerned than have I with the problem confronting the so-called small businesses of this country from the inception of the defense program and the onset of the war. I join with other Senators who have commended the Committee on Small Business for the hearings and for the interest which it has shown in this problem.

I should be the last to want to strike a discordant note in this debate; but I cannot let the occasion pass without making the observation that, in my judgment, the mere enactment of legislation, no matter how well conceived and well drawn, will not solve the problems confronting the small business concerns. The administrative record is strewn with defunct agencies, which have been created one after another for the alleged purpose of seeing that some of the huge sums of money which were being spent for war purposes were allocated to small business concerns. I think the record shows beyond peradventure that, for the most part, such efforts have been entirely in vain. The passage of this bill would not accomplish the results which its authors and Senators who have given it unanimous support today have in mind unless there should be a radical change in the administrative point of view and in the point of view of those who have the power to allocate the contracts in the first place.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out to the able Senator from Wisconsin that in drafting the bill the committee had in mind the very thing which he has just mentioned. The Corporation set up under the bill has only one purpose and one task; and unless it gives its undivided attention to the problems of so-called small business and obtains for such business its share of the distribution of war work, and obtains from it a proper contribution to war production, it will completely fail. It cannot do anything else but devote itself to this particular task, whereas the other agencies of Government to which I think the Senator refers had a divided responsibility. Naturally, when seeking war production, they went where it was most easily found, among the large corporations. However, it seems to me that the Corporation set up under this bill cannot completely fail, because it has not another single solitary thing to do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Connecticut is correct in his statement; but I reiterate my apprehension that unless there is a complete change in the policy of those who are allocating the contracts and of those who are letting the contracts—in short, unless there is a change in the policy of the executive branch of the Government—the fact that the proposed Corporation is designed and conceived for one sole purpose will not avail and will not remedy the situation which has prevailed up to this time. We all know that various agencies have been created in an effort, it was said, to help small business. As a matter of fact, about all that such action has accomplished has been to provide another wailing wall to which the men and organizations seeing themselves caught in a giant pincers movement between priorities, on the one hand, and war contracts, on the other, have come in order to make their last appeal before they were pinched out of the economic life of this country.

Mr. President, I am concerned about this matter not solely from the standpoint of the situation so far as individual business men are concerned, or so far as investors are concerned, or even so far as those employed in the so-called small businesses are concerned.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I am concerned about the situation from two standpoints. First of all, if we do not achieve the objective of the proposed legislation and of other measures which may come from the Small Business Committee, if we do not save the segment of our economy which is made up of so-called small business, we shall change entirely the whole economic structure of the United States, and we shall come out of the war in such a situation that there will be left in the country practically no competition whatsoever. I am concerned about the pending bill from that standpoint. I am concerned about it also because I realize that our enemies are operating on an all-out production basis and that unless we utilize all the facilities of production in our economy we cannot hope to compete successfully with our enemies insofar as production of the materials of war is concerned.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, first I should like to say that I have long admired the intense interest of the Senator from Wisconsin in the problems of small business men. I desire to associate myself with his observation that, unless they are protected and saved from further casualties, we shall undo our national economy as it is planned, and shall do great damage to our country.

I desire to try to give the Senator from Wisconsin comfort, if I can, in that connection. During the course of his recent statement he said that under certain conditions, and to do thus and so, "they" created new corporations or agencies. The Corporation proposed to be created by the pending bill is not proposed to be created by "them." The pending measure is a Senate bill; it did not originate downtown. It met some opposition in certain quarters. It was opposed in part by some of those who I think have been neglectful; and it was only after considerable effort on the part of Members of the Senate, the Small Business Committee, and the Banking and Currency Committee, that the bill finally reached the Senate. So I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin know that the pending bill is one of the really few bills originating in the Congress in recent days.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his observation. I hope that neither the Small Business Committee nor the Banking and Currency Committee will infer

from anything I have said that I am trying to take any credit away from them or that I do not recognize that they initiated the measure and that it is because of the combined efforts of members of the Small Business Committee and of the Banking and Currency Committee that the bill is now before the Senate and about to be passed.

However, once more I desire to say that the best conceived plan, the best drawn piece of legislation, cannot accomplish the objective sought to be accomplished by the pending bill unless there is a radical change in the point of view of the procurement officers of the Army and Navy and of certain persons in strategic positions in the War Production Board. The fact that certain agencies were created by Executive action, at the other end of the Avenue, ostensibly for the purpose of protecting, looking after, and nurturing the small business segment of our economy, and that one after another they have folded up, after failure, is a complete justification of the statement I have made. The statistics regarding the letting of contracts, both as to dollar volume and as to percentage, will show that despite all the lip service, despite all the agencies which, one after another have folded up in despair and defeat, most of the contracts, in volume and percentage, have gone to the giant corporations. Unless something is done to stem that tide we shall wake up to find small business, the competitive segment of our economy, completely trampled on and crushed as a result of the war effort.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. There is just basis for the apprehensions of the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that the matter which disturbed our committee more than anything else was the problem of bringing about some legislation which would overcome the obstacles the Senator has been discussing. Unless we achieve some results in the program proposed in the pending bill we shall see the small business enterprises of the country destroyed, and we shall see built up in our country a totalitarian system which will mean the end of democracy. There is no question about that.

This subject has been discussed for several years. The Temporary National Economic Committee has been studying the problem, and was doing so before the Small Business Committee was created; and I think that every member of our committee has been very much worried about the ability of our committee to work out a scheme whereby we could overcome the obstacles which the Senator from Wisconsin has been discussing. The Smaller War Plants Corporation which we propose to set up under the terms of the pending bill would be staffed by men interested in achieving the results about which we are talking today; it would have experts, engineers, and technicians who are able to study the small plants Mr. Nelson appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and stated that he was wholeheartedly in favor of the proposed legislation, and that he considered the pending bill a solution of the problem.

I am sure that we shall find the most wholehearted support in the War Production Board. If the bill is passed and the Corporation is set up, I am sure we shall find that Mr. Nelson will support the Corporation, and that the Corporation will really accomplish the aims we have in mind.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I appreciate all the reassurances which I have received from him and from other Members of the Senate concerning my apprehensions. I shall be the first to acknowledge it if happily they fail to be realized. I repeat that nothing I have said should be construed as indicating any lack of appreciation for the work of the Senator from Montana and his colleagues on his committee, or the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I simply desire to put my own statement on record. Despite all that Congress may do, unless we obtain a change in the point of view of those who, in the last analysis, have the power to let the contracts, all the legislation which we may pass will not achieve the objectives for which it is designed.

Mr MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say again, for the purpose of emphasis, that the pending bill fixes responsibility; and I should like to take a little of the Senator's time, if I may do so, in order to read an excerpt from Walter Lippmann's column of this morning, which was sent to me, the title of which is "The Passing of the Buck."

The article refers to synthetic rubber. I have not read all the article, but I should like to read one paragraph of it:

> Mr. Jones told the committee that "it would seem we have rubber enough to run us at least 1½ years if we were cut off tomorrow from a supply of natural rubber * * * and that would give us about the time required to build synthetic rubber plants." After quoting this testimony of his to the Senate committee, Mr. Jones adds in his recent report, dated March 21 1942, that "the problem of snythetic rubber was generally discussed in the committee, and it was the consensus that limited operations should be undertaken."

I think the article refers to a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I attended the committee meeting. Synthetic rubber was discussed; but I do not think it was the consensus of opinion of the committe that limited operations should be undertaken. At least it was not my opinion. I raised the question. I begged Mr. Jones to build synthetic rubber plants; but I did not hear anyone except Mr. Jones raise a question against my suggestion.

I do not say this in criticism of him, because all of us misjudged the situation in one way or another, but it is unfortunate, a year or more later, to have the statement made—I do not know whether Mr. Jones is correctly quoted—that it was the consensus of opinion of the committee that we should limit our operations.

I mention this in order to point out to the Senate and to the Senator, because of his apprehension, that the pending bill definitely fixes responsibility. If the Corporation proposed to be set up under the terms of the bill does not do its job it will be a complete failure, which will be obvious to the whole country. There can be no "buck passing" in this instance.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not think there could be much buck passing so far as the agencies to which I have adverted are concerned. After they had been working for awhile it was discovered that they had not accomplished anything. The same thing might happen in the case of the Corporation proposed to be set up under the terms of the pending bill if, as I stated before, those who in the last analysis have the power over letting contracts do not change their attitude and become sympathetic with the idea of making as wide a distribution as possible of contracts, and utilizing as much of our productive capacity as it is possible to use.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not want to give further reassurance; but let me say that I did feel that the failure of the Odlum committee was perhaps due not only to a lack of interest in the War Production Board, but it also was due to the fact that the procurement officers would not give contracts to the small business, and Mr. Odlum could not get the money; in fact, there was so much trouble that he could not accomplish his purpose.

That situation has concentrated the whole business in Mr. Nelson, and under the Executive order he would have power to tell the War Department and Navy Department to let contracts to the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He never before had such power until the issuance of the recent directive.

He has the power to let the subcontracts to small business; he has the power to give them the money to finance the contracts; so that it is certainly true now that, for the first time, one man can do the whole job. Previously it was fair to say that there were three different Departments that had to cooperate, and, of course, it was difficult to obtain cooperation.

I think Mr. Nelson when he came into office issued a statement which seemed to show a hostility to small business, but I was impressed the last two or three times he came before the committee that his attitude had completely changed. I believe that the man to whom we are giving the power is impressed with the necessity of aiding small business; that he has changed his point of view, and, if he appoints the right men on this board, which he has the power to do, I believe the job can be done.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think the job can be done if there is a will to do it, but I say that, up to now, there has not been in the executive branch of the Government sufficient will to accomplish the objective of assuring the survival of small business. Senators can tell me anything they please about

how complicated the set-up was, but I reiterate that, if they had wanted to do this job, they could have done so. They knew that small business was failing; their own statistics showed that it was failing month by month, that contracts were being scattered, and smal' business was being liquidated. The responsibility was on their hands, for they were charged with letting the contracts, in the first place, and, under all the powers that have been given to the executive branch of the Government it is no defense to say that the situation was such that they could "pass the buck."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I call attention to another very salutary provision of this bill, which I think is aimed to bring about the resu!t to which the Senator from Wisconsin is referring. I quote section 5 of the bill, which is as follows:

SEC. 5. The Chairman of the War Production Board shall make a report every 60 days of his operations under this act to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include the names of the business concerns to whom contracts are let, and for whom financing is arranged, by the Corporation, together with the amounts involved, and such report shall include such other information, and such comments and recommendations, with respect to the relation of small business concerns to the war effort, as the Chairman may deem appropriate.

The Senator will observe that Congress is holding control of this situation. We are demanding reports; we are going to insist on results; and I am sure that we can bring about such pressure that we will obtain results.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator is right about it, but I will say that the Congress has been so liberal and so generous and has piled up such a huge backlog of appropriations, to which there is about to be added $18,000,000,000 more on top of the $143,000,000,000 already appropriated or authorized for contracts, that it is a mistake to delude ourselves about how much power we have left.

I am not for one moment criticizing efforts to accomplish the desired objective, but I do want to make of record my own concern and apprehension, in the hope that we will not all go home after we have passed this bill tonight, rub our hands, and say, "The job has been done." It will not be done unless, as the Senator suggests, Congress stays with this question and never lets up on it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin did not mean when he suggested that it is no defense to talk about passing the buck that I was attempting to defend what was going on. I am completely in sympathy with the opinion and expressed views of the Senator from Wisconsin. I deplore the fact that small business has been overlocked. Time and again on the Senate floor and in committee I have condemned the practices which have existed. I was not attempting to defend anyone, but I was expressing the hope, with something of confidence, that this bill would finally reach the industrialists and small businessmen who have been shabbily treated. I want the RECORD to show that I was not attempting to defend or to make any excuses for any of the agencies engaged in this work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand the Senator's position, and I hope that nothing I said will be taken to have been critical of anyone else.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that I think there is another aspect of this problem which should be emphasized. The discussion has turned largely on the proposal to obtain for so-called small business a share of the war contracts; that is important; but I hope we will not overlook the possibilities that remain for small business, which I know are recognized in this bill, insofar as supplying the domestic needs of the country are concerned, because here, it seems to me is a field which may, in the long run, prove more of a boon, more of a life preserver to the small business segment of our economy than war work itself.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have expressed myself earlier in the day with respect to the Murray bill, Senate bill 2250; I have diligently listened, since that time, to the able speeches made by other Senators, and I wish to add my approval of everything good that has been said about the bill. I think it is an excellent bill, and it will prove, in my opinion, if properly administered, to be a great boon to the small business interests of this Nation which are now struggling for their very existence. However, this bill may prove to be another case of "too little and too late." More money might be needed than is provided by the bill, and, so far as being too late is concerned, I know it is too late for some of the small business concerns in my State. They have already had to curtail their operations and lay off hundreds of laboring people because they could not obtain contracts to manufacture war materials which they were qualified and equipped to manufacture.

I also wish to say a few words with reference to the labor situation as it pertains to the slowing down of production of war materials. After listening to the debate on the floor of the Senate yesterday, when time after time it was stated that any amendment with reference to labor could be added to the Murray bill or the Connally bill, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not take recognition of those statements and offer my amendments. If I were convinced that the Connally bill would receive consideration on the floor this week, I should be glad to defer the amendments which I have in mind until that bill comes to the floor, but seeing, as I did yesterday, the power that was put forth by my worthy colleague, the able senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and realizing that his efforts did not gain results and that he was unable to get his bill to the floor for consideration, I hardly think that it is advisable for any other Senator to try to get a labor bill to the floor. If the senior Senator from Texas could not do so, I doubt if any other Senator would be successful. Not knowing that his bill will come before the Senate, I feel it to be my duty to my constituents in the State of Texas to offer my labor amendments to the pending bill.

The amendments which I have in mind do not constitute a substitute for the Connally bill in any manner. They deal with different phases of the labor situation. I am in favor of the Connally bill, and intend to support it, if it ever gets to the floor for consideration; but I should also like to have these other matters come before the Senate. I know that I have two courses open: One is, of course, to offer an amendment to the pending bill, the Murray bill; the other is to offer it to the Connally bill if and when the Connally bill comes before the Senate. I believe in playing safe on the proposition, and offering my amendment to the first bill which is up for consideration, and, if it fails, then I may offer it to the second bill which comes before the Senate.

Mr. President, I can see no objection to offering an amendment such as I have in mind to the Murray bill, in order that it may come before this Senate for a vote. The Senators are all capable and are perfectly able to exercise their own right and vote the way they please.

The amendments will be e.ther adopted or rejected, and the people of this Nation will then know how the Senators stand on this important legislation.

So, Mr. President, I wish to send to the desk two amendments, marked "A" and "B," which I should like to offer as amendments to the committee substitute for the Murray bill, Senate bill 2250, to receive consideration at the proper time, and to be inserted in the bill at the proper place. I should like to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I plead with the Senator not to offer this amendment to the pending bill. The only effect of the amendment would be to destroy the bill, which is designed to do great good in our country. There are millions of small business men all over the United States today who are in danger of bankruptcy, and it seems to me that if the Senator from Texas attempts to destroy the pending bill by offering an amendment of this kind, he is doing a great disservice to the people of this country.

Small business is in danger of being wiped out, and it seems to me that the least Congress can do at this time is to make an effort to save it. Witnesses appeared before our committee and before other committees of the Senate. Ours is not the first committee which has handled this problem. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been interested in the subject for many years, and we all know the work of the Temporary National Economic Committee, which studied the problem for a long period of time, pointing out to the people that our democratic system, which is based upon small business enterprise, upon which our system was built, is in danger of being wiped out.

Here we are, after months of study of the problem, and we have brought in a bill which is really capable of solving the problem for the small business concerns

of the country, which are in danger of being destroyed. It seems to me that the Senator should listen to reason in a matter of this kind, and not permit his enthusiasm for his measure to induce him to submit his amendment at this time.

In addition to what I have already said, it would cause great delay.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Montana might be as generous in his consideration of my wishes in this matter as I am in the consideration of his. I heartily approve his bill, and I believe it is highly necessary. The Senate of the United States cannot cure all these evils with one stroke of the pen. I think many things can be done, among which is the enactment of the bill of the Senator from Montana, also the amendments which I am offering, because my amendments will also greatly benefit the small business enterprises of this Nation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. There is no emergency at present involved in the matter about which the Senator from Texas is talking. A very serious emergency confronts the country with reference to the small business problem. There are no strikes at the present time in factories engaged in war production. War production is increasing rapidly in every section of the country.

I have just received a newspaper from Seattle, Wash., the Seattle Times, in which it is stated that the Seattle plants are far ahead of the Nation in the adoption of the 7-day week. Listen to these headlines:

Shipyards either on or nearing program. Boeing workers expected to be set in 2 weeks.

This paper is dated March 25:

Organized labor and defense industry on Puget Sound were miles ahead of Washington, Wednesday, on the 7-day-week, 24-hour-daily work schedule, and proud of it.

We are witnessing a resurgence of sentiment all over the country in favor of the elimination of these disputes about labor. I think it will be found that in every part of the country labor is anxious to contribute its part to the prosecution of the war. If the war is to be won, it is going to be won by the workers of the country. I think this effort to slap labor in the face at this time is a crime, and I appeal to the Senator to withdraw his proposed amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I can see that the able Senator from Montana makes a very good speech against what he guesses my amendments are. He opposes them, yet he does not know what they are. They have not yet been read to the Senate. I believe that if my amendments were read, he would have a better understanding of them. My amendments do not outlaw strikes or take away any honest rights from honest laboring people, but they do give added American rights and protection to honest laboring people. My amendments would outlaw force and violence in labor disputes, abolish restrictions on hours of labor, abolish overtime wages, and remove discrimination against nonunion labor. I have fully discussed these matters on previous occasion, and it is therefore unnecessary to discuss them again at this time. The amendments have been sent to the desk, and I hope they will be read, considered, and adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following at the proper place in the bill:

That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Every employer shall pay to any of his employees who are engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for commerce, compensation at the same rate for all hours worked by such employee during any pay period."

SEC. 2. Until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, (a) no provision of Federal or State law which limits or restricts hours of employment shall be applicable with respect to employees of any contractor who are engaged in the performance of work directly or indirectly necessary for the fulfillment of any contract between such contractor and the United States, and (b) no provision in any contract heretofore or hereafter made with the United States restricting or limiting the hours of employment of employees employed under or in connection with such contract, and no penalty or forfeiture for a violation of any such provision, shall be enforceable by any officer or agency of the United States.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, is amended by adding at the end of the first section thereof the following new paragraph:

"(f) When wage rates for regular hours of employment have been determined for the purposes of this act, the same hourly wage rates shall apply with respect to all hours worked during any day or workweek or other work period in employment with respect to which wages are determined under this section."

SEC. 4. (a) No employer shall enter into any contract or arrangement, or enforce or carry out the provisions of any contract or arrangement, which provides that with respect to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for such commerce, or engaged in performing work under any contract with the United States, there shall be any discrimination against any person because he is or is not a member of a labor organization.

(b) No employer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, for a period of 2 years after such violation occurs, be eligible to enter into any contract with the United States; and no officer or agency of the United States shall enter into a contract with any such employer during such 2-year period. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the various contracting officers and agencies of the United States informed as to the names of employers who are ineligible by reason of this section to enter into contracts with the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the second amendment for information only.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I certainly do not think the bill should be encumbered with this extraneous matter, which has not been before a committee, and has not been given any consideration or study by the Senate. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the second amendment for information only.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following:

It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any place where a labor dispute exists and by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblage at which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used. As used in this section, the term "labor dispute" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 2 (9) of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Were these amendments read for information, or were they offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first one was offered, the last one was read for information only. The committee amendment is an entire substitute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Were these amendments offered by the Senator from Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first was formally offered, and the second one was read for information only.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Danaher	McCarran
Andrews	Davis	McFarland
Austin	Doxey	McKellar
Bailey	Ellender	McNary
Ball	George	Maloney
Bankhead	Gerry	Maybank
Barbour	Gillette	Mead
Barkley	Glass	Millikin
Bone	Green	Murdock
Brooks	Guffey	Murray
Brown	Gurney	Nye
Bulow	Hayden	O'Daniel
Bunker	Herring	O'Mahoney
Burton	Hill	Overton
Butler	Holman	Pepper
Byrd	Hughes	Radcliffe
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Chandler	Kilgore	Rosier
Chavez	La Follette	Russell
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Schwartz
Clark, Mo.	Lee	Shipstead
Connally	Lucas	Smathers

Smith	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Spencer	Tobey	Walsh
Stewart	Tunnell	Wheeler
Taft	Tydings	Wiley
Thomas, Idaho	Vandenberg	Willis
Thomas, Okla.	Van Nuys	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is or agreeing to the first amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. On my first amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I am one of those Senators who are going to the people. I am one of those Senators who have been threatened at the ballot box. I wish to endorse what the Democratic leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said on the floor of the Senate yesterday with respect to the labor question. I wish to endorse what the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has just said. I shall vote against the amendments proposed to the committee amendment, for three reasons, and I shall only give the last reason. I shall vote against the amendments because there is an ancient rule of the Senate under which when we consider a bill, amendments dealing with any conceivable subject may be attached to the proposed legislation, so that our efforts become futile, and we in the Senate are impotent by reason of that old rule, which, like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, never changes. The laws of the Medes and the Persians did not change, but the Medes and the Persians are gone. I hope the time will soon come when the wise men of the Senate will conclude not to permit the offering of amendments which have no relation to the subject matter of the legislation being considered.

Mr. President, for the reason I have given, and I shall not mention the other two, I shall vote against the amendments to the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas. I hope the time will come when the Senate will free itself from the shackles which now bind it.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Wyoming speaks of the wise men of the Senate I wonder whom he means? I thought all of us here were endowed with wisdom. Does any Senator deny this? What Senators does the Senator include in his remarks?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Out of my great modesty I include all except myself. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. O'DANIEL's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. O'DANIEL's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I suggest that my amendment follow the word "act" and the period in line 10, on page 12, being in subsection (e) of section 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 10, after the word "act" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law all insured banks, as defined in paragraph (8) of subsection (c) of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the Corporation shall act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation, and when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be depositaries of public money, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and they may also be employed as fiscal agents of the Government; and they shall perform all such reasonable duties, as depositaries of public money and financial agents of the Government, as may be required of them. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require of the insured banks thus designated satisfactory security, by the deposit of United States bonds or otherwise for the safe keeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them and for the faithful performance of their duties as financial agents of the Government. In making his designations of depositaries and fiscal agents the Secretary of the Treasury shall not discriminate among the insured banks on the basis of the chartering or supervisory authorities under which the banks may operate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, originally only national banks were depositaries of Government funds. Later Federal Reserve member banks qualified as depositaries of Federal money. The amendment is self-explanatory. Its only purpose is to remove existing restrictions against other banks insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Under existing law the Corporation created under this measure would be prohibited from using the small banks of the country, and thereby the facilities of such banks. There is nothing mandatory in the amendment. It is entirely permissive, and is completely in keeping with the high purposes of the committee sponsoring the bill, which is to bring relief, and aid, and assistance to small business.

I may say that I have talked with the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, and with such other Senators as I could, concerning the amendment, and I believe we are in complete accord with respect to it. I should like to say further that I offer it at the suggestion of the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe the amendment is proper, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. I am wondering if the language in any way conflicts with that which appears in lines 7 and 8, on page 12, providing that the Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, and so on? I call that language to my colleague's attention in the thought that there may be some conflict, and I know that he will wish to resolve it if there be any conflict.

Mr. MALONEY. I discussed that matter with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation officials, who drafted the amendment, and they do not believe there is any conflict.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I dislike to take the time of the Senate at this late hour. I tried to get the floor earlier, after the discussion of the bill by the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the able senior Senator from Wisconsin. I feel, however, that, in justice to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a little should be said about what the R. F. C. has done. I introduce my few remarks by saying that I am in favor of the bill and shall vote for it. I and several other members of the committee were not in accord with the methods of financing that are proposed, but there was not great difference between us.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been the servant of the Congress. It has operated under statutes which we have passed. The first test provided the R. F. C. as to making loans was substantially this: That the loan should be made on full and adequate security.

Subsequently that rule was changed. It so happened that I, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, had the obligation of the revising of that particular section. We changed the test of safety so as to provide that loans should be made when there was reasonable assurance of repayment. That has been the rule up to the present hour, with the exception that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized in various ways to subscribe to the capital stock of banks and corporations, and finally to the capital stock of corporations engaged in the war effort.

Mr. President, by this bill we go a long way further. We provide that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation itself may make loans of any kind, to big business or small business, provided the loans are in aid of national defense. In this hour I think that is necessary. I think it is proper that we should do so; but I think it is somewhat unfortunate to criticize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and those who have had it in charge for adhering to a rule that loans should be made only when there was reasonable assurance of repayment. If the Federal Administrator and the directors of the R. F. C. had opened the

doors of the Treasury, as we propose to open them in this bill—and, as I say, I am willing to do it in the interest of national defense—if they had not followed the law as it was they would have been subject to criticism; but I do not think they can be justly criticized for some rejections when they lived up to the rules and regulations which we established by law.

We go further in this bill. Again I say that I am glad we have done so. We go so far as to say that the War Production Board, a new corporation, with new directors to be appointed by Mr. Donald Nelson, shall be authorized to make loans and advances and subscribe to stock on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Board may determine. This bill should not pass without knowledge on the part of the taxpayers that we are risking $100,000,000 on loans on an entirely new basis. There will be serious losses. They are inevitable. In my judgment, there is no restriction of law whatsoever upon the power of the members of the Board to make loans. There are no limitations. That language will be found in lines 11 to 13 on page 12. Again I say that I have been convinced by the testimony adduced by my friend from Montana and the other members of the Small Business Committee that we ought to go that far.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the criticism which has been made against those who have heretofore been in charge of our loan program can be justified when we consider the laws, rules, and regulations which we in the Congress have laid upon them. I do not want the Senate to feel that many loans have not been made to big corporations as well as to small corporations. I looked over one report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and found that it had made a loan of $50. Possibly it was a loan to enable a small business man who had come to Washington and been turned down to get back home [laughter], but a loan that small was made. Of course, loans have been made running into hundreds of millions of dollars.

I think the RECORD should show that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made loans in connection with the national defense effort, not to rehabilitate banks and insurance companies, which was the original purpose of the R. F. C., but in aid of the defense effort, in excess of $11,494,000,000. The Defense Plants Corporation has financed and contracted to finance the construction and expansion of more than 700 plants throughout the country for the production of ships, planes, tanks, guns, ordnance, magnesium, aluminum, steel, and synthetic rubber, to the amount of $4,797,000,000.

In the aluminum expansion program the Defense Plants Corporation and the R. F. C. have made commitments aggregating $423,000,000, which have increased the annual capacity for the production of aluminum by more than one and a quarter billion pounds, of aluminum sheeting by 360,000,000 pounds, and of aluminum alloy by 154,000,000 pounds. The same is true with regard to magnesium, steel, tin, and many other strategic and critical materials.

With regard to rubber, to which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] has referred, let me say that I was present at the committee meeting to which he alluded in his remarks. The Senator from Connecticut was the only member of that committee who urged the construction of synthetic rubber plants to the fullest possible extent. He was more farsighted than any of us in that respect; but I wish to say also that many other members of the committee, and many members of the Federal Loan Administration, were against going too far. The Army and Navy authorities advised the then Federal Loan Administrator, whose functions have been taken over by the Secretary of Commerce, that there was no real likelihood of interference with our supply of rubber. I am ready to concede that in that respect we were all wrong except the Senator from Connecticut. However, that is not the only time when many of us in the Senate, in the administration, and among the people generally have been wrong in our anticipation of events which have occurred since that time. I think that while a mistake was made, nevertheless a pretty good record was made by the Rubber Reserve Corporation.

Authority for the establishment of that Corporation was set up on June 25, 1940, and on June 29, 4 days later, an agreement was entered into by Mr. Jones in behalf of the Rubber Reserve Corporation, for an arrangement by which large quantities of rubber were purchased—as much as it was possible to purchase from the International Rubber Regulation Committee, a foreign governmental bureau which controlled 97 percent of the world's output of crude rubber.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As a matter of history, does not the Senator from Michigan think he should go back to the Strategic Materials Act which, of course, started the building up of stock piles of rubber?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. I remember very well the efforts of the Senator from Utah, who handled that bill. That also was done; but I am talking about the meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, to which the Senator from Connecticut referred, which resulted in the enactment of the bill creating the Rubber Reserve Corporation. The amount of rubber which the Corporation bought has been increased from time to time. The amount actually received and in transit to the United States is 673,000 tons, at a cost of $292,000,000.

We now have a better stock pile of rubber than we have had at any time in our history. Because of the fact that we have to consider the problem of supplying Great Britain, Russia, and the United Nations, and, because we are using more rubber for military purposes than was ever before contemplated by any of us except possibly the able Senator from Connecticut, it has been necessary to have a very strict rationing of our rubber supply.

The subject of synthetic rubber was discussed by representatives of the National Defense Council in the fall of 1940, almost 18 months ago. Mr. Stettinius advised the building of plants sufficient to manufacture 100,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. This matter was discussed with the President, and the sum of $25,000,000 was authorized for that purpose. As is well known because of the recent disclosures relative to the relationship between the Standard Oil Co. and I. G. Farbenindustrie, of Germany, patents upon the synthetic process were not readily available to American companies or to the Government of the United States itself, and the oil and rubber companies were unwilling to spend any of their own money in manufacturing synthetic rubber, because they, like the military and naval authorities of the United States, thought the supply was secure.

In the testimony of the then Federal Loan Administrator on May 8, 1941, he said:

> It would seem that we have rubber enough to run for at least a year and a half, if we were cut off tomorrow from the supply of natural rubber, and we could build synthetic rubber plants within that time.

At that time estimates were brought to the Federal Administrator showing that we had a supply sufficient for two and a half years, but he cut it down to a year and a half. The problem of synthetic rubber was generally discussed in the committee; and it was the consensus, against the judgment of the Senator from Connecticut, that limited operations should be undertaken for the building of synthetic rubber plants. The President concurred in that course. Shortly thereafter agreements were concluded with the rubber companies and producers of chemicals and oils for the construction and operation of plants, and plans were made to increase the total annual capacity of synthetic rubber plants in the United States to 100,000 tons a year.

I detail these figures to some extent to show that a reasonable effort was made at that time; and while it may be conceded that Mr. Jones, the President, and members of the Banking and Currency Committee who set up these organizations, did not have the foresight to see Pearl Harbor, we are not by any means the only ones in that position.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but he seems to be exceedingly well informed on this bill. I wish to ask him a question: Does not the bill as it stands authorize the Corporation proposed to be created under the terms of the bill to lend any amount of money to anybody, for any purpose, and on any terms, without security?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct, if he will add one qualification. The purpose of the loan, I believe, from a view of the whole bill, must be in furtherance of the national defense effort.

Mr. BAILEY. The language is "essential materials"; and materials would be essential or not, depending upon the judgment of the lending corporation.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. That means anything.

Let us look at it for a moment. I wish to support the proposed legislation; but if I were on the board and should loan a fellow Senator or one of my constituents $100,000, there would be no way to punish me for embezzlement, fraud, or misapplication of public funds. There would be no way to attack such a transaction. We propose to give the members of the board absolute leeway. A member of the board or a majority of the board might lend $100,000 to some person, or buy some land from someone, in utter disregard of common sense or common honesty, on the theory that it was essential. Under the terms of the bill, would there be any way to attack such a procedure?

Mr. BROWN. I think the administration is entirely up to the five-man board proposed to be created by the bill. What they might do would not be reviewable so long as they did not violate the criminal law.

Mr. BAILEY. We propose to run a gift enterprise; it is not a national defense affair. It is proposed to deliver $100,000,000 to an unknown board, to be selected by the President.

Mr. BROWN. No; the Senator is mistaken. The members of the board are to be selected by Mr. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well; that is the same thing. He is chairman of one of the alphabetical agencies. I do not try to keep up with them. The Chairman of the War Production Board would select the members of the five-man board, and the members of the five-man board would go forth with $100,000,000 with absolute liberty and without check, to lend the money to anyone, for any purpose, anywhere, or to buy plants and hand them over.

I am interested in the matter of defense, and I am interested in preserving the small businesses of the country. I am interested in keeping them going. While we carry on the war the population must have a means of livelihood. The proposed legislation relates to $100,000,000 of the money of the people and of the Government, money which we hold in trust, insofar as we hold it at all. I do not think we hold it at all; but insofar as we profess to hold it, we hold it as trustees. Whose money is it? It is the money of the people and of the Government. We are mere trustees. No one of us would lend his own money in the way proposed. If one of us were appointed guardian of a child and were to lend the child's money in this way, he would find his way to the penitentiary. He would be held, first, for waste; and immediately upon the appearance of fraud he would be held for crime.

I wish to vote for the pending bill; but I respectfully suggest to the able Senator who has the floor and to the Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, that we have not reached the stage at which we must turn everything loose. We have not reached the stage—I hope we never shall—at which we shall be exculpated from our responsibilities. We are still liable. We cannot exonerate ourselves; we cannot deliver ourselves from the responsibilities with which we are charged as Members of Congress, yet that is precisely what is proposed to be done. It is proposed to turn over $100,000,000 to five unknown men, to be loaned on any terms to anyone, anywhere, for anything, without check and without accounting. I do not think that is good judgment; I do not think it is good business; I do not think it is good sense; I do not think it is good defense. I think it is laying our defenses open

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator overlooks the fact that the agency which we are undertaking to create is not to be a mere loaning agency.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I do not. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MURRAY. We are engaged in a great war, and we must trust someone. We must trust an admiral in the Navy. We do not suspect that he will sell out to the Japs if he is engaged in a battle. That is the situation in which we are engaged at the present time. We are engaged in a battle of production; and the main purpose and object of the pending bill is to utilize the productive capacity of the country by bringing into production as promptly as possible all the capacity of the small plants of the Nation.

This country's production program is set up under Donald Nelson. We must trust him; we must depend on him, or else we shall be lost. How else can we proceed? We must have some way to enable the small plants of the Nation to participate in the production program. At the present time 49 percent of them are not utilized, and if we are to utilize them we must have some way of doing it. The proposed method is the way we figured out by which the program could be accomplished. We decided on the proposed method after lengthy studies and after conferences with Mr. Nelson, the head of the War Production Board. We decided that the proposed method was the only effective and practical means of bringing into production the small plants.

The Corporation which would be set up under the terms of the bill would be staffed by able competent men who would determine the capacity of such plants to participate in the program, and, having done that, they would determine the amount of funds necessary to enable them to do so. That is a very simple matter.

Of course, if Mr. Nelson and the members of the Board are dishonest, we shall be out of luck, but we must trust someone. I have full confidence in Mr. Nelson. We must trust General MacArthur in the Pacific; we must trust the admirals of the Navy; and we must trust someone in connection with production.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, let me reply to the Senator's speech. The Senator suggests that, because we must trust the general of an army or an admiral with the fleet, we should therefore take public money and "trust" it out. That is a nonsequitur. It does not follow. The admiral goes forth under his oath and under the high command, and he is accountable; he will be court-martialed if he does not discharge his duty, if he needlessly risks the life of his men, or if he needlessly risks the ship itself.

It is not proposed that such a check be put on the members of the board to be set up under the terms of the bill. The Senator has stated the matter correctly. We raise the presumption that the members of the board will be honest and will do the honest thing—a very fine presumption—but the history of the world does not justify such a presumption.

I read the book by Lin Yutang on My Country and My People. Mr. Yutang is Chinese. In the book he said that the people of China would not have auditors for public servants. They put the funds into the hands of the public servants and have no accounting—on what theory? On the theory that the public servant is a gentleman, and that a gentleman should not be inspected. So we have no graft among gentlemen.

We are not going that far at the present time. Ultimately we may reach exactly that point. The pending bill looks in that direction.

On page 12, in connection with the words "essential articles," or wherever the words "essential articles" are found, I suggest that we strike out the words "essential articles" and insert the words "articles essential to the national defense."

I wish to go further than that, and suggest another amendment, that it shall be found that any person, firm, or corporation borrowing this money can be reasonably relied upon, in the judgment of the lending board, to perform the services of essential national defense.

I would then insert a clause, finally, that there should be an accounting to the Congress of the money loaned from month to month, for the purpose of letting us understand just what was going on.

I think that if we make these amendments we will not hamper the national defense, we will not eliminate any active and useful industry, but we will at least have taken some steps to convert this purported or actual gift enterprise into something in the nature of effectual effort to enable people all over the country in good faith to aid in the national defense.

I realize we are all at the point where we feel that we must vote for the proposed legislation, and I am willing to vote for it, but I do ask that we shall put some safeguards around it if for no other reason than to justify the confidence of the good people who in their innocence and wisdom elected us to these positions of trust, and put us in

charge of the power to tax them, the power to borrow money in their names, and the power to spend money. We are unchecked, but they intend that we shall check all those who handle the public funds, and they will be disappointed most of all if we provide for the unchecked and unlimited lending of money without any recourse, and without any accounting. So I do ask that the bill be amended to the extent I have suggested.

Mr. BROWN. In section 5 of the bill on page 13 there is a requirement that the War Production Board shall make a report every 60 days of its operations under the act to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BAILEY. I see that provision.

Mr. BROWN. My purpose in rising as I did was twofold, first, to let the country know from someone on the Committee on Banking and Currency that we were authorizing the appropriation of $100,000,000 under these circumstances. I, for one, think that there will be heavy losses, but also for the reasons which the Senator from North Carolina so well put, I am reluctantly willing to assume the responsibility of voting $100,000,000 for this purpose, knowing that we will suffer severe losses.

I think there is perhaps some justification for the complaint that little business has not received as good treatment as has big business. I think the blame for that is upon Congress rather than upon those who administered the act, and because of that fact I have been willing to go along.

The majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and several others of us, tried to write in some further safeguards, but we were defeated in the committee, but, as I stated earlier in the debate, for the purpose of getting unity, for the purpose of presenting a united front to the country, and of solving this problem, I was willing to go along. But I was not willing to go along without letting the country know that we are authorizing the appropriation of $100,000,000, a part of which in my judgment will be lost. I think it is better that the country should know that before the loss occurs rather than afterward.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not been present during the debate, having been busy in committee work all day, and have not had a chance to hear much of the argument, but I have just heard the suggestions made by the Senator from North Carolina. It seems to me that his suggestions are exceedingly reasonable, and I appeal to the Senator to agree to the amendments, which are in the interest of fair and square dealing. It seems to me they should be a part of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Tennessee should know that I am not in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is in charge of the bill, I know.

Mr. BROWN. I am satisfied to go along with the bill as written, with some reluctance; but I felt that these matters should be called to the attention of the Senate. The Senator from Montana is in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to the Senator from Montana to agree to these very reasonable amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. I have not seen the amendments, and I do not know what they provide. The whole purpose of our committee and the whole purpose of the bill is to provide a flexible method of financing small concerns in order to bring them into the production effort. If you are going to hamstring it, and prevent small business from participating in the defense program, you might as well vote the bill down.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary, the provisions which the Senator from North Carolina has suggested would not hamstring the bill at all.

Mr. MURRAY. What are they?

Mr. McKELLAR. He would merely provide a reasonable, proper method of dealing with the funds, in the interest of the recipients. It will be better for them, it will be better for us, it will be better for the country, in my judgment, and I hope the Senator will look at the amendments, and agree to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I did not hear the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina, but as I caught them, one thing for which he asked was a full report. Of course, we have provision for such a report in the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I may say to the Senator that I suggested a 30-day report. The bill provides for a 60-day report. I would not debate about that, if I may have the other amendments agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know what the other amendments are.

Mr. BAILEY. On page 12, line 17, I propose to insert after the words "manufacture of" the words "articles essential to the national defense." That would confine the lending, at any rate, to the national defense. Then on page 13, line 3, I would insert the same phrase after the word "articles," at the end of the line, so as to read "articles essential to the national defense." Then at the end of the paragraph, in line 19, on page 13, I would add the words: *"Provided,* That no loan shall be made unless the borrower is approved as capable of performing the work in contemplation."

Mr. TAFT. Approved by whom?

Mr. BAILEY. By the lending board.

Mr. TAFT. I certainly see no objection to that. I assume that would be implied. They certainly would not lend unless they thought the loan was all right. I see no objection to that.

As to the other question, of course, the Senate can do as it pleases, and the main purpose is undoubtedly to provide for the manufacture of articles for war purposes. It is also true, however, that in the effort in which we are entering, every purpose is a war purpose. There will be no production in the United States that is not either for the war itself or for a reduced civilian supply. Let us take the automobile industry, for example, although that is not a very good illustration. They might say, "We will convert all the large plants to the manufacture of automobiles or tanks for the Army, but we will manufacture 100,000 automobiles a year in some smaller plants, and we will have to finance them to provide 100,000 automobiles a year for civilian use"—if that is what we are to finally come to, and I think very likely it may be.

I think the scope of the bill would be limited thereby, and I do not see any great purpose to be accomplished in so doing. We are dealing with the War Production Board now, and they certainly are not going out and loan money for all kinds of indirect purposes. They are concerned solely with the war, and they are not going to loan money to a company to produce civilian supplies unless they think the civilian supplies are essential as a part of the entire picture. So, personally, I should rather not have the language "essential for war," but simply the word "essential," so that the board itself may determine whether the work is in fact essential. I think we can be certain that during the war—the measure has a life of only 3 years, I think—the authorities will not go out and finance unnecessary activity.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator from Ohio has correctly stated the attitude of the committee with respect to the proposed amendment. I would have no objection to the first amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina, but the second amendment, in which he undertakes to amend subdivision (2) of subsection (f) of section 4 would completely alter the purpose and object of the bill. Subdivision (2) of subsection (f) undertakes to provide for the manufacture and production of essential civilian articles. There may be some articles which will be absolutely essential in civilian life if we are to prosecute the war successfully. I do not know whether this would be a proper explanation of what might be done under the bill, but suppose it were necessary for us to establish a few processing plants for the purpose of processing sugar beets. That would be an essential civilian production. We might find ourserves in the situation of not being able to prosecute the war successfully unless we have some civilian production of that character. So I shall oppose the second amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina, because it would destroy the very purpose and object of that provision in the bill.

So far as the third proposed amendment is concerned, I do not quite get the purport of it.

Mr. BAILEY. I suppose this language would ruin the bill also, but I still think there is some sense in it: *"Provided,* That no loan shall be made unless the borrower is approved as capable of performing the work in contemplation."

Mr. TOBEY. "Approved" or "proved"?

Mr. BAILEY. "Approved." I do not see how it can be said that that language would ruin the bill. The thing in mind here is to lend out money to anyone,

whether or not he is approved, or whether or not he can do the work, but my idea is that when we legislate we should restrict the matter of spending money as much as we can.

Mr. MURRAY. That language does not, in my estimation, add anything to the bill or take anything from it. That is exactly what the bill was intended to do. I can agree to that.

Mr. BAILEY. But the bill does not so say, Mr. President.

Mr. MURRAY. The bill provides that the Corporation is to investigate all corporations or plants which are able to perform this work, and having determined that they are competent and capable to take the contracts, then the next step is to finance them, if it becomes necessary to do so. Of course, they would not lend money to a plant or corporation which is utterly incapable of carrying out a contract. That would be absolutely absurd, of course. There is no intention of lending money to a plant which is incapable of delivering the goods and performing the contract. I think that as the bill stands it is quite clear that that is what is intended to be done.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not care to carry on the debate further. I know the intentions of the Senators are very good. I would not think of raising any question about the intentions, but legislation ought to carry on its face the intent of the legislators.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no objection to the last amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I have seen many good intentions in the Government and much money wasted, too, with good intentions. I will not go into that detail.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no objection to the last amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to restrict the bill to the purpose we have in mind, and to express the intent so far as we can.

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly. I have no objection to the Senator's last amendment. I merely say that was the purpose and object of the committee in working out the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I offer the amendment in the hope it will be supported. At any rate it will give the lending authority something to lean upon, something to rest upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] yield for that purpose?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think I shall finish my few remarks, and then we will take up the amendments proposed by the Senator from North Carolina. I want to finish what I had to say about rubber by saying that the present authorizations will result in a minimum production of 700,000 tons of rubber annually. I am advised that 600,000 tons is our normal consumption of rubber, and that the investment in this new productive capacity is now $600,000,000. If construction materials are made available to the contractors, facilities for the manufacture of 90,000 tons per year will be completed this year, 250,000 tons by June of 1943, and the entire amount of 700,000 tons will be available at the end of 1943.

Mr. President, briefly I want to mention some of the larger totals of loans made to many corporations producing critical and strategic materials. On aluminum, $245,000,000. On copper, $226,000,000. On lead, $117,000,000. On manganese, $132,000,000. On refined tin, $207,000,000. On tin ore, $129,000,000. On tungsten, $154,000,000. On zinc, $146,000,000. On domestic scrap material, $720,000,000. A grand total upon these and many other smaller commodities, of $2,215,000,000.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks by saying that notwithstanding my reluctance to give such power to the War Production Board, or the board of directors which are to be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board, I feel that it is necessary to do so. I had hoped, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and I think possibly one or two other members of the committee, feel that this authority to loan should be separated from the authority to sublet contracts to various manufacturers, and that that authority at least to a limited extent should be left in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The majority of the committee disagreed with us in that respect. We feel that the job could well be done by the R. F. C. officers, who have had experience along this line.

We then proposed that the officers of the R. F. C., because of their ability to service and collect loans which they have made, should be given at least that authority, and that they should make loans upon the direction of the War Production Board or the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. That the authority should be in the Smaller War Plants Corporation or the War Production Board to direct the making of the loans; but that because of the experience of the officers of the R. F. C., because of the fact that they have officers here and there throughout the country, because they have a large amount of loans out, and a system of bookkeeping and agents, and so on and so forth, they should be given the job of servicing and collecting those loans.

We lost in that respect, except for an insufficient section which I fear is unworkable.

Again I say in the interest of unity, after talking the matter over with the members of the committee who felt as I did, and after discussing the matter quite thoroughly with the administrative authorities downtown, I decided that so far as I was concerned I should go along with this bill. I hope it will do what its proponents say it will do.

I want to say that Mr. Jones and his associates have in my deliberate judgment done all that they could reasonably do under the tests laid down by law. Of course, mistakes have been made and will be. However, the administration of the business of loans by a Government bank, a difficult task, has been one of the many bright spots in the Roosevelt administration. We are in far better shape to fight this war because of wise and intelligent direction of our financial aids to the war effort.

I hope the bill will enlist small business throughout the country. The expenditure of $100,000,000, a portion of which will come back to the Treasury of the United States—some of it will not, of course—will certainly stimulate business throughout the country.

Referring to the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I wish to say, as the Senator from Connecticut told us, that he need have no worry about the proposed board having any connection with any of the former lending authorities in the Department of Commerce or under the Federal Loan Administration. The job will be done entirely by the War Production Board and it will have the responsibility.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I had not intended by anything I said to refer to the loan policy of the Federal Loan Agency. My remarks were directed to the executive branch of the Government, which has had the power and the responsibility in connection with letting billions of dollars worth of contracts.

Mr. BROWN. I thought that was the attitude of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I so understood it; but some of the remarks since made indicated that Senators thought the Senator was talking about the lending authority rather than the contracting authority.

In conclusion, let me say that the general purposes of the bill were approved by Mr. Nelson. The financing part of the bill was not directly approved by him. He made the statement that it did not make any difference to him whether the loans were made through his board or through the R. F. C. The bill has not met with the approval of the War Department and some of the other agencies. As is well known, another lending agency has been set up by Executive order. I think that the two lending agencies, and possibly one more which is in contemplation, could well supplement one another.

I conclude by saying that, despite my objections to some portions of the bill, despite my objection particularly to the failure to give the R. F. C., with its long experience, the authority to service the loans, nevertheless I shall support the bill, and I look for considerable aid to the war effort and to small business men everywhere by it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Montana whether there is to be further debate? I understand that a yea-and-nay vote is desired.

Mr. MURRAY. I think we can complete consideration of the bill in a few minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. We must have a session tomorrow, anyway.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure we can complete the consideration of the bill within a few minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendments to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 4, on page 12, line 17, after the words "manufacturer of" it is proposed to strike out "essential articles" and insert in lieu thereof "articles essential to the national defense"; on page 13, line 3, after the words "production of", it is proposed to strike out "essential articles" and insert in lieu thereof "articles essential to the national defense"; and on the same page, at the end of line 19, it is proposed to add the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no loan shall be made unless the borrower is approved as capable of performing the work in contemplation."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from North Carolina, I suggest that the first two amendments be voted on en bloc, and that the third amendment be voted on separately.

Mr. BAILEY. I offered the three amendments in order that the matter might be before the Senate. However, it is certainly proper to separate the last one from the other two.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in favor of accepting the first amendment, but I am not willing to accept the second amendment, in subdivision (2) of subsection (f) of section 4, because it would completely change the purpose of the bill. That subsection of the bill is intended to enable the Small Plants Corporation to bring about the manufacture of essential civilian articles. The amendment would change it entirely. Of course, if the Senate feels that we do not need any civilian materials in the United States during the prosecution of the war, that is a different situation.

Mr. BAILEY Mr. President, the Senator asks me a question. I do not feel that way at all, but I do feel that the broad lending power in the bill should be limited to the necessities of national defense. It may be that the production of sugar is a necessity of national defense. The Senator might say that it is civilian production, and I might say that it is production for national defense. As George Washington said, "I wish to erect a standard to which the just and the honest may repair." That is all I have in mind. As it is, anything can be done. I wish to limit such loans to the necessities of national defense. I shall ask for a vote on the question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this is a very important measure, and I think we are all in agreement with its objectives. The hour is late, and I should like to study the amendments which have been offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. Keeping that in mind, I hope the Senator from Montana will be willing to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow so that we may have an opportunity to go over the amendments and study them. I think that would be a very much safer way of legislating. It would mean postponement for only a day. There is no particular hurry about passing the bill tonight. Is the Senator agreeable to that suggestion?

Mr. MURRAY. The only remaining matters are the amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina, consideration of which would require only a few moments.

Mr. McNARY. I think it would require considerable time. They are very important. The able Senator from North Carolina has made some suggestions which we should consider. It is now late, and I doubt if we could have opportunity this evening to go thoroughly into the matter. In the interest of better legislation, I suggest that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator feels that we should let the bill go over until tomorrow, I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina will be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINE AND WATERWAY ACROSS NORTHERN FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I apologize to the leader and to all other Members of the Senate. I wish to speak for about 5 minutes before the Senate takes a recess. I contemplated speaking earlier. I hope I may do so now.

I shall ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and have it appropriately referred. By way of explanation, let me say that it relates to the acute situation which now exists with respect to transportation facilities between the Gulf coast area and the Atlantic seaboard. We all know that gasoline sales are now being restricted along the whole Atlantic seaboard. That is because of the extent to which there has been a diversion of tankers and coastwise shipping facilities.

It is not commonly known that there is a greater movement of domestic commerce by inland waterways, lakes, and facilities of that character than by all other methods. So in fact we have only three ways by which we may expect the movement of commodities between the Gulf area and the Atlantic seaboard to be effectuated. One of them is by rail; another by motor transport; and the third by water.

I am informed that the executives of the railroads have announced that of necessity their facilities are not susceptible to any considerable degree of expansion. As a matter of fact, if they are able to repair and replace the facilities which they now have, they will be fortunate indeed.

Motor transport can hardly be expected to contribute very much in addition to what it is contributing, or indeed, as much as it is now contributing, because of the existing shortage of rubber, which promises to become more acute. Therefore, the burden of the commerce will have to be carried by waterways.

What I am proposing, Mr. President, in the bill which I shall ask unanimous consent to introduce, is that the President be authorized to provide the means and method whereby there may be an improvement in the situation, by the construction of a pipe line to carry oil commodities from the Withlacoochee Bay, on the west coast of Florida, a distance of 82 miles to the St. Johns River. It is not ordinarily known that from that point the St. Johns River runs a distance of about 20 miles to the Atlantic Ocean. Therefore, by the construction of a pipe line only 82 miles in length, transportation by barge of petroleum ingredients from the Gulf area, whence they come, to the mouth of the Withlacoochee River would be possible. The major part of that transport operation would be by means of a protected, intracoastal canal which runs almost from Mexico to St. Marks, Fla., a relatively short distance from the mouth of the Withlacoochee River in Withlacoochee Bay to which I refer. Then, when the oil should be delivered at the St. Johns River for transportation in barges, it could be transported through a protected inland waterway all the way to Trenton, N. J. Thereby, I believe it would be possible for shipments of gasoline to reach the Atlantic seaboard from the producing area, and thus to a considerable degree alleviate the shortage.

Mr. President, I propose the foregoing as a temporary method of relief. The more permanent and the more desirable method of relief, I believe, is to construct a sea-level barge canal across northern Florida, along the route which I designate on the map for a pipe line. Such a barge canal with a depth of 12 feet and a width of 150 feet could be constructed in about 18 months, and to a depth of 9 feet it could be constructed in about 15 months. Then it would be possible to have uninterrupted transportation by barges all the way, for example, from Port Arthur or from Galveston, Tex., or from New Orleans, along the inland waterway route through the Gulf area, to the west coast of Florida, and then, by covering a very small area which is not inland waterway, to the mouth of the Withlacoochee River or Withlacoochee Bay; thence across the State of Florida, a distance of 82 miles, into the protected waters of the St. Johns River, thence out on the Atlantic seaboard, thence into the intracoastal canal which runs along the Atlantic coast all the way up to Trenton, N. J.; and on the entire route a draft of 12 feet could be carried.

As the situation is now, it is not generally recognized that two intracoastal waterways come to a dead end in Florida. Of course, the United States did not go to great expense to build an intracoastal waterway all the way from Mexico to St. Marks, Fla., and all the way from Boston to Miami, Fla., simply for the purpose of serving Florida. As a matter of fact, Florida sticks out like a thumb, as it were, along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; and the proposed waterway would make possible the use of the two intracoastal canal facilities, which already have been constructed at large expense.

That, obviously, I think, will be found to be the first stage in the construction of the Florida ship canal. I know that time after time it has been said and thought on the floor of the Senate and

elsewhere that the proposal for the Florida ship canal was some sort of a boondoggling scheme whereby Florida was attempting to get some money out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEWART. As the Senator knows, I have been interested in the same matter for some time, and have discussed it with the Senator in the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. I have been wondering about the matter ever since there have been so many sinkings of tankers and other merchant vessels, particularly along the Atlantic seaboard; that is to say, I have been thinking along the line of the building of a canal, and I have been wondering whether, if such a canal were constructed, it would in anywise reduce, under the present set-up, the number of sinkings of vessels.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to come to the point suggested by the Senator, and I appreciate having the able Senator from Tennessee anticipate my statement. I invite the Senators' attention to the large map at the side of the Chamber. No person can look at the map of the Caribbean area without seeing corroboration of the statement which I have had made to me from what I regard to be responsible and authoritative sources, that in a very short time that canal, if in existence, would result in the saving of enough ships to equal the total cost of construction of the canal.

If any Senator will look at the map which is before us he will see that, from the Panama Canal, there is an inland and protected route all the way up the east coast of Central America, through the straits of Yucatan, across the Gulf of Mexico, to Withlacoochee Bay, which is the western entrance of the proposed canal, and then, of course, there would be a protected area across the State of Florida, so that a vessel which left the Panama Canal en route north to regions in the neighborhood of New York, Philadelphia, and other cities along the northern section of the Atlantic seaboard would not have to go out into the submarine-infested area of the Caribbean until it exited the canal at the mouth of the St. Johns River, on the Atlantic Seaboard, outside Jacksonville. Therefore, any Senator can see what a great duty of convoy the Navy would be relieved of, and what advantages of inland protection our merchant ships transiting the area to and from the Panama Canal would receive if such a canal were in existence.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I understand that most of the tankers which have been plying the Atlantic coast, transporting oil and gasoline to the eastern seaboard as far north as Philadelphia and New York are coming from Galveston, Tex.

Mr. PEPPER. They are; I was about to refer to the fact that they are coming from Galveston, Tex.

Mr. STEWART. The building of the canal in northern Florida would materially reduce the distance required to be traveled by such vessels, would it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me quote to the Senator an authority which I believe is as good as any to which I could refer: That is Gen. Edward M. Markham, who, when Chief of Engineers recommended favorably the construction of the Florida ship canal. A short time ago he was in Washington. He was in the Senate Office Building, and, as he walked down the hall, he noticed the door of my office; but since I was not there at the time, he ascertained my whereabouts, and telephoned to me, saying "Senator, I just wondered if you will mention to your colleagues that if the Florida ship canal were in existence it would be the equivalent of adding 14 percent to the number of tankers we now have in use or in the custody of the United States Government and its citizens."

In other words, the reason for his statement is that, by the use of the Florida ship canal, 23½ hours' time would be saved in making a round trip from the Gulf area to the Atlantic area. That would mean that if the canal were in existence every trip made by vessels transiting it would save 23½ hours in elapsed time. Senators can calculate that that was what General Markham had in mind when he said that the existence of the canal would have the effect of increasing by 14 percent the tankers of the United States

Today we know how badly we need additional tankers. Because the tankers had to be diverted to our foreign trade we have had to return to the expedient of the pipe line and to resort to rationing. I am informed that the total diversion has been about 73 percent; and that means that we have relatively few tankers left in our domestic service.

Senators will also remember the dimensions which the Army engineers have recommended as a minimum: 400 feet in width at the narrowest part of the canal, and a uniform depth of 33 feet. Practically all commercial vessels and all the vessels of the Navy except the largest ones, could transit a canal of such dimensions; certainly, oceangoing vessels in commercial trade could do so.

So, if President Roosevelt, who back in 1934 or 1935 recommended to the Congress the construction of the canal, if Senator Joe Robinson, the esteemed predecessor of our present eminent majority leader, fought the battle for the Florida ship canal, which certainly did not interest the Senator from Arkansas unless it had a national virtue, and if other Members of the Senate who fought for the Florida ship canal, when the President was derided and denounced by some for proposing such a "foolish" project, had been successful in their effort, at the present time the canal would be in existence, and the tanker fleet of the United States would today be 14 percent larger than it is.

I regret that, somehow or other, so many people in the country, and particularly some in the Congress, I am sorry to say, have never been willing to regard the canal on its own merits and fail to remember that it was recommended by the Chief of Engineers of the United States, by the Board of Engineers, and by the President of the United States. The President sent a letter to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] 2 years ago, when the Senate voted on this question, saying that, in the interest of national defense and in the interest of commerce, the construction of the Florida ship canal was justified. That was the word from the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

Mr. President, I did not expect to speak so long, but I did desire to make the statement I have made. The rivers and harbors bill now pending in the House includes an item for the Florida ship canal, and provides an authorization. It provides that it first be constructed to the dimensions of a barge canal. The bill, however, seems to be making not too speedy headway in the House. This is a matter of importance. The need for the canal will grow more acute, and therefore I have taken the liberty of following the course pursued by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] in securing the enlargement of the Soo Canal, which is necessary to the transit of iron ore from the mines to the processing places.

I believe it is necessary to have the Florida ship canal, at least of the dimensions of a barge canal, at the earliest possible time.

Consequently I propose a joint enterprise, the building of a temporary pipe line a distance of 82 miles from the place named, which will result in barges being immediately put to use on the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Atlantic inland waterway, then proceeding with the construction of the canal in due course, until it achieves the dimensions which will be the most favorable and advantageous to the national economy and to the national defense. I apologize to the leader for having taken so much time, and appreciate his patience.

I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a bill at this time for appropriate reference.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I inquire to what committee the bill will be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2426) to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of pipe line and waterway facilities across northern Florida between the intracoastal waterways along the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic seaboard, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday, when we were considering bills on the calendar, and House bill 6328, for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, was reached, I inadvertently overlooked an amendment which I desired to propose to the bill, and the bill was passed. I now enter a motion to reconsider the vote on the passage of the bill and ask that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate. When it reaches the Senate,

I shall then propose the amendment I have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to members of the American Expeditionary Forces by the President of the United States, together with an article published in the Washington Star today in which the letter is embodied.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 31, 1942]

"NATION BEHIND YOU," ROOSEVELT PLEDGES TROOPS ABROAD—PRESIDENT'S LETTER GOES TO SOLDIERS, MARINES IN FOREIGN SERVICE

Describing the enemies of freedom as more tyrannical and more arrogant than ever before, President Roosevelt has pledged to each member of America's armed forces in foreign service the whole force and power of this Nation in their support.

The Commander in Chief's message of confidence and promise of unqualified backing is contained in letters being distributed by the War Department to every soldier abroad and by the Navy Department to every marine on foreign duty.

Releasing the texts of the letters, which are identical except for salutation and the first sentence, the White House explained this morning that the message is not going to Navy personnel, since they are not permanently based at any point outside of American waters.

The letter was drafted in mid-February and already has been distributed to men in North Ireland, Australia, and other foreign stations. In most cases it has been given to soldiers or marines as they embarked from the United States.

The Presidential messages are on a White House letterhead and carry a facsimile signature of the Chief Executive.

Presidential Secretary Stephen Early said he thought President Wilson had sent a communication along the same lines to members of the American Expeditionary Forces in the last war.

Text of the letter addressed to members of the Army expeditionary forces follows:

To Members of the United States Expeditionary Forces:

You are soldiers of the United States Army.

You have embarked for distant places where the war is being fought.

Upon the outcome depends the freedom of your lives, the freedom of the lives of those you love—your fellow citizens—your people.

Never were enemies of freedom more tyrannical, more arrogant.

Yours is a God-fearing, proud, courageous people, which throughout its history has put its freedom under God before all other purposes.

We who stay at home have our duties to perform—duties owed in many parts to you—you will be supported by the whole force and power of this Nation. The victory you win will be victory of all the people—common to them all.

You bear with you the hope and confidence, the gratitude and prayer of your families and your fellow citizens and your President.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The letter addressed to the marines has an appropriately different salutation and begins:

"You are a member of the armed forces of the United States."

From here on this letter is identical with that sent to Army personnel.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL—LETTER FROM SENATOR DOWNEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, yesterday when we were considering the readjusted pay bill, Senate bill 2025, the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was not able to be present. He is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill. He was much interested in it, and gave generously of his time to the consideration of the bill. I received a letter from the Senator from California today which I ask to have read by the clerk at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
March 30, 1942.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We have before us a bill to raise the base pay of the men in our armed services. We have, at long last, an opportunity to make amends for the niggardly treatment we have accorded the defenders of this Nation. I hope we shall take such full and prompt advantage of that opportunity as will atone, at least in part, for our previous parsimony.

I hope, too, that our passage of this bill will put an end to the deplorable attempts of some labor baiters to use our low Army pay schedules as a weapon against civilian workers. In the press and on the radio, they have railed against our paying aircraft laborers $150 a month while giving our draftees only $21. All their righteous emotion has been expended—not, mind you, in protesting the $21 for soldiers, but in angrily assailing the $150 for civilians. Their real purpose in posing the question seems to have been less to aid the soldier than to embarrass labor. They have, in short, failed to see that the prime requisite of the moment is not to deprive the citizen of a decent wage, but to make sure the soldier gets one too.

Let me amplify that point. I think the only firm base for our war-pay policy must be that a skilled worker—military or civilian—shall receive a decent compensation for his services. We are at last giving most of our civilian employees a fair wage; we have not yet done the same for our selectees. But that is not an argument for slicing the pay checks of civilians or wildly accusing them of selfishness. It is, rather, a compelling reason for raising military pay to their level. For our soldiers and sailors are surely as valuable, surely as skilled in their own trade, and surely as deserving as the men on the assembly line. And they should be paid accordingly.

They do not, it is true, need to be paid as much as civilians—in cash. For example, it is estimated that, in food, shelter, clothing, medical services, and such, we are giving each soldier the equivalent of about $70 a month. If now, by the terms of this bill, we give additionally to a first-class private a salary of $42 a month, we will have raised his pay to an actual civilian value of $112 a month.

I do not pretend that I think this will be enough. I would like to see a still ampler allotment. But I do feel that this raise will constitute a long, sure step in the right direction.

There will, inevitably, be some to say that we cannot put a price on patriotism, and some who will use that resounding platitude to excuse our conducting a kind of military sweat-shop. They will say: "Since we owe anyone who risks his life for us an incalculable debt, it is useless to try to compute it in mere dollars and cents." Throwing up their hands in convenient despair, they will resign themselves—and our soldiers and sailors—to the status quo.

I say this is nonsense. We do owe a great debt to all our young men in the armed forces which we may never be able to pay in full. But we must pay what we can. At the very least, we must assure them that we do not regard them as cheap, forced labor, as outcasts from the American standard of living, as entitled only to the wage of a one-armed ditch digger. At the very least, we must give them a self-respecting reward for work well done in the service of the Nation. At the very least, we must give them the pay schedule set forth in the measure before us.

Sincerely,

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, nominating Stephen W. Brennan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the Northern District of New York, vice Frank Cooper, retired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will read the nominations on the calendar.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of registers of land offices.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 1, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen W. Brennan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Hon. Frank Cooper, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

Ellis Purlee to be register of the land office at Sacramento, Calif.

Thomas F. Corbally to be register of the land office at Great Falls, Mont.

Theodore Wanerus to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo.

William G. Johnson to be register of the land office at Cheyenne, Wyo.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Ida D. McCauley, Lucas.
Vivian A. Meredith, Norway.
Ida E. Heffernen, Peosta.
Martin S. Copenhaver, Ralston.
Oscar G. Sharp, Seymour.

LOUISIANA

Charles C. Collier, Campti.

MICHIGAN

Geraldine E. Fox, Falmouth.
Mildred Irene Asher, Orchard Lake
William H. Riekki, Palmer.

MINNESOTA

Walter M. Brucher, Faribault.

NEBRASKA

Edward L. Kimball, Butte.

NEW MEXICO

Arvil M. Waggoner, Bayard.
Thomas M. Rivera, Hanover.
Fannie E. Stearman, Hurley.
Leon Panebouef, Vaughn.

NEW YORK

Clayton F. Smith, Blue Mountain Lake.
Oakley D. Robinson, Clinton Corners.
Maude E. Rogers, Harpursville.
Edna Agnes Connolly, Montrose.
Charles J. Ryemiller, West Sand Lake.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ernest A. Lewis, Dawson.
Olaf L. Svidal, Starkweather.

VIRGINIA

Ireland M. Baker, Hays.
Ruth H. Underwood, Meadows of Dan.
Edna E. Dudley Turner, West Graham.

WASHINGTON

Henning E. Johnson, Du Pont.

WEST VIRGINIA

Queenie V. Keagy, Bruceton Mills.
John Speicher, Hopemont.
Herbert A. Frazier, Winfield.

APPOINTMENTS ON RETIRED LIST IN THE NAVY

Martin K. Metcalf to be a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from March 21, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as Director of Convoys and Routings in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department.

George S. Bryan to be a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from March 21, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as hydrographer in the Navy Department.

William O. Spears to be a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from March 21, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as Director, Pan-American Division, in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend Luther J. Holcomb, D. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church of Durant, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come to thank Thee for Thy many mercies, and to invoke Thy protection and guidance for all the way of life. Grant us grace to please Thee in all that we think and plan and do. Help us to live in such fellowship with Thee that Thou canst not only dwell in us, but work through us.

We thank Thee for our great President, our Commander in Chief. Hold in Thy holy care his life. We pray for each Member of Congress and all engaged in the sacred task of defending our country. Bless us as a Nation, help us at all times to be true to Thee.

May Thy word be a light unto our path and a lamp to guide all in darkness. Bless the work of this day, fit us for its duties and responsibilities, overrule all of our mistakes, and pardon all our sins. We ask it in the name of Jesus, our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Edd Nevins;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Ida Baird;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 4151. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey;

H. R. 4464. An act for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey;

H. R. 4625. An act for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of Goeffrey Orme;

H. R. 5069. An act for the relief of George Garcavy;

H. R. 5363. An act for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.;

H. R. 5452. An act for the relief of Emmett Armstrong;

H. R. 5500. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles L. Clark;

H. R. 5504. An act for the relief of H. J. Abney;

H. R. 5559. An act for the relief of William Horsman;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman;

H. R. 5652. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5686. An act for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga.;

H. R. 5977. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple;

H. R. 6023. An act to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 6387. An act to extend the crediting of military service under the Railroad Retirement Acts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6440. An act to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years; and

H. R. 6714. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and direct- the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 4092. An act for the relief of E. P. Corley;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreational Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, so far as I can recall, history mentions but one man who was able to stop the sun and the march of time. That man was Joshua. Some Members of the Congress of the United States, however, seem to be under the impression that this is a body of Joshuas and that we can stop the movement of time and hold the war in abeyance while we take recesses, postponements, or simply fail to act on matters that are of importance to this Nation. I believe this to be a mistaken policy. We cannot stop this war until we prepare ourselves to win it. We cannot stop it simply by doing nothing. To stop the war we must win it. The only way to win it is to get all-out production. We are not getting that now. There are many factors involved. Some of them relate to wages, profits, hours, and so forth. Congress must act at the earliest possible moment to assure uninterrupted work for as many hours as may be needed. We should also curb unwarranted profits. This action will be possible as quickly as the Committee on Naval Affairs brings a report into this House on the Vinson and Smith bills. For the moment the responsibility rests on the committee, but as soon as they act this House must realize that we do not have the power of Joshua. We are just ordinary humans and we must work to win the war. Congress must work just like all other Americans. Many of us have said, "You can't whip Hitler with a 40-hour week." Neither can Congress lick the Japs with a series of 3-day recesses. I expect to be on this floor the day the Smith and Vinson bills are reported. I hope the committees will expedite their hearings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE POSITIVE OUTLOOK

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last night my wife and I, for about 3 hours, checked up what had been said in the last 2 weeks. We found so many complaints and people talking about the wrongs. We found so few speaking about the good things that had been done by the administration, by the War Department, by the Navy Department, and by the Congress.

Both of my grandmothers were in my home a great deal when I was a boy, and I remember they always used to tell me you could catch more flies with honey than with vinegar. That thing has stuck with me. We can get more war production by positive commendation than by negative condemnation.

I am most gratified when I think of the marvelous things the Army, the Navy, industry, labor, and all the agencies of the Government have done since Pearl Harbor. I marvel at the many wonderful things we have done in such a short time. Never before has a nation done so much constructive work in such a short time.

PROBLEMS OF THE OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include letters from Mr. J. Barton Hutchins of the Oil Producers Agency of California and two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a couple of editorials from California papers and some correspondence from J. Barton Hutchins, of the Oil Producers Agency, having to do with the depletion credit requested by Mr. Morgenthau. Such a cut now is not only going to affect the oil industry, but it will affect the lumber industry, mining, and many other industries important to our Government's war effort. The matters discussed in these letters and editorials would be important even in peacetime, but are much more so in wartime. It is a matter of policy very important to these industries, and I hope every Member of the House will read these articles.

(The matter referred to follows:)

J. BARTON HUTCHINS,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 10, 1942.

Hon. LELAND MERRITT FORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We have the pleasure of enclosing herewith a clipping of Mr. Carl S. Kelty's column from the March 7, 1942 edition of the Los Angeles Examiner.

The matter of depletion has been before you many times, but it is interesting to note that a financial editor of one of our large metropolitan papers, such as Mr. Kelty, senses the significance of the danger in the present issue.

California now must supply all the petroleum requirements for the battle of the Pacific. It is, therefore, important that the stripper wells be encouraged to continue to produce and that new reserves be discovered. At the present time it is not a matter of profits of which we speak. Under the increasing burdens thrust upon all industry, it is a matter of retaining for the oil industry their only tool with which to enable them to wildcat and to discover new reserves, and to prevent the premature abandonment of stripper wells.

The bill to eliminate or reduce the 27½ percent discovery depletion factor is scheduled to be heard before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 23 and 24. On behalf of our war effort in the Pacific and in order to enable us to produce a continuous and substantial supply of petroleum products to keep our ships and tanks moving, and our aircraft flying, and our industry rolling, we now respectfully request that as a member of our California congressional delegation, you contact the members of the Ways and Means Committee and express to them our views, which we hope will be your views.

With every kind regard,
Yours very truly,

BART.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of March 7, 1942]

DEPLETION CREDIT CUT HAZARDS OIL INDUSTRY

(By Carl S. Kelty, financial editor)

Declared by oil men a most serious threat to California's petroleum industry is the proposal by the Treasury Department that the statutory percentage depletion allowance in computing income taxes be rescinded or limited to the recovery of cost of any individual property. This allowance, which is granted to all industries producing natural resources, is, in the case of the oil industry, 27½ of the gross (limited to 50 percent of the net) income from producing operations. The hazard applies with equal force to mining operations, now so important to the Pacific Southwest, and on the north coast to lumbering. The Treasury's proposal reflects again the lack of realistic thinking on the part of Washington authorities, which has characterized attitudes and actions respecting business and industry.

The depletion allowance has been challenged by the Treasury Department as a "glaring loophole" (Secretary Morgenthau's metaphor), and as an unfair advantage to the oil industry. Mr. Morgenthau compared it in a recent speech to the depreciation of assets, saying that in the latter case, when costs had been recovered the depreciation was ended, but that the depletion allowance continued for the life of the property, no matter how many times the cost of the particular property had been recovered.

The depletion allowance, however, is not comparable with ordinary depreciation computations. A machine, depreciated at 10 percent per annum, may be replaced. An oil field cannot be replaced except by discovery of an entirely new oil field.

This new discovery may require literally hundreds of unsuccessful wells before the discovery well is drilled. If depletion for the successful well is not allowed, or if depletion is limited to the recovery of cost on the particular well, how is the oil industry to recover its investment in the numbers of unsuccessful wells?

The same thing applies to mining. Money is expended developing hundreds of mining prospects for every mine that returns even the initial cost

The depletion allowance was originally enacted by Congress as the most practicable method of stimulating discovery of natural resources. It was worked out following the first World War, and after considerable study and investigation, as a method of furnishing incentive to private capital so that additional supplies of needed materials would be sought out and brought into production.

In the succeeding years the economy of the oil industry has been built around the depletion allowance. A change at this time would require a complete revamping of the industry's economics. It would make higher prices mandatory for the industry if costs of exploration and development were to be recoverable

Incentive to additional production at this time in the midst of war with its unbelievable drain on natural resources should be a foremost consideration of the Government. For example, the California oil industry is now almost the only source of supply for the United Nations in the Pacific. Japan has cut off foreign sources of supply and shortage of transportation facilities renders other domestic sources of doubtful value.

That being the case, California's production of oil—fuel oil for the Navy, aviation gasoline for the air force, lubricants for all forces, and fuels and lubricants for war in-

dustries—assumes an importance hardly possible of overestimation.

In particular, fuel oil is of extreme importance, and the crudes from which fuel oil is most readily obtained are in general produced by old, settled fields of many years' standing. Those fields find the economic situation hard to cope with at the present time. They are high-cost fields; their crudes bring low prices, and those low prices are fixed by the Office of Price Administration.

If the Office of Price Administration keeps prices down, and the Congress removes the depletion allowance, most of the old producing wells in the State will be forced to close down.

A commonplace in the oil business is that, insofar as marginal or stripper wells are concerned, the depletion allowance is the difference between ability to operate and absolute inability to carry on.

J. BARTON HUTCHINS,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 12, 1942.

HON. LELAND MERRITT FORD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Once again we bring to your attention the matter of protecting California oil fields in order that they may do their part in winning this war. Mr. Carl S. Kelty, financial editor of the Los Angeles Examiner, again discusses depletion allowance in his editorial column under date of March 10, 1942. We enclose a copy of his comments.

For the United Nations to have lost their source of supply of rubber and oil in the east was one matter—this happened on foreign soil. Our industry, our State, and our Nation are giving physical protection to our oil fields in California against external attack. For a few uninformed or misinformed governmental officials in Washington to unwittingly destroy these vital oil fields by the elimination of the 27½-percent depletion allowance under present conditions, presents a serious matter.

The record which has been made in the past before your honorable body has shown that the 27½-percent depletion allowance has been good for 2 objectives, to wit: (1) To allow the continued existence and productivity of stripper wells, of which there are some 11,000 in California; (2) to allow further discoveries of new sources of reserves. Now, if never before, the above two items are more important to the entire Nation than they ever have been.

We sincerely hope that you will contact the members of the House Ways and Means Committee before March 23 and 24 and give them to understand in no uncertain terms that "oil is ammunition," and such ammunition in the Pacific theater of war must come from California. Our stripper wells must not be prematurely abandoned and new reserves must be found. The people of the Pacific coast are depending on you.

Very truly yours,

BART.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of March 10, 1942]

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE INCENTIVE TO DISCOVERY

(By Carl S. Kelty, financial editor)

As stated in a preceding discussion in this space, the Treasury Department, in recommending new income-tax proposals to Congress, has demanded that the depletion allowance of 27½ percent to producers of natural resources, such as petroleum, minerals, and timber, be restricted to the amount of the original investment in each individual property. This depletion allowance was worked out by Congress more than 20 years ago on showings that for each successful venture in developing oil and mineral producers hundreds of such ventures fail. The principal purpose of the depletion allowance was to encourage discovery and production. The Oil Producers' Agency, Los Angeles, received a telegram yesterday stating the Ways and Means Committee of Congress would hold a hearing March 23 and 24 on the depletion allowance.

A recent report by a subcommittee of the Petroleum Industry War Council, and approved by the council and Oil Coordinator Ickes, pointed out that the depletion allowance served not only as in incentive to exploration but also was of great weight in the prevention of abandonment of "stripper" wells—those on pump and yielding only a few barrels a day.

The Nation's prime need in war is greater and greater production, and the special objective of Coordinator Ickes is to encourage discovery of new oil fields by wildcatting operations. Anything tending to reduce this effort would be harmful.

Mining interests applying to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for loans to open marginal mines are reported to have advised the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that they will not want such loans if the depletion allowance is removed, since they will then be unable to operate the mines. Further reports say that other mining interests have notified the Government that they are holding up all development work pending a clarification of the matter.

Statements credited to the Treasury Department are to the effect that it is suffering a loss of $80,000,000 in annual tax revenue because of the allowance. The figure is not disputed.

The point is, How much more than $80,000,000 would the Treasury lose if the depletion allowance were removed and the oil industry thereby largely taken out of the income-taxpaying brackets? Further, if the removal of the allowance resulted in cessation of new oil discoveries how much tax revenue would be lost to the counties?

From the tax-revenue standpoint, if the depletion allowance results in excess profits to the oil industry, those profits are recaptured by the Government through surtax rates; if the depletion allowance merely permits the oil companies normal profits, its elimination would throw them into deficits and there would be no income-tax revenue.

The principal points in the depletion-allowance matter now are that it is an incentive to exploratory efforts; it is a deterrent to abandonment of small wells; it helps spread the cost of the multitudes of "dry holes" over the successful wells; it is not comparable with depreciation, since an oil field is not replaced except by discovery of a completely new oil field; it does not mean the loss of revenue to the Treasury, but, on the contrary, helps to assure the Treasury of revenue from general taxes levied on the oil industry.

Incidentally, all statements herein regarding the oil industry and the depletion allowance also apply to other natural-resource industries, since they also get the allowance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address I made over the Forum of the Air last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

CONSOLIDATION OF CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in today's issue of the Washington Daily News Mr. Cramer's column contains a paragraph entitled "It is a Good Idea But." Mr. Cramer's idea is that we consolidate the offices of Congressmen in one of the two office buildings and use the other office building for war workers. I want to congratulate Mr. Cramer on that idea. I think it is splendid and in keeping with our plea for economy. We should set an example for other departments of government, and see that they follow.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry, I cannot.

I have also heard that Congressmen are suggesting that the age limit of dependents for income-tax purposes be changed from 18 to 21. May I state to the Members of the House that this would be a scandal second only to the pension grab of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly surprised at the suggestion made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] that Members of Congress be jammed into one office building, where each Member, with all his office help, would have only one room. The suggestion is ridiculous.

You put a Member of Congress and all his office force into one small room, with no place for the Member to read, study, or confer, and you will be doing a great injury to the legislative branch of our Government.

If we need extra building space to house the various governmental agencies, let the Government take some of the buildings now occupied by commercial establishments here in the city, but let us not do anything that will hamper the Members of the House and Senate in carrying the stupendous burdens that are imposed upon them in these trying times.

If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] has too much office space, I must say he is an exception to the rule, for every Member's office that I know anything about is literally crowded.

Let me say another thing: It is about time that Members of Congress stopped these useless criticisms of the legislative branch of our Government and devote themselves to trying to solve the great problems with which we are now confronted.

It is our duty to try to maintain and sustain representative government, which means democracy, which means liberty for the American people, and not be continuously hampering it by useless criticisms.

There is enough work to do, there are enough issues to discuss, there are enough problems to be solved, to absorb all the energies of every Member of both Houses. If there is anything wrong, let us correct it, but let us not aid the enemies of our form of government by carping criticisms that only tend to discredit Congress and shake the faith of the American people in our form of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a short statement from a constituent of mine, A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

LET'S CHANGE THIS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, American people should vigorously condemn the policy and procedure followed by many local draft boards in inducting young men into our armed forces in secrecy and then almost surreptitiously sending these young men from their homes to training camps. It has seemed to me all along that such a policy is dead wrong.

In Toledo and some other localities in my home State on many occasions young men inducted into our armed forces are summoned to draft board offices or the armory, their loved ones compelled to say good-bye to them there, and then these young men in small groups are quietly taken, sometimes through side streets, to the railway station, and there is a silly shush-shush policy regarding the time of their departure.

Relatives are told they should not go to the railway station to see the boys off, and it is made to appear that the hour of departure is a great military secret which should not leak out to Hitler or Hirohito. Local draft boards resorting to these tactics should be repudiated. There is no occasion for secrecy. There is no sense in denying the right of loved ones and admiring friends of inducted soldiers the privilege of public farewells at the railway stations as they leave in response to a grave national duty.

Young Americans inducted into the armed forces of this Nation, instead of being taken from their home cities as if they were being taken to some penal institution, should be marched proudly down the main street of that city. They are entitled to a roaring send-off. Proud American citizens should have an opportunity to observe and cheer them as they go forth on the first lap of a journey which may take them we know not where.

Furthermore, their loved ones should be informed of the time of departure and they and citizens generally should be welcomed by the local draft boards and Army officers, and arrangements should be made by civic organizations to hire bands and secure American Legion drum corps. The public should be informed of the time and place of departure of these new soldiers. I call for an immediate change from the present policy.

Let us give these young men a roaring and affectionate send-off—acclaim them publicly and wish them Godspeed, happy landings, and a safe return.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received by me from Mrs. Villa Cline, of Lake Charles, La.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ]?

There was no objection.

MICHAEL L. BENEDUM DRILLS FOR WEST VIRGINIA OIL TO SOLVE PETROLEUM PROBLEM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a very brief news comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was the poet Longfellow who said:

Age is opportunity no less than youth itself, though in another dress.

This thought is applicable to Michael L. Benedum, native West Virginian, who, nearing the age of 73, joins with his partner, Joe C. Trees, who is past three score and ten, in sinking test wells on a 200,000-acre lease in my State. They undertake this hazardous task in the hope that oil may be found 5,000 feet below the surface of the earth, which can aid in the solution of the eastern petroleum shortage.

Mr. Benedum, active and with the pioneer spirit still coursing strongly through his veins, has a real desire to aid in winning this war. He understands the serious implications of this oil shortage, which is stated by a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor in the following dispatch of March 23:

Automobile drivers had the necessity for gasoline conservation brought home forcibly to them today with the report by the American Petroleum Institute that for every tanker sunk off the American coasts 100,000 automobile tanks were deprived of fuel.

Sinking of a tanker loaded with fuel oil, it was added, meant the loss of sufficient oil to fire 35,000 domestic oil burners.

Stressing the gasoline shortage on east and west coasts, which resulted in a 20-percent reduction in deliveries to filling stations last Thursday, the Institute reported that stocks of gasoline, heating oil, and residual fuel oil on the east coast were 7,000,000 barrels less at the middle of March 1942 than at the same period in 1941.

"In the first 2½ months of 1942 east coast inventories dropped 19,000,000 barrels, while in the comparable 1941 period they declined only 5,500,000 barrels," the report added.

Mr. Speaker, I feel my colleagues will desire to read brief news stories which tell of this development. The following is from the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register:

DEEP-WELL OIL IN WEST VIRGINIA MAY SOLVE EAST'S PROBLEM

PITTSBURGH, March 27.—Michael L. Benedum and Joe C. Trees, world-famous wildcatters who made multimillion-dollar fortunes prospecting for oil, announced today they are seeking solution to the eastern seaboard petroleum shortage in West Virginia.

Almost at the site where the lifelong oil partners made their first "strike" on $800 borrowed capital 46 years ago, Benedum and Trees are drilling deep wells on land that virtually is worked out at upper levels.

The area of operations, according to the announcement, is a 200,000-acre lease in five West Virginia counties bordering the Ohio River near Parkersburg. The lease extends through Pleasants, Ritchie, Tyler, Roane, and Wirt Counties.

Although wells in that area now average only about half a barrel a day, the partners believe untapped oil remains in the Oriskany sands, 5,000 to 6,000 feet below surface. One well at Falls Mills is down 4,500 feet and should reach the lower sand within a month, the announcement said.

If successful, the project will be a boon to the oil-rationed East, because the lease is close to great consuming markets. The region is well supplied with pipe lines, and oil can be shipped on the Ohio by barge.

Benedum and Trees said approximately $500,000 is invested so far in the project for geological and geophysical surveys, leases, and drilling operations.

This story appeared in the Elkins, W. Va., Inter-Mountain:

BENEDUM TO PUT TESTS IN NATIVE STATE—KING OF WILDCATTERS DRILLING DEEP TEST WELLS

PITTSBURGH, March 27.—America's No. 1 oil wildcatters, one described by an associate as inspired by sentiment, have begun the drilling of deep test wells on a 200,000-acre lease in West Virginia in an effort to combat the east coast petroleum shortage.

Michael Benedum, a native of the State, and Joe Trees disclosed last night they are staking $500,000 on their belief that a vast pool of "black gold" lies untapped in the Oriskany sands near the Ohio river in the west-central section of West Virginia.

The idea for redeveloping the field resulted from the gasoline shortage in the east last year, and the work was further spurred by recent tanker sinkings and the increased demand for oil.

HAS GREAT FORTUNE

Benedum, who claims to have the first dollar he earned and is reputed to have ammassed $70,000,000 more, and Trees brought in the rich Tampico field in Mexico about the time the first World War began, and hope they have equal luck in the present conflict.

A spokesman said about $400,000 already has been spent for leasing and an additional $100,000 for test drilling.

The pair drilled their first oil well 46 years ago within gunshot of the No. 1 test operation near Falls Mills, Tyler County, which is now down about 4,500 feet. It will be about 3 weeks before Benedum and Trees learn whether their hunch about the Oriskany sand is right.

My colleagues, these men are patriotic. May success crown their effort in this venture. They think not of monetary reward, but only for the good of our beloved Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the Honorable James A. Farley which appeared in the Columbus (Nebr.) Daily Telegram on March 14, 1942. It was written by the Honorable Edgar Howard, a former distinguished Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain resolutions from various organizations received by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in last night's Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may be permitted to address the House on Thursday next for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INCREASING PAY OF SOLDIERS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the paper last night that the Senate has voted to raise the pay of the enlisted and drafted men in the Army. It recalled to my mind that when the conscription bill was before the House I tried to get an amendment adopted providing a base pay of $50 per month for the drafted men. The amendment was voted down by a small margin.

I sincerely hope that when the action of the Senate is brought to the floor of this House the House will have changed its views as expressed on my amendment and vote to raise the pay of enlisted and drafted men at least up to the amount fixed by the Senate. As a matter of fact, I think the amount mentioned in my amendment, $50, should be passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6483).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

POST-WAR CONDITIONS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite attention to Senate Joint Resolution 131 introduced by Senator PEPPER on February 3, 1941, and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on February 17, 1941.

The joint resolution provides for the appointment of a joint committee of the Congress to make a study of war and post-war problems. Its post-war objective, as I remarked here the other day, is next in importance to winning the war.

I was reading a while back the book by Max Werner entitled "In Battle for the World." I was impressed by this quotation therein of the widely known Englishman, Liddell Hart:

> In exerting ourselves in war to pursue the aims of our policy we ought never to forget the need of preserving what will be needed to maintain them after the war, and that requires the conservation not only of physical, industrial, and financial strength but of spiritual strength. * * * If you concentrate exclusively on victory, with no thought for the after effect, you may be too exhausted to profit by the peace.

The after effect is a problem to which we must now be looking forward. It is something that we must now be taking steps to cushion—to ward off potential situations that could make victory a very hollow thing, indeed.

Dislocations of industry, of labor, of our normal processes generally must be disturbing to anyone who will pause to reflect upon the enormous readjustment that will need to be accomplished immediately upon the termination of the war.

There will be literally millions of men who will be demobilized in large increments by the armed services. There will be literally millions of men and women engaged in the production of munitions of war of one kind or another, which production will be brought to an abrupt close.

These great hosts of people who will have contributed so largely to the winning of the war will want employment, and they will want employment promptly, and they will be entitled to have employment promptly. What are we of the Congress doing about it?

As everyone here knows, many of our industries—our major industries—will not be able immediately to resume their normal lines of manufacture or production because they have been putting all of their capacity into the production of war goods. They have modified their plants and they have changed their tooling, and possibly their production methods. Besides the private industries, we have the specially built plants, being operated either by private industry or the Government, very many of which, no doubt, will be permanently closed down, and others will have to be adjusted to the production of an entirely different line of products. It would seem to be perfectly obvious that millions of people will be forced to engage in other lines of employment while factories are being restored for normal operations or are being adapted to new lines of manufacture, or until post-war purchasing momentum creates a demand that will justify absorbing the surplus of labor that will ensue from the return to peace.

The solution is not blueprints, it is not an idea in some person's mind, it is not a mere list of projects that can be selected from after the demand for jobs has arisen. The answer, very largely, is worth-while projects previously determined upon and readied to the point where work may start without a moment's delay. I have in mind preferably authorized projects of various kinds that have been held in abeyance primarily because of the war. These would comprise, among others, flood control, rivers and harbors, public roads, and public buildings. I also have in mind the readiness of properly placed employment offices, where information will be available as to the location and nature of works in readiness to be undertaken, and the number and type of help required.

It is vital, my friends, that we prepare in such ways. Do not entertain the idea that the Federal Government will not have to return to the provision of jobs following the war. It is the only answer to the labor problem we shall be faced with during the transition from war to peace pursuits and until there can be an absorption of employable labor by industry as it gradually becomes readjusted.

I urge, my friends, with all of the force at my command that we enact without delay the Pepper resolution or take some other definite step looking to the avoidance of the chaos and unrest and discontent that will ensue following the war if provision has not been made previously to provide a means of livelihood for those who will want jobs and who will be entitled to jobs.

I am not in favor of a planning committee. I want a committee that actually will build up a backlog of worthwhile projects, that will see that the projects are readied to the starting point, that they are properly dispersed, and that means will be available for getting the laid-off workers and the demobilized soldiers and sailors to the jobs.

Such a committee should be required to report progress every 3 months. Speed

is of the essence, because the job is a big one and we do not want to be too late, as we have been so often, to meet the demand when it arises, and arise it will.

The joint resolution I referred to follows:

Joint resolution appointing a joint committee of the Congress to make a study of war and post-war problems

Whereas it is apparent that the World War and the tremendous dislocations in the domestic and world economy and trade will present serious unemployment, industrial, trade, and fiscal problems; and

Whereas it is essential that the Congress, the Government, and the country be aware of such problems, so that most appropriate and proper measures to meet them may be prepared: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to be composed of five Senators to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, is hereby authorized and directed to study, survey, and investigate unemployment and relief problems, and cases of dislocation, and problems appearing in our economy, trade, and fiscal affairs in the United States arising, or likely to arise, out of disturbed world conditions, the defense program, and the conditions attending the post-war period. Such committee shall be authorized to act in concert, or cooperation, with any other committee of the Congress having similar objectives, or with any committee appointed by the President, or with any administrative agencies of the Government. It shall be the duty of the committee to collect such data as will be in the public interest and of benefit to the Congress. The committee shall begin its study, survey, and investigation as soon as practicable, and shall continue such study, survey, and investigation expeditiously and with all possible dispatch, and shall at such times as it may see fit, or either House of the Congress may require, report to either House of the Congress any recommendations it may have for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this joint resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of either House of the Congress, during the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I was very much interested in the gentleman's remarks, and I think he is dealing with a most important subject. I would like to make an observation upon it.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be glad to have the gentleman's observation.

Mr. PITTENGER. There is now pending before the House of Representatives the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, a bill that has been considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this Congress, a bill that contains numerous projects, a bill which, in my opinion, will do more, if we get busy and pass it, to prepare a backlog of employment for our post-war period than any other measure now pending in Congress. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on taking the position he does that such preparation for the post-war period is a most important matter and the House can do nothing that will be of more benefit to the American people than to pass the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. In spite of all the misrepresentation, in spite of all the misinformation that has been spread about it, Congress will do something worthy of itself if it will follow such a line of procedure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a short statement.

As we have no legislative program, as we all know, for this week, and will have none for the next week, and being a little hungry for the touch of some friendly hands in another section of the country and for some Texas sunshine, it is my purpose to leave Washington on tomorrow. As the House will be in session at times during this period and there must be an acting Speaker, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee to offer a resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 467) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. E. E. Cox, a Representative from the State of Georgia, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. E. E. Cox as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the sentiment of all those on this side of the aisle when I say that it is our hope that when the Speaker goes back home all those hands to which he refers may be friendly and appreciative hands, and that his constituents who send him here will appreciate the splendid job he is doing as Speaker in view of the difficult job with which he is confronted.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein the joint resolution I referred to in the remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DUTIES OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my idea that Members of Congress are elected in order that the people of their respective districts might have a voice in government. In our constitutional scheme of government all Members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the membership of the Senate are required to submit their respective candidacies to their constituents every 2 years. This very wise provision enables the people to place in the Congress men and women who will truly represent the people. The Congress of the United States is the people's forum through which the Representatives and Senators representing them may crystallize the people's demand for legislation. Any Representative in the Congress who willfully fails or refuses to represent the people and who by his acts and conduct represents only himself or special groups cannot hope to achieve long tenure of office in the Congress. After all is said, the people through the exercise of their sovereign right of franchise can determine the character of men and women that shall represent them in the Congress. The Nation today is engaged in a war, the outcome of which will determine the future course of our Nation and of civilization itself. We are engaged in a war on many fronts, and our armed forces are engaging the enemy throughout the world. We have no time to engage in domestic warfare or in promulgating any theories or social experiments that do not directly contribute to the war effort.

There are some individuals in America, however, who seem to think that this is a war of one political party. I am pleased to note that most Americans, regardless of political affiliation, denounce any such contention. I am convinced that every honest American, regardless of prior feeling with regard to our international or domestic problems, is now determined on one simple course of action, namely, to exert every effort and to make every sacrifice reasonably necessary to insure ultimate and final victory in our war effort.

Unfortunately, there are still those who seem to believe that the great mass of citizens who opposed the foreign policy of the administration are unfitted to render effective service in the Government for the promotion of the war effort. Such individuals, in my judgment, are rendering a great disservice to the Nation. There was room for honest disagreement among reasonable men and women before Pearl Harbor. There is room for constructive criticism and helpful suggestions now that we are at war. But

there is no room for purely political sniping and mud slinging, and distortion of truth and facts for political purposes. Such efforts serve only to promote disunity rather than to achieve the united effort that is necessary to win this war. Many Members of Congress are constantly being subjected to pleas for unity, while at the same time politically inspired editors and commentators continue to make nasty slurs and charges against Members of Congress who have had the courage to vote not only their honest convictions, but also the overwhelming will of those whom they represent.

Take the case of Charles E. Broughton, editor of the Sheboygan Press, of Sheboygan, Wis., and former Democratic national committeeman from that State. I have known Mr. Broughton for many years and, although in disagreement with much of his political philosophy, I would be the last person to question his personal honor, integrity, or Americanism. To me, he presents a strange paradox. Judged by usual standards, he has been and is a successful editor. He has made money. He has achieved a place of prominence in the Democratic Party. He has controlled patronage. In the ordinary affairs of life and in his dealings with his fellow men he has achieved a fine reputation for charity. He has been quick to aid the underprivileged. He is zealous in protecting and promoting the rights and interests of his fellow citizens in the community in which he lives. He has repeatedly sponsored civic projects for the betterment of his community. He is amiable and likeable and personally has many friends. He has played a prominent part in fraternal organizations. He has used his editorial prerogatives to fight racial and religious intolerance.

The strange thing about this gentleman, however, is that despite all these most admirable qualities, in political matters, he is the most intolerant individual I have ever known. While calm and dispassionate in his editorial appraisal in the ordinary affairs and problems of life, in matters involving disagreement over New Deal policies he is utterly and completely irreconcilable. He controls the editorial policy of a large newspaper and can publish what he pleases and deny publication in his paper of any item he pleases. I do not enjoy that privilege or distinction. He can publish editorials in his paper every day. They are read by thousands of people. It does not personally cost him a single penny. He has the power to attempt to destroy character if he so pleases and can promote unity or disunity as the case may be. I fully realize the handicap that confronts any individual who is constantly attacked editorially by such a violently partisan editor. I know full well that he will continue to attack and besmirch me as he has consistently done in the past.

The people who read his editorial columns, however, are entitled to know the facts.

Twice the people of the Sixth Congressional District have elected me as their Representative in the Congress. They so voted in the face of the fact that Editor Broughton has used every means at his command to destroy that public confidence. I have worked hard to merit that confidence and deeply appreciate the hundreds of letters which I have received from people in my district containing continued expressions of confidence.

Faced with rapidly mounting and growing upsurge of feeling against the policies which he has advocated, Mr. Broughton is now apparently desperate. He has now abandoned all pretense of being just, tolerant, and fair, and in his continued attacks upon me, has slipped into the editorial gutter and comes forth throwing columns of editorial mud. I shall not attempt a reply in that manner. Such technique is most frequently a boomerang.

Let me calmly and dispassionately review some facts.

At the election of 1936, I was a candidate for Congress on the Republican ticket. Mr. Broughton and his paper opposed my election. I was defeated by the Democratic incumbent by a very narrow margin. It is to be noted that my Democratic predecessor in office had constant access to the columns of the Sheboygan Press and reams of material were printed in reference to his activities during the campaign and during the session of the Seventy-fifth Congress following. I accepted the verdict of the people without whimpering.

In the election of 1938 I was again a candidate. In this campaign Mr. Broughton and his paper vigorously opposed me on all fronts. I was constantly smeared and belittled. The people elected me by a very substantial majority of all votes cast. Realizing that during the heat of a political campaign many things are sometimes said which otherwise might have been left unsaid, I made it a point to visit Sheboygan and to sit down and talk with Mr. Broughton. He advised me then that I had been fairly elected and that he would cooperate with me in every way in the effective discharge of my duties as a Member of Congress. The cooperation which I have received is well known to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. It is enough to say that as to me Mr. Broughton has adopted the motto: "If I cannot speak ill of my Congressman I will not speak of him at all."

In the campaign of 1940 the people of the Sixth Congressional District, with full knowledge of my attitude on international questions, reelected me to the Congress by a greatly increased majority. In this campaign my friend again resorted to all of the editorial trickery that could be thought up in opposition to my candidacy. My opponents in that election conducted a clean campaign.

Another campaign is approaching and the intemperate and intolerant attitude of my friend is displayed clearly in the open. He has completely forgotten his editorial pleas for unity and is busily engaged in a campaign of hate and vituperation, having for its purpose inflaming public opinion. Still smarting from the results of the last two campaigns, my editor friend has started early this year.

On January 6, 1942, Mr. Broughton published an editorial in which he quoted with approval an editorial published in the Waupaca County Post, written by its editor, Mr. John Burnham. In this Sheboygan Press editorial Mr. Broughton, among other things, said:

> We reproduced the editorial from the Waupaca County Post yesterday because we wanted our readers to know the facts so ably stressed by that publication.

In the Burnham editorial the following statement was made:

> "There they stand—JOSHUA JOHNS, of Algoma; FRANK KEEFE, of Oshkosh; THILL; SMITH; MURRAY; STEVENSON—the men who sat in pompous ignorance and said they would not vote a penny until we are invaded—perhaps meaning until Wisconsin is invaded."

That was one of the facts which Editor Broughton wanted his readers to know. This editorial, in effect, charged that the entire delegation from Wisconsin in the Congress, with the exception of the lone Democratic Representative, had refused to vote a penny for national defense until this Nation was invaded by the attack on Pearl Harbor.

This editorial was so palpably unfair that I immediately wrote the editor of the Sheboygan Press as follows:

> HON. CHARLES E. BROUGHTON,
> *Editor, Sheboygan Press,*
> *Sheboygan, Wis.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. BROUGHTON: On Tuesday, January 6, you published an editorial entitled "A Late Awakening."
>
> In this editorial you quote from and refer to an editorial published in the Waupaca County Post written by Mr. John Burnham. I do not question your right to do this. I do question the propriety of such an editorial in these critical times. There is perfect unity of purpose existing in the Nation at this time, and your editorial can serve no useful purpose except to stimulate disunity.
>
> I cannot fathom the processes of John Burnham's mind. Some light might be thrown on the subject, however, when it is known that he was one of the active members of the League for World Peace and Democracy, which was definitely shown by the Dies committee to be the outstanding subversive group in this country, and which voluntarily disbanded when the facts with relation to its subversive character were disclosed. It seems rather queer that Mr. Burnham would attend meetings of this so-called League for World Peace and Democracy here in Washington and participate in its avowed Communist purpose and suddenly become so warlike in his present attitude.
>
> In the editorial which you quote with approval it is stated: "There they stand—JOSHUA JOHNS of Algoma, FRANK KEEFE of Oshkosh, THILL, SMITH, MURRAY, STEVENSON—the men who sat in pompous ignorance and said they would not vote a penny until we are invaded, perhaps meaning until Wisconsin is invaded." I have before me the complete record of my votes on all legislation providing funds for national defense. I voted against lease-lend appropriations. I voted against an appropriation to build two 45,000-ton battleships, but did support an amendment to transfer these funds for the construction of bombers and fighting planes. I voted for all other appropriations to provide for our national defense amounting to over $50,000,000,000.

It therefore would seem that simple editorial honesty and integrity, which I know you possess, should not permit your approval of the statement contained in the Burnham editorial which I have quoted above.

I do not intend to engage in any acrimonious discussion. It would seem to me that sound editorials should be based upon facts and not palpable falsehoods.

If you are disposed to publish the truth, I shall be pleased to furnish you a compilation of the votes upon every national defense appropriation.

Mr. Broughton wired me, under date of January 14, as follows:

Will be very happy to publish compiled figures on your defense vote.

On January 15, 1942, I wrote Mr. Broughton as follows:

Mr. CHARLES E. BROUGHTON,
Editor, Sheboygan Press,
Sheboygan, Wis.

MY DEAR MR. BROUGHTON: In my letter of January 12, I advised you I would furnish you a record of my votes on national defense appropriation bills

Your wire indicates your interest and desire to receive this information.

I am enclosing it herewith, and trust that you will see that it receives suitable and proper publicity in response to your editorial of January 6.

Thanking you, I am,
Very respectfully yours.

Thereafter on January 17, 1942, the Sheboygan Press published this letter together with a statement indicating my votes on national defense appropriations.

On February 27, 1942, the Sheboygan Press published an editorial entitled, "You Asked for It, Congressman KEEFE." In this editorial Editor Broughton states:

In the old horse-and-buggy days news did not filter out of Washington as rapidly as it does now, and a man like Congressman KEEFE could keep the people of his district in ignorance a whole year.

The charge is that I have attempted to keep the people of the Sixth Congressional District in ignorance. The thousands of people who have written me in the past 3 years, all of whom have received prompt replies to their letters, know how ridiculous such a charge is. I have never hesitated to keep my campaign pledges and to advise the people I am honored to represent of my position on all public questions.

I have written a weekly news letter which has been sent to every newspaper in my district and to a large number of individuals. In these news letters I have outlined my position with respect to the great public questions coming before the Congress and have asked the people for their opinion and assistance. These letters were sent to the Sheboygan Press regularly each week. This newspaper consistently has refused to publish these letters.

On November 20, 1940, I wrote Editor Broughton, among other things, as follows:

I have had hundreds of requests from Sheboygan to be furnished my weekly news letters which are published in most of the papers during the session of Congress. If you have had occasion to read these letters you may not at all times agree, but I feel that the people whom I represent are entitled to know the views of their Representative in the Congress on the great public questions that are constantly coming up.

In reply to this letter, under date of December 3, 1940, Editor Broughton answered me as follows:

Regarding your letter of November 20, we will be glad to publish anything that concerns your activity in Congress or that regards your appearance on the floor, but political propaganda is barred from this paper.

In view of these facts, I believe it is fair to ask who has been guilty of attempting concealment. The people of the Sixth District well know that my Democratic predecessor had constant access to the columns of the Sheboygan Press. Why the distinction, Mr. Broughton? It will be exceedingly hard for most people to suppress a smile when they read the statement of Editor Broughton quoted above that "political propaganda is barred from this paper."

The simple facts are that I have spoken on national radio time, have made speeches on the floor of Congress, and have sent copies of the same to the people whom I am honored to represent, have made innumerable speeches throughout my district, and have utilized every possible means to let the people of the Sixth District of Wisconsin know my attitude on all public questions. These are simple facts, and the statement in the Sheboygan Press editorial of February 27 just referred to comes with poor grace from Editor Broughton. Many people in Sheboygan County have wondered why the Sheboygan Press has refused to publish the information which I have constantly sent. The answer is perfectly obvious. Editor Broughton has been afraid that the people would know the truth and by his policy has attempted to color or suppress it. The few things that Editor Broughton has published in his paper concerning my activities as a Member of Congress have frequently been so distorted by editorial comment as to make it difficult for the readers to know the truth.

Every citizen knows that every word which is spoken upon the floor of Congress and every vote that is taken is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day and that the galleries are filled with news writers who send the news out to the papers of the country almost as fast as the action takes place on the floor of Congress. The people know how perfectly puerile and silly this statement is in Mr. Broughton's editorial.

In paragraph 2 of his February 27 editorial Mr. Broughton refers to the Waupaca County Post editorial of January 6, 1942.

Broughton then goes on to state:

Immediately Congressman KEEFE hurled a broadside from Washington, attacked the Press, and in glorified terms pointed to himself as an example to be likened to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and other noted men of their time. His big frame shook with pretended anger and under date of January 12 he wrote the editor of the Press.

I have hereinbefore quoted in full my letter which he refers to in this paragraph of the February 27 editorial. This letter is the broadside from Washington referred to by Editor Broughton. This is the letter in which he stated that I pointed to myself in glorified terms as an example to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and so forth. I ask any honest person to again read the letter and indicate where allusion to Washington, Jefferson, or any other noted men is to be found therein. I further ask any honest man to indicate where there is anything in that letter to indicate that "his big frame shook with pretended anger." Here is a perfect illustration of a bigoted editor who, regardless of truths and facts, is determined to use his editorial prerogatives in an attempt to smear and kill politically one with whom he does not agree.

I have this to say: I do keep pictures of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln on the walls of my office because I love their records of character, ability, tolerance, and the principles of human liberty for which they stood. I would suggest to Editor Broughton that if he would allow the lives of these great men to inspire his thinking, his political editorials might be more sane and tolerant.

In paragraph 5 of Broughton's February 27 editorial he says:

A wire to Congressman KEEFE brought his so-called defense vote, sworn to as the essence of truth. We accepted it because Mr. KEEFE said in so many words that he never lied. And now see the pickle he is in. According to his own language on January 15, he had never faltered in his aid to Uncle Sam.

What are the facts? In response to Mr. Broughton's wire of January 14 which I have set forth hereinbefore in full, I furnished him a detailed statement of my record on national defense appropriation bills. Among other things I stated in that statement:

I desire to state a fact which is well known to the voters of the Sixth District. I did vote against the lease-lend law and voted against both lease-lend appropriations totaling $12,985,000,000. In this connection it should be noted that I voted for an amendment to the lease-lend bill which would have made an original outright loan direct to Great Britain and her allies of $2,000,000,000. This was on the theory that additional loans might subsequently be made upon showing of necessity without the grant of unlimited power and authority contained in the Lease-Lend Act being given to the Executive This was a conscientious endeavor to protect the people of the United States and to keep this Nation at peace. I have no apology to make for this vote.

In this statement I then recorded each national defense appropriation bill beginning with the naval appropriation bill passed May 8, 1939, and ending with the appropriation bill for national defense passed December 19, 1941, consisting of 16 different appropriation bills.

Mr. Broughton in his editorial states that my statement was sworn to. This is untrue, as he well knows. I would have been glad to swear to it, however, as it states the truth. He further says that he accepted my statement "because Mr. KEEFE said in so many words that he never lied." How mean and how clever! Nothing of the kind and no implication of the kind can be found in my statement. Again it represents the pure figment of editorial imagination. He further states:

And now see the pickle he is in.

This nasty little statement is intended to make it appear that I have made un-

truthful statements to my constituents and that he, Editor Broughton, has exposed them; thus putting me in a pickle. All I care to say is that such contemptible comment should deserve no answer. I think it is fair to say, however, that, like the pickle, my editor friend has gone sour and because of his political bigotry and intolerance, he, like the pickle he refers to, has shrunk.

He further states in his February 27 editorial that "figures don't lie but that liars figure." I shall not reply in kind. I have altogether too much confidence in the spirit of fair play and decency of the American people and especially those of the sixth congressional district to spend any time answering such a statement.

Let us examine the facts. There were 16 national defense appropriation bills passed by the Congress between May 8, 1939 and December 19, 1941, exclusive of the lease-lend appropriations. I stated that I voted against the naval appropriations bill passed May 8, 1939, and gave my reason. I stated and am still of the same opinion that I could not vote for an appropriation that provided for the construction of 45,000-ton battleships at a cost of $100,000,000 per ship, and stated then and repeat now that in my opinion those funds could better have been used to build airplanes and bombers.

Of the remaining 15 bills, 3 were passed by a roll-call vote. Twelve were passed by a voice vote. Editor Broughton now contends that, because there was not a roll-call vote on 12 of these bills, I deceived the voters when I stated that I had voted for them. The fact is that the rules of the House of Representatives provide for 3 methods of voting: A voice vote, a standing vote, and a roll-call vote. In any case a Member of Congress indicates whether he is in favor of or in opposition to the pending measure. The obvious reason why no roll call was asked for on the 12 appropriation bills last referred to is because there was no opposition in the House to their passage and to take the time to call the roll would merely have been a waste of time. Roll calls are usually resorted to when there is opposition to a bill, but where as in the case of these 12 measures there was no opposition a roll call was wholly unnecessary. I repeat again that I voted affirmatively for each of those 12 bills by the only method by which I was permitted to vote.

Editor Broughton makes great capital of the fact that as to the War Department regular appropriation bill, passed June 9, 1941, I am not recorded as voting on Roll Call No. 65 and Roll Call No. 66. What are the facts? I am a member of the Appropriations Committee that reports appropriation bills to the House. I voted for this bill in the Appropriations Committee. I knew there was no opposition to the bill, except the possible negative vote of 1 Representative of the American-Labor Party from New York. I was unable to be present on the floor of the House when the votes were taken on this bill. There were 2 roll-call votes. One was on an amendment offered by Representative ENGEL, of Michigan, to prohibit the expenditure of any of the money appropriated in this bill under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract. I instructed the pair clerk of the House to record my vote in favor of this amendment. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 175 to 179. I was paired with Representative BLOOM, of New York. I was for the amendment. He was against it, and thus our votes were recorded on this roll call. On the final passage of the bill my instructions to the pair clerk were to record me in favor of the bill. On the final passage there were 350 ayes and only 1 nay. Seventy-nine Members were listed as not voting. Because of the fact that there were no Members opposed to the bill with whom I could be paired in favor of the bill, I was paired in a general pair with Representative BLOOM. I voted for this bill in the Appropriations Committee. I gave instructions to the pair clerk to record my vote in favor of this bill in final passage, and the only reason I was not recorded in favor of the bill was because there was only 1 vote in opposition thereto out of the whole membership of the House.

My votes on the repeal of the arms embargo, repeal of the neutrality laws, the draft law and the draft-extension law, and on the lease-lend law are well known to the voters of the Sixth Congressional District. Most of those questions were issues in the last campaign. I shall not enter into any discussion of those votes at this time. I have no apology to make.

We are at war and must have a unified effort and to again stir up the fight on those issues will do nothing but promote national disunity. The declaration of war on December 7 should end that debate. The people will determine whether their Representative misrepresented them on those issues. Loyal Americans, in my judgment, should now devote their energies to winning this war and not become involved in domestic strife here at home.

My editor friend, Broughton, has indicated the course he intends to pursue. He is now even attacking other editors who have attempted to point out the error in his editorial policy. He can continue to approve the experimentation and boondoggling of the New Deal if he so desires. He can continue to soft-pedal the waste and inefficiency of social experimentation. That is his right in a free country. We are at war, however, and I shall devote my efforts to winning it.

The people will meet the issues he has thus raised, and I feel reasonably certain that they will not long countenance such vituperation in the discussion of our common problems. Calling names will not win the war.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2339. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the order heretofore adopted, the House adjourned until Thursday, April 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on the following bills on Thursday, April 2, 1942, at 10 a. m., room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes;

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; and

H. R. 6702, to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1543. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to enable the agencies of the Government to administer certain patents for the best interests of the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

1544. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution exempting from tax the amount paid for admissions to theaters and other activities operated by the War Department or the Navy Department within posts, camps, reservations, and other areas maintained by the Military or Naval Establishments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TRAYNOR.

H. R. 6885. A bill to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 6886. A bill to provide for tolls with respect to the use, for commercial navigation, of the improved inland waterways of the United States, for the purpose of reimbursing the United States for expenditures

made in improving such waterways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2637. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Azalea Welch, Frank W. Worden, Sr., and other citizens of Fort Madison, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors and providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2638. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of William A. Hammond and other residents of Cochituate, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2639. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, O. R. E. Red Seal Broadcasting Co., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to equality regardless of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

O Christ of the lonely way, touched with a feeling of our infirmities and harkening to the cry of little children, we pray for the quiet and the balm of Thy holy presence. We wait at Thy footstool, and we beseech Thee to persuade us that, in the sweep of time, Thy glorious truth is revealed through the patient and devout waiting for the will of God—invisible and eternal, creative and everlasting.

Thou who wert the despised and rejected of men, a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, awaken in our souls an aspiration for communion with Thee, preserving us in the midst of urgent duties from fears and from corroding cares. Grant that Thy authority may be enthroned in every walk of life. How strong, how sovereign the manhood which breathed and looked through Thee; and yet how tender Thy full-orbed soul as Thou didst gaze upon human sorrow—like a blessed dawn falling on the hills of time! O throne of Mystery! O throne of Grace! Thou knowest our longings, Thou hast the power for the emancipation of earth. Have mercy, have mercy; and may our Country learn the discipline of chastisement as it passes through its Gethsemane of the future. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 31, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN W. BRENNAN—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Stephen W. Brennan, of New York, to be United States district judge, northern district of New York.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Thursday, April 9, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., has been set as the time for a hearing in the Judiciary Committee room on this nomination.

THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury has repeatedly recommended the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act. He renewed his recommendation at the last meeting of the Senate Finance Committee dealing with the tax problem. I was very anxious to find out whether the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System continued to join in this recommendation, and I interrogated him upon the subject. I have a letter in reply, in which the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System joins the Secretary of the Treasury in recommending the complete repeal of the Silver Purchase Act. I wish to read the final paragraph of his letter, which is as follows:

> In view of the war situation, it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that so far as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort.

I ask that Chairman Eccles' letter be printed in full in connection with my remarks in the body of the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 30, 1942.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: Because of the many wartime pressures here and also the need to review the silver situation particularly in relation to such agreements as the Government has made or is making with Allied and associated governments, this reply to your letter of March 3 has been delayed.

My own views are generally in accord with those expressed by the Secretary of the Treasury at a press conference last month when he was quoted as favoring repeal of the silver-purchase legislation and as advocating the sale to industry of the silver accumulated by the Treasury during the past 7 years. Likewise, I feel that the points you mention in your letter to me are important ones justifying reconsideration of the silver purchase program at this time with a view to its repeal. I have had no reason to change my own views, which I have publicly expressed for a number of years. I stated before the Special Silver Committee and later before a banking and currency subcommittee of the Senate in 1939 that "I did not know of anything that tended to destroy ultimately the domestic silver industry as thoroughly as the present silver program."

In view of the war situation, it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that so far as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES, *Chairman.*

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hayden	Reed
Austin	Herring	Reynolds
Bailey	Hill	Rosier
Ball	Holman	Russell
Barkley	Hughes	Schwartz
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brown	Kilgore	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lee	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Mead	Vandenberg
Davis	Millikin	Van Nuys
Doxey	Murdock	Wagner
Ellender	Murray	Walsh
George	Nye	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Willis
Glass	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, amounting to $14,197, for the fiscal year 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the

Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF PATENTS BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to be substituted for similar proposed legislation transmitted by the Department of Agriculture to the President of the Senate on July 30, 1941, to enable the agencies of the Government to administer certain patents for the best interests of the public, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Patents.

CHARTER OF WAR INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate (Edwin A. Halsey), stating that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to the provisions of law, had filed with him, as Secretary of the Senate, two certified copies of the Charter of War Insurance Corporation and certificates amending the charter (with accompanying papers); ordered to be placed on file.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from C. E. Davidson, of Portal, N. Dak., expressing the wishes of citizens of that community, praying for the enactment of legislation to the effect that labor employed under the war production program work 8 hours daily for 6 days each week, and also that three shifts be worked, with time and one-half over the ordinary time pay scale for 6 days' labor to be paid for Sunday work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Samuel Fine, of Asbury Park, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit every motorcar in the United States and its possessions not used for essential purposes to be used for pleasure riding between 8 p. m. and 5 a. m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week, so as to effect savings for the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions of the Associated Men's Bible Classes of Greater Kansas City and sundry citizens of Fort Scott, all in the State of Kansas, praying for prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 1234).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 6554. An act to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort; with amendments (Rept. No. 1235).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236).

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSES OF CERTAIN AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of all crashes of United States Army airplanes which have occurred within the continental United States since September 8, 1939, or which may hereafter occur therein during the present war, with a particular view to determining the causes of such crashes and whether any of them was attributable to the activities of enemy agents or fifth columnists in an effort to impede the prosecution of the war. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BONE:

S. 2427. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2428. A bill for the relief of Vincent Andrew Donovan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill 2429, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BONE (for himself and Mr. WALLGREN) introduced Senate bill 2430, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2431. A bill to suspend the operation of the antitrust laws and Federal Trade Commission Act in certain instances requisite to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 2432. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation calling for the observance of Good Friday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, so that those in the armed services who are unable to claim benefits or to take any action which would reduce taxes or assessments against them may be accorded that right. Under the law as passed by the Senate, the members of the armed forces are relieved of penalties when the penalty relates only to the postponement of the debt; and the provision does not go as far as the amendment which I offer.

I believe that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs handled the particular bill. If the original bill came from the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask that the bill I now introduce be referred to the same committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2429) to amend section 500 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUGHES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1942, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 22, line 14, to strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

On page 22, line 25, to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask leave of the Senate to withdraw the amendments which I offered yesterday, not having had time, in the pressure of business yesterday, to prepare them as I should like to have them presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to withdraw the amendments.

Mr. BAILEY. In lieu of the amendments I send forward an amendment, which I ask to have read, and which I shall undertake to explain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place it is proposed to add additional sections, as follows:

SEC. —. Loans or other aid hereunder may be granted only as herein below provided, to wit:

A. To concerns, personal, partnership, or corporate, engaged in peacetime civilian enterprise, that were solvent, going concerns December 1, 1941, which are found by the lending authority to be in need of liquid assets by reason of the incidence or the consequences of the war, or of the Federal policy on account of the war, for the purpose of carrying on business in civilian or defense activity, and which shall be further found are reasonably likely to be expected to survive as solvent enterprises by reason of such loans; or

B. To concerns, personal, partnership or corporate, now engaged or to be hereafter engaged in the production of defense goods or materials, raw or manufactured, upon the finding by the lending authority that such concerns by such loans or aids will be enabled to advance or contribute substantially on a sound basis to essential production for national defense in respect to raw materials or manufactured output.

C. For the purposes of this act a small business or industry is hereby defined as a business having in the latest year of its operations a gross turn-over of not exceeding $400,000.

SEC. —. Whoever shall make false or fraudulent representations for the purpose of obtaining aid or loans under this act shall, upon indictment and a verdict of guilty, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Is this proposed by the able Senator from North Carolina as an omnibus amendment, or are we to consider each subdivision as a separate amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. I offer it as a whole, but I should be perfectly willing to have the sections considered separately.

Mr. McNARY. I am not complaining; I was merely curious to know how the amendment is to be considered by the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. I was offering it in the form of two sections. I suggest that the first section be considered as one amendment, and the final section as another.

Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only long enough to explain the amendment. I am for the pending bill, and I am for bringing relief to the small businesses and industries of our country; but as the bill stands it is wipe open, and the sky is the limit. It is proposed to constitute a board which can lend any amount of money up to $100,000,000 to anyone, at any time, for anything. That is no way to go about helping small business. If we leave it in that shape, we practically invite everyone in the country who would like to get a little money, and without security, to come here and see the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives first, and then go down the street and see the Board. It would be a great embarrassment to the country to start with, it would be a great embarrassment to the Congress, and a great embarrassment to the Board. Meantime, the legitimate and deserving small businesses would find themselves in a competition, a rush on the Treasury, in which I suspect the small businesses would all become lost.

I have undertaken to divide the beneficiaries under the bill into two groups. The first group is "concerns, personal, partnership, or corporate, engaged in peacetime civilian enterprise, that were solvent going concerns December 1, 1941."

The proposed aid is intended to benefit the concerns which were adversely affected by the declaration of war. We do not intend to go to the rescue of all insolvent corporations in the United States. If my amendment shall be adopted, the beneficiaries will be those solvent, going concerns engaged in peacetime civilian enterprise, which were solvent on December 1, 1941, and "which are found by the lending authority to be in need of liquid assets by reason of the incidence or the consequences of the war, or of the Federal policy on account of the war."

The loans will be "for the purpose of carrying on business in civilian or defense activity, and which shall be further found"—and this is with respect to the beneficiaries—"are reasonably likely to be expected to survive as solvent enterprises by reason of such loans."

Why should anyone lend money to a man who cannot reasonably be expected to carry on? Why contribute to his bankruptcy?

I have stated the first category, namely, civilian peacetime business and industries.

The second category is "concerns, personal, partnership, or corporate, now engaged or to be hereafter engaged in the production of defense goods or materials, raw or manufactured, upon the finding by the lending authority that such concerns by such loans or aids will be enabled to advance or contribute substantially on a sound basis to essential production for national defense in respect to raw materials or manufactured output."

That aims the loans directly at the concerns which may now be operating or may hereafter be operating with a view to contributing to the national defense.

In the third paragraph I undertake to define a small business. As the bill reads there are no limitations. The Board could lend money to the United States Steel Corporation just as readily as to a small business. So I propose the following language:

For the purposes of this act a small business or industry is hereby defined as a business having in the latest year of its operations a gross turn-over of not exceeding $400,000.

I simply took that figure as what appeared to me to be a reasonable description of a small business. The amount can be made greater or smaller; but since the bill is intended especially to aid the small businesses, we must have some limit placed in it, which will eliminate the larger businesses, which presumably have an opportunity, under the Executive order, and also an opportunity under the statute, to go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Since we are undertaking to help the small businesses, we must make a definition which will bar the large ones.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he knows that Mr. Jones testified before the Banking and Currency Committee that a small business concern—note now, a small business concern—wanted a preliminary advance of $30,000,000?

Mr. BAILEY. No; I did not know that; but I take it that the Secretary of Commerce was simply reporting a fact—that a small business concern asked for $30,000,000.

Mr. GLASS. Under the bill as reported, the corporation proposed to be created can loan any amount it pleases up to $100,000,000, to anybody it pleases, for any damn purpose it pleases, and we actually eliminated the usual phrase, "with a reasonable expectation of repayment."

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. The Senator from Virginia is directly supporting my amendment with his statement. Unless we place some limitation in the measure, there will be business coming and asking for $1,000,000, $2,000,000, $30,000,000. They have already done so. What becomes of the small local industry under such circumstances? Why not have limitations placed in the bill?

I provide a section which I think is in the nature of a safeguard, and I shall offer it independently of the amendment; but while I am speaking I shall undertake to explain my reasons for it.

The section I propose reads:

Whoever shall make false or fraudulent representations for the purpose of obtaining aid or loans under this act shall, upon indictment and a verdict of guilty, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. President, I do not, I hope, unduly distrust my fellow man. I do not think it is a matter of trust or of distrust. It is a matter of the Congress being trusted by the people and seeing to it that every safeguard is erected to prevent imposition upon the Government. Men will come, or businesses will come, seeking loans from this new board. They will be required to make representations as to their business, their capacity, their volume, and if they should make a false representation with respect to any civilian activity as between one man and another, and obtain money thereby, they would be guilty under the common law of a misdemeanor, or obtaining money under false pretenses. So I think when we hold up a prize of $100,000,000 to all those in our land who would like to borrow some money without security we might at least require that they shall file with the lending authority a business statement, and in filing such statement they should file it under the sanction of a criminal penalty.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our Government has in the past loaned a good deal of money to, we will say, big business, and I am wondering if such a provision as the Senator seeks to place in the bill appears in any bill at all passed by Congress for the purpose of aiding big business.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am not sure, but I will say that I would certainly vote to insert in the general law a clause similar to this. It happens that I was here when the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation bill was passed in 1932, and I remember well the excitement and the pressure under which it was passed. We stayed here one night to pass it. I do not know whether or not it is a secret, but I see no reason now why I should not tell it, even if it were a secret. We were informed officially that unless we should pass that bill by 12 o'clock that night 500 banks in New York State alone would close the next morning at 9 o'clock. It happens that the Senator who gave me that information has passed from the earthly scene, but I know how he importuned certain Senators on the Democratic side to dismiss all party considerations and to dismiss all ordinary considerations and vote for the R. F. C. bill, and I was one of the Senators who agreed to vote for it. I think I knew then what it meant. I could foresee its consequences; but I felt that we must throw the power of the Government into the breach of the depression. I have no recollection about criminal penalties in that bill; but if there were none, I should certainly be in favor of inserting some. That is aside.

Due to the disruptions and dislocations of the war, we confront a situation in which a great many small businesses throughout the land—oil interests, rubber-manufacturing industries, and automobile dealers—are distressed. That is just the beginning. Under the policies of the Government practically every local industry and every local business is going to lose a large portion of its market. The Government is cutting out the sale of radios, ice boxes, and refrigerators, and is telling the people that they shall not have more money for the ordinary necessities of life than can be spared. I think that is true.

That means a tremendous recession in the sale of a great many articles. It means to a considerable degree local paralysis of merchants and industries. We are told it is necessary in order to head off inflation. We propose to enact a great tax bill in order to aid in heading off inflation. I understand the philosophy underlying the suggestion that there will be a national income of $15,000,000,000 for the purchase of things for sale to the people, and that there will be that much money somewhere, but there will not be things to buy with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very much interested in the definition which the Senator proposes to insert in the bill as to the business and nature of business which would receive recognition for loans. If I recall correctly, the Senator fixes the date as of the 1st of December 1941.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. That was just 7 days before the attack at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. McCARRAN. With that in mind, I recall that rules affecting priorities have been put into effect since that date. I am inclined to believe that all the priorities with reference to the manufacture of automobiles, and the sale of automobile accessories, and the sale of automobiles, in all departments, affecting the distributors as well as the manufacturers, have gone into effect since the 1st of December 1941.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me correct the Senator's impression, if he will. The date of December 1, 1941, applies only to the word "solvent." The corporation must have been solvent on December 1, 1941.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what I have in mind. I wish to draw the attention of the Senator to a certain situation. Let us picture an automobile distributor who has had a business turn-over, we will say, of $100,000 a year. He was solvent on the 1st of December 1941, but shortly after that date he was practically put out of business.

Mr. BAILEY. Then he would be eligible if he was solvent on December 1.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I wish further to draw this situation to the attention of the Senator: The priority order has put him out of business completely, so that there is no chance for him to become solvent in that business henceforth.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; but if he were solvent on December 1, 1941, he would be eligible for a loan.

Mr. McCARRAN. But how would he repay the loan when, as a matter of fact, the priority orders have put him out of business?

Mr. BAILEY. That is a serious question, but I think that is addressed to the phrase I have inserted in my amendment, that they shall be found "reasonably likely to be expected to survive."

Mr. McCARRAN. A question immediately arises in that connection. I am trying merely to project my mind along the same path which the Senator is following. I am favorable to the proposal. However, so long as a priority order exists against an automobile dealer—and I am using him only as an example—he cannot reasonably be expected to carry on, because the priority order has now shut him off and will continue to shut him off for an indefinite period.

Mr. BAILEY. I think I can meet the Senator's question by asking him one. Does he propose that the Federal Government shall undertake to make loans without security to all businesses in the United States which may become insolvent or bankrupt during the war?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; far from it. We are going along together in our mental picture of this situation. I am trying to see how the definition fits the actual conditions which exist with reference to certain businesses throughout the country, which are now being heard from very vehemently. I know of dealers in the automobile business—and the Senator must know of such dealers—who are today paying overhead and interest on borrowed money and who have stocks of cars on their floors which they would have sold had it not been for the priority order. If they should sell out the stocks which they have they would be out of business. They are not even permitted to sell the stocks which they have on hand. So if the bill were enacted into law, we should have one rule working against the other.

Mr. BAILEY. As it stands, the bill before us, without the amendment, is a measure under which we could lend any amount of money to anybody, solvent or insolvent, whether there was prospect of repayment or not and whether or not the borrower was injured by the war. We should be opening the door wide. I am trying to fix some limitations.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me ask a further question.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to clear up the Senator's first question. I am trying to fix a limitation under which loans will be constructive and helpful.

We intend to use the $100,000,000 to save the small businesses of the country insofar as we can. If we open the door and have no limit at all, we shall not have enough money to make a drop in the bucket. If we do not have limitations, the legitimate and deserving small businesses which might be saved will be lost in the shuffle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From the question propounded by the Senator from Nevada, apparently he contemplates that the automatic industry is to continue in the automobile business. My understanding of the bill is that such businesses as do not fit into the defense picture will have to be converted into other types of industry which will make a contribution to the defense program. I thought it was the purpose of the bill to help them convert into some useful arm of the defense program.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the precise purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I thought.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it the Senator's idea that by this bill we will transform all those who have been in the automobile business, for example, into some other line of business? Is that the idea of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but that is the idea behind the bill. The purpose is to help convert businesses which are not contributing to the defense program into industries which will contribute to the defense program.

Mr. McCARRAN. With the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, let me cite another illustration which comes closer home. Take the hardware merchant. He cannot obtain priorities. He is going out of business, not because he was not solvent in December 1941, not because he is not solvent now, but because under the priority orders he cannot obtain merchandise to continue in business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A loan would not help a businessman in that condition. Such a loan would not be a constructive loan.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it the Senator's idea that the bill would not help that class of business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think we should make an insolvent business solvent by lending money to the owner, unless we can help him go ahead and do something constructive and valuable. Otherwise, what is the use of lending him money?

Mr. McCARRAN. Such a businessman may have been solvent on December 1, 1941, but he will not be solvent if the priority orders continue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under the terms of the bill it is proposed to lend him some money so that he may convert his business into something constructive toward the war effort. That is the object of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. If we are to transform all those industries into other industries, and make those businessmen go into other businesses, we should know it now.

Mr. BAILEY. We are not going to make them do so. We are going to enable them to do so. My amendment says "for the purpose of carrying on business in civilian and defense activity." It would be done only where it could reasonably be done. We have a war on hand. As I understand, in war we cannot escape casualties. There will be casualties in America. There will be casualties on the sea, in the air, and on the battlefield.

Mr. TOBEY. And in the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. As the Senator from New Hampshire says, there will be casualties in the Senate. There will be casualties in business. I wish I could hope to avoid all casualties; but we cannot avoid casualties in war. The object of the bill is to reduce the casualties to the lowest possible point, and to cushion the small businessmen of America and help them so far as we reasonably can hope to do so. My amendments are thoroughly consistent with that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to correct the Senator's idea with reference to the object of the bill. The object of the bill is not to reduce casualties in small business. It is not intended as relief for small business. The object is to utilize the small plants of the country in war production. If we are to succeed in producing material for conducting the war, it is absolutely essential that the small plants of the country be utilized in that program. At the present time in many sections of the country, if not in all, probably 49 percent of the capacity for production of war materials is not being utilized; and the main object and purpose of the bill is to utilize those plants. The loaning feature is merely incidental.

I am sorry the Senator was not a member of our committee. I am sorry he was unable to attend the extensive hearings which we held. I am sorry he was unable to appear before the Banking and Currency Committee, which is made up of a group of Senators who are just as competent and capable of studying this program as is any of us. The committee of which I am chairman spent several months on this subject. We heard witnesses from all over the United States. We had the advice of bankers. We had the testimony of Bradley Nash, who was Chief of the Financial Section of the War Production Board and who understands this program.

It is impossible for a Senator to walk into the Chamber, without any previous knowledge of the conditions which we have been studying, and determine offhand what kind of a bill should be enacted. I have the greatest respect for the Senator from North Carolina——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for the purpose of making a speech. If he wishes to reply to me, I shall be glad to hear him. I thought he rose for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. I wished to correct the notion of the Senator with reference to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. There will be abundant opportunity to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Would the Senator's amendment prevent a concern which was organized and started in business since December 1 from receiving any funds under the terms of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. The language of the amendment is:

> (b) To concerns, personal, partnership, or corporate, now engaged or to be hereafter engaged in the production of defense goods or materials——

Mr. TOBEY. To what does the date December 1, 1941, relate?

Mr. BAILEY. It relates only to the matter of solvency, and to concerns in civilian activity. My amendment provides for concerns which may be created from now on in defense activities.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I am in full agreement with him about the value and ability of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have always had the utmost respect for it and for each of its members. I do not think it can be said that because I offer an amendment I am suggesting that there is something wrong with the committee. It would be a singular situation if that view should be taken with respect to amendments. According to that view, no Senator could offer an amendment. We should have to do what the committee said or do nothing.

As for attending the sessions of the small business committee, I was requested by constituents to attend, and I attended two sessions, with a very great deal of interest. I have read the report with much interest and sympathy. I drew this amendment last evening because I wished to aim the relief under the terms of the bill directly at the small businesses and industries of the country. I wish the Senate to do so. I wish the Congress to do so. I do not care to trust an unknown committee or board to do so.

In conclusion, if we succeed in converting businesses which are now adversely affected into some other activities in which they can go ahead, we shall be giving them relief. We shall be doing a word of salvage, which will require every dollar of the $100,000,000, and probably more. But if we open the door and have no definition, no limitations, and no standards, I seriously question whether there will be any relief for the deserving and needful small businesses and industries of our country.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. The question which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] asked has been disturbing me somewhat in the matter of the construction of the amendment. As I gather from the answer given to the Senator from New Hampshire, it is the Senator's view that, first, the amendment prescribes certain limitations.

Mr. BAILEY. The first amendment is related to concerns, personal, partnership, or corporate, engaged in peacetime civilian enterprise. I divided the amendment into two parts.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and I understand then the limitations under subdivision B are not additional limitations which would apply to concerns set forth in subdivision A. In other words, a corporation could qualify under subdivision B even if it were not in existence as a going concern on December 1, 1941, provided it engaged in the production of defense goods; is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. Whereas, under subdivision A, a corporation which was in existence on December 1, 1941, could be aided by loans and could continue in the production of civilian goods which were not directly connected with defense activities; is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct; that is the way I interpret the bill. That was the intent of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I think that is clear, although I believe it should be made certain that A and B will not be read as limitations upon every type of corporation, but that, instead, they will be regarded as authorization for loans of different types to different types of corporations.

Mr. BAILEY. I think I could clear up the matter with the Senator if, after the word "loans," at the end of the first paragraph, we should place a semicolon, and then say "or," so as to read, "or to concerns."

Mr. BROWN. Exactly. I suggest that such language be used; then there will be no question about what is meant.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well. I will simply insert the word "or" at the end of paragraph A, and place a semicolon after the word "loans."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Under paragraph A, would it be possible for anyone engaged in the business of agriculture to receive financial aid in the form of a loan? I have in mind that in Oregon and the other Pacific coast States it is difficult to maintain an adequate working force in the agricultural industry. This is due to two causes: First, the drafting by the Army of agricultural workers; and, second, the employment in shipyards, at rates of from $8 to $15 a day, of former agricultural workers, now converted into industrial workers. There will be a period during which agricultural businesses no doubt will need some form of financing while they adjust themselves to the new conditions. My query is this: Under paragraph A are agricultural businesses included? Agriculture is a real business.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I had in mind, of course, following the intent of the original bill. The pursuit of farming or the vocation of farming could be considered a business; but it was my view that the bill was intended to be for the benefit of industries and businesses in the commercial sense.

If we are going into the matter of loans to farmers we should bear in mind that in existing laws very considerable provisions are made for such loans. We should bear in mind, further, that the pending bill in no view could be equal to the demands of 6,000,000 farmers. It is intended to be confined to the small businesses and industries.

There is another consideration: In some sections the farmers may be more or less in distress, and I hear of a shortage of labor; I am sure there will be a shortage of labor on the farms in my section. It is a serious question whether there will be a shortage of production. We have been curtailing production on the farms of America since 1933, on the ground that there was overproduction. There will be a market for the farmers' goods, and I am very grateful that there will be. There will be a market for the services of the workers, and I am very grateful that there will be. In those two phases of our situation we have some comfort and some consolation. Farm prices are now very near to parity, and the farmer's market is available to him. There is a demand for his cotton, his peanuts, his tobacco, his wheat, his hogs, and his cattle.

In the pending bill we are dealing with the small industries and the small businesses whose opportunity to sell has been destroyed, and with the owners of such businesses whose means of livelihood have been taken away. That is not true with respect to farmers. When it becomes true with respect to them, we shall carry them. That is not true with respect to the workers. There is a demand for workers. In the pending bill we are dealing with the small businessmen whose businesses are being destroyed.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to enable me to make an observation?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I happen to have had some personal experience as what is termed "a small manufacturer," under the Senator's definition, in a business which is confronted with possible destruction because of priorities. I also have had experience as a farmer in operating a dairy farm. I previously paid by dairy farm help $50 a month in cash, with living on the farm. I now have difficulty in retaining help at $100 a month, and the business will not stand any higher rate of pay. I have a perfect farm, well equipped, well capitalized, sufficiently financed. The Senator anticipates that production will continue. As a practical operator, I tell him that I doubt if it will. My dairy farm may close down because I cannot continue to subsidize it; and yet in the Portland milkshed the dairy farms are not now able to supply all the milk which is required for the Army forces at Camp Lewis, 200 miles away, and at the 2 recently constructed cantonments in Oregon, each of which has 30,000 troops, and for the increased population incident to the development of the shipbuilding industries.

In my opinion, as one trying to help solve the problem of raising the foodstuffs we must have, production will fall off, because we cannot compete, on the one hand, with the military forces which are taking away from us our farm help, and, on the other hand, with the war industries which are paying wages of from $8 to $15 a day for such labor as we use on the farm.

I do not desire to go too far afield from the subject matter of the debate. I have stated a question, and I understand the Senator's answer to be that, under his amendment, assistance, if justified, is not contemplated to those engaged in agricultural pursuits. Is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. I should not undertake to interpret the committee's intention. My amendments do not restrict the bill in that sense at all; my amendments are in line with the bill. I simply expressed to the Senator my judgment that the bill originated with the Small Business Committee, and was intended to be of aid to small businesses and industries, and not to be of aid by way of lending money to farmers.

I will say to the Senator in that connection that, so long as the people of this country have a reasonable amount of common sense, they will know that in order to maintain the country, in order to carry on the war, we must have adequate agricultural production. That is the basis not only of war but of our civilization. We have been restraining production; but we can loosen those restraints, and can very greatly enlarge our production. I am glad to say that this is one land in which, so far, there is no threat of a food shortage. The United States of America is one country which knows nothing about famine, and we may give our thanks to Providence that that is so.

I wish, however, to answer the Senator. When and if the time shall come that the farmers have sent their sons to the battle line or out onto the sea or into the air in such numbers that they cannot operate their farms or that the workers ordinarily available to agriculture are no longer available, then this country will see to it that the farmer has what is necessary to produce an adequate supply or the country will fold up. We would surrender to famine and of course that would be destruction.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is one more observation I should like to make. On a dairy farm the cows have to be milked at milking time, and if they cannot be milked, they are sent to the butcher.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not surprised to hear that. I have always understocd that was so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, referring to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina I will take the last section first as I understand he has divided the question. The last section reads:

SEC. —. Whoever shall make false or fraudulent representations for the purpose of obtaining aid or loans under this act shall, upon indictment and a verdict of guilty, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Certainly I have no objection to such an amendment. I can hardly believe that the act described is not already a crime. If it is not, it should be made a crime by general statute, for this bill is just a small part of what we are actually doing. I see no reason why the amendment should not be added to the bill, although there is already a section of the Criminal Code which says that anyone who, with the intent of cheating and swindling or defrauding the Government of the United States, or misstates any material fact, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both. My impression is that statute would cover this case, but I see no objection to putting into the bill the criminal section.

When we come to the other section, however, I think it entirely misconceives the purpose of the bill, and would seriously hamper the operation of the plan.

Throughout the address of the Senator from North Carolina he has emphasized relief for small business, help for small business. Frankly, we drew the bill up on an entirely different basis. I do not say that what the Senator from North Carolina has suggested is not one of the purposes; it is one of the necessary results of the bill; but the main purpose of the bill, as stated in its title, is to mobilize the resources of small business in the war effort. In order to add to the productive capacity of the United States, we are building hundreds of large plants all over the country, financing them or building them ourselves, in order to increase production. On the other hand, we have existing facilities wholly unused which the owners are required to shut down because we cannot give them the material to continue their civilian production. The purpose of this bill is to mobilize capacity to produce, for every article which can be added to our total production will be of advantage.

The bill does not take from anybody. It keeps the workmen who are engaged in these plants working in the places where they are, instead of transporting them across the country to some place where there is no housing and where there are no facilities to take care of them.

It seems to me the bill is an obvious and essential measure to bring about the mobilization of this country for war production. We are going to mobilize half the productive capacity of the country. We are going to spend this year, apparently, over $60,000,000,000, which is more than half the total national income, on war production, and then we are not going to get the production we require for the program we are undertaking. Surely the main purpose of anyone interested in this bill is to get additional productive capacity. That was Mr. Nelson's testimony. That is the reason the War Production Board has been interested in the

bill. Mr. Nelson says, "I am not concerned with relief"—I think he might well be a little more concerned with relief than he is—but he says, "Merely because it does relieve little business is certainly not an objection to adding to the productive capacity of the country and that is what the War Production Board wants to get today."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Ohio has brought this matter up in the way in which he has, because there is opportunity for a misunderstanding of this bill to go to the country; in fact, such a misunderstanding is already apparent. That is why I propounded the question to the Senator from North Carolina as I did. It grew out of the colloquy which took place on the floor yesterday between the Senator from Montana in charge of the bill and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], which appears on page 3320 of the RECORD, and in which the junior Senator from Nevada said:

> What the Senator from Montana says about small business being important is very true. My State is very largely made up of small business. I should like to ask a question. I make this statement as a background: A friend of mine who is an automobile dealer has some $200,000 tied up in new cars. Is it not true that the bills which are now pending before the committee would definitely deal with this question?

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] said, "That is correct."

Mr. TAFT. But not this bill, if I may interrupt for a moment; the reference is to another bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. The junior Senator from Nevada was addressing himself to this bill, and the point the Senator from Ohio has suggested is what I desire to have made plain.

> Mr. BUNKER. And also with the situation of tire dealers, who have tire stocks tied up?
>
> Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.
>
> Mr. BUNKER. The committee has performed a very valuable service to the country; and if it should succeed in solving this problem—and I have every reason to believe it will—it would solve one of the most perplexing problems of the day.

Now, let me call the attention of the Senator from Ohio, if I may in his time, to the very fact he has emphasized, and what, to my mind, should be emphasized here, namely, that this bill is not intended to permit a distributor of automobiles or tires to go on with that business, because there is a priority order out against him now, and he cannot overcome it by any provisions of this bill. This is to do what the Senator from Colorado said a moment ago, namely, to permit him to transfer his activities from the business in which he has been engaged to another business which is a wartime essential business.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Nevada is entirely correct.

Now, take the question of solvency. What will be done will have to be largely done on a local basis. An agent of this Corporation may find half a dozen plants in a particular town—take my own city of Cincinnati, for instance—some of which may be automobile shops which will have to be abandoned, and he will work out a program by which four or five such shops may cooperate in making a single article. Perhaps each one will make one part, and another one will have to be financed in order to enable it to assemble those articles into the ultimate product which is to be delivered under the prime contract to the War Department. It may well be that one of the most essential plants in that set-up is insolvent. What difference does it make?

If we loan to the company the money, after the plant is established the Government will, at least, have a mortgage on the plant, and can take it back and realize what it can get. Certainly we are going to lose money on this program. Is not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation going to lose millions and perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars in the work it is doing for the larger plants? Certainly it is going to lose money; but I do not believe that we ought to limit in any way the method by which war production is to be built up. It is not a question of relief; it is not a question whether a man deserves aid from the United States Government, but it is a question whether his little plant can be fitted into a program to utilize men, materials, and machines together with a number of other little plants which are doing more or less the same kind of work.

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Montana, who, I think, rose first.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Ohio, I think, will recall that we had before our committee and before the Banking and Currency Committee the plans that are followed in Germany with reference to utilizing small business, and there was a discussion of those plans by Bradley Nash.

Mr. TAFT. In Germany they are putting machine tools in the hands of men who may be wholly insolvent, but it makes no difference to them, for they want to get the production, and they have gotten the production.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. To state the matter succinctly, if this bill becomes a law, it will transform potentialities of factories into actualities, will it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and will enable a tremendous number of machines which are not used today to be used. A large percentage of machine tools are not being used. Where are they? They are in small plants of one kind and another. Some may not be valuable for war work; others may be; we cannot determine that; we have got to give somebody power to go and form pools in small industry and produce articles which will conform to Army and Navy specifications.

Mr. BONE and Mr. BAILEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Washington, who, I think, rose first.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio referred to a criminal statute which probably would have application to anything that had the aspect of fraud in the operation of this proposed law. I observe in the bill that the Smaller War Plants Corporation as a corporate entity shall have power—omitting certain descriptions—to—

> Prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted.

It could make suitable rules applying to applicants for loans or for assistance and under this proposed statute such rules would be given validity. We breathe the breath of life into them, and, if there was any fraud arising out of an application, the bill would be broad enough to give the board all the information under which it sought to have the penal statute apply in the case.

Mr. TAFT. The penal statute applies to Government corporations as well as to others.

Mr. BONE. The suggestion the Senator from Ohio makes is correct, because the power is given here to make regulations and among them to prescribe what the application for a loan shall contain, and if there is an erroneous or fraudulent statement, such for instance, as happens sometimes in applications for loans to a bank, a man making an application would be liable under the criminal statute to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am impressed by the statement of the Senator from Ohio. He indicates, if I apprehend his meaning, that it is the intention of the bill as it stands to aid in the transfer or the diversion of existing businesses into defense or war activities. He says I was under a misapprehension. I agree that I am. If that is all the bill is going to do, we are going to leave most of the small businesses in this country in the lurch. Let us take an example.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator ask me a question? If he has a question to ask, I shall be glad to yield, but I prefer to continue my remarks.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator permit me to make just a statement?

Mr. TAFT. If it is a question, yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Just to state the consequence?

Mr. TAFT. If it is a question, I yield; otherwise, I should like to proceed.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well, I will ask the Senator whether, in his view of the bill, a firm or business heretofore operating in his State, or in mine, or anywhere else, selling tires or gasoline or oil or automobiles, could look to the proposed legislation, in the view of it he is taking, with any hope.

Mr. TAFT. I think not; no.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator thinks not?

Mr. TAFT. We have another bill which we are offering, to provide aid to the tire industry. It is a very difficult matter to work out. The proposal is that such tire business as there is be diverted entirely to the independent tire dealers, and that the larger companies, which are being made over for war work, be taken out of that field, so as to leave somewhat more for the smaller tire dealers. There may be some machinery

in tire shops which could be worked into war production, though I do not think there is much. There are a great many tools in the automobile shops which can be worked into metal-working processes to complete products the Government needs. I believe we are going to have to approach the tire situation from a different angle, and we now have a bill pending in the Little Business Committee to deal with that subject.

As to the limitation of $400,000, we confront the question of what little business is. I think $400,000 is a somewhat low figure, and I should prefer, if small business is to be defined, to have it defined as concerns which employed before the war, let us say, less than a thousand men. Perhaps the number of men they employed is the better test. But there is this great disadvantage; a few loans may have to be made to large business. Suppose there is a need to get something manufactured, and there are three or four small businesses which can make the different parts, but there is one part which can be made only by the General Electric, and they can make it only by adding machinery which they otherwise would not need. It would be desirable to let the Corporation make a small loan to a big business.

I do not think there is much harm in leaving to the discretion of Donald Nelson, the Director of the War Production Board, to determine what is a small business and what is a big business, and how the program is to be worked out. I cannot think there would be much abuse. After all, let us remember that we have given to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation $10,000,000,000, without any protest from this body, to lend as they choose, to anyone. In this case we are proposing a grant of merely a hundred million dollars. The Corporation is not going to use that hundred million dollars for loans to big business. The man in charge of this activity is trying to do a job with little business. If he does find an especially large loan sought, he may go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and ask it to make it.

It is provided that he can certify the whole thing to the R. F. C. in such cases, and I have no doubt that the man who is running this activity will try to conserve the hundred million dollars, and wherever any large loan is necessary, he will try to push it over to the R. F. C. There is no danger in leaving it to the War Production Board to determine what is big and what is little business. The line between them is arbitrary, a difficult one to draw, and I do not think it is worth while drawing it in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How long, in the opinion of the Senator, will this hundred million last? Will it last over 2 weeks?

Mr. TAFT. I think that depends entirely on the ability and success of the man who operates the program. If he makes a success, it will probably last 6 months. If he does not, he will not lend the money, and it will last during the period of the war. Frankly, I admit this is largely an experiment, and if he does make a success, when he comes back 6 months from now he can get $500,000,000 from this body, and he will not have any trouble, it will take only a day or two to get it through. It is an experiment, and if it is a success, we can consider the enlargement of the program.

Mr. President, it seems to me that any reluctance to make this provision is straining at a gnat when the Senate has swallowed so many camels that it is almost foolish to discuss the question. Consider what we have already done. We have given the Reconstruction Finance Corporation about $10,000,000,000 to lend. They have already committed seven or eight billion dollars, practically all we have given them, and practically all that has gone to large industry.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator will recall that the R. F. C. made one loan, of $65,000,000, to the General Electric Co.

Mr. TAFT. I call attention to a case involving the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, which leased a plant said to cost altogether $90,000,000, built by the Defense Plants Corporation, near Cincinnati, the city in which I live. When the war is over it is conceivable that there may be enough airplane business so that the Wright Aeronautical Corporation will take that plant off the Government's hands, but they are not bound to do it. If it comes back to the Government's hands, the Government will lose $25,000,000 on that plant alone because no one can realize on an industrial plant the amount of money put into it. My figures may be wrong, but the amount involved is approximately in the neighborhood of what I have given.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My reason for asking my original question, as to about how long the $100,000,000 would last, is that it is my opinion that it will not last 2 weeks, and that the fundamental provisions of the bill are very, very important. Therefore, I feel that we are not straining at a gnat at all, that this is a pretty good-sized camel itself, that only the nose of the camel is here at the present time, but that we will get the rest of him right away. I think it is very important.

Mr. TAFT. When we reflect on the time it will take to set up the machinery and get the plan into operation, I doubt the possibility of the money being loaned in 6 months. This money is to be passed out for the purpose of increasing war production, and a man has to do a good deal of work and do it very carefully before he can mobilize tools into any effective production unit.

It is not easy, and that is why it has not been done. That is why we want someone with the special and peculiar duty of doing it. Naturally a man who is concerned with a hundred-million-dollar plant, producing thousands and thousands of airplane engines, is not going to bother with a little plant which will produce a hundred engines. That is why we are trying to put this thing in the hands of one man.

Take the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We gave them power to create any corporation they wanted, for any purpose for which they chose to create it. Without any authority except that, they created the War Insurance Corporation and gave it a capital of a hundred million dollars, exactly the figure concerned here, without the vestige of a suggestion on our part that we were concerned with the expenditure of any such amount as a hundred million dollars.

Mr. Jones is not limited today by anything like the size of the concern to which he may lend money. He is not limited by the solvency of the concern. He may go out and build a plant for anyone, and he has done it, and properly so, because what we are trying to do today is to get production. I do not think anyone is more concerned with retaining the civil rights of the people of the country and maintaining a democracy than am I; and where any measure does threaten the rights of anyone, I certainly think it should be examined with the greatest care.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the bill before us rather would tend to enable people to retain life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, rather than threaten their rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rose for the purpose of giving the Senator from Ohio an opportunity to emphasize the point he has just now made. It seems to me that the position which is taken by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Montana in resisting the proposed amendment is the surest possible guaranty we can now have for the preservation of what we are pleased to call the American way. The preservation of the American way, the preservation of the free system of economy, depends upon the preservation of little business; and if we throw around the War Production Board of the Government all sorts of inhibitions to prevent loans to make use of the productive capacity of small business, we can only expect to see little business die. The solvent companies are the big companies. Many of these little companies which are capable of doing more work are dying now because of action that was taken prior to December 1, 1941.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Wyoming is entirely correct. Men who have been down here to see me are not men who are insolvent and want to get relief from the Government. What they want is to be able to turn their plants into war production and keep going; keep their men employed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly

Mr. TAFT. To tide them over the period in which they know that they would have to shut down, no matter how solvent or insolvent they may be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If an amendment of the kind now proposed were adopted it would have the inevitable effect of emphasizing the control of big enterprise over the war effort. Attention has already been called to the fact that many times on the Senate floor that the War Production Board contracts and the O. P. M. contracts have in the main been granted to the largest corporations of America. Because they are solvent, because they have huge staffs, they have been acquiring contracts; they have a backlog of contracts, while little business throughout the country is starving for lack of contracts and for lack of just exactly the sort of cooperative action and executive initiative which is provided for in this bill.

I sincerely hope that the position of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Ohio will prevail with respect to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when I say that we are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, I mean that we are just giving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation $10,000,000,000 to do anything Mr. Jones chooses with it, and that the President himself is giving the War and Navy Departments power to loan money. The President, in the last week, issued an Executive order, in which he said:

> The War Department, Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission are hereby respectively authorized, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment or modification of contracts, (a) to enter into contracts with any Federal Reserve bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or with any other financing institution guaranteeing such Reserve bank, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or other financing institution against loss of principal or interest on loans, discounts or advances, or on commitments in connection therewith, which may be made by such Reserve bank, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or other financing institution for the purpose of financing any contractor, subcontractor or others engaged in any business or operation which is deemed by the War Department, Navy Department, or Maritime Commission to be necessary, appropriate or convenient for the prosecution of the war.

In this Executive order the President has already given the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission the power to loan money up to—I think we have appropriated $140,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy already, and the President is now giving those Departments power—that is, the officers sitting down there on Constitution Avenue, with no experience in lending whatever—to guarantee the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or anybody else against loss on contracts. In other words the Army and the Navy are making the loans themselves.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. In addition to the policies to which the Senator from Ohio has just referred, he might also direct attention to what we have done in making available to the President $13,000,000,000 under the Lease-Lend Act, to loan, under such terms as he sees fit, so as to provide direct or indirect benefit, and the sudden excitement of Senators over $100,000,000 seems rather trivial.

Mr. TAFT. I was going to mention the Lend-Lease Act. The other day we passed an act to lend the Chinese Government $500,000,000 without the slightest restriction with respect to what it might be used for. I do not know how it is going to be paid out. Apparently Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek can draw funds in Chungking against the United States Government for any purpose he sees fit to draw them. We have appropriated, I think, $15,000,000,000 or $17,000,000,000 for loans to any country in the world, without any security, without the slightest chance, in most cases, that we are going to get any of it back.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator from Ohio wants to be fair about the China loan. He mentioned the name of the commander in chief, Chiang Kai-shek, and said that he could draw the funds for any purpose. In all fairness, is it not just the other way around? He can draw the funds if and when the loaning authority wants to let him have them, and on such conditions as the United States Government will impose.

Mr. TAFT. I inquired at the time the bill was passed as to just how the loan was to be handled, and I could not get any satisfactory answer then, and I am wondering if the Senator from Texas can tell us what the procedure actually is in making the Chinese loan; whose certificate is made with respect to it, and how and when the money is drawn?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was made quite clear in the Committee on Foreign Relations when the matter was before us that it is made on the certificate of the Government of the United States. The purpose of it was, of course, to give added confidence and prestige to Chinese authorities. One of the reasons was to bolster their currency and to make it available for war supplies and any other supplies that they might be able to obtain. We did not, I am sure, approve it with any theory that Chiang Kai-shek simply could take the money and throw it into the Yangtze Kiang if he wanted to. We did not do that. We provided that the United States Government would let him have it with some understanding or stipulation as to what he should do with it. Of course, when he gets it he might violate that provision. So might any other borrower.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it is a little difficult to know whether he has violated it or not. Chungking is a long way from here. It interested me because it is not like the lend-lease proposition. It provides money, not to be used here but money to be used in China; and how we are to determine how the Chinese Government is using it in China I am unable to discover.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator from Ohio voted for the measure.

Mr. TAFT. I voted for the measure, and I am going to vote for the pending bill. I swallowed the camels, but now I object to those who will not swallow the gnat for what seems to be a vitally important war-production purpose.

It is suggested that the R. F. C. should make the loans. I wish to emphasize first that the main purpose of the bill is not the loan, the financing. We have discussed this matter as if it were a financing bill. That is not its main purpose. Its main purpose is to mobilize small industry to take war contracts. The financing provision is included only because financing is in many cases an essential tool to enable the other work to be done. We authorize this corporation to go to the War Department and take the prime contract and then sublet it entirely to various small industries throughout the United States or in particular localities. That is the main purpose of the bill.

When it comes to financing, of course, it could be done by the R. F. C., but it can be done much more quickly if the man who goes out and mobilizes these industries, who sees a certain man, and says, "Can you make this or can you make that?" Can he, at the time he is told, "Yes; we can undertake the contract," tell the contractor that he can obtain a loan of so much money so that when the arrangement for the contract is completed the contractor will not have to go to some other agency and describe the whole thing to them and sell them on the proposition? The complete arrangement will be made more quickly if the man who first sets it up can see to it that the money gets to the place where it is needed to carry out that project. That is the only reason we leave the provision in the measure.

After all, the R. F. C. is, so to speak, banker-minded. Why did we need this power for the War Department to guarantee the R. F. C. on loans? If the War Department should say to the R. F. C., "This is essential for war production," why would not the R. F. C. make the loan tomorrow? I asked Mr. Patterson that question in the committee. I said:

> If you called up the R. F. C. and said, "So and so needs a loan of so much money; it is absolutely necessary for national defense," why should not the R. F. C. make that loan on its own responsibility instead of asking for a guaranty from the War Department?

This is what Mr. Patterson said:

> They are banker-minded and probably have to do so. It is not a strictly banking proposition, I think; it is more a procurement proposition. We are more interested in that loan being effected than they are.

Mr. President, I do not care what their attitude is. If after one thing has been set up it becomes necessary to go to another Government department and again go over the matter, and educate someone with respect to what is attempted to be done, and get the money, it will mean 2 or 3 or 4 weeks more than if the same man who began it does it all. That is why we put the power in this Corporation. It does not mean any reflection on anyone. It is because we feel that if anything is to be done for small business, it is such a difficult proposition, it is so complex, and so hard to do, that you are not going to make a success of it unless you give one man all the power. The man to whom we are giving that power is not some imaginary board. It is Donald Nelson, who has been placed in charge of the whole production program of the United States. He is just as much in charge of this Corporation as Jesse Jones

is of the R. F. C. or of the Defense Plants Corporation. Mr. Nelson is responsible. The people of this country are holding him responsible for the success of our war production effort, and certainly they cannot object to our putting in his hands all the power we can put in his hands to carry out that program.

Mr. President, I do not know that anyone was more anxious to avoid this war than I, but the war has begun. We are in the war. There is no possible outcome except to carry it to a successful conclusion, and that conclusion depends more on speeding up our production of war materials than any other factor in the entire situation, at least in the year 1942 and perhaps in the year 1943. I feel that this bill as it is, as it was written in the committee, without qualifying amendments, can be one of the most effective means of carrying the war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my desire to discuss the pending measure at length, but I merely wish to point to a few paragraphs therein that will indicate the purpose of the bill and the reason the Small Business Committee had, as well as the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, for suggesting its adoption. My purpose is to specifically discuss some of those provisions in the light of the pending amendments that were submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

As was pointed out by Mr. Nelson, one of the main reasons why it was impossible to deal with small-business establishments in contracting for implements of war was because of the large size of the contracts and the vast sums necessary to carry them out. Engineering skill was lacking in small concerns and those in authority preferred to deal with corporations that had the skill, the finances, and that were in a position to assume the responsibility for the performance of the jobs assigned to them.

In other words, the War Production Board thought that it could better deal with large concerns, and that by so doing it could contract with one party who could do a given job as a whole and handle it. In my opinion, the amendments suggested by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina would hamstring the operations of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. I was under a misapprehension, if the Senator from Ohio correctly stated the object of the bill. I gathered, from the creation of the Small Business Committee and from my attendance upon its sessions, that the committee would present legislation intended to aid and cushion the small businesses of the country which are being destroyed by the incidence of the war; but I am now told otherwise.

Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. Is it his view that if the bill should be enacted into law it would not be of assistance to the automobile dealers, tire dealers, or oil and gas dealers who have lost their sales? Is it true that the bill is not intended to aid them, except insofar as they may engage in a war industry?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will read——

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our Small Business Committee has proposed another measure to help automobile and tire dealers. Let me read the purposes of the pending bill. That will answer the Senator's question. If he will refer to page 7, lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, he will find that the purpose is—

To mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns, and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized—

To do what?—

to augment war production.

The primary purpose of the bill is to mobilize all the small businesses of the country in an effort to expand our war production. Section 2, subparagraph (1), on page 7 reads as follows:

(1) To make, or arrange with the Bureau of the Census or such other governmental agency as may be possessed of the necessary personnel and facilities for the making of, a complete inventory of all productive facilities in the United States which may be used for war production.

It is not limited to the automobile business or the refrigerator business or any particular business, as far as that goes. The idea is to make an inventory of all businesses, and to try to get those forces together and to utilize such of them as will fit in the picture so as to increase our war production.

Mr. BAILEY. Those are glorious generalities This language is very fine—

to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns.

That is "big" language. In my State we are dealing with specific cases. I saw some of those who came here from my State. I know who they are. They are prostrate. The Senator from Louisiana tells me that we are to appropriate $100,000,000 to "mobilize" them. That will be a great day. I want something done for them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think the Senator ought to know better than that. He is attempting to discuss a different proposition than the one now before us. The great plants of Chrysler, General Motors, and various other large automobile concerns have been and are being converted from automotive plants into plants to produce war materials. The pending bill would not help them; $100,000,000 would not go very far toward helping them. As a matter of fact, in many instances they have been helped by the R. F. C. In many cases, I am advised, the Federal Government is putting up all of the necessary funds.

It strikes me that if we should adopt the first part of the Senator's amendment, indicated under subdivision A—which reads as follows—

Loans or other aid hereunder may be granted only as hereinbelow provided, to wit:

"A. To concerns, personal, partnership, or corporate, engaged in peacetime civilian enterprise, that were solvent going concerns December 1, 1941, which are found by the lending authority to be in need of liquid assets by reason of the incidence or the consequences of the war, or of the Federal policy on account of the war, for the purpose of carrying on business in civilian or defense activity, and which shall be further found are reasonably likely to be expected to survive as solvent enterprises by reason of such loans"—

the whole bill would be hamstrung. How are we to determine what the assets and liabilities of a concern are? It might be an easy task to determine liabilities, but as to assets we may have difficulty. We have had evidence before us in the Naval Affairs Committee to the effect that concerns with little or no assets—that is, money or equipment—are able to obtain millions of dollars' worth of contracts, not because of the tangible assets they possess, such as money and equipment, but because of the engineering skill which they control, and the large number of trained employees that they have at their disposal. That statement applies particularly to the shipbuilding industry, and I am certain in like manner to many of the small businesses that we might be able to mobilize in our supreme war effort.

Are we to say to the Smaller War Plants Corporation created hereunder, "When you determine what the assets and liabilities of a concern are, you must not give weight to its management, to its engineering facilities, and things of that kind"? Why not leave it to the Corporation, to the same extent as we have in the past left it to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? No such strings were attached to that giant lending Corporation when it was created by the Congress. We left it entirely to Mr. Jones and his Board. In this instance, why not leave it to the Smaller War Plants Corporation? As I see it, the only difference between the two corporations is that the R. F. C. has usually loaned its money to big, established businesses; and the purpose of the proposed corporation is to help small businesses which are necessary in our war production. The question I want answered is, Why should we be so particular in dealing with the little fellow and on the other hand so generous in our dealings with the large concerns?

I wish to read into the RECORD a portion of a release from an Executive order by the President under date of March 23. I think he had particular reference to the bill now before us:

The basic purpose of the order is to put working-capital financing on a war basis. Up to now peacetime restrictions on banks and credit agencies have made it difficult for them to finance war production, although the banks have been anxious to use their resources for prosecution of the war.

Under the order the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission may guarantee or make loans when they are needed for war production. These guaranties will support the operations of the banks, the Federal Reserve System, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other credit agencies. They will not be made under peacetime credit rules. They will be made by production men wherever additional financing is essential for additional production. Peacetime restrictions on credits cannot hold up production of war supplies needed by the armed forces.

I repeat, Mr. President, the last sentence:

Peacetime restrictions on credits cannot hold up production of war supplies needed by the armed forces.

I again ask, why make it almost impossible for little business to obtain necessary funds to increase war production?

The amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that I have previously quoted is directly opposed to the Executive order, to which the statement I have read refers. I predict that if we enact this bill with the amendments proposed by the Senator from North Carolina, we shall have very few applications.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am bound to think that the Senator from Louisiana is now under a misapprehension. He read the statement of the President referring to the Executive order providing a fund for loans. The President stated in general terms the conditions under which the money would be loaned. The Senator is reading the President's statement as though the President had contemplated the measure now before us. That order related to the Executive power of the President. I think that is all right. The President was providing funds for national defense production. I thought we were trying to do something to tide over small business and cushion it from the force of the war. I am repeatedly told that that is not the purpose of the bill. If that is not the intent of the bill, and the President has already set aside a large fund for lending purposes in connection with national defense, I do not see just what we are driving at.

Mr. ELLENDER. Permit me to read one of the paragraphs from the President's statement, which I failed to read. I did not think it was necessary; but, in view of the question propounded by the Senator, let me read it:

The Executive order authorizing the financing of contracts to facilitate the prosecution of the war is aimed at curing a situation which has interfered with the all-out participation of many small-business enterprises in war production. Senators MURRAY, MEAD, and CAPPER have been particularly anxious to bring about this participation. Full production of the Nation's smaller businesses is essential to victory.

I presume the President had in mind the bill now before us, because it is a product of the Small Business Committee, which has held hearings on the subject. Let me repeat to the Senator that if he will read the first part of the bill he will note the purposes for which it is being proposed.

In order to avoid the necessity of the Government making contracts directly with small business, we are proposing the creation of a corporation, not merely for the purpose of lending money to small business, but for the purpose of carrying out contracts, for contracting with the War and Navy Departments, to the same extent as a private corporation could contract, with the understanding that after the corporation enters into a contract it shall have the right to sublet the contract to such small businesses which, in its opinion, will be able to do the work.

By reading the bill in full it will be noted that the sole and only purpose of it is to organize small business in an effort to increase our war production, to make more implements of war for our fighting forces. Let me again quote from page 7 of the bill as to its purpose:

To mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most effectively utilized to augment war production.

The program under the bill is to be managed almost entirely by Mr. Nelson, who is head of the War Production Board. In order for any corporation, be it small or large, to obtain material from which to manufacture various articles, it must go to Mr. Nelson; and I venture to say that, if the bill is passed, no articles will be made by any of the small concerns except to increase the supply of implements of war necessary for our fighting forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to ask the Senator how much consideration was given to the fixing of $100,000,000 as the amount to be authorized by the bill. Why was the amount made $100,000,000, instead of $10,000,000; or why was it made $100,000,000, instead of what I think the amount should have been made—three or four billion dollars? In my State of Colorado, as I said a moment ago, I do not think the $100,000,000 would last 2 weeks; within 2 weeks, I think applications from my State of Colorado alone will be made in the amount of the $100,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean for small businesses which at this time could be converted so as to increase war production?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A limitation of $400,000 has been placed as the figure classifying a business as small, so I do not know how small they will be.

However, let me say that approximately 1 percent of the country's population reside in Colorado. It is my opinion that from the State of Colorado itself applications will be made for $100,000,000 under the provisions of the bill. The reason why I say so is because there is not a chamber of commerce in the whole State of Colorado——

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is very fortunate. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No matter how small the city or how large, which has not asked for war industries. They want war industries everywhere. They must have them, I understand. As soon as I return to my office I intend to send the record of the discussion in the Senate on the pending bill to each one of the chambers of commerce in my State.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh; I misunderstood the Senator a while ago. There are chambers of commerce in Colorado? [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are, and they will want their share of this money.

I just wonder how the committee happened to arrive at the sum of $100,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, it is a nice, neat little sum, and I think it is a fairly good beginning. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created, as I recall, with $100,000,000 capital. We now have authorized it to loan as much as $10,000,000,000; and the chances are that if the operation of the pending bill meets with success, and more money is needed, we shall provide it in short order.

What we are concerned with today, I may say to the Senator from Colorado, is production, the making of implements of war so that we can properly and adequately arm the members of our armed forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am in full agreement with what the Senator says; but the danger in having the amount so small is that those who administer the law will probably look upon it as a small-sized job.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no fear of that. If more money is needed, the manager of the corporation will so tell us in the same manner as my good friend Jesse Jones made his wishes known to us.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is very desirous of learning why we fixed on $100,000,000, I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am very anxious to learn that.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, I realize, with the Senator, that $100,000,000 will not go very far; but, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] explained a little while ago, what we are undertaking in the pending bill is largely an experiment. We have held hearings and have brought witnesses here from all over the country, and we have realized that we are going to get production. We must get it through some such machinery as that which we are seeking to set up under the bill. We fixed on the sum of $100,000,000 because that would at least give us an opportunity to try out the program. Since the agitation has developed as a result of the studies of the committee, the President—as has just been pointed out in the debate—has issued an Executive order in which he has authorized the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to make advances, loans, and commitments to corporations intending to carry on war production.

It will be observed that the Executive order is not in conflict with our bill, but is supplemental to it; and the probability is that our loaning activities will be confined to small plants which find it difficult to get loans through the regular channels; but they will be able to secure the loans only after having the War Production Board and the corporation to be set up under Donald Nelson decide that they are competent and capable of carrying through such contracts and that they are essential for the production program.

The likelihood will be that a great many of the loans which will be made to the small business concerns of the country will be made without the neces-

sity of getting loans from the Corporation at all. There may be a great many small concerns which will be able to take prime contracts without coming to the Smaller War Plants Corporation at all. If they have some commodity, some product, some war material, or instrumentality of any kind which the War Department or the Navy Department needs, they are at liberty to enter into contracts with them directly, and they have been doing so. So I can easily understand that the $100,000,000 will carry us forward to a great extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a good starter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I simply desire to clear up the point that the committee considered the $100,000,000 only as a starter, as an experiment, and that if it works more money will be made available.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; no doubt.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it increases war production, all Senators can rest assured that Congress will be called upon to provide more money, and I think we will vote it without hesitation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator from Montana knows, I have been very anxious to have a program enacted which will put to work every idle screwdriver in the whole Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending bill probably will do that very thing, once they are mobilized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The assurances which Senators have given me that the question of providing funds will not hamper the program in any way whatsoever is very encouraging.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if we further examine the bill it will be seen that, as I have already indicated, the program is to be managed almost entirely by Mr. Nelson, war-production chief. Under paragraph (2), on page 7, in lines 18 to 21, authority is conferred:

> To direct the attention of officers of the Government having procurement powers to the potential productive capacity of plants operated by small concerns.

In other words, material will not be allocated to any concern unless it is to further expand our war-production effort. Expansion of war production is the whole purpose back of the bill, and I feel confident that, with the small starter to which the Senator from Colorado has just now referred, we shall be able to get somewhere.

We are informed that there are in our country today any number of small businesses which now are doing nothing—they are at a standstill—because they cannot obtain the materials with which to continue to turn out the various articles they produced before the war began, and with the expenditure of a few dollars to buy certain tools they might be able to convert their establishments into plants to make war materials.

I repeat, Mr. President, if we should agree to the first part of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, and thus curtail the bill's provisions for extending aid——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I have been utterly persuaded by the Senator's eloquence, and I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for his generosity. Does the Senator withdraw all of his amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; all of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. Mr. President, I shall not impose upon the Senate any longer, as I feel that the issues involved in the pending measure have been sufficiently presented to this body. I am ready to vote.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

> On page 7, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:
> "It shall be the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he is hereby empowered, through the deputy so appointed by him, to cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Director of Civilian Supply in the issuance of all orders limiting the productive capacity of business enterprises, with a view to insuring that small-business concerns will be most efficiently and effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials essential for civilian purposes, and that business enterprises other than small-business concerns will be utilized to the fullest extent for war-production purposes."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, just a few words in explanation of the amendment. I think it is entirely in harmony with the purposes of the bill. It is a positive directive, intended to emphasize the intent and to express the will of Congress, should this bill be enacted, to give to small business as large a portion of the production of civilian supplies as is possible under the circumstances. In conformity with what I said yesterday, while I am anxious for every reason to see that small business shall be utilized, insofar as possible, for war production and for the production of war articles and materials, I am convinced that the greatest hope for the survival of small business and the competitive segment of our economy lies in their being given the opportunity to furnish the necessary civilian materials which must be produced in order that our economy may continue to function. So in order that such a directive may be in this bill, in order that the will and intent of Congress may be emphasized, and in order that the Director of Civilian Defense may realize that he is also responsible for the fate of small business, I have offered the amendment.

I think it is acceptable to the chairman and the members of the Small Business Committee and also to the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency whom I have consulted.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, certain articles which I have written upon this subject since the beginning of the defense program.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Progressive of December 14, 1940]

GIANTS SQUEEZE SMALL PLANTS, STALL DEFENSE

Frenzied grabbing of all defense contracts by the giants of industry is not only depriving smaller plants of their share of defense production but is seriously stalling the entire rearmament program, it was revealed in Washington this week.

While expenditures and production lag far behind schedule, more than 7,500 small factories, equipped with machinery and skilled labor, are denied participation in the program primarily because the big boys don't want them built up during the emergency to remain as potential competitors later on.

Thus some of the biggest corporations of them all have been grabbing contracts they can't meet for several years in order to create a backlog of orders for themselves and prevent the smaller factories from breaking into the defense program.

[From The Progressive of February 15, 1941]

BOB LA FOLLETTE SAYS: "NATION MUST PREPARE NOW FOR ECONOMIC READJUSTMENTS"

Most of the critical economic problems which this country has faced during the past decade can be traced directly to the distortions of our national economy in the last World War. The present defense program—even with the most careful planning—will intensify and create many more such problems. The World War experience has been a costly lesson. It is a tragic fact, therefore, that some of the administrators of the present program are ignoring that lesson.

The total of defense contracts that the Army and Navy Departments have awarded was approximately $11,685,000,000 at the end of January. In addition, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made commitments aggregating approximately $1,100,000,000 in aid of the defense program.

Of the contracts, approximately 43 percent of the total amount is for ships and equipment; 20 percent for airplanes and parts; 17 percent for ordnance and ammunition; 11 percent for construction; and about 9 percent for all other contracts.

Obviously, this distribution of industrial activity in a defense economy is wholly different from the normal distribution of industrial activity in a peacetime economy. For example, ship and boat building, including repair work, constituted only about four-tenths of 1 percent of all manufacturing activity according to the last manufacturing census for which statistics are now available (1937); and manufacturing constitutes only about one-fifth of the national economy in terms of national income.

The aircraft industry in the same census constituted less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all manufacturing in terms of value of products.

Similarly, the contract construction industry in its peak years never comprised more than 5 percent of the total economy in terms of national income produced. Thus, an industrial pattern which is geared to the production of warships, planes, tanks, guns, and munitions of war is an entirely different pattern from peacetime industrial activity.

Some distortion is inevitable. The challenging problem that confronts us is not how to avoid it, but how best to minimize its effects and how to provide a transition back to normal after the crisis has passed.

One of the factors that is unnecessarily aggravating the industrial pattern is the uneven allocation of defense contracts. Granting, in all fairness to those administering the program, that total defense is a tremendous undertaking, that speed is an essential factor, and that the problems are manifold—it does not alter the fact that the present distribution of defense contracts is not only unfair to certain sections of the country, but is

creating, unnecessarily, many new maladjustments in the national economy.

Ten cities in the country have received almost 40 percent of the total value of contracts awarded. Six States have received well over 54 percent. Thirty industrial counties have received over 75 percent.

An immediate effect of this concentration of contracts is the migration of skilled labor. Recently published statistics of the Social Security Board show that the six industrial States mentioned above (that have secured over 54 percent of the defense contracts) have available for employment less than 35 percent of the registered unemployed workers who have "primary skills in selected defense occupational groups."

Further comparison of the statistics with Social Security Board data of April 1940 seems to indicate that already a considerable migration of skilled workers has occurred, since the defense program began. The House of Representatives Select Committee on Interstate Migration which was initially appointed to study the interstate migration of the destitute farmers, as symbolized by the "Okie," made this statement in a preliminary report: "It has become apparent that the final report of this committee must devote considerable attention to the subject of defense."

Migration of the skilled worker is but one of numerous problems that arise from defense maladjustments. A score of social and economic problems, present and future, inevitably attend the centralization and overexpansion of present plant capacity.

In the past few weeks the press and current periodicals have given wide publicity to the inadequate housing and miserable living conditions of workers in some of the "flush" defense towns. The other side of the picture is surplus housing, disrupted social ties, and a "skimmed" labor market in cities which are not so fortunate in securing defense contracts.

Unless there is a sharp reversal of policy, those administering the defense program will have to assume responsibility for increasing the violence of the economic collapse which will inevitably follow a return to more normal conditions.

Pending in Congress are several resolutions to study the expenditures and contracts for national defense. More far-reaching is a pending joint resolution of Senator WAGNER which would establish a Post-Emergency Economic Advisory Commission. Senator WAGNER stated the case well when he said, in presenting his resolution to the Senate:

"If we are to avoid a post-emergency economic collapse, a multitude of problems will press for solution in the field of employment, in foreign trade, and in our fiscal, agricultural, and industrial policies. Consideration of these problems should begin promptly, in order that fully matured plans may be available when the emergency ends. The conversion from a defense economy to a peacetime economy with a minimum of shock and disorder in the economic system will call for statesmanship and national cooperation of the highest order."

[From the Progressive of March 22, 1941]

BOB LA FOLLETTE SAYS: "LET'S NOT DELUDE OURSELVES ABOUT THE CURRENT BOOM"

The expanded Progressive, beginning with this issue, symbolizes a new chapter in national affairs. It marks the beginning of a new era in which a challenging maze of vital issues confronts the Nation. Now is the time for courageous leadership to chart a road through the wilderness of domestic problems; now is the time to work with renewed vigor to prevent our actual involvement in war. The Progressive rededicates itself to these objectives.

The No. 1 job confronting the Nation at the present time is the national defense program. Everyone realizes that the production of warships, guns, and war planes will add nothing to the world's real wealth; everyone knows that the use of armament will add only to human misery, not human happiness.

Yet no sober-minded citizen will deny that we must have armaments and an adequate national defense to insure self-preservation as a nation, and the perpetuation of the liberties we prize so highly.

We must not be misled, however, by the short-sighted viewpoint which assumes that a superabundance of guns and implements of war is all that is necessary to protect our way of life. All the guns in the world will not protect us from totalitarianism engendered by hunger, poverty, or unemployment; nor should we delude ourselves into thinking that a sound prosperity can result from the feverish economic activity of a war or a defense program.

Social and economic reformers who see in our defense program a chance to solve the domestic problems which 8 years of the New Deal failed to achieve will have a bitter awakening when the crisis is passed and a postwar adjustment comes—perhaps even before that time if the pinch of priorities and ration in industry strikes closer home than aluminum pots and pans, the production of which has already been terminated by Government decree.

It is true that much of the defense program is supplementing regular industrial activity and taking up some of the slack that existed before. But it is a sad commentary on democracy at work in America that only during the exigencies of war activity do we approach the maximum utilization of our plant capacities. Idle plant and human capacity in the last decade wasted wealth equivalent to a $5,000 house and $1,000 automobile for every family in the United States.

Some people speak glibly of their willingness to spend any dollar amount to buy defense. These people have neither a concept of the magnitude of billions of dollars nor an understanding of the fact that appropriations mean taxes and more taxes!

Consider for a moment a few comparisons to illustrate the magnitude of sums of money necessary for defense. The Congress is now considering the appropriation bill for the so-called lend-lease program. The President requested $7,000,000,000 for this purpose—and it is probably just the first installment. If that amount were converted into $10 bills and laid end-to-end, the bills would extend twice around the earth at the equator with enough $10 bills left over for five additional rows from New York to Los Angeles.

Twice in 1 year Congress has been asked to raise the national debt limit. The present debt limit of $65,000,000,000 will clearly be inadequate much beyond the next fiscal year. A debt of $100,000,000,000 or the equivalent of a $3,330 debt for every family in the United States is already in sight. Our future fiscal policy, therefore, is one of the major domestic problems before us.

Unless resort is had to repudiation or inflation, Government debts must, of course, be paid in taxes. Careful studies made for the Temporary National Economic Committee indicate that our present tax structure is not only inadequate to raise the sums desired, but also highly inequitable in raising present amounts. The results reported show that taxes in the lower-income groups violate the principle of ability to pay because of consumption and sales taxes that are levied.

Attention should be directed also to the administrative shortcomings of our defense program.

The chief of the contract service and engineering unit of the Office of Production Management told a regional meeting of the National Defense Advisory Commission Division of State and Local Cooperation in Chicago recently that his records showed that of the total of $10,000,000,000 of defense contracts awarded in the last 6 months of 1940, approximately 90 percent of the total value was awarded to about 600 large concerns. He said further that only about 13,000 prime contractors had received contracts out of a total of 200,000 potential prime contractors.

Previously in this column I called attention to the uneven distribution of defense contracts—how 10 cities of the country have received 40 percent of the total value of contracts awarded, how 6 States have received over 54 percent, how 30 industrial counties have received over 75 percent. I also pointed out the aggravating effects of the maldistribution of contracts on our social and economic patterns. Since that time the Senate has authorized a special committee to probe into the situation. It is to be hoped that this committee will make a thorough and fearless inquiry and let the chips fall where they may.

[From the Progressive of August 30, 1941]

BOB LA FOLLETTE SAYS DEFENSE PROGRAM THREATENS EXTINCTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The small business man—a vital segment of industrial America—is being sacrificed on the altar of national defense. An economic pincers movement more powerful and destructive than the giant industrial monopolies have ever been able to muster is being fostered by the Government itself. We face a paradox of depression and unemployment in the midst of defense prosperity. We are threatened with the permanent extinction of small business.

The two jaws of the Government pincers are priorities and defense contracts. Priorities are depriving nondefense industries of raw materials necessary for their existence. Defense contracts have gone for the most part to big business. The result is that small business which is denied materials for normal production must shut down, while big business gets defense contracts to replace normal production.

Already more than 300 items are on the priorities critical list, running the entire alphabet from acetone to zinc. Practically all the industrial raw materials, especially metals, are now included, as well as such varied consumers' goods as wool blankets, men's underwear, tent stoves, and field glasses. Numerous raw materials, including aluminum, copper, nickel, zinc, chromium, magnesium, tungsten, borax, and resin have already been subjected to strict allocation by the Office of Production Management.

CONTRACT ALLOCATION BUNGLED

Present very conservative estimates are that upward of 5,000 small plants face complete idleness in the near future and unemployment directly attributable to priorities may exceed 2,000,000 people. The magnitude of these figures can be appreciated best with these comparisons:

The sharp industrial recession at the end of 1937 involved the lay-off in manufacturing of only about two-thirds as many employees. The upswing in manufacturing employment between June 1940 and June 1941, due both to the direct and indirect effects of the multibillion defense contracts, afforded additional employment for only 1,700,000 people. All manufacturing activity in June 1940 employed less than 12,000,000 people. The major defense industries, according to Office of Production Management, employed less than 2,500,000.

Of course, the theory of the defense program is that defense production will supplant civilian curtailments and that priorities will entail but a transitory crisis. Such optimism, however, is not warranted. The key to the situation—the allocation of defense contracts—has been bungled by the administrators. While paying lip service to the small industrialist, they have awarded almost three-fourths of the dollar value of all defense contracts to 56 giant corporations.

PRESENT SITUATION IS CRUCIAL

As of June 1941 four corporations—Bethlehem Steel, New York Shipbuilding, General Motors, and Curtiss-Wright—had received almost one-fourth of the dollar valu of defense supply contracts, with almost a billion dollars' worth of supply contracts going to the top corporation, Bethlehem Steel. At the other end of the American industrial structure tens of thousands of small industrialists have not shared appreciably in defense contracts and are now being barred from obtaining sufficient materials for their normal civilian production.

Normally, the small and medium plants, employing less than 500 people each, produce about 60 percent of our manufacturing output. These are the plants that are being liquidated by the defense program. A manifold economic waste is involved, not only in the vast production capacity utilized, the idle men and idle machines, but also in the impairment of efficiency in the wholesale shuffling of economic factors to conform to the abnormal allocation of contracts. It should not be overlooked, as reported to the Temporary National Economic Committee by the Federal Trade Commission, that small- and medium-size corporations are the most efficient producers, that the major advantage of size is in sales and market tactics.

For 60 years the small business man has been fighting an uphill battle against the unfair competition of trusts and monopolies. Government antitrust laws, when enforced, have aided him. Crocodile political tears have been shed over his troubles by this administration. But now, with eyes turned in another direction, the administration's defense policies are selling him down the river to big business.

The present situation is crucial. The future implications are even more serious. A heavy responsibility rests on those administering the defense program that past mistakes may be corrected before it is too late.

[From the Progressive of March 21, 1942]

BOB LA FOLLETTE SAYS "SMALL BUSINESS IS BECOMING WAR'S FIRST ECONOMIC CASUALTY"

Thousands of small businesses in America are being strangled to death by Government red tape and maladministration. Despite all the eloquent lip service and the rapid succession of defunct programs on the part of the Government, the average small business man confronts a desperate situation. To date, an administration which claims to be the friend of small business has utterly failed to find a place in the war effort for the thousands of small enterprises which give wholesome sustenance to the economic vitality of every city and hamlet throughout the Nation.

Their impending extinction involves more than the permanent destruction of the democratic, individualistic industrial pattern which has heretofore characterized American economic life. Extinction of small business also involves crippling the war effort, because a vast reservoir of potential industrial capacity will be wasted—a reservoir consisting not only of manpower which can be used most efficiently in present capacities, but also of the intangible values of a "going concern" which could and should do their part in the war effort.

There are—or were until recently—more than 2,750,000 small business enterprises in the United States. Only a small proportion of these are engaged in manufacturing, but almost all are vitally affected by the rules, regulations, restrictions, and rationings of war. A single executive or administrative order, such as the freezing of automobile sales, or tires or typewriters, may affect thousands of these enterprises and almost decimate an entire industry or area overnight.

MOST CONCERNS IGNORED

Naturally, some business casualties in war are just as inevitable as human casualties. No businessman, large or small, can expect to avoid the effects of war, nor is he always justified in criticizing when he is adversely affected.

It must be said, however, that there is ample justification for criticism and discontent with the present Government contracting methods that to date have failed to utilize effectively the facilities and managements of more than 95 percent of the manufacturing concerns in the country. As of February 1, 1942, only 8,238 manufacturing concerns held prime contracts totaling $10,000 or more. According to the latest census, there are 184,000 manufacturing concerns in the United States.

Some progress has been made in the forcing of subcontracting, and in the letting of orders to industrial pools of small manufacturers; but the monthly rate of subcontracting was estimated on February 1, 1942, to be only $430,000,000, and up to the same date only 32 contracts had been made with industrial pools.

BIG BUSINESS DOMINATES WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

It is clearly evident that the small manufacturer is not participating as he should in the war-production program. At the same time, the inexorable pressures of raw material rationings for civilian production are driving him into shut-downs and bankruptcy. Testimony before a special Senate committee recently indicated that bankruptcies of small concerns during the first year of the defense program had increased about 50 percent over 1939—and the situation has become steadily worse.

With big business entrenched in the War Production Board, it is not strange that some of its representatives should seize upon this opportunity to liquidate competition. At the other extreme are the radicals, who look forward with glee to the day when the state will be running the economy through giant trusts, a la Joe Stalin. Unless those in the middle put up a fight of their lives, the pincers movement from the extreme right and the extreme left will blitz small business.

In short, the preservation of small business is imperative as a fundamental objective of post-war planning. Small business represents a phase of American life which is as essential to individual initiative and progress as freedom of opportunity is to democracy.

Admittedly the problems of keeping small business in operation are difficult of solution. More than casual sympathy and assistance are necessary. Government contracting must be improved. Subcontracting must be widely expanded. It may be necessary for the Government to underwrite submarginal loans to tide over the financial difficulties.

Action to save small business is imperative. Time is running fast. Unless there is drastic change in administration policies and appropriate protective action by Congress, small business will be the first economic casualty of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, for more than 2 years we have been struggling along without a definite war-production policy. The people are rightfully disturbed over the lack of progress in war production and the consequent adverse military situation. Delay means needless sacrifice.

When the price-fixing measure came before the Senate many of us expressed the belief that an efficient and successful price-control system was impossible unless the cost of labor was included. The administration leaders did not agree. I voted against final adoption of the conference report because I simply could not understand how prices could be intelligently set without including the item of labor costs. The existing law is defective and new legislation is necessary to clarify and strengthen it.

Last week I issued the following statement to the press:

The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces and our economic resources. He has asked for and received virtual dictatorial powers to meet the tremendous needs of a nation at war for its very existence. He has the power to prevent any stoppage of production in war industries.

Unless industry and labor can meet the problems of production immediately, unless the President promptly exercises his power to eliminate the bottlenecks arising from industrial inefficiency and profiteering and from the 40-hour 5-day week, then the Congress—which has already delayed too long—must do so. The people want action, with no further delay, and they are anything but complacent in regard to the issue. I am asking the President to take the situation in hand now because each day and each hour which pass without action make the loss of life and the sacrifices of the people greater. We cannot permit the problem to drift any longer, and, I repeat, that if the Executive does not act immediately Congress must do so at once.

On the sheer basis of patriotism, in the interest of national unity, industry and labor must agree on a definite war policy relating to the manufacture of war materials. This means a moratorium on the 40-hour week. It means a moratorium on double pay for Sunday and holiday work. It means, in addition, the most stringent control over profits in war contracts, and quick action to remedy inefficiency and abuse on the part of management.

I repeat those views today. Unfortunately, the President has not seen fit to act in this regard. There are numerous measures in the committees bearing upon the situation. Let us have open hearings on them, and let us get them on to the floor and discuss them. Let us once and for all set down a policy for labor and management for the duration of the war.

I received a letter a few days ago from W. D. Bell, secretary-treasurer of the Boise, Idaho, Trades and Labor Council. Let me quote from that letter:

In the town of Boise alone, we have enough idle men to supply an extra shift for practically all the war industry being carried on in Idaho at this time. Just for a matter of record, this morning I counted the applicants for work and found them to amount to a number of 670; multiply this by all the cities and towns in Idaho on a comparative basis and you will have several thousand men in the State of Idaho alone. This is not guesswork on my part and if you wish I would be only too happy to forward the application cards for these people. * * *

In addition to the idle men I have set forth in this letter, we still have large Work Projects Administration projects employing thousands of men in the State of Idaho on relief projects.

Why has this supply not been utilized? Why have these thousands of men on W. P. A. projects in my own State not been put to work to produce the guns, tanks, ships, and planes we need so badly or to relieve the desperate shortage of farm labor?

Our need for munitions is pressing. It is unbelievably urgent. We are in a war for which we were unprepared, and the nations arrayed against us are powerful and strong. If we are to defeat them, we cannot temporize. We cannot think in terms of half-way measures.

We might as well face the fact that our need for war equipment must result in greater and greater tax burdens, the most stringent control over war profits, a lower standard of living, and the temporary loss of some social gains. It is not a pleasant picture, but it is one we must face if we are to maintain our independence.

We are now imperiling our national existence. We are endangering our freedom. We are gambling with our chances for victory. Let us revise our price-fixing system so that it will be all inclusive. Let us adopt a definite labor policy for the duration of the war. Let us place the most stringent control over war profits. Let us proceed as we should in an all-out, total war necessitating tremendous sacrifices on the part of each and every American. If there is any guilt of complacency, it is not with the American people. It is with us in Washington, and we must act without any further delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated. I had intended to offer this amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 13, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

(g) (1) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof, by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both

(2) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it, or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both

(3) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in both the Executive order made by the President with regard to operations of the Federal Reserve bank and in section 7 of the pending bill, by which the R. F. C. is authorized to participate, there is a provision authorizing the War Department and the Navy Department to guarantee loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or by the Federal Reserve banks, out of funds which may have theretofore been appropriated. As I look over the bill I find that such a provision as to the Smaller War Plants Corporation is not contained in it. I think it should be contained in the bill. Of course, the security would be A–1, but it is highly desirable that where it is possible to do so the loans to smaller plants which have contracts with the Government should be guaranteed by the War and Navy Departments. As I have said, such provision is made in the Executive order which the President signed a few days ago, and is made in the bill, with respect to the R. F. C. I see no reason why the same provision should not be in the bill with respect to loans made by the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Therefore, I suggest an amendment, identical with the last sentence in section 7, with a change in the name of the Corporation. The amendment reads:

The War Department and the Navy Department are hereby authorized to participate in or to guarantee any loans made by the Smaller War Plants Corporation pursuant to this act, and, in connection therewith, they may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment.

I think that would add a valuable form of security which might be used by the Corporation. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Montana, and I believe he thinks the amendment would aid in the administration of the proposed law.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not recall offhand the precise language of the Executive order of the President which was issued a few days ago, but my understanding is that it authorized the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to make advances and guarantee loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other Federal agency. This would be another Federal agency, and I believe that under the Executive order of the President they would be authorized to guarantee any loans or advances made by the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I think the amendment of the Senator is proper; it is satisfactory to me, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will this give the Army and Navy the power to veto over the operation of the proposed law?

Mr. BROWN. By no means; it would merely authorize them to guarantee loans which might be made. It does not mean that a loan would have to be guaranteed by the War or the Navy Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would simply authorize it?

Mr. BROWN. It would simply authorize it. It is identical with the provision in the bill with respect to loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and it is identical with the language in the Executive order of the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is very important to have that point cleared up, because in the present situation and set-up the Army and Navy are the very agencies which have blocked small business from getting any part of the war-production program.

Mr. BROWN. Previous to the Executive order issued by the President with regard to Federal Reserve banks, there was no authority in either the War Department or the Navy Department to make a guaranty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 14, after line 16, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. The War Department and the Navy Department are hereby authorized to participate in or to guarantee any loans made pursuant to this act, and in connection therewith they may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reed
Andrews	Herring	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Rosier
Bailey	Holman	Russell
Ball	Hughes	Schwartz
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Brown	La Follette	Spencer
Bulow	Langer	Stewart
Bunker	Lee	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Mead	Vandenberg
Davis	Millikin	Van Nuys
Doxey	Murdock	Wagner
Ellender	Murray	Wallgren
George	Nye	Walsh
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Glass	Overton	Willis
Green	Pepper	
Gurney	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TAFT (when Mr. BURTON's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I understand that if present he would vote as I shall vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. NORRIS' name was called). The senior Senator from Nebraska is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the senior senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present these Senators would vote "yea" on the passage of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent. I am informed he would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—82

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hayden	Reed
Austin	Herring	Reynolds
Bailey	Hill	Rosier
Ball	Holman	Russell
Barkley	Hughes	Schwartz
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brown	Kilgore	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lee	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Mead	Vandenberg
Davis	Millikin	Van Nuys
Doxey	Murdock	Wagner
Ellender	Murray	Walsh
George	Nye	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Willis
Glass	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Bankhead	Burton	Lodge
Barbour	Chandler	Norris
Bilbo	Downey	Wallgren
Brewster	Guffey	White
Bridges	Hatch	

So the bill (S. 2250) was passed.

STRIKES IN NATIONAL DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054, the so-called antistrike bill introduced by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill wil be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of national defense.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the result of conferences which I have had with the Senator from Texas, the minority leader [Mr. McNARY], and other Senators, I wish to make a statement to the Senate with respect to this matter.

As we all know, the House has taken an informal recess over the Easter holidays. I have been seeking to arrange for a similar informal recess on the part of the Senate. Everybody knows that we have been at work for a long time without much cessation in our labors. The Easter holiday is upon us, and many Senators desire to return to their homes for a few days. I think it is not only desirable that that be done, but that it would be beneficial to the country as well as to the Senate itself.

There is nothing to interfere with that program except the possible contingency of taking up for consideration the motion of the Senator from Texas, and the bill which is the subject thereof, and the bill providing an appropriation of $18,000,000,000 for airplanes, which has already passed the House and is now pending in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] advises me that that bill will not be ready for consideration on the part of the Senate before Friday, Saturday, or possibly Monday. I hope the committee can report it on Friday, and that we may take it up then by unanimous consent, or, if not then, on Saturday, so that if we may have an informal recess by agreement, 3 days at a time, we may begin the recess at the end of this week.

If we cannot begin the recess until the end of this week or until Monday, that necessarily would extend beyond a week from Monday the reconvening of the Senate for the transaction of business. In other words, the House having begun its recess practically on Monday of this week, if we cannot begin ours until Monday of next week, in all fairness, I think we should extend ours until Monday, the 20th of April. Therefore I shall ask the Senate and my friend from Texas to agree to that, without regard to recesses or adjournments under the informal agreement by which Senators may be permitted to return home for a few days, the motion of the Senator from Texas be the pending business on the first day when we return from the informal recesses to the transaction of business by the Senate. I am perfectly willing to fix the date as Monday, the 20th of April, because I think that, if we take informal recesses, in all probability we shall not return and be ready for the serious transaction of business earlier than that date. I am willing to agree now that on that date the Senator's motion shall be taken up, or I am willing to leave it indefinitely in this situation: That on the first day when we return from the informal recesses for the transaction of business the Senator's motion shall be the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator agree that in the event we should reconvene prior to the 20th for the transaction of business, my motion shall then be the order of business? That is practically what he has said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I have in mind the possibility of reconvening earlier. The other appropriation bills now pending before the Appropriations Committee are the annual appropriation bills. There is no particular emergency or reason why they should be passed this week or next. However, I think the deficiency bill, involving 31,000 airplanes, ought to be passed upon by the Senate before we take any form of recess and return to our homes, or before we enter into any agreement about an informal recess.

In the event it should become necessary to return here for the transaction of business prior to the 20th of April, Senators will have ample notice of that fact. So far as I am concerned, I shall not be able to leave the city of Washington. I shall be here every day during any recess we may agree upon. I am willing to agree that we shall fix the 20th of April as the

date upon which the Senator's motion will be pending and may be voted upon by the Senate; or if, for any reason, the Senate should reassemble earlier than that date for the consideration of business, then on such date the Senator's motion shall be the pending business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator propound that suggestion in the form of a request for a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Mr. President, having in mind a possible informal recess 3 days at a time beginning within the next few days, I ask unanimous consent that the motion of the Senator from Texas be the pending business before the Senate on the 20th of April, subject to the proviso that if, following such informal recess, the Senate should reassemble earlier than the 20th of April for the transaction of business on such date, the Senator's motion shall be the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Am I to understand that the effect of the suggested agreement would be really to make my motion a special order of business for that day?

Mr BARKLEY. The effect is that it would be a special order for the 20th; and if for any reason the Senate should reassemble on the 15th or 16th, or any day prior to the 20th, in effect it would be a special order for that day, with the understanding that if we enter into an informal agreement it will be understood that we shall meet on Mondays and Thursdays during the informal cessation of business and that our procedure during the informal recess will be governed by whether we happen to meet on Monday or Thursday. On whatever day we reassemble for the transaction of business, the Senator's motion will be the uending business.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand also that the agreement would be unaffected by adjournments or any technical happenings,

Mr. BARKLEY Oh, yes. Under the rules of the Senate, an adjournment nullifies a motion to take up a bill; but we are waiving all that, so as to make the Senator's motion the pending business when we reassemble for the transaction of business, regardless of adjournments, recesses, or anything that may happen in the meantime.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accede to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky. I realize the circumstances which impel him to that course. If this agreement is made, of course, I have the assurance that not later than April 20, or upon any day prior to April 20, when the Senate meets for the transaction of ordinary business, the first business transacted will be a vote upon my motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054.

Mr. DANAHER Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky, in the time of the Senator from Texas, if we are to be given notice in case business is to be transacted on any day earlier than the 20th?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have already stated that if it shall become necessary to reassemble for the transaction of business earlier than April 20 ample notice will be given Senators so that they may return. I will say to the Senator from Texas and to other Senators that I hope it may develop that we may remain somewhat at ease from a legislative standpoint until the 20th of April, which will be 2 weeks from next Monday. Unless Senators receive notice in ample time of an earlier session for the purpose of transacting business, they may make their plans based upon an informal recess until the 20th day of April.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Kentucky whether it would be appropriate to specify the hour?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon on whatever day it reassembles. The motion of the Senator from Texas will then be the pending business. Of course, like any other motion, it will be subject to discussion, but it will be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE WAR-PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. BONE obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to address a few remarks to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky.

Many Senators are of the very strong opinion that the various parts of the war-production problem are so interrelated that it is not fair either to the problem or to the country to take up one segment of it without consideration of the others. Speaking for myself, I am willing to vote for any measures affecting labor which I think are fair. That means the elimination of the present limitation on hours of labor, the prohibition of entrance fees for war work, and any other provision which may be right and proper in the interest of the greatest effectiveness in the prosecution of the war.

At the same time, I do not want to vote for that kind of legislation and completely ignore the question of excess bonuses and excess profits without requiring equality of service from every segment of our economy and from all people.

I venture to suggest to the Democratic and Republican leaders that the Vice President or the two leaders might appoint a committee, consisting of perhaps 10 Members on one side and 5 on the other, distributed over the membership of the Senate, and let the committee make a study of such problems as are pertinent to this whole question.

For example, such a committee should consider the question of inflation, should consider that this year we are pumping $50,000,000,000 into war expenditures, that next year we are to devote at least $70,000,000,000 to the same purpose. That will be $120,000,000,000 in 2 years; and such an expenditure will have a very vital effect upon prices, upon inflation, and upon wages.

It does seem to me that we should make some attack upon the whole problem in a correlated way. It is almost impossible for any standing committee of the Senate to do so. I am a member of the Committee on Education and Labor; we have before us the Smith bill and certain other bills. We can deal with the particular subjects they present, but that still will not affect profits or bonuses or prices or the total mobilization of our power in certain other respects.

So I say again that I should like to bring the subject I have mentioned to the attention of the majority leader, to see whether anything of that character may be done in the interim before the bill of the Senator from Texas is taken up for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion offered by the Senator from Florida, and it is worthy of consideration. However, it raises the question of whether by some omnibus bill we can deal with all the correlated questions involving taxation, limitation of profits, hours of labor, time and a half for overtime, and the whole situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield to the Senator in just a moment.

I do not believe that we can, today, on the spur of the moment, solve that problem. I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Oregon, and other Senators. Of course, we all understand that the question of inflation is inextricably involved in the matter of taxation. The Senate cannot act on tax bills until they have been acted on by the House; and after the House has acted on them they must go to the Senate Committee on Finance. No matter what sort of over-all committee might be appointed to consider all the related subjects and to make a report to the Senate, there is no way to escape the inevitable situation that we cannot deal with taxation bills until they have come to us from the other House of Congress; and then the Senate must first deal with such bills through its Committee on Finance.

That situation raises the question of how far any joint committee or any over-all committee can study all the related questions, bring in recommendations to the Senate, and then have such recommendations split up and referred to the various committees having jurisdiction of them, and all to be done within a week or 2 weeks or within any given time.

However, I shall be glad to consider the matter in the light of the Senator's suggestions and in the light of conversations which I have already had with the Senator from Oregon, the minority leader, and to give them the best possible consideration which I and he may be capable of giving them; but I do not believe that today we can take any action which would be based upon wisdom or

sufficient knowledge to enable us to create such a committee or to take specific action relative to it. However, I do promise the Senator to give the matter my very earnest consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may address a remark to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I previously rose for the purpose of saying what the Senator from Kentucky has already said: That certain parts of the program of the Senator from Florida cannot be handled by the Senate as an original matter, either by unanimous consent or in any other way.

While I am on my feet I should like to add that, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to the creation of any new committee for handling the problems of today. We have standing committees of the Senate which are empowered to handle all such matters, and which have jurisdiction over all of them. Some of us have been here for weeks and months while the Senator from Florida has been speaking in the North and the South, as he said the other day, and in the East and West, and even up in Canada. The Senator from Florida is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, which has under consideration, and has had for months, much of the most important of such legislation; and it seems to me that, instead of creating new committees, if the members of committees which are already in existence would stay here and tend to their business and report proposed legislation to the Senate we might make better progress.

Mr. PEPPER rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BONE. Yes. This is an interesting colloquy, and I am enjoying it. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator has said raises a question which is bound to be before us in the next day or two, when we consider an appropriation bill which the Committee on Appropriations feels we should dispose of before we suspend our activities in the Senate for a week or two. The other day, in the House—I do not say this in criticism, but it is a fact which everyone knows—in the passage of a deficiency appropriation bill providing for 31,000 airplanes, at the very last moment, when the House was ready to act upon the bill, a Member of the House offered an amendment to limit to 6 percent the profits of corporations producing the airplanes. The amendment went through without anyone opening his mouth about it—not even the author of the amendment. It was agreed to without debate.

That raises the question of whether we can reach the subject by an effort to limit profits by the terms of an appropriation bill, or whether it is wiser to reach the subject by taxation. We must pass on that matter in the next day or two, because that bill will be before the Senate. We must either agree to the amendment or reject it; and that situation raises the question of what is the proper procedure.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not yield until he gives me a chance to make a comment.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the other body deals with so fundamental a problem without consideration of the amendment, without debate, simply in order to get rid of an amendment and vote for it, without even the author of the amendment explaining it or undertaking to fix a formula, the Senate is presented with the question of how the amendment can be eliminated. It seems to me to illustrate one of the difficulties suggested by the Senator from Missouri when such matters are dealt with without proper consideration being given to them. That raises a question which is fundamental, the question whether we can best deal with a matter of that sort in an appropriation bill or in a tax bill, in order to recapture profits made by corporations having contracts for the production of articles needed for the national defense.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sorry that the Senator from Missouri took advantage of a suggestion I made in good faith, to leave an imputation that the failure to pass legislation of the sort he thinks desirable is attributable to the fact that I have been making some speeches in the country. I have seen the time when I thought many Senators, and particularly the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], would profit well by spending some of their time in a little closer contact with the people of the country; and I have tried to avail myself of such opportunities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement, he can then make any statement he may care to make.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to ask a question, not to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida exactly what he has done in the Committee on Education and Labor in order to bring before the Senate these very important questions. I did not express any opinion as to whether I was for or against any of the bills; but I do think they are of such importance that the Senate has a right to consider them.

What has the Senator from Florida done in the last 3 or 4 months, in the Committee on Education and Labor, to bring those matters before the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can say that as a member of the committee I have participated in the discussions in the committee and have generally agreed to the course the committee has followed under the leadership of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], whom I regard as one of the eminent and distinguished and sincere Members of this body.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What has been the net result?

Mr. PEPPER. The net result can best be measured perhaps in what one's opinion is as to whether more has been accomplished by the method which has been followed than would have been accomplished by legislation; and I am not the one to be the final arbiter of that matter, or to reach that decision. There are two sides to the question.

At the time when the Smith bill came to the attention of the Committee on Education and Labor we were just about ready to consider it. I was one of the Senators who advocated its consideration, and in December 1941 I issued a public statement to that effect—a statement to which I should gladly call the Senator's attention if he would be kind enough to notice it—advocating that we make the Smith bill the subject for the passage of legislation dealing with the whole question of unfair labor practices and unfair practices in the realm of management; consequently, I felt that at that time such a course would have been the best one to pursue.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I shall gladly defer to him.

Just at that time the committee had before it the Secretary of Labor and everyone that I know of connected with the Government who deals with the subject of labor. They made a joint appeal to the committee to allow the convening in Washington of the conference which was to be called by the President, and they assured the committee that they would not consent to such a conference unless they had already had informal negotiations and were resolved that they would bring from the conference some agreement which would effectively stop strikes in the country.

There the committee was in the predicament of determining whether to go ahead and flimflam, make a great show, and hurry to the floor with a bill, or whether to do something which was requested by the President of the United States indirectly, by his Cabinet officer, by Mr. Davis, the Chairman of the Mediation Board, and practically by the representative of every other agency of the Federal Government dealing with labor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Just a moment, please.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to shut the Senator off.

Mr. PEPPER. We waited, and, as the Senator knows, that conference was held; the result of the conference was a no-strike agreement, and my advice is that the agreement has been substantially kept. The committee could have recommended legislation to the Senate, but I doubt whether any legislation which

the Congress might have passed would have been more effective in stopping strikes than was that voluntary agreement. The problem which today is agitating the country is not the strike problem—and I think the Senator knows that to be true—it is a question of the 40-hour week, time-and-a-half time, and, up until a while ago, double time.

I am not an apologist for the Committee on Education and Labor, but I will say—and the Senator knows it to be true—that on the 17th of June 1940 I stood in my place here and stated, as the RECORD will show, that I favored giving the President the power even at that time to waive any statute, including the wage-and-hour statute, that might interfere with production in this country; and I do not recall that the Senator from Missouri at as early a time as that said anything to that effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not, and will not do so now.

Mr. PEPPER. I said it as a friend of labor. I have been prepared all along to make labor subject itself to any discipline necessary; but I shall not single out labor and ignore the question of profits and bonuses and outrageous business conduct, which also deserve the attention of the Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to trespass unduly on the time of the Senator from Washington——

Mr. BONE. I do not mind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But let me say that what I am talking about is this: There are standing committees of the Senate which have jurisdiction of these matters, and within their own jurisdiction and their wisdom they ought to attend to all the matters which have been suggested by the Senator from Florida. Now, according to what the Senator from Florida has said, he made a statement in favor of the consideration of one particular bill last December; then hied himself away to Canada and points east, west, north, and south, and now comes here and urges the appointment of a new committee. Notwithstanding that the standing committees of the Senate have performed their function, he comes here and urges a new committee for the purpose of taking jurisdiction of all these matters.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Education and Labor; as a matter of fact I am not for the Smith bill; but I do say that the Smith bill involves a subject matter which is of sufficient importance that the Senate itself ought to consider it.

I will say that if instead of making a speech occasionally in the Senate, and then hying off, the Senator from Florida would be in very much better business to stay here and pursue his rights in the committees of which he is a member.

Mr. PEPPER. When the Senator from Florida deems that it will, in his opinion, profit him to take the advice of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as to how he shall conduct himself, he will make inquiry direct of the Senator from Missouri to elicit his advice and consent; but, otherwise, he will continue to conduct himself according to his own best judgment; and he hopes it will not be offensive to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It will be offensive to me if the Senator from Florida comes in and asks unanimous consent, as he was asking a while ago, for the purpose of setting aside the order of business of the Senate and creating a new committee of which he may be able to claim the authorship.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, I never asked unanimous consent a while ago, as the Senator will recall, and as the RECORD will show. I begged leave to call the attention of the leader to a suggestion for his consideration. I was not offering any resolution; I was not offering any bill; and I was not claiming any credit for it. I simply asked the leader to address himself to the subject and to consider whether he thought it had any merit. Before the Senate met this morning, I presented the matter privately to the leader of the majority and to the leader of the minority, but I did not claim any credit for it. Furthermore, I think there are other Senators on this floor who share my belief that, in the nature of things, the standing committees have difficulty in meeting this problem. I will give two or three illustrations.

The Smith bill and other labor bills are pending before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. The antiprofit bill or the bill limiting profit to 6 percent and, as I recall, abolishing any legal limitation in the hours of labor, if I am not in error in my understanding, has just come to the Naval Affairs Committee from the House of Representatives. It is attached to a naval appropriation bill. I wish the Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate to correct me if I am in error.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BONE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is correct. The first attempt to limit profits on munitions contracts was, as the Senator knows, in the Vinson-Trammell bill of 1934. The problem of limiting profits on the building of ships and airplanes since that time has been vested in part in the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Let me say that if there is any grave and difficult problem pending before the Senate, it is that of drafting a proper amendment or a legislative bill which will restrict profits. The committee of which I am chairman has been working on the question from time to time for many months. I have asked the appropriate departments of the Government to suggest methods and ways of reaching war profits. Some have indicated that it was practically impossible to adopt satisfactory legislation. I myself finally suggested a form embodying some of my ideas regarding it; I requested a draft be prepared by the Treasury Department and within a few days they, without official approval, suggested a form of amendment which would appear to deal with the problem from one angle at least. In my opinion, the amendment adopted recently by the House and now before the Committee on Appropriations does not deal effectively with the problem. War profit limitations is, however, a problem which must be settled. We must find a solution. As I said before, I have been discouraged, painfully discouraged, at the lack of help which has come to the Congress from the executive departments of the Government which are dealing with war contracts. There has been a failure to cooperate with us and give us the assistance necessary. It is only fair to say they appear to be unable to decide what to recommend, or they are overwhelmed with other duties that prevent their being in a position to assist.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. WALSH. Let me add a word further. Some people are skeptical of stories about war profits; but every American citizen who has read the newspapers since January 1 last, and read of the increased profits on the part of almost every industrial corporation in the country, comparing last year's profits with the profits before the war boom, has ample evidence that the war has created increased profits of a very substantial character in many of the industries of the country. It is my solemn conviction that, so long as that condition continues, we cannot expect the working people of the United States peacefully to accept curtailment of what they think are their rights.

In my opinion, a bill ought to be drafted that would put a ceiling upon all prices, a ceiling upon the hours of labor and wages, and a ceiling upon profits that would effect all the civilian population of the country. It should be embraced in one law, and then we could justify our action; but we can only do this by asking all the civilian population—merchant and consumer, worker and capitalist—to make the same financial sacrifices we are asking of those in the military forces who must sacrifice infinitely more than money.

I did not mean to say so much, but I wanted to say to the Senator from Kentucky, so far as any prospect of legislation is concerned, that it seems to be almost impossible to frame in clear, direct, positive language a provision which will seize these profits and put them in the Public Treasury. I have met no problem that is more difficult.

Mr BARKLEY. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the complication, especially that which attends the amendment now pending before the Committee on Appropriations on the appropriation bill, grows out of the difficulty of establishing a legislative formula which will apply to all corporations without regard to their condition and financial standing?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. I may say that my mind has been running in the direction of requiring corporations that have Government contracts to make two returns at

the end of each year—one a return upon their private business under the general tax laws and the other a return upon their war business—and calling for a seizure of all their earnings over a certain percentage of the year's war contract business.

Mr. President, the first step to assure uninterrupted production, which is of first importance, is to stop profiteering. So long as profiteering is not outlawed, the worker is naturally going to demand his share. If refused his share, trouble will inevitably follow.

I repeat, the worker cannot be expected to think that he has no right to slow up production through strikes or otherwise in order to enforce his demand for a share of the loot gathered by profiteering contractors.

So long as the average wage earner believes that his employer is making double or triple the money he made in pre-war years he is going to demand a wage increase; and ordinarily he is entitled to it, and his demands will be more justified if prices of the necessities of life continue to rise.

Cut off the possibility of profiteering and labor troubles will also be cut off. The way to help America in this crisis, and increase production, and protect the taxpayers, and help preserve the morale of the fighting forces is to place a ceiling upon prices a ceiling upon profits, and a ceiling upon wages.

The last should not come first, and labor should not be asked to surrender its right to increase its income until the possibility of increasing the income of those who supply the laborer with the necessities of life is limited. Other labor abuses can be dealt with better and more effectively when such a program as outlined above is undertaken. In my opinion, we have delayed long enough—too long, indeed—in requiring, by law, this protection to the toiler, the taxpayer, and our military forces.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to trespass upon the time of the Senator from Washington, but let me suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that I urged almost verbatim the precise argument he is now urging for the necessity of an over-all ceiling on wages, on commodity prices, on transportation, and rents when the bill setting up the Office of Price Administration was before the Senate. The fact that that measure was not adopted and that the so-called Baruch plan, to put it briefly, for over-all control was not adopted was not the fault of the special committee, but was the fault of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States themselves, because that matter was presented to both of them, and neither of them chose to take the responsibility of going all the way out, as many of us in each body felt was necessary. I do not think a special committee would have helped. It was the fault of the House of Representatives and of the Senate themselves.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield just once more, I will not take his time further.

Mr. BONE I yield once more.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Massachusetts very much for what he has said. I know the Senator is aware of the difficulty of any one standing committee meeting and solving all these problems. If any single standing committee of the Senate did succeed in that task, it would have to go outside its own jurisdiction to accomplish the purpose. I did not propose that the personnel of the special committee which I suggested to the leader should come from any particular group of Senators. If the leader thinks well of it, let him form a committee consisting of the chairmen of the committees which do properly have jurisdiction of the several subjects, and then, in consultation, they can correlate their activities and approach the whole subject, and put the solution in one bill, because I may say that I do not intend to vote to kick labor and at the same time not give them assurance that there is to be equality of service and sacrifice demanded of the other people; and I believe other Senators feel the same way. If the leader can find any better way than through the selection of a special committee, constituted as he may see fit, then I certainly hope he will take such action as he thinks best. But we are not going to solve the problem unless the leader puts responsibility upon some one standing committee to do the whole job or somehow or other we create an effective committee which will do the whole job.

I hope, Mr. President, that the next time my able friend from Missouri disagrees with a conscientious proposal I make to the Senate, he will evidence his opinion in some way that is not associated with a personal attack upon some conduct of mine which occurred outside the Senate Chamber.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BONE. I yield, but I should like to make an inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely referred to conduct of the Senator outside the Senate Chamber of which he was bragging on this floor a few days ago.

Mr. BONE. I was about to inquire whether under the rules a Senator having the floor could give a blank check and save yielding all the time, have a sort of blanket agreement that he could be interrupted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has been recognized.

ACQUISITION OF UTILITY SYSTEMS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill proposing a series of amendments to what is known as the Bonneville Act. It had been the purpose of Representative MARTIN F. SMITH of Washington to introduce a similar measure in the House today, but the House is not in session, and he will therefore have to introduce the bill later.

Mr. President, I am introducing this bill for myself and on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who is in agreement with me on the purpose of the amendments. The proposed changes in the Bonneville Act will permit the acquisition of private-utility systems in that part of the Pacific Northwest represented by the States of Washington and Oregon, and it is proposed to accomplish this through the issuance of revenue bonds. These proposed amendments also provide a statutory reorganization and consolidation of the functions of the Government agency now disposing of the power created at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. I want to emphasize that these acquisitions that are contemplated are necessary for the most complete wartime use of the vast power resources and facilities of the Northwest, and that the proposed revenue bonds will be supported by and repayable only from revenues derived from the operation of the great system which will be created under these proposed amendments. It will be more than interesting to Senators to know that this form of financing will not add to the indebtedness of the United States in any way. These amendments represent the rounding out and completion of the legislative job that was begun 5 years ago with the enactment of the Bonneville Act. The objectives sought in this bill are in harmony with the views of the public power forces of the Northwest who have long sought the development contemplated therein.

Almost 5 years ago, as the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River neared completion, the Congress of the United States passed provisional legislation setting up machinery for disposing of the energy produced by that great project. Under the authority for the Bonneville Act a huge network of publicly owned transmission facilities was projected and brought into being, and today the surging power produced by the mighty flow of the Columbia River is sent in all directions over great power lines that stretch from below Eugene, Oreg., in the south, to Seattle, Wash., in the north, and from the shores of the Pacific Ocean eastward to the Idaho State line at Lewiston.

This vast network of Government lines, built and building, is the vital key which has unlocked the latent resources of this great region, and these mighty power resources are now producing the weapons that our Nation must have to protect itself in the grim and bloody conflict facing us. The matchless power resources of this section of the country have become an instrument through which we are fashioning a better life for the people to whom we can bring their blessings. We have brought the blessings of cheap power to every segment of our population in that section, and we have made the electric energy from Bonneville and Grand Coulee a tireless and ever-willing servant, which is taking from the backs of our people an increasing number of the burdens of their daily lives.

The people of the Northwest had long dreamed of a harnessed Columbia River—a river so remarkable in many of its attributes that it is difficult to describe. The flow of the Columbia in second-feet of water is enormous. From the point

where it enters the borders of the State of Washington to the place where it enters the Pacific Ocean the elevations vary to such an extent that the river lends itself admirably to power development. Many of the finest power sites in the United States are on this river, and it is, indeed, our greatest power stream. One need only take one look at the huge Grand Coulee Dam to realize the magnitude of the task of harnessing this turbulent stream with its vast flow of water. Our Government engineers tackled that job and today the Columbia River is in harness at the Grand Coulee Dam, where two and a half million horsepower of energy can be produced. Already substantial amounts of power are being produced there and more will be turned out as rapidly as the turbines and generators can be installed. The power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee is now being sent across hundreds of miles of desert, mountain, and forest. This great transmission system has been interconnected with the publicly owned plants of Seattle and Tacoma, Wash., and Eugene, Oreg., and from this vast grid it will be possible to make power available to almost every corner of the region I have mentioned.

But the dreams of the people of the Northwest did not stop with the mere generation and transmission of the power they own. They have not sought to have these great engineering feats performed merely for the sake of the performance. I have lived my life among them and I know that they have very sincerely wanted their own power to be produced by their own dams and carried over their own transmission facilities and delivered into the homes and business enterprises of our section by their own distribution systems. They did not want the necessity of paying private profit to eastern power combines to stand between them and the cheapest power possible to produce. They wanted this great natural monopoly to be kept under their own control and owned by the people. They wanted this great heritage to pass to their children as the richest possession of the public. Twenty percent of all the water power in this country is found within the State of Washington and it is the greatest heritage that ever came to any people in the way of natural resources. The wealth of mines and oil wells becomes exhausted. Even the timber of a country may be lost by poor handling, but so long as the law of gravity continues to operate, water power remains. The dullest mind can understand why thoughtful citizens were anxious to retain this great asset in the hands of the public.

Let me assure my colleagues that the people of the Northwest believe in public power as they believe in public schools and public roads. My own city of Tacoma has, for years, been the pacemaker in the public power field. So successful has it been in this field that it has been held up as an example of efficiency and successful operation. It owns one of the most complete power systems that supply power to any city the size of my own. Its equipment is fine. It is worth many millions of dollars, and yet it has come to the people as their possession without levying 1 penny of tax upon the taxpayers of that city. Seattle's giant municipal power system is one of the wonders of the country. It is building on the Skagit River a step-by-step power development which will ultimately yield around 1,000,000 horsepower of electric energy.

But the public-power movement is not confined to the cities, because the farmers in my State and the farmers down in Oregon have been outspoken in their desire to get out from under the sapping burden imposed on them by private-power monopolies. Too often have these farmers contrasted the outrageous rates they pay with the light rates of the city of Tacoma and under other public-power operations.

Throughout the State of Washington, public-utility districts, cooperatives, and municipal systems are selling power to the people. Out of the 39 counties in my State, there is only 1 in which there is yet no public body or cooperative organized to supply power to the people. Thirty-two public-utility districts are organized in 30 counties. I have referred to the fact that there are 39 counties in the State, which indicates the degree of organization for public power. Local community leaders are planning this year to form public-utility districts in practically all of the remaining counties. These public-utility districts, including those already in business, are endeavoring to acquire parts of existing private-utility distribution systems located in their respective districts. As of July of last year, 20 R. E. A. cooperatives had been organized in 10 counties in which public-utility districts were not yet formed. These, too, seek to buy existing distribution properties in their territory. Washington has 16 municipally owned electric systems in operation, including the outstanding Seattle, Tacoma, and Centralia facilities. The city of Seattle should own the distribution properties of the duplicating private utility now operating in that city.

In Oregon there have already been formed public bodies and cooperatives in all but 3 of its 36 counties. Ten public-utility districts have been formed, and more are being formed. Thirteen municipally owned systems are in operation, and 13 electric cooperatives have been organized.

To sum up, in the two States most vitally concerned in this matter the public-ownership movement is not only well entrenched but is growing daily. Election after election has shown that the people of my region want the federally developed power to be distributed publicly. So that there may be no misunderstanding, let me assure you that this important and vital movement in the Northwest had its beginning long years before a prudent Federal Government saw fit to first tackle the job of harnessing the waters of the Columbia. My own city of Tacoma was a pioneer in the public-ownership field. In fact, its activities antedate most of the private power operation in the State. The State of Washington has been in the power fight for 25 years, and its people are now grimly determined to settle this issue. The entry of the Federal Government into this field on account of the enormous potential possibilities on the Columbia River did not in anywise alter the views of the people in that section. They want to distribute their own power and they should be encouraged to do so by the Federal Government. Public distribution of the Columbia River power has already brought lower rates, and this will inevitably lead to a much wider market for the quantities of energy that will be produced. All of this operation insures that whatever investment the Government has made in this vast project will be returned to the Treasury.

The purpose of the legislation now proposed is to eliminate duplication of distribution facilities. It is a grim certainty that the public, represented by the Federal Government, and the people of States themselves, are not going to get out of the power business. They are there to stay. Everyone out in that section recognizes the necessity of eliminating duplication, hence the proposals in these amendments which are being tendered. The quickest, most efficient, fairest, and most patriotic way to handle this problem is to purchase existing private systems from their present owners. They are entitled to a fair price—no more, no less. I think there can be every assurance that they will receive that.

The provisions that make possible the acquisition of utility systems and the resale of the distribution facilities to public bodies and cooperatives give the Federal Government the power to assist these public agencies in the task that the present Bonneville Act charted for them. The public-utility districts in the Northwest now have the legal power to make these acquisitions themselves, but they would have to do it on a piecemeal basis—each district acquiring the properties within its own border. Such a procedure is expensive both to the districts and to the private power companies. Only system-wide acquisitions or acquisition of easily severable parts of systems are sensible, efficient, and economical. To effect these, an over-all agency is required—an agency that can buy the systems and resell the parts to the appropriate public bodies, keeping the large generating stations and necessary transmission lines for integration into the Federal system now being rapidly completed. The greater part of the necessary investment in these private systems would be handled by the local public bodies as the sales of the distribution facilities to them are consummated. The Federal Government will keep only those facilities that will be useful to the generation and wholesaling of power. These facilities will cut down the amount that will need to be spent for the construction of lines.

The acquisitions under the amendments I offer are to be financed by revenue bonds and other revenue obligations. Not one cent is thereby added to the national debt. The revenue bonds will be payable solely out of the receipts of the administration. I have had a great deal of experience with revenue bonds. They were to a large extent developed in my State, and the people of that region have

found them a practical and safe way of financing public power enterprises. They have become so acceptable to private investors that we are getting interest rates below those secured for Federal financing.

For a long time I have been working on the problem of attempting to secure a means for aiding the public bodies of the Northwest in acquiring the properties of the private power utilities. I have not only worked hard on this problem, but I have secured the best advice I could get both in the Northwest and here, and I have also had the invaluable assistance of my able colleagues in Congress, whose energy and interest have never abated. Departments here in Washington have been very helpful to all of us. My colleagues and I have carefully considered a large number of drafts of proposed legislation. In an effort to find some common ground upon which various honest viewpoints might be united, I have written reams of provisions. Let me assure all of the interested parties that this has not been a simple problem for me and my colleagues, and we have not been able to find a short cut to its solution. I believe that out of the work and discussion and arguments we have fashioned the most acceptable and best possible mechanism for making possible the acquisitions which our people sincerely want. These amendments to the Bonneville Act weave into that legislation additional powers, duties, responsibilities, and safeguards and put the Federal Government's power investments on the Columbia River on a businesslike, pay-as-you-go basis. I believe that the amendments I am tendering today do the job that needs to be done without doing any violence to the good that has been achieved to date in the Bonneville administration.

The bill is a compromise between extreme positions we have had presented to us from time to time by various of our friends. A clear recognition of the grim necessity confronting us in this war crisis calls for speed in the expansion of our power resources and the most prompt coordination of all our efforts in that field. Along with many others, I have entertained aggressive ideas having to do with long-run administrative problems, but there will be no need for consideration of these or any other problems if this country loses the war. With an eye single to the immediate task that lies ahead, I and those who have so generously worked with me and counseled with me now urge the adoption of those amendments to the Bonneville Act. If this is not done, the public agencies in the Northwest will proceed to take over the private systems by piecemeal and a great deal of the magnificent energy that the Government has so far expended in that field will lose some of its value.

Under the proposals we make in these amendments we do not ask the Federal Government to use its credit to underwrite the operation, but merely to provide the coordinating machinery and to help knit together into a vast power pool the generating resources of the region, so that every kilowatt of energy will be available where it is most needed during this critical period.

The properties to be acquired are, for the most part, linked to giant holding company systems owned and controlled outside of the region by interests utterly alien to the regional welfare. The national and interstate character of these enterprises, and their constant dipping into political fights in the Northwest to retain their alien control over our political life, makes it necessary that the strength and prestige of the National Government be brought into play to see that the Northwest gets a fair deal. Once the distribution properties are owned by local public bodies and cooperatives, which will form the markets for the Federal Government's power, and which will be run by their locally elected officials, no conflict will arise between the Federal wholesaling agency and the local distributors. The Federal Government merely steps into the role of a wholesale producer of power. Cities like Seattle and Tacoma, with their vast municipal systems, will supplement Government plants as wholesalers of power to smaller communities, and they have full power to do so.

Under an Executive order of the President, signed August 26, 1940, the Bonneville Power Administration has been arranging the marketing of the power produced at the Grand Coulee Dam. The amendments I am introducing ratify that arrangement provided by the Executive order. Because the new administration under these amendments will handle power produced all along the Columbia River from Government plants, I believe that the name of the agency should be broadened to Columbia Power Administration instead of Bonneville Power Administration.

It will be noted that in these proposed amendments we make no reference to reclamation. There have been two views concerning this matter expressed by friends of these amendments. One view was that something should be said about the great reclamation development which will follow in the years to come in the Columbia Basin. The other view was not to attempt to make changes in its reclamation laws by any provision in what is intended to be strictly a power act. The latter view is reflected in these amendments. They do not in any way interfere with the present arrangements for the handling of the reclamation problem in our State, or elsewhere, nor with any future financing operations. A large group of Government agencies, including the Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, and other public agencies, will necessarily be required to study the legitimate and proper allocation of costs on the enormous development at Grand Coulee, which is the largest thing of its kind in the world. The existing law provides a means for determining finally the proper allocation of these costs when the studies have been completed. I have been assured by the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Interior Department, and the Bonneville Power Administration that the amendments which I now tender handle this matter in the only satisfactory manner in which it can be handled at this time, and that these amendments are in proper form and will not work to the prejudice of any of the legitimate interests tied into this vast project. This assurance is most gratifying to me.

All these amendments do is to provide adequate machinery for marketing electric energy, and the specific terms of the amendments confine the functions strictly to that field. It is a pure and simple power bill, and it is what I think the people of our Northwest country want. As one of its sponsors, the bill provides what I want to see accomplished.

The establishment of so important an agency as the Columbia Power Administration seems to make another change desirable; that the head of such an agency should be appointed by the President and require confirmation at the hands of the Senate. Such an arrangement makes the Senate part of the appointing power and gives that body an opportunity to protect this important agency from a possible unwise or capricious appointment.

The amendments I am introducing will set up the Federal projects on the Columbia River as a sound business enterprise. The Administration will be on a pay-as-you-go basis. This means that not only will the receipts of the project be used to pay the debt charges on the bonds but they will also pay the capital charges created by appropriations that have been made by these projects. The Government's investment in this gigantic enterprise will be returned dollar for dollar. The Columbia Power Administration will pay its operation and maintenance expenses out of revenues. Here is a new concept of a Government power enterprise. As a matter of fact, it is a very conservative concept. It makes the Government agency do much more than any private utility would be willing to do; that is, to pay interest and amortize its existing investment and to lower rates as rapidly as its revenues will permit. No private power enterprise in this country attempts to amortize capital investment out of revenues, but keeps it intact, thereby imposing forever a constantly increasing burden of interest and dividends on the consuming public. Under the proposals in this bill, if we put the cost of facilities on the books of the Columbia Power Administration, we will take these costs off the books as the facilities are utilized and retired, which is utterly unlike any procedure now employed by private power companies.

I am convinced that these amendments will work, and work splendidly, and that they are in the best interest of the Government and the people of the region. I hope that we shall be able to secure early consideration of the measure so that there will be no delay in bringing to fruition the hopes and aspirations of not only my colleagues here but of all the vast army of the friends of public power in the Northwest.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the impressive remarks made by the distinguished Senator and my colleague from Washington [Mr. BONE]. He has told the story of the legislation most graphically, frankly, and truly. I worked with him on the Bonneville Act, which was our joint production. The amendments he proposes really take the

place of a larger and more ambitious bill which was introduced some time ago. I want to pay tribute to my colleague the Senator from Washington for the industry he has shown and the fashion in which he has arranged his amendments. He has done much for the public service in his State and throughout the West. I think no resident of the great West has made a greater contribution to the solution of public-service and public-utility problems than has the able Senator from Washington, my friend, Senator BONE.

Mr. BONE. I thank my good friend from Oregon for his kind remarks.

I send to the desk the bill to which I have referred, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2430) to amend the Bonneville Act to authorize the acquisition of utility systems and to coordinate the operation of the Government's power facilities on the Columbia River, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations may be authorized to submit to the Senate reports on bills and resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate is about to take a recess I feel that I ought to call up for consideration an important bill which is pending on the calendar. It would be unfortunate, by reason of taking a recess at this time, to have the Senate suspected of being indifferent to the requests of the Navy for public-works authorizations and appropriations. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1269, Senate bill 2406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2406) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senate has become accustomed to receiving from time to time public-works bills from the Committee on Naval Affairs. We have been proceeding at a tremendous pace in expanding the shore public works of the Navy, including buildings, navy yards, equipment, housing facilities for naval officers and enlisted men, training schools, and so forth.

This bill comes before us at the request of the Navy. The request is for an authorization of $1,000,000,000 for public works.

The Navy requested that the hearings be held in executive session; and the committee made a thorough examination, in executive session, with officers of the various bureaus, of all the items in the bill and has voted to recommend its passage. I am not at liberty to go into greater detail. If Senators will turn to the report of the committee they will find that the committee was informed that the funds will be expended for projects, as follows:

Liquid fuel storage facilities	$175,000,000
Aviation facilities	196,300,000
Lighter-than-air facilities	25,000,000
Storage facilities	139,120,000
Fleet facilities	8,525,000
Personnel training and housing facilities	117,165,000
Marine Corps training facilities	20,000,000
Ordnance storage facilities	176,000,000
Hospital and dispensary facilities	42,600,000
Shore radio facilities	11,170,000
Naval Research Laboratory	720,000
Miscellaneous structures	42,000,000
Floating drydock program	46,400,000
Total	1,000,000,000

Your committee is convinced that the authorization for the appropriation of these funds ought to be made by the Congress.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the statement by the able Senator from Massachusetts has been very frank. Probably he has detailed all that could be detailed in an open session of the Senate. I observe that the bill is a Senate bill. Has a companion bill been introduced in the House?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And no action has been taken on it?

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. I presume there has been a break-down, assigning the reasons for the various projects. Is that available to Members of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Full and complete evidence was taken, and a confidential report of the evidence is available to all Members of the Senate. Let me say that because of the confidential character of the subject, it was gone into more closely than usual. The heads of the various bureaus which are to expend the money for the proposed facilities appeared before the committee and rather minutely gave information as to their character and location.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2406) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,000,000,000 for the establishment or development of naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land: *Provided*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, April 3, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Marcel E. Malige, of Idaho, now a Foreign Service Officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, United States Navy, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from April 16, 1942. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Leo Otis Colbert for reappointment as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years effective April 8, 1942.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. William Fletcher Sharp (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. James Henry Burns (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of Ordnance,

with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Charles M. Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, whose term of office expires June 2, 1942.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr. (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

POSTMASTERS

NEW YORK

Theodore M. Stenner, Penfield.

UTAH

Fred L. Gadd, Nephi.

WISCONSIN

Mildred M. Dwyer, East Troy.
Ludy J. Drolson, Lake Nebagamon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1942

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Cox.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we wait on the rim of a cloud so dark that even the sun refused to shine. As the breakers of passion beat against the very soul of Thy Son our reason is tossing on the sea and wrestling for the daybreak. O Saviour alone in the garden, praying and girding Thyself for the struggle, Thou givest us the voice of unuttered speech and the prayer of a troubled heart. We praise Thee that the cloud will not be suffered to hover long above the forbidding hilltop, nor float in the gleam of a wandering sun. In the hour of silence, out of the sealed chamber of Thy soul, the darkness will pass and the immortal light will break through. For our sins, we ask the mercy of the cross and for our country the benediction of Thy love and care.

O Saviour of the world, cleanse our hearts from all unrighteous purposes and as the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so may our souls pant after Thee, O God. Be patient with us as we kneel in the shades of the garden; Thy trial makes us heavy and Thy tears make us weep. Grant that Calvary may be a revealing curtain through which our souls may pass into the uncharted realms of eternal life, and into the haven of peace:

"O angel of the garden,
Descend to us today,
And comfort all our sadness
And drive death's fear away.
We all are sorrow-laden,
Speak to our hearts, we pray,
'He whom ye love is risen
And lives with Christ alway.'"

In the name of the King of Glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 31, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 13, 1942:

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray;

H. R. 2120. An act for the relief of John H. Durnil;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of John Huff;

H. R. 3798. An act to amend the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government";

H. R. 4896. An act for the relief of David B. Byrne;

H. R. 5478. An act for the relief of Nell Mahoney; and

H. R. 6531. An act to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous-metal scrap.

On March 14, 1942:

H. R. 6291. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the coordination of the forwarding and similar servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States.

On March 21, 1942:

H. R. 6758. An act to provide a penalty for violation of restrictions or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing any act in military areas or zones.

On March 27, 1942:

H. R. 6543. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the production of alcohol; and

H. R. 6759. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, so as to permit payment for overtime for Saturday service in lieu of compensatory time.

On March 28, 1942:

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6738. An act to limit the initial base pay of $21 per month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade.

On April 1, 1942:

H. R. 5784. An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as "the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia," to create "the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia," and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 716. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1227. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud;

S. 1334. An act for the relief of Anthony Famiglietti;

S. 1542. An act to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1944. An act for the relief of Thomas Samuel Wuriu;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowance of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2221. An act to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes;

S. 2288. An act to amend subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes";

S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.;

S. 2327. An act to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

S. 2353. An act to amend sections 1305 and 1306 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against payment of deposits and interest thereon of enlisted men until final discharge;

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line;

S. 2380. An act to suspend for the duration of the present war all prohibitions against the marriage of officers of the land and naval forces of the United States;

S. 2381. An act to provide that certain provisions of law relating to the Navy shall be held applicable to the personnel of the Coast Guard when that service is operating as a part of the Navy;

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes;

S. 2387. An act to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Navy, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended;

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution for the relief of sundry Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the return from the House of the bill (H. R. 6328) entitled "An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Post Office Department.
3. The National Archives.
4. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to administer the oath of office.

Mr. COOPER administered the oath of office to Mr. Cox as Speaker pro tempore.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUSING LEGISLATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the bill H. R. 6483 have agreed on a report. I ask unanimous consent that they may have until midnight tonight within which to file that report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when does the gentleman intend to call up the conference report?

Mr. LANHAM. I hope to call it up on Monday next. It is not controversial in any way. It does not increase the amount which was passed by the House in the original bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a complete agreement?

Mr. LANHAM. It is a complete agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a fireside chat to the White House by Robert Morton, an attorney, of Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for two extensions, and in one I wish to include an editorial from the Galveston News and in the second I wish to embrace a copy of a letter which I wrote to the President and his reply to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Virginia in opposition to the St. Lawrence project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the special order entered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of an amendment recently adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special order granted the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders today I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes today following the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the creed of the United Spanish War Veterans of my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may have permisison to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two occasions and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include several letters I have received.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and insert some brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made before the rehabilitation committee of the American Legion at Baltimore on January 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech I made on March 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief poem by a young lady in my district on the war; and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a radio address I delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein two news items, one from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, dated March 27, 1942, headed "To hell with MacArthur, says ex-pension head, Robert Noble."

This is the man who says that this war was precipitated by the United States and Britain, who cut off Japanese rubber and tin, and who, in my opinion, has been responsible for many seditious statements.

The second item is from the Washington Star of March 31, 1942, headed "Traducers of General MacArthur ordered arrested for libel."

Robert Noble is one of the persons I had asked Attorney General Biddle to take into custody. Upon contacting the Attorney General's office, I was advised that at last this Noble had been taken into custody and will be prosecuted. I commend the Attorney General for this.

I understand also that Fritz Kuhn, the former head of the German-American Bund, and about whom I have made an affidavit to cancel his citizenship, will be prosecuted along with other groups in the German-American Bund. I congratulate and commend the Attorney General for this.

Now, if the Attorney General will only show the same kind of action, and really get busy on Harry Bridges and the Hohenlohe woman, it is my opinion that he will inspire great confidence in our people and in the ability of the Government to do its duty, and, in addition, will certainly safeguard the interests, not only of national defense but of the whole country.

[From the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of March 27, 1942]

"TO HELL WITH MACARTHUR," SAYS EX-PENSION HEAD

LOS ANGELES.—Robert Noble, erstwhile old-age pension leader and now head of Friends of Progress, declares that the present war in the Pacific was "precipitated by the United States and Britain, who cut off Japan's rubber and tin."

Noble admitted to the State assembly committee investigating un-American activities that he may have said, in discussing Gen. Douglas MacArthur at a meeting of his political organization two nights ago, "To hell with him."

He was asked by the committee if he had said:

"This 'phony' general we have, Douglas MacArthur—that is the guy that ordered our boys shot on the Capitol steps when they wanted a bonus, remember? Well, as far as I am concerned, to hell with him."

Noble replied, "Those were not my exact words, but I think the position he is boasted up to occupy today is very 'phony'."

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 31, 1942]

TRADUCERS OF GENERAL MACARTHUR ORDERED ARRESTED FOR LIBEL

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., March 31.—Attorney General Early Warren today ordered his Los Angeles office to swear to a complaint charging Robert Noble, Ellis Jones, and others with conspiracy to commit criminal libel in a published statement which cast reflection on Gen. Douglas MacArthur's departure from the Philippines.

Mr. Warren declared that "by no stretch of the imagination" could the Noble-Jones statement, issued in a publication of the Friends of Progress Society, be considered an exercise of the right of free speech.

"It is malicious falsehood and, when coupled with the other material in this and other publications by the same persons, shows a clear and definite purpose not only to defame General MacArthur but also to spread disaffection among our people and cripple our Nation in its war effort," the attorney general said.

"It is libel of the basest sort and, when taken in connection with their other acts, may constitute treason.

"If General MacArthur and his boys can protect our Nation at their posts of duty across the Pacific, the State of California can and will at least protect their good name at home."

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1942]

ISOLATIONIST LEADERS OF WEST COAST SEIZED ON SEDITION CHARGES—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ARRESTS PAIR ACCUSED EARLIER OF LIBELING MACARTHUR

LOS ANGELES, April 1.—Isolationists Robert C. Noble, who shouted "To hell with MacArthur," and Ellis O. Jones, who led a mock impeachment of President Roosevelt, were rearrested last night on Federal charges of sedition.

Almost simultaneously the State filed criminal libel charges against Noble, Jones, and seven others, accusing them of having libeled Gen. Douglas MacArthur in a pamphlet distributed by their Friends of Progress, isolationist organization. Attorney General Earl Warren filed the State charges in Sacramento.

RELEASED BY BIDDLE

Noble, Jones, and four of their followers were arrested shortly after Pearl Harbor and charged with sedition. They were released a few days later on orders from Attorney General Biddle, who said every effort should be made to maintain free speech and public safety. Noble, as judge, and Jones, as prosecutor, had impeached President Roosevelt at a mock trial.

Noble's "To hell with MacArthur" statement was made to a Friends of Progress meeting last week. He confirmed it in testimony before a State assembly committee investigating un-American activities. In other appearances before the committee Noble said he admired Hitler, contended the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was justified, and advocated "Europe for Hitler" and "the Orient for the Japanese." He accused President Roosevelt of meddling in world affairs.

PROLONGED INVESTIGATION

Noble came into public notice a few years ago as promoter of old-age pension plans, then turned to world politics and organized, with Jones, the National Copperheads and Friends of Progress.

He enlisted in the Navy before the World War, but was dishonorably discharged in 1918 after running away three times.

The arrests followed months of investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Noble is suave, handsome, and 44; Jones, mustached, gray-haired, and 65.

Maximum penalties for sedition are 20 years' imprisonment, $10,000 fine, or both. Noble and Jones were jailed in default of $10,000 bond each.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APRIL FOOL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, April 1, All Fool's Day, is past, but the public may continue to be fooled. If so, this will be due, not to a deliberate effort to deceive but to lack of discrimination on the part of many listeners and readers.

I have in mind three sources of great influence—three C's, commentators, columnists, and cartoonists. All are legitimate and may serve useful purposes, even though frequently dealing with prophecy, opinions, and propaganda. The need is that the public distinguish between these and such strictly news-gathering and disseminating agencies as the Associated Press, United Press, and all others, including recognized radio reporting. This differentiation will result in a better understanding on the part of all our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

REPUBLICAN RIVER BASIN—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 690)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5945, a bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

The compact was negotiated by the three States with a view to apportioning the waters of the Republican Basin for irrigation and related uses. I approve of this purpose and of an interstate compact as a means of making the necessary apportionment. In this basin, as in other parts of the arid and semiarid West, the effective use of water and the control of destructive floods demand joint action by the States working in harmonious relation with the Federal agencies concerned.

It is unfortunate that the compact also seeks to withdraw the jurisdiction of the United States over the waters of the Republican Basin for purposes of navigation, and that it appears to restrict the authority of the United States to construct irrigation works and to appropriate water for irrigation purposes in the basin. The provisions having that effect if approved without qualification, would impede the full development of the water resources of the basin and would unduly limit the exercise of the established national interest in such development.

While I find it necessary to withhold my approval of the legislation in its present form, I would be glad to approve a bill which, in assenting to the compact, specifically reserves to the United States all of the rights and responsibilities which it now has in the use and control of the waters of the basin.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1942.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the message will go over until April 13.

There was no objection.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 691)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1057, an act "To establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees."

This legislation, covering about 222,500 field employees of the Postal Service, chiefly clerks in the first- and second-class post offices and carriers in the city-delivery service, would provide pay increases, beginning July 1, 1942, for those employees who have completed 10 years of continuous service, or about three-fourths of all employees covered by the bill.

The hours of service of employees affected by this measure were reduced from 44 to 40 hours per week by the enactment of the 40-hour-week law, effective October 1, 1935.

The clerks in the first- and second-class post offices and the carriers in the city-delivery service have been receiving, for some time, additional compensation at the rate of 10 percent per hour for work between 6 p. m. and 6 a. m.

A recent enactment, approved March 27, 1942, provides for the payment to these employees of extra compensation for work performed on Saturdays.

The increased compensation provided by this bill is made to apply to employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department and also to certain supervisory employees of the Railway Mail Service. All of these employees are already covered by the pay scales of the Classification Act of 1923. Thus, the enactment of this measure would result in discriminatory compensation benefits as between these employees and other classes of employees covered by that act.

The bill is not a temporary measure for increased compensation on account of any rise in the cost of living, but provides instead for a permanent increase in compensation, the first year cost being approximately $14,000,000 and the ultimate annual cost being about $39,000,000.

For the reasons stated above, and because this is not an opportune time for this type of legislation, I find it necessary in the public interest, to withhold my approval of this enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1942.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the message will go over until April 13.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the messages just read will be printed as documents.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we must cast aside everything that hinders us in the winning of the war in which we are now engaged.

I favor the complete abolition of the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. for the duration of the war. I do this fully realizing that the N. Y. A. has helped worthy students in the schools and colleges of drought-stricken Nebraska and that the C. C. C. camps perform a great service in soil and water conservation in this area.

But the fact remains, we are in a war, and up to the present time we have taken a beating in that war. The abolition of these two agencies will not only mean a dollar-saving to the taxpayers but it will make available a large group of administrative and executive officials, as well as office space here in Washington for activities directly connected with the war effort. To merely cut their budgets down means to retain all the overhead and receive none of the benefits. We already have too many bureaucrats here in Washington who could better serve their country in the armed forces.

The time has come in America when we must eliminate a lot of things that may be good, or go down to an ignoble defeat. I hope the Congress will deal with these two agencies swiftly and effectively.

[Here the gave fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SUMNERS of Texas, McLAUGHLIN, and HANCOCK.

TAX LIABILITIES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation were astounded and disturbed by the recent revelation in the House Committee on Naval Affairs that a manufacturing firm in Ohio holding a $50,000,000 contract to manufacture starters for naval airplanes was seeking to reduce its tax liability by inordinate and excessive allowances to its employees.

Knowing that the Internal Revenue Code, under the section dealing with allowable deductions by corporations from gross income in computing their net statutory taxable income, provided for the deduction of only reasonable salaries and compensation, I presented a hypothetical case to Mr. Randolph Paul of the Treasury as to what would happen if more than reasonable amounts were allowed for salaries, and so forth, and this is his reply to me under date of April 1:

In accordance with your oral request, the following is submitted as the tax effect on the given statement of facts:

Assuming a man earning $10,000 salary in 1940 (from a corporation), on which he was liable for Federal income tax for that year in the amount of $528, received an increase in salary for 1941 to $125,000 and after investigation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue it was held that $25,000 represented reasonable compensation resulting in the disallowance of $100,000 of the deduction claimed by the corporation.

Since the individual received the entire amount, he would be taxable thereon while the corporation would be denied the benefit of the deduction of the excessive amount.

Assuming the individual is a married man having no other dependents, his tax liability on $125,000 is $69,939, while his liability on $25,000 would be $6,864. Hence, the tax on the excessive salary would be $63,075 and the tax to be assessed against the corporation as a result of the adjustment (assuming it to be liable at the rate of 72 percent) would be $72,000.

It will accordingly be observed that the aggregate of the additional tax to be assessed against the corporation as a result of the disallowance of the excessive salary in the amount of $100,000 plus the tax payable by the recipient upon the excessive salary would be $135,075; that is, $72,000 plus $63,075.

Therefore, if a corporation made an improper allowance in salary of $100,000

to evade $72,000 of excess profits tax, the combined tax on the corporation and on the individual would be $135,000, or $35,000 more than the entire allowance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate the Speaker pro tempore we have today. We have always had a great deal of confidence and respect for him. He is a gentleman—sound, sane, and sensible. I like to see him sitting in the Speaker's chair, and I hope some day he may be there permanently.

Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of rejoicing that I saw in the paper this morning that the C. I. O., whose president is Mr. Murray, and the American Federation of Labor, whose president is Mr. Green, had assured General MacArthur that labor would do everything in its power to furnish the clothing, food, guns, ships, ammunition, and planes that he needed.

That was fine; but then I read in the same paper that a jurisdictional strike had occurred between the C. I. O. and a local union in the textile industry in New England, which furnishes the clothing that is necessary for these boys. That does not sound very good. That sounds like the New Deal promising one thing and doing another.

Words are not going to win this war. Promises are not going to win this war. It will take action. It means results. We say to Mr. Murray and Mr. Green, to the C. I. O. and to the A. F. of L., and to any other employees' union, that we want them to produce those materials and implements that will win the war and save American liberty and American independence. Let us hope that they get together and put the radical labor leaders out of labor; take the fifth columnists and Communists and put them in concentration camps; then produce the goods for MacArthur that will win this war. That is what we want. That is what you promised, and nothing short of that will do. Nothing short of adequate supplies will satisfy the American people. Nothing short of adequate material to the front for our boys will win the war. Everybody must put his or her shoulder to the wheel for all-out aggressive warfare and victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania will find himself to be in error about it having been either an A. F. of L. or a C. I. O. union that called the strike to which he referred. I am not excusing the strike. I do not think there should be a one of them. But this was an independent union and not one in either the A. F. of L. or C. I. O.

A couple of days ago I made some remarks here about the procedure whereby the chairman of the Dies committee wrote a letter concerning certain employees of the Board of Economic Warfare, and vigorously protested both the procedure employed and the inclusion on that list of at least two names of persons whom I am certain have been done a great injustice. I am convinced my position was and is sound on these points.

I am trying to be fair and just, and I want to give to the House such information as seems to me to be important on any side of the question. Another name that was included in the list was that of Mr. C. Hartley Grattan. On yesterday it was brought to my attention that Mr. C. Hartley Grattan, in May of 1940, which was between the time of the signing of the pact between Russia and Germany and the time that Germany attacked Russia, wrote the foreword to the so-called German white paper, which was an attempt to lay the blame for the invasion of Poland on certain American officials, and that this foreword consists all the way through of a vigorous denunciation of this country's foreign policy or support of England and France. The German white paper was distributed in the United States by Manfred Zapp, the head of Transocean News Service, which was shown conclusively, I believe, to be a Nazi propaganda agency.

I understand that the Vice President has stated that thorough investigation will be made of all these charges in order that justice may be done individuals and the Government service protected as well. I believe that in connection with such an investigation this fact about the German white paper, taken together with the other matters about Mr. Grattan presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in his letter, make a most serious picture, indeed, so far as he is concerned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with pending legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

FOREST PROTECTION

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, Oregon has more standing saw timber than any other State in the Union, in both fir and ponderosa pine. Oregon is sawing, at the present time, more timber than any other State in the Union, and can continue to be the first timber State in the Union if proper methods of selective cutting are adopted and enforced on private lands as well as Government timber lands. The larger portion of the prosperity of our State comes from timber. As a citizen of the State, I am very anxious for the preservation of this valuable natural resource, which can be continued indefinitely, on account of soil and climate, if proper safeguards are adopted to keep down the losses by fire, for protection of the young growth, and regulation of cutting.

When Governor of the State, a few years ago, I was instrumental in arranging a State forest in the western part of the State, which is now growing more valuable each year, and the ripe timber from that State forest will soon be ready for the woodman's ax. Our great danger at the present time is from fire—incendiary, from lightning, and from carelessness.

For several years the State has been highly favored by having many triple C camps, with groups organized into fire fighting units, which proved extremely valuable. Hundreds of fires have started in Oregon in the last 9 years, and have been put out before they have done much damage.

We are in danger this summer from high-flying airplanes, scattering incendiary bombs over the forest areas. Japanese airplanes can approach close to the coast in airplane carriers, and then at night can pass over these forests, distributing the bombs which will start many fires. Often, in the summer, Oregon gets very dry and the forest becomes a tinder box.

Because of war activities, a large amount of timber is now being cut, both on the privately owned lands, and in the forest reserves. The demand next year will be even greater, and wartime depletion of the forests may prove to be very serious. We cannot afford any hazard which can be prevented. It is to be regretted that the Appropriation Committee of the House saw fit to cut the appropriation for forest protection this year below the amount recommended by the Budget. It is to be hoped that the Senate will not only restore the original amount asked for forest protection by the Budget, but will make appropriations

for all that can be advantageously used to protect these forests in the critical, dry days of the summer. The forests of Oregon are a great asset to the State, to the Nation, and to civilization. We cannot afford to lose them. It would be an irreparable disaster.

Recently, the acting forester made his annual report. It is a document well worth reading. Our regional forester, Mr. Lyle F. Watts, of Portland, wrote me a letter, under date of March 27, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of these remarks. It is of concern to all who are interested in preserving our natural resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE,
NORTH PACIFIC REGION,
Portland, Oreg., March 27, 1942.

Hon. WALTER M. PIERCE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR GOVERNOR: The Chief's office has, of course, sent you, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, a copy of the annual report. Some further notes of events in the North Pacific region may be of interest.

War activities have naturally taken priority, and the Forest Service has had a number of assignments. Beginning in June 1940, a detailed study was made of the quantity, location, and ownership of Sitka spruce for aircraft construction, the possibility of increasing the rate of production of logs of aircraft quality, sawing technique, and manufacturing problems.

At the request of the second interceptor command, the Forest Service, working with other forest-protection agencies, has made arrangements to use many lookouts as bases for airplane warning service. Many forest lookout stations in the Cascade and coast ranges now are manned on a 24-hour basis. Surveys have been made of the locations of strategic minerals as well as of the necessary roads to open them. The Chief has been supplied with maps and tabulations for the information of the Office of Production Management. We are constructing one cooperative 16-mile road to a chrome deposit on the Siskiyou National Forest.

Most of the west coast in Washington and Oregon is in a so-called target area. The possibilities of grounding planes, retarding traffic, threatening towns, cantonments, and power lines, and diverting labor from war production by means of forest conflagrations is known to our enemy. In 1940 a master regional protection plan, based on the worst probable conditions of war, was made. In the spring of 1941 Congress appropriated funds for the partial application of this plan in cooperation with State and private protection agencies. The funds became available just in time to meet the worst concentration of lightning fires that organized forest protection has ever had to meet in this area. The 600 additional men employed worked on 860 fires, of which only 2 reached major size.

A similar plan to take care of the even greater hazard this year is ready to put into effect as soon as the necessary appropriation is made available. The protection problem is made more difficult this year by the employment of labor in war industries, the withdrawal of Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and priorities on equipment. All heavy equipment in the region that can be used for fire control, such as tractors, trucks, and graders, is being inventoried. Help is being recruited from schools, colleges, sportsmen's clubs, and other sources. All protection facilities, including fire crews and supervisory overhead, will be pooled. Crews will, of course, be trained in the technique of fire fighting. It is believe that the preparations will be adequate to meet any probable situation.

The Forest Service is participating in the project to map parts of the coast area as a war measure. The costs of this project are financed by the War Department.

Forest officials with training experience have cooperated with the War Production Board in conducting courses at the plant of the Oregon Shipbuilding Co. and elsewhere.

Forest Service officials serve as members of the Agricultural Planning Board, State and county United States Department of Agriculture war boards, and in similar activities. This vital work has made heavy demands on official and personal time. A number of men have joined the armed forces and have not been replaced. The increased demand for timber for war activities has taken much time.

The volume of timber cut in the region in calendar year 1941 in sales and land exchange was 870,678 M feet, valued at $2,207,626. This is 72,209 M feet, $163,429, more than calendar year 1940. The cut in Oregon for sales and exchanges was 553,596 M feet, with a value of $1,238,705. The Deschutes National Forest was at the head of the list, with a cut valued at $367,410. The Malheur was next. Although average stumpage prices are slightly higher than last year, this increase is small, due to the fact that most of the volume of timber sold is under long-term contracts. The region made 1,870 sales in 1941, 650 of them to residents at cost.

Permits were issued for about 487,700 sheep and 85,500 cattle and horses in the North Pacific region. This slight decrease is in line with the production goals of the Department of Agriculture, which call for increased marketing and better management rather than building up the number of stock. It is believed that this policy, accompanied by selective butchering, will produce an increased amount of meat and also build up the quality of the flocks and herds.

You have no doubt been informed of the changes in the organization of the State livestock associations' advisory boards. A permittee from each national forest is elected to the board. The board holds two meetings each year, one of which is held during the summer on the range. This cooperation should promote mutual understanding and better range management.

The number of special-use permits issued on the national forests during the fiscal year was 578, making 4,303 in effect. Of these, 2,334 were charge permits and 1,969 were free.

The number of visits to the national forests for recreation during 1941 was about 4,700,000. This is larger than for 1940, but the length of stay was about 1 day as compared with nearly 2 days for 1940. Defense will require extensive closures and correspondingly decreased use during the war. Tire shortages will reduce public travel. The plan is to interfere as little as practicable with recreational use of developed camp and resort areas along main travel routes. In the high country, where hazard and values are low, the users will be required to register. Use of high-hazard and high-value areas must be restricted strictly to those having business reasons for entry.

In the region 87,281 acres of forest land were obtained by exchange. Of this, 55,920 acres are in Oregon. This exchange of Forest Service timber for land in private ownership is an effective way of extending constructive woods practice.

In the 10-day period, July 11–20, 1,014 fires were caused by lightning on the national forests of the region. This was an unprecedented load. Of these, 881 were held to less than one-quarter acre, 100 to less than 10 acres, 12 exceeded 10 acres, but only 2 reached major size. Losses for the season on national-forest lands were held to 11,559 acres, which is about four one-thousandths of 1 percent of the net area. After the July storms the season presented no unusual difficulties. The number of man-caused fires for the entire year was 226, compared with 514 the preceding year. The Keep Oregon Green and Keep Washington Green campaigns are entitled to much credit for this improvement.

A condition that may be especially troublesome in 1942 is the amount of slash in the woods. Last year, heavy rains fell during the normal slash-burning season, and all but a small fraction of the 1941 slash remains unburned in the woods in addition to the very large current year's addition. Every effort has been and will be made to get rid of this slash before the fire season opens. In State and private-protection areas it is the source of much concern.

On the State and private lands, covered by cooperative protection under the Clarke-McNary Act, the 1941 season resembled that of the national forests. The proportion of fires caused by lightning was the highest of record—more than one-third the total in Washington; well over a half in Oregon. The number of man-caused fires was well below the average, for which much credit is due the fire-prevention campaigns. The area burned, 49,714 acres in Washington, 9,281 acres in Oregon, was much below the usual loss. Incendiarism and land clearing continue to be prolific causes of forest fires.

The Clemons Tree Farm, of 130,000 acres, in Washington, and the Willamette Valley Tree Farms in Oregon are new and welcome developments in private forestry. Intensive protection, planting, and other details of forest management have been started or are planned. Presumably, the areas gradually will increase. Otherwise, the small percentage of the total acreage in private ownership that is involved would be of no great significance. The possibility has been mentioned that the legislation proposed by the joint congressional committee, and which has been submitted to the Congress may have stimulated this advance. Whatever the cause, it is a good beginning.

After the war, an estimated twenty to twenty-five million workers must be shifted from wartime to peacetime employment, and the uncertainty of this adjustment causes much uneasiness. Winning the war takes priority over any activity that cannot become operative until victory is gained. However, this adjustment inevitably must be met, and planning and some preparatory measures merit serious consideration now. The rehabilitation of great areas of forest land in the north Pacific region will give employment to many men for a long time, and will add to the permanent wealth and stability of the Nation.

This sketchy account of the situation in Oregon and Washington of necessity omits many important items. It will be a pleasure to furnish any additional information about the Northwest's forest resources and industry that you may request.

Very sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS,
Regional Forester.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to congratulate the United States Senate. I note the Members of that body have agreed on

a definite day to begin discussion of amendments to the labor bills we passed through the House some time ago. I hope, in doing so, they will also investigate thoroughly and debate this question of discriminations against agriculture.

The farmers of this Nation cannot survive on 20 cents an hour, the rate the cotton farmers are now receiving, and pay prices for manufactured articles based upon an average of 80 cents an hour for industrial wages.

Our boys cannot win this war as long as strikes, slow-downs, and racketeering deny to them the weapons they need, as well as ships and other means of transportation. They get no time and a half for overtime and no double pay for Sundays and holidays.

The system is wrong, and it must be corrected. We cannot afford to let this country go the way of France.

The American people do not want fascism, they do not want nazi-ism, they do not want communism, and they do not want anybody planning a new form of government for us when this war is over. They expect us to maintain representative government, which means democracy for the American people, for us, and for our children. It means liberty, freedom, self-determination, the American way of life, the perpetuation of our form of government and our sacred institutions. That is our responsibility.

Let us keep the faith.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRY. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, now that we are at war, the debate on what our foreign policy should have been before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor is no longer an issue, its discussion should be abandoned forever, or at least suspended, until after we have won the war. Every American has an equal stake in the outcome of this great struggle. We cannot afford to lose. We must win or else become serfs under the yoke of Hitler. We must win or else become creatures of a barbaric civilization that existed more than a thousand years ago. Defeat for us would mean the loss of modern liberties, the restoration of ancient tyrannies, and a return to the depths of the Dark Ages.

Hitler seeks to bring back upon the stage of history a new order which destroys all individuality in the human being, which lives one uniform life of iron discipline and rigid custom, which yields obedience to one master, which marches armed with lust and hate against its enemies, and which moves to destroy all evidences of beauty. enlightenment, and culture. Hitler's domination would make life not worth living.

In this gigantic struggle we and our Allies have met with reverses. These set-backs, however, do not justify any fears for ultimate victory. They do, however, serve as a warning that our Nation faces a hard struggle which requires the united effort of all of us. We cannot and must not permit ourselves to be divided in our war effort—for that is the purpose of Hitler's propaganda; and should his devilish design succeed, we might lose this war. It is an old saying, but worth repeating, "United we stand, divided we fall."

Anti-Semitism is one of Hitler's favorite subjects. His propaganda machine never tires of it. His agents are now secretly spreading it throughout the length and breadth of our country. As in Nazi-Germany, Hitler seeks to separate the gentiles of America from their fellow American Jews by a gulf of hate.

The trend of his recent propaganda is to create the impression in the minds of American gentiles that the Jews are not patriotic and are not assuming their responsibilities for winning this war. This anti-Semitism and Hitler-inspired propaganda comes to my attention through the mails, and more frequently than ever before through the conversation of gullible gentiles whose emotions are so stirred by the war that they frequently fail to check into their sources of information.

Whenever and wherever this malicious propaganda rears its ugly head, we must fight it with the weapons of truth.

We must remind the spreaders that Jews are conscripted for military service on an equal basis with their fellow citizens of other races and religions.

We must remind them that Jews have been prominent in American life since colonial days and are not newcomers to the American scene. Tell them of men like Moses Sexias, who founded the Bank of Rhode Island, and of his brother Gershom, a rabbi, who served as trustee of Columbia College from 1787 to 1815, and who as an ardent patriot participated with 13 other clergymen in the inauguration of President Washington in 1789. Remind them of Rabbi Kaugal of Newport, who was the close friend of Ezra Stiles, president of Yale College, who frequently attended his synagogue to hear him preach, of Israel Jacobs, who was a member of the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1771 and of the United States Congress in 1791–93, of Uriah P. Levy, who at the time of his death in 1862, the highest ranking officer in the United States Navy, presented to the United States Government the famous bronze statue of Thomas Jefferson in the Capitol at Washington, and achieved the establishment of Jefferson's home, Monticello, as a national shrine. Tell them of Haym Solomon, who was of invaluable assistance to Robert Morris in financing the early struggle of our Republic, and who had been interned in prison by the British during the Revolutionary War for 2 years as a spy. Point out to them that Jews here fought in all of our wars, that Jewish veterans of the Civil War, Spanish-American War, and World War No. 1 are alive today. Remind them that when Colin Kelly sank a Japanese warship and became America's first hero of the present war, Meyer Levin, a Jew, was his bombardier, and that Levin is still carrying the fight to the enemy in the Far East as he did with Kelly.

From the founding of our country until the present day, the Jew has helped build up this Nation, and has along with Americans of other races and religions performed his patriotic duties in time of war. He will continue to do so. The first settlement of Jews was established in New York (then New Amsterdam) in 1654, when 23 Jewish refugees arrived on the sail ship *Catarina* from Brazil. Today there are approximately four and a half millions. The emigrants came from everywhere; refugees from Spanish and Portuguese inquisitions, German and Austrian refugees from the despotism of central Europe, and Polish, Russian, and Rumanian refugees from the barbarous bigotry of eastern European tyrants.

These American Jews, whether born abroad or descendants of the refugees on the *Catarina*, know more than any other group in America the blessing of liberty and the horrors of dictatorship and persecution. There have been other Hitlers in their history. They were called Pharaoh and Antiochus, Chmielnicki and Petlura. The Jews have survived them all. They will be a great people when Hitler will be but a horrible memory in the civilized world.

Let us who are not Jews reject the Hitler-inspired propaganda of anti-Semitism. Its purpose is to destroy our national unity and bring about our Nation's destruction. Let me reiterate, "United we stand, divided we fall."

THE MERRY-GO-ROUND COLUMN

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a great source of satisfaction to me to note that there are others catching up with the two "headache boys," referred to as such by the Times-Herald this morning, namely, Pearson and Allen.

Here is a statement signed by Jesse H. Jones, and it is quoted from the Times-Herald this morning:

> There is no truth in the Merry-Go-Round story of April 1 about me. The subject was never mentioned between the President and me, and I am informed by Sidney Weinberg that he never at any time made any such statement to anyone as that accredited to him. As a matter of fact, I favored both the Executive order and the small business bill. Practically all references to me and my work by these columnists over the year have been made for the purpose of injuring me, and where there has been any basis for reference to me, the facts are maliciously distorted through innuendo. This article is typical of their column.
>
> JESSE H. JONES.

These two men, while I admire their ability to ferret out a great deal of news here in Washington, some of which has accomplished a lot of good, have also made their errors, whether intentional or not, and have blasted Mr. Jones for a year or so. Mr. Jones says that where there has been any basis for reference to him in this column the facts were maliciously distorted through innuendo. Mr. Jones has probably been sitting back

and letting these columnists go on their merry way. However, there is a time to call a halt to everything, and apparently Mr. Jones thought this was the time.

I am glad that others are checking up. Now, here is what happened with these same two so-called headache boys concerning myself.

I quote from an article appearing in their column last summer:

> The other day WHEELER called in O'CONNOR and informed him that he was to oppose MURRAY in the Democratic senatorial primary next year.
>
> "MURRAY must go," said WHEELER flatly, "and you're the man to beat him. We need someone of your caliber in the Senate, JIM, and with my backing you can't miss."
>
> "That suits me, BURT," replied O'CONNOR. "But who will run for my seat in the House?"
>
> "Oh, that's all arranged," said WHEELER. "Bailey Storts, my right-hand man here, will be the candidate for your job."

Mr. Speaker, there is not a single word of truth in this publication. No such conversation occurred. There is no more truth in this than in the story denied by Jesse H. Jones, and I am glad there are others besides myself finding out the fact that you cannot believe all you read in that column gotten out by these two so-called headache boys, in spite of the fact that they are nationally known correspondents.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILE TAGS BY DEFENSE WORKERS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a number of law-enforcement bodies in the various States are requiring the soldiers, patriotic defense workers, and those working for the War Department and other governmental defense agencies to purchase additional 1942 automobile tags, even though they have been in the temporary location a short time.

These citizens, who are performing a real service and furthering the defense program, have purchased their 1942 tags in their respective places of abode and it is very unfair to require them to purchase another 1942 tag every time they accept a temporary position in another defense area in another State. It certainly works an undue hardship on them.

This situation is happening quite frequently and I believe it would be wise for each of the Members of the House to look into the matter. I feel sure that the Governors of the various States would not want the police to bother these defense workers who are temporarily located away from their own State.

I believe if our President would issue an Executive order, an additional tag would not be required.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article regarding the 40-hour week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on three topics, and in one to include an article from the Philadelphia Record, in another to include a letter from a leading forester in the Pacific Northwest, and in the other a letter from a leading lawyer in the Pacific Northwest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] for 15 minutes.

AMENDMENTS TO BONNEVILLE ACT

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon Senator HOMER T. BONE, our senior Senator for the State of Washington, acting also in behalf of Senator MON C. WALLGREN, introduced in the Senate certain amendments to the Bonneville Project Act of 1937, S. 2430. Senator MCNARY, of Oregon, expressed his approval of these amendments. In his remarks on the floor of the Senate, Senator BONE stated that it was my intention to introduce a companion measure in the House, and I am doing so at this time. I am asking that it be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which has jurisdiction of all the Bonneville-Grand Coulee legislation, on which committee I am serving.

These amendments deal with the same problems as the larger bill which I introduced last year, and which was also a companion bill to the one introduced by Senator BONE. While the Bone-Smith bill was somewhat more comprehensive, I think that these proposed amendments have the advantage of being more simple and concise. I believe that this legislative procedure will not only simplify the problem of the Congress but will assure to the Bonneville Power Administration the continuity of authorized operation that it must have during these critical times.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Certainly, I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I wish to say to my colleague that I congratulate him on the introduction of the legislative proposal. I am very familiar with it. It deserves early and favorable consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank my colleague for his contribution. The Bonneville Power Administration is now an important war agency of the Government, and these amendments which I am introducing will render it a more effective one. They will make that agency responsible for unifying the power resources of the Columbia River region so that they will be more effective in furthering and aiding the war effort. These amendments provide the unified command so necessary in this sector of the battle front for war materials. The great Pacific Northwest will produce a great proportion of our aluminum and magnesium requirements. Power from our great Federal dams is flowing to aluminum plants, pulp plants, shipyards, sawmills, arsenals, steel and ferroalloy plants and a host of other war industries. No single other factor in the operation of this great new industrial region approximates in importance the great resource of cheap power that the Congress has created in this region. Those of us who sponsored the original Bonneville legislation in 1935 and secured its enactment into law, despite bitter opposition, have had the pleasure of assisting in its development into what is today one of the most essential units in our all-out victory program in the United States.

The amendments that I have introduced and for the enactment of which I intend to devote myself assiduously have several specific objectives. In the first place, we have sought to bring under the terms of the present Bonneville Act the sale of the power from that other great Columbia River development, the Grand Coulee Dam.

At the present time the Bonneville Power Administration is selling Grand Coulee power by virtue of the terms of an Executive order of the President. I would like to see the Congress carry that Executive order into permanent law so as to establish a definite, permanent policy with respect to the sale of power that the Government produces on the Columbia River. I want to urge that we continue the unified command of these great power resources that we have created. I am convinced that the people of my State and of my district want this unified arrangement. I believe that they are looking to us to establish a Columbia Power Administration that will carry forward the great progress that has already been made in the marketing of the energy from these Government dams.

Secondly, these amendments provide a unified command for the acquisitions of private-utility properties that the public bodies and cooperatives of my State have so long sought to make. The slow, cumbersome and costly process of having each public utility district, each cooperative and each municipality attempt separately to purchase the properties in its respective area from the remotely controlled private companies is not a practical workable arrangement. It is expensive both to the public bodies and to the legitimate investors in the private-utility properties. Piecemeal acquisitions entail severance damages that do not benefit the acquiring public body. They are merely an effort to compensate the company for loss of business and are not easily translated fairly and equitably into dollars and cents. Even with the payment of these damages the companies look forward to an uncertain future. The continuation of piecemeal acquisitions will mean that the companies will be left with uneconomic remnants of their systems and their customers will be forced to pay higher charges for the operation of these remaining properties.

A unified command to take over this troublesome and important acquisition problem will make it possible for the public bodies and cooperatives to secure in

the most economical and efficient method the properties they have for so long been seeking to secure. The amendments that I have introduced will permit the Columbia Power Administration to take the leadership and to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation the properties of the private companies whenever such acquisitions are feasible and desirable. The Administration will be required to sell as speedily as possible to the appropriate public bodies and cooperatives the distribution facilities thus acquired. It may retain the generating and transmission properties within its own system so that there will be a single unified power wholesaler in the region.

In order to effect these acquisitions the Administration is authorized to issue revenue bonds. These bonds are payable solely out of the income from the project and do not add 1 penny to the indebtedness of the United States. This latter fact I desire to emphasize very strongly, for it is of the utmost importance during this period of huge, astronomical expenditures for military purposes. We do not, I repeat, impose any financial obligation upon the Federal Government and do not add to the national debt. The bonds will be secured solely and exclusively by the revenues of this great hydroelectric-power project and from our experience with this type of financing in the Pacific Northwest, I am certain in my own mind that these bonds will be so good that our interest rates will be as low if not lower than that generally paid by the Federal Government.

Thirdly, and finally, the amendments which Senator BONE and I have introduced provide for the businesslike operation of this vast public enterprise. The Administration will be decentralized and will have the power to make its day-to-day decisions in the region, providing the type of home rule which Senator BONE and I and the other Members of the congressional delegations from our section have been contending for. It will be enabled to follow sound business practices and will be subject to the same accounting principles as any utility operation. It will have the authority to make all proper business judgments and will be independent in a very real sense from the ordinary cumbersome procedures and practices. The Columbia Power Administration must be in a position to act quickly and efficiently. The amendments that I am introducing will make possible such expeditious handling of the Administration's affairs. Its accounting and funding arrangements will permit the flexibility necessary to the operation of such an enterprise. It will have the right to deal with labor locally and to effect proper agreements for the protection of the workers on the project. We safeguard and secure the hard-won rights of labor to collective bargaining and all the other gains made by labor during the past decade. It will have the same rights and responsibilities with respect to suits and claims that ordinary business enterprises have. The Columbia Power Administration will be an agency that operates under a broad charter of powers, policies, and responsibilities laid down by this Congress. It will be a responsible organization that will pay its own way and return to the Treasury the moneys that have heretofore been appropriated for its use and prove to be self-liquidating and self-amortizing.

In short, the Federal Government has created in the great dams on the Columbia River at Bonneville and Grand Coulee a huge reservoir of power that must be sold so that it will benefit the people of the region. It must be sold in the public interest. It must assume the responsibilities incumbent upon the largest supplier of power in the region. Upon this great utility enterprise will be dependent not only the homes and farms of our section of the country but also the great industrial enterprises that have been brought into the region and that are so important to our national defense. As a public utility the Columbia Power Administration must act quickly. It must be efficient. It must not be free from rules that are proper for the conduct of research bureaus and offices. Its tempo must be geared to the tempo of its generators. For those reasons these amendments provide in the Columbia Power Administration a unified command of all the problems and practices of this enterprise.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. This legislation is so drastic that one of its primary concerns is to pay to the Federal Government every dollar that it has invested in both the Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and in the Bonneville administration transmission system.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman is correct, and we have every reason to believe, and I know that my colleague will agree with me, that those great hydroelectric projects on the Columbia River will be liquidated and amortized in far less time than was originally contemplated when the projects were authorized by the Congress. We are marketing the power generated to a greater extent than ever anticipated, due to the demands of war production, thereby increasing the revenues.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. And when it is finally concluded the projects would not cost the Federal Government 1 cent?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman is correct. These projects will not have cost the taxpayers of the United States one penny, and the money appropriated and expended will be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to my colleague from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. And could the gentleman not differentiate between publicly owned power systems and private systems, by calling attention to the fact that in publicly owned systems the bonded indebtedness is rapidly amortized and reduced, whereas it has been characteristic of privately owned power systems that their bonded indebtedness continues undiminished, because they build their rates upon their bonded indebtedness and securities outstanding.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. My colleague has called attention to an important distinction, and has revealed one of the iniquities and one of the worst evils of private ownership of utilities. The policy of the private power companies, to which he alludes, has been responsible for the high rates which the public has had to pay.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not also true that if it were not for the immense volume of power that is produced at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, we would be unable to carry forward our present war program, particularly with reference to aircraft?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. That is so. We are producing now in the two aluminum plants which are already operating and being served by Bonneville power, both of which happen to be in my district at Vancouver, Wash., and Longview, Wash., I am advised, 242,000,000 pounds of ingot aluminum per year, which is more than the entire national output of aluminum a few years ago, and is absolutely essential to the production of aircraft for the successful waging of the war in which we are engaged.

Mr. ANGELL. And is it not also true that the ultimate program for aluminum is 2,000,000,000 pounds, and that 30 percent of that will be produced from the Columbia River power in these two projects?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I believe those figures are correct.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Speaking of the capitalization of private utilities, is it not a fact also that they not only have capitalized for money invested but for value of franchise and their opportunity to do business so that their capitalization basis reaches far more than the money invested?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I think that is the history of private power companies in our country everywhere, and it has been one of the worst abuses that the public and consumers of electric light and power have had to contend with, and has been responsible for the extortionate rates which have been charged the public by the private power companies.

Mr. PIERCE. I think that is a very proper description.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I digress at this point to say that when I came to Congress in 1933 we did not have a single P. U. D. district in my entire congressional district. The private power interests had a stranglehold on the citizens, industries, and rural communities of my district. After meeting with several defeats and set-backs we now have P. U. D. districts functioning

successfully in every one of the nine counties of my district, and we have Rural Electrification projects in five counties. We are hooked up with Bonneville in eight of my nine counties and in the very near future will be using Bonneville power in every one of the nine counties.

In addition to the establishment of numerous new industries and pay rolls as a result of this public-power development made possible by Bonneville, we have obtained electric-rate reductions which cause substantial savings to all our people. Bonneville has brought, and will continue to bring, to the citizens of southwest Washington more benefits and advantages than any project or enterprise, public or private, in our entire history. It will serve coming generations as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Power Administration will, of course, not be cut loose from the Federal Government. It is true that it will be financially independent in that it will have to make its revenues provide its operation and maintenance expenses as well as the charges on the bonds and on the debt it owes the Treasury. This Administration will still be tied into the executive branch of the Government and its policies and practices, based upon the rules that we lay down, will be subject to Executive review. These amendments set forth arrangements that will permit flexibility where flexibility is needed and control where control is essential.

In recommending these amendments to my colleagues on the floor of the House, I want to make it clear that they have been studied not only by myself but by many of my colleagues. In the main, they are the product of Senator BONE, who has led the public-power movement in the Pacific Northwest for the past 25 years. I know that the whole delegation from the State of Washington is standing solidly behind the principles of these amendments. I know that many of our colleagues from other regions interested in public power have studied them carefully. I know that a number of experts in the executive branch have gone over them and believe them to be a practical, workable, and effective means of discharging the task which needs to be accomplished in the Pacific Northwest. I know that representatives of the Grange, of the public-utility districts, and of the labor unions have agreed to their provisions, for I have been in constant consultation with them. I speak, therefore, not for myself alone but for a large group of citizens who are interested in the conservative development of the Federal Government's great public-power program and in its progressive expansion. I speak, if you please, for the little fellow—the farmer, the worker, and the businessman—in the Pacific Northwest. These folks look to the Columbia River as the master key to unlocking the vast potentialities of our region. We also look upon the Columbia River as one of the most potential weapons in our arsenal which God has provided.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the legislation I propose will strengthen the arm of democracy by providing for the unification of the power resources of this great source of raw materials. This legislation will result in untold benefits to our Nation as a whole. It will aid us in achieving victory in the war of today and bring blessings in the peacetime of tomorrow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 10 minutes.

EXCESS PROFITS ON WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order that I might say for the RECORD a few things with reference to the profits-limitation amendment which the House adopted the other evening on the $18,000,000,000 appropriation bill. At the outset, I may say that I have been amused at the editorials that have attempted to dispose of the issue by an observation that the amendment was adopted without debate or without any explanation.

Those who have made that observation are open to the suggestion that they have not read the RECORD. In fact, in another body yesterday I understand a distinguished member of that body stated that the amendment had been adopted without even the author of the amendment opening his mouth about it. Of course, that distinguished gentleman also had not consulted the RECORD, because on page 3137 of the RECORD for March 28 it will be noted that I did explain the background of the amendment at some length. It occupies a column and a half of the RECORD. I stated that I would offer an amendment at the appropriate place, and asked support for it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I was present on the floor, I will say, when the gentleman's amendment was considered by the House. It was explained to the House, and I was very happy to support it, as were many of this side of the aisle as well as on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

The fact that there was no further explanation at the time the amendment itself was voted upon was due to the fact that the House, at the request of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had limited debate, and time for debate at that time had expired. But, in offering the original amendment, I stated, as the RECORD shows, that I was offering an amendment which I had previously explained. The gentleman from Missouri made a point of order against the amendment as first offered, because it called for affirmative action by an administrative officer. I conceded the point of order and immediately offered the amendment, changed in that particular, and the House adopted it 70 to 8. Personally, I think the first form of the amendment was the better, more workable, if you prefer; but the point of order left me no choice in the matter. I shall revert to this point a little later.

Now, a proper understanding of the amendment calls for recalling the circumstances back of it. Everybody agrees that excessive profits should be curbed; the question is how to do something about it. The amendment which I offered seeks to secure for the Government the right to renegotiate a contract when experience demonstrates that excessive profits are being made.

This approach grew out of the decision in the Bethlehem Steel Co. case, in which the United States Supreme Court delivered a decision on the 16th of February. In that decision Mr. Justice Black pointed out that—

> The problem of war profits is not new in this country. Every war we have engaged in has provided opportunities for profiteering, and they have been too often scandalously seized. * * * But if the Executive is in need of additional laws by which to protect the Nation against war profiteering, the Constitution has given to Congress and not to the Court the power to make them.

The decision of the Court went back to a review of the contract which was given the Bethlehem Corporation by the Government under powers given to the Fleet Corporation in the World War, and pointed out that—

> The price to be paid for each vessel to be constructed and furnished in accordance with the terms of the contract shall be the actual cost, plus the definite amount of profit hereinafter in this article provided for, based upon an estimated base cost to the contractor.

And the contract provided that—

> Should the actual cost be less than the estimated cost, the contractor shall be allowed as profit on each vessel in addition to said fixed sum for profit * * * one-half the amount by which such actual cost of each vessel falls short of the estimated cost—

As Mr. Justice Black very properly observed:

> Thus, a high estimated cost would increase the probability of savings to be divided between Bethlehem and the Government. And the more the estimated cost exceeded actual cost, the greater would be Bethlehem's share. It can be seen, therefore, that the estimated cost agreed upon by the parties is a pivotal figure.

It was for that reason that the Court, in making its holding, said:

> The profits claimed here arise under contracts deliberately let by the Fleet Corporation under authority delegated by the President in accordance with an act of Congress. * * * The question of whether or not this policy was wise is outside our province to decide. Under our form of government we do not have the power to nullify it, as we believe we should necessarily be doing, were we to declare these contracts unenforceable on the ground that profits granted under congressional authority were too high. The profits made in those and other contracts entered into under the same system may justly arouse indignation. But indignation based on the notions of morality of this or any other court cannot be judicially transmuted into a principle of law of greater force than the expressed will of Congress.

In other words, the Court said the responsibility belongs in the lap of Congress, and if the Congress wants to recapture unconscionable profits, Congress itself must act in advance. In the absence of fraud or duress, the courts cannot recapture profits after final settlement has been made. In this case duress was alleged, but denied.

Now, then, that problem of recapture has received considerable attention in committees of the House and by Members of the House, but the difficulty has been how to get at the problem. If taxation would solve the problem, the Bethlehem case would never have been in the Supreme Court. If the mere fixing of profits by law, saying that you shall not make more than so much, would solve the problem, the problem would never have appeared in court as it was here, because supposedly we had a statutory limitation on profits in the World War.

The effect of the Bethlehem decision was to say that if the Government is to recapture unconscionable profits it must preserve its rights before final settlement is made on any given contract. The recapture must be at the source. The stable must be locked before the horse is taken.

So those of us who have been thinking about that phase of it have sought to find some way in which the Government could preserve its right to recovery in spite of making final settlement, some way for the Government to assert a right, if the contractor is not willing to renegotiate voluntarily, and renegotiate the contract on the basis of the costs established by actual performance of the contract.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield briefly.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not follow the gentleman's reasoning that the surtaxes and the profits taxes cannot reach these cases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Had they reached the World War Bethlehem case it never would have been in the courts in 1942.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's position that excess-profits taxes cannot be levied on any profits on a contract once that contract has been consummated and payments made?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; that is not my contention. But it is my contention that such a method is not effective. If the gentleman will read the very interesting opinion of the Court in the Bethlehem case, he will see why the excess-profits tax of itself did not reach the case because of the terms of the contract. The decision makes a very interesting reference to the findings of former Chief Justice Hughes in his justly famous investigation of World War aircraft profits which were not effectively curbed by taxation.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have followed the gentleman with much interest up to this point. I believe he is on the right track with regard to limiting these exorbitant profits. I would like to know what means could be invoked, in the gentleman's opinion, to prevent the covering up of these profits in the form of excessive salaries and the padding of pay rolls such as was developed in the scandalous Jack & Heintz case recently.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The means suggested in my amendment is to require a certificate of costs. Of course, that certificate becomes subject to verification of true costs. It was precisely to meet that problem and related problems that I conferred with some of the officials in the War Department who were working on procurement. I found they had been seeking some voluntary renegotiation of contracts after costs were established. I found they were actually rewriting contracts and reducing the prices to be paid.

I found also that Colonel Kutz, in the Ordnance Department, had evolved a contract which provided that after 25 percent of the run had been made under the contract there would then be a renegotiation of the contract based upon the experience of the costs established up to that point. He testified in our hearings before the committee on this $18,000,000,000 bill, a portion of which was recited in my remarks the other day, that in the case of a machine-gun contract, after a 25-percent run had been made, the costs were examined and the contract was renegotiated with a reduction of 50 percent in the price for the balance of the contract.

So far so good, but, as was observed by one of the officers with whom I discussed this matter, the problem is not with the firm or corporation that is willing to renegotiate on the basis of the cost discovered. The difficulty is to get some means for requiring a renegotiation with the firm or the corporation that does not want to renegotiate. The problem is the bad boy who does not want to be good. So machinery of compulsion was suggested in the amendments which I proposed. In its best form it was in the first amendment, the one dropped by the point of order. I want to read that to you, because, in my own mind, that amendment is preferable to the one the House adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are there not other special orders pending?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is reluctant to put the gentleman's request in view of the fact that the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Oregon, and the gentleman from California all have special orders.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would not indicate a desire to proceed further were it not for the fact that the gentleman from Washington, who just preceded me, was granted a similar request and I made no objection to his request.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to a reasonable extension.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain a request that the gentleman proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to say to the gentleman that the American people owe him a debt of gratitude for offering that amendment, which covers the case completely. As I recall, the gentleman's amendment covers not only contracts to be negotiated under that bill but also covers contracts heretofore entered into.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the final payment is to be made out of funds carried in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Frank Haley, Americanism legislative chairman, Military Order of the Purple Heart, with a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I think there is much in what the gentleman is saying. In the Bethlehem case, to which the gentleman referred, the Government was forced to take the position, by reason of Congress failing to enact adequate legislation, that it was coerced into signing the contract. It is a most unusual and unheard of position for a sovereign to take with reference to some of its subjects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Especially with reference to war powers.

Mr. LEAVY. We ought not to be chargeable with the same dereliction this time that they were 25 years ago.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I daresay every Member of Congress has said he wanted to take the profit out of war. Moreover, there is a great demand in the country today for the enactment of some legislation dealing with the labor situation, but everyone must recognize that the Congress stands no chance of effectively dealing with the labor situation unless it does something to curb excessive and unconscionable profits.

The proposal in the way in which I first offered it provided that that portion of contract payments designated as "the final payment" should not be made from funds in this appropriation bill "until the contractor shall have filed with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be."

It is the latter language to which objection was made on a point of order by

the gentleman from Missouri, the requirement for affirmative action by the procuring Secretary, a provision which kept the machinery of adjustment flexible. That forced me then to offer the amendment with the rigid condition of the 6-percent limitation, rather than permitting the renegotiation agreement to be one satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy. The Members will recognize, of course, that the original draft gave it more leeway and permitted adaptation to circumstances; yet it specifically preserved to the Government the right to renegotiate the contract and to require renegotiation of it on the basis of actual costs. Unless we do something about that, unless we protect our right before that final settlement is made, under the Bethlehem case, the Government is powerless to recover through the courts.

It should be pointed out further that at the time this limitation becomes effective all risk in the contract has been eliminated. The contract has been completed. The costs have been determined. No one can be hurt unless the certificate of costs reveals that there has been an excessive profit, and then the contractor is under obligation to renegotiate on a basis of known costs with an agreement satisfactory to the procuring agency.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I feel quite sure the gentleman does not want to take the position that an appropriate excess-profits tax will not reach excessive profits on war contracts, even though his amendment is not in the law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not concerned so much about the amendment as I am about curbing excessive war profits. The Bethlehem decision seems to say that if something is to be done, Congress must do it in advance. I possibly may not have made my meaning clear, but I fear, for example, that an excess-profits tax does not permit the Government adequately to examine into the case of excessive salaries, such as were cited by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER]. A proper certificate of costs should permit the Government to examine into unusual or improper items of cost and determine their validity as an item of cost.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder if the gentleman heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] this afternoon quoting an expression of opinion from the Treasury Department in which it was said that these excessive salaries would be reached both by taxes against the corporation and taxes on the individual.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; but when the tax is placed on the individual it is at a different rate than on the corporation.

Mr. COLE of New York. But it is on the corporation as well.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that the corporation itself escapes these separate taxes by handing out these bonuses to its employees, and then the tax the Government collects is only from the employees that receive the bonuses?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly that is what happens in the majority of such cases. I am hopeful that a certificate of costs satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy would permit the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to examine into these bonuses and determine whether they are proper costs.

I realize we are tackling a difficult problem, but the difficulty of doing something is no excuse for doing nothing. The people of the country expect us to try. My suggestion is that we preserve the right to renegotiate on the basis of actual costs before final settlement is made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] for 30 minutes.

GUAM

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate disaster at Pearl Harbor and the naval operations in the Pacific since the 7th of December last have commanded the attention of columnists, of editors, and of a considerable number of swivel-chair strategists. Speculations in which the "ifs" appear more prominently than the "hows" have been broadcast from one end of the country to the other. A favorite topic in these speculative adventures has been the island of Guam, its fortification, the part that it might have played had a more extensive shore development program been undertaken there, and in that respect the Congress has been charged with dereliction of duty. Many of the statements are at variance with the actual facts, and the resultant confusion of thought prompts an examination of the record.

Within a very short time after the opening of hostilities in the Pacific on December 7, 1941, our island possession of Guam was captured by the Japanese. The early fall of Guam was not unexpected by our Government, since it was close to and practically surrounded by Japanese-held insular territory, practically devoid of fortifications, and apparently garrisoned by only a small force of fifty-odd sailors and marines.

Guam is the largest and the most populous of the Marianas or Ladrone Islands in the North Pacific. It is about 5,000 nautical miles west of San Francisco, 3,300 miles west of Honolulu, 1,500 miles east of Manila, and about 1,350 miles south of Tokyo. Wake Island is about 1,300 miles to the east. The other Mariana Islands, mandated to Japan after World War No. 1, lie to the north of Guam. Rota, the closest, is only about 50 miles from Guam. To the south are the Caroline Islands and to the east and southeast the Marshall Islands, both also mandated to the Japanese after the World War. Guam is about 30 miles long, has an average width of about 7 miles, and a land area of 206 square miles. The 1940 population was 22,290. The chief city is Agana, which had a population of 10,004 in 1940. Apra, on the middle west coast, is the only good harbor.

Guam was acquired by the United States from Spain in 1898 as a result of the Spanish-American War. It has been administered by the Navy Department ever since. In 1919 the joint Army and Navy board recommended that Guam be developed as an advance naval base and fortified, but no action was taken then. In article XIX of the Washington Naval Armament Limitation Treaty of 1922 the United States, the British Empire, and Japan agreed to maintain the status quo in the Pacific, with certain exceptions, like Hawaii, with regard to fortifications and naval bases. This meant that no new fortifications or naval bases could be established and no measures taken to increase existing naval facilities or coast defense. Therefore the United States could not, under its treaty obligations, develop Guam as a fortified naval base. An aviation force of four planes was stationed there from 1920 to 1932. The planes were withdrawn in 1932.

In December 1934 Japan gave notice of its intention to terminate the Washington Naval Armament Limitation Treaty in December 1936. The treaty was terminated on December 31, 1936, and therefore the restrictions on the development and fortification of the Pacific bases were no longer in force. Japan had withdrawn from the League of Nations in 1933 after the Manchurian episode. In 1936 Japan openly associated itself with Germany by entering the anti-Comintern Pact and in 1937 opened large-scale military operations against China.

Although the other powers lacked authoritative information, it seemed clear that Japan was expanding and developing naval and air bases in various places, and it was suspected that Japan was even developing bases in its mandated islands in violation of the terms of the mandate. In the meantime, our interests in the Far East were changed somewhat by the passage in 1934 of the McLuffie-Tydings Act, which provided self-government for the Philippines and complete independence in 1946.

With the restrictions on development of bases in the Pacific lifted at the end of 1936, the United States Navy began to make plans for the improvement of the facilities at Guam and other islands. On March 15, 1937, the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics addressed a letter to the Chief of Naval Operations, pointing out that Apra Harbor, Guam, was very unsatisfactory for the operation of seaplanes, due to the presence of coral reefs and shoals, and recommending that steps be taken to remove the coral heads and reefs and shoals. Then the Naval Expansion Act of May 17, 1938, directed the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board of naval officers to investigate and report upon the need, for the purposes of national defense, of additional submarines, destroyer, mine, and naval air bases on the coasts of the United States, its Territories and possessions. This board, with Rear Admiral A. J. Hepburn acting as chairman, reported to the Secretary of the Navy on December 1,

1938; a few days more than 3 years thereafter Pearl Harbor was attacked.

The recommendations of the Hepburn board could not be mistaken; not only did the board urge that Guam be developed as a major air and submarine base but the construction of an advanced fleet base was also advocated. "Adequate air and submarine protection securely based on Guam" were the conditions advanced by the board as necessary for making "the island secure against anything short of a major effort on the part of any probable enemy." In the light of our experience at Pearl Harbor, the conditions established by the by the board, as well as the character of the effort—"a major effort"—are both significant; nor should it be overlooked that the report included "appropriate antiaircraft and coast-defense equipment" as essential for the purposes intended. In other words, "adequate air and submarine protection" and "appropriate antiaircraft and coast-defense equipment" were the requisites laid down by the board for the proposed development at Guam. If the island was to play the part envisioned by the Hepburn board, planes and submarines adequate in number and in type and antiaircraft guns and coast-defense equipment of appropriate kinds would have to be available as a part of the program. The dearth of some, if not all, of these essential pieces of equipment at this time, in even more important and strategic places, cannot be ignored as speculative appraisals are made of what might have been Guam's value.

It should be emphasized that the Hepburn board's recommendations contemplated a develoment program of great magnitude:

> A major air and submarine base * * * the establishment of a fully equipped fleet base at Guam, capable of maintaining at least the major part of the fleet in all types.

In connection with this recommendation, the board, apparently having in mind the international situation then existing, recognized that—

> There are, however, other considerations and possibilities of a far greater significance which it is pertinent to take account of in this connection. Although these considerations may be regarded as beyond the precept of the Board, they are of such far-reaching importance that the Board feels impelled to include them in this report.

Aside from other factors, the time required to complete such an undertaking cannot be lightly dismissed.

In January 1939, a bill was introduced in Congress to authorize the construction of certain aviation facilities at Guam, but the project included in the authorization was not that recommended by the Hepburn board.

All that the Navy asked for Guam in January 1939 was an authorization, first, to build a breakwater at Apra Harbor at a cost not to exceed $2,200,000; second, to dredge the harbor to remove coral heads, to provide channels for ships, and for seaplane operations at a cost not to exceed $1,900,000; and, third, to build seaplane ramps and parking space, small power plant, and necessary accessories at a cost not to exceed $900,000. The total authorization would amount to $5,000,000. In the hearings on the bill the representatives of the Navy were very clear and insistent that the proposed project was not that recommended by the Hepburn board and that no fortification was involved. The $5,000,000 was to be used for improving the harbor mainly for seaplanes. The construction of the air and submarine base recommended by the Hepburn board would cost about $80,000,000, and the conversion into an advance fleet base would cost about $150,000,000.

In speaking for the Navy Department, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Edison stated that it was not the policy of the Navy then to fortify Guam or do any more than was asked for in the bill. Mr. Edison said in part on January 31, 1939:

> With specific reference to a question as to whether the project for the Island of Guam is the first step in a program of fortification or whether it is a development separate and distinct from the recommendations made by the Hepburn board, I will state that while the developments now proposed would be useful in connection with any future developments of the harbor and shore facilities at Guam, nevertheless the $5,000,000 project in the bill before the committee falls so far short of meeting the requirements of the Hepburn board that it can, in reality, be considered a separate and distinct development which is an entity in itself and which will be useful to the Navy and to commercial air traffic whether or not any further develcpment is made.
>
> The proposed development will permit the operation of airplanes that may at any future time be in that area. With such a development airplanes can be flown from the continental United States via Oahu, Midway, and Wake. Without such a development planes cannot be operated to the westward beyond their radius from Midway.
>
> Facilities for the operation of airplanes from Guam will add materially to the defensive power of the fleet.
>
> It is impossible to look into the future and see whether or not there will be need for future development of Guam as an airplane base, but we may hope that the future international situation will not make it necessary to use Guam except as a commercial airport.
>
> It is the present policy of the Navy Department now to ask for development only to the extent stated in the bill before this committee.
>
> If unforeseen changes in the international situation should indicate a necessity for further development of an airplane base, then the Congress will be so informed.
>
> We hope that there will be no necessity for further development—none is contemplated at the present time.

The statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy indicated clearly that the Navy looked upon the project which it was then advocating as "a separate and distinct development" from that recommended by the Hepburn board.

Admiral Leahy, Chief of Naval Operations, also pointed out that the Guam project did not involve fortifications. But Admiral Leahy added:

> The necessity for a fully equipped base at Guam seems to depend entirely on the national policy, for which the Navy has no responsibility.

In view of the Hepburn board's report which Secretary of the Navy Swanson stated he approved, and Admiral Leahy's statements, it would seem that the Navy favored the development of Guam as an advance fleet base, or at least as an air and submarine base, but that national policy precluded such recommendation in 1939. In other words, the President's foreign and other policies at that time ruled out the effective fortification or development of Guam as a naval base.

Whether the President had reached a definite decision on foreign policy at that time, especially as to our relations with Japan, is not known. But, apparently, he was hesitant to take such steps as were recommended by the Hepburn board for it does not appear that he made any requests for the necessary authorizations to carry out the proposals. As Admiral Leahy said:

> The necessity depended entirely on the national policy for which the Navy has no responsibility.

That responsibility rested with the President.

The House Naval Affairs Committee reported the base authorization bill with the $5,000,000 Guam item included. A minority report was filed. Those who joined in the report stated that they recognized the right of the United States to establish military facilities at Guam and approved of the necessity of the harbor improvement for the purpose of aiding commercial trans-Pacific aviation. They would approve of harbor work if it were done as a regular river and harbor improvement by the Army Engineers, as in the case of the improvements being made at Midway. To do the work by the Navy Department would involve hazards which would constitute too great a price to pay for the benefits which might inure either to commercial aviation or to the naval service.

The debate on the base bill in the House largely centered around the $5,000,000 Guam authorization. The gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, of the Naval Affairs Committee, led the fight for its retention, pointing out that the project did not involve fortification but only the improvement of the harbor, primarily for seaplane use. Members of both parties spoke against it. The gentleman from New Jersey, Representative SUTPHIN, Democratic member of the Naval Affairs Committee, moved to strike out the Guam item. The Sutphin motion carried on February 23, 1939, by a vote of 205 to 168, with 63 Democratic Members in support of the motion. Obviously, national policy had not as yet been crystallized by the President to such an extent that the fortification of Guam should be advocated or encouraged.

No better authority on this point could be quoted than the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, who said during the course of the debate:

> The one item of this bill that has received the most publicity and the one that has been subject to the most criticism is the provision to expend $5,000,000 to improve the harbor facilities for seaplane operation at the island of Guam in the mid-Pacific.

Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines.

In view of this opposition, the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

The Senate Naval Affairs Committee reported the bill without the Guam project, and the Senate passed the bill also without it. And since no authorization for the Guam project was voted, no money was appropriated for it.

Included in the Budget proposal for public works for 1941 was a $5,000,000 project labeled "Fourteenth naval district, improvements of harbors and channels." Of the $5,000,000, $4,000,000 was for Guam for the following purposes:

Breakwater across entrance of Apra Harbor	$2,200,000
Removal of coral heads in outer harbor	800,000
Dredging inner lagoon and connecting channel	1,000,000

When members of the House Naval Appropriations Subcommittee questioned Rear Admiral Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, as to the procedure which has been followed, he admitted that the items of harbor improvement for Guam were included as a part of the project for which Congress had refused authorization the year before. To justify the request for the appropriation when the authorization had been rejected the year before, Admiral Moreell cited Cannon's Procedure.

He also contended that the project was quite different from that of the previous year since it included only 3 of 15 items then asked for. It is true that the 1939 items of seaplane ramps and parking space, small power plant, and necessary accessories, totaling $900,000, did not appear in the 1940 request. It was contended that the harbor improvement was needed for safe operating conditions for aircraft and vessels en route to and from the Asiatic station. No fortification was involved. Up to this time national policy had not been determined by the President to the point suggested by Admiral Leahy at an earlier date.

The House Appropriations Committee reported the bill with the Guam project retained but with the total-cost limit reduced from $4,000,000 to $3,000,000 and a cash appropriation of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1941. The debate in the House was similar to that of the year previous. Finally Representative RICHARDS, Democrat of South Carolina, moved to strike out the item. His motion carried in a teller vote, 123 to 114, and again the Guam Harbor improvement was rejected by the House, this time in the form of an appropriation.

The Navy requested the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the Guam item, but the committee did not accede to the request. So there was no appropriation for the Guam Harbor improvement project in the Navy Department Appropriation Act for 1941.

Early in 1941 an authorization as well as an appropriation bill for Guam was introduced in Congress. The project included the following items:

Breakwater across entrance to Apra Harbor	$2,200,000
Removal of coral heads, outer harbor	800,000
Dredging inner lagoon and connecting channel	1,000,000
Bombproofing power plant, Piti	175,000
Conversion of power plant, Agana, to oil burning and bombproofing	100,000
Bombproof shelters for personnel	200,000
Recreation facilities	75,000
Bombproofing communication center	150,000

This authorization was accepted by Congress and included in the act of March 23, 1941. The appropriation of the $4,700,000 was made in the Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act for 1941 which was signed on March 17, 1941.

As yet the Congress has no information of the progress which had been made in the work at Guam prior to the time the Japanese took over the island early in December. It must be remembered that the far-away location of this outpost makes speedy construction most difficult. Whether the harbor facilities and the bombproofing of certain shore establishments proved to be of any value must be determined in the future. Whether fortifications, such as were contemplated by the Hepburn board, but never pressed by the Navy or the President, would have materially changed the results of the surprise attack early in December is a debatable question. However, we do have an assertion by a high naval officer in the Department that construction and completion of the $5,000,000 item recommended by the Department in 1939 would not have avoided the devastating attack on Pearl Harbor and would only have made available to the enemy an additional base from which to operate airplanes against us.

In conclusion, a few comments are appropriate: In the first place, it should be clear that no specific proposal for the fortification of Guam and its development as an effective naval base was submitted to Congress for action. The Hepburn board recommended such development and Secretary of the Navy Swanson transmitted its report to Congress "with my approval." Admiral Leahy, Chief of Naval Operations in 1939, testified that in his own opinion such development would be very valuable to the Navy. But such a program was never approved by the President's Budget Bureau in the form of either a request for an authorization or appropriation. It was not a part of his program.

The 1939 request for a $5,000,000 authorization for harbor improvement at Guam was by no means a proposal for fortification. Such improvement would have made Guam more useful for seaplanes and for light naval vessels, but it is clear that the defenses of Guam against the Japanese attack would not have been appreciably strengthened. Failure to fix with any degree of definiteness or certainty our national policy at a very much earlier date than it was fixed appears to be the one factor for not undertaking such fortifications as would have lent themselves to the defense of the island at the time of the attack.

An observation made by Maj. George Fielding Eliot early in 1939 on Guam is pertinent:

> The decision to fortify Guam, or not to fortify, is bound up with the broader question of what our policy in the Far East is going to be. It would be difficult to find a better example of the interlocking character of military and foreign policy, which requires the former to be adequate to support the latter, while requiring the latter not to go beyond the bounds of the former's ability so to support it.
>
> * * * Certainly, the fortification of Guam, the existence there of any considerable striking force, would make easier the operations incident to a war with Japan. But merely beginning these fortifications might precipitate such a war.

Who is there who will deny that the item for harbor improvement as recommended by the Department in 1939 if done as a military project might have been the spark which would have ignited hostilities many months before Pearl Harbor and at a time when this country was far less prepared for war than it was in December 1941? It may well be that the President was reluctant to press the military development of Guam for fear that as Eliot said it might precipitate a war at a time when there was claimed to exist certain commitments made by him with other foreign nations involving extraordinary and far-reaching military obligations and responsibilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 10 minutes.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to discuss a matter which has disturbed me for some time; that is, the matter of certain action on the part of the Bureau of the Budget.

I should like to introduce what I have to say by pointing out that during the past fiscal year the Bureau of the Budget has frozen $37,000,000 of funds that were appropriated by the Congress to the Department of Agriculture for the carrying out of the purposes of section 32. Those purposes have included the stamp plan, the school lunches, and other similar methods of distribution and increased consumption of agricultural commodities, with the primary purpose in view of stabilizing farm prices and preventing surpluses from glutting the market, but with a corresponding effort to get foodstuffs to the people who really need them. The beneficial results of these programs on the health and attendance records of school children are universally acclaimed.

The amount of money frozen by the Budget is enough to have permitted every single one of the estimated 9,000,000 undernourished children in this country to purchase, at a cost of 1 cent, a half pint of milk a day for a year. It is enough, if added to the amount appropriated by the House this year, to have had a school lunch for every one of the 9,000,000 undernourished children in this country during the coming year, and the health of our children is the main

protection against disease and the main assurance of the kind of stalwart people Americans must be as we face this war and the dangers that lie ahead. At the same time, I would point out we have appropriated about $2,000,000,000 directly for lend-lease food shipments. I am not going into a long discussion today about the school-lunch program, in which I believe so much, but I do ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include with my remarks a very excellent article appearing in the Washington Post of last Sunday on this general subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 29, 1942]

BUDGET-AXING PERILS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S PENNY MILK

(By Gerald G. Gross)

Crippling of the Federal Government's surplus-foods program appeared as an immediate threat yesterday.

Penny milk, 5-cent quarts, school lunches, food stamps, direct distribution of food—all are in danger of drastic curtailment because the Budget Bureau has snipped $100,000,000 off the Agricultural Marketing Administration's 1942–43 allotment.

Not only do some 10,000,000 relief and low-income families stand to suffer, if Congress does not restore all or part of the cut, but so do the thousands of farmers who are beneficiaries at the production end. The issue rests, for the moment, with the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, which will open hearings this week on the agriculture supply bill.

STORY IN BRIEF

What has happened, in substance, is this:

In 1941 Congress appropriated, with the Budget Bureau's assent, $100,000,000 to supplement Agriculture's statutory allotment for continuation of its surplus-marketing program. By "statutory allotment" is meant the provision in the 1935 Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act by which 30 percent of customs revenue is made available for this form of agricultural relief each year

During the current fiscal year, accordingly, the Agricultural Marketing Administration had $197,000,000 to spend—$97,000,000 derived from its customs percentage and $100,000,000 as a necessary supplement. Actually, Congress appropriated $125,000,000, but $25,000,000 was impounded by the Budget Bureau last summer for economy reasons.

For the year beginning July 1, however, the Bureau has withheld approval of any supplemental appropriation whatever. Hence, when the agriculture supply bill passed the House recently, it carried nothing for the surplus-foods program.

SHARP REDUCTION LOOMS

Unless there is restorative action by Congress before the bill goes to the President for signature, there will be no alternative to a sharp reduction of the Marketing Administration's activities in behalf of farmers glutted with seasonal surpluses and malnourished consumers in need of this food.

The sum of $131,000,000 will be available under the customs provisions, compared with this year's $97,000,000. Without a supplementary appropriation, however, Agriculture officials face what is to them the unpleasant necessity of literally taking the food out of several million mouths.

Here is Washington's situation:

Thirty-four thousand half-pint bottles of milk are being distributed daily in 64 schools (public and parochial) and 7 settlement houses. More are on a waiting list. But this project, hailed by school and welfare leaders since its inception in January, stands to be cut at least 25 percent—and conceivably abolished—if Congress does not come through.

Eight thousand youngsters in the Capital's elementary schools and 3,000 more in the junior and senior highs are receiving free hot lunches daily. A 40-percent slash is in prospect here.

25,000 BENEFIT MONTHLY

Each month 25,000 men, women, and children on relief or in the lowest income brackets are being aided by free distribution of 600,000 pounds of flour, fruits, vegetables, corn meal, salt pork and sundry surplus foods bought up by the Agricultural Marketing Administration. A still unestimated reduction in this activity is likewise inevitable, as the appropriations bill now stands.

Washington's poor also are served by the Agriculture-Work Projects Administration 5-cent milk plan, by which some 3,700 families are buying an average of 90,000 quarts a month at a nickel each, due to the Federal subsidy which similarly makes the school milk program possible. This successful form of public assistance faces the ax, too.

Also affected would be the District's many summer camps for underprivileged children, which depend in large measure upon surplus food aid and, in the same category, various Work Projects Administration household projects.

The Capital's plight, serious as it is, pales besides that of the Nation as a whole.

The food stamp plan, whose place is taken in the District by direct distribution of surplus foods, today covers 19 States in their entirety. It is in operation in 1,224 counties and 83 cities. In February there were 3,600,000 participants, who obtained in exchange for their blue stamps food valued at $9,600,000.

SIX MILLION ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND SCHOOL LUNCHES

During the same month 6,100,000 children got free hot lunches in 93,000 schools. Into these meals went 66,700,000 pounds of beans, oranges, flour, pork, and dozens of other ingredients worth $5,300,000 on the retail market.

The school-lunch program is in operation in all 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia. February volume of participation and food consumed marked an all-time high.

Through direct distribution of excess foodstuffs, under which the needy are certified as eligible by their local welfare agencies (this is the system in vogue here), 4,400,000 persons obtained 57,000,000 pounds, valued at $4,200,000, without cost to them, last month.

More than 700,000 boys and girls in 29 cities and marketing areas, from Boston to Phoenix, are drinking "penny half-pints" of milk each school day. In 37 other communities programs have been approved and their initiation is awaiting only the letting of contracts.

Six cities, Washington included, are offering 5-cent quarts to families in economic distress, with some 450,000 persons participating and 200,000 quarts being distributed daily.

Cognizant of the fact that all these activities must be curtailed in 1942–43 if Congress withholds a supplementary appropriation, Representative JERRY VOORHIS (Democrat), of California, tried in vain to have a $40,000,000 allotment inserted in the Agriculture supply bill when it was brought out on the House floor on March 12.

In a 5-minute speech, VOORHIS argued the inconsistency of cutting down on surplus food relief in this country when millions of tons are being shipped abroad under lend-lease—"this, I believe, is right"—to launch identical projects over there.

He quoted figures showing that 15 percent of all men examined for selective service have been rejected because of nutritional deficiencies. He pleaded that "farmers who are now engaged in this food-for-freedom program have a right to expect that we will not go back on our moral obligation to see that their prices do not collapse."

But his amendment was defeated on a point of order.

Since there is no special authorization by Congress to appropriate for these surplus marketing and distribution activities, other than the aforementioned section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935, the raising of a point of order against any restorative amendment that may be proposed on the Senate side would kill hopes for a supplemental allotment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand that the money the gentleman speaks of has been appropriated by the Congress and its expenditure has been held up by the executive department?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. By the Budget Bureau. The money was specifically appropriated by the Congress for this purpose. The Bureau of the Budget, however, decides on its own motion that the money should not be spent for this purpose. They freeze it in a fund and it is not available for the purpose for which Congress decided it should be available.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is an illustration of the interesting point which has recently arisen in our Government as to the powers of the two departments of our Government.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct.

This is not the only case in which this has happened. It happened in the case of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] I am sure will confirm that.

Mr. CARTER. I was just going to suggest that that took place in that instance, and I wanted to ask the gentleman from California whether or not he has made a study of the legal phase of the question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that I have tried to do that. I am under the handicap of not being an attorney, but, so far as I can determine—and I have asked that a study be made of this question—the authority of the Bureau of the Budget comes, they claim, from an act called the Antideficiency Act, which was passed in 1906. That act reads as follows:

All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made.

The job of enforcing this provision was given to the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 6166, which I will quote in a moment. It provides that the Bureau of the Budget shall have the

power to determine the allocation and apportionment of appropriations. The purpose of that act, as I understand it, was to give the Budget the power to prevent a department from expending its money so rapidly at the beginning of the fiscal year that they would not have anything at the end of it. It seems to me it is an unwarranted extension of that authority to say that they have a right to determine in effect how much Congress has the right to appropriate for a certain purpose. Executive Order No. 6166, section 16, which was issued by the President under the first reorganization bill, I believe, in March 1933, had these words in it:

> The functions of making, waiving, and modifying apportionments of appropriations are transferred to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

It does not seem to me that you can read into this Executive order the authority to go beyond the apportionment as between the quarters of the fiscal year and actually curtail the total amount of appropriations made for a specific purpose. Indeed, I claim that that is to interpret these powers in a seemingly illegal manner.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman points out is just a sample of what is being done in many instances by bureau chiefs who interpret the law the way they want it interpreted and not according to the intent of the Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that sometimes that apparently happens. I think that is the reason I am here today.

I would like to point out some of the possibilities involved in this procedure. If it is possible, for instance, for the Bureau of the Budget to freeze funds for school lunches which, maybe, some of the other Members are not so interested in as I am, I would like to point out to them the fact that if the Budget can freeze those funds, it also can freeze funds for the legislative appropriations if it wants. At least, there is no more reason, it seems to me, why they could not do it in connection with the legislative appropriation bill carrying the money necessary to maintain the Congress, than it is for them to do it in any one of these other cases.

I would like to follow this up by asking this, if the Budget can decide that the Congress appropriated too much for a certain purpose then why cannot they decide it appropriated too little for another purpose? And if this next step were taken in this direction, the Budget would be in the position of being able to say we are going to take money appropriated for one thing and give it to another. When that time comes the power over the purse of Congress will be gone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to buying lunches in schools, which I think is a very fine thing, but I just want to point out one part of that program. Down here they had canned stuff delivered in one of the finest dairy sections of the country to the country schools where the pupils did not know what to do with it. This shows how inconsistent they are in their policies.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry if that happened. It is the first time that I have heard of it.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that these things have been done for the purpose of reducing expenditures, and I think most of the Members of Congress would be in favor of doing that objective where it can properly and wisely be done, but I submit if the Bureau of the Budget can, upon its own motion, make decisions like this without any approval on the part of Congress, that it is a distinct invasion of the power of Congress to appropriate money and decide how it is to be spent. At the very least, it seems to me the Congress should insist that when the Bureau of the Budget proposes action of this kind it should have first the approval of Congress by means of a joint resolution for its action.

I submit these things for the consideration of the membership and ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks certain quotations from some of the laws, particularly the Antideficiency Act of 1906, upon which I understand the power of the Bureau of the Budget is based, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] for 10 minutes.

OREGON'S WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] for his excellent analysis made on the floor a short time ago of the development of hydroelectric power in the Columbia River Basin. A little later in my remarks, I shall go a little further into the details of the power situation, particularly as it affects my own State of Oregon. Before doing so, however, I shall proceed briefly with another matter.

Mr. Speaker, for over 3 years now the Congress has been in continuous session, with the exception of a few very brief intervals when recesses were taken. We recall that early in the summer of 1940 it was suggested that the Congress adjourn and go home. Even the President himself shared this opinion. The Congress, however, refused to adjourn, and later the world situation became so serious it was found necessary for the Congress to take up immediately for consideration and passage many important matters of legislation having to do with all-out defense. Since that time the exigencies of world conditions have required that Congress stay on the job.

From the outset I supported such a program. I now feel that the House decided correctly in refusing to recess over the Easter holidays but to remain officially in session. I regret, however, that the leaders have decided that controversial matters should not be taken up during this period. There are so many far-reaching legislative programs now pending in the committees of the House which should have immediate consideration, that in my judgment the House erred in refusing to take up these urgent legislative matters having to do with the prosecution of the war. Everyone of us during these critical hours must be willing to make every sacrifice and to devote every available hour of our time for carrying forward our war effort. Congress itself is no exception.

Mr. Speaker, those behind the scenes who are charged with the responsibility of carrying forward our war program freely predict that the remainder of the calendar year 1942 may be the darkest period in the history of our country. The forces of evil which are alined together seeking to strike down forever the civilization of the world are marshaling all of their forces for a heroic effort on every available front to crush us and the other United Nations. They realize fully that when America shall have reached its full stride in the war of production, and ships, tanks, planes, and ammunitions of every description continue to roll without interruption out of our plants and factories, that we and our allies will have gained the superiority in the air, on the water, and on land which will spell defeat to the Axis Powers.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people are aroused to the grim realities that face us. They now realize that we are embroiled in a life-and-death struggle to protect our own country; we are fighting with our backs to the wall. This fight is ours; we are defending our own country and our own people and the American way of life. Our enemies are treacherous, cunning, well equipped and efficient, and are making every sacrifice and employing all of their energies and resources to crush us and the United Nations fighting with us. Nothing counts now except to win the war, which we must and can do if we Americans are willing to pay the price for victory. There is no easy road to victory. It means sacrifice, sweat, and American blood. We must put aside every activity that does not contribute to the winning of the war. All our energies, all our resources, and all our loyalties must be freely given, and we must make every sacrifice to the one supreme objective of crushing the fiendishly efficient Japanese and Nazi hordes who seek our destruction.

The Congress has lodged supreme control and power in the hands of the President, as the Commander in Chief of our military forces, who, with the War Board authorized by the Congress, has full power to conduct the war to a successful termination. For my own part, as a Member of the Congress, I have given and will continue to give complete and full support to the President as Commander in Chief and those under him in charge of the war program to carry forward unhampered during these tragic days confronting us. Partisan politics and personal considerations must have no part in this life-and-death struggle to save America and our people. We are

in for a long, hard pull; but in the end, if we Americans of today will fight as our forebears fought in the Revolutionary days and in the long, hard years of sixty-one to sixty-five, and as General MacArthur and his heroic men fought at Bataan, we will win, because we are fighting a just cause, and we are fighting for the defense of our homes and our country, and we are fighting to crush forever the enemies of civilization itself.

The stupendous task which confronts us demands that every dollar appropriated for all-out defense must be honestly spent and a dollar's worth received for each dollar expended. Waste, graft, and furbelows in war activities must cease; we cannot dance our way to victory. Huge and unconscionable profits must be prohibited, and the crushing burden of taxation necessary for carrying on this almost superhuman effort must be equitably distributed upon all of our citizens. We must be willing to be taxed to the full limit of our ability to pay. We must sacrifice and forego the pleasures to which we have been accustomed, and even many of the peacetime necessities, in order to provide our fighting men at the front with ships, planes, tanks, munitions, and supplies so that they will be adequately equipped to meet our enemies and come out victorious. General MacArthur and his brave American and Philippine soldiers, compelled to fight without adequate planes and reinforcements, should spur every American on to make the greatest sacrifice within his power in order to provide the tools of war and reinforcements so sorely needed. Are we not willing to have less that our soldiers fighting for us may have more with which to crush the treacherous Japanese reaching for their throats? Is it not cheaper to buy victory, regardless of its cost and sacrifices, than to suffer defeat, which means death or slavery?

Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity since last September to return to my own district in Oregon to consult with my constituents. I would be most happy to do so. It would not only give me an opportunity to learn first-hand from the citizens of my district their views on these momentous questions facing our Nation, but would also afford me the opportunity to make surveys and examinations of the various Government projects that have been constructed and are being carried forward now in Oregon. However, I have talked personally with many of the people from my district who have had occasion to come to the Capital, and through an extensive correspondence I have been able to keep in close touch with the viewpoints of my constituents. I know that there are no more loyal citizens in the Nation today than those who live on the west coast. Many of them are descendants of pioneers who migrated to the Oregon country in the covered-wagon days of the forties and fifties. They are a hardy, virile type of citizen and have been accustomed by heritage and personal experiences to depend upon their own endeavors and to reclaim and build for themselves, and I am sure now they are more than anxious to carry the full weight of the responsibilities resting upon them as citizens of this great country. In fact, they are doing this very thing. When the bombs were dropped by the treacherous Japanese at Pearl Harbor a number of the brave sons of Oregon paid the supreme sacrifice. Realizing the great needs of our Government for war funds, our State was one of the first, if not the first in the Nation, to go over the top in the sale of Defense bonds and stamps.

Fortunately, my native State of Oregon borders upon the Columbia River, the second largest river in the United States and the greatest in potential hydroelectric power. The Northwest likewise is blessed with an abundance of natural resources in timber, ores, and metals, which form such a vital part of the defense program. Power and raw materials go hand in hand in building ships, planes, and other tools of war, which we must have in unending abundance if we are to win. It was indeed a fortunate circumstance that many of us in the Pacific Northwest, long before the war broke upon the world, realized the possibilities in the development of these natural resources and critical and strategic materials and the utilization of the hydroelectric power going to waste in the Columbia River. As a result, Bonneville and Grand Coulee came into being. Since my service here in the House, now going on 4 years, I have availed myself of the opportunity on many occasions to draw to the attention of the House from this Well the need for the early completion of Bonneville and the grid system of transformation and transmission facilities, providing the means to bring this huge reservoir of power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee to the areas of production. The great Bonneville project is now nearing completion. Recently I urged on the floor of the House the appropriation which will complete the generating units. The dam itself has long been completed. There are 10 generating units in this great power development, 6 of which have now been completed, and 5 are in operation, and work is progressing on the remaining 4. When all of them shall have been completed, which will be within the next couple of years, the total capacity of the plant, 518,400 kilowatts, will be put to work in our war defense program. In 1941 there were generated 1,480,390,000 kilowatt-hours at Bonneville, which is 86 percent of the maximum possible energy which could have been generated by the equipment installed in that project and utilizing the water available. Of this amount, 98.5 percent was delivered to the Bonneville administrator for sale. The aluminum-reduction plant at Troutdale is being rushed to completion and construction work is advancing on the transmission lines to connect with the Troutdale operation. One of the bottlenecks in our all-out war effort is the lack of fighting aircraft, and the huge generators in the Columbia River area, both at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, are supplying the much-needed energy to produce aluminum and other materials needed for aircraft in our war production program. Approximately 350,000 kilowatts from the 3 new Grand Coulee units will be brought into service during 1943. The total of these 2 Columbia River power projects—Bonneville and Grand Coulee—coming into production in 1943 will be in excess of one-half million kilowatts.

In this calendar year Bonneville and Grand Coulee will provide about one-half of the light metals required by our air program, or an amount in excess of the total amount of such metals manufactured in the entire United States a year and a half ago. The ultimate aluminum program has now been placed at two and two-tenths billion pounds of ingot metal, about one-third of which will come from Columbia River power alone. It will thus be seen the important role being played in war production by Columbia River power.

SHIPBUILDING

Shipbuilding has become one of the most active defense construction activities in my district and the contiguous Washington side of the Columbia River. Bonneville power is being or will be used in the three shipyards now actively at work or under construction. About 1,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power is required for each shipway. The Oregon Shipbuilding Co of Portland, Oreg., has been using about 8,500 kilowatts of Bonneville power since May 24, 1941. This company of late has been launching a ship a day, cargo vessels probably about five or six thousand tons each. Since the estimates recently before the House were prepared, two new shipbuilding facilities have been authorized for the lower Columbia. The first is to be located on Swan Island, Portland, which will require 10,000 kilowatts with 10 shipways. It is planned that this new Swan Island yard will be brought into operation the 15th of May 1942. The Swan Island development will be about 20 percent larger than the Oregon shipbuilding project.

With the recent award of 56 tankers to the Swan Island yard of the Kaiser Co., the total number of ships being produced by this one company in the Columbia River area is 119 ships at Vancouver, 56 tankers at Swan Island, and 131 liberty ships at the St. Johns yard. All of these ships are to be completed next year. It is estimated that 60,000 more shipyard workers will be required in the next 6 months for the new Vancouver and Swan Island yards, which, together with 250,000 already building freighters in the Portland area, means that the supply of skilled workmen is being exhausted. It is estimated that an additional 10,000 workers will be needed in Oregon for cantonment construction and metalcraft industries. Many of these will need vocational training to fit them for the work. The Willamette Iron & Steel Co. and other war industries are similarly engaged in war production. I am advised that an around-the-clock program is in effect in these shipbuilding operations. Our industries have taken an outstanding forward position in this respect. There have been no strikes or other stoppages in these enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, on January 21 this House passed the bill authorizing an appropriation of $750,000,000 for minor combatant and naval vessels of various types, to be used in seaway duty. While for military

reasons it is not permitted to discuss the particular types of vessels that will be constructed, I may say that it is not unlikely that some of them will be of wood construction. We in the Columbia River area are particularly well situated for the construction of this type of vessel. During World War No. 1 we established an outstanding record for the construction of wooden ships. With the necessity for strict enforcement of priorities, limiting the use of steel and other metals, it is becoming more apparent that we must utilize our facilities for the construction of many types of wooden seagoing ships for war purposes. Portland is the hub of the greatest lumber-producing area in the United States, if not in the world. The Long Bell Lumber Co. on the north side of the Columbia River at Longview took the lead in lumber production in the West in 1941, with an output of over 454,000,000 board feet. On the Oregon side, the C. D. Johnson Lumber Co. of Toledo produced 190,000,000 board feet. The greatest available standing body of timber, consisting of Douglas, fir, pine, spruce, cedar, and other varieties, is located in this Northwest area, in what was largely the Old Oregon Country, now comprising the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the record made by the citizens of this Northwest area entitles them to recognition as forward-looking patriotic supporters of our all-out war program. They realize the grim tragedy facing us as a Nation. They know that we cannot win the war with patriotism alone or with huge appropriations made by the Congress or with high-sounding phrases and patriotic speeches. They know, from bitter experience, that war means work, death, and destruction. They know too well that we can lose this war. But they have an abiding faith that we will win and in the resourcefulness of the American people and their loyalty and willingness to make every sacrifice and to do the things which are not easy but difficult and necessary if we are to win. I am happy to be the spokesman for these American citizens in the Third Congressional District of Oregon who are doing and will continue to do their full share in America's great effort to protect and preserve our American democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] for 3 minutes.

CRITICISM OF ONE HOUSE OF CONGRESS BY THE OTHER

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic debacle at Pearl Harbor on December 7, followed by the declaration of a state of war existing between the United States and Japan, Germany, and Italy, there has been an ever-increasing appeal for unity. I regret that the two Houses of Congress have not set an example for the great body politic to follow. The old ethical standard which frowned on criticism of the House by the Senate, and vice versa, seems to have been temporarily, at least, set aside. Such action, if continued, will destroy that unity of purpose that is so necessary in successfully carrying on the war effort. The House and Senate are the Congress of the United States. Distinguished Speakers of the House have in the past commented upon this subject and there is no doubt that under a strict interpretation of the rules such criticism would not be tolerated. I trust that the casting of aspersions upon the integrity of one body by the other will from now on discontinue, and thus add to the confidence that the people of the country ought to have in their Representatives in Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by me on March 22, 1942, at the Shaarey Zedek Temple, Detroit, under the auspices of the Zionist Council of Detroit, Mich.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion in the RECORD of a broadcast by the late Ignace Jan Paderewski in regard to the sale of Defense Savings bonds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address made by Mr. M. E. Darden before a mass meeting held recently in Louisiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DESTRUCTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the speed with which certain administration leaders are trying to liquidate small businesses in this country is very alarming.

I call particular attention to what is happening in the automobile industry, particularly with dealers who have charge of the retail sale and repair of automobiles and tires.

Some weeks ago Mr. Leon Henderson made a statement to the effect that the Government would seize tires from private cars. An experience from my district as a result of this statement will illustrate the effect of such statements in liquidating small automobile dealers. One dealer wrote me that prior to Henderson's statement he had signed up about 50 automobiles for overhauling. When Mr. Henderson made the statement that the Government would seize the tires on private cars, every one of the orders he had taken for repair and overhauling of cars was canceled.

A few days ago Mr. Joseph Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, made a speech in St. Louis. In that speech he stated that the Government would requisition and seize privately owned cars. It seems to me that some of these officials are making a lot of loose statements which are not based upon fact. If the administration intends to seize tires from private cars, or if they intend to requisition cars, they should say so, rather than to intimate that the Government may do this or that. What these and other officials are publicly saying causes further disruption and liquidation of the small business of our country. The backbone of our country is the small businessman of the United States, and it is up to us in Congress to try to protect his integrity, so that he may still furnish that part of our American structure which has made our country free and great.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say, at a later date, on what governmental policies are doing to liquidate small business in our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 716. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1227. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1334. An act for the relief of Anthony Famiglietti; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1542. An act to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

S 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller and others; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1944. An act for the relief of Thomas Samuel Wuriu; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2221. An act to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the

United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher; to the Committee on Claims.

S 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2288. An act to amend subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2327. An act to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2353. An act to amend sections 1305 and 1306 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against payment of deposits and interest thereon, of enlisted men until final discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2380. An act to suspend for the duration of the present war all prohibitions against the marriage of officers of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2381. An act to provide that certain provisions of law relating to the Navy shall be held applicable to the personnel of the Coast Guard when that service is operating as a part of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2387. An act to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Navy, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution for the relief of sundry Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Edd Nevins;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Ida Baird;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 4151. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey;

H. R. 4464. An act for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey;

H. R. 4625. An act for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of Goeffrey Orme;

H. R. 5069. An act for the relief of George Garcavy;

H. R. 5363. An act for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.;

H. R. 5452. An act for the relief of Emmett Armstrong;

H. R. 5500. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles L. Clark;

H. R. 5504. An act for the relief of H. J. Abney;

H. R. 5559. An act for the relief of William Horsman;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman;

H. R. 5652. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5686. An act for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga.;

H. R. 5977. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple;

H. R. 6023. An act to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal-revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the act known as the "Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930" (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 6387. An act to extend the crediting of military service under the Railroad Retirement Acts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6440. An act to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old Naval Hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years; and

H. R. 6714. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, April 6, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1545. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1546. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposal by him from certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1547. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to the commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1548. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 23, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a review of reports on the Illinois River, Ill., with a view to the use of levee districts as reservoirs for the protection and improvement of navigation and flood control in the several drainage districts between Grafton and Starved Rock, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 5, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 692); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5503. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6634. A bill to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 4934. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6887. A bill relating to service on oceangoing vessels of the United States by licensed officers; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6888. A bill to provide for the cost of subsistence and transportation of the families of civilian employees who are assigned to duty beyond the continental United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. R. 6889. A bill to amend the Bonneville Act to authorize the acquisition of utility systems and to coordinate the operation of the Government's power facilities on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 6890. A bill to amend the Bonneville Act to authorize the acquisition of utility systems and to coordinate the operation of the Government's power facilities on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6891. A bill authorizing the judicial council of the circuit to direct that a term of court be not held where the public convenience does not require the holding of such term and there is insufficient business to warrant the holding of such term, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6892. A bill to designate the national-service flag and national-service emblem; to define organizations and persons who shall be entitled to display and wear the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6897. A bill to provide for the dollar-for-dollar matching by the United States of savings by enlisted men in the armed forces through the sale of soldiers, sailors, and marines savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. R. 6893. A bill for the relief of N. C. Lloyd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6894. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Detective Sgt. Herbert E. Brodie and Pvt. Leo Murray, and their resultant dismissal, and to reinstate Detective Sgt. Herbert E. Brodie and Pvt. Leo Murray to their former positions as members of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 6895. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6896. A bill to make Ali Mohammad eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2640. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island Federation of Men's Bible Classes, protesting against the sale of intoxicating beverages within military establishments that house armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2641. By Mr. HOPE: Petition supporting the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2642. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Rev. Matthew Kelly and Lessie Lander and other leading citizens of Danville, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, a bill relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors and the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2643. By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Petition of Nina Hammer and other citizens and residents of Bowling Green and Warren County, Ky., urging the passage of legislation that will speed up the war effort; stop strikes; place all strikers in military service for the duration of the war at regular soldier's pay; change the 40-hour workweek to 48 hours with no extra pay for overtime, Sundays, or holidays; compel by law industry to change from nonessential to war production those refusing to be placed under Government supervision, etc; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. J. L. Fendrich, D. D., pastor of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, grant this day that we may each one be aware of Thy Presence and Power within us. May we so give ourselves to Thy Guidance and Leading that in the deliberations of this hour we may consciously express Thy Will and Law. Through us in this hour may there be expressed a Wisdom to bless our Nation, and an outflowing purpose which may bless the whole earth with the foundation seeds of Peace and Brotherhood.

These things we ask in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GREEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, April 1, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on April 2, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2339) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that Hon. E. E. Cox, a Representative from the State of Georgia, had been elected Speaker pro tempore of the House during the absence of the Speaker.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases, and requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Edd Nevins;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Ida Baird;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 4151. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey;

H. R. 4464. An act for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey;

H. R. 4625. An act for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of Goeffrey Orme;

H. R. 5069. An act for the relief of George Carcavy;

H. R. 5363. An act for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.;

H. R. 5452. An act for the relief of Emmett Armstrong;

H. R. 5500. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles L. Clark;

H. R. 5504. An act for the relief of H. J. Abney;

H. R. 5559. An act for the relief of William Horsman;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman;

H. R. 5652. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5686. An act for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga.;

H. R. 5977. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple;

H. R. 6023. An act to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual

leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 6387. An act to extend the crediting of military service under the railroad retirement acts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6440. An act to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years; and

H. R. 6714. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott.

OBLIGATIONS UNDER RED CROSS CONVENTION OF 1929

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting for the consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State, with an accompanying draft bill, designed the more effectively to carry out our obligations under the Red Cross Convention of 1929.

I commend the report and the proposed legislation to the favorable consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 3, 1942.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report. 2. Draft bill.]

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Post Office, Agriculture, and the Navy which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Miss Lillian Lee of New Orleans, La., in relation to labor problems and praying that a humanitarian course as to hours and wages be pursued in such matters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. A. Collins of Conway, S. C., praying for the adoption of a firm national policy in relation to labor problems in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Commission of the City of Sandusky, Ohio, protesting against adoption of the proposal for the Federal taxation of income from municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Council of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 6750, which proposes to exempt from taxation the gasoline used in trucks transporting certain products and commodities designated as "defense materials"; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the California State Board of Agriculture in relation to economic problems which may arise in relation to the costs to be allocated against various kinds of property in connection with the administration and facilities of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A resolution adopted by the Norfolk (Va.) Council of the American Legion praying the enactment of suggested legislation to create a continental defense force for the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Board of Governors of the Insurance Brokers Exchange, of San Francisco, Calif., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to protect vital installations, such as water systems, power stations, bridges, industrial plants, etc., in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pay of personnel in the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, March 16, 1942.

(By Mr. Wicks)

Whereas every individual and every locality throughout the United States has a common responsibility for the prosecution of the present war, and because an attack on a coastal city or any other locality would constitute an attack upon the entire United States, and the resulting cost of injuries to civilians, whether or not gainfully employed, properly constitutes a part of the total cost of carrying the conflict to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas it is recognized that a part of the cost of war is the obligation of support and maintenance of the economic status of civilians and their dependents deprived of their income or ability to maintain themselves by reason of injuries or death caused by enemy action; and

Whereas various States, including New York, have enacted workmen's compensation laws providing benefits to injured employees or, in case of death, to their dependents, and under such laws have provided methods of administration which, based on trial and long years of experience, meet the wishes of the people of such States as to the amount of the benefits, the best methods of their determination, and the proper procedure for their payment, and the amounts of such benefits established under the various State laws have been fixed by the legislature with due consideration to the economic loss arising from injury or death to employees in the particular State; and

Whereas it is probable that should the attack resulting in the injury or death of civilians take place during their working hours and at their working places, claims under workmen's compensation laws may be filed, and the authorities charged with enforcing such laws may require that compensation be paid to those injured or the dependents of those killed at work; and such awards of compensation under existing laws would constitute a liability against employers, which liability may be assumed by contract by State funds, self-insurers, and insurance companies, and must be paid at least to the extent of existing assets; and the losses resulting from an attack of great proportion might seriously impair their ability not only to pay such awards but also might threaten the very security of the payment of compensation to hundreds of thousands of civilians injured or the dependents of those killed in industry, some of whose claims date back to the very inception of the law; and

Whereas in the enactment of such workmen's compensation laws the various State legislatures did not and could not have had in contemplation the possibility of losses due to war hazards such as currently exist at this time; and

Whereas insofar as such benefits may apply to civilians injured and killed in the course of their employment, the benefits shall be those that would be applicable under the workmen's compensation law in effect in the place at which they were employed; and

Whereas such legislation shall provide, insofar as such persons may be compensated under existing workmen's compensation laws, that the employers, State funds, or the insurance carriers directly responsible therefor, upon making such payments, shall be reimbursed by the United States; and

Whereas such legislation shall provide that existing administrative agencies of the various States and of existing insurance organizations with their extensive service facilities may be utilized to the fullest extent in the administration of such law and the distribution of the benefits thereunder, thus avoiding the necessity of establishing agencies which may prove unnecessary and which would duplicate already existing facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby urges the Congress of the United States to foster and support legislation providing benefits to civilians who may be injured or the dependents of civilians who may be killed by reason of enemy action, which benefits shall be a charge upon the whole people of the United States, equitably and proportionately distributed; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the clerk of the senate be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate,
WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

In assembly, March 18, 1942.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the assembly,
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

A concurrent resolution of the State of New York; to the Committee on Finance:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, February 16, 1942.

Whereas the national administration has enacted legislation to provide old-age security benefits for many of our citizens and is contemplating the expansion of the social-security program to include other groups not now eligible for such benefits; and

Whereas under the social-security law only the employees of covered employers may participate in social-security benefits, and only the covered employers are required to pay social-security tax, the covered employer and the covered employee each paying one-half thereof; and

Whereas there are in the State of New York a great many employees who were formerly covered by the law and were formerly eligible for benefits thereunder, but who, through no action or choice on their part, became ineligible under the law when they, through no action or choice on their part,

became employees of uncovered employers; and

Whereas a great many of such employees, who so became ineligible under the social-security law, are desirous of being eligible thereunder and being covered thereby, and to participate in social-security benefits, and are willing to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered under the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the social-security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social-security law for social-security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 24, 1942.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the United Brethren Church of Russell, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Cumberland, Md., remonstrating against the proposal to tax pension funds established in business firms; to the Committee on Finance.

Petition of members of the First Baptist Church of Cumberland and sundry other citizens, all of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

EXTENSION OF RIGHTS OF VETERANS TO CARRY TERM INSURANCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference, a resolution in the nature of a petition from the Cumberland and York County (Maine) Councils of the American Legion favoring the enactment of legislation in connection with Government war term insurance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under the present law, all 5-year term Government insurance policies expire on July 1, 1942, unless Congress, by law, accords an extension of the 5-year term insurance; and

Whereas many veterans are financially unable to convert said insurance; and

Whereas the failure of Congress to extend said insurance would work a hardship on the families of many veterans who are now carrying term insurance: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the county councils, American Legion of York and Cumberland Counties in the State of Maine in joint session at South Portland on the 10th day of March 1942, respectfully urge the passage of legislation designed to extend the rights of all veterans to carry term insurance for a further term of 5 years; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress from the State of Maine.

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW LONDON, CONN.—FEDERAL TAXATION OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the city council of New London, Conn., on March 16, 1942.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Conference of Mayors has repeatedly and unanimously expressed its implacable opposition to Treasury attempts to impose a Federal tax on the income from State and municipal bonds; and

Whereas in this time of grave national crisis the fullest cooperation between the Federal and municipal governments of the United States is essential to the successful prosecution of our war effort; and

Whereas, despite this grave national emergency and the need for complete unity of purpose and good will between the separate branches of our Government, the Treasury Department persists in its disturbing efforts to impose a Federal tax upon the income from State and municipal bonds and thus needlessly resurrects this highly controversial domestic issue; and

Whereas a tax on future issues of State and municipal bonds would raise only the most negligible revenues at this time and yet would substantially increase the cost of municipal borrowing, which increased costs would have to be absorbed by additional burdens on taxpayers, already overburdened with added State and national taxes and increased costs of living due to the war emergency: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the Council of the City of New London, Conn.:

1. That it hereby expresses the determined opposition of the council of the city of New London, Conn., to the continued attempts of the Treasury Department, either by statute, administrative rulings, or by judicial decree, to impose a Federal tax on State and municipal bonds; and

2. That it expresses the sense of the said common council that this most controversial domestic issue should not at this time and under the pretense of national defense be permitted to irritate and disturb that wholehearted cooperation in our American war effort which is the objective and purpose of New London in common with all the cities of America; and

3. That any such Federal tax on State and municipal bonds, by increasing the cost of borrowing, would throw additional financial burdens on the citizens of New London, who are already making very substantial sacrifices, both directly and indirectly, by way of added State and Federal taxes and through the mounting cost of living; and

4. That the city clerk be, and he hereby is, directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Senators and Congressmen from Connecticut, and to the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives and the members of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—LETTER BY ISAAC C. SUTTON

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, a letter addressed to me by Mr. Isaac C. Sutton, State youth administrator of the National Youth Administration for the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
FOR PENNSYLVANIA,
March 28, 1942.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You may know that there is an organization well financed, which is making a national drive to do away with the National Youth Administration, charging that we are duplicating the work of the schools and wasting public money.

I was talking to one of the Congressmen about it, and he suggested that I write a letter telling our Congressmen and Senators about the situation, particularly as to Pennsylvania.

There is no duplication in the training of youth for war industries, but as a matter of fact the total facilities are not adequate to meet the emergency.

According to the last survey made by the United States Employment Service, there is an estimated need in Pennsylvania of over 150,000 additional trained workers during the year 1942. The last report of the United States Employment Service shows that there were in preemployment training for industries in this State approximately 12,000 youth, and of this number 9,000 were in training in National Youth Administration shops. Both the schools and National Youth Administration shops, where feasible, are working 24 hours a day, 6 days a week, preparing workers for employment in war industries.

Our National Youth Administration boys are employed in shops producing articles for the Army, the Navy, and other governmental agencies. They receive related training from the schools through an appropriation by Congress made specially for this purpose. We have fine cooperation with the State department of public instruction and the educators in the different parts of this State.

In addition to the training in about 90 local shops, we have about 2,000 boys from small towns and the coal regions living cooperatively in resident work centers where they receive intensive training and are placed in war industries. These youth are taken from towns which have no facilities for training and no opportunity for employment. That makes available for training a large number of youth which the schools

have no resident facilities to take care of. These boys receive $30 per month and pay their own expenses; that is, food, cook, heat, light, rent, water, etc.

The charges of extravagance are not borne out by the facts. The truth is that the Navy is paying 50 cents an hour for its trainees; the Army, $70 a month; Westinghouse, Baldwin, and other industries are paying 40 cents an hour; National Youth Administration is paying its youth 15½ cents an hour for production in the shops. Therefore, the wage being paid by private industry, the Army, and the Navy is between 200 percent and 300 percent more than National Youth Administration.

The National Youth Administration pay for its foremen averages $175 per month, while the schools pay for their teachers in our shops an average of $280 per month, or about 60 percent more than we are paying for men with the same qualifications.

It should be borne in mind that the training by the Army, the Navy, and other war industries is being paid for by the Federal Government, and that generally they are not producing anything for the Government.

Our Pennsylvania boys, at 15½ cents, have produced for the Army, the Navy, and other Government agencies approximately 250,000 articles during the past year. I submit that they have earned the money that they have been paid.

During the past year over 27,000 youth in Pennsylvania have left the National Youth Administration, a substantial number of whom have obtained jobs in war industries. Throughout the country approximately 80,000 youth are now in training in National Youth Administration shops.

This week an article in the Baltimore Sun criticized the Pennsylvania National Youth Administration for having unused machinery at the resident center at Lancaster, Pa. We had closed this center because of the breakdown of our sewage system and of our water supply.

The statement about the machinery was absolutely untrue. The center was closed by my orders on March 11, and the next day we started moving the machinery to our newly completed shop at Pottsville. At the time the article appeared, an inspection of the Lancaster shops was made by Army officers representing the War Production Board, and they found them empty, and they also visited the Pottsville shops and expressed gratification of the promptness by which the machinery had been moved and the progress being made in installing it in its new location.

This is an example of the misrepresentations which are being made by certain newspapers which are conducting a campaign against this agency.

I submit that National Youth Administration is filling a need in the present emergency which is vital and at a very moderate cost.

I should be glad to answer any questions.

Cordially yours,

ISAAC C. SUTTON,
State Youth Administrator.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 1st instant,

Mr. TYDINGS, on April 2, 1942, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1237) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 244. A bill for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1238);

H. R. 4981. A bill for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239);

H. R. 5433. A bill for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant; without amendment (Rept. No 1240);

H. R. 5857. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former Acting Chief Disbursing Clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241); and

H. R. 5845. A bill for the relief of Alvira Manfredi; with amendments (Rept. No. 1242).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of George C. Dewey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1243);

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Alice R. Swett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1244);

H. R. 4408. A bill for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1245); and

H. R. 6063. A bill for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 736. A bill for the relief of Ideal Service Station; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247);

H. R. 3476. A bill for the relief of James A. Quillinan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1248); and

H. R. 4413. A bill for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1249).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4180. A bill for the relief of Edward Keating and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251);

H. R. 809. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1252);

H. R. 5596. A bill for the relief of Tommy Huddleston; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1253);

H. R. 5295. A bill for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani; with amendments (Rept. No. 1254); and

H. R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant); with amendments (Rept. No. 1255).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. J. Res 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1256).

INVESTIGATION OF PRIMARIES AND ELECTIONS—SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Privileges and Elections held a meeting this morning and unanimously voted to instruct its chairman to report a resolution, which originates in the committee, regarding the appointment by the Vice President of a special committee of five Senators to make an investigation with respect to primaries and elections. It is customary each 2 years to appoint such committee; the resolution submitted by me is substantially in accordance with the resolution adopted 2 years ago, and every 2 years since 1930. I report the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 235) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1942, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) The extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of United States Senator in 1942 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) The amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign, or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention, held in 1942, at which a candidate for United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) The expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidate; and

(5) Such other matters relating to the election of United States Senators in 1942, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee, under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint,

the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof

SEC. 4. The committee by majority vote may authorize any member of the committee, or any member of a duly authorized subcommittee, to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any member so authorized may hold public hearings, issue subpenas and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, administer oaths and take testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpenas and provide for the service thereof, required by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee, or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate on the first day of the next regular session of the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 1150)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent to file a report from the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, which is part II on Employers' Associations and Collective Bargaining in California. This particular report is entitled "Organized Antiunionism in California Industry Prior to the Passage of the National Labor Relations Act." I urge all Senators who are going away for the holidays and who would like to read something that may throw more light upon the delicate problem which we are going to consider after the expiration of the gentlemen's agreement for a recess, to take this report with them and read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, excerpts from it which begin Pursuant to Senate Resolution 266.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM PART II OF A REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

ON EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA

Introduction

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong., 2d sess.), the committee herein submits an analysis of the economic and historical background of the development of certain labor policies in California industry. The particular policies examined are those antagonistic to trade-unionism and collective bargaining which this committee was authorized to investigate. This is part II of a report which consists of the following 10 parts:

Part I. General introduction.

Part II. Organized antiunionism in California industry prior to the passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

Part III. The disadvantaged status of unorganized labor in California's industrialized agriculture.

Part IV. Employers' associations and their labor policies in California's industrialized agriculture.

Part V. The organization of resistance to collective bargaining in California, 1935–39.

Part VI. A study of labor policies of employers' associations in the Los Angeles area, 1935–39.

Part VII. A study of labor policies of employers' associations in the San Francisco Bay area, 1935–39.

Part VIII. The Associated Farmers of California, Inc.—Its reorganization, policies, and significance, 1935–39.

Part IX. The origin and promotion of recent legislation in California limiting labor's civil rights.

Part X. Conclusions and recommendations.

The nature and scope of the field investigation and hearings, upon which this part II and the succeeding parts are based, are described in part I, which constitutes the general introduction to the entire report.

The history of labor relations in California and to a great extent the history of California's social policy and political development have been a reflection of the struggle between associations of employers and organizations of employees, some permanent and some abortive. To a greater extent than this committee has found elsewhere, associations of employers in California have played a leading role in fixing labor policies, and have been able to impose their influence upon the social and economic structure of the State. For the 35 or 40 years preceding 1933, associations of employers in the two metropolitan centers of the State—San Francisco and Los Angeles—with the active assistance and support of banking and financial interests, successfully maintained a policy of relentless opposition to the recognition of labor unions or collective bargaining. They finally succeeded, in large measure, in imposing this policy not only upon businesses within their respective cities but also upon the economic territory tributary thereto. Their policy of nonrecognition of unions and hostility to collective bargaining became by 1916 the dominant pattern in industrial relations in California. In the last two decades of this period, associations of agricultural employers achieved a controlling influence in the formulation of labor policies in an agricultural system which was rapidly approaching the industrial in many phases of the employment relationship. These agricultural employers' associations adopted the same policy of uncompromising resistance to union organization and fixed it as the pattern for agricultural industry. The large entrepreneurs in both urban and rural industry have exercised the controlling voice in fixing this policy for their respective areas of enterprise. This has made possible the creation of a common front for coordinated and complementary action against existing labor unions and threats of new organization.

The dominance of this pattern of industrial relations was not achieved without years of strife. It meant, for California, intense periods of conflict between unions and employers, alternating with periods when resentment and hostility smoldered beneath the apparently tranquil surface of industrial relations. The policy never brought a real, lasting, and just peace because it was founded on the assumption that the employer was entitled to absolute control over all terms of the employment relation. The implicit denial to employees of any substantial voice in fixing the conditions under which they labored or sought opportunity to earn their livelihood could never result in their wholehearted acceptance, nor could it ever be permanently maintained in the larger texture of American principles and free institutions. The tragic results of this misguided policy of labor relations were revealed in an ever-deepening intensification of a feeling of conflict between the classes in California, in increasingly bitter strikes, and in continued political instability. The history of the unswerving adherence by dominant economic interests to these policies throws light upon repeated labor unrest and civic disunity.

This pattern of industrial relations was not achieved at one time by a concerted and sudden effort; rather, it was achieved by a ceaseless campaign and unremitting vigilance on the part of the employers' associations in which a bewildering and complex variety of antiunion practices was utilized. Strong unions in certain trades or industries had to be broken and stripped of power; constant watch had to be kept lest the workers in such industries form their organizations anew or organize under new banners. Likewise, as changes took place within the economy of California and new classes of wage workers were created, the fight had to be carried to nascent organizations stirring within these newer groups. For example, the increasing need for organization by laborers in industrialized agriculture and the emergence of the motortruck industry as an important feature of the transportation system, presented new problems to employers' associations pledged to the rejection of collective bargaining. In both these fields, low wages and poor working conditions in a disordered labor system provided an incentive to the employees to organize and a motive, on the part of some employers, to resist such organization.

The inclusive character of these employers' associations in California, dominated as they were by a spirit of hostility to effective trade-unionism and collective bargaining, laid the ground work for a tense and complicated pattern of labor relations. Labor unions and employee groups were driven to cooperate with one another to a greater degree, perhaps, than in any other section of the Nation. In California, regrettably, because of this organized antiunionism, industrial employers seemed more nearly arrayed as a class against the exercise of the right of wage earners to organize and bargain collectively than elsewhere. The general strike in San Francisco in 1934 was symptomatic of this situation. Furthermore, unions in California, whenever they were able to achieve a significant stronghold, became conditioned to the necessity of strengthen their position against the expected counterattack from the institutions of organized antiunionism. They sought aggressively to organize workers in related trades or branches of industry and they gave

mutual aid and support to each other even though engaged in different industries and trades. As a result of these practices, the course of labor relations in California, during recent years when union organization gains were made, has been vexed by sympathetic strikes, sweeping organizing drives, and the use of the secondary boycott and so-called "hot cargo" tactics.

The most spectacular instances of this type of response occurred in connection with unions involved in various phases of transportation, with the exception of railroad workers whose collective bargaining position has long been assured by Federal law. Unions of longshoremen, other water-front and maritime employees, and motortruck drivers tried to entrench their newly won position by assisting in the organization of warehousing, processing, and production employees in industries peculiarly dependent upon the forms of transportation in question. The strategic importance of these unions in the transportation industries has constituted a threat, as yet substantially unrealized, to the continued repression of agricultural labor. The unions, operating from their urban strongholds, could challenge organized antiunionism in the hostile rural areas without fear of localized vengeance.

For these reasons, among others, the unions such as those of longshoremen and truck drivers have been the focal point of attack by the employers' associations. Likewise, persistent attempts have been made to outlaw, by court actions or legislative prohibition, such devices as the secondary boycott and the "hot cargo" technique, which labor by cooperative effort has forged to meet organized antiunionism. The unsuccessful State labor initiative of 1938, called proposition No. 1, and the law prohibiting the use of the secondary boycott, recently enacted over Governor Olson's veto, are examples.

Other responses to this well-established and firmly held policy of organized antiunionism, maintained through the employers' associations, were the continued struggles over collective agreements containing measures of union security. Provisions establishing seniority rights, the closed shop, and the hiring hall were sought by the unions. One of the impelling reasons for this insistence was their fear that recognition and bargaining rights, although nominally achieved, were vulnerable to the historically deadly impact of organized antiunionism. The continued maintenance of "belligerent" employers' associations and the continued membership in or financial support of these feared institutions by many employers incited the unions to strive for every measure of security. The repeated attempts of many of these same employer groups to outlaw the closed shop only accentuated the unions' efforts.

Thus, it is evident that the origin, nature, and history of organized antiunionism, as embodied in the belligerent employers' association, is basic to any panoramic survey of the status of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively in California. In providing this background, this part II is divided into two sections. In section 1 there is an analysis of certain economic and historical factors affecting this particular study of employers' associations and collective bargaining. Chapter 1 is an economic analysis of California industry which does not purport to be inclusive. It does serve, however, to bring into focus some of the basic factors which affect the outlines and approach of succeeding parts of the report. It notes the important and significant nature of labor relations in California's agricultural industry, leaving the more detailed discussion of this topic for parts III and IV. It indicates the setting of employment relationships in San Francisco and Los Angeles as the pattern for much of the survey that follows. Chapters 2 and 3 constitute a historical outline of the activity of employers' associations in these two principal urban areas, up to 1933. Except for general characterizations of the form of organization, financing, and leadership of the Industrial Association of San Francisco, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, and the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Los Angeles, which necessarily could not be dated, the material pertains to the years preceding 1933. Section 2 describes the reaction of these associations to section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act and the resurgence of union organization up to 1935.

Conclusion

The continued hostility of organized groups of employers toward trade-unionism and collective bargaining in California's industry predetermined the reaction of employers and employees to the policy embodied in the National Labor Relations Act. Hence, this history gives perspective to succeeding parts of the report which deal with the response of employers to that policy. In addition to this function, however, this history of organized antiunionism, which has persisted for half a century in California, provides a basis for certain conclusions which are relevant to our current national problems and to crises in labor relations which may occur from time to time.

First and foremost, this California industrial history teaches that a democratic government must aggressively maintain adequate safeguards of the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. Employer-employee relationships subject to the complete control of the employer are a breeding ground for economic injustice, industrial unrest, class violence as distinct from group cooperation, and the myriad evils that flow from industrial autocracy. Yet from time to time there are urgings from certain influential quarters that the national labor policy embodied in the National Labor Relations Act should be abandoned or weakened. This political position should be honestly and frankly appraised for what it is, namely, an effort to give renewed license to those who would invade, weaken, or destroy the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. Memories are short. This historical outline should serve to refresh our national recollection at this and other critical times. A familiarity with this type of history should ever deter the Congress from any action by fiat or by failure to appropriate adequate funds to enforce the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act which would result in relaxing the vigilance the Government should exercise over the civil liberties of its citizens.

Should any combination of circumstances in the future bring the right of American labor to organize and bargain collectively to the lowly and unprotected status that marked some stages of California's history, our democracy now grounded in a highly industrialized economy would be in serious danger. A long national experience of which this California history is illustrative gives complete validity to the political conclusion that the power of democratic government must be perpetually on guard to protect the rights of labor.

The events in California's labor relations between 1933 and 1935 demonstrate, furthermore, that effective enforcement of these rights requires more than legislative declaration. The national labor policy embodied in the National Industrial Recovery Act was never actually realized in California, for the reason that institutions and customs long devoted to antiunionism could not be changed without effective legal controls. Organized antiunionism necessitated a vigilant and effectively implemented administration of the national policy. Lacking in these essentials, the act was ineffectual in protecting the employee's right to organize and bargain collectively.

Second, the labor history of California industry prior to 1935 teaches that so long as organized antiunionism remains alive and active it will be able to take advantage of periodically recurring opportunities to damage and thwart our advancing industrial democracy. Organized antiunionism was on the alert to alienate the sympathy of the public and the many enlightened employers who were inclined to favor collective bargaining. This organized hostility dismembered union after union in what was euphoniously termed "a drive to maintain the open shop," which all too often was synonymous for the shop that operated without a collective-bargaining agreement. For a union or a union leader to offend the public taste or to lose in an economic contest meant, in many cases, not only defeat on the particular issue of wages and hours and working conditions but the destruction of any semblance of effective collective bargaining. Here is an explanation for the efforts of trade-unions to obtain the maximum assurance, through various contractual clauses, that their task will be that of representing their membership in collective bargaining, and not that of engaging in a constant struggle for existence. The merits of union-shop clauses, union-security clauses, and other commonly used devices to assure the endurance of collective bargaining, despite the presence of inevitable abuses inherent in any institution, cannot be debated over the conference table or in the legislative chamber without taking cognizance of the dark shadow of organized antiunionism that has made such devices necessary.

The cyclical successes which have often attended the efforts of organized antiunionism should sharpen the discernment of the public and its elected representatives in times when alleged excesses, abuses, or unwise actions of trade-unions or their leaders are paraded before the public of employers. The issue in such situations must always be the correction of proved abuses in a manner that will not weaken the rights of labor to organize and to bargain collectively, with their necessary incidents.

Finally, from this history of antiunionism in California prior to 1935 we may conclude that its organized and conspiratorial activities constitute the most serious aspect of its undemocratic character. That, in the perspective of many decades, one is now privileged to see clearly.

The refusal of an individual company manager or employer to enter wholeheartedly into collective bargaining, or even his use of "unfair labor practices," may be successfully challenged by the administrative process; a change in management due to retirement or other causes may work the cure; a close-range observation of the favorable operation of a collective agreement may produce a change of attitude. Society may overlook the transgressions of the lone offender, unless a powerful individual or a business operation of vast and strategic proportions is involved. Rights, although violated in an isolated case, are commonly respected and customarily enjoyed. The design of the National Labor Relations Act was accommodated to this situation of the individual offender.

But the organized conspiracy of many employers to violate the rights of labor presents a more complicated challenge. If permitted to exist, such a conspiracy constitutes a threat to the whole fabric of industrial democracy. Civil rights are placed in extreme jeopardy; one group, seeking to be the masters, becomes completely set off from those who are cast for the role of slaves. Mutual respect and confidence, cooperation, and all those desirable elements that give stability

to an industrial community cannot exist in an atmosphere foreign to our traditions of the dignity of the individual.

Equally serious is the problem of correction. The normal corrective processes are slow to overcome outmoded habits and concepts when a conspiracy to retain them exists. Law enforcement, geared to dealing with separate violations, may be literally overwhelmed unless provided with more effective weapons. The defiance may spread to envelop a whole community and enlist the forces of local government into a complicity that breeds a break-down of all authority. This process may even be enlarged to apply to a State or region. Then, the National Government is faced with the unpleasant decision of abandoning the policy, allowing it to be flaunted without any peaceable recourse by those whose rights are at stake, or adopting some heavy-handed method of treating the conspirators.

Hence, the organization of employers and related groups to enforce a policy of antiunionism becomes a matter of primary concern to all sincere adherents of sound, democratic government. It is a matter of life or death to trade-unionism. So long as such a policy is permitted to exist in any form in any place, it must be sought out, exposed, and challenged with the appropriate instruments of the Government and public opinion.

Because of this feeling, strongly held, the committee will undertake in subsequent parts of this California report to search out exhaustively the varied manifestations of this antisocial tendency, traditional in California industry, which under the National Labor Relations Act now have become violative of the spirit or letter of national law. The survival of this organized antiunionism, with the passage of years, presents a challenge to democratic government and public opinion that must be met and overcome. To that end, an identification and analysis of its shadowy outlines are a necessary and continuing responsibility of government.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 31, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2339) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2433. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 with respect to the collection of income taxes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2434. A bill to provide for the issuance of flags to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah) introduced Senate bill 2435, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2436. A bill to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorize the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national forest receipts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by exempting from tax the amount paid for admissions to theaters and other activities operated by the War Department or the Navy Department within posts, camps, reservations, and other areas maintained by the Military or Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ANDREWS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 74, line 6, to strike out "seeds", on the same page, line 16, to strike out "seeds,"; and on the same page, line 12, after the colon, to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of such amount shall be used for the purchase of seeds:".

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSES OF CERTAIN AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, day before yesterday I reported from the Committee on Military Affairs Senate Resolution 234 erroneously, and asked for the reference of the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I thought at the time that the resolution had been approved by the Committee on Military Affairs. I have since ascertained that I was mistaken. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for their approval before being referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

FOUR STEPS TO WIN THE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Four Steps To Win the War, delivered by him on March 13, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD BEFORE HOLY NAME SOCIETY OF NEW YORK CUSTOMS OFFICE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the Holy Name Society of the New York Customs Office, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES NEEDED TODAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Policies Needed Today," delivered by him to the Republican State convention at Portland, Maine, on April 1, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY M. S. SZYMCZAK ON INFLATION—WHAT NOW?

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Inflation—What Now? delivered by M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the thirty-first annual convention of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York City, January 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SIXTH COLUMN—ADDRESS BY RICHARD C. PATTERSON, JR.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Sixth Column," delivered by Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, and also excerpts from an article on the same subject published in the recent issue of the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY VAN A. NOMIKOS, SUPREME PRESIDENT, ORDER OF AHEPA

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Van A. Nomikos, supreme president of the Order of Ahepa, at the annual banquet of the organization at the Mayflower Hotel on March 23, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THANKSGIVING DAY DATE—LETTER BY H. S. J. SICKEL

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mr. H. S. J. Sickel relative to the question of the date of Thanksgiving, which appears in the Appendix.]

GLIDER TRAINING—ARTICLE BY FRANK P. WISBAR

[Mr. ROSIER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Gliders for War," written by Frank Paul Wisbar, with Fred Alihoff, and published in Liberty magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR AND THE WAY AHEAD—ARTICLE BY THOMAS BRYANT KENNEDY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of April 1, 1942, containing an article by Thomas Bryant Kennedy, of Chance, Ala., which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself, to introduce a bill and request that it be referred to the appropriate committee. Because of the interest which I think there may be in this measure, I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It is entitled "A bill to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes."

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2435) to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and

Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942."

TITLE I

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the utilization of labor spies, strikebreakers, strikebreaking agencies, oppressive armed guards, industrial munitions, and the perpetration and execution of contracts, conspiracies, combinations, and other conduct in concert hostile to the development of industrial democracy, (1) violates the right of employees to organize, bargain collectively, and engage in concerted activities for their mutual aid and protection; (2) causes and provokes acts of violence, breaches of the peace, and destruction of property, affecting commerce; (3) leads to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce; (4) obstructs the settlement of labor disputes through negotiation and the orderly procedure of collective bargaining, thereby tending to prolong interruption of the free flow of commerce; (5) burdens and obstructs commerce and the free flow of commerce; and (6) interferes with the United States and its agencies in obtaining goods and services pursuant to contract.

(b) The Congress further finds that the use of the channels and instrumentalities of commerce and of the mails for the transportation of goods produced by employers engaged in the activities above referred to, or for the transportation or furnishing of supplies and services for engaging in such activities, tends to spread and perpetuate such activities and the evils resulting therefrom.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the activities referred to in subsection (a) when such activities affect commerce or are engaged in by employers who are engaged in commerce, in the production of goods for commerce, or in furnishing goods or services to the United States and its agencies pursuant to contract, and to prohibit the use of the channels and instrumentalities of commerce and of the mails for the transportation of goods produced by employers who engage in such activities, and for the transportation or furnishing of supplies and services for engaging in such activities.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. Whenever used in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, corporations, associations, business trusts, receivers, trustees, or legal representatives, but shall not include any State or political subdivision thereof.

(b) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or Alaska.

(c) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States, or between any State and any place outside thereof, or between points within the same State but through any place outside thereof, or within the District of Columbia.

(d) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(e) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, in relation to an employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any labor organization, or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(f) The term "employee" includes any individual employed by an employer and any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of or in connection with any labor dispute or has been terminated in contravention of any State or Federal law.

(g) The term "labor dispute" includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure, or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee.

(h) The terms "engage in," "employ," and "utilize" include to suffer or permit to be used.

(i) The term "industrial munitions" means any bomb, grenade, canister, or shell, designed to be projected or capable of being projected by explosive or mechanical force, by hand, or otherwise, and containing, or capable of emitting, any tear gas, sickening gas, or nauseating gas; any shotgun having a barrel of less than 25 inches in length; or any weapon which shoots or is designed to shoot, automatically or semiautomatically, more than one shot without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger.

(j) The term "to furnish" includes to sell, lease, rent, lend, or give, and to supply funds for the acquisition of.

(k) The terms "sale" or "sell" each include any sale, exchange, contract to sell, consignment for sale, shipment for sale, or other disposition.

(l) The term "labor spy" means any person who, for any compensation, promise of compensation, or other inducement, and whether done as a separate duty or as an additional duty in connection with other work, engages in industrial espionage, and includes any person engaged, in whole or in part, in the business of hiring, recruiting, enlisting, or inducing any person to engage in industrial espionage, or in preparing or transmitting the report of a labor spy.

(m) The term "industrial espionage" means reporting, securing and reporting, or attempting to secure and report to an employer, directly or indirectly—

(1) information with respect to the plans or activities of any of his employees or any labor organization with reference to self-organization or mutual aid or protection, or with respect to the identity, number, or composition of the membership of any labor organization, or with respect to the affiliation of any of his employees or prospective employees with a labor organization, without the express consent of such employees or prospective employees, or of such labor organization, as the case may be.

(n) The term "strikebreaker" means any person who, during or in anticipation of a labor dispute, is hired—

(1) to replace any regular employee whose work ceases as a consequence of or in connection with such labor dispute if such person receives or is offered a wage, salary, or other compensation from any source (including transportation to the place of employment, board, lodgings, or other facilities) at a rate in excess of the rate received by or offered in good faith to such regular employee immediately prior to the cessation of his work.

(o) The term "strikebreaking agency" means any person engaged, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, in the business of hiring, recruiting, enlisting, or inducing any person to act as a strikebreaker or labor spy, or in preparing or transmitting the report of a labor spy.

(p) The term "armed" means equipped with, or carrying upon one's person, any firearm or other dangerous weapon.

(q) The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

(r) The term "goods" includes wares, materials, products, supplies, and equipment, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character or any part or ingredient thereof, and includes ships and marine equipment.

(s) The term "produced" means produced, manufactured, mined, packed, assembled, handled, or in any other manner worked on; and for the purposes of this act goods shall be deemed to have been produced in or about a place of employment if employees in or about such place of employment are employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, packing, assembling, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof.

(t) The terms "includes" and "including" when used in a definition contained in this section shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined.

(u) The term "intimidate" means to cause in the mind of a person a reasonable apprehension of violence or damage to him or any member of his family and the term "injure" shall include any damage or actionable wrong to the person or his business, occupation, employment, or source of income.

(v) The term "employers' association" shall include all organizations or associations of employers and all organizations or associations of others supported financially by them, formal or informal, which are engaging in representing, advising, or acting on behalf of employers in labor relations or labor difficulties.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this act, it shall be an oppressive labor practice for any person in any State—

(1) To employ or utilize any labor spy.

(2) To employ or utilize any strikebreaker or strikebreaking agency.

(3) To pay or agree to pay any compensation or gratuity, directly, or indirectly, to, or to make any contracts or payments for the services of, any person who (A) with the authority, knowledge, or consent of his employer, acts as a private guard or peace officer while armed and while absent from the premises or place of business of his employer (except when such person is engaged in the immediate pursuit of an individual committing a crime on such premises), whether or not such person holds a commission from any State or political subdivision thereof: *Provided*, That it shall not be an oppressive labor practice to employ armed private guards or peace officers to the extent reasonably necessary for the protection of persons and property on the premises of the employer or for the pursuit and arrest of persons committing crimes on such property and for protection against theft of goods or money in transit; or (B) acts as a private guard or peace officer during, or in anticipation of, a labor dispute when his employer knows or has reason to know that he has been convicted, under the laws of the United States or of any State, of a crime of homicide or assault with a deadly or dangerous weapon.

(4) (A) To possess industrial munitions in or about any place of employment in or about which goods are being produced for commerce, or for any person engaged in a labor dispute to furnish, directly or indirectly, industrial munitions to any person or to

any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof: *Provided*, That the possession, sale, or disposition of industrial munitions in the regular course of business by any manufacturer or importer thereof, or dealer therein, shall not be deemed to be an oppressive labor practice: *And provided further*, That the possession of industrial munitions by banking institutions or trust companies shall not be deemed to be an oppressive labor practice; or (B) to utilize industrial munitions in connection with any labor dispute, or to possess industrial munitions for the purpose of utilizing them in connection with any labor dispute.

(5) To combine, conspire, or act in concert with any person, injure willfully, or intimidate by the use of force or violence or threat thereof, any person or persons for the purpose of interfering with the exercise of their right to organize, form, join, act as members of, or support labor organizations, or their right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, or their right to engage in concerted activities which are not in violation of law, for the purpose of collective bargaining, including, without limitation of the foregoing, the right to picket peacefully, assemble, and petition for a redress of grievances.

(6) To combine, conspire, or act in concert with any other person, formulate, maintain, or use a blacklist or any other method of identification of persons who are exercising their right to organize, join, or act as members of, or support labor organizations or their right to bargain collectively for the purpose of preventing them from obtaining or retaining employment or for the purpose of causing discrimination against them in the terms or conditions of employment.

(7) To negotiate or enter into any contract, agreement, or understanding, or renewal thereof, oral or written, whereby an employer agrees to refuse to engage in collective bargaining with his employees through their chosen representatives, or giving recognition to labor organizations, provided that this provision shall not apply to a collective agreement with a bona fide labor organization.

(8) To demand or receive of an individual employee a pledge, agreement, or understanding which restricts the freedom of such employee to strike or join a labor organization, or abrogates his freedom of choice in matters of representation.

(9) To act in concert with any two or more employers to injure willfully, or intimidate by the use of force or violence or threats thereof, any employer or members of any labor organization for the purpose of preventing such employers or employees from entering into or abiding by a bona fide collective-bargaining agreement.

(10) To attempt to commit or to conspire to commit any of the oppressive labor practices prescribed in the foregoing subsections 1 through 9 of this section.

(11) To act as an officer or employee of an employers' association, with knowledge that, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act, the association, through its authorized officers, acting under oath, has not registered its identity with the National Labor Relations Board or submitted, within the 12 months preceding, the following types of information as the Board may require by suitable regulations:

The name of the employers' association.

The address at which it has its principal office.

The names and titles of its officers and members.

The date of its establishment or organization.

A copy of its constitution or bylaws, if any.

The locale of its activities.

A detailed financial statement of its expenditures, including, without limitation, of the foregoing, its contributions to other persons or organizations.

The source of its income in detail.

(b) For the purpose of paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (a), proof that any person paid or agreed to pay any compensation or gratuity, directly or indirectly, to, or made a contract or payment for the services of, any person who, during the period covered by such contract, agreement, or payment, or who within 120 days before or after any such agreement, contract, or payment acted as a private guard or peace officer while armed and while absent from the premises or place of business of his employer, shall be prima facie evidence that his employer authorized, had knowledge of, or consented to such action.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person, after the expiration of 90 days from the date of the enactment of this act—

(a) To engage in any oppressive labor practice in or about any place of employment in or about which goods are being produced for commerce;

(b) To engage in any oppressive labor practice (1) affecting commerce or (2) involving or affecting employees who are, or immediately prior to the cessation of their work as a consequence of or in connection with a labor dispute were, employed in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce;

(c) To furnish any person with industrial munitions or services for engaging in any oppressive labor practice affecting commerce or involving or affecting employees employed in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce; or

(d) To discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any employee or prospective employee because he has made any statement with respect to purported violations of the act, or has made any complaint to his employer or to any other person or agency with respect to purported violations of the act, or has filed any complaint with the Department of Labor or the Department of Justice or any other governmental agency charging a violation of the act, or has testified or is about to testify with respect to any violation of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person, after the expiration of 90 days from the date of the enactment of this act—

(1) To use the mails or the channels or instrumentalities of commerce to furnish or offer to any person with industrial munitions or services for engaging in any oppressive labor practice.

(2) To use the mails or the channels or the instrumentalities of commerce to procure industrial munitions or services for engaging in any oppressive labor practice.

PENALTIES

SEC. 6. Any person who violates any of the provisions of sections 4 or 5 shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

COURT PROCEEDINGS AND REVIEWS

SEC. 7. The district courts of the United States, and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, shall have exclusive jurisdiction of violations of this title, and shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain such violations. Any prosecution or suit under this title may be brought in the district wherein the defendant is found or is an inhabitant or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any other district of which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found. Judgments and decrees so rendered shall be subject to review as provided in sections 128 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, secs. 225 and 347).

ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of Labor that any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of this title, he may bring an action in the name of the United States in the proper district court of the United States, or the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin or restrain such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or decree or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

(b) No action to enjoin or restrain any such acts or practices shall be brought except by the Secretary of Labor. The provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 29, secs. 101–115), shall not be applicable to any such action, but the rights, benefits, and protection contained in the provisions of such act shall not be affected in any other manner by any provision of this title.

(c) The Secretary of Labor may transmit such evidence as may be available concerning such acts or practices to the appropriate United States attorney, or to the Attorney General, who may institute appropriate proceedings under this title.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of Labor upon probable cause shown may investigate any facts, conditions, practices, or matters the investigation of which may be necessary or proper to determine whether any person has violated any provisions of this title.

(b) For the purpose of any investigation by the Secretary of Labor under subsection (a), the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act as amended (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents), shall be applicable to such investigation in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of investigations by the Federal Trade Commission under such act as amended.

SEC. 10. No provision of this title, and no investigation, prosecution, or suit instituted under this title shall in any manner limit any of the powers or duties of the National Labor Relations Board under the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 449).

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 11. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the bill is for the purpose of eliminating by sanctions of penal law that conduct by a powerful minority of employers and their associates which interferes seriously with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively and thereby endangers the healthy development of our industrial democracy.

BASIS FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE ACTION

I wish to emphasize to the Senate that this bill is not hasty or intemperate legislation based upon prejudice, emotion, or guess work. The necessity and desirability of such a measure is manifest in

a massive record of undeniable facts unearthed in an intensive investigation, lasting over 4 years, by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman. This subcommittee was authorized in 1936 to investigate violations of rights of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. The public record of its inquiry, the last volume of which is now being printed, comprises eighty-odd volumes. It includes approximately 30,000 pages of published testimony and exhibits which will number in excess of 15,000. Over a thousand witnesses were publicly examined under oath. The greater portion of witnesses were employers and their agents, officers of employers' associations detective agency managers, and private and public police officers. There was considerable testimony from employees, labor union representatives, unaffiliated observers of various incidents, and expert witnesses.

The evidence concerning alleged violations of labor's civil liberties was largely provided by the testimony and acknowledged written documents of those charged with complicity. Persons attacked or accused at the hearings were given an opportunity to respond in person on the matter at issue, so long as the committee was in session, and thereafter to submit their replies in writing for incorporation into the record. Any witness who desired could be attended by counsel. After examination all witnesses were permitted to submit additional statements or additional data, if they desired, and all such material submitted during the course of the hearings which was pertinent to the inquiry was admitted to the subcommittee's record. Exhibits prepared by the subcommittee's staff with regard to the organizations under investigation were submitted to representatives of the latter for their perusal and correction. In all hearings upon a labor dispute or violent clash, representatives of all parties concerned were called to the stand and given an opportunity to confront other witnesses involved and reply to accusations. The ground covered was Nation-wide in scope, ranging from the mines and mills of Alabama and Kentucky and the great industrial areas of the East and Middle West to the factories and fields of California and Arizona. There is hardly any State or geographical area that is not represented in this list of locales where sordid violations of the rights of labor occurred.

To summarize this immense record compiled in this painstaking fashion and its findings thereon, the subcommittee previously has submitted 11 reports. Recently it filed with this body the first of 10 installments of its twelfth report, which will treat its concluding investigation on the west coast in late 1939 and early 1940. Naturally, these reports include in full detail an official summary of the findings of the subcommittee on specific types and sources of violations and interference with the rights of labor. I venture the assertion that no legislative has ever been presented to this body in its long history with any more substantial factual record grounding the propriety and necessity of the legislation proposed.

It is upon this record and these reports that the subcommittee bases one of its major recommendations for legislative action, embodied in the Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942, which I have just introduced. The substantive background of the act, in my opinion, deserves further comment, especially in light of the heated controversy and the passions which have been aroused, not only in this Chamber, but all over the United States, in this critical hour of the country's history.

SUBSTANTIVE BACKGROUND OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

From its beginning the subcommittee deemed its principal function to be the examination and reporting of instances of resistance to and subversion of the fundamental national labor policy favoring collective bargaining for interstate industries, which was established in the National Labor Relations Act and confirmed by the Supreme Court in repeated decisions as the law of the land. The subcommittee has felt that the circumstances surrounding the passage of Senate Resolution 266, which authorized its investigations, properly gave this direction to its efforts. In reporting that resolution favorably to the Senate in May 1936, the full Committee on Education and Labor declared:

> The purpose of the investigation contemplated in Senate Resolution 266 is to acquire knowledge of the full extent to which the rights of labor to organization as established in the Labor Disputes Act is being denied and the extent to which civil liberties are interfered with.

The two phases of the subcommittee's work as expressed in the resolution proved to be closely related. Profound study of undue interference with the rights of labor did not result in overlooking violations of the rights of free speech and assembly; on the contrary, it led to selection and consideration of those violations of constitutional liberties which have the greatest import and significance for the perilous times in which we live. Political and religious conflicts today are less productive of infringements of these fundamental civil rights in this country than struggles over economic problems in the field of industrial relations. Indeed, it may be said that the most spectacular violations of civil liberty coming within the purview of the subcommittee's mandate proved upon investigation to have their roots in economic conflicts of interest; and that any concerted and prolonged rejection of the principles of collective bargaining leads inevitably to the invasion of constitutional liberty as surely as it does to embittered if not violent protest from the side of labor. Continually the subcommittee has had in mind that free association and self-organization are simply the result of the exercise of the fundamental rights of free speech and assembly. An attack on these primary constitutional rights will prevent organization of labor and the processes of collective bargaining; an attack on the latter will lead inevitably to infringement of the primary rights from which they spring.

Decisions of the Supreme Court have confirmed the subcommittee in the view which it has consistently held concerning the essential nature of the rights described in its resolution. The right of self-organization and collective bargaining is a complex whole, embracing the various elements of meetings, speeches, peaceful picketing, the printing and distribution of pamphlets, news, and argument, all of which, however, are traceable, in the final analysis, to the fundamental liberaties of expression and assembly. So compounded, the right of self-organization and collective bargaining is fundamental, is basic, being one phase of the process of free association essential to the democratic way of life.

Following the mandate of the Senate resolution and in conformity with its proven conception, the subcommittee directed its investigations and reports to those activities which were outstanding as oppressive labor practices, ranging from extremes of subtlety and deceit to the utmost in barbarity, which were used to frustrate the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act and destroy the civil liberties of labor which are inherent in the right to organize and bargain collectively.

Early reports of the subcommittee submitted to the Senate in 1937 and 1939 analyzed certain of these practices in great detail. The subcommittee's first report revealed the widespread use of labor spies by employers, and particularly the indefensible and highly profitable industrial espionage services supplied by commercial detective agencies. The second report disclosed the evils and incendiary nature of strikebreaking services in labor disputes and described commercialized strikebreaking and strikeguard agencies. The third report discussed the use of private industrial police as an instrument of opposition to collective bargaining and found that the activities of such private police in the field of labor relations resulted in bloodshed and brutality and the usurpation in many instances of public authority itself. The fourth report analyzed the use of industrial munitions and the accumulation of a large private arsenal in anticipation of labor troubles.

These four reports provided the basis for the subcommittee's legislative recommendations submitted to Congress on May 28, 1939, in the form of Senate bill No. 1970, which was entitled the "Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1939." This bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor; lengthy hearings were held on the bill in May and June of 1939 and it was reported favorably by the full committee. It passed the Senate with amendments on May 27, 1940, by a vote of 47 to 20. In the House it was referred to the Committee on Labor but was not reported out before the end of the session.

But these four distinct practices were not all of the oppressive labor practices disclosed. The subcommittee found that organized antiunionism, functioning primarily through conspiracies of employers or persons financed by employers,

had devised and regularly engaged in a number of additional activities which may rightly be called conspiracies. Indeed, as its inquiry lengthened into years, the subcommittee became more and more impressed with the fact that the wellsprings of resistance to collective bargaining, of which a wide variety of oppressive labor practices were the bitter fruit, were deliberate combinations of employers who belligerently fought the advance of collective bargaining and industrial democracy. In the second phase of its work, the subcommittee examined carefully the origins and conduct of a series of employers' associations, and their affiliates, organized to a greater or lesser degree for the purpose of resisting the policy of collective bargaining as embodied in the national law. Four reports entitled "Labor Policies of Employers' Associations" set forth elaborate and complete studies of the organization, financing, labor relations, and activities of:

First. An employer group in the Nation-wide metal trades industry which is the arsenal of our tools for war production, the National Metal Trades Association;

Second. An employer group in the metropolitan area of Cleveland, Ohio, typical of diversified industrial operations in the East and Middle West;

Third. The National Association of Manufacturers;

Fourth, but by no means least, the so-called Little Steel companies of the steel industry and various affiliated citizens' committees in the area of their operation, which industry, needless to say, furnishes the principal material for war production.

No proposal for legislation affecting unionism can be other than incomplete unless it takes into account the contents of these reports on employers' associations. These matters of public record show that it is a habit, indeed, a function, of certain types of employer groups to kindle fires by propaganda and other devices, thereby lighting the way for legislative restriction of labor's rights. Yet these associations continue to defy the national labor policy and to carry on organized assaults on those rights of labor through labor espionage, company unions, blacklists, strikebreaking systems, vigilantism, and various forms of conspiratorial coercion against labor.

Nor is this a new phenomenon. This type of organization functioned long before the first World War. They were the subject of extended comment in the report of the Industrial Relations Commission in 1915. They escaped legislative treatment in the flurry of excitement of the first World War. They led the fight against labor's rights after that war, culminating in the great open-shop or antiunion drive which weakened organized labor during the 1920's until it was a feeble and ineffective instrument for collective bargaining.

These organizations mobilized the opposition to and defied the policy of section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act; they fought the National Labor Relations Act both before and after its passage in the Congress and its confirmation in the courts. Their lawyers declared the law unconstitutional in advance. Since that act was passed and upheld by the United States Supreme Court, these subversive conspiracies have dedicated a large part of their effort to its circumvention and avoidance, and, all too often, to its flagrant violation. There can be no doubt on the record of this subcommittee's investigation that they have functioned consistently to foster, develop, and direct hysteria against trade unions and collective bargaining. Yes; they are functioning so even now, after Pearl Harbor and after we have declared war. I think some of the investigating committees of the Senate which still have power, and which are interested in winning the war against our enemies abroad, instead of fostering and developing internecine warfare here on the domestic front, could serve the country and the Congress by utilizing their power to ascertain just exactly what function these organizations are now performing and what their ulterior purposes may be.

On the wave of that false hysteria they will seek—yes; are now seeking—to secure legislation restricting labor's fundamental rights. But they do not cease their own consistent drive to obstruct and destroy effective trade-unionism by their own oppressive acts, and they will not do so until constrained by severe penal law consistently and fearlessly enforced.

Mr. President, I stated that it is my firm conviction after these long years of study of this problem that the belligerent employers' associations represent a minority, but because I say that, do not underestimate the economic power which they wield in the Nation today, and, like the Bourbons of France, they have learned nothing from either the events that have taken place in this country or the events that have occurred in the world at large.

The subcommittee's last report, devoted to Employers' Associations and Collective Bargaining in California, the first installment of which has been submitted, shows an astonishing interaction of various antiunion associations in California, conducting oppressive labor practices on a scale that staggers belief, unless one will take the time to read the record of the subcommittee. The report will show that as early as 1938, long before national defense became a daily concern, these organizations then sought through deceiving third-party groups, such as the Associated Farmers, Inc., of California, to foist upon labor through State law some of the same unconstitutional unfair legislation that is being urged as national legislation today.

NEW PROVISIONS ADDED TO ORIGINAL OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES ACT

Until today the subcommittee had not suggested any specific legislation to deal with the belligerent employers' associations except insofar as the original Oppressive Labor Practices Act dealt with some of the major activities of these associations. That original bill has now been amplified in the bill introduced today to include, in addition to the four originally proscribed, certain oppressive labor practices which its reports and record disclose to have been widely carried on by various "belligerent" employers' associations, and to attack such joint employer action directly.

Section 3 (a) of the old bill, S. 1970, in four subsections treated labor espionage, strikebreaking services, private police excesses and the use of industrial munitions. Seven new subsections have been added to this list of oppressive labor practices in section 3 (a) of the bill I introduced this morning on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. New oppressive labor practices proscribed include antiunion vigilantism, blacklisting, employer agreements to refrain from collective bargaining, so-called "yellow-dog" contract practices, and employer coercion of employers or employees to prevent them from practicing collective bargaining. In addition to prohibiting the personal participation of employers and their agents in these specific pursuits, the proposed bill strikes at the heart of "belligerent" employers' association activity hostile to the national labor relations law.

A new subsection makes it an oppressive labor practice to enter into a conspiracy to commit any of the specific oppressive labor practices proscribed. Finally, a penalty is placed upon the officers or employees of any employers' association, whether it is belligerent or wholly proper, which has not supplied to the National Labor Relations Board certain specific types of information which will assist that Board in checking upon organized employer activity in contravention of the National Labor Relations Act.

Thus, in this bill, we present to this body a concrete legislative recommendation designed to eliminate for once and for all the specific oppressive labor practices affecting interstate commerce, which our inquiry shows to have been conducted by employers and their organized institutions. We expect to submit other legislative measures of an entirely different character arising out of other phases of its investigations. These need not be considered here and now.

REASONS FOR PROPOSING THIS LEGISLATION NOW

Throughout the last session of Congress, the senior Senator from Utah and I deferred a reintroduction of the "Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1939." We postponed action despite the fact that this bill had been passed in the Senate in its last session by a vote of over two to one. Nor did we publicly amplify the legislation previously introduced to include those additional outrageous practices that became more clearly defined in the subcommittee's later investigations.

Mr. President, the troubled state of international affairs demanded that the Congress devote its time earnestly and intensely to the debate and development of our foreign policy and the building up of national defense. I shared a disposition to defer any domestic legislation that might divert effort from the national drive toward a well-armed status. I shared a feeling that a vigorous encouragement to a greater use of voluntary mediation and arbitration measures was preferable to a resort to new labor

legislation, and the controversies which it might engender and inject into our national scene.

But now, without any action or encouragement by your subcommittee, or by the senior Senator from Utah or myself, the attention of the Congress and this body has been directly and expressly turned to a series of diverse and complicated measures bearing upon employer-employee relationships.

Mr. President, in an industrial nation those relations are vital to the smooth functioning of an economy even in time of peace. In time of war against nations which are using and utilizing their every productive facility and capacity, employer and employee relations and the ultimate decisions made by the Congress and the people of the country on that subject, may have a large determination in whether we win or lose the war.

Hours and days of the time of Congress and its committees are consumed with discussions of labor legislation. Proposals are pending before the Senate designed to treat labor relations with both emergency and permanent measures. In such a situation I believe we would be derelict in our responsibilities if the Senator from Utah and I did not request—nay, demand; nay, insist upon—a studied consideration of the Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942. If the Nation has time for consideration of any labor legislation, then, by all means, I propose that the bill shall be given consideration and shall receive action one way or the other by this body.

The bill is designed to inhibit those practices which are so reprehensible that they should long ago have been outlawed. Some of these practices have been sharply condemned by various congressional investigating committees covering a period of nearly one-half a century. Yet the practices still persist, and their utilization has grown apace with the growth of our industrial economy, and particularly with the growth of the unit size of our industrial operation.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ROSIER. I wish to inquire if the subcommittee in its investigations made any study of the controls of publicity in our country through the newspaper columnist and the broadcaster? It is evident, as I read the newspapers and listen to the radio commentators, that we get very largely only one side of this question. Did the subcommittee's investigation disclose that there is a studied and systematic effort to suppress one side and to exploit and overmagnify the other side?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The subcommittee made no general inquiry in the field which the Senator's question covers. A reading of the reports of the committee, if the Senator should ever find time, will disclose that we made a very careful study of the publicity and public-opinion-shaping techniques of some of these so-called belligerent employers' associations.

Also, in areas where industrial conflict had taken place, we made some inquiries to see how that policy worked through their affiliates in the field when an industrial conflict, a strike, or a lockout was in progress.

Mr. ROSIER. Did that investigation show that employers' associations more or less controlled the publicity in many phases?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President; I do not think I can say that. However, it showed that employers are well equipped to see that a large, diversified, and subtle type of propaganda gets into the stream of public information and communication.

Upon the introduction of the previous bill in the Senate in 1939, it was stated that it was a measure which was long overdue. The practices it defines have long since passed beyond the pale of public approval or acquiescence. They have been condemned as pernicious, evil activity by administrative bodies and by courts; and it is now time to designate them as criminal offenses with appropriate penalties. The Senate itself concurred in this opinion when it passed the bill in 1940. In passing this bill the Congress would place collective bargaining securely in the framework of law and practice. It would act under the authority of the interstate commerce clause. It would strike down permanently, and not by a temporary measure, those barbarous or deceitful practices and devices which for many decades have been used to poison the stream of industrial labor relations and thwart the rights of labor as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

If the bill were enacted into law, I know of no act of Congress which would do more to assure the men who labor that their organizations and their efforts to exercise their rights and better their economic condition will be preserved from private attack and aggression. The bill would symbolize as nothing else their stake in the democracy we are striving to defend from totalitarian aggression. I insist that such an assurance is needed now to reassure the men who labor that the Nation is not going to yield to the clamorous minority which for the past 6 years, in the Congress and out, has been seeking to subvert, eliminate, or substantially weaken the Federal guaranty of collective bargaining as written upon the statute books of this Nation and confirmed in decision after decision of the highest court of the land.

It is important that labor be given this assurance. In the past few months many of the spokesmen for labor have expressed the fear that the present emergency or the post-war period will be used by antilabor groups to deprive labor of its rights. I believe that this fear is more widely held than the newspapers and the propaganda which we receive through the mails give us reason to believe. If anything is damaging to our unified effort in this time of national peril, it is the creation or existence of a feeling on the part of those upon whom the Nation depends for our war production that the emergency will be used to deprive them of their rights, to drive their wages out of line with living costs, or to expose them to vindictive attacks of employers, some of whom have never made any pretense of concealing their dislike of collective bargaining and their bitter hatred for organizations of workingmen.

Mr. President, I have great respect for my colleagues in this body, as I am sure every one of them knows full well. I have great respect for those who occupy positions in the House of Representatives, at the other end of the Capitol; but I say, Mr. President, that in total war the domestic front is as vital as, if not more vital than, the military front. Unless the men chosen by the people to represent them in this august legislative body and the one at the other end of the Capitol have the intestinal fortitude in this time of peril and crisis to stand up against the storms which rage about us, we may well have fear as to the ultimate survival of democracy in this troubled world. If we do not stop yielding to every wind that blows through the mail, telegrams, over the radio, and in newspaper columns, how can we expect the people to have confidence in the men who are discharging the responsibility of making democracy function in this war crisis?

Mr. President, unless something is done to stop group from being turned against group on the domestic front, unless something is done to unify the Nation sincerely, fundamentally, and down to its core, we may see developing in the next few months, as the military situation continues adverse or deteriorates even further, a division and internecine warfare at home which will destroy this Nation's chance for victory on the field of battle.

The existence of a state of emergency does not make it less desirable to enact a law which would outlaw practices long since condemned by all responsible persons, employers and employees alike. Indeed, the reverse is true. For, in time of emergency when labor is called upon for sacrifices and discipline, the failure to enact such an obviously desirable law can only be interpreted by labor as an indication of bad faith, and evidence confirming its secret fears that plans are afoot to strip it of its rights and privileges. In this connection it should be noted that, while the subcommittee had to overcome every sort of obstruction in unearthing the facts, it could elicit no reasoned justification for the oppressive labor practices exposed, either from the witnesses at legislative hearings or during debate on the floor of the Senate when the bill was under consideration by this body.

It should be remembered—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—that the countries against which we are fighting have eliminated all vestiges of trade-unionism or civil rights. If we in this Congress indicate in any degree that it is our intention or design to refuse protection to the growth of bona fide trade-unionism and industrial democracy, we deprive the Nation of one of its greatest sources of internal and spiritual strength, a feeling on the part of all that they are truly defending a democracy. I believe that the passage of this bill would do a great deal for the morale of labor, in addition to its other obvious benefits, and thereby hasten our ultimate victory.

Mr. President, I do not want anyone within the sound of my voice to draw the conclusion from what I have said that I think the morale of labor is bad. On the contrary, I was told by one of the highest labor authorities in the Government that the morale of labor is so high, and it is functioning so well, that when the morale division of the Army sent out officers to whip up and improve the morale of labor it was found that the morale of labor was so much better than the morale of the officers that the Army is now practicing a rapid rotation of officers in order that they may get morale from labor instead of giving it to labor.

Equally important is the necessity for forging those strong legal tools that assure a vigorous expansion of collective bargaining, free from the insidious and brutal labor practices which often render it impossible.

Those who sincerely wish to promote the war effort through a maximum industrial production free from work stoppages caused by industrial disputes will favor a quick and vigorous extension of collective bargaining to the so-called war industries themselves. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the record of the subcommittee shows beyond peradventure that from the time of the initial growth and advancement of this country the segment of our economy or industrial structure which we normally and usually think of as being the heart of the war industries has been the center of the antiunion, anticollective bargaining forces of this Nation. The so-called war industries are now only about 30 or 40 percent unionized, according to conservative estimates which I have obtained. Many of our vital plants are lacking in the employer-employee machinery conducive to an avoidance of or a settlement of disputes that may, regardless of any law, lead to work stoppages or inefficiency.

The voluntary collective agreement between employer and union containing provisions for voluntary mediation and arbitration before strikes or lock-outs is now recognized, I believe, by the ablest students of the question as the best possible insurance against work stoppages. Every such collective agreement is a pillar in the arsenal of democracy.

Every absence of a collective-bargaining agreement, every refusal to bargain collectively in a genuine, sincere way, constitutes a threat to production for national defense. In the war industries the situation is particularly serious. Powerful groups having dominant positions in the war industries have for years devoted their time, their money, their energy, and their great influence to prevent the exercise of labor's rights, to avoid collective bargaining, and to violate the law of the land which has been on the statute books since 1935. This is not a loose statement; this is not a figment of my imagination. The record of the subcommittee shows that a large percentage of the companies involved in strikes during the past 2 years, which have been officially listed as having a part in war production, have been guilty of violations of the civil rights of their employees and recalcitrant in their attitude toward our national labor policy.

I am peculiarly aware of the dangerous consequences of the past conduct of these companies and their all too present attitude. In the course of the work of the subcommittee I have seen the hearing room grow tense with the recital of past wrongs. I have seen the deep bitterness which such policies of labor relations inevitably bring in their train. A refusal to bargain collectively in good faith is of itself an affront and insult to the dignity and self-respect of employees. It rankles. More than that, it never stands alone, because it must be implemented by devices of repression, espionage, company unions, discrimination, and, ultimately, the purchase and private use of arms. Opposition to collective bargaining and the use of such repressive measures poison the employer-employee relationship. This poison-embittered atmosphere between employer and employee exists in large and important sectors of our war production. We cannot move too rapidly, now that this subject has been forced upon the attention of Congress, to outlaw those oppressive labor practices which, in large part, are responsible for such dissension. Only in that way, in my judgment, can real collective bargaining be expanded and used effectively.

Mr. President, governmental policies and machinery for mediation and arbitration will be more successful if bulwarked by this legislation. Conspiracies to avoid collective bargaining will be vulnerable to swift and severe attack if we pass this bill. Cooling-off periods, voluntary or mandatory, must not become heating-up periods. One of the major causes of strikes in war industries has been the desire of many unions to obtain what they call union-security guaranties, which certain employers have refused to grant. It is suggested from many quarters that trade unions should lay aside their quest for these union-security provisions in collective agreements at this time when conditions of labor demand are so advantageous. Those union-security clauses in large measure are sought by the rank and file to protect them and their rights from the depredations and injury caused by the very oppressive labor practices condemned in this bill. By passing this bill, Congress can promote the national defense and the war effort by outlawing, for all time, those unfair and undemocratic threats to union security.

In my opinion, such action would diminish substantially the number and bitterness of disputes over union-security provisions. Many unions would feel that the present necessity was lessened; many employers would feel that there was no further point in preserving their economic opportunities by using oppressive labor practices to shake off genuine and effective collective bargaining. The closed-shop, open-shop, and kindred problems are of little concern in England. Why? Because for years in that country employers have accepted collective bargaining as the traditional form of employer-employee relationship.

Finally, there is a supreme reason for favorable action on this bill now. I urge that the Oppressive Labor Practice Act of 1942 be passed as a substantial measure of protection to that very democratic form of society we are dedicated to and are striving to preserve. An industrialized society requires us to implement our basic constitutional guaranties of free speech and assembly to their modern economic equivalent, the right to organize and bargain collectively. In my opinion, a free and strong trade union movement, democracy, and freedom from a totalitarian dictatorship are synonymous. Fascism or nazi-ism cannot exist alongside of strong trade unions. Let no real American be deceived on that score. The first step, the sure sign, the essential, the initial aggression of every dictatorship that seeks to destroy all democratic institutions is to weaken trade-unionism. If Senators doubt that, let them take time to read the story of the rise of fascism in Italy and nazi-ism in Germany. When it is weakened, labor loses its rights to protest effectively against economic underprivilege, to assemble and organize for joint action, and to bargain collectively with the managers of industry, be they private or public. When trade-unions are weak, a free industry, a free press, a free church, and a free people can look for eventual enslavement.

The world has witnessed an historical march of Fascist totalitarian dictatorship that requires brief analysis at this time. Modern fascism was born in Italy for the primary purpose of striking down the trade-unions of that nation. The agent was a renegade radical, Benito Mussolini. It was given new impetus when industrial tycoons of Germany paid vast sums to one Adolf Hitler, so that he might break the backs of the great trade-unions of Germany. A confused and panicky Dolfuss, of Austria, opened the door for a German Fascist domination of Europe by blindly turning the guns of his Government against the common housing projects of the trade-unions that were the only strong bulwark between him, his people, and the Nazi assassin. Fascism rode into Spain on the wings of a bloody civil war, initiated by a clique who refused to accept the long-delayed reforms of a government inspired by the trade-unions of Spain. The heart of democratic France to resist was broken when its millions of trade-union workers became dispirited over the treachery of venal politicians, patriot profiteers, and Fascist-minded military has-beens.

What is this lesson of history written so recently in this blood-bathed world? It is that the life of democracy, now threatened by these same forces which confront us across the sea and at home, depends upon the preservation and protection of trade-unions and collective bargaining both in times of foreign war or domestic emergency. I plead, Mr. President, not only with those who are personally or directly interested in labor's rights; I beseech all of those who have any stake in freedom—industrialists, newspaper editors, columnists, radio commentators, churchmen, and just plain citizens; I plead, indeed, to all men of good will. I ask that we rivet tight the armor of protection to our great trade-union movement and the institution of collective bargaining. Let us now, on the threshold of an era packed

with unknown peril to our Nation and our freedom, declare it to be a national policy that we will not tolerate the outstanding source of age-old tyranny in employer-employee relationships in the United States of America. Let us foreclose the possibility that in times of panic or hysteria the forces of oppression will be free to destroy the feebly protected rights of labor through use of these oppressive labor practices.

Do not deceive yourselves, my colleagues, that industrial democracy is so soundly rooted here that such a bill is not necessary. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, after the first World War the advocates of industrial absolutism took advantage of economic stringencies and changing personnel to attack the trade-union movement with every weapon in the arsenal of organized anti-unionism. The damage to industrial democracy was terrific. These same groups refused to accept section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act; they fought the adoption of the National Labor Relations Act and violated it with impunity. They do not hesitate to flout and subvert the principles of that act today. That is all clear from the subcommittee's record. They can well afford the costs of legal defense that permit them, in many instances, to profit by their own perfidy, or, in the end, submit to civil restraint. That gentle treatment is not enough to eliminate these heinous practices.

Even now they seek, by portions of the Smith bill which has passed the House and is pending in a Senate Committee on Education and Labor, not to prevent strikes in war industries but to remove and relax the gentle restraint of the National Labor Relations Act so that "union busting" may proceed apace under the cover of war effort, and this at a time when we are telling the people of America that they are fighting for the "four freedoms" everywhere in the world. About this matter I shall have more to say later. The groups to which I have referred will, under the leadership of the National Association of Manufacturers, their policy body, try time and time again, through controlled sections of the press and their tools in our Government executive and legislative departments alike, to soften the trade-union movement until it is a flabby sham for exploitation.

I ask this body now to give them an irrevocable challenge to abide by our national labor policy or face the criminal penalties imposed by a righteous nation confirmed in its devotion to the ultimate wisdom of a vigorous industrial democracy. I ask this body, I urge, I demand, in the name of 130,000,000 people of this country, upon whom we must depend if we are to win this total war, that there be action upon this measure, one way or the other, now that the Senate has decided to enter this delicate field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The analysis is as follows:

The title of the bill is the Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942. The purposes and policy of the bill are stated in the first two sections which contain findings of fact and definitions of terms.

Section 3 outlines 11 oppressive labor practices against which the bill is directed.

First, it is declared to be an oppressive labor practice to use labor spies.

The second oppressive labor practice is defined as the use of strikebreakers or strikebreaking agencies. Strikebreakers are described as persons who are paid a bonus to replace regular employees during a strike or lock-out.

The third oppressive labor practice is defined as the employment of private guards armed with guns or other dangerous weapons off company property except where necessary for protection against theft of goods or money in transit. The employment of men who have been convicted of crimes of violence to act as private guards during a labor dispute is likewise declared to be an oppressive labor practice.

The fourth oppressive labor practice is defined to be the use or possession of industrial munitions in or about a place of employment or during a labor dispute. Industrial munitions are defined as machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and long-range tear-gas and sickening-gas missiles.

The fifth oppressive labor practice is defined to be participation in a conspiracy or other action in concert to injure or intimidate (terms previously defined) persons for the purpose of interfering with the exercise of their rights to perform various valid acts connected with the organization of unions and collective bargaining. It would include such common practices as physical attacks on union organizers, the unlawful breaking up of union assemblies, physical abuse of peaceful pickets, and other forms of vigilantism which experience has shown are often unchallenged by local law-enforcement officials dominated by local industrial interests.

The sixth oppressive labor practice is defined to be participation in a conspiracy or other act in concert to blacklist persons for the purpose of interfering with their right to organize and bargain collectively.

The seventh oppressive labor practice is defined to be the negotiation of contracts or agreements whereby employers agree with each other to refuse to engage in collective bargaining. This provision is aimed at so-called open-shop agreements, sometimes entered into by employers so as to bind them not to recognize trade-unions or bargain collectively.

The eighth oppressive labor practice as defined outlaws the so-called "yellow-dog" practice or its equivalent whereby individual employees are forced by an employer to agree not to exercise their right to organize or bargain collectively either as a condition of employment, the continuance thereof, or change in status.

The ninth oppressive labor practice is defined to be participation in a conspiracy or other action in concert with a group of employers for the purpose of injuring or intimidating (terms previously defined in the bill) employers and employees so as to prevent collective bargaining. This would include conspiracies by employers to punish a company through damage to its credit, supplies, or sales because it operated on a basis of collective bargaining.

The tenth oppressive labor practice is defined to be participation in a conspiracy to engage in the oppressive labor practices previously prescribed. This particular subsection would eliminate, for all practical purposes, many of the activities of belligerent employers' associations which the committee has encountered, at least insofar as these activities included oppressive labor practices as defined. It would leave complete freedom of speech and association to employers for propagandizing against trade-unionism, seeking legislative or administrative action, or carrying on negotiations in a unified fashion on the employer side of the collective-bargaining agreement.

The eleventh oppressive labor practice is defined to be action as an officer or employee of any type of employers' association (previously defined) with knowledge of the absence of appropriate registration by the association with the National Labor Relations Board and submission of specific types of information required. This provision would enable the National Labor Relations Board to keep track of all employer groups which might possibly be engaged in fomenting activity violative of that act or the Oppressive Labor Practices Act. It would not place penalties upon the members of such organizations who might be wholly innocent and do not have the responsibility for attending the business of the organization. It would place penalties upon the responsible officers and employees whose business it is to attend to such matters.

Sections 4 and 5 of the bill list the prohibited acts. Two classes of persons are brought within the prohibitions of the bill—those who directly engage in oppressive labor practices and those who assist in the commission of oppressive labor practices by furnishing goods or services. There are also two separate types of offenses listed. It is declared to be a crime to engage in an oppressive labor practice which affects commerce or to use the instrumentalities of the mails or of commerce for the purpose of engaging in an oppressive labor practice. In addition, the principle of the Wages and Hours Act is applied so as to make it criminal for an employer who engages in oppressive labor practices to ship his goods into interstate commerce.

Section 6 of the bill fixes maximum penalties of a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment of 6 months for violations of the criminal provisions.

Section 8 authorizes the enforcement of the criminal provisions of the act by the Attorney General. Injunctive remedies are also provided for to restrain violations of the act. The injunctive power can be invoked only by the Secretary of Labor, who is given the necessary investigatory powers to exercise this authority.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial on the same general subject, which I have written for the Progressive in the issue published today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Progressive]

WHO IS THE ENEMY?

The current avalanche of deliberate misinformation about labor's part in the war effort is no more nor less than a foul attack by labor baiters who are more concerned about licking labor than they are about winning the war.

Their vicious attacks have aroused and confused the public. Facts and reason have not caught up with misrepresentation, prejudice, and hate.

Congressional investigating committees could do the country a valuable service by inquiring publicly into the methods and purposes of those who inspired this outburst of antilabor propaganda.

The accusers of labor have carefully and craftily sought to blame labor for the lack of sufficient guns, planes, ships, and tanks on the battle fronts of war. In cold reality, that shortcoming is a much larger issue in which

governmental foreign policies and industrial profit striking are infinitely more responsible.

The hue and outcry has ignored situations like the notorious obstruction of strategic production by profit-minded corporations with international agreements which in effect place profits and patents above country. The exposé on synthetic rubber is a typical case in point. According to the Department of Justice, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, in its quest for an international monopoly, turned over to German industries valuable information on synthetic-rubber processes which was denied to our own Navy Department. This, according to the Assistant Attorney General, is only one dramatic example of the monopolistic practices which are rampant throughout industry and which are a heavy brake on our all-out war production.

When the newspapers, radio commentators, and chambers of commerce expound indignantly on delays in production, why do they always forget about the obstructionist activities of management? A single action, such as that of the Standard Oil Co. in the case of synthetic rubber, may well have a greater impact on the future of this country than the sum total of many labor strikes.

The public has been led to believe that strikes and the 40-hour week are seriously impeding war production. High-ranking officials of the Government who administer the over-all program, and who know, flatly and emphatically say "No." Anyone interested in minute decimals can check the official figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and find that only .18 of total war-production time was lost because of strikes during February. Total man-days lost were less than one-tenth of the time lost 1 year ago, despite the fact that the total number of workers in war production had more than trebled.

Great Britain is often cited by students of labor problems as having an exemplary labor situation, both before and during the war Among other reasons, trade-unionism is old and well established there. It is significant to point out that recent strike activity in the United States compares very favorably with British experience. The British time-loss due to strikes averaged about 100,000 man-days per month last year. The average monthly time-loss in war production in the United States during January and February was approximately one-fifth as much.

If industry or government in general could point to a record of efficiency of 99.982 percent—as United States labor has in the matter of strikes—the war effort would be much more advanced. Unfortunately, there is no practicable manner in which to measure the degree of harm wrought or time lost by the lust for power and profits, or the internal and external bickerings between Government and business and in each.

With regard to the present wage-and-hour law, the false impression still exists widely that the law prohibits a workweek longer than 40 hours. The fact, of course, is that the law merely requires a higher wage scale for time beyond 40 hours. The Department of Labor has continually emphasized that relaxation of the overtime provisions would be wholly ineffectual in increasing war production.

Extra pay for overtime is in many cases a substitute for basic readjustments in wage rates occasioned by the rising cost of living. The removal of overtime pay in these cases would lead inevitably to demands for increased basic rates, and would probably mean an increase in labor disputes. Furthermore, most savings in labor costs on present contracts would not revert to the Government, but would accrue as a windfall to the contractor, who has undoubtedly taken full notice of overtime costs when making the original contract with the Government.

There is no simple panacea for the many labor-management problems. Solutions can be found only when a mutual tolerance and understanding exists among labor, management, Government, and the general public.

Wartime—when the future of each depends upon the cooperative strength of all—is no time to prosecute internal quarrels. The time has come when all must pull together or we may pull the country apart.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.

THE LABOR SITUATION—LETTER BY SIDNEY E. CORNELIUS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a very interesting letter which was written to Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, by Mr. Sidney E. Cornelius, manager of the Manufacturers Association of Hartford County.

I have the permission of Mr. Cornelius and Mr. Nelson to offer this letter for the RECORD. It refers to the labor situation, and particularly to the 40-hour week and time-and-one-half payments in excess thereof.

I do not suppose there is another county in the United States more actively and successfully engaged in the war program than Hartford County in my State. Located in that area are some of the leading industrialists of the country, and among them manufacturing concerns which are very succesfully contributing to the war effort.

I think that the opinion of these industrialists is deserving of the most careful attention and consideration, and it is for that reason that I submit this letter to the Congress and to public view.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 31, 1942.

Mr. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: That Hartford County, as an industrial area, is devoted almost entirely to war production of the most varied character, is well known to you and your associates in the War Production Board. We need not, therefore, dwell upon that fact to substantiate the sincerity of this communication. The members of the Manufacturers Association of Hartford County are today employing more than 120,000 persons.

Your production-plan drive, after receiving its initial impetus from your representatives, has been accorded its due, intense consideration and furthering action by prime contractors and others. It is the desire and ambition of manufacturers here to attempt any practical measure suggested, that gives promise of promoting accelerated production for war and victory.

With that premise in mind these manufacturers are in accord with you that the elimination, at this stage of our endeavors, of the statutory provision for the 40-hour week with time-and-one-half payments in excess thereof, can serve little purpose in the accomplishment of the goal. That it was instituted originally for spreading work to relieve unemployment, a condition that does not exist today, is immaterial. The propriety of its continuance might properly have been established coincidentally with the declaration of the emergency. Its voidance now would result in definite over-all wage decrease. We applaud the spirit which prompted your plea for a 30-day trial of your plan before drastic action in that other regard be taken.

But it is our desire to supplement and definitely augment your efforts by requesting you to urge that congressional action be taken immediately to freeze, as it were, the closed-shop issue, as of the moment. There is no doubt in our minds and, we believe, can be little in the minds of informed people universally, that the continued threat of the closed shop on the part of labor groups is the most hazardous obstacle to complete "all-out for production," that exists today. The prerequisite of union membership and dues payment in order to work in a closed shop engaged in defense production, undoubtedly is having a deterring effect upon many men who desire to leave other occupations and engage in this major effort. We are not overemphasizing this point. The controversy is a source of bewilderment to labor on the whole, and it has a bridling effect upon otherwise willing and enthusiastic management. Eliminate that and you have opened the floodgates of subconscious restraint and accelerated the flow of wholehearted unequivocal determination. To permit and allow an employee to be extra-legally taxed for his inherent right to work; to permit and allow an employer to be compelled, by economic pressure, to accede to and impose that taxation, invites the loss of the very freedoms for which, internationally, we are fighting by force of arms.

Yet the closed shop in industry means just that.

One more point and we conclude our hopeful contribution of assistance. It would seem that the major labor parties, through their national spokesmen, are disposed to recognize that the double-time payments for work on Sundays and holidays, forged into agreements heretofore, should be foregone. It must be remembered that argument advanced for the acceptance by management of double-time payments was to so penalize that practice that it would be prohibitive. Now, by the ultimatum of war production, it is becoming compulsory. Relief should be afforded. The general acceptance and acknowledgment of that on the part of local union representatives and labor generally, would be a constructive step.

We urge that you use your good offices to the furthering of these objectives.

Very truly yours,

MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF HARTFORD COUNTY,
SIDNEY E. CORNELIUS, *Manager.*

TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY OVER HITLER PAGANISM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is Holy Week. Next Sunday will be Easter.

What does this mean to a world at war? Has it any application in a world in which the hearts of millions of men are filled with hate, a world in which men are tearing at each other's throats? Is there any lesson we can draw from these closing hours of Holy Week, distracted as we are by the bursting of shells and agonizing screams of dying men?

If we look with clear eyes we will see a very definite lesson. On the first Good Friday Christ died, an apparent failure. His own people, misled and confused by crafty leaders, had permitted Him to be condemned to death. He died in ignominy between two wretched criminals. As far as human eyes could see, Christ on that Good Friday night was a complete failure.

Yet we now see that the Crucifixion was the necessary prelude to the glorious Resurrection on Easter morning. If religion, like Christ, seems conquered today, faith assures us of the coming of a better day—Easter morning succeeds Good Friday.

Europe, since the advent of its cruel and soulless dictator, has been under a

dark, foreboding cloud, which casts its deadly pall on all men and on all their freedoms—their freedom of speech, their freedom of conscience, their freedom to worship God as they see fit.

While Hitler and his war-maddened followers desperately seek to blot out all our freedoms, the one freedom to which they have dealt their most destructive blow is the freedom of religion. The reason is clear. No man who worships God can in his conscience worship Hitler. Hitler's totalitarian state can tolerate no rival within its realm. The teachings of Christ are incompatible with the pagan Nazi doctrines.

Under Hitler, therefore, religion has been singled out for destruction. Christianity, like its Founder, is to be nailed to the cross in Europe. Hitler's doctrines of hatred cannot tolerate Christ's spirit of peace to men of good will, of justice, of love for one's fellow men, of kindness and of mercy. Christ's teachings about the intrinsic dignity and inalienable rights of each human soul are utterly incompatible with Hitler's doctrine of the foul character of any man not Aryan.

Hitler's scheme cannot succeed while faith in God remains His vile plan to disenfranchise and enslave a section of the human race will be defeated. Christ survived the first Good Friday. He has survived innumerable assaults more desperate than those led by the little paperhanger.

Why do we believe that Hitler will fail to crush our Christian civilization? Well, there is an abundance of evidence to support our belief, in addition to our faith in the immutable justice of God. For instance whether Hitler likes it or not, whether Hitler knows it or not, word does get out of Europe—letters, post cards, messages, whispers seep through the steel ring of Nazi bayonets. Many of these secret messages tell us that the people under Hitler's heel are hearing radio sermons sent out on the short wave from free countries, from England, from America, and from other places. Word comes to us daily that the enslaved but undaunted people of Europe cherish these precious messages of hope even more than they crave news of the progress of the war or of the plans of the United Nations for the final defeat of nazi-ism.

That is a remarkable statement. Think of it. Picture yourself in conquered Norway, Belgium, Holland, or France. You are cold. You are starving. Your life is threatened. You have a little radio hidden in your basement or in your barn. It is against the Nazi law to listen to that radio. You will be killed if you are caught listening. You will be shot without the slightest mercy. But you listen. You crouch in hunger, in darkness, in cold—but you listen. You have the courage, the desire, the faith, to risk your very life to hear a few meager words from those friends across the seas who have faith in Christ and defy Hitler with all his ruthless military might—a few words of courage and faith from across the seas, a few words about Jesus, who once dared face Caesar and defy his earthly power 20 centuries ago.

That is why I am convinced that Hitler has failed. That is why I declare on this Good Friday that the little paperhanger of Munich, suffering from delusions of grandeur, dreaming that he can throw God out of Europe and usurp His throne in the souls of men, is a complete and ridiculous failure. The age-old truths of the Bible are infinitely stronger than the maniacal ravings of that despicable Nazi dictator.

The peoples of Europe are willing to risk their lives to listen to the words of Holy Scripture defying Hitler. They risk their lives daily in order to hear a few words about the God in whom they repose their love and faith. That is why I say there is a similarity between the Resurrection of our Lord 2,000 years ago and the resurrection of religion in Europe today.

In olden times the followers of Christ were persecuted. The age of martyrs has not yet closed. In olden times the priests were tortured and the faithful thrown to the lions in the Roman arena. Today Hitler has omitted the lions, but his tortures are even more fiendish. The diabolical persecution of the men of God within Germany is known to all. We all know of the degradation of the churches and the perversion of the sacred doctrines of religion. We all know the tortures of soul which Hitler has inflicted on the helpless people of Germany—the mass imprisonment of the little common men who tried to worship God in their own way, the mass cremation of the dead, the mass sterilization of unfortunate ones.

My church recognizes clearly, even as does Hitler, that Catholicism and Nazi-ism cannot be reconciled. They are completely incompatible. All American Catholics also recognize this fact. They understand that all Catholics must engage in this struggle to save Christianity. They realize, too, the important obligation, once the fight is won, of laying the foundations of a just and lasting peace based upon Christian principles.

The Catholic Church is not committed to any one particular form of government. I think it is safe to say that catholicism throughout the world favors the democratic form of government, for the reason that the philosophy expressed in democratic constitutions approaches most closely the form of the great truths espoused by the church, such as the intrinsic inherent dignity and inalienable rights of human souls, the obligation of each man to practice justice and charity toward his fellow man, the conception of the state as existing to serve the individual and not the concept of the individual as the mere insignificant tool of the omnipotent state.

It seems to me that the Holy Father can bless the democratic ideas expressed by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill in the Atlantic Charter.

I should like to quote briefly a statement made by Pope Pius XII about 1 month after the war began. The Pope decried the kind of authority which—quoting his words—

> puts itself in the place of the Almighty and elevates the state or group into the last end of life—the supreme criterion of the moral and juridical order—and therefore forbids every appeal to the principles of reason and the Christian conscience.

The Pope went on to say that the successes of such systems could only be transitory, and added:

> To consider the state as something ultimate to which everything else should be subordinated and directed, cannot fail to harm the true and lasting prosperity of nations.

Those are direct quotations from the Pope's encyclical entitled "The Function of the State in the Modern World."

I have touched on some of the things that come to my mind during this Holy Week of 1942—things that lead me to believe firmly that, in spite of appearances, religion is not dying; but rather, is on the eve of a glorious resurrection. This coming Easter Sunday thousands upon thousands of our soldiers will attend religious services, and thousands upon thousands of sailors over the broad blue waters of all the seas of the globe will bend their knees and bow their heads in devout prayer. This coming Easter Sunday, in the thousands of churches throughout the United States, millions upon millions of all creeds of faith will kneel, with bowed heads, before their God and pray earnestly for the overthrow of Nazi paganism, and the restoration of religious freedom, and a peace of justice and charity, that will bring joy and benediction to victor and vanquished alike.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for mentioning and drawing to our attention the life and the works of the Man of Galilee, even Jesus of Nazareth, who is the Master of men and of nations, and as yet the Light and the Life of the world.

ORDER AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MAKE REPORTS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess the Committee on Appropriations may submit to the Senate reports on bills or resolutions before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNCONSCIONABLE PROFITS IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, in keeping with my statement of Monday of this week, I shall read into the RECORD today a list of extortionate salaries paid out of the taxpayers' money to officials of a racketeering industrial corporation, which stands to make a profit of 4,280 percent, or $2,140,000, in 1 year on an admitted investment of not more than $50,000. The figure of $50,000 is somewhat questionable, because the president of the company could not remember, when testifying, whether they had spent $25,000 or $50,000. I look forward to getting in the future an itemized statement of this expenditure.

It is interesting to note the vast difference between the 4,280 percent of profit to be gained by this corporation and the 6 percent voted by the House of

Representatives last week as the maximum profit which might be made in war industry.

Before going further, I shall read briefly from a report released to the press on April 2 by the special committee headed by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], which is investigating the national defense program. I extended an invitation to this committee late in February or early in March to send a subcommittee to Las Vegas, Nev., to look into what appeared to me to be some questionable conduct on the part of the officials of Basic Magnesium, Inc., for which the Defense Plant Corporation is constructing a $63,000,000 magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev.

Some day next week, when I have had time to assemble the information at hand, I shall tie the ends of this amazing scandal of war profiteering together. This information I intend to present to the Senate. Suffice it to say now that the investment of Basic Magnesium, Inc., in this deal in which the Government is putting out $63,000,000 admittedly is not over $50,000 and consists of 36 mining claims situated on the public domain, and a small amount of development work. Reading now in part briefly from the report filed yesterday, the committee said:

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM ON HEARINGS HELD IN LAS VEGAS, NEV., MARCH 23 AND 24, 1942, ON THE SUBJECT OF BASIC MAGNESIUM

The subcommittee has not completed its investigation of the Basic Magnesium, Inc., plant at Las Vegas, further hearings being planned in Washington, and is not ready to submit final recommendations. The facts disclosed at Las Vegas created the impression that Defense Plant Corporation is paying tremendous fees for "know how" which so far has delivered miserable progress, the metal-producing units being only 9 percent complete although the contract was signed August 13, 1941.

The subcommittee is prepared now to urge most strongly that Defense Plant Corporation refuse to accept any such exorbitant royalty terms as proposed by Basic Magnesium, Inc., and those associated with it, for the brucite ore deposits which it proposes to lease to the Government for operation of this plant. These 600 acres of ore deposits were claimed from the public domain by Basic Ores, a subsidiary of Basic Refractories, of Cleveland, which owns 55 percent of Basic Magnesium, Inc.'s stock, and were turned over to Basic Magnesium, Inc., in return for such stock. Testimony of Howard Eells, Basic Magnesium, Inc., president, was that not over $25,000 to $50,000 was spent by his company in proving its claims to these deposits and in some surface explorations. Virtually no diamond drilling has been done. Yet Basic Magnesium, Inc., is asking the Government to pay $1 a ton royalty and all costs of quarrying for these ores, which, if the plant operated at capacity would produce $280,000 a year royalties on a total investment of not over $50,000. Under Basic Magnesium, Inc.'s proposal, these royalties would be doubled if Basic Magnesium, Inc., were not permitted to operate the plant. It is significant that Basic Refractories is leasing quarries near these at 25 cents a ton royalty.

This proposed lease appears to the subcommittee as one of the most flagrant attempts at war profiteering to come to its notice.

Basic Magnesium, Inc., is also to receive a fee for the operation of the plant, which at maximum operation will equal $560,000 a year over a possible period of 30 years, although it is not even sufficiently financially responsible to warrant the leasing of the property to it. Instead, the property is to be operated for the Defense Plant Corporation account on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. The subcommittee can find little or no return to the Defense Plant Corporation to justify any such fee.

In addition, Basic Magnesium, Inc., is to receive a $400,000 fee plus cost for construction and engineering services, although it had had little or no construction experience in the past and although more than $1,000,000 is to be paid in fees for construction, engineering, and architectural services to be performed by others on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

The subcommittee also ascertained that the English company, the plant of which is being duplicated, is a licensee of I. G. Farben of Germany and that it does not have or claim the right to license the operation of the Las Vegas plant. The American patents controlling the process are held by an American corporation, one-half of the stock of which belongs to Alcoa and one-half of which directly or indirectly belongs to the German interests.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that a plant especially one of this magnitude, ought not to have been commenced until after the Defense Plant Corporation had reached an agreement as to the terms of the license under which it was to operate and as to the cost of the raw material (magnesite ores) from which the magnesium was to be produced.

Should Defense Plant Corporation because of poor performance or any other reason, cancel Basic Magnesium, Inc.'s, contract to operate the Las Vegas Plant, it would under that contract have to pay Basic Magnesium, Inc. $1,000,000. In addition, Basic Magnesium, Inc.'s royalties under the proposed ore lease would be doubled to $2 a ton or $560,000 a year. The terms seem to put a premium on mismanagement and incompetency.

Mr. President, in keeping with my statement of last Monday, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a list of the administrative employees of Basic Magnesium, Inc., Las Vegas, Nev.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES, BASIC MAGNESIUM, INC.

Name, position, and salary:	
H. C. Mann, project manager	$36,000
D. W. Stewart, assistant project manager	20,000
W. F. Way, project manager, construction	17,500
G. B. Kaufman, manager, engineering	17,000
J. R. Charles, English consultant	15,000
W. W. Patnoe, chief engineer—Gabbs	13,800
S. J. Fletcher, English consultant	12,000
Harley C. Lee, technical adviser, engineering	12,000
W. R. Battey, director, electrical design	10,400
W. B. Dyer, chief engineer	10,104
R. C. Kelley, director of purchases	10,000
C. A. Warne, controller	10,000
James D. Platt, general assistant to president	9,600
S. A. Carraway, assistant to president	8,500
H. A. Sargent, assistant to president	7,800
E. M. Scott, assistant chief electrical engineer	$7,800
K. L. Bonnell, purchasing agent	7,800
William Mawdsley, consulting engineer	7,540
W. J. Hoesch, chief designer, process	7,540
Clyde L. Hyde, supervisor industrial relations	7,280
R. J. Cole, project manager—Gabbs	7,280
A. H. Fester, auditor	6,500
P. B. Levengood, auditor, assistant secretary	6,500
T. W. Harris, assistant treasurer	6,500
L. H. Cornelius, assistant purchasing agent	6,500
L. L. White, superintendent construction—Gabbs	6,500
H. R. Shire, director plant protection	6,500
C. E. Schmidt, schedule engineer	6,500
J. J. Broz, traffic manager	6,240
W. L. Kent, staff engineer	6,240
John D. Templeton, assistant supervisor, industrial relations	6,240
G. P. Frazer, assistant to project manager, production	$6,000
P. F. Connor, supervisor of housing	6,000
H. J. Woodley, assistant office manager	5,720
W. O. Godwin, office engineer	5,720
J. H. Bradford, staff engineer	5,720
K. P. Deline, assistant director plant protection	5,200
M. M. Muller, staff engineer	4,550
George W. Nielson, assistant development engineer	4,180
J. H. Quayle, Jr., office manager	3,900
L. F. Bayer, development engineer	3,900
C. E. Schwab, assistant development engineer	3,900

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, I hesitate to make this very interesting and unusual list public for fear of the reaction it will have from the men who are training, fighting, and dying for their country at $21 per month; for fear, also, of the reaction of the men, women, and children who are putting their dollars, dimes, and pennies into war bonds and stamps. But in keeping with my statement previously made on the floor, I believe the Senate and the public are entitled to know how the taxpayers' money is being spent by Washington departmental officials. It will be noted that 14 of these officials are receiving more pay than the base pay of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who has literally offered his life for his country.

As a passing comment I might point out—and it will add insult to injury—that the Battle of the Pacific is not won, and to date the people of America are losing the battle of Washington.

The figures I present are official and do not take into consideration any raise in pay which I understand has already been effected in some instances. It should be remembered that the salaries of these officials are being paid out of the taxpayers' money advanced to Basic Magnesium, Inc., operating in Nevada, by the Defense Plant Corporation. In view of the figures submitted, it leaves little reason to wonder that labor is insisting on reasonable hours and good salaries in war industries.

Mr. President, in conclusion I want to make one observation: That it is my

humble and studied opinion that the members of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program are performing one of the greatest services to America that have been performed by any group who sit in the United States Senate.

MARINE WAR-RISK INSURANCE

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6554, Calendar No. 1274.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6554) to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "amended", to insert "effective as of April 1, 1942", so as to read:

That Subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public, No. 677, 76th Cong.), is hereby amended, effective as of April 1, 1942, to read as follows:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "reasons", to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That there shall be reported on the last day of each calendar month to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, the insurance or reinsurance written under clause (2) of this subsection (a), during the preceding month, together with the rates and the reasons for such rates and such insurance and reinsurance."

So as to read:

SUBTITLE—INSURANCE

SEC. 221. (a) Jntil 6 months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed or until such earlier date as the President may designate, the Commission is authorized to provide marine insurance and reinsurance against loss or damage by the risks of war and reinsurance against loss or damage by marine risks, as prescribed in this subtitle, whenever it appears to the Commission that (1) such insurance adequate for the needs of transportation in the water-borne commerce of the United States and its Territories and possessions (including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and any bases or lands leased or occupied by or on behalf of the United States), or of other transportation by water or other vessel services deemed by the Commission to be in the interest of the war effort or the domestic economy of the United States, cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in a State of the United States, or (2) the furnishing by the Commission of such insurance or reinsurance with respect to any such transportation or other vessel services at nominal or other rate basis would be of material benefit to the war effort, or (after consultation with the Office of Price Administration or other agencies) to the domestic economy of the United States, or (after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War) is necessary or advisable for military or naval reasons: *Provided*, That there shall be reported on the last day of each calendar month to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, the insurance or reinsurance written under clause (2) of this subsection (a), during the preceding month, together with the rates and the reasons for such rates and such insurance and reinsurance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 2, after "July", to strike out "10" and insert "14", so as to read:

SEC. 222. The Commission may insure against loss or damage by the risks of war, persons, property, or interests, as follows:

(e) (1) American vessels (including vessels under construction), (2) vessels registered under the law of the Philippine Islands, (3) foreign-flag vessels owned by citizens of the United States (as said term 'citizens' is used in Public Law 173, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 14, 1941) or owned or controlled by, or made available to, the United States or any department or agency thereof, and (4) any foreign-flag vessel not owned or controlled or made available as described in clause (3) hereof, but engaged in the water-borne foreign commerce of the United States or other transportation by water or other vessel services deemed by the Commission to be in the interest of the war effort or the domestic economy of the United States, while so engaged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 15, after the words "participation in", to insert "arranging", and in the same line after the word "insurance", to strike out "transactions", so as to read:

SEC. 223. The Commission may reinsure in whole or in part, any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States, on account of marine and marine war risks, including protection and indemnity risks, assumed by any such company, on persons, property, and interests specified in section 222 of this subtitle, and may reinsure with, or cede or retrocede to, any such company any war-risk insured pursuant to such section 222, or any marine or war-risk reinsured with the Commission as hereinbefore provided. No insurance broker or other person acting in a similar intermediary capacity shall be paid any fee or other consideration by the Commission by virtue of his participation in arranging any insurance wherein the Commission directly insures any of the risk thereof. Reinsurance shall not be provided by the Commission at rates less than (1) the rates established by the Commission on the same or similar risks or (2) the rates charged by the insurance carrier for the insurance so reinsured, whichever is the higher, except that the Commission may make to the insurance carrier such allowance for taxes, commissions, and other customary expenses (not to exceed 5 percent of the premiums paid for that portion of the direct insurance so reinsured) as it may deem reasonably to accord with good business practice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the purpose of the measure is to amend the law so as to cover insurance or reinsurance of certain war-risk hazards. Private insurance companies do write what might be termed the ordinary hazards insurance, that it, peacetime hazards insurance, but they have not been willing, except to a very limited extent, to write war-hazards insurance, and now they have really stopped doing so at all. Very recently we prolonged the life of a law which authorized the Maritime Commission to write such insurance. The pending measure attempts to broaden the scope of that legislation in various respects. For instance, the existing law applies only to insurance of domestic vessels. Much of the foreign commerce of the United States is now being carried in foreign ships, and it is highly desirable that the insurance called for in this bill should apply to such commerce. Some of these foreign ships are not willing to operate without such insurance, and it is not possible usually for them to secure needed insurance from private companies. So this measure provides among other things that the Maritime Commission, either by direct insurance or by reinsurance, may cover also all cases in which the United States Government has some insurable interest in the hull or the cargo of ships belonging to foreign countries.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to have made clear in my mind just what vessels are covered by the insurance The Senator spoke of domestic vessels. Does the Senator mean vessels under the American flag?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. Existing legislation would apply to vessels under the American flag.

Mr. WHITE. Does it also cover foreign vessels which may be temporarily engaged in our trade?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill which is now before the Senate would extend our policy so as to cover such foreign vessels.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to be sure of that. So that the measure covers both foreign and American ships. Does it cover ships in all trades, that is foreign as distinguished from coastwise trade?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It would cover coastwise and foreign vessels, insofar as they are concerned with the war program. However, the Maritime Commission has a wide discretion in interpreting such matters.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish unduly to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does it cover the cargo as well as the ship?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It covers both hull and cargo. It will also cover the crew and the officers, insofar as the war hazards of life, accidents, or property are concerned. It does not cover the ordinary marine hazards of the crew, but it provides for insurance as to lives or injuries of officers and seamen on the ships.

Mr. WHITE. Is there in the bill a limit upon the time during which the Commission may issue this character of insurance?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No.

Mr. WHITE. I ask this question because I have had no chance to read the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is no limit.

Mr. WHITE. That is, this power will continue until we repeal it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. There are also certain special provisions in the measure in regard to nominal charges to be made under certain conditions. No attempt is made in this bill to state the rates for insurance. These rates are to be fixed from time to time by the Maritime Commission in varying schedules.

The bill also contains a provision covering fishing vessels.

Mr. President, legislation of this nature is certainly very much needed. So much of our commerce is carried in foreign ships, or in ships owned by Americans sailing under foreign flags, that it is highly desirable that some protection be created and made immediately available with respect to such ships, to cover the hulls, the cargoes, and the crews.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with the purpose of the proposed legislation. There is one further question I wish to ask. Will the measure permit the coverage of foreign-owned cargo? The bill covers adequately the ship that may be insured, but I wondered if foreign-owned cargo on an insurable ship could also be covered by the insurance?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I understand not necessarily, because there is provision in the measure that the Government must have an insurable interest in what is insured. Of course, foreign cargo might be defined, I suppose, in some cases, so as to include cargoes belonging to foreign countries.

Mr. WHITE. Let us assume that some cargo of real value to the United States in the prosecution of the war was in transit to the United States, but the ownership of the cargo was in foreign hands; I wondered if that might be insured.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The language of the measure is very broad. It not only covers our own commerce but commerce the safety of which is essential to the welfare of the Government, or in the preservation of which we have some interest, or which is desirable for the carrying forward of our domestic economy. There are two or three clauses in the bill of a very broad nature which would satisfactorily cover the situation which I believe the Senator from Maine has in mind.

The provision for reinsurance upon the lives of officers and of sailors does not attempt to cover the ordinary marine life and casualty risks; that is, the officers and sailors would be protected only when death or injury occurred as the result of a war hazard, and not in the ordinary course of transportation. Of course, we realize that the dividing line between what is a war hazard and what might be termed a normal marine hazard is at times rather indistinct. We easily get into a twilight zone; but the language is about as definite in this measure as could be worked out without attempting to go into particulars which would seem to me to be unwise.

The measure is of great importance. There is a pressing need that it shall be passed immediately. I trust the Senate will act favorably upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the question on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not quite yet reached the stage of final passage.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the bill. In fact, I voted to report it favorably to the Senate. I did not know the exact parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossing of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 6554, was read the third time and passed.

APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. DANAHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin when he spoke on a bill which he had introduced. I am very happy that he introduced that bill, because it may serve to focus attention on one problem which is so interrelated with other problems that they too may eventually be considered. He mentioned the fact that in industry there were Bourbons, as if there were not a few Bourbons in every segment of our society, including labor. If we are to be realistic in this time of national peril when unity is so badly needed we must recognize at the outset that no group is all good or all bad and that no legislation should be written in a spirit of rancor against an entire group on the basis of abuses by a limited segment of that group. That, incidentally, is the basis of labor's argument today. We should, however, have legislation which will prevent abuses without unduly penalizing those who are innocent of abuse.

My colleague spoke of the time when the great nation of Germany went under the heel of Hitler, and said, as I recall, that it was because labor unions had lost their vitality. That is only a half-truth. The reason Germany went under the heel of Hitler was that throughout that great nation there were men who made it their business to create classes and divisions among the people, thus weakening the unity of the people. There are men in this great Nation of ours who engender hatred between class and class.

The other day there was introduced into this distinguished body a bill which we are to take up on the 20th, the so-called Connally bill, relating to labor. Perhaps then we shall have the opportunity which the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] spoke about the other day, when he said that we should consider the entire picture.

I am sure that when any thinking American stops to do some thinking he realizes, first and last, that no group in America has a monopoly on truth; nor is any group completely free from men who lack patriotism and vision. I hold no special interest brief for any group, as such, and certainly none for racketeers in any group. What we need now is a consideration by this distinguished body of the entire picture—the public good, the common cause.

I agree with what has been said, that we should try to formulate legislation which will correct the evils, and which will keep intact what my distinguished colleague calls bona fide trade unions. In my opinion, 99 percent of the men who have to meet our pay rolls—the so-called industrialists—are good American citizens. In my opinion, 99 percent of the members of union labor organizations are good American citizens. In my opinion, no church group, no industrial group, no labor group, or any other group in America can prove that it is 100-percent free from the possible abuses of a limited few.

It is said that there are Bourbons among the industrialists and managers of business. Bourbonism is a type of mind. It is a thing which reverts to the old concept of absolutism. It is in evidence in some degree at least in every stratum of our society.

For the first time in our lives we of America are up against something more important than ourselves, our businesses, our jobs, our unions, our comfortable way of living, or our lives. I mean the preservation of America.

The freedom we have and the freedom we will preserve will depend not so much upon external circumstances as upon our inner attitude, our spirit of fairness, our fearless approach to the challenges of the present.

Commencing next Monday, the Senate will recess for 3 days at a time over a period of 2 weeks. It might be well if during that time we should follow the direction and suggestion of some of our churchmen, that all America ask for guidance and direction in this critical

hour. I mean businessmen. I mean labor leaders. I mean farmers. I mean legislators. If America should go defeatist—and I know she never will—it would be, as Lincoln said, because of internal differences. Those who create internal differences are the potential little Hitlers of the future.

Next Sunday we celebrate Easter, which means so much to the Christian world. If we in America could eliminate selfishness and fear and learn the true lesson of Easter we could solve all our problems. Each year Easter brings clearly and definitely to humankind the great truth that spiritual life has continuity, that there is no death or extinction in the realm of the real or the spiritual. If we in America could eliminate selfishness and fear and learn the true lesson of Easter, when we come back here 2 weeks from Monday we should not find on our desks demands and orders that we pass certain class legislation. We should find carloads of communications begging us to pass legislation which would be for the best interests of all the people.

All of us now recognize, no matter whether we are professional men or workers in overalls, managers of business or union men, that we all belong to one great family called the American, and that our first allegiance is to the Nation. We know that in the Axis nations everything belongs to the state. There are no labor unions there, and the state owns the industries that formerly belonged to the people.

We know that this condition was brought about because there were certain planners, certain diabolical minds, who applied to the national life—the life of the people—the same rule that was applied in the conquering of other nations. The rule was divide and conquer. In these nations classes and groups were permitted to come into existence that hated and despised and feared each other, and the planners fanned those flames of hatred and fear so that there was no cohesion in society.

Then the opportunity was present for the dictator mind to take over all groups and abolish all labor unions and destroy all class distinctions, with the result that liberty and freedom, as we know it, was destroyed, and the rights of the individual in relation to property and the education of youth and the right to labor were all obliterated. The mind of the nation was literally put in a straitjacket. Men's thoughts were regimented, and those who revolted faced the concentration camp and the firing squad.

If selfishness and fear were eliminated the leaders in management, in labor, in farm groups, in government agencies, and in war production would tell us that they would gladly forego their peacetime rights and privileges in order that America might be preserved. They would tell us that each group was going to clean its own house. That is the point I make. There is no use in pretending that any individual or any group is all lily white, when we know what the facts are. We know what is going on in every State. We know what a few labor racketeers have done. They are the ones who are truly injuring a great labor movement. Ninety-nine percent of the men and 99 percent of the leaders in labor do not approve what they are doing; nor do 99 percent of the industrial leaders approve of the practices of a few racketeers in their ranks. I know what I am talking about. I have had labor leaders and industrial leaders in my office say so.

I have known labor all my life. I know what it is to sweat at 15 cents an hour in the lumber mills. I know labor. It does not want grafters or racketeers in its midst. It is part of our business to protect legitimate labor from being sabotaged. It is not our business to put labor on a pedestal, where it does not belong, nor is it our business to put legitimate labor organizations out of business. Our job is to preserve America; and the way to preserve America is to make her clean, strong, and wholesome.

There are a few—a very few—Bourbons in every segment of our society. Just think what it would mean in this contest with the Axis Powers if management and labor and every representative of every other class in this country were to say to Congress, "Pass a bill, not a bill that will be class legislation, not one that will cut at the roots of any particular group, but one that will build America strong." Then we would have public servants serving all the public—not segments, not classes—men with the vision of a united nation, one and inseparable.

If we should find such a situation when we come back here 2 weeks from now there would be no question of our victory over the foreign aggressors. We should be assured of overcoming the aggressors; and, what is more, in the postwar days we should not have to face internal squabbles. Let us think about tomorrow. We should be free of much of our domestic differences, free, Mr. President, of exploiters, loafers, betrayers, highjackers, corruptionists, selfish men in every class. There would be no more opportunity for embryo Hitlers in America to create class hatred and division among our people. We would appreciate men who create wealth, men who know how to meet a pay roll, men who can produce the stuff that America needs, as well as the man who labors with the sweat of his brow. What we need is cooperation, a spirit of unionism between the man who manages and the man who labors; and here in this great Hall of Congress we should give that leadership, and not stand solely as special pleaders representing only one class, one group.

We represent 131,000,000 people—those in overalls, those in white collars, those on the farm and those in the factories, those who labor and sweat with their brawn and those who labor and sweat with their brains. There would be no opportunity for racketeers to grow to dictator's stature as they have in Europe, if selfishness were cast out. We would be free to turn all our efforts and energies to making America strong and to bringing harmony to the war-torn, tired, bleeding peoples of Europe and the world when this war is over. We would have learned the noble art of cooperating unselfishly so that the Nation might benefit.

In the next few weeks after Easter, while Congress is in recess, what an opportunity there will be for the leaders of labor, the leaders of industry, the leaders of all groups in America to do the unselfish thing, the patriotic thing, the truly worth-while thing, resulting in making sure the preservation of our beloved country. Yes, Mr. President, if we approach the problem from an over-all view, if we look at it with the perspective of men truly patriotic, not segmentists, we shall pass a bill that will say, to the Bourbons, whether they are in labor, in management, or in politics, "You have got to get out of America; this is no place for you."

I have faith that the leaders of industry, that the leaders in the labor movement, will get rid of the very small percentage of men who are false and blind leaders. You remember, Mr. President, that the Good Book says the blind shall lead the blind, and they will both fall in the ditch. The situation demands that we recognize no allegiance except the allegiance to America, and that requires in this hour unselfish leadership in our country.

TRANSFER OF PHYSICAL FITNESS DIVISION TO FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Physical Fitness Division of the Office of Civilian Defense—the Division which employed Miss Mayris Chaney at a salary of $4,600 to teach dancing as an integral part of the preparations for national defense—has been transferred to the Federal Security Agency. This transfer was made because of the public protest against the Physical Fitness Division being a part of the Office of Civilian Defense. This is simply another runaround, to which we are quite accustomed in Washington; that is to say, when an agency becomes discredited in one department of Government, it is transferred to another. In this instance, the very funds which will be used to pay the expenses of this activity in the Federal Security Agency will come, by diversion, from appropriations already made for the Office of Civilian Defense. It seems, therefore, that the activity will be continued, and the cost of it will be paid from the funds already appropriated for national defense.

The head of the Physical Fitness Division is Mr. Jack Kelly, of Philadelphia, who is a prominent politician of that city. He is known as the National Coordinator of Physical Fitness. I have already called the attention of the Senate to the fact that he has appointed 61 coordinators of different sports, ranging from badminton to weight-lifting.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the continuation of this agency of Government, which has aroused such public resentment, should be left to Congress, and that it should come before Congress for a direct appropriation for its continuance. Instead of doing so, it appears that it will be continued by Executive order and by the transfer of funds from lump-sum appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter I have written on this subject to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

APRIL 1, 1942.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCNUTT: I am informed that the Physical Fitness Division, previously under the Office of Civilian Defense, has today been transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and that Mr. Jack Kelly, of Philadelphia, will be continued as the National Coordinator of Physical Fitness.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures made an investigation of the activities of the Physical Fitness Division of the Office of Civilian Defense. This committee, of which I am chairman, is interested as to the continuance of these activities. It is, of course, very obvious that public indignation was responsible for the transfer of this division to your agency

Your office advised me that on February 24 you wrote the President of the United States asking that funds heretofore allocated to the Office of Civilian Defense be transferred to you to continue the activities of the Physical Fitness Division. This was approved by the President on February 26. This means that the activities of the Physical Fitness Division will be conducted in your department with the use of the funds appropropriated for civilian defense. Therefore, defense funds will continue to be used for the promotion of paddle ball and ping pong.

Your statement today, I am told, is to the effect that the amount allotted to the Physical Fitness Division will be less than the amount requested by National Coordinator Jack Kelly. In my office Mr. Kelly said to me that at least $1,000,000 annually should be spent for this work, and that he would resign unless at least $300,000 was given annually for the expenses of this organization.

Would you be kind enough to give me the following information, as promptly as possible:

1. A full and complete statement of all of the paid employees, with salaries, transferred from the Office of Civilian Defense to your agency.

2. The activities to be performed by each employee and the background and experience of each.

3. A complete list of all coordinators as appointed by National Coordinator Kelly, this list to include the actual appointments made by Mr. Kelly and, then, a list of the local coordinators as appointed by Mr. Kelly's appointees.

Mr. Kelly, as you are aware, as National Coordinator under the Office of Civilian Defense, appointed 61 coordinators of different sports from badminton to weight-lifting.

4. Will the Congress have an opportunity to approve or disapprove the establishment of this organization by voting for or against appropriations for this purpose, or will your activities be financed exclusively by funds transferred by the President from existing defense funds or existing lump-sum appropriations, and thereby deprive Congress of any opportunity to express itself either for or against this new agency of Government which, if carried to its conclusion as outlined by Mr. Kelly, will mean a gigantic plan of regimentation for physical exercise and recreation which, in the end, will be very costly to the Public Treasury.

It may be true that the coordinators of sports and recreation do not receive compensation, but the coordinators that you must employ to coordinate this vast array of such coordinators will be costly, both in salaries and traveling expenses.

With best wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Mr. BYRD. I call further attention, Mr. President, to the fact that Mr. Jack M. Willem, who was appointed by Mr. Jack Kelly as national coordinator of bowling, has undertaken to circularize all the bowling leagues of the country, at the expense of the Federal Government, so as to induce those interested in bowling to use their influence to prevent bowling equipment and supplies from being placed on the restricted list of commodities. In other words, what Mr. Jack Willem wants to do is to influence the Priorities Division of the Government not to interfere with the manufacture and sale of bowling equipment and supplies.

On March 14 Mr. Willem sent to bowlers throughout the country, under Government frank and on official stationery, a letter signed as national bowling coordinator, which contained the following clause:

Almost every product used in the maintenance of bowling equipment and supplies is now on or soon will be placed on the restricted list of commodities for civilian use. Should this happen, pins, alley finishes, repair parts, etc., would be frozen, and bowling's future will be seriously threatened. Without these necessary maintenance supplies there will be no bowling as we know it now.

It is up to you to help continue to prove that bowling has a definite place in building up and safeguarding America's civilian morale and physical fitness.

Mr. Willem then asked that letters be obtained from business firms to the effect that bowling has helped their workers, and that such letters be sent to him for the purpose of influencing the proper agency of Government not to restrict the manufacture of bowling equipment and supplies, on the basis that bowling is an essential defense industry.

All the letters were sent out under Government frank, at Government expense, and Mr. Willem signed the letters as National Bowling Coordinator of the Division of Physical Fitness of the Office of Civilian Defense.

I have already called attention to the fact that Mr. Willem has been identified to me as an executive of the Stack-Globe Advertising Agency, which handles the account of the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co. I am informed that the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co. holds a virtual monopoly on the manufacture of bowling alleys, balls, and pins. So what Mr. Willem is doing in this instance is to use his official position as National Coordinator of Bowling, and by the use of the franking privilege of the Government, to create sentiment so that the company which is a client of his advertising agency can be permitted to obtain supplies of essential equipment, and enable the Stack-Globe Advertising Agency to continue, I assume, to handle the advertising program of the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co.

This is but one instance of the commercializing that is a part of this program of physical fitness, which has as its ultimate design a vast plan of regimentation of the physical activities of the American people.

A copy of Mr. Willem's official letter was sent to me by Mr. John F. Moloney, secretary of the Junior Chamber of Commerce Bowling League of Memphis, Tenn. Mr. Moloney replied to Mr. Willem's letter, stating that while the members of his organization were convinced of the importance of bowling, they did not believe that at a time such as this bowling should be promoted at public expense. Mr. Moloney concluded his letter by saying:

We feel that the circulation of bowling promotion material on Government stationery and under Government frank will do more to injure than to benefit this fine sport.

Mr. Moloney said further that he regarded it as the first obligation of the country to provide our armed forces with the weapons and machines they need to destroy an enemy who would otherwise destroy us, and that he would make no effort to secure priority consideration for the manufacture of bowling equipment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Mr. Moloney's correspondence with Mr. Jack M. Willem, the National Bowling Coordinator.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
DIVISION OF PHYSICAL FITNESS,
March 14, 1942.

IMPORTANT—REQUIRES IMMEDIATE ACTION

To All A. B. C. League Secretaries:

The purpose of this letter is to ask you as an American Bowling Congress league secretary to immediately procure proof, in the form of letters from sponsors of teams in your league and from other business firms and manufacturers of your immediate acquaintance that bowling by their workers has helped them:

1. To do their jobs better.
2. To keep up morale and esprit de corps.
3. To build up "team play" between worker and management.
4. To cut waste and increase actual production.
5. To enjoy a perfect "change of pace" from the grind of increasingly long work hours.
6. And any other benefits that have actually resulted from regular bowling participation by their employees.

Almost every product used in the maintenance of bowling equipment and supplies is now on or soon will be placed on the restricted list of commodities for civilian use. Should this happen, pins, alley finishes, repair parts, etc., would be "frozen" and bowling's future will be seriously threatened. Without these necessary maintenance supplies, there will be no bowling as we know it now.

It is up to you to help us continue to prove that bowling has a definite place in building up and safeguarding America's civilian morale and physical fitness.

This you can do by securing the letters for which we ask.

Will you immediately assign men in your leagues to get such letters of endorsement from officials of the companies represented in your league? Please forward these letters immediately to, or have them addressed directly and mailed to: Mr. Jack M. Willem,

National Bowling Coordinator, Physical Fitness Division, Office of Civilian Defense, 8 South Michigan Avenue Chicago, Ill.

With thousands of these letters, we can present bowling's worth as a necessary civilian recreation to officials in Washington, who must recognize, as does President Roosevelt, that, in the President's own words, "(Americans) * * * ought to have a chance for recreation and for taking their minds off their work, even more than ever before." The physical fitness division of the Office of Civilian Defense has approved bowling as one of the civilian "musts."

A Hale America Bowling Legion is now being organized to enlist every bowler in a drive which will bring bowling's benefits to millions more who need recreation and relaxation in their all-out civilian effort to back up our armed forces. The aims of the Hale America Bowling Legion are:

1. To promote physical fitness.
2. To coordinate mind and muscle.
3. To strengthen morale.
4. To extend recreation benefits.
5. To speed national-defense efforts through individual fitness.
6. To prepare youth for armed defense.

Your immediate and wholehearted cooperation is urged in getting to Mr. Willem as many letters from business and manufacturing officials in your locality as you possibly can.

Let's "keep 'em rolling" for victory—as well as for vim, vigor, and vitality.

Yours truly,

E. H. BAUMGARTEN,
Secretary, American Bowling Congress; Coordinator, Men's Bowling Activity, Office of Civilian Defense.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 20, 1942.*

Mr. JACK M. WILLEM,
National Bowling Coordinator,
Office of Civilian Defense,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I have received your circular letter of March 14, asking that I secure letters from local business firms describing the benefits of bowling to their employees, such letters to be used to convince Washington officials that bowling equipment should continue to be made available. Your letter has been discussed by the members of our league, and while each of us derives a great deal of pleasure and, we believe, benefit from bowling, we find it impossible to comply with your request.

Our league members are familiar with the shortage of materials now affecting every phase of American life. We know that the reason for that shortage is the absolute necessity of providing our armed forces with the weapons and machines they need to destroy an enemy who would otherwise destroy us. We believe that this need comes before bowling.

A number of our league members have joined the armed services. We do not believe it would help their morale to know that those of us who remain at home were bringing pressure upon the Government so that we may "bowl as usual" while they die for lack of equipment.

Some other members of our league have lost jobs and businesses because of the shortage of vital materials. We doubt that these men would feel recompensed for this loss by the fact that they can "bowl as usual."

All our members are convinced of the importance of bowling, but we do not believe that in times like these it is important enough to warrant the action you request. Most of us have endeavored to spread interest in bowling, but we believe that when every dollar is needed for war it is quite inappropriate to promote bowling at public expense. For this reason we feel that the circulation of bowling promotion material on Government stationery and under Government frank will do more to injure than to benefit this fine sport.

Yours very truly,

JOHN F. MOLONEY,
Secretary, Junior Chamber of Commerce Bowling League.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
DIVISION OF PHYSICAL FITNESS,
March 21, 1942.

Mr. JOHN F. MOLONEY,
Secretary, Junior Chamber of Commerce Bowling League,
Memphis, Tenn.

DEAR MR. MOLONEY: There seems to be quite a bit of confusion, due primarily to political squabbles in Washington, and resultingly prejudiced publicity about the place of bowling in the national defense pattern, and about the function of this office.

With regard to the latter, the writer was appointed by the responsible parties in government to coordinate the activities of the Nation's 16,000,000 bowlers and to direct these activities into whatever channels might best be fitted to the Nation's war efforts. Just as you would respond quickly to your country's call for service in any capacity, so, too, did I accept my responsibility. And my service is without compensation in any form.

I am the first to recognize that nonessentials should be discarded in all-out war. But before America's No. 1 participating sport is relegated to the ash can, we must in all fairness examine the facts. This is a war of production, a war which requires the active and efficient service of 18 civilians on the home front for every man in uniform on the battlefield. Anything which increases production helps to benefit that man in uniform and brings the day of peace closer.

Literally thousands of testimonial letters from industrial organizations—many engaged in defense work—testify to the importance of bowling leagues and team activity which has brought about improved relations between labor and management and a higher degree of efficiency in production. In view of this evidence, bowling is not on the questionable grounds of morale or physical fitness but on the firm foundation of production. These industrialists—hard-headed businessmen—recognize bowling in its practical sense, an activity available to persons of all ages, under all weather conditions, at its peak during those months of the year when normal forms of recreation are impossible.

Yours very truly,

JACK M. WILLEM,
National Bowling Coordinator.

Mr. BYRD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed, as a part of my remarks, a communication from the Roller Rink Safety League, of Rockford, Ill.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLLER RINK SAFETY LEAGUE,
Rockford, Ill., March 28, 1942.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator from Virginia,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: You may be interested in the enclosed page of our last bulletin with its comment on Hale America and as an answer to your courtesy of March 19.

Cordially yours,

RUFUS M. FOSTER,
ROLLER RINK SAFETY LEAGUE.

ROLLER RINK SAFETY LEAGUE—BULLETIN
NO. 7—MARCH 1942

THE "HALE AMERICA" IDEA

Many have asked about the "Hale America" physical-fitness program.

Every sports activity in the country, including roller skating, owes a vote of thanks to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, for uncovering this one.

Apparently a group of smart politicians saw an opportunity for some soft jobs at public expense. That seems to be the conclusion.

We were told at our January meeting that our Government was greatly disturbed about the lack of physical development of the average man called for war service; that people generally were to be urged to participate in organized physical exercise; that the provision of such organized physical-exercise facilities was a direct contribution to the war needs of our country; and that roller skating was recognized as one of the desirable forms of physical exercise.

Nothing was disclosed about any elaborate plan to regiment physical activity; of asking our Government for an appropriation of a million dollars for a staff of "coordinators" for each sport activity, as has since been disclosed by Senator BYRD.

Pearl Harbor was fresh in our mind. Everyone was anxious to do everything within our power to help our country to win this war. Naturally, that is our first objective today. Of course, we "stuck our neck out." Who wouldn't? The roller-rink operators at this meeting prepared a letter and a pledge of cooperation to the "Hale America" Department of the Office of Civilian Defense and asked that it be sent to the national headquarters. Of course, we suggested to you and to other rink operators to volunteer your services to your own local civilian defense committees.

We can be thankful that our letter and our pledge of cooperation was not even acknowledged by this "Hale America" outfit; that we did not incur any publicity.

We did express our appreciation to Senator BYRD for his disclosures, and have a very gracious acknowledgment from him.

WAR PROBLEMS

Every American has just one problem now, and that is to make his utmost contribution to the war needs of his country. Until this is done, our privileges, our business, our resources, and even our lives are in hock.

Many will be called upon for personal service to the country, either in the military or the war-production departments. The rest must do all that can be done to preserve as much as possible the normal life of the country.

Some lines of business, such as automobile sales agencies and gasoline stations, will be greatly curtailed or temporarily wiped out.

Other lines of business will prosper. This will be true of the public transportation companies and of practically every line of amusement.

Roller skating has a grand opportunity to advance itself and to be of service to the country from a purely civilian standpoint. This business will have its problems, of course, but they can be solved.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am just in receipt of a copy of a letter which Mr. J. D. Rogers, vice president, Stonega Coke & Coal Co., Big Stone Gap, Va., has written to the Under Secretary of the Treasury, enclosing a voucher for $2,200, which is a patriotic donation by 256 workmen at the Derby Colliery of the Stonega Coke & Coal Co., near Big Stone Gap, Va., to be used for the purpose of financing national defense.

This represents a donation to the United States Treasury of an entire day's earnings. I think this is a very patriotic and fine action on the part of these employees of the Stonega Coke & Coal Co., and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STONEGA COKE & COAL CO., INC.,
Big Stone Gap, Va., March 31, 1942.

Mr. D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On February 20 I wrote Senator HARRY F. BYRD requesting that he determine for me how money donated to the Government for national-defense purposes should be handled; on February 24 Senator BYRD wrote you regarding same, and on February 27 you gave the information to Senator BYRD which I now have before me.

I am enclosing voucher for $2,200, dated March 31, 1942, and made payable to the Treasurer of the United States. On this voucher it is stated:

"This voucher represents the donation of 1 day's pay by 256 men of Derby Local 6353, United Mine Workers of America, Derby Colliery of the Stonega Coke & Coal Co., Derby, Va., and a small donation made by the Stonega Coke & Coal Co. This money is to be used by the Government for national defense."

Two hundred fifty-six men at our Derby colliery donated their entire day's earnings to the United States Treasury, and made the request that the money be sent to the Treasurer of the United States to be used for national defense; no specific item of defense was mentioned, therefore it can be used at the discretion of the Treasurer.

We think this was a very fine gesture on the part of the men working at this colliery, and it would be very much appreciated if you could find time to reply to my letter giving full credit to the spirit of the men who made this gift possible. I wish very much to communicate to them the contents of your letter. The name of the president of Derby Local 6353, United Mine Workers of America, is Mr. Tom Williams; the address is Derby, Va.

Thanking you for your cooperation, I am,
Yours very truly,
J. D. ROGERS, *Vice President.*

EVASION OF CIVIL-SERVICE RULES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, some time ago it was reported to me, as a member of the Committee on Civil Service, that the high standards of our civil service are in serious danger. I have been told more than once that attempts are being made to place in responsible Government positions those who normally could not and should not be certified for such positions. While I have not yet investigated all the reports which have come to me, I have found time to ascertain the facts concerning one complaint which was made directly to me.

It was reported to me that the Federal Communications Commission had requested the Civil Service Commission to certify a man for a position previously held by the Assistant Secretary. I was further advised that, inasmuch as the one whom the Federal Communications Commission desired to hire could not possibly qualify for the job, the qualifications were changed so that they might fit the man, rather than to require the applicant for the job to fit the qualifications.

I requested the President of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, to submit to me a copy of the job write-up of work performed by the former Assistant Secretary of the Federal Communications Commission, and also a job write-up under which his successor would be qualified for the position. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, the correspondence between Mr. Mitchell and myself which pertains to this case.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1942.

Mr. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: I would appreciate it very much if you will have sent to me a copy of the job write-up of work performed by former assistant secretary of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. John B. Reynolds. I would also like to obtain a copy of the register of eligibles for this position.

There have been rumors persistent that efforts are being made to circumvent the civil-service rules by having the requirements fit the applicant rather than the applicant fit the requirements in filling the vacancy to the position I mentioned above. I would appreciate your reply to this at your earliest convenience.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE D. AIKEN.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1942.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Replying to your letter of March 9, I am enclosing herewith copy of a job write-up of work performed by former assistant secretary of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. John B. Reynolds.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

ASSISTANT SECRETARY, CAF–13

Assists the Secretary who is the chief administrative officer of the Commission in the performance of the general duties of the Commission; plans, assigns, directs, and assumes responsibilities for the administrative matters as delegated by the Commission; supervises and directs the installation of office systems, methods, policies, and procedure and correlates and coordinates the various activities of the Commission; directs the preparation of estimates and serves as budget officer of the Commission before the Bureau of the Budget and various congressional appropriations committees; personnel officer of the Commission, in which capacity prepares recommendations relative to the requirements of and changes in personnel and as to their efficiency and performance of work. Deals on own initiative with public and interested parties and press; attends Commission meetings and acts as consultant to the Commissioners in matters relating to Government procedure and requirements, and in the absence of the Secretary assumes his duties and responsibilities as Acting Secretary.

Approved and allocated by Civil Service Commission for former Assistant Secretary (Mr. Reynolds) February 1, 1937.

MARCH 13, 1942.

Mr. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much for the job write-up of work performed by former assistant secretary of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. John B. Reynolds.

Now I would like to have you send me the job write-up of the new assistant secretary, Mr. Edward Cooper.

I notice that you did not mention my request for a copy of the register of eligibles for this position. Am I to understand that compliance with this request is not authorized?

Very truly yours,
GEORGE D. AIKEN.

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: In response to your letter of March 13, 1942, I am enclosing copy of a new job sheet, in accordance with which it is expected to fill the position formerly held by Mr. John B. Reynolds of the Federal Communications Commission.

The Federal Communications Commission apparently wishes to fill that position by a special assistant to the Commissioners.

I must have overlooked your request for a copy of the register of eligibles for the position in question or I would have explained that situation. It is impossible to say what register would be used until there is an agreement on the duties of the position and that point apparently has only now been settled.

The duties of the position, as set forth in this job sheet, will now have to be compared with the duties as set forth in announcements of examinations held to obtain eligibles for filling positions with similar duties. The register that is most likely to be used is one resulting from an examination held for administrative and executive positions, and there are something like 6,000 names on that register. It is impossible to say, without going through the register, whether there are any persons who might meet the particular requirements as set forth in the job sheet. In the event no one was found on that register, there are other registers we would have to go through to see if we could find persons with these particular qualifications.

I trust this gives you the information desired, but if there is anything further, please write me again.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONERS

Under the general direction of the Commissioners and the secretary, to be responsible for the final preparation and presentation of the Commission's budget estimates to the Bureau of the Budget and the House Appropriations Committee; for acting as liaison officer between the Commission and the telephone, telegraph, and broadcasting companies, and administrative and legislative bodies, State and Federal, on matters of procedure and findings, and with a view to ascertaining and clarifying the nature of specific complaints; deals on own initiative with public and interested parties; attends Commission meetings and acts as consultant to the Commissioners in matters relating to Government procedure and requirements, particularly problems of communications, and advises the Commission on all problems arising from legislative proposals, and in the absence of the secretary assumes his duties and responsibilities as acting secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it appears to me that here is an instance of an attempted flagrant violation of the principles of civil service for the purpose of putting into this $5,600 job a man who could not qualify for it. If he were qualified for the job, then, there would be no need of changing the job sheet.

The Civil Service Commission has not advised me whether the new job write-up qualifies this man for the job.

I am not in any way criticizing the Civil Service Commission. It was reported to me a short time ago, from

another source, that the Civil Service Commission finally refused to certify him for this job which would be held under the new job write-up.

Furthermore, I want to make it plain that I am not criticizing the applicant himself for the job. I know nothing about him; I have heard that he is very capable in his own line of work, even though he cannot qualify under the existing job sheet for this particular job. The fact remains however, that according to the job sheet, the Federal Communications Commission apparently did request the qualifying of a lobbyist at $5,600 a year.

As I stated, Mr. President, this is not the only complaint which has come to me, but it is the only one into which I have specifically inquired. I intend to follow up some of the others. I know that in the case of some departments of the Government it may be necessary to deviate from strict rules, but I feel that we should make every effort to see to it that the high plane or standard of our civil-service system is not weakened or lowered. There is plenty of work for everyone to do in this war effort. Now is not the time, if ever there shall be a time, to hire lobbyists for Government commissions or to make Government jobs for those who cannot get them under the regular procedure.

CLEARNESS AND SINGLENESS OF PURPOSE—PARAPHRASE OF LINCOLN'S LETTER TO GREELEY

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, before proceeding with the regular order of business of the Senate, I wish to read into the RECORD at this point a statement which I think may be helpful with regard to our singleness of purpose in the war at this time.

In 1862, when Horace Greeley wrote an editorial in the New York Tribune raising doubt as to the clearness and singleness of the purpose of President Lincoln toward the war then in progress, Lincoln replied in a famous letter which has set the pattern for any statement seeking to emphasize singleness and clearness of purpose.

In recommending a policy for the present war, therefore, I wrote a paraphrase of that letter, which I read on March 23 in Cleveland, Ohio, and more recently in Portland, Maine. I believe its pattern of thought is helpful, and therefore I present it here as a recommendation to all of us alike—Republicans, Democrats, independents, employees, employers, farmers, and all other American men and women, and every race, condition, and creed. Lincoln's letter, paraphrased to meet the condition of today, is as follows:

As to the policy we are pursuing we must not leave anyone in doubt.

We would win the war. We would win it completely and in the shortest way. The sooner it is won the greater will be the opportunity of America and of all humanity to resume the forward course of civilization.

If there be those who would not win the war unless they could at the same time save the New Deal, or any other deal, we do not agree with them. If there be those who would not win the war unless they could at the same time destroy the New Deal, or any other deal, we do not agree with them. Our paramount object in this struggle is to win the war and save the freedom of America, and is not either to save or to destroy the New Deal or any other deal.

If we could win the war without destroying the New Deal, we would do it; and if we could win the war by destroying the New Deal, we would do it; and if we could win the war by destroying parts of the New Deal and saving other parts of the New Deal, we would also do that. What we do about the New Deal we do because we believe it helps to win the war, and what we forbear we forbear because we do not believe it would help to win the war. We shall do less whenever we shall believe what we are doing hurts the cause of the United Nations in the war, and we shall do more whenever we shall believe doing more will help the cause of the United Nations in the war. We shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and we shall adopt new views as fast as they shall appear to be true views.

We have here stated our purpose according to our view of our duty, and we intend no modification of our oft-expressed wish that all men everywhere shall be free, and that we in America shall return speedily to the enjoyment of a free and representative government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS SOCIALISM (S. DOC. NO. 196)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the question of shortages in important materials has been brought to the front in the last few days, particularly in reference to the shortage of rubber and tin, involving monopolistic practices of corporations that have enjoyed monopolistic immunity.

The disorder manifested in our economic system is shown to be due largely to monopolistic practices of corporations operating in violation of our antitrust laws. In my opinion, lack of prosecution of these violations must be held responsible for the chaotic condition of our economy. On the 30th of last month the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] inserted in the RECORD some extracts from the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. The information contained therein is of such importance that I think it should be made available to as many of our population in the United States as are interested in reading it. I think it should be published as a Senate document, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement and extracts submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, and printed in the RECORD on March 30, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask to include in my request for unanimous consent that the document be printed in the regular RECORD type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that is a matter which is governed by the regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing.

BANKING FACILITIES AT MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the military authorities have been somewhat disturbed about the lack of banking facilities in the larger military camps. After some consultation with them the Comptroller of the Currency has asked that a bill be passed which would authorize the establishment of branch banks in military camps upon approval of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be. The Banking and Currency Committee has unanimously reported such a bill. There is absolutely no opposition to it. I have taken it up with the minority leader and he is agreeable to the consideration and passage of the measure. I am sure there will be no opposition to it, and, if there is any, I will withdraw my request for its consideration. I therefore ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1603, calendar No. 1272.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1603) to provide for the extension of banking facilities at military reservations and at navy yards and stations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5155 of Revised Statutes of 1873, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 36; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 12, sec. 36), be further amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, a national bank may, upon authorization of the Comptroller of the Currency and subject to such conditions and limitations as he shall prescribe, provide banking facilities at United States military reservations and navy yards and stations, but no such authorization shall become effective or continue in effect except with the consent of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, whichever has jurisdiction."

DEFENSE HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TAFT (for Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. (a) The sum of $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of enabling the National Housing Agency to provide housing in or near the District of Columbia (including living quarters for single persons and for families) for employees of the United States whose duties

are determined by the National Housing Administrator to be essential to national defense and to require them to reside in or near the District of Columbia.

"(b) In providing the housing for which an appropriation is authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the National Housing Administrator is authorized to exercise all of the powers specified in subsections (a) and (b) of section 1 of this Act, subject to the limitations upon exercise of such powers specified in such subsections.

"(c) The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available to pay administrative expenses in connection with providing the housing for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(d) The housing provided with funds authorized to be appropriated by this section may be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposing of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income.

"SEC. 402. (a) The sum of $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of enabling the Federal Works Administrator to provide public works and equipment therefor in and near the District of Columbia. Such public works may include, but shall not be limited to, schools, waterworks, sewers, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets, roads, facilities for the disposal of sewage, garbage, and refuse, and other types of necessary public works.

"(b) In providing the public works and equipment therefor for which appropriations are authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to exercise all of the powers specified in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 202 of this Act. Such public works and equipment therefor shall be provided subject to the provisions of section 203 of this Act.

"(c) The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available to pay administrative expenses in connection with providing the public works and equipment therefor for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept for the District of Columbia, and the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to make to the District of Columbia, advancements for the provision of public works and equipment therefor, such advancements to be deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

"(b) Sums advanced to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia hereunder shall be available for the provision, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of any or all public works and equipment therefor described in section 402 hereof, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including employment of engineering and other professional services and other technical and administrative personnel without reference to the civil-service requirements or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The repayment of any sums so advanced and the payment of interest thereon shall be in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as are set forth in sections 3 and 4 of the Act of December 20, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 362, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"(c) The Commissioners shall submit with their annual estimates to the Congress a report of their activities and expenditures under this section.

"SEC. 404. As used in this Act the term 'Federal Works Administrator' or 'Administrator,' or 'Federal Works Agency' shall, with respect to housing, be deemed to refer to the National Housing Administrator or the National Housing Agency, as the case may be. Such terms shall, with respect to public works and equipment therefor, be deemed to refer to the Federal Works Administrator or the Federal Works Agency, as the case may be."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALLAN J. ELLENDER,
CLAUDE PEPPER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

FRITZ G. LANHAM,
C. JASPER BELL,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

ARMY NOMINATIONS REPORTED—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably sundry nominations, practically all of which are routine. All these nominations were passed upon by a subcommittee of our committee delegated to ascertain the merits or demerits of the officers concerned.

When I say the nominations are routine, I may say there are two exceptions, one of them being in the case of the nomination of Brig. Gen. William Fletcher Sharp, now in the Philippines on active duty, to be major general, and the other the nomination of Maj. Gen. James Henry Burns to be chief of ordnance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator wish to obtain action on these nominations today?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to have action on them today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that after the call of the Executive Calendar the Senator ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the nominations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Very well. I should like to ask the Senator, while we are on the subject of nominations, whether I am correct in understanding that between now and the 20th of April no business of any nature whatsoever will be transacted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not quite that. I might make a statement in that connection. It had been expected that the legislative appropriation bill would be considered today, but, for reasons which did not appear on the surface, it seemed wise that it go over until Monday. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations, by Monday, will have reported the deficiency bill, carrying an appropriation of $18,000,000,000 or more, for aircraft and other matters pertaining to the war effort. I hope that Monday we may dispose of these two appropriation bills, and that following that we may take a series of 3-day recesses until the 20th of April, unless some emergency should call us together sooner. Unless the Members of the Senate receive word prior to the 20th that their presence is needed, they may be at ease until that date.

I think there will be no objection to disposing of conference reports which may be ready for consideration during the recess.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As well as nominations?

Mr. BARKLEY. And nominations; but, so far as I can say, no important legislation will be considered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was particularly interested in nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we are able to report from the Committee on Appropriations the large appropriation bill to which the Senator from Kentucky has referred, and it should be passed Monday, it no doubt would have to go to conference. If any of us are to return to our homes during the informal recess, we will have to get away within the next few days, and I was wondering whether we could not have a meeting on Tuesday, for instance, in order to take up the conference report on the large appropriation bill. I am sure we could get the bill through conference within a day, certainly within 2 days, and if we could have a meeting on Tuesday, some of us on the committee would be given an opportunity to have a day or two at home.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion, and I had it in mind. Assuming we pass the appropriation bill Monday and it shall go to conference, there will be one or two controversial matters which could be worked out, and my view is that when the conferees agree on a report and it comes back to the two Houses, there will be no particular controversy over the report, and we might adopt the conference report at once. I am willing and glad to accommodate myself to the convenience of the Committee on Appropriations, and the conference committee also, so that we may dispose of the conference report at the very earliest possible date, even though it may require a meeting on Tuesday or Wednesday, in order that, if Senators wish to do so, they may return to their homes for a few days, with the assurance that no important legislation will be taken up without their being given ample notice.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope that arrangement can be made. It will be rather difficult to have a quorum after Monday, I imagine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the same time, no doubt, with an appropriation bill such as the one to which reference has been

made, carrying so large an appropriation for the necessary expenses of the Army, unless the conference report shall be acted on soon, the bill will be considerably delayed, and I do not think such a measure should be delayed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think we should delay until the end of our informal recess the determination of a bill of that type. Of course, I shall accommodate myself to the convenience of the committee, and cooperate with the Senator from Tennessee in disposing of the bill at the very earliest date, even though it may require a session Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, while both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Tennessee are present, I should like to call attention to the reference which has been made to the deficiency appropriation bill. Is that a correct description of the $18,000,000,000 bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; this is the sixth deficiency bill at this session of Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator help my thinking by telling me why it is called a deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a deficiency in the money which the War Department and the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission need, and such appropriations always come before the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and before the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DANAHER. It does not mean that the agencies mentioned, the departments the Senator has enumerated, have actually spent $18,000,000,000 more than we previously appropriated, does it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, it does not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it would be more appropriate to refer to the bill as the sixth supplemental appropriation bill, rather than as a deficiency bill, because it is to take effect immediately, and is not one of the annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year beginning July 1. It really is a supplemental appropriation bill, not necessarily in all its features a deficiency bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct, although this particular bill carries deficiencies for a number of departments other than the War Department.

Mr. BARKLEY. For a number of other agencies and departments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that probably the bill is called a deficiency bill because it goes before the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. All these large war appropriations have gone before that subcommittee, which is known as the deficiency subcommittee. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, it is really more of a supplemental appropriation bill than a deficiency bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator, and I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I had in mind that it was only a month or so ago that he was explaining to us that the appropriations at that time had accumulated in such vast totals that some $58,000,000,000 would be unexpended as of June 30, 1942. To that vast sum thus unexpended we would now add, by supplemental appropriations, another $18,000,000,000, which, I assume, will make a total of $76,000,000,000 which will be unexpended on June 30.

Mr. McKELLAR. Most of it will not be expended, but it all will be allocated by that time. The bill which the Senate passed in January carried a little less than $33,000,000,000. Before that there was another, I think in December, but the one in January carried $33,000,000,000, and the bill we are about to report will carry $18,000,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Perhaps we can close the discussion by the observation that, instead of the bill getting its name "deficiency" from having been assigned to a deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, it means we are going to appropriate $18,000,000,000 more of income which we do not now have.

Mr. McKELLAR. For the war.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to have immediate action on the nominations he has today reported from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to have immediate consideration of the nominations. They are routine, with the exception of two officers, one serving in the Philippines and the other nominated to be chief of ordnance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 6, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Carlton J. H. Hayes, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Davies, Jr., of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles I. Lafferty, of Atlantic City, N. J., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa. Reappointment.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Alan G. Kirk to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 24th day of November 1941.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William R. Munroe, January 1, 1942.
John F. Shafroth, Jr., March 1, 1942.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Charles A. Baker, December 8, 1941.
Leon S. Fiske, December 8, 1941.
Thorvald A. Solberg, January 1, 1942.
Fred M. Earle, January 1, 1942.
Frank P. Thomas, January 1, 1942.
Robert W. Cary, January 1, 1942.
Benjamin F. Perry, January 1, 1942.
Hubert E. Paddock, January 1, 1942.
William S. Popham, January 1, 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

John P. Heath	Vincent W. Grady
Charles R. Brown	Arnold E. True
Leon J. Huffman	William R. Cooke, Jr.
Peter G. Hale	John S. Crenshaw
Adelbert F. Converse	Alex M. Loker
Bernard E. Manseau	William D. Hoover
Harold D. Baker	Raymond A. Hansen
Bradford E. Grow	John C. Lester
Armand J. Robertson	Thomas B. Dugan
Campbell H. Minckler	Omer A. Kneeland
William S. G. Davis	Hyman G. Rickover
George C. Miller	Harold F. Pullen
George H. Lyttle	Marion E. Murphy
Jasper T. Acuff	Archibald E. Uehlinger
Harold R. Parker	

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Robert D. Conrad, July 1, 1941.
Robert F. Martin, December 8, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Alfred R. Truslow, Jr.	William White
Frank T. Corbin	Eugene S. Sarsfield
John Eldridge, Jr.	Ernest R. Perry
Harry H. McIlhenny	George L. Shane
John E. Fitzgibbon	Charles M. Tooke
George Knuepfer	Ernest W. Lamons
Edward J. Drew	Frederic F. Agens
Ernest Blake	Robert C. Winters
Henry J. Armstrong, Jr.	Jack H. Lewis
Benjamin Katz	Edmund T. Napier, Jr.
Daniel B. Miller	Lee W. Parke
Charles H. Quinn	Edward N. Teall, Jr.
Anderson Offutt	James L. Shank
Clifton B. Maddox	Emmanuel T. Goyette

Arthur K. Ehle	Harry R. Hummer, Jr.
George L. Hansen	Thomas C. Green
Philip A. Tague, Jr.	John O. R. Coll
Robert A. Johnson	Samuel M. Pickering
William F. Royall	John S. Tracy
Levi J. Knight, Jr.	George B. H. Stallings
Eugene F. McDaniel	William D. Irvin
Renwick S. Calderhead	Charles W. Parker
Harry L. Hicks	Claude L. Weigle
David B. Coleman	Joseph A. Flynn
Myron W. Graybill	Milton T. Dayton
William H. Potts	Clarence E. Boyd
John G. McClaughry	James K. Averill
William R. Ignatius	Curtis A. Myers
William E. Kaitner	Albert B. Mayfield, Jr.
Leonidas W. Pancoast	George A. Lange
Harry M. Denty	Clarence E. Cortner
Joshua W. Cooper	Glenn W. Legwen, Jr.
Francis E. Cromwell	Glynn R. Donaho
Granville A. Moore	Alston Ramsay
Edward P. Southwick	Paul D. Gross

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Edward R. Nelson, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Willard J. Bain, July 1, 1941.
Willie M. Dickey, July 1, 1941.
Clinton A. Neyman, Jr., October 2, 1941.
Donald N. Clay, November 1, 1941.
J. C. Gillespie Wilson, November 1, 1941.
John D. Gerwick, November 1, 1941.
James M. Wolfe, Jr., December 8, 1941.
John S. Fletcher, December 8, 1941.
William J. Francis, Jr., December 16, 1941.
John H. Brandt, December 16, 1941.
Albert R. Weldon, December 16, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Frank E. Sellers, Jr.	Matthew S. Schmidling
William B. Wideman	Arthur M. Purdy
Roy C. Klinker	Philip F. Hauck
William R. Barnes	Franklin G. Hess
Frank McE. Smith	Carleton R. Kear, Jr.
Warren W. Armstrong	Thomas D. McGrath
Alton E. Paddock	Richard E. Harmer
Albert L. Carlson	John H. Cotten
Raleigh C. Kirkpatrick, Jr.	Lloyd A. Smith
	Edward B. Schutt

Ensign Robert B. Byrnes to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 2d day of June 1941.

The following-named medical inspectors to be medical directors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941:

Bertram Groesbeck, Jr.
Millard F. Hudson
John H. Robbins

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Dwight J. Wharton
Harvey E. Robins
John F. Luten

Passed Assistant Surgeon Douglas T. Prehn to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Assistant Surgeon Robert V. King to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of August 1941.

The following-named dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941:

Arthur H. Yando
Charles C. Tinsley

The following-named dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Gunnar N. Wennerberg
Theodore DeW. Allan

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Walter W. Lippold, April 1, 1941.
Kenneth L. Urban, August 1, 1941.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Roland W. Rickertts to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 16th day of December 1941.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John B. Cline, December 8, 1941.
Christian L. Ewald, January 1, 1942.
Fletcher McC. Lamkin, January 1, 1942.
Constantine C. Mathas, January 1, 1942.

Gunner Wilbur R. Hunter to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of November 1940.

Radio Electrician Clifton Shumaker to be a chief radio electrician in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of July 1941.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

Joe B. Decker, December 2, 1941.
Ralph H. Packer, January 1, 1942.
Frank McDole, January 1, 1942.

The following named lieutenant commanders to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Carter A. Printup, September 1, 1939.
Paul W. Hord, October 1, 1939.
Willis H. Pickton, October 1, 1939.
Paul A. Hartzell, October 1, 1939.
Waldo Tullsen, October 1, 1939.
William G. H. Lind, October 1, 1939.
Thomas C. Thomas, October 1, 1939.
Joe W. Stryker, October 1, 1939.
Eugene E. Paro, October 1, 1939.
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr., December 29, 1939.
Claude W. Haman, August 16, 1940.
Benjamin Van M. Russell, November 1, 1940.
John G. Foster, Jr., December 13, 1940.
Harold T. Deutermann, August 1, 1941.
Edwin W. Herron, August 1, 1941.
Thomas O. Oberrender, Jr., August 1, 1941.
Arnold W. McKechnie, August 1, 1941.
Liles W. Creighton, September 1, 1941.
David C. White, September 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Barry K. Atkins, October 1, 1939.
John A. Tyree, Jr., July 9, 1940.
Wallace A. Sherrill, July 13, 1940.
John S. Coye, Jr., August 16, 1940.
Raymond B. Jacoby, November 1, 1940.
Joseph W. Williams, Jr., November 10, 1940.
Murray Hanson, November 23, 1940.
Lemuel M. Stevens, Jr., January 5, 1941.
Raymond P. Zimmerman, May 1, 1941.
Isthmian L. Powell, May 24, 1941.
Edward W. Abbot, June 1, 1941.

The following-named paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of September 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

James R. Hanna
James P. Dowden

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Donald W. Twigg, December 13, 1940.
Alfred T. Magnell, December 13, 1940.
Thomas P. O'Connell, December 13, 1940.
Laurence A. White, May 24, 1941.
Howard F. Kuehl, June 1, 1941.

Wallace L. Chesbro to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 20th day of October 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 26th day of March 1942:

Talcott Bates	William H. Requarth
Otto A. Will, Jr.	Joseph A. Tyburczy
Roger D. Sherman	John H. Griffin
George L. Basham	Merrill W. Etzenhouser
Richter H. Wiggall	Robert M Wallace
David J. Henry	Thomas R. Counihan
Edward F. McGrath	Robert H. Parker
Ralph L. Christy, Jr.	William C. Hamby
Paul P. Pickering	Gilbert C. Campbell
Walworth R. Slenger	Nevin R. Trimbur
Charles A. Sand	Kenneth N. Roberts
Bruce R. McCampbell	John J. Tordoff
Edward W. Pinkham, Jr.	John F. Barber
	Jerome J. Burke
Robert B. Lindsay	Frederick A. Ruoff
Harold A. Smedal	Robert B. Strother
Gustavus D. Bock	Herbert Wilson, Jr.
Kenneth M. Coyne	James N. Jeter
Henry C. Hunley, Jr.	Louis R. Gens
Lloyd A. Boehm	

Assistant Paymaster Raphael A. Zoeller to be an ensign in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939.

The following Reserve officers to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Charles H. Johnson, Jr., June 1, 1939.
John P. Aymond, June 1, 1939.
Frank W. Bampton, June 1, 1939.
Edgar H. Forrest, June 1, 1939.
Wade C. Wells, June 1, 1939.
Gordon A. Bowker, November 28, 1939.
Vernon J. Coley, Jr., June 6, 1940.
Frank V. Andrews, June 13, 1940.
John E. Parrott, June 19, 1940.
Augustus Knight, Jr., June 24, 1940.

MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Ralph S. Keyser to be a major general in the Marine Corps on the retired list for temporary service from the 20th day of March 1942.

Brig. Gen. Seth Williams, the Quartermaster, United States Marine Corps, to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 20th day of March 1942.

Col. Ralph J. Mitchell to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 30th day of March 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE

Maj. Gen. James Henry Burns (colonel, Ordnance Department) Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Charles M. Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, whose term of office expires June 2, 1942.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS

John Mitchell Willis, Jr.
Michael Joseph Hitchko
Robert Hicks Holmes
Arthur Joseph Carbonell
Edward Jenner Whiteley

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, DENTAL CORPS

George Nicholas Schulte
Edwin Howell Smith, Jr.
Julius Calvin Sexson
Frank Archer Mitchell

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Perry Cole Ragan

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. James Lee Massey

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Lt. Col. Edward Marion George
Lt. Col. Wallace Marmaduke Allison

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. James Aloysius Cain, Jr.

TO CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

First Lt. Ronald LeVerne Martin

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. James Arthur Plant
Second Lt. William Thomas Seawell
Second Lt. Howard Clarke Goodell
Second Lt. Kenneth O'Reilly Dessert
Second Lt. Hume Peabody, Jr.
Second Lt. Ben Isbel Mayo, Jr.
Second Lt. Robert Merrill Tuttle
Second Lt. John Langford Locke
Second Lt. Wayne Edgar Rhynard
Second Lt. Charles Edwin Jones
Second Lt. John Miles Henschke
Second Lt. David Ernest Kunkel, Jr.
Second Lt. Clarence Lewis Elder
Second Lt. Robert James Colleran
Second Lt. Floyd Sturdevan Cofer, Jr.
Second Lt. Willis Bruner Sawyer
Second Lt. John Adams Brooks 3d
Second Lt. Clifford Elbert Cole.
Second Lt. Eric Thomas de Jonckheere
Second Lt. William LeRoy Mitchell, Jr.
Second Lt. Leon Herman Berger
Second Lt. George Hamilton Stillson, Jr.
Second Lt. Edwin Watson Brown
Second Lt. Paul Rutherford Larson
Second Lt. Herbert Welcome Frawley, Jr.
Second Lt. Jack Leith Bentley
Second Lt. Andrew Julius Evans, Jr.
Second Lt. Robert William Horn
Second Lt. Walter Leon Moore, Jr.
Second Lt. Richard William Kline
Second Lt. Paul James O'Brien
Second Lt. Thomas Rees Cramer
Second Lt. William Wallace Brier 4th
Second Lt. Clinton Field Ball
Second Lt. Rob Reed McNagny, Jr.
Second Lt. Fred Miles Hampton
Second Lt. Charles Love Mullins
Second Lt. Charles Sumner Seamans 3d
Second Lt. James Henderson Dieneit
Second Lt. Gwynne Sutherland Curtis, Jr.
Second Lt. Horace Grattan Foster, Jr.
Second Lt. John William Meador
Second Lt. George Scratchley Brown
Second Lt. Richards Abner Aldridge
Second Lt. Joseph John Weidner
Second Lt. George Luther Hicks 3d
Second Lt. Edison Kermit Walters
Second Lt. Maxwell Weston Sullivan, Jr.
Second Lt. Charles Fuller Matheson
Second Lt. Thomas Goldsborough Corbin
Second Lt. Harry Canavan Harvey
Second Lt. Roderic Dhu O'Connor
Second Lt. Edgar Mathews Sliney
Second Lt. Charles Edwin Thomas 3d
Second Lt. Edwin Forrest Harding, Jr.
Second Lt. Jean Albert Jack

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Harry Albert Flint, Cavalry.
Walter Melville Robertson, Infantry.
John Henry Lindt, Coast Artillery Corps.
Pearl Lee Thomas, Cavalry.
Sidney Vincent Bingham, Cavalry.
Bird Spencer DuBois, Coast Artillery Corps.
Isaac Spalding, Field Artillery.
Harry James Malony, Field Artillery.
Henry Lytton Flynn, Cavalry
Robert Fee Hyatt, Field Artillery.
Harold Marvin Rayner, Cavalry.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captain

Edward James Watson

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps

William Henry Anderson

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Robert Walter Stika

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Lt. Col. Howard Burdette Nurse
First Lt. Carl Morton Sciple
First Lt. Charles Murray Henley
First Lt. Daniel Allen Richards

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Alden Pugh Taber
First Lt. William Russell Huber

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. Willard Stewart Paul

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Burton Curtis Andrus, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be lieutenant colonels

Guy Lewis McNeil, Air Corps.
Landon Johnson Lockett, Infantry.
Columbus Bierce Lenow, Finance Department.
Charles Henry Calais, Infantry.
William Thomas Johnson, Financc Department.
Clarence Prescott Talbot, Air Corps.
Charles Deans Calley, Field Artillery.
Alfred Miljevaich Jewett, Air Corps.
Loyd Daniel Bunting, Infantry.
Elam LaFayette Stewart, Quartermaster Corps.
Louie Clifford Mallory, Air Corps.
Bob Childs, Infantry.
Lewis Selwyn Webster, Air Corps.
Virgil Grover Allen, Infantry.
William Edward Smith, Quartermaster Corps.
William Andrew Smith, Quartermaster Corps.
Roy William Camblin, Air Corps.
Ray Eric Cavenee, Infantry.
Wade Darragh Killen, Infantry.
Andrew Jackson Schriver, Jr., Infantry.
Frank James Lawrence, Infantry.
Dorrance Scott Roysdon, Infantry.
Hyatt Floyd Newell, Infantry.
John Easton McCammon, Infantry.
Jules Verne Sims, Infantry.
Charles Carlton, Infantry.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

Frederick Clay Weekley
George N. Schuhmann

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

Elbert LaFayette Fenske

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Ralph William Mohri

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr.
William Fletcher Sharp

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Walter D. Cannon, Campo.
Charles M. Rice, Hamilton City.
Emelia S. Schutt, Lafayette.
Ernest Lavagnino, San Juan Bautista.
Floyd M. Filson, Tennant.
Benjamin H. Steeg, Twentynine Palms.

MARYLAND

Cecil E. Trinkaus, Oella.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph F. Gallagher, Olyphant.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Theodore O. Wedel, canon, Washington Cathedral, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who makest us glad with the yearly remembrance of the Resurrection of Thy Son, our Lord, and who art ever ready to open the gate of eternal life, even here and now, to those who yield themselves to Thy will and who worship Thy holy Name: Grant us a full measure of Easter joy; and may this Easter message bring to all men of good will throughout the world a new courage and a fresh hope. As the disciples on the Resurrection morn were astonished and turned from hopelessness to dauntless faith, so may all who revere Thee today receive the grace of Eastertide in their hearts.

Give to our Nation a renewed vision of the glory of its high calling—to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly before Thee. Let the joy of hope and the courage of godly faith spring up anew among our people that we may rejoice in Thy presence as sons and daughters of the morning. We ask it through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 3, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund created in accordance with law, including a summary of the operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RELIEF OF PRESENT AND FORMER POSTMASTERS AND ACTING POSTMASTERS

A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment

of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1941

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Works Agency transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania urging Congress to foster and enact legislation providing benefits to civilians who may be injured or the dependents of civilians who may be killed by reason of enemy action, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency (see resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. GUFFEY).

By Mr CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a memorial signed by members of Lodge No. 728 of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, of Junction City, Kans., reaffirming their "no strike" pledge, and remonstrating against the enactment of certain pending and proposed labor legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Local No. 312, International Hod Carriers', Building, and Common Laborers' Union of America, of Pittsburg, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the 40-hour-week provision of existing law, and also against any change in the overtime pay scale; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition of sundry citizens of Manhattan, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IN THE SENATE,
March 31, 1942.

Whereas every individual and every locality throughout the United States has a common responsibility for the prosecution of the present war, and because an attack on a coastal city or any other locality would constitute an attack upon the entire United States, and the resulting cost of injuries to civilians, whether or not gainfully employed, properly constitutes a part of the total cost of carrying the conflict to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas it is recognized that a part of the cost of war is the obligation of support and maintenance of the economic status of civilians and their dependents deprived of their income or ability to maintain themselves by reason of injuries or death caused by enemy action; and

Whereas various States, including Pennsylvania, have enacted workmen's compensation laws providing benefits to injured employees or, in case of death, to their dependents, and under such laws have provided methods of administration which, based on trial and long years of experience, meet the wishes of the people of such States as to the amount of the benefits, the best methods of their determination, and the proper procedure for their payment; and the amounts of such benefits established under the various State laws have been fixed by the legislature with due consideration to the economic loss arising from injury or death to employees in the particular State; and

Whereas it is probable that should the attack resulting in the injury or death of civilians take place during their working hours and at their working places, claims under workmen's compensation laws may be filed, and the authorities charged with enforcing such laws may require that compensation be paid to those injured or the dependents of those killed at work; and such awards of compensation under liability may be assumed by contract by State funds, self-insurers, and insurance companies, and must be paid at least to the extent of existing assets; and the losses resulting from an attack of great proportion might seriously impair their ability not only to pay such awards, but also might threaten the very security of the payment of compensation to hundreds of thousands of civilians injured or the dependents of those killed in industry, some of whose claims date back to the very inception of the law; and

Whereas in the enactment of such workmen's compensation laws the various State legislatures did not and could not have had in contemplation the possibility of losses due to war hazards such as currently exist at this time; and

Whereas insofar as such benefits may apply to civilians injured and killed in the course of their employment, the benefits shall be those that would be applicable under the workmen's compensation law in effect in the place at which they were employed; and

Whereas such legislation shall provide, insofar as such persons may be compensated under existing workmen's compensation laws, that the employers, State funds, or the insurance carriers directly responsible therefor, upon making such payments, shall be reimbursed by the United States; and

Whereas such legislation shall provide that existing administrative agencies of the various States and of existing insurance organizations with their extensive service facilities may be utilized to the fullest extent in the administration of such law and the distribution of the benefits thereunder, thus avoiding the necessity of establishing agencies which may prove unnecessary and which would duplicate already existing facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania hereby urges the Congress of the United States to foster and support legislation providing benefits to civilians who may be injured or the dependents of civilians who may be killed by reason of enemy action which benefits shall be a charge upon the whole people of the United States, equitably and proportionately distributed; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the Congress elected from the State of Pennsylvania.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania on the 31st day of March 1942.

GEORGE F. HOLMES,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

PETITION AND RESOLUTIONS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate disposition and printing in the RECORD, without all the names attached thereto, a petition and several resolutions received from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition and resolutions presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received, appropriately disposed of, and printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached.

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

RIVER FALLS, WIS., *March 24, 1942.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, members of the River Falls State Teachers College, urge you to use all of your influence and your vote to enact in Congress a law suspending for the duration of the war the 40 hours a week, the extra pay for overtime and holidays and Sunday, and the closed shop. We need every industry manufacturing war material to run 24 hours a day and 365 days a year. Stop this wrangle of labor and industry at once and set all to work.

JAMES I. MALOTT,
O. M. HANNA,
(And other citizens).

To the Committee on Finance:

Whereas bill H. R. 6750 seeks to promote the prosecution of war by exempting any defense contractor from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use or consumption of tangible personal property and services; and

Whereas said bill, if enacted into law, will add more burdens to the taxpayers of the country, who are now paying their share of the war burden and who are further aiding the Government in its prosecution of the war by purchasing war stamps and bonds, contributing to the Red Cross and kindred organizations, organized to relieve the burden and furnish comfort to those in the armed forces: Therefore be it

Resolved by the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, That it hereby goes on record as unalterably opposed to bill H. R. 6750, which seeks to exempt any defense contractor from taxation in the performance of any defense contract, and hereby urges its representatives in Congress to oppose the said bill as unfair to the taxpayers of this State;

Resolved further, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and to the Senators and Congressmen from Milwaukee County.

Whereas there has been a concerted effort in Congress to pass legislation consisting of a tax bill by which the interest on municipal bonds would be taxed under Federal income-tax laws; and

Whereas the expenses of cities have greatly increased on account of the national emergency due to increase in wages and increase of cost of materials and increase in services especially arising out of civilian defense; and

Whereas the sources of revenues of municipal corporations, such as cities, is decreased rather than increased on account of the expanding field of taxation assumed by the Federal Government; and

Whereas it is the belief of the mayor and Common Council of the City of La Crosse that to levy a tax upon the interest from municipal bonds would further increase the cost of local government without increasing benefits to the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of La Crosse, That this body does express its opposition to the Federal Government levying a tax upon the income derived from the interest on municipal bonds because of

the reasons set forth in the preamble of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Representative in Congress from this district and to the Senators representing the State of Wisconsin.

GREEN BAY, WIS., *March 18, 1942.*

To the honorable chairman and members of the Brown County Board of Supervisors.

GENTLEMEN: Whereas the war emergency has created a host of additional burdens upon counties, towns, cities, and villages; and

Whereas the curtailment of production of automobiles and allied industries, together with numerous peacetime consumer goods, have substantially reduced the amount of personal property subject to taxation; and

Whereas this has forced a great number of concerns out of business, materially reducing the assessed valuation of such property; and

Whereas the extent of the war effort will continue to expand for an indefinite time in the future, thereby continuing to reduce the valuation of taxable real and personal property; and

Whereas it is essential for the maintenance of local services that the present method of taxation be not disturbed; and

Whereas any loss in local revenue must be made up by increasing the tax on the house owner, the farmer, and the small businessman; and

Whereas H. R. 6750 is now before the Congress of the United States and provides for the exemption of certain taxes for those engaged in war production work without any method of supplementing the losses occurring from such exemptions to the various municipalities and such taxes being vital to the continuation of the welfare and safety of the various communities in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby strenuously oppose the passage of bill H. R. 6750, now before the Congress of the United States, for the reasons set out above; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senators ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE and ALEXANDER WILEY and to Congressman JOSHUA JOHNS urging them to oppose the passage of such legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

MARTIN JANSSEN,
BERNARD L. ROTHE,
HARRY E. MASSE,
HENRY C. WITTIG,
TRUE ANDERSON,
Committee on Finance.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Brown, ss:

Omer F. Rothe, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is the county clerk in and for Brown County, Wis.; that the foregoing resolution is a true and correct copy of resolution passed by the Brown County Board of Supervisors on March 18, 1942.

OMER F. ROTHE,
County Clerk, Brown County, Wis.

PRODUCTION FOR THE WAR EFFORT—PETITION FROM SUMNER COUNTY, TENN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to read at this point a petition which was sent to the Members of the Senate and House from Tennessee, dated Gallatin, Tenn., March 1942:

To the Members of the Senate and House from Tennessee:

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens of Sumner County, Tenn.—

A county of about 32,000 people—

are deeply concerned, as must be all true Americans, that production of war equipment by the United States should be placed, with all possible dispatch, upon a basis of 100 percent of capacity. Our needs and those of our allies are pressing. To meet them is imperative to victory, and victory is imperative to the preservation of our liberties and those of mankind.

We cannot win the war unless we supply our soldiers at the front with the necessary weapons and supplies with which to fight. It has become evident that the full production of the implements of war will not and cannot be obtained without expansion of work hours and the protection of production from interruption, which means sabotage of our defense program.

We urge you, it being, in our firm judgment, your patriotic duty—one which we are confident is approved by the overwhelming sentiment of this community and State—to advocate and support legislation of the following nature and purposes:

To suspend the 40-hour workweek for the duration of the war.

To make unlawful all strikes or lock-outs in war industries for the war period. No substitutes will do.

Respectfully.

That very concise statement is signed by more than 700 citizens of Sumner County. It is contrary to the rules of the Senate to print the names of petitioners, and, therefore, I cannot ask that the names be published in the RECORD, but I wish to say that the citizenship of this county is outstanding and of the highest character. The county was the home of such men as Gen. William B. Bate, who served in the Senate for many years; Edward W. Carmack, another brilliant Senator from Tennessee, and many others. There are no more patriotic or courageous people in the world than those of Sumner County, Tenn., and their opinion means much to me.

DON'T BLEED BUSINESS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA DISPATCH

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a front-page editorial from the Philadelphia Dispatch of April 5, 1942, entitled "Don't Bleed Business." I also ask that the editorial be referred to the Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T BLEED BUSINESS

Your typical American industry isn't trying to profiteer out of this war. It isn't trying to double and redouble its profits. It knows perfectly well that the bulk of earnings will be taken in taxes, and it has no complaint to make about that. But industry does want to retain the right to do business, and that hinges upon its ability to make enough profit to keep going.

It is one thing to tax profits after they are made. It is a very different thing to tax the wealth which makes profits possible. It is one thing to assess profits for needed public revenue. It is quite another thing to take the money that is needed for expansion, for reasonable reserves, for experiment, for betterment, and for other expenditures which are necessary to industrial progress.

One reason we're fighting this war is to keep freedom of opportunity and enterprise alive. After the war, we hope, there will still be private business, private jobs, opportunities for all. Business will need money then to change back from a war to a peace economy. It will need a backlog to carry it through the period when war production suddenly stops, and peace production has not yet begun. It will need that, not primarily for its own sake, but for the sake of the millions of ordinary people who will want jobs and commodities and a place to invest their little savings.

This is what we must keep in mind in considering tax bills. We are going to have superheavy war taxation—that's necessary. We are going to tax war profits right to the hilt; that, too, is necessary and proper. But we must not adopt a system of taxation which will take from us the ability to keep going and do business in the time-tested American way.

ATTITUDE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION WITH RESPECT TO THE WAR PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have received from Francis M. Sullivan, acting director of the legislative committee of the American Legion, setting forth the wishes of that organization with respect to the war program. I am in hearty accord with the American Legion legislative program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1942.

DEAR SENATOR: The American Legion has expressed itself on the subject of work interruption in war-production plants at four of its important gatherings, such expressions being in the form of resolutions.

Our last national convention, held at Milwaukee last September, adopted the first of these. Additional resolutions came from our national executive committee at a meeting held at Indianapolis last November. The most recent declarations were made by our national defense committee and by our national legislative committee at meetings held at Washington, D. C.

A compilation of these expressions is attached hereto. It is the earnest hope of our organization that they will be given careful and serious consideration by the Congress in this hour of great crisis.

As you know, the American Legion's membership is over 1,100,000. A large number of our members are also from the ranks of labor. Our membership is but a cross section of the United States, and all phases of American life were represented when these resolutions were adopted, especially at the last national convention.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Acting Director,
National Legislative Committee.

From the Milwaukee national convention, September 15–18, 1941:

"We demand continuing production in all industry vital to national defense and compulsory arbitration of all labor disputes therein.

"We commend those labor organizations which have sought to purge themselves of subversive elements."

Excerpt from universal-service resolution, adopted at Milwaukee national convention, September 15–18, 1941:

"For more than 20 years the American Legion has had before the Congress a program for universal service in time of emergency or national danger. We reaffirm the principle of universal service as applicable equally to the armed forces, capital, and labor, and we call upon those elements of capital and labor who have been parties to delay, disturbance,

and strikes in essential defense industries to examine their responsibility to the Nation in the light of the common sacrifice which all have to make."

The following resolutions were adopted at a meeting of the national executive committee, such meeting held November 6–7, 1941:

"We record as a matter of common knowledge that stoppages without warrant or justification in the aircraft industry have impeded national defense." (From the report of the National Aeronautics Commission.)

"Whereas for 22 years the American Legion has advocated that adequate national defense is necessary if our Nation is to live; and

"Whereas in the present crisis our Nation has adopted the program of all-out defense; and

"Whereas the President of the United States declared on November 6, 1941, 'That Americans must make full sacrifices now, must submerge labor differences, and work three shifts a day to help defeat Hitler and bring about the better world we aim to build'; and

"Whereas we find that our national sacrifice and effort are being wasted, and in all too many instances our defense objectives are failing of attainment because:

"(a) Confusion and delay result from the failure of the President of the United States and Congress to delegate authority and responsibility for defense production to a single agency.

"(b) Labor racketeers and profiteers who place personal advantage above the welfare of the Nation are crippling industry through strikes and lock-outs.

"(c) Loyal workers are intimidated, beaten, and prevented from working by goon squads, who crush opposition by force.

"(d) The American people are not aroused to the danger of war being forced upon us and finding us unprepared: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved,

"1. That the national executive committee of the American Legion urges immediate creation of a national defense agency, similar to the War Industries Board of World War No. 1, to be given full authority and responsibility for attaining our national defense objectives.

"2. That an equitable plan be placed in effect to utilize the entire manpower of the country in national defense.

"3. That all strikes in defense industry be outlawed and for so long as the law of this land drafts men into the armed services of our Nation and makes it a disloyal act and criminal offense to desert therefrom that it be made a disloyal act and criminal offense to incite strikes, to foment labor trouble, to strike, or to advocate slow-downs or sit-downs in defense industry or to otherwise willfully obstruct defense production.

"4. That defense industry be drafted if selfish advantage is placed above the welfare of the Nation.

"5. That prices, wages, and rents be immediately stabilized." (From the National Defense Committee.)

"Whereas the President of the United States in his public addresses has proclaimed the constitutional right of all workingmen to seek employment to their best advantage; and

"Whereas such a policy is vitally necessary and essential to the advancement and continuing effectiveness of the program of national defense; and

"Whereas he has further declared that the national defense output cannot be hampered by the selfish obstruction of any small minority of either industrial managers or labor leaders, and also that labor as a whole knows that the small minority is a menace to the cause of labor itself as well as to the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas under conditions of war or full emergency there is no constitutional limitation to the power of the Government to protect the paramount public safety and welfare: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States to carry out and to effectively put into operation the policies and purposes hereinbefore enunciated, that he proclaim adequate protection will be given to maintain the uninterrupted and continuous employment of all industry and those employed in industry, to the end there will be maximum efficiency in work and production; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress provide drastic measures and severe penalties against individuals, management or organizations, who may attempt, directly or indirectly, by any means or device whatsoever, to prevent, impede or slow down production of work in any business or industry engaged in any phase of the national defense program." (From the resolutions subcommittee.)

The following resolutions were adopted at a special meeting of the national defense committee at a special meeting held in Washington, D. C., January 19–21, 1942:

"Whereas winning the war in the shortest possible time requires perfect coordination of all effort, civilian and military; and

"Whereas coordination of effort is dependent for success upon clear definition of responsibility and authority: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the National Defense Committee of the American Legion, That in the protection of property and industry valuable to national defense responsibility and authority should be fixed as follows: The armed forces of the United States should be responsible for offense against the enemy and defense against enemy attack. State governments should be responsible for maintaining law and order within States, the guarding of State property and the establishment of an emergency force to meet and temporarily control unforeseeable crises, dangers, and attacks; and

"That owners of industry and property valuable to winning the war be required under Federal authority and under Federal supervision and control to provide guard service adequate to protect their plants and properties under Federal supervision and direction."

"Whereas the successful prosecution of war requires integration of all forces including manpower necessary to win this war; and

"Whereas such successful prosecution involves not only the manpower of industries, but also the manpower of the armed forces: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion, through its national commander, in association with the chairman of the national defense committee, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and the chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, of the American Legion, study the problems of manpower in its relation to industry vital to national defense and the armed forces with particular regard to the United States Navy; and the national defense committee herewith grants authority in its name to the above-mentioned group, after such study, to take such steps as in their judgment may best further the total war effort."

The national legislative committee met at Washington, D. C., December 8–9, 1941, and one of its "statements of principles" read as follows:

"The American Legion at its last national convention, also at the November 1941 meeting of its national executive committee expressed its opposition to any interruption of defense production, either by industrial managers or labor leaders. The committee therefore calls upon the administration to support, and the Congress to immediately enact, legislation which will clearly define both the rights and duties of employer and employee and which will prevent any interruption of defense production."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 3d instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, on April 4, 1942, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1257) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2109. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1258).

By Mr. BONE, from the Committee on Patents:

S. 2427. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2437. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 2438, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT TO SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1942, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"That any person engaged in the performance of (1) any contract or order for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, pursuant to provisions of the act entitled 'An act further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved March 11, 1941, or (2) any contract or order for the United States, or (3) any subcontract or suborder necessary or appropriate to the fulfillment of any contract or order for any such government or for the United States, who shall discriminate against or in favor of any employee or prospective employee or applicant for employment, because of his race, color, or creed, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for not exceeding 6 months, or both."

ADDRESSES AND PAPERS OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: DEVELOPMENT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in making request on March 17 ultimo for the compilation and printing as a public document of certain speeches of the President of the United States on the development of the United States foreign policy, through inadvertence I did not ask that two addresses of the President delivered in 1942 be included in the document. I now ask that the address of January 6 and that of February 23 of this year be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER TO MAINE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Republicans of the State of Maine recently assembled in convention. That gathering was presided over and was addressed by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. His speech was one of power and persuasiveness. I ask unanimous consent that that speech may be printed in the RECORD, and I commend its reading to all Members of the Senate, especially those across the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Maine is one whom we all respect, and in view of the fact that he conversed with some of us on this side of the aisle with respect to the powerful speech he was going to make before he made it, I am quite sure that we can read it with great advantage and with interest, and that we will be persuaded by it.

While I am on my feet I wish to say that I have also seen a copy of the Republican State platform adopted at the same convention in Maine, and, insofar as it deals with the national problems which now face us, it might well have been written by any well-organized and harmonious Democratic convention.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will read the speech and will consider the platform, I think he will agree that the Republicans of Maine have set a mark to which my Democratic colleagues might well aspire.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am happy to express my accord with that statement, and I am happy to congratulate not only the people of Maine but the two outstanding leaders of Maine, the senior and junior Senators from Maine [Mr. WHITE and Mr. BREWSTER], in guiding their convention in such happy channels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing the address in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first political convention in the United States since Pearl Harbor convenes in Maine today. We are at the dawn of a campaign that may well affect the destiny of mankind for centuries.

Maine Republicans are once again privileged to point the way. The trumpet must not give forth an uncertain sound.

At Pearl Harbor the Japanese sank far more than they have yet realized. Down with our battleships went the partisan differences in America upon which the totalitarians depended to divide and destroy the democracies.

While the Japanese gloat over the tragic consequences of their treachery to our naval and air forces, they miss entirely the militant and united America that is rising from the depths.

Columbus discovered America in 1492. Hitler is due to discover America in 1942.

But the battle is not won. Tough times lie ahead. When Nehemiah was building the wall about Jerusalem, his enemies besought him to come down and talk it over, but Nehemiah was not to be diverted from his task. "Why should I come down to talk with you?" he said. So today there are not lacking those who wish to sit down and talk it over. They do not seem to realize that the time for talk and argument has passed.

One says there is a capitalist making unholy profits out of war. Another points out a laborer asking 8 days' pay for 8 hours' work.

Here is a farmer who demands more than parity, and there a group who refuse to work because of a dislike for a fellow workman.

Another asks why we should fight for the English or the Russians.

These are some of the techniques on which Hitler confidently counts to destroy the "decadent democracies." "Divide and destroy" have been the tactics of the dictator ever since time began.

Europe lies prostrate—except for Stalin's hosts—in tribute to the efficacy of boring from within. Everywhere were found the Quislings who would serve the conqueror's plan.

Only in England and in Russia Hitler's head collided with a stone wall. That stone wall was built of men who deemed the liberty of their country more precious than their lives. In poor downtrodden China the Japanese also collided with a living wall that has for 4 years held back the flood that now in 3 short months has overrun most of the remainder of the Far East. The Chinese have shown the qualities that entitle their nation to live on terms of full equality with the great nations of the earth. But the debate goes on. Our ardent disciple of democracy asks why he should strain himself until some other fellow has ceased to loaf on the job.

The answer is very simple. As far as I am concerned this is my private war with Hitler and Hirohito. The life of our country is at stake. That means the life of every one of us and all that life in America has come to mean.

I hope to find some help here and abroad. The only question asked is our alinement against a common foe.

When our sons line up beside MacArthur in Australia there will be Republicans and Democrats, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants—all mixed up together and no questions asked. In trenches elsewhere fighting the same enemy of mankind will be Russians and Chinese.

No one surrenders his ideas or his ideals by playing on a ball team with some other fellow he may not like.

Our ancestors, of whom we are most proud, were not Tories in 1775, nor copperheads in 1863, nor pro-German in 1918. Nor are we as the trustees of their heritage going to be appeasers or obstructionists in 1942.

After the disciple of division has finished pointing the finger of scorn at those who are not doing their full part, let us see who there is on the other side.

Let us begin with the thousands of American boys who have thrilled the world with their battle on Bataan. They are doing their full part.

Let us count the half million Americans who are roaming the seas and the skies by night and day in sunshine and storm to keep America secure. They are doing their full part.

Let us call the roll of the millions who are in training and are moving to the battle front. They are doing their full part.

Let us turn our thoughts to all the myriad millions on the farms and in the factories who are working patiently and honestly and devotedly to do their part in supplying the food and the tools that are essential in modern war.

We are choosing up sides. I choose to stand with MacArthur. At each crisis in American history a Divine Providence has given us a man. Out of the fox holes of Bataan and the caves of Corregidor MacArthur has emerged to capture and consolidate the confidence of a collapsing world.

But finally the disciple of dissent asks: "What about this man Roosevelt?" Some are apparently quite persuaded that his works are of the devil.

Time does not permit to argue this proposition, but, in justice to ourselves, let us look at the record.

War found this Nation more nearly adequately prepared than any previous war in our history.

Within 1 month Donald Nelson was installed as production czar. In the last war it took more than a year to accomplish this most essential step.

Within 3 months Douglas MacArthur was given supreme command of all our forces in our most critical theater of war and the whole world rang with cheers.

Certainly these things warrant confidence that the President as Commander in Chief of our armies and Navy and Air Force is moving to consolidate American might for complete, utter, and final military victory.

Let us get on with the job. What can each one of us do? Each may save and serve.

Everything one goes without releases material and manpower to help the fighting front.

Conceive of the power of an America absolutely devoted to a victorious offensive. Picture 130,000,000 Americans thinking in terms of giving rather than getting.

Suppose every man, woman, and child in America asked themselves each morning "What can I do today to help?" "What can I go without to relieve a little the strain on our farms and factories and transportation?"

Saving everything possible and putting our savings into Victory bonds will mobilize the might of America into an irresistible force.

Every day in every way let each do what he can.

Meanwhile in Washington more and more Members of Congress are coming to realize that the country is far ahead of the Congress in recognition of the peril with which we are faced.

We must not lose Australia. MacArthur is a guaranty that the utmost will be made of everything we send. It is up to us here to see that nothing impedes the flow.

More ships, more planes, more guns, more tanks in order that American boys may fight on an equality with the yellow men of the East. Then we shall not need to doubt the issue. This means, however, today—not tomorrow.

In the flames of Pearl Harbor we catch the gleam of the eyes of the denizens of darkened Asia and Europe. Behind them we catch a glimmer of the millions who have been enslaved.

America goes forth once more in a great crusade in the cause of human freedom.

The issue cannot be in doubt. Partisan differences perished in the fires of Pearl Harbor. All became Americans dedicated to a common and an assured victory.

Maine Republicans in this northeastern bastion may well send ringing across the country their message of courage and confidence and unfaltering devotion to America and all it means.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was called from the

Chamber when the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] spoke, and during the colloquy which he had with the majority leader. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the matter which the senior Senator from Maine had printed in the RECORD, the resolutions adopted as a Republican platform at the Republican State convention in Maine over which I presided, calling attention to their pledge of wholehearted support to the President in a vigorous and efficient prosecution of the war. In the first political convention in the coming campaign we inaugurated what may be a unique feature. We invited the postmaster of Portland, Mrs. Helen C. Donahue, who happens to be a very distinguished citizen, and who before Pearl Harbor was considered a Democrat, to set up a booth on the floor of the Republican State convention for the sale of Defense bonds. During the 2 days of that convention the members of the convention bought more than $32,000 worth of Defense bonds showing in substantial measure the wholehearted support of this effort by the people of Maine.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Republicans of Maine assembled in convention, which is a vital part of the American form of government for which our Nation is now fighting, adopt the following statement of principles:

The paramount duty of every American citizen is to take his full part in bringing about a decisive and complete military victory. In attaining this result, party politics, as such, have no place.

The Republican party of Maine pledges its wholehearted support to the President in a vigorous and efficient prosecution of the war.

We urge upon the Congress that proper measures be taken, so far as consistent with an ultimate and speedy victory, to reduce to a minimum expenditures for nonwar purposes and to eliminate at once all nonessential governmental activities, to insure a just and fair distribution of the burdens of war, to make certain that no one profits unduly from the war, to impose rigid restraints on inflation, and to assure preservation of the constitutional guaranties vouchsafed in the Bill of Rights.

We commend the sound, economical, and responsive administration of our State's business under the leadership of Governor Sewall.

We heartily endorse the action of Governor Sewall and the legislature in their prompt building up of military and civilian defense, in the enactment of liberal legislation, in keeping expenditures entirely within appropriations, and in effecting substantial economies without curtailment of essential services.

We pledge continued efforts by a Republican Governor and legislature toward further progressive legislation and further economies wherever possible without crippling essential services by the State, and toward increased efficiency in the operation of all State departments.

We advocate a whole-souled continuance by our citizens of that heritage of faith, fortitude, and simplicity of life which have made this State outstanding in the councils of the Nation.

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE A. L. ZINN ON THE JAPANESE PROBLEM IN NEW MEXICO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Japanese Problem in New Mexico," delivered by Justice A. L. Zinn, of the New Mexico Supreme Court, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMINDER OF RELIGIOUS OBLIGATIONS BY REV. ALBERT RHETT STUART, D. D.

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of religious obligations, presented on Easter Sunday by Rev. Albert Rhett Stuart, D. D., rector of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6868, making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

DECORATIONS FOR OUTSTANDING CONDUCT OR SERVICE BY MEMBERS OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar No. 1295, House Joint Resolution 263, to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, provided the joint resolution will not require extended debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am familiar with the joint resolution, and I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the United States Maritime Commission is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, to provide and award a medal of such material and design and with such devices and inscriptions as the Commission may deem suitable to each person who in the American merchant marine, on or after September 3, 1939, has distinguished himself or during the war distinguishes himself by outstanding conduct or service in the line of duty. Such medals shall be presented with appropriate ceremony as specified by the Commission.

SEC. 2. There may be issued with each medal a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu of the medal. Not more than one medal shall be issued hereunder to any person, but for each succeeding instance sufficient to justify the award of a medal to such person the Commission may award a suitable bar or other emblem or insignia to be worn with the medal and the corresponding rosette or other device. In case any person who so distinguishes himself as to justify the award of a medal or decoration hereunder dies before the award can be made to him, the award may be made and the medal or decoration presented such representative of the deceased as the Commission deems proper.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this joint resolution authorizes the Maritime Commission to award a medal to each person in the American merchant marine who, on or any time after September 3, 1939, has distinguished himself by outstanding conduct or service in the line of duty. There is also a provision for the issuance of a rosette or other device which can be worn in lieu of the medal. Not more than one medal can be issued to any one person, but after the presentation of the medal the recipient may from time to time for later outstanding service or services receive from the Commission suitable bars or other emblems or insignia to be worn with the medal. In the event the hero has died before the medal is presented, the presentation would be made to his family.

Similar medals are presented in the Army and the Navy, and in view of the nature of service rendered by the officers and seamen of the merchant marine and the hazards to which they are subjected, it is certainly reasonable that such recognition should be accorded to them. At present no such award is made, although it is possible for a sailor to receive a lifesaving medal from the Secretary of the Treasury, and, of course, there are certain private associations which make awards for heroism at sea.

After the end of the World War—that is, in December 1920—an act was passed which authorized the award of medals for extraordinary heroism or distinguished service in the line of duty for members of the merchant marine. That act, however was passed 2 years after the war was over, and apparently no such awards were actually made.

One of the most successful, brilliant chapters in the history of the present war is the magnificent record of the officers and seamen of our merchant marine. Certainly the recognition which this resolution would call for is a most suitable and worthy one.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to read a brief editorial from the Baltimore Sun of April 2, 1942. The editorial is entitled "Honor Alone Is Payment for Courage," and reads as follows:

Senator RADCLIFFE joins those who support the principle of the bill authorizing the Government to award official medals to sailors of the merchant marine who distinguish themselves by heroic conduct in the presence of the enemy. It is gratifying to learn that the Senator approves the object of the bill. He should, for it is no more than recognition of the plain fact that a man who does more than his duty under fire is a brave man, whatever uniform he wears.

The men who sail the ships that carry supplies for us and our Allies are doing as much to beat the enemy as the men who point the guns on our warships. This was always true;

but in the old days, when international law still commanded respect, the job of the merchant sailors was safer than that of the crews of the men-o'-war, so it was no more than right for the honors to be reserved for the men who took the greater risk.

But since the submarines have begun to fire without warning, the lives of the sailors of the merchant marine are imperiled no less than those of Navy men. It has always been recognized that courage cannot be paid for with money; the only adequate compensation for courage is honor, and a brave man is entitled to that sort of payment, no matter to what service he belongs. It is to be hoped that Congress will recognize this obligation and arrange for its discharge.

Certainly it can be said of the officers and sailors in our merchant marine that their hearts are always eager, their hands ready for the work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF PRIMARIES AND ELECTIONS—SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for the purpose of requesting consideration for Senate Resolution 235, which was reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections on Friday last? I think it will take only a few moments.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it will take only a brief time, I shall yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It will not take very long, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee. I desire, however, to make a brief explanation, as it is a rather important matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Senate Resolution 235 was reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections last Friday and was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. From that committee, I report the resolution back favorably without amendment.

In making this report, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that section 2 of the resolution is much broader in its scope than was a similar provision in the resolution reported by the committee and adopted by the Senate in 1940.

Furthermore, I invite the attention of the Senate to section 5 of the resolution, which authorizes the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to appoint one or more persons on behalf of the committee to conduct investigations in the various States dealing with the general election of 1942, as well as the primaries I invite the attention of the Senate to this provision merely for the purpose of saying that this resolution contains a provision which will permit the committee to appoint investigators similar to those appointed in the recent case involving the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. There was so much criticism, both direct and by implication, as to what the investigators did in that particular case that before the Senate acts upon this very important measure, dealing with all the elections in the various States in 1942, I think the Senate should hesitate and pause, at least for a moment, before they accept the resolution in the form in which it is now presented. In other words, we may have the same situation again in connection with the investigators which arose in the case of the Senator from North Dakota. I want merely to place the Senate on notice as to the type of resolution that has come from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in order that the committee which may be appointed by the Vice President of the United States under the resolution will not have to suffer the same amount of condemnation which the Committee on Privileges and Elections suffered as a result of the investigators appointed by it in the Langer case.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am much attracted by the remarks of the able Senator from Illinois. I, too, desire to have time to study the provision upon which he has made comment. The resolution has not reached the calendar, as I understand?

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution has not reached the calendar. It has, however, been reported by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I have just now reported it from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I desired to ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution, but its importance is such that I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the points I have suggested before making the request.

Mr. McNARY. I always like to accommodate the able Senator, and I hope he understands, but I should have to object to the immediate consideration of the resolution today, if he has that in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the reason for the objection of the Senator from Oregon, and, if it is proper, I should like to have the resolution go to the calendar for further study and consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wanted to observe that the resolution itself, by its language, goes further than previous resolutions have gone. It does not go any further than committees have gone that have been appointed to carry out this function of investigation. I do not know how long, but I know for a number of years it has been customary for the committee appointed by the Vice President to send investigators into the States to make what they call "an investigation," and report back to the full committee for such action as the committee may desire to take. Whether they had any authority to do that, may be open to question, and it may be questionable whether some individual person may wisely or properly be sent into a State to carry on an ex parte investigation where nobody on either side of the controversy or the contest for a Senatorship has any knowledge of or any opportunity to examine anybody or even the examiner himself. So it is a matter that ought to have the careful consideration of the Senate, and I think the resolution ought to go over so as to give an opportunity to the Senate to study the broad authority given in the resolution itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the able Senator from Kentucky for his contribution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the resolution placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 6 OF REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, I wish to file an additional report, made up by two subcommittees after a trip of investigation and inspection of shipbuilding, the light metals, and the aircraft industry in the West. The report goes into all these phases, both from testimony and from personal observation in the plants.

I believe this report is opportune at this time, as it is in part an answer to many statements which are being made on the streets and in the press with reference to slow-downs—in other words, with reference to deliberate slowdowns in defense industry, sometimes charged to management, sometimes charged to labor.

We first investigated the light-metals industry on the Pacific coast, taking testimony in Spokane and also at Las Vegas, Nev. It developed that there really are three processes on the west coast, none of which the subcommittee felt had been fully proven processes, but which the subcommittee also felt should be gone into more fully than they have been up to the present time, in at least two phases, notably the Doerner process and the Hangira process. The Hangira process has a plant practically completed capable of large production, and it is the opinion of the committee that our light-metals division should go into that and into the present high charges for magnesium, and allow them to demonstrate, by buying their product at cost, as they have offered, without cost to the Government, the desirability of the erection of a plant.

The Doerner process, we believe, is similar, and it is our opinion that there should be a plant built to test that process instead of spending so much money on the I. G. Farben process.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] last week submitted a part of this report, with reference to the I. G. Farben process, at Las Vegas, Nev., and the subcommittee joined with the Senator from Nevada in his comment on the fact that "know how" is costing the Government entirely too much there. In fact, we felt that, as used there, those were about the most expensive two words we had not met any place.

There developed one thing the Senator from Nevada did not bring out, namely, that the English company operating in Las Vegas, which, in conjunction with an American company, is building a $70,000,000 plant, does not even have a license to manufacture magnesium in the United States. It has a license in England, but

the process there used is patented in the United States by an American company owned by I. G. Farben, and it has not even a license as yet. I think the whole matter should be thoroughly investigated before any greater sums of money are committed, particularly before any $1-a-ton lease is signed for getting magnesite out of ground which was but recently public domain.

Another item the report covers is the question of slow-down in the aircraft industry. When we went to the Pacific coast we were met with the charge that management was deliberately slowing down aircraft production. A thorough investigation in the plants on the coast convinced us, and would convince any other Member of the Senate, that there is no deliberate slowdown of any kind. Those plants are up to production schedule, and I think the people of the United States can feel confident as to production of airplanes.

There is only one problem; that is, that in making the over-all planning, the original planners of the defense program failed to take into account the fact that an airplane factory is an assembly factory. They endeavor to build up an airplane production program based on giving huge contracts to an assembly plant. They made no provision for building up the thousands of small plants which will make the parts. Those plants are not on a cost-plus basis. It is a gamble with them as to whether the increased orders will make worth while the expansion of their plants or their production.

The only slow-down we find is not a slow-down in the production schedule, and it is our belief, and we so report, that the production could be increased by synchronizing the thousands of small-parts plants which are furnishing parts for the production.

We also investigated the shipyards on the Pacific coast, against which the same charge—that is, of slowdown—has been lodged. We found 10,000-ton steel freighters being built in 105 days, complete, which was 45 days less than the original schedule. Observation showed no slowdown, either deliberate or unintentional. The shipyards do fear possible shortage of steel, which is practically the only thing they feel may cause a slowdown in ship production on the coast. That is another part of the program which is functioning satisfactorily on the west coast. We must, however, keep up with them in boilers, engines, and steel.

While we were on the coast we also investigated the question of capital and labor disputes. Apparently everything was working satisfactorily between capital and labor. Only one question was taken up. One plant manager said that if he could bring about an agreement eliminating jurisdictional disputes and enabling him to hire men from various unions in proportion to the normal need in the shipyards, with permission to work them on anything which was most advantageous, he thought he could speed up production. That was the only substantial suggestion made.

The 40-hour week was working satisfactorily on the coast, where there was 7-day production, 24 hours a day.

Mr. President, these were the high points in the report to which I desired to call the attention of the Senate.

I also think that a careful perusal of the results would in large part tend to allay the fears and the feeling which appears to be prevalent concerning slowdowns, which arise to a large extent, we found, from statements of irresponsible people.

As to the question of the defense of the Pacific coast, the committee took occasion to investigate that matter. There has been much discussion of unity of command. There is not unity of command on the Pacific coast, but there is unity of information, and the committee found that there is cooperation between the Army and the Navy. I think the Pacific coast is well defended and comes as close to unity of command as it can come with the present statutory set-up of our defense departments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator from West Virginia concluded?

Mr. KILGORE. I have finished.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia one question, if I may.

Mr McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Senator from West Virginia is a member of the Truman committee, and was one of the subcommittee which recently went to the Pacific coast to investigate the airplane industry.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. My attention was attracted to a speech made over the radio by Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board. In the speech he took direct issue with the Truman committee upon certain facts and as to certain findings made by the subcommittee visiting the coast. His statement was contrary to what the Senator's committee found. It is rather difficult to square the two reports and reach an intelligent decision as to who is right.

Mr. KILGORE. I have not read the speech in question, but I had a conference with Mr. Nelson's assistant on aviation, a gentleman by the name of Locke, I think. The only point on which he took issue was the recommendation made by the committee that there was needed an over-all production man on aviation. Mr. Nelson's assistant stated to me that they had been trying to get such a man, but had been unable to procure one. The only recommendation we made respecting higher production was that they put in an over-all production expert, drafted from aviation, to look after the building up of the parts production, to enable them to complete their planes.

He states that they are up to their production schedule. They said to us that they could increase production schedules approximately 40 percent and produce more with existing plants if they could get the parts. At one plant we saw 117 planes on the line, just lacking one or two parts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have a tremendous amount of respect for the distinguished chairman of the Truman committee; in fact, that can be said for all the members of the committee. I know they have done constructive work in their long investigations. But when I read in the Times-Herald this morning an article by Frank C. Waldrop entitled "Are We Getting Planes?" which is so in conflict with what the committee report is as to what is being done in the airplane factories on the Pacific coast, it does seem to me that the matter should be cleared up in some way. May I respectfully suggest that some of these men be called before the committee, if that has not been done. An explanation of the article in this morning's newspaper is undoubtedly in order. Perhaps the Senator has not seen the article.

Mr. KILGORE. I have not seen it this morning.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a very disappointing article.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the article is overdisappointing. We took up the question of the schedule of production furnished these plants by the War Production Board, and found they were up to schedule. If the War Production Board is not giving them a fast enough schedule, we could not check that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that it may appear along with the discussion which has just taken place, a speech made by Mr. Donald Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, and broadcast over the radio, at a banquet of the Military Order of the World War, held in New York Saturday night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be here tonight to take my part in this observance of Army Day.

We Americans these days realize as never before how much we owe to our Army. All that we have now and all that we hope to have in the future depends, in the last analysis, upon the courage and devotion of the individual soldier and upon the skill and efficiency of the Army as a whole. The magnificent record of what our soldiers are doing in the Far East is making one of the finest chapters in the long history of the American Army. It is something for all of us at home to be proud of; more important, it is something for all of us to live up to.

That last point is important. Any army, and ours most of all, is a cross section of the Nation. In our fighting forces today men of all races and all nations are serving as comrades in the common cause. In the Philippines, for example, Chinese soldiers are fighting in our ranks, and the splendid record of the Jose Rizaid regiment of Filipino soldiers in General Wainwright's army has earned the highest praise.

In the long run the Army is what the country is; it reflects the country's virtues, and it is hampered by the country's faults. We know its morale is influenced by our own. We are part of the equation. Our fate is up to the Army—but we ourselves set the limits within which the Army can operate.

So we cannot appraise our situation on Army Day of 1942 without at the same time appraising the job which we at home have been doing. We have no doubts whatever about the way our men in the field are delivering: we know perfectly well that what they do will be beyond praise. It is probable that some dark months lie just ahead of us. We can face those months with complete confidence if we can satisfy ourselves that the job at home is going to be done as well as it needs to be done.

I should like to talk about this job at home with some detail. It is the biggest job, bar none, that this or any other country ever tackled at any time in history. It is so huge that we can break every record we ever made and still fall short of the need. What we have done so far would be an amazing achievement if it did not have to be measured against an absolute emergency.

Consider the situation as it existed in the early summer of 1940, when the President called the National Defense Advisory Commission into being.

All in all, we had no munitions industry worthy of the name—and we were just beginning to understand that what we had to do was create the greatest munitions industry on earth and get it into full swing in the shortest possible space of time.

Nor is that all. The job kept on growing. The size of the thing we had to do kept increasing faster than our own program for handling it. In that far-away June of 1940, we were getting in shape to spend $4,000,000,000 in 2 years; the program has mushroomed so rapidly that this year we are spending fifty billions, with seventy more to be spent next year. And as the size of the job kept increasing, the nature of the job kept changing due to changes in the world strategic picture. Nothing can stay fixed anywhere in war.

When you look back, I am sure you will agree that we set out to do the impossible. We have not yet done the impossible—but we are doing it. The achievements this Nation has recorded during the last twenty-odd months are as remarkable as anything in our history. We cannot be satisfied, because the sky is the limit; but do not let the fact that we are not satisfied delude you into the feeling that nothing much has been accomplished.

Let's look at a few of these achievements for a moment:

The Army Ordnance Department is today doing four times as much business as it did at the peak of the first World War. By "four times as much business" I, of course, mean that it is handling four times the volume of orders for military goods. The fruits of this increase can be seen in action. I would like to remark that the Garand rifle was just getting into production in the summer of 1940, when the Springfield arsenal was turning out 250 a day. Within a year that production had been put up to more than 1,000 a day; it has continued to increase, until today there is a Garand for everyone of our combat soldiers who is supposed to have one. And the point is that the Garand is the best military rifle on earth. A platoon of infantrymen armed with Garand rifles has three times the fire power of a platoon armed with Springfields.

Furthermore, this new weapon has proved that it will stand up under the hardest of usage. General MacArthur's reports have shown that on Bataan Peninsula this gun has met every test, in some cases being used constantly for a week without cleaning or lubrication.

I don't propose to indulge in a recital of dry statistics here. Yet it is worth while to point out that when we entered this war we had 10 modern factories turning out machine guns. Four new plants to manufacture high explosives were in operation at the time of Pearl Harbor, as were two huge smokeless-powder plants. Frankford Arsenal, virtually our sole source of supply for small-arms ammunition when the first World War began, is today turning out more cartridges each month than it made in all of 1918—and two other huge small-arms ammunition plants are also in operation, with more on the way. I have chosen these examples more or less at random to show that the Army has to its credit striking records of accomplishment on the home front as well as in the field.

The record is even more striking in the field of aviation.

Begin your consideration of the airplane picture by realizing that the airplane-production program adopted after Pearl Harbor was presumed by practically everyone to be bigger than could possibly be attained. It was an "impossible" program if there ever was one. We met our schedules in January, and we made 23 percent more planes than we had made in December. We exceeded our schedules in February, which, of course, called for an increase over January. In March again we met the schedule, which increases in line with the President's objective.

Remember, too, that meeting those schedules involves infinitely more than just making a lot of airplanes. The strategic picture changes constantly; as it changes, the numbers of the different kinds of planes you need change, which, in turn, may easily mean a doubling or tripling of the demand for certain component parts, even though the total over-all number of planes you are going to make remains the same. For example, a little time ago it became necessary to put much greater emphasis on the long-range four-engine bomber. That, obviously, meant a much heavier demand for airplane motors and superchargers. That, in turn, meant a temporary reduction in the number of motors that could be supplied to certain manufacturers of single-motored and twin-motored planes. In a few cases that caused those manufacturers to cut their operating schedules to 5 days per week. And that, unfortunately, led a number of people to conclude that either the workers or the management in those plants were at fault. The fact was, of course, that those reduced operating schedules were not the fault of either the workers or the executives in the plants concerned.

And while we are on the subject of airplanes, I would like to say a word or two about the quality of the product that is being made. Our planes have turned in outstanding performance records all over the world—in the Far East, in North Africa with the British, and on all other battle fronts. For example, over Bali late in February a formation of 16 Curtiss P–40's attacked greatly superior numbers of Japanese planes and shot down 30 of the enemy. Only 2 of our planes were lost. A similar number of P–40's over Soerabaya a day or so later tangled with 2 Jap fighters and 25 Jap bombers. We lost 1 plane; the Japs lost 1 fighter and 5 bombers. American volunteer flyers flying P–40's for the Chinese Army in Burma have shot down between 200 and 300 Jap planes, getting 41 in 2 successive days in February.

American planes used by the British in the Near East have made equally impressive records. One group of 18 Kittyhawks—as the British have named their latest P–40 fighter—took on more than 30 Axis dive bombers and fighters over Libya, shooting down 20 of the enemy without losing one of their own number.

Our heavy bombers are doing equally well. Off New Guinea last month, for instance, a flight of five B–17's attacked a Jap naval concentration. Returning, they were jumped by a formation of Jap fighter planes. They successfully fought off that attack, downing five Jap fighters without a loss to themselves.

It would be possible to go on in that vein almost indefinitely, but I have said enough. I am sure, to indicate that every American can be proud, not only of the heroic men who are flying those planes, but also of the men in the Army and in our aviation industry who designed and built them.

And in that connection let me take advantage of this opportunity to pay my own tribute to those devoted men in the Army to whose patient and unrecognized efforts during the last 20 years much of the excellence of our modern equipment is due.

Shortly after the last war ended the Ordnance Department was assigned the task of studying all our basic combat equipment in the light of lessons learned in 1917 and 1918 and was instructed to work out new designs wherever such were necessary. Ordnance officers accordingly undertook this large-scale program, which—due to the great increase in the strength of defensive weapons in the last war—was in essence a program to recapture the offensive. Through many peacetime years, unnoticed by the general public and hampered by lack of sufficient funds, these men kept on with this job. Concurrently the same sort of research went forward in the Signal Corps, the Air Corps, and other arms. We are now reaping the benefits of those long years of labor. That the weapons now being produced are such excellent ones is largely due to the work that was done between 1920 and 1940.

To return to our present production program:

We are ahead of schedule on tank production. Our production of merchant shipping is rising rapidly; we should meet this year's schedule. The same is true of our production of antiaircraft and antitank guns. America's industrial plant is really beginning to roll. A new era of management-labor cooperation is developing, which will prove of immense value to the entire Nation.

Yet this is no time for easy optimism. Measured by any ordinary standard, this Nation has done extremely well, but we aren't measuring by ordinary standards any more. Instead, we are measuring our performance against the greatest emergency the country has ever faced. What would be a superlative performance at any other time could easily turn out to be short of the goal we must reach. It has been said often, but we must continue to say it: No matter how well we are doing, we must do even better. One gun, 1 plane, 1 tank, or 1 ship finished this spring may be worth 10 finished a year from now.

So as we look at the future to see how we may fare during the stormy months just ahead, our confidence in this home front can arise only from the conviction that a people who have done as well as the American people have done in the last few months can do even better from now on. We face enormous problems, and it will take the best brains and the best efforts we have to solve them.

Chief of these problems is the old, old problem of materials. To meet our military demands we must provide enormous quantities of the basic metals and of fabricated and semifinished parts. In many cases the different parts of our production program set up competing demands for these things, so that we face not simply a problem of increasing the supply, but of balancing the division of what we have among a large number of competing demands. That problem of balance runs all through the picture. It exists in everything from basic metals like nickel to finished component parts like airplane motors.

Indeed, our entire airplane-production program is largely a matter of balance—of weighing requirements against each other, of eliminating bottlenecks and of smoothing out the flow of parts and materials. This is a problem which is entirely possible to solve—I am convinced that it is being solved—but it is exceedingly complicated.

A factory which makes airplanes, for instance, may draw all of its various parts from scores of different factories. The same may be true of many of the factories which supply these parts. If you drew a chart to show the flow of all the parts that go into a single big bomber you would have a regular spider web—and if any single thread anywhere in that network is broken, the production of the finished airplane is delayed. Consequently, increasing the speed of airplane production is by no means a simple matter. You can't just go into the factory that turns out the finished plane, do a job there, and walk off content. You have to go into the plants that make the castings and forgings, into the engine plants, into the plants that make the electrical equipment, into the gun factories; you have to look into the production of gun mounts, superchargers, and bomb sights; you have to go back to the copper, the aluminum, the bauxite, and all the other things. All along this involved and complicated line you have to regulate the flow, the tempo, so that in the end you may be able to speed the movement of completed airplanes from the final assembly line.

This problem is most acute and obvious in the production of airplanes. But it exists in greater or lesser degree throughout our whole war-production program. Each part of the program interlocks somewhere with another part. Whenever the demand for one particular item increases, there is an immediate effect on the production of half a dozen or more entirely different items.

So it is easy to see why this enormous war program of ours is having such a marked effect on ordinary civilian production. Even if it were not possible to make any military goods whatever in civilian factories, we should nevertheless be obliged to proceed with drastic orders curtailing civilian production. The materials to make war goods and civilian goods simply do not exist.

Yet shortages of materials are not the only shortages that stand in our way. To an increasing degree, we are encountering shortages of fabricating and processing facilities—which, in turn, is another compelling reason for the conversion to war production of civilian manufacturing plants. We don't have time to make the new machines, build the new factories, and train the new workers for all of our war production. An increasing part of this load has to be borne by our existing facilities. Thus both the need for materials and the need for factories are compelling us to cut deeper into the civilian economy. During the past month we have ordered many large industries to get entirely out of civilian production so that they can handle war orders. This process will go deeper and deeper; and it must go constantly faster and faster.

Here again, the problem is not a simple one. You can't simply turn a switch—or sign an order—and get a whole chain of factories out of one kind of production and into another. It is necessary to find precisely what sort of military goods the factories in question are capable of producing, and to gear those possibilities into your current schedule of requirements. This involves careful studies of equipment, of the tolerances of machines, and so on; frequently it calls for a complete retooling. Each conversion job is a problem in itself, and no two are quite alike.

This recital of the problems ahead of us is given you in order that you may understand why this business of increasing war production does not always seem to move as rapidly as we would like. Yet all of these problems are problems which can be solved. There is no insuperable obstacle in our way. If it were not for the time factor we could be extremely optimistic about the entire program.

But the time is short. Never were we under such pressure to do a big job quickly. Because the pressure is so great, our immediate success—our ability to get out more war goods now, instead of a few months from now—depends in no small measure on the willingness of executives and workers in our war plants to make the job a matter of individual, personal responsibility. We are calling on all of the people who have places in our war-production lines for that added bit of personal effort that can spell the difference between success and failure. We recently launched a Nation-wide production drive, the basic aim of which is to enlist enthusiastic and cooperative support all up and down the line. The response to this has been highly encouraging. It has made me feel that this Nation will meet the challenge, not only over the long pull, but also from the short-range viewpoint. We know we can win if we have the time. In this production drive we are undertaking to snatch a little extra time by making each minute and each day count double. Our success in meeting the demands we face during the critical weeks and months just ahead will depend largely on the extra effort which workers and management now on the job are able to put forth. From every indication, that extra effort will be forthcoming.

No man can be an undiluted optimist these days. Yet I firmly believe that no American who sees the whole picture need give way to dark pessimism either. Our fighting men have proven on bloody fields that the valor and endurance of American manhood are as magnificent today as they ever were. They have shown that if we at home give them just a 50-50 chance, by providing them with the weapons and the support they need, they will do the rest.

Speaking for the millions of men and women engaged on the home front in the great job of providing those weapons and that support, I want to say this to our fighting men everywhere:

You have given us hope and courage. We will live up to the ideal you have set for us. We know what your need is: we are going to move ahead and meet that need in spite of any and all obstacles. We will not let you down.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for his report of our investigation on the west coast. He touched lightly on magnesium, a metal which I believe is going to be the magic metal of the future. It is difficult for some persons to realize that our program calls for 725,000,000 pounds of magnesium to be made this year. Up to now we have never in this country manufactured more than 33,000,000 pounds in any 1 year, and that has been manufactured by the Dow Chemical Co., using salt-water brine.

As we visited various places on the west coast the testimony proved to us that there was any amount of the necessary ores for the manufacture of magnesium. We have made a considerable study of the magnesium problems, and the subcommittee intends to continue to carry on that study.

Mr. President, I should like Senators to spend a little time in checking over the short report which has been submitted by our subcommittee, because I think it will enlighten them with respect to what we have tried to do in assisting in the manufacture of magnesium, which is such an important metal at the present time. Until lately magnesium has been used in this country only for the manufacture of incendiary bombs and flares, but today the aircraft manufacturers in the West tell us that they will use as much magnesium as they can possibly obtain.

Magnesium is one-third lighter than aluminum, and in every respect the airplane industry seems to feel that it is the important metal, and it seems that Germany has far surpassed anything we have ever tried to do in making full use of this very unusual metal.

At some later time I hope to go into this subject a little further. While I do not happen to be a metallurgist, I think we might be able to enlighten many Members of the Senate as to just what this particular tricky metal is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] or the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] a question while we are on the subject of the report which has just been submitted. A few days ago I read an article in a newspaper in which it was stated that the subcommittee in its report to the full committee had made the statement that in the aviation industry and in the shipbuilding industry, which they also investigated, I believe, all the employers of labor in those two industries whom they interviewed, with one exception, made the statement that they did not believe that any change in the 40-hour-week arrangement would be advantageous to industry. Did the newspaper article correctly report the committee, and is that shown in the report?

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, that is shown in the report, and it is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to discuss the matter. I simply wished to ask if that statement is contained in the report of the subcommittee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee whose report the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has just presented, and I should like to refer briefly to the point raised by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. It is not quite true that all the employers except one told us that lengthening the workweek would not help production. We inquired of the employers. We made it a point at every plant we visited to go over with the employers and the executives their labor-relations problems, and only 1 out of perhaps 60 or 80 executives with whom we talked about the subject suggested to us that lengthening the workweek would help production. He happened to be an executive in the one plant we visited where it was obvious to us that the labor-relations picture was not good.

One thing struck me in our visit to these plants and in the general public attitude as we were able to ascertain it on the west coast. Censorship in wartime is always a difficult problem to handle, but it certainly is true on the

Pacific coast that the lack of accurate, authentic information on our production picture put out by responsible Government agencies has produced a fertile field for rumors and that, in the absence of authentic information, all kinds of stories about production slow-downs by management and by labor were going the rounds on the west coast.

I realize that the War Production Board and the service departments are confronted with a tough problem, but if it were at all possible, without giving valuable information to the enemy, to afford the American people more authentic information on just what we are producing, I think it would greatly help to improve public morale and confidence in this effort.

One other thing that impressed me was that the War Production Board and other agencies have been asking the public on the radio and through the press day after day to work harder and to increase production. It is a generalized demand. We found in every plant we visited that management and labor are willing and anxious to do everything they can to increase production, but that all too often a shortage in some critical part or material is preventing them from doing it. That certainly was true in the aircraft industry. Instead of making generalized pleas for more production, which tend to upset the public but do not direct the enthusiasm and energy which is aroused into any specific channel, perhaps it would be better for our Government agencies to concentrate on increasing production in those bottlenecks—there are not so very many of them—which are really holding up top-speed production on the big assembly lines.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hesitate to take any more time, but I wish to comment for just a moment on the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], with which I in the main concur. I realize, as I think we all realize, that when the people do not know what the situation is most anyone who comes along and tells them what it is can "get away with it," because he pretends to know, and they have no evidence to counteract what he thinks. I know that has been responsible very largely for the doubt and confusion which have existed and which now exist to a greater or less degree in the minds of all our people as to just how we are getting along in the way of production.

For instance, I think if the American people knew month by month the number of airplanes being produced they would be very well satisfied with the result, but that raises this question: We all know that the airplanes are divided into categories. There are bombers, there are fighters, there are pursuit planes, and there are training planes, and there are also other categories of planes. Of course, in the production of planes we have to consider the total. I have in a modest way inquired why it would not be advisable to let the people know month by month the number of planes we are producing, but I have been met with the statement that if the total number is announced the impression might be created, in the first place, that they were all fighters and all bombers, whereas they are not, and cannot be. If information is given out with a breakdown as to the number of bombers and the number of fighters and the number of training planes, of course, that information reaches the enemy. It presents a difficult situation as to how far in detail the Government can go in informing its own people. If there were any way to inform them without it being broadcast around the world, of course, it would be a different problem, but that we cannot do now with the present facilities of communication.

I feel that, insofar as it is possible and wise without giving any advantage whatever to the enemy by way of information as to the location of our war facilities, such information should be given to the people. This applies to tanks, antiaircraft guns, and the whole assembly line of fighting materials. So far as it is possible for our Government to give the people the information for which they are eager, and in the absence of which they are likely to be imposed upon by persons who pretend to have but do not have accurate information in respect to the subject, the information should be given. However, I would not for a moment advocate that we put in the possession of our enemies any vital information merely in order that we may put it in the possession of our own people. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators who are members of the subcommittee, and who have made a conscientious and careful survey of the production of war materials.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I did not intend to criticize the officials who must decide what news to release and what to withhold.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not so understand the Senator.

Mr. BALL. They confront a difficult job and they have to weigh many factors. I suggest that possibly in their deliberations they have not given sufficient weight to the extent to which public confidence and morale generally will determine whether or not we shall win this war. That should be one of the factors to be very carefully weighed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], pursuant to Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, will be printed.

THE WAR-PRODUCTION EFFORT TO DATE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, today is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the declaration of war against Germany in World War No. 1.

Four months ago tomorrow we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, and on the day following we declared war against Japan.

Thereafter, in quick succession, practically all the nations of the world took sides, either for or against the United States and our allied nations.

Today we are in war—war east and war west.

Today the nations of the earth, embracing some 2,000,000,000 people, almost without exception, have forsaken the paths of peace and are practicing the arts of war.

Today business as usual, the pursuits of peace, and even civilization itself have been suspended for the duration.

Unless we prepare to fight, and then fight to win, business as usual, peace, and even civilization itself will not again return to America, either North, Central, or South.

This is a war for the life or death of peoples and nations, and out of this contest one group will emerge as the victor and the other group may perish.

After 18 months of preparation and 4 months of actual warfare the people are entitled to know the facts.

The question is constantly asked, What is our status today?

The people should know the facts, but the best interests of our people at home and of our men in uniform abroad will not be served by making too many facts public to the world.

Without being too specific, I wish to place in the RECORD a general summary of the production of war equipment to date.

On Saturday night Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, assured our people and our Allies that we are ahead of production schedules on both airplanes and tanks.

He said:

We met our schedules in January and we made 23 percent more planes than we had made in December. We exceeded our schedule in February, which, of course, called for an increase over January. In March again we met the schedule, which increases in line with the President's objective. We are ahead of schedule in tank production. Our production of merchant shipping is rising rapidly. We should meet this year's schedule. The same is true of our production of antiaircraft and antitank guns. America's industrial plant is really beginning to roll.

Supplementing the report made by our war production chief, I wish to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of a most remarkable analysis of our war production effort to date. This report was prepared by Cecil B. Dickson, formerly a resident of my State of Oklahoma, and now one of the outstanding writers of the country.

The article is entitled "Twenty-five Years After," and was published as the leading news story on the front page of the Washington Post of April 5, 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

25 YEARS AFTER—ARMY NOW 20 TIMES AS BIG AS ONE ENTERING 1917 WAR

(By Cecil B. Dickson)

Twenty-five years ago tomorrow the United States declared war against Germany.

It possessed:

A poorly equipped, untrained army of about 100,000 men and about 50,000 raw National Guard men.

Fifty-five airplanes, none equipped for combat service.

Thirty-five pilots, only four of whom could qualify for combat.

A few coastwise and tramp ships to constitute the merchant marine.

A fair Navy that was being built up by the 1916 act authorizing 156 ships.

Few war industries, and those jammed with Allies' orders.

Next Tuesday will end the fourth month of America's entry into World War No. 2—remember Pearl Harbor.

It possessed:

An Army of more than 2,000,000 trained men, which will be increased to 3,600,000 before next fall's snow flies.

Thousands of airplanes here and in the four corners of the earth fighting the Axis Powers.

Army and naval air forces of about 600,000 and a goal of 2,000,000.

Hundreds of cargo ships and tankers and 30,000,000 deadweight tons being built or under contract.

A Navy twice the size of that in 1917, and which is being increased rapidly.

War industries that are being built to beat the jig—Japs, Italians, Germans.

War production is rolling.

Output of planes has about doubled since December 7.

Production of tanks is so far ahead of schedule that the goal has been increased.

Ships, naval and cargo, now roll off the ways at an average of one a day and two a day is slated by midsummer.

Conversion of automobile factories, closed down in January, to war production is progressing faster than expected.

Hundreds of thousands of men have been sent to Australia, Newfoundland, Greenland, Iceland, England, Ireland, South America, Alaska, British islands in the Atlantic, and other places not yet announced.

They are well armed, well fed, clothed, housed, and protected from the air. They are inoculated against disease.

American aviators are flying bombers to Australia, England, Africa, India, and China.

Every plane carries a pay load in food, ammunition, medicine, and other supplies.

Twenty-five years ago, when the United States joined hard-hit France and England in the fight for democracy, it was so ill-prepared that the Kaiser thought our entry would have no effect on the outcome of the war.

War was declared on April 6.

Gen. John J. Pershing, although notified on May 10, was designated officially on May 28 as commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Force.

The first American convoy to reach France—on June 13, 1917—consisted of only 14 ships, including escorting destroyers and cruisers, and contained only 14,500 officers and men.

Congress enacted the 21 to 31 year draft and President Wilson signed it May 10.

Ten months after the United States entered World War No. 1 General Pershing cabled the War Department in protest against reports of certain newspapers that thousands of American planes were flying in France.

In his book My Experiences in the World War, General Pershing reproduced his cable, saying.

"As a matter of fact there is not today a single American-made plane in Europe."

Describing the deplorable condition of that time, General Pershing said:

"It was depressing to think that 10 months had elapsed since our entry into the war and we were just barely ready with 1 division of 25,000 men.

PEOPLE HAD BEEN DECEIVED

"With all our wealth, our manpower, and our ability, this was the net result of our efforts up to the moment; all because our people had been deceived by the false and fatuous theory that it was unnecessary in time of peace to make even preliminary preparations for war."

As if taking heed from General Pershing's post-war warning, President Roosevelt began building up the Navy shortly after he entered the White House in 1933.

In a historic speech in Chicago, he branded Dictators Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese as "aggressors" and warned the democracies of the world that they were threatened in Europe, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere.

He began to build up the Nation's air power after Austria and Czechoslovakia fell. In 1939, he asked Congress for 6,000 Army planes. He got 5,500. Later, he secured permission from Congress to lift the plane limit. Unsuccessfully, he called for repeal of the arms embargo in the hope that it would prevent spread of war in Europe.

Immediately after Hitler marched into Poland in 1939, he increased the Army and Navy. Congress finally repealed the arms embargo. Then the so-called phony war period set in. The British and French were invited to buy planes and munitions here. They did. May 1940 saw the steel gray mechanized hordes sweep across the European lowlands, subjugate France and Norway, and loose on England thousands of fire-belching bombs. Britons thanked God that Hitler failed to follow up his Dunkirk victory with an invasion of the tiny islands.

ASKS FOR CONSCRIPTION

During this period, President Roosevelt launched a huge merchant shipbuilding program. He called for a bigger Navy and a larger Army. He told the Americas to look at the map of the world and see how close South America is to Berlin.

In the face of a national convention and a campaign for election to a third term in a divided Nation he inaugurated a record-breaking defense program, including a two-ocean navy. For the first time in history he asked for peacetime conscription to train young Americans for the Army. The first draftees were inducted 13 months before Pearl Harbor.

Carrying out his 1940 campaign pledges to the embattled democracies, President Roosevelt went before Congress in January 1941, and proposed the unique lend-lease program.

Thus, by these steps and by stirring the people to the threat from abroad, President Roosevelt paved the way for preparedness for the war that was certain to come to this Nation.

Shipyards were expanded. Battle-torn British warships came here for repairs.

American planes, supplies, and munitions were felt by the Axis.

The rapid-fire Garand rifle was adopted for our fighting forces, and the building of tanks, guns, and planes was speeded up.

Had it not been for this preparedness program, the United States might have been in the condition it was when it went to war in 1917. It might have been invaded after Pearl Harbor. General MacArthur might now be a prisoner of the Japanese in the Philippines instead of commander of the United Nations' fighting forces in the Far East.

PEARL HARBOR BOMBED

Despite these preparations, the Japanese hit Pearl Harbor before the United States was ready for an all-out war.

Nonetheless, the record of his Government's war effort in the first 4 months far surpasses anything it ever did before.

This, notwithstanding bottlenecks, labor trouble, critics, blunders, mismanagement, and confusion.

Industrial production is breaking records.

Employment is soaring.

Labor disturbances are being held to a minimum.

Congress has given President Roosevelt every power and every dollar he has asked for war purposes.

Thousands of the 1,100,000 enemy aliens have been placed in concentration camps or under control.

In every war plant where a worker receives word of a son, relative, or friend having been killed, wounded, or missing, management reports voluntary increased production.

Labor realizes it has a stake in this war.

The worker appreciates liberty in a democracy.

Management generally is fair.

Management, capital, and labor, all have been making mistakes.

In the War Production Board there are some representatives of big business who, unwittingly, in seeking to secure more business for their monopolistic enterprises, have caused trouble and delay in the Nation getting production from small concerns. These small plants contain about 50 percent of the Nation's industrial productive capacity.

NELSON'S BIG JOB

But War Production Board Director Donald Nelson is working on this problem. His first job was to get the huge automobile manufacturing plants and other giant industries converted to war production. This is being done rapidly after a slow start.

Eighty-seven of the 90 General Motors plants, all of the Ford, Chrysler, Studebaker, Nash, Hudson, and Willys-Overland plants are now in war production.

Airplane plants have been expanded. Assembly lines for the speedy mass production of huge bombers are now operating. New airplane plants are going into production within a few weeks.

Employment is soaring. Since December 7, it has gradually increased. Unemployment has dropped to 3,500,000 and all of these workers are to be absorbed by fall. Plans are under way to induce about a million women, who have never worked, to join in the war production parade.

Plans for further increases in the Army are now being laid. Within a few weeks, disclosure will be made that the Army will increase its 3,600,000 number for this year to more than 5,000,000 men. The Navy, now with 500,000, and the Marine Corps with 104,000, also are to be increased as new warships come off the line and new naval bases are constructed here and abroad.

Great strides have also been made by President Roosevelt on the military and naval fronts. Supreme and united commands have been established. It was a year after General Pershing arrived in France before a united command was really established.

SOUTH AMERICA JOINS EFFORT

Most of the South American countries have joined in the effort. It was through the efforts and planning of President Roosevelt that this was accomplished.

In contrast to this and the first 4 months of World War No 1, the United States had then only 285,000 Springfield rifles, 400 light field guns, 150 heavy field guns, and 1,500 machine guns of 4 different types. The Army had to use Enfield rifles, which some private manufacturers had been making for the British and Russians.

In that same period, Congress provided only $4,000,000,000 for the war, including $640,000,000 for aviation.

The Army lacked trained officers to man the American Expeditionary Forces, initially supposed to number only 500,000. "Ninety-day wonders" led them into action. It was April in 1918 before the United States had 300,000 men in France. But before November 11 of that year, more than 2,000,000 were in Europe.

Since that historic day, December 8, when President Roosevelt stood before Congress and asked for a declaration of war against Japan:

Ninety billion dollars have been provided for the war effort to send the program to $160,000,000,000;

Ten billion dollars in cash has been expended by the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and other agencies for the war effort, compared with $6,000,000,000 in the 5 previous months;

Outlay for lend-lease aid to Great Britain, Russia, China, and other United Nations jumped from $700,000,000 to $2,500,000,000.

SIXTY BILLIONS FOR AVIATION

Money already provided for aviation approximates $60,000,000,000 and provides funds for all but about 35,000 of President Roosevelt's goal of 185,000 planes in 1942–43—60,000 this year and 125,000 next.

Funds for housing, equipping, transporting, feeding, clothing, and arming an army of 3,600,000 have been provided.

Money for a Navy of 500,000 men and a Marine Corps of 104,000 has been made available to bring the American fighting forces this year to more than the 4,000,000 in uniform in World War No. 1.

Sufficient money has been appropriated to carry out most all of the remainder of the President's 2-year program calling for 18,000,000 tons of shipping, 120,000 tanks, and 55,000 antiaircraft guns.

Soon another bill, providing about $35,000,000,000, will be passed by Congress to provide funds to complete the program.

Lend-lease cash has been increased to $20,000,000,000, while under provisions of the war legislation, a total of $50,000,000,000 of the entire program can be diverted to the use of United Nations.

The public debt limit was increased from $65,000,000,000 to $125,000,000,000 to help finance the war.

Borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was increased by $3,500,000,000, to provide a billion-dollar war damage insurance corporation to pay damages on property due to the war, and for $400,000,000 in synthetic rubber plants, in addition to hundreds of millions for new aluminum and magnesium plants.

INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT SOARS

Six billions in taxes have been collected and more than three billions in defense bonds have been sold.

A $9,000,000,000 war revenue bill has been projected.

Industrial output, particularly in steel, machinery, shipbuilding, transportation equipment, and other durable-goods industries where the majority of military products are since Pearl Harbor

The Federal Reserve Board's index shows that industrial production was 166 percent of the 1935–39 average on December 7. It jumped to 168 before the end of December, despite the Christmas holiday period, when it usually slumps. Durable-goods production, already at a high rate due to the lend-lease program and the Nation's own armament effort, jumped to 227 percent of the 1935–39 average, a gain of about 10 points since Pearl Harbor.

Thousands of men and women worked on Christmas Day and throughout the holiday season in steel mills, airplane factories, and in shops to swell production.

Four months from Pearl Harbor, industrial production hit new high peaks. From 166 on December 7, it jumped to nearly 175 percent. In the fourth week of March it had topped 173 percent

Steel production in the Pittsburgh area, the largest in the country, soared last week to 100 percent for the first time since the beginning of the war, while the steel industry as a whole operated at about 98 percent. This is a high average due to repairs that must be made from time to time in blast furnaces. A 98-percent average is equal to an annual rate of about 87,000,000 net tons. This represents an increase rate of several million tons over December 7.

GREAT SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

Contracts for 23,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant ships have been let by the Maritime Commission, an increase since December 7 of 9,000,000 tons.

This tonnage is larger than President Roosevelt's original 18,000,000-ton goal for 1942–43, announced in January.

This shipbuilding program is the greatest in world history.

It calls for 2,300 new cargo and tanker vessels within less than 24 months. More than 250 smaller ships are being built.

The schedule calls for 750 ships this year—an average of 2 a day. Already the average is slightly better than 1 a day. The schedule for 2 years is an average of 3 a day.

While the production progress is great, even more is expected as bottlenecks on materials are widened. The War Production Board has closed down civilian production in hundreds of consumers' goods plants, such as refrigerators, electrical devices, and radios.

They are being converted as rapidly as possible. The War Production Board, which has approved $10,000,000,000 in war contracts since Pearl Harbor, has the job of awarding many billions more in the months to come. They will go to converted and hundreds of new plants to be constructed and old ones to be expanded.

And when they all get to turning out the things the armed forces need to defeat the Axis, the war of production will end in victory for the United States and the United Nations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6554) to amend war-risk-insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request the bill (H. R. 6328) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6554) to amend war-risk-insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, pursuant to action by the Committee on Appropriations, I submit a notice in writing of a motion to suspend the rule with reference to an amendment to House bill 6868, making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The notice in writing submitted by Mr. McKELLAR is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 47, after line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 403 (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "Department" means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term "Secretary" means the Chairman of such Commission, and the terms "renegotiate" and "renegotiation" include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section, the term "contract" includes a subcontract and the term "contractor" includes a subcontractor.

"(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

"(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor. Such contractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts

recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. No suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts hereafter made and to all contracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided (in the case of contracts heretofore made) that final payment pursuant to such contract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any other costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any other excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable.

"(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each Department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount of $500,000 or more, statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail, as such Secretary may require. Such statements shall be made under oath, except for such interim reports as may be required by the Secretary. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor.

"(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of each Department, separately or jointly with the Secretary of one or both of the other Departments, shall prescribe regulations which will, to the fullest extent practicable, indicate in advance the profits on contracts which will be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section. In prescribing such regulations, there shall be taken into consideration the amount and character of the personal services, equipment, material, and working capital, and the length of time likely to be required for performing various contracts and such other factors as are deemed appropriate by the Secretary or Secretaries prescribing such regulations. In any event, any profits on any contract in excess of the amount set out in the following schedule of maximum profit rates shall be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section unless the Secretary of the Department concerned makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of such contract. A report of any such determination shall be made to the Congress within 30 days from the date thereof.

"SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM PROFIT RATES

"Ten percent of so much of the contract price as does not exceed $100,000; plus

"Eight percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $100,000 but does not exceed $500,000; plus

"Six percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $500,000 but does not exceed $1,000,000; plus

"Five percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $1,000,000 but does not exceed $5,000,000; plus

"Four percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $5,000,000 but does not exceed $20,000,000; plus

"Three percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $20,000,000 but does not exceed $50,000,000; plus

"Two percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $50,000,000.

"In the case of a contract entered into on a cost-plus basis, the costs of performing the contract shall be included in determining the contract price for the purposes of this subsection. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that the Secretary of any Department may not deem profits equal to or less than the amount set out in the foregoing schedule to be excessive profits for the purposes of this section.

"(g) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

"(h) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR. I submit a similar notice in writing with respect to another amendment which the committee has authorized.

The notice in writing, submitted by Mr. McKELLAR, is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 48, line 19, before the period, insert "*Provided*, That purchases of automobiles heretofore made at prices not in excess of those herein authorized are hereby authorized and validated."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to inquire, if the amendments submitted by the Senator in charge of the bill are now received, whether the vote on the two important amendments will go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McKELLAR. I was hopeful that I could obtain a unanimous-consent agreement that they might be considered today; but out of an abundance of precaution, fearing that some Senator might object, I have given the notice, so that the amendments may go over and be considered tomorrow. The only question is whether we shall consider them today or tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think consent could be had to consider these two important amendments today.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, I am very glad I gave the notice.

Mr. GEORGE. I wished to make it clear, so that we would not be expecting them to come up today, unless for discussion by those who favor them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to proceed for a few moments with a discussion of the pending bill.

This is the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill of 1942. The appropriations carried in the bill are divided into three classes. They were divided into such classes in the House, and the Senate committee has followed the classification.

Appropriations for the military activities of the War Department constitute more than nine-tenths of all the appropriations; and I desire to say that the larger portion of the War Department appropriations will be spent for the purpose of building additional airplanes for the Department. There are also appropriations and contract authorizations for the Navy Department, and appropriations and contract authorizations for certain civil agencies.

The House reported a bill of $17,375,959,445 for war Department activities and for the purpose of expanding the Army to a strength of approximately 3,600,000 men. Most of the appropriations are for the purpose of fitting out, equipping, preparing, and training a 3,600,000-man Army. That is proposed to be done by December 31, 1942.

A very large portion of the money now proposed to be appropriated—namely, $6,990,000,000—is for the construction of airplanes, complete with spares, radios, and ordnance, in order to meet the President's objective as set forth in his speech of January 6, 1942, for the production of 60,000 airplanes in the calendar year 1942 and 125,000 airplanes in the calendar year 1943. This is the second step in the airplane-production program. The additional planes make it necessary to have additional ground facilities, organization, and equipment for a larger number of operating units and a large increase in pilot output; and the added expense for such purposes will be $3,680,000,000.

The bill also provides for pay, subsistence, training, transportation, and otherwise caring for such expansion as will be necessary before July 1, next, and housing for an army of a strength of approximately 3,600,000 men by December 31, 1942; and this will cost $2,050,000,000.

In addition to the appropriations for airplanes and personnel, there are incidental and added maintenance and operation charges and expenses of $450,000,000 for storage and shipping facilities; and for all such purposes and projects an amount of $2,500,000,000 is to be added. To this amount is added $2,220,000,000, in round numbers, for defense aid.

That is the bill as it passed the House. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was $18,156,961,345. To that large sum the Senate committee has added $905,000,000-plus, so that the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is approximately $19,062,000,000.

At this point I desire to state to the Senate what the increases are.

For the War Department there is provided in the bill what is known as the Army Specialist Corps. Provision for the Army Specialist Corps was left out by the House. It was testified that the Army desired to have 6 000 specialists, with a pay schedule of from $2,300 to $8,000 a year. These are to be technicians, as shown on page 3 of the bill. The amount required for the specialist corps is $2,218,100.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment.

These men are to wear uniforms, but not regulation Army uniforms; and they will not be officers. The corps will be a civilian corps, to be used by the Army. The committee was convinced of the practicability of the use of such men, and it provided that they should be appointed by the President, but by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr President, I regard this as a very beneficial change in the policy of the War Department. That is, the effect of the provision to which the Senator refers—separating and distinguishing the gentlemen who come in to perform civilian military service from those who are engaged in combat service—is very important, as I see it, in order to protect the morale of the fighting soldier.

There is a proviso in the text about which I wish to inquire, since I do not understand it. It is the last proviso on page 3, lines 14 to 18:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any member of that corps unless such member is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I have understood, throughout the history of this piece of legislation and the plans which led up to it, that a very large number, in fact by far the largest number of men who will belong to this corps are in a group who are not officers. They are in a group of men who correspond to laborers; and I cannot understand what this proviso means if we take it literally to mean what it says.

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony was, and a large amount of testimony was taken by the committee, that these men are to be what are called technicians, men who may be sent abroad or who may be put on civilian duty which now is performed by regular officers of the Army, and, therefore, their employment will spare a number of regular officers of the Army who can be better engaged in more active work, as these men will be put only on civilian work.

It is a new scheme. It is a departure from established methods in our Army, and the committee thought, out of caution and care, that these officials should be selected by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

There was a question raised in the committee as to whether the lower-paid employees—those in the class who receive $2,300, $2,600, and $3,200—might be excluded, but after most careful consideration it was decided not to exclude them. The committee went very thoroughly into this matter because the House report, as the Senator will recall, is opposed to it, and therefore we wanted to make the matter as secure as possible, and yet to give the Army the advantage of this corps of technicians if they were really needed. We also wanted to be certain that they were technicians, and not simply men to fill places. That was the idea of the committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say that, although it is not what I would choose if I, myself, were trying to frame the legislation, I am ready to cooperate with the judgment of the committee on that policy.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator is.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will go along with the committee in that respect, with great interest in its success. I now understand from the answer that these employees, who are really on the basis of laborers, are not regarded as being within the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not within the military force. They are expected to wear uniforms, but the uniforms will be different from those of the Regular Army.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand; but does this provision relate solely to men who will acquire some sort of appointments with commissions?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. Commissions are not provided for at all. They are not to be Army officers at all. They are to be civilian technicians under the control of the Army. That is the proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think this information ought to be kept on the record. As I understand the Senator, there will be no majors, no captains, no officers of title, and no insignia of rank.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; and no retired pay—nothing except employment as technicians by the Army itself.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then, as I understand the Senator's explanation, there will not be in the corps any persons who are in the status of laborers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nothing was said about laborers. The lowest salary is $2,300 and the highest is $8,000. A corps of technicians is what is intended.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it the intention in organizing this specialist corps to have this new uniformed force take over Army office work as rapidly as possible in the city of Washington? To what extent is it intended that the new corps will take over desk jobs?

Mr. McKELLAR. That depends entirely upon the Army in Washington, because the specialist corps will be entirely under the control and dominion of the Army in Washington.

Mr. GURNEY. I realize that, but I was wondering if there was any program to do what I have suggested so as to relieve commissioned officers for combat service by the appointment of these specialists who might not be able to pass the rigid physical requirements for commissions in the Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will quote from the statement of General Somervell, who is one of the most accomplished officers in the Army, on page 11 of the hearings:

General SOMERVELL. In the first place, we appreciate very much what you have said about the character of Army officers; but we don't think we have any corner on honesty, Senator. Secondly, the people in the Army who have been trained for these duties have already been used. I mean, we haven't an inexhaustible supply. Consequently, we have to supplement the number we have now.

The problem before us is whether we put the men in a suit like the one I am wearing, with shoulder straps or what not on it, or in a different kind of suit. It is the same man, and we think it is better to put him in a nonmilitary uniform, if his duties are primarily nonmilitary duties, that is, in command of other kinds of activities. This doesn't mean that this is going to be done outside of the Quartermaster Corps, for example, speaking of the purchasing. The Quartermaster General is going to continue to be in charge of the purchasing. But he is going to have to supplement his force, either with Reserve officers or officers commissioned in the Army of the United States, as it is now, or supplement them in part with people in this Army Specialist Corps. That is the whole problem. It will be the same individuals and the same number of men.

His idea is that the Army needed men, for instance, who were well qualified and experienced along the line of purchasing supplies for the Army, but who would still be under control of the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, and would not be commissioned officers. His idea is that they are to be businessmen, in control of business matters within the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. May I ask a further question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. Was there any information given before the committee to the effect that men who go into the specialist corps would be those who had been put into a special classification under the selective service for limited service?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir. The Army would have carte blanche to employ the best men they could get, and they are not to stand civil-service examinations, they are not to stand any kind of examination, except what the Army wants to subject them to.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me ask a further question, if I may.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. When these men come into the specialist corps, will that relieve

them from their obligations under the selective service law?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for an additional observation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The testimony showed very clearly that the Army must have the technicians for whom the bill makes provision. The only question is whether they shall be taken into the Regular Military Establishment and given commissions, entitling them to wear the regular standard uniform, with shoulder straps, and with salaries to correspond, or shall be organized as a special corps, to include the same men, with uniforms but without the rank designations.

The uniforms, no doubt, will be similar to Army uniforms and will contain United States insignia and probably some sort of insignia to designate that the wearer is in the specialist corps, but members of the corps will not have the special insignia of lieutenants or captains or majors or colonels or generals.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me make one more statement; then I shall be glad to yield. The only purpose of the uniform, as I understand, is this: Under the provisions of the Geneva Convention men of any nation who engage in war activities, if they are captured and are not in uniform are treated as spies and are subject to be shot. The uniform will protect them, and if they are captured wearing the uniform, they will become prisoners of war and will be treated as such.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Oklahoma has just answered the question that was in my mind; but, if the Senator will yield for an observation, I want to make a further comment. As a trustee of the State university, I have for years observed young men spend some part of 4 years in educating themselves in military science and in drilling in order to acquire skill in military tactics. I have observed them spend some part of the vacation, during which usually in the northern section of the country they go to work to try to earn something, training in camps. After 4 years of such dicipline and effort, they graduate with a second lieutenant's commission.

It cannot help the Army of the United States, the combat troops, the officers on whom we depend for victory in combat if we put the uniform and insignia of rank upon gentleman who never have sacrificed or done a single thing to acquire the special distinction and authority which the Government gives to the young men to whom I have referred who really undergo a special education in order to acquire not only qualities of leadership but the skills which are necessary.

I think that this is one of the most important and beneficial changes of policy on the part of the Government I have seen come before the Senate. It is a grave thing to have the morale of our officers who are in command of combat troops impaired by anything at all, and I say there is nothing, in my opinion, that would have a greater tendency to impair it than to put the uniform and the insignia upon men who never in their lifetime have lifted a hand to acquire the knowledge, ability, and attainments for which the uniform and insignia stand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I desire to thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind words.

I wish to add two short excerpts from a letter written by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, about this same subject:

> The purpose of the specialist corps is to establish under military control, a group of civilians whose professional, scientific, and business talents are essential to the success of the prosecution of war. To obtain such individuals in the Army, it is now necessary to commission them in military grades for which they are not qualified. In order to organize and control this group, it is considered absolutely necessary that they be organized into a corps and authorized a distinctive uniform which will accord appropriate recognition of their status in the Military Establishment.
>
> The War Department is convinced that there is a genuine need for the Army Specialist Corps. Recent studies by the Army, including elements in theaters of operations, indicate that a disproportionate part of our trained military personnel is being consumed in overhead activities. The Army Specialist Corps will permit us to turn these duties over to a group of specialists which will be under the complete control of the Army.

General Marshall further says:

> In general, members of the specialist corps will be without military training. If commissioned in the Army, officers who would be junior to them and who have spent years qualifying themselves—

Using the very argument the Senator from Vermont has used—

> would naturally resent being made subordinate to persons with no military training. This is an important morale issue, which is constantly present in the commissioning in the Army of professional and technical experts who have no military background. The specialist corps can meet this issue. Specialist corps members will, insofar as it is practicable, be chosen from persons not subject to, or who have been deferred from, induction into the military service. The specialist corps will be a supplement to, and not a competitor of, the Army.

No age limit is fixed, and that question will not arise, nor will the question of rank arise.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asked whether those assigned to the specialist corps would be excused from service under the selective draft. I wish to quote the testimony on that point:

> Senator O'MAHONEY. But I take it the answer would also be in the affirmative if the question were, Are you able to take in men who are physically capable of passing the examination? Would the answer be "Yes"?
>
> General HILLDRING. The answer would be "Yes," but the protection of them from the draft would be "No," Senator. If we took such a man in, that would not, per se, give him immunity from Selective Service, and that is the point I wanted to make.
>
> Senator O'MAHONEY. I am glad you made it, because that makes it possible for us to say that this system would not be an outlet whereby to escape actual draft service.
>
> General HILLDRING. Absolutely not.

Mr. President, I have referred to this testimony to support my belief that we should not excuse men from service under the selective draft by putting them into civilian employment under the Government. I am opposed to that, our committee is opposed to it, and I am sure that nothing of that kind will be done. Indeed, I think that most of those who will go into the specialist corps, if the House and the Senate and the President shall agree to the provision, will be men who probably will not come within the draft at all; that is, the corps will be composed of older men.

Mr AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator's statement brings us right to the significant element in the selective training and service law; that is, the element of selection. That is one of the most important elements in the law. A local board having under consideration an enrollee who is in the specialist corps will, under the law, take into consideration the question whether the man's service is more important to his country in the place where he is than if he were put into the armed forces. They have the power to leave him where he can serve his country best.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the next increase of appropriation in the bill is for Army transportation, for the chartering of merchant ships. It was established by the evidence before us that while there are not many ships which can be chartered, there are some, and, of course, everyone knows the desirability of obtaining those ships if they can be obtained, and an appropriation of $56,490,798 was added for this purpose.

Mr. President, I do not think it requires argument to convince anyone that wherever we can buy a ship at this time we should do so. The committee, holding to that view, has added this item to the bill.

The largest addition to the bill was under the Navy Department, Bureau of Yards and Docks, in which category $809,000,000 was added. The reason for this additional estimate was given by Admiral Moreell, who said:

> The $9,000,000 is to finance the purchase of utilities, such as locomotives, box cars, flat cars, locomotive cranes, hauler cranes, truck cranes, tractors, etc., for the entire Naval Establishment. With the expansion in the shore stations of the Navy we have received large requests for equipment of this character to enable the stations to carry on their work, and we have just not had enough funds to finance those requests.

They had already received about twelve and a half million dollars, and he wanted a $9,000,000 deficiency, to which the committee agreed. Again Admiral Moreell asked for $800,000,000—

> for the program of miscellaneous public works, which is designed to parallel the expansions in the other branches of the Navy.

I mean by that the increase in personnel for both the Navy and the Marine Corps to 1,000,000 and 200,000, respectively, automatically entails an increase in the training facilities and in the housing facilities and the hospital facilities.

This included repair work and vocational schools. It was said that with this appropriation they could train a million men. This constituted, of course, a very large part of the increase recommended by the Senate committee.

The Coast Guard Marine Training Corps was given $5,000,000, making the total increase in the appropriation for the Navy Department $814,000,000.

In the general appropriation title the Senate committee recommended a contract authorization for access roads of $25,400,000, there being a Budget estimate therefor. There was also added $3,500,000 for Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio.

The Selective Service System was granted $3,770,000

The Tennessee Valley Authority, for building a phosphorus manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala., was allowed $3,000,000.

Various items for the District of Columbia were added, amounting to $328,817.18. By the way, the items asked for by the District of Columbia amounted to over half a million dollars, but only the most pressing items, such as those for food, clothing, hospitalization, and other necessary items, were allowed by the committee.

I now come to a very important matter, which is especially interesting to the Senators from the Pacific coast. It is the item, first, of $250,000, for the national-forest protection and management, to enable the proper officials to protect our national forests.

The emergency forest-fire-control organization was given an additional $16,100,000. The House had allowed $2,000,000, and the Budget estimate was $5,000,000. There was much testimony before the committee as to conditions in our national forests in the West, which probably are our largest forests, unless those in Alaska are larger. I do not think they are, though. I am speaking from my own recollection. Anyway, enormous and magnificent forests are to be found in the far western States. As we all know, there are many Japanese in those States who are being moved back from the coast and put into concentration camps. It is easy to set these forests afire, and our committee thought it was necessary to appropriate a sum sufficiently large, according to the opinion of those who are carrying out the proposal, to protect the forests. Their estimate was for about $19,000,000. Therefore we added a sum which will bring the appropriation up to approximately that figure. Knowing, as I do, something about those forests, having visited the West a number of times, and having seen the magnificent trees which are still standing there, I think we could not spend our money to better advantage than by affording the necessary protection, both from ordinary fires, and from what might be called fires in the nature of sabotage. For these reasons the committee unanimously recommended even more than the Budget estimate, more than three times the Budget estimate, and has recommended this amount to be used by those whose duty it is to control the forest fires in the West.

In this connection, I wish to say that I have received hundreds of telegrams, and I think other Senators have received a large number, too, from State authorities in the West, who are working in harmony and in cooperation with the national authorities in saving the forests. I hope very much that the provision will be agreed to.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely desire to say to the Senator that I am very much gratified to note that the committee restored the amount which the Department asked, because those of us from the Pacific Coast States—and I note present at this time both Senators from Oregon [Mr. McNARY and Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]—know that that whole area, which is heavily timbered, has been at times swept by terrifying fires.

Mr. President, just one other thought. I drove through South Carolina a short while ago and was astonished to find—I do not know why I should have been, but I was astonished to find signs in South Carolina similar to signs in the States of Washington and Oregon, warning against setting forest fires. Upon inquiry I discovered that the Southern States were also trying to develop a new type of reforestation which would give to the South a new source of wealth in lieu of that which had previously been almost wantonly destroyed by the wrong sort of cutting. So it is gratifying to know that this item will not only help the West but will also help all sections of the country, including the States along the east coast.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we also granted $185,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. There was a Budget estimate for this item, and the proof was overwhelming that it was needed.

For the Department of Commerce, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, for automatic posting systems at New York and Washington, $4,080,000 is provided. I think that is a very popular expenditure of the Government's money, for better methods of defense, and unless I am asked about it I shall not discuss the item. I think the committee thought that it was highly proper that the item should go into the bill.

For the Interior Department, fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities—national defense—there is an item of $1,240,200. That applies to Government forests which are under the control of the National Government and under the control of the Interior Department. For that reason a portion of the money which was referred to a while ago is given directly to that Department. I am glad to say that I think the Interior Department, and the Department of Commerce, which has charge of the protection against forest fires, and the fire departments of the various States and the various counties in the West, are all joining in a very determined effort to prevent fires.

Also, Mr. President, under the Department of Labor, for salaries and expenses, apprenticeship training program, an item of $90,000 was allowed.

For the Commissioners of Conciliation, $150,000 was provided.

The total under the general civil appropriations, title III, is $32,694,017.18.

Mr. President, that brings me to two amendments which the committee authorized to be offered. They are not in order, but notice in writing has been given, and the chairman of the committee will submit the amendments under that notice, unless unanimous consent is granted beforehand, so that they may be submitted today. I think it is proper to submit one amendment. It was one of the most earnestly considered amendments in the whole bill. The House provision appears on page 47——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what amendment is that?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the House amendment which the Senate committee struck out concerning our attempt to control contracts to some extent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am advised that the Senator is about to discuss the House provision with respect to limitation on profits?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has given, and properly so, notice of action tomorrow, which is necessary under the rules, of course, to endeavor to suspend the rule because of the fact that the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. I take it that the House amendment was a limitation, and here we have legislation which comes wholly within the prohibition of the rule. If we are to consider that amendment tomorrow—and it will be necessary to obtain a two-thirds vote for its consideration—why does the Senator launch into a discussion of it today? Why not take the bill up today and consider all the items which are not controversial, or which are not involved in the question of a suspension of the rule, and leave that matter for consideration tomorrow? We had an understanding that after today there would be more or less of a holiday, subject, of course, to sessions on Mondays and Thursdays. I would suggest to the Senator that if he starts out on the amendment today, what is said today will have to be repeated tomorrow. Let us clean up the bill as far as we can today, and then recess until tomorrow, and have simply one proposition before us, which is a very important one.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is the intention of any Senator to object to considering the amendment today I think the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon is very wise.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that was understood. I may say in the absence of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and in his name, that I shall have to object. I should have to object in my

own name, because I think the amendment clearly comes within the rule, and I also always insist on the enforcement of the rules, as I do today. I understand the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] objected to consideration of the matter today. I will make the statement now positively, that objection will be made to taking up the amendment today.

Mr. McKELLAR. With that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments, except two, or really except the one to which reference has just been had, be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in "Title I—War Department", on page 1, line 8, to strike out:

For additional amounts for the Military Establishment, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, to be supplemental to, and to be merged with, the appropriations under the same heads in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified under such heads, respectively, in such act, as follows:

And to insert:

For additional amounts for appropriations for the Military Establishment, fiscal year 1942, which, together with the unexpended balances remaining under all appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, shall be supplemental to, merged with, and become a part of, the appropriations under the respective heads in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended by acts supplemental thereto, including the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified under said heads, respectively, in those acts, except as otherwise provided herein; and such appropriations heretofore and herein made shall remain available until June 30, 1943, for the purposes of such appropriations, including obligations chargeable against appropriations for the Military Establishment for the respective purposes of said appropriations for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, as follows:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Finance Department", on page 3, line 7, to strike out the subhead "Pay of the Army", and to insert "Finance Service, Army"; in line 9, before the word "For", to insert "Pay of the Army:", and in line 10, after the word "States", to strike out "$325,113,462" and to insert the following: "including the pay of members of the Army Specialist Corps, $327,331,562: *Provided*, That members of that corps who are assigned to the supply services of the Army may be paid from the appropriations for the work upon which they are engaged: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any member of that corps unless such member is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, to strike out the subheading "Travel of the Army" and to insert before the word "For", the words "Travel of the Army:".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 8, to strike out the subhead "Apprehension of deserters" and in line 9, before the word "Funds" to insert "Apprehension of deserters:".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 13, to strike out the subhead "Finance Service"; in line 14, before the word "For", to insert "Finance Service:"; and in line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$419,478,462", and insert "$421,696,562."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps", on page 6, line 2, to insert as a subhead the words "Quartermaster Service, Army"; in line 14, after the word "transportation", to strike out "$761,412,202" and insert "$817,912,000"; in line 16, to strike out the subhead "Welfare of enlisted men"; and in line 19, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,317,225,479" and insert "$1,373,725,277."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 12, to strike out the subhead "Engineer Service, Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions", on page 9, line 14, after the words "apply to", to strike out "persons who have lost their citizenship by serving in the armed forces of another nation but who apply and are accepted for service in the Army of the United States" and to insert "military personnel."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in Title II—Navy Department, on page 12, after line 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, NAVY

Funds appropriated under the heading "Welfare and recreation" shall be available for the hire and use of buildings, grounds, services, facilities, and subsistence for rehabilitation and recuperation of naval personnel returned from war service at sea or on shore beyond the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, the Canal Zone, and insular possessions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance", on page 13, after line 16, to insert:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $9,000,000.

Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For public works and public utilities, Bureau of Yards and Docks, including the acquisition of necessary land, $800,000,000, which, together with the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under this head, shall be finally accounted for as one fund, which fund shall be available for continuing or completing the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken thereunder, for acquisition or construction of temporary or emergency buildings and facilities at localities within or without the United States, needed by the Navy and specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, including collateral public-works items and other expenses: *Provided*, That contracts for work under this appropriation may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

No part of the appropriations in this act under the Navy Department shall be expended for a permanent type of construction at any shore establishment of any character acquired subsequently to the calendar year 1938, unless such establishment shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy as a permanent establishment, and, in that event, a permanent type of construction shall be used only to meet such permanent requirements as the Secretary of the Navy may approve: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent construction of a type sufficiently substantial for the use intended, nor apply to construction projects now under contract or in progress: *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations may be obligated for the construction of quarters, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, for greater amounts per unit than follow:

Permanent construction:

For commissioned officer, $10,000.

For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, $7,500.

For enlisted man, $6,000.

Temporary construction:

For commissioned officer, $7,500.

For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, $5,000.

For enlisted man, $3,500.

The fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract hereafter entered into under this appropriation shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps", on page 16, after line 5, to insert "*Provided*, That the appropriations under this heading for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the purchase of civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $25 per man, to be issued when necessary to marines given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unfitness, or inaptitude."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels", under the subhead "Coast Guard", on page 17, after line 10, to insert:

Maritime training fund, Coast Guard: For the purchase of training ships for merchant marine personnel, $5,000,000.

Appropriations under the Coast Guard for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the purchase of civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $25 per man, to be issued when necessary to members of the Coast Guard given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unfitness, or inaptitude.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions", on page 18, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 202. The appropriations of the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 24, to change the number of the section from "202" to "203."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in "Title III — General appropriations — Legislative", on page 19, line 3, to insert:

SENATE

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, contingent fund of the Senate, for the fiscal year 1942, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1943.

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for folding speeches and pamphlets at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, contingent fund of the Senate, for the fiscal year 1942, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1943.

The amendment was agreed to:

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency", on page 26, line 8, after the words "amount of", to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$25,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 14, to insert:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1942, to remain available until expended, for continuing construction and equipment of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, $3,500,000: *Provided*, That the limitation of $13,300,000 upon the total cost of construction and equipment of said Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory is hereby increased to $18,171,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 22, to insert:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

For an additional amount for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified for the appropriation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, $3,770,000, which amount, together with the said appropriation and $3,500,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, shall be consolidated and constitute one fund: *Provided*, That from the date of the approval of this act to June 30, 1943, the Director of Selective Service, in prescribing per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence for officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and of the Reserve components thereof, traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, pursuant to the first paragraph of section 12 of the act approved June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 631), as amended, is hereby authorized to prescribe such per diem rates of allowance, whether or not orders are given to such officers for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, and without regard to the length of time away from their designated posts of duty under such orders.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 20, to insert:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Tennessee Valley Authority fund: For an additional amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, fiscal year 1942, for the beginning of construction of a fertilizer and elemental phosphorus manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala., and the acquisition of land in connection with the accomplishment of this project, $3,000,000, to be available for the administrative objects of expenditure and subject to the conditions specified under this heading in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 15, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GENERAL EXPENSES

Department of Insurance, salaries: For an additional amount for personal services, fiscal year 1942, $2,445.

Office of Administrator of Rent Control, salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, including personal services and printing and binding, fiscal year 1942, $5,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 29, to insert:

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for general necessary expenses of District offices, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions and limitations specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1942, $7,200.

Postage: For an additional amount for postage for strictly official mail matter, including the rental of postage-meter equipment, fiscal year 1942, $4,000.

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding, fiscal year 1942, including the condition specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 13, to insert:

COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

Street cleaning: For an additional amount for dust prevention, sweeping and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitation specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $20,000.

Collection and disposal of refuse, expenses: For an additional amount to enable the Commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, etc., fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to insert:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Community Center Department: For an additional amount for all expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Community Center Department, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified in the appropriation under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $15,000.

Buildings and grounds: For the completion of six unfinished classrooms at the Lafayette School, fiscal year 1942, to remain available during the fiscal year 1943, $45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 12, to insert:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Inspections: For an additional amount for inspections, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $15,000.

Tuberculosis sanatoria, expenses: For an additional amount for provisions, and so forth, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations specified in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $40,000.

Repairs and improvements: For an additional amount for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, including roads and sidewalks, fiscal year 1942, $9,173.

Gallinger Municipal Hospital, expenses: For an additional amount for maintenance of the hospital, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitation specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $73,700, and the amount specified for purchase (including exchange) of two motortrucks is increased to $2,400.

Repairs: For an additional amount for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, fiscal year 1942, $6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 10, to insert:

COURTS

Municipal court: For an additional amount for contingent expenses, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 15, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

Jail: For an additional amount for maintenance and support of prisoners of the District of Columbia at the jail, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $4,650.

Workhouse and reformatory, expenses: For an additional amount for maintenance, care, and support of inmates, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $12,000.

District of Columbia Training School: For an additional amount for maintenance and other necessary expenses, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitation specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $15,000.

Industrial Home School for Colored Children: For an additional amount for maintenance, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitation specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 12, to insert:

MILITIA

For an additional amount for personal services and other expenses, fiscal year 1941, including the objects and subject to the limitations specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1941, $1,409.18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 17, to insert:

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture,

Forest Service, salaries and expenses," on page 33, line 7, after "1942", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 17, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$35,000"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$18,100,000"; and on page 34, line 7, after the word "property", to insert a proviso, as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the maintenance, including the pay of enrollees, of any Civilian Conservation Corps camps transferred to the Forest Service either by Congress, or by the President under authority granted by section 801 of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942, shall be payable out of this appropriation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine", on page 34, line 18, after "1942", to strike out "$1,665,000" and insert "$1,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," on page 36, line 19, after "1942", to strike out "$1,940,000" and insert "$6,020,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary", on page 38, line 17, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$50,000"; and in line 25, after the figures "1942", to strike out "$324,800" and insert "$1,565,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary", on page 42, after line 12, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, apprenticeship training program (national defense): For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1942 for "Salaries and expenses, apprenticeship training program (national defense)," including the objects specified under this heading in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1942, $90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 23, after "1942", to strike out "$76,500" and insert "$226,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions", on page 45, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 401. Section 2 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and the last proviso under the caption Military Posts in title IV, Military Appropriation Act, 1941, are hereby repealed.

And insert:

SEC. 401. The last proviso under the caption "Military posts" in title IV, Military Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public, No. 800, 76th Cong.), is hereby repealed, and section 2 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved August 25 1941 (Public Law 247, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, to file with the Congress, within 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, a complete list of all contracts in excess of $50,000, including contracts for the purchase of land, undertaken during such fiscal year for the expenditure of funds appropriated by this or any other act, showing (1) a summary of the subject matter of each contract; (2) the names of the contractors; (3) the names of the persons who approved the specifications, consummated the making or concluded the negotiation of any such contract on behalf of the Government, and of all persons who participated in the negotiations on behalf of the contractor; (4) if any such contract was awarded without competitive bidding, a statement of the principal or controlling reason for the selection of the contractor; and (5) as to contracts for the purchase of land, also the location, area, intended use, the purchase price, and assessed value thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 402A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as "final payment" to any contractor who fails to file with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation of contract and reimbursement of profits in excess of 6 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, this amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$862.50" and insert "$925."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerks will renumber the sections to conform to the amendments agreed to this day.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer at this time an amendment on page 48, line 19, before the period, to insert "*Provided*, That purchases of automobiles heretofore made at prices not in excess of those herein authorized are hereby authorized and validated."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated by the clerk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 19, before the period, it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That purchases of automobiles heretofore made at prices not in excess of those herein authorized are hereby authorized and validated."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that amendment arises in this way: There was a limitation of $750 on the purchase of automobiles.

Mr. McNARY. On how many automobiles?

Mr. McKELLAR. The limitation of $750 applied to one automobile. Some time ago the Army desired quite a large number of automobiles, and gave an order for them. The Ford Co. notified the Army that it could not furnish the automobiles in the limited time specified because of the order which forbade the manufacture of automobiles and turned the automotive industry into an arms-producing industry, unless overtime were allowed. The Department went to the Judge Advocate General, and the Judge Advocate General gave an opinion to the effect that under the peculiar circumstances the Army had a right to pay more. The Army thereupon bought 9,300 automobiles at $770 each, instead of $750. The purpose of the amendment is to validate that purchase. The Army officials acted upon the opinion of the Judge Advocate General. It seems there was some mistake about that opinion. The Army has already received a large number of the automobiles, and they actually cost $20 more. The difference between the limitation and the actual cost was $20.

Mr. McNARY. How many automobiles are involved?

Mr. McKELLAR. Nine thousand three hundred. The amount involved is about $193,000.

Mr. McNARY. To what use are the automobiles put?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are put to all the uses for which cars are employed in the Army and Navy.

Mr. McNARY. That is a very general answer.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is; and only very general language was given to us.

Mr. McNARY. I object to the consideration of the amendment today.

Mr. McKELLAR. I give notice that I shall bring up the amendment tomorrow. I am doing so under the instructions of the committee. I have already given notice, as required by the rules.

In order to clear up the record in connection with the amendment going over until tomorrow, there is some question as to whether we shall adjourn or take a recess. Our leader advises me that he wishes to have the Senate take a recess; but in order to be certain, I think I should ask for a ruling from the Chair as to whether, in giving the notice, we ought to specify a calendar day or a legislative day. I merely wish to be sure that we can take up this amendment tomorrow. If the Chair thinks that we cannot, I shall ask the leader to move to adjourn, until tomorrow rather than take a recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the ruling of the Chair. It does not make any particular difference to me whether we recess or adjourn. If we adjourn, we shall have to have what is known as a morning hour tomorrow. If we recess, that will not be necessary. It does not make any difference to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should much prefer to have the Chair hold that a calendar day is meant by the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Under the precedents, the Chair holds that in this case a day will be construed to be a calendar day.

Mr. BARKLEY. So it makes no difference whether we recess or adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. That completes the bill, with the exception of the two amendments which have gone over because of the rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while I am opposed to the committee amendment to the pending bill proposing a limitation on profits, I am particularly opposed to the terms in which that amendment is

written. It seems to me that those terms are unreasonable, and that they prescribe no standard whatever. At this time I wish to submit a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee. Unfortunately, I was not able to see the committee amendment until this morning. My amendment has been very hastily prepared. While it has in it the general ideas I wish to present, I reserve the right to offer another amendment tomorrow. In order that it may be printed and in the hands of Senators tomorrow, I submit a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee and ask that it be printed and lie on the table, and also printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. TAFT, intended to be proposed by him to the (H. R. 6863) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 402 (a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission are hereby instructed to insert in every contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such department a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price which represents excessive profits, determined as hereinafter provided, and a provision requiring the contractor to insert in every subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price representing excessive profits, determined as hereinafter provided, and a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

(b) All sums provided to be paid by the contract in excess of cost, plus a percentage of the contract price determined as hereinafter provided, shall be deemed to be excess profits for the purposes of this section. The cost of performing contracts shall be determined in accordance with the method of cost accounting regularly employed in keeping the books of the contractor in question, but if no such method of cost accounting has been employed, or if the method so employed does not, in the opinion of the Profits Board hereinafter created, clearly reflect such cost, such cost shall be determined in accordance with such method as in the opinion of said Board, does clearly reflect such cost. In the case of a contractor which does not regularly employ a method of cost accounting in keeping its books, such contractor may, with the approval of the Secretary, determine the allocation of indirect costs to be made to contracts according to the ratio of direct cost of performing contracts to total costs. Irrespective of the method employed by any contractor for determining costs of performing contracts, no item of cost shall be charged to the performance of any such contract or used in any manner for the purpose of determining the cost of such performance, unless such item would have been chargeable against such contract if such contract had been subject to the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 27, 1934 (known as the Vinson-Trammell Act), prior to the enactment of the Second Revenue Act of 1940. In determining cost no allowance shall be made for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor, or for any other costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. All taxes, including excess-profits taxes, normal taxes, and surtaxes, may be included as part of the cost.

(c) There is hereby created a Profits Board, to be made up of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the War Production Board. Each of such members shall have the right to appoint a substitute to serve as a member of the Board and perform all of the functions of such member. Such Board shall forthwith classify all contracts in as many classes as it may determine, giving due regard to the character of the article involved, the nature of the contract, the amount of capital required in manufacturing or other activities essential to performance of the contract, the rate of turn-over, and other factors. The Board shall then determine a proper percentage of total cost to be allowed in the case of each such type of contract, to be in no case less than 2 percent of total cost and in no case more than 10 percent of total cost. The Board shall fix such percentages of total cost for each type of contract as in its opinion will return to the contractors entering into such type of contract approximately 5 percent per annum on the capital which it has invested in the business. The percentage so fixed by the Board shall be added to the cost, and those sums in excess of the cost plus the percentage so fixed shall be deemed to be excessive profits.

(d) The Profits Board shall have power to make regulations with regard to the proper method of determining costs and percentages of cost.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement in regard to the pending bill. I do not desire to delay consideration of the bill, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that with the passage of this bill, containing appropriations aggregating $19,000,000,000, there will be available an unexpended cash balance of $100,000,000,000 in funds already appropriated for national defense. That $100,000,000,000 does not include any contract authorizations. Neither does it include the large appropriation made for cargo ships. One hundred billion dollars lies unexpended from funds already appropriated for national defense.

Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is more anxious to see this country go forward in its defense program than is the Senator from Virginia; but it seems to me that the time must come when the Congress of the United States should ask the agencies in charge of our defense program to give some specifications as to when these huge sums will be expended. On the basis of the expenditures of last month, which were somewhat in excess of $2,000,000,000, it will take 50 months to spend the $100,000,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which has been very carefully prepared, showing the defense expenditures beginning with July 1940. As the Senate may recall, that was the month following the fall of France. The statement likewise shows each month the unexpended appropriated balances for national defense. I may say that in July 1940, $194,000,000 was appropriated for national defense, with unexpended balances for that month of $7,764,000,000.

The statement gives the expenditures for each month and the unexpended balances for each month. I ask that the statement be incorporated in the RECORD, because I think the attention of the country should be called to the fact that, with this bill, there remains in the Treasury of the United States $100,000,000,000 available for national defense. I think we may remember and recall that the war will not be won by appropriation bills; that this money should be expended; and that the tanks, airplanes, battleships, and other things for which the money is to be expended should be brought quickly into actual existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Without objection, the statement submitted by the Senator from Virginia will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

Statement of national defense expenditures and unexpended balance, July 1940 to February 1942, inclusive

	Defense expenditures	Defense unexpended balances
1940:		
July	$194,000,000	$7,764,471,929
August	220,000,000	7,544,471,929
September	237,000,000	10,142,752,223
October	309,000,000	11,330,987,305
November	393,000,000	10,987,987,305
December	494,000,000	10,493,987,305
1941:		
January	591,000,000	9,902,987,305
February	613,000,000	9,778,487,305
March	773,000,000	17,387,999,682
April	787,000,000	19,008,686,070
May	858,000,000	18,319,242,070
June	833,000,000	17,469,175,056
July	966,000,000	32,102,052,926
August	1,129,000,000	37,517,779,089
September	1,327,000,000	36,190,386,406
October	1,534,000,000	40,809,714,246
November	1,446,000,000	39,355,111,665
December	1,847,000,000	47,095,578,301
1942:		
January	2,101,000,000	57,520,696,349
February	[1] 2,201,000,000	[2] 79,692,505,859

[1] Figures taken from Treasury bulletin and Daily Treasury Statements.

[2] Inclusive of $14,045,339,974 in Naval Appropriation Act for 1943, approved Feb. 7, 1942, which amount will not be available until July 1, 1942. These balances represent the cash balances, that is, after deducting the cash expenditures; of course, there are a great many unliquidated obligations standing against all balances.

NOTE.—The statement given above of the unexpended balances available for national defense refers to what may be termed cash balances subject to immediate expenditure. These balances do not include contract authorizations, which will add many billions more to the total of $100,000,000,000 now unexpended and available for disbursement for defense purposes. Neither do these figures include very large sums already appropriated for cargo ships and other items connected with national defense. The figures given above are the national defense expenditures exclusively, such as procurement of military supplies, construction of camps, payments to soldiers and sailors, etc.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask if consideration of the pending bill is to go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. McKELLAR. As under a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in this holy season, a sacred and solemn occasion which culminated in an ever-joyous Easter Sunday, commemorative of Christ's resurrection, it is fitting to give thanks that we live in a land of freedom of divine worship; the equality before the law and in our social and civic life of all

forms of religious expression consistent with the common good is an American right unique in the history of peoples. It goes even beyond the theory and practice of religious tolerance, which is always a characteristic of a true democracy, and stands in compelling contrast with the situation existent in the totalitarian countries.

This distinctively American attitude toward religion began in a material sense with the forging of our Constitution, and received emphasis by being incorporated into the very first of the articles of the Bill of Rights which stated that—

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Without interruption, the principle has continued down to this day and is unquestionably the choicest right in our American heritage. It is the keystone of our Republic.

The antithesis of this right of each and every American citizen—Catholic, Protestant, or Jew—to worship God in his own way and to believe theological and ethical doctrines dictated to him by his own conscience, without political interference, active or positive, is an attitude of those states which claim to be morally omnipotent. It is true that in this terrible war in which the whole world is engulfed there is no clear-cut line of demarcation between the two groups of combatants on the basis of religious tolerance; but, by and large, this principle is more widely recognized on the part of the Allied Nations than it is on the side of the Axis. To say that this is exclusively a holy war would be an error of oversimplification; but it will be most difficult for us to preserve our traditional American religious freedom if we are conquered by the Axis. Violent terroristic measures effectuated by the sword can crush this freedom more effectively than can peaceful antireligious indoctrination.

What will happen in the matter of religious freedom if there is an Axis victory may be inferred from what has taken place in religion-loving Germany under Hitler. Italy would not be strong enough to interfere with the German pattern of subordinating church to state even if Italy wished to do so. Japan—which, as a nation, has never forsaken its program, not even in a nominal sense—would certainly have no reason to preserve our religious liberty. The religious situation in Nazi Germany speaks for itself.

The persecution of organized religion has become a recognized and common weapon in the hands of Nazi leaders. They would replace belief in God with belief in Hitler, and would make a religious nazi-ism. Rosenberg, the leader of the new national pagan church in Nazi Germany, said at the Nuremburg party congress in 1938:

> I am absolutely clear in my mind, and I think I can speak for the Fuehrer as well, that both the Catholic Church and the Evangelical Confessional Church as they exist at present must vanish from the life of the people.

The basic principles of the pagan religion which Rosenberg plans as the National Reich Church have been published in a 30-point program which reached our American press late last fall.

Briefly, under this new National Reich Church, the Holy Bible is banned from the altars of all churches, and the holy book of the new religion becomes Hitler's Mein Kampf. The cross is removed from the altars of all churches, to be replaced by a sword and the swastika. Baptism and the religious ceremonies of marriage and burial are abolished. All church property of all faiths will be handed over to the state.

Let me quote in their entirety points 4 and 5 of the Rosenberg plan. They are:

> Other churches or religious associations, above all those based on international bodies or directed from abroad, will not be tolerated in Germany by the National Reich Church. The National Reich Church is immutably fixed in its one objective: to destroy the Christian belief imported into Germany in the unfortunate year 800, which tenets conflict with both the heart and mentality of the German.

Point seven declares:

> There will be no * * * pastors, chaplains, or religious orders; only the national "orators," who are state functionaries, will be allowed to speak.

Services are to be held on Saturday night.

In another point Rosenberg says:

> All church property belonging to all confessions shall be immediately handed over to the state.

In other points:

> Immediate cessation of the printing of the Bible—

as well as its distribution or importation, is demanded. All religious papers are to be suppressed.

Accompanying the suppression of the ceremony of baptism is the requirement that parents of a new baby swear an oath before the altar of the Reich church that they are Aryan. They must vow also—

> To bring up their child in the German spirit for the German people—

before he may receive a birth certificate as a German citizen.

There is a similar oath for marriage. Good Friday is replaced by a youth day, and all other religious festivals, as we know them, are abolished.

Such a program is progressing rapidly within Germany. Christian church property is continually being confiscated. Jewish synagogues and temples have long since been destroyed. Strict Nazi circles eliminated Christian ceremonies some time ago. On June 1, 1941, all Catholic periodicals, bulletins, and newspapers were forced by the Nazis to cease publication. The same thing is true of Protestant religious publications in Nazi Germany.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference in the United States, which represents all the Catholic bishops in the United States, has received word from abroad that all Catholic monasteries in Nazi Germany have now been closed by government order. Many Protestant religious buildings suffered a similar fate long ago.

We all know of the horrors suffered by victims of the new order in countries occupied by the Nazis. Among the worst sufferers was Catholic Poland. The excellent pamphlet on Nazi propaganda tactics, Divide and Conquer, published by the Office of Facts and Figures this past week, stated that according to Cardinal Hlond, of Poland, the Catholic Church has been practically wiped out in western or Nazi Poland. Three-quarters of the population have been deprived of the services of the church, even on their death beds. Think of it—even on their death beds.

In 2 archdioceses in Poland 1,338 religious buildings have been destroyed or closed, of which over 600 were churches. One thousand three hundred and thirty-eight houses of God defiled openly in only these 2 provinces. The sum total of damage done by the Nazis in western Poland alone is too staggering to contemplate.

Now, let me tell my fellow Senators what the new Nazi Party leader, Bormann, who has taken the place of Rudolf Hess as Hitler's right-hand man in the nefarious Nazi dealings, had to say about the fate of Christianity in the German state.

In a document which was intended for his party subordinates, and which fell into the hands of Douglas Miller, former commercial attaché at the American Embassy in Berlin, Bormann said that Christianity in the German state must be annihilated forever.

Bormann said:

> Nazi and Christian ideologies are irreconcilable. The Christian church is based on the ignorance of mankind, for only thus are the Christian churches able to maintain their power.

Think of it! The Nazi religion, according to Bormann, is based on the "latest of scientific research"—research that has brought death and destruction to millions of people within and without Nazi Germany.

The Nazi philosophy, on the other hand, according to Bormann, is based—I quote—on the "latest of scientific research."

The Nazi Party leader remarks further on Christianity. Nobody would know anything about Christianity, he says, if he had not been "stuffed" with it in his youth by the priests. Thus states Bormann, if German youth hear nothing more of Christianity, whose doctrine he considers so inferior to the German ideals, "Christianity will cease to exist."

Every influence, says Bormann, which might diminish or injure Hitler's leadership must be eliminated. He states: "The people must be liberated more and more from the churches, and their parasites, the priests. Such influence must be broken, absolutely and definitely."

Everyone, no doubt, is familiar with the heroic efforts of that distinguished Lutheran churchman, Rev. Dr. Neimoeller, and I am sure that many heard over the radio a few days ago what happened to a leading churchman in Norway who undertook to resent restrictions and limitations upon his church and his people. In the concluding statement of the report it was explained that that churchman is now listed among the "missing."

I quote Bormann's concluding words. Mark them well, my colleagues, for the deadly purpose of the Nazi leaders has never been more definitely stated than here. Bormann declares:

Just as the obnoxious influence of astrologists, soothsayers, and other swindlers has been suppressed and eliminated by the state, so must the power and influence of the churches be annihilated forever. Only after this has been achieved * * * will the existence of the nation and the Reich be assured forever.

This then is an admission, from the Nazi Party leader himself, that God stands in the way of the continued existence of the Nazi state.

Certainly we know that men who live according to the laws of God could never be a party to that most dastardly of Nazi crimes against the German people themselves—the so-called mercy killings.

The doing away with innocent citizens, which the Nazis call mercy killings, can be explained only as the murder of German citizens with the approval of the German state. The excuse for murder is that these German citizens are "unproductive." In other words, if one is maimed, blind, or injured in some manner which makes him unable to play what the Nazis consider a productive part in the life of the country, he is murdered, in cold blood, by his own leaders. God alone knows what terrible crimes have been committed against the foes of the Nazis inside Germany, against those who do not conform to the Nazi pattern, by this nefarious scheme of legalized murder.

A German bishop, inside Germany, had the courage not long ago to denounce this terrible blood-chilling practice in a sermon delivered in Westphalia, which was recently smuggled out of Germany. The bishop of Muenster, Clemens von Galen, one of Germany's leading churchmen, declared in this sermon:

According to what I have learned on good authority, the practice in homes and clinics in Westphalia is to draw up lists of patients who are transferred elsewhere as unproductive citizens, and after some time they are put to death.

Some disease or other is given as the cause of death—

Says Bishop von Galen—

but as the bodies are immediately cremated, neither their families nor the regular police can afterwards find out whether the disease is genuine or what really was the cause of the death.

The bishop commented:

It is the thought that these patients are like old machines which can no longer work. Like an old horse which has become incurably lame, or like a cow which can no longer give milk.

The bishop continued:

If one admits the principle that unproductive men can be killed, then woe to our gallant soldiers who come back to their country wounded, maimed, or sick. None of us will be sure of his life.

The good bishop, in his concluding words, summed up the conditions which have come about in Germany, in the Nazi state where all freedom, as well as religious freedom, has been eliminated from the life of the people. He declares:

The name of God is constantly ridiculed, dishonored, and blasphemed. As for the first commandment, men have been created according to their own good pleasure, false gods to adore—nature, the state, the people, the race.

Is it surprising then—

Bishop von Galen asks—

that they also try to claim divine prerogatives, and to make themselves the masters of the life and death of their neighbors?

In reciting these facts, I know that Nazi Germany is not the only country since the end of the first World War to embark upon an insane policy of religious persecution aimed at the destruction of Christianity upon which ultimately our own American creed of liberty of religious freedom rests. But in the present situation, it is the Nazi leaders who constitute the greatest, immediate menace to the survival of the American manner of dealing with the problem of divinity of religious convictions among men. Surely that fact should weigh heavily on the side of our decision to defeat our enemies, while giving thanks to Almighty God in this holy season for His aid in raising up a republic of freemen who are pledged to maintain and defend that ideal of surpassing splendor—religious liberty.

The religious-loving Protestants, Catholics, and Jews of Germany are Hitler's victims today. The nations he has conquered have lost their right to practice the religion of their choice. This dread menace must never come to the Americas.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to offer to the pending bill an amendment which, in my judgment, is in keeping with the religious spirit that fills our hearts and our souls at this holy season of Easter tide. We all know that in the conduct of the war, and the letting of defense contracts, racial and religious discrimination has, unfortunately, crept in here and there; that men whose parents came from certain portions of Europe and men, although their sons are in the Army have been, because of their names or color, listed as unworthy or unwanted in some of our defense industries, and in the work on some of our defense contracts. As the appropriation bill before the Senate has to do with defense work and defense contracts, I desire to offer an amendment which is aimed to prevent discrimination against or in favor of any employee or prospective employee or applicant for employment because of his race, color, or creed and to provide suitable penalties for the violation of this mandate. I offer the amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, speaking of the amendment which was just offered, I wish to approve its purpose, and referring to the bill which is before the Senate, those of us who heard the testimony pertaining to the bill feel that it should be passed, and I intend to vote for it. However, there is a growing feeling throughout the country, a feeling which has been expressed here in the Senate, that we will not be able to expend efficiently and intelligently the vast and unheard-of sums we have appropriated for the war effort. The objectives and the purposes for which we are asked to appropriate these funds are good, and it remains for those who administer our vast war effort to put them to the most efficient and effective use.

In the ultimate analysis, the measure of production is labor and energy—that is, man-hours and kilowatt-hours.

The real cost of the production of a gun, tank, plane, ship, supplies, or munitions is the man-hours and the kilowatt-hours required for their fabrication, plus the man-hours and kilowatt-hours to produce the materials from which the item is made, plus the man-hours and the kilowatt-hours for the upkeep of the plant, plus the man-hours and the kilowatt-hours to supply the personal needs of the men doing the work.

The fact that these essential elements have not been properly analyzed and coordinated is undoubtedly responsible for some of the lag and delay in our war production to date.

The bill under consideration provides for vastly expanding facilities for a larger Navy and the Marine Corps, and provides for the clerks to register the manpower of the entire country. It is certainly evident now that this war effort will tax to the extreme every ounce of manpower possible for the military service, plus every possible ounce of manpower, and plus every possible kilowatt-hour for production, plus the financial resources of the entire Nation. I am sure that by now we realize that mere dollars, even if we had them, can produce nothing.

The system of employment now pursued is bringing much concern to a very large percentage of our population, for it is depriving them of an opportunity to join in the war program. Not thousands but millions of our people are kept in unemployment because of age limits, and hundreds of thousands are discriminated against because of race or color. These conditions must be corrected if, as we hope, we are to have complete unity and maximum production.

Imagine, if you can, the establishment of an age limit that would deprive us, in many instances, of our most experienced industrialists who are successfully setting up the vast assembly and supply lines for the most rapid and efficient production of our war materials.

On the other hand, we are practically eliminating the great army of World War men, who gave their energies in the first great World War. I speak now of the approximately 5,000,000 men who were called into the service in 1917 and 1918. These men are now beyond the age of 45.

They are subject to registration, but are not acceptable for enlistment except in a few instances.

The Army established a low age limit in many classifications not exceeding 35 years for both officers and men. The Navy maximum is 50 for lieutenant commanders, and 44 for lieutenants. The Merchant Marine has done a little better, with a maximum of 54 years. The United States Civil Service Commission raised some of its age limits to 57.

In industry the limitations have been so great, even for such simple positions as guards, that both older men and women have been deprived of opportunities to obtain employment.

Recently the War Department asked men who had been officers in the World War to submit questionnaires for commissions or administrative employment. An unusually large number of applicants responded, but, as yet, little has been done toward the commissioning or the appointment of these older men.

So impressive is this ban on age that even graduates of West Point and of the United States Naval Academy, who normally would retire at 64, are not called from the reserves into active service after they are 60. These men could easily take the places of younger men at desk positions, releasing the younger men for the more active service.

When it is considered that persons must reach 65 before being eligible for old-age assistance in many States, it will be understood how serious this situation is in regard to our old people, especially with the cost of living rising, while they are denied employment. This unemployment rigor also extends to the partially physically incapacitated who might, during this emergency, be safely employed in many lines of industry.

I have received an unusually large number of inquiries from these older people asking for an opportunity to participate in the defense of their country, and while we are appropriating this additional vast amount of public money, I take this opportunity of calling these facts to the attention of those charged with the administration of the war effort, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and particularly those who are to award these contracts, for they can certainly influence industry to start now in a vastly increased manner to relinquish some of their more rigid regulations, and to pull back these older people, training them during this period, before the sturdy and the strong young men of America will be called upon for extended active service in the armed forces of the Nation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move hereafter to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely: At the proper place in the bill insert the following additional sections:

SEC. —. It shall be unlawful to receive, require the payment of, or pay any sum of money, or fee of any nature, as an initiation fee or charge which is made a condition precedent to the right, or opportunity, to work upon any war work, as defined by the War Production Board. Any person violating this provision shall upon conviction be punished by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by fine not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. —. The President shall proclaim a day, and, if necessary, in his judgment, an exact time of day within the last 2 years which shall be deemed for the duration of the war to be the date on which existed the standard maximum level of prices for all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, and interest on money, and the standard maximum level of compensation for all services.

The price or compensation existing at the time fixed in the proclamation of the President shall for the duration of the war, or until the revocation of the Presidential proclamation by the President become the standard maximum price for the acquisition, or use of all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, and rates of interest and the standard maximum level of compensation for services to which such price, or compensation, respectively, applied at such time: *Provided, however,* That the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may whenever it deem such action necessary to the effective prosecution of the war, and in the public interest, or to avoid any undue hardship, alter any price, or rate of compensation, in any case, or class of cases.

If any such maximum price or maximum compensation is altered as herein provided by the Office of Price Administration with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, then the price or compensation so fixed shall constitute the maximum price of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, capital, or credit, or compensation to be paid and received for any services rendered.

The Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may when no price level for the acquisition or use of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, or credit, or compensation level for services existed on the date proclaimed by the President, fix the maximum price for the acquisition or use of any such goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, or credit, and the maximum compensation for any such services.

Any person charging or paying a higher price for any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property and interest on money, capital, or credit, or any person paying or receiving a greater compensation than so fixed by the Office of Price Administration shall upon conviction be imprisoned not exceeding 1 year, or fined not exceeding $1,000, or both. This provision shall be effective for the duration of the war only.

Mr. PEPPER also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice will be received and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida to state the purport of the amendment he has just sent to the desk to be printed.

Mr. PEPPER. There are two amendments. The first makes it unlawful to impose any charge in the nature of an initiation fee or charge as a condition precedent to the right or opportunity for a person to work upon any war work as defined by the War Production Board. As the Senator will observe, it is intended to strike at the evil, which has unhappily and unfortunately grown up in the country, of requiring excessive sums to be paid by would-be workers on defense projects as a precedent to their opportunity to begin work.

The second amendment may perhaps best be described as being a statement in my own feeble way of the Baruch plan for fixing an over-all ceiling on prices of all kinds of goods, commodities, and articles, including rents of real property, and including interest on money, and a ceiling on compensation to be paid for services.

The amendment contemplates that the President shall proclaim a certain day, or, if in his decision it is necessary, a particular time of day as well, which shall be considered for the duration of the war as the day on which existed the standard maximum level of prices and compensation. That standard maximum level is made the standard for the duration of the war, but power is conferred upon the Office of Price Administration, when acting in concurrence with the Chairman of the War Production Board or his representative, and the Chairman of the Economic Warfare Board or his representative, to alter the price or compensation for services existing upon the date chosen and proclaimed by the President.

The amendment also gives the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the War Production Board or his representative and the Chairman of the Economic Warfare Board or his representative, the power to fix as a maximum standard any price or compensation for services for which there was not a standard on the day proclaimed by the President.

The amendment provides a penalty to be imposed on anyone who violates the standards which are thus prescribed, and it specifically limits the application of the law to the duration of the war.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I had stepped out of the Chamber for a moment, and I wish to ask about the procedure. Is the Senator describing a proposed amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I have offered two amendments to be proposed to the pending appropriation bill, and have given notice in writing that I shall proceed to ask for a waiver of the rule so that the amendments may be considered hereafter, when it is possible under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Florida rose to give notice of his desire to seek a waiver of the rule in order to offer two amendments to the pending appropriation bill, I interrupted him to ask whether he would be good enough to describe to us what the proposed amendments were.

He has just concluded his statement in reply to my request.

I was about to remark that this suggestion by the Senator from Florida is an indication of the wisdom of the fundamental rule of the Senate against legislative amendments upon an appropriation bill. The experience of legislative bodies has been, over a long period of years, that proper consideration cannot be given to legislative matters when they are offered as riders to appropriation bills. Therefore, the rule has always been that no such amendment can be offered unless two-thirds of the Senators agree that it should be offered.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I am in complete agreement with him that the Baruch plan, or some plan very similar to it with respect to price stabilization, should be adopted. During the debate upon the price-control bill I pointed out that, in my judgment, that measure was defective, that it would not serve its purpose. The appropriation bill which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has brought before the Senate after careful consideration by the Committee on Appropriations is in itself a demonstration of the validity of this contention, because there are in the bill numerous items of increased appropriation which have been made necessary by increased prices.

My feeling is that the subject matter of the amendments to be suggested by the Senator from Florida is of such tremendous importance that they should not be considered at this time. I feel that if there is one thing the Congress owes to the people of the country it is that it shall give consideration and deliberate judgment to the legislation which is proposed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wished to say that I am sure the Senator would not say that the proposal concerning the reexamination of contracts, renegotiation and fixing of contract prices in contracts, is an example of the general suggestion he has made. The House inserted in the bill as passed by it a provision on this very subject, which the Senate committee have stricken out, as it was perfectly proper to do.

I will submit to the Senator another question in that regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not mention that amendment at all. The Senator from Tennessee was not on the floor at the time I spoke of the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I have just come into the Chamber.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senate was about to recess when the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] rose and gave notice of an intention to move a suspension of the rule in order that two amendments might be added to the bill. The first of these amendments is one which undertakes, as I understand his description, to place a limitation upon the initiation fee which may be charged by labor unions to persons who present themselves for work upon any war contract.

Mr. PEPPER. To prohibit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To prohibit. Not to limit, but to prohibit. The second amendment is to propose in substance the Baruch plan.

I interrupted the Senator from Florida to remark that when he asks that two such far-reaching amendments be added to an appropriation bill he is only demonstrating the validity of the rule against legislative riders upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, and I agree with the Senator, because in the instant case, I will say to the Senator from Florida, the Appropriations Committee has had no opportunity to consider the proposed legislation. But I thought the Senator also suggested as falling within the purview of the point made by him the amendment which was directed by the committee to be offered on the floor, and which will be offered on the floor tomorrow by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I had not even mentioned that amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that. I will say to the Senator from Florida that the difference between the two is tremendously striking in this respect. I think the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and all other Senators who are on the Appropriations Committee will agree with me when I say that the amendment on which we shall vote tomorrow concerning the reexamination of contracts and profits made under the war contracts, has been as carefully examined into as any proposal ever was by any committee since I have been here.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is covering a great deal of territory in that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am covering this much territory: I have been in the Senate for 26 years, and I have never seen an amendment given more careful consideration by any committee than that amendment was given, and the Senator from Wyoming probably gave it more attention than any other member of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President, I would not accept that compliment. I do want to say here and now that the Senator from Tennessee, who is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the pending deficiency bill, has been most considerate of all members of the committee, and a great deal of attention has been devoted to the particular amendment dealing with the renegotiation of war contracts. There can be no doubt about that. That amendment is altogether in harmony with the provisions of the bill itself. The Case amendment, so-called, presented in the other House, was in the form of a limitation on appropriations. I am ready to say that under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee the committee has been most careful and most meticulous in its consideration of this problem; but it opens the door to the amendments which are now being proposed by the Senator from Florida, which; of course, deal with some of the most fundamental problems that are before the Congress, some of the most fundamental problems that are before the administration, but upon which no judgment has as yet been announced by the legislative committees charged with the responsibility for those provisions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senators allow me to read the two amendments, because they will not be in print until tomorrow morning; and if any Senators are interested in their contents, I should like to advise them so far as possible. The first amendment, which will be proposed tomorrow, reads as follows:

It shall be unlawful to receive, require the payment of, or pay any sum of money, or fee of any nature, as an initiation fee or charge which is made a condition precedent to the right, or opportunity, to work upon any war work, as defined by the War Production Board. Any person violating this provision shall upon conviction be punished by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or by fine not exceeding $1,000.

The second amendment reads as follows:

The President shall proclaim a day, and if necessary in his judgment, an exact time of day within the last 2 years which shall be deemed for the duration of the war to be the date on which existed the standard maximum level of prices for all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property and interest on money, and the standard maximum level of compensation for all services.

The price or compensation, existing at the time fixed in the proclamation of the President shall for the duration of the war, or until the revocation of the Presidential proclamation by the President become the standard maximum price for the acquisition, or use of all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, and rates of interest, and the standard maximum level of compensation for services to which such price or compensation, respectively, applied at such time: *Provided, however,* That the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman or his representative of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may, whenever it deem such action necessary to the effective prosecution of the war, and in the public interest, or to avoid any undue hardship, alter any price, or rate of compensation, in any case, or class of cases.

If any such maximum price, or maximum compensation is altered, as herein provided, by the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, then the price, or compensation so fixed shall constitute the maximum price of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, capital, or credit or compensation to be paid and received for any services rendered.

The Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may when no price level for the acquisition, or use of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, or credit, or compensation level for services existed on the date proclaimed by the President, fix the maximum price for the acquisition, or use of any such goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, or credit, and the maximum compensation for any such services.

Any person charging, or paying a higher price for any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property and interest on money, capital, or credit, or any person paying or receiving a greater compensation than so fixed by the Office of Price Administration shall upon conviction be imprisoned not exceeding 1 year, or fined not exceeding $1,000, or both. This provision shall be effective for the duration of the war only.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether either one of those proposals has ever been submitted to or considered by any committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean the substance of the amendments?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the substance of them.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know that the first one—prohibiting the payment of initiation fees before persons can work upon war work—has been considered by any committee, but I understand that on one occasion the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in consideration of the price-control bill, did consider the general subject which is covered in the second amendment—the so-called Baruch plan. I have been told by Mr. Baruch that it was his understanding that his testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, which I have read, was also incorporated in the hearings in the Senate committee. So, to answer the Senator's question, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, so far as I am informed, did have an opportunity, when considering the price-control bill, to consider that general plan and that general purpose. I have submitted neither one of these amendments to any committee of the Senate because I have not had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. But at the time consideration was given to the Baruch plan the country was not at war.

Mr. PEPPER. No; the country was not at war at that time. That is my understanding.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. So as to keep the record straight with regard to the consideration of the Baruch plan by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to say that the Senator from Florida has accurately stated the situation. Mr. Baruch testified at some length before the House committee. His testimony as given before the House committee was introduced in the record of the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. That happened to occur, I will say to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], after Pearl Harbor. We started our hearings on the 9th of December, the Tuesday after Pearl Harbor. I may add, however, that no serious consideration was given to the plan, because it was felt both by the great majority of Senators on the subcommittee and by those in charge of the matter uptown in the administration—Mr. Henderson and others—that we could adequately cover the situation by the enactment of the legislation substantially as it was enacted.

With the permission of the Senator from Florida, I should like to say that it seems to me the administration, the Senate—in fact, the entire Congress—have overlooked a very important provision in the price-control bill which consists of one sentence of just a few lines, which I shall read:

It shall be the policy of those departments and agencies of the Government dealing with wages (including the Department of Labor and its various bureaus, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the National War Labor Board, and others heretofore or hereafter created), within the limits of their authority and jurisdiction to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and equitable wages, and cost of production.

It is my judgment, Mr President, that if the administrative authorities gave full force and effect to the congressional policy laid down in section 1 of the act, considering that in connection with the no-strike policy of labor we could adequately cover this entire matter. In other words, Congress told the administrative authorities in charge of the regulation of wages and hours that it was our policy that wages should be stabilized as of the date of the enactment of the law, which was January 30, 1942. If the administrative authorities would take cognizance of section 1 of the act, as they should do, and administer it as Congress intended they should administer it, the authorities we have already set up, which are named in section 1 of the act, would have a definite statement of what the policy of Congress is—that is that wages should be stabilized as of the date of enactment of the law.

I understand something about the Baruch plan. The only difference between what we did in the price-control bill and the Baruch plan was this: In the price-control bill we gave the authority of control over prices to the Price Administrator, and we left the authority controlling wages in the boards which have already been established for that purpose, on the general theory that it was altogether too big a job to go to the Price Administrator; but the various agencies were told to coordinate their wage stabilization with the price stabilization of Mr. Henderson. About 5 or 6 weeks ago, Mr. Henderson, very wisely called the attention of the administrative authorities to section 1 of the act and urged action under it. It is my judgment that if they would follow the congressional policy laid down in section 1 we should have adequate control of the price situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan whether there is anything in the price-control bill which in any way whatsoever undertakes to control profits?

Mr. BROWN. In the same section to which I have referred there is a direction that insofar as wages are concerned, in their relationship to the cost of production, they shall be stabilized substantially as of January 30.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of that.

Mr. BROWN. However, I will say frankly to the Senator from Wyoming, that we did not attempt in the price-control bill to control the matter of profits, because it was our idea that that problem could be better dealt with in a tax bill. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I perhaps had more to do with the make-up of this particular section than anyone else, but I will give first honors in that connection to the Senator from Ohio. We both happened to be members of the Finance Committee. We felt that the matter of profits could best be taken care of through a tax bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. Before we go on I should like to answer the Senator from Wyoming. There is something in the price-control bill having to do with profits and production. In determining the price the Administrator shall take into consideration any increase or decrease in profits in the year ending October 1, 1941, or subsequent thereto. So there is a reference to profits. However, they are not intended to be the predominant factor in fixing prices.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the Price Administrator fixes prices he does so for everybody in the industry. Profits are individual, but price ceilings are universal.

Mr. TAFT. I happen to know of two industries, the semivitrified china industry and the vitreous china industry, in which he has determined what the profits were for this year, and has based his price fixing probably on the fact that profits were greater in 1941 than they were in 1940.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator refers to the over-all profit for the entire industry?

Mr. TAFT. The over-all profit for the entire industry, which is a rather limited industry, with a limited number of plants which are more or less in the same situation.

Mr. BROWN. The subject of control of profits in connection with Government contracts was not in any way covered by the price-control bill. That is the subject in which we are now particularly interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Having obtained answers from the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Ohio to the effect that in the price-control bill there is no specific control of profits as such, I ask the Senator from Florida whether in the proposal which he offers there is any attempt to control profits.

Mr. PEPPER. It is the intent of this proposal to vest that power in the Office of the Price Administrator, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the War Production Board, or his representative, and of the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, or his representative. It might be more clearly stated than it is in the amendment, but it was intended that in their power to fix prices in any case or class of cases they should have the power to fix profits, and in that way

would be able effectively to control that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By way of illustrating the difficulties of reaching any considered conclusion in this matter, I wish to read the text of the Senator's amendment dealing with this particular problem:

> The Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board—

Observe that there is a broad delegation of power from the Chairman to any representative he may choose—

> and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare—

If I were inclined to make a wisecrack, I might say that that would make it possible to delegate this power to any one of numerous individuals against whom the gentleman from Texas [Representative DIES] has recently been directing his shafts.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare were to abuse his privilege in that way, it would be a matter for scrutiny by Congress and the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me proceed—

> may when no price level for the acquisition, or use of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, or credit, or compensation level for services existed on the date proclaimed by the President, fix the maximum price for the acquisition, or use of any such goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, or interest on money, or credit and the maximum compensation for any such services.

I am ready to acknowledge that the Senator from Florida is a very gifted, able and eloquent Member of this body; but I think he will find great difficulty in reading into any of the language which I have just quoted from his amendment any power to control profits.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator did not read the section under which I intended that power to exist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I intended to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the Senator did. The paragraph to which I invite his attention reads as follows:

> The price, or compensation, existing at the time fixed in the proclamation of the President shall, for the duration of the war or until the revocation of the Presidential proclamation by the President, become the standard maximum price for the acquisition or use of all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, and rates of interest and the standard maximum level of compensation for services to which such price, or compensation, respectively, applied at such time: *Provided, however,* That the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may, whenever it deems such action necessary to the effective prosecution of the war and in the public interest, or to avoid any undue hardship, alter any price, or rate of compensation, in any case, or class of cases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I submit that that is merely the escape clause of the Baruch proposal, intended to permit the price levels to be increased. I will say to the Senator that while the Appropriations Committee was considering the problem of controlling profits, I had the opportunity of reading to the subcommittee the tentative draft which was proposed by Mr. Baruch in his very notable article of several years ago; and we were disappointed to find that there was no specific reference there to profits, and so the suggestion which several members of the committee had in mind, of offering the Baruch plan as a substitute for the plans which were under consideration, was abandoned.

Let me again call to the attention of the Senator the first paragraph of his amendment:

> The President shall proclaim a day, and if necessary in his judgment, an exact time of day within the last 2 years which shall be deemed for the duration of the war to be the date on which existed the standard maximum level of prices for all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property, and interest on money, and the standard maximum level of compensation for all services.

Obviously that sentence contains a very controversial suggestion. It gives authority to the President to pick out any day within the past 2 years and to fix that day as the day which will control the price of any particular commodity. The fixing of prices for particular industries, for particular commodities, and for particular sections of the country would open the door wide to all sorts of abuse—not intentional abuse, but unintentional abuse. It would be utterly and completely unjust. My own feeling is that the plan to be adopted should be an over-all plan at the present time, not with authority to the President or anybody else to go back into the past and select a particular date which might be good for the industries of Florida and bad for the industries of Maine, or good for the industries of Wyoming and bad for the industries of Michigan. It is an utterly impossible suggestion, as it seems to me. However, my point now is not to discuss the merits of the Senator's proposal, because in principle I quite agree with him as to it; but I point out how perfectly impossible it is for the Senate to legislate intelligently and beneficially in such a manner.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. A moment ago the Senator from Wyoming made a statement which I think should be corrected by reading the pertinent rule of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will correct me if I was mistaken.

Mr. HAYDEN. The proposal submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is a committee amendment which deals with the question of regulating the profits made under Government contracts. It deals with that very narrow question. The Senator from Wyoming implied that the amendments proposed by the Senator from Florida would be in order on an amendment of that kind; that the committee amendment, if agreed to, would open the door; and that anything could be put on.

I desire to read the pertinent Senate rule.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order that I may protect the record of my own fairly reasonable acquaintance with the rules let me say that my point was merely that a motion to suspend the rule so as to attach a legislative rider is the same, no matter what the subject may be. Let me say that the principle of legislation on an appropriation bill is frowned upon by the rules.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is subdivision 4 of rule XVI:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; * * *.

I wish to say very frankly to the Senator from Florida that certainly his proposals are not germane to the provisions which the committee recommends, and that, therefore, he must depend upon obtaining a two-thirds vote of the Senate to have his amendments considered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry before yielding to him?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I make the following parliamentary inquiry: I should like to know whether the present language of the appropriation bill relative to the subject of regulation of profits—the Case amendment, as it is called, I am told—violates in itself the rule against an amendment which proposes general legislation being received to any general appropriation bill, and whether the rule will have to be waived in case that matter is considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). The Chair holds that in that case the amendment is a limitation, and not legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. The Chair holds that all the language in the bill which deals with the question of profits constitutes a limitation of an appropriation, and not legislation? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the language which was put in the bill in the House is so considered.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I understood that an additional amendment was proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations to be put into the bill, and I intended to address myself to the question whether an amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations is by way of limitation or whether it is legislation which, in order to be considered by the Senate, requires a waiver of the rule, pursuant to an appropriate notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]

gave notice today that he would move to suspend the rule for the purpose of offering the amendment to which the Senator from Florida has just referred.

Mr. PEPPER. So a suspension of the rule will be necessary in order to enable the Senate to consider the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee, constituting legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That raises the presumption that it would be legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say that I was directed by the Committee on Appropriations to submit the amendment in that way.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just one other comment before I conclude.

I appreciate the advice of the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that, in his opinion, the amendments I have offered would not be germane to the committee amendment offered by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. If I understand the rules of the Senate, however, the matter of germaneness in such cases is not passed upon by the Chair, but is passed upon by the Senate itself; and, of course, the opinion of the Senator would simply constitute his own opinion and would not necessarily be determinative of the opinion of the whole Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Unless the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I am about to conclude.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish later to propound a parliamentary inquiry. I can do so now if the Senator chooses to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to ask, as a parliamentary inquiry, if the amendments proposed by the Senator from Florida should in fact be tabled tomorrow, if it could be done without prejudicing the bill as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules of the Senate, an amendment may be laid on the table without prejudicing the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. That would be my own view as to the way to dispose of the matter, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the able Senator from Connecticut will be here tomorrow to express his views, and perhaps to have an opportunity to record his vote, so that it will be a matter of permanent record as to what his opinion is on this controversial subject. I am sure there are a great many persons in the country who are interested in the opinions of all of us on these controversial subjects.

Mr. President, let me say a word in conclusion. I have done what I could to get a consideration of the whole question of profits, prices, and other matters relating to the total mobilization of the country's effort as a single subject. So far I have not succeeded. Therefore the only course I know of which is available to the individual Members of the Senate is to do what the other House did, and endeavor to attach to legislation that comes before the body subjects which the amendment makes appropriate to the measure.

I therefore tried to present these two amendments, because I think they ought to be considered in connection with any legislation on the subject of profits. I know, of course, that the subject of profits should not be dealt with on an appropriation bill; but I did not put the subject on the bill, and if the Senate is to deal with one phase of this problem tomorrow or next day, it ought to deal with all phases of it. Therefore I have offered to the Senate these amendments for the purpose of considering the whole question, and matters relating thereto, along with the consideration of the profits amendment, if it is the intention of the committee to include that subject in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Florida that the method he has adopted probably is a very effective one by which to call the attention of the country and of the Government to the subject matter of his amendments; and I am hopeful that, as a result of what he has done, immediate consideration may be given to these fundamental problems.

As I understand from this very brief acquaintance with the Senator's proposal, he is asking only that the policies which are embodied in these amendments shall be incorporated in our law for the duration of the war. There is no purpose upon the part of the Senator from Florida to enunciate a permanent policy with respect to any of these matters. I think I have correctly understood him; and the Senator nods in acquiescence.

ECONOMIC TREATIES BY PRIVATE GROUPS

Mr. President, there is a permanent phase to this matter as well as a temporary phase. It has been illustrated by numerous events during the past several weeks. One of the most striking of all these, I think, was the testimony given before the Truman committee by representatives of the parent Standard Oil Co., known as the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, with respect to international cartels controlling patents.

There has recently been called to my attention an advertisement which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on March 27, 1942; and I ask that it may be read from the desk by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the advertisement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Standard Oil Co. of California is in no way whatsoever involved in the assertions of the Department of Justice, concerning relationship between the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Axis countries. This company is not in any way interested in the patents for the manufacture of synthetic rubber under discussion

STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA.
MARCH 27, 1942.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is very significant that the Standard Oil Co. of California should find itself called upon or, perhaps, I should say that the Standard Oil Co. of California should find it desirable, in a newspaper advertisement to disavow any connection with the cartel arrangement which was made in 1929 by the parent New Jersey corporation.

This incident suggests to my mind the desirability of entering in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the agreement which was reached by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey with I. G. Farben, the German Dye Trust. It should be borne in mind that I. G. Farben was an organization created in Germany shortly after the Versailles Treaty was agreed upon, and its purpose was to reestablish monopolistic control of the dye industry by industrial leaders of Germany. The purpose went much further than that; the purpose was not only to establish world-wide control of the dye industry; the purpose also was to destroy the German Republic. The German imperialists succeeded in that purpose, and some of the leaders of I. G. Farben were the very men who financed Herr Hitler in his rise to power.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for information whether it was found by the Truman committee that this contract or cartel was still in existence?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Truman committee, as I understand, has made no finding. I desire to be utterly fair and utterly just. It should be pointed out that the officers of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey agreed with the Department of Justice that a consent decree abolishing this particular cartel should be entered.

Mr. McKELLAR. When was that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I have a copy of the judgment on my desk, but, at any rate, the date of the decree was within the past 30 days; I do not know the exact date.

Mr. President, as I had occasion to say when the Truman committee was good enough to permit me to intervene in the hearing last week and address a few questions to Mr. Farish, the president of the Standard Oil Co., and to Mr. Howard, the vice president, I have no doubt whatsoever of the patriotism of these gentlemen; I make no charge whatever against their loyalty to America. I believe that their intention is to do everything in their power to aid the United States to win the war. As a matter of fact, I have reason to know, from personal conversations which I had several years ago with Mr. Farish, that he gave his full personal approval to the foreign policy of this Government. That, however, is altogether aside from the question.

What we are dealing with here is a fundamental effect upon the peace of the world, the prosperity of mankind, of international cartel agreements.

They amount, Mr. President, to economic treaties which are put into effect by private groups without any review whatsoever on behalf of all the people of the United States. When the founders of this Government drafted the Constitution of the United States they were so jealous of international agreements that they provided that the President

could negotiate treaties but that the treaties could not become effective until approved by the Senate of the United States by a two-thirds vote. Nevertheless, the fact stares us in the face that numerous great corporate entities existing in this country have through many years been engaged in making international economic treaties dividing world trade and fixing prices. Those treaties are written and consummated not only without any approval by any branch of the Government of the United States but without the approval even of the stockholders of the corporations which are bound by the agreements.

I said a moment ago that I thought there ought to be incorporated in the RECORD the full text of the cartel agreement which was entered into by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey with I. G. Farben, because, Mr. President, it tells the story in simple, straightforward language of the difficulty, of the tragedy, indeed, in which the world is involved. Governments, social organizations of all kinds, are the product of the life of men; the economic demands which are made upon individual men and women for the maintenance of their own lives are the circumstances which enter into the creation of all types of organizations, and particularly into organizations both of business and of government.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS SUPREME

When the Declaration of Independence was written, Mr. President, it was drafted by men who understood that the purpose of government was to enable individual men to protect those great gifts of providence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There can be no doubt as to what this Government of ours was established to protect. The Declaration of Independence is an instrument of government which is honored by word, but frequently, I fear, is not well understood. We say we support the Declaration of Independence, but do we know what it declares? Let me read it, Mr. President, or at least a portion of it:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.

Not some men; all of them; the Filipinos, the Malayans, the Burmese, the Hindu, the white man, the Negro, the American Indian, every man, "all men are created equal."

> That they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Observe the next phrase:

> That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it.

The whole reason that this world is today involved in war and that the people of this country, the Members of this Congress, and the Executive of this country are wondering what we shall do to win the war, and how it should be fought, is that the world-wide arrangements which have been made, affecting the economic existence of all peoples, are such that they have closed the door of economic opportunity. Because economic opportunity has been restricted, governments are tottering.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am inclined to think the Senator is orrect. But is not this the remedy? When there is a contract in restraint of trade made between citizens of our country and citizens of another country for the purpose of confining the business to themselves, and leaving others out, are not the contractors punishable under the anti-trust laws which are now on our books?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, Mr. President.

VIOLATIONS OF FUNDAMENTAL LAW

Mr. McKELLAR. Cannot such agreements be abolished, be set aside, just as the particular agreement to which the Senator is referring was set aside by the court, by a consent decree of court? Could not such agreements as the Senator has mentioned be set aside in the same way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; with great difficulty. There is no specific law requiring the registration of these cartel agreements, and one of my reasons for occupying the floor at this moment is that I intend in a few moments to present a bill which will undertake to make that necessary. It is true, as the Senator from Tennessee has very well said, that agreements of this kind are in violation of the fundamental law of our people that combinations in restraint of trade are unlawful per se. They are condemned by the common law, as the Senator, who is an experienced lawyer, well knows; but the difficulty has been in enforcing that condemnation.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are inhibited by specific statute. Just as the cartel arrangement of which the Senator has just spoken, signed by the Standard Oil and by I. G. Farben, of Germany, was restrained, all contracts made with citizens or aliens in restraint of trade come under the ban of what is known as the Sherman anti-trust law, passed many years ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Sherman antitrust law has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree; and I say to the Senator that I think his proposed bill to give further jurisdiction to our courts to deal with the matters concerning which he is speaking is very timely, and I have no doubt it will pass if the Senator pushes it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the agreement which was entered into by I. G. Farbenindustrie Aktiengesellschaft and Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey on the 9th day of November 1929:

> I. G. Farbenindustrie Aktiengesellschaft, a German corporation, of Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, hereinafter referred to as "I. G." and
>
> Standard Oil Co., a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey, hereinafter referred to as "the company."
>
> Whereas I. G. and the Company are two of the four parties named in the agreement of even date herewith, a copy of which is annexed hereto, and the terms of which require close cooperation between I. G. and the Company along technical lines; and
>
> Whereas the Company recognizes the preferred position of I. G. in the industries known as chemical, and I. G. recognizes the preferred position of the Company in the industries known as oil and natural gas; and
>
> Whereas neither party has any plan or policy of so far expanding its existing business in the direction of the other party's industry as to become a serious competitor of that other party, but each recognizes that certain overlapping activities will exist—

Mr. President, let me read that paragraph of this formal agreement once more. Its importance cannot be overemphasized.

> Whereas neither party has any plan or policy of so far expanding its existing business in the direction of the other party's industry as to become a serious competitor of that other party, but each recognizes that certain overlapping activities will exist:
>
> Now, therefore, with a view to preventing such overlap from becoming a source of mutual irritation and unwillingness to cooperate on technical lines as is required under said four-party agreement, the parties hereto have agreed that their policies shall be as follows:
>
> ARTICLE 1. New chemical developments by the company.

Now, Mr. President, we are dealing with new chemical developments by the American Co., by the American partner to this international cartel.

> If the company shall desire to initiate anywhere in the world a new chemical development not closely related to its then business, it will offer to I. G. control of such new enterprise (including the patent rights thereto) on fair and reasonable terms.

CONTROL OFFERED TO GERMAN MONOPOLY

Can it be imagined, Mr. President, that any organization created in America by operation of law would be willing to bind itself to offer control to a foreign group?

Bear in mind what I say, that the organization to which this control was offered was the very organization which destroyed the German Republic, destroyed democracy in Germany, and brought about the establishment of the present unholy dictatorship.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have the Senator from Wyoming enter in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the last effective binding date of this contract.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The date of the consent decree, by which, let it be remembered, the officers of Standard agreed without a suit to abandon its obligation.

Mr. BONE. On what date was the decree entered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Within the past 30 days; I do not recall the exact date. It was the consent decree which was brought about by the Department of Justice, under the activity of Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust proceedings.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator

from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator does not say in his statement whether the control of patents by the Farben Co. was confined to Germany, or to Germany and her satellites, or whether the control existed with respect to patent rights all over the world.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to come to that. The understanding was, in terms and in effect, a division of the world into two groups. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was to have free hand with respect to oil, and I. G. Farben was to have free hand with respect to chemicals. That is why the matter has become of such supreme importance at this time, because the synthetic-rubber process is a chemical process, control of which, under this agreement, was given to Germany.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I do not wish to bother the Senator from Wyoming if he desires not to be interrupted. I wonder if he objects to interruptions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They do not bother me at all.

Mr. BONE. Over the years the Senator and I have indulged in colloquy on the floor of the Senate about these cartel arrangements, and I think the Senator understands my attitude of mind toward them. They now, and will always, I think, present to students of history a very peculiar picture. Most students of history had come to believe that the feudal system had been shot to death in the French Revolution, but now we see feudalism in a new dress being engrafted on our capitalist society. I think it is one of the most astounding manifestations of modern history to see a feudalistic control. The baron on the hill, with his castle, disappeared, but the baron behind the mahogany desk now sits with another baron or group of barons, and, by virtue of economic control, buttressed by laws which we pass, they parcel out the whole world for exploitation.

One group takes one segment of the world, another group another segment, while we sit here thinking that we exercise power, whereas the real power—the economic power—is being exercised without limit by private individuals, through sanction of law

I think there is one effective answer to this sort of control. I know we will probably never get around to it because we are like a small boy who has his finger in a doorjamb and is closing the door on it, the while shrieking his agony so that everyone may hear him. If it is suggested to him that he merely open the door and take his hand out, he thinks that is not the orthodox way to do it. He prefers to suffer rather than to save his finger.

These gentlemen can have all the cartel controls they please, in aluminum or anything else, but I suggest, though I realize the suggestion may perhaps cause consternation on the part of some of my brethren, that one effective answer would be for Uncle Sam to build some aluminum factories and manufacture aluminum. Congress could control the patents and the cartel would not be worth a snap of the fingers. As a lawyer, I know that to be so, and I am sure the Senator from Wyoming knows it. I realize that it is asking too much to suggest that we manufacture aluminum for our own Government. That would not be right. It might offend high heaven if we undertook such an atrocious thing as that.

ARBITRARY POLITICAL CONTROL FOLLOWS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has made these remarks because he points up the argument I am making. The existence of arbitrary private control over the economic lives of the people leads directly to arbitrary political control. It was precisely because I. G. Farben was controlling the economic destiny of the people of Germany and of Europe that finally the political control passed into the hands of the dictators. It is just as inevitable as the following of night after day. If we surrender economic control to a small group, we cannot quarrel if political control in the hands of a small group immediately follows.

Mr. President, what I am saying now is directed to the leaders of corporate business in the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I should not want the Senator to leave the implication that there are not at least some of us in the Senate who hope that we shall have some free enterprise in our economic relationships with other countries after the war. I think that what the Senator from Wyoming is pointing out is that the Standard Oil Co. and the I. G. Farben Co. entered into an arrangement which would be illegal under the Sherman antitrust law or the common law. In reality, the Sherman antitrust law is merely a statutory expression of the common law against monopoly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. BROWN. I presume almost every great enterprise in my great State of Michigan—Parke, Davis & Co. in drugs, General Motors Co., the Ford Motor Co., and other great enterprises—had branches throughout the world. As the Senator knows, the Oppeln plant in Germany was owned by the General Motors Corporation when Mr. Hitler took it over in 1939, and he sent to Mr. Knudsen, through his representatives there, a little piece of paper saying, "We have taken over the Oppeln plant." Nothing was said as to whether anything would ever be paid for it; but it was taken over. I do not think we ought to leave the implication that it was unpatriotic for these great industrial enterprises to have their branch establishments in many countries of the world.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator does not think that I gave such an implication, does he?

Mr. BROWN. No; but I fear that such an inference might be drawn from some of the things the Senator has said. The Senator is talking about political freedom and economic freedom. I desire to emphasize that I do not want anything that is here said to imply that all of us, or at least the Senator from Michigan, will approve of a situation after the great scourge of war which now afflicts us shall have passed which will prevent us from giving to the 300,000,000 people of India the benefits of America's economic progress, from giving to them the benefits of mass production, of the patent rights which we have established, which enable us to make goods and merchandise beneficial to those people. In other words, I am hopeful that when the time comes we shall have a little less of narrow nationalism and a little wider participation on the part of all peoples, particularly in the Far East, in the benefits of American mass production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator is now talking about a subject that is altogether different from that which I am discussing. I quite agree with him. I have no thought whatsoever that there should be any such thing as a narrow nationalism. What I am inviting the attention of the Senator from Michigan to is that in the past great organizations in this country and in Germany have entered into economic treaties without the knowledge of their government, which have resulted not only in the exploitation of the peoples of foreign countries, but have resulted in the exploitation of our own peoples.

Mr. BROWN. And which were illegal under the laws of this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And which were illegal. That is correct. As I see it, there is only one way effectively to prevent that sort of thing, which is to require that when a corporation of the United States undertakes to enter into an agreement of this kind with a corporation of some foreign country, it shall at least file notice of its intention with the Government of the United States. The representatives of the people of this country ought to be apprised of the economic adventures of our private organizations throughout the world, otherwise it will be possible to discover that only by the expenditure of large sums of money and by difficult and tortuous investigations.

Mr. President, I have no desire to build up an all-powerful and arbitrary government. I wish to see private enterprise protected and preserved and maintained. I do not wish to see corporations as such brought under a regimentary policy by the Government; but I am convinced, after years of study, that there is only one way to preserve free enterprise, and that is by making certain that all private groups of this kind shall observe certain definite standards of conduct and of policy to be laid down by the Government of the United States. I would set them free from regimentation; I would not clothe any Government board or commission with the power to operate business; but if we are to avoid that, Mr. President, there is only one way to do it, and that is by having the Congress of the United States lay down the standards which shall guide the activity of these organizations. Mr. President, it will not be dreamed for a moment that

the Standard Oil Co. could have entered into an agreement not to become a serious competitor of I. G. Farben if the people of the United States knew what it was doing at the time it was doing it.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. It seems to me that in merely trying to curb men's greed by resorting to some forms of publicity such as have been suggested by the Senator from Wyoming, we run into another angle of the problem which makes the publicity feature seem rather futile at times. If a private corporation has grown so great that it is, first, virtually a monopoly because of its size, and, second, it exercises monopolistic control because of control of basic patents, there is not any effective way of controlling its prices.

Let us take the field of aluminum as an example. The aluminum combine in this country is not even subjected to that form of regulation which is applied to power companies, for instance. I do not stand here and admit for one moment that that form of regulation is effective. I think it is a fake and a fraud, and it has been proven so times without number. The public has been mercilessly rooked even under this so-called regulation, when one sees the utility companies go into politics and become so potent in American life as to become the regulators of their own regulators.

But we do not have that form of regulation for certain kinds of private monopoly. They do not mind some form of publicity if they can control market prices. That is why I suggest to the Senator that if we reach a point where businessmen lay aside all those restraints which ought to be self-imposed by business which does not want to have socialistic practices put into operation in this country—and I often wonder whether these men flirt with that sort of thing—if they are not willing to impose upon themselves some reasonable and rational restraints in the matter of prices charged the public, what right have they to expect that the Government will not compete with them in time?

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and I have lived long enough to know that the antitrust statute has been virtually a dead letter on the books. A few venturesome souls such as Thurman Arnold have occasionally invoked the thunderbolts of the law, but he has been roasted all over the country for doing so, and his name has been made obnoxious in many quarters because he undertook to invoke the antitrust laws of the country. After a while that spasm of virtue will die down and the public will forget about it, and we will go back to the old abuses.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming, who may not agree with me, that if we had one Government aluminum plant which could be a yardstick for aluminum, such as a gigantic power plant can be a yardstick for power in one section of the country, all the boys in the game would be good boys. The Government then would have something in the nature of a yardstick by which it could assure reasonable prices. But if we are simply going to rely on prosecutions and publicity these slick boys are going to get around them. The Senator and I have lived long enough to know how they get around them. Look at the discussion which went on in this body for 3 or 4 years about what the Axis was doing long before we got into the war. Yet we were doing business with them right along. That is an example of how careless we are in our operations.

THE CARTEL AGREEMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was reading article I of the charter of the international I. G. Farben-Standard cartel. Let me begin again, so that Senators who have been diverted by the colloquy may pick up the thread:

ARTICLE I. New chemical developments by the company.

Meaning the Standard Oil Co.

If the company shall desire to initiate anywhere in the world a new chemical development not closely related to its then business, it will offer to I. G. control of such new enterprise (including the patent rights thereto) on fair and reasonable terms.

Examples: (a) A development not related at all is the production of artificial silk by present methods.

(b) A development related but not closely related is the production of nonhydrocarbon solvents from natural gas.

In framing this agreement, the drafters were not content with the plain statement of their purpose in the words of the article, but they gave examples of the sort of process which the company would have to give away, and the sort of process which was so related to the oil industry that it could keep it.

ART. II. New chemical developments by I. G.:

1. If I. G. shall desire to initiate outside of Germany—

That is, anywhere in the world outside Germany—

(as "Germany" is defined in art. XIV of said four-party agreement) a new chemical development which cannot be advantageously carried on except as a department of an oil or natural-gas business, it will offer control thereof (including the patent rights thereto) to the company on fair and reasonable terms.

That was a binding obligation upon I. G. to give control to the Standard Oil Co. in cases of the kind mentioned in that paragraph.

Examples: (a) The production of solvents, whether hydrocarbon or nonhydrocarbon, from olefines produced in refining oils.

(b) The production of an antiknock compound to the extent that the name shall be sold to or through oil companies.

2. If I. G. shall desire to initiate outside of Germany (as "Germany" is defined in art. XIV of said four-party agreement), a new chemical development not covered by subparagraph 1 of this article, but related to the then business of the company, as, for example, by use of natural gas or petroleum products, I. G. will offer to the company a substantial but not controlling participation.

Examples: (a) The production of fixed nitrogen from natural gas.

(b) The production of acetylene from natural or refinery gas.

Article III. Duration of this agreement.

This agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the subsidiaries of the respective parties hereto as provided in article XIII of said four-party agreement, to the same extent as if said article were incorporated in this agreement, it being understood that no subsidiary corporation or the character referred to in paragraph B of said article 13 shall have the privilege of ratifying either the four-party agreement or this agreement without also ratifying the other.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have set their hands and seals on the day and year first above mentioned.

I. G. FARBENINDUSTRIE AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT.

By (signed) SCHMITZ v. KNIERIEM.

That, Mr. President, is the same Mr. Hermann Schmitz who was one of the backers of the Hitler movement, and who was one of the group which conspired in Germany for the destruction of the German Republic.

The agreement is signed on behalf of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey by W. C. Teagle.

The parties to this cartel charter were very careful to make certain that it should be maintained in principle, no matter what governments should do. As a consequence, a so-called coordination agreement was embodied in a letter signed by Mr. Teagle, who was then president of Standard. From this letter I quote the following significant paragraph:

In the event the performance of these agreements or of any material provisions thereof by either party should be hereafter restrained or prevented by operation of any existing or future law, or the beneficial interest of either party be alienated to a substantial degree by operation of law or governmental authority, the parties should enter into new negotiations in the spirit of the present agreements and endeavor to adapt their relations to the changed conditions which have so arisen.

It will be observed that this was an undertaking to the effect that if any material provision of the private economic treaty between Farben and Standard should thereafter be "restrained or prevented" by law or governmental authority, the parties nevertheless should enter into new negotiations "in the spirit of the present agreements."

Mr. President, without taking all the time that would be necessary to do so, it is important only that I should mention that the agreement entered into in 1929 was reasserted in 1939. It was reasserted by what was known as the Hague compact, the purpose of which was to make certain that if anything transpired which should upset this agreement, it could thereafter be renegotiated and reestablished.

The 1939 agreement made at The Hague contained these paragraphs, outlining the obligation of the Standard Oil Co.:

* * * if it shall appear from * * * reports that the division of territory of exclusive ownership between the parties as herein effected have not been equitable in its financial results as judged by the agreement of September 30, 1930 (which was based on the 1929 agreement), then the parties shall correct the inequity in such manner as may seem most fair and advantageous at the time.

Pursuant to the foregoing, I. G., the Standard Development Co., and Jasco shall make or cause to be made any formal assignments or execute any further instruments necessary to put into effect the present readjustment and any required future readjustment of the rights and interests of the parties to the agreement of September 30, 1930.

That agreement was entered into in 1939, in contemplation of the war. Its purpose was, so far as possible, to retain the cartel arrangement so that when the war was over the division of territory and the division of profits might be reasserted. This was the purpose which actuated the partners as late as February 20, 1941, when, according to the statement presented to the Truman committee by Mr. Thurman Arnold, a confidential letter was written to Mr. Howard, vice president of Standard Oil Co. by one of his staff. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR FRANK: As intimated to you briefly the other day, Dr. Ringer came to Paris to see me before I left the end of January—

Dr Ringer, of course, was a representative of I. G.—

and asked me to give you the following meassage in regard to cable which he had received, I believe, from your good self:

"Jasco cable will be difficult but one underlying point is that Jasco contract has not been wiped out as agreed; whatever done the final financial outcome original intention of old Jasco agreement should govern."

Thereby indicating that as late as February 1941 it was still the purpose of the partners to this world cartel agreement to maintain the arrangement which they had made.

AGREEMENT NOW TERMINATED

Mr. President, it is only proper to say that when Mr. Farish, the president of Standard, and Mr. Howard, vice president, were on the stand before the Truman committee, the quotations which I have now cited to the Senate were called to their attention and they were asked whether, in their opinion, the consent decree was a Government act which could be set aside by them for their private purposes after the war. Mr. Howard, with the approval of Mr. Farish, agreed, in response to the question which was directed to them, that the consent decree has put an end to that cartel agreement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator understand the consent decree virtually to mean an admission on the part of the Standard Oil Co. of the charges alleged in the bill of complaint? It practically amounts to that, does it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no other conclusion.

Mr. HILL. There can be no other conclusion except that it is an admission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true.

Mr. HILL. What happened in this case was that the Standard Oil Co. practically made what we would call in a criminal case an admission of guilt, threw itself on the mercy of the court, and the court proceeded to hand down a finding. Is not that what it amounted to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right; but, Mr. President, it would be unjust and unfair to assume that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey is the only organization which has been engaged in international agreements of this kind. It was brought out during the Truman committee hearing that Procter & Gamble have an international agreement with I. G. Farben with respect to synthetic fats. It has been brought out and referred to upon this floor that General Electric had an agreement with Krupp, the munitions manufacturers of Germany, with respect to certain products. The hearings of the Temporary National Economic Committee developed much testimony on world cartels. The hearing is part 25 of the T. N. E. C. hearings.

Mr. President, I desire to make it as clear as possible that, in my judgment, this is a more or less natural development of the expansion of trade; and I cite the instances not for the purpose of casting any reflection upon the patriotism of the men who negotiated this agreement but for the purpose of calling attention to the essential need of hereafter establishing a formula which will prevent the creation of international cartels, which stifle economic opportunity.

NATIONAL STANDARDS NECESSARY

Mr. President, there never has been a leader of political or economic thought in America who has not agreed that the public, in self-protection, should establish some controls and some direction over the activities of organizations of this kind. It is not only in the world-cartel field but in domestic fields that the agreements and combinations of private groups without any public supervision in the way of standards operate to the disadvantage of the public. Labor organizations and farm organizations, as well as industrial organizations, come into existence, follow policies and adopt agreements which intimately affect the lives of millions of persons who have no way under the sun of controlling or shaping or directing those activities. Over and over again, Mr. President, I have called attention to the fact that since the creation of this Government of ours, and the admission by the ratification of the Constitution of the Original States, no new State has ever entered the Union until its charter was approved on behalf of all the people by the Congress of the United States. Go into each State and you will find that no city is set up and the people of that city permitted to govern themselves unless in accordance with the standards laid down by the State legislature in the municipal corporation law of each State.

As long ago as 1911 Senator John Sharp Williams, representing the great State of Mississippi, introduced upon this floor a bill to bring corporations under some sort of Federal supervision by way of licensing. It was not his purpose to regiment the corporations. His purpose was only to provide that their organization should be in accordance with the standards and with the policy laid down in the interests of all the people.

THE WICKERSHAM BILL

During the administration of William Howard Taft there was introduced in this body by a predecessor of mine from the State of Wyoming, the Honorable Clarence D. Clark, who at that time was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a measure setting up standards for national corporations. The late Senator Borah and I on numerous occasions presented to this body bills intended to provide this sort of public direction, again I say not in the sense of regimentation but in the sense that the organizations, the groups created by individual initiative to affect the economic welfare of all the people should receive their authority from the only body which can speak for all the people, namely, the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I desire to say that the Senator has, in my opinion, rendered a very distinguished service in this matter. As chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and since in committees and on this floor, he has brought to the attention of the Senate, the Congress, and the public many facts which constitute a very real contribution to this subject. I know how the Senator has labored in this matter; and I, for one, want to thank him and to wish more power to him in his efforts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He is very kind in his reference to the humble efforts I have been making. I can speak frankly about this matter because the idea is not mine. It did not spring from my mind. It is a suggestion as old as the system under which we live.

No corporation ever came into existence without the authority of the people. We have not had a national corporation law solely because the Congress of the United States has desired to retain that power for the States. The progress of invention has been such, such great advance has been made in technological matters, that it is no longer possible for the States to protect their own people with respect to matters of this kind. This became apparent more than 50 years ago when the first Interstate Commerce Act was passed. It was passed because the national railroads had become so great and powerful that the separate States could not regulate them in the public interest; and so we began to build up in Washington the bureaucracy, and the Interstate Commerce Commission was created. There has scarcely been a 5-year period since, whether under the Democrats or under the Republicans, in which we have not seen the Federal Government expand; and it has been expanding in the direction of discretionary control because we have not been willing to set up by law standards for corporate control.

NATIONAL CHARTERS FOR NATIONAL CORPORATIONS

So, Mr. President, I am now going to introduce another form of the bill which has been before the Senate for more than 30 years, in one form or another, sponsored by men of great ability and great learning. The first bill, as I say, was drafted by Senator John Sharp Wil-

liams. The second bill of which I have knowledge was drafted by George Wickersham, Attorney General in the administration of William Howard Taft. Another bill was drafted by the late Senator Borah. With some assistance, I myself drafted one. A little later Senator Borah and I collaborated and introduced a bill; and now, Mr. President, I introduce a new Federal incorporation bill, and ask that it may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The first section of the bill is the title section.

The second section deals with definitions.

The third section requires that every corporation engaged in commerce, every trade association, and every labor organization engaged in commerce, or which represents or is composed of any person the cessation of whose work would affect commerce, shall obtain from the Commission a certificate of statutory compliance. The purpose is not to do away with State charters, but merely to set up standards which, in the national field, shall be followed by these organizations.

Section 4 provides for the issuance of a certificate of compliance to any corporation the articles of incorporation or association of which in addition to conforming to the requirements of the State of incorporation, shall conform to the following requirements:

A. Prohibit that corporation from having as a director any person who is (1) a director of, employed by, or has any financial interest in, any competing corporation; or (2) a director of, employed by, or has any financial interest in any corporation which has business with such corporation.

B. Provides that each director of such corporation shall have an actual and bona fide financial interest in such corporation.

I shall not attempt to read each of these sections, Mr President. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be set forth in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish, however, to call attention to two of the provisions dealing with the subject of cartels. The first of these, which is subparagraph (E) of section 4, which reads:

E. Provides that a copy of any general plan or program with any foreign corporation or foreign national, directly or indirectly, and with any corporation or person controlled by any foreign corporation or national, to effect the exchange or transfer of property, franchises, or other rights, including patents or licenses, whether through purchase, assignment, lease, or sale or otherwise, shall be filed with the Department of Justice of the United States, and shall be completely disclosed to each stockholder of record prior to the time that such general plan or program shall become legally effective.

F. Provides that a copy of every contract, agreement, or arrangement and any purchase, assignment, lease, or sale of property, franchises or other rights, including patents and licenses, with, to, or from any foreign corporation or foreign national, directly or indirectly, or with, to, or from any corporation or persons controlled by a foreign corporation or a foreign national, shall be filed with the Department of Justice of the United States at least 30 days after such contract, agreement, arrangement, purchase, assignment, lease, or sale has been entered into or made.

Mr. President, I think it is obvious that the effect of those provisions would merely mean public disclosure of facts of the most intimate importance to all the people of the United States.

Section 5 deals with the statutory compliance by trade associations.

Section 6 deals with a statutory compliance by labor organizations. This section provides that the charter of such labor organizations dealing in interstate commerce shall have the following requirements:

(a) Election of officers shall be held at least once each year;

(b) Ballots shall permit voters to vote for any person nominated as a candidate or for any other person. Any member of the organization shall be permitted to observe the collection and counting of ballots.

(c) There shall be a detailed accounting by independent accountants of the funds, assets and liabilities, expenditures and receipts of the organization, not less than once every 2 years. A report of such accounting shall be made public, and a copy thereof filed with the Commission.

(d) No initiation fee for any member shall exceed $10.

Section 7 provides penalties for the act as a whole.

Section 8 deals with the jurisdiction of the courts.

Sections 9 and 10 are formal provisions.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST PARAMOUNT

Mr. President, I wish to say that a bill of this kind is not hostile to any such organization, whether it be an organization of capital or of labor. A bill of this kind is essential in the public interest, to establish public standards which shall guide all these organizations.

The people of the United States are not very much concerned with what transpires in the legislature of a particular State because such matters ordinarily affect only the people of the State. The laws passed by the State of Massachusetts or the State of Indiana or the State of Kentucky or the State of Vermant seldom have any national significance because they are essentially local; but when a great corporation, such as the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, enters into an international cartel agreement it enters into an agreement which affects the intimate existence of every citizen of this country, and of many other countries, too. Likewise, when a great labor organization such as the United Mine Workers of America, the C. I. O., or the A. F. of L., adopts policies and programs it frequently affects the welfare of the whole people.

As I say, it is no attack upon any of these organizations to say that the standards ought to be laid down by the representatives of all the people of the United States; and the sooner, Mr. President, we recognize the fact that such standards should be formulated and that the public has an interest in them, the sooner we shall escape from the evils of pressure groups and group government.

The war which is now going on is a war which has resulted from pressure groups. What happened in Germany, what happened in Russia, what happened in Italy was that the class conflict became so acute that in each instance a particular class took charge of the Government, to the detriment of every member of every other class.

If we are to preserve democracy, if we are to preserve the essentials of individual liberty, if we are to preserve the Government of the United States as a government of all the people, then there is only one way to do it, and that is to take action of this kind, which will prevent the emergence of a particular class with sufficient power, either by way of money or by way of numbers, to take control of the government of all of us.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill I have introduced be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I think I have already obtained unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2438) providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations, trade associations, and labor organizations engaged in or affecting commerce, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Exhibit 1]

Be it enacted, etc.,

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the Federal Charter Compliance Act of 1941.

SEC. 2. Definitions: As used in this act (a) "person" means any individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or group of persons.

(b) "Commerce" means commerce, trade, traffic, transportation, or communication with foreign nations or among the several States or from any State to any place outside thereof or in the District of Columbia.

(c) "Affecting commerce" means in commerce or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(d) "State" means any State of the United States, or the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States.

(e) "Corporation" shall include any body corporate, business trust, joint stock company, limited partnership, or syndicate, and shall include related corporations.

(f) A corporation shall be deemed to be engaged in commerce if the corporation itself or any related corporation is engaged in commerce.

(g) "Trade association" shall mean any association, corporated or unincorporated, any of the members of which engage in commerce, which gathers information from its members concerning trade practices or concerning the individual business of its members or which advises its members as to trade practices, or the future conduct of business.

(h) A related corporation is a corporation which is a subsidiary or affiliate of, or which directly or indirectly controls, or is controlled by, or is under direct or indirect common control with, another corporation. Two corporations shall be deemed to be related if —— percent of the stock of either such corporation is owned by the other or by any related corporation.

(i) The term "labor organization" means any organization, of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, including separately each central or national organization and each local or

branch or lodge whether or not affiliated with such an organization, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rate of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

(j) The charter of a corporation, trade association, or labor organization shall mean the charter, articles of incorporation, certificate of incorporation, constitution, agreement, or other document or documents setting forth the basic structure of the corporation or organization and the fundamental rules under which it operates.

(k) "Commission" shall mean the —— Commission

SEC. 3. Certificate of Statutory Compliance: (a) On and after 1 year from the date of approval of this act, every corporation engaged in commerce, every trade association, and every labor organization engaged in commerce, or which represents or is composed of any persons the cessation of whose work would affect commerce shall obtain from the Commission a certificate a statutory compliance.

(b) An applicant for a certificate of statutory compliance shall file with the Commission a certified copy of its charter. If the charter conforms to the requirements prescribed in sections 4, 5, or 6 of this act, the Commission shall issue a certificate of statutory compliance.

(c) A certificate of statutory compliance shall be given if the charter filed with the Commission complies with the requirements of this statute. Any applicant to whom a certificate of statutory compliance is denied may, within 60 days after such denial, file a petition to compel the Commission to issue it a certificate of statutory compliance in any district court of the United States in which the applicant has an office, does business, or in which any of the members of a labor organization are employed, or in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and if the district court determine that the applicant's charter complies with the provisions of this act, it shall order the Commission to issue a certificate of statutory compliance. Proceedings filed pursuant to this paragraph shall be summary in form. The charter filed by the applicant shall in each instance be attached to the petition. Such proceedings shall be set for hearing at the earliest possible time. Appeals from the decision of the District Court may be taken as in ordinary civil actions.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall issue a certificate of compliance to any corporation, the articles of incorporation or association of which, in addition to conforming to the requirements of the State of incorporation, shall conform to the following requirements:

A. Prohibits that corporation from having as a director any person who is (1) director of, employed by, or has any financial interest in any competing corporation; or (2) a director of, employed by, or has any financial interest in any corporation which has business with such corporation;

B. Provides that each director of such corporation shall have an actual and bona fide financial interest in such corporation;

C. Provides that such corporation shall reasonably compensate its directors and provides a procedure by means of which the directors shall be at frequent intervals fully informed as to the operations of the corporation; and provide for the meeting of such directors not less frequently than once each month. There shall be kept full and complete transcripts of all meetings of the board of directors or any committee thereof;

D. Provides that complete disclosure in a written report mailed to each stockholder of record shall be made of all transactions between any director and the corporation during the year preceding, and any dealings by the directors in the stock or other securities of such corporation;

E. Provides that a copy of any general plan or program with any foreign corporation or foreign national, directly or indirectly, and with any corporation or person controlled by any foreign corporation or national, to effect the exchange or transfer of property, franchises, or other rights, including patents or licenses, whether through purchase, assignment, lease, or sale or otherwise, shall be filed with the Department of Justice of the United States and shall be completely disclosed to each stockholder of record prior to the time that such general plan or program shall become legally effective.

F. Provides that a copy of every contract, agreement, or arrangement, and any purchase, assignment, lease, or sale of property, franchises, or other rights, including patents and licenses, with, to, or from any foreign corporation or foreign national, directly or indirectly, or with, to, or from any corporation or persons controlled by a foreign corporation or foreign national, shall be filed with the Department of Justice of the United States within 30 days after such contract, agreement, arrangement, purchase, assignment, lease, or sale has been entered into or made.

G. Provides that the directors of such corporations shall be deemed to be trustees for the stockholders and required to exercise the degree of care employed by a trustee in the administration of a business with which he is familiar.

H. Provides that any directors of such corporation shall be individually and civilly liable to the corporation for any damage caused to the corporate estate through the violation by the corporation of any Federal law, where any act constituting such violation was authorized, ordered, or done by any such director.

I. Prohibits the reimbursement by the corporation to any director or officer of any expense sustained by him or incurred in his behalf as a result of his violation of any Federal law.

J. Provides that any director who fails to attend meetings of the board of directors over a 6-month period forfeits his directorship.

K. Provides that each share of stock shall give the holder thereof the right to cast one vote in all matters which are determined by vote of the stockholders.

L. Provides that any proposal which is approved by the board of directors and which alters the existing rights of any stockholder or security holder shall be fully disclosed to the stockholders within a reasonable time before their consent to such proposal is sought.

M. Provides for full disclosure to the stockholders of any voluntary payments made by the corporation.

N. Provides that any amendment of the charter which alters the existing rights of any stockholders or security holders shall be submitted to, and shall not become effective until approved by, such class of stockholders or security holders for a vote by such class voting as a class.

O. Provides that such corporation shall not directly or indirectly in the future purchase shares of stock or other interests in any corporation or company principally engaged in a business other than the principal business of such corporation.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall issue a certificate of statutory compliance to any trade association the charter of which conforms to the following requirements:

The association shall file with the Commission a semiannual report (a) stating the services performed by such association and the type of data collected or disseminated by such association, (b) listing the publications of such association and designating the subject matter and date of all letters or other documents published by the association to its membership, and the officers, directors, employees, and members of such association, and (c) including full minutes of all meetings of the officers, directors, or members of such association. Affidavits required by the responsible officers of the association shall accompany such report and shall state that there has been disclosure of all relevant acts and services of the association.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall issue a certificate of statutory compliance to any labor organization, the charter of which conforms to the following requirements:

(a) Election of officers shall be held at least once each year.

(b) Ballots shall permit voters to vote for any person nominated as a candidate or for any other person. Any member of the organization shall be permitted to observe the collection and counting of ballots.

(c) There shall be a detailed accounting by independent accountants of the funds, assets and liabilities, expenditures and receipts, of the organization, not less than once every 2 years. A report of such accounting shall be made public, and a copy thereof filed with the Commission.

(d) No initiation fee for any members shall exceed $10.

SEC. 7. Penalties: (a) Any corporation or trade association engaging in commerce without having received from the Commission a certificate of statutory compliance shall be liable for civil penalties in the following amounts:

(1) Twenty-five dollars for each of the first 30 days upon which the corporation or trade association so engages in commerce;

(2) An amount equal to 1 percent of the book value of the capital stock of the corporation or of the assets of the trade association for each month after the first 30 days during any part of which the corporation so engages in commerce.

(b) Any labor organization subject to this act which has not received a certificate of statutory compliance will be disqualified to act as collective-bargaining agent under the National Labor Relations Act and, in addition, will be liable for civil penalties in the following amounts:

(1) Ten dollars for each of the first 30 days during which such organization continues to operate without such a certificate.

(2) An amount equal to $1 per member for each month after the first 30 days during any part of which such organization continues to operate without such a certificate.

(c) Such penalties shall be recoverable in a civil action brought in the name of the United States in a United States district court in any district in which the corporation, trade association, or labor organization has an office or engages in business. Suits for penalties on behalf of the United States shall be prosecuted by the United States district attorneys or by the Attorney General. The corporation, trade association, or organization shall have the right to recover penalties it has paid or owes the United States from any officer, director or other person responsible for its violation of this act. Such officers, directors, or other persons shall also be liable for such penalties jointly with the corporation, trade association or organization, and the United States may join as defendants such officers, directors, or other persons in any action brought against the corporation, trade association, or organization.

(d) The United States, through the United States district attorneys or the Attorney General, may bring suit to enjoin or restrain any violations of this act and to restore the condition of any corporation, trade association, or organization as nearly as possible to that which would have existed if this act had not been violated. The United States may also, acting through the Attorney General, bring action to revoke the certificate of statutory compliance of any corporation, trade association, or labor organization which has will-

fully, knowingly, or repeatedly violated the provisions of sections 4, 5, or 6 of this act, or the charter provisions required by this act, or which has amended its charter so that a certificate of statutory compliance would not now be granted. Any person who discriminates against or willfully injures any other person because he has brought or might bring an action authorized under this act shall be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 8. Jurisdiction of courts: The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to entertain all actions and proceedings authorized under this act.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 10. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, or any part thereof, is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when a few moments ago I gave notice of my intention to move hereafter to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate for the purpose of proposing a certain amendment to H. R. 6868, which is now before the Senate, I incorporated in that notice what might well be considered two amendments. I should like, at this time, to give notice in writing, in accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, of my intention to move hereafter to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate for the purpose of proposing certain amendments attached to the notice in connection with House bill 6868.

Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I have given altogether three notices in writing, as will appear in the RECORD. Two amendments are presented together, and then I have two additional notices which separately embody certain amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notices presented by the Senator from Florida will be received and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing of my intention to move hereafter to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: At the proper place in the bill insert the following additional section:

"It shall be unlawful to receive, require the payment of, or pay any sum of money, or fee of any nature as an initiation fee or charge which is made a condition precedent to the right, or opportunity, to work upon any war work as defined by the War Production Board. Any person violating this provision shall upon conviction be punished by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or by fine not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. PEPPER also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PEPPER also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing of my intention to move hereafter to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: At the proper place in the bill insert the following additional section:

"SEC. —. The President shall proclaim a day and, if necessary in his judgment, an exact time of day within the last 2 years which shall be deemed for the duration of the war to be the date on which existed the standard maximum level of prices for all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property and interest on money, and the standard maximum level of compensation for all services.

"The price or compensation existing at the time fixed in the proclamation of the President shall for the duration of the war, or until the revocation of the Presidential proclamation by the President, become the standard maximum price for the acquisition or use of all goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property and rates of interest and the standard maximum level of compensation for services to which such price or compensation, respectively, applied at such time: *Provided, however,* That the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may, whenever it deem such action necessary to the effective prosecution of the war and in the public interest, or to avoid any undue hardship, alter any price or rate of compensation in any case or class of cases, and such alteration may be made as often as may be found necessary to the effective prosecution of the war or in the public interest or to avoid undue hardship.

"If any such maximum price or maximum compensation is altered, as herein provided, by the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, then the price or compensation so fixed shall constitute the maximum price of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property or interest on money, capital, or credit, or compensation to be paid and received for any services rendered.

The Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the Chairman, or his representative, of the War Production Board, and the Chairman, or his representative, of the Board of Economic Warfare, may, when no price level for the acquisition or use of any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property or interest on money, or credit, or compensation level for services existed on the date proclaimed by the President, fix the maximum price for the acquisition or use of any such goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property or interest on money or credit, and the maximum compensation for any such services.

"Any person charging or paying a higher price for any goods, articles, or commodities, including rental of property and interest on money, capital or credit, or any person paying or receiving a greater compensation than so fixed by the Office of Price Administration shall upon conviction be imprisoned not exceeding 1 year or fined not exceeding $1,000, or both. This provision shall be effective for the duration of the war only."

Mr. PEPPER also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6868, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CONSENT DECREE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND STANDARD OIL CO. OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the consent decree which was entered into between the United States through the Department of Justice and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. I think this decree is a matter of such vital public importance that it should be made public, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Marcel E. Malige, of Idaho, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 7, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

William Rude Jackson to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Capt. Alva D. Bernhard to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of November 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, April 6 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Melvin Manecke, Argenta.
Gerd Willms, Crescent City.
Alice D. Condit, Elsah.
Warthen K. Kimball, Gurnee.
Keith K. Angle, Hillview.
Urban A. Tempel, Ivesdale.
Henry Dwyer, Ladd.
Virginia D. Wall, Nebo.
Charles T. Gilbert, New Canton.
Albert W. Butler, Sublette.
Mollie E. Patterson, Waltonville.
Martha H. Prevo, West Union.

NEW YORK

Eva Purcell, Barryville.
William Burns Kirk, De Witt.
Agnes H. Brink, Endwell.
Ralph N. Schaack, Gowanda.
Raymond H. LaClair, Huntington.
Grace S. G. Davies, Lake Kushaqua.
Harold H. Sly, New Hampton.
Mary L. Doyle, Tannersville.
Catherine J. McMahon, Wyandanch.

NORTH CAROLINA

Colus W. Williams, Fallston.
August D. Wessell, Hallsboro.
James R. Crowder, Peachland.

PUERTO RICO

Jose G. de Iturrondo, Carolina.
Francisca Rodriguez, Juana Diaz.
Monserrate Figueroa, Lajas.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Fore J. Waston, Kingstree.
Gordon W. Morris, Society Hill.
Mollie S. West, Tucapau.
Lottie M. Vernon, Wellford.
Palmer A. Matthews, Winnsboro.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1942

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COX.

The Right Reverend James M. Maxon, D. D., LL. D., bishop of Tennessee, Protestant Episcopal Church, offered the following prayer:

O God, Father of all peoples on earth, our refuge and our strength, guide and protect, we pray Thee, our Nation in this fiery trial of war. Grant us true repentance, and take away our offenses, that, with clean hands and pure hearts, we may go forward, united in purpose, to serve the cause of justice and brotherhood. Save us from hatred, cruelty, and malice. Endue our leaders, and especially the Speaker and Members of this House, with courage and wisdom—strengthen and protect our defenders, wherever they may be, by land, by sea, and in the air, and suffer no dishonor to stain our arms. Safeguard and multiply the ministers of mercy, succor the wounded, relieve the dying, and comfort the bereaved. Bless those who labor in field and factory, in office and home, for our country's welfare. Make a speedy end to tyrannies on earth, and deliver the desolate and oppressed of all nations. Hasten the advent of a righteous peace, and establish Thy kingdom of righteousness, through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 2, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6554. An act to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1603. An act to provide for the extension of banking facilities at military reservations and at navy yards and stations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 139) entitled "An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Post Office Department.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table and any previous special order I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special order of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SALE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO JAPAN PRIOR TO PEARL HARBOR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the old proverb "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones" is still a good one. I was interested to notice the following statement in a newspaper I picked up recently:

Standard officials were said by Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle to have used the contracts as an excuse for continued shipments of gasoline and oil to the Condor Air Line against the wishes of the State Department.

I am not defending the Standard Oil Co. on any contracts they had with any foreign lines to furnish gasoline and oil to the Axis, but I do remind you that I tried to get the Secretary of State last year to stop the shipment of oil to Japan. At that time they were shipping an average of 72,000 barrels of oil a day, 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, and 350 barrels of machine oil. Together with others, I took it up with the State Department in an effort to have them stop it, but they would not. Secretary Ickes was thereafter appointed Oil Coordinator. We told him that that gasoline and oil would be used against American boys if we ever got into war, and he agreed with us about it, but we could not get the State Department to stop it. As I read their criticism of others I think they themselves should bear their share of criticism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DEFENSE HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 6483, "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statements made by the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. (a) The sum of $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of enabling the National Housing Agency to provide housing in or near the District of Columbia (including living quarters for single persons and for families) for employees of the United States whose duties are determined by the National Housing Administrator to be essential to national defense and to require them to reside in or near the District of Columbia.

"(b) In providing the housing for which an appropriation is authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the National Housing Administrator is authorized to exercise all of the powers specified in subsections (a) and (b) of section 1 of this Act, subject to the limitations upon exercise of such powers specified in such subsections.

"(c) The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available to pay administrative expenses in connection with providing the housing for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated

"(d) The housing provided with funds authorized to be appropriated by this section may be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposing of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income.

"SEC. 402. (a) The sum of $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of enabling the Federal Works Administrator to provide public works and equipment therefor in and near the District of Columbia. Such public works may include, but shall not be limited to, schools, waterworks, sewers, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets, roads, facilities for the disposal of sewage, garbage, and refuse, and other types of necessary public works.

"(b) In providing the public works and equipment therefor for which appropriations are authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to exercise all of the powers specified in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 202 of this Act. Such public works and equipment therefor shall be provided subject to the provisions of section 203 of this Act.

"(c) The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available to pay administrative expenses in connection with providing the public works and equipment therefor for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept for the District of Columbia, and the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to make to the District of Columbia, advancements for the provision of public works and equipment therefor, such advancements to be deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

"(b) Sums advanced to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia hereunder shall be available for the provision, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of any or all public works and equipment therefor described in section 402 hereof, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including employment of engineering and other professional services and other technical and administrative personnel without reference to the civil-service requirements or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The repayment of any sums so advanced and the payment of interest thereon shall be in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as are set forth in sections 3 and 4 of the act of December 20, 1941 (Public Law No. 362, 77th Cong.).

"(c) The Commissioners shall submit with their annual estimates to the Congress a report of their activities and expenditures under this section.

"SEC. 404. As used in this act the term 'Federal Works Administrator' or 'Administrator', or 'Federal Works Agency' shall, with respect to housing, be deemed to refer to the National Housing Administrator or the National Housing Agency, as the case may be. Such terms shall, with respect to public works and equipment therefor, be deemed to refer to the Federal Works Administrator or the Federal Works Agency, as the case may be."

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRITZ G. LANHAM,
C. JASPER BELL,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALIEN J. ELLENDER,
CLAUDE PEPPER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This was a clerical amendment made necessary by reason of a change proposed by the Senate in the new propcsed title IV of the act of October 14, 1940, whereby authority to provide housing and public works is contained in two sections, rather than in one section as in the bill as it passed the House. In view of the fact that the substitute for title IV agreed to by the conference committee follows the form of the Senate bill, the House recedes on this amendment.

Amendment No. 2: The bill as it passed the House proposed to add to the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, a new title IV (1) authorizing the appropriation of $50,000,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to provide housing, and public works and equipment therefor, in and near the District of Columbia; (2) authorizing the sale or disposition of the housing so provided, except to any agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income; and (3) authorizing the Public Works Administrator to make advances to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the provision of any or all of the public works referred to above, and providing for repayment of such advances in accordance with sections 3 and 4 of the act of December 20, 1941.

The Senate, by amendment No. 2, struck out the proposed title IV and inserted a substitute therefor which is similar to the House provision except that it (1) authorized the appropriation of $40,000,000 for housing in or near the District of Columbia; (2) authorized the appropriation of an additional $5,000,000 to be used for housing on an area consisting of approximately nine blocks in the southwest portion of the city of Washington and to provide temporary housing for persons required to move from such area; (3) authorized the appropriation of $25,000,000 for public works and equipment therefor in and near the District of Columbia; (4) provided that the cost-per-family dwelling unit of any such housing should not exceed an average cost per family dwelling unit of $4,000; and (5) specified that the functions under title IV with respect to housing should be exercised by the National Housing Agency and the National Housing Administrator (to whom other functions relating to housing under the act of October 14, 1940, were transferred by Executive Order No. 9070, issued February 24, 1942), and included a new section 404 providing that the term "Administrator" wherever appearing in title III of the act of October 14, 1940, should with respect to housing constructed under the new title IV, be deemed to refer to the National Housing Administrator.

The substitute for the Senate amendment, agreed to in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report, (1) authorizes the appropriation of $30,000,000 for housing in and near the District of Columbia; (2) authorizes the appropriation of $20,000,000 for public works and equipment therefor in and near the District of Columbia; (3) eliminates the Senate provision for an appropriation for housing on an area consisting of approximately nine blocks in the southwest portion of the city of Washington; and (4) eliminates the Senate provision permitting the average per unit cost of family dwellings to be not in excess of $4,000, thus leaving applicable the limitations as to average cost now provided by law. It also provides in section 404, that for purposes of all the provisions of the act of October 14, 1940, the term "Federal Works Administrator" or "Administrator" or "Federal Works Agency" when used with reference to housing, shall be deemed to refer to the National Housing Administrator or the National Housing Agency as the case may be, and when used with reference to public works and equipment therefor shall be deemed to refer to the Federal Works Administrator or the Federal Works Agency, as the case may be.

FRITZ G. LANHAM,
C. JASPER BELL,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the conference report to the House?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, I shall be glad to; I wish to make a brief explanation of the conference report. When the House passed this measure which has to do with

housing and public works, or community facilities, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, it authorized an appropriation of $50,000,000 for these two purposes, made necessary by the influx of defense workers into Washington.

After the bill was passed by the House, the President issued under the War Powers Act an Executive order placing defense housing under the control of the National Housing Agency, and placing the public works, or community facilities, in the congested defense areas under the control and supervision of the Federal Works Agency.

The bill was amended in the Senate to conform with the provisions of that Executive order and the conference report is in accordance with those provisions.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the Senate amendment, I understood the Senate amended the House bill by increasing it $20,000,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. I am coming to that.

Mr. RICH. The House disagreed with the Senate?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. I am coming to that explanation.

Mr. RICH. I want to ask the gentleman a question after he has finished.

Mr. LANHAM. When the bill was considered in the Senate, the authorization was increased by $20,000,000, $5,000,000 of which were earmarked for nine blocks in a slum area in Southwest Washington under what is generally known as the Goodwille plan. There is also embodied in this conference report, which has to do with the new title IV dealing with this metropolitan area, a provision that the funds authorized under this measure are not to be used for slum clearance.

It might be well to state, first, the policy of this act in order that it may be generally understood. The policy is that Federal funds for defense housing shall not be expended except to take care of the excess which may be required by reason of the lack of available housing and in addition to such needed housing as private capital will construct. It is further the purpose of the measure that at the end of the emergency there will be recouped for the Treasury as much of the expenditures made for defense housing as possible, and there is also in the act a provision that houses may be sold, even during the emergency, to those who wish to buy them as permanent residences.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. The gentleman has undertaken an explanation, but I did not hear it. Is the Goodwille project included in this or not?

Mr. LANHAM. No. The Goodwille project is not included in this conference report. That was part of the $20,000,000 added by the Senate.

The situation is that there is necessity for speed and expedition in the construction of this housing. The only way that it could be considered this week was by bringing in a conference report which is not controversial; so the Senate yielded to the insistence of the House conferees that we eliminate the $20,000,000 which they had added to the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. RICH. Is it the object to build great large units of housing facilities or are you going to try to build small individual units?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is anticipating what I was about to state, and I am going to make an explanation of that.

Mr. RICH. There is another question. When the gentleman is elaborating upon that question, will he tell us whether they are going to build individual units and what the expectation is of those who are building them because of this speed. Are you going to sell them at a certain fixed price regardless of what the cost was or are you going to try to do a good businesslike job of building units like a sound business administration would?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be glad to make explanation of that.

Mr. RICH. Give us a little light on that, because we do not want any more Arthurdales here in Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say with reference to sales of these houses that the act provides for their sale at their fair market value.

Mr. RICH. I will be interested in that. We do not want any more Arthurdales here in Washington.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the District of Columbia Committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the kind words toward the committee which I represent and myself, expressed by the gentleman from Texas, and I desire at this point to say that there has been no lack of interest in the House on the subject of defense housing in the District of Columbia, even though the amount agreed to now by the managers on the part of the Senate come to the figure of $50,000,000, which is proposed in the bill. I think there has been an indication in some quarters that the House was not cognizant of this problem perhaps as acutely as was the Senate. There were disagreements, to be sure; but on the need for housing now, the House has joined the Senate in recognizing this problem. Have you not also taken into full consideration the necessity for the services that go along with the housing program? I speak particularly at this point of the need for greater hospitalization in the Washington area?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman has called attention to two features that I should like to mention.

In the first place, with reference to the speedy enactment of this bill, may I say that the estimate came from the Bureau of the Budget late one afternoon. The bill was introduced in the House the next day. Of course, it was not available in print until the following day, but on the first day when it was available in print, the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, assisted by the Committee on the District of Columbia, began hearings and at their conclusion reported the bill. Just as soon as a rule could be obtained it was taken up by the House and was passed by the House, as I recall, on the 11th day of February. So there has certainly been no lack of diligence on the part of the House of Representatives.

Now, before coming to the second feature which the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia mentioned, may I say that we also eliminated from the Senate bill a provision which would have increased the average cost of dwelling units, and we have kept the average cost of the units as they already appear in the act.

In view of the fact that the President of the United States has made a recommendation in which the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have been very much interested, to the effect that temporary dwellings, largely of a domitory type, be constructed for the unmarried workers coming into the District of Columbia, it has been our thought that there are several advantages in such construction. In the first place, it is cheaper. In the second place, it gives an opportunity for genial association of workers. In the next place, it simplifies the traffic problem in that these workers will in many instances be closer to their work, within walking distance, and in other instances can be taken in large numbers in busses without many stops.

Further, this type of construction would eliminate many of the difficulties that would arise after the emergency with reference to the private real-estate business, with which there is no purpose of the Government to interfere, and there should not be.

By reason of the fact that this construction will be cheaper, and that it is the belief of the committee that it should be resorted to in every possible instance, we have made a division in this bill of the funds to be disposed of, that $30,000,000 of the $50,000,000 will be for housing and $20,000,000 for public works, or so-called community facilities. The hearings indicate very clearly that there will be a need for these facilities, not only in the matter of hospitalization, to which the gentleman from West Virginia referred, but in the matter of sewerage, water connections, schools, and various things of that kind. It was for that reason that the division was made as between the housing and the community facilities.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say, first, that we have the greatest regard for the chairman of this committee and his associates. I do not think the committee could have a better chairman. I congratulate the committee on the fact that your are building temporary housing which is not to interfere with the real-estate operations of this town. I do not know of any other place in the United States where the development companies have gone out and spent their own money to try to increase the size of the community as they

have here, not only in the District but in Maryland and Virginia. They did that with their own capital, at no cost to the Government. That is what we want to do. I am glad you are taking that position.

Further, these houses are to be only temporary, and I suppose when the emergency is over, because they will be located on plots of ground on which the Federal Government would not want to have permanent buildings, you will have to remove them.

Mr. HOLMES rose.

Mr. RICH. I am only congratulating the gentleman now on what he is doing. I think he is doing a good job.

I want to know whether you will keep your fingers on this money, so that some bureaucrats or some departments will not get their hands on it and do a lot of things this committees does not want done.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, we do not have charge of the administration, but I feel sure there is not a committee in the House of Representatives which is more diligent in following up appropriations and trying to see that the money is expended in accordance with the legislative intent than the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. RICH. If you do that, then I am sure we will get dollar for dollar on this money invested, but if you do not do that, then I am afraid of what may happen.

Mr. LANHAM. May I call the attention of the gentleman, in view of what he has said, to a statement contained in our committee report when we first presented this bill to the House of Representatives:

> The committee are very definitely of the opinion that private enterprise should supply as much of the permanent housing as is possible, and that the defense housing proposed in this measure should be restricted to the minimum necessary for the additional personnel to be provided for during the emergency in connection with the war activities. Temporary dormitories for unmarried workers will afford opportunity for association with fellow workers, minimize the problem of transportation, keep the amount of Federal expenditure within reasonable bounds, and relieve the situation with reference to normal real-estate activities when the emergency is over.

That is our policy and that is our purpose, as expressed in our report when we first presented this bill.

Mr. RICH. Who is going to have charge of the spending of this money?

Mr. LANHAM. The housing will be under the control of the National Housing Agency, recently organized in accordance with an Executive order, and the public works, or community facilities, will be under the control of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. RICH. You are going to follow this up and see that the act is carried out as the committee intended it to be carried out?

Mr. LANHAM. We do our very best in that regard. We have done so and expect to continue to do so.

Mr. RICH. We charge you to do that, and if you do it we will be satisfied.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOLMES. Originally this legislation came in with a unanimous report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We have tried in this legislation to build a practical solution of the housing problem here in the District of Columbia. As the chairman has said, I think that the differences between the Senate and House conferees have been amicably adjusted, and we come in here with a unanimous report because we need these houses at the present time in the District of Columbia.

As to the administration of this law, may I say that we, as members of this committee, not only have contacts with complaints that Members of the House get directly but we are besieged by groups from the various communities in connection with the problems they are having with these housing units. I can assure my colleague from Pennsylvania that we have had assurance from the heads of the National Housing Agency and the Federal Works Agency that they will cooperate with Congress and with the officials of the municipalities back home. There is no reason in the world a happy solution cannot be worked out if this law is administered right.

Mr. RICH. I am happy to hear that statement.

Will the gentleman from Texas yield further, so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES]?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RICH. I understand that the rules and regulations laid down by the Department of Labor are such that if they are carried out these housing projects will cost millions of dollars more on account of increased labor costs.

Mr. HOLMES. I think the gentleman is incorrectly informed on that particular phase. We have placed in the bill a limit of $3,750 for any unit in connection with this construction. It has been our experience that these units have been built for less than the price we have set in our legislation.

Mr. RICH. All I am thinking of is that $5,750 is a lot of money.

Mr. HOLMES. It is $3,750. The Senate increased it to $4,000, but the Senate receded and concurred in the House provision of $3,750.

Mr. RICH. Can anybody get a job on the construction of these housing units, or are you going to compel everyone to join a labor union and pay the labor union $300 before they can get a job on these projects?

Mr. HOLMES. I can appreciate the sentiment and the feelings of my colleague from Pennsylvania, but we are not the executive or administrative branch of the Government.

Mr. RICH. That is what I wanted to get from the chairman.

Mr. HOLMES. The bill states on what basis and principle the legislation has been recommended and adopted by the House.

Mr. RICH. Let me ask the chairman whether we can stop this racketeering of the labor unions in demanding of everybody that gets a job on any construction that he pay anywhere from $50 to $1,100, as they did in the case of some of these cantonments in order to get a job as a carpenter. This is a crime to our civilization and would indicate that we have not any more red blood in our veins and we should say that we will not permit any more buildings to be constructed under conditions of that kind. It is a crime to permit it to continue, and I hope the committee will go into that phase of the situation as well.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, right along that line, I would like to ask whether this construction will be done under the higher wage scale that prevails in the District, apparently, on all construction which the Federal Government pays for, or will it be on the wage scale which prevails for all private building construction?

Mr. LANHAM. We hope, of course, that the construction will be done as economically as possible. We do not, as a committee, have control of the wage-scale situation, but it is certainly to be hoped that the money that is authorized to be appropriated in this bill will do the job. The other matters are beyond our control, of course, as a committee, and are for the determination of the Congress on legislation relating to that particular subject.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It seems to me that if this dual wage scale continues to prevail in the District of Columbia and all of this construction is let at the higher wage scale, it will stop private building in the District, which helps to relieve this congestion.

Mr. LANHAM. There has been a great deal of discussion of that very matter, and the newspapers indicate that the Department of Labor now has it under consideration and has not yet rendered its final decision.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. None of this fund, I suppose, will be used for building cantonments or camps for interned enemy aliens? Out in my country this question has been raised.

Mr. LANHAM. No; that is not the purpose of this measure. This is for employees of the United States Government working here in defense activities.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I understand the chairman to say that a part of the fund would be used for schoolhouses or their equipment, if necessary, or is it all for dwellings?

Mr. LANHAM. No; $30,000,000 is for the housing, most of which we trust will be temporary, and $20,000,000 for community facilities, which is a rather all-inclusive term from the standpoint of the things necessary for normal life in these congested areas.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the rent rates be uniform or will they be fixed according to the individual income of the employees?

Mr. LANHAM. The rent rates will be in accordance with the terms of other provisions of the act that insofar as possible they must be economic rents, and that will not be so difficult with respect to these temporary buildings. In exceptional cases, where it would interfere with defense activities, there is leeway in the matter of rents.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In other words, they will be regulated according to the earnings of the individual?

Mr. LANHAM. No; not exactly that. They will, wherever it is possible, be an economic rent. If that rent should be burdensome in any particular case, then the provision of the act is such there can be some leeway and an allowance made.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. May I inquire if these contracts will be let on a competitive basis or on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis?

Mr. LANHAM. The provision of the act is that they may be let either on a competitive basis of bids or on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, but not upon a cost-plus basis.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The reason I inquire is that yesterday's papers carried an article where it was stated that the Labor Board had held they must pay the highest prevailing wage scale and stated the cost would be from 25 percent up in excess of what is the usual cost. I felt that if the private contractors could bid and operate in accordance with their regular methods we would save possibly 20 or 25 percent in the cost of construction.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, that will be in charge of the administrative authorities and they have the leeway of competitive bids or cost plus a fixed fee.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. The gentleman has been giving some very interesting information with regard to rent rates. I am wondering if he will further develop that phase of the matter with regard to whether the income from these dormitories, and so forth will be sufficient in his judgment to make it a self-sustaining venture, so that the Congress will not be asked later on for any sort of deficiency appropriation.

Mr. LANHAM. It is not the intention that the Congress will be asked for any deficiency appropriation concerning any housing that is authorized in this measure. Now, whether additional housing will be needed, the future and the extent of the war activities will determine, but it is not contemplated there will be any deficiency appropriation asked with reference to the housing that is now being provided for.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. So far as the chairman knows, then, the income from rents from these properties will be sufficient to sustain them and take care of the necessary operating costs?

Mr. LANHAM. That is our belief.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. It has come to my attention that there is a possibility, or at least that it is being considered, that there will be erected a large temporary building on the Mall for the purpose of housing some 40,000 or 50,000 Government employees, with approximately an 8-foot space for each occupant in this temporary building, which is to be of wood construction. I am wondering whether there is any thought that the money appropriated in this bill might be used for such a purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. The money authorized by this bill can be used for the construction of temporary housing and we hope that most of it will be used for that purpose. Just where it will be located is not for us to determine. It seems to me that it would perhaps be impossible to locate on the Mall housing for the great number of people to whom my friend has referred. However, with the Government land that is owned in many places in the District and in contiguous territory, I feel that if these structures are placed on Government land insofar as possible, they will be less expensive.

Mr. HOOK. I hope no such project will be even contemplated or consummated, because the erection of such a large building with only an 8-foot space to each occupant, 40,000 or 50,000 of them, certainly, if nothing else, would be a real firetrap and a hazard.

Mr. LANHAM. We have no information to that effect. We hope that this will be administered prudently in every respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Speaker pro tempore may be authorized to sign enrolled bills H. R. 6483 and H. R. 6554.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OBLIGATIONS UNDER RED CROSS CONVENTION, 1929 (H. DOC. NO. 693)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting for the consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State, with an accompanying draft bill, designed the more effectively to carry out our obligations under the Red Cross Convention of 1929.

I commend the report and the proposed legislation to the favorable consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 3, 1942.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report. 2. Draft bill.]

RETURN OF BILL (H. R. 6328) TO SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Senate, which was read:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request return from the House of Representatives of the bill (H. R. 6328) entitled "An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for the settlement of individual claims, approved by the War Department."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6554) to amend war-risk-insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "amended", insert ", effective as of April 1, 1942."

Page 2, line 21, after "reasons", insert ": *Provided*, That there shall be reported on the last day of each calendar month to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, the insurance or reinsurance written under clause (2) of this subsection (a), during the preceding month, together with the rates and the reasons for such rates and such insurance and reinsurance."

Page 3, line 19, strike out "10" and insert "14."

Page 5, line 6, after "in", insert "arranging."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "transaction."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I shall not object. I appreciate the urgency of this legislation. However, I think that the RECORD should show why and just exactly what the amendments are.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment made by the Senate is the insertion of the words "effective as of April 1, 1942." The reason for that is that the syndicate that has been writing war-risk insurance and marine insurance

on the hulls, cargoes, crew, and other subjects of insurance in maritime matters gave notice that on March 31 of this year it would cease to write war-risk insurance on hulls, and the result is that it would be impossible to get war-risk insurance unless the Government were to write it on the hulls. I believe they still write insurance on cargoes and crew, so that in order to prevent a hiatus, or gap, and in order that the business which is so important should go forward, the Senate wrote the amendment "effective as of April 1, 1942." It is so important to get this through that I requested that it be sent over the first thing today, and I believe steps have been taken to have the enrolled copy ready for signature at once.

The next amendment is the one to be found on the second page:

Provided, That there shall be reported on the last day of each calendar month to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, the insurance or reinsurance written under clause (2) of this subdivision (a), during the preceding month, together with the rates and the reasons for such rates and such insurance and reinsurance.

It developed before the committee that in some cases the Government would have to write at lower rates than these rates that would be compensatory. That may be true in the case of shipments to Alaska. It may be true also wherever they should find that this insurance at nominal or other rate bases would be of material benefit to the war effort or after consultation with the Office of Price Administration or other agencies, to the domestic economy of the United States, or after consultation with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is necessary or advisable for military or naval reasons. Constituting, as that provision did, something of an exception, in that it was giving nominal or lower rates than customarily applied, the Senate was of the opinion, and I think the amendment is wise, that the reasons for the application of that rate and for insurance at that nominal or lower rate than would normally issue, should be set forth in a report each month to the House committee and to the Senate committee, with the reasons therefor, and that that report should be made, together with a statement of the rates and the reason for such rates and such insurance and reinsurance.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield. I have not finished the explanation as to all of the amendments, however.

Mr. PLOESER. But I want to ask the gentleman a question pertaining to this particular amendment. I think it is a very fine provision requiring reports to the committee of the House, but I wondered why the Senate did not include in the requirement a report of losses. This omission was probably just an oversight, but it is highly important. Rates without losses mean very little. On the other hand, it might be that your committee could interpret the words "reasons for such rates" to include the necessity for reporting all losses. I am hopeful that, rather than attempting to change this by further amendment, your committee will interpret the provision in such fashion.

Mr. BLAND. I do hope there will be no effort to change it now. I think a report of losses would be available at any time—that is, to any Member of Congress or to any committee of Congress. Anybody could call on the Commission for a statement as to all the insurance written as of a certain date, on what written, and the losses thereon. I would guard very much against a statement of losses, and even as to insurance, because it is highly desirable to keep information away from the enemy. In some cases it is desirable not to specify even the name of the vessel. It is thought that specification of the name of the vessel might by some underground process reach the enemy and contribute to submarine losses.

Mr. PLOESER. I agree with the most distinguished gentleman from Virginia in his interpretation of what might necessarily be kept secret. In this regard I should trust the very keen and able judgment of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. I would not want it to reflect any information that would be helpful to the enemy.

Mr. BLAND. I know the gentleman would not.

Mr. PLOESER. I am hopeful, however, that the committee will insist on a complete insurance picture. That must necessarily include losses. It is highly important that we get adequate rates for the losses we are to assume.

Mr. BLAND. If necessary to get that, it would be an item that could be covered under the investigational authority that has been granted to the committee and which the committee is exercising.

The next amendment is merely a change of date.

The last amendment is changing a word in the amendment that was offered in the committee by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. The gentleman from California is very much interested in this amendment, and before this was agreed to I asked that he be consulted. I saw him Saturday, and it is agreeable to him.

Instead of saying "no insurance broker shall be paid any fee or other consideration by the Commission by virtue of his participation in any insurance transaction," the word "transaction" was stricken out and the word "arranging" was inserted before the words "any insurance"; because it was the objective to prevent any fee being paid to some other fellow for working up the insurance. But it may be that it will be necessary to use the services of that broker where a loss had occurred, or something like that, and that would be prohibited by the word "transaction." So the change was made to prevent payment of "any fee or other consideration by the Commission by virtue of his participation in arranging any insurance wherein the Commission directly insures any of the risk thereof."

Those are all the amendments that have been made except in the correction of a date.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, where in the Senate amendments do they provide for a change of the authorization under this bill, to allow our War Risk Insurance Corporation which is set up, or the Maritime Commission's corporation, to insure foreign cargoes and foreign hulls?

Mr. BLAND. There was no change. That was in the original bill. I may say for the information of the gentleman that that is identically what was done in the World War No. 1 insurance bill. We permitted the insurance of the ships of our Allies. Take, for instance, the South American governments that are doing business, they are not insured in their business, but in the domestic commerce of the United States, or where those ships would be needed for our purposes. Sometimes you have to take whatever ship you can get. It is essential that we provide insurance. I do not know that this will follow now, but as a result of the war-risk insurance, similar insurance in many respects in World War No. 1, there was returned at the end of the war to the Treasury $17,000,000 over and above the losses.

Mr. PLOESER. I have no intention of objecting, but I make the point for a most important reason. I would dislike to see the tendency in the underwriting management of any war-risk-insurance corporation set up by our Government to assume all the war losses of all of our Allies. It is not the United States' duty to assume all the losses of this war.

Mr. BLAND. With Great Britain there would be no danger, because Great Britain is herself protecting her own insurance companies.

Mr. PLOESER. I was not concerned about Great Britain. The British have long demonstrated their ability in matters of insurance, particularly marine insurance.

There are many countries that do not have marine insurance. We did not have it to any extent until after the first World War. It is one of the hardest things to build up where a government is not engaged in the maritime business. We have gradually built it up through the period from 1920 up to the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I quite agree with the gentleman from Missouri that this is a very important matter. When the subject was before the Rules Committee these same points were raised. Some very pertinent observations were made on the floor when this bill was before the House. Only the necessities of the hour warrant this type of legislation. I have that faith in the distinguished gentleman from Missouri to believe that he would not bring this bill here were not the necessity such as to require it. I mean the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman happens to be from Virginia, but he has some

of the Missouri attributes in requiring that facts and necessities be shown.

Mr. MICHENER. We all appreciate that. I am sure we are all glad of the contributions of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] because by education, training, and experience he is as well if not better qualified to discuss matters of insurance than anyone among us. Knowing the facts as he does, being familiar with the industry as he is, I think he is patriotic when he withdraws his objection.

Mr. BLAND. I can assure the gentleman that the insurance companies are in agreement about this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD some remarks made by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor on the finance amendments recently adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE 4-H CLUBS AND THE WAR

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is throughout our broad land this week definite action to mobilize the strength of the 4-H movement behind the great struggle. I want to take this opportunity to voice my approval of such action. It gives me a feeling of security, and it should give the feeling of security to every person in the United States. The youth of this country, dedicated as it is to the preservation of everything Americans hold dear, should certainly be included in this great movement. I feel that the 4-H Clubs and the 4-H organization should be especially praised at this time for the marvelous work which they are doing in the rural sections of the country, and I want to congratulate them here and now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the West Los Angeles Independent, Words Won't Do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY DURING WARTIME

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a news item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a news item taken from the Washington Post of April 3, 1942, titled as follows: "United States in Cheese Business; Seizes Syracuse Plant." The article states that—

A Federal agency went into the cheese-making business today for the first time * * *.

After reading this item I took this matter up with the Director of the Budget and asked him to advise me upon what authority money had been made available for any such purpose, and also, the source of authority for N. J. Cladakis to take over the operation of this plant. I asked if money was appropriated specifically for this, and, if not, under what general authority it was authorized.

I was advised by the Budget Bureau that no Federal funds were available for any such procedure. This happened on Friday, and I was later advised, on Monday, that this article should not have been published, and that Cladakis was only trying to make a deal to take the output of this plant.

There have been several such items as this published lately, and in one instance, private industry was taken over. Is it possible that this Department sought to do this hoping no one would take exception to it, and that this was a sort of trial balloon to see if they could get away with it?

I think it time right now to tell those who think they can take this hour of emergency to establish in government the philosophy of Karl Marx, that they cannot do it. Let us put an end to this threat right now, and do it definitely and positively. We must win this war, but in winning this war, we want an all-out and complete victory. That means the defeat of our enemies from without, but certainly does not stop there. It must mean, also, a defeat of those now in high places in government, who wish, in this hour of crisis, to change our form of government and substitute certain European philosophies, consisting of socialism, nazi-ism, fascism, and communism, all of which spring from the teachings of Karl Marx.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1942]

UNITED STATES IN CHEESE BUSINESS—SEIZES SYRACUSE PLANT

NEW YORK, April 2.—A Federal agency went into the cheese-making business today for the first time when the Milk Marketing Administration for the New York metropolitan area found that "the step was imperative to combat evil influences that are seeking to freeze small cooperatives out of their market."

With the consent of the owners of the Netherlands Dairy Co. plant in Syracuse, N. Y., Administrator N. J. Cladakis leased the cheese plant, which will begin operating under his control tomorrow.

"The program will be extended, if necessary, to assure dairy cooperatives a market for their milk and to make certain that the production of cheese and other dairy products for national defense and the lend-lease program continues," Cladakis asserted in a statement.

Cladakis reported that many cooperatives had been refused markets in New York City unless they agreed to supply the milk at less than cost, while several manufacturing plants in the milkshed had shut their doors on milk from these cooperatives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD to include an article by Maj Gen. William C. Rivers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First, to extend my own remarks and include a statement presented to the Ways and Means Committee; and secondly, to extend my remarks and to include a letter from a soldier on the 40-hour-week proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: One that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial quoting my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by Wheeler McMillen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there is about to be instituted in this country a system of sugar rationing. I rise today not to discuss that, although it seems to me

there is some doubt as to whether it is justified on the basis of information now available.

What I want to do is to call attention to the fact that unless we make some effort to coordinate the activities of the various agencies in this country dealing with food we are likely to have rationing in the case of a number of other food commodities. The farmers of this country have indicated that they intend to produce more this year than any year in our history. They will do so if weather conditions are normal and if they can secure sufficient labor and machinery. However, unless we can coordinate this production with transportation, storage, processing, and distribution better than is being done now, I very much fear we are going to have rationing of many food products. There are at least half a dozen governmental agencies now dealing with various matters involving food. They are not working together. There should and must be a definite policy and an integrated administration of the same.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the administration would adopt a policy permitting sugar processors to secure increased facilities, the farmers of America would produce enough sugar beets and sugarcane to take care of our own needs here in this country.

Mr. HOPE. I think something more could be done along that line than is being done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have four requests. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial; that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast participated in by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and the other gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]; that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD; and, finally, I ask that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to the Department of Agriculture, and the reply, concerning the coming wheat referendum vote to be held throughout the Nation on May 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics; in one to include two letters from residents of my own State and in the other to include a statement made by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

POOLING OF AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURING FACILITIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, heartening news comes from the war effort, so far as the aircraft industry on the west coast is concerned. Eight plants manufacturing fighting planes for this Nation and our Allies have joined forces in a public pronouncement which tells us that they are exchanging information and pooling their resources; in other words, instead of standing alone they are working together.

What those eight manufacturing concerns are doing on the west coast should be done in the East and on the east coast, namely, Fairchild, Glenn Martin, Curtiss-Wright, Bell, Republic, and many others, should join with the other manufacturers that we shall have an all-out aircraft-production effort, because, as I have repeatedly stated on this floor, and as the people of America now know, planes properly maintained and placed at the fighting fronts will be the deciding factor in winning this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a short telegram.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Huntsville Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable H. M. Sutherland, of Clintwood, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial fro mthe Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MILLS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GENERAL MacARTHUR RECOMMENDED 6 PERCENT WAR PROFITS LIMITATION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I supported the 6-percent war-profits limitation amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the $18,000,000,000 appropriation bill, which amendment was adopted by the House by a viva voce vote.

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that it will be of interest to the Members of the House and the American people to know that this very type of legislation to curb war profits has been recommended and favored by no less a personage than the gallant intrepid hero of Bataan and now chief commander of all the armed forces of the United Nations in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I find that in the Seventy-first Congress, Public Resolution No. 98 was adopted by Congress creating the War Policies Commission to consider legislation to remove the profits of war, and hearings were held March 5, 1931, to May 22, 1931. During these hearings Gen. Douglas MacArthur, then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in a prepared statement which he read to the Commission, advocated and proposed to Congress that the profits of industry in wartime be limited to 6 percent.

I quote from a colloquy which appears on page 382 of the hearings, between our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] and General MacArthur, reading as follows:

Mr. COLLINS. Suppose you were dealing with the head of the United States Steel Corporation on the price of products of that corporation. Under this plan of yours, how would you arrive at the price to be paid?

General MACARTHUR. By a coordinated agreement, under the set-up that we have outlined.

Mr. COLLINS. You called it negotiations.

General MACARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Then, in negotiating that agreement, you state also, if I understood you correctly, you would undertake to pay them a profit of 6 percent.

General MACARTHUR. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. COLLINS. A profit of 6 percent?

General MACARTHUR. That is correct.

Mr. COLLINS. On what it is claimed is the investment?

General MACARTHUR. That is correct.

Mr. COLLINS. And you would do the same way with every other concern?

General MACARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, these views of General MacArthur are just as sound today as they were a decade ago and should receive from Congress the favorable consideration to which they are entitled. Let us insure that the economic injustices of the first World War are not repeated and that unconscionable profits are prohibited by statutory enactment. Let us draft dollars as well as men.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I commend the gentleman on his diligence and his interest in the subject in bringing us this very interesting contribution to the 6-percent-profit-limitation discussion. I was entirely unaware of this background. I think the gentleman has performed a distinct service in bringing it to the attention of the Members at this time. I think this may also be brought to the attention of the other body, which is taking up consideration of the question today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his statement. I join with him in expressing the hope that the Senate, which is now considering this very subject, will place a limitation of 6 percent on the profits of industry during this war, as recommended by General MacArthur.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE NEW TAX MEASURE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be great interest among the Members of the House when the sessions start next week in getting the report from our friends who have been home meeting their constituents. One thing of which I am very certain is that they will find that their constituents will want action to eliminate war profiteering by any person or group. I am sure whatever expressions come back to us will at least include that idea.

In the present crisis, with the very existence of the Nation at stake, and with each citizen having an equal interest in the outcome, every person must expect to make some direct contribution to the war effort. Individual advantage and selfishness cannot be tolerated. We are all in this war together, and we cannot expect the men in uniform, who are offering their very lives, to make all the sacrifice.

This war is going to cost plenty without anyone profiteering out of it. Already we have a war program involving an aggregate expenditure of $160,000,000,000, or somewhat in excess of the assessed value of all real estate in the United States, and there is no telling what the ultimate cost will be.

Mr. Speaker, my real object in taking the floor at this time is to refer to the pending hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the new tax measure, which have been going on for 5 weeks. There has been such diversity of opinion between the Treasury and the other witnesses who have appeared before the committee that I think the House might like to know a little something of that situation.

Let me refer to some of the recommendations of the Treasury, both through the Secretary of the Treasury and his tax adviser, Mr. Paul.

The Treasury is proposing drastic increases in individual income taxes. Practically all the witnesses who have appeared before the committee are united in the idea that there should be more moderate increases than the Treasury Department asked for.

The Treasury wants a burdensome corporation income tax. The witnesses want a more moderate increase.

The Treasury wants a 75-percent limit on the excess-profits tax. The witnesses advocate 90 percent or more. There is once that the witnesses appearing before the committee want a higher tax than the Treasury does, but I think the explanation of that is very simple. They feel that it is proper to take the major part of any excess profits, but feel that the ordinary corporate income tax should not be so burdensome as to cripple business and industry.

The Treasury opposed the sales tax, but the great majority of the witnesses who have been interrogated on the sales tax have asked for its adoption. I am going to refer to the question of the sales tax a little later, so I shall not touch on it further at the moment.

The Treasury wants mandatory joint returns. Most of the witnesses have opposed joint returns. Of course, as we all know, that question has been before us before. One of the outstanding features of it is the community-property tax, to which I shall refer later.

The Treasury wants to tax present and future issues of State and municipal bonds. The witnesses very decidedly do not. A hearing occupying all 1 day was held by the committee on that subject. The States from California to Maine objected to the taxation of their local bonds. I think the question involved is not altogether a matter of dollars and cents to the Treasury; it is a matter of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States themselves, the States desiring to retain their individuality and the Treasury, or the administration, at all times endeavoring to secure more control over State action. That is very apparent in many items. I shall later refer to this subject in further detail.

The Treasury wants a higher tax on capital gains. The witnesses want a lower tax.

The Treasury wants to do away with percentage depletion for oil wells and mines. The witnesses do not, and a very strong hearing was held on that matter.

So it goes. Virtually every proposal of the Treasury is being objected to by the interested parties. The diversity of the feeling illustrates very plainly the difficulty under which the Committee on Ways and Means is laboring. It is also evidence of the fact that it will be hard to raise the full amount requested. So, to refer again to the sales tax, it seems to some of us, and I admit that I am one of them, that no matter what the argument against the sales tax may be, in order to anywhere near cover the amount the Treasury asks for we are getting to the point of recognizing that probably a retail sales tax must be levied. Otherwise I do not see how we are going to be able to raise the amount requested.

The President has proposed that we levy nine billions of additional taxes to augment the present Federal tax load of eighteen billions. Seven billions is proposed to be raised by general taxation and two billions by increasing the social-security taxes. If this program should be fulfilled, the Federal tax burden, plus the ten billions collected in State and municipal revenues, would bring the aggregate tax load in this country to $37,000,000,000 annually.

I have always been a strong advocate of a pay-as-we-go fiscal policy, but at the present rate of expenditures, involving an outlay of fifty-nine billions in the coming fiscal year, it would be not only impracticable but impossible to realize.

In my opinion, we should not try to raise all of the nine billions of additional taxes requested by the President at this time. The benefits to be achieved by victory over the Axis Powers will inure to posterity as well as to the present generation of taxpayers, and there is no reason therefore why future taxpayers should not share some of the cost. Moreover, while we should attempt to raise all we can by current taxes, there is a point beyond which we cannot go without drying up the tax sources.

Since 1932 we have had 15 bills raising taxes, and in 1 year we had two major tax bills. It seems to me it may be that we have reached a pretty high level of taxation.

Our present Federal tax load is already three times as great as was imposed during the years of the first World War. Since the fall of France, we have increased Federal taxes three times, and the country has hardly become adjusted to the last increase of three and one-half billions. We had difficulty, as the House well knows, in securing that $3,500,000,000 last year. We figured and figured at that time before we found means of getting that amount. Of course, now we have the incentive of supporting the war to the very best of our ability and to the last cent of payment. But nevertheless, no matter how long this war continues, or when we win the victory, it will be a victory for future generations. It may be that the amount of $7,000,000,000 to be raised by taxation at the present time is rather high and that some of that burden might very well go into the general debt of the country. We have raised the limitation to $125,000,000,000. We have not as yet actually allocated all of that $125,000,000,000, but it will be in the neighborhood of that by next year. I hesitate to set any definite figure as to how high we should increase taxes at this time, but it seems clear that we can at least dispense with the proposed increase in social-security taxes. Further social legislation can very well wait until we have won the war, because if we do not win, all our so-called social gains will be lost, anyway. Furthermore, we should

keep social-security taxes for social-security purposes. Once we start using them for helping to finance the Government or to skim off the people's purchasing power as an anti-inflation measure, we will have established a bad precedent that may ultimately wreck the whole social-security program.

As to the balance of the nine billions, for which the President has asked, we should keep in mind the heavy, additional taxes which have recently been imposed and add further burdens more gradually, so that the people can become adjusted to them. I am sure our citizens will gladly pay any amount of taxes that may be necessary to insure victory, but we should not increase the load too much at any one time.

Many people can pay increased taxes out of higher earnings resulting from the war program, but to others, whose incomes have not increased, and may possibly have decreased, higher taxes mean a reduction in their standard of living. We must keep this latter group especially in mind in framing the new tax bill. Ultimately, the cost of the war will necessarily drive down the standard of living of our whole people, and it will be much better for all if opportunity is given for readjustment to meet each additional burden before a new one is imposed. Our people can stand a great deal if they are gradually prepared for it.

It seems to me that the chief defect of the Treasury's tax program is that it reflects a lack of imagination on the part of those responsible for it. The Treasury has discovered no new sources of revenue, but continues to overwork the income tax, which has borne the brunt of all tax increases since 1932. As a result of the last tax bill, those in the lower income brackets had their taxes increased three to four times over the previous level, and now the Treasury proposes to double this amount. The same is very largely true of the corporation tax, which ultimately is borne by the shareholders, many of whom are of small means, in addition to the individual income tax on their dividends.

I favor further increases in the income tax, both individual and corporate, but not as high as the Treasury proposes. So far as the corporate taxes are concerned, it would seem that Congress might put more emphasis on the excess-profits tax than under the Treasury plan and less emphasis on the corporation income tax.

Further revenue could be obtained from the income tax if the residents of the nine so-called community property States were required to pay their fair share of the tax burden. At present the laws in those States treat the income of the husband as belonging one-half to the wife, and each file Federal income-tax returns on one-half the salary. This means that the income is taxed under lower brackets of the graduated surtax schedule, with the result that the Federal income tax does not operate equally throughout the country. For example, a married person in Massachusetts with an income of $25,000 must now pay a Federal income tax of $6,864, but a California resident with the same income would pay only $4,355, a saving of $2,509. I have long urged that this loophole in the Federal tax law be closed, and for years have had a bill pending which would require those in the community-property States to pay the same tax as residents of the other 39 States have to pay.

It is frequently said that every citizen should be required to make some direct tax contribution to the war effort. Most people, I believe, are eager to do so. It seems to me that the Ways and Means Committee might very well give consideration to the imposition of a special war tax, to be paid by all the people. A retail sales tax has been suggested in many quarters as being admirably suited for this purpose. It would be collected in small amounts, and thus would not be a hardship to pay. Those who had the most to spend would pay the most, which would include those who have benefited most from the war boom. While the objection is made that it would bear most heavily on those of small means, this fact is overcome by reason of the high income tax which the more-well-to-do have to pay in addition to being subject to any sales tax which might be imposed. We already have excise taxes on a great many commodities, which are, in effect, sales taxes.

While the Treasury has proposed that the interest on outstanding as well as future issues of State and municipal securities be subject to Federal income tax, it appears that this proposal has little chance of enactment, at least so far as outstanding issues are concerned. Even should future issues be taxed, the revenue would be small for a long period of years, and to the extent that any gain resulted to the Federal Treasury, a corresponding loss would accrue to the States and municipalities by reason of having to pay higher interest rates, which would, in turn, be reflected in higher taxes on property owners in the States and local communities.

In conclusion, let me state that if any Members have any ideas to submit to the committee regarding the tax problem, I am sure the committee will be glad to have the benefit of them.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have been interested in all of the remarks the gentleman has made, and I think they are of great help to the Members of the House, especially calling attention to the taxation of municipal bonds and securities, which are now tax-exempt. Outside of the Treasury Department witnesses, were there any other witnesses who advocated the taxation of such bonds?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think not. Of course, I may say that the actual amount involved is not very large, but it is the principle involved that is more important than the actual dollars that might be secured by that method of taxation. The principle of maintaining the independence of the States has been very much stressed in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the gentleman stated the Treasury recommended an increase in the tax on the people in the lower income brackets?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; they do not reduce the lower brackets.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But they increase the rate?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; very decidedly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It seems to me they should be aware, and, of course, all of us are aware, of the fact that the large bulk of our population is living on a fixed income.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is true. I have touched upon that in my statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And they are getting no profit out of the war program. In fact, most of them are not getting any work or contracts as a result of the war program. If they take away this small, fixed income of the American people by an increase in the rate of taxation, they will soon liquidate all of our people who are not beneficiaries of the war program.

Mr. TREADWAY. And in addition to what the gentleman says, there is the possibility of doing great harm to certain people who may be obliged to depend on investment income. For instance, many widows and elderly people. Such a program would add very heavily to their burdens and make it very difficult for them to meet their taxes and still have enough of an income to live on.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That would apply to the school teachers and all others who have a fixed income.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct, and, of course, we all must realize that none of us can live in the same way we have lived in the past, and we must expect to sacrifice and we want to sacrifice, and that is a part of our idea of helping in the war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All of us are willing to suffer, but we do not want to see this waste in the defense program, and we do not want these defense profits and all this racketeering going on.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have very strong views on that subject. As the gentleman knows, I am on the Byrd committee, which is endeavoring to reduce expenditures on nondefense items.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And the gentleman is doing a fine job, too.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman referred to a recommendation of the Treasury in reference to taxing State and municipal securities. The gentleman has been on the Ways and Means Committee for many, many years.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes. I believe I am the oldest man in point of service on the committee, not even excepting the distinguished chairman.

Mr. COCHRAN. I realize that many of the Members here were in short pants when the gentleman first began service on the Ways and Means Committee. For 30 years the Treasury has made that same recommendation, Democrats and Republicans alike. Is not that correct?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman see any change in the attitude of the committee or in the attitude of the Members of Congress on that subject? Heretofore the committee and Congress refused to act favorably on the suggestion.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think I ought to preface any answer that I make to the gentleman by saying that I am speaking only for myself, not in any way representing anybody else on the committee. The fact is that the hearings have so occupied the committee during the 5 weeks that they have been going on, that there have been no conferences between members of the committee, no executive sessions.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman recalls the hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means on a bill that I introduced in reference to States sales taxes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sullivan, appeared before the Committee on Rules on that bill and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is here this morning, asked him if he was opposed to that bill, because he had in mind the recommendation of the Treasury in regard to State and municipal securities taxes. Of course, the Secretary did not want to commit himself. The Treasury was afraid it would jeopardize its policy which they had followed over this long period of years, when they endorsed the taxing of local and State securities. However, I recall that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] asked Mr. Sullivan, "Is it your purpose to provide for this taxation on future issues only, or do you propose to go back and want the Congress to include all the outstanding issues?" Mr. Sullivan replied, "We certainly want to go back and tax all the outstanding issues." I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is present, whether that is not correct?

Mr. MICHENER. That is correct.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have never favored taxing past issues. I think that would evidence a lack of good faith upon the part of the Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I desired to show is that the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury is gambling on getting something which the gentleman knows, and which I know, he is not going to get, and at the same time refuses to try to save two or three billion dollars for the Nation's Government. The two or three billion can be saved, and should be saved, and it is no credit to the Treasury to take the position it does. Each proposition should be decided on its merits. One should not be coupled with the other. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for permitting me to make this observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Army Day quite appropriately affords me the opportunity to pay tribute to Gen. George C. Marshall, one of the greatest military strategists which this Nation has ever produced. Although he has been selected for the highest post within the designation of the Chief Executive, with which goes the responsibility of directing our armed forces throughout the far-flung battle areas the world over, he labors silently and modestly without the fanfare of publicity and as a rule far removed from the plaudits of the people.

His genius, his labors, and his aggressive though unheralded actions cover and make possible the Army's heroic accomplishments from Bataan to Zamboanga in the Philippines, from Port Darwin to Ceylon, and from Iceland and northern Ireland to Panama and to Dutch Guiana.

Every move of the Army calculated to bring ultimate victory in north Africa and throughout the Near East has been planned and approved by America's foremost soldier.

I take this opportunity to appraise the real value of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and to focus the attention of the people upon this quiet though brilliant and productive soldier. He himself shuns and evades publicity, because he is too modest and occupied with the greatest task which has ever been thrust upon a soldier serving in the same capacity.

Far removed from the spotlight of activity as he is, we are prone to overlook a man of the finest character, a soldier of great ability, a strategist of the highest order, and a man of action.

I am certain that the House of Representatives joins with me in applauding the brilliant and historic accomplishments of our Chief of Staff. I want to convey to him my personal congratulations on Army Day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Fort Smith Tribune, of Arkansas, entitled "Municipal Ownership."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGIMENTATION OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the remarks of my colleague from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], made earlier in the afternoon, in which he raised some question about the matter of rationing and the matter of priorities. All of us want to do everything we can to cooperate with the Government in its all-out efforts to win this war, but I am wondering if the different steps that have been taken, say, for example, in respect to the automobile industry, in respect to tire rationing, and the various priorities and rationing problems that have been handled for the Government—there is some question whether these steps have been guided by experienced men, who know how to handle these problems with the least hardship to the American people. Frankly, I doubt that it has. Then, further, we have this question of a sugar shortage and the rationing of sugar. The newspapers indicate that that is going to spread out to other fields, where foodstuffs are involved. All that means more and more regimentation, and I doubt the wisdom or the necessity for all those drastic steps. I think the Congress ought to scan very carefully the activities of these agencies that have been created, before any such steps are really taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. My colleague from Minnesota is not laying at the door of Congress the mistakes that have been committed by the administration, I hope?

Mr. PITTENGER. Most certainly not; but what I am saying is that the people are going to look to Congress so that it will in some way curb these Government agencies if they need to be regulated themselves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absense was granted to Mr. ANDERSON of California (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 1 week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article on the subject of union initiation fees, dues,

the 40-hour week, and so forth, from the Tulsa (Okla.) World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1603. An act to provide for the extension of banking facilities at military reservations and at navy yards and stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 6554. An act to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Edd Nevins;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Ida Baird;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 4151. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey;

H. R. 4464. An act for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey;

H. R. 4625. An act for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Orme;

H. R. 5069. An act for the relief of George Garcavy;

H. R. 5363. An act for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.;

H. R. 5452. An act for the relief of Emmett Armstrong;

H. R. 5500. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles L. Clark;

H. R. 5504. An act for the relief of H. J. Abney;

H. R. 5559. An act for the relief of William Horsman;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman;

H. R. 5652. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5686. An act for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga.;

H. R. 5977. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple;

H. R. 6023. An act to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal-revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 6387. An act to extend the crediting of military service under the railroad retirement acts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6440. An act to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years; and

H. R. 6714. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Thursday, April 9, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1549. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration covering the operations for the year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 514); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1550. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, of the exchange stabilization fund; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1551. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; to the Committee on Roads.

1552. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes, to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1553. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the creation of, and award to, the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and to similar personnel of friendly foreign countries a decoration known as the Legion of Merit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6829. A bill to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6898. A bill to temporarily permit boarding houses and lodging or rooming houses in the District of Columbia notwithstanding the prohibition of the zoning regulations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6899. A bill to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6900. A bill to prohibit discrimination with respect to employment in the service of the United States or employment resulting from expenditures made by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 6901. A bill to enable the agencies of the Government to administer certain patents for the best interests of the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 6902. A bill to provide for the hearing of certain criminal cases by United States commissioners; to fix compensation of United States commissioners; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 6903. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relative to old-age security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing benefits to civilians who may be injured or the dependents of civilians who may be killed by reason of enemy action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing benefits to civilians who may be injured or killed by enemy action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 6904. A bill for the relief of the Bridgeport irrigation district; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Manuel G. Souza and Manuel Souza, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 6906. A bill for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 6907. A bill for the relief of Mrs. P. R. Yeager; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2644. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Common Council of the city of Mount Vernon, N. Y., opposing the continued attempts of the Treasury Department, whether by statute, administrative rulings or by judicial decree to impose a Federal tax on the income of State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2645. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the social security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social security law for social security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay, not only the amount of employee contributions, but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2646. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the National Association of Postal Supervisors of Los Angeles, going on record as favoring the reappointment of Mary D. Briggs as postmaster of Los Angeles on a noncompetitive basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2647. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Pastors Willis and Nora Craven and 60 voting members of the congregation of Pleasant Plain Friends Church, Pleasant Plain, Iowa, uring the passage of Senate bill 860 to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to pro ide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2648. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Secretary Bergen County Chamber of Commerce, Hackensack, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the continuation of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

2649. Also, petition of the deputy attorney general of the State of Nevada, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2650. Also, petition of the county clerk of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2651. Also, petition of the Daughters of the American Revolution, State of Illinois, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to flag etiquette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2652. Also, petition of a list of voters of the State of Texas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expediting the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Theodore O. Wedel, canon, Washington Cathedral, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the true sun of the world, evermore rising and never going down; who, by Thy light and power dost nourish and make joyful all things, as well that are in heaven, as also that are on earth: We beseech Thee mercifully and favorably to shine into our hearts, that the night and darkness of sin and the fear of mortal enemies may be driven away. Grant that we may shoulder the heat and burdens of our tragic years without stumbling or offense, and may walk as in the daytime, being pure and clean from the works of darkness, and abounding in all good works which Thou hast prepared for us to walk in. We ask it through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 6, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations in the Marine Corps was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Doxey	Nye
Andrews	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bulow	Kilgore	Taft
Bunker	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Millikin	Willis
Downey	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES and Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRINITY RIVER, TEX., WATERSHED SURVEY REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Trinity River watershed in Texas, based on an investigation authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Frank I. Hogan, attorney, Huntington Park, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to license each war worker; to settle the matter of birth certificates; to prohibit age-limit restrictions in industry for skilled workers from 45 to 65 years of age; to remove all exemptions from payment of income taxes in the low brackets, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by J. H. Miller, business agent of the Building and Construction Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, of Pittsburg, Kans., remonstrating on behalf of the council against any change in the existing 40-hour workweek provision of law or in the overtime-pay scale; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BURTON:

A petition of sundry citizens of Kalida, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense

in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION OF GEARY COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of the Agricultural Producers Association of Geary County, Kans., and transmitted to me in a letter. This organization has taken a stand for a reform in the method of conducting the A. A. A. wheat referendum on May 2, 1942.

There being no objection, the letter addressed to Mr. CAPPER, embodying resolutions, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNCTION CITY, KANS., *March 19, 1942.*

Senator A. CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

The Agricultural Producer's Association of Geary County, Kans., in meeting assembled this 19th day of March 1942, do resolve that:

Whereas the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is oppressive and un-American in principle, restricting the maximum products of vital food products at a time when food is needed to win this war, therefore, we, the Agricultural Producer's Association of Geary County, Kans., do urge the immediate repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration; and

Whereas the wheat referendum, set for May 2, 1942, if conducted under the present rules promulgated by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration will be notoriously unjust and discriminatory, therefore, we, the Agricultural Producer's Association of Geary County, Kans., ask you to employ immediately every means in your power to bring about a repeal of the election rules now operative, and to see to it that the coming wheat referendum on May 2 shall be conducted fairly, and that the rules governing it shall conform as closely as possible to the laws now governing national and State elections in our country; and

Whereas farmers are asked for all-out production, which also means farm expense, therefore, we, the Agricultural Producer's Association of Geary County, Kans., urge the immediate elimination of parity payments and commodity loans. We ask parity prices on all farm commodities for all farmers, thus assuring all farmers a means of running their farms on a full-production basis; and

Whereas waste weakens our Nation, therefore, we, the Agricultural Producer's Association of Geary County, Kans., urge that inefficient spending cease, that unnecessary bureaus, agencies, and commissions be abolished, that legislation be enacted abolishing the 40-hour labor week; and

Whereas the above are vital problems in winning this war, therefore, we, the Agricultural Producer's Association of Geary County, Kans., urge that these resolutions be spread upon the RECORD and given your immediate attention.

Respectfully,

G. W. SCHMIDT,
President.
ADRIAN LOECKLE,
Secretary.

(And other members of the association.)

ALL-OUT WAR EFFORT—PETITIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD the text of a petition just received by me and signed by a large number of businessmen of Hiawatha, Kans., and farmers of Brown County. I ask that the petition lie on the table.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

We, the undersigned American citizens, hereby respectfully petition the President and Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to eliminate the following specified hazards detrimental to 100 percent all-out war effort:

1. Elimination of excess profits of industrial corporations and individuals having war contracts.

2. Stop all strikes, walk-outs, slow-downs, or other methods of retarding production of war material.

3. Suspension during the war crisis of 40-hour week, holidays, and extra pay.

4. Regulation of labor unions the same as industrial organizations, and make it possible for all American citizens to work in war production plants.

5. Elimination of all possible Government expenditures not in connection with war production and not needed for the immediate protection and welfare of the American people and suspend departments of the Government whose mission and activities are wholly for peacetime and do not contribute to the present war emergency.

6. Pass new laws, make Executive orders, and enforce the present laws in order to accomplish the foregoing results.

We, as American citizens, with our sons, brothers, relatives, and friends now in the armed forces protecting our country, hereby pledge our utmost effort and being toward bringing about successful conclusion of the war, but demand the President and Congress take the steps necessary to eliminate the needless handicaps, expenditures, and conflicts retarding all-out war effort, which are destroying the morale of the American citizens.

PETITION FROM CITIZENS OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND., FOR ALL-OUT WAR EFFORT

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., and vicinity, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1942.

Whereas, we, the undersigned residents of Indianapolis, Ind., and environs, are vitally interested in the successful culmination of the present world-wide struggle for the preservation of our democracy; and

Whereas, we, as citizens of the United States, feel that everyone within their physical, spiritual, and financial means should, as true Americans, do all in their power to foster and promote this conclusion; and

Whereas we believe that this conclusion should be attained with the minimum waste of time and taxpayers' money, both present and future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, as American citizens, taxpayers, parents of boys in armed forces, residents of Indianapolis, Ind., and vicinity, representing no individual group, creed, or organization, do hereby urge and request that our immediate representatives in the Congress of the United States, namely, Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS, Senator RAYMOND WILLIS, and Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, foster, promote, and support legislation, irrespective of politics, that will accomplish this objective in the following manner:

1. Require the immediate incorporating of all unions.

2. Eliminate all union activities during working hours in any and all plants engaged in war production, and establish severe penalties for violation of such regulations.

3. Eliminate all unions and union activities in war-production plants, where such plants are operated "at cost" for the United States Government.

4. Eliminate the 40-hour week for the duration of the war, with the guaranty of the Government that this privilege will be restored by the Government as soon as the Government feels that conditions justify it.

5. Eliminate the wage scale of "time and one-half" and "double time" in all plants engaged in war production, with the guaranty of the Government that such privileges will be restored by the Government as soon as it is considered expedient.

6. Request the President of the United States to appoint a Secretary of Labor in his Cabinet who will command the respect of employee and employer alike.

7. Follow up the many reports of the Dies committee, and eliminate all persons from Government, war production, or armed forces, who are, or have been, connected with organizations engaged in subversive activities, detrimental to the welfare of our country.

Signed by James H. Argus and 671 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind.

REPORTS OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following reports of the Committee on Military Affairs were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 506. A bill to require the issuance by the General Accounting Office of a quarterly certificate of settlement of money accounts to United States property and disbursing officers of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1260).

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2422. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261).

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2368. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2439. A bill for the relief of Andrew Stenman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. NORRIS):

S. 2440. A bill for the relief of the Bridgeport Irrigation District; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2441. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and proclaimed by the President on August 4, 1932 (47 Stat. 2074, 2092), by making it a criminal offense for any person to use the emblem and name of the Red Cross for commercial or other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2442. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WALLGREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500,000 for the construction and equipment of a Northwest electrodevelopment laboratory, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

BROADCAST TO JAPANESE PEOPLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator THOMAS of Utah broadcast to the people of Japan on Pearl Harbor Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY FRANCIS B. SAYRE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Francis B. Sayre, United States Commissioner to the Philippines, which appears in the Appendix.]

INSTRUCTIONS OF JOSEPH B. EASTMAN RELATIVE TO RAIL AND BUS TRANSPORTATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the instructions issued by Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, relative to rail and bus transportation, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE 40-HOUR WEEK

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a citizen of Oregon regarding the 40-hour week, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am about to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement, I should be very happy if Senators would give me their attention.

Yesterday there was passed over a proposed amendment on page 47, of the pending bill, beginning in line 10, where the committee recommended that there be stricken from the bill as it passed the House the following provision:

SEC. 402A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as "final payment" to any contractor who fails to file with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation of contract and reimbursement of profits in excess of 6 percent.

I am about to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 in order that I may offer an amendment to cover the matter proposed to be stricken out, and I should like to have the amendment printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. McKELLAR, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 402. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'Department' means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term 'Secretary' means the Chairman of such Commission, and the terms 'renegotiate' and 'renegotiation' include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section, the term 'contract' includes a subcontract and the term 'contractor' includes a subcontractor.

"(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

"(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor. Such contractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. No suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts hereafter made and to all contracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided (in the case of contracts heretofore made) that final payment pursuant to such contract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any other costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any other excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable.

"(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each Department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount of $500,000 or more, statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail as such Secretary may require. Such statements shall be made under oath, except for such interim reports as may be required by the Secretary. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor.

"(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of each Department, separately or jointly with the Secretary of one or both of the other Departments, shall prescribe regulations which will, to the fullest extent practicable, indicate in advance the profits on contracts which will be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section. In prescribing such regulations, there shall be taken into consideration the amount and character of the personal services, equipment, material, and working capital, and the length of time likely to be required for performing various contracts and such other factors as are deemed appropriate by the Secretary or Secretaries prescribing such regulations. In any event, any profits on any contract in excess of the amount set out in the following schedule of maximum profit rates shall be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section unless the Secretary of the Department concerned makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of such contract. A report of any such determination shall be made to the Congress within 30 days from the date thereof.

"SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM PROFIT RATES

"10 percent of so much of the contract price as does not exceed $100,000; plus

"8 percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $100,000 but does not exceed $500,000; plus

"6 percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $500,000 but does not exceed $1,000,000; plus

"5 percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $1,000,000 but does not exceed $5,000,000; plus

"4 percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $5,000,000 but does not exceed $20,000,000; plus

"3 percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $20,000,000 but does not exceed $50,000,000; plus

"2 percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $50,000,000.

"In the case of a contract entered into on a cost-plus basis, the costs of performing the contract shall be included in determining the contract price for the purposes of this subsection. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that

the Secretary of any Department may not deem profits equal to or less than the amount set out in the foregoing schedule to be excessive profits for the purposes of this section.

"(g) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

"(h) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when the bill came over from the House, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations I called in representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, the agencies directly affected by this provision. They came before us, and I earnestly urged them to go over the provision and see if they could not work out a plan which would reduce the costs and at the same time not be unworkable, as they claim this particular provision would be.

I wish to say for the representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission that I never saw gentlemen who worked more carefully or actively to secure a plan which would bring about that which we all desire. I need not call names, but there appeared a lieutenant general of the Army, one or two major generals, and others representing the Army; there were admirals of the Navy, and there was Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission, together with various officials under them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, some of us are trying to locate the committee amendment. Is it in the RECORD?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but the amendment I am about to offer is on the desks of Senators.

Mr. PEPPER. It does not seem to be on our desks.

Mr. McKELLAR. An amendment to the bill was proposed by me. I was authorized by the committee to propose it on the floor of the Senate. It does not appear in the bill, it is a separate amendment.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] proposed a provision which they thought would enable the various governmental agencies concerned with war contracts to negotiate the prices in the various contracts. I asked the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Wyoming if they would not take the amendment I am about to propose and go over it and make any suggestions which might occur to them. They acted with the greatest care and consideration and went over the proposal with the representatives of the three departments concerned.

We then had the representatives of the three departments return to our committee, with the Senator from Louisiana and Senator from Wyoming, who appeared before the subcommittee. There was no disagreement among the three departments; there was complete agreement on the part of every member of the subcommittee, to everything in the amendment which the committee authorized me to offer, with one exception—and I wish to call particular attention to the exception. It concerns subsection (f), beginning on page 5 of the proposed amendment.

There was a unanimous agreement on the part of the departments and all the members of the subcommittee, so far as we could ascertain, to all the provisions of the amendment, with the exception of subsection (f). The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] offered what is now subsection (f) of the committee amendment, and the subcommittee agreed to it. When it came before the full committee, either the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] or the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], or both of them together, offered what had previously been agreed upon as an amendment to the language which the subcommittee had reported. Under those circumstances a tie vote resulted, eight Senators voting in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma and eight against it. Therefore the Thomas amendment remains in the committee amendment. Thereupon the full committee voted unanimously, except for one member, to instruct the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the amendment on the floor of the Senate. That is the reason the amendment is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of division of opinion so far as concerns the Thomas amendment, which is known as the schedule of rates. The three governmental divisions object to the schedule of rates. The three are in favor of the remainder of the committee amendment. The full Committee on Appropriations was evenly divided on the rate schedules. If any Senator does not understand just what the proposal is, I shall be glad to have him ask any questions at this point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. What is now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment on page 47 to eliminate section 402 (a) of the House bill.

Mr. TAFT. That amendment has not been agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it has not been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was passed over last night.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. From the Senator's remarks I gather that representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission expressed a desire to reduce the unconscionable profits on war contracts.

Mr. McKELLAR. They all did. Not only that, but they joined together and prepared this amendment, with some minor alterations which were made afterward, with the exception of subsection (f).

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What I cannot understand is this: The departments have been letting contracts under which these exorbitant profits have been made. If they desired to eliminate this profiteering, why did they not do so? I protested more than a year and a half ago against the method of letting contracts on a cost-plus basis which resulted in this robbery of the taxpayers. Why did not the departments in question do in the first place what is now proposed to be done?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what we now propose to put into the law.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But why did not the officials who now come at the request of Congress to express their opinion of the matter in the first place do as they now suggest be done?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a question I cannot answer. The Senator would have to ask the question of those to whom he has referred. Of course, they were unquestionably responsible for the contracts.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the proposal now before us affect contracts already let?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it will affect all contracts.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It will not result in a charge of violation of contract, will it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that it can be worked out, but there is a provision in the bill which says that if any part of the bill is declared unconstitutional the remaining part of the bill will remain in effect.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to say on the floor of the Senate that I think the letting of some of these contracts under the circumstances under which they have been let is one of the most unpatriotic acts that could be performed by any American citizen in time of war.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Would it not be fair to say that some 3,000,000 contracts have been let?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. And that possibly not more than 200 contracts could be classed as bad contracts to the unconscionable degree?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember. Of course, publicity has been given only to a small number.

Mr. GURNEY. A very small number.

Mr. McKELLAR. A small number. I wish to say for the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission that they have entered into the spirit of this matter fully. They desire a provision to go into the contracts declaring that price adjustment can be made later on, that a different price can be negotiated, so that they can protect the Government from racketeers.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it not a fact that if they had the authority now to renegotiate contracts which have been let in the last year or so, out of the 3,000,000 contracts which are now in force they might not now consider more than one or two hundred contracts?

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not give the number, but they say that a very small number would have to be examined.

Mr. GURNEY. My memory of the testimony is that there are less than 200 contracts which they would examine——

Mr. McKELLAR. I think one witness did so testify.

Mr. GURNEY. Out of the total of 3,000,000 contracts which have been let by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. With reference to existing contracts, contracts which have already been let, as I understand, the Senator's proposed amendment would cover those contracts just as well as future contracts.

Mr McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Suppose a person who has a contract does not wish to renegotiate, would the Senator's amendment give to the Government the power to cancel that contract and force renegotiation?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the person who has the contract will not agree to renegotiate, the amendment provides that the Secretary may withhold from him so much of the contract price as represents excessive profits.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will recall that the Supreme Court handed down a decision several weeks ago saying that it would not set aside a contract because there happened to be an unconscionable profit in it; that the Congress had the power to legislate to prevent unconscionable profits, but that the Court would not undertake to set aside such contracts.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is precisely what we propose to do in the bill.

Mr. HILL. I understand what the Senator from Tennessee has in mind. I wish to make sure that that is exactly what the amendment provides so far as existing contracts are concerned. Suppose a contractor has a contract today, and the Government feels that he is making an unconscionable or unreasonable profit; what can the Government do?

Mr. TYDINGS. It can reopen it.

Mr. HILL. Suppose the contractor says he does not want to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think there will be one contract in a million in connection with which the contractor will not wish to continue the negotiations.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true—the Senator from Tennessee was in the Senate at the time, and I was not—that during the World War we gave to the President or some agency of the Government the power to cancel contracts under certain conditions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Under certain conditions, but I think the power was inoperative largely, and I know it did not work satisfactorily. We have before us a proposal which I think will work, and I think will result in enormous saving to the Government. So much do I think so that, after talking to the various members of the subcommittee, after talking to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], for whom I have the greatest and highest respect and esteem, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to strike out section 402 (a) of the bill, and to substitute therefore all of the amendment authorized by the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of subsection (f), beginning on page 5, line 13, and ending on page 7, line 5.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that section 402 (a), found on page 47 of the bill, lines 10 to 17, both inclusive, be stricken out, and that there be substituted therefor all of the amendment, which I send to the desk, except subsection (f).

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment, I think, violates paragraph 4 of rule XVI, in that it introduces legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I rise for information.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Parliamentarian tells me that my motion ought to be divided. Instead of making a motion I shall ask unanimous consent. I now ask unanimous consent to strike from the bill section 402 (a), on page 47, lines 10 to 17, both inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendment to strike out, on page 47, lines 10 to 17, inclusive, is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, I move the adoption of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Section 402 (a), which was the House provision, has now been stricken from the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has moved that an amendment, modified in line with his explanation just now made, be inserted in place of section 402 (a)?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator what would be in conference should the Senate adopt the amendment as modified by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The whole matter would be in conference. The House has passed a provision limiting profits to 6 percent. That would be in conference; also, the provision which I have suggested would be in conference.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, if the amendment as modified were agreed to, it would be permissible for the Taft amendment to be considered in conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would.

Mr. TYDINGS. And any other amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. And any other amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. The gap would be so large that practically any proposal dealing with legislation on the subject of limitation of profits would be properly in conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. My opinion is that no matter how meritorious either the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee or the amendment of the Senator from Ohio may be in its philosophy, when the matter goes to conference some additional consideration will be required to perfect any solution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

The Senator from Maryland is exactly correct; and in order that the entire matter may have the fullest consideration when the bill is passed, I shall propose as conferees all the members of the subcommittee. The subcommittee consists of the chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. Any amendment, of course, may be considered. We want to save the Government from unconscionable contracts; and we want to do exactly what is right and workable. I told the gentlemen from the departments this morning that I should be very happy to have them come before the conferees if they have any objection to the plan which has been proposed.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in view of the House provision, does not the Senator feel that if the suggested amendment were adopted the conferees would be more or less bound to impose, in an appropriation bill, a limit on profits, and that the conferees could not propose to deal with the question by way of an excess-profits tax?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot agree to that statement; and I will tell the Senator why. We do not want to slow down the production effort of our country. We want to have contracts honestly made, honestly carried out, or honestly renegotiated all the way along the line. We do not want to slow down production at this time. I think that the two purposes can be effected. I can see how they can well be effected without a limitation, or with certain limitations. I do not think we ought to be tied down to a plan. We ought to act solely for the benefit of this country at such a time as this. That is what our committee proposes to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to make it clear that the amendment which I have offered is offered only as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee if an amendment of that nature is to be adopted. Personally I think that no

amendment should be adopted. In my opinion the only scientific way to deal with the question of profits is through an excess-profits tax. I am prepared to vote for a 100-percent excess-profits tax. I maintain that the proposed method of dealing with the question would slow down production, and that if we shall pursue the policy suggested by the Senator from Tennessee the conferees will be bound to adopt a profit limitation on each individual war contract, imposing great administrative difficulty in this situation and abandoning the solution which seems to me to be the only reasonable solution, namely, an excess-profits tax of from 90 to 100 percent.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. My name appears on the list of suggested conferees. If I went into the conference I would not feel morally bound by reason of the fact that the House did a very foolish thing. The author of the House provision came before our committee and confessed that it was utterly unworkable. I would not feel bound to take part in any scheme to fix limitations.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator is asking me to give him authority to fix limitations if he wishes to do so, or not to fix them if he does not wish to do so. It seems to me that the proposal of the committee is utterly unreasonable. If the committee does not think that there ought to be a profit limitation on each individual war contract then there ought to be no amendment at all, and the Senate conferees ought to go into the conference and reject the House provision, as we have just rejected it. But if we adopt a profit limitation on each individual contract, no matter in what form, I say that the conferees must necessarily come back with a profit limitation on each individual war contract. I think that is the wrong way to do it. I wish to present the reasons why I believe the Senate should not adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senate adopts the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, then the two Houses will have agreed upon one thing—namely, the renegotiation of contracts. We are proposing in this amendment to carry on the renegotiation of contracts by the methods now being used by the departments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will again yield, I should like to ask him what renegotiation of contracts means. I have not been able to tell. Does it mean setting aside the old contract; and is the new one to be voluntary?

Mr. McKELLAR. The contract would not be set aside at all.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Secretary of War do all the renegotiating?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. I can illustrate it——

Mr. TAFT. We have already enacted a law authorizing the Secretary of War to renegotiate contracts. He has that power under the Second War Powers Act. The power to renegotiate contracts already exists. We do not need this amendment for that purpose if the renegotiation is voluntary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to comment briefly on the parliamentary situation. As I understand, the able Senator from Tennessee has offered an amendment as a substitute for the House provision, which has been stricken from the bill. I think the amendment should be offered as an amendment and not as a substitute.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Parliamentarian says it should be offered as an amendment, I shall offer it in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has agreed to strike out section 402 (a); and therefore the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee could not be offered as a substitute for that provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I offer it as an amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator will again yield, I should like to make a further statement.

It is my judgment that the conferees would be limited within the provisions of the House language, which is a limitation, and the provisions of the Senate amendment, which would be legislation. If I correctly interpret the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I do not believe that the conferees could bring back a taxing provision, such as an excess-profits tax.

The bill before us is an appropriation bill. The Constitution requires that a tax measure originate in the House. Therefore I think it would be outside the jurisdiction of the conferees to bring in any provision regarding an excess-profits tax. That would have to be done in connection with a revenue bill originating in the House. However, on the question of legislation, as between the House limitation and the proposed Senate amendment there would be a very wide range, although it would not go to the extent of touching war profits.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee violates paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in accordance with the notice in writing which I gave yesterday, I move that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended in order that I may offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is obviously bad practice for the Senate to indulge in legislation on an appropriation bill. The provisions against such procedure are contained in the rules of the House and in the rules of the Senate. The reasons for them are admirably illustrated by the situation in which we find ourselves. We have before us a subject which does not particularly concern the Appropriations Committee, which only the Appropriations Committee has considered, and which it has considered hastily, under the necessity of considering an $18,000,000,000 appropriation bill for airplanes, which should be immediately passed. The subject has not been given adequate consideration.

In effect, the request of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona is that we give authority to a conference committee to call before it representatives of the various departments to go into the whole question of profits limitations and work out a new system of profits limitations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to have the parliamentary situation made clear. If the section inserted by the House is stricken out and no substitute is adopted, then the matter in conference will be whether the House provision, some modification of the House provision, or no provision at all shall be incorporated in the bill. If I understand human nature as I should like to understand it, and as I think I understand it in some cases, I do not believe that the House wants this large appropriation bill to go through without an attempt being made to recapture, in the most equitable and sound form possible, abnormal profits. Therefore, if we have only the House provision, and no proposal at all on the part of the Senate, the conferees, if they stay within the rule, are very likely to arrive at some fixed figure which may not be workable. On the other hand, if we put in the proposal as modified by the Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. McKELLAR. As modified by the unanimous vote of the committee, with one exception.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we put in the proposal offered by the Senator from Tennessee, then the range is so much wider that a more equitable and sound proposal can be brought in without any violation of the rights of the House, of the Senate, or of the conferees themselves. It is that phase of the matter, in the absence of a tax provision which is excluded, as the Senator from Oregon says, that inclines me to support the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee, so that the conferees will have a wider latitude of action—latitude which I am afraid, if we simply eliminate the House proposal, will not be permitted to the conferees of the two Houses.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place, I do not agree with the Senator from Maryland at all. I think if we have adopted nothing, and if the House adopts the 6-percent limitation, we shall be able to substitute any other amendment limiting profits if it resembles the 6-percent limitation in any way. I believe we shall have just as broad a field as if we strike out all limitations.

Furthermore, I do not believe the House is going to hold up an appropriation bill providing $18,000,000,000 for airplanes which are needed in order to

insert legislation in an appropriation bill. I do not believe the House is going to insist on that if the Senate vote that they do not want to proceed in that way. If they want to adopt the excess-profits-tax method—and I will say, for myself, that I would make it a 100-percent excess-profits tax—I think that is the only reasonable way in which to limit profits. I know that the members of the Truman committee all feel that way about the matter. That committee has been considering the same question. Once this amendment is adopted, I believe the conference committee must report a profit limitation on each individual contract.

Mr. President, I think this is a complicated question and a difficult one. I may say frankly that some 3 months ago I started to draw a law with a profit limitation on each individual contract. I challenge any Senator to draw a satisfactory limitation of that nature that will make sense that will not involve a perfectly tremendous amount of administrative work in determining the costs on each individual contract, or else give completely arbitrary power to the Secretary.

In the amendment we have struck out subsection (f). Subsection (f) certainly was completely unreasonable. Everyone agrees to that. After the committee had fully considered the question, presumably, it decided that it was wrong, and struck out the most striking feature of the amendment; but the remainder of the amendment, in my opinion, is much worse than subsection (f), which has been removed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to call to the Senator's attention the language appearing on page 3 of the proposed amendment, beginning in line 17 and going down to the bottom of the page. I should like to ask the Senator's opinion whether any proposed contractor would have a contract at all, in fact, if the amendment is agreed to and the bill as amended enacted into law; because it says:

> No suit or action may be maintained in any court.

The negotiation is entirely with the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Maritime Commission. So would it not really mean that a manufacturer would not in fact have a contract at all if the amendment should become a part of the law with this provision in it?

Mr. TAFT. Not only do I agree with the Senator as to that provision, but under that provision no contractor may sue the Government if the Government will not pay the amount provided in the contract. That would be an end of the whole system of suits in the Court of Claims which has been established in this country for scores of years. However, worse than that, if the amendment shall be agreed to, no contractor will have any contract with the United States Government. No man can know, when he makes a contract with the Government, whether he will receive the contract price or will not receive the contract price. No man can know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I will yield in a moment; but first I should like to make the point which I have been endeavoring to make with respect to the amendment. No man would be able to tell, for 10 years after he had been paid the contract price, whether the Government might not come around some day and sue him to get back all or any portion of the profit he might have acquired. Under this provision he must agree in the contract that the Secretary of War, in the case of contracts with the War Department, may determine at any time, in his individual and arbitrary opinion, what are excessive profits.

On page 2 it is provided that the contract must contain a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty. I do not know what renegotiation means, whether it means by force or whether it simply means that the Secretary may set aside the old contract and say, "You will not have a new contract until you agree with me on a new price." I suppose that must be what it means. If the provision is that the Secretary of War may say at any time, "This contract, formally made, signed, and sealed by the United States, is no good any more, Mr. X; come around and renegotiate with me tomorrow"; when Mr. X comes around the next day, so far as I can see, the Secretary of War may say, "You must take half the price I offered you before." Mr. X will have to take it, or lose all the money he has spent.

Second, there must be a provision for the retention by the United States of any amount of the contract price or repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits. Not only now, but for 10 years to come, a Secretary may come in and say, "Well, the way I feel today, I think 1 percent return during the war was enough." I see no possible basis of going to court and obtaining any review whatever of the arbitrary determination of the Secretary of War.

Again, at the top of page 3:

> (c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor.

There may be a general statute of limitations somewhere, but there certainly is none in this bill; and for years to come any one of 3,000,000 contracts—and probably there will be 10,000,000 more—may be opened up by the Department of Justice, and the Secretary may make an arbitrary determination that so much is excessive profit, and the United States may bring suit and recover that amount. If we are going to decide that no man shall get excessive profits even on an individual contract—and I think that perhaps can be done—certainly definite rules ought to be prescribed by Congress at least to give some department or some court a basis for determining whether or not a particular contract is returning excessive profits.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very much impressed by what the Senator is saying, and, of course, by the difficulty that attends this whole problem. I am sure we all have in mind the statement made by Mr. Nelson—I believe it was quoted yesterday—that most businessmen would be willing to do their part, provided they were assured against impairment of their capital. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in his opinion, some basis might not be found whereby the contractor could be assured against loss by the Government, and then the Government could fix the fee that he should receive for the service he rendered, at the same time having power in the Government to scrutinize outrageous payments in the form of bonuses and excessive salaries. Is not the idea of giving assurance to the contractor against loss the thing he is principally concerned about? That may include legitimate hazards against which he cannot fairly protect himself; but if he were protected against loss, and then if he were given an adequate or reasonable limited fee for his service, and the whole were properly scrutinized, does the Senator think that would be about as good a basis as might be found for dealing with this subject?

Mr. TAFT. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Florida is a very reasonable one. It only illustrates, however, that if we want to work out this problem, it has to be worked out very carefully. It has to be worked out after consultation with all the departments. I believe it would be possible to carry out such a provision against loss, and, on the other hand, a provision against more than a reasonable return.

The amendment I shall offer prescribes that limitations shall be so drawn that there shall be only 5 percent net return on capital per annum. In my amendment I create a profits board, which determines in advance what fixed fee or percentage will presumably return the contractor about 5 percent on his money. The chief difference between the substitute I offered and this amendment is that under my substitute the contractor knows in advance, when he makes the contract, what the contract is, and he knows how much money he is to get, and he knows that if he makes more than that he will have to pay it back.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's substitute was the subject of my inquiry. He objects to the provision in the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee because it provides for the readjustment or

renegotiation of contracts after they are made. As I have read the Senator's amendment, section 402, on the second page, it provides that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission are instructed to insert in every contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such department a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States—of course, the repayment to the United States is a repayment made after the contract is entered into, and perhaps after it has been completed—if it involves what the board regards as excessive profits.

Mr. TAFT. No; if it involves what the Board has determined, before the contract was made, would be excessive profits.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if the Board should later determine that under the contract which they had already entered into too much profit had been made, and part of it had to be returned, it would be, in effect, a reopening and a renegotiation of the contract.

Mr. TAFT. No; if the Senator will read the amendment I submitted——

Mr. BARKLEY. I have just been reading it and trying to understand it.

Mr. TAFT. It authorizes the Profits Board to fix, in the case of airplane contracts, say, 6 percent as a reasonable gross limitation on the amount of the contract; 7 percent, say, on battleships; 2 percent, perhaps, on shoes or something else; 10 percent on tanks, according to the proper percentage applicable to each type of contract. It is to be done in advance, however. The man who makes the contract knows what he is supposed to get, and he knows that if it works out in such a way that he gets more than that he will have to pay back the excess. It can be definitely determined, and a court can determine it, because the Board will have made its regulations in advance; and the amendment does not leave to the arbitrary discretion of the Secretary of War for the next 10 years the determination of profits.

Mr. BARKLEY. It leaves it to the determination of a board made up of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission.

Mr. TAFT. To make regulations in advance.

Mr. BARKLEY. To determine the amount of profits made in other departments than their own. In other words, any one of these three, as a member of the Board, would be passing on the profits made under contracts with a department outside of his own.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not right if we are going to permit a profit of 6 percent on airplanes and 7 percent on naval vessels that both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy should determine that question? We want to put them in a relatively just position and do not want to have the Navy paying three times as much profit as the Army is paying. We would have a board to determine the proper level of the percentage of profits on these contracts. I think it would be much better if we could put the whole question on an annual basis, the net return on capital basis and the excess-profits-tax basis, because I think that it is almost impossible satisfactorily to determine the profits of each contract. Not only that, but I think if a contractor is limited to 5 percent, or less than that, for the year, after taxes, when he gets his tax bill the people would be satisfied. That is what they are interested in. They want a company not to make excessive profits. Whether they make a profit on one contract and a loss on another, it makes no particular difference.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator, and I have, on a number of occasions, stated on the floor that I think the better way to deal with this subject would be in the tax bill, for then the committee which is charged with the responsibility of writing tax bills could go into all phases of the subject, examine it exhaustively, and undertake to write a tax bill which would stop up the loopholes through which large corporations are able to escape the payment of excess-profits taxes.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator. I think we must supplement the excess-profits tax with a further provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of our opinion about the course this legislation should have taken, we are confronted with the proposition that it is here; it is before us, and it must be dealt with. The House put the provision in the bill. We can strike out the House provision and put nothing in its place, and let it go to conference, and in that position try to write a provision by way of substitute or amendment. That would give the conferees an opportunity to work it out on the basis of sound judgment, with the advice and consultation of those charged with the responsibility of production who have a feeling—and I suppose we all understand they have such a feeling—that, instead of writing something in the bill which may appear to be limiting profits but which might hold up production because men might hesitate to enter into contracts, the better strategy, the part of wisdom, would be to send this bill to conference where it can go, even though we strike out everything about the subject in such a condition as will leave the conferees the widest possible field to deal with the subject.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio, if it were adopted, would provide a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 10, or an average of 5——

Mr. TAFT. I have changed that provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that under that provision it would be necessary for the conferees to bring something back here within the range of from 2 to 10. That is the difficulty about the amendment which the committee authorized originally in that part of the section which the Senate has stricken out. If that goes to conference, then we have the proposition for a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 10 on one side, dealing with all contracts, not only those entered into under this bill but those without the bill. There would be a graduated scale. It would be a very complicated proposition from a parliamentary standpoint, to work out a report on the part of the conferees, and they would have to take into consideration, if they tried to compromise between those two figures, the fact that in the House bill there is a straight limitation of 6 percent on all contracts under this bill, and under the Senator's original proposition it would be from 2 percent to 10 percent on contracts under this bill, and all other contracts. So that, in working out a parliamentary compromise, it seems to me that the conferees would be woefully handicapped, and that objection attaches to the Senator's amendment which is offered as a substitute.

It seems to me that the conferees would have great difficulty in the light of the suddenness of the proposal and the lack of full information on the part of both Houses of the Congress in regard to what is wise, with no committee investigation, no committee report, for no one has made an exhaustive report. The Committee on Appropriations attempted to do so because it had to deal with the subject and could not escape it. They either had to write a compromise or had to strike out the House provision altogether, which would still leave it in conference without any adequate investigation on the part of the committee. Even under the circumstances, I think the Committee on Appropriations did well in going into it as far as they did; but I am sure the members of the Appropriations Committee will concede that even they did not have the knowledge that may be necessary to write a workable provision. The suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee would leave the conferees in a position where they would have to bring something back; there can be no doubt about that; they would have to bring something back on the profit question. They could yield and bring back the House provision, which is a straight limitation, or the House conferees could yield and report the Senate provision authorizing a readjustment and renegotiation of the contracts, which, I think, in some form, would be a better way to deal with it, and which would embarrass the Procurement Agency, the War Production Board, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission less than any rigid percentage we might try to write into the bill on the floor of the Senate.

For that reason I hope that the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee will be agreed to by the Senate and that the bill will go to conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me the argument made by the Senator from Kentucky is a conclusive argument against adopting this particular amendment. He says that this, which is probably the most serious and important measure the Congress has had to deal with since the first of January, has not been considered by a committee; that it has been acted on hastily; that it has been acted on without study. I am only quoting the words of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that; I do not deny that; I do not think any committee of the Congress has given sufficient study to this matter to enable it

to write a workable provision which we can say is the last word.

Mr. TAFT. If the conference committee shall give it such study it will be different from most conference committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio himself which he has offered has had no study by a committee. I presume the Senator himself, since he has offered it, has given it some study or he would not have offered it; but, I hardly believe he thinks his amendment is the last word on the subject.

Mr. TAFT. I am not satisfied with my amendment, but it seems to me that the argument made that we should adopt something in which we do not believe in order that it may go to a conference committee to determine what action shall be taken, is absolutely contrary to every parliamentary principle the Senate of the United States ought to stand by.

Mr. BARKLEY. If this matter had been brought to the Senate originally as an amendment to this bill or a similar bill, I should have opposed any amendment on the subject. We are not responsible for the fact that it is before us. It came here in the bill from the other House. We cannot ignore the fact that it is in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. We can take it out of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, we can take it out so far as the Senate is concerned, but if the Senate should take it out would it be taken out so far as the conference is concerned? It still must go to conference, and the conferees would be limited to a percentage or nothing at all.

Mr. TAFT. The Senate can reject the conference report if the House proposes to insist on legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not believe that they will do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would bring about still more delay of an urgent bill which is necessary in order to increase the number of our aircraft.

Mr. TAFT. There has not been an argument made in favor of this amendment. The argument is that we ought to adopt an amendment, no matter what it may be, in order to get it to conference, and let the conferees decide the question. I do not think we can do that. I think we must consider the merits of the particular amendment. I cannot imagine any amendment that would tend more to destroy the whole productive effort than this amendment, because no man can possibly know, under it, whether he has a contract today or whether he will be paid the contract price or three-fourths of the contract price or half of the contract price or whether he will suffer a loss.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This amendment, as it is now offered, was drawn by the several departments interested in this matter, and if they had thought that it would stop the productive effort, if they had thought it was unworkable, they would not have suggested it. It was prepared originally by representatives of the three departments.

Mr. TAFT. I want to say that I have talked with high officials of the Navy Department, and they take the position that it would absolutely check and slow down the whole productive effort of the Navy. I can quote the Navy Department as well as can the Senator from Tennessee, and the Navy Department has not agreed on this. They came down this morning and said they wanted subsection (f) out.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee did not say that the Department agreed to the amendment containing subsection (f).

Mr. TAFT. I thought that was the point of his argument.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I have not offered subsection (f).

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I can say, without revealing any confidence, for I think that they so testified before the committee, that they would prefer no legislation on this subject at all in this bill. In that regard they agree with the Senator, and they agree with me and with the chairman of the Committee on Finance and other Senators; but, recognizing the fact that this provision is in the bill and must be dealt with, these agencies undertook to cooperate with the committee in drawing a provision which would be workable and which would not retard production. I have this morning conferred with the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, Admiral Land; with the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal; with the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson; with representatives of the Treasury Department, all of them sitting together in conference, and they unanimously are of the opinion that the provision now offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee will not only not retard production but that it is infinitely better than any percentage provision we might write into the bill or any restriction which would result in fear on the part of contractors that they could not afford to enter into contracts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I find that executive officials are always willing to have complete and arbitrary power given to them. They feel that they will always be so just that they will satisfy the contractors.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator said the departments did not want this.

Mr. TAFT. That is what he told me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whom the Senator means by "he."

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say that they all agreed they would rather not have anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator and I agree to that; but we have to have something.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the logical way to go about not having a thing is not to put anything about it in the bill. That is the way to obtain the result the Senator from Kentucky wants, and what the Senator from Tennessee wants, to strike out the House provision, and stand by our guns. Then we will not get anything. That is the only way I know of that will result in our not getting anything, which is the result we all desire.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the conference report came back it would have something in it which we would have to vote up or down, without any chance of changing it in any respect.

Mr. TAFT. Not if our conferees stand by our position in the matter, as presumably they will.

Mr. President, no man can get a contract with the Government, under this amendment, and have the faintest idea what money he is going to obtain. He will be entirely at the mercy of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. As I have said, they think they are going to be so fair that they are going to satisfy the contractors. They will not, because the contractors know that, before this, officials with arbitrary power have exercised that power in an arbitrary way.

Is all of subsection (f) out of the bill, I ask the Senator from Tennessee? If so, there is no provision for making any rules in advance at all, and the bill leaves the whole matter in the arbitrary and individual discretion of the Secretaries, without any rule whatever to determine, in the case of each contract, whether a particular contractor has or has not obtained an excessive profit.

Mr. President, it seems to me clear that the proper way to limit profits is to limit them by an excess-profits tax. I quite agree that we should plug up holes in the excess-profits tax; we should give the Secretary of the Treasury the power to disallow excessive salaries, to disallow bonuses, to disallow excessive reserves, to disallow even excessive advertising costs; we should give him power to eliminate various ways in which money can be spent. But the proper way to deal with the matter finally is to say, "You can earn whatever profit you can, and we will impose an excess-profits tax and take every cent over and above the amount subject to the normal tax." I think it should possibly be 90 percent instead of 100 percent. The exact percentage must be determined at the time the tax bill is drawn, but it seems to me that that is the way to deal with the profits question. To try to divide it up between individual contracts is unsound, and, in my opinion, would seriously hamper the whole process of making contracts with the United States Government.

I believe the Senate should refuse to suspend the rule in order to insert in the pending bill a general legislative provision covering the entire field of profits on contracts with the United States Government.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the majority leader. I was very much interested in his statement—and I do not know that I caught it clearly—as to the result of his personal conference this morning with the officials of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should have included Mr. Donald Nelson, who was not

able to be at the conference, but who has talked with me since over the telephone. The Committee on Appropriations, when it had the pending bill before it, had called these gentlemen into conference and had heard their testimony, and they had cooperated in trying to work out an amendment on the basis of the fact that they had to deal with the subject, inasmuch as it was in the House bill.

What was worked out in the committee originally, I think, was known as the Overton-O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was.

Mr. BARKLEY. With one or two slight modifications, and that is substantially what is left in the amendment. That was agreeable to the various departments, including the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the W. P. B.

In view of the fact that the committee had reported not only that amendment but had reported the sliding scale contained in subsection (f), all these departments were disturbed lest, if the amendment were adopted or if a similar provision should be adopted, it would retard the program and the making of contracts. Therefore this conference was held—at their request, I will say, but I gladly arranged it, of course. These gentlemen were all represented. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], in charge of the pending bill, were also present.

Inquiry was made as to what would be the effect or what would be the attitude of these gentlemen toward the matter if subsection (f), providing the sliding scale, were eliminated and the rest of the amendment were offered. It was the unanimous agreement that that would be much better than attempting in the bill now in the Senate to fix a sliding scale, or any scale.

I may say also that those gentlemen agreed generally with the feeling some of us have, that the whole subject should not have been dealt with in an appropriation bill, especially an urgent appropriation bill, making appropriations for defense activities; but, inasmuch as it is in the bill, no matter what we do here it will still be in the bill, unless the conferees should strike it all out, and they agreed that the wiser course to pursue would be to act on the amendment now pending, and the unanimous judgment is that the amendment as now offered is in the best form possible, in view of the fact that we have to deal with the subject at all.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to ask a further question: Is it the considered and unanimous opinion of those attending the conference that this amendment as now drawn will not retard war production?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would say that there is a lingering fear in the mind of one or two that it may retard, but it is the unanimous view that it will retard less than any suggestion which has been offered, less than the House provision, and less than the amendment as it was originally proposed by the committee.

Mr. BROOKS. I think that is the main question for us all to keep in mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I may say that since the conference was held—and it adjourned only in time for us to come to the floor—Mr. Nelson, head of the W. P. B., has called me over the telephone to confirm the judgment that the Navy Department, the War Department, the Maritime Commission all agree with respect to the wisdom of pursuing this course and express a desire that, in the interest of framing a workable provision which would not hinder contracts or retard the program, we agree to this suggestion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Let me ask one more question before I yield. Is it the thought of these gentlemen, and was it considered in the conference, that if the pending amendment were adopted, something even better might be worked out in conference?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely; I say that unreservedly.

Mr. TAFT. Was it not true, may I ask, that it was on the assurance of the Senator from Kentucky as to what the parliamentary situation was, and what could or could not be done in conference, and relying entirely on the judgment of the Senator from Kentucky as to the parliamentary procedure, that these gentlemen reached the rather extraordinary conclusion of supporting something to which they are opposed?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that question requires an answer, but if it does, the answer is "No." I do not think anyone, even the best parliamentarians here—and I do not claim to be one of them—can ever give any assurance of what a conference committee can or may do. We all know that when all the language after the enacting clause of a bill is stricken out and new language inserted, with only minor changes in the bill, the conferees have wider authority than if the bill is amended section by section. But in view of the fact that the House adopted a rigid 6 percent provision in the bill it passed, and in view of the fact that we are setting up a rule, if the amendment shall be adopted, to provide for the renegotiation and readjustment of contracts by the heads of the various departments, the conferees would certainly have wider discretion than they would have if we inserted a provision for a sliding scale of from 2 to 10 percent or any other percentage, or the Senator's amendment, which was more or less cursorially discussed.

Mr. TAFT. Except in one respect, that they would not have power to reject it, which we all agree should be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; they would not have authority to reject the whole matter and throw it out the door. We agree to that.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me address a question to the Senator from Tennessee having the bill in charge. Is it the purpose and the Senator's thought to have the men representing these departments appear before the conferees for the general purpose of working out the best possible arrangement?

Mr. McKELLAR. All the members of the subcommittee will be conferees on the part of the Senate, if the Presiding Officer follows my request, and I invited all the department representatives to appear before the conference committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, in the conference this morning, to which I have already referred and which the Senator from Tennessee attended, he assured the representatives of the various departments not only that they would be heard before the conferees but he insisted that they come and cooperate with the conference committee in working out the best possible provision.

Mr. BROOKS. So far as I am concerned, I think that clarifies the situation greatly. There is one thing which I think we must keep in mind, namely, that we are now dealing with an appropriation bill which will provide the implements of war for the men whom this Government has arbitrarily taken from their homes and, under orders, sent from two to eight thousand miles from this country to fight our battles. What I want to be sure of in everything I vote for is that the first consideration shall be the maximum and the speediest production of those implements, so they may get to the men in the field.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that is the purpose of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS. With the understanding we now have I believe this amendment is acceptable to those who participated in the discussion. It was not acceptable in the original form before the committee. But if this is acceptable with the idea that the department officials heretofore referred to will be called before the conferees, and the conferees have the same purpose animating the majority of the Senate, namely, to expedite production of war materials, then I think we are carrying out that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the subcommittee which heard this matter discussed in detail, but I am not satisfied to vote without saying a brief word about the situation. I think we are all agreed that there are two objectives in mind. First, we want to give every possible encouragement to the largest possible output of the factories of this country of ours in the war effort. Second, I think we want to be assured, so far as we can be by legislative action, that there shall be no unconscionable profit made by those who are engaged in this war effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has splendidly stated the objectives.

Mr. WHITE. With those objectives we are all in complete agreement. The way to the attainment of those ends is not always clear. I find that I cannot cast a vote which entirely satisfies me. I do not like to deal with the question of profit in an appropriation bill. I think it would be infinitely sounder procedure to proceed as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has suggested, and to reach these profits by an excess-profits tax by a bill reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate, and considered on its merits as a tax proposal designed to bring into the Treasury of the United States any amount over a legitimate and proper

profit; but Mr. President, that is not the situation which confronts us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Action on this proposal will not interfere in the slightest degree with the passage of an excess-profits measure. I wish to say to the Senator that I am not only 100 percent for such an act, but I have been talking to my distinguished friend who sits beside me, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for months about getting such a measure before the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to say that I am confronted by a fact rather than by a theory. I am reminded of a story I heard my grandfather tell many times. He said he once had a discussion with Louis Agassiz, the great naturalist of Harvard College, as to the size of trout found in the waters of the Rangeley Lakes, Maine, and that Agassiz contended that the eastern brook trout never grew to more than 3 pounds in weight.

My grandfather at one time thereafter sent Louis Agassiz a brook trout weighing 7 pounds. Agassiz acknowledged its receipt in these words:

> The theory of a lifetime kicked to death by a stubborn fact.

That is what I am confronted with here—a stubborn fact. I do not like the House provision with respect to the question of profits. I am reluctant to see the bill go to conference with only that amendment in conference, for I fear the consequence may be, because of the parliamentary situation, substantially what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has suggested.

The amendment which the committee has presented, and which I assume will be agreed to, is in a form I do not like. I think it is rather loose in its phraseology. I do not know who I am criticizing, but I offer the criticism. I think it is indefinite in its terms, and I think it is conferring much arbitrary power upon the executive arm of the Government; but I feel safer to have the bill go to conference with the pending Senate amendment in it than to have the legislation go to conference with only the House provision in it.

Mr. President, notwithstanding my aversion to legislation on appropriation bills, in this instance I shall vote to suspend the rule so that this provision may be considered by the Senate. While I do not like it in its present terms, I have high hope that the subcommittee serving as members of the conference committee will work out a provision without the infirmities of this draft, which will do substantial justice as between the Government of the United States and the people of the United States and those who may hold contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order that he may offer his amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Doxey	Murray
Andrews	George	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Herring	Reed
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bulow	Kilgore	Taft
Bunker	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	White
Davis	Mead	Wiley
Downey	Millikin	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair kindly state the question now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering the amendment of the committee to the appropriation bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. OVERTON (when Mr. ELLENDER's name was called). The junior Senator from Louisiana is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). The senior Senator from Wisconsin is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. NORRIS' name was called). The senior Senator from Nebraska is absent because of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DANAHER (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). The junior Senator from New Hampshire is absent on important public business. Were he here, he would note "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] is absent on official business. Were he present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily detained from the Senate today. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is necessarily detained from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting they would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES and Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] are unavoidably absent. I am not advised how these Senators would vote.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is holding hearings in the West on Indian matters. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—51

Andrews	George	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Herring	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bulow	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Doxey	Murray	Willis

NAYS—10

Aiken	Davis	Shipstead
Ball	Gurney	Taft
Brown	Lucas	
Danaher	Reed	

NOT VOTING—35

Barbour	Hatch	Rosier
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Spencer
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Lee	Tobey
Chavez	Lodge	Tunnell
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Ellender	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Norris	Walsh
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Glass	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI is agreed to, and the amendment is in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now offer the modified amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I make the point of order that the clerk is not reading the amendment as it is now before the Senate. The rule has just been suspended in order to enable the Senate to consider a definite, specific amendment; and that amendment is not being read to the Senate. When the amendment shall have been read, the Senate may do as it pleases with the amendment; but first the amendment must be read to the Senate in full. The whole amendment, as ordered by the committee, is now before the Senate for such consideration and such action as the Senate may see fit to take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment should be read as set forth in the notice.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 403. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "Department" means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term "Secretary" means the Chairman of such Commission, and the terms "renegotiate" and "renegotiation" include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section, the term "contract" includes a subcontract and the term "contractor" includes a subcontractor.

(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor. Such contractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. No suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts hereafter made and to all contracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided (in the case of contracts heretofore made) that final payment pursuant to such contract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any other costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any other excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable.

(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount of $500,000 or more, statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail, as such Secretary may require. Such statements shall be made under oath, except for such interim reports as may be required by the Secretary. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor.

(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of each department, separately or jointly with the Secretary of one or both of the other departments, shall prescribe regulations which will, to the fullest extent practicable, indicate in advance the profits on contracts which will be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section. In prescribing such regulations, there shall be taken into consideration the amount and character of the personal services, equipment, material, and working capital, and the length of time likely to be required for performing various contracts and such other factors as are deemed appropriate by the Secretary or Secretaries prescribing such regulations. In any event, any profits on any contract in excess of the amount set out in the following schedule of maximum profit rates shall be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section unless the Secretary of the department concerned makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of such contract. A report of any such determination shall be made to the Congress within 30 days from the date thereof.

SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM PROFIT RATES

Ten percent of so much of the contract price as does not exceed $100,000; plus

Eight percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $100,000 but does not exceed $500,000; plus

Six percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $500,000 but does not exceed $1,000,000; plus

Five percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $1,000,000 but does not exceed $5,000,000; plus

Four percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $5,000,000 but does not exceed $20,000,000; plus

Three percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $20,000,000 but does not exceed $50,000,000; plus

Two percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $50,000,000.

In the case of a contract entered into on a cost-plus basis, the costs of performing the contract shall be included in determining the contract price for the purposes of this subsection. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that the Secretary of any Department may not deem profits equal to or less than the amount set out in the foregoing schedule to be excessive profits for the purposes of this section.

(g) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

(h) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to perfect the amendment by striking out subsection (f), beginning in line 13, on page 5, and ending at the end of line 5, on page 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think perhaps a brief statement should be made before the vote is taken on this motion.

The other body inserted section 402A. That was a criticism of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission because, had there been no complaint about excess profits, there would have been no occasion for such a section in the House bill. So the House action in placing in the bill a 6-percent limitation upon profits in defense contracts is a criticism of the three departments charged with making these contracts.

The departments do not like to be criticized. The departments did not want this section in the bill in the first place. They wan. the section stricken out. Now the Senate has stricken out section 402A, and the question arises whether the Senate will place in the bill something to take the place of the section stricken out by the Senate.

Mr. President, when this matter came before the Subcommittee on Appropriations it occasioned a few days' discussion. The departments wanted nothing placed in the bill instead of the House provision; the departments wanted the Senate to strike this provision out and place nothing in its stead.

It was testified before the committee that they wanted nothing done; it was testified before the committee that mistakes have been made; it was admitted before the committee that excessive profits have been made, were being made, and would continue to be made, upon contracts already in existence. On one contract, of between forty and fifty million dollars, it was admitted that a profit of about $15,000,000 was due under the contract. It was stated before the committee that the departments preferred to set up their own organization to reaudit these contracts and scale them down. They preferred such a system than to have the Congress adopt a proposal for adjustment according to some schedule.

That did not suit me. I was opposed to 6 percent. That is too low on small contracts and entirely too high on the larger contracts. On a hundred-dollar contract a 6-percent profit would be $6; on a thousand-dollar contract a 6-percent profit would be $60; on a $10,000 contract a 6-percent profit would be $600. Contractors in the smaller brackets cannot afford to come here and submit bids for a contract and go through the process of making a contract and all the red tape that is necessary on a 6-percent-profit basis. In the larger brackets, however, 6 percent, in my opinion, is entirely too high. On a hundred-million-dollar contract 6-percent profit would be $6,000,000; on a $500,000,000 contract a 6-percent profit would be $30,000,000.

Mr. President, because 6 percent is too small in the lower brackets, in my opinion, and because 6 percent is too high in the larger brackets, I felt impelled to submit to the committee a sliding scale commencing at $100,000 and on such a contract providing for a larger fee than 6 percent. So I suggested to the committee that on a contract up to $100,000 there be fixed a maximum fee of 10 percent, which would be $10,000. A profit of $10,000 would not necessarily have to be allowed; that would be the maximum amount which could be allowed on a contract of that size.

On a $1,000 000 contract the maximum fee that could be allowed under the schedule would be $72,000.

On a hundred-million-dollar contract the maximum fee to be allowed under this provision would be $1,772,000.

Then, when it comes to the larger contracts, the profit is scaled down to approximately 2 percent. On the larger contracts the maximum fee is 2.1 percent, and on the smaller contracts it runs up as high as 10 percent.

In the committee the vote stood 8 for the schedule and 8 against the schedule. This schedule was in the amendment that was presented to the committee; it took a majority vote to get it out; and the vote being a tie, the motion did not prevail. So the amendment was reported to the Senate in the form the subcommittee agreed upon, a sliding scale ranging from 10 percent on the small contracts down to 2.1 percent on the very large contracts.

Mr. President, I realize that this entire question must go to conference. After the amendment was printed I had a conference with the representatives of the War Department, and, as I recall, for the War Production Board. The attorneys suggested some amendments which appealed to me, and I promised to offer the amendments submitted by them to subsection (f).

So I propose to offer an amendment to subsection (f) before the vote shall come on the motion to strike it out, for we have the right to perfect an amendment proposed to be stricken out.

On page 6, in line 22 of the amendment, after the figures "$50,000,000", I desire to offer an amendment, which I will ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. McKELLAR, on page 6, at the end of line 22, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: *"Provided,* That in the renegotiation of two or more contracts with any person, firm, association, or corporation the secretaries of the respective departments, as herein defined, shall have authority to consolidate such contracts with respect to profits to the end that such consolidated contract may come within the provisions of said schedule of maximum profit rates: *Provided further,* That the determination of costs and profits allowed by the secretaries of the respective departments shall be final: *And provided further,* That insofar as it is practicable, the determination of profits shall be made for the fiscal year of the contractor."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there are two provisions in that amendment which is submitted at the request of the attorneys for the consolidated departments. The first is this: The Government has numerous contracts with various large concerns, for example, the General Electric Co. The Government may have with them a thousand contracts for various items which they produce. So with Chrysler, with Ford, with General Motors, and other corporations the Government may have a great number of contracts. On some of these contracts the percentage of profit might be nil, on others the percentage might be very small, while on others it might be considerably larger. So the attorneys think that, in a perfecting amendment affecting profits, they should be allowed to consolidate all their contracts during a fiscal year, figure the profit on the whole group of contracts during the fiscal year, and then adjust such profits within the sliding scale if such is adopted. I thought that such proposal was reasonable, and I agreed to offer the amendment.

The second proposal is that some of the large concerns do not have their fiscal year run concurrently with the Government's fiscal year. The Government fiscal year begins on the first day of July and ends on the 30th day of June; but some of the large corporations have their fiscal year begin on another date, and, of course, end at another time. So, inasmuch as their books are set up to keep track of their business according to their fiscal year as determined by themselves, the attorneys for the Government suggested that the Government, in adjudicating these contracts, should take their books on the fiscal year as determined by the contractors themselves. That would simplify the matter and make it easy for both sides to come to some determination.

Not knowing whether or not subsection (f) is to be stricken, I do suggest, for the consideration of the Senate, that the amendment should be adopted, then the motion will come later on whether or not we should strike out the entire subsection as amended. I submit that amendment first.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I recall what occurred on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the subcommittee, indicated earlier in the day that it was his intention to submit his motion for suspension of the rule, and then to submit a modified amendment, the modification being the elimination from the amendment of subsection (f). After the rule was suspended the

Senator from Tennessee made his motion. From a parliamentary view, as I understand, he was not authorized to offer the modified amendment, inasmuch as the notice to suspend was given with respect to a particular amendment which included subsection (f).

The vote upon the suspension of the rule, however, was taken with the understanding on the part of a great many Senators that the whole question of perfecting the amendment should be delegated to the conference. It was announced by the Senator from Tennessee that he would ask for the appointment of all the members of the subcommittee as conferees. It was announced that at a conference this morning the majority leader gave the representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, to understand that they would be invited to appear before the conference committee. That being the case, when the vote upon the motion to suspend the rule was taken, the members of the Senate were of the opinion that the amendment would not be perfected upon the floor, that no attempt would be made to perfect it upon the floor, that subsection (f) would be eliminated, and that the whole matter would thereby be transferred to the conference committee.

My parliamentary inquiry is whether it is now within the rules to move to reconsider the vote whereby the rule was suspended, and if so, when such a motion may be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, it is my purpose to carry out the plan which was submitted this morning, first in the way of a unanimous-consent request, and then by way of a motion, to move at this time to strike out subsection (f) of the amendment, and let the Senate vote on that. I think there will be no necessity whatsoever for a motion to reconsider. So, if I am in order, if the Senator will yield to me for that purpose, I move to strike out subsection (f).

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My inquiry was made because the Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment intended to perfect the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. He merely wanted to perfect it, and I see no reason why the Senate could not give him permission to perfect the amendment by the addition of the matter he presented to the Senate, and then vote on my motion to strike it out. I think the whole parliamentary difficulty could be settled in that way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may have an answer to my query, I will say to the Senator that my purpose in presenting the query is to have it clearly understood that in the event we are going to spend much time now in attempting to perfect the amendment, I may feel obligated to make a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the rule was suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that any Senator voting in the affirmative, or any Senator who did not vote at all, may offer a motion to reconsider the vote by which the rule was suspended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At any time during this day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At any time during this calendar day, or within the next 2 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it will be necessary to move to reconsider.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. A two-thirds vote is required to suspend a rule. What vote would be required to reconsider the vote by which the rule was suspended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A majority vote would be required to reconsider.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that he ask leave to perfect the amendment known as subsection (f) and let that be done. I see no reason why it should not be done. Then I can move, as I shall, to strike out the entire subsection (f) as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, no issue is raised about the parliamentary situation. We all knew, or should have known, that the amendment as offered by the committee would be presented if the rule was suspended, that no one Senator had a right to modify that amendment prior to its being presented to the Senate. After it was presented to the Senate, no one Senator has a right to modify it. Whatever is done must be done by the Senate itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood that perfectly, and that is what I was trying to do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In order to amend the amendment offered by the committee, affirmative action by the Senate is required. I submitted my perfecting amendment at the request of the attorneys, and there were some others present. Having given the Senate the reason for the amendment—and it occurred to me that the amendment was not only germane, but entirely sound—I agreed to offer the amendment in the Senate at the proper time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the amendment just offered to subsection (f) would contemplate permitting the secretaries of the respective departments to take into consideration all the contracts which one individual had undertaken during a period of time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. One individual, one firm, one association, or one corporation.

Mr. McCARRAN. So that if a loss had been sustained in one or more contracts, the loss might be considered in computing the profits?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is exactly the idea, and in the renegotiation of the contract of the concern, company, or whatever it may be, the officials could take into consideration all contracts, and consolidate them for the purpose of adjusting the profits. That was the first proposal. The second was to take the fiscal year as determined by the contractor as the basis for such adjustment.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEE. What motion is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have moved to strike out subsection (f) from the amendment, and that is the question, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma offered a perfecting amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the adoption of a perfecting amendment now have any effect upon the nature of the action the Senate would have to take to reconsider the vote by which the amendment is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would hold that it would.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has moved to strike out subsection (f). The Chair has held that the Senator from Oklahoma can offer a perfecting amendment to that section before we finally vote on whether it shall be stricken. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that even if the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma should be agreed to, the Senate could then vote on the original motion of the Senator from Tennessee to strike out subsection (f) as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will recur on the question to strike out.

The question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the motion now is pending to strike out subsection (f), which would mean to strike out the subsection as amended. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that subsection (f) as amended be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the subsection as amended was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of each Department, separately or jointly with the Secretary of one or

both of the other Departments, shall prescribe regulations which will, to the fullest extent practicable, indicate in advance the profits on contracts which will be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section. In prescribing such regulations, there shall be taken into consideration the amount and character of the personal services, equipment, material, and working capital, and the length of time likely to be required for performing various contracts and such other factors as are deemed appropriate by the Secretary or Secretaries prescribing such regulations. In any event, any profits on any contract in excess of the amount set out in the following schedule of maximum profit rates shall be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section unless the Secretary of the Department concerned makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of such contract. A report of any such determination shall be made to the Congress within 30 days from the date thereof.

SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM PROFIT RATES

Ten percent of so much of the contract price as does not exceed $100,000; plus

Eight percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $100,000 but does not exceed $500,000; plus

Six percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $500,000 but does not exceed $1,000,000; plus

Five percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $1,000,000 but does not exceed $5,000,000; plus

Four percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $5,000,000 but does not exceed $20,000,000; plus

Three percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $20,000,000 but does not exceed $50,000,000; plus

Two percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $50,000,000:

Provided, That in the renegotiation of two or more contracts with any person, firm, association, or corporation, the Secretaries of the respective Departments, as herein defined, shall have authority to consolidate such contracts with respect to profits to the end that such consolidated contract may come within the provisions of said Schedule of Maximum Profit Rates: *Provided further*, That the determination of costs and profits allowed by the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall be final: *And provided further*, That insofar as is practicable the determination of profits shall be made for the fiscal year of the contractor.

In the case of a contract entered into on a cost-plus basis, the costs of performing the contract shall be included in determining the contract price for the purposes of this subsection. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that the Secretary of any Department may not deem profits equal to or less than the amount set out in the foregoing schedule to be excessive profits for the purposes of this section.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us have a vote.

Mr. LEE obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid I did not understand the respect in which the senior Senator from Oklahoma altered subsection (f) as it appeared in the McKellar amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I merely added two perfecting amendments. One provided that in the renegotiation of contracts, whether the contractor were a person, a firm, an association, or a corporation, the Government and the contractor could take into consideration all contracts the contractor had and renegotiate and consider all the contracts. On some contracts there may be losses and on some there may be excess profits, but they could consider the whole group as one in the adjustment of the profits. That was the first proposal. The second proposal was to permit of the adjusting of the contract or contracts on the basis of the contractor's fiscal year, which may be on different dates from the Government's fiscal year. That is in the interest of bookkeeping and efficiency in the adjustment of contracts.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma does not undertake to fix profits. The Senator's amendment simply fixes the ceilings, and the profits cannot go beyond these ceilings. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the amendment the schedule is a maximum schedule beyond which they cannot go save in one particular case. If for some good cause it could be shown that the maximum is not high enough, especially on a very small contract, for illustration, then the Secretary having the responsibility of adjusting the contract can make a statement and give some reason which is good to him, and then he can give the contractor a larger percentage than the schedule provides.

Mr. HILL. By taking into consideration other contracts, or on the one particular contract in question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the amendment, if a concern has only one contract, then only the one contract is taken into consideration. If the concern has ten or twenty or a thousand, as some have, the whole group of contracts is taken into consideration.

Mr. HILL. This is the thought I had in mind. We hear much about ceilings on rents, ceilings on wages, and ceilings on prices and on practically everything. What the Senator's amendment basically does is to put a ceiling on profits.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the senior Senator from Oklahoma a question. As I understand the amendment he has offered to subsection (f), and which has been agreed to, if any concern had three contracts which it had entered into separately with any department, and on two of those contracts there was no profit at all but a loss, then the appropriate department could take all three of the contracts and renegotiate them so as to provide a profit somewhere between 2 and 10 percent on the three contracts, whereas, if each one separately was considered on its own basis, two of them might sustain a loss and one of them might sustain a profit. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, under the amendment as it now stands, although a concern had three contracts separately with a department, and they were negotiated as a group and renegotiated as a group, and there was a loss in two cases and a profit in another, the department could so readjust the contracts as to provide a profit on all three, notwithstanding that separately there would have been a loss?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The allowance of the maximum ceiling on the one might save the contractor from loss on the three.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; between the 2 and the 10 percent. The department under the amendment as it now stands could revive the profit situation in two contracts in which there was a loss, and provide somewhere between the minimum and maximum profit on all three.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For good reasons, with a certificate, I understand the department handling the contracts could make such an adjustment.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the result would be that in many cases it might result in an excess profit on one contract where there was a profit in order to make up for losses on the other two.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, has the Senator from Tennessee made his motion to strike out subsection (f), as amended?

Mr. McKELLAR. The motion has already been made.

Mr. LEE. That motion is pending?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LEE. So I understood.

Mr. President, it has been said that one cannot pay for patriotism. That is true, but we should do everything we can to keep from penalizing patriotism as much as possible. When a soldier is drafted he quits whatever job he is working at, and whatever salary he is drawing, and takes an economic loss in order to serve his country. In the World War the average period of service of a soldier was 16 months. Assuming that the soldier was drawing a daily wage of $7 a day, when he quit that wage and went to work for a dollar a day he took an economic loss in the average period of service of over $2,000. Those are simply cold figures. We penalized him over $2,000 for the privilege of being patriotic. We did not intend to do it, but it was the result of circumstances which surrounded that war. We placed a penalty on his patriotism of over $2,000 even if he were working at day wages. In addition to that there are those many other soldiers who left better jobs than $7 a day and they took a greater economic loss.

War is a community effort. When we are engaged in war we as a Nation are not creating wealth; we are destroying wealth. Every time one of our big guns explodes thousands of dollars goes up in smoke. Only when a nation is engaged in peacetime pursuits are we creating wealth. Therefore, only when we are creating wealth should we rely upon the profit incentive as a motive to cause men to act. In connection with the pending measure we are still clinging to the profit incentive in order to get a production of arms. I shall oppose the motion to strike subsection (f) which places a ceiling on profits, although I do not believe

we should provide for any profit at all. The reason I shall oppose the motion to strike that provision is that I hope when the tax bill comes along we can place such a stiff tax on profits that we can recover all of them.

Mr. President, if any man comes out of the war with 1-percent profit then someone else has paid double. We are not making profits. We are not creating wealth. We are destroying wealth. Therefore, allowing any profit at all is allowing some men to profit while others are paying double. If every individual in the United States does not come out of this war worth less than he had when he went into it, then other individuals somewhere are bearing more than their fair share of war.

Mr. President, I served in the World War as a buck private, an assistant buck private in the rear ranks. I know what it cost me economically to serve. I am proud I served. I was proud then. I would be ashamed if I had not served. I think that is the general spirit of all the soldiers today. But when we try to get manufacturers to manufacture arms by holding up in front of them the incentive of profit, then we are placing them under one incentive while we are placing the soldier under another. The soldier is under a mandatory order. Furthermore, we depend upon patriotism to motivate the soldier. We depend upon law to raise an army. But in this measure we are clinging to the profit incentive to get manufacturers to produce arms.

Mr. President, 2-percent profit sounds like but a little profit, but when we are figuring the cost we are figuring the depreciation, breakage, rental, payment of services for management; we are figuring everything that goes into the cost of manufacturing goods. Then why should we provide for any profit at all?

I realize that it has been argued that we should not attach this provision to the appropriation bill because any profit ceiling is unworkable. I do not think so. I recognize that it is difficult, but I do not believe it is unworkable. In such an amendment as the pending one we provide a blueprint of our policy, and within the scope of the amendment I believe that the men charged with executing this law can work it out, and we do have something here which will limit the ceiling on profits.

Mr. President, when I returned from France after the other war I was very much shocked and surprised to learn that some people in this country had been making money while we were serving in France. The people of this country were very much shocked at what was found by an investigating committee appointed by the Senate, which did a very fine piece of work in uncovering the unconscionable profits which were made out of that war. I believe that the chairman of that committee stated that altogether 23,000 millionaires had been made out of a war which cost the average person of this country blood and money. That, Mr. President, is not right. If I interpret the feelings of the people correctly, the moral revulsion which swept over America was not so much one of pacifism as it was a determination that never again should some persons profit while others sacrificed.

Mr. President, we are now facing the same situation which a Congress faced some 25 years ago. We are at the beginning of what looks like a long and bloody war. Yet we are told that we should not place any profit ceiling on an appropriation bill.

When the men got out of the service in the last war following the armistice they organized into different ex-service organizations—the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, the American Legion, and other ex-service organizations and their auxiliaries. There was one thing on which every ex-service man agreed, and tl at was that if we should have another war Congress should enact a universal service law. For awhile we called it a "universal draft" law.

That meant that everything which was necessary to prosecute a war should be placed on the same basis. If we draft men we should draft money. If we draft men we should draft materials. If we draft men we should draft factories. If we draft men we should draft resources. Everything should be on the same basis. Every person should be subject to the same mandate of service. Every dollar and every dime of resources should be subject to the use of the Government in prosecuting the war. Every natural resource and every wheel of machinery should be subject to draft in case of war.

That is the program of the men who fought the last war. If we had such a program today we should not be divided among ourselves on whether one person is carrying a greater burden than another. We should not be divided on the question of labor. We should not be divided on the question of profits. There would be no profits.

Mr. President, the only fair program is to draft everything we need. We need money, men, and materials; and they all ought to be subject to the power of the Government in prosecuting the war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have listened with much interest and appreciation to all the able Senator from Oklahoma has said. My ideas are in a large sense thoroughly in accord with his. I am unable to understand why we draft men for the Army—and have but recently agreed to pay them $42 a month, not to die, but to serve—and at the same time we permit certain persons in this country to earn millions in profits from the war.

I have been somewhat disturbed recently in regard to the action of labor. I have always been known as a friend of labor. I have always been labor's friend. I am now; but at the same time I am rather disturbed when I observe, through the columns of the press from day to day, that there is a strike here and a strike there. On the other hand, for some reason I cannot greatly blame the employees, particularly when I observe, by way of the committee hearings and through the columns of the press, that manufacturers of implements of death are becoming millionaires overnight. One company I recently read about became so conscience-stricken that it actually turned back to the Government voluntarily profits of millions of dollars which it had made, about which the Government knew nothing.

I want an opportunity to restrict labor when it is necessary for the advancement of our offensive program. I want an opportunity to limit the profits of the millionaires who are being bred overnight, and are springing up everywhere like mushrooms in the desert.

The Senator has just said that he intends to vote with the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on his motion to strike——

Mr. LEE. No.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Did I misunderstand the Senator?

Mr. LEE. I said that I would oppose the motion of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to strike from the bill the profit-limitation provision. I am supporting the subcommittee amendment to keep the profit limitation in the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I humbly beg the Senator's pardon. I was agreeing with all he said in regard to profits and service, but I could not understand, if the Senator believes in the limitation of profits, how that objective was to be reached by the elimination of this subsection. Let me make this statement to the Senator, because the probabilities are that I shall have nothing further to say about the whole matter until we vote on it: I want an opportunity to restrain labor when I feel it is necessary; and I want an opportunity to restrict capital when I feel it is necessary. However, I do not want to vote to restrict capital and profits unless I have an opportunity to vote to restrict labor when I feel it is necessary. I am seeking an opportunity to vote upon both those subjects at the same time. I do not want to find myself voting in one direction in relation to capital and then find that I shall not have an opportunity to vote in reference to labor.

In conclusion, I thank the Senator very much for having provided me with a portion of his time. I apologize again for having misconstrued his remarks. I was merely wondering how I could aid in the restriction of labor by striking out this subsection.

Mr. LEE. I think I did say that I shall support the committee amendment, but I did not have in mind the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thought the able Senator had in mind supporting the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, which amendment is to strike out subsection (f).

Mr. LEE. My only quarrel with section (f) is that it allows any profits at all. All costs would be taken care of, including salaries of management, rental of buildings, breakage, and depreciation. I see no reason why there should be any profits at all, since the men who are serving in the ranks—at least those who are below the ranks of commissioned officers—are serving for less than they could obtain if they were not in the Army. So

they are not even guaranteed their normal income. They are serving at less than normal income.

My argument is that there should be no profits, because we are not creating wealth. We are destroying wealth, and what this Congress should be considering is how we can distribute the loss equally. I feel that the subcommittee amendment is a step in that direction and gives a working chart for the administrators who are charged with the business of prosecuting the war. Further, I hope that when the tax bill comes before us we can recover through it any profits which may slide through under such other legislation as we may enact.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. From what I understand, I believe that the majority of the Members of Congress are in favor of restricting capital and preventing the accumulation of huge fortunes as the result of the war. How are we to bring about any restriction at all if we eliminate subsection (f), as advocated by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LEE. I think the proposal in the subcommittee amendment would be a better way of doing it than the suggestion which I saw in the newspapers by one of the administrators, which did not have any teeth in it. The subcommittee has carefully worked out this provision, and I believe, to the extent it goes, it would be effective. That is why I want to see it retained in the bill.

Some argue that we should now let the matter of profits go entirely and deal with them under the tax bill, but I do not agree with that view. I think we ought to adopt every possible method to prevent profits and tax them, too. Our situation is similar to that of the man who received a telegram saying: "Your mother-in-law just died. What shall we do with the body?"

He wired back: "Embalm, cremate, and bury. Take no chances." [Laughter.]

That is my policy with respect to prohibiting profits in this war. I intend to utilize every possible opportunity to prevent any profits coming out of the war. I cannot repeat often enough that if anybody makes even 1-percent profit out of the war somebody else pays double.

Mr. President, this is only a mild beginning. We have made some progress against profits. When we prohibited the further issuance of tax-exempt bonds by the Federal Government, I think we went a long way toward taking the profits out of financing war, because now we can reach any profits that result from the purchase of war bonds, whereas in the other war we could not do so, for the reason that so many of them were tax-exempt.

This step in this bill is the mildest, I think, that we can take; and it is my hope that as we pass other measures we shall pass still more restrictive legislation against profits. If we had a plan whereby every manufacturer would be put on the same basis—that is, that the Government would simply guarantee costs and appeal to his patriotism—I believe, if all were put on the same plan and on the same basis, the big majority of them would cooperate. Those who refuse should be compelled to cooperate. That is why I take advantage of this opportunity to speak once more for the ex-service men's program—that is, a universal draft, a universal service act. We shall never solve the problem that confronts us in this war or in any other war until we put everything in the Nation on the same basis, until we decide that war is a community effort, that no one shall profit, that everyone shall serve, and that the burden of war shall be equally distributed. Even after we have done that, and we have paid and paid and paid in this country, even then when our soldiers come back from the front, as they will come back, showing the scars of battle, showing what they paid for war, we shall realize that we were not able to contribute as much as the soldiers in this war to make the world safe against slavery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to strike out subsection (f), as amended.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Austin	Guffey	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Herring	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brown	Kilgore	Stewart
Bulow	Langer	Taft
Bunker	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	White
Davis	Mead	Wiley
Downey	Millikin	Willis
Doxey	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have moved to strike out subsection (f) in accordance with an understanding that I thought we had earlier in the day when I asked unanimous consent to do the same thing, which was objected to by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Of course, it was in furtherance of that agreement that I made the motion to strike out subsection (f). I think subsection (f) by all means should be stricken out, because we voted to suspend the rule on the assumption that we would take the amended amendment of the committee to conference; and if we should take it to conference, that would take in everything. It would take in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]; it would take in the substitute of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]; it would take in everything. As a matter of fact, the conference would be completely open; and I explained that the whole membership of the subcommittee was to be on the conference committee, which will still be done.

In order to carry out, as I thought, an understanding among us all that this course should be pursued, since every man will have his chance in the committee of conference, it seemed to me that this subsection ought to be stricken out; and I hope the Senate will strike it out.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I cannot agree with the assumption of the Senator that a vote in favor of the motion to suspend the rule amounted to any sort of unanimous-consent agreement as to what was to be done after the amendment came before the Senate for consideration. All that the motion to suspend the rule did was to say that in contravention of its ordinary practice, in contravention of the standing rule of the Senate, the Senate would consider, on an appropriation bill, general legislation of a certain character.

The Senator did state, while he was arguing in favor of the motion to suspend the rule, that it was his purpose to have appointed as conferees all the members of his subcommittee, comprising Senators with various trends of thought on this matter; but certainly there was no unanimous-consent agreement as to what was to go to the conferees, and no unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate should delegate to conferees its powers to write a new bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; just one moment. The Senator from Tennessee did not suggest any such thing as that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator did suggest that there was some sort of an agreement here.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Tennessee asked unanimous consent to carry out this program, saying that everything then would be sent to conference, and the only Senator who objected at the time was the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Only one Senator can object at a time.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I know that in theory only one Senator can object at a time, but frequently I have known a dozen to object. It may not be parliamentary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not in the least criticizing the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I hope not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But it seems to me it is an unfair argument to suggest that because Senators voted in favor of the motion to suspend the rule and open up this matter to debate they are precluded thereafter from going ahead and voting in general effect for the very amendment the Senator from Tennessee himself proposed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not think any Senator is precluded—not at all. Every Senator has a right to vote just as he pleases.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I voted for the motion to suspend the rule; and am

glad that I did so, and I would do so again; but I intend to vote against the Senator's motion to strike out subsection (f).

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to add to what the Senator from Tennessee has said a further observation on a point which I think the Senator from Missouri has overlooked. There are many Members of the Senate who would not have voted to suspend the rule if they had not understood that the amendment was to be modified, and that there was an agreement to that effect. When the motion to suspend the rule was still pending, and not acted upon, one-third of this body could have prevented the consideration of the amendment at all, and there were many Members of the Senate who were prepared to do whatever might be necessary to make certain that the rule was not suspended if they had not understood, as a result of the open discussion on the floor, that the Senator from Tennessee would move to strike out subsection (f) and that, that subsection having been stricken, the whole matter would be before the conferees.

Speaking for myself, I have no hesitation in saying that I would not have surrendered the position in which I was at that time, having an opportunity to resist the suspension of the rule, if I had had the remoted belief that there would have been any objection to striking subsection (f) from the bill. If it had been the intention to perfect this amendment upon the floor, that might have been expressed, and Members of the Senate would have been guided thereby; but many of us judged from what was said here and from what was not said that there would be no objection.

So, Mr. President, I know that I speak for a great many other Senators, several of whom came to me before the vote was taken upon the motion to suspend the rule, to ask whether such a vote might safely be cast, when I express the hope that the amendment now offered by the Senator from Tennessee, which carries out the understanding had by many Members of the Senate, will prevail.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In confirmation of what the Senator has just said, it might be appropriate to observe that, possibly, some Senators who are now present were not present during the discussion this morning on the motion to suspend the rule, wherein it was stated that it was the general belief of all those charged with the responsibility of production, including the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, that the elimination of subsection (f) and the adoption of the remainder of the amendment in drafting which they had in effect cooperated with members of the Appropriations Committee in the beginning, would very greatly facilitate their ability to make contracts and would dispel fears that might prevail that production would be retarded. They are perfectly sincere about that. There is no politics in it; they have no axes to grind; they are charged with a great responsibility; and they have to deal with it day by day across the table with contractors. I think they know their problem, and it was their unanimous judgment, which was conveyed to the Senate in the colloquy which occurred that, while originally, as many of us feel, it would have been better not to have brought this subject into an appropriation bill, inasmuch as it is in the bill, the wiser course would be to send the bill to conference with the provisions now left in the amendment free from the sliding-scale restrictions, which would make it necessary in conference to provide some more or less rigid percentage upon profits that might not be deemed wise in the absence of further information.

I know that many Senators, who would have, without that assurance, voted against the motion to suspend the rule, voted for it with that understanding. I do not mean to say that binds anybody at all in the Senate. The Senator from Oklahoma was correct when he stated that, from the parliamentary standpoint, the amendment had to be presented, as it was stated in the motion to suspend the rule. There is no doubt about that. The Senator from Missouri is correct in saying that whatever we did does not bind anybody as to how he may vote now on this motion; but the motion was agreed to in the light of the discussion which had taken place up to that time, in which there was not much controversy, as to the general feeling and the general judgment of those charged with the responsibility of production.

I therefore feel that the Senator's motion should be adopted. I know many Senators would not have voted to suspend the rule; I myself would not have done so, I will say frankly, if I had not felt that it was the wiser course to pursue, rather than to take chances simply on striking out the House provision and sending the bill to conference under such conditions as that the Senate conferees would be greatly handicapped in drafting a workable provision on the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Kentucky states the understanding as I believe it to be, and I shall add only an additional word. I think there is no doubt at all that every Member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is desirous of making certain that no unconscionable profits shall be made on any of these contracts. I know that no person is more desirous of taking the profits out of war than is the Senator from Wyoming. I have repeatedly, not only on the floor of the Senate but elsewhere, declared my belief that that ought to be done.

The point involved here, Mr. President, is simply that the conferees shall have as wide latitude as possible in working out this proposed legislation. It is perfectly obvious, from what has transpired already, that it is most difficult to legislate upon the floor. The Senator from Oklahoma only this morning offered an additional amendment to subsection (f), an amendment which would easily lend itself to protracted discussion. I made no effort to discuss the amendment, because I had the feeling that the whole matter would be taken care of in the conference committee, where it could be more efficiently handled.

If subsection (f) shall be stricken from the bill, the latitude of the conferees will be much greater than if it shall be allowed to remain in the bill, and it is merely for the purpose of preserving that latitude that I fell that subsection (f) should be stricken, because, when all is said and done, the business of the Army and the business of the Navy is not to journey over the country auditing books of contractors but to obtain production so that we may win this war.

The appropriation bill is before us, primarily, for the purpose of making it possible to secure an additional and much enlarged air fleet. We should not complicate that by prolonged discussion upon technical matters which the chairman of the Finance Committee feels might better be delegated to the Finance Committee in working out the tax bill and matters which other Senators feel might better be handled by the committee.

So, Mr. President, without taking up further time of the Senate, I again express my hope that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will prevail.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I doubt very much if there is any misunderstanding in the Senate. This matter was gone into over a period of several days, during which time members of the General Staff of the Army and others were present. General Somervell and Donald Nelson were requested to give to the committee their suggestions in the way of authority or a change from the House language with a percentage limitation. General Somervell returned with a suggested amendment, which amendment was approved by Mr. Donald Nelson by his letter which appears in the RECORD.

To the question propounded to him by a member of the committee, "Does this suggested amendment change existing conditions? Could you not now do all that is suggested by this amendment without the amendment?" General Somervell replied, "Yes"; and not once did he make that reply, but twice during the hearings. When we strike out subsection (f) from the suggested amendment we come right back to the language of the provisions which General Somervell stated were unnecessary because the same thing could be done now under existing law.

All that appears in subsection (f) was adopted by a vote of the whole Committee on Appropriations. That was tested out by a vote in the committee, in which, with subsection (f) out, we were asked to vote on the provision which would now go to conference if subsection (f) were eliminated. That was not agreed to. A vote was then taken on the whole amendment with subsection (f) in it, and, if I may use the expression, that was overwhelmingly agreed to.

What is the record since that time? Following the adoption of that amendment, which is the amendment which will go to conference now if subjection (f)

is left in, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized by the full committee to apply to this body to suspend the rule. That authorization was given to him as to the whole amendment, not as to a part of the amendment, because, I say with all due respect to him, that the amendment could not have been agreed to in the committee without subsection (f) in it. It was not so agreed to. But subsection (f), with the remainder of the language, was adopted, and the Senator from Tennessee was authorized to apply to this body for a suspension of the rule. There is no misunderstanding, no one here has been misled. The able Senator from Wyoming, as a member of the committee, knows that everything I am reciting is true.

Without any suggestion of a reflection whatever, I doubt whether the chairman of the subcommittee should make this motion to strike out a vital part of that which his committee authorized him to bring to this body as a whole. However, that is a matter for his discretion, and it is a matter for the committee.

When we leave out subsection (f), if we do leave it out, we strike from the amendment the vital part which the Committee on Appropriations overwhelmingly voted into the amendment, and without which the Senate would not have the amendment before it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Wyoming has made some reference to the fact that some Senators might not have voted for the motion to suspend the rule, in which he was also joined by the Senator from Kentucky, unless they had believed that the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to strike out subsection (f) would have prevailed. Does not the Senator know that there were many Senators on this floor, at least some Senators, who would not have voted for the motion to suspend the rule if they had believed that on a record vote the motion to strike out subsection (f) would have prevailed? I can say for myself that my only reason for voting for the motion to reconsider was that I thought we would have an opportunity to fight out this question of subsection (f) fairly in the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall refer to myself in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I voted against the amendment with subsection (f) out. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I voted for the amendment with subsection (f) in, and other Senators did likewise, without mentioning any names, because it is not necessary, in view of the fact that no record vote was taken.

It is not to be said here with any degree of seriousness that anyone has been misled. The whole thing is plain; the whole thing is clear. It seems to me that if the Senator now persists in his motion to strike subsection (f), after his committee has authorized him to bring it in before the Senate and to ask the Senate to vote upon it, that is his business; but the Senate should retain subsection (f) in the amendment. Otherwise, we go into conference with no suggestion of a limitation fixed by the Senate of the United States upon profits to be made out of contracts.

Mr. President, the whole country has been aroused by the news which has been published as to excessive profits. It has been testified before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate that the War Department itself has compelled contractors to deliver up some $80,000,000 which they have discovered up to date. If they can do that, they could certainly take the proposed provisions as a further armament and a further authority to bring back money which has been taken from the taxpayers of this country.

What is more, when there is talk about auditing the books, how is the Government to obtain stolen profits unless the books are audited? It is the duty of the War Department to see to it that no excess profits are authorized from the time of the making of the contract down to the time the last dollar is paid. They are the custodians of the people's money, because we are voting them not only the eighteen or nineteen billion dollars provided in the bill before us, but we have voted billions of dollars besides in other measures, and to charge the War Department with circumspection in limiting profits seems to me to be the duty of Congress.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I think no one who knows the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] or the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] or any of our other colleagues could doubt their good faith, but I differ with them on this occasion.

I realize that some of the men charged with the administration of these contracts tell us that such a provision as subsection (f) would make it difficult to apply the law, and they claim they will prevent profits by negotiating their contracts. But during the other war we heard the same kind of argument. It was said, "Now let the boys profit, and we will take it away from them in the way of taxes afterward." But, somehow or other, the greatest crop of millionaires America ever saw came out of that war. What was promised was not done.

At the very time when we were actually placing a ceiling on prices in this country, while we were placing a ceiling on farm prices and on all other prices, the Interstate Commerce Commission granted an increase in freight rates and passenger rates, at the time the railroads had the greatest traffic they had had since before the other war. I say we cannot depend on the officials to prevent profits. They have grown up with profit in their blood. They believe in it. In peacetimes, when this country is making a profit, it is all right, but they cannot shift their thinking over into a time when we are destroying wealth, when everyone should be taking a loss, and when every contract they negotiate should not be on the basis of giving the contractor enough sugar to sweeten his coffee so that he would grab off a contract.

I dare say that every Senator on this floor, unless he was appointed to his seat, has gone before the people and told them that if war came again he would oppose profits. Gentlemen, there will be a roll call. How are you going to vote? At the proper time I shall ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, during the last war we had the cost-plus contract system, and it was under that system that many millionaires were made. Adopt the procedure now suggested, and we will go back to the same old World War cost-plus contract system.

The best practical way of bringing about the kind of "no profit" arrangement which the Senator from Oklahoma recommends would be to seize all business and let the Government run it and manage it so that no one makes anything.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has spoken about going back to the cost-plus program. I should like to ask the Senator whether it was not shown before the Committee on Appropriations that about 60 percent in volume of the contracts heretofore made were on the cost-plus basis. We are not getting away from it.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The contracts now made upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis are quite different from the World War cost-plus contracts. Some contracts are for materials of common manufacture, things the ordinary prices of which are fixed by competition. If, for example, there is a need for electric-light bulbs, we know what the ordinary price of an electric-light bulb is, and can buy it at an agreed price.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not like to interrupt the Senator, but I hope he does not mean to leave the impression that the construction contracts for the construction of camps and the like were not on a cost-plus basis also.

Mr. HAYDEN. The cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system, which is an improvement over the old cost-plus, was generally used in constructing cantonments in 1940. I understand that about half the Army camps were constructed under competitive-bid contracts, and that the other half were handled on the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. The officials of the War Department claim they have saved money for the Government in many instances by handling camp construction in that way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall yield in a moment. The point I wish to make is that if Congress adopts a series of percentages, we will inevitably return to the World War cost-plus basis inside those percentages. If contractors have all their costs guaranteed, it is certainly going to cost the Government more money. That is my honest judgment about the pending amendment. Millionaires were made in the other war with the cost-plus contracts. We should abandon that idea and should handle contracts by the method here proposed. That is the sound, sensible way to proceed. Congress cannot lay down any fixed rule as to profits on contracts.

Here is one company to whom the money was furnished by the Government for construction. Here is another company which invested its own capital for construction. The same rule cannot be adopted with justice to each of them.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LEE. How does the Senator propose to keep the profits out?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are two ways, and very simple ways. For instance, a manufacturer is asked to convert an automobile factory into a factory to build tanks. The manufacturer does not know what the conversion is going to cost. The company does not know what the unit price should be on the tanks. So it figures upon a price large enough to make itself perfectly safe. It turns out that the conversion took place in much less time and was much less expensive than had been anticipated. It is later demonstrated that by more skillful manufacturing methods the tanks can be made for less money than provided for in the contract. In such a case it is perfectly proper for the War Department to say, "You are making too much profit. Let us renegotiate your contract." That has been done in the last few weeks with a saving of $85,000,000 to the Government. That is the way the situation is now being handled and that is the method which by this amendment will become fixed by law.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator think that will prevent all the profits?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The next way in which to get the profiteer is by an excess-profits tax.

Mr. LEE. The Senator will recall that not very long ago when the Finance Committee brought in a tax bill it proposed an excess-profits tax, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offered a proposal for an excess-profits tax which was steeper, which would have taken more of the profits, but we were given the same argument then, the same chloroform, that "It cannot be done. That simply will not work out." Somehow or other when we come to consider the profits of the "big boys" there is always something mysterious about them; that a way to get them back cannot be worked out.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator suggests a method whereby there will be no profits at all. He would have the Government take over all industry and run it just as is done in the countries where totalitarian governments are in control.

The Senator from Oklahoma spoke about the Truman committee. Let me point out that that committee is serving the country in a most excellent manner, and in a perfectly constitutional manner. It is doing just what an investigating committee has a perfect right to do. Congress appropriates money, and has a right to follow the money up and see that it is honestly and correctly expended, according to law, as the Congress intended it should be. The Truman committee is doing that. It is not attempting to take charge of the conduct of the war, like a congressional committee of that name did during the Civil War, which embarrassed Abraham Lincoln and his generals by trying to dictate military strategy. The Truman committee is acting in a perfectly constitutional manner. It is exposing excessive profits and practices detrimental to the country's war effort. It does not recommend a limitation on profits.

Mr. LEE. Another committee has.

Mr. HAYDEN. What committee?

Mr. LEE. A subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Committee on Appropriations ought not to include legislation in an appropriation bill except by unanimous consent.

Mr. LEE. The Senate gave the committee permission to do so by a two-thirds vote a while ago.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona that the members of the special committee of which I happen to be the chairman are extremely happy to hear the remarks of the able and distinguished Senator from Arizona, and I wish to say that it is the conclusion of that committee—I have not consulted every member of it—that this amendment in toto is bad legislation from the standpoint of the welfare of the Government of the United States; that if subsection (f) is left in the bill we are simply going back to the old cost-plus contracts, and we shall be as bad off as if we had no profit legislation whatsoever. By leaving subsection (f) in the bill the contractor is not given any reason whatever to cut costs and to work efficiently. The more money he expends the greater his percentage of profit will be and the more it will cost the Government of the United States. I think this is bad legislation from start to finish, and I expect to vote against the amendment as a whole. I should have voted against it in the committee had I been present at the committee meeting when the matter was considered, but, much to my regret, I was not able to be present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that there are two things that all Americans desire to see accomplished. We all want maximum production of war materials in the least possible time. The second is that the American people do not want to be robbed while this vast quantity of war materials is being produced.

The question is as to how to get this work done at a reasonable cost to the Government. That is the sole issue here. If we take action the result of which is to slow down production, then we are denying equipment to our soldiers and sailors and helping to lose the war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I interrupted the Senator when he was discussing cost-plus contracts. I realize that the Senator is thoroughly familiar with all the phases of this legislation. I wondered if he would state briefly the difference between cost-plus, which he and I and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] believe will be made effective by the retention of subsection (f), and cost plus a fixed fee, which was the method used in the construction of Army camps, but not the method which was used during the World War.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, during the World War a cost-plus contract was awarded. If the contractor started out on the basis that the work would cost a million dollars and it turned out that it cost $2,000,000, his profit on the contract was twice as great. So that there was no incentive to economy. On the other hand, the more he spent the more money he made. That was the way such contracts were handled in the World War. In this war the War Department has devised a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract. If it was estimated that the job would cost a million dollars, the amount the contractor got to do the job was fixed on that basis. If the work cost $2,000,000, the contractor does not make any more than if it had cost a million dollars, because, the fee being fixed in advance, he could not make any more. Therefore there was an incentive for him to do the work for a million dollars instead of for $2,000,000, because he could not make any more money in any event. But when work can be handled by competitive bidding, that is a better way to do it. It cannot be handled by competitive bidding if we have fixed profits such as are set out in the proposed amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire to second the statement made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] about the proposed legislation. From my experience on the Truman committee, I am convinced that it would have exactly the opposite result from that sought by its sponsors. I think I am as interested as is any other Member of the Senate in eliminating excess profits. I am even more interested in speeding up our war production. I am convinced that the proposal not only would be ineffective in limiting profits but would increase costs and delay production.

Mr. President, it seems to me the logical place to take care of excess profits is in the tax bill. The Treasury Department has a formula for determining costs and profits, a formula which has been worked out over the years, which is known to all businessmen. They know what they are up against. If we are to make the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission duplicate the auditing jobs which the Treasury does, they will also have to work out some kind of a formula to determine what are costs and what are profits.

I may add that it seems to me to be immaterial whether we adopt subsection (f) or not, because if the service departments are honestly to carry out the intent of the other provisions of the amendment, they will themselves have to develop some kind of a formula similar to that set out in subsection (f).

I believe the proposed action would result in a long step being taken toward getting back to the very cost-plus or percentage of cost contracts which resulted in the tremendous scandals after the first World War.

What would be the effect, for instance, in the case of a contractor who had a contract for $50,000,000 with a fixed fee of 2 percent, or $1,000,000? He reaches a point about in the middle of the job and finds out he is going to wind up that job with only $45,000,000 or $40,000,000 of cost, which could cut his fee $200,000. What will he do? Will he continue and try to keep the costs down, or will he try to get them up to the point where there will be no cut in his fee? The effect of the proposed legislation would be to provide an incentive to keep the costs up to the point where the departments letting the contracts would have no excuse for renegotiating contracts and taking back some of the profits.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If we eliminate subsection (f), that leaves no limitation at all, does it not?

Mr. BALL. I said in my opening remarks that it seems to me that if we eliminate subsection (f), the War Department and the Navy Department will have to develop some kind of formula very similar to subsection (f) if they are going to carry out and implement the intent of this proposed legislation.

Mr. LEE. That puts it right back where we started—just exactly nowhere.

Mr. BALL. Certainly. Further, it seems to me from my observations as a member of the Truman committee that the proposed legislation simply introduces more red tape into the negotiation of contracts in Washington. We have seen instance after instance of the negotiation of a contract taking anywhere from one-quarter to one-half as much time as the actual execution of the contract. Certainly this type of provision would introduce another serious uncertainty into the contract negotiations, and inevitably delay them considerably. In war production we ought to eliminate every delay possible of elimination.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems the discussion of this situation has wandered far afield, and very much in the direction of a circle. Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] gave notice of a motion to suspend the rule for the consideration of a particular amendment which had been printed and was on the desk of every Senator. Today the Senator from Tennessee, who had announced on yesterday that he was offering the motion to suspend the rule by authority and by direction of the full Committee on Appropriations, as I understand, announced that if the motion to suspend the rule should be adopted, on his own responsibility, without the authority and direction of the Committee on Appropriations, he would make a motion to modify his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before doing so I went to each and every member of the Appropriations Committee whom I could find. I am quite sure I saw the majority of those present. Each and every member of the Committee on Appropriations whom I saw assured me that he approved the plan. All, except the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], told me that they approved the plan; and on that approval I acted. I am entirely within my rights in having acted after having consulted with other members of the committee. I did not consult the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. There may have been several members of the committee whom I did not consult; but I am quite sure that the majority of the committee were consulted before the action was taken.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. In view of what the Senator from Tennessee has said, I wish to state for the record that this is the first I have heard of his proposal. I was not consulted. I did not agree to it, and do not now agree.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not consult the Senator from Rhode Island, as I recall, because I could not find him. I said at the very beginning that I had not consulted every member of the committee. I did not. However, the Senator from Rhode Island was present in the Senate and voted as I voted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to make the record clear with my good friend the Senator from Tennessee. If he thought he consulted me with reference to this change, he must have consulted someone else, because he did not discuss the matter with me at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not consult the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to have it thoroughly understood that in the vote which I shall cast and in the remarks which I am now making I have no desire whatever to criticize either the Senator from Tennessee or the Appropriations Committee. I simply recount the facts. Yesterday the Senate was given notice, under the rules, for the consideration of a particular amendment, which contained as its essential part subsection (f). If we leave subsection (f) out of the amendment the amendment does not amount to a hill of beans. There is no use in taking any action whatever.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If we take it out, the War Department and those who make contracts could make contracts which would net the contractors as high a percentage as the Department wanted them to have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The contractor could make as high a percentage of profit as he now can make under the so-called cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, which is supposed to be such an improvement over the old cost-plus contract, but which amounts to exactly the same thing.

Mr. LEE. Let me ask the Senator if it is not true that for years we have worked on tax bills. The Senator and I were both coauthors, along with many other Senators, of a tax bill which the Senate passed, but which never got any further. We have introduced other similar measures and tried to have them passed. We have been tackling the problem of profits ever since I have been in the Senate, and we have always been met with the same argument with which we are now met, namely, that it cannot be done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] said something to the effect that General Somervell had said that without subsection (f) there was nothing in the amendment which would authorize the departments to do anything that they do not now have the right to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. He so stated on two occasions.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what he said:

General SOMERVELL. In other words, we now have a Board of Contract Adjustments. We are examining these contracts. We have just completed a review or renegotiation of a contract with the Continental Motors, which made an over-all savings of approximately $40,000,000—a pretty substantial amount—and we are doing the same with another set of contracts today. So far we have received cooperation from the people concerned in going over these contracts, and we expect to continue to receive it. However, this gives us the right to demand certain things which we now get merely by agreement.

Senator McKELLAR. I think it accomplishes a great deal.

General SOMERVELL. It does.

Mr. McCARRAN. To what was he then referring?

Mr. McKELLAR. He was referring to the amendment which the three departments had prepared and which had been gone over by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me interrupt the Senator at that point, at the hazard of repetition, to say that in answer to an inquiry propounded to him by the Senator from Oklahoma he said that there was nothing in the suggested amendment which the departments had prepared that would authorize them to do more than they can now do. In answer to a question which I propounded to him in person to the same effect he answered that there was nothing in the suggested amendment which could not be done under existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. He said that, but modified it in this way—I read from page 87 of the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. I doubt very much whether you have a right, when you make a contract with a citizen and he makes an unconscionable profit after you go into the contract, I doubt very much whether you have got a right to redraft the contract so as to provide that he will make only a reasonable profit. I do not think you have got that right under the law.

General SOMERVELL. We have not got the right.

The whole purpose of the amendment is to give the departments the legal right

to renegotiate contracts without depending upon a contractor who has exacted unconscionable profits. It should not be merely in his discretion as to whether the contract should be renegotiated and the price refixed, but the law should provide that it should be done. That is why the amendment is offered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have the floor. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. It would not only be written into the law but would be written into every contract hereafter entered into, because the language is:

> The secretary of each department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract * * * a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I must decline to yield. I do not like to decline to yield to the majority leader.

The Senator from Louisiana is too good a lawyer not to know that if we should strike out subsection (f) in the amendment there would not be a single thing in the amendment which the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy does not now have the right to do.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator if he will only permit me to finish this thought. The Secretary may now put such a provision in a contract. There is nothing on the face of the earth to prohibit the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy from putting such a reserve clause in a contract at the present time. The amendment, without subsection (f), merely holds out the hope of something that cannot be accomplished, because it is simply a restatement of powers which already exist.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct when he makes the statement that the secretary of any of the departments may insert such a clause in a contract; but, as a matter of fact, the renegotiation-of-price clause has not been in the contracts. If the amendment were enacted into law the law would require the head of each department, and of the Maritime Commission, to insert the renegotiation-of-price provision in every contract. It would not be discretionary. It would be mandatory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it ought to be mandatory; but without subsection (f) the amendment would confer no additional power over what is now given to any Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy who honestly tries to perform his duty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I call attention to the fact that not only does the amendment as it is now proposed, without subsection (f), apply to future contracts; but subsection (c) of the amendment, on page 3, provides that it shall apply to all contracts heretofore or hereafter made, whether there is or not any renegotiation provision in them. So the departments could go into all contracts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think that we could enact a law impairing the validity of contracts?

Mr. BARKLEY. We did so after the last World War. We provided by law for readjustment of contracts which had been entered into. The Constitution of the United States provides that the States may not enact such laws.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know what the Constitution of the United States provides; but does the Senator think that the Congress can impair the validity of contracts?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that subsection (c) would be a constitutional enactment. It provides as follows:

> (c) The secretary of each department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor.

It goes on in detail. It is applicable to all contracts heretofore entered into, as well as contracts hereafter entered into.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not set up any scale.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it does not set up any scale.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, my purpose in rising was to point out the vice of this method of legislation. Neither the Appropriations Committee of the House nor the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has the slightest jurisdiction over this sort of legislation. Such legislation on general appropriation bills is forbidden by specific rules of both the House and the Senate.

Having been served with notice yesterday by the agent of the Appropriations Committee that a particular amendment was to be considered, having under the rule brought up that matter today, and having had it impressed upon us by the majority leader and by the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill that it was necessary to take some action other than merely striking out this usurpation of power by legislation in an appropriation bill, and that it was necessary to take some action to send the measure to conference, having obtained a majority of two-thirds—the necessary majority—for the mere consideration of the subject by the Senate, we are now told that if we are going to take some steps to limit profits in order to keep people from gouging the Government, it is an evidence of bad faith even to vote for the very amendment which was ordered reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, it seems to me that very clearly shows the vice of this whole system of legislation. Now the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], one of the ablest Members of the Senate, says that the adoption of subsection (f) will result in the reestablishment of cost-plus contracts; and perhaps it may contribute in that direction. I disagree very much with the Senator from Arizona that the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is any better than the old, gouging cost-plus-percentage contracts, except in degree. Any lawyer who has ever tried a case for or against a public utility knows that what the public utility is interested in is not so much its rate of return as the rate basis upon which it will be allowed to charge fees; and as much gouging of the Government is possible under the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis as under the cost-plus-percentage basis. What Congress should do, really, instead of adopting any of the propositions which are now before us, is to go back and reenact the law flatly prohibiting cost-plus contracts, because that is where the Government is gouged.

However, Mr. President, I cannot too strongly emphasize the indignation I feel when, having voted to set aside the rule of the Senate to permit the Appropriations Committee to usurp the jurisdiction of the legislative committee having jurisdiction in this matter, we now are told that unless we vote to strike out the only essential element of the very amendment which we voted to suspend the rule in order to be able to consider, we shall be guilty of bad faith. It seems to me that if we are to do anything at all we should keep subsection (f) in the amendment. If we are to keep subsection (f) in the amendment, then we should strike out the House amendment, vote down the McKellar amendment when subsection (f) has been deleted from it, vote to strike out the House provision, and go to bat with the House on the question whether or not this is the right way to handle this very important and essential matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to strike out subsection (f), as amended.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there is only one controversial point in the amendment, and that is embraced in subsection (f). No one can disagree to the other part of the amendment, because there is nothing to disagree to. It does not provide for anything, and does not keep anything from being done.

When the committee met, the War Department, speaking through its agents, was against the Case amendment, which was a part of the House bill, but which has now been stricken from the measure. Knowing that we desired to consider the same subject matter, the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], asked that certain persons come before the subcommittee. Mr. Nelson came before the subcommittee; the representatives of the War Department came before the subcommittee; and they were against any amendment. That did not suit our subcommittee, and especially did not suit our chairman. We stood by him. He asked

the representatives to prepare something and bring it back and submit it as a substitute for the Case amendment. They did not desire to have anything of that sort in the bill; and they went out and brought back a joint resolution which they knew could not be made a part of this measure unless the Senate should vote to suspend the rule. They brought back a joint resolution, and they proceeded to explain it. After the explanation was made—General Somervell was on the stand—I questioned General Somervell; and in that connection I refer to page 86 of the hearings on this particular bill.

I asked General Somervell this question:

> What does this do that is not now being done?
>
> General SOMERVELL. Nothing.

That is the answer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, let me point out that just below, on the same page, he said:

> However, this gives us the right to demand certain things which we now get merely by agreement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the testimony showed that the Government has the power to do anything it wants to do with regard to these contracts.

As I understand, this is only a guide. That is true, but it is a guide in the nature of a limitation. The departments do not want any limitation. Industry does not want any limitation. The question is whether or not the Senate wants a limitation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I feel that I should make a very brief statement about this matter. I do not want to argue it. The amendment has not been argued on its merits even up to this time, with all due respect to those who have spoken on it.

I came to the Senate Chamber yesterday to resist this amendment, because it belongs primarily to the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, and there is no effective way of dealing with profits except through taxation. I fully realize that. I was met with this amendment, proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations.

Everyone knows that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee is a man of the highest honor and of the utmost integrity. There is not a Member of this body who will question that statement. He is acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee so far as this bill is concerned—not merely this amendment, but this bill. I would have been on the floor today discussing the merits of this amendment, which is bad—wholly bad. In my opinion the amendment will almost defeat the war effort if it is enacted at this time. I do not, however, want to go into a discussion of the merits of it.

I was advised this morning by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who had submitted this amendment on behalf of the Appropriations Committee, that after conference and after discussion he would be willing to strike from the amendment subsection (f), and would take the initiative in doing so.

I personally did not want the other parts of the amendment, and do not want them now, and they will not be productive of expeditious handling of war production; but I relied on the Senator who offered the amendment in all good faith. I went into a conference this morning with the majority leader. I intended to assert the right of the Finance Committee to consider this matter. That committee will consider it under great embarrassment if the Senate is to write tax provisions into this bill; and the limitation here is substantially a tax measure.

I came to the Senate Chamber and conferred with every Senator who has offered an amendment on this subject. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] frankly said that he would not agree to the suspension of the rule, but he did not object to the elimination of subsection (f) so much as he objects to the suspension of the rule in order to permit legislation of this kind. He was in perfect good faith about it. He was in the open about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, at the time I spoke I understood that the amendment had already been modified by eliminating subsection (f).

Mr. GEORGE. I understood it also. The Senator from Tennessee, who had this amendment printed, who was the representative of his committee on this floor, and who had acted in a straightforward manner in everything he had said and done, rose and said that if the rule were suspended he proposed to strike out section (f); he even asked unanimous consent to suspend the rule and to offer the amendment with section (f) eliminated. The Senator from Ohio at first objected; that is, he objected to the suspension of the rule, but, as he has said to the Senate frankly, he made his discussion on the theory that the Senator from Tennessee had already, by unanimous consent or by agreement, modified the amendment.

I certainly would have opposed the suspension of the rule to consider legislation of this character on this bill, not because I want to see excessive profits made by a contractor, for I am as strongly opposed to that as is anyone else, and I am perfectly willing in every possible way to limit profits, but because I think I know that with this bill passed the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will be severely handicapped in their effort to consider a proper excess-profits tax bill. The Ways and Means Committee is already holding daily hearings and expect to close the hearings about the 15th of this month on the tax bill.

I have very carefully considered the other provisions of the bill as to whether they would affect the power of the taxing committee to deal with this all-important question. The bill does not directly affect the power of the Finance Committee; but indirectly it does, because it will be impossible for any manufacturer or other person who has had a contract with the Government to know what his profits are until after his contract has been closed and he has been sued in the courts and a recovery had of him, if one of the secretaries does not withhold a part of his payments. So it will be many years before the contractor will know whether he made profits or did not make profits, or how much.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Did not the Supreme Court recently pass on the profits of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in a lawsuit which had lasted ever since the first World War?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, they did; but the Bethlehem Steel Co. contract was reexamined, not under a statute similar to that here proposed, which would authorize the recovery of excess profits. There was no congressional expression on the subject, and that was the basis of the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. LEE. If we should eliminate subsection (f), there would not be any expression of Congress in the statute.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; because this bill, outside section (f), requires the secretaries to put into the contracts all these provisions to withhold payment and to institute suit if there has been an excessive profit made.

Mr. LEE. There was no recovery from the Bethlehem Steel Co., was there, although there were millions of dollars involved?

Mr. GEORGE. It does not make any difference whether millions of dollars or millions of cents were involved, so far as that goes, but the Bethlehem Steel case was decided precisely because there were not at that time on the statute books the provisions proposed to be put into this bill; and for that reason the case fell down.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I interrupt the Senator merely to endorse his words and to point out, in addition, that the second War Powers Act, which was signed by the President within the fortnight, gives to the Chairman of the War Production Board authority to examine the books and contracts of defense contractors, which is an authority that did not exist when the old Bethlehem Steel Co. contract was made.

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite true.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I understood the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to say, a few minutes ago, that there had been legislation on the books during the first World War that permitted a reexamination of contracts.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said after the war was over Congress did enact legislation which permitted the Government to go back and examine contracts, but there was no such law at the time the World War was being fought.

Mr. BONE. I wanted to ask about that, particularly with a special reference to the Bethlehem Steel contract case, because the Supreme Court has just

passed on that, and it has left the Government absolutely defenseless. The Senator from Georgia knows about that case, which was decided only a few days ago.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that case was decided a short time ago, but if the provisions embodied in this bill had been the law at the time the Bethlehem Steel Co. made the contract, the decision of the Supreme Court would have been directly to the contrary. The Government would have had the right to recover. The Court put its decision squarely on the ground that Congress had not provided for recovery of excess profits.

Mr. BONE. That leads me to inquire of the Senator if this amendment does not contain other provisions which permit the Government to renegotiate contracts?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely; it not only permits it but requires it; it also requires the withholding of excess profits, it requires suit to recover excess profits, it declares that the contractor who has received excess profits is indebted to the United States, and fixes the liability on which suit may be brought. So the amendment is of very great consequence without subsection (f).

Coming back to subsection (f), I think it is bad, but I shall not discuss its merits or demerits. I merely rose to say that I certainly would have urged the Senate to have allowed the Finance Committee to have considered, at least, conjointly with the Appropriations Committee, these provisions, because they do directly affect and directly increase the burden of the Finance Committee in undertaking to provide a proper excess tax bill.

It must be remembered that while we have an excess-profits-tax act, that act was passed before we went to war; it was last amended before we got into this war, when the excess profits, of course, were being earned because of large contracts placed in the United States by the French and British, in the first instance, and then by our own Government under the defense program which we were well into at the time of the amendment of the excess-profits tax. It must also be remembered that under the present excess-profits tax act not everything we have been reading about will by any means be permitted to escape the provisions of the law. Take the case in Ohio of the Jack & Heintz Co., as I recall the name, a corporation which paid exorbitant salaries and then gave bonuses to officers and to employees. Mr. President, do you suppose the Secretary of the Treasury is going to allow that organization to escape the tax law? The Secretary of the Treasury can disregard unreasonable salaries; he can look through those bonuses, and what will happen to the Jack & Heintz Co. will be a tax assessment which will very nearly put them into bankruptcy unless they make some profit on other items.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Following the World War, was there not a tax placed taking 80 percent of the profit; and, in spite of that, did we not have a crop of millionaires?

Mr. GEORGE. There was a war tax, but the trouble about the first World War tax was that the contracts were all cost-plus contracts; and under subsection (f) to such contracts is where every contractor in this country will be driven.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LEE. That does not answer my question. The Senator argues that we should cure the profits evil by taxation. I still ask him if we did not have an 80-percent tax imposed during the first World War?

Mr. GEORGE. We had an excess-profits tax, but it was not the same kind of an excess-profits tax we have now, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LEE. But it let the profiteers slip through.

Mr. GEORGE. It let them "slip through" because the tax act had not been passed, in the first instance, in the World War until a great many persons had accumulated enormous profits, and, then, because of the very fact that they were allowed to operate under cost-plus contracts, the excess-profits act itself was not an altogether effective act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It might also be observed that at the beginning of the first World War the income tax was a new instrument of taxation in this country, and neither the Treasury nor the Congress had become very well acquainted with it or very expert with regard to it.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we have learned much since that time, by experience and observation, in the writing of tax bills and in their administration.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite right. The Income Tax Act, at the beginning of the first World War, was only 10 percent; that was the highest rate; and it never went above 12 percent normal. At this moment our normal tax is 31 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Furthermore, we had not enacted any income-tax law until late in 1913——

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which was the year before the World War broke out, and only a little over 3 years before we actually got into it. There were amendments during the World War increasing the rates of the income tax, individual and corporate, but we cannot compare the knowledge of and experience with our tax laws which we now have with the knowledge and experience we had from 1914 to 1918.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is exactly right, because at the beginning of World War No. 1 the maximum tax rate on personal incomes was only 10 percent. That rate did not go higher than 12 percent during the war. There was an excess-profits tax, and an additional war-profits tax which was in effect for a while, and the excess-profits tax was based entirely upon invested income. The law allowed 8-percent credit before the imposition of an excess-profits tax.

At this time the normal and surtax on corporate income amount to 31 percent. The excess-profits tax is 65 percent. It is the simplest sort of a calculation to show that we can take a 40-percent normal tax and 90 percent excess-profits tax and cut the profits of all corporations down to 6 percent, because when we take 90 percent, under the present reversal of credit principle, which we have in the Tax Act, we leave only 10 percent, and when we take 40 percent of that, there is but 6 percent of profit left.

I am merely calling the attention of the Senate to that fact. The Secretary of the Treasury is recommending not 40 percent normal and surtax but 56 percent normal and surtax, and is recommending 75 percent excess-profits tax. Apply those taxes and there will not be any millionaires made. But I am not sure that I would not rather see one man escape with a million dollars which he had stolen rather than see our boys in Australia and in Africa and elsewhere about the earth die because they had not the machines and arms with which to fight.

Millionaires are not going to be made as the result of this war; do not think so for a moment. I have never objected on this floor to the consideration of any bill because it really intruded upon the jurisdiction of a committee charged with tremendous responsibility, but I was prepared to come before the Senate and ask that before it passed the pending bill this matter should go to the Committee on Finance so that the committee might consider it, because I know how important it will be if the amendment as the committee reported it shall be actually enacted.

It is important without subsection (f), as I have already said, because there can be no final determination of profits under the proposed law until some time after the contracts are made, and in many instances perhaps years afterward. But that is not a matter of such serious importance; it is not a matter of such serious consequence, and when the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who laid this amendment before us yesterday and gave his notice of intention to move to suspend the rule, this morning said that he wished to suspend the rule, but he wished to offer the amendment with subsection (f) cut, I had no doubt that all the Senators here who are on the Committee on Appropriations and heard the statement were acquiescing in it, or they would have arisen then and said, "No, I would not vote to suspend the rule with this provision out of the amendment," which in very large measure supersedes the powers of the Finance Committee to consider a proper excess-profits-tax bill at this session.

I assure the Senate that we will have an opportunity to consider such a bill, and, furthermore, it is proposed that the excess-profits tax be made applicable back to December 31, 1941, so that on contracts already performed and as

to money already collected, both the personal income and the excess-profits normal and surtax provisions of the act will apply, even if the money was received since December 31.

Mr. President, that is the situation as it stands. This is a very important amendment. Without subsection (f) it puts a very heavy burden upon the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission. It puts a responsibility upon those officials which they will find it very difficult to discharge without slowing down the war program.

I was happy to go along with the suggestion of the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations after a conference this morning in which the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and other representatives of the Government participated, because I thought it would avoid this debate and would possibly avoid the injection of a matter into the consideration of the appropriation bill which, until the House conferees could return and meet with the Senate conferees, would almost certainly stop the execution of contracts.

The whole proposal will be in conference, under any circumstances, and the same committee which framed the amendment will be represented in the conference, according to the statement made this morning by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. It did seem to me that that covered the whole proposal in a way which should be satisfactory.

I hope that no one will think for a moment that because we want to proceed here in an orderly and effective way any Senator desires to see exorbitant profits made. Taken as a whole, the amendment will furnish protection for legitimate contractors who have their own money invested, men who made America, who are making the machines with which to win the war, if we are to win it; but we would be opening the door to fly-by-night concerns, who are borrowing all their capital from Government itself, and are operating on shoestrings. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] brought to our attention here the other day the case of a company with a minimum investment, with all its capital pledged by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which will take contracts under which it can make 10 percent. But the great concerns, which have their own capital and character builded into their plants, who must make the steel, who must make the guns, who must provide the instrumentalities with which we expect to win the war, will be penalized, and they can be cut down to a little profit of 2.1 percent.

I am not pleading for profits, however, but I now say that if we are going to measure profits by the size of the contract, we have a concept which I do not understand. If it takes 10 times as much work and 10 times as much material and 10 times as much genius to build a battleship as it does for some little fly-by-night to come here and borrow $63,000,000 from the R. F. C., putting $50,000 of its own money into a contract on which they can get 2 percent, I cannot understand why the other concern, which is building a battleship, is not entitled to profit at relatively the same rates.

I do not want any of these contractors to get high profits, and they will not get high profits, because we will be able to impose an excess-profits tax of not not less than 90 percent, and if we take the normal at 40, or if we take the normal at 56, as the Treasury has recommended, then the excess-profits tax recommended by the Treasury will reduce all profits to a very small maximum.

I hope the Senate will not vote this particular subsection into the bill. I recognize that no Senator is bound not to vote as he pleases, but I came here prepared to resist the whole amendment, and hesitated very much not to do so under any circumstances, because suspension of the rule to consider important matters of this kind cannot be the best way to proceed. It is only when there is an extreme situation which needs immediate attention that we should, in my opinion, disregard all rules and suspend all rules. But such occasions do arise, so that there is provided a method for suspension. This is not a case of that kind. In this case certainly the Finance Committee should have an opportunity of studying conjointly with other committees of the Congress which have the responsibility this important proposal, which would very seriously handicap the Finance Committee in working out a tax program if the amendment with subsection (f) in it shall be retained and agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, there is merely one point I wish to make in connection with the discussion. I hoped I would not be obliged to speak on the subject at all, but it seems to me that so much of the discussion has been based on the assumption that subsection (f) and the schedule of maximum profit rates would limit the power of the secretaries of the various departments to make contracts, either for a larger profit or for a less profit, that I wish to draw attention for a few moments to the language of the bill.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee who voted with the great majority of that committee to report the bill favorably with this provision included, I wish to draw to the attention of my fellow Senators the fact that there is nothing in the bill to prevent the secretary of a department making a contract providing for an even larger profit than the 10-percent maximum stated in the schedule.

On page 6 of the committee amendment, if Senators will look at lines 1 to 5, they will find the provision that any profits on any contract in excess of the amount set out in the schedule—

shall be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section unless—

Note the word "unless"—

unless the secretary of the department concerned makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of such contract.

In other words, if the secretary of a department makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of any particular contract he may authorize a larger profit; so he is not limited by this schedule of maximum profits. On the other hand, it is not to be assumed that the secretary of any department will not provide for less profits than stated in this schedule, because after the schedule is set out, it is stated particularly—and this distinguishes it from the cost-plus contracts of the last war—that—

In the case of a contract entered into on a cost-plus basis, the costs of performing the contract shall be included in determining the contract price for the purposes of this subsection.

It further provides that—

The foregoing provisions of this subsection—

That is the schedule of maximum profit rates—

shall not be construed to mean that the secretary of any department may not deem profits equal to or less than the amount set out in the foregoing schedule to be excessive profits for the purpose of this section.

In other words, he is expected under the language of this measure, to agree to less profits than provided in the schedule.

Senators may ask then, What effect has the schedule? It has a purely psychological effect, and that psychological effect is twofold. In the first place, it has a psychological effect on the secretaries of the departments themselves. The Congress is not unloading the question onto these departments of the Government. The Congress itself has set up what it regards as a reasonable measure of profits in the average case. The Congress says, "In our opinion the schedule is a reasonable schedule of profits. The Congress will not criticize you in the average case if that is the schedule you adopt."

So in a certain sense there is a justification for the profits, but not in the special case where the price is too low or the price is too high, according to the schedule.

The second point of psychological advantage—it is a subsidiary point, but it should not be ignored—is that the people of this country are calling for a limitation on prices. They want to have Congress make some provision with respect to the question of unlimited prices included in the contract. This provision encourages the public to believe that the standards set by the Congress will be adhered to in the main, and encourages the people to believe that we are acting on the matter, and not simply ducking it and postponing action until some other time, as we have done so frequently in the past.

For the reasons stated I feel it to be my duty to draw to the attention of the Senate the fact that this schedule is merely a suggestive schedule, and is not open to much of the criticism which has been leveled at it in the discussion today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The vote is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to strike out subsection (f) of the so-called original McKellar amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Subsection (f), as amended, which is proposed to be stricken out, will be set forth in the RECORD at this point.

Subsection (f), as amended, is as follows:

(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of each Department, separately or jointly with the Secretary of one or both of the other Departments, shall prescribe regulations which will, to the fullest extent practicable, indicate in advance the profits on contracts which will be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section. In prescribing such regulations, there shall be taken into consideration the amount and character of the personal services, equipment, material, and working capital, and the length of time likely to be required for performing various contracts and such other factors as are deemed appropriate by the Secretary or Secretaries prescribing such regulations. In any event, any profits on any contract in excess of the amount set out in the following schedule of maximum profit rates shall be deemed to be excessive for the purposes of this section unless the Secretary of the Department concerned makes a specific determination that a greater profit is not excessive in the case of such contract. A report of any such determination shall be made to the Congress within 30 days from the date thereof.

SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM PROFIT RATES

Ten percent of so much of the contract price as does not exceed $100,000; plus

Eight percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $100,000 but does not exceed $500,000; plus

Six percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $500,000 but does not exceed $1,000,000; plus

Five percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $1,000,000 but does not exceed $5,000,000; plus

Four percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $5,000,000 but does not exceed $20,000,000; plus

Three percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $20,000,000 but does not exceed $50,000,000; plus

Two percent of so much of the contract price as exceeds $50,000,000:

Provided, That in the renegotiation of two or more contracts with any person, firm, association, or corporation, the secretaries of the respective departments, as herein defined, shall have authority to consolidate such contracts with respect to profits to the end that such consolidated contract may come within the provisions of said schedule of maximum-profit rates: *Provided further*, That the determination of costs and profits allowed by the secretaries of the respective departments shall be final: *And provided further*, That insofar as is practicable the determination of profits shall be made for the fiscal year of the contractor.

In the case of a contract entered into on a cost-plus basis, the costs of performing the contract shall be included in determining the contract price for the purposes of this subsection. The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that the secretary of any department may not deem profits equal to or less than the amount set out in the foregoing schedule to be excessive profits for the purposes of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that, if present, he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERTON (when Mr. ELLENDER'S name was called). The junior Senator from Louisiana is unavoidably absent.

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S name was called). On this vote the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If the Senator from Wisconsin were present, he would vote "nay," and if the Senator from Pennsylvania were present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. DANAHER (when Mr. TOBEY'S name was called). I announce that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. RADCLIFFE (when Mr. TYDINGS' name was called). My colleague is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Earlier in the day when the vote was taken to suspend the rule I was absent because of a conference I was having with the Mexican Ambassador in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Had I been present then I should have voted "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on business at the War Department.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is in the West, holding hearings on Indian matters.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES and Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Danaher	Overton
Austin	Davis	Radcliffe
Bailey	George	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Stewart
Barkley	Hayden	Taft
Bone	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Lucas	Truman
Brooks	McKellar	Van Nuys
Brown	McNary	Wallgren
Bunker	Maybank	White
Burton	Millikin	Wiley
Caraway	Murray	Willis
Clark, Idaho	Nye	
Connally	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—21

Bankhead	Holman	Mead
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Russell
Doxey	Lee	Schwartz
Green	McCarran	Shipstead
Hill	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews	Glass	Smathers
Barbour	Guffey	Smith
Bilbo	Hatch	Spencer
Bridges	Hughes	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Chandler	Lodge	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Downey	Murdock	Wagner
Ellender	Norris	Walsh
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Gillette	Rosier	

So Mr. MCKELLAR'S motion to strike out subsection (f) of the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered on behalf of the committee by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is the bill open to further amendment?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The pending amendment has not yet been finally disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered on behalf of the committee by the Senator from Tennessee, as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment by way of a perfecting amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

When we passed the First War Powers Act, approved December 18, 1941, we appended section 401 thereto, which reads:

Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his statement? I did not catch it. My attention was distracted for a moment. I dislike to ask the Senator to repeat it.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Tennessee is always so cooperative that I am happy to comply.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to turn to page 7 of the amendment. I offer a new subsection, to be known as subsection (i). It may be briefly stated.

This section shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 3 years after the termination of the war.

Mr. President, the idea back of that proposal is simple.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking it to conference.

Mr. DANAHER. While I appreciate the acquiescence of the Senator from Tennessee, let me state that there is nothing whatever in the pending amendment which would limit the period within which the order, the renegotiation of the contract, and ultimately the retention or withdrawal of profits may be undertaken under the authority of the amendment. The power is unlimited in any way. It seems to me that a reasonable period should be fixed by law within which the powers thus granted may be exercised. I think that a reasonable period would be 3 years following the termination of the war.

I wish that statement to appear as a matter of record, so that when the bill goes to conference there can be some objectivity, at least, on the part of our conferees with reference to a termination date.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am inclined to think that there ought to be a termination date, and therefore I shall be glad, so far as I can do so, to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to turn to line 7, on page 7. After the word "department", I move to amend by inserting the following:

in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government

That language, Mr. President, is a paraphrase, interpolated at the proper point in subsection (g), and is derived from Title II of the First War Powers Act. There should be some regulations, some directions, some standards prescribed by which there will be some uniformity of operation by the heads of the departments with reference to the delegation of authority contemplated under subsection (g).

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I now ask the Senator from Tennessee to turn to page 3 of the amendment. In lines 17 to 20 we find a sentence reading:

No suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection.

I move to amend by deleting that sentence.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment. I think there ought to be some change in that language; but the Senator's amendment would strike it out entirely. I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment, and if he does insist on it, I think it should not be agreed to. I was frank with him with respect to his other amendments. I am frank with him with respect to this one. I think the language should be changed, but it can be changed in conference, and I have no doubt it will be changed.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to explain my viewpoint with reference to this proposed amendment.

So far as I know there is in no existing statute a denial of recourse by American citizens to our courts. So far as I know there has never been a denial of the right of a citizen to bring suit arising on a contract. When the fifth amendment to the Constitution was adopted it expressly provided that no citizen shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

The remainder of subsection (c), in which this sentence appears, makes it apparent that the secretary of each of the departments is to be able to take into consideration outstanding contracts to the number, we are told, of probably 3,000,000, and to revalue and renegotiate all those contracts. Surely there is deprivation of due process involved in such action. I cannot believe that such a thing would be legal. I cannot believe that it would not do violence to our understanding of what the powers and rights of the departments should be under this or any similar legislation.

From the last two lines of subsection (c) on page 3 it becomes apparent that so long as final payment pursuant to the contract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act, all past contracts may be gone into, and the individual who has a right under any such contract is to be denied recourse to the courts.

I have no question that the Senator from Tennessee has in mind that we could write into the bill a clause which would be prospective in operation, and which would apply to all contracts to be written in the future. I have no doubt that we can make any statute a part of a contract which we authorize a department of Government to enter into. However, I do not believe that we have any right, power, or legal authority retroactively to deny to our citizens rights under their contracts, and, above all, to deny them a suit in court.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

With such thoughts, Mr. President, it seems to me that the best possible way to reach this situation in conference is to strike out the offending sentence, which would deny to citizens the right of access to the courts; and then in conference, when the conferees rewrite this section in some particulars, they can properly make the language apply prospectively to all contracts hereafter rewritten, or renegotiated, as the case may be. Mr. President, we should not deny for many months— perhaps years—after the execution of the contracts the right of access to the courts by an individual citizen deprived of his rights. He should have the right to go to court and test his rights.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is no provision in the House bill prescribing how one may go into court or be deprived of the right to go into court. If this provision were stricken out there would be nothing in conference about the matter. With this provision left in, and nothing in the House bill about it, the conferees could draft any provision they thought desirable.

I am wondering whether the Senator from Connecticut has in mind any language which he would substitute for the present language, so that the matter could be taken to conference and be threshed out in conference. If the Senator has some such language in mind, I shall be glad to have him state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Put in a limitation of time, and that will take care of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; if the Senator from Connecticut will suggest a limitation of time, or will rearrange the provision so that the whole matter can be taken to conference, I shall be glad to have him do so. However, when he moves to strike it out, if that motion shall be agreed to we shall have no power at all over the matter in conference. I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say that I should dislike to see this language go to conference, because it seems to me it is an utterly unconscionable and utterly unjustifiable provision. What it would do would be to deny a citizen of the United States the right to go into court and seek to recover what a secretary might have determined, without any standard whatsoever, to be an unjust profit. In other words, without any standard laid down in the bill, any secretary would be able to determine that this, that, or the other amount received by a contractor would be an excess profit.

I simply cannot see that. I simply cannot think of this as America if we are to say that our citizens cannot go into court and test their right to money which, as contractors, they may or may not have earned under a contract with the Government of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, of course, I share the sentiment of the Senator from Maine. I believe it to be absolutely correct. We should recall that in subsection (d), on page 4, the department head will be authorized to provide for salaries for officers or employees not in excess of a reasonable amount, and he may make allowance to the individual contractor for what he says shall not be deemed excessive reserves. It does not say what the reserves are for, whether

they are for amortization, or what the particular type of reserves may be. It simply says that the department head may say that they are excessive or not, as he decides, according to standards which he proclaims, and they may be different standards, depending on the department which invokes the act.

Indeed, Mr. President, the next subsection—subsection (e), which requires that contractors shall file such detailed statements at such times and in such forms as the Secretary may require—then proceeds to say that the powers conferred by the subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor. We can actually envisage the case of Mr. Knox saying to Mr. Stimson, "You keep away. Let me act. This contractor has more contracts with me than he has with you. He has larger contracts with my Department than he has with yours. Besides, my people, my engineers, my standards are higher; my tests are more precise;" and we are going to make certain that there will be no trace of excess reserves left to the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Tennessee, or his agents and nominees and contractors, whoever they may be. That is a preposterous thing, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The purpose of that language undoubtedly was—I did not write it, but I know what the purpose was—to require the contractor to enter into the negotiations which are specified in this subsection of section (c). Would it not meet the requirements the Senator suggests, and would it not meet every requirement, to have it read in this way:

No suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection until the remedies provided for in this subsection have been pursued.

Mr. DANAHER. What remedies, let me ask the Senator, does he find in that subsection, or in this section?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state them to the Senator:

The secretary of each department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price—

Suppose the contractor did not do it?

(2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor.

It seems to me that the suggestion I made, or some language similar to it, would cover the suggestion made by the Senator, namely, that the contractor surely ought not to be permitted to enter suit until after the section has been complied with.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator certainly has not forgotten that in the original Conscription Act we authorized the secretary to go to any contractor, to any industry, to an entire industry if he chose, and say, "Here is an order; take it," on the terms and on the conditions described by the secretary; and if the contractor does not take it the Government may take his whole plant, indeed his whole industry, away from him.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a great deal worse than prohibiting him from bringing a suit; but I realize the force of the point the Senator has made. I think unquestionably the language should be "until after the requirements of this act have been complied with;" and, if the Senator will frame the language, I shall be very happy to accept it.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well. Mr. President, I am going to withdraw the amendment to strike out that particular sentence and substitute in lieu thereof the following, inserting some new words:

No suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor on account of any contract hereafter entered into pursuant to the provisions of this subsection.

I move the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, 1 minute. I believe it would be better still to have a time limit within which it may be done. I do not like to close the courts to anybody. That language would close them. What I suggested was not to permit the contractor to use the courts until after the provisions of this section have been complied with. I think they ought to be complied with by both the Government and the contractor, and suit ought to be permitted after that; and, if the Senator will rearrange his language, I shall be very happy to accept it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has done me the good turn of saying, in his last exchange here, what I hoped he would state; namely, that he agreed in principle with what I was trying to establish. So long as he agrees with that, so long as he does not want to close the courts to American citizens, and so long as he wants to give them a right to go into court and sue on their contracts, which is what I want to have them have a right to do, and he has so stated; I know that we can easily work out a solution of this problem. Consequently, I withdraw the amendment previously suggested which elicited that comment from the Senator from Tennessee, and move the following in line 17:

After the expiration of this act, no suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor—

And so forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was trying to get the attention of the Chair in order that I might address an inquiry to the Senator from Connecticut. May I ask the Senator to restate the fifth substitute for his original amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think, in fairness to the Senator from Connecticut, it ought to be said that he did that largely at my suggestion, for which I thank him.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, so that there will be no confusion in the mind of the Senator from Wyoming—not that I apprehend that there is any, but I want to make certain—in line 17, I move to interpolate these words:

After the expiration of this act, no suit or action—

And otherwise, without change, readopt the language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say "After the expiration of this act"?

Mr. DANAHER. I will supply the clerk with a written copy of the amendment; but for present purposes I may orally state it as follows: "After the expiration of this section, no suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor * * *" etc. Thus we would create a statute of limitations but retain a right to sue in proper cases during the life of the section and while action may be taken under it. But the right to sue is protected, not denied. Hasty consideration of legislation in this fashion makes for confusion, but with the right to sue protected, at least, we can later properly write additional protective language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that what the Senator is saying, then, is that any person who makes excessive profits and who is adjudged as having made excessive profits, may sue while this act is in force—this act which is intended to prevent excessive profits—but after the act has ceased to be effective he may not sue?

Mr. DANAHER. No; that is not the way it is stated, I am sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly what the Senator said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will reread his language, if he then still thinks he is following the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee I think he will find himself grievously mistaken. What the Senator from Tennessee suggested was that nobody be allowed to bring suit until the requirements of this subsection have been complied with. What the Senator has done in his language is to say that after the expiration of this act nobody may bring suit, which is a different proposition.

Mr. DANAHER. That is what it says.

Mr. McKELLAR. That means after three years. It is a mere statute of limitations, and I do not see there should be difficulty about that. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we are very anxious to dispose of the pending bill before we take a recess this afternoon, and I hope Senators will be patient and remain in the Senate until we have concluded the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

SEC. 402 (a). The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission are hereby instructed to insert in every contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such department, (1) a provision for the retention by the United States, or the repayment to the United States, of any amount of the contract price which represents excessive profits, determined as hereinafter provided, (2) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in every subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract a provision for the retention by the United States, or the repayment to the United States, of any amount of the contract price representing excessive profits, determined as hereinafter provided, and (3) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

(b) All sums provided to be paid by the contract in excess of the contractor's cost, plus a percentage of the contract price determined as hereinafter provided in paragraph (c), shall be deemed to be excessive profits for the purposes of this section. The cost of performing contracts shall be determined in accordance with the method of cost accounting regularly employed in keeping the books of the contractor in question, but if no such method of cost accounting has been employed, or if the method so employed does not in the opinion of the War Profits Board hereinafter created clearly reflect such cost such cost shall be determined in accordance with such method as in the opinion of said Board does clearly reflect such cost. In the case of a contractor which does not regularly employ a method of cost accounting in keeping its books, such contractor may, with the approval of the secretary, determine the allocation of indirect costs to be made to contracts according to the ratio of direct cost of performing contracts to total costs Irrespective of the method employed by any contractor for determining costs of performing contracts, no item of cost shall be charged to the performance of any such contract, or used in any manner for the purpose of determining the cost of such performance, unless such item would have been chargeable against such contract if such contract had been subject to the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 27, 1934 (known as the Vinson-Trammell Act), prior to the enactment of the Second Revenue Act of 1940. In determining cost no allowance shall be made for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount as determined by the War Profits Board; nor shall any allowance be made for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor, or for any other costs incurred by the contractor which are found by the War Profits Board to be excessive and unreasonable. All taxes, except excess-profits taxes, normal corporation income taxes, and corporation surtaxes, may be included as part of the cost. The War Profits Board shall prescribe uniform regulations, listing those items of cost which shall be disallowed under this paragraph.

(c) There is hereby created a War Profits Board, to be made up of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the War Production Board. Each of such members shall have the right to appoint a substitute to serve as a member of the Board and perform all of the functions of such member. Such Board shall forthwith classify all contracts in as many classes as it may determine, giving due regard to the character of the article or service involved, the nature of the contract, the amount of capital required in manufacturing, service or other activities essential to performance of the contract, the rate of turn-over, and other factors. The Board shall then determine in the case of each such type of contract the proper percentage of total contractor's cost (or other definite allowance for profits on a fixed fee, sliding scale, or otherwise), which in its opinion will return to the contractors entering into such type of contract approximately 6 percent per annum on the capital which they have invested in their business, net after Federal excess-profits taxes, normal corporation income taxes, and corporation income surtaxes.

(d) The War Profits Board shall make uniform regulations with regard to the proper method of determining costs and percentage of cost. The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the clerical assistants and other personnel required by the War Profits Board to perform the functions prescribed by this section.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the substitute I am offering is somewhat amended from the form in which it was printed and is on the desks of Senators. The principal difference is that instead of leaving the question to the discretion of the Secretary of War and the other officials to say what is an excessive profit and what is not, as the amendment at present reads, it proposes to set up a War Profits Board, made up of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the War Production Board, which shall prescribe different types of contract, and the method in which the profits shall be limited, the percentage of profit, or the fixed fee, or the sliding scale, or whatever method may be adopted.

The point I am trying to make is that, in my opinion, persons who have contracts with the Government should know in advance, by definite regulation, how their costs and profits are to be determined. The principal objection I have to the McKellar amendment is that it leaves it wide open in every case to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission to say that any profit is excessive. Not only the present Secretary of War, or Secretary of the Navy, but the Secretary 5 years from now, could say, "I think 1 percent is enough," and could recover all the rest, although the amount had been paid, and the contractor had earned the money which he had received. The proposal of the substitute is to establish a board which shall definitely determine the regulations.

I wish to add that personally I do not think a satisfactory provision for limitation on contracts can be worked out. I think my provision would be more successful than an attempt to base the regulation on a fixed fee. I think we must recognize that different kinds of articles must have different fixed fees, if there are to be fixed fees, airplanes one thing, battleships another, shoes another, clothing another, that someone has to determine what it shall be, if fixed fees are insisted on. But I do not see how we can work out a limitation on a particular contract without going right back to the old cost-plus basis, which was discredited in the World War and should be discredited now.

I think the only way to limit profits is by a limitation on the net profit a man earns over a 12-month period, for the determination of which we have already set up the machinery in the Treasury Department. I feel very strongly that the whole theory behind the amendment is wrong, and that we should not send anything to conference, but if there is to be something it seems to me that the philosophy underlying my substitute is sounder than that of the McKellar amendment.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks that in the present status of affairs, if the McKellar amendment shall be adopted, my proposal can be considered by the conference committee, and whether in all probability it would receive consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unquestionably it can be considered under the rules of the House and the Senate, and I should be very happy to give it every consideration, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I take it that what the Senate did when we voted earlier in the day was to delegate to the conference committee the problem of working out a limitation of profits. I cannot see how the vote could be interpreted as decisive of anything else. I have been greatly pleased by the fact that many voted to suspend the rule, notably, the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Georgia, and stated that they thought it was all wrong to have any profit limitation at all except on excess profits, perhaps, and that has been the position taken by every one who has studied the problem up to this time. I think it is unfortunate that the matter goes to conference at all, but if I am correct in believing that the Senate is really delegating to the conference committee the writing of a profits limitation, I am perfectly willing to let my substitute go to the committee, under the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that it can be considered by the conferees, and I shall withdraw it for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is withdrawn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I overlooked presenting an amendment which was suggested by the Department. On page 4 of my amendment, at the end of line 18, I propose to insert.

Each such Secretary may, whenever he deems it appropriate or in the interest of economy or the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, request the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purposes of making examinations and determinations with respect to profits under this section, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall make such services available for such purposes.

I have submitted the amendment to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, and he sees no objection to it going to conference. I hope it may go to conference. I am not sure about it myself. It may save a great deal of duplication of service, and therefore save money, and for that reason I should like to have it agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as I interpret the amendment—and the Senator from Tennessee agrees with my interpretation—it does not relieve the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission of responsibility. It merely permits them to make use of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purpose of ascertaining facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator from Ohio raised a question which interested me, with respect to the duty of the conferees in dealing with a limitation on profits. Am I to understand that the conferees will take up the subject and deal with it thoroughly and adequately in the conference between the House and the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the rules of the Senate, even if we did not want to, we would be compelled to do so. During the time I have been a Member of the Senate I have served on many conferences, and we have had the most active and vigorous conferences imaginable.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Senator expects to have all the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 14 in number, as a group, appointed conferees, and I presume the House will do likewise.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House has taken similar action, and that was one of the reasons why I made the suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, some 25 in number?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, there will be 39 sitting around the table.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think there are 25 in the House; I think there are about 12 or 13 in the House and about the same number in the Senate. But many will not be present. Many are absent from the city, as the Senator knows, and I think in the peculiar circumstances surrounding the bill, it might help to have as many of the Senate subcommittee as possible on the conference committee, and for that reason I am making the suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been repeatedly stated on the floor by Members of the Senate that the pending bill will definitely slow down war production.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I thought it would have that effect, I should not be for it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am thinking of what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] have stated, and I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made some reference to the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I repeat, if I thought it would slow down production, I should not be for it.

Mr. LUCAS. If the bill, in its very nature, is a slow-down measure so far as war production is concerned, I am wondering how much further the war effort will be slowed down if the conferees are going to sit for any great length of time attempting to work out a very delicate formula, as I understand it must be, insofar as limitation of profits is concerned. It seems to me that a contractor would hesitate and pause if conferees are going to sit for any great length of time to prepare a formula which will limit profits. If that is the case, I cannot help definitely agreeing with those who say that the measure will slow down the war-production effort. That is my only interest in rising; it has been my only interest in the discussion all the way through. It was because I do not want to see war production slowed down that I voted originally with the Senator from Ohio against the motion to suspend the rule, because it seems to me we have been taken off our feet to some extent because of what the House did in the last moments of the consideration of the bill, when there were present on the floor of the House only about 56 Members.

If the Senate had stood firm and not agreed to what the House did, and permitted the limitation of profits to come up in the regular way, ultimately through the Finance Committee, I think it would be much better from the standpoint of war production and from the standpoint of providing ultimately the kind of limitation of profits which the country ought to have. If it shall be worked out in conference and done properly it will take a long time, in my humble opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator is entitled to his views. I differ with him all along the line.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the pending question now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] offered on behalf of the committee, as amended, is now before the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. What became of the Taft substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio withdrew it.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to make an inquiry. I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he would consider one of the amendments of which I gave notice yesterday, which embodies imperfectly the plan known as the Baruch plan, to be germane if offered as a substitute for the so-called McKellar amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be compelled to answer that in the negative.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, the purpose of the House provision was to progress the war by the limitation of profits, and the purpose of my amendment is to do the same thing, to progress the war by the limitation of profits and fix an overall price ceiling; but, of course, if the Senator feels that it would not be germane, then I would have to offer it separately under the notice given.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I should have to take that position about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], as amended, to insert in the bill a new section 402 (a).

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have two further amendments. The first one will need explanation. I think the other one has already been explained. The Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, came to see me this morning about a certain matter. He said that the work in his office has piled up tremendously. Personally I know his statement to be true, and I presume every other Senator knows that the Bureau of the Budget has had an almost intolerable burden placed upon it in the last 2 months.

The law now provides for an assistant director, and the Director of the Budget is very anxious to appoint an assistant director. He wants one appointed at the same salary he himself is now getting. Ordinarily the assistant director would get $9,000, as I recall, but the Director wants Congress to authorize an assistant director at $10,000. He went into the matter with me in some detail.

His proposal has the approval of the President. Those of us who know what the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has to do will realize that he should have a competent assistant. The amendment is on page 20, after line 19, to insert the following language:

> Executive Office of the President.
> Bureau of the Budget.
> The salary of the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be at the rate of $10,000 per annum after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. President, this is a small matter, it is true, in one sense, and in another sense it is a very important matter, because I do not see how one man can do the work of Director for any great length of time. I shall ask the Senate to agree to the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is not that amendment in the nature of legislation? Does it not create a new office?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Office of Assistant Director is already provided for, but it is not at the salary of $10,000. I hope the Senator will not object to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered

by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on page 20, after line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. The last amendment I have, Mr. President, deals with the matter concerning which I spoke on the floor of the Senate yesterday. On page 48, line 19, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following language:

Provided, That purchases of automobiles heretofore made at prices not in excess of those herein authorized are hereby authorized and validated.

Those are the Ford automobiles which went to the War Department at a cost of $770 when the limit of cost was $750. The entire amount in money involved is $193,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arizona to explain that amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The advantage of agreeing to the amendment at this time is that if it is agreed to the Government can take a discount of $60,000 on that sum of money, whereas if the appropriation is made later, the time limit on the discount provided for in the contract will have elapsed, which will result in the Government losing $60,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on page 48, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. That completes the committee's amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on page 48 of the bill, in line 14, after the words "Navy Department," I offer an amendment to insert the words: "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in the case of the government of the District of Columbia."

I ask that that amendment be agreed to and taken to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, for the sake of the record I should like to draw the attention of the Senate to subsection (f), which was stricken from the committee amendment. I wish to point out that by the liberal terms of that subsection, had it been retained, the Senate would have voted to allow a company operating in my State at this time on an admitted and a questionable capitalization of $50,000 a profit of $1,260,000 on a $63,000,000 contract, and $1,400,000 on a $70,000,000 contract. I am not prepared to do so at this time, but later this week I shall show the Senate that to date, and particularly in this instance, in which the contract was let in August 1941, the War Department, the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Light Metals Division of the War Production Board have not kept faith with the taxpayers of the Nation in regard to excessive and unconscionable profits in the allocation of contracts. I hope the conference committee will take into consideration, when it sets the limit on profits, the amount of money which a company has invested in carrying out a contract.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator is referring to the case about which he spoke on the floor of the Senate a day or two ago.

Mr. BUNKER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that under the terms of the amendment that matter will undoubtedly be taken care of. It certainly ought to be. I think it is one of the most remarkable instances of fraud against the Government of which I have heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUNKER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does not mean that the Senate would have voted that amount of profit. He means that that is the limit of profit which the company could have obtained. The Senate would not have been voting the company that amount of profit.

Mr. BUNKER. I mean to say that that amount would have been permissible under subsection (f), which has just been rejected by the Senate. That is why I could not vote for it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I assure the Senate that I shall be brief. I am proposing to take up an amendment to House bill 6868 with respect to which I gave written notice in the Senate yesterday afternoon. The amendment is as follows:

It shall be unlawful to receive, require the payment of, or pay any sum of money, or fee of any nature, as an initiation fee or charge which is made a condition precedent to the right, or opportunity, to work upon any war work, as defined by the War Production Board. Any person violating this provision shall upon conviction be punished by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or by fine not exceeding $1,000.

Before I make the motion to suspend the rule, which will, of course, be necessary, notice with respect to which was given yesterday, I should like to say a word about the amendment.

As a Member of the Senate I have voted almost invariably for things which organized labor expected of the Congress. However, in the past few weeks I have come to the solemn conclusion—not without difficulty—that the time has come when the friends of labor must stand up and do things which in the long run will, I know, be for the best interests of labor.

Every day I am receiving telegrams and letters from Florida advising me that not only citizens of Florida but personal friends of mine have already given their lives for their country in this great struggle. I hope I am mistaken, but I foresee nothing ahead of us except a long, bitter, bloody struggle which will come near to draining white the people of the United States of America. When I go back to Florida and look into the face of a mother who has already given her son, and with her knowing that in the same town somebody is practicing a form of piracy upon American citizens who are trying to help the soldiers get equipment, which I have not tried to prevent, I cannot feel that I have been living up to my obligation as a Senator or as a citizen.

If only moderate fees had been charged there would have been little complaint, no doubt, but the amount has greedily been increased until it has become a real burden and a flagrant abuse.

This has not been an easy decision for me because, not having been on the side of those who were opponents of labor, and now appearing to oppose labor, I suppose I shall be left without the support of either group; but in case that should occur I dare say it would not make a great deal of difference to the country. If I had to pursue a contrary course and receive a contrary reward I should not be very happy about it.

I have offered this amendment in order that it might be added to the bill. I realize that we do not like to take an appropriation bill as a subject of legislation, but we have already done so in one instance.

This is not a complicated amendment. It is simple in its provisions. Everybody knows the evil to which it is addressed. It is an abuse which has grown up. I think that if labor will purge itself of this practice, as it is required to do under my amendment, its standing with the American people will protect it against greater injury which otherwise will be inflicted upon it later. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended, pursuant to a written notice which I gave yesterday afternoon, in order that I may offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the first question is on the motion to suspend the rule. I make the point of order against the proposed amendment, and I wish to state why I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit the Chair to make a statement? The Senator from Florida has made a motion to suspend the rule so that he may offer an amendment. The motion to suspend the rule is the question now before the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee intend to discuss the motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. Only briefly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish merely to make this observation: Today the Senate has been required to consider extraneous legislative matters outside the appropriation bill because that bill came to us from the House with a legislative proposal in it, so we could not avoid giving it consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only that, but the committee has already given that proposal the most careful and scrutinizing consideration. We have not given any consideration whatever to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

It has not been brought before the committee. It has been offered only after the bill has reached the floor of the Senate. For that reason I must make the point of order. The Senator now moves to suspend the rule. I think the rule ought not to be suspended in such a case, because the committee has given no consideration whatsoever to the proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. Of course, we are all concerned about the things we read and hear in regard to abuses which are claimed to exist with reference to initiation fees. That subject is the heart of what the Senator is seeking to reach. I think that aside from the question of policy involved, a committee qualified to do so ought to look into the constitutional power of Congress to say to a carpenter's union in some town in any State what it shall charge as an initiation fee. It may be that a State legislature could do so, and it may be that it ought to do so; but I think there is some question whether Congress, even in connection with war contracts, may say to an electrical union, a carpenter's union, a plumber's union, or any other local labor organization, whether affiliated with the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O., what it may charge as an admission fee for membership in the union.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

That question arises under the amendment because the Senator proposes to reach a case in which such a fee is charged as a condition for obtaining employment. The question would arise in any case in which the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, or any other Government agency had entered into an agreement with respect to the employment of members of labor organizations.

If there were such an arrangement within the War Department, the Navy Department, or any other department, no matter how small the initiation fee that might be charged, even if only $1, it might be claimed that the person had to pay the fee in order to get into the union and in order to obtain employment; and, if the fee were accepted, the penalty would apply, and it would apply also to the person who paid the fee, even though it might be only a dollar—which is, of course, a ridiculously low fee.

We have heard a great deal of publicity about the exorbitant fees which have been charged in some cases. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] made a statement on the floor the other day in which he said that the labor organizations have collected $30,000,000. It so happens that that is an average of about $30 a piece, because an additional million men have joined organizations of one kind or another; so the average is about $30 a person, as I understand.

However, the whole trouble lies in the question whether Congress can go down into any local community and, by law, say how much a man shall pay in order to get into a lodge; whether, if we had the power to do that, this is the way to do it; whether it is wise to attempt to provide for it on an appropriation bill. I do not believe it is. I do not believe this is the way to legislate. I think the power and the policy and the facts involved—we are not familiar with them; we have seen newspaper reports, but we do not know what the facts are—ought to be gone into by a legislative committee, so that when we have legislation before us on this subject, if we shall have, we will know how much is true, how much is false, and how much should be discarded, if we can discard any of it.

For that reason I think it is unfortunate to seek, without any information or any investigation by a committee, by suspension of the rule, to put this kind of legislation or any other legislation on an appropriation bill.

As I said earlier today, I would have voted against suspending the rule to put in the bill even the amendment offered by the Committee on Appropriations if such a provision were not already in the bill, so that we could not ignore it or avoid dealing with the subject.

For that reason I shall have to vote against the motion of the Senator from Florida to suspend the rule.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr President, I appreciate what the Senator has said. I only want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the prohibition would apply only in case payment of the fee is made a condition precedent to the right to work in defense work, as defined by the War Production Board. If the practice does not exist, the prohibition could not do any harm; and we know that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, no matter how legitimate might be the entry of any man into a labor organization by the payment of the regular fee, it might be charged that he had been required to pay the fee in order to get a job.

Mr. PEPPER. But, of course, the charge would have to be proved before there could be any conviction under the statute. That would be a question of fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if a man is charged with the commission of a crime, the charge must be proven before he can be convicted. However, under the suggested language, the penalty would be laid at both ends of the transaction—on the one who got in and on the one who let him in.

Mr. PEPPER. The provision is suggested in order to stamp out this vicious practice which has brought us, by not correcting it, into more disrepute than almost anything else I know of has done.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As I understand, the Senator is desirous of asking that the rule be suspended in order that he may offer an amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What does the Senator's amendment call for?

Mr. PEPPER. It provides as follows:

It shall be unlawful to receive, require the payment of, or pay any sum of money, or fee of any nature, as an initiation fee or charge which is made a condition precedent to the right, or opportunity, to work upon any war work, as defined by the War Production Board. Any person violating this provision shall upon conviction be punished by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or by fine not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two about that matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I believe that any man in America who is able bodied and who wants to aid his Government——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point in order. Is the Senator from North Carolina addressing the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand that I have the floor. The Senator from Florida yielded to me.

Mr. PEPPER. I yielded to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Florida yield the floor to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator from Florida yielded to me temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida still has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He still has the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was under the impression that the Senator from Florida was about to yield to me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator from Florida has asked that the rule be suspended in order that he may offer an amendment to this bill to the effect that any American citizen who is desirous of working in an industry engaged in the manufacture of war materials for defensive or offensive purposes may do so without paying an initiation fee, or an entrance fee, or a fee providing him with the right to work for the Government of the United States.

I desire to say a few words about this matter; and I do not propose to apologize to my colleagues for speaking my thoughts now, for the very reason that the people of America are today demanding that we register our attitude concerning the conduct of certain labor organizations. The people of America are demanding that we let them know how we stand, whether we are going to permit this practice to continue, or whether we are going to endeavor to stop it by some legislation in this body.

I repeat that I believe that any and every able-bodied man, or woman for that matter, who is desirous of aiding the Government in the preparation of its defensive or offensive program should be permitted to go into a factory or plant and work. If he or she is a man or woman of good character, an American citizen, either native-born or naturalized, he or she should be permitted to work now, when our country is in peril.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection, has said to us that this is not the time or the place for the acceptance of legislative

proposals of this sort in the form of amendments. I very much dislike to disagree with him. Perhaps he is right; but I believe that the time to do anything of this sort is to do it now, while we have the opportunity, because I seriously doubt if we shall ever have another opportunity to vote upon the Senator's proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator, if I may be permitted to do so. I am speaking by the courtesy of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Connally bill has been set as a special order of business for the 20th of this month, and today is the 7th. An amendment could be easily offered to that bill for this very purpose, so that the delay would not be very great. That is what I recall about the matter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

A moment ago, when we had up here an amendment which I thought would limit the profits of the profiteers in this war, I voted to leave that amendment in the appropriation bill because the amendment said that the profits should be limited to from 2 to 10 percent. I voted for the limitation of profits to from 2 to 10 percent. At that time we were told that that was not the proper time to offer the amendment; that it ought to be eliminated from the bill; that we ought to wait and offer it at some other time.

I did not take that view of it. I wanted to express to the American people today by a registered vote how I felt about the millions upon millions of dollars which are being taken away from the taxpayers of America in war profits. Today I had the opportunity of voting, and did vote, to limit the profits of the war profiteers to rates between 2 to 10 percent, and I am glad opportunity was provided me to vote for such a limitation of profits.

Our distinguished colleagues said this bill was not the measure to which such an amendment should be added, that we should wait until the contractors made the profits and then take the profits away from them by taxation. Perhaps we will take them away by taxation and perhaps we will not, but the time to act is now, when the opportunity is presented and, insofar as I am concerned, I am anxious to register my attitude relative to these enormous profits, and I am anxious to register my attitude concerning the conduct of labor.

I claim that I am one of labor's best friends. The Senator from Florida makes the same claim. I believe the records of the Congress will show that whenever I have been afforded the opportunity of recording my vote for or against labor, nine times out of ten I have voted for labor. I have not only been labor's friend in the past, but I am still labor's friend, and I believe that the legislation which is proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, if enacted, will be the best thing that ever happened to labor. I am for his amendment, and I hope I shall have an opportunity of voting today in favor of his amendment, because if it shall be agreed to, it will reflect more friendliness toward labor than has been suggested at any time during this session of Congress.

Now is the time to act. It is better and cheaper to keep your horse locked up in the stable than not keep him locked, and have him stolen, and have to ride 500 miles after him. That is very expensive. I want the opportunity to vote now.

Many complaints are being made throughout the country about labor. I do not think those complaints should be registered against labor as a whole. I know that the great majority of laboring men in this country, whether that body of laboring men is constituted of native-born or naturalized citizens, believe in doing the right thing, and that they are just as patriotic as any man who occupies a seat in this body.

Our Nation is in peril. We have had nothing but bad news since December 7, and we are going to have months upon months of bad news to follow. We have but one objective in mind, and that one objective is to win the war. If we lose the war, we shall have lost our all. It does not make any difference what our individual opinions were before December 7, whether we were isolationists or were internationalists, we are all one now, we are seeking national unity, and we are seeking production in order that we may place in the hands and upon the shoulders of the men of America the instruments with which they may best defend themselves.

We all know that before the war is over millions of American boys will be killed, and the casualty lists will be coming home. The boys will be buried beneath the soil of Florida, of North Carolina, and of every other State in the Union. If we do not vision the death of our young men, who are today in 27 different places in the world, constituting 27 different expeditionary forces—if we do not vision that millions of our young men are going to be killed, then there is but one alternative for us to envision, and that is a withdrawal of our forces from all parts of the world back to the Western Hemisphere, and that we cannot sanction because we were assaulted in a dastardly manner by the Japanese, and because the other Axis Powers, Italy and Germany, declared war against us, all we could do in retaliation was to declare war against them.

Let me say one thing further to the Senator from Florida, having in mind his amendment. I wish to repeat, so that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of anyone, we have arrived at an hour when every man and every woman in this country, black or white, native-born or naturalized, young or old, rich or poor, must put their shoulders to the wheel and work day and night in order to prepare for the struggle which we are now facing.

The people of America want to know whether or not we are going to permit them to work with their own hands in the factories and in the mills to make arms, to provide shields and instruments of protection for their sons who are going to be called upon to die. In this connection I wish to relate a little incident. A few days ago there came into my office a gentleman who said:

> Senator, the hand of death has reached into my home.

With tears in his eyes he said:

> I am poor, as you know. We have but one child. My wife and I struggled all our lives to put him through the common schools, after which we scrimped and saved money for the purpose of sending that boy, the idol of our hearts, to college. He graduated, he came home, he was a fine, clean, manly fellow, of excellent character. He has never given his mother or me, his father, the slightest concern. He has been good and dutiful and respectful, and although we are poor, ordinary people, when he came out of college he put his arms around us and we wept in happiness because we had been able to provide for him by scrimping and saving.
>
> Then came the draft, and in the interest of our country we gave our son. The hand of death has reached across the threshold of our home. Our son is in a camp. He will be sent away. We do not know whether he will ever return. If he does not, life will be worth nothing to us. If my son never returns to me I want to die, and my wife does, too, because he is all in God's world we have. But we are glad he has been called. I am glad he is going. We thank God that we have a fine young man as our son to shoulder arms in defense of this Government. But I want him protected. I want him to be provided with the arms and the implements with which he will have an even chance with the enemy. We want him to live, if it is possible. We want to see his smiling face again. We want to see him at the fireside at home with us. But we know he will never come back unless he is provided the implements with which to fight, the arms with which to defend himself, and a safe convoy to the battlefield and back.

Millions of mothers and fathers today are demanding that we use every conceivable means to save their boys. They are realizing the situation now for the first time, because thousands upon thousands, as we all know, are being made ready to go here and to go there, but they are demanding, as mothers and fathers, that they be permitted to join in the work necessary for the preservation of the idols of their hearts by way of being permitted to go into the plants and the factories to make implements necessary for their protection.

Mr. President, if we want to register our position and let the American people know without hesitation where we stand upon the question of profits and where we stand in regard to labor unions, now is the time. I am for the labor unions. I have always been a laboring man. I am now. I believe that the members of labor organizations have as much right to organize and to associate themselves together for the protection of their own individual interests as any other groups or organizations have, whether they be capitalistic or otherwise.

Mr. President, I am indebted to the Senator from Florida for providing me with an opportunity today to register my vote in this matter which concerns fathers and mothers who have given all they have in the world to aid in the protection of their country and in winning victory for the United Nations. My vote will register my approval, will register my request and back up the requests of

the fathers and the mothers who have given their boys, that those fathers and mothers, without paying a fee to a labor organization, may be permitted to go into defense plants and, with their own hands, make the arms which are necessary for the protection of their sons.

I hope that this body will vote to suspend the rule in order that the amendment of the Senator from Florida may be brought before the Senate for consideration, and that we may be provided the opportunity of saying now whether we believe that any men or women who want to work in the interests of their country and to help their own children, may do so without paying any individual organization for the privilege.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have the completest sympathy with the objectives sought to be attained by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. What the Senator aims at is a vicious practice under a vicious labor policy which has been followed all through the period of war construction. A bill is now pending in the Senate, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and by the Committee on the Judiciary placed in the hands of a subcommittee, which seeks to attain the same objective.

On Monday of last week I addressed the Senate at considerable length on that subject, and set out in much detail the vicious and deplorable practices which have been and are now being carried out. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Florida or the Senator from North Carolina in principle. I am sorry I cannot go along with the method which has been adopted to bring this question up at this time.

Mr. President, in the first place, when we recessed under the gentleman's-agreement program it was understood that, except for the appropriation bill which we are considering now, no legislation of importance would be brought up before the 20th of April. We ought to carry out that agreement. I have suggested to the Senator from Florida the doubtful wisdom of bringing up his proposal at this time.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I shall conclude and yield the floor in a moment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I simply wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. REED. I shall yield shortly. In the years I have been in the Senate I have more than once objected to attempts made to write important legislation into an appropriation bill from the floor of the Senate. I think it is a dangerous practice, which ought not to be encouraged, and which ought not to be permitted.

I have some doubt whether, under the widespread labor practices in effect at the present time the proposal of the Senator from Florida would be workable. His amendment provides:

> It shall be unlawful to receive, require the payment of, or pay any sum of money, or fee of any nature, as an initiation fee or charge which is made a condition precedent to the right, or opportunity, to work upon any war work, as defined by the War Production Board.

If a particular factory were wholly devoted to war work it might not be so difficult, but where there is a mixture of work, a part for the Government and a part for private purposes, I think the amendment would perhaps stop the whole works. I am unable to see how it could be made effective.

A matter of this character, important as it is, far reaching as it is, ought to have the careful attention and scrutiny of the committee which has jurisdiction over matters of this kind. That is why I cannot vote for a suspension of the rule at this time, under these circumstances. Yet I wish to say again to the Senator from Florida that I thoroughly believe in the objective which he is trying to reach. I hope at a later date, before the Congress dies next winter, that we shall have enacted legislation which will reach the objective which the Senator from Florida seeks, and with which I have complete sympathy.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield for a question?

Mr. REED. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to observe that—

> Hope deferred maketh the heart sick.

Ever since I have been in the Senate I have seen die in committee measures designed to reform ill-advised social experiments.

Mr. REED. May I interrupt the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes.

Mr. REED. I yield only for a question.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I wish to ask the Senator a question. Has the Senator from Kansas any assurance that the committee to which this or any other proposed remedy for the ill-advised social experiments is sent will consider it and bring it to the floor, and will we still be Members of this body then?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to make reply to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I can say to the Senator from Oregon that a subcommittee was appointed the next day after the bill of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The subcommittee has met, and tomorrow there will be placed in its hands a long and complete list of witnesses to be heard in public hearings. It has been my privilege to be chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for a year and a half, and not to my knowledge has the committee ever been charged with negligence or pigeonholing a single piece of legislation that was placed in its hands, nor will these particular Holman or Reed bills be pigeonholed by that committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. May I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], who is now in the Chair, and who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to which the bill has been referred, to give added assurance to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] would be willing to answer frankly, but it is not right for us to take advantage of a Senator who is in the Chair to exact a pledge from him as chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if this amendment is not in the ideal form or in the exact language in which it should be, it can certainly go to conference and there be reexamined and improved if the circumstances so require. On a simple, clear-cut matter such as this, at a time when the Senate is dealing with another extraneous matter on an appropriation bill, I see no reason why it cannot also let this provision go to conference. Let us send back to the House some kind of a provision with respect to labor legislation, to show the House that all such legislation originating over there does not die when it reaches the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to suspend the rule.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Florida that on the 20th of this month a motion to proceed to consider the so-called Connally bill will be the first order of business. I shall vote to consider the Connally bill. When it comes up, it will be open to amendment.

The amendment of the Senator from Florida would be entirely appropriate and germane to the Connally bill; and when the Connally bill comes up less than 2 weeks from today there will be an opportunity to bring up this matter again. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that if he offers the substance of his amendment he may depend upon my support for whatever it may be worth. I doubt whether the amendment is in workable shape the way it is now worded, but so far as the substance of it is concerned I shall support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

> That any person engaged in the performance of (1) any contract or order for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, pursuant to provisions of the act entitled "An act further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 11, 1941, or (2) any contract or order for the United States, or (3) any subcontract or suborder

necessary or appropriate to the fulfillment of any contract or order for any such government or for the United States, who shall discriminate against or in favor of any employee or prospective employee or applicant for employment because of his race, color, or creed, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for not exceeding 6 months, or both

Mr. MEAD. I trust that the Senator in charge of the bill will take this amendment to conference without any debate on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the Senate vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the Senator from Tennessee, in charge of the bill, has studied this amendment in the light of rule XVI.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is undoubtedly subject to a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Rule XVI imposes on the Senator in charge of the bill the responsibility for making the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Apparently the Senate voted "aye." Therefore I shall have to make the point of order. I regret it very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MEAD. Did not the Chair announce that the "ayes" have it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not the final decision.

Mr. MEAD. Is not that a decision?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MEAD. Not after the decision is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was not the final decision of the Chair. The Chair was trying to ascertain whether the "ayes" or "noes" had it, and the Chair stated that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MEAD. That is ascertaining the vote, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At that time the Senator from Tennessee rose and made a point of order. The Chair had not determined that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. MEAD. The Chair stated that the "ayes" have it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MEAD. There is no difference, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist upon his amendment, because it is clearly subject to a point of order. Not only that, but as I heard the "ayes" and "noes" apparently the "noes" were in the majority.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. A division was called for before the result was announced.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing to have the question settled by a division, if it is so desired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The rule prescribes that the Senator in charge of the bill must invoke the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am rather inclined to think that the Senator is correct. Therefore, I make the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about the rule.

Mr. MEAD. Mr President, what I am interested in is the decision of the Chair. The Chair announced the result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The decision of the Chair was that the "ayes" appeared to have it, but the Chair was about to determine whether or not the "ayes" had it, which would have given opportunity for a division. That is what the Chair was expecting. At that time the Senator from Tennessee made the point of order.

Mr. MEAD. That is what I was interested in. I wanted a decision on the action taken by the Chair.

The next action is upon the point of order raised by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustained the point of order.

Mr. MEAD. That is the decision of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I now wish to call up the other amendment with respect to which I gave notice, providing for the freezing of prices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall have to make the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The amendment is covered by appropriate notice. I realize that a two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rule.

I shall take only a moment to explain the purport of the amendment.

It is not fair to me or to the plan itself to have it considered under these circumstances. However, I wish to lay it before the Senate and ask that it be considered. It is a plan which that great American, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, evolved out of his vast experience. It is in the public interest, in time of war, that prices be frozen below a certain ceiling; that there be a maximum price level and wage level; and that the whole economy be frozen beneath a certain maximum.

I read the amendment yesterday. It has been on the desks of Senators. According to this morning's newspaper Mr. Murray, of the C. I. O., states that the threat of inflation is already facing labor. He stated that there has been a rise of 15 percent in the cost of living for labor. That is true, because since the war started the Congress has not limited rising prices. We are not meeting the march of inflation. Consequently, I offer the amendment, and ask that the rule be waived, and that the amendment be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order to offer an amendment.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If no further amendment be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6868) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating sundry officers for advancement and citizens for appointment as officers, all in the Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marcel E. Malige, of Idaho, to be a consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 9, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Capt. (temporary) Robert W. Rickert to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 22d day of March 1942.

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, to rank from the dates stated:

Francis P. McCarthy, from the 15th day of April 1940.

Robert G. Owens, Jr., from the 7th day of June 1940.

Thomas J. Ahern, from the 7th day of June 1940.

Philip R. White, from the 10th day of August 1940.

Rubin Iden, from the 20th day of August 1940.

Dred F. Parks, from the 21st day of October 1940.

Alfred L. Owens, a citizen of North Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of August 1941.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942:

Bryan F. Jinnett, Jr., a citizen of Alabama.

William I. Kent, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Carl O. J. Grussendorf, a citizen of Minnesota.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Marcel E. Malige to be a consul general of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Hugh A. Reynolds, Junction City.
Walter R. Guilfoile, Mays Lick.

OHIO

Cora M. Burns, Beloit.
Dora H. McGonagle, Junction City.
Walter W. Farra, Lewisburg.
Henry W. Myers, Luckey.
Marjorie M. Bankes, Malta.
Harry E. Miller, New Concord.
George R. Daubenmire, Pleasantville.
Ralph W. Detrick, Quincy.
Albert E. Beardmore, Salem.
Winifred Hine, Tallmadge.
Algy R. Murphy, Troy.

TEXAS

Geraldine Palmer, Groves.
Harry E. Filleman, Hondo.

WYOMING

Richard M. Turner, Frontier.
Oscar W. Dahlquist, Mountainview.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles W. F. Smith, canon, Washington Cathedral, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who dost reveal Thyself to man alike in the freshness of a spring day and in the necessities of labor; alike in the resurrection to life eternal and in the shadow of death: We pray Thee to open our eyes that we may behold Thy hand in all Thy works. Give us joy in Thy bountiful provisions of a fruitful earth, and teach us diligence in our tasks. Make us ready to sacrifice and to share alike for the fulfillment of Thy purposes, that no man may withhold his due nor fail to receive his proper reward. And when the necessity of the final sacrifice is forced upon us, do Thou teach us to expect the victory that lies beyond the shadow of death and to be worthy of that resurrection unto life which Thou hast promised in Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 7, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the president of that academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations, Inc., consisting of 20 member associations for the colored community of the District, favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to abolish the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia and to substitute therefor a housing board to be under the Commissioners of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Helen Drummond Partridge, president of the Women's Law Observance Association of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the use of sugar in the manufacture of intoxicating liquor, as sugar is being rationed as a food, and favoring the prompt stoppage of the sale of liquor to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ABOLITION OF 40-HOUR WEEK—RESOLUTION OF BARBER COUNTY, KANS., COUNCIL OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred a resolution in the nature of a memorial adopted by the Barber County (Kans.) Council of Women's Clubs, in reunion at Kiowa, Kans. The resolution relates to the 40-hour week, and is signed by Mrs. H. A. Schriver, president, and attested by Mrs. R. W. Lonker, secretary.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Whereas the Barber County, Kans., Council of Women's Clubs, in reunion at Kiowa, Kans., and each and every woman's club in said county represented;

Whereas we, like all of the citizens of Barber County, Kans., are deeply concerned over the growing unrest and dissatisfaction and uncertainty of the citizens of our county, State, and Nation;

Whereas over 90 percent of the families of Barber County, Kans., has a son, a brother, a husband, or a near relative in the armed forces of the United States of America giving of their time, their energy, and offering their lives to the end that our way of life will be preserved;

Whereas the citizens of the county have met all demands made on them by their Government and have oversubscribed every quota asked of them and will willingly and gladly continue to do so;

Whereas we are convinced that during the past several years an organized labor bloc, headed by unscrupulous leaders, has developed in the United States and is now attempting to dictate not only the direction of our war effort but also the pattern of our way of life and government to follow the war. This group is so well known, as are their operations, that we do not need to more clearly identify them: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Barber County Council of Clubs, That it is the opinion of this organization, and we urge on our representatives in Congress, both of the House and Senate, that in order to properly prepare our defense and offense and to preserve our present form of government, that immediate steps be taken to curb the control and domination of the so-called organized labor leaders, and to this end the 40-hour week should be abolished, and no Government contracts should be let to any person or corporation who will require membership of its employees in any labor organization as a prerequisite to obtain employment.

We are convinced that this resolution expresses the sentiments of the vast majority of the people of Kansas, and any Senator or Congressman who does not or cannot wholeheartedly and vigorously support it, and by his acts and conduct show that he is supporting it, can no longer represent the people of Kansas in Congress.

I move the adoption of this resolution and recommend that a copy of it be mailed to

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator CLYDE REED, and CLIFFORD HOPE.

The resolution was adopted.

Mrs. H. A. SHRIVER,
President.
Mrs. R. W. LONKER,
Secretary.

STRIKES, OVERTIME, AND DOUBLE PAY IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES — PETITION FROM NEWPORT, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask consent to present and have appropriately referred a petition signed by Sydney F. Davis and 15 other citizens of Newport, Vt., requesting the abolition of overtime pay and double pay on Sunday, and other things, for the duration of the war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition of the Senator from Vermont will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RIGHTS OF LABOR—MEMORIAL FROM ST. ALBANS, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask consent to present and have referred to the Committee on Education and Labor a memorial signed by Chester O. Harmeon and 197 other citizens of St. Albans, Vt., protesting against the enactment of any legislation which would deprive labor of its free American rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition will be received and, as requested, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5143) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1263) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Charles I. Lafferty, of Atlantic City, N. J., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa. (reappointment).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2443. A bill for the relief of Willard T. Twitchell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2444. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct synthetic-rubber production plants having an annual productive capacity of 400,000 tons and to create the United States Rubber Authority to operate such plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. WHITE) introduced Senate bill 2445, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR AUTHORIZATION BILL—CHANNEL FROM APALACHICOLA RIVER TO ST. ANDREWS BAY, FLA.

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5993) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AIKEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6802, the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1943, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 7, to strike out lines 23 to 26, inclusive.

On page 8, to strike out lines 4 to 13, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For clerical assistance for each Senator from each State which has a population of more than 3,000,000 inhabitants, $1,000 for each 1,000,000 inhabitants or major fraction thereof in excess of 3,000,000 inhabitants, which shall be in addition to any other amount for clerical assistance to which each such Senator is entitled; in all, $78,000."

INVESTIGATION OF THE TELEGRAPH INDUSTRY—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McFARLAND (for Mr. WHEELER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 236), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, authorized by Senate Resolution 95 of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and Senate Resolution 268 of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, to investigate the telegraph industry is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, to complete the investigation authorized by the above-mentioned resolutions, $2,500 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized for said purposes.

ARMY DAY ADDRESSES BY DONALD M. NELSON AND GENERAL SOMERVELL (S. DOC. NO. 198)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document two Army Day addresses, one delivered by Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, and the other by Lieutenant General Somervell.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY WICKARD ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard on the subject of the 1942 farm-crops program, published in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of April 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LORD HALIFAX ON BRITAIN'S ACTIVITIES IN THE WAR

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, taken from the New York Times of March 19, 1942, reviewing Britain's activities during 2½ years of war, which appears in the Appendix.]

OVERTIME PAYMENTS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE ASTORIA (OREG.) ASTORIAN-BUDGET

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Noble Sacrifice," relative to overtime payments for labor in defense industries, published in the Astoria (Oreg.) Astorian-Budget, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORDELL HULL—EDITORIAL FROM MIAMI (FLA.) DAILY NEWS

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Hon. Cordell Hull, published in the Miami (Fla.) Daily News of March 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY DAVID J. WILKIE ON CONVERSION OF AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY TO WAR PRODUCTION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Auto Industry Goes Into High for War," written by David J. Wilkie and published in the Washington Post of today, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson entitled "Reduce Washington Office Population 50 Percent and War Effort Would Move Faster," published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of April 6, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S PRAYER—POEM BY HORACE G. CARLISLE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "The President's Prayer Dispels Despair," which appears in the Appendix.]

UNCONSCIONABLE PROFITS IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, a pall of sadness and regret must enshroud the American people today when they realize that Bataan has just fallen, and that two British cruisers have been sunk off India. Those individuals in America who have participated in taking unconscionable profits on war contracts and who have slowed down war production are worthy of the disgust and contempt of every patriotic American.

Mr. President, on Friday of last week I promised to tie together for the Senate the ends of one of the most scandalous stories of war profiteering that has ever come to the attention of the Truman committee—the case of Basic Magnesium, Inc., an industrial corporation of Cleveland, Ohio, operating in Nevada, which stands to make a profit of 4,280 percent in 1 year on an admitted investment of less than $50,000.

On Thursday of last week a subcommittee of the Senate committee investigating war industries reported, after conducting hearings at my request at Las Vegas in March, that Basic Magnesium, Inc., was guilty of "one of the most flagrant attempts at war profiteering" to come to its attention.

On the following day I read into the RECORD a list of extortionate salaries paid to 42 officials of Basic Magnesium, Inc., out of public funds—salaries as high as $36,000 a year; salaries of 42 men totaling nearly $400,000 annually; salaries coming out of the $63,000,000 the Defense Plant Corporation set aside for the construction of a magnesite refinery at Las Vegas, which it has agreed to lease to Basic Magnesium, Inc.

I shall address the Senate later on several phases of this matter which have not yet been brought to its attention. Today I shall lay before this body additional data to warrant the conclusion that the Defense Plant Corporation has entered into an agreement with Basic Magnesium, Inc., that is so sinister as to indicate that some officials in our Government are guilty of malfeasance in the performance of their duties.

I shall also outline the startling ramifications that project Basic Magnesium, Inc., into the picture of international intrigue, involving English and German interests.

If the agreement between the Defense Plant Corporation and Basic Magnesium, Inc., represents a cross section of conduct on the part of the Defense Plant Corporation, I can come to only one conclusion, namely, that we are tolerating the existence of an agency of the Government that is so corrupt as to make profiteering in the last war look like petty larceny by comparison.

No one realizes more keenly than do the Members of the United States Senate the incalculable load that is being carried by the President in the prosecution of this war. He has the confidence of the American people. He must have the loyalty of the governmental departments. The fraud which is being perpetrated by the Defense Plant Corporation and Basic Magnesium, Inc., is a betrayal of the President and of the American people. Money will not win this war, and unconscionable profits will only prolong the war. The saddest betrayal in the history of man was negotiated for thirty pieces of silver.

Now to tie the ends of this amazing scandal together, which I shall do as briefly and graphically as possible.

Basic Magnesium, Inc., came into being in 1941, a child of the fertile promotional brain of Howard P. Eells, Jr., of Cleveland, Ohio, president of Basic Refractories, Inc. This corporation had obtained development rights on 36 mining claims on the public domain in Nye County, Nev.

These claims were transferred by Basic Refractories, Inc., to Basic Magnesium, Inc., a subsidiary, also headed by Eells, in return for 55 percent of the stock in Basic Magnesium, Inc.

These claims, on which Basic Refractories admittedly expended less than $50,000, represented the sole asset of Basic Magnesium, Inc., the corporation to which Defense Plant Corporation is giving $63,000,000 to build a refinery at Las Vegas.

Now comes the international angle: The remaining 45 percent of the stock in Basic Magnesium, Inc., was given to Magnesium Elektron, Ltd., of England, which furnished the knowledge of a refining process. Although this process is known as the "English process," it is operated by Magnesium Elektron, Ltd., under a licensing agreement which permitted the operation of plants in England. There is serious question as to the contribution of Magnesium Elektron, Ltd., of the process, since they do not own, nor do they have the license to operate, this process in the United States. The American patents controlling the process are held by an American corporation, one-half of the stock of which belongs to Aluminum Co. of America and one-half of which directly or indirectly belongs to the German interests.

As to the agreement between Defense Plant Corporation and Basic Magnesium, Inc., I will review some of the interesting and almost unbelievable expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

Although Basic Magnesium, Inc., has had little or no construction experience, they are to receive a gift of $300,000 for "supervising" the construction of the plant. Remembering that Defense Plant Corporation pays all the bills, including the salaries, wages, and materials, as well as construction, engineers, and contractors' fees and profits in the amount of nearly a million dollars, it can be seen why I use the term "gift" when I refer to the $300,000 which is Basic Magnesium's share for construction.

As a matter of fact, not only are the salaries of those engaged in construction of the plant paid by the Defense Plant Corporation, but those engaged in operation and management as well. There are only three salaries which come out of the profits to Basic Magnesium, and these are those paid to Heigden, secretary-treasurer of Basic Magnesium, Inc., Major Ball, vice president of Basic Magnesium, Inc., and British consultant, and to Eells himself.

Before I take up the matter of these profits in detail, of which the $300,000 item is only a small part, I wish to mention several other interesting expenditures of public funds to which Defense Plant Corporation agreed.

Prior to the formation of Basic Magnesium, Inc., and prior to the signing of the contract, Basic Refractories claimed to have expended in the promotion of this enterprise and the negotiation of the contract the sum of $211,000. This no doubt includes Eells' numerous trips to Washington and entertainment at the Mayflower Hotel. This sum is now being repaid by the Defense Plant Corporation to Basic Refractories. In other words, the Government paid the corporation for promoting its officials out of $63,000,000. This incidental item comes under the heading of "Expenses" and is not included in the figuring of the profits.

Another miscellaneous item of interest has to do with a particular kind of peat moss which is used in the process of manufacturing magnesium and of which the Government had purchased the complete stock of British Columbia. Besides the price which the Government is paying for this peat moss, the Defense Plant Corporation is paying a group of Canadian and American distributors an $84,000-a-year bonus for the release of all their available stock to Basic Magnesium, Inc. Thus the Government is paying the distributors for peat moss which they no longer have to distribute.

The Defense Plant Corporation also agreed to pay a firm of architects $26,000 for the privilege of using plans for 800 demountable houses at the Las Vegas plant—plans which had previously been used on another Government project. Thus the Government bought the same plans twice.

The Defense Plant Corporation is now paying traveling expenses and salaries of 45 officials of Basic Magnesium now in England studying the process. At the same time Defense Plant Corporation is paying the salaries of English technicians who are in America promoting the interests of their company.

Is it any wonder that Basic Magnesium, Inc., declined to cooperate with the investigator of the Truman committee? When the investigator of the Truman committee, acting under the authority of a resolution passed by the United States Senate, visited the plant, he found that orders had been given, in a written memorandum circulated throughout the plant, that employees or officials of Basic Magnesium were not to give him any information. Two members of the Basic Magnesium, Inc., police force were detailed to follow the investigator to see that no employee disobeyed these orders.

Now to consider the profiteering angles. The Defense Plant Corporation agreed to pay Basic Magnesium, Inc., $1,000,000 in case the Government sold the plant to some other company during the year following completion of the construction. Should a sale be contemplated, Basic Magnesium, Inc., was to be given first opportunity to buy, the price to be set by arbitration. Thus, as the committee report stated, the terms of the contract seem to place a premium on incompetence and mismanagement.

Defense Plant Corporation agreed also to pay an estimated $560,000 for management and operation of the plant annually, after capacity production has been reached, which is expected in November of this year.

There is an agreement now being negotiated whereby the Defense Plant Corporation agrees to pay $1 a ton royalty, or $280,000 annually, on the ore, with all mining, milling, and hauling costs to be paid by the Defense Plant Corporation. In case the plant is sold, the royalty on this ore is doubled to $2 a ton, or $560,000 annually, with the Defense Plant Corporation agreeing to continue to purchase the ore at this source for a period of 10 years, notwithstanding the fact that it may be purchased cheaper elsewhere in Nevada.

The remaining item in the $2,140,000 profit is the $300,000 Basic Magnesium, Inc., will receive on completion of the construction of the project, which I mentioned before.

Although it is almost impossible to believe, there is no obligation on the part of Basic Magnesium, Inc., to repay any of the money paid out by the Defense Plant Corporation. There is absolutely no collateral securing the sums advanced by Defense Plant Corporation.

Neither company, Basic Magnesium, Inc., or the English company, Magnesium Elektron, Ltd., had sufficient assets or was sufficiently financially responsible to warrant such an extension of credit on a sound business basis.

Basic Magnesium, Inc., has a carte blanche agreement to act for and in behalf of the Defense Plant Corporation to establish the matter of policy, subject to the "review" of the Defense Plant Corporation. The "review" is in the form of

a past audit, but does not give the Government immediate control over the property or the expenditure of money. Thus the Defense Plant Corporation has no direct supervision over either the quality of the construction or efficient operation. How, then, could they be certain that the project would be completed as expeditiously and economically as possible? The only function of the Defense Plant Corporation in this matter to date has been paying the bills.

And, finally, remember that the product of the plant is not to be furnished the Government at cost. The contract provides that the product shall be sold at a "reasonable price, designed to yield a fair margin of profit."

I do not intend, if I can help it, to allow the taxpayers' money to be wantonly wasted in a promotional scheme that will not accomplish the ends sought by our Government in this war effort.

It is unholy to think that any individual or group of individuals would steal from the public coffers under the pretense of patriotism or the cloak of war emergency.

I will not stand idly by and have a department in Washington or a group of promoters exploit the resources of my State and saddle onto its people an unsound, temporary industry dedicated to the personal profit of a few greedy individuals. The manufacturing of magnesium is vital to the war effort. This plant must produce at the earliest possible date. Not only that but it must continue in operation after the war on a sound, commercial basis. Neither of these objectives can be accomplished under the management of Howard P. Eells, Jr.

I demand that the contracts be rewritten. I demand that this project be established on a sound financial foundation, and that a change in management be effected at once. I demand that the immediate and permanent operation of the project be insured.

The unusual political ramifications surrounding the writing of this contract warrant a complete investigation of the Defense Plant Corporation, which I demand be made.

The unlimited resources of Nevada are at the disposal of our Government in our war effort. The quicker the war is won, the more American lives will be saved. But we will not contribute one pound of metal as tribute to a group of racketeering promoters at the expense of the lives of the boys in uniform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Delay in Building Magnesium Plant Charged by Rail Brotherhoods," published in the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette of April 4, 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette of April 4, 1942]

DELAY IN BUILDING MAGNESIUM PLANT CHARGED BY RAIL BROTHERHOODS—SLOW ROUTING OF MATERIALS IS ALLEGED—WESTERN SENATORS ARE NOTIFIED BY RAILROAD ORGANIZATIONS

OMAHA, April 4.—Charging delay in construction of the Basic Magnesium, Inc., plant in southern Nevada, through circuitous routing of materials, members of the General Chairmen's Association of the brotherhoods of the Union Pacific Railroad sent protests today to Senators from Nevada, Nebraska, Wyoming, Utah, and to Senator TRUMAN, chairman of the Senate Defense Investigation Committee.

The telegrams of protest were signed by Walter Blakemore, of Pocatello, Idaho, chairman, and Leon C. Westbrook, of Los Angeles, secretary of the association, following a meeting here.

The protests declared that "our primary interest is in the prompt completion in the most orderly fashion of this plant, which is predicated upon war necessities, and while we are directly interested in the handling of business over the efficient, double-tracked line of the Union Pacific from Council Bluffs, Iowa, to Salt Lake City, that interest is secondary to circumstance.

"There can be no sound reason for diversion of these materials which has occurred in the last 48 hours. Knowing your interest in the war effort, we are certain you will want, in your own way, to take such steps as may be necessary to keep this material flowing by the most direct route."

Blakemore and other members of the association charged that materials were being diverted over other roads as a matter of retaliation against Union Pacific by Basic Magnesium, Inc.

The company, they asserted, took exception to the Union Pacific's activities in the promotion of the dolomite magnesium process, rather than the corporation's brucite process.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] on the information which he has placed before the Senate with respect to the scandalous situation concerning a magnesium plant in my neighbor State. Certainly, in the language of the West those who are looting the United States Treasury should not merely be investigated; they should be prosecuted; they should be jailed. I wish to compliment the Senator from Nevada on the position he has taken in the matter. I hope he will not drop what he is doing at this time, but will follow it up, for certainly such doings will undermine the confidence of the people of the country in the whole defense set-up.

The Senator from Nevada, the youngest Member of this body, deserves the highest praise for his fearless presentation of what has all the earmarks of one of the most outrageous scandals in the history of our Government.

I concur in his recommendation that the administration must act now to clean its house.

I am willing to join in any nonpolitical effort in that direction, because these evils must be corrected if our country is to endure.

Politics must be adjourned. We must unite in a common effort to stamp out our enemies from within, because they are as dangerous as those from without.

The Senator from Nevada has performed a distinct service to his country. He is a fine example of young manhood. The Nation needs more men of his courage and character in Congress.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for his remarks.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CONSOLIDATION OF COMMUNICATION COMPANIES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself I wish to introduce a bill which will make permissible the consolidation of the domestic telegraph communication companies as a consolidated company, and the consolidation of the international telegraph communications companies as a consolidated company.

The proposed legislation is the outgrowth of a study of this subject made by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate under Senate resolution 95 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which provided for "a thorough and complete study of the telegraph industry, including the economic conditions of the telegraph carriers, their relations to corporations engaged in other forms of communications, and the tendencies toward consolidation and a monopoly in such industry."

As the result of a study made in pursuance of this resolution, the Committee on Interstate Commerce made its report on the 28th day of October 1941, which report contained the following recommendations:

1. That the Congress approve an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, permitting—

(a) Domestic American telegraph carriers to merge; and

(b) International American telegraph carriers to merge; but with

(c) A proviso that there should be no merger between or common control of domestic and international communications carriers but permitting a merger of domestic carriers into one entity and international carriers into a second and entirely separate and distinct entity; and

(d) The legislation should define "domestic" and "international" carriers and shall not prevent the inclusion of all existing operations of any domestic carrier, which may be engaged partially in international telegraph communications, into a merged domestic enterprise, and shall empower the Federal Communications Commission eventually to require the merged domestic carrier to restrict itself solely to domestic telegraph operations if found to be in the public interest; and

(e) There should be no requirement that the domestic or international mergers be carried out simultaneously or at all; and

(f) The legislation should enjoin that the responsible Government regulatory agencies require that the merged company or companies be of the simplest possible financial structure; and

(g) The legislation should make specific provision for the fullest reasonable protection of all the workers in any unit of the industry which is consolidated, including a formula of dismissal pay and pension payments, to the end that no worker shall be put in a worse condition as a result of merger, and due care should be exercised to protect fully the pension rights and pension payments and group insurance rights of any employee who may be affected by merger, and that the Federal Communications Commission be given specific authority to study

and make rules and regulations covering the careful fulfillment of these labor-protection requirements as a condition precedent to merger; and

(h) That the legislation also should require in addition to these labor-protection requirements, specific proper safeguards for the interests of the using and general public and the industry as a whole or individual units thereof; and

(i) The legislation should grant the Federal Communications Commission appropriate regulatory powers with respect to the fair and equitable treatment of traffic between the domestic and international carriers; and

(j) The legislation should make special provision that in the event wire telegraph and leased wire telegraph facilities of the Bell System become a part of the merged domestic carrier that due care be exercised that there should be no interference or impairment of national defense communications needs; and

(k) The legislation should require specifically that in the event of either domestic or international mergers, there shall be no reduction in telegraph circuit facilities for the armed services or other Government agencies during the present emergency; and

(l) The legislation should incorporate the existing provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 (relating to radio licensees, sec. 310a) so that the merged company or companies be 80 percent owned by American nationals.

2. That the Congress should give consideration to modification of the provision of the 1866 Post Roads Act which permits a discrimination between the rate paid for telegraphic transmittal of Government messages and the rate paid by private users of telegraph.

These recommendations were based upon the findings of the committee, one of the most urgent of which was the finding that the Postal Telegraph Co—third largest carrier—was in imminent financial danger. It was found that by September 1, 1941, less than $750,000 remained of a $5,000,000 working-capital loan made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Since that time the Postal Telegraph Co. has borrowed an additional one and a half million dollars from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which sum, we are informed, is largely used up at the present time. While the Western Union Telegraph Co., the largest land-line carrier, is presently operating at a profit, it has experienced great losses in recent years. Like the Postal, it has lost a large portion of its revenue to the Government subsidized air mail, to the telegraph facilities of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and the radio point-to-point communication facilities. It also has a substantial debt structure, which may prove dangerous to it in the event another major business depression occurs.

I will not, at this time, attempt to state all the findings made by the committee, but merely wish to call the Senate's attention to the urgent necessity for immediate legislation upon this subject. It was the unanimous opinion of the Interstate Commerce Committee that it would be disastrous to allow any of the communication systems to fail, and particularly to fail at this time when all possible facilities are needed.

Being a member of the subcommittee which made this study, I was requested to introduce proposed legislation carrying out the recommendations of the committee. In doing this, I felt it proper to ask my colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], also a member of the subcommittee, to cooperate and join with me in the introduction of the measure. As Senators know, the Senator from Maine has, for several years past, made a most careful study of the problems confronting communication companies.

In presenting the bill neither the Senator from Maine nor I contend that it is perfect. We called in representatives of labor and of industry and discussed informally with them what, in their opinion, should be placed in such legislation. Their views do not completely coincide, and it is, therefore, impossible to draft legislation which will please everyone.

We personally felt that one of the most important provisions in the bill should be the protection of employees. We have, therefore, gone further in this bill to protect the man who has become trained in the telegraph profession from losing his position and seniority than any legislation ever enacted by Congress. We have guaranteed to the person who was employed on March 1 of last year, which is a little over a year ago, a position with the new company with a salary not less than he will be receiving at the time of the consolidation. We have also provided for the protection of the employees' rights and benefits under the retirement acts of the different companies. The protection afforded employees under the bill is so far reaching as to guarantee to the employees that all of them who have spent any appreciable time in their profession may continue their employment without financial loss.

Should one or more of the companies fail at the present time, employees who have spent 15 or 20 years with such company would lose their positions at a time in life when it would be almost impossible for them to reestablish themselves in any other profession.

As I stated before, the Senator from Maine and I do not contend that the proposed legislation is perfect, nor do we present it as necessarily containing all the views of either of us, but it is introduced as request legislation to carry out the views of the committee as expressed in their recommendation, with the hope that any deficiencies which may appear after public hearings may be remedied.

I now, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself, ask consent to introduce the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2445) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations or mergers of telegraph operations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] did me the courtesy to join my name with his as sponsor for the proposed legislation he has just introduced. I think I should say to the Senator that he is very kind in so doing, and I ought to add the assurance to the Senate that the real work in connection with the proposed legislation has been done by him and not by me. It was the Senator from Arizona who presided over the preliminary hearing held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. He presided and conducted those hearings with patience, with understanding, and with skill. It was the Senator from Arizona who carried on the discussions with interested persons, which made contribution to this first draft of legislation, and I am warranted in saying also that it was the comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter possessed by the Senator from Arizona and his skill as a draftsman which are responsible for the bill in the form in which it is now presented.

Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word in more detailed explanation of some of the provisions of the bill. If written into law, the bill will legalize the consolidation of domestic telegraph companies, and a consolidation of international telegraph companies. It does not, however, permit the consolidation of domestic and international companies. Consolidations in either field will be voluntary and not mandatory. Any voluntary merger, if determined upon by present competing companies, must in various respects conform to statutory prescriptions, and must have the approval of the Federal Communications Commission.

The general cause for this permitted action is the unsatisfactory condition of the whole domestic telegraph industry. The immediate occasion for it is the desperate financial plight of the Postal Co. It is accepted as certain by those familiar with the situation that our two principal domestic telegraph carriers must work out a plan of merger which will merit the approval of our regulatory body, the Federal Communications Commission, or there must speedily come the liquidation of the Postal Co. and its disappearance as a competitive factor in communications.

A further alternative, Mr. President, might be the taking over and the operation of the Postal System by the Federal Government. This would in turn present to us most serious problems. It would result in direct governmental competition with the Western Union, the present largest unit in the domestic wire communication field; and competition, direct or indirect, by the Government with other methods and means of domestic communication.

It might conceivably result in the assumption by Government of the entire burden of domestic wire and point-to-point radio communication. I infinitely prefer to this possibility the unification of the domestic wire companies now operating into a consolidated company within the law and under the watchful eye and the broad regulatory powers of our Communications Commission.

I am not entirely satisfied with the present draft of the bill. In fact, I doubt the wisdom of some of its purposes and provisions. However, in my opinion, it will serve as an appropriate basis for further committee study and for a revised and perfected committee draft, which in turn will merit early consideration by the Senate.

Section 222 of the proposed legislation is a new section added to the end of part II of the 1934 Communications Act.

Subsection (a) of section 222 makes lawful, with the approval of the Communications Commission, the merger of telegraph companies. There is added to section 222 (a) a proviso prohibiting the merger of a domestic company with an international company, and, correspondingly, of an international company with a domestic company.

Subsection (b) of section 222 provides for the filing of an application with the Commission setting forth in detail any proposed plan of merger and asking approval thereof. The paragraph covers the requirement for a public hearing on the application, and notice to interested parties. It authorizes the Commission, subject to the terms of the legislation, to enter an order approving the proposed consolidation.

Subsection (c) (1) authorizes the consolidated domestic carrier, as a part of the plan of consolidation, to take over the domestic operations of an international carrier. I emphasize that it is only the domestic operations of the international carrier which may be taken over.

Subsection (c) (2) requires that the merger of domestic telegraph carriers shall provide for the divestment by the consolidated domestic carrier of the international operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation of the domestic companies.

Subsection (d) (1) authorizes a consolidated international carrier, as a part of the plan of consolidation, to take over the international operations of any domestic telegraph company.

Subsection (d) (2) requires that an approved merger of international carriers shall provide for the divestment by the consolidated international carrier of all domestic operations by any party to the international merger. These provisions assure, we believe, an effective separation of domestic communications from international communications.

Subsection (e) seeks to prevent alien control, directly or indirectly, of any consolidated carrier.

Subsection (f) (1) and subsection (f) (2), which follows, are an effort, first, to provide for an equitable and just distribution by a consolidated domestic carrier, among international carriers not consolidated, of traffic originating in the United States and destined for points without the United States. Secondly, it provides for an equitable and just distribution by a consolidated international carrier, among domestic carriers not consolidated, of traffic originating without the United States and destined for points within the United States. These two subsections have significance in the event of a merger in either the domestic or international field without a merger in both fields of operation.

Subsection (f) (3) provides that if after a year's experience the Commission finds that the distribution of traffic between domestic and international carriers is not just, fair, and equitable it may, by its order, after hearing, prescribe the just, fair, and equitable distribution thereof.

Subsection (g) is made up of several subparagraphs, and deals with the labor problems which inhere in any consolidation of presently competing companies. Briefly, they assure that any employee who has been employed by a constituent carrier for a period of 5 years prior to the merger shall be employed by the consolidated carrier, at a rate of compensation not less than he was receiving at the time of approval of the consolidation, and that he shall be employed, unless he otherwise agrees, on the same class of work; second, that an individual who has been employed for less than 5 years, but who was employed on March 1, 1940, who was employed on the date of approval of the merger, and whose employment has been continuous between March 1, 1941, and approval of the merger, shall be employed by the consolidated carrier at a rate not less than that received by him at the date of approval of the merger, but with the further provision that the class of work of such a person may be changed without his consent.

Another paragraph dealing with labor provides that if an employee not covered by either of the two preceding provisions to which I have referred is discharged by the consolidated carrier, such carrier shall pay the discharged employee severance pay, as provided in detail in the provisions of the bill.

There is a further requirement for travel pay and expenses, and temporary additional compensation for an employee transferred from one community to another.

Subparagraph (5) of subsection (g) requires the consolidated carrier to guarantee the payment of all pension, health, insurance, or other benefits to which employees may be entitled from the companies entering into the consolidation. There are other provisions for the protection of labor against the possible effects upon employees of an authorized consolidation.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Arizona that if written into law or made effective as a condition of consolidation, these provisions would afford labor security and advantages obtained through no other legislation upon the statute books.

There are other provisions of the bill which merit some notice; but I think the provisions referred to by the Senator from Arizona and mentioned by me cover the phases of the bill which will have the largest public interest.

NORWEGIAN RESISTANCE TO THE NAZIS

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in view of the bad news this morning from Bataan, it is particularly appropriate today to recall that just 2 years ago this morning the Nazis first attacked one of our Allies in this war, the little nation of Norway. That attack was as treacherous as that of the Japanese on our own Pearl Harbor last December.

The Norwegians were a peaceful people. Their military establishments probably were weaker in proportion to their population than those of the United States, where lived another peaceful people at that time. Consequently, despite the heroic resistance of the little Norwegian army, it was only a matter of a few weeks before the Nazis ruled their homeland. But although the Nazis have conquered the soil of Norway, today they are further than ever from conquering the people of Norway. The Norwegians are still fighting for their freedom; and their gallant resistance in the face of tremendous odds is a challenge and a shining example to the people of America.

Here in great and powerful America we complain and criticise because our Army, our Navy, and our air force have not yet built up sufficient striking power to take the offensive in the Far East. Perhaps we can learn something from the indomitable spirit of the Norwegian people. For nearly 2 years their homeland has been ruled by the ruthless Nazis, but the people of Norway continue to resist and to fight for their freedom with whatever weapons they can reach.

Only last week 1,100 Norwegian clergymen of the Norwegian state church resigned their pulpits in protest against the rule of Quisling, the Nazi puppet. More than 9,000 or Norway's 10,500 teachers resigned from the Nazi dominated teachers' union; and today more than 2,000 of them are in concentration camps. Hardly a day passes which does not see more and more Norwegian youths, aided by their friends and relatives in Norway, braving the storms and dangers of the North Sea in their little fishing boats to go across to England, and from there to North America. They are not fleeing to safety. They are escaping to join the Royal Norwegian Air Force and other units of the Norwegian army in the hope of having a chance to strike back at the Nazis who have conquered their Norway.

Today those boys are fighting side by side with the other members of the United Nations forces. We are thankful that America is not today in the position of Norway, and, God willing, it never will be; but I am confident that the spirit of the American people will rise to meet any crisis with the same gallantry and indomitable courage displayed by the Norwegians. It is that spirit, as well as the tanks and guns and planes we are producing, that makes certain the eventual defeat of tyranny.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand there will be no executive session of the Senate today. There are three nominations which have been reported from the Committee on Commerce—one of Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery for reappointment as a member of the United States Maritime Commission, one of Dr. Leo Otis Colbert for reappointment as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and one of Mr. William Rude Jackson to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Commerce Committee,

and joined the other members in favorably reporting these nominations. Because of the special qualifications, experience and knowledge possessed by Admiral Vickery, I join the able Senator from Alabama in seeking immediate consideration of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be read.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, United States Navy, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from April 16, 1942 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo Otis Colbert for reappointment as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years, effective April 8, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Rude Jackson to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

CRITICAL DAYS—NORWEGIAN COURAGE AND RESISTANCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for any great length of time. However, in view of the fact that today is a day which some of us who have Viking blood in our veins feel should be remembered by the Senate and by the Nation in commemoration of the great sacrifices of that martyr nation, little Norway, since the invasion 2 years ago, I desire to say a few words.

In September 1939 I was a representative of this Nation attending the Interparliamentary Union at Oslo, Norway. It will be remembered that the meeting was held about 2 weeks before the Germans struck into Poland. Gathered at the capital of that little nation, Norway, were the representatives of all the free parliaments on earth. Germany was not represented there; Japan was not represented there; Italy was not represented there; but representatives from the parliamentary nations were there. It was my privilege to have an audience with the King. It was my privilege to attend the functions of the Interparliamentary Union; and if I had the gift of an artist, I would portray for the Senate the critical, tense situation which existed. Telegrams were constantly coming in; radiograms were being received from all the other capitals of Europe. Men were recognizing that great events were about to take place. I remember that one night I had dinner with Lord Davies, of the British delegation. While we sat at dinner he received a telegram. We saw him no more after that; he flew back to London.

Mr. President, today, 2 years after Norway was ruthlessly invaded, Bataan fell. The next 100 days, it has been said, are to be the most critical days in the history of the world. If we look about we can, when we remember what happened in Norway, profitably ask a few questions. In the next 100 days can Hitler push Russia back beyond the Caucasus? In the next 100 days will Hitler get control of the oil fields at Grosny and Baku? If he does, we know that will add to the length of the war. Mr. President, will Vichy send her Navy into the battle for the Axis? Vichy is a conundrum; the world is wondering where Vichy stands. Will Turkey be forced to join the Axis Powers or will she stand firm? Will Spain and Portugal, under diplomatic or military pressure, join the Axis Powers? Will Japan join hands with Germany and attempt to strike at Russia from the east as Germany strikes from the west?

Reverting to Norway, I said I had an audience with the King, and I very distinctly remember saying to him then, "It seems to me that all the small democratic nations of Europe would do well to get behind a large nation and form an association of some kind by means of which they would operate together." It was then that he said to me, "No; we have faith that the neutrality arrangement which we have with Hitler will carry through, as it did with the Kaiser."

How mistaken they all were. That little nation went down under the hammer blows that came from the sea and the land and the sky.

However, as suggested by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the spirit of Norway lives on; it is not dead. The courage of the Norwegian people is a constant example to the world. The flame of liberty burns intensely there. The men of the church, the men of the schools, the men of the parliamentary body, the farmers, the merchants, the professional men, all of them sense that this is a battle for great, vital principles. Norway's 30,000 seamen and 99 percent of her people are fighting the Nazis. Norway believes that the wave of the future will be the wave of democracy and not the wave of the totalitarian government.

We know, Mr. President, that America did not want this war, but we were attacked, and now we are not simply fighting for our liberty side by side with Norway and the other democracies of the world, but we are fighting for our life. Democracy all over the world recognizes that it is a fight to the finish to see which ideology shall finally prevail. Shall it be the old idea of absolutism, now under the new name of nazi-ism or fascism, or the ideology of Japan, or shall it be the American way, the American freedoms, the American concept which shall prevail?

In the political field the issue is, Shall the hands of the clock be turned back a thousand years? and, as was so ably demonstrated by the clergymen of Norway the other day, another issue is in the field of religion, Shall the hand of the clock be turned back 2,000 years in the field of religion? These are the two questions that mark the two large issues.

We know that the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States manifest the democratic way of life, and we know that those very ideas have sprung from the religious concept of man as brother to man. Democracy practiced by good men is the Golden Rule in action—do unto others as you would be done by. It is a way of thought and life, and we shall make sure that, on this continent at least, no dictator shall dominate the minds of men, the channels through which God's inspirational ideas are fed.

The enslaved nations, from which many of us have sprung, France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, are still thinking freedom's thoughts, and, with our help, they will join the ranks of free men later on.

Of course, Mr. President, we are fighting for home and country, but we are also fighting for an ideal, for the things of the spirit, for the unfettered mind, for human dignity. Only in a democracy, where the minds of men are free, do we find that respect for the dignity of the individual which differentiates democracy from a totalitarian form of government.

Under the Stars and Stripes we believe in the intelligence and the integrity of the average man; under the swastika, the average man does not count; he is not supposed to have enough sense to decide things for himself, and, therefore, he must be governed by master men, who have absolute power over the public and private life of every citizen. The Axis Powers hate democracy because they know that freedom of man, exemplified in a republic, is the fruit of religion.

Here in America we have thoughts of freedom. Witness the preamble to the Constitution. I quote:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

What inspired language! Every phrase of it could well be the subject of a master oration. We are to establish justice; we are to promote the general welfare—not the welfare of any particular class or group but the general welfare—and we are to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, making us trustees of those great values and those great freedoms which were handed down to us.

Mr. President, witness some other language which, like a great beacon, shines forth in the sky, and which should be burned into the consciousness of each of us. I quote from the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal—

All men—

> that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And then:

That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I believe that if in our schools those two great beacon-light statements were burned into the consciousness of every youth, so they would comprehend the real meaning, the inner meaning of each phrase, our youth and ourselves would be not only better citizens but better qualified to meet the challenge of today.

Mr. President, we have inculcated into our economy that it is the function of each citizen to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before our God. The democratic way of life which glorifies this country is not a static thing; it is a growing thing. As man grows and appreciates the things of the spirit, democracy will grow. It is an attitude toward life which each member of the American social order possesses.

Mr. President, a week from Monday next we will take up the Connally bill. At that time there will, undoubtedly, be a number of amendments offered. It appears from letters and from newspaper columns and from other sources that many persons have conceived the idea that in the United States Senate their representatives are either pro-labor or anti-labor, pro-industry or anti-industry.

The real, true approach to this problem, as I am sure every Senator sees it, is this: In this tragic period all of us are pro-America, and what we want is to have taken out of the American economy the influence of those minds, those men, those groups of men who are selfish, who selfishly place group interest above the welfare of all the people and thus jeopardize victory.

Of course, it is the human element that controls. As I said before, bad men make bad legislation; bad men make bad business conditions; bad men make bad labor conditions. There is, however, no thought in the Congress of the United States that the Congress should, in any way, take from any group in this country any of its inalienable rights, as mentioned in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution. The thought is that we should remove from the national picture those elements that would "termite" the very values which are mentioned in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution.

Thus, Mr. President, after speaking the other day on this very subject in the Senate, I received a letter which suggested that I must be pro this or anti that. I repeat that, in my opinion, the Senate of the United States wants to cleanse our economy of those factors which would interfere with the greatest possible war production and which would make more difficult the victory of our cause. No one wants defeat. I am sure no one in industry wants defeat, and no one in labor wants defeat. Consequently, if we could remove from the picture those racketeer-minded persons whom we find in every segment of our society we would get rid of an element which is causing great damage to our country.

Mr. President, the Axis Powers would have us believe that we should feed our souls with the material philosophies of men, the thought that there are master races and races to be enslaved, and that greed and injustice make for "the new order." We know that such thinking leads only to rotten politics, to a degenerate race, and to poverty, injustice, and international strife. We know that such teachings bring tyranny in management, in labor, in politics, and in government; we know that such thinking leads to decay and the turning of the hands of the clock back, and we reach the conclusion that only through right thinking, through reeducation, if you please, can the real values which make for freedom and liberty be maintained in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a statement under the heading "Norway continues the fight," signed by Wilhelm Morgenstierne, Minister of Norway, Washington, April 8, 1942, and published in today's Washington Post.

As indicated by the Minister of Norway in this article, Norway carries on in her battle for freedom. Her King and 30,000 of her seamen and thousands of her youth are in the actual fighting forces opposing the Nazis.

Norway, the land of the Vikings, from which have come so many of our citizens, is about 125,000 square miles in area, about the size of California. It possesses the most rugged and broken stretch of seaboard in the world, with a coastline, measuring the shoreline of the fjords, of 12,000 miles. The nature of Norway is extremely varied. Pine-clad hills and great forests, the wild grandeur of the towering mountains, the myriad fjords, the valleys placid and smiling, the mighty glaciers clinging to the mountain slopes, the cool lakes—this is the land which sent forth Leif Ericson in the year 1,000 to discover North America. This is the land that sent its blood stream into France and into Britain, into Ireland, Scotland, and into northern Italy. It was the Vikings who founded the city of Dublin in the ninth century. In those days they were the sea rovers guided only by the stars, but they were also the great traders of their day.

But, Mr. President, before misfortune struck Norway 2 years ago today, that people had emerged from many shadows and they had found their way up the ladder of civilization until most of their economic and political problems were solved. There were no great rich and there were no poor in that land. That little nation, before it was invaded, each year more than balanced its budget and laid aside some money for what was thought might be rainy days ahead.

The last century in Norway was a century of progress. In fact, that little nation was a laboratory where freedom prevailed and where freemen practiced the rules of liberty. As a result, poetry, music, and the sciences prospered and developed and the people were happy. Henrik Wergeland was the poet of the new freedom. He was a Norwegian Byron, with a touch of Shelley. In music there was Edvard Grieg and an Ole Bull, and in the field of letters there were writers like Ibsen, Björnson, Lee, and others. Men who were not simply poets and authors but who were prophets and seers; men who not only influenced the lives of that nation but the thinking of all peoples.

Norway has a population of a little more than 3,000,000 people, yet before she was invaded she had the fourth largest merchant fleet in the world. In the field of capital and labor Norway had established a balance between the rights of organized labor and capital, on the one side, and society as a whole on the other. It permitted labor organizations to be sued the same as capital organizations. It required that both obey the law of the land.

This little land of Norway in the field of agriculture, prior to Germany's invasion, had established a system of balance also between agriculture and the state.

This people were not afraid of "government in the picture." But when government entered the picture to compete with its own citizens government had no advantage. The purpose of government was to aid the citizen and not to injure the citizen; to create values, not destroy values. Cooperative organizations in Norway functioned previous to Hitler's invasion equitably and constructively.

Now this "land of promise"—economically and socially—has been overrun by the Nazis. But I repeat, Mr. President, the spirit of the people is not dead. It is a living flame and a living example for all the world to behold.

The iron heels of goose-stepping Nazi legions have thundered over all of Norway and the other conquered lands and have ground into the earth the hard-won rights and liberties of freemen.

These peoples are temporarily fettered with the chains of Nazi bondage in a menacing new order of tyranny, of pillage, and privation; but, Mr. President, the hopes and souls of freemen can never be permanently fettered. The love of liberty and freedom, like the love of Christianity, can be whipped into the catacombs and scourged into martyrdom, but it cannot be annihilated.

The great values of freedom and religion become dearer under the whiplash of oppression. Freedom's flame burns fiercest when its torch is locked in the hearts and minds of freemen now enslaved. The dreams and hopes of liberty soar highest in the lengthening shadows of conquest.

Freemen now slaves know what they have lost and the knowledge fires them with a fierce determination to recapture their own.

Today there are tall sons of the Vikings in Bergen, at Stavanger and Trondheim, looking westward over the fjords toward a people still free.

The loss of Bataan today brings their problem closer to us. The loss of Bataan gives us a grim picture of the battle in the east and the possibilities for further disasters.

The harrowing lesson of Norway and the other conquered countries will not be in vain if it makes all of the world realize the peril of losing freedom and the need

for paying any price to retain it. The hopes of liberty-loving peoples everywhere, be they fettered or free, are one today.

Our destiny here in America in the march of history ahead is to realize those hopes—to cast off the shackles of tyranny and to insure the survival of freemen.

I renew my request that Mr. Morgenstierne's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY CONTINUES THE FIGHT

If the world wants a true measure of Hitler's new order—not as a blueprint or as an ideology—but in naked, deadly practice, it might turn to Norway under Nazi domination.

Two years ago Norway, as we knew it, as some of our American friends knew it, was a fairly prosperous country, the home of a hard-working, progressive, contented people, which had set its face toward a future of freedom under the law, political and industrial democracy, social justice, and international decency.

Then suddenly in the dead of night, between April 8 and 9, 1940, the Nazis, assisted by their advance agents inside Norway, posing as friends and "protectors," broke into our peaceful land, bombing and burning our cities, towns, and farms, indiscriminately killing our men, women, and children. There are certain aspects of the German rape of Norway which, I believe, will secure for it the place as one of the blackest, or perhaps I should say the most yellow pages of history. In the eternal and indelible annals of humankind nobody shall ever deprive Herr Hitler of the accomplishment of having thrown in 2 short years, by brute and stupid force, the Norwegian and other enlightened and forward-striving peoples back into dark, Teutonic ages.

In spite of the immediate terrible hardships and horrors, all Norwegians are deeply grateful that from the first moment our nation and its leaders chose the path of honor and resistance. When everything seemed to crumble around them, our great King Haakon and the Nygaardsvold government refused to accept the slave terms offered by Herr Hitler to a free and proud people. As always before the Norwegian people would rather die on their feet than live on their knees.

For 2 long months of hardship and heroism they fought on Norwegian soil, against the overwhelming forces of barbarism. When at last King Haakon and his government were forced, temporarily, to leave Norway, they went to England in order to continue from there, in accordance with the unanimous mandate of the Norwegian Parliament, the fight for Norway's freedom and independence.

In the meantime, the Nazis are the temporary masters of Norway. History will relate and the world will long remember how these brutes raped and endeavored to strangle our people. One by one some of our finest, outstanding citizens and patriots are being arrested, tortured—yes, tortured—and murdered. The president of the University of Norway and other outstanding leaders of our people are being placed in dark cells and starved into everything except submission. "The wave of the future" in Norway is a wave of crime and horror and torture. Today the people of Norway—99 percent of them—carry on against the oppressors in a way which shall never be forgotten. The Church of Norway, headed by the bishops, have, by their high and uncompromising stand, given to this fight a deep religious significance. The 1 percent of Norwegian traitors, that motley crowd of feeble-minded boobs and self-seekers called Quislings—only tend to confirm the fact of a Norwegian people united against the barbarians. Some day, I am sure, history will say of the Norwegian people—with the words of Mr. Churchill about the British: "This was their greatest hour."

In the meantime, Norwegians abroad, under the inspiring leadership of King Haakon the Great, Crown Prince Olav, and the legal Norwegian Government in London, are carrying on the fight and the work on the external front. Under their leadership the great Norwegian merchant marine and its incomparable sailors are sailing the oceans carrying supplies to our common battle fronts. Norwegian soldiers of the air, of land, and sea are training in Great Britain and in Canada. The Norwegian Government, even under present harassing circumstances, is meeting all its financial obligations, and its foreign representatives are carrying the message of Norway's fight and Norway's faith to all free nations of the world.

In spite of serious set-backs and bitter disappointments, did we ever doubt that Norway would once more be free and ours? But today, on the second anniversary of the rape of Norway, we feel doubly reassured. For the first time in history the American people, with their vast resources and unconquerable spirit, are not only our friends but also our comrades in arms. We are fighting shoulder to shoulder with a people we love and admire and with whom we share our most precious ideals and aspirations.

Norwegians and Americans are inseparably united in this great fight, the most momentous crusade in history, against the enemies of human progress and Christian civilization.

Together we shall win as surely as dawn follows night. And when we have won, we and our Allies shall stand together, prepared and alert, as the guardians of law, liberty, and popular government, never again permitting the hordes of barbarism to threaten our freedom and our way of life.

WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE,
Minister of Norway.

WASHINGTON, *April 8.*

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, MINNESOTA

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on page 8 of the calendar there appears as order of business 1275, House bill 6495, providing for the construction of a bridge in Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6495) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on March 10 I presented in the Senate an Associated Press dispatch containing a statement by the National Manufacturers' Association, and I asked, without any criticism by me, that the situation covered by the statement be investigated. Since that time Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, at which time I asked him if he would be kind enough to have the statement checked. I might say that the information was circulated, by whom I do not know, from the backwoods to the cities.

After looking into the matter Mr. Nelson has today sent me a statement showing exactly the strike situation in the war-production effort in January and February of this year. I am glad the report shows a lesser number of strikes and man-hours lost than was shown by the report of the National Manufacturers' Association. However, I am distressed that it shows any strikes at all, particularly when we consider the position in which we found ourselves in January and February. My desire was for information, to help the war effort, without regard to any group.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the report of the War Production Board, as presented by Mr. Donald Nelson in his letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1942.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In accordance with your request, I am attaching herewith a copy of my letter to Senator THOMAS concerning the current strike situation.

Sincerely yours,

D. M. NELSON, *Chairman.*

[Attachment: Letter.]

APRIL 2, 1942.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: This is in response to the request made of me while testifying before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on March 19 to present to you the data concerning the strike situation in January and February with particular reference to the March 2 press release of the National Association of Manufacturers.

I have had an exhaustive study made of this situation in the course of which all information on strikes available to the Federal Government, including the detailed lists of the National Association of Manufacturers, has been examined by analysts from my immediate office and from the Labor Division of the War Production Board.

Before giving you the results of this study, I should like to point out that there will probably always be disagreement as to such statistics because of differences in judgment as to whether individual stoppages materially impede war production, and because of differences in information available to compilers. Moreover, I should like further to point out that the preliminary figures of the Interdepartmental Conference erred on the low side of the actual situation, and the figures of the National Association of Manufacturers were even more greatly on the side of excess. A most careful review shows that the loss of war production through strikes and lock-outs during January and February was less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the labor that went into war production during these months, and also shows that such stoppages did not have an appreciable effect on the production of war material.

Our judgment and information as of this date indicates that there were in January: 25 stoppages affecting the war program, involving 9,620 men and resulting in a loss of 20,310 man-days of work. Similar figures for February are: 48 stoppages, 22,010 men and 80,830 man-days. These may be contrasted with the figures given by the National Association of Manufacturers for January of 43 stoppages, 15,512 men, and 82,747 man-days, and for February of 76 stoppages, 70,905 men, and 253,603 man-days.

In further explanation of these figures you may be interested to learn that our January figures include 5, and our February figures

15 stoppages not listed by the National Association of Manufacturers, and exclude a number listed by them where we found no strikes, or where we found that such interference as there was did not directly retard military activity. As an important instance of the latter, we cite the case of Selby Shoe Co., Portsmouth, Ohio, in which the National Association of Manufacturers found 14,400 man-days lost to war production in January and 48,260 in February. We find, however, that this company makes women's shoes and was working on no war contracts during these months.

Another important case which might be cited is the National Association of Manufacturers' figure of 17,000 man-days lost in a number of unnamed plants on the west coast where companies did not operate on Washington's Birthday because the workers demanded double time. I have already expressed to you my conviction that the payment of double time for holidays as such interferes with production. However, we have not included an estimate of the time lost on Washington's Birthday because we have no accurate information on this matter. I feel, however, that, if available, such time should be added to our February figures.

For your further information we are attaching hereto the company-by-company analysis for January and February, 1942.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

PROBLEMS OF BUSINESS IN THE WAR EFFORT—FORTUNE MAGAZINE POLL

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, yesterday there came to my desk a rather remarkable document. It is the result of a poll by Fortune Magazine taken among 5,000 representative businessmen of the United States. It appears that there was posed to them the question, "What is or are the most important problems now confronting your business growing out of the war effort?"

The answers were broken down into some 10 major categories, and the replies become all the more interesting when it is made to appear as a result of this synthesis that, according to these representative businessmen, labor problems are seventh on the list of problems confronting them, apparently seventh in the degree of seriousness with which they regard the problems.

The Fortune poll shows that slightly more than 5 percent of businessmen throughout the United States regard the labor problem, other than shortages, but including wage rates and unions, as their primary business problem.

In this connection I should like to call attention to a release made public on April 1 by the Department of Labor showing average weekly hours of labor in certain industries. It appears that in the machine tool and accessories industry the average weekly hours were 55; in the production of firearms, 53.1 hours; in the production of aircraft, 48.7 hours; and in shipbuilding, 48.2 hours.

APPEAL FOR UNITY BY JNO. H. SWISHER & SON, INC.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand one of the most stirring challenges I have seen, an appeal to the whole country for total mobilization in the prosecution of the war. This was issued to the American people by a Florida company, Jno. H. Swisher & Son, Inc., of Jacksonville, Fla. At the expense of that company the appeal was carried as a full-page advertisement in all the leading metropolitan daily papers under the title "Let's Stop This 'Fiddling While Rome Burns.'" The appeal reads:

LET'S STOP THIS "FIDDLING WHILE ROME BURNS"

(An open letter to the Government of the United States, to management, to the rank and file of labor, and to all Americans who want unity, action, and victory.)

For many months America has been fiddling while Rome burned about our heads.

Fiddling with "business as usual" during the vital pre-war years while the storm signals were plainly flying.

Fiddling with isolationist arguments while our delighted enemies were secretly preparing violent death for our armed forces and civilian population.

Fiddling with needless, unpatriotic industrial strife at a time when labor and management should have been working shoulder to shoulder for preparedness.

Fiddling with selfish quarrels about time-and-a-half and double-time pay—scandalously climaxed by the Washington's Birthday work stoppage in a number of basic war-production plants.

Fiddling while power-hungry men put personal ambition above national safety.

Fiddling clumsily with the urgent task of converting our industry to war work.

Fiddling ineffectively with the all-important job of accumulating stock piles of essential materials.

WHO'S AT FAULT BECAUSE WE FIDDLED?

Everybody.
Government.
Management.
Labor.

Every mother's son and daughter of us.

We fiddled and we fiddled. Pearl Harbor woke us up. But we thought dollars could buy a quick victory so we went back to our self-satisfied fiddling again.

How deadly wrong we were.

Now it's time—it's past time—to quit fiddling, America.

It's time for the offensive, fighting action that's traditional with Americans. Time to make a mighty, united effort to accomplish the impossible as we have always done when miracles are needed.

The problems are many and difficult. The menace is frightful. We can and will win if we quit fiddling and go to fighting. But we've got to do it now.

We, of Jno. H. Swisher & Son, Inc., thought we were doing our full share: We bought quantities of Defense bonds. We encouraged our 2,800 workers to buy Defense bonds and stamps. We were complacent because we have been and are operating to full capacity and because our cigars produce thousands of dollars in revenue taxes for Uncle Sam every day.

Then we took critical stock of ourselves. And we discovered that we, too, had been fiddling. We found these things:

That we have one of the South's best equipped machine shops with large excess capacity suitable for making certain types of war materials.

That this machine shop alone can yield 2,000 man-hours a day for war production on a three-shift basis—nearly three-quarters of a million man-hours a year, working 7 days a week.

That we have nearly 100 highly skilled machinists and mechanics as a nucleus for training and supervision.

That sharp sacrifices in our plant arrangement would provide big areas of floor space for additional machines or hand operations in making war equipment.

That our capable executive staff is eager to shoulder the added responsibilities, the heavier burden, the lengthened hours of work without additional recompense or salary.

And now we offer these extra plant facilities, these executives, these fighting loyalties to the Government of the United States for use in war production.

BUT WE DON'T WANT ONE PENNY OF PROFIT FROM WAR CONTRACTS

We will accept and execute war orders at actual cost of labor, materials, etc., on a strict break-even basis.

We can do this because our primary business is cigar making. We can do it as long as the returns from this business pay our operating costs. Although we strongly believe in industry's right to make a fair profit just as we believe in the workers' right to fair wages, in this case we do not want profits.

WHAT WE WANT IS TO STOP FIDDLING WHILE ROME BURNS! WE WANT TO HELP WIN THIS WAR! AND WE WANT TO START NOW!

We have already begun to seek war contracts. We are ready to make the sacrifices that acceptance of this offer will clearly require us to make.

There are no strings attached to this proposal. We ask no profits. We simply want to quit fiddling and go to fighting.

We believe that the same attitude prevails in the ranks of American labor. We believe that a great majority of war workers would gladly work overtime at straight pay in order to speed war production.

We believe that the rank and file of labor is also tired of fiddling while Rome burns. Labor has everything to lose if we lose this war.

We believe that no true American wants to add unreasonably to the cost of war and war materials—a cost that will be reflected in fearsome taxes which every worker will have to pay.

Therefore, we invite labor to make the sacrifice of yielding up time and a half and double-time pay in connection with defense production assigned to our plant.

This is merely a suggestion—not a stipulation. Regardless of labor's decision our offer stands.

We repeat that we're tired of fiddling while Rome burns.

Let's stop this fiddling of which we have all been guilty. Instead, let's get busy at once to create a mighty chorus of national sacrifice, production, and unity. We can return to our bickerings when victory has been won.

How about it, Uncle Sam? Will you accept our offer?

How about it, Labor? Will you cooperate?

How about it, America? Do we fiddle or do we fight?

CARL S. SWISHER,
President, Jno. H. Swisher & Son, Inc., Manufacturers of King Edward Cigars, Jacksonville, Fla.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Raymond Miller, of Galatea, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (reappointment), which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Raymond Miller, of Galatea, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (reappointment).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE DIRECTOR

Leo Otis Colbert to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER

William Rude Jackson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Cox.

The Reverend Hugh W. Glenn, Wesley Chapel Methodist Church, New Albany, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the constant access that we have to the throne of grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Bestow Thou upon our beloved President, our Senate, and this assembled House, all those graces and virtues that will make them acceptable to Thee. May Thy guiding Spirit incline these Thy servants to register their patriotic devotion on the side of truth, righteousness, purity, and justice by the dedication of themselves to Thee and to the sacred rights of human freedom. Add strength to their faith, ardor to their love, and help them to seek the heights of open fellowship with Thee. Renew their physical strength, give them the courage of their convictions, and unite them in singleness of heart and purpose. Out of our confusion and despair, help us to see that in Thy will is our peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 6, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1942:

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain;

H. R. 4151. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey;

H. R. 4464. An act for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey;

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Orme;

H. R. 5069. An act for the relief of George Garcavy;

H. R. 5363. An act for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.;

H. R. 5452. An act for the relief of Emmett Armstrong;

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, and further to define the powers of a district judge in certain suits;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 6714. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott.

On April 8, 1942:

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Edd Nevins;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Ida Baird;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 5559. An act for the relief of William Horsman;

H. R. 5652. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga.;

H. R. 5977. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple;

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6387. An act to extend the crediting of military service under the railroad retirement acts, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6440. An act to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on April 7, 1942, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6483. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted to the Chair on April 6, 1942, the Chair did on Tuesday, April 7, 1942, sign the enrolled bill of the House, H. R. 6483, entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An Act to Expedite the Provision of Housing in Connection With National Defense and for Other Purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two consent requests: First to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Democrat, of Holyoke, Mass.; and second to extend my remarks and include excerpts from a recent speech by Gov. Frank M. Dixon, of Alabama, pointing out some of the things we must dispense with in order to win the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is ordered.

There were no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business for the day I may address the House for 25 minutes on the subject Labor in the War Effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and insert resolutions adopted by the legislature of my State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today the board of education of my city is 100 years old. Although the bill establishing the original board was passed by the legislature on April 9, 1842, city-wide observance of the anniversary will be postponed until next week because the schools are now in recess for the Easter holidays.

Exhibitions and observances will be held throughout the city and 1,000,000 children will learn what it means to write on slates, do arithmetic on an abacus, and peruse McGuffey's reader. On Tuesday 732 schools will be conducted for at least part of the day in the manner of 1842.

Boys with dirty faces will be washed by girls before their classes. Some will wear dunce caps. Oral examinations will be conducted by visiting trustees. There also will be exhibitions of the new education system. The celebration will close with a dinner at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria on April 20.

Should you be in New York City next week we would be pleased to have you pay a visit to one of our schools.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HARRY KAHN

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4665, to provide for the payment of the sum of $3,000 to Harry Kahn, as compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an accident involving an Army truck.

It appears that on the evening of April 16, 1931, an Army truck was proceeding northward on the Washington-Richmond Highway, bound for Fort Humphreys, Va. Upon approaching the entrance of the fort, the driver reduced his speed in order to make a right-hand turn into the gateway. As he did so, the engine stalled and the vehicle came to a stop, a short distance south of the gate entrance. The driver attempted to crank the engine and encountered some difficulties. A tail light of a kerosene type was burning at the rear of the truck.

At about the same time Mr. Kahn was driving a passenger automobile in the same direction, and crashed into the truck from the rear. As a result of the collision he sustained personal injuries and a passenger riding with him was killed. Mr. Kahn apparently asserts that he was unable to see the tail light of the truck, owing to the fact that he was blinded by lights from oncoming traffic, but does not contend that he made any effort to stop or slow down when he was unable to see the road ahead of him.

It does not appear that the driver of the Government vehicle was guilty of any negligence whatsoever. I am unable to agree with the suggestion that it was his duty to place a flare back of the truck, since the truck was stalled only momentarily, and he was attempting to get the engine started. Moreover, I am advised that the existing provision of the Virginia Code, requiring flares or torches to protect any bus or truck that is disabled and stops upon the highway, did not become law until 1938, while the accident here involved occurred in 1931.

While the lamentable results of the collision are to be deplored, there does not appear to be any moral obligation on the part of the Government to compensate the claimant under the circumstances.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I feel constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1942.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the message will be postponed until April 13.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RELIEF OF H. J. ABNEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5504, "For the relief of H. J. Abney."

This enrolled bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to H. J. Abney, Columbia, S. C., the sum of $1,419.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when he was shot and wounded by a military policeman in Columbia, S. C., on February 22, 1941.

On the night of February 22, 1941, the military policeman in question, Corporal Vilas L. Davis, military police detachment, Fort Jackson, S. C., on duty in the city of Columbia, S. C., was dispatched, under competent orders, with two privates, to investigate a disorder at the University Lunch in the city of Columbia, in response to a telephone call in which it was stated that a soldier was involved in the disorder. In the investigation following, Corporal Davis became involved in an altercation with Mr. Abney, which resulted in the shooting of Mr. Abney by Corporal Davis.

Corporal Davis was tried on May 2, 1941, by general court-martial for assault upon Homer J. Abney, with intent to do him bodily harm, by shooting him in the thigh with a pistol. The accused defended on grounds of self-defense and was acquitted by the court. It must be borne in mind that this court observed the witnesses and weighed the evidence submitted.

While the action of the court in absolving the accused from criminal liability is not determinative of the question of any moral obligation of the United States to come to the aid of one injured through the acts of its agents acting under color of office, or otherwise, the substantial showing that the injured party was the aggressor negatives such obligation. The evidence is clear that Mr. Abney took the law in his own hands in the matter of the collection of a small debt, and that his conduct created the disturbance which resulted in his injury. This, coupled with his acts of aggression committed against Corporal Davis, is convincing that there is not only no legal but no moral basis for the proposed relief.

In this view of the matter, the approval of this enactment would establish a precedent contrary to sound public policy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1942.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the message will be postponed until April 13 next.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an Army Day address by Lieutenant General Somervell before the Military Order of the World War at a recent Army Day dinner in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of shipbuilding in the Great Lakes region and to include a statement or press release by the United States Maritime Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with Senator MURRAY, of Montana, in the sponsorship of legislation designed to speed up the extensive manufacture of synthetic rubber. My bill proposes the establishment of the United States Rubber Authority with full power and funds to acquire sites, to construct plants, and to operate facilities for the swift production of at least 400,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

Government ownership and operation of plants of this character is strictly a wartime expedient. Under normal circumstances I would not advocate it. But 30,000,000 motorists in America realize that conditions today are far from normal. The leaders of our war effort are keenly aware that rubber is now more precious than gold. Without an adequate supply of the commodity we are militarily bankrupt. We have no moral, military, or national right to jeopardize our armed forces nor essential civilian activity by short-sighted, ineffective methods for the provision of essential rubber volume.

Therefore it appears to me that we must face the realities of the current situation and deal forthrightly with them. Too many public and private agencies have been dwelling in the land of make-believe, gambling not upon our strength but upon the weakness and compassion of our real and potential enemies. Now we must necessarily rely on our own strength and upon our own ability to produce.

I would be satisfied to further subsidize private production, but, according to Mr. Jones' reasoning, we have about tapped the immediate extent of that source. Because I strongly feel that we cannot tamper with this emergency, I see no other swift, workable means for maximum production in synthetic rubber than in making it the Federal Government's responsibility.

I doubt if anyone will challenge the effectiveness of the plan proposed in my bill. If private companies are not equal to the task of vastly increased synthetic-rubber production—and it appears they are not—then it is plainly the Government's obligation to do the job. My bill presents a practical method of doing the job and—most important—of getting it done quickly.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is something very peculiar about the synthetic rubber situation in the United States. Washington has been filled with rumors and whisperings about the manipulation which was indulged in to prevent the establishment of a synthetic rubber industry in the United States. Usually the blame was laid by administration spokesmen on general conditions, although Department of Commerce Secretary Jesse Jones, who also is head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of the R. F. C.-owned and controlled Rubber Reserve Company, was allowed to take the blame for a serious miscalculation, if not worse, which is now becoming apparent.

It has been reported in some circles in Washington that the real reason behind the lag in the establishment of synthetic rubber plants was that President Roosevelt did not want to offend the British and Dutch rubber interests. Also, that he wanted to encourage the establishment of a rubber-growing industry in some of the Latin American countries. It is also said that he, as well as Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, did not want a new industry established under pressure of the war needs which after the war would want a high tariff.

William L. Batt, in testifying before the Truman defense investigating committee recently, disclosed that the synthetic-rubber program had been torpedoed in some way under Jones' management. This Mr. Jones denies. He did admit, however, in testifying before the Truman committee, that the British-Dutch combine had blocked the efforts of the United States to build up a larger stock pile of natural rubber although it had been selling rubber to the Japs up to the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

It is important to the American people that the record be kept straight in this regard, because it is so similar to the domestic sugar situation. It will be recalled that in spite of the most earnest warnings on the part of those who best knew the sugar situation that the advent of a general war would create a sugar shortage in the United States, both the President and the then Secretary of Agriculture, HENRY A. WALLACE, favored a reduction rather than an increase in the sugar-producing facilities of the United States. Many sugar companies were killed off by the adroit use of the quotas.

More than a year ago in these comments it was pointed out that synthetic rubber—strictly speaking of a natural rubber substitute—superior to the natural rubber itself could readily be manufactured from alcohol. It was pointed out that the alcohol for the production of this rubber could be made in alcohol plants from surplus corn, wheat, even the waste materials on the farm. Without going too deeply into the chemistry, the process was to redistill alcohol over a catalyst of aluminum into a chemical called butadiene. The butadiene, plus another chemical called styrene, polymerizes into this rubber substitute.

It was also pointed out that in quantities this rubber could be produced to sell for about the price of natural rubber. Its qualities were such, however, as to make it of vastly greater durability and utility than the natural-rubber product.

It was foreseen by many authorities as long as 2 years ago that there would be a rubber shortage in this country in the event of war, and that such a rubber shortage would come along with a sugar shortage. In spite of these warnings the administration opposed the establishment of alcohol plants for the purpose of producing alcohol for power, combined with gasoline in internal-combustion motors, and also for this rubber substitute.

The result of that mistaken and blind policy of opposition is that the American people are now confronted with a shortage of three materials essential to American life, not one of which they need to have suffered if the administration had listened to those who knew the situation. One is a shortage of gasoline. Fuel alcohol can be produced in quantities at a comparatively low price to be combined with gasoline. Enough alcohol could have been produced to have prevented any gasoline shortage. A second shortage is that of rubber tires, which could have been entirely prevented by foresight on the part of the administration if it had given encouragement to the establishment of these alcohol plants to produce the alcohol necessary for conversion into rubber substitutes. The third is the sugar shortage. The American people have been told that part of their available sugar has already been used to produce alcohol. Surplus corn and surplus wheat, in the amount of more than a billion bushels, are still overshadowing the American farmer's market, and costing the Government, and through the Government the taxpayers, a lot of money when that corn and wheat could have been used in the manufacture of alcohol, thereby releasing the supply of sugar for use as such.

Instead of that the administration closed its eyes to the dangers that everyone else saw inherent in any war situation. The people are today paying the penalty for that. All through this entire investigation there is a singular effort, apparently, by spokesmen of the administration, including Mr. Jones, to discuss frankly the reason why the administration for years refused to assist in the establishment of alcohol plants, synthetic-rubber plants, rubber-substitute plants, and an expansion of the sugar industry.

It is devoutly to be hoped that this situation will be remedied forthwith, because this may be a long war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written on the subject of silver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House the coming week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from Southern California Business, published by the Los

Angeles Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Liberate America's Great Strength."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

THE PLAIN TRUTH ABOUT THE WAR

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an item from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, dated April 4, 1942, entitled "The Plain Truth About the War."

This is an excellent editorial, written without heat or destructive criticism, but dealing in some plain facts that all ought to know, and certainly is pertinent to our war program.

It should be noted, for instance, that Congress has appropriated ninety billion for the Army, of which twelve billion has been expended to date; forty-three billion for the Navy, of which only six billion has been spent; and for lend-lease, eighteen and one-half billion, out of which less than two billion has gone forward to our Allies. The Maritime Commission has been voted six and one-half billion, of which only three hundred and three million has been spent.

The editorial reviews the over-all plan, and I think properly so. It does it in a very calm, decent, American, factual way. I think Congress would do well to do this very thing itself, even if we have to set up a committee whose duty it would be simply to watch how the over-all plan is working, how appropriations are being translated into commodities for our war program, make constructive suggestions on progress and accomplishment, without political animosity, and furnish much needed information to Congress in general, using as its main idea, constructive cooperation toward the end of full and quick accomplishment of our war plans.

It will not avail us very much to fulfill our program in 1943 if we lose in 1942.

[From the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of April 4, 1942]

PLAIN TRUTHS ABOUT THE WAR

The news from the Russian war front, where Germany appears to have begun her spring campaign in the Ukraine and the Crimea, is hopeful but not reassuring.

The news from Burma where the Japanese Army is driving toward the invasion of India, is disturbing and serious.

Here in America, where we have undertaken both the tremendous task of supplying our allies with war equipment and the adequate defense of our own territory, our industrial war output is lacking in the volume which war's exigencies demand. That, too, is not good news.

The American people are beginning to realize this. They had felt assurance when Congress quickly and gladly made the vast appropriations that had been asked by the President. Congress did its part in making unprecedented funds available for the war. But the executive departments of the Government have not crystallized industry into war production as rapidly as the funds granted by Congress led the public to hope for and expect.

A few figures are instructive. There is available, or before Congress, appropriations for the Army that total $90,000,000,000. The actual amount spent to date is about $12,000,000,000.

For the Navy $43,000,000,000 are available or in process of appropriation. Of this amount only $6,000,000,000 have been spent.

Lend-lease has been voted, or soon will be voted, $18,500,000,000. Of this, according to the President's reports to Congress, less than $2,000,000,000 has gone to our allies, and a considerable part of this was agricultural products, not guns, planes, or munitions.

The Maritime Commission, which is entrusted with the task of building ships to carry our Army and its equipment and supplies to the battlefronts and to furnish the Navy with the many supply ships it requires, has been voted $6,500,000,000. The actual production of ships to date has caused an outlay of only $303,000,000.

These outlays are increasing greatly now and will continue to do so. But the figures measure what has been done to date.

This has been due to several causes, the primary one being the time required to build and equip factories. There was also a failure in the executive departments at Washington, from the President down, to realize the magnitude of the task we had set ourselves. For example, we permitted the manufacture of automobiles to continue for months that should have been employed in retooling the plants for war production.

In saying this we do not wish to be critical or fault-finding. It is important, however, that the public know the facts.

The reports from the Axis countries, which may not be accepted unreservedly, indicate that the war production in Germany, Japan, and Italy, and the conquered countries were the equivalent in 1941 to what would cost $45,000,000,000 in America. Our production was less than thirteen billions. To this is to be added England's output and that of Russia.

Apparently Washington has been satisfied with plans that would bring our maximum war effort in 1943. Now it appears that this year, 1942, may be the crucial one. Whether it is or not, it is clear that billions voted by Congress will not win the war unless they go into war production quickly and efficiently.

This calls for a tremendous expansion of manpower in war industry. It will require many more restrictions, probably, on goods for civilian use. Last year approximately 5,600,000 workers were employed in war production. Director Donald Nelson of War Production Board says we must produce $40,000,000,000 of war equipment and supplies this year—more than three times last year's output.

This means that 10,000,000 more persons must be trained and put to work in war industry. At the same time we must draft 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more men for the Army and Navy and their air corps.

This is a prodigious undertaking. It calls for the utmost effort from every American. Without this war production the Axis may win this war, and liberty in America will be lost as it has been in France.

We say this in all seriousness. The American people have never faced a graver peril or been called upon to make greater effort or more serious sacrifice.

We are making notable progress in airplane and tank production. We are far short of our needs in shipbuilding and in many other respects. It is no time for complacency or for shirking. This year may be decisive in this war. What America produces in every kind of war supply and equipment may turn the tide our way on the great battlefronts.

Washington knows this but fails to appreciate that the American people also understand it and are ready to respond loyally to every demand that may be made on them.

What Washington needs to realize is that if there is failure it will be due to official delay or hesitancy and not to any lack of spirit or self-sacrificing patriotism. Today the American people stand ready to do their part; they rightly ask vigorous, driving, intelligent leadership.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial relative to the W. P. A. in Carter County, Okla.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 16 1942 a week from today, at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts from committee reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Capt. Joseph K. Carson, Oregon Department Commander of the American Legion, on the subject Why the Legion Fought for Strong United States Defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today, and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject on which I spoke just a moment ago, synthetic rubber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my office has been swamped with correspondence on the subject of nondefense economy within the past few weeks. This is as it should be, because I believe that, more now than ever before, the public should be awakened to the vital necessity of rigid economy in Government, elimination of all nonessential activities, and concentration of all our resources, financial and otherwise, in an all-out effort to win this war with the least possible sacrifice of the lives and blood of our people.

I am proud of my record on the subject of nondefense economy. I believe that the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland approve this record. It would be fair to state that it is a record which goes back as far as, if not actually antedating, that of any Member of Congress—House or Senate.

My record on this subject is perfectly clear and has long since been established. It has been demonstrated both by words and actions. In fact, my efforts on behalf of nondefense economy resulted in the following statements which were published in the Washington press on Sunday, December 7, 1941, the very day of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

"But to those on Capitol Hill, who have watched his quiet, lone-wolf attention to business, he has definitely done a good job. He has been not only the people's friend but the taxpayers' friend. He is consistently penny-conscious.

"Slowly the story is getting around the Fourth District as to how Congressman MEYER has prevented the squandering of Federal funds.

"One of the most notable economy moves was MEYER's investigation of Coast Guard officers' housing at the Curtis Bay Coast Guard depot. MEYER heard that a lot of money was being spent and asked Rear Admiral R. R. Waesche about it. The Coast Guard commander sent back plans for the new housing project, and when MEYER broke them into details he found that each Coast Guard officer would be housed in a palatial mansion averaging $20,000 apiece.

"As a result of MEYER's probing, the Coast Guard has modified its housing project in line with more economical standards.

"Last spring MEYER was invited to go along on a 2-months' junket to the Pacific coast to survey defense housing by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, of which he is a member. But he told his committee colleagues that 2 months was too long to take off; also, that he felt the most typical and interesting housing plans in the country were right in Maryland. When the committee came back from its jaunt he literally dragged them across the State line and proved it.

"Last spring MEYER took the floor in demanding a cut of nondefense expenditures. Today the White House itself is urging similar stringent economies."

Not only have I fought for and voted for nondefense economy during my entire term of office, but so far back as Tuesday, May 20, 1941, almost a year ago, I had occasion to predict to the House that this subject was becoming increasingly important. I refer to the following speech:

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last week, when the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, I felt constrained to support a number of amendments offered, even though I found myself to be the sole majority Member voting with the minority side of the House. This was, to me, a new and not altogether pleasant experience, but since then I have heard from many majority Members who feel that my reasons for so doing were sound. A teller vote was called for on two of the amendments offered which were designed to effect economies in the routine departments of Government, and, although rejected, the teller vote in one stood—yeas 66, nays 79; and in the other—yeas 73, nays 79; indicating that there is a strong sentiment for retrenchment. After the defeat of each amendment designed to reduce expenditures, I voted again with the minority party to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with the recommendation that the committee reduce the bill $21,469,245.61 from the various items, with the exception of those items specified in hearings as national defense.

My reason for taking this position is based on the certain knowledge that all expenditures not directly connected with defense should be curtailed as much as possible in order that the entire resources of the Nation may be concentrated on the job at hand. I believe we are united as to the policy of building a strong defense against any possible aggression and that we are united in the belief that we should finance this program as far as is practicable on a pay-as-you-go basis. I believe that every individual and every business in the country is willing to pay a fair share of the additional tax burden that will be necessary. However, it must be remembered that our peacetime budget and tax load over the last 10 years has been the largest in the history of the country, and it is essential that this staggering cost be apportioned in an equitable manner and the burden on our citizens eased as much as possible so that it will not of itself hamper the program of defense; and it is imperative, to my mind, that spending for nondefense needs be reduced in an effort to make it possible to meet this stupendous obligation. It must also be kept in mind that mere designation as a defense measure does not make it such. This is the case with the St. Lawrence seaway project, which was defeated on its merits, but is now being urged upon us as a necessity to national defense.

It occurred to me that there was no better place to begin economizing than with this appropriation bill which provided for an increase of approximately $21,500,000 over the previous year for the use of the Department of the Interior, and, while the effort was entirely unsuccessful, I do feel from present indications that drastic moves for economy are forthcoming, and urge that we face in a very real and active way the necessity for rigid economy in unessential nondefense activities as a vital part of the national defense program.

It has been my policy during the emergency to lend my support to those measures which tend to strengthen our country economically and build up its defenses and to oppose any reckless pouring out of money on nondefense measures.

That this subject of unessential nondefense economy is very much alive is evidenced by recent editorials in many leading newspapers and periodicals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 16, 1941, which I am now filing, and I hope it will have the attention of the membership.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 16, 1941]

A SHAKE-UP IS NEEDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"It would be a tragic error to assume that we can expand our defense production on a colossal scale and still go our usual ways, whether as a government or as individuals. It would be folly to assume that we can continue to spend now for nondefense needs as we did in normal times."—Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau.

On Wednesday the House of Representatives, asked to institute economies, voted to separate Dr. Ruth Gruber, alleged Communist, from the pay roll of the Department of the Interior. This would be a $5,000 saving. At the same time, however, the House approved and sent to the Senate a bill to appropriate $177,027,078 for the use of the Department of the Interior, which would be $21,477,345 more than the current year's appropriation.

This is fantastic. The Department of the Interior provides, in its vast, amorphous, catch-all roominess, a convenient location for countless unessential, nondefense groups and projects. The Department is a congeries of divisions, bureaus, boards, administrations, services, branches, subbranches, commissions, and committees. Merely to list them in close, fine print requires page after page of the Congressional Directory. Nobody, not even Mr. Ickes himself, knows everything that goes on in this grab bag Department, but everyone knows that here is an opportunity to avoid the tragic error of which Mr. Morgenthau spoke when he warned

against spending for unessential nondefense purposes.

The Nation faces a probable public debt of $90,000,000,000. It faces a future darker and more uncertain than at any time since Washington first took the oath of office. Yet, with national safety at stake, the House of Representatives goes its usual way and votes to add $21,000,000 more to the taxpayers' burden. And for a Department full of unessential, nondefense projects.

My record on nondefense economy is augmented by the fact that I have not taken time out to play politics, but have concentrated all my energy and time on my office and the serious problems incident to winning the war. This is no time to play politics. It is a luxury in which I cannot indulge. I have but one job and that job is to attend to the public business. I have attended every session of Congress and have answered every roll call. In my opinion, a public office is truly a public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement from the Washington press of December 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two short newspaper articles relating to the work of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Missouri Farm Bureau News under date of April 1, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an Easter message by William Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of regimentation, priorities, allocations, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SHIPBUILDING FACILITIES ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a news item in today's paper carries a lot of interesting information about what the automobile industry is now doing in Detroit in the war-production program. In its concluding paragraph, after describing the war materials that are being turned out there, it states:

Speed up the building of ships, so that we can get our planes and tanks and guns into the hands of our fighting men on all the far-flung fronts of this war.

Mr. Speaker, months and months ago we pointed out to administration leaders the need for the decentralization of industry so that war industries could be located in the Midwest. As part of that program we pointed out the shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes. I am referring particularly to Lake Superior, but I do not exclude the other Great Lakes. The Great Lakes have shipyards, they have shipbuilding facilities. I call attention at this time to these facilities because I believe some of the administration leaders and some of the men in charge of that program are overlooking the possibilities.

It is true that large boats cannot be constructed in the Great Lakes shipyards because we made a mistake a long time ago in not deepening the St. Lawrence seaway channel to a 27-foot depth. The seaway channel, at the present time, is only 14 feet in depth, and this makes necessary the construction of a smaller type of vessel in the yards on the Great Lakes. Recent newspaper items indicate a shipbuilding program and increased activity in shipyards located on the Atlantic seaboard and on the western coast.

Congress should authorize the St. Lawrence seaway project at once so that oceangoing boats could travel in a 27-foot channel. Such boats could then be built in the shipyards on the Great Lakes.

I also want to point out that at the present time there is plenty of skilled labor available in the Midwest, and it is to the economic advantage of this country to keep such labor there and to give the employment. This is perhaps just another reason why the Congress should act favorably on the St. Lawrence seaway project. However, until such action is taken, I want to direct attention to the fact that the Great Lakes still have shipbuilding facilities and that the Government ought to construct the smaller craft at the shipyards now available in the Great Lake ports.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 months I have received numerous letters from my constituents urging me to vote for legislation to outlaw strikes on national defense projects. I have also received numerous letters asking that the 40-hour-week law be amended so that no worker would be entitled to time and a half pay after working 40 hours on a national defense project.

I know that the people of my district are well aware of the fact that I have and will continue to vote to repeal any law which has a tendency to retard the work in defense industries. As far back as April 15, 1941, on the floor of this House, I expressed my sentiment on the strike situation existing in national defense industries; therefore there should be no doubt in any of my constituents' minds as to my position on matters of this nature.

We voted for the so-called Smith bill December 3, 1941, 4 days before the Pearl Harbor incident, and this bill is now pending before the Senate. I am certain that if the Senate will pass the Smith labor bill, the people of this country will consider this a direct demand to the President and the executive departments to correct the labor situation and do away with the 40-hour-week program for the duration of the war. We all know that the President with his wartime power has full authority to correct this situation without an act of Congress.

I personally am not in a position to know whether strikes and other irregularities of this nature have caused delays in manufacturing war materials. I am here to represent the people of the Sixth District of South Carolina, and it seems to me that the majority of them are in

favor of passing some antistrike legislation for the duration of the war, and they are anxious to have the 40-hour-week law repealed for the duration. I shall strive to see that their wishes are granted by continuing to assist in every way possible in having our war program expedited.

I have cast my vote for the benefit of labor many times during the past few years; however, I believe that labor, the industrial leaders, and every other person enjoying the benefits granted by the Constitution of this country should forget their personal gains and all get behind the wheel and push in an effort to help the President bear the burden which rests upon his shoulders at this time.

A majority of the labor legislation now on the statute books was enacted before I became a Member of Congress, and it is my understanding that this legislation was passed during the depression and had as its purpose spreading the work in the different industries as much as possible so that every person would have at least an opportunity to work 5 8-hour days a week.

Labor is entitled to its fair share of profit and authority, but no more. Industry is entitled to its fair share of profit and authority, but no more. The American people want this, but they also want and demand that production machinery must not be stopped by strikes or any other interference. I fully realize that the rights of labor have not always been respected by capital. On the other hand, I am aware of the fact that labor must sacrifice along with all other American groups in a common effort to win this war. The winning of this war is our first objective, and we can win only by outstripping the Axis Powers in producing more planes and tanks.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the labor unions and labor in my district are as patriotic as any other group of people in the United States, and they would be among the last people in these United States to retard our war effort. I wish that the laborers and people as a whole throughout the United States were as patriotic as our people in South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, in defense of the Congress, may I say that by legislation we have removed all the restrictions as to the number of planes, tanks, ships, and other necessary war equipmen we may build, and have authorized the War and Navy Departments to proceed with only the sky as a limit. We have appropriated billions of dollars for this purpose, and it is certainly not the fault of Congress if these billions have not been transformed into tanks and guns. This job lies at the doorsteps of the President, our Commander in Chief, and, from the best information I can get, he is doing a good job and leading us toward victory.

I am certain that the Members of the House of Representatives have received a great deal of criticism that they do not deserve, as we have long since passed legislation which is now being advocated by the majority of the people of my district.

The greatest aid our people can give our Commander in Chief at the present time is to try to keep unfounded rumors from being spread among the masses, who are already frantic and disturbed over the few reverses we have received at the hands of our enemies. It is true that we have lost some territory; however, our casualty list is relatively small compared to that of our enemy. We will win this war, and at the same time we want to save the lives of as many of our fine young men as possible. Therefore I hope that our people must and will be patient and let our Commander in Chief and his leaders in the Army and Navy lead us in this war.

America is not accustomed to defeat, and America will not be defeated unless she defeats herself. This is the time when every American should manifest his patriotic spirit to its deepest depths. Our people throughout the United States can render a wonderful service by assisting our Government officials in stamping out false rumors being spread by Hitler's propaganda agents.

I know that when a peace-loving people are thoroughly aroused and fully realize the seriousness of the situation confronting them they will take matters in their own hands and it will not be left up to the Government officials to stop certain newspaper editors, radio commentators, and columnists from making wild guesses and statements which are calculated to lead the people of this country into a state of confusion.

I have spent practically every day in my office during the past 3 years in an effort to assist in preparing our country for the emergency with which it is confronted today, and since war was declared I have used every ounce of energy that I have in trying to expedite the building of war materials and to bring this war to a speedy, successful end. I have not had time to visit the people of my district as it is absolutely impossible to properly carry on one's work as a Congressman while Congress is in session and, at the same time, visit the people of one's district 500 miles distant. I know of nothing that would give me more pleasure than to spend several months traveling around over my district; however, I know that this would not be of any assistance to our President in carrying the war program to a successful end.

Mr. Speaker, the records will prove that I have not cast a single vote during the past year with the idea of advancing my political career, and it is my sincere hope that the people of our country will adjourn politics until this war is over. Labor and industrial leaders should not take advantage of this crisis to advance their personal interests and enrich themselves while our brothers, sons, and loved ones are dying on the battle fronts.

CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCESS ROADS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 6908) to authorize appropriation of an additional $100,000,000 for construction and improvement of access roads to military and naval reservations, to war industries, and to sources of strategic raw materials.

The bill is recommended by the Acting Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, with the approval of the President.

It would simply amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941, Public Law No. 295, by striking out the figure "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$250,000,000."

Section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 provides as follows:

> Access roads: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to provide for the construction and improvement of access roads (including bridges, tubes, and tunnels thereon) to military and naval reservations to defense industries and defense industry sites, and to the sources of raw materials, when such roads are certified to the Federal Works Administrator as important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for replacing existing highways and highway connections that are shut off from general public use by necessary closures or restrictions at military and naval reservations and defense industry sites. The acquisition of new or additional rights-of-way necessary for such projects may, to the extent determined by the Federal Works Administrator, be included as part of the construction of such projects, and Federal funds shall be available to pay the cost of such acquisition. For carrying out the purpose of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, the sum of $150,000,000, which shall be available, without regard to apportionment among the several States, for paying all or any part of the cost thereof: *Provided, however,* That in determining the expenditure of the funds under this section due consideration shall be given to projects for such roads in States which have heretofore expended their own funds for the immediate construction of roads and highways deemed essential to the national defense, which roads and highways, but for the action of such States, would be properly considered for construction with Federal funds under the provisions of this section.

My understanding is that the $150,000,000 originally authorized for construction of access roads to centers of war activity has been expended or obligated, and that in our expanding war program at least $100,000,000 in addition will be required for such facilities.

Specific locations or projects, of course, are not considered by the Congress. Details of proposed construction are worked out by officials of the Army or Navy, in cooperation with the various State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration.

Many Members will recall that on June 21, 1940, President Roosevelt directed the

Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency to "make a survey of our highway facilities from the viewpoint of national defense" and suggested that "particular attention be paid to the strength of bridges, the width of strategic roads, adequacy of ingress to and egress from urban centers, and the servicing of existing and proposed Army, naval, and air bases."

It is thus seen that nearly 2 years ago the President foresaw the important relationship of adequate highway transportation facilities to our national defense program.

That serviceable highways are a vital war necessity is the plain implication of hundreds of reports on the use of highways by war industries and their workers. These reports make it clear that many industries are as dependent as a modern army on motor vehicles.

For example, the Ford bomber plant at Ypsilanti, Mich., probably will employ more than 50,000 people this year, and it is expected they will travel to work in 22,000 private cars. Plant officials expect to get 25 percent of their necessary raw materials by motortruck, 75 percent by rail. Outgoing, the products of the plant will probably move 60 percent by truck, 40 percent by air.

A recent survey shows that 95 percent of the 7,000 employees of the Hudson Navy Arsenal in Detroit are brought to their work by highway transportation. The arsenal gets 75 percent of its raw materials by truck, 25 percent by rail, and the finished product is transported by the two means in about the same proportion.

These are typical examples of the situation at thousands of centers of our war activity. Clearly the highways are playing a vital role in our war effort.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders previously granted I may address the House today for 15 minutes on the subject of magnesium.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain protests against the proposed tax on the telephone pension fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Shenandoah Sentinel on soil conservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, every letter I receive convinces me that the American people, almost without exception, are willing and anxious to do everything within their power to bring our war production to maximum efficiency and to supply our soldiers fighting at the front with every weapon and all equipment necessary to enable them to defeat our enemies. They are willing to sacrifice and go without not only the luxuries to which we have been accustomed but many of the necessities of life. Our Government has asked them to go without sugar, tires, gasoline, and many other daily necessities which have become a part of the very fabric of our industrial and social life. Our people are willing to do this to win the war and save our country and to save our lives. They are not willing, however, and I am not willing, to permit the material and supplies and the war funds raised from high taxes and bond sales to be frittered away in graft, excessive profits, furbelows, and boondoggling.

Many of us here in the Congress have been uncovering by every effort possible and available to us the waste and useless expenditures of war appropriations. We uncovered a striking example recently where a concern with $100,000 invested has been awarded $58,000,000 in war contracts. It was charging the Government $600 for an airplane starter which cost the firm only $272 to produce. In order to cover up these huge excessive profits this concern boosted the salary of the president from $25,000 to $145,845 in 1941 and paid to the personal secretary of the president, a woman holding a minor position, $39,356 for 1941, and has paid her $18,295 in the first 10 weeks of 1942. Another employee—an assistant controller—was given work with the firm last November for $3,600 a year. Six weeks later he was paid by this concern a bonus of $10,000, which he admitted in his testimony before the congressional committee that he did not earn.

The Congress has placed the power to prosecute the war in the hands of the Commander in Chief and the various departments charged with the responsibility of spending the moneys appropriated and contracting for the munitions and supplies necessary to prosecute the war. The Congress cannot supervise or attend to the detailed operations in carrying out this huge enterprise. For my own part, I demand that those who have been given this responsibility eliminate completely these excessive profits and wasting of public funds. If we are to succeed in this enterprise and win the war, those in charge of the program must realize once and for all that the American people will not stand for the weakening of our efforts, the slowing down of war production, and the wasting of public funds by such reprehensible conduct as the one to which I have alluded. It should not be assumed, however, that this contract to which I have referred is a fair sample of what is going on in the furnishing of our war supplies and material. I am glad to say that most of our citizens who are contracting with the Government are honest and seeking to do a good job and at a reasonable profit, and they should not be censored by the reason of what is being done by some of these chiselers and dishonest contractors who are seeking to mulct the Government.

Anyone who slows down our war production and our war efforts or impedes our progress toward victory, either by excessive and dishonest profits or charges for war material, or by stoppage and slowing down of our efforts through excessive demands of any kind and from any source, whether it be capital, labor, or the public, is guilty of reprehensible conduct and is engaging in treasonable action against our Government.

The Congress has made it clear that so far as lies within its power it will not vote funds for boondoggling and carrying on in the guise of national defense activities which have no relation to defense. This attitude of Congress was brought particularly to the front in its clamping down on the activities of the Office of Civilian Defense. The employment of night club dancers and many others of similar attainments whose training and experience have not equipped them to occupy positions of authority in the defense of our civilian population has been banned by Congressional action. As a result there has been a promise that the whole Department of Civilian Defense will be revamped and all of the frills, cream puffs, dancing, and other frivolous activities completely eradicated. It now appears that there were literally dozens and perhaps hundreds of this type of employees on the pay roll of this particular activity, and in almost every instance no consideration was given to the fitness of the particular employee for the position he or she occupied, and the work to be performed had no bearing upon civilian defense. We in the Congress provide funds for the civilian defense in order to protect the civilian population against possible air raids and other attacks. There was no intention that the funds appropriated should be used for these boondoggling activities.

This stupendous task which we face has led many of us here in the Congress to demand that every dollar we are appropriating for all-out defense must be judiciously spent and a dollar's worth of equipment and defense secured for each dollar expended. Therefore, we demanded that the boondoggling and waste of Federal funds in war contracts cease. It has been clearly demonstrated that immense sums have been absolutely squandered and wasted in putting into effect our war program. Huge and unconscionable profits have been realized by some contractors and grossly excessive prices have been paid for materials and land, and leeches in the guise of brokers have been acting as go-betweens between the Government and contractors, and have been sucking the lifeblood of our Nation in seizing upon huge payments exacted in the guise of services rendered in bringing the Government and the contractors together. Such practices are un-American and little short of treason, and must be stopped.

The sooner we realize that we are fighting with our backs to the wall to save democracy and our own country and that

everyone must join in the effort with all his energy and resources if we are to win, and these frivolous peacetime activities and boondoggling expenditures must cease, the sooner the whole program will go forward and there will be complete unity behind the program. These practices unquestionably have curtailed defense bond sales, as disclosed by the receipts of the Secretary of the Treasury. The law recently enacted providing pensions for Congressmen has also added to confusion and unquestionably has been reflected in bond sales. I am strongly opposed to this bill, voted against it in 1939 and voted to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, during my entire service in the Congress I have urged full preparedness so that we might be equipped completely with modern tools and munitions of warfare with which to defend ourselves in case we were attacked. The success of modern warfare depends almost entirely upon modern mechanized equipment on the land, on and under the water, and in the air. Unfortunately, when war broke upon us we were not fully prepared. Our fighting forces on the battle fronts have been compelled to meet the adversary at a great disadvantage. In almost every instance the enemy has been superior in force and equipment. We have been working feverishly in our great industrial plants, airplane factories, and shipyards to meet these deficiencies. We particularly need airplanes and ships. Fortunately, we are now beginning to see daylight, and these tools of war are coming out of our plants in ever-increasing numbers, and we can look forward to the day when we will gain superiority and then we can confidently expect a favorable turn in the fortunes of the war.

In the meantime, every American, regardless of his position or situation in life, must decide for himself what more he can do to bring about this superiority in fighting strength. Every decision each of us have to make must be measured by the yardstick, "Will it help win the war," not will it help me or will it bring greater returns to me or to my family, or will it advance my personal interests, or will it help me politically, but the only consideration is, "Will it help win the war." If we fail in this, we fail in all. Unless we win, America is doomed. Let us all work together full speed and win. Stop graft, waste, and delays.

In the battle of Bataan, the Japanese painted themselves green and hid in the trees in the jungle and unobserved carried on their sniping, picking off American soldiers here and there. The same tactics have been used in every country during this titanic struggle but in a different way. The fifth columnists filtrated into France, Belgium, Holland, and all the countries overrun by the Nazis. Here in America there are individuals filling this same role. They may not be painted green or hid in treetops, but they stand in the market places, in the shops, in the homes, and on the streets and snipe at the efforts being made by the administration and those who are charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war and the Congress which under the Constitution must provide the means for the prosecution of the war. Many of them for purely personal and selfish reasons to advance their own interests or gain a political job seek to undermine the war program and render ineffective those charged with the responsibility of the prosecution of the war in the executive and the legislative departments of our Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 15 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The effect of the amendment is to authorize the appropriation of funds, other than 30 percent of the customs receipts, for the purposes for which section 32 money has heretofore been authorized to be expended.

When the agricultural appropriation bill passed the House I offered an amendment, the design and purpose of which was to provide sufficient funds so that we might have a school-lunch program for the undernourished children of America, which would be commensurate with the need and so we would be in a position to take care of any crop surplus situations that may arise in connection with the very great expansion of our farm production called for by the food-for-freedom program. The amendment was stricken out on a point of order. This piece of legislation which I am introducing today would leave the Congress in a position, which it is not now in to decide what amount it felt was necessary to be had for the purposes of commodity distribution, the stamp plan, the school-lunch program, and the program of supporting farm prices against the possibility of surpluses destroying that price structure. It would remove all that program from complete dependence which it now has upon 30 percent of customs receipts, however much that may be.

America is at war. She is in the very middle of the only total war in all history.

Realization of all that means, of the terrible magnitude of the task that lies ahead of us, of the deprivation and suffering to be endured—all these are being borne in upon our people.

When the course of a people's destiny changes so drastically as has that of America since Pearl Harbor it is inevitable that there will be confusion in our minds. Some things we have struggled hard to gain must, for the time being, be given up. Special group interests must universally give way to the commonn defense and general welfare, to use the words of the Constitution. The times demand not a generally higher standard of living to make possible the employment of all but rather a reduction in consumption—especially of certain types of goods—in order that we may produce more tanks and planes and ships and guns.

But with it all we cannot, if we would have real victory in the end, forget that tanks and planes and ships and guns are of no avail without men. Nor are men likely to gain victory unless they and the nation behind them are driven by great, simple, and essentially religious ideals. Especially is this true of America. We are a people slow to wrath. We are not an imperialistic nation We are still, on the whole, rather far from the scenes of actual combat. Yet we must be moved by a spirit that is as consecrated and determined as that which impels a man to fight for his very home when it is under direct attack.

The cause of democracy, moreover, must not be allowed to be a generalized and nebulous thing. It must have substance—it must mean to people certain very practical things which they can understand. Ideals of our common life together must be taking shape even as we fight the war. For at bottom this war is more than military conflict. It is a world-wide battle between two diametrically opposite philosophies of life and government. The battle is for the allegiance of people around the world. Ultimately there is no question of a doubt that that side will win which demonstrates to the millions of human beings in the world that in the highest and best sense it deserves to win.

What finer demonstration of the fact that America deserves to win could be given than this. If while we turn away frivolity and luxury and group selfishness and while we devote all our fat and some of our sinew to the war we at the same time devote ourselves to the realization of this simple ideal: "There shall be no undernourished, no hungry school child in all the United States."

WHAT GENERAL HERSHEY SAID

And just in case anyone might contend that this proposal of mine is not of importance to winning the war, I want to call attention to a statement of General Hershey, Director of Selective Service before the National Nutrition Conference on May 27, 1941. Here is what he said:

> It has been estimated that perhaps one-third of the men rejected (for physical unfitness) was due either directly or indirectly to nutritional deficiencies. In terms of men the Army today has been deprived of 150,000 men who should be able to do duty as soldiers. This is 15 percent of the total number which have been physically examined by the Selective Service System.
>
> It is perhaps of little use to speculate on what should have been done by our schools, by parents, by health bodies, or by the Government. * * * It is a condition we should recognize as dangerous, and which we should take immediate, positive, and vigorous measures to correct.

I heard the Surgeon General of the United States only the other night state that this school-lunch program has been the most basically helpful step in improving the health of the American people that has been taken by our Nation.

I know there are a lot of things we cannot do during this war. I know there are many things we must and should go without. I know that many expenditures of Government will have to be cut down, but I submit there is one basic policy we ought to pursue, and that is the policy of seeing to it that there shall be no malnutrition in our country at the present time, at least among the children. If there is one thing most necessary to the strength of our Nation, most helpful in preventing tuberculosis and other diseases, it is a good diet for our children.

HOW MANY UNDERNOURISHED SCHOOL CHILDREN DO WE HAVE?

There are undernourished children among the generation of tomorrow in our country. There are about 9,000,000 of them. This is just 9,000,000 more than there ought to be and 9,000,000 more than there need to be. For an expenditure of between $60,000,000 and $90,000,000 of Federal funds we can make it true that there will not be one. The exact determination of the actual number of undernourished or malnourished school children in the United States is of course not easy. Tests of nutritional status involve the checking of a great many data, and even an exhaustive physical test sometimes yields questionable results.

However, what constitutes an adequate diet is very well known, and a number of studies on the adequacy of diets have been made. One of the most significant is the Nation-wide survey conducted by the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture in 1935–36. It was found at this time that 27 percent of the families in the country had good diets, 38 percent had fair diets, and 35 percent had poor diets. A diet providing a wide margin of safety above nutritional requirements was classified as good; that providing a narrow margin, fair; and that deficient in the things necessary for vigor, normal development, and health, was called poor.

As would be expected, dietary conditions were particularly bad among low-income families. Of the families spending about $1.75 per person per week for food, 75 percent had poor diets. At the time of the study, $1.75 per person per week was the average food expenditure for nonrelief families in the $500–$1,000 annual income class, and, of course, was well above the average for relief families. In 1936, 47 percent of all American families had incomes of less than $1,000. Of course, that situation is somewhat improved now—but not as much, I fear, as we would like to believe. That low-income families have more than the average number of children is well known. And so it is evident that the 35 percent of the families that have had inadequate diets, include much more than 35 percent of the children.

The National Resources Committee's report, Consumer Incomes in the United States—1935–36—shows that 32 percent of all families in the United States had incomes of less than $750 per year, and nearly half—47 percent—had incomes of less than $1,000. Further reference to the Bureau of Home Economics study discussed above will establish a strong supposition that 75 percent of these low-income families had inadequate diets. Again, this indicates that more than one-third of the families in the country have inadequate diets because they cannot afford better diets.

A Bureau of Labor Statistics study of employed wage earners and clerical workers in 1935–36 showed that more than 40 percent of the children in this relatively favored group lived in families whose incomes were below the level necessary to provide an adequate diet, as well as suitable housing, clothing, and medical care. And, of course, families in these circumstances are going to have an inadequate diet. It is unreasonable to expect families to budget for a suitable diet by falling below the maintenance level in all the other necessities of life.

What effect the rise in national income in the past few years has had on these figures cannot yet be determined, but it must be remembered that the rise in income has been accompanied by a rise in living costs. And for many people the rise in living costs has been greater than the increase in income. It is significant that as late as 1939 it was estimated that 19 percent of the children in the country were members of families on public relief rolls, and in December 1941, 9,700,000 people were dependent on some form of public relief for their living. If we add to these the families which under good standards would be eligible for relief, but are subsisting mainly on food from the Surplus Marketing Administration, and above all the millions of families who have never asked or received any relief, but which have an income of less than $1,000 a year, it is readily apparent that the undernourished "one-third of a nation" is not an idle phrase.

Since the school population of the country is about 28,000,000, a realistic study of the above reports leads to the inevitable conclusion that upward of nine or ten million children of school age are denied an adequate diet simply because the family income does not permit it. And a very great percentage of these children live not in city slums but on the farms of the Nation themselves.

These are the children from which America's whole future strength must come. They are the ones that will inherit the world situation we are now creating. It will be no easy one. It is not only sound national policy but a matter of simple justice that we give them a fair and decent start.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

What then shall we do about it? Fortunately a method and program has already been tried out and found to be good. It is ready to our hand if we will take it and use it with the vigor it and the children of America deserve.

I am introducing today an amendment to section 32 of Public Law No. 320, to permit the Department of Agriculture to continue and expand its aid to school-lunch programs for undernourished children. That is the reason for this speech.

I do not know how well acquainted the Members are with the school-lunch programs for undernourished children. In December of 1941 the Department of Agriculture, through the Surplus Marketing Administration, helped feed approximately five and one-half million of the estimated 9,000,000 undernourished children in the United States. Over 80,000 schools operated lunch programs supported in part by commodities furnished by the Surplus Marketing Administration. About 75 percent of the children received a complete hot meal; the other 25 percent got only cold lunches, sometimes only fruit juice.

I have seen, and will later present, some of the thousands of letters from teachers and parents in the files of the Surplus Marketing Administration testifying to the importance of the school-lunch program. Letters from teachers telling of children bringing to school only a piece of corn bread smeared with lard for their noon lunch, and frequently these children had come to school with no breakfast; of children who brought empty lunch pails to school, and at lunch time went to some secluded part of the school grounds so that their companions would not know they had no lunch; copies of letters from parents to teachers saying that the children had to work in the cottonfield that day, but that they would come to school at noon to get their regular lunch.

As you know, Public Law No. 320 was passed as an aid to agriculture. It provides, among other things, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by getting them to persons in low-income groups. Under this legislation the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation and its successor, the Surplus Marketing Administration, have purchased agricultural commodities when a surplus situation threatened the price structure. There have been times when prompt action by this agency has been the one thing that has saved the markets for some farm commodities from complete demoralization.

One of the ways—and I personally think the most important one—in which the Surplus Marketing Administration has used these commodities is in the school-lunch program.

Briefly, the school-lunch program works this way: Commodities purchased by the Surplus Marketing Administration are allocated to State departments of welfare who, in turn, allocate them to schools which certify that they have undernourished children in attendance. Whatever commodities are available are allotted to schools on the basis of the number of undernourished children, and these children are given free lunches. At the same time, every effort is made to have all children in the school served the same food, so that there is no discrimination whatever between the paying and nonpaying children. Local sponsors of the program, who may be boards of education, parent-teacher associations, or other public-spirited civic groups furnish labor, equipment, and foods to supplement those furnished by the Surplus Marketing Administration. The children do not need to know, and in most cases probably do not know, that the Federal Government is giving them anything. There is just a lunch where there was none before—that is all.

Administration and management of the school-lunch program is left entirely to the local sponsor and the actual working out of it takes almost as many forms as there are schools participating. The

Surplus Marketing Administration and State departments of welfare exercise only nominal supervision over the program to make sure that the food is properly utilized, that it meets the greatest need it can, and that no child is treated or made to feel an object of charity or of governmental largess.

Up to now the distribution of these commodities to hungry children has depended entirely upon the surplus situation with respect to the commodities themselves and upon the chance that 30 percent of tariff receipts would be sufficient to carry on this and the other programs dependent on that money. At this time, because of the war and the increased demand for food products, commodities available on a strict surplus basis are limited in variety and quantity, and they will probably change rather drastically from time to time. The volume of imports, furthermore, is an altogether uncertain quantity and will undoubtedly be very small indeed for the next several years. I think, with the agricultural situation changing from day to day, and with the financial provision for section 32 work so very uncertain, it is time we amend this legislation so that funds in addition to tariff receipts can be appropriated, if necessary, to make possible these school lunches and to see that they meet the basic need of the children.

The Surplus Marketing Administration is now besieged by anxious teachers, parents, and interested people of every sort who fear that under the emergency program, Federal aid for school lunches will be curtailed or cut off completely. The tone of the letters leaves no doubt that lunch programs will have to be completely abandoned in many areas if this aid is denied.

Of course, the poorest communities, which are least able to do anything for themselves, will be the hardest hit.

I do not want to see this splendid work curtailed; rather, I think because of the war, we must expand it to the point that there is not one hungry child in the land. One of the four freedoms, for which we are fighting, is freedom from want. The farmers of America are being asked to produce not only enough food for America and her fighting forces but also enough for the people of many other lands as well. What can we say to millions of our own undernourished children if we take away from them their one decent meal a day?

WHAT OTHER NATIONS HAVE DONE

I would like to talk for a moment about nation school-lunch legislation in other countries. France, in 1882, made the establishment of school funds for meals and other extra-curricular activity mandatory upon communities. Free school lunches have also been supported by national legislation in Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Austria, Belgium, and some other countries.

In Central and South America no less than 13 countries support free breakfast, lunch, and milk projects wholly or partly from federal funds.

In England, school lunches became a national issue upon the publication in 1902 of a statement that only two of every five men who wished to become soldiers in the Boer War were physically fit. This is similar to the experience of our own Selective Service officials, who found that of the first million men examined in the recent draft, 15 percent had to be rejected because of disabilities traceable to nutritional defects. A committee of Parliament found that "We have got to the point where we must face the question whether the logical culmination of free education is not free meals in some form or other, it being cruelty to force a child to go and learn what it has not the strength to learn." In 1906 the Provision of Meals Act put the feeding of undernourished children in the hands of local educational authorities. The legislation was not mandatory, but under this and following acts of Parliament the movement for free school lunches rapidly gained strength up to the beginning of the present war.

Now what has England done with school lunch under her war program? Has she abandoned it? No. In the midst of the greatest crisis in her history, and with the distribution of food severely restricted, England has gone ahead far more rapidly with her school-lunch program than ever before. England, of course has long since passed through the period we are now in and has already reached the inescapable conclusion that nothing is more vital to the defense effort than an adequately fed population. I understand the central government of England is now subsidizing milk for school children up to 100 percent, and school lunches up to 95 percent of the total cost and the announced policy of the ministry of food is to expand school lunches until all the 5,000,000 elementary- and secondary-school children in the country are included. In addition school canteens are given larger allowances of the protective foods than are ordinary restaurants and cafes. If England with her shortage of food, can do this, should we, with our tremendous stocks of food, consider reducing the little help we are now giving this important work?

I do not see how we, with our tremendous production of food, can do less than England has done

The United States has been slow to follow the lead of other countries in regard to school lunches—a means to national health and strength. A number of municipalities and private groups set up free and low-cost lunch programs in schools around the beginning of the century. However, it was not until the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, as an adjunct of their surplus-disposal activities, made commodities available for lunches for undernourished school children, that Nation-wide interest in a school lunch program was aroused. There is still no national legislation on school lunches. Such legislation—legislation to establish a principle in our country—the principle of "no hungry children in America" is what I am offering and what I am talking about today.

WHAT MY BILL WILL DO

Because the Department of Agriculture's aid to school-lunch programs has depended upon the purchase of commodities that were actually in surplus, and because there has been no policy adopted and no assurance of financial support, its donations have been irregular and somewhat undependable. Local sponsors have frequently carried on under great difficulties, but they have carried on in most cases. However, if the Department of Agriculture should have to discontinue its aid, there is no doubt that much of this work will be given up.

Under the present legislation the Department may soon be handicapped in its prosecution of the school-lunch program by the rather vague language of Public Law No. 320 which has been interpreted to permit only commodities in surplus to be purchased for distribution to low-income groups, and which makes no provision for appropriations, aside from the 30 percent of customs receipts. Under the food-for-freedom program it is almost certain that local surplus situations will arise which will justify purchases by the Department of Agriculture under the present act. However, it may become very important, if a good school-lunch program is to be maintained, that limited supplemental purchases be made of commodities not in surplus. How, indeed, could food be better used than to supply really dietary needs of children? It is to meet this situation that I want to amend this legislation. The amendment will enable the Congress to establish the policy and principle of a sustained, orderly, and adequate school-lunch program to the end that Americans may proudly say, "There is being reared in our Nation the strongest, healthiest, most intelligent future race that the world has ever known."

AS A NECESSARY WAR MEASURE

I have mentioned before the importance of keeping school-lunch programs going from a nutritional and national welfare point of view. I would like now to mention their possible great importance as a measure of meeting war emergencies. If air raids come while children are in school, the children will in most cases have to stay in the building until the "all clear." What an immense morale builder a warm meal would be at a time like this is immediately apparent.

If evacuations become necessary, undoubtedly school buildings will be turned into evacuee shelters. In such a case, the importance of a feeding program already in operation cannot be overestimated.

The National Nutrition Committee and the Conference on Women's Activities in Civilian Defense have endorsed school-lunch programs as a defense measure.

HOW ABOUT OUR FARMERS?

And what about the farmers of America? While we do not anticipate any important agricultural surpluses during the period of the emergency, we should remember that when the war is over there is danger that our farmers will be in an even worse position than they were before we entered the war, unless we have

the will to prevent this. But if we have established it as a principle of our life that where children are hungry there we will see that food is sent them, the best of all possible outlets for distributing any surpluses will be readily available.

Local sponsors, teachers, parents, and school children are going to do everything they can to keep these programs going. We can help them immeasurably by permitting the Department of Agriculture to purchase and distribute the simple kinds of food that are necessary to supplement what local people can do to make sure that America's rising generation is prepared to meet tomorrow's world with strong bodies and vigorous minds.

ESTIMATED COST OF AN ADEQUATE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM AND SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM SERVING 9,000,000 CHILDREN

It has been carefully estimated that a school-lunch program giving consideration to a variety of foodstuffs which would substantially reduce malnutrition among 9,000,000 school children, would cost the Department of Agriculture between sixty and ninety million dollars a year, depending on types of food purchased and, of course, the price. This expenditure, of course, contemplates the distribution only of foods widely grown in this country, and for which the Surplus Marketing Administration has conducted surplus removal programs in the past few years.

This cost is based on the continuance of present operations, wherein local sponsors furnish all equipment and labor and the supplementary foods necessary to make a well-rounded meal. The cost to the S. M. A. would be about $1.10 per child per month—5 cents a meal. With the normal average supplementation by the sponsor, the average child would receive an adequate, nutritionally planned hot lunch, worth, at cost, from 10 to 12 cents each school day.

A table is attached showing the estimated purchases necessary to support a well-planned, nutritious program for 9,000,000 children.

It should be noted that the S. M. A. will spend on the 1941–42 program, which will serve a peak of 6,500,000 children and an average of 4,500,000 children, only about $30,000,000. The apparent discrepancy between this year's expenditures and those outlined in the table lies chiefly in the fact that the present program does not at all measure up to the best program discussed above. While most of the commodities on the attached table have been available from time to time this year, only a few have been available to all schools all year. In fact, the program has been in extreme jeopardy in a number of low-income areas because the S. M. A. has not been able to supply sufficient of the most-needed foods.

A school-milk program whereby 9,000,000 children would get one-half pint of milk per day at a cost of not more than 1 cent per half-pint would cost approximately $20,000,000 a year. This estimate is based on the operation of S. M. A.'s present small school-milk program, in which the sponsor or the children pay 1 cent per half-pint and S. M. A. pays the balance of the cost. Twenty million dollars surely is a small price to pay for so really great a thing.

Rough estimates of foodstuffs required for school-lunch program to cover five to nine million children [1]

Commodity	School lunch, 5,000,000 children	School lunch, 9,000,000 children
	Million units	*Million units*
Dairy products:		
Butter ..... pounds	30.0	54.0
Dry skim milk ..... do	22.5	40.5
Poultry products: Eggs ..... dozen	15.0	27.0
Fruits:		
Apples ..... bushels	1.3	2.4
Pears ..... do	.1	.3
Peaches ..... do	.3	.5
Oranges ..... boxes	1.5	2.7
Grapefruit ..... do	2.7	4.8
Dried prunes ..... tons	[2] 11.2	[2] 20.2
Raisins ..... do	[2] 11.2	[2] 20.2
Vegetables:		
Dry beans ..... 100-pound bags	.2	.4
Potatoes ..... do	.6	1.1
Onions ..... do	.1	.1
Fresh tomatoes ..... bushels	.3	.5
Cabbage ..... tons	[2] 3.7	[2] 6.7
Carrots ..... bushels	.3	.5
Beets ..... do	.1	.1
Cereal products:		
Flour, wheat equivalent ..... bushels	.8	1.5
Corn meal and hominy grits, corn equivalent ..... bushels	.3	.5
Meat products: Pork ..... pounds	15.0	27.0
Other products:		
Peanut butter farm equivalent ..... tons	[2] 13.0	[2] 23.4
Lard ..... pounds	15.0	27.0

[1] Program for 5,000,000 children estimated to cost $45,000,000; program for 9,000,000 children estimated to cost $90,000,000.
[2] Thousand tons.

Source of data: Economic Analysis Section, Surplus Marketing Administration, Dec. 8, 1941.

THE FUTURE FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Every farmer in America is being asked to increase his production of foodstuffs as his contribution to the food-for-freedom program. Most all of them will do so.

During the first World War they did the same thing, and when the war was over they were forgotten, and in 1920 there began a depression for American agriculture which lasted—tragic as it is to say it—right down to the outbreak of the present conflict.

We owe a moral obligation at the very least to farmers participating in the food-for-freedom program to see that this same thing does not happen again. And we can fulfill that obligation. The straightforward way to do it is to adopt policies now which will give some reasonable assurance that the bottom will not drop out of the American farmer's market or his prices after the war is won.

It is true, of course, that during the war employment and wages will be at a high level. Some even forecast that before we are finished with this job there will be little or no unemployment.

But that should not affect our adopting now, while it is comparatively easy to do so, sound and farsighted national policies which will stand us in good stead when the war is over. One such policy would be this: America is determined to stamp out undernourishment among her school children.

Such a policy would mean that, both now and in the future, this school-lunch program would be maintained at whatever level was necessary to end undernourishment. Nor would the cost be so very great. To provide school lunches today for the estimated 9,000,000 undernourished children would require, as has been said, between $60,000,000 and $90,000,000—a cheap price indeed for us to pay to enable us to say to all the world that here is one nation that applies its democracy in thoroughgoing fashion where it means the most.

Furthermore, the effect of such a policy would mean that, in the future, should other home markets for the farmers food products be cut down, this one—for school lunches—would correspondingly increase. Nor can the benefit to the farmers be measured solely in the actual number of dollars spent in direct purchases of the supplies for the school lunches. Such purchases, as proven by experience, would help to stiffen prices all along the line in a time of falling prices.

I would not be so foolish as to claim that a program of ending undernourishment among America's children will alone solve our farmers problems for all time to come. But I do say it would be right and just and that it would give the kind of solid assurance to American agriculture which it should have now.

OUR OWN PEOPLE—AND THE PEOPLE OF OTHER NATIONS

America is not fighting this war alone. There are other nations fighting on our side and we are pledged to give them every assistance we can. We have undertaken to furnish them with arms and we have undertaken to furnish them with food. Few Americans will disagree with our doing this. But it means that we must be more than ever certain that there are no hungry people in our own land.

ITEMS FROM LOCAL SOURCES ON NECESSITY FOR, AND VALUE OF SCHOOL LUNCHES

Here are a few copies of letters from teachers, statements by interested persons, and newspaper stories, testifying to the undernourishment of school children and to the value of the school-lunch program in combatting it.

I am informed that thousands of similar items are in the field offices of the Surplus Marketing Administration.

[From a report by school-lunch representative for Texas]

J. W. Mosely, Collin County, Tex., school superintendent, said that before any of the schools in his county were certified for the receipt of commodities, extensive research was made among all the school children, and the persons making this investigation were amazed to learn the number of empty lunch baskets the children carried to school, just because they were too proud to let anyone know they did not have any lunch. He stated the look on the children's faces when they walk into a lunchroom at noon for a steaming, hot lunch has repaid him a thousand times for any small trouble it might have been to get this program started in Collin County.

[From the Hoosier Sentinel, Daviess County, Ind., of December 1940]

"But it wasn't my turn to eat, teacher." This was the reply a little girl gave the principal of a Daviess County school. The child had fainted at chapel exercises and the principal suspected malnutrition and hunger had brought about the child's collapse.

Further questioning developed a story of deprivation that chilled the teacher's heart.

There were seven children in the little girl's family beside the father and mother. The father was employed on W. P. A. at $52 a month, and try as she might, the harassed mother could not make ends meet. It was therefore decided that the members of the family would "take turns" at the table at mealtime. Prolonged participation in the "turn taking" and the scanty meals at other times had caused the 13-year-old girl to faint.

School authorities decided to investigate the school-lunch program, to the end that this child and many others in the community who lived in like circumstances could be assured of one good meal a day. Now this child and her brothers and sisters and her schoolmates have nourishing meals every day. There is no longer any need to "take turns" at the family table.

[From the Long Prairie Leader, Todd County, Minn., of February 1941]

At a certain school in the county, it was noticed that a girl who regularly carried a lunch pail to school, never ate her lunch with the other children. The girl would always take her lunch and sit in seclusion during the lunch period. Investigation revealed that the lunch pail was merely a blind; it contained nothing, but the girl pretended to eat, and sat in seclusion because she did not want her schoolmates to know that she did not have any food at the noon hour.

[Letter from school teacher—Alabama]

We have been trying to operate a lunchroom in our school for 3 years, but have not done as well as it seemed that we should. However, this year has started off much better than any previous year. Our attendance is better, the health of the children is above the average, the interest in class has gone up considerably.

The greatest good that is outstanding is the fact that our children seem to have more pep and go in them. Where the children did hang around in the house, they are glad when playtime comes so that they may play.

S. D. WHITTEN,
Principal, Flint School
Route 2, Decatur, Ala.

MARCH 5, 1941.

[From a report by school-lunch representative for Texas]

The county-school superintendent of Kaufman County, Tex., and a friend were talking with a teacher in a remote rural school one day when a child appeared with a note which he handed to the teacher. She read it, smiled, and told the child it would be all right.

After he left she read the note to the two men. It had been written by one of the seventh-grade pupils, explaining that he and his brother, the messenger, were necessarily kept out of school that morning to pick some cotton for their father; however, to save them a place at the table because they would be there for lunch and afternoon classes.

[From a report by school-lunch representative in Indiana]

Commenting on the school-lunch project in Carr Township, Ind., a public-health nurse said: "The most noticeable thing to us about this program other than the physical improvement was the mental attitude.

"Our indigent cases have always slipped off to a corner or eaten their entire lunch from their lunch basket or newspaper with head ducked because of embarrassment about the lunch's contents. But now they can sit with heads up and share the same foods and enjoy lunch hour."

DECEMBER 1940.

[Letter from school teacher, Missouri]

The children in this school are all from very poor families, part of them coming to school without lunch and part bringing very little. On one occasion one family of children brought only popcorn for lunch, while most of the time they brought nothing at all. The commodities are certainly needed here as at times I have had to buy food for them. It is very unpleasant to see children come to school without food.

Now we have at least one hot dish every day. I have taught in rural schools for 15 years and in that time have seen many children come to school without food. I believe the surplus commodities are responsible for making many children well and happy, and I am quite sure is doing a great deal of good.

MARY MCBRIAN,
Teacher, Elk Grove School,
Caldwell County, Mo.

JANUARY 1941.

[From a report by a school-lunch representative in Texas, February 1941]

Mr. R. B. Cunningham, of Dallas, visited the Rand colored school in Egypt settlement, Kaufman County, where he contacted the principal of the school. The Rand colored school is operating the hot-lunch program with Work Projects Administration assistance. Mr. Cunningham said that everything about the school was immaculately clean. One corner of the schoolroom had been partitioned off for space for a kitchen and pantry. The noonday meal was being prepared at the time of his visit, and among other things being prepared was a large pan of rice pudding, in which they were using rice, evaporated milk, butter, and raisins supplied by the commodity department. Seventy-five children are being served lunch at this school. The principal told Mr. Cunningham that now daily attendance remains stationary at approximately 89 percent, whereas prior to the hot-lunch program the daily attendance was always less than 75 percent.

[Letter from a Missouri school teacher, January 1941]

We feel that the hot-lunch program is one of the best things the State of Missouri has done for the children in many years. I find that my school children have gained from 3 to 10 pounds of flesh since we started about the first of September. This is my second year to sponsor the hot-lunch program, and I find that it also helps attendance. Wish to say that our program is working perfectly, and we are very grateful to the State of Missouri for it.

PEARL BEAL,
Teacher, Middle Smith School,
District 104, Stoddard County, Mo.

Notice that Miss Beal does not even mention the Federal Government or the Department of Agriculture at all. Which surely proves that this program far from fostering dependence upon Washington is actually developing an increased degree of local responsibility.

USE OF ESTABLISHED SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS AS A BASIS FOR COMMUNITY FEEDING STATIONS IN EMERGENCIES

How an established school-lunch program can serve in an emergency where a large number of people must be fed, is aptly illustrated by the following item from the Lincoln County (Mo.) Social Security News for October 1941:

The hot-lunch program in the Silex schools, which has been operating so successfully the past couple of years, found that it was in a position in the recent flood to fill a very definite need. As every home with the exception of 2 in that community was badly flooded, the people not only did not have any place to eat, but did not have any food, as practically all foodstuffs were destroyed. As classes were closed for several days, it was broadcast by a public-address system in Silex that meals would be fed to all comers in the dining room of the school. During the first 3 days after the flood, over 500 persons a day were fed hot, well-balanced meals, and 3 times a day. The Social Security office allocated extra (S. M. A.) commodities for this emergency, and additional foods were purchased by individuals and other organizations. Without a doubt, the people of the Silex community are sold on their hot-lunch programs now, more than ever before.

The Surplus Marketing Administration is now storing in strategic centers quantities of food which, in case of an emergency, can be quickly made available for distribution to the distressed population. In such situations, well set-up school-lunch operations would be invaluable for feeding people who would be unable to prepare their own food.

HOW CHILDREN IMPROVED IN ATTENDANCE AND SCHOLARSHIP IN SCHOOLS HAVING SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS—A SCIENTIFIC STUDY

While it is difficult to measure benefits of a school-lunch program objectively, a study in Camden County, Mo., by the county superintendent of schools and the secretary-director of the State social security commission seems to merit attention.

The study was made from records in the county superintendent's office after the close of the school term, so that neither teachers nor pupils knew of the study. Ten schools were surveyed which served a hot lunch during the 1940 school year, but had not done so the previous year. Ten similar schools which had no lunch program either year were selected as a control group. An attempt was made to pair the schools in the two groups, so that the control group would be the same as the survey group as to location, enrollment, and economic conditions of the families served. All 20 schools were rural and nonconsolidated, and 12—6 in each group—had the same teachers both years

Attendance

The percentage of daily attendance to enrollment for the two groups is shown below:

	Percent attendance 1938–39	Percent attendance 1939–40	Gain in percent attendance
Control group	69.18	70.54	1.36
Survey group	70.99	[1]84.34	13.35

[1] School lunch served to this group.

Reference to the above table shows that the control group, which did not serve lunch either year, had an attendance of about 70 percent for each year. However, the survey group, which also had approximately 70-percent attendance in the 1939 school year, jumped to 84-percent attendance in 1940, after a school-lunch program was started. Inasmuch as the schools in the two groups were similar in every respect—including attendance in 1939—there seems no reason

to doubt that the lunch program was instrumental in bringing about the increased attendance. This study bears out less objective observations on the same subject by teachers and other interested persons. Hundreds of letters to S. M. A. representatives have spoken of better attendance as a result of school-lunch programs.

Scholarship

Since it was recognized that any grading system is extremely subjective, only the 12 schools having the same teachers both years were used in the scholarship study. To eliminate a possible error because of difference in innate intelligence, only the grades of children who were in school both years were used in the study.

A system of grade points was used in determining scholarship. An excellent mark was given 4 points; superior, 3; average, 2; poor, 1; failure, 0. The following table shows total grade points for the children for the 2 years studied:

	Grade points, 1938–39	Grade points, 1939–40	Percent change
Control group (52 children)...	1,050	1,055	−0.09
Survey group (75 children)...	1,614	[1] 1,763	9.23

[1] School lunch served to this group.

As in the attendance study, no significant change is seen between the 2 years in the control group. However, in the survey group grades were markedly higher after the institution of the school lunch program. Again this bears out statements from teachers referring to better discipline, better attention, and higher marks because of school lunches.

Is this work worth while? Is it worth making a stable part of America's principles of justice and government? I believe with all my soul it is. My bill, in the nature of an amendment to section 32 of Public Law 320, will make that possible. I commend it to the House and to the people of America.

The text of my amendment and the text of section 32 as presently written follow:

SECTION 32 AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED BY VOORHIS BILL

A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 32. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. *There are authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the amount herein appropriated, such amounts as the Congress may, from time to time, deem necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this section.* [Such] *The* sums *appropriated by this section or pursuant to the authorization herein contained* shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) [encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means] *divert* from the normal channels of trade and commerce *agricultural commodities and products thereof, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means*; or [by increasing their utilization] *increase the utilization of such commodities and products*, through benefits indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups [as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture]; *or distribute such commodities and products through school-lunch and child feeding programs;* and/or (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity *or product thereof* for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion, [and what constitutes] normal channels of trade and commerce, *low-income groups*, and [what constitutes] normal production for domestic consumption shall be final. The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount that may be devoted, during any fiscal year after June 30, 1939, to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof in such fiscal year, shall not exceed 25 per centum of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year: *Provided, however, that this 25 per centum provision shall not apply to amounts devoted to a stamp plan used to effectuate the purposes of this section, and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, the 25 per centum provision shall continue to be calculated on the aggregate amount available for the purposes of this section.*

"The provisions of Public Act No. 165, 75th Congress, approved June 28, 1937, as amended, relating to the expenditure of funds transferred to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation shall be applicable to expenditures made by the Secretary in carrying out clauses (1) and (2) hereof. The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress, on the first day of each regular session, a report setting forth his operations in carrying out the purposes of this section and the expenditures made in connection therewith.

SECTION 32, AS NOW WRITTEN

SEC. 32. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final. The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above-specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount that may be devoted, during any fiscal year after June 30, 1939, to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof in such fiscal year, shall not exceed 25 percent of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for 15 minutes.

NORWAY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the Members of the House that today is the second anniversary of the invasion of Norway by our common enemy, Nazi Germany.

We must not lose the significance of this day. Norway before April 1940 was a free country. Liberty was the birthright of the Norwegian, and he treasured that most valuable human possession as much as we do.

Not that love of freedom is a characteristic peculiar to the Norwegian. Not at all. Many another nation has treasured her liberty—and lost it to the Nazi conqueror.

What is peculiar to Norway is her behavior after she was invaded by Hitler's armies, and supposedly had been conquered. True, she had all the outer manifestations of a conquered nation—with a Nazi occupation force with a puppet government chosen from a handful of Norwegian traitors.

But 99 percent of Norway's people did not like the idea of a foreign ruler. Even worse was the traitor Quisling and his aides, who in the eyes of this overwhelming majority were contemptible and loathsome men.

And so Norway's people decided to join us actively in the United Nations' battle to defeat Hitler.

We must not underestimate this decision. Norway's merchant fleet at the start of this war was the fastest, the most modern, and the fourth largest in the world. It was the biggest prize of the oceans, and a vital force in Britain's battle to survive. History may well prove that Norway's choice was a decisive factor in the ultimate victory of the United Nations.

The role of Norway's gallant fleet will go down in history as one of the most heroic and brilliant efforts of the United Nations in this war.

The inspiration for this high endeavor of Norwegian seamen stems not only from their intense desire to free Norway

from the German invaders, but equally from the amazing strength of resistance within Norway itself to the conquerors.

For as important as Norway's fight for the United Nations by sea has been her inspirational fight by land.

All Norway is in revolt. Norwegians have not forgotten how the treacherous Germans swept down upon Norway in April 1940, releasing deadly bombs on Norwegian civilians while they proclaimed that they were protecting Norway against British designs.

Norwegians have not forgotten, too, how they took starving German children in their homes after the first World War, only to have these same children, grown up now, turn their guns on Norwegian children.

These are things a Norwegian cannot forget. And so the Norwegians in Norway have staged a grim and bitter rebellion against their conquerors.

Long before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the American people had a deep hatred for the Axis enemy who could so brutally and treacherously attack a relatively undefended people.

We followed with the most intense feeling the efforts of the people in Norway to strike at their Nazi oppressors.

But now this struggle of the Norwegian people is our concern in a greater sense. The success of the Norwegian revolt against the Nazis is as vital as the struggle of every other link in our widespread United Nations front fighting the Axis enemies.

As I speak today, eleven hundred Norwegian clergymen have resigned their posts in protest against the laws of the traitor Quisling regime.

After Quisling was appointed Premier-President of Norway by his Nazi masters on February 1, he passed a law requiring all Norwegian children from the age of 10 to 18 to join the Norwegian Nazi youth organization.

This would mean that Norway's children would be under complete control of the Nazis. They would be taught only what the Nazis wanted them to be taught—the bestial, vicious Nazi way of thought and life.

This Norway's people could not permit.

First the seven bishops of the Norwegian State Church resigned. On the eve of their mass resignation, February 24, each bishop stated:

> The spiritual activity which is given by ordination at the Lord's altar is still mine by divine and human law. I will still exercise this vocation so far as is in the power of one not in office.

Quisling thought differently. On Good Friday and on Easter, the bishops were ordered to stay in their homes, and storm troopers were put on guard to make sure that they did.

No bishops appeared in the Norwegian churches on Easter. But the waiting congregations were not disappointed. For the Easter message of the Norwegian Church this year was the mass resignation of all Norway's clergymen from their posts. Following the example of their bishops, they took this way of protesting against Nazi attempts to control the youth of Norway.

Quisling calls this insurrection and war. The Norwegian churchmen call it the fight to be free. And these courageous clergymen say that they will be leading their congregations next Sunday, for they still consider themselves the true ministers of the Norwegian people.

The protest against the Quisling youth law was taken up by the teachers as well. Shortly after the action of the bishops, more than 9,000 of Norway's 10,000 teachers resigned from the nazified teachers' union. Two thousand of them are now in concentration camps or toiling at hard labor on the railroads in the far north.

The rebellious voice of Norway may be heard too from the lawyers, who have resigned from the lawyers' association, thereby risking disbarment; from the doctors, who refuse to continue in the hospitals which have been taken over by the Nazis; from the athletes, who will not participate in Quisling-managed sports events; from thousands of other patriots who quietly conduct campaigns of sabotage which produce mysterious train wrecks, landslides, and even the strange unexplained deaths of German guards.

You may ask how the Norwegians manage to do these things without being shot. The answer is that many of them are shot. But there are always more brave people to take their places.

Not long ago two well-known Norwegian athletes died suddenly in a German prison in Oslo. One, Kristian Aubert, was 30 years old. He had been arrested for reasons unknown on February 5. He was in perfect health when taken to prison, but he died there on February 20. He had been so fearfully mauled by his Nazi captors that his family was never permitted to see either his body or his clothes.

The other victim, Tor Salvesen, was only twenty-nine. He, too, was in perfect health when arrested. He died within a fortnight after his internment. No explanation was ever given.

Within a few days, the Norwegian White Book will be released in this country, containing further authenticated, first-hand accounts of Nazi torture in the German prison in Norway. Released by the Norwegian Government in London, it is now in the process of translation here in Washington.

These are not isolated cases. They have happened too tragically often before this to people in every occupied country who have resisted Nazi tyranny.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is making a very interesting statement about a great country, and it was my good fortune in 1937 to visit Norway, and of the 12 European countries which I have visited, there was none more peaceful, more prosperous, and apparently happier than the people of Norway. I was impressed with the churches which were built out in the rural sections of the country, and in the small towns, and in the cities. Everywhere it seemed that the people were devoutly religious, a very fine, kind-hearted, generous people. It is tragic to me to think of the awful experience through which they are going, due to the torture of Hitler and his gang, and I am sure that with the fine spirit those people have, they will yet arise and be free.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his fine statement.

It is to stop the torture of innocent people by brutal dictators that we are fighting this war against the Axis. It is to free the people of the occupied countries, as well as to defend the freedom of our own America, that we are straining every resource at our command.

We will never rest until Norway, and every other nation which has felt the oppressive hand of the Axis is free.

THE SACRIFICES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time one cannot help but observe the wonderful sacrifices of the American people and the marvelous things they are doing. They are getting along without just about everything back home, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] remarked a few moments ago. They will soon have their sugar rationed, and a great many other items, which they are gladly giving up, or lessening their supply of, so that the forces of aggression can be thrust back and conquered. It is my hope that this Congress will recognize what they are doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for 10 minutes.

MAGNESIUM

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I spoke on the floor of this House with reference to the subject of magnesium. Subsequently a newspaper column referred to that as an unreported speech. I recognize that this one may meet the same fate, but I hope to call to the attention of those persons here today, and to the people of the United States, things I regard as significant in the production of magnesium, a critical and essential war mineral.

This morning's issue of the Washington Post carries a story, copyrighted by the New York Tribune, Inc., explaining that a consent decree against the Aluminum Co. of America ending a patent-pool agreement with the German chemical trust I. G. Farbenindustrie, is expected to be acted upon within the next few days by the entering of a consent decree. That statement would leave the impression that the Aluminum Co. of America was going to be the only company involved in the magnesium production conspiracy suit.

I think it important to call the attention of this Congress to the fact that, just as in the case of rubber patents where the Standard Oil Co. was involved

with I. G. Farben, of Germany, so in this instance in the case of the magnesium production restriction suit, the Aluminum Co. of America is not the only person involved and not the principal person involved. If I thought that Thurman Arnold's division would be so lax in its duties as to find only the Aluminum Co. of America, I would have lost long ago a great deal of the respect I hold for that gentleman. But I am convinced that when the story of this Federal decree is published in the newspapers it will show that the suit is not only against the Aluminum Co. of America, but against the Dow Chemical Co., whose sole reputation has been made as a producer of magnesium; and against also the American Magnesium Corporation, owned by Alcoa, and against the Magnesium Development Corporation, a patent-holding company which licenses only the Dow Chemical Co. to manufacture magnesium in America.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Do you not think that Thurman Arnold has done an outstanding job in calling attention to these various problems?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I think Thurman Arnold has done an outstanding job in calling attention to these problems. I think when the story of what has happened in our magnesium situation is told we will be as grateful to Thurman Arnold for developing that information as we are grateful to him for finding out why it is that German panzer divisions now roll across Europe on synthetic rubber while we in America cannot have it.

Mr. PITTENGER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to say that I think Thurman Arnold is one of the ablest men in administration circles.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

I desire at this time to refer briefly to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 9, 1940, in which you will find remarks by my colleague from California [Mr. VOORHIS] on the subject of these antitrust prosecutions. You will find that away back there, long before we got into this defense activity, there was pointed out to this House the fact that Germany produced 12,000 of the 22,000 tons of magnesium produced in this world in 1939, and that the United States produced 2,410 tons only, because it was restricted by various deals which Dow had with the German companies.

I desire to call the attention of this House to the fact that these companies are, or should be, and I hope will be, named in this consent decree. Not only the Aluminum Co. of America, as this newspaper article would have you believe, but as the man who wrote the article, I think, could easily have found out, the Dow Chemical Co., the American Magnesium Corporation, and the Magnesium Development Corporation.

I desire to point out something else that has not had a great deal of attention so far. It is the fact that on April 4 there was a vesting order signed by Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, that took charge of some very important stock of this Magnesium Development Corporation. If you desire further information on it I can refer you to the Federal Register for Thursday, April 9, page 2698, where title VIII lists actions against aliens in nationality, and points out the vesting order by which Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, has taken over half the stock of the Magnesium Development Corporation. That is a matter of official record which I trust will get more attention in the newspapers, because the Aluminum Co. of America owns the other half of that stock.

Now, who was the owner of the half interest which Mr. Crowley took over? It was the I. G. Farbenindustrie, the German Dye and Chemical Trust. I think it is important to remember that this stock has now reached the city of Washington and can be voted by Mr. Crowley. That is important, because if that permission had not been obtained the stock of that company could not now be voted to permit the magnesium producers in the United States to make use of these important patents.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I recall it, in connection with another speech which the gentleman recently made on this same subject, he pointed out that the price of magnesium had always been maintained at a considerably higher figure than the price of aluminum. Is that not correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman also states that there were proven processes for the production of magnesium which could bring the price of magnesium down very much lower than it now is. My question is, Is it not true that magnesium competes with aluminum for certain uses, and in certain respects, such as in some airplane construction, is positively superior to aluminum?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct. The price of magnesium has been running around 22 to 25 cents a pound. Some of the processes which I described on March 17 seem to offer possibilities of producing magnesium at from 4 to 5 cents a pound. The gentleman is quite correct in referring to its competitive nature against certain types of aluminum, because now we must recognize that many of our processes require magnesium if the aluminum is to be strong enough to be actually used for dive-bombing purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again, briefly?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It therefore becomes of extreme significance that an aluminum corporation should control the patent rights on a development of magnesium, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Highly significant, but not too strange when you understand all of the processes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. These patent rights should be available to the United States and the development of these processes should be pressed to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It is extremely important that the development should be stressed.

I desire further to call to the attention of this House the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 3, at page 3319, contains some very interesting reading. I have read that and was not too surprised to find that certain officials of Basic Magnesium, Inc., were drawing tremendous salaries all out of proportion to what they could possibly be entitled. I think that the genealogy, if I may so designate it, of Basic Magnesium, Inc., is very interesting. I hope to be able to convince you that I. G. Farbenindustrie—the German Dye Trust—has an interest in that great plant. Let me point out to you that Magnesium Electron, Ltd., a British firm, controls Basic Magnesium, Inc. This statement has been made to me by officials of the W. P. B. I do not believe it is very hard to prove the facts, and I suggest that the members of the Truman committee, or some other committee which has the power to subpena witnesses under oath, which I as an individual do not possess, can very quickly establish the facts.

So, I say, Magnesium Electron Limited controls Basic Magnesium, Incorporated. Magnesium Electron, Limited, was owned one-half by I. G. Farbenindustrie. Eventually the British Alien Property Custodian took over that half of the stock. Here you see that a German holding company owned a half interest in a British company which in turn owned control of Basic Magnesium, Incorporated, which is building its great plant at Las Vegas, Nev. Some of the results of that unholy alliance were outlined in another body not too long ago.

I think it is an extremely unusual situation when our own companies, owned by citizens who try to develop magnesium in America, cannot do it; but the I. G. Farbenindustrie, because it has pooling arrangements with Dow Chemical Co. and the Aluminum Co. of America, get that sort of concession from the American people—get it approved by the War Production Board and financed by Defense Plants Corporation. I think it is too bad, for example, that the territory served by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] cannot have a certain type of development, yet the great Basic Magnesium plant can be built, and approved quickly and speedily because it seems to have some connection with the German dye and chemical trust.

I hope in the next day or two, also, to call the attention of this House to the peculiar manufacturing process which is now being exploited as our newest great savior in the magnesium business. I refer to the ferro-silicon process that I mentioned on March 17. The process then was not in operation, it was on the drawing boards, but it was going to be the great producer of magnesium. So we were promised last October, so we were promised in January, so we were

promised in this great month of April; but nothing concrete yet has happened. This seems to bear out what I have previously called to your attention.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I am wondering if the gentleman saw the announcement in the press this morning that the Dow Chemical Co. and the Aluminum Co. of America, who are under indictment jointly with the I. G. Farbenindustrie, are agreeing that a consent decree may be entered on criminal charges now pending against them and will pay the fines and release the patents?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I have referred to that, and that is the occasion for these remarks.

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; but does it not seem unfortunate that this great Nation in its hour of peril must depend upon a group whose misconduct will have been officially established, in connection with strangling production by contract agreement with our enemies?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I entirely agree; no one should overlook that point.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There are great deposits of magnesium in the gentleman's State of New Mexico, and in my State of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman believe it would be wise to develop these deposits during this emergency?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I believe it would be wise, but I think it would be extremely difficult unless you have a tie-up with I. G. Farbenindustrie—and this we do not in New Mexico nor do you in Oklahoma. Otherwise, I think it would be difficult to develop.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It will be interesting to see what happens in the case of Basic Magnesium and I. G. Farbenindustrie. It is too bad that the purely domestic companies that we should rely upon should have this type of competition in their production. It may be developed in a short time that a Government official has returned to Washington, within the last 48 hours, with news concerning the Permanente plant. What that news is ought to be of interest to the War Department. It certainly has been of interest to me. I think you will find when it is revealed that that plant cannot be expected to carry the load heretofore assigned to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, in closing, may I suggest that the House of Representatives, and certainly the War Production Board, has a responsibility to check this magnesium situation. The people of this country cannot be expected to be complacent forever when they find that their great resources needed for incendiary bombs and for dive bombers are in the hands of the enemy. I think it is a situation that long ago should have been corrected, and certainly should be corrected now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1942:

H. R. 6554. An act to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

On April 7, 1942:

H. R. 6483. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1554. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1555. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Secretary's order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1556. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a request received from the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1557. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a resolution from the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1558. A letter from the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, transmitting their second annual report (H. Doc. No. 694); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1559. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

1560. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of Medals of Honor, Distinguished Service Medals, and Navy Crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1561. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty; to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLaughlin: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 271. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1942, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree; without amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1899. An act for the relief of

Lawrence Brizendine; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILLETTE: Committee on Claims. S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister; without amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias; without amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4251. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Lair; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Georgie Knox and Orion Knox; with amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5275. A bill for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5317. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood; with amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5329. A bill for the relief of J. J. McIntosh; with amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5565. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5723. A bill for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of E. A. Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5955. A bill for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch; with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6557. A bill for the relief of James Gilmore and Marion Gilmore; with amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 6908. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6909. A bill to change the name of Woodley Place in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6910. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration to construct synthetic rubber production plants having an annual productive capacity of 400,000 tons and to create the United States Rubber Authority to operate such plants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6911. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and proclaimed by the President on August 4, 1932 (47 Stat. 2074, 2092), by making it a criminal offense for any person to use the emblem and name of the Red Cross for commercial or other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 6912. A bill to repeal section 404 of title 11 of United States Code, 1940 edition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 6913. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6914. A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6915. A bill to invest the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States with original and exclusive jurisdiction to review the question of the legality of the detention of any alien detained under title II or title III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BLAND introduced a bill (H. R. 6916) for the relief of the Baltimore, Crisfield & Onancock Line, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2653. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, to provide benefits to civilians who may be injured or killed by reason of enemy action; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2654. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2655. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress to foster legislation providing benefits to civilians or dependents who may be injured or killed by reason of enemy action, which benefits shall be a charge upon the whole people of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2656. Also, petition of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Vicinity, urging the expeditious passage of the Sweeney bill (H. R. 6486) by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2657. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the social-security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social-security law for social-security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay, not only the amount of employee contributions, but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2658. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 60 citizens of Lacona, Iowa, and vicinity, advocating the enactment of Senate bill 860 so as to give the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2659. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Vicinity, favoring the passage of the Sweeney bill (H. R. 6486); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2660. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. J. A. Hawthorne, president, Women's Christian Temperance Union, and other citizens of Washington, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2661. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of sundry residents of Boston, favoring the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Theodore O. Wedel, canon, Washington Cathedral, offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, ruler of heaven and earth, raise up, we pray Thee, Thy power, and come among us, and with great might succor us; that whereas, through our sins and our weaknesses we are sore hindered in the tasks which we face at this crisis of our history, Thy grace and mercy may speedily help and deliver us. To Thee it belongeth to punish wrong and to defend justice and right. Save us, we humbly beseech Thee, from the hands of our enemies; that we, being armed with Thy defense, may be preserved to glorify Thee in a new age

of just dealing among men and nations and of a reestablished rule of Thy eternal law, until the nations of the world may become one in the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 9, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CANCELATION OF CERTAIN DEBTS TO UNITED STATES BY INDIANS AND INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF LOYALTY BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., avowing the loyal support of the people of the Virgin Islands to the United States of America in the war against the Imperial Government of Japan and other Axis Powers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CREDIT TO MUNICIPAL TREASURIES OF VIRGIN ISLANDS OF INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (session 1941), favoring the enactment of legislation to permit all internal-revenue taxes collected on liquors and articles arriving from the Virgin Islands into the United States to be credited to the municipal treasuries of the government of the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the board of trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund (the Secretary of the Treasury, managing trustee; the Secretary of Labor and the Chairman of the Social Security Board, all ex officio), transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report of that Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Department of War (7) and The National Archives, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

BATAAN AND THE ANSWER

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I cannot speak here without the sense that there are other men beside ourselves in this Chamber—unseen men; wounded, captured, and even dead men; the men of Bataan. They stand invisibly at our elbows, their faces haggard and drawn and bloody, and they ask us the silent question, "Will you let it happen again?"

They do not cry reproaches at us, though well they might. They do not ask us why, through all the dawdling years of peace, we failed to decide either to abandon the Philippines or to fortify them adequately. No. They do not speak for themselves at all. They speak for those who come after—for their comrades in Australia, in Burma, in Alaska, Iceland, and Greenland, in all the far-flung posts of this global war. They speak for these men and they ask us again, "Will you let it happen to them, too?"

What answer can we give but, "No! There will be no more Bataans! Never again will American men go into battle outnumbered and outgunned and outplaned if we can help it! And no selfish interests or partisan obstructions will stand in our way long!"

That is the answer we can and must give to the men of Bataan. But what can we say to their mothers and fathers, wives, and brothers? Very little, I think, that will in any way offset their loss. It is not enough to say, "Your men were heroes." Words are cheap, but they bring no boys home. It is only by action, action, and more action here on our home front that we can prove how much their sacrifice has meant to us. It is only by discarding the last dull weights of our inertia and buckling down to our tasks in deadly earnest that we can show these heart-torn men and women that their boys did not die in vain. Only the evidence of our sweat, only the obvious fact of our awakened purposes and our steel-riveted determination will testify to the sincerity of our grief, the honesty of our praises.

Let us remember some bitter truths as we go forward in the months to come. Let us remember that Bataan did not fall from any fault of MacArthur or his staff; they did magnificently with the little we saw fit to give them. Nor did Bataan fall because of any Filipino fifth column; the loyalty of these fine people, which is the best tribute our islands policy could receive, has never been in question.

No; Bataan fell because of us—the rest of us. It fell because of our lack of foresight, our slothfulness, our incapacity to make up our minds and act. It fell because we never really determined to defend it, we over here in this country. We gave MacArthur a tenth of what he needed to fortify his islands, and gave it grudgingly and too late.

It is idle to hunt for scapegoats. We are all guilty. What is needed now is not breast beating, but atonement. We must make up for what we have done and what we have left undone. We must make up for it not only by our effort and our will to sacrifice but by preserving an unshakable, confident front to the enemy. We must show them that Bataan has been not our Waterloo but our Alamo. Whatever the mistake of our policies in the past, we have now but one policy—Victory! And but one word—Determination!

DONATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to present for the RECORD a letter which bears interestingly on, at least, one phase of the moot question of American morale in connection with the war effort. It bears upon the voluntary interest which the American people are displaying in the war effort.

I was recently intrigued by an item which I saw in the daily statement of the Treasury Department which read "Donations to the Government for national defense." I inquired into the matter, and I have an interesting response from the Under Secretary of the Treasury D. W. Bell. I think it is significant, it may be suggestive, and it may point to a pattern worthy of emulation that since Pearl Harbor there have been 5,589 voluntary donations to the Treasury totaling $478,248 49.

The character of these donations is of interest. I emphasize this one:

The donation of a day's pay from 7,000 employees of one large airplane factory amounted to more than $71,000.

This is a phase of the national effort, Mr. President, to which little or no attention has been directed. I think it is very much worth while that Mr. Bell's letter be extended in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, March 30, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of your letter of March 20 in which you express an interest in the fund "Donations to the Government for national defense," its extent and growth.

On December 7, 1941, the day on which Pearl Harbor was attacked, total donations amounted to $45,350.07 Since December 7, and up to and including March 25, 1942, the Treasury has received 5,589 donations, totaling $478,248.49. Largely as a result of radio broadcasts by Commentators Pearson and Allen and by Walter Winchell, 1,461 donations, amounting to $98,032.43, were received during the week December 28, 1941–January 3, 1942. These donations came in the form of checks, money orders currency, coin, Defense bonds, Savings stamps, and veterans' adjusted-service certificates. Other donations of rings, watches, and even gold teeth fillings have been received. Several persons have tendered their life savings. Frequently they come from groups of American citizens through lodges, schools, social groups,

churches, labor organizations, associations, and other types of organizations. In several cases we have received contributions of a day's pay from employees to which the employer has added the day's profits. The donation of a day's pay from 7,000 employees of one large airplane factory amounted to more than $71,000.

More significant than the money value of these donations is the spirit of patriotism behind them and the evidence of love which a democratic and free people have for their Government.

Up to March 27, 1942, the date of approval of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, there was no law authorizing the Treasury to accept donations to apply to specific purposes of national defense, such as the purchase of bombers and the construction of ships. It was necessary to hold all such conditional gifts in a suspense account for further instructions from the donor. This act will permit the Treasury to accept conditional gifts and to allocate voluntary contributions for purposes specified by the donors, and will enable the Treasury to give effect to the requests of donors and apply their contributions to specified purposes.

Very sincerely yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Waupaca, Wis., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, March 24, 1942.

Whereas the nations of the earth are engaged in a mighty struggle to determine whether right and brotherhood shall rule the world or might and hatred; and

Whereas the United States has dedicated her every resource in an unretreating determination that a just peace shall consummate that struggle; and

Whereas the ranks of our armed forces are filled and are being filled with the best and most valiant of our country's men, and victory cannot be achieved without the full and unlimited strength and capacity of industry and production; and

Whereas it is recognized that every available man must be released for military duty, without loss of production of the necessities of war, and it has been made known to us by the Government, by the military authorities, by industry and business in every field of activity that the production for war and civilian defense wil be endangered unless all available men and women serve in the industries allied with war and defense; and

Whereas the women of the Nation possess knowledge, skill, training, and ability both necessary and useful for these purposes, and are not only willing but eager to serve their country during the present war; and

Whereas it is only through training and opportunity that this great source of productive strength can be released to maintain and increase the production that is imperative, and to sustain our business and industrial power to capacity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby respectfully urged to enact H. R. 6806, a bill providing for the registration of women between the ages of 18 and 65 under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, April 1, 1942.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the alleged destruction of 2,000,000 acres of wheat in the State of Kansas under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Michigan Good Roads Federation protesting against any increase in the Federal tax rates on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Commission of the City of Owosso, Mich., protesting against adoption of the proposal to impose a Federal tax on State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Social Security program to municipal employees; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Ingham County, Mich., protesting against adoption of the proposal to impose a Federal tax on State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Ronald Willing Workers Club, of Ionia County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to restrict and suppress the traffic in alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROSECUTION OF THE WAR—RESOLUTIONS, ETC., FROM KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a letter containing a resolution adopted by Twin Mound Grange, No. 1499, and attested by Clyde Hiatt, secretary of Richland, Kans. I believe this expression is fairly representative of the sentiment of the citizens of Kansas and of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHLAND, KANS., *April 9, 1942.*

Senator CLYDE REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a recent meeting of Twin Mound Grange, No. 1499, your bill on labor and labor racketeers, was discussed and heartily endorsed. By unanimous vote of the grange the secretary was instructed to write you that we would back you to the limit and we hope that you will continue the fight to the point where no man will have to pay tribute for the right to earn a living.

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE HIATT,
Secretary of Twin Mound Grange, No. 1499.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks without all the signatures attached thereto a letter in the nature of a petition signed by 37 citizens of Winfield, Kans. I feel that this expression is fairly typical of the sentiment of citizens of Kansas and of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

WINFIELD, KANS., *March 20, 1942.*

Senator CLYDE REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We thoroughly agree with the President we should have nonpartisan participation in an all-out war effort, an uninterrupted production line.

We believe the President should have as advisers efficient, alert, and hard-hitting men capable of making important decisions quickly.

We protest against Harry Hopkins as closest adviser to the President; unfortunately he is ill and incapable.

We protest against Labor Secretary Perkins, who always listens to gangster labor leaders, but turns a deaf ear to workingmen or women, and industries that have made our Nation the greatest in the world.

We protest against Oil Coordinator Ickes, who is able to create and does cause a gas shortage on the east coast while he is prohibiting oil to be produced in the Middle West.

We demand as advisers to the President, and also Cabinet members, men who are willing to work for the best interest of our Government.

We demand Congress make it unlawful for any money whatsoever to be appropriated unless every dollar is designated for which it is to be spent.

How are radio programs of propaganda and advertising of Government bureaus financed? Is it tax money or by sale of defense bonds? We do not want propaganda, we want barefaced facts and we can take it without music.

Mr. Nelson asks for a 50-percent increase in war production. We demand Congress cooperate fully and make necessary adjustments in laws immediately, in order that either union or nonunion men may work as long hours as they can keep physically fit without time and one-half pay for over 40 hours work a week.

Congress must enforce rigid economy in Government expenditures. All American resources must buy war equipment and this must be done efficiently and wisely.

We demand Congress discontinue every Government bureau and agency that is not vitally important in producing war equipment or the functioning of our Government.

We demand an investigation by Federal Bureau of Investigation in conditions of sabotage of water-front harbors where war equipment is being loaded; also suppress all enemy publications.

We believe the first step in civilian defense is organization of home guards in every city, town and community and request this be done immediately.

Sincerely,

F. R. KEENEY.
F. B. EVANS.
(And 35 other citizens of Winfield, Kans.)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by a mass meeting in Concordia, Kans., which was largely attended. The resolution was signed by 84 persons. It reasonably represents, in my opinion, the prevailing sentiment among an overwhelming majority of citizens of Kansas and of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

As loyal yet apprehensive Americans we stand dazed and horrified at the ghastly defeats suffered by our armed forces. Although for years the Congress has appropriated billions for defense, we were not ready at Pearl Harbor, and since have been unable to defend our own territory, even with the aid of powerful allies.

The defense effort crumbled under the assault of greedy strikes, which our Government treated with Munich-like complacency, and the war effort is failing for the same reason.

The governmental requirement of the closed shop in war industries we denounce and brand a most atrocious betrayal of the gallant MacArthur and his heroic men. It smells to high heaven. It is the most un-American monstrosity ever foisted on our soldiers and the common people.

When the time has come that an honest American laboring man is willing to labor in the defense of his country at an honest wage, but is prevented unless he pay high dues to the bosses of labor unions, Americans are no longer free. The war effort is not speeded. It is impeded. The Government is robbed of honest, patriotic effort. The laborer suffers a shake-down, and only the tenderized hams of John L. Lewis and his ilk are benefited, and the boodle of this gang is free from income tax. The laboring man, union or nonunion, is not to blame for this plundering. The racketeers of organized labor saw a golden opportunity and the Government gave the green light to pillage.

The closed shop must go out or our ships will go down.

And during these frightful times, when our country is meeting the greatest peril in its history, we still have the wage-hour law.

True, it prevents no man from working as many hours per week as he likes, but time and a half is demanded for time after 40 hours and double time for holidays and Sundays. These mounting costs are reflected in costs of munitions which the people must pay. No war effort will be successful on such a time schedule. In the fox holes in the Philippines the cream of our youth exposed to death, shocking wounds, and searing flames get no overtime or double time. But it is traditional that soldiers fight for patriotism and love of country. Shame it is that the $21-a-day boys working in closed shops cannot envision that background when their country is in peril. They can and do, but labor leader parasites will not countenance such realism.

The wage-hour law must go out for the duration.

The French nation permitted its preparedness to be shackled by these same things.

We must take no chances. See where France is.

Those high in Government circles have winked at profiteering by industry and labor, but are shocked at the thought of the farmer receiving a fair income from his investment and labor. If there is such a thing as a skilled laborer the farmer is one. The prices he receives from his crops raised through the hazards of weather and pests is his salary. He is just as much entitled to a fair salary as the machinist or the mechanic, but it is said to be shameful on the part of the farmer to ask a fair price. A recent speaker said that since March 1933 the income of industry, labor, and agriculture have been kept at a fair balance. The balance is $21 a day for the union worker, $21 a month for the soldier and about $21 a year for the farmer. The imposition in 1941 of the 49-cent penalty on wheat was plain trickery. The courts have so held and the Secretary of Agriculture should be content with that ruling and refrain from an appeal to the United States Supreme Court. Agriculture has been restricted, regimented, bludgeoned, and crushed and now it should have fair play. The 49-cent penalty imposed last year should be refunded. There should be no restrictions imposed on the production of the farmer with the world at war and a world to feed. There is no such thing as needless surpluses in times of war.

Profiteering, whether indulged in by industry, labor, or the professional patriot, must be stopped and stopped now. At the close of World War No. 1 we all said that in the event of a similar catastrophe the Government should draft industry and labor as well as armed forces. How soon we forget.

Members of Congress should cease bickering over canals, dams, and fan dancers and devote their time and energy to the successful prosecution of this war.

Holding firmly to the above views, it is by us, the undersigned citizens of Concordia, Cloud County, Kans., called in assembly by the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Concordia.

Resolved,

1. We demand that you immediately use all of your efforts and influence to secure an immediate abolishment of the closed shop system in war work.

2. We demand that you immediately use all of your efforts and influence to procure the enactment of a law outlawing strikes and profiteering for the duration of the war.

3. We demand that you immediately use all of your efforts and influence to secure an immediate repeal of the wage-hour law.

4. We demand that you procure the enactment of a law repealing the iniquitous and illegal 49-cent penalty imposed on the wheat farmer in this country in 1941 and remove all restrictions and penalties on agricultural production.

5. We further demand that you immediately use all of your efforts and influence to insure the successful prosecution of the war by elimination of the pork barrel, petty disputes over nondefense works, and expenditures, and that you and other Members of Congress conduct yourselves as statesmen and not politicians.

6. We express the sentiment that if the Congress enact the above laws and that if anyone of them be vetoed by the President of the United States, it will be the sense of the people of this country that he is thereby destroying the unity created by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor.

E. W. THOMPSON,
J. C. PECK,
H. A. INGRAM,
(And sundry other citizens of Concordia, Kans.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2446. A bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2447. A bill providing for per capita payments to the Seminole Indians in Oklahoma from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ANDREWS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1943, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 74, line 16, to strike out "seeds."

On page 74, line 20, after the colon, to insert the following: *"Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for making seeds available to agricultural producers only if such seeds are furnished directly to such agricultural producers by regularly established jobbers and dealers in such seeds:".

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—RECOMMITTAL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is pending on the calendar of the Senate the legislative appropriation bill, H. R. 6802, Calendar No. 1276. Since it was reported to the Senate I have talked with some of the members of the Appropriations Committee who are interested in some amendments which were offered in the committee, and who now, upon second thought, think that some of the provisions therein contained might be modified. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee for further consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the request made by the able Senator from Maryland. I am simply wondering if his proposal fits into the plan and agreement made between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oregon. It was understood when the bill was reported several weeks ago that it would follow the consideration of the labor legislation which will be initiated a week from today.

I see very cogent reasons for the recommittal of the bill, especially with respect to the provisions the able Senator from Maryland discussed with me. I think I may say in the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that the proposal now made probably does not violate the understanding we had.

I believe that the bill, if recommitted, might be reported again to the Senate by a week from today, so that it would take its place as if it had not been recommitted. With the understanding that action shall be taken so as not to

defer its final consideration unreasonably, I shall have no objection, indeed, with that understanding, I join with the Senator from Maryland in his request that the bill be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say for the information of the Senate that I discussed the matter with the majority leader the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] before he left day before yesterday, and he was in accord with the request I am now making, and it was his intention, as it is mine, to have the bill again reported from the Committee on Appropriations quickly, so that it will not lose the place it now occupies for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, House bill 6802, the legislative appropriation bill, will be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE CHEROKEES FOR SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Comptroller General be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to audit the accounts of the Cherokees entitled to per capita compensation for lands sold to the United States under the treaty of 1846 (9 Stat. 71), giving the United States full credit for the several payments made to said Indians as of the times such payments were made, and, after applying the rule laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States (38 U. S. Repts. 257, 270), and in accordance with the precedents established by the Congress of the United States as set forth in the report of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate (S. Rept. No. 172, 77th Cong.), and the report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives (H. Rept. No. 953, 77th Cong.), and Public Law No. 199, Seventy-seventh Congress, to certify the result of such audits to the Senate for its information.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BULOW TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

[Mr. BULOW asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him for delivery over the radio in South Dakota by electrical transcription, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY SENATOR DAVIS ON VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him and published in the Middletown (Pa.) Press of April 10, 1942, entitled "Volunteer Firemen Render an Important National Service," which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. JONES' EXCUSES—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BUNKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Jones' Excuses," published in the Washington Post of April 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEBT AND TAXES—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Debt and Taxes," published in the New York Times of April 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF INFLATION

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the press dispatches carry the news that the President of the United States has intimated very strongly at his press conferences that the administration's experts are working now upon an anti-inflation program which is expected to be submitted to the Congress at a very early date, and that that program will in all probability include an over-all control of commodities, wages, retail, and wholesale prices, and manufacturers' profits. If this news be true, as in all probability it is—and the situation is so plain that all who run may read—then it seems to me that it must be heartening to every American who has been deeply concerned with the dread danger of inflation.

Mr. President, when the measure setting up the present price-control agency was before this body for final passage, I stated that I thought it was a makeshift bill, an imperfect bill, a bad bill, because it did not establish over-all control of wages, farm prices, commodity prices, retail prices, transportation, rents, profits, and the other elements which enter into the production of maximum efficiency. I stated then that I would vote for the measure, not because I thought it was a good bill—I realized that it was a bad bill—but because I believed that it would so completely and so speedily demonstrate its own inefficiency that it would be necessary at a very early date to return with an over-all control bill, along the line of the so-called Baruch plan. I stated that position again when the conference report came in, providing in the bill only for partial, ineffective, halting price control.

Mr. President, there are some of us on this floor who have always believed that when a war situation developed it would be necessary to resort to controls which in ordinary times, or indeed in any times, would be called totalitarian. I believed that to be so certainly when in the fall of 1940 I read the article on the dangers of inflation written by that great American, Bernard M. Baruch, when he advocated a setting of ceilings on all these elements.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REED. I inquire of the senior Senator from Missouri whether the attitude of the President to which he has adverted is not also heartening to those of us on this floor who have constantly urged control of profits, wages, and prices.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is certainly heartening to all Americans who are opposed to inflation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit, I am delighted to find that once more, as seems to be the almost invariable rule, I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator. We have agreed on a great many occasions, and it is always a comfort to me to find myself in his very good company.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There never was a chance, in my view, that the original price control, with its side doors and its back doors, could save this country from the debacle of inflation. If we are now to have all-out price control on a rational basis, along the general lines of the Baruch plan in general, I join the Senator from Missouri in welcoming America's first chance to beat the spiral of inflation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I rose only for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that while I am not in favor of starting out to repress labor, and I am certainly opposed to any legislation which would work a hardship on the farmer, I recognize the fact that laboring men, whether organized or unorganized, are Americans and are a part of this Nation, and that farmers, whether they belong to one farmers' organization or another, or do not belong to any, are Americans and are a part of the Nation. Lawyers, doctors, merchant chiefs, butchers, bakers, candlestick makers; in short, every class of Americans, are a part of the picture, and must make the same sacrifices every other American makes. And I am thoroughly convinced that with a few odious exceptions they are all willing to do their full share and more if they are convinced that the burden is to be equitably distributed.

As I suggested a while ago, in my opinion, if this country had followed the advice of Bernard M. Baruch in its broad, general lines, first enunciated by him in 1940, at least so far as its application to the present situation is concerned—for he enunciated the general theory many years before—billions of dollars of inflation which has already come about since that time might have been avoided, and we might not have been confronted by the necessity for more drastic legislation to stop the spiral of inflation.

Mr. Baruch's great experience in the World War, and his constant study since that time, have made him better qualified to speak on that subject than any other man in America. If the Congress of the United States had any gratitude in its soul it would give Mr. Baruch a congressional medal of honor for his services during the last war.

But, Mr. President, that is not what I rose to discuss. I rose merely to call attention to the fact that not only should the anti-inflation program of the President be submitted to the Congress with all speed and be passed by the Congress with all speed but that the powers already granted to the Office of Price Administration, such as they are, should be exercised immediately, pending the consideration of the anti-inflation program of the President, which will necessarily take a few days to consider. Action should be taken at once, in order to head off the effort to beat the program before it can reach Congress and be considered. An effort is already being made to sabotage the whole of this most salutary provision for a price ceiling.

Last Saturday I had occasion to visit, with my wife, one of the large department stores in the city of Washington,

where a few days before she had reserved some articles. She found that since she had made the reservation, just a day or two before, the articles had advanced in price some 30 percent. I was very much interested in that and began to make inquiry. I found that the whole staff of that great department store were engaged in marking up prices all along the line.

We then went to another department in the store and looked at some cotton quilts which my wife had happened to examine the day before, and when she had examined them the price was $4.50 a pair. When she examined them Saturday the price was $6.75 a pair, indicating an advance of 50 percent.

I began to be interested, and there came to my attention the case of a lady who had gone to the shoe department of a great department store and examined a couple of pairs of shoes, but had not made up her mind as between the two pairs when she went to lunch. During her lunch she made up her mind and came back about an hour later and asked for the pair of shoes she had decided to buy. That pair of shoes had advanced 50 cents during the lunch hour.

I am not leveling any criticism at this particular department store. I have made such inquiry since, as I have had opportunity, and have found the same thing is occurring in all the department stores. If they are following this practice, the smaller retailer will necessarily be forced to the same course, and that procedure is described in all quarters as an effort to "beat the ceilings."

It is said the President's program will be sent to Congress by the end of the week, and I hope that is true. In the natural course of events, it will necessarily take several days for the Congress to consider the matter, and during that time incalculable damage may be done in the matter of marking up retail prices, and possibly marking up wholesale prices, in an effort to "beat the ceilings."

It, therefore, seems to me that Mr. Henderson, the Price Administrator, should defeat that effort in the meantime by using the powers he now has, and clamping a ceiling on prices. In this connection, there is suggested to me the desirability, when proposals for permanent legislation shall come before us, of fixing an antecedent date on the ceilings which we are to fix, in order to defeat such chiseling in the meantime.

While I am on the subject of inflation, I wish to add that the news reports also indicate that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which now has under consideration a great tax bill, which will soon be reported to the House of Representatives, is very strongly disposed toward a general sales tax. It seems to me to be an incongruity that a great many men and a great many women who are honestly alarmed by the fear of inflation, who are as anxious as any of the rest of us to avoid the great danger of inflation, nevertheless should be calmly disposed, or disposed in any degree whatever, toward such a proposal as a general sales tax, because anti-inflation legislation and a sales tax are mutually incompatible; they are hostile to each other, they are impossible of enforcement together, for, no matter what anti-inflation measure we adopt, once we set our course upon the path of general sales taxes, and superimpose them upon the large and burdensome sales taxes now imposed by most of the States, and the large number of excise taxes now imposed by the Federal Government, we will have inflation which will out-inflation inflation. Sales taxes would completely nullify any anti-inflation measures which might be adopted.

I have no knowledge whatever as to what goes on in the House Committee on Ways and Means, and I do not know what course the House of Representatives may take when, in its constitutional function of originating revenue measures, it may send a bill to the Senate, but the Constitution of the United States also provides that taxes cannot be imposed without the acquiescence of this body. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, as a Member of this body, and as a member of the Finance Committee of this body, I give notice that some of us will not see a measure providing a general sales tax enacted by Congress without the bitterest last-ditch fight any of us are able to make, because we do not desire knowingly to consent to the enactment of a measure which will nullify any anti-inflation legislation we may pass, and inevitably set us upon the spiral of the worst inflation this country has ever seen.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not one of the vital weaknesses of a sales tax the fact that it will inevitably be pyramided? Whether we call it pyramiding or not, the consumer will pay probably two or three times as much as the tax because the tax will be pyramided. Is not that true?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is eminently correct in his assumption.

Mr. President, I think it is an undoubted fact that no system of sales taxation has ever been devised which can avoid the vice of pyramiding or imposing a tax very much larger than the tax intended to be imposed, and also of bearing most heavily on that class of the people least able to pay.

The pyramiding feature of a sales tax simply means that if you impose a small enough sales tax to be in any way tolerable, with any exemptions as to food and clothing, you do not raise enough money to amount to very much in accomplishing your tax objective. If, on the other hand, you put the basic tax high enough to accomplish your tax objective, it pyramids so rapidly as to impose an intolerable burden on those least able to pay and starts the inflation spiral to a point where it cannot be controlled by any other means.

I did not desire to precipitate an extended discussion of the sales tax at this time; but in view of the discussion which has been going forward in that regard, I simply desire to give notice on the part of at least some of us on the Finance Committee and some of us in the Senate that any attempt to impose a sales tax will be as bitterly fought as we know how to fight it.

INFLATION AND THE VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, from reading some of the newspaper stories and hearing some of the commentators the country would naturally be led to believe that we are now in the upward spirals of inflation. That occasions a question as to just what inflation is. A few years ago we had very low prices. When we had very low prices we had a very small amount of money in circulation. So low prices and a small amount of money in circulation go together.

About 10 years ago a movement was started throughout the country to increase prices, and the Congress enacted legislation having that end in view. The plan was to increase the amount of money in circulation and thereby to cheapen the dollar. At the time this movement got under way in 1933 we had scarcely more than $4,000,000,000 of actual money in circulation. At that time we had the lowest prices in my lifetime. At that time the dollar had a buying power of 167 cents. That means that the dollar at that time, in 1932–33, bought on the average $1.67 worth of commodities. Of course, that was depression almost to the *n*th degree, and it was Nation-wide.

The movement was started to increase the money in circulation, to cheapen the dollar, and to raise prices, and as that program was carried out prices were increased and the dollar was cheapened. That program has been going on now for 10 years.

I think the Senate should be reminded and the country should know just where we are from time to time. At the present moment we are still in deflation. Notwithstanding all we have done, we have not reduced the value of the dollar to 100 cents in value or buying power.

Of course, that brings up the question, "How do you value the dollar?" Mr. President, we have a plan for valuing the dollar. It is valued according to a system of statistics. In our country we have what is known as the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This system is made up of some 900 commodities. The price of a certain quantity of each of these 900 commodities is taken. Then once each week the wholesale price of the given quantity of 900 commodities is ascertained. When the prices of the given number of the 900 commodities are ascertained they are all added together and divided by the number. If the average has risen, that means that the general price level has risen, and that means that the dollar has fallen in buying power.

Since 1933 the dollar has lost some of its buying power. We have reduced the value of the dollar from 167 cents until last Thursday the dollar was worth on the same basis and according to the same yardstick 1.021 cents. So the dollar today contains more than 100 cents of buying power as measured by this yardstick.

Some of us for a long time have had a goal. That goal is to return to the

value of the dollar of 1926. At that time our people were all rather busy. At that time we had rather good times throughout the country. At that time we were paying, first, the running expenses of our Government, and, secondly, we were retiring $1,000,000,000 worth of bonds, representing Government debt, a year. At that time we had what was known by a large number of our people as the Coolidge era of prosperity. That era was based upon a 100-cent dollar and based upon a 100-percent price level. In that era we had the 100-cent dollar as measured by property values, which is the only way one can measure the value of the dollar, and measured by that dollar wheat was selling for around $1.50 a bushel, and cotton was selling for from 20 to 22 cents a pound.

At the present time we are approximating that level. As the dollar goes down in buying power, prices rise. Today wheat is selling on the futures market for around $1.30 a bushel, and cotton is selling on the futures market for around 20 cents a pound; and if the dollar still keeps on falling in value, prices will rise, and when the dollar reaches the 100-cent level wheat will have advanced to the $1.50-a-bushel level and cotton to the 22-cents-a-pound level. This development justifies the arguments I have made for over 10 years.

So, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that, based upon the Coolidge era of prosperity and based upon the good times the people thought they were then having, we still have a dollar today valued at $1.02, which means that the price level is not up to 100, because when the dollar is above 100 the price level is below 100. So when the dollar now is at $1.02 in terms of value, the price level is 97.9, which is practically 98 percent.

So, Mr. President, as the matter now is developing, very shortly we shall have the dollar down to 100 cents, and we shall have the price level up to 100. There they will meet, and that is the place where, in my opinion, they should be stabilized. That point in our economy will be reached within the next few weeks, perhaps 1 month at the most, because the dollar is losing value at the rate of about one-half a cent a week, so in a month's time the dollar will be down to 100 cents, the price level will be up to 100, and at that time we shall be back to the Coolidge standard of 1926.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Oklahoma just referred to the point I had in mind. I was very much interested in knowing the basis he used for comparison. It was my impression, and is now, that the Bureau of Labor Statistics uses 1926 as a basis.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Oklahoma just referred to that, after I had risen to my feet to interrupt him.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the purchasing power of the dollar today compared with the purchasing power of the dollar in 1926?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The purchasing power of the dollar in 1926 was 100 cents. The purchasing power today is 102 cents. So the dollar today, as measured by the value of property of all kinds, has in it a value of 2 cents more than it had in 1926. It is my contention, Mr. President, that until the dollar falls to 100 cents and until the price level rises to 100, we shall still be in deflation. Then when each—the value of the dollar and the price level—reaches 100, the two meet and deflation will be at an end, and inflation will not have begun. Thereafter if the dollar value should fall below 100 and the price level should go above 100, then inflation will have started.

Mr. President, I have never advocated inflation. I have condemned deflation and have advocated reflation to reestablish the 100-percent-price level. I have been arguing on the Senate floor for years in favor of getting back to the 1926 level Then when we get back to such a level I am in favor of taking such steps as may be necessary—whatever they may be—to keep the dollar value from falling below 100 cents.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to express agreement with the Senator from Oklahoma that there is no inflation at present, at least until the price level of today—which, of course, includes the purchasing power of the dollar—can reasonably be related to the price level and the purchasing power of the dollar in 1926. Until prices exceed the 1926 price level and until the purchasing power of the dollar is greatly reduced below the 1926 purchasing power, there can be no inflation.

What I am saying in agreement with the Senator from Oklahoma is not to be taken as a change from the position I have frequently stated on this floor—that profits, prices, and wages are all interrelated factors and that we cannot control one of them independently of the others.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think the able Senator from Oklahoma must keep in mind that in the main his comparisons with respect to the dollar relate to raw agricultural commodities. I also have those figures. Included in the calculation is the so-called parity price. What the Senator from Missouri was discussing awhile ago was not a comparison of prices of raw, unfinished, unprocessed agricultural commodities, but prices of finished products, with respect to which there has been a write-up after the products have left the hands of the manufacturer, the processor, or the producer. Will the able Senator from Oklahoma indicate what is the purchasing power of the dollar with respect to the finished products which are now on the shelves and available for the final consumer?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The price level, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, depends wholly upon wholesale prices. The price level, according to this statistical system is not based upon the prices of finished products alone. It is based upon the prices of raw materials, and perhaps upon some finished products, but all prices are on the wholesale standpoint.

I know that prices are going up. Occasionally—not very often—I have to buy some clothes. A tailor comes to see me once in a while. Before the holidays he came to see me with some samples. He had some cloth in which I was interested, and he gave me the price for a suit from that particular cloth. During the past few days the same tailor came to see me again, with the same samples. I looked at the same piece of cloth, and he wanted 25 percent more for a suit made from that cloth today than he was willing to make the same suit for before the holidays. Besides, now he would not have to put any cuffs on the trousers, so I think he should have offered a reduction. [Laughter.]

Prices are now inclined to go up. That is because there is more money available to the public than the public can use efficiently. When we have more money than we can spend prices are inclined to go up. Having a larger amount of money, at the same time we now have not quite so many things to buy.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. In regard to the suit of clothes, the Senator says the price has gone up 25 percent. How much has the price of wool gone up?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The tailor has the same piece of cloth now which he had 3 or 4 months ago. So far as I can see there is no occasion for demanding 25 percent more for the suit now than he could have made it for in December.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. The fact of the matter is that there is a ceiling on the price of wool. It cannot go up.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Let me suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that possibly he is not doing business with the right tailor. It so happens that at the present time a very well-known tailoring concern is making me two suits of clothes. They are charging me the same price which they charged me last year for two suits. I limit myself to two suits a year. If I were like the Senator from Oklahoma, one of the best dressed men in the Senate, I should have to have more clothes than that. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I was getting quotations on only one suit. I congratulate the Senator from Kansas. I suspect that he has not paid his income tax in full. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. This debate suggests the inquiry as to whether the consumptive propensity enters into the question to some extent.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no doubt about it. The people have more money with which to buy. The

rule is that the amount of money in circulation should be equivalent to the amount of goods available and which may be purchased. If we could keep the amount of money in circulation at the right level, and could keep the amount of goods ready for distribution at the right level, we should not have very much trouble about inflation. However, we now have a great amount of money in circulation, and not so many goods. For that reason the people are willing to pay more for the things they need.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to interrupt the Senator from Oklahoma merely to express again my entire agreement with him. I am as much opposed as anybody could be to real inflation, which is dangerous. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that there can be no inflation until the price level is comparable to that of 1926. Nobody talked about inflation in 1926. We were prosperous. As a matter of fact, we cannot be prosperous unless we have business in large volume, more brisk than was the case at the time of the very ebb of the depression.

One trouble in dealing with this question is that many of our citizens, including Members of this body, make mental comparisons with the low price level of the early 1930's. Such comparisons are entirely erroneous, misleading, and unfortunate. We must go back to a period when times were normal, or nearly normal. It is very difficult to use the term "normal," because the price level goes up and down. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses 1926, which, I think, is a fair basis upon which to calculate.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for permitting me to interrupt him. I merely wished to emphasize what has been previously stated. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma in his desire to avoid inflation. I also agree with him that we should control the factors to which reference has been made. I am glad to see that the President is taking the lead. We have discussed this subject to a great extent on the floor of the Senate. Many of us have pointed out that the main factors to be considered are prices, wages, and profits. If we are to attempt a system of control, all the factors must be controlled.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is not necessary that one be a seer to know that prices are going up. Everyone knows that to be a fact. They are going up, first, because the supply of goods is diminishing, and, secondly, because the supply of money is increasing. The question is, What shall we do about it and who shall do what? Congress is presumed to be the policy-making branch of our Government. It is the duty of Congress to shape the policy. Of course, we cannot execute the laws which we enact. Some think we should. They are now demanding that we not only make the laws but interpret them and execute them. That is beyond our constitutional power.

Inasmuch as prices are going up, the supply of goods will be still further limited, and the supply of money is bound to be more plentiful, something must be done about this matter or we shall have real inflation. Everyone must agree to that premise. The question is, What can be done about it?

The size of the gold dollar does not control the value of the dollar. The size of the silver dollar does not control it. Only one thing controls the value of money, in the main, and that is the number of dollars in circulation, the dollars which are available for the people. That is the main controlling factor. The second controlling factor is the amount of goods available to be purchased.

So, Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and others in expressing the hope that we may have a formula for holding the dollar value at 100. It will be there by the time we can enact legislation. The dollar will be down to 100 cents in value, and the price level will be up to 100. They both should be maintained at that point. In my opinion there is only one way to do so. It would not do any good still further to cut the size of the gold dollar. That would not do the job. It would not be sufficient now to try to take out of circulation, money already in circulation. It cannot be done. It is too late. We can do so to a certain extent by a sales tax by selling Defense stamps and bonds, and by increasing taxes. We can remove some of the excess money from circulation which is an influence toward inflation; but that cannot be done effectively for the reason that each month we are spending more money than we spent the month before. So far as we can see into the future, that condition will continue. This month we are spending $2,000,000,000. Next month we shall be spending $3,000,000,000; the following month perhaps $4,000,000,000; and by the end of this year we shall be spending perhaps $5,000,000,000 a month. That means that the influence toward inflation is constantly increasing. We cannot take money out of circulation, because every day we are putting money into circulation faster than we could take it out.

In my opinion, the only way to control inflation is through a system of freezing prices. If prices are not frozen, they will spiral and climb. If prices of all kinds are fixed and frozen, it is immaterial of what material the dollar is made. Of whatever it is made and irrespective of the number in circulation, the value of such dollar will be determined by the frozen prices. The dollar might be worth more if the freezing were released. We can control prices by legislation or by orders under legislation. We can do the best we can to keep down the money supply through taxation, the sale of stamps and bonds, and other means which may be devised. But with the vast amount of war spending now constantly increasing, in my opinion, to control and prevent inflation effectively we must freeze prices of all kinds all up and down the line.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE NOMINATION CONFIRMED—CHARLES I. LAFFERTY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the only nomination on the Executive Calendar is that of Mr. Charles I. Lafferty for reappointment as comptroller of customs at Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles I. Lafferty, of Atlantic City, N. J., for reappointment as comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

RECESS UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in conformity with the order of the Senate previously entered, I move that the Senate now take a recess until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, April 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry T. Foley, of Yonkers, N. Y., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. Reappointment.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Harry C. Blanton, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri. Mr. Blanton is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.

Sterling Hutcheson, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia. Mr. Hutcheson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert L. Ailworth, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia. Mr. Ailworth is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.

William Thomas Dowd, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina. Mr. Dowd is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 28, 1942.

Ford S. Worthy, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina. Mr. Worthy is now serving

in this office under an appointment which expired March 12, 1942.

John White Stuart, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia. Mr. Stuart is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Austin S. Imirie to be a principal administrative officer in national headquarters, Selective Service System. The compensation to be paid Mr. Imirie will be $5,600 per annum.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles I. Lafferty to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art worthy of more than our deepest love, our highest praise, and our purest devotion, we pray that it may be the goal of our aspirations and desires to be one with Thee in Thine Eternal Spirit and Will.

Grant that our spirits may always beat time to that which is noble, just, and righteous. Give us honesty of mind and humanity of heart. Purge us of all selfishness and self-interest.

We pray that in the conflict in which we are now engaged we may know how to mobilize the sinews of the soul and gird ourselves with fortitude, fidelity, and faith. Give unto those who are on the battle front and the home front courage and calmness, enabling them to carry on without fear and without faltering.

When we are tempted to become discouraged and disheartened, may we have a vision that sees beyond tragedy, assured that the future belongs to God and that out of all the strife and struggles there will come that which is curative and creative for the welfare of mankind and the building of a better world.

Hear us in the name of our risen Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 9, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, coming over from April 2, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The motion was agreed to.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The next unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, coming over from April 2, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

HARRY KAHN

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 4665) for the relief of Harry Kahn, coming over from April 9, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

There was no objection.

H. J. ABNEY

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 5504) for the relief of H. J. Abney, coming over from April 9, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

There was no objection.

FORTIFICATION OF WINES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we should like to hear what the report is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has called up a conference report, and asks unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
FRANK H. BUCK,
FRANK CROWTHER,
Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first Senate amendment provided that the maximum penal sum of any bond required for any bonded winery or bonded storeroom shall be $50,000. Existing law requires that the wine producer's bond should be sufficient to fully cover at all times the payment of internal-revenue taxes due to be paid by him. The Senate amendment merely establishes a maximum of $50,000 with respect to any one wine producer. The House recedes.

The second Senate amendment amends the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to prohibit statements of alcoholic content of wines in any advertisement by radio, newspaper, periodical, or other publication, or by any sign or outdoor advertisement or any other printed or graphic matter. The House recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
FRANK H. BUCK,
FRANK CROWTHER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the amendments propose to do only two things, both of which are approved by the Treasury Department. The conference report has already been adopted by the other body. The Committee on Ways and Means has considered the matter and is unanimous in its opinion that these amendments should be agreed to. In fact, one of them appeared in its original form, the $50,000 allotment in the bill, as introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], but by an error it was not incorporated in the final draft as passed by the House. There has been no change in the House bill. There is only the addition of two matters.

The second amendment provides only that advertising of sweet wines—that is, those from 14 to 20 percent—must follow the same rules and regulations as wines under 14 percent. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to go down to Magruder's or the Connecticut Avenue Wine & Liquor Store, or anywhere else, and buy wine, he will still see printed on the label the amount of alcoholic content in those wines; but what we are trying to do is to adopt a uniform rule as far as advertising is concerned—public displays,

open-air advertising, radio, and so forth—so that nobody will go into a particular store under the impression that he is getting there a greater alcoholic content than he would somewhere else.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand the amendment that was added by the Senate, in which the gentleman desires the concurrence of the House, the alcoholic content of wines containing more than 14 percent of alcohol does not have to be listed in advertisements. Is that correct?

Mr. BUCK. They may not be hereafter advertised as containing such and such an amount of alcohol. I may say to the gentleman that there has been a great deal of objection from our southern colleagues because they felt that the advertising of sherry as having a 20 percent alcoholic content was increasing the trade there to the detriment of the population and of auto drivers. Let us cut that out. Let us be somewhat of a prohibitionist in our views for once in our lives.

Mr. RICH. I never bought any wine and I never bought any liquor of any kind and I am speaking from that standpoint, which I presume the gentleman will realize.

Mr. BUCK. The only time I ever saw the gentleman in possession of any wine or any liquor was when he waved a bottle of Puerto Rican rum here in the House.

Mr. RICH. I will say to the gentleman that that was given to me by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Virgin Islands Rum Co. who have got everybody in this country into the rum business. I am against having the Government in the rum business and that was the reason I waved that bottle of wine or rum here. I wanted the people to know that they are already in the rum business.

Now, let us get to the matter of the alcoholic content of wine. We have the Pure Food and Drugs Act, which requires that the alcoholic content of everything that the people of this country consume shall be shown on the label.

Mr. BUCK. Pardon me, let me correct the gentleman. Both the labeling section and the advertising section are contained in section 205 of title XXVII of the United States Code. Let me say that while they are in different subdivisions, this provision that the Senate adopted does not in any manner permit the erasure of the statement on the bottle saying it is 9-percent alcohol, or 14 percent, 18 percent, or 20 percent, whatever it is. This provision will prohibit something being put on the billboard or prevent someone going on the radio somewhere and saying, "Come to our wine store because we have the highest percentage-of-alcohol wine there is," no matter whether it is high-grade wine or not. It seems to me that when those representing wine districts on the Ways and Means Committee and those representing dry districts can agree on a proposition of this kind it ill behooves anybody to get up here and say that this is not for the welfare of the country.

Mr. RICH. If it is for the welfare of the country, then I am for it, but I just doubt that if you were going to permit advertisements to go out without telling the people of this country that the wine contains 20 or 25 percent of alcohol. And because they buy that wine and they get lots of kick out of it, then they think they are doing something good for themselves, when they are only pickling their bodies by drinking the damned stuff. It is about time we did something to prevent that kind of advertising. I do not think it is good for the American people to be pickled with alcohol, and I tell you right now if there ever was a time when the American people ought to retain their wits and cultivate sound bodies that time is now, especially if we are going to get on with this war. I am for doing those things that are going to be for the best interests of American manhood and American womanhood, and I do not want to see the boys and girls of this country pickled in alcohol, and I do not think we ought to have legislation that is going to have any such effect. That is my honest belief.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is arguing for the purpose of the amendment, and for the benefit of the other Members of the House, I will read what John L. Sullivan, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, said about the amendment:

> This Department is of the opinion that this proposed amendment will have a good effect because it will exclude from the advertising media mentioned the references to the alcoholic content of the product advertised. It is entirely consistent with the position the Department has taken in respect of the advertising of fortified wines. There the Department's position has been that the advertisers of wines shall not use the word "fortified" in connection with their advertisements because the word "fortified" indicates the strengthening of a normal wine by the addition of distilled spirits. Indeed, the effect produced by the departmental ban on the use of the word "fortified" in connection with the advertising of wines is to some extent nullified by the statements of alcoholic content of wines as required by the law.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. No; I have moved the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE J. ADAM BEDE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce at this time the passing of J. Adam Bede, a former Member of the House. Mr. Bede's home was in Duluth, Minn., and he passed away on Saturday, April 11. He was 86 years of age.

Mr. Bede served three terms in Congress. He was first elected in 1902 and was reelected to the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses. His death removes one of the great characters of America. He had no superior on the public platform and his reputation as a humorist was of the highest order. Always a student of the affairs of government, Mr. Bede ranked as an expert in the field of transportation problems.

He served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee when he was a Member of the House and his interest in that subject continued to the time of his death. He was one of the leading exponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and many of you will recall your pleasant visits with him when he attended committee meetings of the Rivers and Harbors Committee last fall.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I concur in everything that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] said with reference to our departed friend, J. Adam Bede, of Duluth. Mr. Bede served in this body from 1902 until 1906. He was a very kindly man, able and dependable. I have never heard J. Adam Bede say anything but good of anyone. He had a host of friends, not alone in Minnesota but here in the Nation's Capital, all of whom admired him for his intellectual honesty, his cordial fellowship, and his ability. Mr. Bede was easily one of the biggest men of his time, at the turn of the century, when he was a Member of this body; and in common with thousands and thousands in Minnesota, I mourn his death. I am glad to have this opportunity to say a few words of tribute to his memory, which will long live.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I learned of the passing of J. Adam Bede as just announced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]. I join with my colleagues from Minnesota in the tribute they have paid to him.

Mr. Bede was first elected to serve in the Fifty-eighth Congress and was reelected to the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses. He was born in Lorain County, Ohio, in 1856. After learning the printer's trade he taught school and was engaged in newspaper work. He supported Grover Cleveland in 1888 and 1892; was appointed United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota in 1894 and served through the great railroad strikes of that year. He returned to the Republican Party on the financial issue in 1896 and campaigned in several States that year. He was nominated and elected as a Republican to the House of Representatives.

He had a national reputation as an orator and as a student of affairs of government. He had friends throughout the country and was ever interested in the development of the great Northwest. Shortly before his death he spent considerable time in Washington in the interest of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Bede was of a most friendly and kindly disposition; I have never known

him to say anything that was harsh or unkind about anyone.

His fame as an orator and statesman will live with the years. The great Northwest has lost one of its able advocates and thousands of us in Minnesota have lost a true friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to join in the tribute paid the memory of J. Adam Bede by my colleagues from Minnesota, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. KNUTSON, and Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Bede will live long in the thoughts of the people of our State and his friends will cherish for years to come his great kindliness of character. A month ago I had the pleasure of discussing with him the seaway, and I only regret he did not live long enough to see his dream come true.

MR. EUGENE MEYER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr COX. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have publicly applauded Mr. Eugene Meyer. Not one word of praise have I ever spoken of him would I change, because he is a man of extraordinary ability. However, I regret that he has seen fit to accuse Secretary Jesse Jones of dereliction of duty or lack of foresight. It so happens that Mr. Jones' position is so firmly fixed in the public esteem that the people of this country are not going to permit criticism to rivet him to the rocks because of a too great loyalty to his chief, whose greatest fault history will probably say is too great a love for all mankind. Mr Speaker, this is no time to look for a scapegoat. If there be sin, it is the sin of all. Prior to Pearl Harbor preparation for war proceeded as rapidly as public sentiment would permit. This is a time for unity, for concord, and for common action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the menhaden fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a very splendid article by a former Member of this House, Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, on A Time When Men Grow Tall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a newspaper article and an editorial from the Benton Harbor News Palladium.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I request indefinite leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] on account of serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND THE FINANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I want to call to your attention, and I am sure that within the next few days it will come to your attention. The Government has issued an order freezing the sale of automobiles, and the finance companies of the country are taking advantage of that order, and in the State of Florida are demanding that payments be made far beyond what the dealers are able to pay and telling them that unless they make those payments they will take over, that they are liquidating their finance companies. We do not want to see these finance companies destroy these automobile dealers. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has some authority to loan them, but not enough, and I am introducing a bill today which I hope every Member of the House will study, for the protection of these automobile dealers. I am sure that they are willing to make every sacrifice necessary, and we should not be willing to sacrifice them to the finance companies. I have evidence that these finance companies are taking advantage of this situation to enrich themselves and will be glad to submit it to anyone who is interested at the proper time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a radio address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Binghamton Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed unanimously by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Sheboygan Press of April 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of today's business and any other special orders that I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the day's calendar and all other business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that the Treasury statement of April 9 shows we have gone in the red about a billion and a third dollars per month during this year. A billion and a third dollars a month. In 9 months we have gone in the red about $12,000,000,000.

Last fall the President of the United States said we should have increased taxes; that we should raise eight or nine billion dollars more by taxation to keep our Treasury in better position. I thought the Ways and Means Committee would bring a tax bill in here about December so that it would begin to operate some time in January. But 3 months of this year have gone. We have not received the tax bill. If we do not get a tax bill, bankruptcy is confronting us. How can you win a war with a bankrupt treasury? If the people of this country do not realize soon that they have to pay for the war and pay for the extravagances of this administration and keep the Treasury nearer in balance, we will go into bankruptcy, and then it will be terrible. We have to increase our taxes if we are going to win the war. Procrastination is dangerous. You have been running in the red for 12 years. The Treasury is depleted; the country is in danger. Everybody must pay to the limit of his ability if we are to be a stable government. You cannot operate a navy or army and air corps with a bankrupt nation. A word to the wise is sufficient.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I request 3 days leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] on account of important official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CHURCH STILL FREE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, from Norway the best news a free people can offer the world has come through to America; 1,100 clergymen resigned in protest against the efforts of Norway's Quisling to Nazify the Norwegian church. Half a dozen of the nation's leading bishops have already been placed in concentration camps, and they are certain to be joined by hundreds more before light replaces darkness throughout Europe.

To those who have accused the church of vacillation and lack of leadership in these trying days, the example of such men as Niemoeller in Germany and Berggrav in Norway should come as a stirring answer. Freedom will never be crushed so long as men are willing to give up their lives that it may live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to George P. Sheridan, Director of the National Youth Administration in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and to include a letter addressed to me and my reply to the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some short resolutions adopted by the city of Portland on the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the Jersey Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE J. ADAM BEDE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the late J. Adam Bebe was a friend of my father. I am constrained on that account not to be silent as I learn of his death.

That what I say does not run into a long lot of words is not to be taken as a measure of the respect I desire to show the memory of my father's friend.

Mr. Bede was a member of the Fifty-eighth to Sixtieth Congresses. During his service in Congress he made many friends and made an indelible impression on those with whom he was associated for all time.

A man of more than ordinary ability, fearless and fair, he was deserving of the genuine regard and respect of political friend and foe alike, and was so accredited.

I knew him in days gone by, and was more than pleased to renew the acquaintance and friendship during the last year when and while he was actively engaged in an effort to further the interests of the St. Lawrence River project, to which he knew I was unalterably opposed, as of the present.

I listened to his arguments, he knowing that I did not agree with either his premise or his conclusions. I told him just what I thought about the proposition, with which he unalterably disagreed.

These friendly controversial colloquies never raised a ripple of discord to disturb the friendly relations between us.

The more I saw of him the better I liked him and the more genuinely I respected him.

I am sorry to learn of his passing. Minnesota has lost one of its very able citizens and the country a man whose integrity was unquestioned, whose ability was far above the average, whose enthusiasm for and whose belief in those things for which he stood was as unlimited and as unchangeable as the mountains round about Jerusalem. We need and can ill afford to lose such men as J. Adam Bede.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the legislative business of the day has been disposed of and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a statement I made before the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from an article in PM of Friday, April 10, 1942, captioned "Probe due on HOFFMAN," the following is quoted:

> HOFFMAN is wanted for questioning by the Federal grand jury that already has indicted George Sylvester Vierick, Nazi propagandist; George Hill, FISH's former secretary-clerk; and several others for helping spread the gospel according to Hitler in the United States of America.

Farther down in the article is this sentence, which refers to two talks made on the floor of the House, one on January 27, the other on January 30, in the following language:

> The Hoffman speech was titled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas."

That statement is a deliberate falsehood, for the two speeches were entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," and no reference to Roosevelt as a Judas was contained therein.

In the Detroit News, under date of April 10, is found this statement:

> HOFFMAN, bitterly outspoken isolationist from Allegan, has, grand-jury investigators assert, either consciously or otherwise, let his speeches in the House of Representatives be used as part of an anti-Roosevelt, anti-British, anti-Jewish campaign, which, the investigators declare, is clearly subversive.

The foregoing statement is wholly false, for the speeches referred to, being those of January 27 and January 30, are speeches made in opposition to the effort of certain anti-Americans to cause us to surrender our independence, adopt a declaration of interdependence, become a part of a United States of the World, and lose our national identity.

The Detroit News article of April 10 contained this further statement:

> Circulation of HOFFMAN's speeches was one of the activities of George Sylvester Vierick, recently convicted Nazi master spy, according to preliminary grand-jury developments last week. It developed late Thursday that HOFFMAN had supplied reprints of his "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech to an anti-British editor in Omaha, Nebr.

That charge is false, insofar as it refers to my talks made on the floor of the House as a "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech. Nor did Vierick, whom I do not know, ever, to my knowledge, circulate any speech made by me. Moreover, speeches made on the House floor can be purchased of the Government printer by anyone securing copies of the RECORD. Even Maloney might quote the Bible to justify his smear campaign, but that would not give him an air of sanctity.

The newspaper comments quoted above call in question my loyalty, my patriotism, my integrity, and raise a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that the first statement read, to wit—

> HOFFMAN is wanted for questioning by the Federal grand jury that already has indicted George Sylvester Vierick, Nazi propagandist; George Hill, FISH's former secretary-clerk; and several others for helping spread the gospel according to Hitler in the United States of America—

constitutes a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a propaganda sheet put out by the World Fellowship, Inc.; and two full-page ads, one from the Washington Star of January 5, and the other from the New York Times of December 18, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me to preface my remarks by calling attention to the fact that under the law grand-jury proceedings are supposed to be secret; that no witness called before the grand jury is permitted to divulge the substance of his

testimony. Nor is anyone, special prosecutor, grand-jury foreman, member of the grand jury, or court attendant guarding the deliberations of a grand jury, permitted, under the law to disclose any of the proceedings of the grand jury.

Notwithstanding this strict rule of law, the purpose of which is to prevent those whose activities are being investigated from learning what is being done, if is apparent that the spirit, if not the letter, of the law is being violated by the investigators employed either by Special Attorney Maloney or the grand jury itself.

Much information has been given to the public through the press by those purporting to be acting for the grand jury. Note this statement from the Detroit News:

> Circulation of HOFFMAN'S speeches was one of the activities of George Sylvester Vierick, recently convicted Nazi master spy, according to preliminary grand-jury developments last week.

Just when and why did special grand-jury investigators disclose to the public press matters under investigation by the grand jury? Those who have read the Washington Post have noted with amazement the disclosure by that paper of grand-jury testimony. It would seem as though the Post's reporter had access to transcripts of the testimony. That should not be.

I suggest that the Speaker of the House appoint a committee to call before it the special attorney, Maloney, reporters for the Post, and the grand-jury investigators, and ascertain whether or not the present investigation is not being conducted as a smear campaign in an effort to defeat all those who, prior to December 7, might be considered as isolationists; that such a committee inquire as to whether or not the special attorney himself did not, when seeking an extension of the life of the grand jury, make the statement that, if he was given 3 additional months, he could defeat every Republican candidate for Congress who had been opposed to our entry into war.

I also suggest that the committee investigate and determine whether the proceedings of the grand jury have been secret, as required by law, and whether a reporter for the Washington Post has not, in some unauthorized way, obtained access to grand-jury records.

Let us return now to the charge made against me to the effect that the speeches made by me on January 27 and 30 are being used by Nazi agents.

Naturally, I have no way of knowing by whom and how those two speeches are being used. To that charge suffice it to say that the Constitution itself may be used and quoted from by convicted criminals; that it is a common saying that the devil can quote Scripture for his own purpose.

For those two speeches I make not the slightest apology. Those speeches were printed in the RECORD at the time they were made. Later, permission to revise them was given on the floor, as is stated in the reprint of the two when they were combined.

In my judgment, anyone who can find anything in either of those speeches—copies of which will be furnished to any Member desiring the same—which is disloyal, unpatriotic, un-American, must have a twisted and a warped mind or be in favor of surrendering our independence, hauling down our flag and becoming a principality or dominion of some world organization.

There is in those two speeches not one word which anyone who loves this country, who believes in our Constitution, who wants to preserve for our posterity the liberties and the freedom which we have enjoyed, can find any fault.

Those speeches have been referred to as "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speeches. That is a false statement. The reprint shows on its face that it is made in opposition to those who would destroy our national identity. The first one does use the words "a Judas," but it uses them in connection with the efforts of Clarence Streit and his associates, and I repeat that charge here and now that Streit and those who would destroy our national identity are betrayers of our country.

If Prosecutor Maloney and the grand jury are really interested in exposing sedition and subversive activities, I suggest to him that the grand jury, by investigation, obtain answers to the following:

First. Are our drafted men fighting in foreign lands for the preservation of our national identity?

Second. Do those fighting men need supplies and munitions of war, such as clothing, guns, ammunition, tanks, planes, ships?

Third. Is it not true that one member of a family is drafted for active 24-hour service?

Fourth. Is it not true that the brother or the father of the drafted man, when he seeks to aid in the production of the munitions or material the drafted man needs, is first required to pay a union before he can go to work?

Fifth. If a man can be drafted, as he is, to serve in a foreign land 24 hours a day in the fighting forces, why should his father or brother who remains at home be required to pay an initiation fee to a union when he seeks to work in support of the drafted man?

Sixth. What right has a union to require a man to pay an initiation fee and monthly dues as a condition precedent to national defense work?

Seventh. What, if anything, are you or the grand jury doing to end that unlawful, subversive conduct?

Eighth. Do you not know that exorbitant profits have been made by some corporations? If you do, what action are you or the grand jury taking to end that practice?

Apparently you are inquiring into my right to make a speech advocating the preservation of our National Government, the continuance of our Government under our Constitution.

Ninth. Why do you condemn such a speech and ignore activities which have actually interfered, and are today interfering, with the effort of our fighting men to preserve that Government?

If, in the opinion of Maloney, the speeches of January 27 and 30 are improper, why does he not investigate that portion of the press which carries the statement that those speeches are "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speeches? Why does he not call before the grand jury Stokes of the Washington Post and ask him to point out the words in that speech which state that Roosevelt is a Judas? Why does he not ask Stokes whether he, too, believes that the Stars and Stripes should come down, that our Declaration of Independence should be disregarded, and that we should become a principality of some foreign nation? Why does he not ask Stokes whether he is an American or whether he is a subject of some foreign nation?

Let him ask Stokes whether he believes that we should continue to remain the United States of America or whether we should become a part of a world group.

Let me add that I have no apologies to make for the speeches of January 27 and January 30; that I defy anyone to find in them one word of disloyalty; one word that is un-American.

I have not now, I never had, any connection whatsoever with Vierick, with Hill, with Hudson, with Winrod, or anyone else who to my knowledge is circulating any pro-Nazi material. If any of those who have sent out copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes are engaged in subversive or seditious activities, they are doing it without my knowledge and neither Prosecutor Maloney nor anyone else should criticize the fact that a patriotic talk such as Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes was given circulation.

The prosecutor has no more right to link me with any pro-Nazi agent than I would have to link him with a murderer or any other criminal who might be seen in the courtroom with him.

Let me reaffirm my opposition to all those who seek to destroy our Nation by subversive propaganda asking us to surrender our independence, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in lieu thereof a foreign flag, be it the flag of Hitler or the flag of a world supergovernment.

For me, the Stars and Stripes and the principles they represent are good enough.

I ask Prosecutor Maloney: Does he favor the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes? Does he think it adds to the war effort to tell our people that we should surrender our independence and now join in a United States of the World? Does he believe that we should appropriate, as asked by World Fellowship, Inc., $1,100,000,000 to form a world government, while we now need every dollar of our resources to win this war?

I was told this morning that the district attorney—we will call him Mr. Maloney hereafter—wanted me down before the grand jury at 10:30. I just came back late last night, and having work on the desk, I thought that the district attorney could wait until this afternoon, so I told him I would be down at 3 o'clock, and, graciously, no objection was made.

After you go before a grand jury you cannot disclose anything that happens there; the proceedings of a grand jury, of course, are secret. What has been bothering me of late is the fact that for some time the papers have been telling

what the grand jury was doing and what the witnesses were supposed to have disclosed. For example, in this article this morning and in the press of the tenth, and of other dates, it is stated that according to grand-jury investigators I had been circulating or permitting somebody to circulate some of my material, someone who is an agent of the Nazi government. That statement is false. Now, where do the papers get that idea? How does the press know what the grand jury is doing? How do the boys of the press, how do the boys who report for the Washington Post know what things have happened, what proceedings have been had before the grand jury? I would suggest to Maloney that he investigate some of his own investigators, and that hereafter the information that is given out be given out in accordance with the law and with grand-jury procedure, with which he is doubtless familiar.

Going now to these charges that are made and to the newspaper headlines which state that I made a speech entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," that much of it is right. This is the rest of the title as given by some of the press, "Or Roosevelt Is a Judas": The title of that speech is "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes"— not "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas." I have copies of that reprint here, and I hope that every Member of the House will take one of them and see if they can find in that talk, which is a combination of two talks I made on the floor of the House, one on January 27 and the other on the 30th of January, any reference anywhere to the President as a Judas. The words "a Judas" were used, but how and where and to whom do they refer? Those two words have reference to Streit.

In the first part of the speech what was I talking about? I was talking about this group called World Fellowship, Inc., and another one, Federal Union, Inc. Here are the two of them.

What did those groups propose to do? We are in a war, a war which needs the efforts of every individual, yet that group seeks to distract the attention of our people by calling upon us at this time, a time of great national danger, to do what? To forsake and give up the Declaration of Independence adopted by our forefathers in 1776 and to adopt in place thereof a declaration of interdependence. They ask us, in effect, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in place thereof the flag of a world super-government.

The other organization, World Fellowship, Inc., came along, and they asked this House, through this circular, marked "Exhibit C," which every Member has received, to give the President of the United States on his birthday, January 30, and that is the date of the last speech, $100,000,000—think of it—to be used for what? For the carrying on of the war? For the buying of munitions? For the buying of ships? No; no. They asked us to give $100,000,000 to Tom, Dick, and Harry, men selected by the President as representatives of foreign nations, to form a United States of the World, of which we should be a part.

They go further and say that when the President has appointed these men—and who they will be no one knows—when he has appointed these men, and when they have written this constitution of the world government, which was to supersede or override at least, our Constitution, we were also to give to him by that same bill which they asked someone in the House to introduce, $1,000,000,000 to be used at the discretion of these men to effectuate, to make active this United States of the World.

Is there any reason why every loyal American should not oppose with all his heart, with all his mind, and with all his strength an effort like that to betray our country?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield? I do not want to divert the gentleman from the course of his train of thought. But it seems to me the thing that the Members of the House would be immediately concerned with is how the gentleman's speeches happened to get into this publication, whether they were with or without his consent. That is the crux of the thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Get into what?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Into this circular, referred to in today's Post, that went out all over the country. This circular letter is said to have contained a copy of the gentleman's speech in which he refers to the President and other people, and I think it may fairly be assumed he meant to class them with Judas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The President of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not do any such thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I have read it. I wrote it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman did not call him a Judas, that is about the only thing the gentleman has not called the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whatever I said about him prior to our entry into the war I stand on, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What we would like to know is how the gentleman's speeches got into that letter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman suggests that there is a disloyal thought in my mind, he is just drawing on his imagination.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I did not suggest that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman even thinks, on the other hand, that I am going to accept all of the President's policies, he is mistaken, and I have heard the gentleman himself stand on this floor and criticize the activities of this administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may do it again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no question about that. You have condemned just as bitterly as I have the wasteful spending of this administration; you have condemned just as bitterly as I have the hiring of these fan dancers, these boondogglers, and teachers of horseshoe throwing, bowling, and all of those things.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. None of my speeches have ever been circulated by any subversive group. How did the gentleman's speech get into that letter?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is easily answered. You may just as well ask, How does anyone get a copy of the Bible when he goes to a hotel? There is a Gideon in many a hotel room, is there not? If you recited the Lord's Prayer on the floor of the Congress, is there any way by which you could prevent anyone, even a Nazi agent, from circulating it? I made those two speeches on the floor of the House. Certain women came into my office and asked if they could have copies of that reprinted. I was going to send out those speeches to the people of my district, and I did send them out. These women wanted copies. I said, "All right." One of them was just as good, just as loyal a woman who ever lived; the other I did not know personally. Did the gentleman ever refuse anyone who came to him and wanted a copy of his speech?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I say right now we ought to be very scrupulously careful where our speeches go. I do not believe any Member of Congress ought to be permitted in this emergency to let anyone send his speeches anywhere. I think a Member of Congress ought to be permitted to send to his constituents whatever he wants to send under his own authority, but it is a dangerous thing in this emergency for us to permit speeches to be printed and promiscuously sent out in quantities to be circulated possibly for ulterior purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, of course, for ulterior purposes. No Member of this House would send out speeches for ulterior purposes. Is it not true, as a matter of law and as a matter of fact, that I can order as many of the gentleman's speeches, and he can order as many of mine as he wants, if he pays for the printing?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is not true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You can buy copies of the RECORD, can you not? And the RECORD will contain a copy of your speech.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman cannot have my speech reprinted without my consent at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. Answer my question. Does the gentleman say I cannot send to the Public Printer and get a copy of the RECORD?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, the gentleman can buy copies of the public RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman say that I cannot have as many reprinted as I wish?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman cannot, not by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but cannot I have them printed by anybody—an outside printer?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech that was sent out was printed by the Government Printing Office and could only have been secured on his order, unless he gave someone else permission to have that reprinted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right about that, but answer the other question. When I get a copy of the gentleman's speech from the Public Printer, can I not at my own expense have as many reprinted as I want to?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not in the form in which the gentleman's speech was circulated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In any form.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some place else.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We are not talking about some place else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech came from the Government Printing Office. That is what he is talking about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure it did.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. How did this association get quantities of the gentleman's speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you in a moment. You answer my question. Can I not have the gentleman's speech reprinted at my own expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not in that form.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In some other form, then. The gentleman knows I can.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have been here 20 years, and I never knew a Congressman to have another Congressman's speech reprinted without his permission. I have not known it to happen. I do not think there is a Member of the body who would do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is doubtless true. Speeches of Congressmen have been reprinted by other organizations at their own expense, not at the Government Printing Office, and the gentleman must be aware of it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech, though, was from the Government Printing Office; it was not printed some place else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITE Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now. I want to tell him how these speeches got out.

I started to tell the gentleman how these speeches got out. I was ordering this reprint for circulation in my district, and it has been circulated in my district to every rural box holder. It is going to be circulated in my district to all of the city box holders in the district and, if I can get the names, to all of the individual voters in my district, because it has been charged as being a "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech, and that is not true. Moreover, no greater service can be rendered at this time than to inform our people of this effort to destroy our Government. I am going to send one to every voter in my district, to every voter, and let him read it for himself. Let each voter see for himself how false is the charge that it is not 100-percent American. Some in the district have read it and they do not put any such construction on it as has the gentleman. What our people say is that this is no time to talk about doing away with our Constitution, this is no time to talk about the hauling down of our flag, this is no time to talk about the surrendering of our national identity and becoming a part of a world supergovernment. Our people are all for the winning of the war but they will not support a movement to scrap our national existence. That is what they say at home.

When these speeches were ordered they came in. A woman who lives here in Washington—a gray-haired woman—came to the office, and she had a list of her friends in a book—printed. She asked me if she could have some of them to send to her friends. She sat down there at the desk and she directed those in franked envelopes to her friends, members of a patriotic organization. Is there anything wrong about that?

Not only that, but others that were sent out were sent out at the request of the people, all of whom I assume to be loyal Americans, who were contributing to or paid the cost of printing them. The district attorney here, if he wants, or anyone else who wants to know who paid for them, can come over to my office and get that information. The files are open. The letters are open that they wrote me asking for them. I would be glad to have the gentleman read some of the letters that were written requesting copies of those speeches. The gentleman might get a different idea as to what the speech was, and the purport of it, and the effect of it if he would read some of these letters, undoubtedly from patriotic Americans who think this is no time to talk of lowering the Stars and Stripes.

So those speeches went out in the flat as they were brought in here, not in franked envelopes. Speeches in franked envelopes went to the people of my district and the others went to these people outside the district and whatever they did with them, naturally, I do not know. I never met this man Viereck; and I never met this man Hill until he called at my office, stating that he was secretary for another Congressman, and made a request with reference to the RECORD; and I have no recollection of ever meeting Hudson or any of these other men named in the newspapers. Yet these papers charge that I, in some incomprehensible way, am hooked up with those men. That is a falsehood and every Member of this House ought to know it is a falsehood.

Going one step farther, what is this man Maloney doing anyway? It was reported to me this morning when I got here that Mr. Maloney had made the statement—and you Republicans ought to take notice of this—he wanted another year and he finally got 3 months, and at that time the statement was made that if he could get a 3 months' extension he would get every Republican, defeat every Republican, who is a Member of this House and who had been an isolationist prior to December 7. I am telling you over on that side, too, that you men who have been isolationists or you men who have been critical, are going to meet with the same fate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very serious accusation. Upon what basis does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I make that statement on information conveyed to me this morning and upon the newspaper reports of his actions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but will the gentleman state the source?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will not state the source. If I did we would probably have that man before the grand jury.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, the gentleman refuses, but the gentleman has made the statement that the Assistant United States Attorney——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Special attorney.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, he is connected with the Department of Justice and according to the gentleman he has said that, give him 3 months and he would defeat every Republican Member of the House. That is a very drastic statement and I think the gentleman ought to take the House into his confidence and inform the House the source of the statement and not leave it, as the gentleman has, a statement based upon hearsay evidence. In other words, somebody has told the gentleman from Michigan, apparently, according to what he says, that that statement was made, and the gentleman refuses to disclose who told him. If the gentleman did, that would be the best evidence. As the matter stands now that is purely hearsay. Would the gentleman want to leave himself in that position?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman wants to leave it that way. That is a drastic statement, but it is not as drastic as what the district attorney down here is doing. Just why does the district attorney down here want to mention the name of Hill in connection with my name? Why does he want to mention the name of Vierick in connection with my name? Those speeches are a matter of public record, and the sending out of them is a matter of public record if he wants to discover the truth. The number of copies printed and the price paid are matters of public record. What is he after? He is making ammunition for the campaign. That is what he is doing. If he wants to investigate subversive activities, why does he not investigate these people who want to go into this Union Now? I am not the only one who objects to that. Here is the dean of the House who had something to say on that subject. Look at the RECORD, page 887 January 30, when I was talking about this matter, I said:

> That organization would inveigle our citizens into a united states of the world where their property, their incomes, would be at the mercy of Old World politicians.
>
> I see before me the dean of the House, who has served here for more than 30 years. Because of his age and training, he has had a wealth of experience. He must know what the people, at least the people of his district and in the great city of Chicago, are thinking. I would inquire of him now for the purpose of information only, and no other purpose, whether he feels that if this movement to create a supergovernment, this movement to make us one of either the United States of the World, or United Nations—if this drive continues—whether our people will continue to have the same faith, the same enthusiasm for the policies of the administration they now have?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] asked if I would yield, and I said yes, and he said:

Mr. SABATH. I will say to the gentleman that I am of the honest opinion that the American people will never give up their independence and the rights and the privileges that come to them because of our independence. They cherish it, they will fight for it, and will never agree that it be in any way abolished or modified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I hope that on the floor of this House, because he has great influence here and with the administration, he will use his influence and his voice to speak against this movement.

So I suggest to Maloney that he call before him the authors of those two page advertisements and the author of this circular, who wants us to appropriate $1,100 000,000 for the purpose of forming a world supergovernment; and I suggest that he find out who supplies their funds, and who gives them the list that they send this material to, and what their purpose is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I don't want to interrogate the gentleman from Michigan, but I am very much interested in the charge that he made, because if that is true, it is a very serious charge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What charge?

Mr. McCORMACK. About the Special Assistant Attorney General's wanting an extension of time and his stating that if he had it he would defeat the Republicans. Of course, we know that is ridiculous, to begin with; that nobody could bring about that accomplishment; and I am concerned about that statement and, in fairness to a gentleman who cannot take the floor——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whom does the gentleman mean—who cannot take the floor?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Maloney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, he will have me down before the grand jury this afternoon, and you will see the whole thing spread through the newspapers in the morning, in the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the fact is the gentleman would not be down there except for these speeches that were printed by the Public Printer that had been used by the organization that was under investigation, so from that angle we have to look at the origin of them, and the gentleman is to blame himself; but coming back——

Mr. HOFFMAN. And what am I to blame for? Am I to be criticized because I insist upon the preservation of our national existence? I made a speech to that effect, it came into the hands of others who sent it out at their own expense with statements to which I do not subscribe. So I am told that even though the speech is patriotic, it should not have been made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman be willing to tell the House Judiciary Committee the source of that information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will keep it for Maloney if he wants it.

Mr. McCORMACK. What?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For Maloney. The gentleman knows him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I never met him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is the smear artist.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was he smearing when he convicted Vierick?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, he was not; but even the devil himself has some good qualities.

Mr. McCORMACK. I investigated Mr. Vierick 6 years ago. He has always been a spy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did he not rewrite the President's speeches, or some of them?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know that the gentleman is any more correct in that than in the previous statement he made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. You say he did not. I do not know. That question just shows you and the Members how easy it is to ask a question and leave a distasteful thought. The gentleman does not claim that I ever knew Vierick or met him?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not even going into that. I accept the gentleman's word for it. I am only concerned about the statement that he made, the charge about the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, he has the grand jury, and he has the power of subpena and the power of administering an oath, and he can get all of that information himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always believe in respecting character and reputation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman better talk to Maloney.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking to the gentleman from Michigan. I do not know Mr. Maloney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Neither do I—never met him

Mr. McCORMACK. I give the gentleman one more opportunity——

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to; I answer "No" now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to disclose the source of his information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to ask the question. I answer "No."

Mr. McCORMACK. Did this woman pay for the speeches?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Part of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state how much he purchased and how much she did?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot tell without the record. If the gentleman wants to call my office, I will tell him. They paid part and I paid part.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that Congress should pass a law that would forbid the reprinting of speeches unless the Member who made the speeches paid for them, would be a good thing?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think that kind of a law in connection with a law which would prevent the bureaucrats sending out their propaganda might be a good thing, because we do not send out one fraction of what they do. Of late, for several years, Government funds have been used to popularize the pet theories of bureaucrats.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I desire at this time to put into the RECORD a statement of a newspaper reporter giving a brief account of a dinner held recently at the Willard Hotel at which the speakers called for the liquidation of all leading noninterventionists by every possible means, including the Mann Act, income tax, or direct attack or smearing. The war is being fought to save America from Nazi methods and the fear of the gestapo, yet it is proposed by the overseas writers to outdo the worst features of Hitler's Germany to destroy freedom of speech and purge Members of Congress for trying to keep America out of war unless attacked, prior to Pearl Harbor. That is the surest way to discord and disunity and a disservice toward winning the war. At a luncheon the other day Senator HIRAM JOHNSON came over to me and he was so mad he could hardly speak. He asked me if I had seen or heard about a certain dinner of the overseas reporters a week or so ago. I said I had not. Then he proceeded to tell me about it and asked me to look at what John O'Donnell wrote in the newspaper about it. This is what I found. It comes from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, March 30, 1942. It is headed "Extract from 'Capitol Stuff,' by John O'Donnell, page 13, March 30, 1942," and it reads as follows:

Saturday night members of the Cabinet and Supreme Court were guests at the Willard of the Overseas Writers Association, and heard some bloodthirsty appeals, with much talk of concentration camps and treason, from ex-reporters now turned starry-eyed crusaders at so much per month or per lecture.

The American press which had opposed this Nation's intervention in the war before the Pearl Harbor attack were hammered lustily, with the anvil chorus led by the three former reporters of the Chicago Tribune.

The significant point is that such potent Roosevelt advisers as Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter—

I am told that Secretary of the Navy Knox was there also—

and the paid personnel of the official propaganda agencies applauded lustily such declarations as: "The American Senate must be taught the facts of life. * * * The important thing is to put an end to criticism of the Roosevelt administration by whatever means may be necessary. * * * Be ruthless as the enemy. * * * Get him on his income tax or the Mann Act. * * * Hang him * * * shoot him * * * or lock him up in a concentration camp."

Those in sooth are wild and whirring words. But the fact that they were proclaimed at a Washington dinner party before men who are directing the Nation's war effort and that they received an emotional administration claque, indicates the drift of the time. After all, there's a national election on the way. And a tighter censorship.

I spoke to Senator TAFT, who was nearby, and asked him what he knew about it. He said he knew about it and had a copy of it and thought it was disgraceful. I understand also that Senator VANDENBERG was there, and said that this

account understates and does not do justice to what was said. When speeches like that are made and go out in the public press that they intend to get all the noninterventionists, particularly the leaders, and to purge them one way or another, stop at nothing, the time has come for the noninterventionists to fight back, and if we are going to be purged through the income tax, through attacks of that kind and smear attacks, it is time for the Congress to take some cognizance of it and to defend the right of free speech and of Members of Congress to send out and distribute their speeches.

I want these remarks to go right into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not to enter into a discussion, because remarks of that kind, if made, we would all condemn. But as I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], he is trying to connect up the administration because a few happened to be there if they were there, when those remarks were made. They were made by one or two or three former associates, reporters, or whatever they were, of the Chicago Tribune. Is that right?

Mr. FISH. I was not there. It says they were formerly reporters on the Tribune, but Justice Frankfurter was there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have you ever been present at a gathering when somebody made a statement that you did not agree with?

Mr. FISH. But I understand they were applauding the statements, which appeared in the press.

Mr. McCORMACK. Senator VANDENBERG was there?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. You would not say that his presence there gave any sinister aspect to it?

Mr. FISH. I think Senator VANDENBERG will speak for himself at the proper time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes.

Mr. FISH. He undoubtedly holds the same view I hold, and probably most other Members of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. But Senator VANDENBERG was there the same as the others who were there?

Mr. FISH. But Senator VANDENBERG was not applauding those remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is in a very embarrassing position to sell his point, particularly in view of the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] at this particular occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield any further, Mr. Speaker. Replying to what the gentleman from New York said, those remarks just quoted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] were made down here, as I understand it, at some dinner. Of course, everyone who was there did not subscribe to them, nor is everyone who was there to be criticized because they were made. I am asking now how anyone can criticize me, how the district attorney can find fault with me because I made a speech in which there was not one word of seditious or subversive material, and that was sent out by someone else with his own views. How can you criticize any one Member of the House on account of that procedure? There is not a thing wrong with the speech. If there was something wrong with that speech, why did not somebody on the majority side object when it was made? Why has not somebody asked that it be stricken from the RECORD? It is a matter of public record. There it is. It has been in the RECORD since January 30 and not 1 of the 434 Members of this House has questioned it or asserted that it is not a patriotic speech. Because someone alleged to be connected with Hitler picked it up and sent it out I am called on the carpet.

Calling attention to and exposing this movement to destroy our national existence; asking for unity under our own Government, allegiance to our own Government alone, serves notice upon Hitler that united our people will fight him to the bitter end. It might well be said that those who would suppress talks of this kind, who would condemn a Member of Congress because he objects to our domestic affairs being governed and controlled by a group of internationalists, lend encouragement to Hitler.

What about the loyalty of the paper PM, and of its reporter who falsely, as can be noted by every man who reads the speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," asserts that that speech was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas"?

What about the loyalty of the newspaper and its staff writer, Dillard Stokes, when in the Washington Post that writer stated that in the speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," President Roosevelt was called a Judas? Stokes knows that he lied when he wrote that, and it is apparent that he did it deliberately. He is so filled with venom that he must hate himself. Certainly the truth is not in him.

I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] sitting before me. Not long ago his name was coupled in a similar way in connection with proposed labor legislation. One of the papers out in our country, a Detroit paper, reported that Frankensteen told the convention of the C. I. O. that they might just as well accept the 48-hour week, because if they did not VINSON—he is the chairman of your Naval Affairs Committee—DIES, and COX, and HOFFMAN would be happy men and Congress would ram it down their throats. I do not know why they are accepting it—probably because they find public sentiment swinging that way now. But to get back to this talk, get this paragraph:

> While we are celebrating today the President's birthday we should have this other movement in mind. There are many of us who in the past have bitterly opposed some of the President's political policies. There are some of us who will continue to oppose those domestic policies while giving him support in the effort to win the war. There is none, however, who should in my judgment at least not be able and willing to join in the hope that God will grant him many happier returns of the day. We can all join in the request that God give him wisdom, and strength, and courage to frown upon such efforts as the one which is here suggested.

Now, what is the district attorney after? What are these others, who made such speeches as the gentleman from New York referred to, after? What are they trying to accomplish? You know what they are trying to accomplish: They are trying to silence every single man who criticizes anything that this administration advocates. They are trying to suppress free speech, the freedom of the press. This drive seems to be a follow-up to the recent Biddle bill. The suppression of free speech is what they are trying to bring about. That is their purpose. And if we let them succeed then that is the end of representative government in this country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I wish the gentleman, when he goes before the grand jury, would ask Mr. Maloney what has become of the investigation and the report that is due Congress on subversive employees on the Federal pay roll that has grown from 500 when the Dies committee first called it to the attention of the House, to 1,100 when the Attorney General asked the Dies committee for a report just this last year, and now the list has grown to over 3,000; and the Attorney General has not seen fit to give the report to Congress even though there is a positive mandate that they should give it? I would like to find out why the grand jury's attention has not been called to these subversive people on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I go before the grand jury they will be asking and I shall be answering. It will not be my privilege to ask anything or to suggest anything, and that is why I am making this statement today so that this afternoon after I have been before the grand jury and some fellows say, "Well, that is an executive session, but I wish you would tell us how they are getting along; what they ask you, what you said." I cannot tell them anything. I will suggest this further thing to the United States District Attorney, suggest it now, not when I go before the grand jury, but I am going to ask him a question here. I want him to answer this question, Our men are going to war, they need munitions of war. On this side of the highway goes a long unending line of American boys and men, the best in our country, physically. They are going, all of them, willingly and gladly, but they have to go whether they want to or whether they do not want to. They are going to be inducted to fight, to sacrifice their lives if need be, to serve 24 hours a day, 7 days in the week. Over on this other side of this same highway is an unending line of men knocking at the factory gate, but they do not get in until they come across with a stated sum of money paid to an agency which is not a Government agency. On one side of the street you march them down; you make them serve, you make them fight, and on the other side of the street the brothers, and the fathers who are seeking to manufacture clothing and implements of war,

the guns, the tanks, and the ships, see this Government stand by and say to them, "No, you cannot go in and work in support of the man who has gone to war until you pay the organization of Green, or Murray, $2, $5, $50, $100, or $200, and monthly dues."

Let some district attorney investigate that. There is something that is subversive. There is something that is not only seditious but is action which stops production. Do they want something real? Do they want to investigate and prosecute something that actually hinders the war effort? They need not fool around with the circulation of any speech I have made, if that is what they are after.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. If the gentleman cannot ask questions, in one of his answers he might make the suggestion that they worked around for 3½ or 4 years with Harry Bridges, who has destroyed hundreds of millions of dollars of property, who has destroyed the merchant marine, yet we have not had an Attorney General who has had the intestinal fortitude to take him. You have had a Secretary of Labor who has protected him, and all down through the Government they have protected him. Make some suggestion, if these men are anxious to have real government, why they do not go into their own Government and take men like Harry Bridges and Fritz Kuhn. If these birds want to know something, why do they not go into something real? Make some suggestions along that line.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The record shows over the last few years that some of these officials are not interested in the activities of the Communists; they are not interested in the racketeers; they are not interested in the men who by force and violence prevent other men from working in the defense of their country; they are not interested in the men who charge a fee for the exercise of patriotic efforts by others. Oh, no; they are not interested in that. They are interested in Republicans; they are interested in Democrats who have criticized some of the crackpot schemes and object to some of these crackpots, as the Democrats have designed them, being employed in Government offices.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have tried earnestly and consistently since we got into this war to support every move of this administration which had any tendency to aid in winning the war. I have criticized, and I intend to criticize, those who want to betray our country and force us into an international world super-government, thereby doing away with our constitutional form of government and the hauling down of our flag. If the Attorney General or the district attorney, Maloney, can make anything out of that, or if anybody else can make anything out of that, they are welcome.

My people at home know what I have been saying. If they do not like it, if they do not approve of it, next November they will have the opportunity to express their will, and they will, you need not worry about that. If I do not come back, then you know the ideas I have advanced are not the ones to which they subscribe, or perhaps you will know that Maloney, Winchell, and a few more of that kind have succeeded in their campaign, and that I have been prevented from presenting my side of the argument adequately. However, I am satisfied. They told me at home when I was there, and I got a response when I spoke, bless your dear hearts, before an audience of U. A. W., C. I. O.'s, who wore the caps—they said they were not going to ask for time and a half or double pay. That is the U. A. W., C. I. O., that we have in the Fourth Congressional District. They are not going to ask for it. They said they were not. That is the rank and file. Whatever a few leaders may demand, the workers themselves do not intend to ask anything unfair.

I am satisfied from that expression of opinion, as well as from the others that I got at home, that our people are more realistic about this war, are more ready to make complete sacrifice than are the officials here in Washington, and I intend to continue to do all I can along that same line.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman that we admire the stand he has taken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Never mind that. If the gentleman has something to ask let us have it

Mr. RICH. I wonder why the gentleman has to subject himself to a grand jury investigation. I admire the great courage he has in going down there.

Why does he have to submit to a grand jury that is trying to wreck him? It is not necessary

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no reason to believe the grand jury is trying to wreck me, and no citizen of this country, least of all myself, should object, and I certainly do not, to going before a grand jury any time and answering questions. It is only a man who is guilty of some offense, a man who has violated some law, who objects to answering to the grand jury or to any prosecuting officer. I am going.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Along the line the gentleman has been speaking, may I say that the people out in the country know what is going on. They are doing what they can to win the war. They know what is going on in Washington. Has the gentleman read the first article in the last Reader's Digest along the very line the gentleman is talking about, as to the great amount of time being spent in Washington in cocktail lounges instead of trying to win the war in Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman complained a little bit about the construction I put on his speech, and this is the copy of the reprint he handed me. As the gentleman well knows, in the front of his first speech he, himself, put the subheading, "A Judas."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Who was the gentleman talking about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Streit. Let me read the whole paragraph:

> That war, the cost of which no man can estimate and which, if carried on according to present plans, will take the lives of millions of American men, the President and his supporters tell us is being fought to bring to other peoples the same right of independence and self-government which we have enjoyed.

Then the next paragraph:

> The hypocrisy of those who claim that to be the purpose of our present involvement in this war is clearly demonstrated when we receive from them a petition to repudiate our own independence, surrender our existence as an independent Nation, and become a part of the United States of the World.

Note the words "from them."

That petition came from Streit and others, not from the President.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. So the gentleman was talking about Streit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly, and Ickes up there. He signed the thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They were the two Judases the gentleman was referring to. The gentleman did not mean to call the President of the United States a Judas or hypocrite?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. I never lack words when I want to criticize. If I intended to call the President a Judas I undoubtedly would have said so on the floor of this House. I had no such intention and I did not so state.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to have the gentleman's affirmation that he did not mean to call the President a hypocrite or a Judas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, certainly not. That speech is entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." One distinguished gentleman up there in the Press Gallery, Crawford, of PM, said the speech was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Flag or the President Is a Judas." There is no such implication in it. That is not the title of the speech—Crawford knew the title was "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." Yet he deliberately stated that untruth. Why? There is not a Member on this floor who does not know that I have never hesitated to express my opinion here. If I had wanted to charge somebody with something, I would not do it indirectly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has been very gracious about permitting interruptions and I certainly have no ulterior motive in what I will say to the gentleman, if the gentleman will indulge me. The difficulty, I think, is not what the gentleman has said in his speech. I think the gentleman or any other Member of Congress ought to have the right to differ as emphatically as he wishes to differ with the policy of any administration. That is not the difficulty. I would be the last one to do more than just to take friendly issue with the gentleman upon what he might say.

The difficulty here has been that the gentleman's speech has been taken and diverted and distorted, according to his statement, from what it really meant,

and put into the channels of subversive elements, then found itself in an envelope from a subversive group advising the people to secure arms and to prepare and be ready for a revolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know anything about that. I never heard or read of anything of that kind until the gentleman just stated it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the Members of this Congress ought to protect themselves from that. A Member of Congress ought to have the right to say whatever he wants to say and to mail it to his own constituents and to be prepared to take the responsibility. He should not be permitted to print things and put them in the hands of or even permit them to get into the hands of elements that are going to divert and distort them and put them entirely out of their own meaning, and put such an interpretation on them as was put on this affair. It puts the whole House of Representatives under indictment, and it ought to be stopped by this body as a whole by some policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to what the gentleman from Virginia has said, I agree with all he has said, except one thing. The gentleman said we should prevent speeches getting into certain hands and from being distorted. I will be glad to learn how we can prevent distortion when we cannot anticipate it. How could I know that Crawford would write or his paper publish a false title to that patriotic talk? I would not knowingly send out any remarks of mine to any agent of a foreign power, or to anyone who I thought would give it to any foreign agent, or use it for an improper purpose. But here comes the difficulty. For example, the D. A. R. writes me for speeches. I feel flattered because the D. A. R. writes me asking for speeches, and so would every other Member, and they would admit it if modesty did not forbid. The D. A. R. is all right. No one questions its loyalty. Suppose one of the members of the D. A. R. asks me for 50 or 500 copies of a speech. I think the speech is all right. They do, too. I send it to them and they give it to someone else, thinking that that third party is all right. The speech ultimately finds its way into improper hands. These agents do not come out and advertise their activities. They work under cover. So it is that these things happen. How can that be prevented?

If this House wishes to adopt the policy for the duration of the war of denying to Senators and to its Members the right to express loyal, patriotic views in the halls of Congress, or, if it permits the making of such speeches, to deny to Senators and to Members of the House the right to send those speeches out to their constituents or, as has been here suggested, to other citizens of the United States whose loyalty is unquestioned, just because some of those speeches may fall into the hands of others who send them out with their own subversive publications, so be it.

If we adopt that policy, then, in fairness to our people, we should prevent the publication by administration spokesmen, by the press generally, of all information which in any way tends to criticize, unjustly or justly, anything that any Government official may do. Such a bill was recently before the Senate. It received but scant consideration.

The issue here today is whether or not free speech, speech which is not subversive, which is not seditious, which carries an argument for the preservation of our national existence, shall be suppressed simply because someone who is not considered patriotic, who may be found to be an agent of a foreign power, circulates that loyal, patriotic utterance.

As I stated not long ago, the devil himself can quote Scripture to serve his purpose, and it occurs to me that those who find fault with this particular speech entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," seem to be inclined to do that very thing. It occurs to me that they, rather than myself, are giving encouragement to Hitler; are telling him that we, as a people, are about ready—as we would be if their views prevailed—to give up our national existence.

Following are the three advertisements advocating a world super-government:

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of December 18, 1941]

TO WIN THIS WAR WE NEED UNION NOW

A PETITION ON THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future;

That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis;

That this program be only the first step in the gradual, peaceful extension of our principles of federal union to all peoples willing and able to adhere to them, so that from this nucleus may grow eventually a universal world government of, by, and for the people.

To the 30,000,000 Who Favor Union:

Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States "after the war" should "join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order."

If you are among those who agree we need union then to keep a potiential aggressor from breaking loose, surely you must agree we need that union now to meet the powerful combination of aggressors already on the march.

We are now in one of those molten moments when the iron of basic policy can and will be somehow shaped. If we fail to form it in a union now we may all too soon find ourselves repeating the Franco-British tragedy. We may find that, while we put our time on lesser things, events were hammering the iron into another form, into an alliance with men and methods molded in a structure which only its collapse could change.

In union there is power

We must not let up for one instant in our prosecution of the war. We must unremittingly prosecute it. Organizing the power of the democracies is essential to that task. Organizing it effectively in a union will distract us no more from defense than improvising the cumbersome, entangling structure of an alliance.

There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide not only for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

Granted, the immediate extension of our Federal principles is practicable only with those of our associates in the war willing and able to combine on this basis. But it would be utter folly to delay applying them where possible simply because they cannot now be universally extended. Common sense says to unite at once with those practiced in democracy and to cooperate with the others the best way we can, until they too shall desire, and can apply, these Federal democratic principles.

Remember now what happened to the League Covenant after the war. Remember now the moral slump that always follows war, the return of petty politics. Consider now that if we merely promise union after the war, the Axis will drive their peoples on by reminding them of what a Senate minority did to the promised League after World War No. 1. But once the oppressed peoples see that this union is no dream but a living, growing, winning world United States, with a place in its Congress they may earn by regaining their own freedom—what a means we then shall have to wreck the Axis from within.

In union there is peace

How many, many lives we shall save by this great expeditionary idea when once we give it life. It will be fighting for our sons day and night, awake or sleeping, for it will be fighting, too, for the sons of German, Italian, Japanese mothers, who know not what they do. It will be fighting for us far behind the enemy lines, where our warplanes rarely reach. No dictator can clamp his hand upon it, or be certain it will not one day be fighting for us in his staff itself.

The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves and our friends and foes that this war will end in a world united states. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now.

"We implore you (as the English workmen implored Lincoln to free the slaves) not to faint in your providential mission. While your enthusiasm is aflame and the tide of events runs high, let the work be finished effectually. Leave no root of bitterness to spring up and work fresh misery to your children."

As citizens to our fellow citizens, we recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr., Russell W. Davenport, John Foster Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J. Roberts, Harry G. Scherman, Wm. Jay Schieffelin.

THE UNITED STATES ITSELF BEGAN AS A WAR MEASURE

We the people of the United States have once more reached a time to try men's souls. Let us not mistake this moment nor the nature of this test. Lincoln measured it for us when he said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Here stands the free principle that the state—the world—is made for all men equally. We hold its citadel.

There rises the despotic dogma that one man is the state. In Berlin is centered the direction of its far-flung land, sea, air, and undercover forces, highly centered behind a ruthless master plan.

Disunion was the European way

How much longer can we let our answer be the same old fatal answer—divided navies, divided armies, divided production, divided

counsels, divided actions, divided democracies * * * falling underneath a common yoke? Shall we risk answering with an alliance? Stake our all upon this method that has already brought catastrophe to France and Britain?

We recognize already that we must unite the power of all our 48 States. We recognize that the British must unite the power of all their Commonwealth of Nations. We have not recognized—and we must at once—that we need above all to unite the whole arch together. We must unite both sides upon a keystone. Then the common burden will but unite us more.

An arch without a keystone can be no arch of triumph.

What shall the keystone be? Let us seek guidance from those master builders who raised our own citadel of freedom.

They, the people of our Original Thirteen States, once faced the problem we face now. They had never before united in any way for any purpose. But when their common freedom was at stake they did not try to save it with 13 independent armies or even with a supreme interallied council. Instead, with revolutionary vision and vigor, they invented a new and stronger keystone.

They set up at once a common government.

They gave that Government the power to make war and peace for all.

They gave it the power to name one common commander in chief.

And they issued through it a resounding declaration of the universal and eternal common principles of human freedom on which they proposed to build a new world.

Thus, in the midst of war, they created the United States itself as a war measure.

They then developed this emergency war policy into a permanent way to keep the peace among their States by adopting a more perfect Union in our Federal Constitution.

Union is the American way

Since then every American generation has boldly extended these principles of freedom through union to more states and more people of all kinds.

Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa have already adopted these same principles. Britain showed its faith in them when it begged France, tragically too late, to change alliance into union.

Here, then, in our own American principles of Federal Union lies the time-tested answer to our problem. Here lies the way to win this war, the peace, and the future. We are not so feeble that we cannot achieve greatly, as our fathers achieved before us. Let us then take up this task at once and turn this great danger into a great opportunity. Let us begin now a World United States.

Federal Union, Inc., A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Balduf, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1942]

IN UNION NOW LIES POWER TO WIN THE WAR AND THE PEACE

A PETITION

That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future.

That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis.

That this program be only the first step in the gradual, peaceful extension of our principles of federal union to all peoples willing and able to adhere to them, so that from this nucleus may grow eventually a universal world government of, by, and for the people.

THE UNITED STATES ITSELF BEGAN AS A WAR MEASURE

We welcome President Roosevelt's conferences with Prime Minister Churchill, and the "Declaration of United Nations." We must prosecute the war unremittingly. Organizing effectively the power of the free peoples is essential to that task. We value highly conferences and temporary measures to provide more unified action immediately. But in meeting this need let us, in the present formative period, take care to open—not close—the way to immediate union of the democracies within the broader anti-Axis coalition.

Conferences, agreements between heads of governments, alliances, supreme interallied councils—valuable as they may be—these are not union, but substitutes that have already failed democracy. The British and French relied on them. They had a unified command. They agreed to make no separate peace. But they based their unity on two sovereign governments, acting in alliance, not on a united sovereign people acting in union through a common government. And their alliance collapsed.

Alliance failed the British and French

Prime Minister Churchill sought salvation then in the American way of union. He implored France to join Britain in this declaration of union:

"* * * France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations but one Franco-British Union. The constitution of the union will provide for joint organs of defense, foreign, financial, and economic policies. Every citizen of France will enjoy immediate citizenship of Great Britain; every British subject will become a citizen of France * * * During the war there shall be a single war cabinet, and all the forces of Britain and France, whether on land, sea, or in the air, will be placed under its directions * * *."

Now the responsibility is ours, either to create or defer too long that common community or state, whose importance Mr. Churchill stressed in the Senate December 26. Shall we begin with the British back where they began with the French? Or where they left off—with an offer of union now, the old, war-tested United States way?

Organizing the democracies effectively in a union need take no longer than organizing them in an ineffective alliance or supreme war council, and will safeguard their national rights far more securely and equally. There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

The Soviet States have a common government

Granted, immediate extension of our democratic Federal principles to all our war associates is impracticable. But common sense says to unite at once with those practiced in democracy while cooperating with the others in the best way we can, until they desire and can apply our principles.

We gain from the fact that all the Soviet Republics are already united in one government, as are also all the Chinese-speaking people, once so divided. Surely we and they must agree that union now of the democracies wherever possible is equally to the general advantage. Victory depends in no small part on sea and air factors, now divided between Britain and us, whose nature requires a common government even more than do the land factors in Russia and China, vast and important as they are.

We the people of the United States have once more reached a time to try men's souls. Let us not mistake this moment nor the nature of this test. Lincoln measured it for us when he said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

We recognize already that we must unite the power of all our 48 States. We recognize that the British must unite the power of all their Commonwealth of Nations. We have not recognized—and we must at once—that we need above all to unite the whole arch of democracy.

An arch without a keystone can be no arch of triumph.

Union Is the United States Way

The people of our original Thirteen States once faced the problem the democracies face now. They had never before united for any purpose. But when their common freedom was at stake they did not try to save it with 13 independent armies, or even with a "supreme interallied council." Instead, with revolutionary vision and vigor, they invented a new and stronger keystone:

They set up at once a common Government.

They gave it the power to make war and peace for all.

They let it name one common Commander in Chief.

And they issued through it a resounding Declaration of the universal and eternal common principles of human freedom on which they proposed to build a New World.

Thus, in the midst of war, they created the United States itself as a war measure.

They then developed this emergency war policy into a permanent way to keep the peace among their States by adopting a more perfect Union in our Federal Constitution. Since then, every American generation has boldly extended these principles of freedom through union to more states and more people of all kinds. Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa have already adopted these principles. Britain showed its faith in them when it offered union to France.

Here, then, in our own American principles of Federal Union lies the way to win this war, the peace, and the future. We are not so feeble that we cannot do what our fatners have already done. Let us then turn this great danger into a great opportunity. Let us begin now a World United States.

As citizens to our fellow citizens: We recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

Robert Woods Bliss, Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr., Russell W. Davenport, John Foster Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J. Roberts, Daniel Calhoun Roper, Wm. Jay Schieffelin.

THIRTY MILLION AMERICANS FAVOR UNION

Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States after the war should join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order.

If you are among those who agree we need union then to keep a potential aggressor from breaking loose, surely you must agree we need that union now to meet the powerful combination of aggressors already on the march.

To refuse to recognize this so as to avoid controversy will not save our sons, any more than failure to recognize that a germ caused diphtheria saved life in the past.

Remember now the moral slump that always follows war, the return of petty politics. Consider now that if we merely promise union after the war, the Axis will drive their peoples on by reminding them of what a Senate minority did to the promised League * * * after World War No. 1. But once the oppressed peoples see that this union is no dream but a living, growing, winning world United States, with a place in its Congress they may earn by regaining their own

freedom—what a means we then shall have to wreck the Axis from within.

How many, many lives we shall save by this great expeditionary idea—once we give it life. It will be fighting for our sons day and night far behind the enemy lines. No dictator can be certain it will not be fighting for us in his staff itself.

The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves, and our friends and foes, that this war will end in a union of the free. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now.

"We implore you [as the English workmen implored Lincoln to free the slaves] not to faint in your providential mission. While your enthusiasm is aflame, and the tide of events runs high, let the work be finished effectually. Leave no root of bitterness to spring up and work fresh misery to your children."

Federal Union, Inc.; A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Balduf, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

EXHIBIT C

In Time of War—Prepare for Peace—World Fellowship, Inc.

(Started in 1918—the Armistice year)

A continuous world government convention centers in its new year-round world fellowship center (388 acres, six buildings)—inviting people of all countries, races, classes, creeds, and conditions to develop "ideals for world government of, for, and by the people."

On New Hampshire 16, 5 miles south of Conway. Address for mail, telegrams, bus, railway, freight, express: Conway, N. H. Telephone Madison 4-22.

CHARLES F WELLER,
Founder and President.
EUGENIA WINSTON WELLER,
Secretary.
(The two general executives.)
LOUIS A. BOWMAN, *Treasurer.*
(LaSalle National Bank, Chicago, and Carroll County Trust Co., Conway, N. H.)
L. I. PUTNAM, C. P. A.,
Auditor.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We ask the Members of the Senate and House to take the three steps presented here for your consideration. We shall be glad to appear before any committee of the House or Senate or before a joint session to answer any and all questions.

We hope these two joint resolutions will be introduced and passed by Congress on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942. A present to him, to us, to the world.

CHARLES DAVIS, C. E., D. ENG.,
Founder-Trustee, World Government Foundation and Honorary President World Peace Association, Jenkins, Minn.
CARL A. RYAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.
(With over 300 cooperating organizations in 56 countries.)
Approved by:
CHARLES F. WELLER,
Founder and President, World Fellowship, Inc.
GEORGE C. DIEHL,
Chairman, Executive Committee, World Government Foundation.
DARWIN J. MESSEROLE,
Director of Legislation, World Government Foundation.

STEP 1

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to set up and create a Federation of the World, a World Peace Government, under the title of the United Nations of the World.

Whereas we hold these truths of be self-evident:

1. Peoples, savage or civilized, have never lived together save under some form of government.

2. All governments exist by their successful organization and use of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical forces of mankind.

3. A government losing control of these forces fails.

4. Village, town, city, county, provincial, and state governments do not ask the abandonment of the other governments or the national government for them to exist, for each is supported by and dependent for its very existence on the others, as they will be under a world government.

5. Lack of government means chaos in its territory—hence world chaos and its wars throughout the ages.

6. The world without a government has always been and always will be at war until there is a world government in control of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical forces needed for its existence.

7. As with villages, towns, cities, counties, provinces, states, and nations a world government can bring "* * * on earth peace, good will toward men," a goal worthy of the efforts of all mankind.

8. Peace—not war—makes for the safety of mankind.

9. Peace—not war—makes for the preservation of mankind.

10. Peace—not war—makes for the well-being of mankind.

11. Peace—not war—makes for the prosperity of mankind.

12. Peace—not war—makes for the world trade of mankind.

13. Peace—not war—makes for the profits of mankind; and

Whereas belief in these thirteen self-evident truths makes it necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the federation of the world, a world peace government under the title of the United Nations of the World including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended by the President in his sole and absolute discretion to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution and in addition the sum of $1,000,000,000 for the immediate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution.

The President may appoint such committees and summon such advisers, from any part of the world, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the foregoing purposes with all convenient speed.

STEP 2

(Should be taken the same day as step 1)

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to create a world government

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions or legislatures in three-fourths of the several States:

"Article 22. Creation of a world government

"SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to create, ordain, form, set up, establish, join, enter, unite with, and become a part of a world government.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to put into effect and to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

STEP 3

When step two has been ratified by the people of the United States of America, acting through the legislatures of our 48 States or Congress will have the power, under section 2 of article 22 of the Constitution of the United States of America, to enact the needed legislation to provide for the entrance of the United States of America into the world government set up by our great President and to provide for the election of our representatives therein and other matters.

These three steps are not the scraps of paper of Wilson's fourteen points, the League of Nations, the Atlantic Agreement, the 26-nation agreement, the Rio Agreement. (If they grab at this straw.)

None were enforced and none can be enforced for the peace that all mankind wants and prays for.

These three steps are concrete, definite, enforceable, and create a world government with power to preserve peace.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to answer a statement that was made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the declaration of the gentleman from Michigan. I cannot accept, without challenge, one statement he made with respect to a man whom I have known for many years, a man who is my friend, a man who holds the respect of the bar of the State of New York, and is considered one of the most able prosecutors in the country, Mr. William Power Maloney. I am certain, although I have not had any occasion to discuss the question with him, that Mr. Maloney has never made any such statement as attributed to him by the gentleman from Michigan. I am certain that it is an untruth. I know that at

the proper time and in due course I shall be able to refute the serious implications of this unwarranted allegation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the problem of surplus commodities and the C. C. C. camps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia on the subject of Ireland's responsibility in the present war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article by Col. J. E. Myers, retired.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

CAPITALISM IN AMERICA IS ON TRIAL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, capitalism in America is on trial. Those who desire the most to preserve the system are doing the most to destroy it. The lessons of history mean nothing to those who would destroy all the gains of organized labor won in the last 50 years. Under our kind of capitalism, labor is a partner and if the system is to work, a just balance between labor and capital must be the object of all national legislation.

To say now, when we are engaged in war, that labor must be stripped of its rights while capital goes its way with the blessing of the Government, would not only be a mistake, but would be the beginning of the end of capitalism in this country regardless of what any of our enemies can do.

The war has presented to capital and its blind supporters, hirelings, and sympathizers a grand opportunity to destroy in one blow all the gains of labor in a half century. It is not that these schemers are so concerned about our country, it is that they find this an opportune time to do what they have wanted to do for a generation—put the laboring class down where it will live on such crumbs as capital sees fit to hand it. Their theory is no doubt that with labor castigated, more profits will be divided among the "more worthy."

Show me a Member of Congress who now is demanding the repeal of labor laws who was not—before the war—willing to undertake the same thing. The war has put an instrument in their hands with which to strike mightier blows at labor. Newspapers rush to the aid of these destroyers. But ask yourselves how many newspapers—daily papers—there are in the United States that do not receive the major part of their incomes from the business corporations of this country. These papers create public opinion and if a newspaper hammers away long enough on one subject, its readers will form the opinion that the paper wants formed. In this way there is more misinformation about labor laws in the United States than on any subject before the people for discussion today.

Labor alone is charged with the fact that we are not producing fast enough in the United States. Let us examine the whole case and see if organized labor is alone responsible for the defeats we have suffered in this war so far.

The first fact to start with is this:

The President of the United States is also the Commander in Chief of all our forces—Army, Navy, air, and submarine defenses. He says that the repeal of labor laws is not necessary. If he thought for 1 minute that labor was alone responsible for our defeats, is there any sane Member of this House who would say that the President would not act? I am not of the same political faith as the President—I cannot understand why he insists upon being a Democrat—but since we are in this war, I will be the last Member of this House to refuse to support the Commander in Chief.

Second. Those who are in charge of our war production say the repeal of labor laws is unnecessary. Do you suppose, from Donald Nelson down, these men would say the repeal of labor legislation is unnecessary if they were convinced that labor alone was responsible for our defeats? These men must know the facts, and where is there a Congressman on this floor who can state truthfully that labor is responsible for our losses thus far? We do not have the facts to prove this charge for the very good reason that the charge is false. Newspapers have gotten in their work—the paid press has carried out its orders—and many readers believe what they have read in print. Petitions, letters, and telegrams roll into every congressional office in Washington. Congressmen do not become alarmed over one letter or one telegram or one petition, but when they arrive in bundles and threaten to oust every last Congressman on the job if the labor laws are not suspended during the war, many Members get panicky and reecho what the paid press has said.

I can see no reason for all this panic; the worst that can happen to any Congressman is that he will be defeated and turned out to graze on a shorter pasture than that to which he is accustomed. Suppose he is defeated; the country will go on the same as ever; Congress will meet and adjourn the same as ever. I, for one, refuse to be frightened by this method. First, I want to know the facts—not the opinions of the paid press, but the facts. I will then act and vote what I believe the facts warrant. Secondly, if the proof is that labor alone is responsible for our losses thus far, I will vote just like any other Member ought to vote—to put a stop to the interference of labor. That is my position on this matter, and no number of letters or telegrams or the threat of defeat will change my attitude. I propose to keep my mind clear to do the right thing when the entire case is presented to us. I am reminded of what Lincoln said:

> I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

Third. There is too much misinformation in the country with respect to labor laws. The 40-hour week is merely a standard. For all concerned it was found better for both labor and capital to limit the number of hours to 40 per week. There are countless numbers of skilled-labor jobs where, to work men more than 8 hours per day, efficiency is broken, accidents increase, and defective work is produced.

Under the present law men can work over 40 hours per week. They are doing it right now in emergency cases. The following table tells the story.

Ninety percent of the shipbuilders are working 12 hours overtime per week.

Ninety-six percent of the men in the machine-tool industry are employed 56 hours per week.

Sixty-six percent of the engine builders are working 54 hours a week.

It is not a question of hours at all; it is a question of pay. For overtime, the laborer is paid time and one-half. It is merely a question of compensation.

In the face of constantly rising prices in the cost of living, it would not be justice to cut wages. The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows the index of 900 wholesale price lists 19 percent higher than a year ago.

Labor strikes alone are charged with being the cause of holding up production. The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that a year ago the average time lost on account of strikes was 12 hours per man per year, and many of these strikes were called against union orders. The average hours worked would be approximately 52 hours per week per man. Fifty-two weeks would equal 2,704 hours, and strikes accounted for a loss of only 12 of these 2,704 hours.

When we get right down to the facts, anyone can see that the time lost on strikes is practically nothing when compared to a year's work.

In January of this year the time lost by strikes was six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the time actually worked. In February it was only eight one-hundredths of the total time worked. Besides this, of all the workmen involved in February strikes, 25 percent was accounted for in a single textile mill in New England.

The months of March and April will show, from present indications, a still smaller percentage of time lost.

The above record demonstrates conclusively that the time lost by labor was not the cause of the slowing down of production—even granting that it has slowed down.

Suppose we had wiped all labor laws from the statute books. Would we have had strikes? There is absolutely no doubt about it. England has declared strikes unlawful during the war, but the record shows more far-reaching strikes now than before Parliament passed the law.

Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Federal Works Agency Administrator, in arguing against repealing labor laws, said:

> Industrial history proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production.

President Roosevelt, at his press conference on March 19, said that according to the National Safety Council, 460,000,000 man-days of productive effort were lost as a result of industrial accidents; 160,000,000 man-days were lost on account of common colds and other respiratory ailments; that the man-days lost by strikes were only 30,000,000. The following table, therefore, speaks volumes:

Man-days lost by accidents	460,000,000
Man-days lost by colds	160,000,000
Man-days lost by strikes	30,000,000

Strikes were responsible for 4.06 percent of lost time; other causes were responsible for 95.04 percent of lost time.

The charge is made that laborers get good wages and are not exposed to danger. I wonder if the workers are not subject to danger. During the past year there were 101,500 deaths as a result of industrial accidents and a further number of 350,000 were permanently disabled. From this record it would seem that our superpatriots, who never overlook an opportunity to snipe at labor, should take time out to check what labor is giving in this war.

It is obvious, without further argument, that had there been no labor laws upon the statute books, more men would have been killed and more injured by working overtime to such an extent that the human machine would be incapable of the alertness necessary in a dangerous calling. The amount of work performed per hour is more important than merely the number of hours put in. In skilled professions it is well known that the worker cannot be overtaxed without fatal results flowing from it. These results affect the worker and the employer and in the end losses all around come from the effort.

Fourth. Capital itself is not clamoring for the repeal of labor laws. Fortune magazine recently polled businessmen of managerial rank, and of the 5,000 replies received to this question, "What is the most important problem facing your business in the war years ahead?" only 7.8 percent named labor troubles and 41.2 percent named shortage of materials, effects of priorities, and allocations. The following table conclusively upholds this contention:

	Primary problem	Secondary problem	Total mentions
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Shortage of materials, effects of priorities and allocations	37.4	3.8	41.2
Government: Red tape, interference, indecision, war inefficiency, ultimate aims	17.3	4.6	21.9
Plant conversion or readaptation of organization to war needs	10.6	1.8	12.4
Shortage of necessary personnel	13.0	4.4	17.4
Finance: Reserves, investments, solvency	10.2	2.4	12.6
Reduced need for product or services	5.3	1.1	6.4
Labor problems, other than shortages, including wage rates, unions	5.2	2.6	7.8
Taxes	4.8	2.7	7.5
Research and post-war adjustments	3.5	3.7	7.2
Inflation	2.2	1.8	4.0
Transportation	1.9	1.5	3.4
Rising costs versus stabilized prices	1.5	.1	1.6
Import and export stoppages	1.4	.2	1.6
Other answers	5.2	.3	5.5
Total, including multiple answers	119.5	31.0	150.5

Fifth. The profits made by industrialists on war contracts are a positive incentive to strikes. That these profits are in too many cases unconscionable and unjust the following facts will demonstrate: During 1941, 71 leading corporations handling war contracts increased their profits over 1939 and 1940 until last year showed an increase of 77 percent over 1939. Vultee Aircraft increased their profits 730 percent. Consolidated Aircraft increased theirs 472 percent; Bell Aircraft, 591 percent; Colorado Steel & Iron, 840 percent; Savage Arms, 233 percent; Interlake Iron, 190 percent; General Steel Castings, 190 percent; Sun Oil, 107 percent; and Aviation Corporation, 2,690 percent.

The evidence of greed and profit making is stupendous. Jack & Heintz Co. sold airplane motor starters to the Government for $600 each, and then admitted to the Tolan committee that the starters cost only $272.

These corporations are able to circumvent the law on excess-profits tax by paying unheard-of salaries and bonuses. United States Steel for 1941 put aside $25,000,000, paid four times as much in taxes to the Government as they did in 1940, and then made a net profit of $116,000,000.

The Basic Magnesium Co., on an investment of between $25,000 and $50,000, stands to make 4,280 percent in 1942, or $2,140,000.

The Todd Shipbuilding Corporation made a profit margin of 62 percent on a recently completed Government contract. This corporation had 35,000 men working for them and their profit averaged $1.80 per man per day.

Sixth. The laborers will not sell out their Government. Can as much be said for some of our greatest corporations? Have these corporations not restricted production; have they not boosted prices? Have they not refused to hand out their work to smaller factories with the hope that they could build up their own factories by Government subsidy? Have not dollar-a-year men favored their own concerns of origin to the detriment of all other manufacturers engaged in the same line of production? The Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Thurman Arnold, in his report to Congress, said:

> There is not an organized basic industry in the United States which has not restricted production by some device or other.

Corporation salaries: We hear no complaints from the people about this matter, but we hear much about the fact that labor is paid more than the soldier. Let's look at the record. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, we find the following salaries paid by corporations: Twenty-nine men made salaries ranging from $75,000 to $442,560. In addition to this, these men shared in the profits of their own businesses, and in many instances received bonuses. Several, from all sources, made a million dollars annually. Even taking out the income tax on these salaries, the balance is an unconscionable amount, especially when our country is fighting for its life.

The report of the Securities Exchange Commission has something to say about bonuses. The salary of Dahlberg, president of the Celotex Corporation was listed at $36,000, but his bonus for the year was $157,871.98. G W. Mason, president of Nash-Kelvinator, received a salary of $125,731.07, but received bonuses aggregating $100,000. Joseph W. Fraser, president, Willys-Overland Motors, received a salary of $60,000 and a bonus of $42,000.

Compare these salaries with the salaries paid our officers in the defense forces of the United States. Men like General MacArthur, who is giving his all in the defense of this country, receives less than $10,000 annually. Compare MacArthur's salary with the men drawing down $500,000 in industry.

Seventh. Labor is willing to give up all it has for the defense of the United States. No labor organization would even ask for pay and a half for overtime if the Government would benefit. But when the reduced pay rolls only swell the profits of the employer, labor kicks. Did anyone ever hear of a laborer with too much money? When he gets any he spends it, and all down the creek of business the grounds are watered.

A large percentage of the soldiers, probably 65 percent, come from the farms and from labor groups. Do you suppose the fathers of these boys are not patriotic; do you suppose they would wish this Nation defeated and all individual liberty lost? It is preposterous to think that labor is not patriotic. Do you suppose these men must be made peons while the corporations grow richer in order to win this war. My answer is "No."

It is the duty of Congress to establish a just relationship between labor and capital and make the combination work. If it will work in an emergency like the present—and I think it will—there will be all the more reason for doing justice to both now to the end that the close of the war may not see our economic system destroyed.

It is up to the Congress to insist that our system of government under capitalism shall actually work. We are contributing to disaster when we attack simply one element of our national system. If we insist on wiping off the statute books all protection to labor, and shut our eyes to the unconscionable profits of capital, we are well on the road to destruction. Two things can happen by this blind, unconsidered legislation. First, it will take the heart out of labor, and there will not be the incentive to action which we must have now. In the second place, in the long course of events the result will be the destruction of the entire capitalistic system.

When the Government destroys labor laws the next step will be the necessary taking over of all private industry by the Government. At no time could it be so easily done as now. When that has been done does anyone think the Government, that is, the people—would stand for the salaries and bonuses now being paid to business executives? The cry that the soldiers are fighting for $21 per month, while labor demands overtime pay after 40 hours, would be met by the far greater cry that the most important leaders in this war—generals and admirals—are receiving less than $10,000 annually while business executives are receiving in some instances $500,000 and in rare instances close to a million dollars annually What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

To deliberately set a wedge between capital and labor by destroying all labor rights would be to start a fight here at home by which our energies would be consumed and the way made easy for our enemies. If this Congress should wipe off the statute books all labor legislation, no better news could reach Germany and Japan. In these dark days we must take the system we have and make it work. Labor and capital must work together to supply what our forces need. It is the duty of Congress to keep a just and equitable balance between capital and labor, to the end that both elements shall have an incentive to sacrifice for their common country.

The proof is abundant that labor itself has through strikes had little effect on slowing up production as compared to other causes.

The stock argument of those who wish to abolish labor legislation is that every citizen should have the right to work without paying any organization a membership fee. Yes; if every citizen had that right, he would have the right to work for a peons pay. Those who take advantage of a labor organization should remember that for half a century this fight for a better day for the laborer has been going on. Better wages, better living conditions, safer equipment, the banishment of child labor, and more reasonable hours have been the result. A worker who now comes to work enjoys the fruits of the fight made by labor and should be glad to contribute to a cause that has made his job honorable and respectable and a job where he can live as a man and not a slave.

Just what is back of this vicious attack against labor I do not know. All other evils have been brushed aside, and no demand is made for anything except to repeal the labor laws of this country. I do not look upon this matter in the light of my own political interest, but in the light of what is right and just. The labor vote in North Dakota is small, but the facts demonstrate that labor is not to blame for our defeats. I have alined myself on the side of what I conceive to be right, and the political winds can blow.

Out of all this disturbance I trust many good things will come. If we can remain united as a people, with one object in view—to defeat our enemies—there is no combination of powers on earth that can defeat the United States. We may hear of losses and defeats for some time to come, but the moment we are supreme in the air we shall hear of victories. It took a long time to convince the people of this country that the air force was an indispensable asset in present-day warfare. The people know it now. They know that a battleship is absolutely useless without abundant air protection; they know now that defenses are of little avail without the protection of an air force. We are getting down to business now, and I do not believe we have slowed down in our defense production. We are turning out 3,300 fighting planes per month, and that number is constantly rising. Donald Nelson's latest report says:

> The aviation schedule of 60,000 planes in 1942 is being met, and the tank output is ahead of schedule. The same thing is true of antitank and antiaircraft guns. A new era of management-labor cooperation is developing.

I predict that within 3 months we shall hear of victories, and if we can remain united here at home, our fighting forces will bring that victory that means so much for the entire people of the earth.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr BURDICK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Right along the line the gentleman has been speaking about, I received a letter from the smeltermen at Anaconda, Mont., stating their opposition to any change in the labor laws and pointing out that the smeltermen were working 24 hours a day in 3 shifts of 8 hours each, and 48 hours a week, under the present system

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman also feel that sometimes folks seem to lose sight of the fact that under the Selective Service Act every group in our population contributes its sons to the Army in exact proportion to the number of people belonging to that group? So when a distinction is made between labor as a group on the one hand and men in the armed forces on the other hand, there is not any more merit to making that distinction than there would be in making a distinction between any other group and the men in the armed forces. The men in the armed forces come from the homes of labor, from the homes of farmers, and from the homes of everybody in the country, just the same.

Mr. BURDICK. I will say in answer to the gentleman that 65 percent of all the soldiers now serving in defense of this country come from the farms and from the labor groups—65 percent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman have any figures upon how many of those soldiers are carrying union cards?

Mr. BURDICK. No; I do not have the figures on that, but I know the fathers of these fellows are carrying union cards, and to say that a man is not patriotic just because he happens to be a farmer or a laborer, when his own boy is in the service, is something I cannot comprehend

Mr. RICH Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Who would make such a statement as that? I cannot imagine any man making such a statement.

Mr. BURDICK. It would take about 25 sheets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to spread out a record of those who condemn labor because it is unpatriotic.

Mr. RICH. I would think there is something wrong with anyone who condemns labor as being unpatriotic, but there are men in labor unions that are doing things that the labor unions and the men in labor unions do not agree with and do not want to abide by, because they are so radical, and yet they have such a hand on labor that they are forcing labor to do things they do not want to do. Labor itself would not do such things if they could get free of their clutches.

Mr. BURDICK. I am giving here the reasons labor is not responsible.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman have facts and figures to show what percentage of profit has been made on the capitalization of the industries to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. BURDICK. I have pointed out a few individual cases.

Mr. RICH. If I may ask the gentleman one further question, does the gentleman believe that the people in this Government who are giving out these contracts that would permit the exorbitant profits that have been made by some of these corporations were justified in awarding such contracts as would permit the making of such exorbitant profits?

Mr. BURDICK. No, I do not. That is shown by the statement I have made about the various companies.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think the Government officials who are responsible for giving out contracts of that kind ought to be investigated to see whether there is something wrong, because, certainly, there is something wrong somewhere when they give a man a

contract out of which they make profits such as the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. BURDICK. I would not investigate the man, but I would investigate the system by which they enter into these contracts.

Mr. HOOK. I think that is the point, but is it not true that it is peculiar to all wars that there is a certain minority group that exacts a high price for cooperation?

Mr. BURDICK. Well, if they find a chance to make money easily.

Mr. COLE of New York. In regard to the Jack-Heintz matter, the criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was directed to the Navy Department for having entered into such an agreement. The fact is that this Jack-Heintz Co. was one of two makers of an item which the Government sorely needed. They demanded this high price of $600 from the Government. The Government thought because of the urgency of the situation they needed the instrument, regardless of price. Then they later found that the price was exorbitant, and it was the Department itself which brought this matter to the attention of the Tolan committee, and as a result of that investigation the contracts have been renegotiated, and a surplus of some $9,000,000 or more will be turned back to the Government. The price has been renegotiated to $300. Therefore it is not the fault of the Navy officials for having entered into such an agreement.

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, I would not want to investigate any individual, because he is working under a system. If there is anything wrong, it is a wrong in the system under which the man is compelled to work.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Has the gentleman any information in respect to the pension that is paid to Mr. Walter Gifford by the Telephone Co., who draws a pension of $60,000 a year at the expense of the stockholders and the telephone users of the United States?

Mr. BURDICK. I do not know that I have that particular name, but I have the whole system figured out. I suggest that we make a comparison of such salaries as that with the salary that is paid to a man like General MacArthur and a lot of generals now at the front, who receive less than $10,000 a year. We have all heard it stated often on the floor. Look at the soldier serving for $21 a month and compare that with a laborer at home who is getting $16 a day. Well, why not compare the salary that General MacArthur gets, of $9,000 a year, with the salary of a president of a concern who gets $575,000 a year?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, on the part of others who have special orders, the Chair recognizes the gentleman for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks, because I was looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with reference to a certain Navy appropriation bill back in 1937, and I find where the gentleman and myself had made arguments along the same lines, that we could build a battleship for fifty or sixty or seventy million dollars that could be sunk in a second by a bomb from an airplane.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting a speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in Springfield, Mass., on last Friday evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the regular order of business and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may be privileged to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a resolution passed by the Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LIVING CONDITIONS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, what I want to address my remarks to is conditions existing in the city of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what conditions in Washington—those which we are forced to put up with to live and those under which our war program is being carried out by some of our leaders—are in many instances intolerable and are steadily growing worse. In fact they have reached a point where our very war effort is being seriously handicapped and delayed.

The stampede of pleasure seekers, chiselers, grafters, and those seeking fat Government contracts is growing daily, and the city is overflowing with these parasites, as President Roosevelt has so appropriately termed them.

I think the President was right when he stated that all these parasites should get out of Washington. To President Roosevelt's parasites I want to add pleasure seekers, grafters, and chiselers. I think that Washington and the District of Columbia should be declared a war zone and those not directly connected with the Government and the war effort or essential business should be forced to get out for the duration.

Washington should not only be cleaned up but out, so that conditions would at least be livable and the operations of our Government could be carried on in a businesslike manner. Homes and apartment houses should be commandeered by the Government until the war is over. Naturally, the owners would be paid reasonable rentals.

No one should be allowed to enter the District without first having secured a certificate to show he was not a parasite but a person engaged in vital war and government work or who had legitimate business here. The whole war structure should be reorganized from the White House down the line so that our war effort could be carried out with but one thing—victory—in mind, and so that any person, a businessman or anyone else who was trying to help could come here, see the people he wanted, transact his business in a few days and get back home. As it is now he is shoved from one Government agency to another; from one petty official to another. No one knows just what he is doing or why; no one seems to have any authority, and the buck passing, lack of coordination, lack of centralized authority, overlapping agencies, useless bureaus, and wasted effort going on here is enough to make the ordinary citizen shudder with despair. It no doubt makes our enemies shout with glee. In many ways official Washington is really helping Japan and Germany win this war right here in Washington.

Those people who are here doing their bit come from the four corners of the United States, by far the majority from places where climatic conditions are at least livable. It is bad enough to live in Washington under normal conditions. Even the chamber of commerce, I think, will admit that Washington's climate is about the most miserable in the country. What is going to happen to this sweltering mass of humanity in our offices, rooms, apartment houses, and on the streets and trolleys this summer when temperatures hit 90 and 100 and the humidity goes up to 60 or 70?

With people packed in here like sardines, almost anything could and probably will happen. Think of the tragedy if Washington were to be bombed or an epidemic break out. Living conditions for those who are here doing their best to help win this war should be the best, not the worst, in the country. I know of instances where people engaged in war work here are seeking a way to honorably get out of this madhouse.

I do not have to tell you our boys are being slaughtered on land and on sea. We have the finest fighting men in the world. They are ready to die and are dying for their country and to protect you and me.

The eyes of these boys are turned on Washington for guidance, for protection,

to see that the flow of weapons and ammunitions is undiminished.

And what do these boys see? They see a city of chaotic conditions. A city bursting with red tape and gold braid, captain's bars and general's stars. A city overflowing with pleasure seekers, grafters, chiselers, and other parasites.

Where was official Washington when our battered, bleeding, starving troops on Bataan scanned the skies and the seas for planes and ships which never came? "Give us just a few planes," was their plea. "Give us just a little equipment and we will hold our own."

My God, gentlemen, where was official Washington during all this? At a cocktail party? Being photographed? Or trying to decide whose responsibility it was to get aid to these brave men?

Clark Lee, an Associated Press correspondent who has been recording the history of the battle of the Philippines through his dispatches, wrote on April 11 and I quote, in part:

> Equipment available to the defenders proved its worth, but there was not enough of it. The Army seemed to have only one or two pieces of the United States most modern equipment—one radio direction finder, one fully equipped antiaircraft battery, one squadron of torpedo boats, one group of mounted 75's.

Is not that the most awful thing you ever heard of? Those responsible for this shameful shortage of equipment should be charged with treason. Think of our brave men fighting hundreds of thousands of Japs with this kind of stuff. We should bow our heads in shame.

These boys also look to Washington and see a city where legitimate businessmen who are doing their very best to help this country and this Government shoved from one official to another; from one agency to another, for days, weeks, and even months. It is enough to fill the most patriotic American with disgust.

I wish every Member of this House would read the article entitled "Are We Awake—Even Yet?" in the April issue of the Reader's Digest. It is a bitter indictment of the Capital City of these United States.

I quote some of the more pertinent passages:

> The set-backs of the United States in the first months of the war have reflected not so much military failure as an intellectual failure. We have not been out-fought but outmaneuvered and out-thought.
>
> Yet despite this catalog of catastrophe, despite the fact that everybody says we have learned a terrible lesson, there is no general agreement on what that lesson is; and one ventures to inquire whether even now we have cleared our minds of old ideas, habits, and prejudices, whether as a Nation we are awake to the grim realities of war.
>
> In the year 1941 we turned out $20,000,000,000 worth of peacetime goods with machines which could have been converted to war work * * *.
>
> Hope Ridings Miller, society editor of the Washington Post, reported the other day: "This town recently has given itself over to the most hectic round of partying anybody has ever heard of."

The author, James B. Reston, a New York Times correspondent here, goes on to recite many of Washington's weaknesses.

But just imagine the Capital of the United States in the time of war "Giving itself over to the most hectic round of partying anybody has ever heard of."

The war and Government workers are doing the best they can under the circumstances. Rooms are almost impossible to find. Those that can be rented are priced so outrageously high that many cannot afford to meet the demands of the landlords. Hundreds, after a short stay here, find conditions so rotten that they turn around and go home in despair and disgust.

"There's lots of rooms in the outlying districts," the Civil Service Commission says. But who can afford to pay transportation charges back and forth each day, or who is going to spend 1, 2, or 3 hours a day going back and forth from work after working 10 or 12 hours?

How would Members of this House like to live in Washington on $1,440 a year and try to eat, sleep, pay transportation, insurance, dental and doctor bills, buy clothes, meet other incidental expenses, go to a show once in a while, and save a few dollars for war bonds? You would say it was impossible. It is impossible under the conditions which exist in Washington.

Hotels and rooming houses are crammed full. Some of these persons are legitimate Government workers; hundreds are pleasure seekers; many are after fat Government contracts or commissions in the Army or Navy; others are here just to see the crowds and the excitement. In this latter group are the rich, those who can afford to pay Washington's prices, get the most livable rooms and the best meals; hundreds of thousands of others cannot.

Hotels do not care whether they rent you a room or not. You can take it or leave it. Hotels will not give monthly or weekly rates, but charge by the day, apparently with the idea that if you do not stay long they can raise the price to the next party who comes along.

Restaurants are overcrowded. You cannot get a decent meal without waiting from half an hour to an hour and a half. The cry of the restaurant owners is, "Get 'em at a table, get the most money you can for the least food, and get 'em out as soon as you can to make room for someone else."

Conditions in the kitchens where this mass of food is prepared must be anything but sanitary. They could not be otherwise.

Waiters and waitresses in countless places, especially where thousands of our Government workers are forced to eat, serve food while wearing indescribably dirty uniforms. Dishes are washed—or rather half-washed—and filthy garbage is carted away under your very nose.

Half the time you cannot get a cab. Streetcars are so full of perspiring, worn-out Government workers that many prefer to walk in spite of the vast distances.

Washington grocery stores, drug stores, clothing shops, and others, in hundreds of instances, have doubled prices since the boom began. Low-paid families find it impossible to eat decently because of the prices charged.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson has placed ceilings on everything but the very things that people must have to live—food, clothing, drugs, and a place to sleep. This is the most asinine thing I ever heard of. Food prices, drug and clothing prices go upward and upward in a never ending spiral and Henderson and our other Government leaders sit placidly by and do nothing, or at the most go to a cocktail party, or take a vacation.

The Washington idea of winning this war seems to be to get yourself a nice fat Government job, like that of Price Administrator. Then you call in the press and the photographers and issue a bunch of fine-sounding statements on what you are going to do to win this war in the next couple of months. Then you get yourself photographed sitting down, standing up, smiling, looking grimly, seriously, shaking hands, and in every other conceivable pose. Then comes a round of high-powered cocktail parties at which thousands of Japs and Germans are killed. The most masterful diplomatic coups in the world are made. In fact, the very war is won and peace is declared over these Martinis and whisky sours.

The next step on this Washington road to success is to pull out for a much needed rest in South America or some other country, forgetting, of course, that this Nation of ours is at war and is confronted with the greatest crisis in history.

If Henderson had to go to South America for a much-needed rest this winter, just where in the h—— will he and the others go this summer when it gets hot here and there is even more work to be done and more vital decisions to be made?

I approve of what the author, James B. Reston, of Are We Awake—Even Yet, says in the Reader's Digest, and I quote:

> This is not intended to give the impression that Government officials do nothing but attend parties. Most of them work early and late. But they cannot escape a great number of these social affairs, and the atmosphere of Washington is not yet one of grim, relentless war work.
>
> This social whirl is part of the same mentality that causes some of the highest-ranking Cabinet secretaries and other top officials to squander their energy, ingenuity, and time in maneuvering for position.

People tell me that many Washington citizens are buying new homes with 3 or 4 extra bedrooms and are renting these rooms out at $20, $25, $30, and even more a month. They are paying for these homes by gouging Government workers. All the way from 2 or 3 persons to 15 or 20 persons, according to newspaper stories, are using a single bathroom. If that is not an intolerable condition, I would like to know what is.

If Washington was to be declared a war zone, and those not connected with the Government and the war effort were chased out, these proposed vast housing projects would not be needed. It would not be necessary to spend millions of dollars in Government money for these buildings which will be empty and useless after the war.

The battle cry of Washington seems not to be "Lets cut out the red tape and the politics and get together and win this war," but "Let's soak them all. Let's

have politics as usual. Let's have our fun and our vacations. War is fun. It may not last long. Long live prosperity!"

When will official Washington realize there is a war to be won? This war cannot be won by talking and making headlines or at cocktail parties and banquets. It cannot be won by red tape, "buck passing," and shifting responsibility. But it can be won by full cooperation, hard-headed thinking, drastic decisions, and an all-out effort.

Official Washington had better wake up. Wake up before it is too late.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Does not the gentleman think we have got plenty of room out in Montana and in the western part of the United States for these people?

Mr O'CONNOR Oh. God bless them, I wish they could all come to Montana. They would work for nothing if they could be out there in that salubrious climate, which makes the old young and the young continue young and abounding with life and energy; where every night they would sleep under a blanket; where the stately mountain peaks vie with each other for the first rays of the early morning sun; where the snow-covered mountains reach so high they pierce the clouds and kiss the feet of the angels as they are floating over the clouds.

Where the broad expanse of the western plains begin at the rushing river's edge and go spreading back to the very feet of the pine-covered mountains on either side; where the beautiful, graceful antelope, the timid, fleeting deer, the rugged bear, and the stately elk may still be seen despite the advances of the white man's civilization.

Where the ice-cold, crystal-clear streams have their birth at the foot of mammoth, glistening white glaciers, to continue their way through fertile valleys to join the muddy Missouri; where the wiley trout defy the efforts of the most skillful anglers to get them into their creels; where the eastern tourist sees vast fields of waving grain, green alfalfa fields, meadows hip deep with wild hay, the broad expanses of the sugar-beet fields, and the thousands of head of white-faced beef cattle, as well as millions of sheep.

Would that this great Capital of these United States could be moved to this matchless paradise—but you have diverted me.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to start that at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

STATE TAXATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the story of the flea and the elephant. The circus was coming to town and the flea on the elephant's ear naturally went across with the elephant upon a bridge which was thereby caused to shake dangerously. As he got across on the other side, after his terror had subsided, he whispered into the ear he was biting, "Oh, big boy, didn't we shake it?"

There are any number of instances of such confused thinking. Whenever any flea bites afflict any part of our body politic there are always persons who assert the claim of the flea on the elephant's ear.

I refer specifically and ask your attention to the bill H. R. 6750, a bill which, in my reasoned judgment, is one of the most terrific in its implications of danger to our form of government that this Nation has ever seen. It is with profound regret that I note that it has the stamp of approval of one of the greatest committees of this Congress, the Ways and Means Committee. Let me read you what it states:

> To promote the prosecution of war by exempting from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property and services for use in performing defense contracts—

That is in the title. In section 1 of title I it provides that such taxes shall be outlawed and that any defense contractor shall be exempt from State, Territorial, county, municipal, and other local taxes, and any such taxes imposed by Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands or any political subdivision thereof.

In section 201 of title II it further provides:

> After the effective date of title I of this act—

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker—

> No State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof shall make claim for, collect, or receive any tax of a type with respect to which an exemption is provided by title I hereof which has accrued subsequent to the declaration of national emergency made by the President on September 8, 1939.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this the so-called Cochran bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. With pleasure.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Would not the gentleman say that under that part of the bill a contractor who had been awarded a contract on the basis of accruing State sales taxes would thereby be the beneficiary of such an exemption?

Mr. HOBBS. A bid contractor would, of course; it would be to his advantage; the Government would get no benefit out of it whatever, to the contrary a financial detriment. There is a provision in the bill, however, which attempts to correct that. Whether it does or not, I am not prepared to say. May I lay down for your thoughtful consideration a few propositions which no one can deny. I am not going into any lengthy discussion, but I will give you the citation of authorities upon which I base my statements in the course of my remarks.

The first proposition I want to lay down is that immunity of the Federal Government from State taxation of any kind is unquestionable. Our friend, David Lawrence, in his informative column, which is usually as accurate as any, says:

> Any one or all of the 48 States may tax the Army and Navy war contracts.

There has never been a word in the history of jurisprudence or declaration of law by any supreme court of any standing that agrees with that; the truth is just the reverse.

He says that:

> The War and Navy Departments have been blocked by the Treasury Department, which looks at the matter from its own departmental standpoint. It has been planning to raise revenue by taxing the income from State and municipal bonds and, naturally, does not wish to be impairing any other sources of State revenue.

This may be where we see the colored gentleman in the woodpile; in other words, that may be where we begin to get down to the milk in the coconut.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. What impressed me—and I want to say that I am in full agreement with the expressions of the gentleman from Alabama on this bill, the contractor takes into consideration the question of the sales tax, or the gross income tax, or whatever tax there is in the State at the time he bids on the contract; and if he should be exempt from the payment of that tax it would not inure to the benefit of the Government at all, it would be his personal profit on the contract.

Mr. HOBBS. I answered that in reply to the gentleman from Washington. That may or may not be an accurate statement. There is an attempt in this bill to correct such an injustice. I refer to the proviso in section 1.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that where an industry comes into a district and sets up a defense plant it throws additional burdens on the municipality for school facilities, roads, and so forth?

Mr. HOBBS. That is undoubtedly true; and, of course, police protection has to be extended, fire protection, and other municipal services; but that is not the burden of my song or the point I am making. I do not think such considerations should be included, because the Federal Government is making rather liberal appropriations of the taxpayers' money to compensate the States for those damages and is giving the States by location of defense or war industries the benefits that derive naturally from their location. Therefore, I do not agree with the gentleman on that point, that that is one of the damning points against this bill. There may be merit in the contention, I am not saying there is not; but that is not any part of what I am seeking to call to the attention of Congress.

My point is that the Federal Government, no matter what this Congress might say, cannot be subject to State taxation.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does not the gentleman think in connection with legislation that has such far-reaching and uncertain possibilities as this legislation, there ought to be more than just a few departmental heads appear before a committee and testify? It is my understanding that the public generally has not been invited to attend these hearings and give testimony for or against this measure.

Mr. HOBBS. There again, though I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished gentleman with whom I have had the pleasure of serving on one of the great committees of this House for a year, I cannot agree with him. I do not believe we should have had more but fewer witnesses.

I am shocked, grieved, and horrified that any man should have espoused this bill either on the floor or before the Ways and Means Committee. It is a terrible indictment of this Congress that such a bill should be seriously considered. To say that the Congress of the United States should arrogate to itself the right to say to a sovereign State, "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not tax one of thine own citizens" is too preposterous to consider seriously. You cannot by exemption defeat the power of the sovereign States to tax. You cannot say that the States can or cannot tax. They are the source of our taxing power. They are the ones from whom we derive our power, limited as it is. The tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is our brief. We should not have to say a word on that subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand this bill, and I think this is a point that ought to be made clear in the understanding of the people, this is not to free the Federal Government from taxation by States. In other words, any property that the Federal Government buys now is not subject, as I understand it, to those taxes if the Federal Government itself buys it.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This goes much further and relates to the contractor who is simply performing a work as an independent contractor for the Federal Government?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has it not always been true that the independent contractor paid these taxes?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No objection has even been raised until now, even though during all these years they have been performing under just such an arrangement as this?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not an attorney, as the distinguished gentleman knows, and perhaps I approach this matter from a little different point of view. I would like to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. HOBBS. I welcome the gentleman's question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman believe that in times such as the present, when to such a great extent we are called upon over and over again to furnish Federal funds for the meeting of various problems throughout the country, it is most unwise policy to cut off a source of State revenue, and then run the risk that because of having done that there may be an increased dependence upon Federal revenues to take care of governmental needs?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do, but I do not want to be misunderstood. I flatly deny that the Federal Government has any such power. It has not. While I believe it would be unwise for it to exercise that power if it had it, I do not want to get away from my major thesis, which is that it has no such power.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I am interested in the gentleman's statement, because I originally opposed this bill myself. Does not the gentleman feel that if the principle involved in this bill is established it practically makes the State subservient to the Federal Government?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, it will. The gentleman is exactly right.

Now I must decline to yield further, as much as I love to be courteous and generous, until I have finished my statement, because all of these questions are right in line with my thinking. I beg the loan of your ears for a few minutes until I can conclude my statement.

The second proposition is that Congress may waive this immunity, but it has to do it by a clear and unequivocal act of the legislature.

The third is equally indisputable. No assertion of this immunity is necessary. I want you to get your teeth into that. Every one of these propositions is backed by a long and unbroken line of Supreme Court decisions to the effect that no assertion whatsoever is necessary to give the Federal Government immunity from State taxation.

Going further than my distinguished colleague from Alabama asked me to go, and where I was glad to go with him, going much further than that, not only is the Federal Government exempt but any agency of the Federal Government is also exempt from State taxation. There need be no assertion of immunity whatever. It rises from the fountainhead of our rights of this kind and is found in the Constitution itself. Therefore, unless clearly waived, Federal immunity obtains, and nothing that Congress can do may change it. In other words, we can by our action waive constitutional immunity if we see fit to do so. We have done nothing of the kind here. Therefore, the Federal Government needs no change of law but merely requires a simple change in the form of contracts.

All you need is to designate a contractor in one of these war industries as the agent of Uncle Sam, which he is—essentially and truly he is nothing else—simply designate him as the agent for the construction of this cantonment, this powder plant, this shell-loading plant, or what not. That is what he is. Why not say so?

Let me give you an illustration of this case in point. King & Boozer, a lumber dealer in Anniston, Ala., is a contractor on a cost-plus fixed-fee basis. Go to King & Boozer and say, "We want to buy some lumber from you for the construction of a cantonment." They will say, "All right; be glad to sell it to you f. o. b. the delivery point," which is the point of construction on the reservation at Fort McClellan. The contract provides in so many words that immediately upon delivery title to the lumber delivered passes to the Federal Government, and that nothing that can be done by the contractor in charge is valid without the approval of the local constructing quartermaster, an officer of the Army. The location of the delivery, I mean the point on the ground where it shall be delivered, and everything else, is under the exclusive control of the Federal Government. Yet they say that these contractors are not agents of the Federal Government.

Then they go ahead and say in that contract, and the contractor shall pay all costs of assembling this material, including State taxes, and we, the Government, will refund those costs including taxes and anything else that you pay out in accordance with this contract.

Can you imagine anything plainer? It is just indisputable that those contractors are the agents of the Federal Government. Yet all we need to do is to say so, and imediately there is no controversy whatever as to the bomb-proof immunity from State, county, municipal, or any other taxation.

The Supreme Court of Alabama said in its decision that we should look through form to substance. Essentially we know that this tax is paid as a State tax by the Federal Government in the way of a refund. We are at war, and Uncle Sam is building a cantonment to train our soldiers. Essentially he foots the bill and, therefore, is exempt from taxes of any kind by the State, county, or any municipality. The Supreme Court of Alabama was overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States on that point. We are still at war, and will not, because of our repugnance to the idea of change, change the nomenclature in our contracts to make these men who are our agents, our agents. Do that and the problem is solved, and you need not try to kill the sovereign States.

Please let me read you a most excellent letter I received from one of the best lawyers I know. While I am not convinced, as he is, that the decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama was wrong and that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States was right in reversing the decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama in the recent cases, nevertheless, I commend his statement of fundamental principles underlying both decisions:

The decisions in the so-called *Alabama cases* (*King & Boozer* v. *State*, 3 So. (2d) 572;

and *United States et al* v. *Curry, Commissioner of Revenue*, 3 So. (2d) 582; and *Alabama* v. *King and Boozer*, 314 U. S. 1), made no change in the rule of intergovernmental tax immunity, but rightly held that an independent contractor was not entitled to be construed as an agent and was, therefore, necessarily required to pay any lawful taxes imposed upon him with respect to any activity in which he was engaged, or for any privilege which he might exercise in his own name for profit.

In the hearings before the committee, it is suggested that the Supreme Court, in the decisions in the Alabama cases, clearly indicated "that Congress had the power to enact legislation of this character." What the Supreme Court said is as follows:

> Congress has declined to pass legislation immunizing from State taxation contractors under cost-plus contracts for the construction of governmental projects. Consequently the participants in the present transaction enjoy only such tax immunity as is afforded by the Constitution itself, and we are not now concerned with the extent and the appropriate exercise of the power of Congress to free such transactions from State taxation of individuals in such circumstances that the economic burden of the tax is passed on to the National Government. The Government, rightly we think disclaims any contention that the Constitution, unaided by congressional legislation, prohibits a tax exacted from the contractors merely because it is passed on economically by the terms of the contract or otherwise, as a part of the construction cost of the Government. So far as such a nondiscriminatory State tax upon the contractor enters into the cost of the materials to the Government, that is but a normal incident of the organization within the same territory of two independent taxing sovereignties. The asserted right of the one to be free of taxation by the other does not spell immunity from paying the added costs, attributable to the taxation of those who furnish supplies to the Government and who have been granted no tax immunity.

You will note that Mr. Chief Justice Stone very aptly used the terms "immunizing" and "immunity," and that no reference was made to any right of the Federal Government to prescribe or grant exemptions to any one from the payment of State taxes. Yet this seems to be the approach and purpose of the bill

The history of the matter is that Congress having refused to pass legislation authorizing the contractors to act as agents for the National Government in making purchases of material left them in a status necessarily subject to State taxation. It is logical, therefore, to conclude that what the Supreme Court had in mind was that unless the contractors were granted authority to act as such agents, rather than in their own names, they could not enjoy any immunity from State taxation. Of course, if the Government purchased in its own name, or by and through the duly authorized agent acting in the capacity as agent rather than as an independent contractor, as indicated by the Court, such transaction would be free from State taxation for the reason that the purchase would be correctly construed as having been made for the principal and, therefore, entitled to immunity of the Government.

It seems to me that there has been a misconception of the Court's meaning, for the right of the State to tax an individual who acts in his own name for private profit, and not as an authorized agent, is a right expressly reserved to the States under the Constitution—article X.

It is not enough to say that the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto are the supreme laws of the land, if such laws are designed to destroy the right of a State to collect its lawful revenue, "the lifeblood of the State."

As expressed by Mr. Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316), "the power to tax involves the power to destroy." However, the right to prevent taxation equally involves the power to destroy.

For instance, if the Congress may exempt citizens of a State from the payment of their otherwise lawfully imposed tax burden merely because Congress determines that an indirect benefit will ensue to the National Government, there would be no end to the possible exercise of the power of Congress to exempt from State taxation. For instance, better to secure the repayment of Government obligations, the citizens might be exempted from the payment of any taxation to the State. Better to enable a contractor to perform a contract, the exemptions from State taxation might be extended to any and all forms of taxation which Congress determines constitute an interference with his ability to perform a contract.

In a time of war, it will be difficult to find any business which could not establish some facts to show a substantial connection with or furtherance of the national program. Especially would this be true if we devote all of our efforts to winning the war.

It is not sufficient to say that the bill is enacted in furtherance of the prosecution of the war, for the following reasons:

(a) Purchases made by the Government, directly or through its agents, are already immune from all State taxation, unless consent to tax has been expressly granted by the Congress.

(b) If the Government prefers to follow the procedure of the employment of independent contractors, there is no more delay or interference involved in permitting the contractor to pay the State tax than is involved in his own transactions under private contracts. Certainly, a mere detail of checking the items involved in accomplishing reimbursement for both the price of the goods and the tax is not sufficient to justify a drastic interference with the operation of the State's system of taxation.

(c) When the question was first considered by Congress, it was recognized that the immunity of the National Government could not be extended to cover purchases made by contractors in their own names and upon their own credit, operating for private gain—the percentage of compensation being partly based upon the amount of purchases—and, therefore, it was proposed to authorize the contractors to act as agents for the Government in making purchases of materials. This proposal was defeated, but its enactment would immunize such transactions without the violation of any constitutional rights of the States. Such action would not seriously affect the State's revenues, nor the State's system of taxation.

The present proposal is apparently designed to relieve not only the Government itself directly, but all of the contractors, manufacturers, transportation companies, and utilities from the payment of various State taxes, merely because the economic burden thereof will indirectly or eventually become a part of the cost of prosecuting the war.

When we realize that every major activity may be converted to a direct or an indirect war effort, if Congress undertakes to prevent any form of State taxation from becoming a part of the cost of the war effort, there would be no limit to the national interference with the State fiscal program. Even the present proposal would doubtless so seriously affect some States as to soon cause a default in outstanding obligations.

Surely the problem may be solved with proper consideration to both the National and State problems involved. There is no limitation upon the credit or taxing powers of the National Government, in the exercise of the war powers, and, therefore, fiscal reasons alone would not seem to justify a far-reaching interference with, even a confiscation of, the State's sources of revenue. While all that the State has may, if necessary, be taken to win the war, the Constitution contemplates just compensation.

If the States' reserved powers of taxation have no constitutional protection against the exercise of the war powers of the National Government, the States may easily be discredited and made impotent in their attempt to preserve their sovereignty and enforce their laws; and if the war powers justify such national legislation, other Federal powers may likewise be made the basis of further encroachments upon the rights of the States to impose the various forms of taxation upon privately owned property, and various activities exercised by private citizens for profit, because of an indirect effect upon some phase of the national program.

Such a course may eventually be more disastrous to our dual system of democratic government than we may now visualize. The States may neither coin money nor readily replace the loss of revenues if every major source of production is, as it should be, converted to the production of the essentials for the successful prosecution of the war; and, therefore, the National Government which alone may cope with the unusual financial strain of war should not directly or indirectly destroy the efficiency of the State governments. There would be no counterbalancing benefit, and the States would have no alternative source from which to replenish revenues necessary to continue the protection of their credit or the performance of essential State functions and services.

The inexorable logic of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland et al.* (4 Wheat. 361, 431) laid the foundation and erected the main superstructure of the legal temple of intergovernmental tax immunity. This was in 1819. But from that day to this,

what he then wrote remains the law. It is just as true today as it was then:

That the power to tax involves the power to destroy.

It is equally true that the power to exempt persons, classes, or subjects from the operation of a tax involves the power to destroy the power which levied the tax.

A State of the American Union is either sovereign in the realm of undelegated taxing power or it is not. It can no more be subject to Federal control in this realm of its reserved taxing power than the Federal Government can be subject to State control within its recognized sphere of supremacy.

Never before in the history of American law has there been so bold an assertion of the hitherto unclaimed alleged right of the Federal Government to invade the sacred precincts of the undoubted right of the sovereign States to tax as they may see fit within their respective fields of their undelegated taxing powers. This bill, H. R. 6750, is so novel in this respect that it would be amusing were it not so lethal in its threat of destruction of the undelegated sovereign power of taxation in the States, yea, destruction of the very life of the States.

Of course, no such preposterous claim would be asserted but upon the shallow theory of wartime necessity. But this argument, plausible though it may seem at first blush, falls of its own weight when examined in the light of reason. The existence of any national emergency or of war itself does not nor can it change the structure of our Government. It neither adds to nor subtracts from the reserved powers of the States nor those delegated to the Federal Government. The Supreme Court of the United States has so frequently enunciated this axiom of law as to render the citation of authority unnecessary. It is manifestly no more permissible nor pardonable to transcend the limits of Federal power in war than in peace. Beyond the limit of Federal power there is no power, and any attempted assertion to the contrary is usurpation.

It has been suggested that this is but the first step of encroachment leading to the tenuous claim of the reciprocal right in the Federal Government to tax State, county, and municipal bonds. This is reasonable and may be so. But two wrongs never made a right—one rape never justifies another.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LESSON OF BATAAN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 9, 1942, the evening newspaper bore the headline "36,000 American and Filipino soldiers face death or capture on Bataan."

I could see their faces, bleeding and ghastly and their eyes burning with a fierce determination and a tinge of bitterness. To some other people they were a segment of the American Army that had with brilliant and heroic success fought a delaying action on that peninsula. But to themselves they were living individual human beings, young men who had not made the world what it was and who wanted to live as much as anyone. And all night I could feel their breath on my face and it was full of strength and sweat and tiredness.

The only thing I could think of was Herman Hagedorn's poem—especially the last lines which go like this:

We dead keep watch! You shall not sleep nor rest

We died. And now you others who must live
Shall do a harder thing than dying is—
For you shall think! And ghosts shall drive you on!

And I did think. I thought about how I had voted for the Selective Service Act and how some of those men on Bataan would not have been there if Congress had not passed that law. True, I did not see then and I do not know now what else we could have done. And I thought about how I had voted for going to war after Pearl Harbor—how, along with all the rest of the Congress I had voted for war because there just was nothing else we could have honorably done. But I also thought of the years that had followed the World War—how the world had slipped and slid from one tragic mistake to another because there was no real leadership for a constructive, strong peace, how if there had been such leadership those men on Bataan might not be dying, and all this might not have happened. The cleanness of our country's cause under all the circumstances I did not and do not for a moment doubt. But those men on Bataan were saying to me that there had been years when something better could have been done; they were saying that a way should have been found; and they were saying that they had folks that would miss them and long for them through dreary years if they died; and they were saying that there was one thing men like them would not stand for again. And that was failure to win this war which they had so nobly begun and then to really establish peace.

Hitler is an evil force. His government is an oppressive, heartless state. Japan's military are an evil force. Their government is an oppressive, heartless state within a state. But no reason, no logic, no explaining why does any good. The blood of those men on Bataan is on my hands just as it is on the hands of every person who has ever had the least position of responsibility or leadership since World War No. 1. It is on the hands of every man who ever made a speech that was not a good enough speech, or ever tried to correct the things that have been wrong with the world and failed to do it.

We are filled not only with a profound admiration and gratitude but with remorse and sorrow. It would not be too much to say that as we think of their story we are heartbroken. We shall give them heroes' places in all the American history books of the future. But it is not euough. Only one thing will be enough. Only one thing. And that is that "these dead shall not have died in vain," as Lincoln put it.

Bataan could not be relieved. General Wainwright and his white and brown soldiers could not be helped without killing countless other men like them. Undoubtedly those things are true. I do not know anything about military strategy. But I do know those of us who could not relieve them, who were told we had to leave them there have got to live in sight of their bloodshot eyes, in sound of their voices, and in reach of their breath until we remake the world. Yes; we have got to live that way until this war is won. But more than that we have got to live that way until a peace far, far stronger than the last peace has been built and until a world enough better than this world, enough better than the world of 1918–39, has been wrought out so that young men can live and have hope again. The men of Bataan, whether they lie there much too quietly or whether they go to spend bitter days in Japanese prison camps, have done their part and more. That better peace and that better world they have helped to make possible. But they cannot build them. Neither can anyone who is not in mind and spirit close, indeed, to what those men went through.

The only kind of men who can make that kind of peace and build that kind of world are men who cannot and will not escape for even an hour from the searing glance of those American and Filipino men who died upon Bataan Peninsula.

May God give us such men. I have faith He will.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at this epic of American heroism I am impelled to give voice to certain things which I see possibly impending in the future. Our country and the nations with which we fight have suffered certain defeats. It is no wonder. Any free people operates inevitably under certain handicaps when confronted by enslaved people at war. Our strength will come when our spirit is strong to meet all things. I do not think we have yet met the most severe blow. I do not know when it may come, but it is hard for me to believe that dictatorships like the Nazi dictatorship and like the Japanese have not laid plans deep enough and clever enough so that some day in the future our country will be wracked by attacks such as we have not yet seen. Just when it will come I do not know, neither does anybody else. I pray God it will not come, but I think it important that our people be braced for the possibility that on a day previously prepared these people may strike—strike through sabotage in certain places in our Nation. I know our F. B. I. and our Army and Navy intelligence are the best in the world, and certainly up to date they have done a remarkably effective job. I think their toughest days lie yet ahead. What I fear is that a spirit of criticism of the other fellow—I am not talking about an administration, but I am talking about a spirit on the part of one group of people saying everything would be all right if only that bunch over there were doing its part, and the spirit of the other group saying that everything would be all right if certain other fellows would do their part. This can grow. It can be fostered. It is possible to foster a spirit of uncertainty and confusion of

suspicion and distrust among us. It is possible that further victories will be won by Germany and Japan, and it may be then that the darkest hour yet will come on our country. I want us to be ready for it because out of that darkest hour will emerge a Nation even stronger than we have ever been before, a Nation that can feel the breath of men who died on Bataan on its very face, as most of our people do now. And Hitler, however clever his plans may be, and however far they may go, and wherever they may strike, is not going to be able to rock this country. We will pass through it and we will pass through it safely and we will pass through it stronger than we were before. I say these things also because I believe it important for people around the world to know that America is prepared to do whatever she needs to do in these darkest hours.

A singleness of purpose on the part of every single soul in Washington will awaken that same singleness of purpose throughout this Nation. It is simply not true that men and women in the Government lack devotion or earnestness, but I am not so sure but what the people are ahead of Washington in this respect even now. I am sure that as realization of the meaning of some of these disasters comes to them they will become not embittered, but they will learn, as you and I must learn, that we pass now through the valley of the shadow of death for democracy itself and that the hope of the future lies in our preparation for whatever may be in store for us.

I have not one shadow of doubt in my mind about what the final outcome of this struggle will be. The reason I have no doubt is because I believe with all my heart and soul in the kind of God that brought man onto this earth, not that he might be mocked with self-destruction, but that he might find resources in his mind and soul to believe there is a way out of whatever difficulties and dangers may arise. I believe God has made the soul and spirit of men even in death stronger than anything else in the whole world. This is and must be our ultimate resource. It cannot and will not fail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a paper on taxation by Mr. John F. Selle, of Gainesville, Fla.; and in another place to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short article from the Bricklayers Union Journal and a letter from Mr. Harry Stevenson, president of the International Molders and Foundry Workers Union of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND FINANCE COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House previously made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Certainly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a letter sent to the New York Times by James G. McDonald, a member of the Board of Education of New York, and also an editorial on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND FINANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to inform the House of what is going on in my State in regard to finance companies, and I am sure the same thing is going on in other States. One minute was not sufficient time, and that is the reason I have asked more time. The gentleman from Florida, Congressman PETERSON, and all members of the Florida delegation have been cooperating with me in this matter. When I was down in Florida invariably when I ran into a small automobile agent or dealer I was told of the trouble that they were having with the finance companies, and I wondered at that time why we had not heard of this trouble before, but it is clear to me now. At the time I discussed the matter with them I wired to Mr. Donald Nelson and Mr. Leon Henderson and told them something must be done to relieve these automobile dealers, and that it must be done at once. I got a reply wire back, which went to Florida and came up here, and came to me after I got back from Florida. The wire came from Mr. Cyrus McCormick, in the Office of Price Administrator. This is the wire I received:

> Please supply detailed information regarding finance companies demanding interest and principal. Have heard this frequently suggested, but never proved.

At first the wire offended me, but I thought for a little while, and I came to the conclusion that the reason it has never been proved is because the finance companies are a little too shrewd. I want to repeat something I said earlier in the day, and that is that the Government has frozen the sales of automobiles. Dealers can sell these automobiles only to certain people, and sometimes those people have cars already, and many of our small dealers, the ones that you and I represent, the men who hold maybe 15 to 25 automobiles, are unable to sell any of their cars. To give you a little information as to how these finance companies operate, I want to read a statement. First, let me say that I know these things to be true, and I challenge anyone to contradict it, including the finance companies, because they cannot do it. Some of those companies have been fair and I am not condemning them. And I would like to name the companies which have been unfair in the State of Florida, but, if I did so, they would know immediately who gave that information, and the dealers are afraid to say anything about it publicly, because they know they are at the mercy of these finance companies. So I asked for a statement, and here is how they operate:

When a dealer buys a new car from the factory, the finance companies pay the factory, and the dealer gives the finance company a demand note or sometimes a 90-day note, and a time trust receipt. It has been the practice in normal times for the dealer to reduce the amount of the notes every 90 days, or 6 months, or according to the particular finance company he was doing business with. This practice was all right, when the times were normal and there was a steady flow of business. The cars moved right out, and there was not much chance of having to reduce these notes. Now, however, under the Government freeze order, and the fact that through the rationing program the cars are not being sold, the finance companies are requiring the dealers to pay interest on these notes, and some companies are requiring reduction on the notes or additional principal payments. These things, of course, work a hardship on the dealers as many of us do not have the cash to meet these requirements, and yet if we do not, naturally we can have the cars taken away from us under the terms of the notes and trust receipts and in many instances dealers have invested considerable cash in the cars, and the finance companies would benefit by selling the cars eventually and realizing on the full price of the car.

The dealers do not want anyone to lose anything. They do, however, feel that the finance companies should be required to stay the collection of principal payments and interest on these notes because the sale of the cars has been materially restricted under Government orders, and a dealer who did sell them to meet the finance company requirements would be violating the law. It seems only fair that the finance companies who, in the past, have profited greatly through the dealers' efforts should be required by the Government to cease their demands until the cars can be sold and not harass dealers.

I believe that you and I agree with them in that.

Many dealers stocked up with new cars late last fall in anticipation of the curtailment of new-car production, not expecting a stop order by the Government, and these cars are now on the dealers' showrooms and have been there long enough for the maturity dates to be coming close, so you can see why we are just beginning to hear from them. That is the reason for the necessity of immediate remedial action on someone's part.

The requirement that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can purchase cars from dealers when such cars were bought after January 16, 1942, does not help one particle, because most of the cars were on dealers' showrooms before that time. They are new 1942 cars and cannot be sold except to essential users and there are very few of them able to buy The dealers have expressed themselves many times that they are willing to sacrifice to help in the war effort, but they are not willing for the rich finance companies to take advantage of the situation and bleed the dealers for cash that they will sorely need later on in order to keep their doors open, just because the finance companies have the legal right to do so.

I agree that they should not do it.

It is one thing to tell a person that they cannot sell their merchandise which brings

them their bread and butter, and still ask them to pay moneys on that merchandise, but it would be a better thing to tell these finance companies that they, too, must wait and share the burden After all they are still making profits from the retail contracts that the dealers sell to them on the used cars that they sell.

Now, the reason this matter has not come to our attention, the reason Mr. McCormick cannot get proof of it is because those finance companies are smart enough that they will not write one of these dealers and tell him, "You pay the interest and curtailment and the flat charge that they make or we will come in and take your automobile away." If they write to one of the dealers, they simply make a very fair proposition to him, and then they come around and tell him personally, "We can take these cars. We do not have to go through a court process, so you had better come across and do what we want you to do."

I have here a letter in my hand. I am not going to read it, because it would disclose who it came from to the finance company and get him into trouble, but it is a letter in which they absolutely demand a larger payment than he is possibly able to make under present conditions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. They tell him in his letter, they say, "After you have made this payment, then we might do something to help you out, but you have first got to make the payment." They are going to the dealers and saying, "We are going to liquidate our business." In other words, what they are actually saying to them is, "We are going to close shop and we are going to have these payments, and if it is necessary for us to take the automobile on which you have made large payments already upon which you have paid interest, upon which you have accumulated overhead, unless you pay us we are going to take those cars."

What they are planning to do is to take those automobiles and sell them at a large profit.

Let me go a little further. I could give you a great deal of information along this line, and when the proper time comes I will do it, and I will get witnesses who are not afraid to testify, but some action must be taken, because the responsibility is on all of us. When the Government made this freezing order and stopped their sale, then the Government had another responsibility, and that was to see that the finance companies did not profit by this act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel that this is a place where we should see to it that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some other agency should be in a position to step in and save some of these men?

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In addition, let me tell you something further which they are doing. Take Frigidaire and almost all those companies producing electric refrigerators, and many other small businesses. They are financed by these finance companies, and they are doing the same thing to them. We are going to have to have legislation in that regard.

I will tell you something further that I have from the inside, and that is that when we started this war program the President wanted to encourage existing finance companies to finance as far as possible, and they have financed some of the war contracts; but today they are retarding those contracts because they want to run things as they like and not as we would like to have them run. This is entirely wrong, and if they do not do something to correct the thing, I shall be willing to bring in an investigating resolution to investigate every one of them that has anything to do with a war contract. I think they will be glad to cooperate before we get through with them.

In regard to what the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] said, if he is still present I want to say I have introduced a bill today because I know that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not have the proper authority at the present time, I have introduced a bill today to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend these dealers that amount of money which is necessary to protect their equity over whatever period is necessary; and when they do that they are immediately subrogated to the rights of these finance companies. They do not have to say, "If you are willing to sell this paper we will buy it"; they can give these dealers a check and they can take paper up I think it is a bill that ought to be passed, because it is the only way we are going to help these dealers unless the Government comes in and absorbs every one of these automobiles.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HENDRICKS I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words the Government says to these dealers: "You cannot sell your cars except at a certain time and only to certain people;" yet their cost, overhead, and wages are going on all the time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And there ought to be machinery whereby they should not be exposed to the danger of being put into bankruptcy or failure during that period.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Absolutely, and the organization that we would not want to profiteer because of some war order is the finance company, because we know they make their money all the time, and they are doing exactly what the gentleman says.

I hope the committee to which this bill is referred will give us some prompt action, because something must be done and I am going to insist on it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines [Mr. ELIZALDE] before the Amen Corner Club of Pittsburgh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr HOFFMAN] I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today and to insert therein certain excerpts from letters and statements as to the checks he received for the speeches he referred to in his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Thursday, April 9, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, April 14, 1942, in room 1310, House Office Building. Business to be considered: Hearings on S. 2025, to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service:

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1562. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 1, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination, of the Tensas River, La., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1563. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1564. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Tracy; to the Committee on Claims.

1565. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $5,420,000, and proposed provisions relative to the same appropriation, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 697); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

1566. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for his disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1567. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1568. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, amounting to $1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and 1943 (H. Doc. No. 698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6818. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1996. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1997. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr BEITER:

H. R. 6917 A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and to the widows, children, and dependents of certain persons, injured while performing duty as firemen on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6918 A bill for the relief of distributors, agents, and dealers of automobiles, motor trucks, and other motor vehicles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6919 A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto new sections authorizing authorized agents of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, or of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, cable, radio or any other similar messages or communications, and the testimony concerning same admissible evidence; requiring telegraph and cable companies to furnish such agencies with copies of communications in their possession or under their possession or under their control upon request; providing punishment for violations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MASON:

H. R. 6920 A bill to remove the requirement of a fee for the payment of a money order at an office other than that on which the order is drawn; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr POAGE:

H. R. 6921 A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6922. A bill for the relief of Mrs. August McCall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 6923. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 6924. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6925. A bill to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, esquire, for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2662. By Mr HOPE: Petition urging the Federal Government to take action to prevent the giving or dispensing of alcoholic liquors to soldiers or sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2663. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Assembly of the Legislature of the State of New York, providing for the enactment of House bill 6806; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2664. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of the local federation No. 92, of Federated Shop Crafts members, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Smith, Boren, and Wickersham bills, and urging retention of labor laws now existing; to the Committee on Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou O Eternal God, who are the Judge and Supreme Ruler of the Universe, we pray that Thou wilt inspire us with a clear vision of Thy holy will and a cheerful obedience to Thy laws.

We humbly confess that again and again we follow the desires of our own hearts, placing our confidence in human ingenuity and material strength apart from Thee. Grant that when Thy judgments are upon the earth the inhabitants thereof may learn righteousness and obedience.

In all the difficult experiences of life may we never give ourselves over to bitter rebellion and sullen resignation, but help us to sing the songs of hope and of high resolve and endeavor, confident that Thou wilt lead us out of darkness into the dawn of a better day.

We pray that the purposes and plans of these Thy servants and all whom Thou hast called to positions of trust and leadership in the life of our Republic may be filled with that wisdom which cometh from above. May the glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, be Thine forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE S. FORRY LAUCKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce the death of one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my privilege to know. Mr. S. Forry Laucks, of York, Pa., an industrial leader of much importance to the Nation, one who was beloved by his employees and who join me today in expressing deep

sorrow at his passing. He was owner of the York Safe & Lock Co., whose business activities covered the entire world and whose product can be found in every part of the civilized world today.

Mr. Laucks was a farsighted gentleman, intensely patriotic, and was the first industrialist in the Nation to obtain an Army contract.

What was a cornfield 9 months ago is now covered with a tremendous ordnance plant making contribution to our national defense of much importance. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I voice the sentiment of this legislative body in expressing our sorrow. The fine spirit characteristic of this fine American will mean much to the Nation, and particularly to my section, in the years to come.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record]

S. FORRY LAUCKS

Small enterprises the country over sharing in war production jobbed out to them on subcontracts can thank S. Forry Laucks for the experiment which led to adoption of this national policy.

Laucks, farsighted industrialist, who died last week, had risen to the top the hard way. He started as an office boy for the York Safe & Lock Co. Three years later, when the firm was on the verge of bankruptcy, Laucks became general manager. He not only put it back on its feet but developed it into a world-wide business, equipping principal banks in this and other countries with vaults whose mechanisms were works of outstanding precision.

Pitching into the problems of defense, Laucks was the first industrialist to obtain an Army contract since the last war. He recognized the value of the skill and tools in small independent plants. He worked out the York plan, by which small plants cooperated in handling armament contracts which none of them could have assumed individually.

Today that system has spread defense employment to thousands of men in small mills, machine shops, and two-by-four establishments.

Laucks was the all-too-rare type of liberal industrialist. Pennsylvania will miss his able counsel—in industry, and in politics, in which he was a pioneer New Dealer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a short editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF PIERRE LAVAL AS PREMIER OF FRANCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, today a traitor receives his 30 pieces of silver. Pierre Laval has by order of his Nazi master become Premier of the so-called French Government at Vichy. This so-called government does not represent the people of France. It is but an agency of Adolf Hitler.

For nearly 2 years we have hoped that the aged Marshal Petain might be able to salvage some semblance of liberty for the French people. Today all France except such portions of the empire as fight with the United Nations under the leadership of the brave and patriotic General DeGaulle are under the complete control of Germany. And what has this policy of cowardly appeasement secured for the French people? Is their lot any better than that of the heroic Dutch or the brave Norwegians or the indomitable Yugoslavs? At least these people, along with the Greeks, the Czechs, and the Poles, have the respect and admiration of mankind, while the French of Vichy have nothing but the contempt of their conquerors and their friends.

What has French appeasement done to the rest of the world? Vichy France appeased Japan and made possible the Japanese conquest of the Philippines, the Dutch Indies, Singapore, India, and the Far East by turning French Indochina over to the "protective" custody of the Japs. Vichy France appeased Hitler by using American food and oil to supply Rommel's army in North Africa, thereby making necessary continued war in that portion of the world.

Does a Member of this House believe for 1 minute that the arch traitor of modern times will hesitate to turn Madagascar over to the Japs and Dakar to the Germans? Do you wonder why Axis submarines have been able to operate so freely in the Caribbean Sea and off the northeast coast of Brazil? Where do you suppose they are being supplied? If they have not been supplied at Martinique, it is a perfectly safe assumption that with Hitler's stooge in power in Vichy they will be supplied there unless we act now to make it impossible.

The Free French, the real representatives of the French people, are our friends. We should make them our allies. We should aid them in taking possession of these danger points. We should do it today, April 14, 1942. We should repudiate any policy of appeasement. England appeased Hitler and later Mussolini. We appeased Japan. What were the results? Stabs in the back. So it will always be. Thousands of American boys have died in the Philippines because Vichy France was ready even under Marshal Petain to appease Japan. Laval has proved himself to be the enemy of all free people. Let America act today to aid the Free French. Let us have an end to appeasement.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, today we learn that Pierre Laval has become vice premier of Vichy France. Some say this means the delivery of the French Fleet to the Axis. Surely France has not become so depraved. Surely every Frenchman must know that if this fleet is delivered to Hitler, France will never have another fleet regardless of who wins the war.

Mr. Speaker, if I could have the attention of M. Laval this minute, I would like to say to him this: Sir, America is going to hold France strictly accountable for all contributions she may make to the aid and comfort of America's enemies, who are also the enemies of France. If the French Fleet is delivered to the Nazis, sir, it will be the complete and inglorious end of the French Nation. The blood of American heroes of yesterday will cry out from the very soil of France itself in protest of such treachery and betrayal The blood of American heroes now dying for human decency will have its revenge against such French duplicity. Generations of Americans yet unborn will never forget nor forgive such an insult to American faith and honor. Sir, if you want to incur the profound, eternal contempt and hatred of a long, powerful, and honorable friend, if you want to lose the support and incur the enmity for the next 1,000 years of the world's greatest Nation, then, sir, deliver the French Fleet to the Axis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein a statement by the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce on the remarkable work that the industries of New Jersey are doing in the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in the Atlantic Legionnaire, entitled "Civil Liberties."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter written to the editor of the New York Times by a distinguished former Member of the House, Hon. William S. Bennet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PHEIFFER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, in my home town of Malone, N. Y., I have a friend who owns and operates his own

drug store. On April 1 he heard of the ruling of the War Production Board and would not sell any tooth paste unless someone turned in an old tube. Many of the people were kind of provoked at him; consequently, they went two doors down the street and stocked up at Woolworth's, where they did not have to turn in any old tubes.

This in itself is a small matter. There are going to be more of these rules put into effect, but I think they should be put into effect in such manner that everyone starts even and not penalize the small business man just because he is patriotic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FLANAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. William Green to me and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE SITUATION OF FRANCE TODAY

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks of the two gentlemen from Texas who just preceded me in regard to the situation of France today. I am sure that history will prove that our position with regard to the French and their dealings with the Germans has so far netted us nothing and that if our position in this respect is to be continued it will result in disaster. Certainly the events of the world in the past few years have proven beyond the possibility of a doubt that no policy of appeasement can be successful, that no policy of appeasement can bring anything but ultimate disaster to the nation which practices it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think this Nation should proceed without delay to take possession by force of all French territory which we believe to be necessary to the successful prosecution of this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INCREASED PAY FOR SOLDIERS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, scarcely a day passes that several young men, splendid young Americans, do not drop into my office and pay me a personal visit as they come from my district in upstate New York down to the great training camps of the South. In each case it is a great pleasure to witness the patriotism and loyalty they manifest in every statement they make to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House give consideration as early as possible to the bill raising the pay of soldiers from $21 to $42. This bill recently passed the Senate and is about to be brought before the House. It is my hope that these sterling young men will be rewarded for their patriotic efforts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] may have an unlimited leave of absence because of a serious illness in his immediate family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about appeasement. I think it is all sound. We have heard a good deal about subversive interests and the necessity of taking them into custody and protecting this country. Nevertheless, you find Harry Bridges running at large. If ever there was a question of appeasement, of mealy-mouthed, weak-sister handling by Government officials, there is a great example. Are they afraid of him? Are they afraid of his power? You are witnessing the effect of his destruction of our merchant marine right now. You cannot rely on him nor his teachings. Nevertheless, Madam Perkins, your Attorney General, and those who are afraid of Harry Bridges are letting him destroy those parts of this Government that would help our defense program. You had better think that over.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INCREASED PAY FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I informed the House that Oklahoma was second to Oregon in percentage of voluntary enlistments in the armed forces. Today Oklahoma is first among our 48 States.

I also point with pride to the fact that Oklahoma has received the National Safety Council award, with all the 48 States competing. It has also won for the fifth consecutive time the award from the 14 Southern States in the southern division.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the late Governor E. W. Marland, whom all of you knew, and who formerly served as a Member of the House, is due a great part of this credit, as well as the State senators and representatives in Oklahoma who helped enact the legislation. Also, Walter B. Johnson, the present director of public safety, and our Governor, Leon C. Phillips, and Harold Mueller, president of the State safety commission, and the citizenship as a whole deserves commendation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

IMPORTANCE OF A SOUND TREASURY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, words sometimes are cheap. It requires some intestinal fortitude at a time like this when we talk about appeasement and we are discouraged about things that are happening. Do not stretch out too far; do not go beyond your ability to protect yourself. We should know our own limitations. It is very well to say that the men in the Army should be paid additional money and I quite agree with that, but we should do something back home to stop the radical labor leaders and those who would demand such high and exorbitant wages in industry, both management and labor, and those who wish to have many things that are nonessential for the people of this country at the cost of the overburdened Government Treasury because the country cannot stand the enormous cost. I think that the men in

the armed services ought to receive as much or more than anybody else in this country. They work 24 hours a day and subject themselves to death, but where are you going to get the money? You have got to realize that you cannot fight a war if you do not have a sound Treasury. We cannot fight a war successfully if we cannot finance the Army. We cannot fight a war if we cannot finance the Navy, and we cannot fight a war if we do not finance the Air Service. All these things must be taken into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

You who would keep on spending and spending so the people back home think you are an angel for giving them something for nothing, beware; you must place additional burdens on them in the form of taxation. Your people will have to pay the bills for your folly of appropriation after appropriation. Be sensible; be sane; be wise. For every dollar expended we should get additional taxes. Ask yourself the question, Where will we get the money? Can the Treasury stand it? Can the country survive if we have a financial break-down?

Can we survive if the President and Congress keep on as they have in the past several years in waste and extravagance? I say there is a wreck ahead if you do not get more wisdom and get it quick.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Electrical Workers' Journal entitled "Businessman's Attitude," and also I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PAY OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the increase of the soldiers' pay, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that at the time the original conscription bill was introduced, my recollection is that it provided pay for the conscripted boys at the rate of $5 per month. When the bill came to the House it carried pay at the rate of $21 a month. When the bill was before this House for final consideration I tried to amend it by providing for a base pay of $50 per month. I think any Member of Congress or any Member of the Senate of the United States ought to be ashamed of himself if he would ask a man to serve in the United States Army and take the chances on his life for less than $50 per month. I sincerely hope that when the matter comes before this House for action the House will act unanimously in favor of the raise in the pay of these men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NEWSPAPER COLUMNISTS AND THE WAR

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the delicate questions that is now being discussed, and will be discussed very much in the next few months, is how far in this great crisis we are going to allow the newspaper columnists to go in criticism and how far those who talk over the radio are going to be able to criticize and find fault. I have read much discussion of the subject and it is worthy of our careful thought and study. Nowhere have I found it more carefully discussed than in a broadcast of Raymond Gram Swing. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert this broadcast as a part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Little by little the picture begins to piece together of the effort the United States is making in the southwest Pacific. The first American troops to arrive in Australia were on their way to the Philippines, and being too late to be landed there, continued their voyage and reached Australia just before Christmas. These troops left the United States before the outbreak of the war. They were not soldiers comprising r definite unit but were being sent as replacements. Since that time definite units have arrived in Australia in an intermittent stream. Among the first were air units complete with ground forces and planes.

There also are infantry units. The forces already in Australia are great enough for a correspondent to remark that in some Australian cities they outnumber the Australian soldiers to be seen on the streets by as much as 3 to 1.

If a convoy can cross the Pacific to Australia at an average of 10 knots—which is guessing it high—and if the distance from our west coast to Australia is 7,000 miles (one-third the distance around the globe), the actual crossing will take some 29 days. To bring a convoy together, to assemble the forces that are to use it, and to lead them, takes weeks. And it is another guess that at the very least 2 months are needed to transform a decision to send forces to Australia into the actual arrival of the convoy at its Australian destination. Say that a convoy arrived in Australia today, the decision to send it must have been made not later than January 19. The probability is that several convoys have arrived in Australia since that first consignment which had failed to reach the Philippines. And the decision to send them logically must have been made before the middle of January. That brings us back in time to the visit of Prime Minister Churchill, when problems of grand strategy were under consideration. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill conferred and parted, and nothing about grand strategy was revealed—not until troops arrived in Northern Ireland, and then this week when we find Australia already alive with American soldiers and flyers. Then on February 22 the President finally sent the order to General MacArthur to go to Australia to take over the supreme command. The General put off his departure until a few days ago, and whether intentionally or otherwise, he did not put in his appearance until he had a sizable American force as nucleus of his command.

Now I ask you to go back over the weeks preceding Washington's Birthday, with remembrance of what people were saying in this country. It was the time of rising impatience. Some critics needled the President. Many asked what the Navy was doing. The impression could have been made at the time that only the critics knew how to conduct a war and that up at the top there was nothing but inaction. There was, in this time, deep and most human discouragement throughout the country. The Japanese victories were humiliating, and the inactivity, for so it appeared to be, was increasingly unbearable. Well, there should be a good many red faces in the country today among those who spoke and wrote most ignorantly, and there should be an upsurge of trust among those who, not wishing to weaken morale by public criticism, still were discouraged more than the truth warranted.

This has been lesson No. 1 of America's war on how not to behave in a democracy. It may stimulate more voluntary discipline in the future. For without discipline no war can be won, and the voluntary kind is the only discipline, in the nature of things, that keeps a democracy democratic. Part of this lesson has been that there always are persons ready to exploit public impatience and despair. That is the right of these persons, but it now can be seen that exhortations to patience and confidence would have better fitted the truth. The critics did not further the war effort. They did not speed those troops to Australia by a single hour. They did nothing to hasten General MacArthur's appointment. But they did make a great many people think that their leaders were not doing what precisely they were doing.

Another aspect of the grand strategy that was decided a good while back was sending General Stillwell to Chungking. That was known at the time, but the meaning of it only became clear gradually. First, this American officer became member of the staff of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Today he becomes the commanding officer of two Chinese armies in Burma. He operates under the Generalissimo. So it was decided some while ago that this intertwining of the American with the Chinese interests should be transformed into reality on the field of battle. In other words, the men who are responsible for the grand strategy saw deeply and acted early. How wisely they acted only time will tell. We still know only what we see in Australia and other places. It may be galling not to know just what is being done to meet a certain situation. But this is a war of survival and the war is going to be won only by well-planned action at the front and by unity and work at home. Action at the front, to be effective, has to be prepared in secrecy. Well, today it can be acknowledged that a great deal has been prepared in secrecy, and the trigger jumpers who found fault so immodestly just didn't know what they were talking about. And this is an appropriate moment to expect a rededication to unity. And an ingredient of national unity is trust in leadership until that leadership has demonstrated that it is not leading. Another ingredient is patience. There are others, but it is chiefly these which have been lacking.

WAGES AND HOURS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately from labor leaders about the propaganda to set aside the wage-hour law. Just look at this labor-paid page ad in yesterday's Washington Post, full of untruth. That is a very different propaganda on the side of labor, now taking the aggressive to keep itself above the Government. I have just come back from my district, where I held open forums in all 10 county seats with large attendance everywhere, and I say to my friends the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that the people of northeast Kansas are 95 percent with them in setting aside the wage-hour law in defense for the duration, also the closed shop, and limiting the profits of production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two places.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF SOLDIERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who spoke about the soldiers getting more pay, to the fact that I introduced a bill some time ago which provides that the soldiers in the combat area and the combat service receive the same compensation that the workers at home are receiving in the industrial plants. I hope the gentleman will get back of that bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And I say to the gentleman that I worked for years and years to readjust the compensation of the veterans of the World War, and that now is the time for us to adjust the compensation of these boys while they are living and can use it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suggest the gentleman get back of that bill I introduced. It is a good one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AIRPLANE ENGINE FACTORY DENIED ST. LOUIS—INSUFFICIENT POWER

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of April there appeared in the press and particularly in the St. Louis press, an article to the effect that the city of St. Louis had been denied an airplane-engine factory, a $30,000,000 airplane-engine factory, because of the lack of sufficient power. That must have carried with it a note of irony for some of us, in view of the debates held in this House only a few days ago, in which the Bull Shoals and the Table Rock Dams in Arkansas and Missouri were denied by this House, even though the President of the United States, the War Production Board, the War Department, all said they were necessary in view of what the Army had in mind for that area.

The amendment to strike Bull Shoals was offered by the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr COCHRAN].

Los Angeles gets its power from Boulder Dam, 240 miles away. St. Louis is only 215 miles from Table Rock and Bull Shoals. These dams could be built in 2½ years and would produce 880,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power annually.

Arkansas has been specifically denied one aluminun plant and one synthetic-rubber plant for lack of sufficient power.

I quote from a St. Louis paper:

CITY VIRTUALLY RULED OUT AS PLANT SITE—NOT ENOUGH POWER GUARANTEED FOR ENGINE FACTORY, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD OFFICIAL SAYS

(By Sam O'Neal)

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Edwin M. Martin, chairman of the plant site board of the War Production Board, which passes on all new war production plant locations, said today St. Louis has been virtually eliminated from consideration as the site of a $30,000,000 airplane engine factory because of inadequate power facilities.

Martin told the Star-Times the past record of labor unions engaged in war production in St. Louis was not the deciding factor.

"The proposed new plant will require a power load of 20,000 to 30,000 kilowatts," Martin said "The power division of War Production Board and officials of Union Electric Co. of Missouri agree that much power cannot be guaranteed in St. Louis

"Two other cities have a surplus of power for the project and we must take that into consideration. As matters stand now, St. Louis is about out of the picture."

CLARK ALSO INFORMED

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, who, with his Missouri colleague, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, has been working to obtain the plane engine plant for St. Louis, said he also had been advised today that lack of power had become what appeared to be an insurmountable barrier to St. Louis' prospects of getting the new industry

The Star-Times disclosed exclusively on January 28 that experts of the Federal Power Commission and the power division of War Production Board, headed by J A. Krug, were convinced that St. Louis industrial area would be confronted with a serious power shortage before the end of 1942, and had drafted a tentative plan for rationing power there.

Because of the power situation, Martin asserted in an interview with the Star-Times that the plant site board had not given serious consideration to the opposition in military and aviation circles to locating the plant in St. Louis because of the city's past labor record in plants with war contracts.

He said, however, that work stoppages, impeding war production in the St Louis industrial area prior to the Pearl Harbor attack would have been a formidable barrier if the power situation had not prevailed.

Some other War Production Board officials in conversations with the Star-Times used strong language to describe their attitude toward some labor leaders in St. Louis.

It also was learned that opposition to locating war plants in the St. Louis area still prevails in high military circles and among war industry leaders.

MANAGEMENT DUBIOUS

The Plant Site Board usually gives executives of companies for which new war production factories are being built some voice in selecting sites. It is known the management of the airplane-engine company was dubious about locating in St. Louis because of labor conditions.

Because this unfavorable attitude may make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for St. Louis to get any other war industries, several prominent persons here interested in the city's welfare are going ahead in their efforts to exact pledges from labor leaders that there will be no recurrence of labor troubles which have marred the city's past record.

The St. Louis labor supply, becoming an increasingly important factor in plant locations as the Nation heads into a possible manpower shortage this fall, has not been an issue in the Plant Site Board's consideration of the city for the engine plant, which will employ about 30,000 workers.

PRIORITIES OPENED FIELD

"Six months ago," Martin said, "it looked like there might be a serious shortage of labor in St. Louis. However, priorities have closed so many plants there that it now looks like the labor supply will be ample to meet the needs."

Thus only two obstacles, but both formidable, must be removed before St. Louis can hope to successfully bid for new war industries. They are: (1) Increased power facilities, and (2) improvement in the labor situation.

It was emphasized by Martin and others that allowances have been made, in forecasting a power shortage in St Louis, for the recent addition of 40,000 kilowatts of capacity by Union Electric and the plan to gain another additional 40,000 kilowatts soon, plus prospects of an additional 80,000 kilowatts under schedule

UNION ELECTRIC'S POSITION GIVEN

J. Wesley McAfee, president of Union Electric, told the Star-Times today: "If the Government wants to put the engine plant here, we'll deliver the power but then certain other Government plans for expansion of existing war facilities here will have to be foregone.

"The whole problem is simply a question of what the Government wants to do."

McAfee explained that three men from Union Electric went to Washington 2 weeks ago and discussed all the potentialities of the power situation here. The decision at that time was, he said, that if as-yet-unrevealed plans for the expansion of such plants as the TNT plant at Weldon Spring and the small-arms ammunition plant go through, there will not be power available for the proposed airplane-engine factory.

COMPANY'S POSITION

"I am in a somewhat peculiar position," said McAfee. "If I try to say that we are now delivering all the power we can generate, anyone can check up and find that it isn't true. We are adding 40,000 kilowatts within the next few days. In September we'll add 80,000 more, and at the beginning of next year there will be another 80,000. That means a total of 200,000 more kilowatts, enough to handle easily the 30,000 increase the engine plant would mean.

"But the point is there are certain plans under oot, plans I am not at liberty to reveal, that call for he use of all that power.

"Now, of course, if the Government decides it doesn't want to follow those plans but instead wants to put the new plant here, we can deliver the power. But there will have to be a decision."

POSSIBILITIES OF SAVING

Asked whether reduction in civilian use might give the company enough additional power to fill expansion plans and the engine factory as well, McAfee said a survey had been made and it was determined that strictest restrictions on civilian use would increase the available power for industrial use by only about 1 percent

Possible curtailment of nonwar industrial effort had also been considered, he stated, but Washington seemed inclined to let priority restrictions cut down such industries rather than close them by edict to gain more power.

"If the Government wants us to cut off those consumers, however," McAfee said, "we're willing to do it. The policy of doing whatever the Government wants is not only the policy we want to follow but the policy we have to follow."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] is here with his Arkansas Valley Authority again.

Now, the gentleman gives us the startling information that due to a shortage of power, the city of St. Louis, of which I have the honor to represent in part, is going to be deprived of a $30,000,000 defense plant. Now, what are the facts? Mr. Donald Nelson felt that St. Louis would be an excellent place for either a bomber plant or an airplane engine plant. At the outset another official took the position that due to a labor situation in St. Louis the Army Air Corps did not want to go into that city. When it was shown that there was no labor trouble in St. Louis, that all of the labor organizations pledged themselves to cooperate in every manner, shape or form with the Government, then someone raised the question as to whether or not there was sufficient power available in St. Louis for such a plant.

Now, as far as the city of St. Louis is concerned, I can say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I think it will be able to take care of itself. The gentleman from Arkansas, however, makes this statement, not for the purpose of advising the House that St. Louis might lose a national defense plant due to a shortage of power, but he seeks to create the impression that if the Congress authorizes the construction of the power dams at Table Rock on the White River in Missouri and at Bull Shoals in Arkansas, power would be available for a national defense plant in St. Louis.

First of all, let me say that officials who should know what they are talking about say there is not a shortage of power in St. Louis. Assuming that there was a shortage of power in St. Louis, the gentleman from Arkansas knows full well that the power dams at Bull Shoals and Table Rock could not be completed until 1944 or 1945, and then only if turbines were available. Now I am advised that it is no easy matter to get priorities for turbines. If anyone doubts that statement, let him ask the Federal Power Commission. Aside from the turbines, of course, everyone knows that copper is absolutely at a premium. Transmission lines are needed in connection with any power dam.

I do not want to convey the impression that it would be necessary to construct transmission lines all the way from Bull Shoals and Table Rock to St. Louis, but it might be interesting for one to consider the distance between St. Louis and these two projects. Table Rock is just north of the Arkansas boundary line and is approximately 275 miles from St. Louis. To reach Bull Shoals it is necessary to cross into Arkansas and travel 10 miles, if not more. I do not feel that anybody will question the statement that 275 miles is quite a distance.

Any statement such as the gentleman from Arkansas makes relative to a shortage of power in St. Louis is certainly not going to remove my objections to the construction of the power dams at Table Rock and Bull Shoals. I do not feel that the House of Representatives should authorize an expenditure of $87,500,000, when everyone in authority admits that with no interruption whatsoever from the standpoint of securing the necessary material, the projects could not be completed until 1944 or 1945.

In northern Arkansas you have one outstanding national defense plant, an aluminum project. The Government is building a $20,000,000 power project to serve the aluminum plant. This is in itself an example that the Government would not wait for the construction of a hydroelectric plant either at Norfork, Bull Shoals, or Table Rock for power for a national defense plant that it wants in operation at an early date. If it is feasible for the Government to construct a $20,000,000 power project for the aluminum plant, would it not be justified in constructing a plant with whatever amount was necessary to operate a bomber or engine plant in St. Louis, provided those in authority felt that was necessary from the standpoint of prosecuting the war? You could construct a power plant on the Mississippi River in St. Louis, generate power from coal, as several private plants are now doing there, and complete it in months, where it would take years to secure power transmitted to St. Louis from the power projects which the gentleman from Arkansas advocates.

I will tell the gentleman from Arkansas now that my answer is "No" insofar as Table Rock and Bull Shoals are concerned. He cannot change my opinion by simply calling attention of the House to the fact that there was a newspaper article that indicated St. Louis might lose a $30,000,000 plant due to a shortage of power. His project certainly would not help this situation in the least. Therefore, when the War Department civil functions appropriation bill returns to the House, I will continue my opposition to the two projects which he advances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun of April 5, 1942, by Mr. Arnold Sullivan, entitled "Sixth Columnists."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SECREST was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Evening Star on the death of the bandsmen on the ill-fated Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, having lately returned from a short visit to my district, as most of the Members have been privileged to do, I feel under the necessity of calling attention to one problem that is very, very acute and that is causing a great deal of uncertainty and unrest at this time. I think it may safely be said that under the provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which in effect provides that private property shall not be taken without due process of law and without just compensation, the effect of the order of the Price Administrator freezing stocks of new automobiles and trucks was to seize and confiscate the property of private individuals and corporations without making any provision for compensation for the property in effect seized.

Now, we have recognized the justice of the fifth amendment to the Constitution in law after law down through the years. The most recent debates on the subject were in connection with the war powers bill, where this Congress endeavored to very jealously and zealously protect the rights of private property that might be taken in connection with the war effort and to provide for compensation. It has been recognized in the theory of eminent domain, the right to compensation where property is taken for public use. While the analogy may not be exactly accurate, the effect, insofar as the automobile retail dealers are concerned, is exactly the same.

Let me cite a concrete case of a dealer in my district. When that freezing order went into effect he had some three-hundred-odd new cars in his stock. He occupies not only one garage, but several. He occupies other buildings where these new cars and trucks are stored.

In the normal conduct of his business, that would be a small number of cars for him to dispose of at retail. The freezing order caught him with those cars. It caught many other dealers with new cars on their floors. Many of them are financially able to handle the situation, perhaps, for a short time, but many of the small dealers have those cars financed on floor plans by finance companies. Now they are compelled to sit there and await the opportunity to sell a new car on a certificate issued by the local rationing board. How many cars are being sold under this rationing program? The number is infinitesimal. All rationing boards throughout the country are of the opinion—and I have contacted a number of them—that the program is not working out. If the present program is continued these dealers are all going to be faced with ultimate bankruptcy.

To me it is an unfair proposition to say to a man who is in a legitimate business of selling transportation in the form of new cars, "Your business is going to be closed up. Your property is going to be frozen. You cannot dispose of your stocks except under rationing regulations." The patriotic dealer responded splendidly, but had every reason to expect that the Government would protect him in some reasonable way so that he would

not be forced to lose not only his job and income but also his life's work.

Mr. Speaker, such a situation confronts the dealers of America today, and a good Government must not expect these dealers to accept their fate without a fight.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. Does the Government pretend to make any arrangements by which they will take over this stock, or do they let the dealers simply sit there and take all the loss?

Mr. KEEFE. The situation at the present time is that the Government has done nothing. There are a number of bills pending in this House and in the Senate that propose to give some relief, through the medium of loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other types of relief to those dealers. There is a bill pending which proposes to make some concessions and protection in the matter of leaseholds and rents. It seems to me, however, that when the Government froze that stock of new cars they had in mind some governmental necessity for those cars. By this action the Government just as effectively seized these cars as though it had proceeded in condemnation proceedings. The difference is, however, that the dealer has received no compensation for his property.

In the case of the dealer I have in mind, with the allotment of new cars in the county in which he is operating, he will be years and years before he is able to sell his stock of new cars. Now what is happening? He has to service those cars constantly. He has to keep the batteries charged. He has to see that air is placed in those tires. He has to pay storage charges in buildings to store them. His expense and overhead is eating him up, so that he, like every other garage owner in this country, will face ultimate, complete financial ruin unless some aid is extended by this Government.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. I presume the gentleman has in mind also the fact that these new cars have started to deteriorate, that parts are rusting because it is impossible for them to be moved?

Mr. KEEFE. I was told when I was home that there are hundreds of cars exposed to the weather that are lying on the docks, that have been transported across the Great Lakes from Detroit, that are absolutely deteriorating out in the fields where the tires are down in the mud; and these people cannot move these cars. To me it is a complete economic loss. Under the present rationing proposition, yes, a defense worker can go to a rationing board and perhaps if he can show qualifications he can get a certificate for a new car. The number of certificates that have been issued in my county is perfectly absurd; they would not keep one garage operating. What is the result? A man goes to a rationing board, gets a certificate to buy a car if he is eligible. He is a marked man; every dealer in the county follows that man around because he has it in his power to purchase a new car. And what is the result? Dealers are so anxious to dispose of their frozen stocks that they will make deals with holders of certificates so that there is absolutely no profit in the deal and perhaps an ultimate loss to the dealer when he makes the deal, because he figures his loss will not be as great under those circumstances as it would be if he were compelled to sit there and hold that car.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that perhaps the most practical solution to this would be for Congress to authorize the R. F. C. to take over all this stock of cars that is held by dealers, or to have some other governmental agency take possession and ownership of these stocks?

Mr. KEEFE. It seems to me that if there be any justification for the rationing order at all, the justification lies in the fact that the Government is attempting by this rationing procedure to protect and conserve absolutely needed transportation facilities, and to eliminate these cars being placed in the category of purely pleasure vehicles, and in the hands of purely pleasure drivers on the highways. If this be true, and if it be necessary for the preservation of the war effort, then it seems to me it is only fair to these garage dealers that the Government step in and take these cars off the hands of these people who have them on their floors and cannot do anything with them. A mere loan, in my opinion, will not be sufficient, because the servicing of that loan will put the dealer in a position where he cannot meet his obligation due to his continued expense of overhead and depreciation that is taking place.

Let me call your attention to the fact that finance companies throughout the country are stepping in and taking cars that have been financed on the floor plan, taking them into their possession. I do not know whether they are able to sell; I understand they are not; they have to still store them. The whole thing is in a state of chaos. Take the case, for example, of a salesman working for a garage who bought a 1942 demonstrator late last year. He cannot sell that car without a certificate from the rationing board. Most of such salesmen bought their demonstrators on a monthly payment plan through a financing company; most of them have an equity in their cars. They should be allowed to sell their cars and get their equity out, for their jobs and their chance to make a livelihood are gone. The freezing provisions prohibit these salesmen from getting their equity out of their cars when they are out of employment and permits the finance company to come in and take those cars away from the salesmen.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The clothing by Congress of the R. F. C with additional powers to make loans in the critical situation to which the gentleman directs our attention today would only partially solve a very acute problem.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly so.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Office of Price Administration, taking the responsibility for the freezing of this stock of the automobile dealers of America, has also the added responsibility of seeing that these men are not faced with financial ruin through an edict of the Government of the United States.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from West Virginia has said; I agree also with the previous expressions made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for Congress to take some action at this time in order to authorize the Government purchase of these stocks of the dealers. As a consequence some action must be taken before the O. P. A. has the authority to take over these stocks and pay for them. I do not know whether the R. F. C. is permitted at the present time through the Defense Plant Corporation or some other agency to take over the ownership of these cars or not, but certainly legislation must be provided so that some governmental agency will be able to relieve these dealers of these stocks.

Mr. KEEFE. Everybody knows something about business; he knows what overhead will do, continuing overhead applied to just a few occasional sales as in the case of the dealer I am talking about, the man who used to sell a couple of thousand cars a year. His overhead must be spread now over the possible sale of perhaps 50 cars. What is it going to do to him? It is bound to put him out of business; and Congress must act in this matter and do it at once. We cannot delay this matter; it will be too late.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to congratulate the gentleman for calling the attention of the House and the Congress to this critical situation. The conditions the gentleman has described as existing in his State are typical of the conditions existing in my own State. The Government of the United States owes the duty to these people whose cars are frozen to compensate those people just as much as if the Government went out and condemned my property. In the latter instance I would be entitled to just compensation. Those people are entitled to just compensation if their cars are taken in that manner.

Mr. KEEFE. May I call attention to another situation. Here is a dealer I talked with. They are simply frantic, their life work is involved in the operation of this business, they do not know what they are going to do. Here is a man with 23 new cars on the floor. He is in a rented garage. He has his equipment there, he has his repair business there, his books are there; he has been conducting business there for years. Now, that man simply cannot move out. He has no place to take those cars. He wants to quit business, he wants to stop, he wants to get into something else and

find a job. But he is saddled with those cars around his neck and he does not know what to do with them.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Some few weeks ago or perhaps a month ago, this House appointed a special committee to investigate the small businessmen's affairs. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman of that committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand so.

Mr. MAY. I took before that committee a Mr. H. H. Loring, of Norfolk, Va., who had some $600,000 of an investment in automobiles and in automobile equipment. He made a clean-cut statement of the situation as it applies to some 40,000 dealers in this country. It looks as if we ought to get some legislation through.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that we talk, talk, and talk, and we have committees that investigate, investigate, and investigate; but we are not going to win this war with talk, either on the floor of this House or at any other place, and we are not going to solve this problem with talk. I know I am talking now, but I am trying in the only effective way that I know how to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress so that something may be done.

This Government must do something to solve the situation because it is unfair to take the stocks of these people, freeze them and put the dealers out of business. Let me give you an illustration as to how this fear has crept into other business.

Out in my district there are a number of great grocery chains that have unlimited stocks of sugar in their warehouses and in their stores. When the idea of sugar rationing came out, in a patriotic gesture they started to ration sugar in 2-pound sacks. That is all they would sell to a customer. Now, when they see what has happened to the automobile dealer, they are not going to continue to take a chance of having their investment in that sugar frozen, and I know of my own knowledge that certain of them have been delivering sugar in 100-pound sacks to anybody who wants to come and get it. The explanation is, "We are not going to sit here and hold this sugar and be subjected to a rationing program that will not permit us to get rid of it for perhaps the next 10 years by selling it in 2-pound packages."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is performing a great service by emphasizing this situation, which I think is critical and inexcusable. We are by Government edict confiscating the business of the automobile and tire people. Let me direct the gentleman's attention to this fact, and the gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee: Reference has been made to the Government taking over these cars. We have appropriated, or when the bill now pending in the Senate passes we will have appropriated, so far as we know, everything that the Army, the Navy, and the Government needs presently for transportation. I would hate to see the Government get control of all these cars with the temptation that there would be to send them out to departments where they are not needed. What should be done, and it ought to be done immediately and it could be done, is for the Government to take the cars that the Government needs, and they know now what they need, out of these frozen stocks and immediately release the rest of them. That would solve the problem. It could be done in 30 days, and it ought to be done.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the proposition. The Government should take out of these frozen stocks of cars and trucks all of the things that they need for governmental activities and the balance of these cars, so far as this rationing business is concerned, should be immediately released so that these dealers can get their investment out, and so that this transportation will be in the hands of the people. That is all there is to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article I wrote for the South Dakota Republican Herald on the progress of the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years now the House of Representatives has been endeavoring to amend the National Labor Relations Act and bring some order out of the chaos in labor relations. We have been unsuccessful in doing so. For the last several months the Congress has been trying to work out and adopt some formula to do away with the racket of requiring American citizens to pay tribute to labor unions for the privilege of working for their country. Up to this time we have been unsuccessful.

I think the Congress ought to know that we have what appears to be another legislative body in competition with us here in Washington. I refer to the War Labor Board set-up by the President, which has no authority from the Congress. It is set up by Executive order. The purpose behind the War Labor Board is all right and I approve of it and am for it, because we ought to get these disputes settled, but when the War Labor Board undertakes to amend the National Labor Relations Act and when the War Labor Board undertakes to impose upon American workmen the condition that they cannot work without paying tribute to the labor unions, it is going further than this Congress has ever been willing to go.

The particular instance to which I wish to call the attention of the House is a decision rendered by the War Labor Board a couple of days ago in the case of the Walker Turner Co. against the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America. The facts of that case are that that company has declined to give the union a closed shop and has declined to give it a union shop. The matter went to the War Labor Board and was there considered. Only day before yesterday that Board handed down a decision in which they ordered, ordered by compulsion, that every man who is a member of that union must remain as a member of that union as a condition of his employment. That is in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act, section 8.

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization.

It is obvious that to require an employee, as a condition of employment, to remain a member of a particular union whether he wants to or not is doing the very thing the law says cannot be done; namely, encouraging membership in a labor organization.

There is one exception, and only one exception, to that rule laid down in section 8, and that is that it does not preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization to require as a condition of employment membership therein, and so forth, but that is predicated upon an agreement; in other words, the law states that if the union and the company agree voluntarily, of their own volition, to a closed shop the law authorizes that, but there is no law anywhere on earth that authorizes any court, or anybody, set up by any Executive order, to require that a man shall either be or remain a member of a labor union, and any court or any board that at this time imposes upon any employee the obligation as a condition of employment that he must belong to a labor union is acting in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act, which Congress enacted and which Congress up to now has never been able to amend.

It is a queer thing that Congress, which, under the Constitution, is supposed to be the legislative arm of the Government, has been trying to correct these evils. The House has passed legislation amending the National Labor Relations Act, and we are right now in the midst of a very heated discussion in an attempt to enact law that will insure to American workmen that they can work for their country without paying tribute to anybody.

The sentiment of this Nation is overwhelmingly for that principle of the right to work without paying tribute. The sentiment of this Congress is overwhelmingly for the proposition that free American citizens must be permitted to work without paying tribute to anybody. Yet we find in the face of that sentiment and in the face of the fact that Congress is at this moment considering the remedy for that evil, that a board set up with no

legislative authority, by Executive order, presumes to so amend the National Labor Relations Act as to require American citizens to pay tribute for the privilege of working.

It is a coincidence, but it so happened that just last week the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision on that question in the case of National Labor Relations Board against the Electric Vacuum Cleaner Corporation. The situation there was this: The company had an agreement with certain affiliates of the American Federation of Labor. They had what was known as a union-shop agreement, that everybody had to belong to the union in order to work. That was a written contract. It had been lived up to. But along came the C. I. O. and decided that there is some good gravy in that corporation and that it would like to have that membership, and it decided to try to organize it.

Apparently, from the facts stated in that case, the company did not want the C. I. O. to organize, it having already made an agreement with this American Federation of Labor union. The company proceeded to give the American Federation of Labor a closed-shop contract.

The Supreme Court in that case holds that that company violated the National Labor Relations Act just as the War Labor Board yesterday violated the National Labor Relations Act. They violated it because they had given to this union a union shop and followed it by a closed-shop agreement, and the Court held that giving them this union shop was a discrimination because a man belonged or did not belong to a labor union and therefore set the whole thing aside.

Now if these rival legislative bodies we have around Washington here are going to continue to operate, I want to express the hope that they will at least read the laws that they are supposed to act upon; and if they do not know anything about them themselves, that they will employ competent counsel who will know and can advise them as to the law. I express the further hope that they will put themselves in line with the decisions of the Supreme Court, if they are going to usurp the powers of Congress and are not going to wait until we can enact a law that says that American citizens shall not be compelled to pay tribute in order to work for their company. If they say Congress shall not do that and that they are going to fix up this closed-shop matter before we get around to it, I hope at least they will conform to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

You know there are supposed to be three branches of government. We are supposed to be the legislative branch; we are supposed to make the laws; and the Supreme Court is supposed to be the judicial branch, and they are supposed to construe the laws; and the executive branch is supposed to execute the laws. Now, if these executive agencies are going to make the laws and then construe the laws, I hope that they will at least pay some attention to the sentiment of this Nation, which is that no man ought to be required to pay tribute to anybody for the privilege of working, and I hope they will pay some attention to this particular case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States last week.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is known as a good lawyer, has had judicial experience, and I would just like to have the benefit of his observation on this question. Since the Congress, as the legislative branch of the Government, has enacted legislation to set up a Labor Relations Board and invested that Board with the right to make determinations and issue orders, is it within the province of the executive branch of the Government to order something in conflict with what the legislative branch of the Government has already done?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I believe I shall answer the gentleman in this way. I do not want to be critical of the theory of the War Labor Board. I think we have to do a lot of things during this war in a little different way from what we would do them in normal times, and I approve of the idea of having any kind of board and every kind of board that will try to straighten these things out, as long as they live within the law. The complaint I am making this morning is that only Congress ought to be able to amend the National Labor Relations Act and not the War Labor Board.

Mr. MAY. That is the very question I asked the gentleman, whether or not it is within the power of the executive branch to make a ruling in conflict with that act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course not.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is correct in saying that the War Labor Board is not a creature of Congress. Where do they get the funds to operate in that case?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The truth is we have written a lot of blank checks around here in the days gone by.

Mr. KEAN. Then the money comes from one of these blank-check funds and is probably passed on by the President.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no information about that and I would rather not answer that question.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping yesterday that some Member who had been in the House many more years than I would give us a eulogy on the man whose democratic principles we are trying to preserve today—Thomas Jefferson, whose birthday we celebrated yesterday.

I happen to be occupying room 1013 in the new House Office Building, and right opposite the room on the concrete railing along there is a bronze tablet, and on that bronze tablet is inscribed the following:

Site of hotel of Conrad and McMunn, where boarded Thomas Jefferson, and from where he went to be inaugurated President of the United States March 4, 1801.

In other words, the room I occupy it the new House Office Building is exactly on the site where Thomas Jefferson had his room when he went to be inaugurated President of the United States, and I think it quite an honor to occupy that room, and I also think it quite an honor to get up here today and say that one of these days all of us will have an opportunity to go down here where we took up some old Korean cherry trees and dedicate a memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

For many years resolutions came before Congress to build a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. It was our late beloved colleague, Hon. John J. Boylan, of New York, a member of our Appropriations Committee, who was the sparkplug back of the move to build this memorial. The Deficiency Appropriations Committee in October 1938 included the money to start building this memorial, and the following year gave the additional amount necessary for its completion. Those on the Deficiency Appropriations Committee at the time were: Hon. Edward T. Taylor, chairman; Hon. Clarence Cannon; Hon. Clifton A. Woodrum; Hon. John J. Boylan; Hon. Louis Ludlow; Hon. Thomas McMillan; Hon. J. Buell Snyder; Hon. John Taber; Hon. Robert L. Bacon; and Hon. Richard B. Wigglesworth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement entitled "Bituminous Coal Is the Critical Material."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL SHORT AND ADMIRAL KIMMEL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 last, Army Day, I delivered an address at Pikesville, Ky., portions of which have been quoted in the press and widely circulated, and in many respects misinterpreted. So far as I was quoted in the press and so far as I have read those quotations, I think they were substantially correct, but the misrepresentation and the misinterpretation by a few people, from whom I received some three or four letters, is due to the fact that all I said on the particular subject relating to General Short and Admiral Kimmel was not reported in the newspapers. I was quoted in the press at large as having favored the shooting of General Short and Admiral Kimmel, and this was done without

any mention whatever of a prefatory statement which I used before making that remark. I said in substance that if, after a full, fair, and complete court-martial hearing, it was found that General Short and Admiral Kimmel were guilty of criminal negligence, resulting in the death of some 3,400 of our young men, I believed I would favor a shooting match. For that statement I have no apology to make.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. In just a moment. Having had considerable experience in the practice of the law before I came to Congress, and having spent several months on the bench, I am not in the habit of wanting to execute men without a trial. As a matter of fact, over a period of over 35 years of actual law practice—and by the way, I was admitted 42 years ago—I prosecuted a great many men for crimes involving their lives and liberty. I defended a great many more than I prosecuted. I would never condemn any man, and in fact I would not even condemn a sheep-killing dog, without a fair trial. I now yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, knowing the gentleman from Kentucky as I do, I know that he is an A No. 1 lawyer, and that usually he is the defender of anybody in trouble. I just could not imagine the gentleman wanting anybody to engage in a shooting match, or wanting them to be shot without having first a fair trial, and I really felt that the press had misquoted the gentleman when I read that, knowing him as I do. I see now that my idea about the gentleman was justified, when he says he would not shoot even a sheep-killing dog without giving it a fair trial.

Mr. MAY. I believe in equal and exact justice to all men, with special privileges to none.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND SHOPS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PACE). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most constructive speeches that has been made in Congress in a long time was delivered this afternoon by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in connection with the freezing order which froze all automobiles as of January 1, and in connection therewith, the other freezing and rationing orders of the Office of Price Administration, in connection with automobiles, rubber tires, and so forth.

I think the contributions made in the course of that discussion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and by others, were very constructive and very helpful. I want to say to the Members of this House that the American public ought to know that it was an agency of the executive branch of the Government which issued those orders. Four hundred and thirty-five Members of Congress cannot handle details of war agencies in connection with war problems. The Congress has the job of passing legislation that will enable the Commander in Chief, through his deputies, and agencies to do the job.

In my opinion, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], demonstrated clearly, fairly, and squarely the inefficiency, and total lack of appreciation on the part of someone in the Office of Price Administration of the problems of the American people and of the steps that ought to be taken to win the war. The best way to lose this war is to retain inefficient, short-sighted men in responsible executive positions where they can punish small American businessmen, and the automobile dealer, and others where the average American citizen is going to be ruined. Those things related by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] ought not take place. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made a great contribution in pointing out this inefficiency. It is now up to the executive department of the Government to do some housecleaning.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been very much interested in what the gentleman has said and what those who preceded him have said. I am inclined to agree with a great deal of it. For instance, the automobile dealers have been severely punished——

Mr. PITTENGER. They have been ruined—not punished, but ruined.

Mr. BROOKS. They are being forced out of business, but would the gentleman go a step further? For instance, I saw in the papers about 10 days ago that six oil refineries in the Houston area of Texas were being closed down by order of the War Production Board for a similar reason. Would the gentleman go a step further and take care of them also?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. You would take care of all of them?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes. I would say we do not want inexperienced men in Government positions issuing orders that will put small businessmen out of business, the way it is being done, unless there is absolute necessity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes, following any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by inserting therein a copy of an address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House, at Boston, March 17, at the two hundred and fifth annual dinner of the Charitable Irish Society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXATION

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of discussion throughout the country as to the merits and demerits of a general sales tax. The impact of this discussion naturally reacts on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, which is holding sessions to study every possible avenue through which the Government can reap tax revenues.

If the war and the spending continue, as they bid fair to do, a general sales tax, unwelcome as it is, may have to be considered. In the meantime there is a form of vicious, uncontrolled, hidden sales tax which is being permitted to go on day after day. That is inflation of prices.

There are two ways of taxing the consumer. One is by direct taxation, which is painful. The other is by indirect taxation, which is less painful, but just as burdensome. Hidden taxes have always been one of the forms of taxation. It is, of course, elementary with economists that price at the point of consumption is entirely costs plus all profits. Hidden taxes are taxes passed on from hand to hand in the form of the price of the product or service, and paid by the consumer without his realizing what percentage of the price of the things he buys is actually cost of production plus profits, and what percentage is taxation.

In direct taxation the Government collects the tax. In indirect taxation, as in inflationary prices, the Government lets the businessman collect the tax and then the Government can recover from the businessman, the latter acting as a collection agent of the Government. Not only is inflation the most vicious and uncontrolled method of hidden taxation, but it is the most inefficient, because it makes no provision whatever for inequities. Up to a certain point every family must spend about the same sum of money for the necessities of life. Beyond that point luxuries may enter into the picture. But, up to the point of luxury, each family, of necessity, must consume about so much bread and so much meat and so many vegetables and wear about so many clothes and burn about so much fuel to provide heat, and so on.

Obviously then, any taxation hidden in price must bear more heavily upon the poor consumer than upon the rich. Those who, by reason of a restricted purse, have to content themselves with hand-to-mouth buying pay a greater price than those who can buy in greater quantities. All sorts of inequities enter into this picture and it is for this reason that it is so essential to control inflation, or rather to prevent inflation as far as possible.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative J. WILLIAM DITTER, in a direct question to Mr. Leon Henderson during a session of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House asked Mr. Henderson point-blank whether or not there could be any such

thing as accurate price control without the control of all of the factors of cost. Mr. Henderson promptly answered that there could not. And yet, up to this hour, months and months afterward, the administration has evaded the issue of controlling all the costs of production, while, at the same time, trying to fix a good many prices.

One of the crying needs of the Nation at this time is a courageous attitude on the part of the administration to meet the growing inflation frankly and honestly in order to protect the low-income people of this Nation from this vicious form of hidden and indirect taxation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with what has been said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] concerning the automobile dealers' problem. This is serious, and Congress should do something at once to prevent these businesses from going to the wall.

It surely is not just to freeze a stock of cars, whether it be one or five hundred, without seeing to it that the dealer be protected financially from loss.

Certainly our United States can take better care of this as a whole, financially, rather than to make one group, already hard hit by necessary wartime regulations, go bankrupt.

Our Government should buy from every dealer every car frozen in stock. Our Government should allow the dealer sufficient overhead expense in connection with such transaction, that the dealer does not lose financially through such sale. I also strongly urge that any garage storing cars which can only be sold under certificates given out by rationing boards should be paid not only storage charges but also sufficient allowances to keep these new cars from deteriorating while in stock.

Congress must arrange as soon as possible some fair solution to this problem, as well as to the problems of the numerous small retail dealers in lines of business now clamped down upon because of war conditions, which certainly is no fault of theirs. We must all help to meet these problems and should not expect these men to perhaps lose their businesses of years' standing because of circumstances beyond their control.

Let us do something on this, Members of the House, before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert an article from the East Harlem News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert therein the result of Fortune management poll from Fortune Magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the House is in session on Thursday next I may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes, following any other special orders that may have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION FOR RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot leave unchallenged the remarks that have been made here with regard to the activities of the War Production Board and especially the automotive branch with regard to the automobile dealers of this Nation.

There seems to be a continuous running barrage in and out of Congress charging inefficiency and dereliction of duty of Government officials. I believe that a certain amount of criticism is a healthy thing in a democratic form of government; however, when open blanket charges are made I do not believe it goes toward building unity that is so sadly needed in this Nation during these trying times. Charges of inefficiency should be specific, naming the individuals and setting forth the specific indictment of inefficiency of that individual, so that it can either be proven or disproved. This continuing indictment of inefficiency reflects upon the Government and only gives the enemies of our Nation an opportunity to carry on their underhanded attempt to break down the confidence of the people in our Government.

I believe that the officials of the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration are giving thorough and complete study to the whole problem that confronts the dealers and retailers of automobiles.

As we turn our memories back a year or so, we will find that this administration, realizing the grave responsibility that it was facing on the question of all-out production in the national defense of America, requested the great automotive industry to convert to the war program. The request so made was not complied with and a very concerted effort was carried on by the automotive industry to stop any curtailment in the production of automobiles. The result was that last year the automobile industry enjoyed the most profitable year in its history.

It was not until war stared us in the face that they realized the grave responsibility which was theirs and then followed out the request of the administration and converted their factories to war production. I want at this time to congratulate them on the fine cooperation they are now giving. I do not believe that there is any industry in the whole United States that is contributing more to our war program at the present time than the automotive industry. They certainly are going full production ahead in bombers, tanks, machine guns, and all things that their plants can be retooled to in order to bring about 100 percent war production.

The shock that came necessarily so because of the delay in the automobile industry to realize their place in the war program was such that the automobile dealers, necessarily a part of this great program, were caught in the jam that followed. They had to sacrifice, and I understand very willingly, for the best interest of this Nation in the winning of the war. We fully realize that the dealers themselves cannot nor should not bear the full brunt of this burden. Therefore, the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board have been giving thorough study, as I said, to this grave problem.

There are two sections necessarily that must be considered, and they are: One, the handling of trucks; and, second, the handling of automobile passenger cars. I must at this time say that the Office of Price Administration has already proposed a dealers release plan to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is commonly known as the bail-out plan. I do not know the specific details of this plan, but I do know that the plan was proposed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and that the officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation met or are meeting with the manufacturers in Detroit. The plan will permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to take the cars on hand that are held by the dealers at the original cost plus the financing and storage charges up to date and will allow the dealers to hold these cars under proper financing through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until they are called for under the rationing system and sold on the market.

So there is an effort on the part of the Government agencies charged with the handling of this part of the program. They cannot put into operation such a huge program overnight. It takes study and work, which necessarily takes time.

I have all the sympathy in the world for the dealers in the problem they are confronted with, but I also want it understood that our Government agencies and those charged with the duty of administering those agencies are doing their level best under the circumstances to relieve this very burdensome situation.

The plan, I understand, applies to both trucks and passenger cars. The reason that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials met with the manufacturers was to see that a proper agreement was made with the manufacturers, so that the cars and trucks would be delivered to the Government in good condition and that the manufacturers would guarantee such delivery through their dealers.

The Office of Price Administration set up their rationing program as of March 2 and a field inventory shows that there are on hand on the dealers' floors at the present time about 150,000 trucks, which will have to be parceled out over a period of 2 years. The first month's survey shows that under the present rationing plan there were about 8,000 units per month being moved and a study is being made to liberalize this rationing plan so as to increase the number of units to be

moved. In other words, that the whole program is to be speeded up.

They have not only worked on this problem as far as the retailers are concerned, but they have also set up another plan so as to give the dealers a certain means of revenue. That is, they have done everything in their power to see that cars and trucks are kept running and there has been a liberal flow of parts for repairs of automobiles and trucks now on the road. This has been a great help to the dealers. Of course, as time goes on, if there develops a shortage of parts, it will not be the fault of the War Production Board, but just one of those things that develops in wartime that cannot be helped, so that there might be a little difficulty in the repair work on cars and trucks in the future. However, every study possible is being given to the problem so as to give the dealers and garagemen the best that brains can produce. I do not believe there is any inefficiency that can be chargeable to these agencies and such charges should not be made loosely.

Let me say further that according to the latest official figures from the field that there has only been 40 percent of the quota of cars allotted for sale sold on the market since the rationing program has been put into effect. Therefore there is a study being made so that there will be a liberalizing of the present rationing plan that will help to move the present cars that are now being held by the dealers.

Another study that is being given by the Office of Price Administration is that they are attempting to buy up the junk cars for the reclaiming of the rubber that is on those junk cars and scrapping the metal to be used for scrap iron. This plan will be presented shortly to the Metals Reserve Corporation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

So necessarily in this conversion the automobile dealers throughout the United States have sacrificed but everything possible is being done to help them. It is only natural that when such a change in our usual business methods confronts us in the war program that we must meet it and meet it with sacrifice.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Michigan just made the statement that everything is being done which it is possible to do to aid these automobile retailers. Does the gentleman have in mind any specific thing that the Government is doing to aid these retail distributors at the present time?

Mr. HOOK. I understand that the War Production Board is doing everything it can by making a complete survey and giving all the assistance it can, as I just mentioned. I do not know of any other specific things, especially when this thing came as fast as it did, and in face of the fact they refused to meet the problem.

Mr. KEEFE. Who refused?

Mr. HOOK. The automobile manufacturers.

Mr. KEEFE. But we are dealing entirely with dealers.

Mr. HOOK. All right; the automobile dealer is only one step away from the manufacturer. When manufacturers cannot turn out any more cars, certainly dealers cannot sell cars; and if dealers cannot sell cars, then the dealers necessarily must meet the problem with the assistance of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen's time be extended 2 minutes so I may propound a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made reference to some remarks which I made earlier this afternoon dealing entirely with the problem of the local dealer who has on hand in his garage cars already manufactured which he cannot sell and dispose of. This is the complaint which has been made; and if the gentleman knows of anything that is being done by the Government to alleviate this situation I would like to have him tell the House, because I have not been told of it, and I do not know of any automobile dealer who knows of any such thing that is being done to help them.

Mr. HOOK. I understand—and I am willing to be corrected if I am wrong—that a financial set-up has been arrived at whereby each one of these dealers is being paid a certain sum for the storage of those cars, as I just mentioned. A schedule has been set up whereby certain classes of people are entitled to priorities on cars, physicians for example and those in key positions in the war program. The cars are to be rationed as they are needed.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman: Does he know of any activity of the Government through which these automobile dealers are being paid for the storage of these cars? If so, my dealers would like to know of it. I have never heard of any such thing.

Mr. HOOK. It is my understanding that there is, as I mentioned, although I may be wrong. I doubt that I am.

Mr. KEEFE. The suggestion was made at one time that some such thing as that be done, that the dealers be paid something for the storage and care of these cars; but nothing has been done, and nothing is being done today to alleviate the situation.

Mr. HOOK. There is at least an authorization that when the car is sold the dealer may charge the buyer with the storage and cost of financing, although I understand that this will be corrected by the plan of the Office of Price Administration and the R. F. C.

Mr. KEEFE. But the thing the gentleman seems to overlook is the fact that under the tire-rationing order and the limitations as to the character and type of people who can get certificates from the local rationing board—the opportunities to sell these cars in stock are so limited that the dealers will be eaten up with overhead and other expenses before they will ever be able to get rid of their stocks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. I do not know exactly what studies the War Production Board has actually made; all I know is what I am told, and that I must and intend to rely upon; but common sense, it seems to me, would indicate that when cars are not being manufactured as they were before the few cars available will be needed for specific purposes, and we cannot just dump those cars on the market with no replacement production coming out of the factories. What is going to happen then? They naturally must have a rationing system to conform with the plan they have developed.

Mr. KEEFE. No one will object to the gentleman's statement in that regard; that perhaps the rationing system may be all right; but the thing the gentleman wants to keep in mind is that we must not put the burden on these garage dealers to handle and store and service and finance these cars during the period of years this rationing program may be carried on. The Government ought to step in and take care of them.

Mr. HOOK. I agree with the gentleman; but the Government certainly must act at some place and formulate the best plan that can be devised under the circumstances. I do not think that the charge of inefficiency and dereliction of duty of the O. P. A. or the War Production Board or any of the officers or officials in charge is substantiated by the record. Time will prove that these men are fine, capable executives and administrators, doing, in my opinion, a fine job under very adverse conditions. Let us not be too critical at this time, but give credit where credit is due.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad this subject came up, because I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin is interested in the small dealer as well as I am, and I know, too, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is interested in the small dealer. I do not know whether either of those two gentlemen were present yesterday when I addressed the House for 8 minutes on the conditions that exist all over the country or not. In the first place there has been absolutely nothing done to help these dealers, although proposals have been made.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has the authority to lend certain money to these dealers, but that authority is not going to help these dealers, because in most cases the cars were purchased before this order went into effect. They were cars bought back in 1941, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cannot lend them money to carry on.

Yesterday I introduced a bill to help these dealers. You will find that the finance companies all over the country are now closing in on the small dealers, and they are going to take these cars away from them unless we do something immediately. As I stated, I introduced a bill yesterday authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend to these dealers as much money as is necessary, over any period of time necessary, to protect their entire equity, and when they have done that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will immediately become subrogated to the rights of these finance companies.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated, nothing has been done, and if we wait and continue trying to get something done, it seems to me nothing will be done until these dealers are completely ruined. They are willing to sacrifice, they are not complaining about this freezing order at all, but many of them have not been able to sell one car since this order went into effect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the automobile dealers are not objecting to the sacrifices they have to make, but in many instances they have not been able to sell a single car because their sales are limited to certain classes of people.

May I say that in many instances these finance companies are demanding more in payment right now than these dealers are able to raise. They have not sold any cars and yet the dealers are told: "If you do not pay, we are going to come in and take your automobile." That situation exists due to the freezing order. They cannot sell, yet we have issued no order telling these finance companies that they cannot take the automobiles. The finance companies are going to profit. They are the war profiteers as a result of this order and it must be stopped.

I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. HOOK and Mr. HOFFMAN] will get a copy of this bill and will assist in getting action in reference to this matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that I did hear the statement, and I heard his plea with reference to the bill which he has introduced. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. HENDRICKS. But it is going to require immediate action and not a long time of hearings.

Mr. KEEFE. I tried to impress that on the House a moment ago. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], when I was speaking this afternoon, indicated that the Appropriations Committee has now appropriated for all departments of Government, the War, Army, and Navy, and has provided for all the items of procurement in the form of trucks, cars, and everything else that they can see a need for. If that is true, why does not the Army take all it needs off the hands of these dealers now and pay for them and if the Government's interest is protected, why not cut out this rationing business entirely?

Mr. HENDRICKS. It is because they have only been authorized but not directed to do so. We must direct them to do so. Something has got to be done about this situation or we are going to have a storm.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is only half-past 1; I know they are anxious to adjourn to go to the ball game.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am not going to the ball game. I have not the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not mean the gentleman. Can the gentleman tell me how we, on the minority side, can help? The majority has control of this legislation and are not doing anything.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman can call the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and ask him to report this bill out so that we can get something done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I could do that, but that will not get your bill out.

Mr. HENDRICKS. It may if enough of you call.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You tell me how to help, and I will help.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is the only way; bring pressure on the committee, and ask them to do something, because it is necessary that something be done. I know that every Member of Congress is interested.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know they are. Two doors down from my home is located one of my bitterest local political opponents, and the last time I was home he had 11 new trucks that he cannot sell. He wants to get rid of them. He asked me how he could do it, but I do not know.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The Government can buy these cars outright, but it has not done that. We can pass a bill authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to let them have whatever money is necessary, over any period that is necessary, and subrogate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the rights of the finance companies who are going in now and taking these automobiles and making a profit because of the order issued by the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our farmers and co-ops want these trucks too, to haul milk and supplies to the creameries and mills. How can they get them?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I hope they can get them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, April 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, April 15, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m. April 17, 20, and 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1569. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Naselle River, Pacific County, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1570. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administration, covering the year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 699); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 494. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles O. Nevel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Joseph

Donatelli and Rose Donatelli; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie Lavoda Wiggins; with amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Alfred Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5013. A bill for the relief of James P. Crawford; with amendment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5385. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Yates; with amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Lillian Woodward; with amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborn; with amendment (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5680. A bill for the relief of James M. Hays; without amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6033. A bill for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6594. A bill for the relief of M. V. Forsythe; with amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6797. A bill for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6848. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6926. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 6927. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 6928. A bill to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6929. A bill to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6931 A bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6932. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to solidarize itself with the policy of the President of the United States, the War Production Board, and labor organization, preferring the voluntary renunciation of labor of the right to strike and of the limitations of the working day; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enactment of House bill 6806; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNS:

H. R. 6933. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2665. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 34 residents of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 4000, a bill to take liquor out of Army and Navy camps as a patriotic measure to conserve the health, morale, and efficiency of our soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2666. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of J. O. Cameron and 66 other voters of Lawrence County, Pa., urging that Senate bill 860 be brought before the Congress and a favorable vote taken thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2667. Also, petition of 37 members of the West Sunbury United Presbyterian Church, Butler County, Pa., urging a ban on the sale of any intoxicating drink for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2668. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., 31 Boylston Street, Brookline, Mass., on freezing of cars; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2669. By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota: Resolution of the Aurora Lodge of the A. F. and A. M. at Carrington, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2670. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Commercial National Bank of Greenville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference of meeting the national crisis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2671. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Smith-Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2672. Also, petition of a list of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, worship, honor, blessing, and power Thou art infinitely worthy to receive. We beseech Thee to mark for us the star on the horizon and let us hear the music on the troubled waters. Do Thou bless us with repose for meditation and reflection, compassing us with thoughts of seriousness, of responsibility, and inspiring us with a stimulus for righteousness, justice, and confidence. Cause us to use our power to bring the good things of life to those who are weak and impoverished and to give them the chartered rights to peace, happiness, and self-realization.

Remind us, our Father, in the midst of ill tidings, of Thy eternal calm and that Thou art a tower of defense to those who call Thee Lord and Master. Prepare our hands anew for heavy tasks, for willing sacrifice, and for the duties demanded by each day. In the hours of peril be Thou with our country's defenders in the far-away places of this torn earth; keep them strong and hopeful while our souls speak by our prayers and by our unwavering devotion. Blessed Lord, save us all from that hate which engenders blindness and at the last causes spiritual death. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this bill have in it the pay raise for the men in the service?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it does not.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does the bill contain?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the House passed the bill it provided $18,156,000,000. As the Senate passed it, the total is $19 062,000,000, most all of which is for the Army and the Navy.

Mr. RICH Can the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, tell us where we are going to get all the money we are appropriating?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The same place we get the money we have been appropriating for some time.

Mr. RICH. The trouble is that that place has been dried up for 10 or 12 years.

Mr CANNON of Missouri. No; the patriotism of the American people never dries up.

Mr. RICH. Until you get the new tax bill in here to tax the people to get money, the way you are spending money I do not know what you are going to do but bankrupt the Government. That is all I can see ahead unless you try to get the income to meet your outgo. As the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman ought to get in consultation with the chairman of the Ways and Means and work a little closer in harmony.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All the Members of the House have recently been in consultation with the people at home, and they approve of the expenditure of every dollar provided in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Missouri tell us briefly the principal changes made in this bill by the Senate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are 80 amendments, adding $905,000,000. They cover a great many subjects, too numerous to mention at this time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. But the bill does not include the salary raise for the men in the service?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was not included in the Budget estimates sent to us or in the amendments added by the Senate. I believe there is legislation now pending elsewhere to accomplish that end.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, CASEY of Massachusetts, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, DITTER, and ENGEL.

RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

[Mr. NICHOLS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to quote from the Chairman of the Agricultural Marketing Administration in regard to gambling in agricultural products.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

COAL INDUSTRY WILL SUFFER STAGGERING BLOW IF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IS APPROVED

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, despite frantic efforts on the part of advocates of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway to minimize the devastating effect of the project on the great coal industry of the Nation, it is an indisputable fact that serious economic results will follow the approval of this ill-timed and ill-advised expenditure of public funds.

The bituminous-coal industry of the United States is as much opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence hydro project and seaway as it was when evidence was presented before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in July 1941. It was pointed out at that time by spokesmen for the coal industry that we stood to lose several million tons of coal. The minimum that we would be expected to lose would be approximately 5,500,000 tons annually, as that quantity is equivalent to the present proposed horsepower to be installed. That is a direct loss. It is not possible for anyone to estimate what the actual loss might be.

It has been said by the proponents that it might possibly develop that this project would produce from six to seven hundred million horsepower, and if that be true the coal industry would stand to lose some 30,000,000 tons of coal annually. In order for one to visualize what this means to the industry, it is only necessary to analyze what the loss of 1,000,000 tons means. In gross revenue it would exceed $2,000,000 to the producing coal companies. Mine labor would lose about 65 percent of that sum. The railroads would likewise lose about $2,000,000, and railroad labor loss would be about half of that sum. So, for each million tons of coal lost over $4,000,000 in gross income is taken from the railroads and coal industry, and of that $2,000,000 is taken from those who work in the mines and on the railroads. These are direct losses. They are the kind of losses that create bread lines. Should it develop that only the minimum loss of five and one-half million tons of coal was made effective, then the gross loss to the railroads and the coal industry would be about $11,000,000 annually, and we reiterate that neither industry is in position to stand any such displacement or dislocation of their economy.

Just recently, during the cold spell, the facilities now located on the Niagara River were made impotent to a degree because of the floating ice in the river. Steam plants, producing their power from coal, had to be called on to make up the deficiency. That is general knowledge, which was printed throughout the region. If the present facilities are handicapped by reason of floating ice during severe cold weather, then it would seem to be the height of folly to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to build additional hydro plants so that they could be rendered inadequate as the result of severe weather.

A good deal of apprehension exists in this country today that some enemy might drop bombs on this continent. Should that unfortunate thing happen, what could be a better target than a large hydroelectric plant furnishing power for a great many war industries? Common sense dictates that it is far better to have a dozen steam plants located in the general area but separated so that each could perform its proper duty and if by chance one was destroyed it would not cripple the entire war program.

No one has yet testified that this project is absolutely essential to national defense. Several testified that it was needed for national defense.

There has been some rumor that the project might be separated, that is, abandonment of the seaway part of the project at this time. To do that does not lessen the opposition of the coal industry at all. We expose the entire interior of our country to seagoing vessels, possibly of an enemy character. We open up our markets to foreign countries, and we may expect those countries, when the war is over, to go to any extreme to market their products. Coal will be one of those products, and, assuming that the seaway is constructed, we may expect a flood of coal from Europe and Asia to take the place of American-produced coal and make American labor idle. It must be understood that there is no such thing as comparable wages with any other country in the world, as compared with those being paid by the mining industry in this country.

If the seaway portion is abandoned, then the people of the Midwest, who have been sold on this whole proposition on the grounds that their products would be moved direct from the factories and plants in Detroit and Duluth to foreign countries via the river, have been deceived, and it would be a breaking of faith with those people from those sections of the country who have been led to believe that they would reap great benefits from this international seaway.

Now at this time, when the life of the Nation is at stake, there is no reason on earth for this vast expenditure. If power is needed, it can be secured from steam plants far more quickly than this project can be constructed. No one contends that it can be built in less than several years. Today we need every piece of machinery; every ounce of energy that we have should be devoted to war essentials. "Pork barrel" politics have no place in the present defense program.

THE FATE OF FRANCE

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, the news from France grows more ominous day by day. German control over the unoccupied portion of that unfortunate nation is growing more and more rigid. Laval is back in the cabinet, and it seems fair to assume that he will strengthen the hand of Hitler by placing Darlan, of the Navy, and Dent, of the Army, in positions where they can be as active as possible in collaborating with the mad dog of Berlin in his world-wide holocaust.

These men are notorious enemies of the British and by virtue of that fact are also notorious and dangerous enemies of every democracy or free nation in the world and are indeed a dire menace to all humanity. Because of our many years of friendship, our love of democracy, and the former high code of honor of the French people, we had hoped that France would refuse to be a party to Hitler's rape of civilization. That hope has carried us much farther along the road of appeasement than can be justified by sound judgment.

We hope that the French people will rise in their wrath and prevent these traitorous leaders from leading them any farther down the road to destruction. As for us, this must be the parting of the way. We are fighting for our very lives. All who are against our Allies are against us. We must so class them now and after the war. The British and the Americans saved France from German enslavement in 1918. Are they now to repay us by a stab in the back with their naval dagger?

If these international racketeers have no regard for their own honor, or the honor of their nation, let them at least reflect upon their own certain fate. This time, as last time, the freemen of free countries will win the war. There can be no question about that. Let it be understood, however, that the end of this war will be far different from the end of the last. This time we are determined that for the expenditure of so much of our blood and our treasure we will visit a just measure of retribution upon those responsible for or assisting in the initiation or prosecution of this hellish program of mass enslavement, torture, murder, and assassination.

No mistaken sense of chivalry, no maudlin sympathy for the vanquished, no interference by irresponsible sentimentalists shall prevent the gallows from discharging its duty to long-suffering humanity. Those responsible for this awful crime against God and man and all of their Quislings must and shall suffer the fate of the degenerate felons and pirates of old. None, from those who planned and ordered the enslavement, starvation, and massacre of helpless men, women, and children, to those who assisted, encouraged, or condone these atrocities shall escape.

When this war is won, the search for the guilty ones must be carried on so relentlessly that no lair so secluded, no isle so lonely, no spot so distant be allowed to protect them. Their prosecution must be so merciless that only the hand of the suicide or the assassin can save them from the just, certain, and speedy vengeance of our outraged civilization. Let Laval, Darlan, and Dent reflect upon their certain doom, if they betray France and democracy. They will eventually swing from the gallows and their memory be forever tarred by the odious pitch reserved for the memory of traitors.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONSOLIDATION OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SERVICES AND NEED OF ACTION AGAINST SUBVERSIVE PUBLICATIONS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time today to discuss two matters very briefly. One is the question of the urgent need, in my opinion, of a consolidation of all Government information services. The other is the imperative need of immediate action against subversive publications that are passing through our mails.

I learn this morning that the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice already have moved to keep from the mails the publication known as Social Justice.

I have learned also that some action is contemplated very shortly in the matter of consolidation of information services. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time and ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House on this subject for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before yielding the floor, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PRIEST. I gladly yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after any other special order today I may address the House for 15 minutes, and I make the same request for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the time granted me for today.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SERVICES

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on the subject that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] talked about. My bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That none of the funds appropriated in any act shall be used by any Government department, agency, or independent establishment, except the War and Navy Departments, for these purposes, namely:

1. Publications not required by law;
2. Press service;
3. Radio broadcasting;
4. Group contacts;
5. Exhibits;
6. Motion pictures;
7. Lantern slides and lecture material;
8. Photography;
9. Individual contracts;
10. Posters;

and the amounts submitted by the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Federal Government to the Budget Bureau for these purposes shall not be available therefor and shall be recovered into the Treasury.

A few weeks ago I had considerable correspondence with Mr. Henderson's office in regard to conserving paper. I received a letter from his office admitting that Government publicity was being abused. When the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House, I had a detail of the amount of money being expended for publicity by the Interior Department—its every branch and agency. The total amount of the information service in that $160,000,000 appropriation bill was $2,440,000, roughly. Of this amount only $226,000 was necessary for answering correspondence. Another $700,000, roughly, was necessary for the publications required by law. That leaves, roughly, in the Interior Department $1,500,000 that is expended for publicity material. This House only cut $100,000 of this waste 2 weeks ago; $1,400,000 of this waste is still in the 1943 bill. I point out that $1,400,000 is a small item in comparison with the billions of dollars we are spending today, deficit financed, for the operation of our Government for domestic purposes and for war purposes. The point is that there is only one issue confronting our people and this Congress and the President of the United States today. It is the issue of turning all of the manpower, all of the strength, all of the resources of our country toward the production of guns and planes and tanks to win this war, and to win it as quickly as possible. This is only a part of the picture of the useless waste and expenditure of funds that is taking place in this Government today. I think this bill will strike out twenty million of the $27,000,000 propaganda pay roll for useless manpower that should be eliminated and should not be continued in the Federal Government for 1 more day. Ever since Pearl Harbor this country has had a united people. Ever since Pearl Harbor these publicity experts continue the effort to set class against class; continue

a struggle that tends to destroy national unity; a class struggle of selfishness which they wish to promote in order to get control of the Government on a social philosophy that represents neither the Republican nor the Democratic Parties.

I think it would save this $20,000,000 from the Federal pay roll and strike out $25,000,000 from a $50,000,000 postage bill. I think it would strike out $1,500,000 from a $2,400,000 paper bill the Government agencies and the independent establishments of the Government now spill ink upon and have for some time. In addition to that it would release this money which could be applied to building the necessary material to win the war.

I notice with a great deal of interest the statement of the President, reported on the front page of the Washington Post this morning. He corresponded with an economist friend of his in regard to cutting nondefense expenditures. The issue is not what any economist thinks of what could be cut. The issue is not, as many times it has been in the past, to build up straw men, to be knocked down, on the subject of nondefense expenditures. The issue may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is not a glamourous subject; it is a subject that has to be attacked item by item. Hunting useless waste of money and manpower that might be thrown into an effort to win the war is a thankless, slaving job that requires the midnight oil and a passion for duty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Finally, Mr. Speaker, to find out how expenditures could be cut, we would not necessarily turn to some theorist or some friend of any one of us. We could only find nondefense expenditures by hard work, by searching questions, and insisting upon complete and full answers. The answer to nondefense expenditures may be found in the work of all the committees. Sad to say, after the committee hearings are printed, many of them go into the ashcan and are never read or analyzed. I have examined the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill. I saw there an alarming table of the housing expenditures in the District of Columbia. I want to point out an expenditure of nearly $200 per unit for every one of those pill boxes for architects' fees alone. This will continue if more of us do not read the hearings.

It will grow to an enormous expenditure that could be cut. It is indefensible. Only by looking at the facts in each case can we determine what is wrong.

The next man that might be consulted in regard to cutting nondefense expenditures is Mr. Lindsay Warren. I wonder why anyone should seek out an economist, not a Government expert, if you please, instead of the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, in whom we all have the utmost confidence. He is a member of the majority party, but I think I am voicing the spirit of the members on the minority when I say we have the utmost confidence in the pronouncements and in the judgment of Mr. Lindsay Warren. Why not have Mr. Warren, in accordance with the present Budget and Accounting Act, make to the President and to this Congress a report of the expenditures that might be cut?

I hope that the Members of the House will see that there is early consideration of this or a similar bill. I am not jealous of my draft of this bill. I am not jealous that any bill bearing my name should be adopted, but I am jealous that our boys do not die at the front for lack of planes—die like dogs, trying to get across a narrow strip of water from the Bataan Peninsula to Corregidor, because they do not have planes and guns. I am interested in releasing all of these nondefense workers, of the Government in particular, and putting them to producing things that will protect our men and furnish them a bridge to victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXPENDITURES IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is not a member who will not agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] about the reduction of all unnecessary governmental expenditures. I want to say two things with regard to his remarks.

In the first place, I think it is very important that there be emphasis, along with justifiable criticism, regarding minor items, on the big over-all picture of what we are doing and what we are not doing. I think it is very important that there be given to the country the real basic facts in the situation. For example, in connection with some of the appropriation bills that we have recently passed, I very seldom have heard any mention, very seldom—I do not know that I have ever heard it off the floor—of the fact that the Interior Department appropriation was cut about one-third under what it had been in the previous year; that the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill was cut about 40 percent under what it was in the previous year. In other words, that the committees and the Congress are making very substantial reductions.

However, I have a letter here from the director of the Department of Agriculture in my own State, in which he makes an appeal with regard to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, which is an agency of the Department of Agriculture that has to do obviously with the eradication of pests and diseases—and hence with the possibility of increased farm production.

The House made a cut from $382,000 to $82,000 in the amount available for the control of the Japanese beetle. We made it because we said we wanted to fight Japs instead of fighting beetles. It does not seem to me that is very sound ground by which to legislate. The beetles might be very good friends of the Japs if we let them get started. Here is an item on which the protection of many of our crops depends. I use it only as an example. It seems to me we have got to be sensible and reasonable and sane in all of these matters.

In connection with this particular item for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine there was an item of some $4,000,000 in the agricultural appropriation bill when it came to the floor. In connection with the Department of Agriculture bill there were many speeches made, many amendments offered to cut the item. Then there came in on the deficiency appropriation bill, which dealt largely with war items, a couple of days later, an item of $2,500,000 for precisely the same agency in the Department of Agriculture, and not one word was said about it on the floor.

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me that the big thing has to be kept in mind; that the whole picture has to be kept in mind, and that something has to be said when a committee brings in a bill that saves fifty or sixty or four hundred million dollars, instead of straining at gnats on some of these items that are not altogether understood by many Members of the House, but which may, in fact, be of great importance. In other words, I am as much for reducing unnecessary expenditures as anybody. I want to do it sensibly and reasonably as well as effectively.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DEFENSE BONDS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, my object in taking this time at the moment is to make a little report to the House on something I ran into in my district the other day which interested me very much.

From time to time I have dropped remarks to the effect that I did not believe that we as a people were purchasing Defense bonds at the rate we should. I reiterate that statement today and submit this illustration as evidence that I am correct: While in one of the very large factories in my district this week which is about 100 percent in defense effort I learned that as a result of the manager taking some 4 or 5 minutes at a noon hour to make a little speech to the payrollees there engaged, that the number of employees subscribing for Defense bonds jumped from around 42 percent up to about 92 percent, with the per capita pay-roll check-off jumping from around $7.50 per employee up to about $17.50 per employee per pay day. In other words with a plant manager having spoken a few words in addition to the letters which are sent to the workmen by the Treasury Department, and what they hear over the

radio and read in the press, the subscriptions for Defense bonds almost doubled among those employees.

When you can take a very large industrial plant, a company that has thousands of employees, and with practically no pressure whatsoever, move them up to 92.5 percent of the employees subscribing for bonds, I say that verifies what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said a moment ago when he spoke about the fact that the patriotism of the American people never runs dry.

I wish our people as a whole would begin purchasing not later than July 1, a minimum of $2,500,000,000 worth of defense bonds per month. I notice that the disbursements for defense are now running around three billions per month. I understand that is to move rapidly toward three and one-half, four billions, five billions, and perhaps reach a peak of seven billions. I repeat that if we do not purchase defense bonds as individuals and thereby force the Treasury to sell those bonds largely to the commercial banks, we shall add to the President's troubles of somehow controlling or preventing inflation; and in this respect I sincerely hope that the President will move rapidly toward placing further ceilings, establishing further consumption cards, and doing whatever is necessary to prevent the cost of living index which involves the industrial payrollees and other people of this country, from further rising beyond present levels. When I study the figures that are issued week after week by the Department of Labor and see these constant rises in the cost of living it gives me concern because it is not in keeping with the other job that we have in hand, namely, prosecuting the war. I wish to say to the President that so far as I am personally concerned, and simply reiterating what I said when the price control bill was under consideration, I am prepared to go all the way in preventing inflation, and if that is now what the President wishes to do he can count on my support. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will bring in a tax bill which will materially increase taxes on individuals and on corporations, especially those largely engaged in carrying out war contracts and which are having a pretty heavy profit running in their favor at the present time after calculating the present tax burdens under present laws. It is my firm belief that if we would take care of this inflation problem it would make unnecessary certain types of labor legislation now being advocated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made at Washington, Kans., last Thursday night.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE GEN HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep regret to announce the passing of a truly great Oklahoman, a great American, in the death of Gen. Hugh Johnson.

General Johnson, as every Member of the House knows, has made a deep contribution to his country and to its service in a military and political way. It is true that I have not agreed with General Johnson on many of his views on foreign policy, on many of his views on American politics, but I do know that General Johnson was a sincere, conscientious, and courageous American, who virtually gave his life in an effort to help the democracy he loved so dearly. He was an Oklahoma citizen, one of whom we are proud and one whose passing the State deeply regrets as a loss not only to the State but to the Nation.

General Johnson came to Oklahoma in a covered wagon when only 11 with his pioneer family. His mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson, still lives in Okmulgee and the General listed Oklahoma as his home.

Early, Johnson was a colorful figure, running away from home at 16 in an attempt to join in the fighting in the Spanish-American War. He was stopped by his parents.

After an education at the Oklahoma Northwestern Teachers College he entered West Point and graduated there in 1903. Gradually during his service as a cavalry officer he advanced from second lieutenant to brigadier general in 1918, seeing service under General Pershing in the Mexican expeditions and also occupying positions of key authority in World War No. 1.

During his service as a horse soldier, Johnson acquired the picturesque vocabulary that marked his later orders as the boss of N. R. A. and as a columnist.

The nearly perfect functioning of the Selective Service System is largely accredited to General Johnson who perfected the plan during World War No. 1, when he was executive of that work. He watched it closely during its set-up for the present war and was an ardent advocate of the adoption of the system following the fall of France. The adoption of decentralized control was his own and it was this idea that is accredited with making the system fair and workable.

During his service in World War No. 1, General Johnson became well acquainted with Bernard Baruch and was associated closely with him in the work in the War Industries Board. Much of the planning and arrangements for M-day was the joint opinion of Baruch and General Johnson.

The General found himself popularized as "Old Iron Pants" when the cavalry nickname stuck as he took over the famous "Blue Eagle" of N. R. A. During those hectic days he was the busiest man in Washington as he attempted to vitalize the idea of a planned recovery. Whatever authority he had he used in order to establish the N. R. A. and never avoided a fight with either politicos or industrialist or bureau heads in his efforts to put over the plan.

Later, following the discontinuance of N. R. A., after the Supreme Court decision, Johnson turned columnist and earned the reputation as a salty and forceful writer.

While he has often been a severe and hard critic of government and its policy, his pen always expressed the belief of the General himself and never as a mouthpiece for any group or faction. I could not always agree with his conclusions nor his policies, but recognized in him an American, anxious in his own way to guide the policies in the direction he believed to be the best for his Nation.

Death came early this morning, after a long fight against illness that had confined him to Walter Reed Hospital here. Pneumonia complicated by other illness put an end to a patriotic and colorful American. With him at his death were his mother and his son, Lt. Col. Kilbourne Johnson.

CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1942

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, April 21, 1942, it may be in order, under the rules, to call individual bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5802 An act to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions; and

H. R. 6495 An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, April 16, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m. April

17, 20, and 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1571. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 1, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Turkey River, Iowa, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 700); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1572. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Willapa River, in Pacific County, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 701); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1573. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Susquehanna River and tributaries, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, authorized under the provisions of House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, which was enacted into law, with modifications, in section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved on January 21, 1927; and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and the acts of Congress approved on June 20 and 25, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 702); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1574. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mails on star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1575. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $60,000 (H. Doc. No. 703); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1576. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the National Housing Agency and the Federal Works Agency, totaling $50,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 704); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1577. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, involving a net increase of $2,046,278, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 705); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 6295. A bill to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 6935. A bill extending the provisions for freezing the debt obligations of persons subject to the draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6936. A bill providing free laundry and dry-cleaning service to members of the military and naval forces while on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 6937. A bill restricting the appropriations of all Government departments or agencies of the Government with respect to all publications not required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2673. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, opposing the bill known as House bill 6250, which would dispense with the literacy test in applications of aliens over 50 years of age for naturalization, and favoring the provision of the election law of the State of New York which provides for a literacy test for all alien applicants for citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2674. Also, resolution of the American Bureau of Chiropractic, New York State Auxiliary, No. 47, urging the President of the United States to take cognizance of mechanical injuries to the backs of soldiers, and that appropriate steps be taken for the permanent creation of a place in the health service of the armed forces for chiropractic, either as a part of the present set-up of the Medical Corps or that a separate and distinct chiropractic corps be created to be confined strictly to the administration of chiropractic to soldiers who are in need of that type of health service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2675. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., petitioning Congress to enact legislation providing for the establishment of daylight-saving time, superimposed upon the war time now in effect throughout the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Very Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of heaven and earth, whose beauteous world reveals the robe of an eternal glory, with whom is no variableness, no ebbing tide, no night, no changing shade: Hold Thou our feeble hands in Thine, as again we enter into the secret mystery of a new and gladsome day with its manifold tasks, its untried plans, that we may come to a more intimate knowledge of Thy will, and to a better understanding of ourselves.

Grant, we beseech Thee, to every citizen of our beloved country, grace to respond with heart and soul and mind to the call of duty in this high and holy service in behalf of our sorrow-laden world. And despite the present shadow and the agony of strife, grant that a new radiance may emerge to light the way for all the races of mankind, so that righteousness may walk this way once more, and the voice proclaiming justice, mercy, and a common brotherhood may never again be hushed. We ask it in our Saviour's name, and for His sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 13, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DITTER, and

Mr. ENGEL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5802. An act to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions; and

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

REPORTS OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following messages from the President of the United States, which were read and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a brief résumé of the third report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the calendar year 1938 and the first 6 months of 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1942.*

[NOTE.—Report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a brief résumé of the fourth report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1939, and ending June 30, 1940.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE. *April 16, 1942.*

[NOTE.—Report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Eighth Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administration, for the year ended December 31, 1941 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EASEMENT IN LANDS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (4), Justice (4), Agriculture (15), Commerce, and Labor; Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Savannah, Ga., Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Chicago, Ill., The National Archives (2), Federal Works Agency (2), United States courts, northern district of California, the Federal Security Agency, United States Employees Compensation Commission (2), the Civil Service Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Panama Canal, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ELIMINATION OF NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES—LETTER FROM E. T. TAYLOR

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, the war emergency has made it necessary to appropriate vast sums for defense purposes. Under such conditions it is essential that other expenditures should be cut to the bone. As the various appropriation bills come before us we should do everything possible to eliminate nonessentials, and especially activities which have been proved of little or no advantage to the public.

Agriculture is completely loyal to the war program, and its leaders recognize the trend toward a reductio.. in expenditures which are not essential. In providing abundant food supplies for ourselves and other nations associated with us, our farmers are performing an important service toward the ultimate victory which is sure to come. Congress in passing upon appropriations should do nothing which would tend to hinder agriculture and thus retard the flow of essential food supplies. Every encouragement must continue to be given to the proper activities of the Department of Agriculture. At the same time some of the ill-considered schemes which have been costly but which have been of little or no service to agriculture as a whole should be eliminated. There has been too great a tendency in recent years toward a regimentation of agriculture and its use as a laboratory for experimentation with untried ideas for changes in our social and economic institutions.

The feeling of some of the farmers of my State toward wasteful expenditures for agriculture is expressed graphically in a letter which I received from E. T. Taylor, master of the Idaho State Grange. The letter relates directly to the pending agricultural appropriation bill. I can vouch for the esteem in which Mr. Taylor is held among the farmers of Idaho and as to the importance which should be attached to his views.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taylor's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO STATE GRANGE,
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, March 25, 1942.

Senator JOHN THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you for your letter of the 19th, in which you enclosed copies of the Agriculture Department appropriations bill.

In reply to your request that I look it over and offer any suggestions that might come to mind, I beg to suggest the following as being some places where it appears to my mind that changes might be made.

The work of the Extension Department has become so duplicated with work of the Soil Conservation, Bureau of Home Economics, Farm Security Administration, and many similar activities that it would seem that a real cut should be made in the grand total appropriated for these activities.

Recently, at a meeting held in Coeur d'Alene, 19 women were present and lectured by representatives of 6 different agencies, all on the subject of farm gardens. This meeting probably cost the taxpayers around $75 for the per diem and expenses of these lecturers.

In this connection, one representative of the Extension Department, who is a real garden expert and who has covered this work for years, could have given more advice and better advice than the whole group put together.

The Extension Department functioned in good shape in the last war without the aid of the swarms of useless incompetents who have now a place in the trough.

It is now impossible to hold a farm meeting of any kind without its being packed with Federal officeholders, all trying to foist their departments onto the farmer. Farm Credit, Farm Security, Soil Conservation, Bureau of Home Economics, Commodity Credit, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, bug hunters, and a great array of other agencies are there trying to get the farmer to borrow more money, swallow hair-brained crackpot ideas and schemes, all of which are the vehicle which keeps the agency on the pay roll.

In the last war the control of weeds, rodents, bugs, and pests, marketing problems, and everything necessary to be of real aid to the farmer was handled ably and well by the Extension Service. Now each activity has a bureau of its own, and if a question is now asked of an extension agent regarding any subject it becomes necessary for the extension agent to take it up with some of the other agencies. He dares not tell you himself, because the other departments will start a fight right away on the claim their territory is being invaded.

The time has come to cut out of our Agriculture Department all of the duplication of effort and useless activities that have been placed in it in the past few years.

There is a legitimate need for an efficient Department of Agriculture, but it has been made a nest of separate departments performing much absolutely useless service, and duplication of worthy activities.

It would be my suggestion that the Soil Conservation Service, Weed Control, Home Economics, and similar work, all in a much reduced form, be abolished as departments and the work put back in the Extension Department.

I would further suggest that the personnel and traveling expenses be sharply reduced for all activities associated with the Agriculture Department. Put a ridér on the bill to the effect that they must use the mails instead of the roads to get their yarns over Farm personal calls and group meetings, costing the taxpayers large sums, are the way business is done now, where a franked letter would get over a far better story as it might come from some person who really was qualified to put it out.

On page 42 of the report I note the appropriation calls for $501,315 for administration of the Soil Conservation Service, which is a reduction of less than 2 percent in personnel costs On the other hand, the sum to be expended by this Department has been cut $3,199,905, or about 12 percent. It would seem the personnel should be cut with the cut in services rendered.

The appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, on page 43, shows salaries and expenses raised $11,352 while the amount of service to be rendered has been cut 22 percent. It would seem we are hanging onto the straphangers for future use. I believe this department has been operated as one of the most inefficient in Idaho, of any I have contacted.

This agency has been trying to organize cheese factories near Jerome and Twin Falls, right in the territory of the finest cooperative factories in the State. They are trying to set up cooperative stores and the statement of some of their workers is that "We must get more money out or we will be out of a job."

From a perusal of the bill it seems that the House has really tried to whittle it down, and I am much pleased to see that they took the position they display. I trust that the Senate may back them up and cut some more out also.

In the connection of appropriations will say that I am firmly of the opinion that all nonwar expenditures should be cut to the bone. The time has come when every ounce of effort must go into the war program. The fight by hundreds of useless agencies to hang onto their jobs is clearly disgusting to a large percentage of the citizens.

I have taken a lot of your time listening to my view on this matter, but I feel that a plain statement is what you wanted.

With best wishes to you in this day of difficulties, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. T. TAYLOR,
Master, Idaho State Grange.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Peter Friezen, secretary of Farmers' Union, Local No. 768, of Cathay, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation favorable to the agricultural interests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by Harmony Lodge, No. 450, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, Helpers, and Welders of America, American Federation of Labor, affiliated with the Navy Yard Metal Trades Council, Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation to abolish the 40-hour workweek provision of law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens, telephone employees, of Hagerstown, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to tax trust funds set aside for pension purposes by companies and corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of Frederick and Cumberland, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROSECUTION OF THE WAR—RESOLUTIONS OF LOYALTY OF PORTUGUESE-AMERICAN CIVIC LEAGUE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN presented resolutions adopted by the Portuguese-American Civic League of Rhode Island, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the officers and members of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Rhode Island greatly appreciate the privileges, opportunities, and liberties afforded them by the United States of America; and

Whereas these men and women believe in the principles of democracy underlying the Government; and

Whereas these men and women cherish and love this land of freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the officers and members of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Rhode Island, will do everything within our power whereby said privileges, opportunities, and liberties will continue in this great land, that we will in every way possible give everything, even to sacrifice our lives, if necessary, in order that those things which we hold sacred might continue to live and endure at all times.

Whereas the United States of America has been treacherously attacked by a member of the Axis Powers, thus threatening the liberty, tranquillity, and general welfare of all Americans as ordained and established in the Constitution of the United States of America, thus necessitating the United States of America to enter into this World War; and

Whereas the annual convention of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Rhode Island is this 15th day of February 1942 in session at Smithfield, R. I.; and

Whereas the delegates at this convention represent many of Portuguese descent who are United States citizens, either fortunately b. birth or wisely by naturalization, residing throughout the State of Rhode Island: Be it

Resolved, That we firmly and sincerely endorse all measures adopted by the United States Government to bring to a final success and victory this war for the preservation of our democracy and the peace of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That as 100-percent true and loyal American citizens we stand solidly with the United States of America, regardless of what nation or nations are now or may hereafter enter into war against the United States of America.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2448. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Arthur Foran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2449. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2450. A bill to authorize the President to acquire a stock pile of motor vehicles and parts and equipment therefor for national defense purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2451. A bill for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard;

S. 2453. A bill to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2454. A bill to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 2456. A bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 2457. A bill to amend the act of April 27, 1916, establishing the Army and Navy Medal of Honor roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 2458. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; and

S. 2459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in dual capacity; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PROHIBITION OF EMPLOYMENT OF ENEMY ALIENS IN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

In my opinion there has been an apparent pat-on-the-back policy with reference to the treatment of enemy aliens who are obviously against this country. On the whole, I feel that the great masses of our labor forces are doing a good job, but we must eliminate from employment eligibility all those who are not eager to aid our industries in producing with a maximum of efficiency.

Mr. President, there is now a law on the statute books prohibiting employment of enemy aliens, but apparently its provisions are not sufficiently strong to make it effective. Reports to officials in our armed services indicate that numbers of enemy aliens are employed in war-production plants. If our war effort is to be effective, we must eliminate the possibility of the fifth column, the most effective weapon of the Axis. To eliminate the fifth column we must, first of all, see that enemy aliens are not given the opportunity for sabotage.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2460) to prohibit the employment of enemy aliens in war industries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the support of Indian schools not otherwise provided for, and for other Indian educational purposes, etc., from $7,531,005 to $7,771,005, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RETIREMENT, WITH ADVANCED RANK, OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on page 7 of the Senate Calendar will be found Order No. 1260, Senate bill 2285, to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy. I should like to have the bill recommitted to the Naval Affairs Committee for the purpose of further study and consideration. Therefore, I move that Senate bill 2285 be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIS TO INDIANA REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by him to the Indiana Republican State Committee on April 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY AT COMMUNION BREAKFAST FOR SCHRAFFT EMPLOYEES

[Mr MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the communion breakfast for Schrafft employees, New York City, April 13, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUNISH THE DISLOYAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE GOLDFIELD (NEV.) NEWS

[Mr. BUNKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Punish the Disloyal," published in the Goldfield (Nev.) News of April 10, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR PROBLEMS AND PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the morning press carried a story that the President of the United States and his war labor cabinet will sit in conference today in an effort to bridge the gap between the views of labor and industry and wage stabilization. On Monday last the press carried a story on wage and profit ceilings and referred to a discussion by Charles Pack, head of the Doehler Die Casting Co., the Nation's largest producer of die castings, in which this gentleman said in a radio forum that profit ceilings were undemocratic, and that wage-profit limitations tend to kill incentive, encourage waste, incompetence, and inefficiency.

The morning press also carried a statement of labor leaders, who said that any proposed ceiling over wages is absolutely out, but they added that the President's suggestion for a stabilization of wages, along with profits and prices, has won increasing support in labor circles.

Mr. President, the diversity of opinion upon the question of wage stabilization thus exemplified is similar to that in the United States Senate today upon what seems to me to be probably the most important, indeed, the paramount, issue on the home front at this moment. In view of the fact that the Senate of the United States has unanimously agreed to take up on Monday next the Connally labor bill, it seems to me that this meeting in the White House at this moment is exceedingly timely.

During the past few weeks Members of Congress have seen their mail increase by leaps and bounds, due to the great difference of opinion which exists in America today upon fundamental questions affecting the labor situation. High-pressure methods have been used by various groups in attempting to persuade or intimidate or coerce certain Members of Congress with respect to their particular viewpoint upon a complicated question.

On the other hand, hundreds of spontaneous letters have reached Members of Congress from every section of the country, written by those who have no interest other than to do the correct thing which will produce more in the way of war supplies and implements to the end that America may win this war and the totalitarian powers may be defeated.

I have read, Mr. President, the arguments which have been presented upon both sides of this question; I have studied the letters which have come to my office from various persons in my State who have a very definite opinion as to what should be done; and, strange as it may seem, it is difficult to find any great groups agreeing upon the proper solution of the labor problem.

Obviously, whatever is done in connection with legislation which may be enacted, if we enter upon the consideration of this question next week, many in this country will be disappointed.

During this same period of time we have been receiving this mail we have also heard various Senators express themselves very vigorously upon certain phases of proposed labor legislation.

Mr. President, when we start debating the Connally labor bill the door will be open to move the substitution of every labor bill which is now pending before the Senate—and there are at least three, and perhaps more—and each Senator who has introduced a labor bill in the Senate believes that he has a panacea for the labor troubles which exist in the country today. Any amendment involving the labor situation may be offered; and, out of these many different thoughts and ideas on what is best for America, will come bitterness, rancor, and disappointment before we finish these debates. Not only will such feelings come to the Senate, but starting next week what the Senate may do about labor legislation will be reflected throughout the four corners of the Nation.

Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of making a most serious suggestion to the President of the United States and his War Labor Board, that during this conference they discuss every phase of the so-called labor legislation now pending before the Senate. When I say "every phase" I mean every proposition which has heretofore been seriously raised by Members of the Senate and the people of this Nation. I am now talking about the question of wage limitations. I am talking about the number of hours a week that men should work in this emergency. I am discussing overtime and double time, and I am discussing the racketeering feature that exists not only in the labor organization, but also in the management in certain instances.

Mr. President, the real racketeers in the labor organizations are few and far between, but I undertake to say that they are doing more damage to the morale of this country in our effort successfully to prosecute the war, than any other single element involved in the labor problem.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the heads of the American Federation of Labor and of the Congress of Industrial Organizations for burying the hatchet in this great emergency, and in presenting a united front, insofar as those two great organizations are concerned. If these great leaders could, in this emergency, purge the racketeers in their entirety, few though they be in number, it would be a great stimulant to the morale of this country, insofar as unity is concerned, which is so indispensable if we are to win the war.

If the labor leaders, during this emergency, could adopt a policy which would permit a man to go into a defense work by the payment of a nominal sum as union dues, it would do more to allay the fears and increase the courage and restore the morale of our people than any other single act.

Mr. President, I am speaking from personal experience, which I have had in my own State, in the case of a great defense plant at Wilmington, Ill., where millions upon millions of dollars have been spent, and where men were charged exorbitant sums for the privilege of going to work upon a defense plant; I took it upon myself in that instance, through William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to break up that case of racketeering at this plant, and while the unions did exact a considerable sum in exorbitant dues from those who desired to work, the racket was ultimately ended because of President Green's intervention.

I fear the same thing is going to happen again in the case of the gigantic plants between Springfield and Decatur, Ill., upon which construction is being started. I have already seen signs of the racketeers moving in, racketeers who have not the country's interest at heart, but only their own selfish interests. It is a small matter, but, Mr. President, it is the small things creeping in on the domestic front that are causing disunity here. It is not the large things. It was pensions, it was a fan dancer, it was a little waste here and there, or a bonus of a small amount, or racketeering labor, that seemed to get the big play through the press, and which seemed to disturb the American people most seriously.

So, Mr. President, again I urge the President of the United States and the

War Labor Board to attempt along with management, to initiate in the conference today a program that will be satisfactory to the great majority of the American people.

We hear talk of making sacrifices. No one has made any sacrifices in America as yet, except the soldiers, the sailors, and the marines. No Member of Congress has made any sacrifice; no member of a labor organization has made any sacrifice; no member of management has made any sacrifice, and no member of Government, whether he be in the legislative, the executive, or the judicial branch, has made any sacrifices, when we compare civilian activities with what the men in uniform are doing at this very moment throughout the world.

Mr. President, we have not seen anything to date, so far as sacrifice is concerned. I admit that I am a pessimist and have been for a long time. I read the daily headlines about what our boys are doing, and I also see that Japan continues to go on and on, conquering vast stretches of territories, and extending her command farther and farther into the Pacific and into the Indian Ocean. I know Mr. Hitler continues to hold Europe in his grasp. We have not seen anything as yet, but we will soon see the greatest offensive against Russia and the United Nations around the Mediterranean the world has ever known, and the horror and the destruction of life and property in this drive will be the greatest in all war history. That the Allies can hold on I am not certain. God knows I pray they will. But while this world catastrophe is at our very feet, when the world is on fire, when the United States of America stands almost alone—at least she might stand alone as the last citadel of liberty anywhere on earth—we in America quarrel and squabble, dilly-daily and delay about some little, insignificant this or that.

Oh, Mr. President, I sometimes think we are following in the footsteps of France before she fell, when her politicians and her statesmen and her people fiddled while Hitler was preparing. My hope is that through arbitration and through sacrifice upon the part of management and labor and Government, through give-and-take methods, which is the real American way, we may be able to do something between now and next week which will give to the Senate of the United States a labor program on which we can agree in a hurry, and which will be highly satisfactory to the American people. It is the most important question for solution now existing on the home front, and I make the prophecy now that just as surely as we start a serious debate upon the labor question in the United States Senate it will take a week or 10 days before every Member of the Senate who has some idea or notion, honestly believing it to be constructive and sound, can have an opportunity to be heard. It will be a long time before we finally reach a vote upon some kind of a bill. When that bill comes out of the United States Senate I fear it will be a legislative monstrosity which will not be acceptable to a great many Senators who may be compelled to vote for it.

Mr. President, I want to see production stimulated and not disturbed, but just as surely as we take up labor legislation, just as certainly as we do not arbitrate the labor question rather than legislate, we are going to have disturbances throughout the United States of America.

I hold no brief for labor, and I hold no brief for management. I have no pet theories as to what should or should not be done in connection with this important problem. The only thing the Senator from Illinois wants to see done is that which will be best for the interests of this great country of ours. That is what the people want. They want to see selfishness eliminated and politics adjourned. They would like to see a united front in Washington upon legislation which means so much in our successful prosecution of the war.

Sometimes, Mr. President, we have to give and we have to take; we have to make sacrifices; and sometimes individuals must admit that they have been wrong in the past, in order to pass constructive legislation which will accomplish the immediate objective. Sometimes individuals must look facts squarely in the face as they exist at the moment, and not permit something which has happened in the past to influence their judgment upon a great issue such as that before the Senate of the United States. That is what should be borne in mind in this conference today. Labor and management must look this important problem squarely in the face, and give and take, and make sacrifices, and come out with a program which will be satisfactory to the American people, because I honestly believe that the legislative body cannot legislate a labor program which will be satisfactory to the people.

Mr. President, probably what I have said will fall on deaf ears, but I have never been more sincere upon a matter since I have been a Member of the Senate than I am upon this one question, which deals so closely with the economic situation on the home front, upon which I feel it my duty to express an opinion. I hope that something constructive will come out of the conference today. My plea is that we arbitrate now, before it is too late. We must preserve unity. We must keep the morale of the American people on a high plateau. This is absolutely necessary if we are to win the war in which we are engaged.

ORGANIZATION OF JEWISH MILITARY UNITS IN PALESTINE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the battle for the Middle East and the Mediterranean is rapidly taking ominous form. Vichy's collaboration with Hitler in designating Pierre Laval premier is the tip-off. Soon Gibraltar and Suez will join embattled Malta in hearing and feeling the detonation of Hitler's cruel wrath. All civilization awaits with bated breath the outcome of this impending titanic struggle. More men to arms in that threatened area is the need of the hour insofar as the United Nations are concerned. In the expressive language of Winston Churchill, all men instinctively feel with him "the crisis of manpower is at hand and will dominate the year 1942." If that be true it is best that we take stock of the situation. What are the prospects of overcoming Hitler's concentrated might? Gibraltar is strong and should withstand assault. Malta has proved her ability to take constant and continuous punishment. Britain has a fine army in Egypt fairly well equipped and fairly well supported by ships and planes, but General Rommel, Hitler's able military leader, is poised to strike a mighty blow. Soon we shall know whether the United Nation's army in Egypt is of sufficient strength. The outcome is a gambler's chance right at this moment. How tragic the uncertainty when all civilization depends upon a clear-cut victory. Why not array more men to our colors and strengthen our arms and be certain of success and leave nothing to doubt. We must have no more Dunkirks and Singapores.

Palestine stands at the very gates of Suez, the vital focal point of the lifeline of the United Nations. Suez must be held and Palestine can be an important factor in its support. Seventy-five miles east of the Suez Canal there awaits in idleness a potential Jewish army begging and pleading for the right to fight to hold Suez. One hundred thousand Jews in Palestine are demanding now as I speak the opportunity and the right to fight on the side of the defenders of Suez. When the enemy's gun is leveled at the heart, the time for quibbling is past. When the United Nations know that Hitler and Hirohito have planned with sadistic glee to clasp hands—their bloody hands—across the Suez Canal, how can the decision be postponed?

Last December the committee for a Jewish army assembled here in Washington and made known its objective. This committee is nonpartisan and nonsectarian. Many Members of Congress belong to it. The senior Senator from Colorado is a member. Our objective is to create a Jewish army to fight at the side of the United Nations on a par with the Free French, the Free Poles, the Free Czechs, and other free nationals. This new army is to be composed of Palestinian and stateless Jews from many parts of the world. No Jew from America would be eligible, for American Jews will fight under the Stars and Stripes. In Palestine there are many young, courageous Jews anxious to defend their ancient home. They know the terrain and many of them have had military training. They will be joined by the disinherited, dispossessed and stateless Jews from all the Nazi-occupied countries of Europe who have already felt the crushing power of Nazi oppression. From the Middle East it is estimated that 100,000 Jews would be recruited in 24 hours. From other parts of the world another 100,000 would flock to join. Thus an army of 200,000 men would be able to render yeoman service in the cause of survival.

I can think of no reason for the British Government's hesitation to create a Jewish army in the Middle East now. The Free French, the Free Poles, and the Free Czechs have not been denied this right. Certainly a fighting chance should be given a people bluntly told by their persecutor and would-be conqueror that they will be exterminated. Good sportsmanship, not to mention other more compelling reasons, would dictate such a right. In the House of Representatives of the United States is pending this concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to direct the Secretary of State to petition the Government of Great Britain to take such action as may be necessary to permit the organization of all-Jewish military units in Palestine.

Britain should not compel Congress to adopt that concurrent resolution. She should not force her western ally, upon whom she must depend for survival, to ask her formally to make an obviously advantageous decision in this mutual cause. The avowed policy of the United States is to furnish arms to anyone willing to fight the common enemy. America is proud to be the arsenal of democracy, and she has made "a willingness to fight" the only qualification for arms assistance. It is 12,000 miles from America to Suez. America may not therefore be able to get men to Egypt in time, but most certainly we can get arms and munitions to men in Palestine now on the ground ready and waiting to receive these arms when Britain gives approval. I plead with the leaders of Britain to act before the hour grow later.

DEATH OF GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, it may not be inappropriate at this time when the last sad rites are being held for him, to revert for a moment to the contemplation of the death of a very great American. General Hugh Johnson was all of that, and he was more. He pursued a straight path, perhaps roughly at times, but always with fidelity and with truth. He was a man who had an exterior which did not commend itself to certain people, but underneath there was a heart—a heart as big as ever beat in the breast of any man.

General Johnson was a critic, as we sometimes heard, but there was never any malice in what he said. There was never any attempt to glorify himself at the expense of one of his fellow beings. He criticized, and sometimes his criticisms were harsh, but the particular event needed that sort of criticism, and that sort of criticism was good.

Mr. President, General Johnson had such a career as would have made most men extremely proud. I remember during the first World War when he, a younger man, served those who were older than he, and did the work which was required in the first drawing of the lottery then held in relation to the draft. General Johnson was the man who prepared the ground for that draft, and when his work was done it was well done.

So it was with his whole life. He had certain things to say. He said them well. He said them in pointed English which all of us could understand. He did not try at all to do that which he might have done and which his education entitled him to do—use a style of English expression which would be difficult of understanding and comprehension, but he talked plainly to those to whom he wished to talk—the great body of the people.

He was a man of extraordinary ability. He was a man of absolute integrity. His honesty never was questioned. He was a man who, pursuing his course in life, did that which he believed to be right.

Mr. President, I mourn him as a great American, for he was a great American. I realize that such a tribute may detract somewhat from his stature, for in these days when our minds and our hearts are frequently given over to persons and races other than our own, to mourn a man as a great American may in the eyes of certain persons be a sin, but I am willing to commit that sin, and I mourn Gen. Hugh Johnson because he represented a great American school.

Let him rest in peace. He has played his part upon the stage of the world's theater. He has played it well. He has played a man's part in the life that was his and during the trying events of the last few years. He has done well. Let him rest in peace.

LABOR PROBLEMS AND PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am unable to let this occasion pass without expressing my agreement in general with the important and timely statement made a few moments ago by the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] regarding the war problem in respect to labor legislation which Congress, the country, and labor itself confront. I agree with him that nothing could be more important than an affirmative, all-out program by way of voluntary agreement covering all related phases of the problem in the current White House conferences. I do not believe it will ever be possible to answer the vitally pressing economic factors on the home front that are involved in the war problem in this country except as they are answered simultaneously in respect to the problems of management, the problems of profits, the problems of labor, and the problems of prices. We can never do that successfully in general Senate debate.

As the Senate knows, I have always said that all-out price control, covering wages, profits, and prices ought to be given to the country as a single, comprehensive unit by way of defense against the suicide of inflationary spirals. The same thing is true of labor legislation. The sacrifices of both labor and management should be defined in the same formula so that each is assured of equity. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that if on next Monday we are to confront a general pell-mell melee on the floor of the Senate in respect to labor legislation, we are not likely to get the prudent and considered result which the situation requires. I join in the emphasis which the Senator from Illinois has put upon the necessity for high and effective and specific administration leadership in the creation of an all-out program in this regard.

Mr. President, I wish to specify one exhibit to demonstrate the complex nature of this challenge—the wide divergence of perfectly conscientious public opinion—in respect to one of these controverted factors. Yesterday the Secretary of the Navy, in testifying before a House committee, said, according to last evening's newspapers, that the 40-hour week issue is a wage question only. I do not think that the 40-hour week question is a wage question or a war-cost question only, in its general impact upon the morale of the American people. I emphatically disagree. True, it is purely a question of overtime pay in its mathematical aspect. But in its larger aspect it is taken by millions of our people as a symbol of our alleged unwillingness to give an all-out effort to the supply lines which sustain our fighting sons. It is folly to ignore this irresistible psychology.

Is there any justification for that public attitude? There certainly is. One of the ablest discussions of the matter which I have read in some time appeared recently in an editorial in the Washington Star, from which I wish to quote in part:

Without regard to the question whether the 40-hour week, under existing circumstances, should or should not be continued, the indisputable fact is that the primary purpose of the statute is to discourage and penalize work in excess of 40 hours a week.

There can be no question about it. It is an indisputable fact; and that is the prime reason the statute was passed. There was a very definite need at the time for its passage for that specific purpose; but that specific purpose ceases to exist for the duration of this war. Such a purpose is at direct variance with every demand of the Government for more and ever more production. Such a purpose is in direct conflict with the needs of the Army and the Navy. Such a purpose collides with the public conviction as to what is needed to win this war.

I continue to quote from the editorial:

It is quite true, as Mr. Walling says—

Mr. Walling being the new Wage and Hour Administrator—

It is quite true, as Mr. Walling says, that the workweek in most war plants is in excess of 40 hours, but what he neglects to bring out is the fact that this is being done by nullifying the plain intent and effect of the statute. Thus, the real question is whether a law frankly intended to discourage work in excess of 40 hours should be retained and defended when a longer workweek has become a national necessity. To argue that a longer workweek can be introduced in spite of the law is simply to dodge the true issue.

What I am saying is that the country has its eyes on the true issue. At least a great preponderance of the country believes that it has its eyes on the true issue—and beliefs are the raw materials of morale.

Continuing to read:

Mr. Walling himself is the best authority as to the real purpose of the statute, and this real purpose readily may be ascertained by examining the brief bearing his name which has been submitted to the Supreme Court in the so-called Belo case, involving the validity of the wage and hour law. The following excerpts are pertinent.

I now quote from the Wage and Hour Administrator, in his brief in the Supreme Court:

But the Wages and Hours Act shows on its face that section 7 was directed to maximum hours. The legislative history is exceedingly clear that Congress was concerned with hours as well as with wages, and that the time-and-a-half requirement of section 7 was intended to discourage overtime work by requiring the employer to pay extra compensation therefor regardless of the magnitude of the employee's regular rate of pay. * * * By requiring overtime compensation at 150 percent of the regular rate, Congress plainly intended to discourage hours of work in excess of the stated maxima.

This is the Wage and Hour Administrator describing the purpose of the 40-hour workweek law.

Congress plainly intended to discourage hours of work in excess of the stated maxima.

That is precisely the opinion of vast groups of the people of the country today, rightly or wrongly.

Continuing to quote from Mr. Walling's brief:

This intent is clear both on the face of the act and from its legislative history * * *. Such additional compensation at 150 percent of the regular rate was intended as a sanction to enforce the statutory prohibition of employment beyond the maximum number of hours.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Administrator Walling is about the best authority available on the subject of the purpose of the 40-hour workweek law. I do not blame labor in the slightest for resisting any effort to strike down the basic peacetime principle of the 40-hour workweek. If it is even temporarily suspended, obviously it should be done only for the duration of this crisis, and only on the express terms that the 40-hour workweek shall automatically recur at the end of the emergency. But, Mr. President, during the emergency I do not believe we can satisfy the American people, I do not believe we can satisfy our men in uniform, that we in the Congress have given our full dedication to the war effort necessary to sustain our fighting sons at the front unless we create a 48-hour workweek basis for the duration of the conflict, or unless labor invites this change by voluntary attitudes.

I now revert to the address by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. He said that it is better to reach these results voluntarily than by legislation. To that I heartily agree. It is in that spirit that I endorse his belief that the greatest contribution labor and management can make to the welfare of their country at this time is a voluntary agreement upon some of the fundamental things which are essential to the creation of a satisfied public morale.

Manifestly this includes profit limitations for management. Indeed that should be the starting point. There should be no such things as excess war profits. I am talking about mutual restraints upon all concerned. I am talking about viewing all of these problems through the eyes of the American soldier on Bataan and the American sailor on the battle seas.

But I was particularly discussing the 40-hour week and its status as a powerfully influential war symbol.

I think that patriotic organized labor made a great contribution to its own best welfare when it voluntarily gave up double time for Saturdays and holidays. I think it would make a tremendous contribution—an invincible contribution—to its own welfare and to its entrenched standing with the American people if it were voluntarily to accept an appropriately safeguarded 48-hour basic workweek for the duration of this war.

I would not blame labor for resisting any such 48-hour workweek if the advantage of the extension should inure to the benefit of the contracting employer. Of course, any overtime which the contractor figured in the basis of his price when he got his contract ought to be taken from him and returned to the Government. The recent proposition made in behalf of 400,000 radio and electrical union workers affiliated with the C. I. O., voluntarily offering to give up all overtime of this nature if the overtime were paid back into the Treasury of the United States, is typical of the sort of attitude which I am saying immensely advantages labor itself, and tremendously encourages the country.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois was correct. I doubt whether we can hope next week to work out on the floor of the Senate a complete program covering the unavoidably interlinked factors of wages, management, profits, and prices. I think we require the sort of executive recommendation and leadership for which the Senator from Illinois pleaded, because we are in a war, and war is essentially an executive function. If we can have this sort of voluntary agreement covering the essential things—and I have only touched upon one of them—to be done in behalf of maximum uninterrupted war production, it will electrify America. It will be the greatest single contribution that can be made to the public morale and to the war effort. But, Mr. President, if we cannot have it voluntarily, we shall have to get it involuntarily.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with my previous remarks I referred to an editorial from the Washington Star, but neglected to ask that it be published in full at the conclusion of my statement. I now make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial in full is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 21, 1942]

ISSUES—TRUE AND FALSE

The charge by various officials that the public has been misinformed regarding the effect of the 40-hour week and that the press is partly responsible for this state of affairs does not bear up well under close examination.

Last Tuesday, for example, the President, authorizing direct quotation, said there was an "amazing state of misinformation" on this question. He placed the blame on the newspapers and irresponsible speeches in Congress. More recently L. Metcalfe Walling, head of the Wage and Hour Division, said that "some of our editorial writers" would have the public believe that we are trying to fight the war on a 40-hour week.

Since neither critic referred specifically to any offending newspaper or editorial writer, it is impossible, of course, to make any categorical denial of the accusations. But it can be said with confidence that newspapers on the whole have not misrepresented this question. On the contrary, the difficulty arises from the fact that champions of the 40-hour week, like Mr. Walling, have shifted their ground and are attempting to direct their arguments to a new issue, one which is wholly different from that originally raised by those who disagree with them.

Without regard to the question whether the 40-hour week, under existing circumstances, should or should not be continued, the indisputable fact is that the primary purpose of the statute is to discourage and penalize work in excess of 40 hours a week. It is quite true, as Mr. Walling says, that the workweek in most war plants is in excess of 40 hours, but what he neglects to bring out is the fact that this is being done by nullifying the plain intent and effect of the statute. Thus the real question is whether a law frankly intended to discourage work in excess of 40 hours should be retained and defended when a longer workweek has become a national necessity. To argue that a longer workweek can be introduced in spite of the law is simply to dodge the true issue.

Mr. Walling himself is the best authority as to the real purpose of the statute, and this real purpose readily may be ascertained by examining the brief bearing his name which has been submitted to the Supreme Court in the so-called Belo case, involving the validity of the wage-and-hour law. The following excerpts are pertinent.

"But the Wages and Hours Act shows on its face that section 7 was directed to maximum hours. The legislative history is exceedingly clear that Congress was concerned with hours as well as with wages and that the time and a half requirement of section 7 was intended to discourage overtime work by requiring the employer to pay extra compensation therefor regardless of the magnitude of the employee's regular rate of pay * * *. By requiring overtime compensation at 150 percent of the regular rate, Congress plainly intended to discourage hours of work in excess of the stated maxima * * *. This intent is clear both on the face of the act and from its legislative history * * *. Such additional compensation at 150 percent of the regular rate was intended as a sanction to enforce the statutory prohibition of employment beyond the maximum number of hours."

In the light of this language from Mr. Walling's brief there can be no doubt as to the intent and probable effect of the act. Yet he and other administration officials defend the statute and urge that it be retained, although they necessarily concede and actually cite as an argument in support of their position the fact that it is not having its intended effect—that, in fact, its intent is being nullified in war industries.

The truth, of course, is that the 40-hour limitation—the plain intent of Congress—is being nullified by the payment of time and a half for overtime. But the penalty is not being paid by the employers, as intended by the act. Instead, it is being paid by the public. If this, under the circumstances, is necessary and proper, all well and good, but officials who avoid discussion of this basic fact have little reason to accuse the press of misrepresenting the issue.

INVESTIGATION OF PRIMARIES AND ELECTIONS—SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 235, which is now on the calendar.

This resolution was unanimously recommended by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It was submitted on April 3, 1942, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and reported back by that committee without amendment on April 6. The resolution is similar to those which have been passed in almost every recent congressional election year—1930, 1934, 1938, and 1940. Each time some slight variation was made because of the experience of the committees in the previous congressional elections. The same thing is true now. We have added a couple of new provisions; but, as a whole, the resolution is similar to the one which was passed 2 years ago.

It is important that the resolution be agreed to without further delay, because it relates to primaries as well as to elections, and primaries are now being held; in fact, already have been held. The resolution is not a controversial one. It is certainly on a nonpartisan basis; and I therefore ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 235, submitted by Mr. GREEN on April 3, 1942, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1942, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) The extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of United States Senator in 1942 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) The amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention held in 1942, at which a candidate for United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) The expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidate; and

(5) Such other matters relating to the election of United States Senators in 1942, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee, under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

SEC. 4. The committee by majority vote may authorize any member of the committee, or any member of a duly authorized subcommittee, to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any member so authorized may hold public hearings, issue subpenas and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, administer oaths, and take testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpenas and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee, or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate on the first day of the next regular session of the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, more than a week ago this resolution was called to the attention of the Senate by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. At that time he expressed some doubt regarding one section of the resolution. I regret that he is temporarily absent. I joined with him in objecting to the consideration of the resolution at that time. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution today if it is agreeable to the other Senators, particularly the Senator from Illinois.

The resolution is in the usual form, and is similar to resolutions which have been adopted by the Senate for many years without debate or objection. I think it is precisely in the language of the one which was before the Senate last year regarding campaign expenditures. There is immediate necessity for its adoption, which I think always ought to be considered in matters of this kind that come up during a practical recess of Congress. There is need for legislation of this kind, since it covers primary elections as well as other elections, and a primary election was held yesterday to which I attach some importance and significance.

In view of that fact, if it is perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Illinois, I have personally no objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not intend to object. I should like to inquire, however, what appropriation is authorized by the resolution.

Mr. GREEN. The amount is the same as in previous years—$30,000.

Mr. WALSH. In previous years, have additional sums been asked by the committee?

Mr. GREEN. I am not informed as to that.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think I can answer that question. Last year I think $30,000 more than covered the expenses of the investigation, but in some former years, particularly when we had before us the Vare case and the Smith case, a larger sum was appropriated for the activities of a special committee.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, much depends upon what is developed.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; but the pending resolution provides that the expenses of the committee shall not exceed $30,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. If the committee needs additional funds it will have to come to the Senate and ask for them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

STRIKES AND SLOWDOWNS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have received from Rear Admiral C. W. Fisher, Director of Shore Establishments of the Navy Department, an official report respecting strikes and slowdowns for the week ending April 11, 1942.

I shall read this report to the Senate. I shall do so because if slowdowns, as

this report says, are interfering with our war-production program, then immediate action should be taken, as nothing would be more insidious as undermining our public morale than slowdowns which reduce production.

These slowdowns were reported in eight very vital war plants having important contracts. This report does not include alleged slowdowns on contracts made by the Maritime Commission or the War Department; but I have asked for information as to these, also.

I wish to emphasize that I am making this information public for the purpose of directing public attention to this ominous situation. I am not attempting to place the blame—whether it lies with labor, lack of cooperation on the part of the manufacturers, or inefficiency of Washington bureaus. I do say, all I know is the statement in the report of the Navy Department however, that this condition has been reported officially by the Navy Department and has been referred to in testimony before the House committee by Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission.

This report is especially impressive to me in that at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, Long Island City, N. Y., in several sections of the plant, the report says, all of the employees, including the foremen, are enemy aliens. If this be the case, then it is the duty of the proper branch of Government to clean out all enemy aliens in such an important plant, which is reported by the Navy Department to be operating at only 40 percent of full capacity.

At the Hayes Manufacturing Corporation, Grand Rapids, Mich., while the primary cause of the operation at 65 percent of capacity is given by the Navy Department as the union's demand for wage increases, yet the further statement is made that continual changes in specifications by prime contractors are also a contributing cause.

At the Bendix Aviation Co., South Bend, Ind., it is stated that 75 percent of production exists because workers are one-half hour late in reporting for work in the morning, and stop one-half hour before the shift ends. It is also reported that the management is not using all available machines.

Unless these slowdowns are stopped immediately, some steps must be taken to determine at once who is to blame—whether labor, management, or the bureaus at Washington. Wherever the blame rests, it is imperative that correction be made promptly. The only way we can win this war is by means of a united effort on the part of all our citizens.

This report is signed by Rear Admiral C. W. Fisher, and was prepared by direction of Mr. L. M. Atkins. It reads as follows:

The following slowdowns have been reported:

Atlas Press Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.

Status: Twenty-five percent slowdown has been in effect since February 25, due to S. W. O. C. demand for closed shop and wage increases.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What is embraced in the term "slowdown"?

Mr. BYRD. A slowdown, as I understand, is due to causes which could be corrected, and as a result the plants are not operating at full capacity.

Mr. WALSH. The term does not necessarily mean voluntarily refusing to do a day's work; does it?

Mr. BYRD. I think it could mean that.

Mr. WALSH. It is a rather broad statement.

Mr. BYRD. It is a broad statement; and I was so astonished at it that I have taken the privilege of having it inserted in the RECORD and telling the Senate about it.

The report came from the Navy Department. I shall read the Senator the reasons given in the various instances for the slowdowns. I repeat:

The following slowdowns have been reported:

Atlas Press Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.

Status: Twenty-five-percent slowdown has been in effect since February 25, due to Steel Workers' Organizing Committee demand for closed shop and wage increases.

Aluminum Co. of America, Detroit, Mich.—

One of the most vital of all defense plants—

Status: This company has been operating at approximately 40 percent of capacity and it is alleged that the local leaders of the Congress of Industrial Organizations are responsible.

Bendix Aviation Co., South Bend, Ind.—

A very important war plant—

Status: Seventy-five percent production exists at this plant as a result of workers on each shift reporting for work a half an hour late and stopping a half hour before the shift ends. It is also reported that the management is not using all available machines.

Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, Long Island City, N. Y.

Status: This plant is operating at 40 percent of capacity due to labor leaders' demand for slowdown, and also because of inefficient management It is reported that in several sections of the plant all of the employees, including the foremen, are enemy aliens.

Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Columbus, Ohio—

A most vital war plant—

Status: The inspector of naval aircraft reports that United Automobile Workers-Congress of Industrial Organizations local labor leaders were responsible for constant discontent of the workers caused by statements that they were overworked, the hours too long, and wages inadequate. Plant operating about 60 percent of capacity.

Hayes Manufacturing Corporation, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Status: This company is an important prime contractor and also an important supplier of aircraft parts for Brewster Aeronautical Corporation. The plant is operating at 65 percent of capacity and it appears that the primary cause of the trouble is the unions' demand for wage increases. However, management reports that continual changes in specifications by prime contractors is also a contributing cause.

Shelmar Products Co., Mount Vernon, Ohio.

Status: As a result of 90-percent slow-down beginning April 6, company has had to close plant. Issue, wage increases.

Thorrez-Maes Manufacturing Co., Jackson, Mich.

Status: Since the men returned to work on February 11 after a prolonged strike, a slowdown has resulted. National Labor Relations Board held an election March 31 with Congress of Industrial Organizations winning. However, the election has not solved the difficulties.

This report was signed and sent to me voluntarily by Rear Admiral C. W. Fisher, Director of Shore Establishments of the Navy Department. I know nothing about the matter except what is contained in the report.

Mr. President, I ask to insert in the RECORD a report on strikes on naval defense contracts.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Subject: Strikes on naval defense contracts.

There are listed below strikes which were in effect during the week ending April 11, 1942, in plants having naval defense contracts. More information may be obtained from the Shore Establishments Division, room 2505, branch 4674, where information as to discrepancies noticed or as to urgency of contracts in the plants listed should be sent.

The following strikes have been settled:

Goodyear Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio: Began April 7; ended April 7. Status: 220 fabricators affected. There was a sit-down strike of the first two shifts. Issue, wages.

Ohio Tool Co.: Cleveland, Ohio: Began April 4; ended April 7. Status: 41 affected. Issue, wages.

Roller Bearings Co. of America, Trenton, N. J.: Began March 26; ended March 30. Status: 375 affected.

The following strike is continuing:

Naval Ordnance Plant, South Charleston, W. Va.: Began April 10. Status: 2,000 affected. Issue, wages. When the midnight shift reported for work on April 10, 15 men were picketing the main gate, and prevented all workers from entering the plant. The strike was called by a local leader of the S. W. O. C., but was otherwise unauthorized. The Governor of West Virginia has been requested to use his influence to end the strike.

USE OF FRANKING PRIVILEGE BY BOWLING COORDINATOR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, some days ago I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that Mr. Jack M. Willem, National Bowling Coordinator, had been using the franking privilege for the purpose of creating throughout the country sentiment to have bowling established as a vital defense project and thereby exclude bowling equipment from priority orders. I submitted a copy of this circular to the Postmaster General, whose reply states these communications were sent out illegally under the franking privilege. Therefore, I have asked him to prosecute the parties guilty of this practice.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the letter from Postmaster General Walker and a copy of my reply; likewise, a copy of a letter I have written to the Honorable Paul V McNutt, head of the Federal Security Agency, to which agency the Physical Fitness Division of the Office of Civilian Defense was transferred.

This demonstrates the extent to which the Physical Fitness Division has been used for commercializing, as Mr. Willem is identified to me as an executive of the

Stack-Globe Advertising Agency, which handles the account of the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., which company, I understand, holds a virtual monopoly on the manufacture of bowling equipment.

I have seen an advertisement in Collier's April 4 issue inserted by the Brunswick Balke-Collender Co. In the corner of this advertisement is the following:

Hale America! Join the Hale America Bowling Legion. Get in touch with your league secretary at once to find out how you, too, can actively participate in the physical fitness program of the Office of Civilian Defense.

This indicates the commercial tie-up between Mr. Willem, as national bowling coordinator, and the company which has a monopoly of the manufacture of bowling equipment.

I have furnished the Postmaster General full information by statements of those who received the literature from Mr. Willem's office, urging that letters be secured from citizens stating that bowling has helped them, these letters to be sent to Washington to prevent bowling equipment and supplies from being placed under restrictions because of defense needs.

I assume the Postmaster General will institute proceedings immediately for this violation of the law.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1942.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 4, submitting a circular from the Office of Civilian Defense and inviting attention to the request therein "to use influence to prevent restrictions being placed on bowling equipment." It is noted that the circular is sent out over the name of E. H. Baumgarten, secretary, American Bowling Congress, and Coordinator, Men's Bowling Activity, Office of Civilian Defense.

Under the law governing the exercise of the penalty privilege embodied in section 615, Postal Laws and Regulations, such privilege is restricted to "officers of the United States Government" solely for the purpose of transmitting in the mails free of postage "matters relating exclusively to the business of the Government of the United States."

The circular does not relate exclusively to the business of the Government and, furthermore, the Secretary of the American Bowling Congress as such is not an officer of the Government.

Very truly yours,
FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

APRIL 15, 1942.

Hon. FRANK C. WALKER,
The Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALKER: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 9.

You state in this letter that the circular from the Office of Civilian Defense, the purpose of which was to influence the Government to classify bowling equipment as an essential part of national defense, does not relate exclusively to the business of the Government and, therefore, was distributed illegally through the mails.

Enclosed is one of the original envelopes, showing that this was distributed under frank, and I can furnish other evidence, if you desire.

I ask that you institute the proper proceedings to impose all penalties against those who are guilty of using the mail under Government frank for this purpose. I ask this because I am informed that Mr. Jack M. Willem is an executive of the Stack-Globe Advertising Agency, which handles the account of the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., which company I understand holds a virtual monopoly on the manufacture of bowling equipment. This not only indicates a lack of patriotism but shows the use of the official frank under the Office of Civilian Defense to accomplish a purpose which would be of direct financial benefit to Mr. Willem, assuming that he is a member of this firm, which I am informed by responsible persons is correct.

With best wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,
HARRY F. BYRD.

APRIL 15, 1942.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCNUTT: A complaint has been made to me that Mr. Jack M. Willem, who is National Bowling Coordinator under your Physical Fitness Division, has been using the franking privilege of the Government for the purpose of creating sentiment to have bowling equipment considered as being necessary to national defense and, therefore, not subject to priority regulations.

I have submitted the correspondence to the Postmaster General, Mr. Frank C. Walker, and enclose you a copy of his reply, likewise a copy of my letter to Postmaster General Walker, asking him to proceed against those guilty of this violation of the franking privilege.

The circular letter which was sent out under the frank was printed on the letterhead of Jack M. Willem, National Bowling Coordinator, Division of Physical Fitness, Office of Civilian Defense, and was signed by E. H. Baumgarten, Secretary, American Bowling Congress, Coordinator, Men's Bowling Activity, Office of Civilian Defense. I enclose you a copy of this correspondence, which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am calling this to your attention, as I assume you will want to take the proper steps to discipline those who are guilty of such practice.

With best wishes, I am
Cordially yours,
HARRY F. BYRD.

RACIAL RELATIONS ADVISERS IN OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial and an article from the Washington Tribune, a Negro publication, in which reference is made to the amounts paid by the Office of Civilian Defense for so-called racial advisers who have been appointed throughout the country.

When an investigation of this agency was before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I stated that the Negroes of America were just as patriotic as any other class of our citizens and did not need special racial advisers in order to have them participate in the fullest measure in the war effort of our country. A leading Negro publication, the Washington Tribune, confirms this position.

In view of the importance of this utterance as coming from one of the leading Negro newspapers of the country, I desire to have it made a part of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the editorial and article from this publication.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Tribune]

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE AND NEGRO THINKING

Something stinks in the Race Relations Unit of the Office of Civilian Defense.

This office, headed by Mrs. Crystal Bird Fauset, was created when Mayor LaGuardia and Mrs. Roosevelt were running things in the DuPont Circle Building.

While the function of the Race Relations Unit would appear obvious, we have yet to feel the presence of the unit with its dozens of Negroes on its pay rolls.

Mrs. Fauset, renowned for her acceptance of speaking engagements which she never fulfills, is harder to reach than the President; consequently all we have been able to ascertain concerning her duties is that she is hired at $4,600 to advise her boss "what the Negro thinks."

She has surrounded herself with "little race advisers" in the field, who keep her posted on "what the Negro thinks" in the region, and she, in turn, relays this thinking to Dean Landis.

The Tribune thinks that the employment of some 15 Negroes at $4,600 per year removes these Negroes from the "turf" but serves no useful purpose, and is out of place in the Office of Civilian Defense, which should be building air-raid shelters and preparing this country for protection during an air raid, whether the Negro thinks or not. It is so much "bunk" and waste of the taxpayers' money.

We think Mrs. Fauset thinks so too, for she has refused to give us the names, salaries, and functions of her unusually large staff, for fear some Members of Congress may think as the Tribune thinks, and as the record of the Race Relations Unit suggests, that the Race Relations Unit of the Office of Civilian Defense should be abolished. We'll tell you why next week.

[From the Washington Tribune of April 11, 1942]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS IN SALARIES PAID IN OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE FOR "RACE ADVISERS"

The Federal Government is spending $120,000 a year to maintain its Race Relations Unit of the Office of Civilian Defense. This is more money than is spent by any other Government department or agency for advice on Negro affairs. The few departments of Government that employ Negro advisers receive all the advice they want from one person.

But the Office of Civilian Defense has employed seven Negroes, with the title of "Racial Relations Adviser" at salaries of $4,600 each. It has one assistant racial relations adviser at $3,800 a year; two are employed at $3,200 a year, with titles of "Associate Racial Relations Adviser." One physical fitness representative is employed at $3,200 a year and an information specialist at $3,800 completes the list of Negro executives in the Office of Civilian Defense.

FORTY-NINE CLERKS

These 12 officials require the assistance of 49 clerks, stenographers, and secretaries, with an average salary of $1,440 per year, totaling an annual expenditure for clerks for 12 race relations advisers of $70,560. The total salaries paid executives of the Race Relations Unit amounts to $49,560. In other words, the Office of Civilian Defense is paying $119,960 for advice on Negro relations.

A look-see at the list of advisers reveals the following names:

Crystal Byrd Fauset, Anna A. Hedgeman, Furman L. Templeton, Charles V. Carr, Loring B. Moore, Joseph J. Rhoads, Maj. Milton T. Dean

Thelma P. Tabb, assistant racial relations adviser, is said to have resigned. William D. Alexander is the information specialist. Pauline Redmond and Charlotte Moton are associate racial relations advisers, and Jesse Owens is the physical-fitness representative.

DEAN OF ADVISERS

Mrs. Fauset, being the first racial relations adviser appointed, and assigned to Washington headquarters, is supposed to be the dean of advisers, inasmuch as it was upon her advice that these other advisers were appointed and assigned to various regions

The relative accomplishments of this unusually large corps of race advisers is uncertain, inasmuch as Mrs. Fauset declined to give this information to the Tribune, or even reveal any information whatsoever concerning her division.

Through protest and other methods, the Tribune finally succeeded in getting a portion of this information from the chief of the press relations section of the Office of Civilian Defense.

There are several departments of the Government where the employment of a race relations adviser is of utmost importance, but the Office of Civilian Defense, created as it was for the purpose of handling the responsibility for protection of life and property during the war, is not such an agency that should call for a corps of Negro advisers at a cost to the Government of $120,000 per year.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS IN ADVISERS

The stake of the Negro in the war is as great and in many respects greater than that of any other racial group. By that token Negroes should be and are willing to make sacrifices the same as any other race. We have individuals and responsible agencies created to deal with the Negro problems. They know those problems They know what is in the best interest of the race as a whole, and they are willing to impart that information to any governmental agency that requests it, and free of charge

An example of what we have in mind is the recent appointment of two prominent Negroes as advisers to the Secretary of Agriculture at $1 a year. The advice they will give to Secretary Wickard, at a cost to the Government of $2 a year, will, in all probability, be a hundred times more reliable and valuable than the advice that is costing us $120,000 a year.

As we scan the list of advisers, associate and what not, there are many names not familiar to the Negroes generally. Who they are and what their qualifications are to serve as advisers for a race of some 15,000,000 people are very important questions, the answers to which the Negroes are certainly entitled to have.

SHOULD BE COMPETENT

What it is about these people that the race relations adviser in Washington does not want publicized remains a mystery. There are advisers for six different districts. The Negroes within these districts are entitled to know who the Negro is that is advising on their particular affairs. They should have assurances that the persons giving the advice are competent to advise.

The newspapers are entitled to have any information concerning the war efforts that does not give aid and comfort to the enemy. An information specialist is employed at $3,800 per year to maintain press relations with the Negro press. We have read very little of Office of Civilian Defense activities from his pen, and this paper has not had the first release from his office.

TO ADVISE ON ADVISERS

He was not permitted to give us the names, salaries, and titles of Negroes employed by the Office of Civilian Defense. How this could be of aid and comfort to the enemy we do not know. Apparently there was some difference of opinion concerning this aspect for the chief of the press relations relayed the information to us.

The background of these advisers will be gone into, and brought to public attention in articles on the Office of Civilian Defense that will follow. We feel that the Tribune should advise the Negro public of the activities of the advisers, and this will be done in succeeding articles.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Harry T. Foley, of Yonkers, N. Y., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. Reappointment.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

Raymond Miller, of Galatea, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. Reappointment.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Alva D. Bernhard, to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from November 23, 1941;

Capt. Alan G. Kirk, to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from November 24, 1941;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy;

Several officers for promotion as general officers in the Marine Corps; and

Several officers for appointment and promotion and several citizens for appointment as second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar

Mr SMATHERS. I move that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 20, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Daniel Gaudin, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

E. M. Basye, of Missouri, to be Work Projects administrator for Missouri, effective May 1, 1942.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Albert H. Ladner, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1941, vice John M. Morin, deceased.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Arthur J. Ewing, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. Reappointment.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Earl D. Krickbaum, of Pennsylvania, to be a principal statistician in the Selective Service System.

The compensation to be paid Mr. Krickbaum will be $5,600 per annum.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Emil Fred Reinhardt (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ira Thomas Wyche (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Gustav Henry Franke (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Ralph Corbett Smith (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Geoffrey Prescott Baldwin (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Richard Schmidt (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Jerome Jackson Waters, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Augustus Milton Gurney (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Rex Webb Beasley (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Gardiner Helmick (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Russell Gilbert Barkalow (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery, Army of the United States.

Col. William Glenn Livesay (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Archibald Campbell (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Carey Lee (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hume Peabody (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank O'Driscoll Hunter (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Air Corps.

Col. Harold Lee George (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Eugene Farthing (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col Shepler Ward FitzGerald, Air Corps.

Col. Walter Francis Kraus (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col Isaiah Davies (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps) Air Corps

Col Philip Edward Brown (lieutenant colonel Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Angus Davison (lieutenant colonel Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States

Col. Harold Mark McClelland (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Ernest Dahlquist (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Clayton Lawrence Bissell (lieutenant colonel Air Corps), Air Corps.

Col. Claire Lee Chennault (captain, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. Robert Patrick Campbell, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Paul Celestin Le Golvan, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Walter Cecil Twineham, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt Herbert Edward Block, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Frederick Whiting Timmerman, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt Abraham Chartock, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Lyman Lincoln Judge, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Robin Bruce Epler, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 13, 1939

Second Lt Julius Porter Faris, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1939, effective April 29, 1942

Second Lt Donald Haynes Heaton, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Albert Howell Snider, Signal Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Jesse Duncan Thompson, Infantry, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Harry White Trimble, Infantry, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Wharton Clayton Cochran, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt John Frederick Harris, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Harold Edward Nankivell, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Harold Wesly Norton, Field Artillery, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Edgar Thornton Poole, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt Clyde Arnold Thompson, Infantry, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt George Henry Pittman, Jr., Signal Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from April 1, 1942

Lt. Col. Charles Nathaniel Sawyer, Signal Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Richard Cook, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Max Weston Sullivan, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Franklin Cummings Sibert, Infantry (temporary major general, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Archibald Vincent Arnold, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col Stephen J. Chamberlin, Infantry (temporary brigadier general, Army of the United States)

Lt. Col John Traylor McLane, Cavalry (temporary colonel Army of the United States)

Lt. Col. William Horace Hobson, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Raymond Oscar Barton, Infantry (temporary brigadier general, Army of the United States,

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 3, 1942

Maj. Leo George Clarke, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from May 4, 1942

Maj. Hugh Carlton Dorrien, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States)

Maj Shirley Randolph Hurt, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj James Carl Horne, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj Werner Watson Moore, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States)

Maj Fremont Byron Hodson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Robert Theodore Zane, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps)

Maj Irving Compton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States)

Maj Rudolph William Broedlow, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Albert Edmund Rothermich, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States)

Maj Stowe Thompson Sutton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj James Ainsworth Brown, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Elliott Raymond Thorpe, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Douglas Sugg, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj Milo Cooper Pratt, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. LeRoy Allen Walthall, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 31, 1942

Maj. Lucas Victor Beau, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary colonel, Air Corps).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Edward Allen Noyes, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 9, 1942.

Lt. Col. Charles Woodward Riley, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 10, 1942.

Lt. Col. Charles George Sinclair, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 11, 1942.

Lt. Col. Charles George Hutter, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 12, 1942.

Lt. Col. Frederick Henry Petters, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 13, 1942.

Lt. Col. Robert Parvin Williams, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States) with rank from May 15, 1942.

Lt Col. Edwin Brooks Maynard, Medical Corps, with rank from May 16, 1942.

Lt. Col Harvard Clayton Moore, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 17, 1942.

Lt. Col. Arden Freer, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 18, 1942.

Lt. Col. Paul Adolph Schule, Medical Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from May 19, 1942.

To be majors

Capt. Roland Keith Charles, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 20, 1942.

Capt. Joseph Julius Hornisher, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 22, 1942.

To be captains

First Lt. Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 4, 1942.

First Lt. Wilbur Dwight Dice, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 10, 1942.

First Lt. Ralph Everett Reiner, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 15, 1942.

First Lt. Francis Patterson Wells, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 17, 1942.

First Lt. William Nelson Donovan, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 29, 1942.

First Lt. Norman Clemm Veale, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 30, 1942.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Richard Jackmond Burch, Dental Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from May 5, 1942.

First Lt. James Perry Williams, Dental Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 22, 1942.

CHAPLAINS

To be major

Chaplain (captain) Frederick Herbert Moehlmann, United States Army (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from May 9, 1942.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 16 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

POSTMASTER

Silvio Broussard to be postmaster at New Iberia, in the State of Louisiana.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

James G. Mosley, Rison.

MISSOURI

Pearl E. Bussert, Wardell.

NEW JERSEY

Ernest B. Helmrich, Hopatcong.
Edith B. Brooks, Kingston.
Anthony J. Ciocci, New Providence.
William J. Morris, Wyckoff.

OKLAHOMA

Grace E. Wandell, Coyle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father of life, we raise our thoughts to Thee in prayer at the dawning of a new day. Help us to be as those who broaden, deepen, and purify it by word and deed. As workers for humanity, we are essaying the greatest task that is possible in these dark times; do Thou give us hope and encouragement where they are not visible. He who gave His Son to die for us will freely give us all things. Grant that Thy spirit may weapon us with love and kindness, with service and sympathy for all who are broken by the cruel misfortunes of war.

We beseech Thee to inspire us with a great calm, with untroubled hearts, and with an invulnerable faith that there may be no waste of energy, no contagious fear, and no weariness in the performance of our appointed duties. In these most critical days, we pray that our country may battle for our fathers' noblest legacy, for the trust that the Lord of light hath placed in our hands, and for the finest impulses invigorating our souls. In the name of St. Mary's Holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939 entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the Department of War and the National Archives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 9, 1942:

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman; and

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider

On April 10, 1942:

H. R. 6483. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

On April 11, 1942:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; and

H. R. 6554. An act to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

RELIEF OF JACQUES HAILPERN ET AL.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 1541, for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after the the word "said", down to and including the word "available", in line 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman how much is involved in this bill?

Mr. MASON. This does not involve anything. It is an immigration matter. The part stricken out by the Senate provided for deducting three from Rumania's quota. There is no such thing as a Rumanian quota, so that the Senate amendment just clears up the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from the California State Real Estate Association entitled "An Appeal to All Citizens."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

GREATER EFFORT NEEDED TO WIN THE WAR

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the illusion that the richest, and potentially the strongest, nation in the world cannot be defeated can cause us to lose the war.

To say that this dangerous, false perception is peculiar only to the minds of the people is entirely erroneous. Mail coming into congressional offices gives evidence that the people all over the country are not complacent about the war; they are deeply concerned. On a recent visit to my congressional district I was impressed by the fact that everyone realizes the seriousness of the situation. They are eager and anxious. They look to Washington for encouragement, and get little. There is a general impression that Washington is suffering from the illusion that money, and money alone, will win the war. But dollar bills alone cannot stop a tank.

Wealth and resources will win the war, but only when the money is used to convert our resources into tanks, planes, guns, ships, and ammunition. No military leader would wantonly waste implements of war just because he might have at his disposal an unlimited quantity. Dollars are potential weapons for defense and offense, and they must not be wasted. Those dollars for financing the war must come from the people in the form of taxes and from the purchase of war savings bonds and stamps. Is it any wonder that the people are demanding that all nonessential Government spending be curtailed?

Let us look for a moment at what successful prosecution of the war will cost. It is estimated that we will spend $300,000,000,000 to defeat the Axis Powers. Plans already call for spending $170,000,000,000, and from that amount we will get only 125,000 of the 185,000 planes; 45,000 of the 120,000 tanks; to say nothing of the naval expansion during 1942 and 1943. At the end of next year we will be spending approximately $7,000,000,000 each month. With a prospective program of $300,000,000,000 is not the time overdue for us to stop extravagant and useless spending of not only the dollars we have now but the dollars that future generations will sweat and struggle to earn?

Out through this country there is no expressed objection to what it will cost to win the war. But there is a very definite expression against the continued boondoggling, with all its related extravagance. For instance, I heard over and over during my recent visit back home this modern version of a famous statement, "I'm willing to buy bonds if my money is used to win the war, but not for nonessential spending." That statement came from loyal American citizens whose patriotism is above reproach. It is evidence that the people fully realize that we cannot win the war and insure the peace that follows unless dollars are converted into the tools required to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to take the time of the Members of the House to enumerate the many suggestions which have been made to curtail nonessential spending. It is all in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Just let me say briefly that it has been soundly estimated that from two to three billions of dollars annually can be lopped off Government expenditures without in any way deterring the war effort. On the contrary, it would obviously add to the successful prosecution of the war. Not only would those billions materially aid in defeating Germany and Japan, but the effect on morale, that intangible asset so essential to success, could be measured only in terms of victory.

If it were possible to wipe out all nonessential spending in one clean sweep, the task would be simplified. But we know that it is not as easy as that. It can only be accomplished by a reduction here, a curtailment there, and, in some cases, an entire elimination. Again I say that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can be

found the aggregate solution. The job can only be done by definitely discouraging the illusion of the many bureaucrats in the Government, each of whom has the opinion that his agency can win the war if given a sufficient amount of money.

Mr Speaker, every board, commission, bureau, agency, and department of our Government must become war-conscious. And that means that they must become economy-conscious respecting the expenditure of the people's money in time of war. Spending must be limited to our war effort and to those things absolutely necessary to the maintenance of government. We must deny every other policy of spending and wasting of our resources. Our enemies are not wasting and squandering their resources; they are not frittering away their money for fan dancers, comic strips, and glamour. On the contrary, they are using their money to produce from their resources ships, planes, tanks, and guns. They are injecting every business policy and economic touch in their war effort. They are definitely out to lick us. It is a challenge we must meet.

To meet the challenge of the enemy, wasteful spending must be stopped, boondoggling must come to an end, and the needless things must be forgotten and eliminated.

It is tragic to behold the people struggling to earn, to save, and to contribute in this all-out war effort while those in high positions in Government continue to spend the taxpayers' money on promotional schemes not in the least related to the war effort. If Washington officialdom will come to its senses and set the example of sacrifice, the people will match it—and more. No longer will the outcome of the war be in doubt. We will win.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with three different matters and to include in connection therewith two resolutions from the Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of America, Circle, Mont., and one extension covering the subject A 16-Hour Day for Congressmen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include correspondence with several constituents relative to defense projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include four 5-minute radio addresses delivered in the interest of the selling campaign of bonds and stamps. I do not think that this will exceed the limit, but I ask that I may have unanimous consent to insert them in today's RECORD regardless of the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND SLOWDOWNS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that we were going to have legislation considered this week by the House relative to the slowing up of production and the strikes that are going on in the country in order that American labor may be given the opportunity to work in industry wherever it chose, so long as the laboring man is perfectly well satisfied; that they would not be stopped from working by radical labor leaders.

The situation is that we have men of the Army and Navy at the front; we are paying them $21 a month. They work 24 hours a day; and we should do everything we can to see that these men are furnished arms, ammunition, ships, food, and the things which will further the interest of America so far as winning the war is concerned.

With the slowdown strikes that are going on in the country at the present time, we do not know what is happening or what will happen if they continue. When we look at the decisions that are being rendered now by the Labor Board, I say we are fiddling while Rome burns. We are not protecting our American shores or doing the thing that is best for our soldiers in the field—the men who are risking their lives for our safety.

Let us do our duty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that everything should be done to speed production, but I do wish to observe that it would have been most pleasing to me and more helpful to the country if prior to December 7 the gentleman from Pennsylvania had voted for legislation, the passage of which some of us fought to obtain and without which our country on December 7 would have been in a practically defenseless position.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michgan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to heartily commend and salute President Roosevelt and the Pacific War Council for so promptly and decisively nailing to the mast the confusing and disturbing report of yesterday that there was some question as to whether General MacArthur has been given absolute and supreme command in the southwest Pacific. It was reassuring to learn this morning that the President and the Council are in complete agreement on the incontrovertibly sound proposition that the general shall have a free rein in commanding and making disposition of all Allied forces within his orbit. In my judgment, not only our country but all of our Allies should join in signing a blank check to General MacArthur, and he should be allowed to fill in the blanks for any amount of money, of resources, and of manpower that he needs to continue so valiantly carrying the torch for all free men in the southwest Pacific and in any other part of the war zone to which he is sent. In brief, we should give him without stint complete and supreme authority, and the untrammeled right to freely exercise it, without let or hindrance. There cannot be, there must not be, the slightest degree of dissidence or quibbling on this score.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FOOD PRICES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SMALL MEAT PACKERS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion I have criticized the orders of the Office of Price Administration. They ought to be commended when they issue orders that are sound and proper and in the interest of the American people, but when they do not do that their defects ought to be pointed out, and I shall continue to do that.

I have had called to my attention an order of the Office of Price Administration freezing the prices of pork products of the different packers throughout the United States. I have here a reprint of an editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of April 7 which conveys the information that 13 percent of the packing houses of this country will be forced out of business by reason of this recent order of the Office of Price Administration. Here we are talking about doing something for small business, and then they issue an order that will put 13 percent of the packing houses out of business.

All of us realize the tragedy which will come from inflation. All of us want to avoid it. We have to depend on the administrative Government officials to follow the necessary procedure if we are to escape the ruin which would come. We do not want to see the price of food products go upward and upward.

However, I cannot see any justification for an order fixing a price ceiling on dressed pork at wholesale levels, based upon a particular period, which period happens to work to the disadvantage of small meat packers. Incidentally, this order of the Office of Price Administration works to the advantage of the big wholesalers.

In some way, mysterious or otherwise, the effect of this order is to do just what this editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce says that it will do. The order will force out of business the small meat packers and permit the big meat packers to manipulate conditions to their advantage. Hogs are now selling for more money than they sold for during the period when the ceiling was put on pork products. This works directly to the disadvantage of the small meat packers.

What is the Office of Price Administration going to do about it? The easy thing for them to do is to tell the small packers that orders are orders and that they are just real sorry about it. The sensible thing for the Office of Price Administration to do is to modify its former order and do that right away. That order established inequalities as between the large meat packers and the small meat packers, and, of course, the "large fellows" are very happy about it.

That order ought to be amended, not next year, but right now, and those subordinate officers responsible for the order ought to take action immediately.

There has been too much destruction of the small businessman and I have pointed this out to the Members of the House of Representatives on other occasions.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the American Legion of the State of Colorado.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has become a frequent occurrence to hear someone criticize some of us who did not vote for all the appropriation bills that were presented prior to December 7. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] just called attention, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] had finished speaking, to the fact that it would have been better if the gentleman had voted for some of those appropriations. Let us not have any misunderstanding about it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is wrong. I did not use the word "appropriations."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, money then, or laws. What was it the gentleman said, laws?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman had better read what I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right; anyway, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was criticized because he did not do something, vote for something, before December 7.

If I get correctly what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] said, it was this:

> I do wish to observe that it would have been most pleasing to me and more helpful to the country, if, prior to December 7, the gentleman from Pennsylvania had voted for legislation whose passage some of us fought to obtain and without whose passage our country would have been on December 7 in a practically defenseless position.
>
> The gentleman now says he fought for peace and that, if we had followed his votes, we would have been prepared. Well, that raises an interesting question. The gentleman voted against an appropriation for Guam of $5,000,000.

So, after all, the word "appropriation" seems to have been used by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. In any event, the criticism so often made that, by voting against appropriations, Members had hindered the war efforts of this country, falls flat. The reason that the criticism is without merit will be found in the words of the Speaker of this House, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1079 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. The words of our Speaker are these:

> Congress is being criticized, but Congress has given the President every law and every dollar he has asked for defense purposes.

Those are the words of the Speaker of this House.

Let no one hereafter arise on this floor and charge that, if this country were unprepared for war, the responsibility for that condition rests either upon the House, upon any group in the House, or upon any individual Member of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] may have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by himself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, if he can tell us what program we may expect next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and on Tuesday individual bills on the Private Calendar will be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That does not include any omnibus bills?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; there is no intention to take up any omnibus bills on Tuesday.

Of course, there is pending the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill providing about $18,000,000,000, which is being considered in conference now, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight Saturday to file a conference report, so that matter will be in order if the conferees agree.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That report will be in order on either one of the first 2 days of next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I would assume so, but naturally, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will be consulted as to what day it will come up.

However, if they agree the chances are the report will come up Monday or Tuesday as we want to pass that as quickly as possible.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the program for the week after next Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That I am unable to state.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes may have until midnight of April 18, 1942, to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably, without amendment, House Resolution 468, authorizing the printing of additional copies of a revision of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of a revision of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to Members by the Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. In reference to the printing of these additional copies, can the gentleman tell us how the distribution is going to be made by the Speaker? Does the resolution provide that the Speaker has the right to give them out as he chooses or are they distributed proportionately to the individual Members of the Congress?

Mr. JARMAN. As I understand, it is customary for the Speaker to have one copy sent to each Member first and then the remainder of about 1,000 copies will be distributed by the Speaker to the new Members and to those who may need an extra copy or two. In other words, the matter of distribution is within the discretion of the Speaker.

Mr. RICH. That is the customary procedure in distributing these books?

Mr. JARMAN. It is.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What will be the cost of printing these 1,500 copies?

Mr. JARMAN. There has been no estimate obtained from the Public Printer but the cost will be just a little bit more than the usual cost has been because things have gone up a little. This is the customary and usual resolution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman state what has been the cost heretofore, approximately?

Mr. JARMAN. I really do not know.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When were the last copies printed?

The SPEAKER. The chair will answer that question by stating that that was about 8 years ago. This resolution is adopted about every 7 or 8 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Are they needed at this time?

Mr. JARMAN. Inquiry has been made about that and they are needed at this time.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of business, and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after all other business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all of the other special orders today, I be granted 7 minutes in which to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, why I voted as I did, previous to December 7, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address recently delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, at Enid, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THIRD REPORT OF HIGH COMMISSIONER TO PHILIPPINES (H. DOC. NO. 706)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required in section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Phillippine Islands, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a brief résumé of the third report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the calendar year 1938 and the first 6 months of 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1942.*

FOURTH REPORT OF HIGH COMMISSIONER TO PHILIPPINES (H. DOC. NO. 707)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a brief résumé of the fourth report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1939, and ending June 30, 1940.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1942.*

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC CONVENTION

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6913) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is the usual resolution to allow the Marine Band to go to a convention?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and in that connection I may say to the House that it is the policy of the Navy Department to permit the Marine Band to go at Government expense to the conventions of only two organizations—the Grand Army of the Republic and the Confederate Veterans Reunion. This bill permits the band to go to the convention of the Grand Army of the Republic at Indianapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., from September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such convention, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $7,068.70, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed $5 per day each for additional living expenses while on duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN SUBMARINES

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6932) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes 200,000 tons of additional submarines to be built. It will cost in the neighborhood of $900,000,000. I do not desire to state how many submarines will be carved out of the 200,000 tons. The Naval Affairs Committee had a hearing on the bill yesterday and unanimously reported it. The bill is recommended by the Bureau of Ships and by the Navy Department. It is very urgent that this legislation be enacted as early as possible to enable contracts to be made, so that a continuous shipbuilding program in the construction of submarines may go forward as rapidly as possible. Just as soon as a submarine now leaves the ways it is highly necessary in the defense of the country that some other submarine be put upon the ways for immediate construction.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree with all that. Of course, we want to have the bill enacted as quickly as possible, but I ask the gentleman whether the minority members of his committee knew that this bill was to be called up at this time?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I did not announce it to the committee when we adjourned the hearing on the other important bill, but there is no objection from any member of the committee for the consideration of this bill, because we unanimously voted it out yesterday, and I sent for the minority members just a moment ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate all that; but do you not think we should have the minority members of the committee present when the matter is called up?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I believe the gentleman ought to withdraw his request now.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield before he withdraws the request?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think this is one of the most important steps that has yet been taken. The United States has a greater coast line than the entire continent of Europe, and one of the greatest defensive weapons is the submarine. I should like to see this House provide for at least 1,000 first-class submarines. We must be prepared to defend our shores at all costs.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want it understood I am not objecting to it at all. I am for the bill; but I do say when a bill is called up in this House, the members of the committee reporting the bill should know when it is being called up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I was hoping that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] might arrive on the floor before the Speaker recognized me.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are several special orders. I would suggest we might take up the special orders, and by that time members of the Naval Affairs Committee on the minority side can be present.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman. I therefore ask unanimous consent that during the special order I may obtain recognition for the purpose of presenting this bill and another bill, and I withdraw my request for the time being for the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER The gentleman withdraws his unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of the bill, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman later.

The Chair desires to make this statement. When a Member comes to the Chair saying he wants to make a unanimous-consent request to call up a bill, the Chair always asks whether he has consulted the ranking minority member and the majority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I appreciate that, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] did come to me and ask permission to call it up. I told him, "Yes, if the membership of the Naval Affairs Committee were present." They are not present at the moment, so I thought it might be well to let it go over until they are here.

The SPEAKER. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is eminently correct.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And so do I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address on money and credit, by Mr. Carl A. Smith, of Dayton, Ohio, a very valuable contribution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT MADE TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a great many years, and I want to say that I think the hearing this morning was probably the most interesting of any I ever have attended during my membership on that committee.

Secretary Morgenthau arranged with the chairman to bring before the committee representatives of unions whose members are employed by General Motors, also the vice president and another official of General Motors, to explain the method whereby employees of the company are voluntarily and enthusiastically purchasing war bonds. Elaborate charts were presented to the committee who received the remarks of those present most cordially. My colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], remarked that he wished every Member of Congress could have been present to hear the explanation made by a representative of the company about the plan followed in selling bonds to the workmen. Following this remark I suggested that the clerk arrange to secure a thousand extra copies of the hearing so that Members of Congress could have the benefit of the testimony regarding this patriotic movement.

The Secretary of the Treasury informed us that similar plans are under way with all large employers of labor, and that it is hoped through the voluntary cooperation of employers and employees throughout the country that very large sales of bonds will be made.

I commend study of the hearing to the House membership.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ALL-OUT WOODEN SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from newspaper articles and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is nearly 2 years ago since I started to advocate an all-out wooden shipbuilding program to meet the shipping requirements of our country. I have continued to vigorously urge the construction of wooden merchant vessels during all this time. Following frequent contacts with officials of the National Defense Council, the Office of Production Management, the United States Maritime Commission, and the Bureau of

Ships, United States Navy, I discussed the subject rather fully on the floor of the House. This was almost a year ago. Many of my colleagues indicated that they agreed with me and my efforts in this regard received much favorable comment in the press and over the radio throughout the country. I received a great many letters from private citizens and civic organizations in all sections of the Nation. Organized labor particularly expressed its belief in the soundness of my proposal.

I am reviving today my campaign for an all-out wooden shipbuilding program. In doing so I desire at the outset to have it clearly and distinctly understood, so that there may be no misunderstanding about it, that I am not criticizing or finding any fault with the steel shipbuilding program so far as it goes. My only contention is that the steel shipbuilding program does not go far enough, that it is not sufficient for the job required and that we should and must without further delay start building merchant cargo ships and freighters out of wood.

I have contended, and still contend, that our wooden shipbuilding program in World War No. 1 justified itself and was a decided factor in shortening and winning the war. Undoubtedly, in some instances, when green and unseasoned timber was used, there were leakages and cargoes were damaged. I think you could probably find the same small percentage of failures and unsatisfactory results in all construction work during wartime emergency when speed is essential, no matter what materials are used or what type of construction it may be, as fortuitous results do not happen only in the case of shipbuilding.

However, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to any unbiased person who is conversant with the facts whether it is not true that most of the wooden merchant ships which were built and used during the last World War proved satisfactory. In fact, the building of these vessels enabled us to transport 4,000,000 troops to Europe, together with the supplies, war materials, and foodstuffs which were also transported abroad in wooden bottoms.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of recorded history that in 1917 President Woodrow Wilson challenged the shipbuilders of the Nation to "span the Atlantic with a bridge of wooden ships." From Maine to Washington, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, the shipbuilders responded so magnificently to President Wilson's challenge that historians of the World War have declared that the dispatch and effectiveness with which the shipbuilders acted contributed as much as any other single factor to the defeat of Germany in 1918.

However, all the officials of the Federal Government in the various departments, who are in charge of our shipbuilding program, have been committed irrevocably to a policy of constructing all our merchant vessels out of steel. Excepting for mine sweepers and other small craft, there has been no wooden shipbuilding program to speak of. I am of the opinion that this policy constitutes one of the most serious errors of judgment of which our Government has been guilty in the conduct of our national defense and war effort.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. How much shipbuilding is now being done on the Columbia River? My understanding is that quite a few ships are being built.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PIERCE. I just wondered if the gentleman knew the number.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am unable to state how much shipbuilding is going on there. There is some shipbuilding in my own district, but it is entirely steel construction except for small mine sweepers and other lesser craft, as I have stated. Those yards are doing a fine job but the program should be expanded to include wooden ships.

Mr. PIERCE. What is the prejudice against wooden ships?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Frankly, after having discussed it, as I have, with all the officials in the various agencies of the Federal Government who are interested in the shipbuilding program, I am unable to understand what the reason is, unless it is prejudice and opinion that certainly is not founded upon any facts.

Mr. PIERCE. Are iron ships safer against submarines?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Not at all. I believe my colleague from Oregon will agree with me when I say that any ship, whether constructed of steel, wood, or some other material, struck by a modern torpedo is going to be seriously damaged, and if it is struck in the right spot it is going to sink.

Mr. PIERCE. The many yards on the Columbia River are busy now, but I thought some of them were building wooden ships.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I believe the gentleman will find they are building steel ships, which is all right as far as it goes.

Mr. PIERCE. All steel?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. There is very little wooden shipbuilding proceeding on the Columbia River or anywhere else. The Government program calls for steel construction.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. I have been giving this matter thought myself as I have been reading in the papers of our race against time, and especially of the heavy sinkings off the Atlantic coast. For the life of me I cannot understand why we should not be constructing wooden ships; and I am glad to hear the gentleman say that they would not sink any easier from submarine attacks than would steel ships.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his contribution. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this is naturally a matter in which he would be deeply interested.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the last article that was penned by Gen. Hugh Johnson, a very colorful character and a very great American, who has gone to his reward, in which he discussed very aptly, very kindly—very firmly, however—the need for greater production. The central thought in the whole article is that we produce more ships, produce them faster. I believe the statement in its entirety supports the gentleman's contention now made in his address to the House. I wonder if he would mind examining it later, and if he thinks well, to ask that it be included in his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I shall be pleased, indeed, to place the article by Gen. Hugh Johnson in the RECORD.

We all regret his untimely passing whether we have agreed with him on all occasions or not. He was a great, a loyal, and a patriotic American, and certainly one of the outstanding officers in the first World War. When he makes a statement such as the gentleman from Georgia has indicated, it should carry a great deal of weight.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact there is a threatened fuel-oil shortage in the Northwest, in the gentleman's State and also in Oregon. It has been suggested that the Government embark on a program of wooden-ship construction for the purpose of carrying oil, the ships to take the place of steel oil tankers which are so badly needed elsewhere, and which are being sunk. Does the gentleman believe this suggestion is possible, and that it might be the means of relieving the Northwest from this threatened shortage?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. It seems to me the gentleman's suggestion ought to receive very serious study and consideration and relates to a very vital problem which must receive attention. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out in a speech which I made on this floor last June 1941, that the outcome of the Battle of the Atlantic might well depend upon our speed and capacity in offsetting the heavy British merchant marine losses, which were then averaging 5,000,000 tons a year. I urged rather vehemently, as it must have seemed at that time to those having supervision of our shipbuilding program, that we should lose no time in increasing to an extent never before dreamed of, our own merchant fleet, as a part of our national defense program in order to meet our own requirements in case of future emergency. I stressed the obvious fact that shipbuilding was a matter of first and paramount importance. In this connection, I emphasized the desirability and necessity of constructing wooden ships, because our supply of steel would probably prove to be inadequate and not even sufficient for

our great war munitions program, especially if we became directly involved in the war and had to go on a total all-out war basis. This, of course, was long before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a world in which events are moving very swiftly and blitzkrieg is for the time being even more of a grim reality in the Pacific than in the Atlantic. The intensified submarine and U-boat warfare of the Nazis has moved right up to our own shores and our own shipping and tanker losses are appalling. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, declared in Parliament recently that we are "losing the Battle of the Atlantic." In the meantime, public opinion as reflected by the press and the radio in our country is rapidly crystallizing in favor of our doing something about the shipping situation. There is much sentiment among our people, and in Congress, in favor of our taking the offensive in this war as soon as we are able to do so. Whether we can take the offensive or not depends definitely upon whether we can transport the men, munitions, and supplies to the theater of operations; it is going to depend upon our ability to maintain a bridge of cargo ships on the long supply routes to remote parts of the world. Shipping—bottoms—supplies the answer to the question, "Too little and too late."

I quote from the current issue of the United States News, Washington, D. C., April 10, 1942:

United States and Britain both are being blockaded, both are hampered by shipping losses, by inability to move goods in adequate volume to the battle fronts.

The fact is: Unless the United States and British navies check present losses, this year will end with only a minor increase in tonnage of vital merchant shipping. Losses are that severe. They're limiting drastically the 1942 United States war effort. Result is that planes and tanks and guns are piling up on docks; that Russia isn't getting the supplies formally promised; that Australia and India and the Middle East are receiving smaller supplies than they might be receiving.

Troubles basically are two: (1) inability of British and American navies to solve the submarine problem; (2) failure of United States planners to fix sights at a high enough level in shipbuilding. This program is least far advanced of war programs.

This means: There isn't to be large-scale fighting by American forces in 1942. There isn't to be really large-scale movement of troops outside of the United States.

Shipping is this war's present bottleneck, and it's a bad one.

I quote from the United States News, Washington, D. C., issue of March 27, 1942:

Right now the United States war effort is impeded by an acute shipping shortage.

It's no longer the inability of American industry to produce war goods that creates the bottleneck. Instead, more goods are being produced than can be moved.

Causes are two: (1) the high and rising trend in sinkings, mostly in United States waters; (2) the rather leisurely tempo of new ship construction, when compared with the need. Tendency of officials is to compare shipbuilding with past rates of building, not with today's needs. It's a dangerous tendency. Lack of merchant shipping probably will be responsible for the next instance of "too little and too late." This problem is an old one, but isn't being met.

I quote from an article by Mr. John C. Henry, in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., March 17, 1942:

With the present shipbuilding program calling for 8,000,000 deadweight tons this year, there have been assertions within the W. P. B. that steel shortages are forcing a lag in production.

The Associated Press, Washington, D. C., stated in a dispatch March 20, 1942:

Chairman Admiral Emory S. Land of the Maritime Commission indicated that the processed material problem likewise was acute, for he said the Commission got only 154,659 of the 220,386 tons of steel it needed in January.

I quote from Constantine Brown in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., March 15, 1942:

OFFENSIVE MUST WAIT

Although political oratory revolved about an offensive, policy continued to be defensive and continues to be so, for we have not yet the men or—what is more important—the ships to send across the Atlantic the hundreds of thousands of men and millions of tons of equipment necessary to engage the forces of the United Nations in an offensive against the Nazis.

Our fundamental weakness with respect to an offensive—which now seems certain to take place in Europe—is the lack of ships. We have the men, and the engagements in which they have figured so far prove their superiority to anything the enemy can offer. We will also have the equipment in a few months, but shipping, which is as vital as men and equipment, is still the weak spot in our armor. Until the powers in Washington have taken this matter seriously in hand it is doubtful whether the much demanded and much needed offensive can be undertaken by the United Nations.

I quote the article by Walter Trohan, in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., March 11, 1942:

SHIP SHORTAGE BLOCKS AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE, NAVAL AUTHORITIES ADMIT—OFFENSIVE MUST WAIT TILL CRAFT ARE BUILT, SAY CAPITAL EXPERTS

(By Walter Trohan)

The United States lacks sufficient merchant ships to transport and maintain a large expeditionary force to carry the war to Hitler, Capital military and naval experts agreed yesterday.

The crying need of the Nation is ships and more ships to build a bridge to the enemy, the experts said, as agitation for taking the offensive against the Axis grew among the people of the United Nations.

Although this country transported an army of 2,000,000 men abroad in the last war, the problem of doing it again is far more complicated than it was in 1917, according to the experts.

In the last war this country could depend on British ships and other Allies, to a lesser degree, to carry troops. In this war, experts said, any substantial American expeditionary force will have to be carried by the American merchant marine.

PERILED BY SUBS AND PLANES

In 1917 the Allies had control of the seas and the problem of air control at ports was of no importance. Even so, it took 19 months to transport the 2,000,000 men, and Allied ports were taxed so that special ports had to be built in France.

Today Axis subs roam the oceans and planes are ready to move against landing parties. There are no friendly ports waiting on the continent. The expeditionary force will have to blast its way against sea, air, and land forces to any soil it will secure.

The availability of the American merchant fleet for transport and maintenance service depends on a wide variety of factors. Chief among these are the distance the force will have to go, its size and the maintenance of the supply of raw materials, which must be imported, to make arms at home.

STRAIN ON UNITED STATES SHIPPING

Experts estimate that it takes 17 deadweight tons of shipping to transport a soldier today and 3.4 tons to maintain him 3,000 miles from home. This means that if the United States is to send an expeditionary force of 4,000,000 men to Europe, it would take a fleet of 14,000,000 tons to supply them in the field.

On June 30, 1939, the United States oceangoing merchant marine aggregated 1,398 vessels of 8,134,890 gross tons. Operating in foreign trade were 319 ships of 2,094,212 tons.

President Roosevelt, in planning to take the offensive against the Axis in 1943, set a shipbuilding goal of 8,000,000 tons for 1942 and 10,000,000 tons for 1943. Shipbuilding was about 1,000,000 tons in 1941

SUPPLY PROBLEM COMPLICATED

At present, experts recognize, the American merchant marine is not large enough to maintain an army of 4,000,000 men abroad, to say nothing of transporting them.

In the World War it was estimated that 7½ tons of shipping were necessary for the transportation of a soldier. Mechanized warfare has more than doubled the required tonnage.

I quote Hon. W. H. Harrison, Production Director of the War Production Board, Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., March 7, 1942:

LACK OF METALS DELAYING SHIP, PLANE OUTPUT

American merchant-ship construction, to counteract the Axis submarine siege and to prepare for expeditionary forces, is being delayed by shortages of materials.

The figures for February and the explanation for the lag behind President Roosevelt's blueprint-for-victory program were disclosed yesterday by W. H. Harrison, Production Director of the War Production Board. The plane output, he added, is also being slowed for want of more materials.

LACK OF METALS FELT

Harrison said that while the shipyards were launching one ship a day, through February and March, this was about 10 less than scheduled for last month in the President's program of 8,000,000 tons of new bottoms this year.

Harrison said plane production was ahead of the President's schedule for 60,000 armed flyers this year, but with more materials the schedule could be bettered.

"At the moment," he said, "the limiting factor in arms output all along the line is materials. February and March shipbuilding are falling behind due to slowness of steelplate deliveries in October and November."

I quote the United States News, Washington, D. C., March 20, 1942:

This country hasn't the merchant ships needed to carry and to supply any important force to distant battlefields.

I quote Newsweek, February 16, 1942:

It's not generally realized, but the shipping shortage of the United Nations is severe and is preventing Washington from getting much more than the most vital materials to the southwestern Pacific.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. How much is being put out now monthly? The statement has been made that one ship a day is going into the water.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. That is true. The present rate of construction, if I am correctly informed, is about a ship a day.

Mr. PIERCE. When will it reach two a day?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The losses are probably three a day on the average, and they have been that for some time.

Mr. PIERCE. When will it reach two a day?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The rate of construction?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. It is expected that they will step it up to two a day, but even that will not be adequate to offset the losses from the U-boat and submarine warfare.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman has no information as to the date they expect two a day?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I have not. The conjectured date is probably about midsummer.

Mr. PIERCE. Then three a day at the close of the year?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I think so.

Mr. PIERCE. That is the plan?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. That is the plan, but they are behind schedule now, as I understand it.

Mr. ARNOLD. We ought to gain on the sinkings instead of just matching them?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. We should, by all means.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with these quotations ad infinitum, but I have called attention to a sufficient number to make it clear that there is a growing realization that our shipping shortage is the real bottleneck in our whole war effort, which fact is also being referred to over the air by our radio commentators, Fulton Lewis, Jr., Earl Godwin, F. R. Baukhage, and others. It gives me no personal satisfaction to say, "I told you so," but this is the very acute situation I warned against nearly 2 years ago, and which I have repeatedly warned was likely to come to pass.

Mr. Speaker, we should have launched 2 years ago—1 year ago—the greatest wooden shipbuilding program of all time. We should launch it right now. A mammoth fleet of wooden merchant ships is the greatest national asset we can possess. It is absolutely necessary and essential if we are going to win the war, and we are going to win it. It is not enough to build tanks, guns, and airplanes unless we also have the ships to transport them. Ships and still more ships is the crying need of this country today. Our victory in this war depends upon our ability to transport troops, war materials, and supplies over vast stretches of ocean. We must build a bridge of ships such as mankind has never seen if the vital lifeline of supplies, of weapons, and food is to be maintained.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. I want to revert to the colloquy the gentleman had with reference to sinkings and the construction of ships. I heard it stated the other day before the Ways and Means Committee, I think by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], that we were building two ships a day right now, but that we were losing three every day. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am very glad to have the gentleman's contribution. I may add that just a few days ago, on April 13, Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, whom I admire very much for his ability and fine Americanism, in testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, stated that we are behind in the 1942 war program. The writer of this article in the Associated Press, as published in the Evening Star, made this comment:

> The admiral hedged somewhat when committee members attempted to get him to express his opinion on whether enough steel would be available to meet the accelerated program.

They then quote the admiral, who said:

> If we do not get the steel, you won't get the ships. I cannot say we will get the steel, but we have been promised it by the War Production Board.

If that is the case and we are behind with the program, and there is doubt about getting steel, in the name of common sense and for the welfare of our country and in order to shorten this war, thereby saving the lives of our boys and saving the Treasury of the United States billions of dollars, why not use wood, as we did in World War No. 1?

Mr. COX. Everyone knows that Admiral Land is a hard hitter, a great American, a great soldier; everyone has great confidence in him. I wonder if in the appearance before the committee to which the gentleman refers the admiral gave any expression of his views on the subject of wooden ships. I have been told that the admiral felt rather friendly toward the suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I may say to the gentleman that I have communicated with Admiral Land and I know that he perhaps may be personally rather sympathetic toward wooden ships, but there is someone in the Government somewhere who is responsible for the fact that there has been a discrimination against wood. The program has been entirely and exclusively steel construction.

Mr. COX. In modern warfare is it much more difficult to sink a steel ship than a wooden ship?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. It is not. As matter of fact, I am going to come to that a little later, and I think the contrary is the fact, but let us assume they are on a par.

Mr. HAINES. I was going to ask the same question as the gentleman from Georgia asked, whether there was a great deal more difficulty in sinking a steel ship than a wooden ship. It is my understanding these wooden ships are very, very finely constructed. It is my understanding that right now because of the shortage of steel they are now obliged to use a great deal of wooden construction in the racks to hold bombs and whatnot in these ships. I do not know anything about wooden ships, but I think the gentleman is to be complimented on the approach that he makes to the problem and for the information he is giving and in calling the matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his kind contribution, and that he realizes that we are trying to be helpful to our country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret I did not hear all of the gentleman's speech in relation to this matter. It seems to me that the most difficult situation the country is confronted with now is transportation by ships. In view of the shortage of the material necessary for the construction of steel ships, it seems that the gentleman's idea is at least worthy of further thought and investigation by the Government, because we have a world of timber in the gentleman's territory, and likewise in my own territory, out of which all kind of ships could be built. Personally, I feel that the gentleman is indeed to be congratulated for bringing the entire matter before the Members of the House. It is certainly gratifying to see so many Members here at this time, too.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Montana, and I am very glad that he agrees with me. We have a plentiful supply of raw material in the West, the South, and throughout the country; there is no possible shortage of timber.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. There are many safety zones in the interior, as I understand it, where there is sufficient water to float these wooden ships.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. That is true.

Mr. COX. In other words, the accommodations in that regard that could provide for the construction of wooden ships are innumerable.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Absolutely; they are almost unlimited in this country. These boats could be built out in the Pacific Northwest, they could be built in New England, they could be built in Maine and Vermont, they could be built in the Gulf States; in fact, anywhere in this country, pretty nearly, especially along the coast lines and inland waterways as well.

Mr. COX. I understand it takes about 4½ feet of water to float a wooden ship of considerable size.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. That is true.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. For the information of the gentleman, I may say that we are already building 108-footers up at Shelburn Harbor on Lake Champlain.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am glad to hear that. Does not the gentleman agree with me that we should expand our wooden shipbuilding program in this country?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Absolutely. I have been trying to work along that line.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that it is much more difficult to sink a wooden ship with a bomb or with a torpedo than it is to destroy a metal ship? That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Yes. One reason for that is that wooden sailing ships would be safer in submarine zones as they have no propellers to disclose their location to U-boat mechanical listening devices. That is one reason given in favor of the wooden construction. Of course, there are numerous other reasons.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not due to the fact that a metal-constructed ship sinks more quickly than a wooden ship, because the latter floats unless there are too many holes in it?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Yes; although I am not arguing the respective merits of wood and steel. I concede that steel is good but I contend that wood is also good and should be used, in order to build all the ships that are needed to win the war.

The gentleman and all of us, I think, have read some of Peter B. Kyne's "Cappy Ricks" stories. One of the main characters in those stories is Capt. Matt Peasley, who happens to be a retired sea captain who lives in my district. He has traveled the seven seas all over the world. He has this to say:

> The displacement is much less with a wooden ship. If proper compartments were built, such ships, even though shelled or bombed, could float for a long while, enabling cargo salvage in many cases. A wooden ship with proper care will last 25 to 30 years. Given the lumber and enough ship's carpenters one could be sent down the ways every 5 or 6 weeks.

Captain Peasley recalled one instance where a sailing ship was launched 21 days after its keel beams were laid.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine address he has made on this subject.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his gracious words.

Mr. SPRINGER. In connection with the building of these wooden ships, may I say that we have the Great Lakes in the Midwest. Does not the gentleman think we should inaugurate a building program on the Great Lakes, which are located far inland, and which would give an opportunity for that construction?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I may say to the gentleman that the Great Lakes would be ideally situated for a wooden shipbuilding program, there is no question about it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman believe the very situation he describes renders it mandatory that we speed up the rivers and harbors bill in order to have inland waterways on which to operate a great many of these vessels?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I agree with the gentleman, but I think we had better build the ships, too, while we are at it. What we need now, above everything else, is ships and more ships.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. We need both of them.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. We need both.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The railroads are absolutely unable to carry the traffic. If we should be threatened with an invasion on the Pacific coast there would be a tremendous shortage of cars. Today we have an inner-coastal waterway from New Jersey all the way around to Mexico, except across the Florida Strait. Remember that. If we had a 12-foot barge canal across the Florida Strait we could have a barge line all the way from Mexico to New Jersey that is protected, because it is an inner-coastal waterway. Of course the railroads do not want it. They want to enrich themselves and build up a backlog of finances for the future. But we are at war now and we need this transportation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Of course, the gentleman from Mississippi has referred to a very important phase, but I am more concerned with a discussion of the oceanic transportation problem so vital to our war effort.

Out in the Pacific Northwest, and I think it is true in the South, we have had to divert much of our shipping that was formerly utilized in coastwise shipping. A lot of that tonnage has had to be diverted to the war effort. The result is that we are suffering from an actual shortage of bottoms in our own commerce and shipping and trading within the United States.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It has been stated by some of the leaders in the administration that if we had a connection across the Florida Strait this oil could be carried in wooden barges. These barges can be easily and speedily built out of the raw material we have not only on the Pacific coast but in the Gulf States.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Would not that be wiser than trying to build everything out of steel, including more steel tankers, of which we have a shortage today, when we can build vessels of all types for oceanic as well as coastwise shipping out of wood?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think we ought to use that steel to build submarines and submarine chasers and destroyers and battleships.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. And to build our two-ocean navy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may be given 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special orders heretofore granted by the House, there are six pending special orders.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if the other Members having special orders do not object, that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are other special orders for today, and it is a most unusual procedure for a Member who has a special order to request additional time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am the one who asked that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER. And, Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object to say that it is most unusual for anybody, not excepting the gentleman from Montana, to make such a request when there are other gentlemen waiting here with special orders. If they have no objection, I certainly have none, but I think they ought to be consulted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has called attention to the fact that other special orders have been placed on the calendar; and if there is no objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I may say I am very reluctant to use this additional time because of other special orders. However, I myself, on previous occasions, have made similar concessions for other Members of the House, and I want to thank all the Members for their courtesy and, particularly, my gracious friend the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield.

Mr. COX. This is a rather extraordinary situation. The gentleman is discussing the most vital problem before the American people at the present time. I hope the press is impressed and that the gentleman's statement will be given publicity throughout the country in order that the public may be advised and public sentiment in support of the gentleman's leadership on this question may be had.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the fact that we are not short of transportation in the inland territory of the United States. The railroads are meeting the problem of transportation, and I think the gen-

tleman's idea of building wooden ships for purposes of oceangoing traffic is sufficient to cover the situation at this time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In reply I want to say that the gentleman from Montana is wrong. We are running short of transportation facilities throughout the United States, and we need our inland waterways developed for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that we can develop the inland waterways when we have more time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman from Montana that I would like to have more time, but we have not the time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have a war to win now.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I think that both the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are correct, from their respective viewpoints, but that is a subject I prefer not to discuss at this time. I would rather continue my discussion of the main issue, which I conceive to be, and which my colleagues agree with me, is meeting the shipping crisis in our war effort. It seems to me the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] correctly described the situation when he said it was the most serious problem facing our country at this time.

Mr. Speaker, these ships do not have to be built of steel. Indeed, the constantly growing demand for steel for war vessels for our two-ocean Navy, for heavy ordnance such as tanks, big guns, antiaircraft and munitions of multifarious types, not to mention purely domestic uses for thousands of locomotives and freight cars for the railroads, precludes the use of steel for the construction of merchant ships. The North American Aviation Co. is experimenting with the substitution of steel for aluminum, of which there is also a shortage, in the production of airplanes. For the present, the substitution, I am advised, is confined to combat trainer planes, but metallurgical research now in progress contemplates its early extension to the entire military aircraft field. The substitution is a low carbon, low alloy steel which company engineers have stated has a high safety factor. It would seem to be wiser to use steel for the construction of airplanes than for the construction of huge freighters, when the latter can just as well be built of wood, a material of which we have an almost unlimited supply.

Mr. Speaker, steel ships are no more impervious to attack than wooden ships. In modern warfare if any ship, wooden or steel, is hit by a modern torpedo, it is going to be seriously damaged, and if struck in a vulnerable spot is going to sink, whether it is made of wood or steel. Indeed, wooden sailing ships would be safer in submarine zones, as they have no propellers to disclose their location to U-boat mechanical listening devices. There are, of course, honest differences of opinion as to which construction is the most desirable and advantageous, which is the most serviceable and the least costly in the long run. I am not prepared to argue those matters and, frankly, I—and I am convinced, the American people—do not care a fig about those considerations at this time. We are certainly not in a position to argue and be swayed by the considerations which would influence us in arriving at a decision in ordinary or normal times, in peacetime. This is war and undoubtedly the most serious and dangerous war in which our Nation ever engaged.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with War Production Chief Donald M. Nelson, who said a few weeks ago that the Nation's shipbuilding program has "just got to come through" this year because the country's fate is at stake. I quote from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., March 7, 1942:

UNITED STATES FATE HINGES ON SHIPS—NELSON WARNS 1942 PROGRAM "MUST COME THROUGH"

War Production Chief Donald M. Nelson said today the Nation's shipbuilding program has "just got to come through" this year because the country's fate is at stake.

He was asked at an informal press conference about the statement yesterday by William H. Harrison, director of War Production Board production, that there was a possibility that the President's goal of 8,000,000 tons of new bottoms this year might not be met.

"I have not recognized any such possibility," Nelson replied. "The shipbuilding program has just got to come through. The whole Nation is at stake."

Herbert Carey in an article in Nation's Business, April 1942, presents a graphic picture of the shipping crisis. I quote:

Meanwhile the need for ships is—doubling? Certainly. Quadrupling? Perhaps. Ships are the life of our war effort. We have pooled goods, money, men, and promises with Great Britain. If we had more ships—plenty of ships—the British people could have one egg a day instead of four a month; we could get planes and guns and shells to Australia; we could relieve the Philippines; we could put an armed force into Libya and Murmansk and Iraq and Egypt. We could back up the British until they could take a chance on invading the continent and relieving the pressure on Russia. That would disabuse the Japanese mind of any idea that Russia could be safely tackled. We could take that string of Japanese-held islands in the Pacific and light with flares the way into Tokyo and Nagasaki.

If we had plenty of ships, perhaps hundreds of thousands of American lives might be saved. The value of a ship today is not measured in dollars. Ship prices are fixed in days and delivered cargoes. America can produce all the things needed for winning the war.

Mr. Speaker, our shipping requirements are going to be infinitely greater than anyone has anticipated. We cannot afford to gamble in this vitally important matter. We cannot afford to be biased or prejudiced or governed by preconceived notions. I think it is perfectly obvious that the wise and patriotic thing to do is to immediately plant and carry into execution the most gigantic and extensive wooden-ship building program ever undertaken by any nation in the history of the world.

We are going to need every wooden ship which can possibly be constructed, and the sooner we start building them the sooner we are going to win the war. The sooner we win the war the fewer lives and the less treasure it is going to cost us to gain the ultimate victory. We should utilize at once every idle shipyard and start immediately building new shipyards in those sections of the country where the raw material is available for shipbuilding purposes. We should put to work every idle ship carpenter and mechanic in the Nation and start training thousands of men to build ships.

Our production of war materials is already in high gear. As rapidly as the planes and tanks and guns leave the production lines they should be loaded on ships for the far-flung battle fronts on which we must win this war in order to keep it as far removed as possible from our own country. The problem of winning the war resolves itself in the final analysis into a shipping problem. Therefore our output of ships must be speeded up. We must offset and exceed the toll of the enemy submarine and surface raiders. We must transport to our expeditionary forces the materials and supplies which are essential to their well-being and effectiveness. Upon how well we perform that task will depend the outcome of the war and the future destiny of America and liberty-loving people throughout the world.

Article in the Washington Daily News, April 15, 1942:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

These are tough times, and they are going to be tougher.

Bataan is gone—gone after forcing the Japs to gather 10-to-1 odds in men and hundreds to one in planes.

Wainwright and his American and Filipino boys put up the kind of a fight that makes you feel like cheering and crying at the same time. The fact they lost detracts in no way from their glory.

But we can't shut our eyes to the fact they did lose. Our Pacific outposts are now Hawaii, Australia, and the Aleutians.

Corregidor is merely a temporary and isolated rock of resistance—a tribute to undying bravery, but no longer an integral part of our Pacific defenses.

No earthly good can come of talking about what might have been, and I am going to keep my mouth shut on that score. Let's face just what we are up against now.

We are preparing to fight a war and fighting it at the same time. This means just one thing.

We've got to take a licking until we are able to swing a few from the ankles ourselves.

We've got to produce as never before—against time.

We must maintain our outposts as long as possible, even if it means that the boys go down fighting—against time.

We're going to use that time to sweat out every last weapon that we can.

We're going to raise and train and equip an army and transport it on a scale never before attempted.

We will live on bare subsistence if necessary to do this.

The time for all this sacrifice is right now.

Actually, in a few short months, we now appear to be meeting the President's program which at first seemed fantastically high. But even this is only the beginning.

The great need is ships. Tanks and planes rusting in warehouses will do neither us nor our Allies any good.

Every day the bedraggled survivors of a torpedoed tanker or merchant ship battle their way into port.

Every day the oil, guns, tanks, ships, and planes, so sorely needed on our battle fronts, are lost through sinkings. The rate of ship construction is all too slow to absorb these losses and still get sufficient equipment across the thousands of miles of ocean to the battle fronts.

This, then, is our prime battle front. We must build ships faster and faster and cut down the sinkings.

When Hitler's spring offensive starts, there will be more need than ever for all sinews of war.

When the time comes for our own offensive, we will need an avalanche of weapons mustered by unheard of numbers of men carried in myriads of ships.

Bataan's loss and setting the little so-and-so Nippons on their ears can be answered only through production on a scale that staggers the imagination.

The devotion to duty shown by the men who fought there must be matched in factories, shipyards, homes, in the board rooms of corporations and in the headquarters of unions.

It must be matched by the truck drivers, the train engineers, the office workers, the bank clerks, the miners, the civil servants, and the politicians—above all—politicians.

Washington and Congress must remember that we are fighting a war all over the world with Americans' blood and tears, and not a November congressional election.

Editorial in the Washington Daily News April 15, 1942:

WITHOUT SHIPS WE FAIL

This year, 750 new cargo ships. Next year, 1,500 new cargo ships. Those are the goals set by the President. And they're too low.

But we're not even making them. Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, tells a congressional committee:

"We'll have to step up production 13 percent if we build the ships called for by the President in 1942. We'll have to step up production 25 percent more if we build the ships called for in 1943."

Can it be done? At least that much must be done. Planes, tanks, guns, munitions are rolling in ever-rising volume from our war plants, but they can't roll across the oceans. Big bombers can fly themselves to Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia. But for everything else there must be ships.

Without ships the fighter planes, tanks, guns, munitions will merely pile up in our own ports. Without ships we cannot adequately arm and feed our own armies, let alone those of our allies. Without ships—far more ships than we have and far more than we are getting built—we cannot win this war.

Axis submarines have been sinking 3 cargo ships for every 2 launched by United Nations shipyards. Given time, we will lick the U-boat menace, but the Japs and the Germans are determined not to give us time.

So the only answer for us is to speed up the building of ships, to the President's goals without fail, beyond those goals if humanly possible.

* * * * *

Too much uncertainty about prompt deliveries of steel. Too much bad management. * * *

More is needed: Prompter, more effective machinery for settling disputes. Assurance of steel deliveries. Speedy use by the Maritime Commission of the power conferred by the President yesterday to acquire, use, and dispose of any sort of private property necessary for the building of merchant ships. Fearless determination of the facts behind charges that vested interests and orthodox-minded shipbuilders have obstructed new and faster methods and are preventing fair trial of such revolutionary ideas as the proposed *Sea Otter* cargo boats.

We can achieve all of the President's other production goals but fail in our war effort unless we build more ships. That is our greatest problem. Any person, any interest that stands in the way of its solution must be swept aside.

Editorial in the Evening Star April 14, 1942:

BEHIND SCHEDULE

The disclosure by Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, that this year's shipbuilding program is falling behind schedule is a matter of most serious concern.

Admiral Land's statement was made before the House Naval Affairs Committee and he did not submit specific figures. Curiously enough, at the time he was testifying an Associated Press dispatch from Boston quoted Secretary of the Navy Knox as expressing satisfaction with the Nation's shipbuilding program. There was no explanation of this comment, but, if the Secretary had reference to merchant shipping, it was sharply at variance with the view advanced by the Commission Chairman.

Advising the committee that merchant shipping losses were "extremely serious" in February and March, Admiral Land said that production during the balance of this year will have to be stepped up by 13 percent if the President's goal of 8,000,000 tons of new shipping is to be reached.

At this particular time, nothing could be more harmful to our war effort than to fall down on the job of building the merchant ships which must be available if American supplies and American troops are to be transported to the fighting fronts across both oceans. To fall behind in production by even as much as 10 percent, especially with ships being sunk at the present rate, would be a setback of the first magnitude in this critical year of the war.

From reading Admiral Land's testimony, it appears that there is no one cause of the building slump, nor is there any single remedy. * * *

Admiral land made it clear, however, that he was not blaming labor exclusively, advising the committee that the failure to maintain the necessary level of production was due in part to a lack of materials to keep production at peak capacity and to "bad management" in some instances.

Article in Washington Sunday Star, April 12, 1942:

SHIPBUILDING NOW REGARDED AS CRITICAL BOTTLENECK

NEW YORK, April 11.—The battle of production at home has taken a new turn, says Business Week in its analysis of the business outlook today.

Now shipbuilding is the critical bottleneck—an indication of how the war, itself, is the ultimate arbiter of what happens to American business.

After the fall of France the production emphasis was on planes. Then, when Germany launched its 1940 sea offensive, the emphasis turned to ships. During the battle of Russia the demand shifted to tanks. Then, after Pearl Harbor, planes once more got first call—and primarily, bombers, which could be flown to the Pacific battle front.

But today the need is to get armament to the men at the front. And cargo ships have taken an A-1-a priority rating in terms of strategical necessity.

The reason is fairly clear, the magazine states. Since the outbreak of the war the United Nations have lost more shipping than they have produced. And what makes matters worse, lines of communications have lengthened. What formerly took one ton of shipping, now often takes three or four tons, particularly since vessels have to travel in slow-moving convoys.

The net result is that today our shipping and shipbuilding are far short of requirements, and henceforth the War Production Board increasingly will put pressure on shipyards and suppliers to speed output.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts and editorials from newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. SHANNON. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a report from the Public Printer, and I find that my extension of remarks referred to earlier in the day is $15 over the limit. I therefore renew my request that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter reprinted in a newspaper in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WAR

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read my address, as I cannot see very well. First, I just want to say that this is an address on the subject of war by a real peace man. I have never been for war in my life and I am not for war now if it could be avoided. I refer in this speech to two men who served in this House, a Benton and a Benton. Both Bentons to whom I refer served in the House, and one of them served for 30 years in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the address of the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a phase of our war consciousness that was brought to my attention on a recent return to my home town by Dr. M. W. Pickard, an eminent physician, art connoisseur, and world traveler. This phase is depicted in war paintings of Thomas Hart Benton, reproduced in the spring 1942 issue of the University Review, a publication of the University of Kansas City, Mo.

These paintings have an arresting significance at this time, as the news of the disaster that has occurred to our forces in Luzon, and the great losses we have

sustained there in men and the implements of war, come filtering through the daily press in all their grim details.

Gratifying as it may be that we are assured that the end came to our little Philippine Army after a heroic defense against a vastly superior force in the air and on the ground and at sea of the enemy invaders, there is a note in the dispatches that have come through that makes us pause for serious contemplation, and that justifies, I hope, the few remarks I shall make on the floor of this House today.

We are told not only that our numbers and implements in Luzon were inferior—vastly inferior to those of the Japanese invaders—but the astounding fact is revealed that our men were underfed, ill from disease, and physically weak from exhaustion, shortage of rations, and lack of rest under terrific bombardments, day and night.

FORCED UPON US BY A COTERIE OF DESPOTS

The usual answer, I am aware, will be made to this gruesome array of reported conditions that "this is war and we must expect such reverses in war." Which is true enough, but it is not by any means the whole story. War in itself is an institution of horror and bloodshed and destruction that should never have found a place in the civilization of this twentieth century.

The present war was started in the outmoded civilization—or lack of civilization—of an old world whose traditions of warfare stretch back across 2,000 years of fighting and slaughter. It is a war, I grant, that was forced upon us by a coterie of despots and military gangsters whose only aims were personal ambitions and a greedy nationalism whose objects were aggrandizement and conquest and the suppression of personal liberties.

It is a war that promises to be the most horrible and devastating of all the wars that have ever afflicted mankind in the past—a war of machines that past generations never dreamed of, and of new and strange devices of slaughter and human extermination such as have never before been conceived in the brains of the most vicious of human beings.

We are in that war now almost in the capacity of a mysterious stranger, as our national ideals have long been divorced from a belief in war as the only means of settling national differences. And we are finding out by repeated disasters that we were called into that war unready in spirit, unprepared in implements, and unconscious of the great sacrifices that this war would entail upon our American ideals and our American way of living.

THIS ARTIST SYMBOLIZES THE EVILS OF WAR

But my purpose at this time is not to make excuses or to fabricate apologies for failures or to criticize misguided theories or misdirected functions. We are hearing enough of those things.

I have asked these few moments of your time to talk about war itself and what it means to a people, so that, come what may, we may be able to face the grim future intelligently and bravely and to so acquit ourselves as haters of war that we shall help to outlaw it from the councils of nations for all time to come.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, this thought came to me from the pages of a magazine edited by the faculty and a distinguished staff of writers of the University of Kansas City, Mo. At the instance of Dr. M. W. Pickard, I called the president of the university, Dr. Clarence R. Decker, and he supplied me with a copy of the issue of the magazine containing reproductions of the war paintings of Thomas Hart Benton, together with an explanation of the aims and purposes of his artistic creations.

It is unfortunate that these paintings cannot be reproduced on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe that this artist's conceptions of the evils of war and his patriotic explanation of the purpose for which they were created should be in the hands of every American and become familiar to every member of his family. The story that is told in these pictures is one that, in my opinion, could not be told in words. He has placed therein, in a most vivid and convincing way, all the horrors of war and the menacing evils that wars are bringing to our boasted civilization.

VIVID CONCEPTION OF GRIMMEST HORRORS OF WAR

Let me say a word here about the Benton family. The present famous artist member of this long distinguished family is an acknowledged genius, a man of undisguised opinions, a true American patriot, and a man who is not afraid to speak and to picture the truth as he sees it. I know little of the technique of his art. I know only that I can look upon his work and feel that here, in his bold and tragic figures, he has depicted for us the grimmest horrors that war represents, and the shattered ideals that it brings upon a liberty loving, Christian people.

His father, M. E. Benton—Maecenas Eason Benton—I knew well. He at one time served as a Member of this House from Missouri. He was born in Obion County, Tenn., attended two western Tennessee academies and the University of St. Louis, Mo., was graduated from the law department of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1870, and soon thereafter commenced the practice of law in Neosho, Newton County, Mo. He took a leading part in Missouri Democratic politics. He was president of the Democratic State Conventions in 1890, 1896, and 1898. He was United States Attorney from March 1885 to July 1889, and later was elected to this House from his district in Missouri and served in the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, and Fifty-eighth Congresses. He was an eloquent statesman, a true Democrat in every sense of the word, and one whose friendship I was proud to enjoy. It was my privilege to serve with him in the Constitutional Conventions of my State of 1922 and 1923, which established its present code historically.

There was another Benton with whom you are all historically acquainted—Thomas Hart Benton—after whom the artist is named. He made history in this Nation when these halls echoed to the eloquence of Clay and Webster and Calhoun and the other giants of the days gone by. The voice of "Old Bullion," as Benton came to be called, was among the ruling voices of the land in those days when great issues were pending. He not only was a statesman, an orator, an editor, and a Member of the Senate for 30 years, but was the historian of the Senate after his retirement from that body. He died here in Washington April 10, 1858, and lies buried in Bellefontaine Cemetery, St. Louis, Mo.

THE BENTONS WERE MEN WHO KNEW WAR

My own home town of Kansas City has a monolith erected to his memory on a high hill overlooking the Missouri River, on which is inscribed his prophetic words, uttered when Kansas City was but a straggling village, that there where the Kaw River mingled its waters with the turbulent Missouri, would one day be built up a great metropolis. The tradition is that as he uttered these words he stood upon Missouri soil and faced the great river whose steamboats were then laying the foundations for his great vision at a wharf at the foot of Main Street, known as Westport Landing.

This Benton was a grand uncle of Maecenas Benton, the father of Thomas Hart Benton, the artist of the war pictures.

Nor is that all of the genealogy of the Benton family. I want to add that John C. Fremont, the first Presidential nominee of the Republican Party, in 1856, and known to fame as the Pathfinder of the West, was allied to the senatorial veteran by marriage. He married a daughter of Thomas Hart Benton in a romantic ceremony that became a great tradition in Missouri, where she was greatly honored and loved, as well as throughout the Nation, as a leading spirit and a loving helpmate.

All the Bentons I have mentioned in our artist's ancestry were men who knew war and who had taken part in the great conflicts of their day. Thomas Hart Benton, the renowned Senator, fought in the War of 1812 alongside of General Jackson; and Maecenas Eason Benton, the father of our artist, served as a Confederate soldier with the Army of Tennessee, his native State, in the War Between the States. The artist Thomas Hart Benton served in the United States Navy in the First World War.

"YEAR OF PERIL PAINTINGS"

The paintings I have referred to are seven in number. I wish to offer here Mr. Benton's own explanations of these pictures, which he entitles "Year of Peril Paintings."

1. STARRY NIGHT

The stars that look down on the seas of the world in this year of peril see men die grotesque and horrible deaths in order that their brothers may hope to live in freedom.

2. EXTERMINATE

Evil and predatory forces are always with us, in all places, at all times. Now and then these forces, cunningly join small powers until they have attained great powers, threaten to enslave the world. Humanity must then rise up and tear their evil out of them and kill them. For this task sensual

hate, ferocity, and brute will are necessary. Humanity must deny itself to save itself. The evil that is in the world today, concentrated in the lusting brigandry of the German and Japanese militarists with their new technical means of destruction and enslavement, will not be conquered except by the most merciless determination. America must match the destructive will of these powers with an equally destructive will of her own. They will otherwise devour her substance and wrap what remains of the digestion thereof around the necks of her people.

3. INDIFFERENCE

Because some of the inertia of a widely pervasive national sloth and some of the deadening effects of a widespread national habit of ignoring the unprecedented had crept even into the minds of those who had the technical defense of America in their hands, young men died and machines were needlessly destroyed before we even knew that war was upon us.

4. CASUALTY

If comfort is derived from reports that casualties in some remote action were few, be reminded of the real meaning of the word. It means that living men's bodies have been pierced and torn apart and probably also that valuable instruments of war have been destroyed with them. If too many things like this occur in far-away places because of halting productive measures at home, the war will be lost to us and the enemy come upon us and make us know at our very firesides the real and shattering human meaning of the word "casualty."

5. THE SOWERS

Are we to stand by and let them reap? These sowers of death, bloated with their gorge of human blood, are right now marching over the curve of the earth straight toward us, leaving fires of destruction in every furrow of the lands they traverse. They will not be halted by our refusing to see them nor will they be softened by cajoleries of appeasement. They want what we have, and with their brigands they will take it unless we can find again some of the iron that was in the souls of our fighting forefathers.

6. THE HARVEST

Farmers of America, who yet look comfortably over your quiet fields, you are going to be called upon this year to work harder than you have ever worked in your lives. Respond to the call that those who are fighting for you may keep their bellies full and their muscles hard. Without your help the soldiers and sailors who battle for safety of your land cannot maintain their strength. If they fail in their strength, your strength will be of no avail when the planes of the enemy come over the hills and down the valleys of America to reap your fields with fire.

7. AGAIN

Jesus Christ has stood through the centuries as the preeminent symbol of the brotherhood of man. Over and over again evil people, mad with dreams of power, have driven the centurion spear into His side. Once again today—just as man with his world-wide exchange of goods, and with his new devices of communication, has approached a realizable economic brotherhood—the old assault is loosed, mastery not brotherhood, control not share, are the slogans of the new attackers.

DEDICATED TO AMERICANS AS FOOD FOR THOUGHT

In another article in the same magazine (the University Review, spring 1942, the University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo.) Mr. Benton gives this further explanation of the pictures and the reasons that have influenced him in their creation for the good of the Nation:

I have made these pictures, as I have at other times spoken, in the interest of realistic seeing and with the hope that I might be of help in pulling some Americans out of their shells of pretense and make-believe. The pictures are not technically realistic. They do not represent accurately anything that I have seen with my eyes or that another may see with his. They are realistic just the same. I believe that they are true representations of the moment even though the symbols used are imaginative.

There are no bathing beauties dressed up in soldier outfits in these pictures. There are no silk-stockinged legs. There are no pretty boys out of collar advertisements to suggest that this war is a gigolo party. There is no glossing over of the kind of hard ferocity that men must have to beat down the evil that is now upon us. In these designs there is no hiding of the fact that war is killing and the grim will to kill. There is none of the pollyanna fat that the American people are in the habit of being fed.

I have made the pictures for all Americans who will look at them. They are dedicated, however, to those new Americans, who, born again through appreciation of their country's great need, find themselves with new shares of patriotism and intelligence, and new wills to see what is what and to come to grips with it in this year of peril.

WE MUST HAVE UNITY SUCH AS WE HAVE NEVER KNOWN

At another point in his article Mr. Benton says:

The moment has come when Americans must shake off their sloth and face reality and the inescapable logic of events in that reality.

And the moment has come when we must have unity such as we have never known. Unity. Not merely the emotional unity that flared suddenly after Pearl Harbor, but a unity of all-out practical, purposeful, and realistic thinking, seeing and doing. Without it we perish.

Now I will conclude. My purpose is to call your attention to Mr. Benton's symbolism of war, and I have fully given you his patriotic elucidation of his purposes in his creations. Like all the Bentons before him, he is an ardent patriot, a lover of all the freedoms, a good citizen, and an honest and fearless devotee of his art.

As a man may look into his own mirror and see a face that no one knows as well as he himself, so the observer may face these Benton pictures, as I have, and see in them a world of thoughts and meanings that signify much to me—much more perhaps than they may signify to some other minded observers. I see in them all the horrors of grim-visaged war, but I see also that the madmen who brought these wars to involve our own Nation must be called to account if we are to hold secure the liberties we have so long and so securely enjoyed.

My wish is that these great paintings may find a place in our national galleries and that the symbolism they express may bring our generation and the rising one to truthful conceptions of the horrors and the uselessness of wars and the evils that we know to be concealed behind and beneath their outward "pomp and circumstances."

I cannot believe that destiny will ever decree the destruction of this Republic. Nevertheless the way to make sure that it will not perish from this earth at this time is for every American to subordinate his every interest and stand as one in support of our Government and civilization in this the greatest crisis that has ever confronted our people.

CONSTRUCTION OF SUBMARINES

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6932) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as I stated a short time ago, is to increase the tonnage of submarines, to authorize 200,000 additional tons of submarines. The Navy Department believes that it is necessary and they ask the favorable consideration of this bill immediately.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the experience of this war has demonstrated the extreme need for submarines.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. The Navy Department proposed to enter into a contract and commence the construction of these submarines just as soon as this bill becomes law.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. I rise to point out that this originated in the committee itself and the Navy was very glad to get it.

Mr. HESS. And when the bill was introduced, the Navy Department said that it would ask for 170,000 tons. The Committee increased that amount to 200,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It may be improper for me to ask this question, but I know that the country is very much interested in the submarine development. Has the gentleman's committee any figures that he is able to give of what is being done in this respect?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It would not be wise to disclose anything about the submarines, what they are doing, except what is given out officially by the Navy Department. The committee knows how many submarines we have in commission, and how many submarines are being built. The committee has a great deal of information that we just cannot give to the House, but the committee is trying to keep posted about every phase of what is going on in the war.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Possibly the gentleman can give me this information. About how long will it take to build an average, ordinary submarine?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can state that we are building submarines now faster than ever before in the history of the Government.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is very reassuring.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I assume that the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy desires this?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is a departmental bill that I have been urging in the department ever since January, because I became convinced that we ought to have more submarines. The bill came up from the Navy Department on Monday and I introduced it on Monday, and notified the Secretary of a committee meeting and that I was introducing the bill. He said to introduce the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the Navy Department appear?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It appeared in support of the bill and asked that it be immediately considered.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And, of course, it approved the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am heartily in support of the gentleman's bill. I think we all realize and particularly the Navy Department realizes now, that if there is any one thing that we need more than we have, it is submarines, and the gentleman is to be congratulated for bringing it onto the floor of the House. It has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say for the benefit of the public, as the war is shaping up, the war in the Pacific looks like an aviation war. The war in the Atlantic looks like a submarine war. There must be augmentation of both of those arms of defense and aggression.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The submarines provided for in this bill is evidently fine procedure, but are we building the instruments, whether it is boats or airplanes or balloons, so that we may be able to catch the submarines that are sent from Germany to this side?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know how you are going to catch them except to destroy them. We are doing everything humanly possible to put on an aggressive warfare in the Atlantic and get rid of the submarine menace which is exceedingly dangerous and exceedingly destructive of our commerce.

Mr. RICH. I want to say that if any Member of the House has the confidence of the House I believe it is the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and the men working with him. We will have to permit you to go ahead and let us go get them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I may say that the committee proposes to have before it every shipbuilder that can build these submarines, and we will talk straight talk to them, to see how quickly these submarines can be built. Do not lose sight of the fact that we have an enormous shipbuilding program on submarines under way today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know of no one in the House who is disposed to criticize either the committee or the Navy Department. Has the gentleman as chairman of that committee learned of any Member of the House who is disposed to oppose or criticize either the committee or any member of the Navy Department?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Congress has wholeheartedly supported every naval measure that has come before it, irrespective of which side of the aisle the Members may sit on.

Mr. PAE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I notice the bill calls for 170,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That has been amended.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think if anyone can give me the comforting assurance I am looking for, the gentleman from Georgia can do so, but there is a very humiliating situation, especially on the Atlantic coast, where I have just been, about the lack of any movement toward converting yachts, fishing vessels, and other things, into subchasers. I think the gentleman must be informed about that. As I am informed—and I think I am—there has been a tremendous fall down on that. There are many idle boat yards that could be employed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true. They have not done everything we would like to have done, but I may say that in the program we have already enacted, it permitted a large number of ships to be converted. There is a limitation on how fast it can be done. The Navy Department is cognizant of the submarine menace in the Atlantic. They are doing everything humanly possible to combat it.

Mr. GIFFORD. There is a bottleneck somewhere. Does the gentleman care to tell us where it is?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is it engines? Is it electrical equipment? What is it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It may be due to the fact that we do not have the trained personnel to do it as fast as we desire it to be done. For instance, the other day Admiral Land testified that we had 17,000 ship workers in a shipbuilding plant, but of that 17,000 only 700 of them were shipbuilders. That is the condition all throughout the shipbuilding industry. You have a great number of people, but all of them are not qualified to turn out the work as speedily as possible.

Mr. GIFFORD. I must compliment the gentleman. On these 110-foot subchasers there is an E mark—excellent—hanging under the flag of one shipbuilding concern. There are a lot of hulls, but only one boat has been turned out.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I will talk to the gentleman privately about that.

Mr. GIFFORD. But the public are demanding of me to talk about it. I think if anybody can give this House information, the gentleman from Georgia can.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I regret that I do not care to go into all the details, because it is out of the question to do so. I do not want to dodge any question, but there are certain things that it is not proper to discuss on the floor of the House.

Mr. GIFFORD. Shall I tell my public that—that it should not be discussed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authorized composition of the United States Navy in under-age vessels, as established by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as amended by the acts of May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 401), June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 394), July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 779), and December 23, 1941 (Public Law 369, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), is hereby further increased by 200,000 tons of combatant ships.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is hereby authorized to provide the total under-age composition authorized in section 1 of this act, including replacements thereof as authorized by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), by undertaking the construction of combatant ships of such types and tonnages as he determines to be necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "by", strike out "one hundred and seventy" and insert "two hundred."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF BUREAU OF NAVIGATION TO BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 6874, to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to change the name of the Bureau of Navigation to the Bureau of Personnel, because all of the navigation features of the old Bureau of Navigation have been taken away and it is now nothing more than strictly a personnel bureau.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. This change of name, as I understand, does not in any way contemplate a present change so far as the chief of the bureau is concerned.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all; it is nothing but merely changing the name from "Bureau of Navigation" to "Bureau of Personnel." All of the appropriations and everything relating to the Bureau of Navigation relate to the Bureau of Personnel. It is so fixed in the bill.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman would yield, I should like to take the opportunity of saying a word of commendation with reference to the administrative work that Admiral Jacobs' bureau is carrying on. He as the head of the Bureau of Navigation has been in charge of personnel matters; and his handling of this work has been of such a high character that I certainly hope it may be contemplated that he will continue in this work.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree fully with what the gentleman states, and may say to him that this bill was presented to the committee by Admiral Jacobs himself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy shall be designated the Bureau of Naval Personnel. The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and the assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation shall be designated, respectively, as the Chief of Naval Personnel and the Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel.

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws now in force relating to the Bureau of Navigation shall now and hereafter apply to the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S NAVAL AUXILIARY RESERVE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6807) to establish a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], ranking minority member of the Naval Affairs Committee. After the bill was introduced, however, it became a departmental bill. The Navy Department endorses this bill. I shall ask the gentleman from Minnesota to seeking recognition in order to explain the bill to the House.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is simply to amend existing law relating to the Naval Reserve in order to make women eligible for enrollment in the Naval Reserve.

It is contemplated that women will fill a great many positions of military character now filled by qualified personnel who are fit, seagoing officers and men in decoding work for instance. We anticipate that over a thousand officers can be released for sea duty in this field alone. Decoding is something that cannot be done by civilian employees; it must be done by those actually in the military service. There are many other types of work that can be done as well by women as by men and in many cases better: For instance, operation of certain devices for airplane detection.

We do not know how many women will ultimately be enrolled, but it may reach possibly 150,000 with the full Navy of something over a million. .

There is a precedent for this in the yeomanettes of the World War. They worked very satisfactorily; they released hundreds and hundreds of young men for duty afloat. This bill, however, contemplates a broader service than yeomanette duty.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished Minority Leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this bill contemplate using women on board ships, or will they be assigned to shore duty only?

Mr. MAAS. They will be assigned to shore duty only. It will mean that many seagoing officers can be released from shore duty for duty afloat.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I may state to the House that they are enrolling now approximately 9,000 men in the Navy for various shore activities, taking young men who are graduating from school and older men. I requested the Bureau of Navigation—now the Personnel Bureau—to send to every Member of the House a complete break-down showing in which class they are recruiting, so that your constituents may have the information and you may impart it to them. In that set-up there are a great many places that will be filled by men. Under this bill a woman over 20 years of age may be substituted and permit these young men to go to sea.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under this bill the women go into the service, as I understand it.

Mr. MAAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I read in the press this week a letter from a nurse in Australia telling of the conditions there and how the officers there can entertain the nurses—I suppose by buying meals; she did not say—but entertain them. She also said that the nurses there in Australia were not permitted to make social engagements with the privates. Are the officers the only ones the nurses may have social contact with? Must they accept only invitations from officers and refuse invitations from privates? Is there that distinct discrimination?

Mr. MAAS. If the gentleman will let me answer his question, nurses now have the status of commissioned officers. It has never been good policy, never been permitted in the armed forces, for officers to fraternize with enlisted personnel.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the officers have that special privilege and the privates have not. If the nurse is married to a private, he could not take her out?

Mr. MAAS That is a little ridiculous.

Mr HOFFMAN. Perhaps it seems so to the privates.

Mr. MAAS. I do not think the gentleman's familiarity with the military service of modern times is sufficient so that he realizes and recognizes the situation that exists today.

Mr HOFFMAN. I will admit my ignorance with military matters, but I have a little knowledge of ordinary things, being 67, such as human nature. It seems absurd and ridiculous to me that a nurse 20 or 21 years of age cannot accept an invitation from a private near her own age, but must go out with somebody who, may I say, is a baldheaded, a large-around officer, perhaps twice or three times her age.

Mr MAAS. Is the gentleman talking about me?

Mr HOFFMAN. Certainly not. In all seriousness, I think it is wrong to deny a private the privilege, if the nurse is willing, of going out to dinner.

Mr VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that in the Army and in the Navy it is not for the best morale to have noncommissioned officers fraternize with commissioned officers. At Walter Reed, where they have Army nurses, it is not permissible for the enlisted personnel to go out with one who holds a commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not even to church?

Mr VINSON of Georgia. Oh, they can go to church.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that there will be in this corps a good many of the so-called yeomenettes. In the Nurse Corps they are all officers. I do not know whether they will be called yeomenettes in this war, though. If they want to see the enlisted men or the yeomen, there is a chance to go out with them under Navy regulations. The Navy tells me they plan to use only 1,000 women in the beginning. Mr. Speaker, this is war and there is only one thing that we have to consider today; that is the expeditious winning of the war and

victory. The Navy Department has stated it wants this corps, just as the Army wanted the Women's Auxiliary Corps. That to my mind is the principal reason for passing this bill immediately. I may remind the House that thousands of women have already asked to join the W. A. A. C., the Army Auxiliary Corps.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that in England the detectors, for instance, that locate the airplanes which fly from the Continent of Europe, are women. The bulk of that work is done by women. We can do the same thing in this country, thereby releasing able-bodied men to go to the ships to help fight.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. During the World War the English women, the English W. A. A. C., proved valuable to our own services.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, Will these women be in the Navy or will they be serving merely with the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will serve in the Navy. They will take the oath just like any other person who goes into the Navy. The bulk of them will be what is called petty officers and warrant officers and chief warrant officers, with just a few limited to commission rank.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And will have the same rate of pay?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will draw the same pay that a petty officer in the Navy draws and the same pay that a commisisoned officer draws. They will be entitled to the same considerations that the Reserve officers receive. They will get the same pensions if they are injured in line of duty. In other words, they are a part and parcel of the Navy detailed to doing certain work which the women of this country can do just as efficiently as men.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the policy contemplate that they will be assigned to do duty with the Marine Corps?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will be assigned anywhere that the Navy needs them in shore establishments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They will be in the marines, too?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will be anywhere, whether it be the Marines or the Air Corps. They will be on duty at the shore establishments wherever the Navy needs them.

Mr. MAAS. May I say that under the language of the act they can also be in the Marine Corps. Whether the Marine Corps will adopt the policy of using them or not I do not know, but this is broad enough so that the Marine Corps can use them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is entirely voluntary.

Mr. MAAS. The whole bill is entirely voluntary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding after section 401 thereof an additional title as follows:

"TITLE V—WOMEN'S AUXILIARY RESERVE

"SEC. 501. A Women's Auxiliary Reserve is hereby established which shall be a branch of the Naval Reserve and shall be administered under the same provisions in all respects (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Auxiliary Reserve) as those contained in this act or which may hereafter be enacted with respect to the Volunteer Reserve. Appointments and enlistments in the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall be made only in time of war and for periods to expire not later than 6 months after the termination of the war."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 5, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Reserve established by this title shall be composed of members who have attained the age of 20 years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION AGAINST FOREST FIRES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a very serious situation has developed in our Northwest, where a great stand of valuable timber is owned by the Government and is intermingled with privately owned timber. This Congress long ago established a policy of cooperating with these private owners in the State in working out fire protection. I am told that there is a bill (H. R. 6868) that has been passed by the House and Senate and is now in conference that contains an amendment dealing with fire protection. It is very essential and important that adequate appropriations be made to protect this most valuable resource from fire and sabotage. I have received telegrams and letters from the Governor of the State of Idaho and officials of a large number of companies in support of securing by action of the conferees a sufficient amount of money to protect this most valuable resource.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain telegrams and communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

BOISE, IDAHO.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

McKellar amendment to emergency forest-fire control bill, H. R. 6868, to include cost of C. C. C. nullifies value of this bill. Understand the bill is before joint conference committees House and Senate today. Sincerely hope this amendment will not be retained and that bill will be passed without amendment.

H. C. SHELLWORTH.

SPOKANE, WASH., *April 15, 1942.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Learned today Senate amendment increasing appropriation for emergency forest-fire control contains proviso that pay roll and maintenance cost of C. C. C. camps transferred to Forest Service would come out of this appropriation. It is feared here that this would defeat primary purpose of bill, which is forest-fire control and forest protection. Please investigate this possibility; for we believe nothing should interfere with provision of adequate wartime forest protection.

E. R. EDGERTON,
Chairman, Timber Products Bureau,
Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *April 14, 1942.*

Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE:

Senator MCKELLAR'S proviso attached to emergency forest-fire control, permitting maintenance and payment of C. C. C. enrollees of any C. C. C. camp transferred by Congress or the President under Second War Powers Act to the Forest Service be payable from this appropriatio is defeating purpose of the act. This money is essential for additional fire-protection measures that are necessary, due to war emergency. Under McKellar plan too much of the money may be spent in C. C. C. maintenance not connected with fire protection. Have no objection to continuing C. C. C., but it is not most essential fire-protection agency and will be manned by youths, most of whom will be young for such hazardous work. Hope you will protest this proviso and suggest if you think necessary that it be distributed similar to Clarke-McNary funds.

NORTH IDAHO FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
E. C. RETTIG, *Secretary.*

STATE OF IDAHO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, April 13, 1942.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I want to impress on you the importance of restoring the $18,000,000 appropriation for emergency fire control on Federal, State, and private lands in the Pacific Northwest.

This matter is now in joint Senate and House committee.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

CHASE A. CLARK,
Governor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARMY NURSES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked the question I did ask of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] as to whether nurses in the Army were permitted to associate with privates in all seriousness, because of a story I read in the paper where a nurse was telling of the conditions in Australia. She was not complaining at all, as I understood it. She

had been wounded somewhere in the islands, in Bataan I think it was, and then been evacuated to Australia. She wrote about how anxious the people of Australia were to make the lot of the nurses there agreeable and bearable. Then she referred to the fact that the officers in the American Expeditionary Force were most kind to the nurses and very solicitous about furnishing them with entertainment and getting their minds off their troubles, which is what we would expect of the officers.

Then she wrote that while the nurses were permitted to be entertained by the officers they were not permitted to be entertained by the privates. I know the privates do not have very much money; just a few dollars. I meet some of them in Washington who have but little money when they come here to the city on leave. In view of the cost of meals here and when even a picture show costs 66 cents per person, the boys really cannot get anywhere with the girls. Over here by the Supreme Court Building, where I live, I see some of these boys as they come to town.

I have no particular sympathy or concern for these big, hard-boiled fellows, strong ones, maybe 25 or 26 years old, who can force themselves in anywhere, but there are a lot of little fellows, bashful boys; some who have never been far from the farm or from home; boys who are not aggressive; who are self-conscious; timid in everything but fighting. They look like lost souls wandering around here.

I met one the other evening. I asked, "Where are you going?" He said, "I was just going to walk around." I said, "Where are you staying?" He had seen a Michigan license on my car and, being from Michigan, from the eastern part of the State, he stopped and talked to me. He was lonesome. Think of it; that boy was so hard up for entertainment he wanted to talk and visit with me just because he saw a license plate from his own State on a car. He did not know what to do. He said, "I am here till 5 o'clock." I said, "Where are you staying?" He said, "Oh, I am just walking around. I have no place to stay. I am off until 5 o'clock in the morning. I will just walk around."

It is pretty lonesome for the privates, is it not? And it must be much more lonesome way off down there in Australia. Here is a good boy, your boy or my boy, down there alone on a private's pay. He has a little time off, a few hours—a few, very few dollars. Maybe he knows some of these nurses. Maybe some of them have taken care of him. Maybe he wants to take one of them out and buy her a hamburger and onions; maybe he wants to buy her a half and half; maybe he has a few pennies in his pocket so he can do it. But the Army regulations say no. Why? Because he is a private.

It is within the realms of possibility that he meets his own sister. Stranger things have happened. The other day two brothers met on the streets of a city in Australia, after a separation of 2 years. Yet this boy, your boy or mine—meeting his own sister, is barred by the regulation of the Army from buying her a dinner. Why? Because he is a private.

It is all right to shoot him; it is all right for him to fight—and that he does gladly and willingly—but when it comes to going out with some of the sisters from the States, regulations will not permit it.

I am not criticizing that regulation. Maybe that is the way it should be; maybe that is the way it must be; but to me, at least, with all due respect and admiration for our officers, it seems as though we are asking the nurses to make quite a sacrifice just to confine their sympathy and solace to the officers. I repeat, I am not criticizing the officers, and I am quite sure that those officers in Australia do not average as large around or as many years as they do here in Washington, but is there not some way that we can soften that regulation—lessen the hardship a bit? If the boys cannot go with the girls, cannot entertain them, cannot buy them a sack of popcorn or peanuts or a bottle of pop, can we not fix it so that the privates can at least look at them?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I suggest that the gentleman and I can probably set up a "lonely hearts" column and help them out considerably.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It may be, but I doubt it. The gentleman is a lot younger than I am—many, many years younger; but even at my advanced age I have not yet reached that stage where letter writing satisfies or takes the place of everything in the way of entertainment.

Let me repeat, I am not critical. I suppose some of these columnists that do not want me elected again will pick this up as indicative of my being critical of Navy regulations or of the Navy officials. That is not true, because down at the bottom of what I am saying rests that desire in every one of these boys to see a little of home life while so far from home. We all know that. If these nurses all have to be officers, let us send some telephone operators down to Australia, or another corps of women who are not officers, but as privates as are the boys; the soldiers and sailors can then have a few words with those girls. Do you not see what I am getting at? Must all the women in the service be officers? I would like to make their lot as easy as possible.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 7 minutes.

FINANCING THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm opinion that we cannot too often appraise the job involved in properly financing the present war effort. Let us consider some current figures.

March 27 last, Chairman CANNON, of the Appropriations Committee, submitted to us a table showing all appropriations and contract authorizations for national defense for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 (a) that have already been enacted, (b) which are pending before Congress in this and other appropriation bills for both the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, (c) those requested in Budget estimates pending in Congress for the fiscal year 1943 for appropriation bills that have not yet been considered, and (d) the estimated amount that will be required after June 30, 1943, to complete construction of the expanded Navy. The total amount of all data incorporated in the statement is $160,889,714,255, and exclusive of funds loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under date of March 21 last, Mr. Jesse Jones, head of the R. F. C., informed the House that the commitments made by his agency as of that date amounted to $11,494,438,962. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that we have commitments on the barrel head of about $172,000,000,000.

HOW IS THE MONEY TO BE RAISED?

From press reports the last few days it would appear that the Ways and Means Committee and the President and the Treasury are all somewhat backing down on an aggressive taxation policy and that taxes as heavy as those first announced will not now be called for in the forthcoming tax measure. Can it be that this being an election year has greatly influenced the attitude of the President, the Treasury, and the committee? It is again my firm opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country are ready to pay much higher taxes and that they are far ahead of the Congress and the President and the Treasury in this respect. I believe that the people prefer higher taxes to some of the policies we are likely to follow in raising this fantastic sum of money which has been referred to by Chairman CANNON and Mr. Jesse Jones.

Let us look at another set of figures. I now refer to the Daily Statement of the Treasury of April 10, 1942. This statement shows that for the first 10 days of April the Treasury disbursed for national defense $1,026,757,449.97—at a rate higher than $3,000,000,000 per month. As I pointed out, yesterday in my remarks here on the floor this monthly figure is to move rapidly toward $3,500,000,000, then to $4,000,000,000, and on up to let us say $7,000,000,000 per month.

SALES OF DEFENSE BONDS SINCE APRIL 1941

The Treasury's Defense bond sales campaign opened last May 1, 1941. Since that time the more than 130,000,000 people in this country have purchased only $4,858,848,000 of these bonds.

Sales of United States Savings bonds for March 1942 amounted to $557,892,000, and this was a decrease of 20.7 percent from February sales which amounted to $703,300,000. It is argued that this drop in volume of sales was primarily due to the income-tax payments falling due in March. But, Mr. Speaker, we should have in mind at all times that this war and its financing will not wait for quarterly tax-payment adjustments. We shall have to tighten our belts and proceed to sound finance, or suffer the consequences sooner or later. I again say that we should be purchasing these Defense or Savings bonds at no less than $25,000,000,000 per annum and the performances for February and for March

are far below what the people of this country can and should be doing.

I make this observation again, Mr. Speaker, primarily for the following reasons:

First. Let us look ahead for the coming 12 to 18 months.

It can well be argued that during this coming period the Treasury will have to enter the security market for the sale of $45,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000. I again submit the old questions, How are these new issues to be disposed of? Who will purchase them? The commercial banks or the people? When I say "the people" I refer to the use of their savings and current income and this includes all savings institutions along with the individuals. It does not include the commercial banks, or the Federal Reserve Banks.

Second. If the Treasury is to sell, say $45,000,000,000 of new paper it is reasonable to assume that during the 18-month period the people will not voluntarily purchase more than an average of let us say $1,000,000,000 of paper per month, or say $18,000,000,000. This would leave a balance of say $27,000,000,000 to be disposed of. And who or what institutions will buy this volume of paper? Let us assume that the insurance companies will purchase, let us say, a total of $1,500,000,000 and other lending institutions other than commercial banks say $1,200,000,000, or say a total to insurance companies, savings institutions and other investors outside the individual class, $2,700,000,000. Deducting this from the $27,000,000,000 would leave a round balance of $24,300,000,000 to be sold to the the commercial banks.

Third. If the commercial banks are to purchase about $24,300,000,000 of Treasury paper what will be the economic or monetary, or both, consequences of this sudden rise in demand deposits? Will that not add fuel to the inflationary fires which are now bothering the President and others who are administering prices, material, wage agreements, and price indexes?

Fourth. If the commercial banks are to purchase these new issues at such a rapid rate what is to occur with respect to excess reserves of member banks in particular? Will the Board of Governors, with the assistance of the Congress increase them, or voluntarily decrease them?

Fifth. If the commercial banks continue to expand commercial loans along with the financing of the war effort, may I ask to what extent and how are the banks to meet the problem of diminishing excess reserves as a result of the loans so made?

Sixth. The increase in currency circulation which is running in excess of $3,000,000,000 monthly also presents a further problem to the banks from the standpoint of diminishing excess reserves and, when considered in the light of the above potential sales of bonds to the commercial banks. If these withdrawals of currency, which now amount to a total of more than $11,300,000,000, are to continue at the presently high weekly volume we can appreciate that eventually a serious problem will have to be met.

Seventh. As the Treasury builds up its deposits in the Federal Reserve banks still another excess reserve problem is presented to the banks. In this connection it is well to point out that the Treasury's recent balance dipped below $200,000,000 and it is reasonable to assume this low level will be materially raised at an early date. I should think the very volume of disbursements would force an increase.

Eighth. The question of compulsory purchase of defense bonds is before us. The Treasury is, I am informed, opposed to legislation which would force the public to buy defense bonds. At a later date the Secretary may find it advisable to support such legislation. But from his public utterances it would appear that he has been fairly well satisfied with the volume of sales of bonds to the public. I have given the figures for the period since May 1, 1941. Probably he now has his hopes pinned on what industrial employees are likely to do in the way of purchases. But suppose the 52,000,000 pay rollees purchase an average of $200 worth of bonds per annum that would provide for only $10,000,000,000. Who is to purchase the other $20,000,000,000 needed to be sold? American people in factory, on farm, and in the office are patriotic but these are large figures we are dealing with today. It is my guess we shall have to do a lot of planning before those whose names appear on pay rolls save as much as $10,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 per annum and under high costs of living which are now taking hold of everyone. As late as January 1941 I told the Ways and Means Committee that it would, within a short period, be considering legislation designed to force our people to save and invest in these Government issues. That day has arrived and the problem is before us. Wishful thinking will not sell the bonds. The people will have to buy and buy every day and week and month and year for the duration. The sooner we stop the sales of demand issues the better it will be for all. It may appear difficult to us to do without certain comforts and buy bonds. But, if we delay, invite destructive inflation and fail in carrying out a sound financial program, we shall suffer much more than we will if we buy bonds, widely diffuse the issues among the people and keep them out of the commercial banks.

Selling the bonds to the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks may be the momentary easy way to raise the dollars for war. But, I refer you to the comments of the Secretary and the Chairman of the Board of Governors as to where these new issues should be placed. In my opinion no greater issue is directly before our people than that of a sound financing and tax program. We had better lay aside the politics of the situation and get to the roots and do the necessary. In this case it can well be too little and too late. It is one thing to go out and assume the burdens of our allies and still another matter properly to finance the obligations therein involved.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Did I understand the gentleman to say there is not going to be a new tax measure?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I did not mean to say there would not be a tax measure, but Secretary Morgenthau appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and made certain recommendations, and, according to the paper this morning, the President will not ask any additions to the $7,000,000,000. There was $2,000,000,000 additional to be brought into the picture.

Here is also a statement in the Washington Post this morning on the other issues I was discussing. With reference to the compulsory defense loans or compulsory savings, we are softening up. This is election year, and it is not nice politically to pass extra-heavy taxes in an election year. The people in my district are ready to pay more taxes and they are willing to go along with a greater tax burden. I think the Congress makes an error in not going along with the people in that respect. In the April issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin appears a very illuminative article on profits of 245 corporations. I suggest that those who are interested in this tax and bond question read it carefully. It gives pertinent information. In some way we shall have to further tax excessive profits of corporations or greatly submit the Congress to severe criticism. Certainly whatever tax burden is applied to individuals and corporations should be applied in a manner that will not destroy the capital structure being taxed. We have to obtain revenue and we also have to maintain employment and production, and all taxes must be assessed with this view in mind. But no one can justify exorbitant profits on war operations, and this issue must be met eventually. To get by this coming election, the administration may defer many tax burdens until next year. But sooner or later some administration must face the issue, and face it without any shadow boxing. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I am ready to face the whole issue this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRAYNOR). Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Norwich Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter I received from Mr. Donald M. Nelson in reply to an inquiry I made as to the number of

times responsible officials of the Office of Price Administration appeared before committees of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT DEMAND DEBT

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when we flee from danger we do not stickle about the vehicle. I am confused as to how much Congressmen dare say, or complain, or attempt to awaken the public. I have already been told today that the lack of subchasers is a subject that perhaps should not be discussed upon the floor of the House. My people are anxious about it, and ask me to explain why there are so many sinkings on the Atlantic coast, and at the same time so many fishing boats and yachts still riding idle at anchor. We provided funds for such protection many months ago. I am not blaming anybody because there may be good reasons for the apparent condition. We have a right to say that we are interested, and have we not the right to demand information of this sort? Some investigating committees disclose some unhappy conditions that may comfort the enemy. I want my people to know if there is any good reason for these sinkings because of lack of subchasers and other craft. If there is a good reason, can we not stand the truth, even though it may give a little aid and comfort to the enemy? In talking to my audiences I face that question, and I have to do just as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] did today and answer by saying that that is a matter that is perhaps not wise to talk about at this time. I don't want that to go too far, however. It is a bit too embarrassing. It may be that my people think that I should know what is going on, and that I am not properly representing them. Also I want them to understand that it is necessary for them to purchase war bonds.

But today I want to talk about this vehicle that we are using in financing ourselves. I follow the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and I asked for this time because I wanted to further emphasize his argument. He is a man who knows, who has studied these financial subjects, and no one can or does challenge his statements. He has the real facts and is informed. He is willing to vote for a heavy tax bill, and he is willing to vote for forced savings, even though he knows perfectly well that Congressmen will hangle about a tax bill, especially in an election year. I will vote for a heavy tax bill, even though a corporation tells me that I am taking their nearly all from them, and not allowing them a dollar to be paid on their debt, and I am ready to vote for a sales tax bill even though I have to vote an imposition on the man with seven or nine children, because we must have the money. But what I am at the moment worried about and because I think the matter might be adjusted without bringing aid and comfort to the enemy, is that demand debt that we are piling up every day. Seven and a half billion dollars of demand debt already. After we collected huge taxes on March 15, did you not read that a billion and a half dollars of debt certificates for 6 months were issued? Now this is a worrisome thing. We are selling Defense bonds and stamps with the provision that after 6 months the owner can demand the money from the Treasury. Soon there will be a huge demand debt against the United States. If we sell a billion dollars a month of this sort of debt are we not placing our country in real jeopardy? Is it because the vehicle is easy riding or because we can get money on such short-time investment at a low rate of interest?

In the last World War common sense told us we should sell 20- or 30-year bonds. My bankers tell me we can sell 20-year bonds now at 3½ percent. Why do we not do it? Why jeopardize the Nation by having twenty billion, thirty billion—you cannot tell what it will be—of demand debt. Should we not pay immediate attention to this danger? I must criticize it as a matter of common sense. If our people have confidence in our Government for 20 years, and I think they have, we should ask that term of credit. We Congressmen should demand that method of finance. We are faced with the necessity to urge our people to buy bonds, and for one I would prefer to urge the purchase of longer term issues and attempt to avert a catastrophe. I would refer to a city of 100,000 people. They thought they had done very well because they had bought $2,000,000 worth of bonds in the last 3 months. Suppose they bought three times that amount in a year, that would be $7,000,000. They are making house-to-house canvass to get everybody to sign pledges to purchase. I would plead with them, "Do not publicize that poor fellow who cannot buy." We do not wholly like that method, but it is necessary. If we have to borrow $32,000,000,000, and we have to raise by taxes $27,000,000,000, that seemingly being the plan for the fiscal year which begins shortly, we face a serious situation. But will you help me with these figures? We have 130,000,000 people. How many communities are there of 100,000 people? Thirteen hundred. Multiply that by 7,000,000 and how much have you? Only $9,000,000,000 out of the $32,000,000,000. That $28,000,000,000 must come, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] says, mostly from commercial banks, as some of us have constantly predicted it would. That means further inflation; yes, worse than that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield briefly.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate you on being ahead of the majority of the Members of Congress in recommending this, because if we have a billion dollars issued and the people would come on to the Treasury and demand payment, it would wreck the country.

Mr. GIFFORD. I trust. I have not been lacking in voicing the danger of the commercial banks taking over these loans. But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is far ahead of me. He knows more than I. I confess myself to be a pupil of the gentleman from Michigan. His voice ought to be heeded; and I want him to join me in demanding that this demand debt be not further greatly increased. It is indeed highly dangerous. It is probably unnecessary. It is a reflection on the patriotism of our people, that they would not buy long-term securities. It seems to be done because they desire to make a showing of low interest rates. That seems the only possible answer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under no circumstances should we continue to put out savings bonds or defense bonds subject to cashing in after 60 days, as at present. Those cashings should not be permitted until a post-war period.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. This administration seems to have the idea that progress is simply swapping old troubles for new ones.

Now, that is the message I wanted to bring to this House today. The responsibility lies with us, in great measure. We must call this, in no uncertain terms, to the attention of the administration and demand that they offer 20-year bonds to the public, paying 3½ percent, if necessary.

I do not want to be unpatriotic in criticism. Often I dare not say what I think. I cannot answer my people in criticism of how we are getting along in the war effort, but I want to impress upon you that my people on the Atlantic coast are worrying about those sinkings. Vessel after vessel comes into port in my State and they say, "We saw only one patrol plane all the way up from Florida. We did not see a single patrol boat." When we find that those subchasers are not being put out as they should be, there is a bottleneck somewhere. I, of course, cannot locate it, but I must tell my people that somehow we are trying to remedy it. I want some word of reassurance or explanation.

I hope I have illuminated the subject of "demand debt." I hope the Treasury does not want to obscure it so that the people will realize the danger of a demand debt. I think most of us fully realize it, but if they want to keep it obscure, "obscuration can be secured by termination of the illumination." I terminate my illumination.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] for 10 minutes.

LIFTING OF DRILLING RESTRICTIONS IN ILLINOIS

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, on December 22, 1941, there was issued by the Office of Production Management, Order M-68, which limits the drilling of new oil wells to one for each 40-acre tract. The purpose given for its issuance was the conservation of steel pipe. The administration of the order was placed in the Office of Petroleum Coordinator in the Department of the Interior. When the detrimental effect of this order with respect to Illinois oil production became apparent, I contacted officials in that

Division, and have since periodically called to their attention the very serious effect this order is having upon production of oil; upon the drilling contractors and their employees, as well as land owners. I have contended that Illinois is different from other oil-producing areas of the United States in that our oil is contained in very small pools that are difficult to locate, and which can be found only through drilling operations. When one of these small pools is discovered, it is absolutely necessary that the independent driller be allowed to proceed with his operations on not larger than 20-acre tracts of land in order to enable him to profitably continue operations and to make full recovery of the oil. By requiring 40-acre spacing, he reaches too soon the edge of the pool and too many of his wells are "dry holes." In fact, the percentage of "dry holes" in relation to oil wells drilled in Illinois increased from 25 percent during the 3 months before the order went into effect, to 48 percent in March and 61 percent in the first week of April. No concern can continue operations with that large a percentage of "dry holes."

Illinois land is owned in smaller tracts than is the case in western oil-producing States. There are numerous 10- and 20-acre holdings, and, in large part, these are leased by different companies, so that consolidation into 40-acre tracts is not possible. Furthermore, individual small landowners have sold a part of their royalty to widely scattered individuals, and agreements cannot be reached, to meet the requirements of order No. M-68 that wells be drilled either in the center of each 40-acre tract, or in a uniform pattern. I contend that location of wells should be on each 20 acres, at a point to be determined by the operator's judgment based on geological determinations.

True, the Illinois Legislature has not enacted a proration bill, but the production of oil in our State is largely from McCloskey lime, and the wells prorate themselves. Production decreases rapidly from lime structures, and during the year or two that oil is being pumped from this formation, there is a monthly decline, and at the end of that period of time, practically all the oil is recovered and the well closed down. The best evidence of this is in the fact that the present 329,000 barrel daily production is 100,000 barrels per day less than it was 20 weeks ago when order No. M-68 went into effect, which order caused practically all operators to cease making locations for new wells. These operators completed the wells they had under way, and the situation at the present time is that practically no activity is to be found. The drilling concerns have stacked their rigs; the drilling crews have disintegrated and gone into other States or other employment; many small cities of the oil-producing area have declined 15 to 20 percent in population; and the owners of land are not able even to secure offset wells. As a result, their land is being partially drained by wells that are producing on an adjoining tract. This is a serious situation, and I have urged the Petroleum Coordinator to modify this ruling.

On April 8 there came to Washington Mr. Sam Jarvis, of Decatur, Ill., a very intelligent and successful independent oil operator and refinery owner, and Attorney Allen K. Swann, of Evansville, Ind., who represents many oil companies. I was glad of the opportunity to cooperate with them, in conjunction with Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, in an effort to secure a modification of the above order. It was they who suggested to the Coordinator of Petroleum that the material in a number of unused western pipe lines be reclaimed and used in the construction of a new line from the Texas and Oklahoma fields to the Mississippi River. From there the oil can be transported by barge lines and other forms of transportation to the eastern seaboard. It was pointed out to the officials in the Department that then the railroad oil-tank cars can serve almost exclusively the Mid-Continent field, of which Illinois is a part, and in that way this rolling stock would move two and one-half times more oil than at present on the longer hauls from the southwestern oil fields.

We also urged a modification of M-68, and it was pointed out that perhaps enough pipe could be reclaimed from oil wells in Illinois, where production had ended, to provide for the next 6 to 9 months' drilling operations. It was requested by the Coordinator that a survey and estimate of this material be had and a report made at the earliest moment. This information will undoubtedly be available next week, and we are hopeful we may accomplish the desired result. It was also pointed out that, with the Japanese in possession of the oil fields of the Dutch East Indies and other countries they have overrun, the United Nations must largely depend upon production in the United States for all purposes. With the threat to the oil fields of Burma, India, Iraq, and Iran, there is a possibility those sources of supply will entirely be cut off. Certainly we do not want to be caught short on oil, as we were with respect to rubber, and the Petroleum Coordinator was requested to consider all these facts and permit the development of the Mid-Continent oil pools, as had been done prior to the issuance of their order. It is only through such unrestricted operations that these small pools in Illinois and elsewhere can be discovered. This is a slow process and one that cannot be done hurriedly should our Government and our Allies need increased production. I, therefore, call again upon the Coordinator of Petroleum in the Department of the Interior to recommend a modification of order M-68 before it is too late.

PREVIOUS ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time that I might answer the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I always admire for doing the thing he thinks is best. That has been my guiding principle in trying to perform my services in the House of Representatives: To do that which I think is best for my country. That is the only object I have in view in being in Congress and have had no other objective.

When the majority leader took occasion to refer to my votes previous to December 7 he criticized my action because I did not support legislation that the administration and he proposed. Let me say to the majority leader that all the legislation so proposed was passed. My vote therefore had nothing whatever to do with the outcome. Had I voted for all those things they recommended the situation would not have been changed.

The answer I wish to make to the majority leader at this time is that if he and the Congress had voted as I wanted to vote this country would not be at war today; America would be at peace with the world, and the President's good-neighbor policy would be put to practical application. I was against this country's getting into this war; and I did not take the advice or counsel of anyone who was interested in trying to get this country into the position where we should be the defenders of the world. I was for America and am for America first, last, and all the time.

The Monroe Doctrine is made up of three propositions: First, that we do not want any more colonization in the United States; second, that we want no interference in Americas by people in the Eastern Hemisphere; and third, that we will not interfere with people in the Eastern Hemisphere. Had we been guided solely by a desire to carry out the fundamental principles of the Monroe Doctrine we should have let Europe, Asia, and Africa alone instead of going to the point where it was our duty to assume control and try to regulate them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RICH. If I can get time beyond my 7 minutes. I certainly want to yield to the majority leader, but I wish to complete my statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suggest to the gentleman that he restudy the history of the Monroe Doctrine, for I am sure he does not want to leave an erroneous impression.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Massachusetts has studied it, I am sure, and he has given the people of this country so much of his information as to what the doctrine stands for that surely the people must know his position. I, too, know a little of the history of this Nation. I, too, know what some of the people of this country want. We are a peaceful Nation; we have always been a peaceful Nation. May God help us to preserve America as a peaceful Nation. But we are in the war, and there is only one thing to do, that is to fight ourselves out of it.

If the House had followed the votes I cast before December 7, we would now be prepared for the eventualities which confronted us then and the eventualities that confront us now. If we had been prepared, then there might be some reason to go ahead and do what you are doing now. Nobody knew this better than the President of the United States that we were not prepared for war. You

had no business getting into this war, as you did. We would not have the Governor of North Carolina coming up here and pleading for vessels to protect the shores of his State if we were prepared. You would have had our Nation defended before we got into this terrible mess.

It seems pretty hard that I have to get up here and defend myself and my action, but I do not care who it is or where he comes from, I am satisfied with the votes I cast, Mr. Majority Leader, and I shall defend my position. You will have to defend yourself and your votes.

On pages 367 and 368 of the RECORD will be found a statement that I made in reference to sending supplies to Japan and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this matter at this point in the RECORD as a part of my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

SUPPLIES FOR JAPAN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now at war. It probably does not come with good grace to come on the floor of the House and say, "I told you so; I told you so." Sometimes people might think that one is trying to blow his own horn or do something in order that he might get some particular praise—that is not the motive, however—for something he had seen in the past that ought to be remedied by the administration. But you will find that if we are going to win this war, some of the statements that have been made by us who have objected to the New Deal and the New Deal way of doing things should be given a little more credit, and for some of the criticisms that we may make in the future, consideration should be given on the part of the administration.

If we must refrain from calling this administration a New Deal administration, because of the war, and if we cannot criticize your wrongs, then we are going to find out that eventually we may go on the rocks so badly that this Nation will suffer, because they do not take into consideration some of the advice that we may have to offer.

On January 3, 1939, I offered House Joint Resolution 45. On January 6, 1941, I introduced the same resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert that in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed to cause to be suspended commercial relations with the Empire of Japan by prohibiting the importation into the United States from or by Japan and the exportation from the United States into the Empire of Japan of goods and merchandise of every kind and character during the occupation of Chinese territory by armed troops of the Imperial Government of Japan."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, that resolution dealt with trading with Japan during the time they were at war with China. I wanted this Government to stop shipping materials to Japan, such as oil and scrap iron, during the time they were engaged in that undeclared war with China. Had we and Great Britain done so there would be no war with Japan today.

Then on September 26, 1940, I called it again to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives. On January 16, 1941, page 6315 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when we were dealing with the oil situation and Mr. Ickes was appointed Oil Coordinator and we were considering a bill with reference to it, I made this statement to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] on the floor of the House:

"Mr. RICH. The reason I bring that to the attention of the gentleman from Utah is because of the fact that today the Secretary is permitting 42,000 barrels of oil, 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, and 3,500 barrels of machine oil to be shipped to Japan. It would seem to me if the administration wanted to conserve our oil and gasoline they would stop shipping it out of the country to a place where it might eventually be used against us.

"Let me express the hope also that the gentleman will recommend to the Secretary of the Interior that he stop this practice. I have already done so."

Not only did I call that to the attention of the House on the 6th of May, but, as you will see by page 3721 of the RECORD, I called attention to it again, and on the 13th of May 1941, page 4087 of the RECORD, I made further remarks on the subject.

Last February when Secretary Ickes was before our Committee on the Interior I asked him:

"Mr. Secretary, for the year 1939 you shipped 72,000 barrels of oil a day and 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline to Japan each and every day, on the average. If you do not look out, that material you are shipping to them will be used against this country."

And the Secretary said he agreed with me, but that it was up to the Secretary of State to handle the situation.

Then you will remember Mr. Ickes was made Oil Coordinator. In his capacity of Oil Coordinator I wrote him a letter on the 2d of June reading as follows:

JUNE 2, 1941.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ICKES: I note in the papers that the President has appointed you Petroleum Coordinator for the National Defense.

You will recall that when we had the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill we spoke to you in reference to the fact that 42,000 barrels of oil a day, 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, and 4,500 barrels of machine oil were being shipped to Japan daily. Before we conserve the supply for our own use, it seems to me we should discontinue our shipments to Japan, not only because we may need the oil here but that it may be used against us in case of war. What is your thought in this respect, and will the oil supply be curtailed, and to what extent?

I will appreciate any information you can give me on this subject, and wish to thank you in advance for same.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT F. RICH.

I did not receive a reply from Secretary Ickes and I was unable to get in touch with him by telephone. On the 24th of June I wrote him again and asked for a reply. On June 25 he wrote me as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF PETROLEUM COORDINATOR FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Washington, June 25, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RICH: I am sorry that I have been so late in replying to your letter of June 2, and hope that you will not construe this delay as any lack of interest or courtesy on my part.

I am glad to have your views on the conservation of oil and exports to Japan. As the policies and regulations concerning foreign shipments of petroleum products fall under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State, I have taken the liberty of calling your letter to his attention.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense.

Secretary Ickes referred my letter to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State sent me the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
July 9, 1941.

The Honorable ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RICH: The Secretary of the Interior has recently referred to me your letter of June 2, 1941, regarding exports of oil to Japan.

Since June 20, 1941, the export of all petroleum products has been prohibited except when authorized by license. No license is issued until after a consideration of many factors related to the national defense, both those bearing on the domestic supply and consumption of petroleum and those affecting our relations with other powers. You may be sure that the problems you suggest are receiving most careful attention.

Sincerely yours,

SUMNER WELLES, *Acting Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate these letters as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Maybe we do not know anything; maybe the present administration could see nothing wrong in such a course as they were pursuing. Now it should be all clear and they know they made a mistake. The point I do make is that had this Government stopped shipping oil to Japan 2 years ago—oil they have been storing—they would not now be able to use that oil and those materials against American sailors and soldiers whom we are sending by the thousands across the vast expanse of the Pacific; we would have averted that and kept them from warring upon us. Our Government, by permitting American oil interests to fill Japanese requests for oil at the expense of the American stockholders of these oil companies, enabled Japan, within 1 year, to double her supply. Surely it cannot be said the Secretary of State did not know something was brewing; and we certainly might have known when the Secretary of State made the demands of Japan that he did just prior to Pearl Harbor that some such result as Pearl Harbor would flow from the demand.

I am behind the President of the United States to win this war. This is about the only thing I am behind him in, because I do not agree with his political policies at all. I am for the American people and the American form of government, but if we do not use some of the knowledge that is given to the administration by those who oppose the policies of the administration, God help America, for it will then be too late. Many wasteful and extravagant things are being done at public expense, and the Treasury of the United States will not be able to stand the drain if we continue the way we are going and also at the rate the President says he is going to spend, and spend, and spend for the war for the coming year. The thing that counts is not how many dollars we spend but what results we get for each dollar that is spent. That is what will accomplish most for the stability of the American Army and the American Navy. We want the utmost amount of airplane produced for every dollar of cost to the American taxpayer. We want every gun, every vessel, and everything that will aid and assist our armed forces in being victorious, but in the interest of the Ameri-

can Treasury and taxpayer we must see that for every dollar spent we get 100 cents' worth of value received.

If we do not, I do not know how the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is going to raise the money to carry on if we are extravagant. I know that he and the Ways and Means Committee have their hands full trying to determine what kind of taxes to impose on the American people. If he thinks that will be an easy job and if the Members of the Congress themselves think it is an easy job you wait until the taxpayers find out about it. Of course, if they present a tax bill that is at all reasonable we will have to support it, but you are going to be responsible.

Let us not be wasteful and extravagant in the expenditure of our funds. Cut down unnecessary expenses so that we can make it easier for the Ways and Means Committee and easier for the taxpayers, so that the men the President appoints and gives authority to go out and win this war will win it and the American flag will wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave. We want to save America from the domineering influence of Japan, Italy, or Germany, or any country under the control of Mr. Hitler. I am for licking Mr. Hitler, and licking him soundly, but it is going to try the American people to the very limit of their ability, not only in the mustering of soldiers, sailors, and men, but in a financial way. Our people are going to pay for it in sweat, blood, and tears.

Let us do everything we can now, but do it in a way that is the American way. Let us do the right thing at the right time. I hope the American Congress and the present administration will recognize the fact that some of the criticism aimed at the present administration is not because we want to criticize and hamper the progress of the war but because we want to win the war, and we want to do it in a good, sound way. Just criticism should be welcomed. I hope we will not have to say again, "I told you so."

Mr. RICH. For the benefit of the majority leader, may I say that on January 3, 1939, I offered a resolution to try to stop the shipping of scrap iron and oil to Japan, because I knew that this scrap iron was liable to come back to us in the form of bullets, ships, or something else. I tried to stop it then, but I got no results. If I had received the aid and assistance of the majority leader, and more on that side, maybe those same bullets would not be coming back over here now. We would have our scrap and our oil and Japan would not have it. At the same time I called attention to the fact that we were shipping 42,000 barrels of oil, 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, and 3,500 barrels of machine oil a day to Japan. We took this up with Secretary Ickes, and the Secretary wanted to stop it, but what was the result? We went to the State Department, and the State Department would not permit it. I congratulate Secretary Ickes for trying to stop this, but the President of the United States and the State Department would not permit it. They wanted to deal with Japan. What is the result? You know, so do I, who was right.

If they had followed the suggestion we made, we would be in a better position. We passed the lend-lease bill, yes, but I was against the lend-lease proposition because in this country we have enough to do to take care of our own business. Canada did not have a conscription law. Why should we pass one? India did not give all-out aid to Britain. There was no reason why we should offer our all in sacrifice. The Irish would not do anything in Ireland to aid and assist Great Britain and there was no reason why we should stick our necks out in European affairs or the affairs of any other continent until all of Britain's possessions offered their all. The President can give away 36 billion of our supplies if he wants to. How can we call it defense? It is all-out war.

I am 100 percent for winning this war, and I will go along with you to that end, but I reserve the right to criticize those things the administration is doing that I think needs criticism. I am against the New Deal because it is wrecking us. I hope you will give consideration to some of the things that we are recommending. If you were perfect, then we could not criticize you; but the waste and extravagance that you tolerate is not justifiable; the extravagance you tolerate is only breaking us down financially. The labor strife you permit is a crime to our soldiers whose lives are at stake.

I was against the arming of the isle of Guam because it was a notice to Japan we meant war on them. It was just a silly move to go to war on Japan until they attack us. I was against conscription because it meant getting into active warfare. I was opposed to giving the 50 vessels away, as it was actively getting into war. I was opposed to convoying ships, as it meant, as the President said, "To convoy means to shoot, and to shoot means war." I was opposed to going to Iceland, as the Monroe Doctrine said we should not. I was opposed to killing the Neutrality Act, as it was to prohibit the President from convoying into the danger zones he set up himself by law.

Oh, it is sad to think how our leaders erred the past several years. But now that we are in it, we will fight ourselves out somehow, I am sure.

We who make constructive criticisms are not fifth columnists nor Nazi sympathizers. God forbid.

I hope the majority leader will give us some credit for our judgment. We do not all think alike; some are for war, some are for peace. Some want strikes, some do not. Some want regimentation, some do not. Some want to retain our form of government, some do not. Some still want free speech, some do not. Some want freedom, some do not. I am for constitutional government, as per the oath I took when I entered Congress, and I will continue to fight for it and for the preservation of our country. I am for America first, last, and all the time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has reacted to a little mild observation I made earlier in the day. I agree with the gentleman on production. We all want production. I stated in my speech this morning:

> I do wish to observe that it would have been most pleasing to me and more helpful to the country if prior to December 7 the gentleman from Pennsylvania had voted for legislation whose passage some of us fought to obtain and without whose passage our country on December 7 would have been in a practically defenseless position.

The gentleman now says "he fought for peace and that if we had followed his votes we would have been prepared." Well, that raises an interesting question.

The gentleman voted against an appropriation for Guam of $5,000,000. He did not vote on the expansion of the Coast Guard national defense authorization bill. He voted for the Vorys amendment prohibiting shipment of arms to governments fighting Hitler. He voted against passage of the Neutrality Act in 1939, but he did not vote when additional facilities for a more adequate defense of the Panama Canal was involved, and I refer to the motion to recommit.

He voted against the conference report in 1939 on the Neutrality Act. He did not vote when there was an appropriation being considered to acquire 52,000 acres of land in connection with the extension of Ft. Knox. He voted "nay" on the Selective Service Act. He voted "nay" on the Lend-Lease Act. He voted "nay" on the lend-lease appropriation. He voted to recommit the Selective Service Extension Act of 1941 which passed by 1 vote. He voted against its passage in the first place. He voted against the arming of merchant vessels and he voted against the Senate amendments.

Those are a few of the gentleman's votes. Now the gentleman says that if we had followed his votes we would have been prepared in the present emergency.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that if you had followed me, we would not be in the war, you would not have demanded of Japan that they get out of China in 10 days, thereby permitting Japan to attack us on December 7. You have gotten into this trouble, and you have no one to blame but yourselves. We should have used every effort to keep out of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is right, and that is why I believe the gentleman ought to stop taking the floor so frequently and making speeches that only bring about division throughout the country.

The gentleman is a good American and I respect him. I think he is one of the finest Members of the House. I have a fondness for him, and I am not indulging in flattery. I call a spade a spade. The gentleman is impulsive. The gentleman is up on his feet before he knows what it is all about. If the gentleman would only think 10 seconds longer before taking the floor, he would refrain from making some of the what I term to be intemperate statements he has made.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman does not like what I say because you want to go

ahead and do everything you want to, and you do not want criticism. That is the trouble with you. You think you know it all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include a newspaper editorial, and in another to include several editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by a mass meeting of laborers, farmers, and businessmen of Redwood Falls, Minn., in connection with the 40-hour week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SUSTAINS REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN L. SWEENEY, OF OHIO, IN HIS ACTION FOR LIBEL, BASED ON A PUBLICATION BY PEARSON AND ALLEN IN THEIR WASHINGTON DAILY MERRY-GO-ROUND

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a decision of the United States circuit court of appeals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the apparent interest of a number of Members, who have spoken to me, I thought it would be of information to the House to bring the membership up to date by stating that on Monday of this week, April 13, 1942, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision in my favor in holding that an article, referring to me, published by Pearson and Allen in their Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round, and republished in a number of newspapers throughout the United States, was libelous per se, because the article falsely accused me of opposing a man for appointment to a Federal judgeship because he was a Jew. As I have stated heretofore in this House, I have never in all my life entertained any feelings of prejudice against Jews or any other races.

It is apparent from the reading of the newspapers today that the press, especially the columnists, are stretching the so-called privilege of freedom of the press, guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution. Resort to that guaranty was the argument unsuccessfully advanced before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The particular columnists in question, for instance, have a long record of attacks on men in public life. To mention a few, like Mr. Hoover when he was President, Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, and the membership will undoubtedly recall a book, entitled "The Nine Old Men," referring to the then members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

All these matters, of course, were before the Supreme Court, and in addition thereto reference was made in that Court to a certain action for libel brought against the same writers by none other than the most distinguished American of our times, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. This decision by Supreme Court of the United States is worth all the time and money spent, and the abuse I have taken since I started the several lawsuits 3 years ago.

I express my thanks to my chief counsel in the litigation, Hon. John J. O'Connor and his assistant, Attorney William F. Cusick, together with other counsel of record in bringing about this successful result. The Jews of Cleveland, Ohio, where I was born and raised, who know me as an individual and as a judge in that community for 8 years before I came to Congress, know my reputation for tolerance. For the past 10 years I have assisted in reuniting hundreds of European Jews with their loved ones in this country. During my service in Congress it has been my pleasure to appoint to the United States Military Academy at West Point three fine American-born Jewish boys who fulfill every American tradition of loyalty and patriotism.

This decision of the Supreme Court will register a blow at anti-Semitism in this country and will cause columnists and newspapers to be careful in the future in writing and publishing false statements concerning Members of Congress and others in public life.

I am including in this speech the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and I ask the Members to read it. It is the law of the State of New York and I trust will be the law of the land, having been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States on April 13, 1942. The decision is as follows:

[United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. No. 350—October term, 1940. Argued June 2, 1941. Decided July 18, 1941. Martin L. Sweeney, plaintiff-appellant against Schenectady Union Publishing Co., defendant appellee]

Appeal from an order of the district court for the northern district of New York granting defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint in an action for libel on the ground that no cause of action was pleaded.

Before: L. Hand, Chase, and Clark, circuit judges.

Charles G. Fryer, attorney for defendant appellee.

DeGraff & Foy, attorneys for plaintiff appellant; John O'Connor, William F. Conway, of counsel.

Chase, circuit judge:

Jurisdiction in this suit for the libelous publication by the defendant of the statements concerning the plaintiff which will presently be set forth rests upon diversity, the plaintiff being a resident of Ohio and the defendant a New York corporation. The appeal is from an order dismissing the complaint on motion after the filing of an answer consisting of a general denial, special matter in mitigation of damages, and the truth of the matter printed, coupled with the right to comment fairly thereon. No special damages were alleged, and the question before us is whether the publication which on this appeal must be taken for granted as having actually been made and having been false, was libelous per se; *O'Connell* v. *Press Publishing Co.* (214 N. Y. 362; 108 N. E. 556).

The complaint alleged that the plaintiff, a Representative in Congress from Ohio and a lawyer by profession, who was a member of the bar in good standing in the State of Ohio, had been "injured in his good name, fame, and reputation, in the conduct and execution of his official duties as a duly elected and chosen Representative of the people of the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States, in pursuance of his profession as a practicing attorney in good standing before the bar in the State of Ohio, in his standing in the community wherein he resides, and in the high regard, respect, confidence, and esteem he has hitherto enjoyed among his associates both in the Congress of the United States and in the legal fraternity and elsewhere" by the publication by the defendant in a newspaper called the Schenectady Union Star, which is widely circulated and read "in the State of New York and the States of the United States and among the people thereof" of the following:

"A hot behind-the-scenes fight is raging in Democratic congressional ranks over the effort of Father Coughlin to prevent the appointment of a Jewish judge in Cleveland.

"The proposed appointee is Emerich Burt Freed, United States district attorney in Cleveland and former law partner of Senator Bulkley, who is on the verge of being elevated to the United States district court.

"This has aroused the violent opposition of Representative MARTIN L. SWEENEY, Democrat, of Cleveland, known as the chief congressional spokesman of Father Coughlin.

"Basis of the Sweeney-Coughlin opposition is the fact that Freed is a Jew, and one not born in the United States. Born in Hungary in 1897, Freed was brought to the United States at the age of 13; was naturalized 10 years later.

"Irate, Representative SWEENEY is endeavoring to call a caucus of Ohio Representatives December 28 to protest against his appointment."

The matter so published was received by the defendant for publication from an organization known as United Feature Syndicate, Inc. It was published in much the same form in many other newspapers in this country and the resulting libel suits brought in various courts by this plaintiff have been numerous. In some instances motions to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the publication was not libelous per se have been granted; in some such motions have been denied. Decisions in other jurisdictions, however, are not only conflicting but are for us inconclusive since they have turned on the application of the libel law of States other than New York while here we must be governed by the law of the State of New York; *Erie Railroad Co.* v. *Tompkins* (304 U. S. 64). We are not concerned, however, with any libel upon the plaintiff as a lawyer, since no reference was made in the publication to that profession of his; *Keene* v. *Tribune Association* (76 Hun. 488).

The false statements published concerning him neither separately nor together make him out to be a character more offensive to right-thinking people than he would be as the spokesman in Congress of Father Coughlin; who opposed the appointment of a man named Freed to the office of United States district judge because Freed was a Jew and one not born in the United States; and who was angry about the matter to the point of attempting to have Ohio Congressmen protest in caucus against Freed's appointment.

But, all else aside, they do clearly attribute to him the desire and purpose to try to prevent the appointment of Freed to the office mentioned for the reason that Freed is a Jew who was foreign born. The context does not

fairly permit reading the language as making the foreign birth of Freed the all-sufficient cause of the plaintiff's opposition to his appointment but rather the contrary by stressing the fact that he was a Jew whose foreign birth apparently but gave an additional basis for plaintiff's opposition. And so the decisive question to be determined on this appeal is whether or not the publication of such false and unprivileged statements concerning the plaintiff within the last few years in the places as alleged in the complaint may be said as a matter of law not to have created any liability in the absence of special damages.

The New York law, as stated in *Kimmerle* v. *New York Evening Journal, Inc.* (262 N. Y. 99; 186 N. E. 217), makes libelous per se the publication of "words which tend to expose one to public hatred, shame, obloquy, contumely, odium, contempt, ridicule, aversion, ostracism, degradation, or disgrace, or to induce an evil opinion of one in the minds of right-thinking persons, and to deprive one of their confidence and friendly intercourse in society." To the same effect is *Sydney* v. *MacFadden Newspaper Publishing Corporation* (242 N. Y. 208; 151 N. E. 209). This is in general accord with the definition found in the Restatement of the Law of Torts. See section 559. The test is whether right-thinking persons would be reasonably expected to be induced by the publication to believe that it truthfully represented the plaintiff's attitude on the subject of Freed's appointment and would be likely to regard him as a consequence in such a way that his reputation was injured in one or more of the respects above noted. It is of course, not easy to apply this general test to a case of this nature. Opinions or prejudices concerning the matter in hand might well lead to different conclusions.

Some principles established in New York libel law are especially helpful in arriving at a just decision. One of them is that a false statement need not necessarily charge the violation of any law to be libelous per se; and another is that, when made of a public official, false accusations which may well lead right-thinking people to believe him unworthy of public trust and confidence are libelous per se (*Bennett* v. *Commercial Advertiser Association* (230 N. Y. 125). And still another is that an unprivileged, published falsehood need not make all, or even a majority, of those who read it think the less of the person defamed. It is enough if a noticeable part of many who read it are made to hate, despise, scorn, or be contemptuous of the person concerning whom the false statements have been published: *Peck* v. *Tribune Co.* (214 U. S. 195; Restatement, Torts, sec. 559 (e)).

And certainly the time and place of publication must be given due weight and effect. This plaintiff, by being accused of trying to deprive a man of an appointment to public office because, presumably both in race and religion, he was Jewish, would, intolerance being what it is, no doubt gain approval and increased respect in some quarters; and in others, where only the hit bird flutters, there would be indifference; but in a country still dedicated to religious and racial freedom, decent, liberty-loving people still are present in great numbers and still are greatly offended by the narrow-minded injustice of the bigots who see individuals only en masse and condemn them merely because their ancestors were of a certain race or they themselves are of a certain religion. Those who hate intolerance are prone to regard the person who believes in and practices acts of intolerance with aversion and contempt. And in these times when it is universal knowledge that one foreign dictator gained his power by practices which included large-scale, unreasonable Jewish persecutions which have played an important part in making his name an anathema in many parts of this country the publication of statements such as those alleged may well gain for the person falsely accused the scorn and contempt of the right-thinking in appreciable numbers. Freedom of speech is, as it always has been, freedom to tell the truth and comment fairly upon facts, and not a license to spread damaging falsehoods in the guise of news gathering and its dissemination.

Moreover, in places where Jews make up a sizable portion of the population, as they are known to do in part of the territory in which it is alleged that the defendant's newspaper circulated when the publication was made, it may be taken for granted that there will be an appreciable number who will hate or hold in contempt one who discriminates against a Jew merely because he is a Jew, whether born in this country or not. A majority of the court is of the opinion that the complaint is sufficient under the principles above stated and that the defendant should be required to meet it on the merits.

Order reversed and cause remanded for trial.

I hope the decision will stiffen the spines of the Members of this House who have been the victims in the past of these and similar false accusations, and who probably will be again.

[Here the gavel fell.]

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5802. An act to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions; and

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 20, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be resumed at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 5, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., April 17, 20, and 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1578. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 3, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the New Creek, N. Y., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1579. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 1, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Matanuska River in the vicinity of Matanuska, Alaska, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control adopted on June 20, 1940; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1580. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1581. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1582. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the assessment of tangible property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1583. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6913. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6529. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1331. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals, lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6071. A bill to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 6604. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6932. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6874. A bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6807. A bill to establish a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 2212. A bill to suspend during a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2369. A bill for the relief of Rachib Shriay; with amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSEY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6939. A bill for the relief of sundry aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSEY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6940. A bill for the relief of sundry aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6941. A bill for the relief of sundry aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6102. A bill confirming the claim of Augustus Dominque Turand for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392 in report of commissioners dated January 9, 1812; with amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6942. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of San Rafael Creek, Calif., and its tributaries, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6943. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty of certain physically fit retired officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6944. A bill to provide for the creation of and award to the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and to similar personnel of friendly foreign countries a decoration known as the Legion of Merit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6945. A bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6946. A bill to protect and facilitate the privilege of voting by members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 6938. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Kligler (Robert E. Arden); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6947. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2676. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of Ruth Ellis and other residents of Shiawassee County, asking for enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2677. Also, petition of Mrs. Forest Stevenson and 30 others, asking for immediate passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2678. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Arthur H. Wicks, member of the Senate of the State of New York, and concurred in by the Assembly of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to foster legislation providing benefits to civilians or dependents who may be injured or killed by reason of enemy action, which benefits will be a charge upon the whole people of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2679. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Oswego, Oswego County, N. Y., urging that sentence of persons found guilty of sabotage, espionage, or subversive activities be the maximum provided by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2680. Also, petition of the Townsend Club of Herring, N. Y., Thirty-second Congressional District, urging an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide for national old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2681. Also, petition of Miss Jane Todd, member of the Assembly of the State of New York, and concurred in by the Senate of the State of New York, urging that House bill 6806, a bill providing for the registration of women between the ages of 18 and 65 under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, be enacted; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2682. Also, petition of 15 citizens of Oneida, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages in or near any Army camp or naval establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2683. Also, petition of Malcolm Wilson, member of the Assembly of the State of New York, and concurred in by the Senate of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Social Security Act to provide all employees formerly covered by this law and made contributions in the form of employees tax and who became ineligible through no action on their part, may again become eligible for benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2684. Also, petition of Fred A. Young, member of the Senate of the State of New York, and concurred in by the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting Congress to effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada in order that the movement of persons and products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting an efficient prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2685. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Page County, Iowa; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2686. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., resolving that the city council petition the War Production Board to establish its regional office in Los Angeles in order that the Federal Government make itself available to the industries being geared to an all-out defense effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2687. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of J. E. Hayes, of Manhattan, Kans., and 95 others demanding emergency legislation eliminating the 40-hour week for labor for the duration of the war and that capital and labor be forced to settle their differences for the purpose of stepping up war production to the maximum; and demanding further that every item of unnecessary expense be eliminated from the governmental budget; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2688. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted during the last meeting of the department executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, on January 17, 1942, that the Civilian Conservation Corps maintain camps for veterans; that the Civilian Conservation Corps may be reduced; that the veteran camps are a very great benefit to the veterans from many

viewpoints; that the Federal Government is called upon to provide some protection for the vast expenditure which has been made in our national forests; and that the department commander and executive committee take the proper procedure to bring this to the attention of the proper Federal officials; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2689. By the SPEAKER: Petition of a list of voters from Williamsport, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of all things, by whose eternal thought the worlds were made, and by whose sleepless care they are upheld: Grant to us all a clearer vision of our task, a more intensive purpose, as, under the subduing power of the spirit of Thy calm, we bring all scattered thoughts into captivity unto Thee. Do Thou sanctify each endeavor in behalf of our beloved country, mantle us with the wings of Thy love, that in virtue we may walk the path of glory with liberty in righteousness as our crown of pride, marching breast-forward a united people in whom no fear shall dwell save only that of being faithless to our trust.

Vouchsafe to our President and all who share with him the vast responsibilities of leadership a glimpse of those invisible forces brooding o'er this weight and woe, and grant them in these days of wordless longing the sense of Thy power, that, through the lonely ways of suffering and pain, they may climb to those shining heights white with the Presence of the Living God.

Bless our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and all who serve our country, and do Thou remember no more our base material pride that in the past has brought us only days of shame, but do Thou reveal to us anew the truth, ofttimes forgotten, that the enduring strength of a nation's life is coextensive with its high ideals. In our Saviour's name we pray and for His sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 16, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States withdrawing a nomination and submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	Overton
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Herring	Rosier
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Brown	Kilgore	Stewart
Bulow	La Follette	Taft
Bunker	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Doxey	Murray	Walsh
Ellender	Norris	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has been delayed in reaching Washington.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is attending a meeting of the Republican National Committee and is therefore necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the joint statement issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada on April 17 last.

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Prime Minister of Canada and the President announced today that, at the invitation of the Prime Minister, a conference, in which all of the United Nations with air-training programs under way, either in the United States or Canada, would be invited to participate, would be held in Ottawa early in May.

The purpose of the meeting lies along the lines of further united military efforts. The meeting in Ottawa would extend the air programs to take in the training of personnel to operate the military aircraft to the end that the most effective use will be made of all resources of personnel.

Great progress has already been made in pooling the airplane production of the United Nations.

Plans for the conference developed out of the recognition of the desirability of more closely coordinating the British Commonwealth (including Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) air-training plan with the greatly extended air-training program undertaken by the United States and others of the United Nations. In addition, this would include China, Norway, the Netherlands, and several others which are already at war with the Axis.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A petition of sundry citizens of Kent County, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit strikes in defense plants and to discontinue double pay for Sundays and holidays, also time and a half for overtime for more than 40 hours per week in defense industries, and also to limit profits in war industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors for Saginaw, Mich., stating that "we encourage all county officials and employees to earnestly adhere to their Nation's call for economy and cooperation in their several duties and responsibilities," and pledging "every effort to assist all local agencies in the prosecution of the war and the preservation of home defense as well as to assist the States and Federal agencies to promote and finance the war effort," etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr MEAD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Finance.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, February 16, 1942.

Whereas the national administration has enacted legislation to provide old-age security benefits for many of our citizens and is contemplating the expansion of the social-security program to include other groups not now eligible for such benefits; and

Whereas under the social-security law only the employees of covered employers may participate in social-security benefits, and only the covered employers are required to pay social-security tax, the covered employer and the covered employee each paying one-half thereof; and

Whereas there are in the State of New York a great many employees who were formerly covered by the law and were formerly eligible for benefits thereunder, but who, through no action or choice on their part, became ineligible under the law when they, through no

action or choice on their part, became employees of uncovered employers; and

Whereas a great many of such employees who so became ineligible under the social-security law are desirous of being eligible thereunder and being covered thereby, and to participate in social-security benefits, and are willing to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered under the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the social-security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social-security law for social-security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 24, 1942. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the Senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, March 16, 1942.

Whereas every individual and every locality throughout the United States has a common responsibility for the prosecution of the present war, and because an attack on a coastal city or any other locality would constitute an attack upon the entire United States, and the resulting cost of injuries to civilians, whether or not gainfully employed, properly constitutes a part of the total cost of carrying the conflict to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas it is recognized that a part of the cost of war is the obligation of support and maintenance of the economic status of civilians and their dependents deprived of their income or ability to maintain themselves by reason of injuries or death caused by enemy action; and

Whereas various States, including New York, have enacted workmen's compensation laws providing benefits to injured employees or, in case of death, to their dependents, and under such laws have provided methods of administration which, based on trial and long years of experience, meet the wishes of the people of such States as to the amount of the benefits, the best methods of their determination and the proper procedure for their payment, and the amounts of such benefits established under the various State laws have been fixed by the legislature with due consideration to the economic loss arising from injury or death to employees in the particular State; and

Whereas it is probable that should the attack resulting in the injury or death of civilians take place during their working hours and at their working places, claims under workmen's compensation laws may be filed, and the authorities charged with enforcing such laws may require that compensation be paid to those injured or the dependents of those killed at work; and such awards of compensation under existing laws would constitute a liability against employers, which liability may be assumed by contract by State funds, self-insurers, and insurance companies, and must be paid at least to the extent of existing assets; and the losses resulting from an attack of great proportion might seriously impair their ability not only to pay such awards, but also might threaten the very security of the payment of compensation to hundreds of thousands of civilians injured or the dependents of those killed in industry, some of whose claims date back to the very inception of the law; and

Whereas in the enactment of such workmen's compensation laws the various State legislatures did not and could not have had in contemplation the possibility of losses due to war hazards such as currently exist at this time; and

Whereas insofar as such benefits may apply to civilians injured and killed in the course of their employment, the benefits shall be those that would be applicable under the workmen's compensation law in effect in the place at which they were employed; and

Whereas such legislation shall provide, insofar as such persons may be compensated under existing workmen's compensation laws, that the employers, State funds or the insurance carriers directly responsible therefor, upon making such payments, shall be reimbursed by the United States; and

Whereas such legislation shall provide that existing administrative agencies of the various States and of existing insurance organizations with their extensive service facilities may be utilized to the fullest extent in the administration of such law and the distribution of the benefits thereunder, thus avoiding the necessity of establishing agencies which may prove unnecessary and which would duplicate already existing facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby urges the Congress of the United States to foster and support legislation providing benefits to civilians who may be injured or the dependents of civilians who may be killed by reason of enemy action, which benefits shall be a charge upon the whole people of the United States, equitably and proportionately distributed; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the clerk of the senate be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, March 18, 1942. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

JEWISH ARMY IN PALESTINE—RESOLUTION OF ELMIRA (N. Y.) CHAPTER OF ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

Mr. MEAD presented a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the Elmira (N. Y.) Chapter of the Zionist Organization of America, with reference to the creation of an army in Palestine to fight under British command.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
OF AMERICA,
ELMIRA CHAPTER,
Elmira, N. Y., April 15, 1942.

Senator JAMES M. MEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: At the last meeting of the Elmira Chapter of the Zionist Organization of America the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"We, the Elmira Chapter of the Zionist Organization of America, fervently working and praying for the victory of America and the United Nations—the victory of truth, justice, and freedom—express our grave concern over the continued refusal of the British Government to grant to the Jews of Palestine their rightful place and status as Allies in our common struggle. The Holy Land, whence sprang humanity's noblest ideals, has been destined to constitute one of the most vital strategic areas in humanity's gravest trial. The Jews of Palestine stand eagerly prepared to give their energies, their resources, their lives to the service of the democratic cause and for the defense of the homeland they have reclaimed by their heroic toil. Today they are being denied the opportunity of full participation in the battle for civilization.

"We declare that the Jews of Palestine must be granted not only the opportunity to participate fully, but the right to participate equally. They must be admitted to the war against barbarism not grudgingly, but in the full exercise of their right and status as a free people on its own soil. They who have been so cruelly persecuted by Nazi tyranny, they who bled for freedom, demand a place on the firing line to play their part in the defeat of nazi-ism in their own name, under the inspiration of the ancient emblems of the Jewish people and in the dynamic recognition of the equality and freedom of all peoples.

"We therefore respectfully urge you to use your good offices in conformity with the spirit and traditions of this country to help secure for the Jews of Palestine the right to organize a Jewish fighting force under British command or Allied command.

"We ask such recognition for the Jews of Palestine in the name of the Jewish people who have been the victims of Fascist persecution; in the name of the Homeland hallowed by Jewish sacrifices and restored by Jewish efforts; in the name of the victory all free peoples are uniting to achieve; in the name of the ideals of freedom and justice and equality to which the United Nations are dedicated in the great struggle in which we are now engaged."

Respectfully submitted.

EUGENE I. FISCHER,
Secretary.

PREPARATION FOR LASTING PEACE—PETITION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to offer, for reference to the appropriate committee and printing in the RECORD, a letter embodying a petition, which has been sent to me by Miss Mary Ware Dennett, chairman of World Federalists, which petition was signed by many citizens of the State of Connecticut. It refers to the need that we "prepare in time of war for lasting peace," and suggests "calling at the earliest possible moment a convention of representatives of all free peoples to frame a world federal constitution."

There being no objection, the letter embodying the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD FEDERALISTS,
NEW YORK COMMITTEE FOR A
DEMOCRATIC WORLD GOVERNMENT,
April 8, 1942.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: In March 1942 the following residents of the State of Connecticut: Addie L. Webber, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Earl S. Warren, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Effie G. Silverthorne, 309 Windham Road, Willimantic; Mrs. William Sargent, 350 Windham Road, Willimantic; Mrs. Bessie Morton, Rockville; Ludella Morgan, 875 Main Street, Willimantic; Mrs. E. J. Morgan, 875 Main Street, Willimantic; E. J. Morgan, 875 Main Street, Willimantic; Arthur E. Morrill, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Mrs. Ada N. Merrifield, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Caroline A. Lester, 309 Windham Road, Willimantic; Minnie A. Kramer, 363 Windham Road, Willimantic; J. H. Keith, 353 Windham Road, Willimantic; E. L. Keith, 353 Windham Road, Willimantic; Mrs. Charlotte Johnson, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Mrs. Elizabeth Green, Windham Road, Willimantic; Walter House, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Mrs. Harriett House, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Joseph H. Heath, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Alice M. Heath, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Mrs. Mary M. Hama, 188 Prospect Street, Willimantic; Mrs. Stella Gregory, 754 Main Street, Willimantic; Margaret Deardon, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Mrs. H. E. Downer, Turner Street, Willimantic; Mrs. Frank Chamberlin, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Frank E. Chamberlin, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Lottie A. Beckwith, Camp Ground, Willimantic; Mrs. Elizabeth Barrows, 134 Prospect Street, Willimantic; Frank Anthony, 353 Windham Road, Willimantic; Ella Anthony, 353 Windham Road, Willimantic; Philip Angello, 158 Gifford Avenue, Willimantic; Herbert F. Allen, Camp Ground, Willimantic; William Howard Donahue, Old Lyme; Margaret S. Lincoln, 4403 Whitney Avenue, Mount Carmel; Irving Fisher, Box 1825, New Haven; Mrs. Allan Cowperthwaite, New Haven; Sara Walter, 28 Pierce Place, Stamford; William M. Agar, Taconic; have signed the following petition:

"We, undersigned citizens of the United States of America, respectfully petition our President and Congress to prepare in time of war for lasting peace by calling at the earliest possible moment a convention of representatives of all free peoples to frame a world Federal constitution under which we may unite to establish and maintain order through democratic world government.

"It is our conviction that membership in this world union should be open to all other peoples when they are able and willing to meet simple, just, and democratic requirements of admission, so that it will grow quickly and peacefully into an all-inclusive commonwealth of man. Only such a world order, we hold, can create the conditions under which economic justice, security, and opportunity for all can prevail.

"We confidently believe that this action by the United States would shorten the war through its influence on all other peoples, including those under enemy governments, and would help to bring a form of victory which would also win the peace."

This brings the total number of signatures to the above petition in the State of Connecticut to 91 on March 31, 1942.

Sincerely yours,
MARY WARE DENNETT,
Chairman.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present to the Senate a list of 5,154 petitioners from 14 States, asking for the enactment of Senate bill 860. These petitioners are distressed over the deplorable conditions existing in and around Army and Navy reservations caused by liquor, and believe that our war effort would be much more effective if conditions were improved during the war as provided in Senate bill 860.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of States and the number of petitioners be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the list will be printed in the RECORD.

The list referred to is as follows:

PETITIONS IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 860

Arkansas: Gillham	49
California:	
Pomona	17
Live Oak	27
Florida:	
Pinellas Park	70
Miami	37
Illinois: Mount Vernon	85
Indiana: Liberty Center	18
Iowa:	
Earlham	18
Elliott	48
Maryland: Baltimore	144
Massachusetts: Newton	18
Montana: Butte	24
New Jersey:	
Camden	11
Clarksboro	54
Irvington	59
New York:	
Albany	43
Argyle	36
Ballston Spa	10
Clayton	51
Chili	38
Easton	17
Falconer	26
Freeville	17
Guilderland	25
Harpursville	38
Honeoye Falls	41
Jamestown	45
LaFargeville	50
Lebanon	20
Orleans County	40
Newburgh	250
Newfield	46
Ransonville	41
Rochester	25
Sprakers	29
Syracuse	177
Waterport	17
Watertown	41
Wilson	24
Erie County	21
Cortland	29
Pennsylvania:	
New Brighton	13
Pittsburgh	189
Wilkinsburg	53
South Dakota: Watertown	13
Texas:	
Borger	95
Corpus Christi	123
Douglas	57
Eagle Lake	14
Electra	347
Littlefield	110
San Antonio	41
Washington:	
Bellingham	34
Bremerton	186
Brewster	111
Burlington	33
Castle Rock	81
Centralia	22
Chelan	45
Coupeville	17
Custer	46
Elma	44
Everson	43

PETITIONS IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 860—Con.

Washington—Continued	
Kelso	38
Kirkland	22
Longview	281
Manette	76
Mount Vernon	268
Port Orchard	140
Seattle	254
Shelton	130
Snohomish	113
Tacoma	24
Vancouver	50
Washington	23
Winlock	43
Wisconsin: Antigo	71
Miscellaneous	5
Total	5,154

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1264) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 2461. A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 2462. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2463. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts and Robert Roberts (collectively); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 2464. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2465. A bill to amend section 557 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2466. A bill to amend section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Senate passed Senate bill 2025, increasing the remuneration of the enlisted men of the Army. Today, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], I ask consent to introduce a bill providing for the dependents of our enlisted men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 2467. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill 2468, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2469. A bill for the relief of William Edward Fleming; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2470. A bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BROWN also introduced Senate bill 2471, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and appears under a separate hearing, and he also introduced Senate bill 2472, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a bill to bring into the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act inductees or draftees who entered the service since the enactment of the law. On examination of the act I find that it does not cover the cases of draftees who incurred obligations after the date of the approval of the act and before the date of their induction into service. I ask that this bill, providing for an amendment to cover such cases, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, because the legislation originated in that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2468) to amend section 302 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF TEACHERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND EMPLOYEES OF OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill amending the so-called Hatch Act, which, if enacted, will eliminate the prohibition against political activities by teachers in the public schools.

I also ask consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD two letters from the National Education Association, as well as a statement from the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letters and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The letters and statement presented by Mr. BROWN are as follows:

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY THROUGH EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1942.

The Honorable PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: I have just returned from the San Francisco Convention of the National Education Association with the conviction that the teachers of practically every State in the Union will fight vigorously for the passage of the Brown amendment to the Hatch Act, and are desirous of following the guidance of our commission in this matter.

I was indeed sorry to learn of Senator HATCH's accident. I hope you have been able to get his consent to advance your amendment in his absence. I would appreciate very much any information you have concerning the advancement of this bill so that appropriate action may be taken by the teachers in the various States.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

DONALD DUSHANE.

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY THROUGH EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1942.

The Honorable PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Senator From Michigan,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: I am very much pleased with the communication you have received from Senator HATCH expressing his approval of action on your amendment. Since my last interview with you I have talked to a number of leading school men of the country and I am sure we are ready to proceed in support of your amendment as soon as it is ready for action.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

DONALD DUSHANE.

THE HATCH ACT AND THE SCHOOLS

The Hatch Act must be amended to safeguard freedom of learning and teaching. The original act, passed in 1939, was an outgrowth of alleged abuses of Federal relief funds in the various States. After a brief experience it was claimed that some of the abuses were caused by State employees receiving part pay from Federal sources, so the act was amended in 1940 by extending it to certain State officers and employees.

Although teachers belong to a profession that does not condone or indulge in corrupt political practices, and although the record of debate in Congress does not indicate that there was any belief that teachers needed to be restrained from improper political procedure, yet the Hatch Act, as finally enacted and interpreted, interferes with the long recognized political rights of many thousands of American teachers.

Some of the provisions of the Hatch Act seek to prevent political corruption and are in no sense injurious to the teaching profession, and in fact, in some cases provide necessary protection. There are other sections, however, which are definitely objectionable to teachers, which will limit their effectiveness, and which will interfere with the full functioning of teachers as protectors and citizenship instructors of millions of students.

Teachers have been slow to realize the full significance and the wide applications of the Hatch Act. It was at first believed that it covered only teachers in land-grant colleges and vocational teachers in federally aided systems. As questions have arisen concerning the extent of this law the United States Civil Service Commission has made rulings and it now appears that in view of recent interpretations the Hatch Act can be, and probably will be, construed to apply to a majority of American teachers.

One of the basic purposes of the defense commission is to protect teachers from conditions which interfere with their full functioning. The commission believes that certain sections of the Hatch Act interfere with the protection of public schools, interfere with the freedom of teaching, and will be used as a means of threatening, intimidating, and coercing leaders, administrators, and other members of the teaching profession. The defense commission will make every effort to bring about such amendments of the Hatch Act as will restore and protect teachers' necessary rights and freedoms.

Three sections should be amended

A careful study of the Hatch Act reveals three sections which, from the standpoint of the teaching profession, are objectionable and should be amended:

Section 2 of the act, although not yet adjudicated by the courts, will probably prevent numerous members of the teaching profession from discussing Federal policies involved in any election, or the qualifications of candidates for Federal office in their classrooms or teachers' meetings.

Likewise, section 9 (a) may be so interpreted as to discourage all teachers employed by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia from discussing Federal issues involved in an election or the merits of the candidates for Federal office in their classrooms or teachers' meetings. These teachers are specifically prohibited from taking any part in political management or in political campaigns.

Section 12 prohibits any State or local teacher or school official, any part of whose compensation is derived from Federal loans or grants, from doing or saying anything, as teachers, which will influence any nomination or election. This section also prevents any participation by such teachers in political management or political campaigns. Teachers affected by this act cannot become candidates for any political office.

To whom does the Hatch Act apply?

The law authorizes the United States Civil Service Commission to interpret and enforce various provisions of the act. Based on actions by the United States Civil Service Commission up to the present time, it may be said authoritatively that:

1. All employees of land-grant colleges and universities, except possibly those engaged in building construction, are included in the provisions of the Hatch Act.

2. All vocational teachers and employees, any part of whose compensation comes from Federal aid, are likewise included.

3. All teachers whose compensation is in any part derived from the income of Federal grazing and forest lands are subject to the Hatch Act.

4. In view of prior decisions, it is probable that all teachers whose school systems receive any Federal vocational funds will be subject to the Hatch Act, unless such funds are accounted for separately from other school funds.

5. In the light of prior decisions it is probable that teachers, any part of whose income comes from land grants from the Federal Government to State school systems, will be included under the Hatch Act. Such an interpretation would include under the provisions of the Hatch Act a majority of teachers in the United States.

Why teachers should be excluded

Following is a brief statement of reasons why teachers should be excluded from sections 2 9 (a), and 12 of the Hatch Act:

1. Teachers belong to a profession which disapproves of and does not engage in pernicious political practices, and they would continue to be good citizens without the Hatch Act.

2. This act is discriminatory in that it applied to some teachers and not to others.

3. The Hatch Act interferes with the freedom of teachers to discuss political issues freely and without Federal political control or censorship. In order to train our youth for understanding and participation in American political life it is of vital importance that the teachers' freedom to teach the truth shall not be interfered with.

4. If teachers are to train effectively our youth for citizenship they must have full rights of citizenship themselves.

5. American public schools are dependent upon the understanding and loyalty of our citizens for their financial support and their development and improvement. Very often questions involving the welfare of the schools are issues in political elections. Frequently candidates who are enemies of education run for political office. The integrity and often the very existence of schools depend upon the political activity of members of the teaching profession. It is part of their professional obligation to keep the needs and problems of the schools before the voters of their communities and States.

6. Under the Federal Constitution the management and control of education is a State function. A comparison between American schools and those of totalitarian countries would seem to indicate the wisdom of local and State control of education. The partial disfranchisement and the muzzling of local and State teachers by the Federal Government is as unnecessary and unjustifiable as it is dangerous and alarming.

The Defense Commission believes that section 2, 9 (a), and 12 of the Hatch Act should not apply to members of the teaching profession and will make every effort to have this law amended.

DESIGNATION OF LOCKS AT ST. MARYS FALLS CANAL, MICH.—THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. BROWN. I ask consent to introduce a bill to direct the Secretary of War to designate the lock now known as the fourth lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur Lock, and to provide for the immediate designation of the new lock at such canal, authorized by section 17 of Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress, as the Governor Chase S. Osborn Lock.

Mr. President, the designation of the lock known as the fourth lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, is a most fitting honor to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose heroic defense in the Philippines is the marvel of all of us. This lock has now no name. It is one of the greatest engineering projects of its kind in the world. It is 80 feet in width and 1,350 feet long and is one of the two principal locks carrying the commerce of the Great Lakes. As everyone knows, this is one of the most vital transportation arteries in our war effort, because almost all our iron is carried through it. Here our steel and other war materials originate.

The new lock about to be constructed under the bill would be named the Governor Chase S. Osborn Lock. Governor Osborn has been a resident of the Sault almost all of his life. He was Governor of Michigan in the years 1911 and 1912, two of the greatest years in Michigan's governmental history. Through Governor Osborn's far-sighted and progressive leadership, Michigan was placed in the forefront of States in the so-called liberal group. The first workmen's compensation law was then enacted, and many of the reforms in behalf of the average man which have become statute law were then pioneered. Governor Osborn generously donated much to the Federal park at the entrance to the locks. It is one of the beauty spots of northern Michigan. He has been looked upon as the leading citizen of our State for a generation, and it is most fitting that this honor to him in his home town should be made while he is living.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2472) providing for the designation of certain locks at St. Marys Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, in connection with the bill introduced by me relative to the naming of the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, an editorial from the Detroit Free Press on the same general subject. The editorial is one of the finest I have yet read with respect to our war effort. It is so thoroughly in accord with my own ideas that I wish I could have been the author of the editorial. It was written by John S. Knight, the broad-minded and able publisher of the Detroit Free Press, the Miami Herald, and the Akron Beacon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of April 19, 1942]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

As the United States approaches the end of 5 months' declared war against the Axis Powers, it becomes more and more evident that we can win this struggle for survival in only one way.

The sole course that holds the hope of eventual and complete victory lies in casting aside the dangerous "defense" psychology which we have embraced with such ardor and adopt, in its place, a mental, spiritual, and physical war policy, which will put us on the offensive as a nation unafraid to risk the dangers and make the sacrifices which such a change will entail.

Buying bonds for "defense," turning out planes and tanks for "defense," conscripting an army for "defense" were understandable slogans a year ago. But the term "defense" should now be dropped for once and for all. It no longer applies to the vital problem at hand of winning the war.

No country ever won a major conflict by remaining behind established borders and barricades and leaving the enemy free to attack when and where he pleased.

Nor will the United States win this war if we allow Hitler to continue to choose the time and place for his onslaughts against the United Nations.

France's famed Maginot line proved poor protection against Germany's modernized attack but had not the people of France been assured by their military experts that all the advantage lay with them in fighting a "defensive" war?

The mighty base at Singapore was considered impregnable by the British because they had heard for generations that England's naval power was supreme wherever her flag was flown.

The much-heralded armies of Poland, Belgium, Holland, and France were swept aside like tin soldiers because all the advantages of a well-timed, splendidly executed offensive were fully capitalized by Germany.

In more recent months, Japan has demonstrated to the sorrow of the Allies that she had perfected a type of amphibious warfare beautifully suited to a war of surprise and aggression in the South Pacific.

Although they are sometimes disdainfully referred to as "copy cats," the Jap transports stay out of harbors and their troops carry light equipment for beach landings, which are effectively protected by ample air support.

The defeats sustained in the Pacific can be attributed to lack of Allied air power, air power that the British didn't possess, air power that we couldn't get there in time.

Without attempting to pose as an expert on the science of modern warfare and its strategy, is there not considerable danger in our becoming so concerned over what is taking place in the Pacific that we may lose sight of our main objective, which is to break Hitler's hold on Europe?

Today everybody is waiting almost breathlessly to see if Russia can hold out against Hitler's widely advertised spring offensive. Once he launches this drive are we to stand by and patiently await the outcome, contenting ourselves with shipping supplies to Russia?

Or will President Roosevelt and General Marshall be successful in convincing the British that this is the time to create a new front in Italy or France, which will prevent Hitler from using his usually successful formula of overwhelming one nation at a time?

In a two-front war Hitler's difficulties would increase immeasurably. The preponderance of air power would no longer be on his side.

There are several million troops standing by in England. They should be used in an offensive directed against the Continent; not in 1943, as believed planned by the British, but now.

Their places can be taken by American soldiers, whose first assignment will be protection of the British Isles but who later will be called upon to join the invading forces as they are replaced in England by more of our troops.

Dangerous? Hazardous? Costly? Yes; all of these, but far less dangerous, hazardous, and costly in the long run than to stand by while Hitler wins one objective after another and eventually we find ourselves standing alone while we are attacked by Hitler and the French Fleet on one coast and Japan on the other.

If this war is to be won, it must be carried to the enemy. We should never allow it to progress to the stage where it is being fought on American soil. The best guaranty of our security and final victory lies in conducting the most spirited offensive that it is possible for our military strategists to devise.

Our production figures are growing better every day. We are turning out the implements of war well ahead of schedule. The training of our men in the field is moving forward in a manner which is pleasing to the General Staff.

But the war can't be won just by producing more guns, tanks, and supplies. Too many people believe it can, just as too many people have the idea that if we build more airplanes than Hitler and Japan, the war will be over.

It would be nice if that were so. But it is fallacious reasoning to believe that airplanes alone hold the key to victory. Before this war, there were many noted naval experts who placed all their trust in sea power. We know now how antiquated this reasoning was.

Victory for the United Nations lies in the intelligent coordination of air power, sea power, and land power.

Heavy bombers protected by fighter planes can prepare the path for invasion. Our battle wagons, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, supported from the air can hold the enemy's fleet in check at sea.

But it takes infantry and artillery to make landings, occupy enemy territory, and hold it against counterattack.

Hitler will never be beaten until his troops are driven out of the occupied countries of Europe. The British Empire lacks the manpower to do the job alone. This was demonstrated when the Australians in Libya had to be rushed home after hostilities broke out in the Pacific.

That puts the job squarely up to the United States. It is a gigantic assignment fraught with great danger and many risks. It will mean casualties running into the hundreds of thousands. Many of these lives will be lost on the Atlantic, many more on the battlefields of Europe. The thought of sending such a vast expeditionary force abroad casts a chill into the heart of every American parent.

But it is the only way this war can be won.

Lulling ourselves with mounting production figures will not be enough. Nor the buying of war bonds or giving up sugar and tires.

Let us profit by the lessons of history and note in Hitler's time what happens to nations intending to fight a defensive war.

The hour has arrived when as a people we began thinking in terms of launching a formidable offensive of our own. The fight must be carried to the enemy and won on his soil.

God grant that we shall the courage and the strength to see to it that the powerful forces alined against us will never succeed in making America their battleground.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. SCHWARTZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 79, after line 6, to insert:

Kendrick project, Kortes Dam, $3,000,000.

Shoshone project, Heart Mountain power development, $815,000.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BULOW TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

[Mr. BULOW asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him, to be delivered over the radio in South Dakota by electrical transcription, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR BULOW'S CANDIDACY—ADDRESS BY EUGENE MAHONEY

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address to the people of South Dakota by Mr. Eugene Mahoney, an attorney of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

WE CAN'T WIN THE WAR BY DEFENSE METHODS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HUGHES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Senator THOMAS of Utah, delivered on March 9, 1942, on the topic "We Can't Win the War by Defense Methods," which appears in the Appendix.]

WOMEN IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator TRUMAN in reference to the part being played by women in defense industries, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Milwaukee Civic Alliance, at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 14, 1942, on the subject Wartime Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

A UNITED FRONT AGAINST TYRANNY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on April 14, 1942 on the subject A United Front Against Tyranny, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO MONEY TO WASTE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on April 17, 1942, before the thirty-ninth semiannual meeting of the National Petroleum Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, on the topic, No Money to Waste, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY TO NEW YORK POST OFFICE HOLY NAME SOCIETY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, at the annual communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the New York Post Office, at the Hotel Astor, April 19, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYER BY DR. GEORGE GILMOUR, OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a prayer offered by Dr. George Gilmour at the United Liberal Church, St. Petersburg, Fla., which appears in the Appendix.]

DR. WILBUR L. CROSS

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from Hartford Courant referring to Dr. Wilbur L. Cross, former Governor of Connecticut, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM BY AMERICAN RAILROADS

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the National Petroleum News referring to the accomplishments of American railroads in the movement of petroleum, and to the successful operation of the undertaking by Mr. John Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITAIN FINDS GAIN IN WORKS COUNCIL—ARTICLE BY CRAIG THOMPSON

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Craig Thompson entitled "Britain Finds Gain in Works Council," published in the New York Times of April 20, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MICHELSON'S FOG OVER GUAM—ARTICLE BY GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by George Rothwell Brown, published in the Washington Times-Herald of today, entitled "Michelson's Fog Over Guam," which appears in the Appendix.]

MAINTENANCE OF UNINTERRUPTED OPERATION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement arrived at on April 1, the special order for this hour is the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to Senators who may desire to present routine business.

(Several bills were introduced, and other routine business transacted, which appear under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to make this observation, but the practice has recently been inaugurated of some Senator obtaining the floor and yielding for matters which should properly come up during the morning hour. We have a very important matter pending this morning. The able Senator from Texas has the floor, having been recognized, and I shall object to his yielding, except for a question, until we dispose of the pending business. There will then be the remainder of the day for the consideration of minor matters, such as those now being pressed by some Senators.

Mr. BULOW Mr President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield, and the Senator from Oregon may object again if he desires. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I have prepared an address to be delivered over the radio in South Dakota by electrical transcription, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. McNARY. I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon makes a point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr. McNARY. That the Senator from Texas can yield only for a question, and the Senator from South Dakota is not asking a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr LEE. When will we be permitted to put these various matters in the RECORD, in a situation such as this, when the Senator from Texas has the floor on the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma can ask permission to insert material in the RECORD when he gets recognition in his own right.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am always glad to accommodate Senators, but I have a statement I wish to make, if I may proceed.

With respect to the motion to proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 2054, I beg to say that it had been my purpose to insist upon the motion at this time. However, the President of the United States has personally requested me not to press the motion until he sends a message to the Senate and the House within the approximate period of a week from this date. The President has authorized me to say that he made this request, and that he expects to send a message to the Congress relating to the establishment of a general national policy regarding the cost of living, and all factors relating thereto, including labor. It is also the expectation of the President to address the Nation over the radio following the presentation of the message to the Congress.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I feel compelled to withhold insistence upon the motion at this time. However, I feel that in fairness to my own views and position, I should say that I am deeply concerned with respect to

delays in the production of war materials by reason of disturbances in labor relations.

This war is being waged for the safety and security of every American citizen. Our troops are fighting and shedding their blood in order that Americans may enjoy their way of life and their privileges and opportunities. Those in the ranks of labor, as well as all other citizens, owe a duty to the country.

When we need men for the Army we do not ask their consent—we draft them. When we need money for the Treasury, we do not ask the consent of the taxpayers—we tax them. When manufacturers want to secure materials, we do not ask their consent as to how much they shall receive—we clamp down on them with priorities. When citizens want tires, we do not ask their consent—we ration them. Labor alone must not demand that the Government secure their consent with regard to doing their duty to the country which protects them and their opportunities to make a fair wage.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I assume that the distinguished Senator from Texas has not changed his attitude toward the progress of the proposed legislation without having given the subject very careful consideration. If he has given it such consideration, he will not be embarrassed in answering questions regarding why we should accede to this request, assuming that the Executive, especially in time of war, and because of his capacity not only as President, but also as Commander in Chief, has an impressive weight upon the Congress with respect to the performance of its functions when such performance affects the conduct of the war. Respecting that viewpoint, nevertheless, I think the Congress is entitled to know why, after weeks of delay, which seems to some of us to have been unnecessary, we are now asked to slow down in this important effort, the only kind of effort the Congress can make toward the prosecution of the war to victory. Therefore, I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether he has considered the effect upon the prosecution of the war of delay in enactment of legislation aimed only at continuous, uninterrupted, maximum production of war materials? Has the Senator considered the effect of this request upon our performance of the function of legislation touching this subject?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall say to the Senator from Vermont that I very deeply appreciate his interest in this matter. The Senator from Vermont is a distinguished member of the Committtee on the Judiciary, and participated in the deliberations of that committee on this bill, and was hearty in his support of it, and I can well understand his concern at the situation as presented.

I shall say to the Senator from Vermont that it is the view of the President of the United States that the approximately 1 week's delay occasioned by his preparing and sending to the Congress a message dealing not only with this subject but with a number of related matters, is justified, for he feels that it will be a material contribution toward the conduct of the war. He feels that the message and the radio speech to the Nation will be a contribution toward unity of view and harmony of opinion in the prosecution of the war.

I know, as, of course, the Senator from Vermont knows, that if this particular bill should be passed and it does not suit the President, if we should rush it through, as he might feel, at an untimely moment, he could easily dispose of it by veto, and his veto would probably be effective, since it takes a two-thirds vote of the Congress to override the President's veto.

I shall say to the Senator from Vermont that I was very anxious and am still anxious to secure the adoption of this motion. I have not, in anywise, changed my views as to the desirability of the proposed legislation; but, since the Constitution makes the Executive, in a way, a part of the legislative process by requiring his approval of bills which Congress enacts, since it lays upon him the further duty of advising the Congress from time to time as to measures and policies which should be considered, and in view of the direct request by the President that the matter simply be delayed and postponed for a week, the Senator from Texas felt under an imperative compulsion, so far as he was concerned, to withhold for the week any pressure in behalf of this motion.

That is about all I can say to the Senator from Vermont. I cannot, of course, probe into all the mysteries and policies respecting what may occur in the prosecution of the war, but we have had assurances, at least from the press, that production is going forward in a very satisfactory fashion in most of the branches of industrial production for the war, and I suppose that is the reason why the President feels that possibly he can contribute something to the Senate and the House in the way of an over-all picture which may, in the long run, instead of delaying, contribute to the better prosecution of the war. That is about all I can say to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas what his attitude will be a week from today with respect to this proposed legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not——

Mr. AUSTIN. I mean not with respect to the substance of the proposed legislation, but with respect to proceeding to its consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is calling on me now to give an opinion in advance of the message and all the matters contained in it. I hardly regard that as a fair senatorial question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I waive that question, and I shall ask another.

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean by that, as the Senator knows, that in this rapidly moving, kaleidoscopic picture, any Senator who says what he is going to do tomorrow is very foolish, because he does not know. At present I feel compelled to state that I have not changed my views in any respect regarding the desirability and the soundness of the proposed legislation, and I should like to see it enacted, although I do not pretend to know all there is about the subject. I know that other Senators have other bills and other measures and other amendments which they would no doubt offer, and which the Senate might adopt. I understand the Committee on Labor has been "in labor" all morning on a substitute which they expect to offer in case my bill comes up before the Senate, and so I should rather say to the Senator from Vermont that I cannot probe into my mind and know exactly what I will do next Monday. I may talk to the Senator again between now and Monday. I may talk to the President again.

I shall say to the Senator that the request which was made of me was made in the presence of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the majority leader of the House, so that it was not only personal but official. The Senator from Texas felt compelled to accede to that request.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the pending motion holds a favored position today on the calendar. Has the Senator considered the possibility of obtaining for his motion respecting his bill a similar position on the next Monday, following this Monday?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall say to the Senator that I have contemplated that, and I hope I can secure the consent of the Senate to preserve the status of my opinion following the President's message. I do not know whether that should be Monday or Tuesday. The message is coming to Congress when we meet Monday, and then the President is going to speak to the Nation that night on the radio. It may be wiser to say Tuesday, but I am perfectly willing to have the motion to call up my bill in order. I desire, however, to retain the status for this motion so that when we convene after the message shall have been delivered it will be in the same position it now occupies.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate shall convene following the delivery of the message by the President of the United States, the motion which I now have pending before the Senate may be in order, so that I may at that time present my motion for immediate consideration of Senate bill 2054.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Does that necessarily mean that the pendency of the motion will interfere with the consideration of

other business, and that other business cannot be considered without obtaining unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the Senator's motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that if the request of the Senator from Texas is agreed to, the consideration of the ordinary business of the Senate would not be interfered with in the meantime.

Mr. McNARY. This would operate as a special order for Monday or Tuesday of next week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would operate as a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to submit a suggestion to the Senator for his comment. I think under the circumstances there are obvious reasons for waiting upon Executive recommendation with respect to a subject as complicated and complex as this one is, and of course the Senator's bill only touches one phase of it. On the other hand, I think there is something to be said for making some progress today, because, in my opinion, the country has waited a very long time for Senate action upon these related subjects, and I think the country thinks that we long since passed the zero hour here in Washington without appropriate action.

I rather dislike to see the day go by without some progress being made toward fixing the purpose of the Senate to legislate. I was going to suggest to the Senator this inquiry: Why might we not agree to the Senator's motion making his bill the unfinished business today, and then temporarily lay it aside until such day next week as the Senator might indicate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his sympathy, and from his attitude I am sure I shall have his support on the bill.

It has been suggested to me, however, in view of the inquiry propounded by the Senator from Oregon, that if, as the Senator from Michigan suggests, the motion should be agreed to, then it would require unanimous consent to transact other business in the meantime, such as consideration of bills on the calendar and other matters which it might be desired to bring before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did I understand the Chair to say that unanimous consent had been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not as yet been granted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, what the Senator would do is simply to have his motion in order either next Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Pending; not in order, but pending.

Mr. HILL. Well, consideration of his motion would come up automatically after the reading of the message from the President. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Texas would simply delay consideration of his motion which is now pending until that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the purpose of making the request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, the present request of the Senator from Texas is simply to preserve the status quo as to the special order of April 1, 1942, with reference to today, until after the President shall have delivered his message?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In which case the order shall then come into effect. In that situation the motion of the Senator from Texas would be considered as pending at the next meeting of the Senate after the President delivers his message. If, on the other hand, we should follow the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan and now make the bill of the Senator from Texas the unfinished business, it could not be displaced in the meantime without unanimous consent, except on motion, which would have the effect of displacing it permanently, in which case the bill would lose its status. If the motion of the Senator from Texas is made after the delivery of the President's message, and the motion is agreed to, making the bill of the Senator from Texas the unfinished business, then, of course, the bill will be subject to amendment by any other labor proposal which may be offered from any quarter.

Mr. HILL. The effect would be the same as though the motion should come up today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that the people of the country are today looking intently to Congress. What we do in respect to this matter is of very great importance, affecting, I think, the morale of our people. Personally, I should prefer to do something positive rather than to take the course now suggested. In any event, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not yield the position of advantage now occupied by the proposed legislation without providing for its reinstatement on a day certain in the future.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont and also the Senator from Michigan what they think of this suggestion: Instead of making the motion in order on the day following the delivery of the message, the bill could be made the pending business on that date.

Mr. AUSTIN. That would be very much better. I am sure that all the people would feel a sense of greater security if some such result as that were accomplished here today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Texas mean to make it in order to consider his motion to take up his bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Senator from Vermont wanted some definite action. It occurred to me that if the request were modified so that, instead of making the motion in order, the bill were made the pending business, that would be another step toward bringing the bill before the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. That would make the bill a special order of business.

Mr. HILL. Consideration of the Senator's motion would be a special order of business.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was my original request; but I am suggesting a possible modification of the request in order to satisfy Senators who are in sympathy with the bill.

Mr. HILL. As I understood, the original request of the Senator from Texas would make it the order of the day, so to speak, to consider whether the Senate should take up his bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. My original request was to preserve the status as it now exists. That status would provide for consideration of my motion. The Senate could adopt or reject the motion.

The suggestion now made is to make the bill a special order of business, and make it the pending business, which would not require an affirmative vote of the Senate later to take it up. It would be up I am not making such a request for unanimous consent. I simply propounded the proposal to the Senator from Vermont so as to obtain his view about it. I do not know whether I could obtain unanimous consent of the Senate for such a proposal. I see some Senators indicating by a shake of their heads that they would not agree, so I will not ask unanimous consent when I know I cannot obtain it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was about to suggest to the Senator from Texas that it seems to me that the latest suggestion would not be very fair. It would mean that by unanimous consent the Senate had already disposed of the motion to proceed to consider his bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I grant that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the Senator from Texas is entitled to maintain his position. I do not want to do anything to prevent him from carrying out the plans which he has in mind. Personally I could not agree to the latest suggestion, because it would not express my position.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Wisconsin indicates that he would object.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am perfectly willing to accept the responsibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to put the responsibility on him. However, there is no use in asking unanimous consent when I see three or four heads shaking, saying "no."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may the request be stated? Precisely what is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Texas restate his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not have a photographic mind. I may vary a word or two.

I ask unanimous consent that on the day following the delivery of the message of the President of the United States to the Congress the motion of the Senator from Texas to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054, a bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of national defense, be in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. If I correctly understand the unanimous request by the Senator from Texas, it is rather indefinite. We do not know when the President will send a message to Congress. Personally I have no objection to postponing consideration of the motion to a definite date, not later than next Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator agree to next Tuesday? The reason I suggest that is that the President will not have made his speech to the country until Monday night. For us to receive his message at 12 o'clock, and then proceed at once to take up something without any opportunity thoroughly to study and read the message might seem like undue haste. If the Senator will agree to Tuesday, I am perfectly willing to substitute Tuesday following next Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I do not object to Tuesday, so long as the date is set specifically.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree to that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS AND NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last Wednesday Gov. Leon C. Phillips, of Oklahoma, in testifying before the Senate Education and Labor Committee, made some very derogatory statements with respect to the C. C. C. and N. Y. A. organizations of Oklahoma.

These statements do not represent the belief or attitude of the people of my State. They merely represent the personal feelings and prejudice of Governor Phillips. His statements were not based upon any thorough investigation, and when asked for facts and figures he admitted that he did not have them.

Both these Federal agencies have met with universally popular approval in our State. The young people in the C. C. C. camps and N. Y. A. organization are the finest type of American youth. Both these agencies have contributed materially to the building of character as well as the teaching of trades, and in many cases the rehabilitation of young lives.

Therefore, I feel that I am representing the people of Oklahoma when I say that the statements of our Governor are very much resented by the people of our State.

The trades learned in both these organizations are of inestimable value to our war program at the present time. The training the young people have received and are receiving is helping to relieve the bottlenecks in our industrial program today.

Mr. Bruce Carter, the N. Y. A. director of Oklahoma, has made the following statement regarding the organization in our State:

I am surprised that the Governor of the great and progressive State of Oklahoma would refer to thousands of Oklahoma youth as "jailbirds." I am surprised that he would be willing to retard the war effort by stopping 500 youth a month from going to work in vital war industries. I am surprised that he would say that Oklahoma youth won't work when we have this letter from Joseph J. Jenks, personnel officer of the United States Aluminum Co., of Fairfield, Conn.:

"We feel that your organization has done a wonderful job starting this emergency program and aiding us in securing qualified workers to meet our needs. I might also add that if you can supply us with 100 foundry workers within the next month, we shall be more than pleased to employ them. I would appreciate it very much if these boys could be selected from Oklahoma."

When we have this letter from the California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.:

"Our records indicated that these men have come to us well qualified for shipyard work and that they have since proven themselves to be excellent employees."

When we have this letter from the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, of Burbank, Calif.:

"After observing our records we find that your boys without exception have been above average. We feel that the training they received from your projects has been very inclusive and entirely satisfactory for our work at Lockheed."

When the M. B. Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Haven, Conn., said:

"The National Youth Administration is doing a worth-while job and their contribution of semiskilled workers is invaluable in the present emergency."

I am surprised that he would be willing to penalize the youth of Oklahoma by refusing them the opportunity of training that will equip them for a job in the vital war effort.

We have some 3,220 youth in Oklahoma today in 28 war-production shops, who are receiving training in machine shop, sheet metal, welding, foundry, joinery, radio, auto mechanics, pattern making, electrical, power sewing, and aircraft woodwork. I am surprised that Governor Phillips does not know his Oklahoma well enough to know that since Pearl Harbor the National Youth Administration has sent more than 100 youths every week to jobs in the war-production plants.

Since November of last year, we have sent from 25 to 65 youths every week to New Haven, Conn., where these youths are employed by the Vaught-Sikoraky Airplane Corporation, the United States Aluminum Co., etc. To the Denver ordnance plant in Denver, to the shipbuilding yards on the coast and on the Gulf, we have sent scores of youth. Literally hundreds of youth from Oklahoma are employed by Boeing Aircraft Co., Stearman Aircraft, Beachcraft, and Cessna Aircraft Cos. in Wichita, Kans., as well as all of the airplane factories on the Pacific coast.

I knew that the red-haired, cigar-chewing Governor of Oklahoma hated the present administration; I knew he hated President Roosevelt and all he stands for, but I did not believe he would allow his prejudiced mind to attack and condemn his own youth within the State of Oklahoma.

Governor Phillips does not know the National Youth Administration in Oklahoma; he could not make such an attack if he did know the program.

Only today I received a telegram asking the National Youth Administration "to send 40 welders to Seattle, Wash., on April 26, 40 on May 3, and 25 each week thereafter." I received a telegram yesterday asking us to increase our quota to 75 a week to go to Connecticut.

BRUCE G. CARTER,
State Youth Administrator.

Mr. President, no one is in a better position to refute the statements of Governor Phillips officially than Mrs. Mabel Bassett, who for a number of years has been and is today commissioner of charities and corrections for the State of Oklahoma. She made the following statement in a telegram to President Roosevelt:

As State commissioner of charities and corrections serving my twentieth year in this capacity, I want to say the statement made by Governor Phillips is untrue and has no foundation whatever. Working constantly as I do with youth in Oklahoma and prisoners in our institutions, I must say the National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps are and have been of untold benefit to the youth of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I have a whole sheaf of telegrams from all over Oklahoma protesting the statement of Governor Phillips; but in the interest of economy in space and time I shall read only a few of the most representative of these telegrams. The remainder I shall refer to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and ask that they be printed as a part of their record in the hearings on this subject.

First, I wish to read a telegram from Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Gordon, who run a filling station at Chickasha:

CHICKASHA, OKLA.

Senator JOSH LEE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am ashamed of Governor Phillips' unfair attack. Fight for continuance of great youth program.

Mr. and Mrs. H. L. GORDON,
Viaduct Service Station.

Next, I wish to read one from a Baptist pastor at Altus, Okla.:

ALTUS, OKLA., *April 20, 1942.*

Senator JOSH LEE,
Washington, D. C.:

I regret ill-advised misrepresentations of our Governor concerning National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps programs. He by no means expresses the views of the best and informed citizens here. Will appreciate all you can do to counteract his statements and to boost these great programs for our youth. Sincerely,

WINSTON BORUM,
Pastor, First Baptist Church.

Then I wish to read one from a groceryman at Durant, Okla.:

DURANT, OKLA., *April 18, 1942.*

Hon. JOSH LEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We could do without a Governor much better than we could our National Youth Administration at this particular time. We are making manpower for defense work.

PRATTS' GROCERY.

Then, finally, I wish to read a telegram from an educator at Oklahoma City:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
April 17, 1942.

Senator JOSH LEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOSH: Phillips' blast at the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration makes us furious. His lack of understanding appalling. He belongs to the small but prominent and noisy crowd of Pharisees and tellers of half-truths among your constituents. The number the Civilian Conservation Corps has kept out of jail is the real issue. One could wish many members of church to which you and I belong were in jail for then the world would know if it works where needed. I think that many of the Civilian Conservation Corps boys who keep out of jail are better men than you or I and I know they are better men than Red Phillips.

ERNEST E. BROWN.

Incidentally, Dr. Brown at one time was president of one of the colleges in Oklahoma.

Then I wish to read a letter from the police matron of Enid, Okla., Mrs. W. S. Whitt, who is in a particularly good position to speak officially on this question.

ENID, OKLA., *April 17, 1942.*

Senator JOSH LEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Governor of Oklahoma has made a personal attack on the National Youth Administration and has made statements that I know are untrue as a whole. I have been on the advisory board of the National Youth Administration in Enid 6 years and have constantly observed the progress and growth and know its values.

From my position as police matron and juvenile officer it was easy for me to discover the youth who needed the work and training. Every border-line case of moral break-down I found I helped to get them in the National Youth Administration and I have followed through with them and not one have gone to prison as our Governor stated. Instead I've seen them rehabilitated into good citizens who now are happily married and have private employment or have qualified for the Army, Navy, or defense work. Had it not been for the National Youth Administration, I fear they may have had a record which would have disqualified them for this national service.

I've also known the supervisors personally and not one have I known to have a shady reputation in morals or habits.

Enid needs this National Youth Administration and I make a personal appeal to you to help with your influence to keep it in our State.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. W. S. WHITT, *Police Matron.*

Also, I should like to read a letter from the United States Aluminum Co., of Connecticut. The letter is addressed to the N. Y. A. director of Connecticut. This aluminum company, in requesting foundry workers, specifically requested that they be sent from Oklahoma. I quote:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *October 4, 1941.*

Mr. RICHARD A. BARRETT,
Administrator, National
Youth Administration,
New Haven, Conn.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to give you a report of satisfactory progress of the National Youth Administration boys that we have employed at our plant.

We feel that your organization has done a wonderful job starting this emergency program and aiding us in securing qualified workers to meet our needs.

I might also add that if you can supply us with 100 foundry workers within the next month we shall be more than pleased to employ them. I would appreciate it very much if these boys could be selected from Oklahoma.

With best wishes for the continuance of your organization, I am,

Very truly yours,
THE U. S. ALUMINUM CO.,
JOSEPH J. JENKS,
Personnel Officer.

At this point I wish to read a telegram and letter addressed to Representative JED JOHNSON, of Oklahoma:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *April 17, 1942.*

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration have been closer to my heart than any of the other Government organizations because they train youth and the salvation of our country depends on youth.

The work they do has been most constructive for the State as well as highly beneficial to the individual. I have had these boys in my home. I know they are all right. I strongly urge their continuation. We do not want to turn the National Youth Administration over to any other group.

RUBE MARTIN,
Chairman, Oklahoma State
Legislative Board, Brotherhood of
Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *April 17, 1942.*

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I noticed in the press there has been an unwarranted attack made upon the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps by the Chief Executive of Oklahoma and I am asking you to present these views to the committee, of which Senator MCKELLAR is chairman, to testify against S. 2295.

I know from experience that the Civilian Conservation Corps has encouraged and given opportunity to farm boys in this State in a time of need. They have done useful work in conserving our natural resources and encouragement always tends to elevate youth to a higher plane. Reports come to me that farmers who actually employ Civilian Conservation Corps youth testify that the boys do an unusually good job in fence building, terracing, sodding, and tank building.

In my opinion, the Governor would have had a great deal more trouble in the Granite Reformatory had it not have been for the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration.

And for the National Youth Administration youth who have received training in Oklahoma, you only have to refer to the facts and results, which show 3,220 Oklahoma youth are in 28 shops learning trades that will give them jobs in war production industries. More than 500 of these boys every month go into aircraft factories, tank factories, and other armament production plants. The training that has been given by the National Youth Administration in Oklahoma has aided both the youth and the families in times of adversity and prepared them to meet the emergency in an all-out war, as no other one thing has done. It was a blessing that we had the National Youth Administration to train the youth to help us. The records will bear me out that we have had more volunteers into the armed service than any other State in the Nation with one exception.

We need the National Youth Administration now as never before, and I am firmly convinced that the National Youth Administration should be an independent establishment and not consolidated or changed at this time.

TOM W. CHEEK,
President, Oklahoma Farmers
Union, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Mr. President, I have telegrams from 64 county judges in our State. We have 77 counties, and 62 of the telegrams from county judges state that no enrollees of the N. Y. A. have records in their courts. Only 2 county judges report N. Y. A. enrollees as having court records. The name of one of these boys does not show on the finance records of the N. Y. A., and another is shown as not being on the N. Y. A. at the time of his conviction for petty larceny.

A few of the county judges report that they are unable to give accurate and detailed reports, but that to their knowledge no such records exist. Some of the county judges refer to both the N. Y. A. and C. C. C. enrollees as having no court records.

Mr. President, I am happy to offer this official record in refutation to the charges of Governor Phillips.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SILVER-PURCHASING LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY ECONOMISTS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON MONETARY POLICY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a brief statement made by the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy recommending the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and the Domestic Silver Purchase Act of 1939. I ask that the signatures also be appended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

APRIL 20, 1942.

We, the undersigned members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, again urge Congress to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934, and the domestic silver purchase law of July 6, 1939.

The former has never been sound in principle or practice, the common arguments for it were neither valid nor admirable, and its results have in the main been harmful to both the United States and certain foreign countries.

The latter act has been an indefensible subsidy to the domestic producers of silver and has forced the Treasury to pay approximately twice the world-market price for this domestic silver with the consequence that the Treasury has greatly overvalued the silver which it holds.

Both acts have disturbed the silver markets of the world, have drained silver from industry and other countries' treasuries to our Treasury vaults, and have been important factors in the expansion of our money supply at a time when such expansion has been unnecessary and undesirable.

It is gratifying to note that both Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and Chairman Eccles of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are recommending the repeal of these laws. In January of this year, Secretary Morgenthau stated to the House Appropriations Committee that "So far as I am concerned, I will be glad to see Congress strike all of the silver legislation off the books." In the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in March and at a press conference in February he again made similar statements.

Chairman Eccles, in a letter to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG on March 30, this year, stated that his views on this matter are generally in accord with those expressed by Secretary Morgenthau. Chairman Eccles pointed out in this letter that he had held these views for several years and added: "In view of the war situation, it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that so far as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort."

On April 20, 1934, the executive committee of the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy issued a statement opposing the enactment of the pending Silver Purchase Act of 1934

Substantial majorities of the full committee signed pronouncements in opposition to the Government's silver program as follows:

May 25 1936: Recommending abandonment of the silver purchase policy and that Treasury silver be disposed of as advantageously as possible;

June 14 1937: Advocating repeal of the silver purchase program;

December 28, 1937: Urging, among other things, repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934;

December 23, 1938: Urging that Government subsidy to silver interests be ended and that the Silver Purchase Act be repealed;

May 15, 1939: Urging enactment of the Townsend bill repealing the Silver Purchase Act of 1934;

September 30, 1941: Recommending, among other things, repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and of the act of July 6, 1939, providing for the purchase of domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce—approximately twice the market price.

We agree with Secretary Morgenthau's statement of January that if the Government's silver program were repealed "It would be helpful at this time. I think it would be well received."

Eugene E. Agger, Rutgers University; Benjamin M. Anderson, Jr., University of California at Los Angeles; Charles C. Arbuthnot, Western Reserve University; Don C. Barrett, Haverford College; Benjamin H. Beckhart, Columbia University; James Washington Bell, Northwestern University; Ernest L. Bogart, University of Illinois; Frederick A. Bradford, Lehigh University; William A. Brown, Jr., Brown University; J. Ray Cable, Washington University; Wilbur P. Calhoun, University of Cincinnati; Neil Carothers, Lehigh University; Edward H. Collins, New York Herald Tribune; Garfield V. Cox, the University of Chicago; William W. Cumberland, Wellington & Co., New York; Charles A. Dice, Ohio State University; D. W. Ellsworth, E. W. Axe & Co., Inc., New York; William D. Ennis, Stevens Institute of Technology; Fred R. Fairchild, Yale University; Clyde Olin Fisher, Wesleyan University; J. Anderson Fitzgerald, the University of Texas; Herbert F. Fraser, Swarthmore College; Roy L. Garis, Vanderbilt University; Arthur D. Gayer, Queens College; Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn College; Earl J. Hamilton, Duke University (with reservations as to second paragraph); Lewis H. Haney, New York University; E. C. Harwood, American Institute for Economic Research; Hudson B. Hastings, Yale University; William F. Haunhart, Southern Methodist University; Frederick C. Hicks, University of Cincinnati; John Thom Holdsworth, the University of Miami; Edwin W. Kemmerer, Princeton University; William H. Kiekhofer, the University of Wisconsin; David Kinley, University of Illinois; William H. Kniffin, Bank of Rockville Centre Trust Co., Long Island; Frederic E. Lee, University of Illinois; J. L. Leonard, University of Southern California; James D. Magee, New York University; Arthur W. Marget, University of Minnesota; A. Wilfred May, New York City; Mark C. Mills, Indiana University; Margaret G. Myers, Vassar College; Melchoir Palyi, the University of Wisconsin; Ernest Minor Patterson, University of Pennsylvania; Clyde W. Phelps, University of Chattanooga; Charles L. Prather, Syracuse University; Howard H. Preston, University of Washington; Leland Rex Robinson, 76 Beaver Street, New York; R. G. Rodkey, University of Michigan; Olin Glenn Saxon, Yale University; Joseph A. Schumpeter, Harvard University; Walter E. Spahr, New York University; Oliver M. W. Sprague, Harvard University; William H. Steiner, Brooklyn College; Charles S. Tippetts, Mercersburg Academy; Alvin S. Tostlebe, The College of Wooster; James B. Trant, Louisiana State University; Rufus S. Tucker, Westfield, N. J.; Russell Weisman, Western Reserve University; William O. Weyforth, Johns Hopkins University; Nathaniel R. Whitney, the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati; Edward Wiest, University of Kentucky; Max Winkler, College of the City of New York; Ivan Wright, Brooklyn College.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1541) for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STARNES, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6807. An act to establish a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 6807. An act to establish a Woman's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy and for other purposes;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the 31st of March, I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed House bill 6328, for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department. I now make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the bill is to credit the accounts of certain disbursing officers. My reason for moving to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed is to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, this is a bill from the Senator's committee, the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And I take it that the amendment which the Senator will offer will be a committee amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed? The Chair hears none. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 13, after the word "pay", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the nature of this proceeding. May I ask the able Senator if this bill has been passed?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it was passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. When?

Mr. ELLENDER. On the 30th of March, and it was sent to the other House on the 31st of March.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the present proceeding is to correct an error. A phrase was left out of the original bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it was inadadvertently left out; and what I am proposing to do is to write into the bill a provision which should have been in it originally.

Mr. McNARY. With that explanation, I have no objection. I did not understand it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, is the bill in the Senate or has it been sent to the House?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was sent to the House on the 31st of March, and I asked that it be returned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I intend to move, at the appropriate time, that the Senate stand in recess until Thursday next. In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that, during the recess of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations may have permission of the Senate to submit conference reports, reports on bills, and other reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered

TOTAL MOBILIZATION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I doubt if any other office receives more letters, telegrams, petitions, and resolutions on the labor question than mine.

I consider it to be my duty as well as my privilege to present the petitions and opinions of the people of Oklahoma to the National Congress and to the public in general. Therefore, I took the floor of the Senate day after day in an effort to represent the feeling of my people as expressed in their communications to me.

Day after day I urged that the committees in charge of labor bills give the Senate an opportunity to vote on them. Ir fact, for more than 2 years I have been urging that we clear our decks for action in an all-out war effort. By that I mean that all money, material, and manpower should be mobilized for war.

I believe this should be done, first, because it will make for a more efficient and effective war effort, and, second, because it will more nearly equalize the burdens of war.

With respect to the first point, the primary consideration before us today is to win the war. Every other consideration must take second place to the all-important business of winning the war. Everything the legislative branch of the Government can do to implement the winning of the war should be done.

I am convinced that a complete mobilization of all our money, men, and materials will help win the war.

Such mobilization, in my opinion, would prevent one group from fighting another. It would make for greater efficiency because it would substitute a systematic operation in the place of a policy which depends in part upon governmental power to draft men for military service and, on the other hand, upon an appeal to the patriotic impulses.

Mr. President, it was agreed 3 weeks ago that on this day we would begin the consideration of these questions. I had hoped on this day to have an opportunity to vote against racketeering in war industries. I am sure that the laboring people of America will welcome legislation preventing the outrageous practice of requiring men to pay for the privilege of working. It is ironical for American citizens to have to pay for the privilege of working in war industries in order to win a war for freedom.

From reports which I have received from many sources, it is evident that in my own State it is necessary for laborers to pay from $16.65 for common labor up to $100 for skilled labor merely for the chance to work, with no guaranty that they can get a job; and if they get one, there is no guaranty that it will last a longer time than is sufficient to enable them to reimburse themselves for the fees paid.

This situation, in my opinion, is an abuse of the privileges of organized labor. I believe that the great majority of the rank and file of the men who carry union cards resent this practice and would like to see it outlawed.

I am convinced that President Roosevelt's decisions are based upon what he believes will give us maximum production in the shortest possible time. I know that he believes, as most of us do, that we can get more production by the voluntary effort of freemen who are working to win this war. Already he and the bona fide labor leaders of this country have accomplished great results toward this end.

I shall support the President of the United States in his leadership in prosecuting this war, and I find no conflict in so doing and in opposing abuses and injustices wherever they may occur. I am convinced that President Roosevelt does not condone or approve either labor racketeering or management profiteering.

Therefore, Mr. President, unless in the near future President Roosevelt announces a policy outlawing the charging of fees or prohibiting them by Presidential proclamation or some other method, I hope that the Congress will act on this question when the bill of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] next comes before the Senate for action.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] stated that President Roosevelt had requested him to postpone action on his bill, involving so intimately the war effort, until the President himself could announce to the country a war-labor policy. The Senator from Texas himself has twice been a member of the armed forces of the United States; he has served as a soldier in two wars. Therefore, when the President of the United States requested him to postpone action on this important question, he felt, as a good soldier, it was his duty to do so.

The Constitution of the United States places upon the President as Commander in Chief the responsibility for prosecuting the war. It is the duty of Congress to advise and help the President, and, in legislative matters, to follow his leadership in the prosecution of the war. I have confidence and hope that the President will, in the near future, announce a clear-cut labor policy which will eliminate labor racketeering, on the one hand, and management profiteering, on the other. If the President does not include in his statement the elimination of the initiation fees for the privilege of working, I shall be one, at least, to urge with all my energy that action be taken by the Congress to outlaw that practice.

Mr. President, when I returned from the last war I had an abiding conviction that if another war should come, the primary consideration must be to win the war, and that the second consideration should be to equalize, so far as humanly possible, the burdens of the war. I confess to you, Mr. President, that my patriotism was shocked and hurt when I came home and learned the inequalities which resulted from the last war.

When we came back from the other war, we came back with a resolution in our hearts that if war should ever come again to the United States we would do our part to equalize the burdens of the war.

At this very time we find certain groups in this country fighting against other groups. One day one group will have a full-page advertisement in the newspaper urging its side, the next day the other group will have a full-page advertisement in the same paper urging its contentions. Why is that? It is because we do not have a clear-cut policy.

Unless President Roosevelt shall outline a war policy including a labor policy and a no-profit policy, including complete mobilization of the men, money, and materials of this country, I shall actively support the amendment now being proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], providing for a complete mobilization of men, money, and materials. Only by such a plan can we end the fight between labor and management. So long as the profit incentive exists, so long as there is a profit, there will be contention between the two groups as to which one is going to get the greatest share of the profit. Until the profit motive is removed, we will have that contention.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the plan of raising money to finance the war by voluntary subscription is rapidly breaking down. We draft men, but we beg for money. Secretary Morgenthau still believes that he can borrow money fast enough to finance the war; yet last month he was able to sell only about half a billion dollars' worth of war bonds. We would have to sell about $3,000,000,000 worth a month in order to keep up with our war contracts. Why is money so sacred, why is property so sacred, that the same Government which can command men to put on the uniform and shoulder rifles cannot likewise command other men to lend of their financial resources in order to finance the war? Why must we always approach property with mincing, cautious steps?

When I voted to draft men, when I voted to take the flesh and blood of our land in order to prosecute this war, I said in my conscience then, "I am ready to go all the way and vote for a mandatory program with respect to everything else that is needed." After we draft a man to fight, to me, it seems a waste of time to argue that we should not likewise draft dollars, through forced loans.

There is sufficient wealth in this country, and I believe we should immediately enact legislation requiring men to lend of their financial resources, under the same mandatory power by which we call the boys from the farms and the homes of this country and ask them to face death.

Mr. President, I had prepared an amendment to be offered to the bill sponsored by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], which I intended to offer this morning, providing for a mandatory sale of war bonds on the basis of ability to lend. Such a provision would be just as fair as a selective draft law. It would be just as fair as a graduated-income-tax law. We plead for people to lend money. It would be just as reasonable to make the payment of taxes voluntary as to make the lending of money during wartime a matter of voluntary action. We may have to borrow on future earnings.

Should we leave the amount of bonds a man shall buy either to his patriotism or to his desire for profit or to the strong-arm methods of pressure committees? None of these is a fair criterion for determining the amount of war bonds a man should buy. He should buy in proportion to his ability to buy, and I have an amendment which would embody that very principle in law. The amendment would make it obligatory upon the Treasury Department, by some fair yardstick, of which they have several, to determine a man's ability to lend credit to his Government. Then, as money is needed, as each bond issue is offered, each man should be required to lend his fair share by the purchase of war bonds.

Mr. President, those bonds should not be transferrable. In that regard they would be like the soldier bonus certificates. That would mean that when pay day came, and the money was to be paid back on the bonds, the money would go back to the sources from which it came; it would go back to the grass roots in the little towns instead of going back to the financial centers, when the Government began paying off.

Let us take the case of a man who has great wealth. Perhaps his wealth is in nonliquid assets, but it certainly represents a backlog of credit which the Treasury of the United States should have the privilege of using in order to back up our financial structure in this time of need in order that we may prevent depreciation in the value of our currency.

Mr. President, I shall await with keen interest and anticipation a further statement by the President of the United States with respect to the prosecution of the war, the prevention of inflation, the price ceiling, the labor question, and the prevention of profits, which I understand he is to include in his statement of policy. He is the leader. I have followed him. Sometimes I have followed him when I was criticized for doing so. I would not change any of that, because I believe he is the greatest leader in the world today. He has been right 100 percent every step of the way in this war effort. He saw the cloud rising when it came up over the horizon no larger than a man's hand. It was then with the prophetic vision which he has always had with respect to world affairs that he announced to the world, "The storm is coming. Let us fortify ourselves against that day when everything we hold dear will be challenged."

I started following the President then. There were some who did not believe what he said. It was difficult to get some persons to realize that he was right with respect to the war which he knew was coming. He has been right from that day until this.

Now in a national crisis like this we cannot follow but one leader. Therefore his wisdom should guide us in making our major decisions on these important questions. He is the Commander in Chief. The Constitution makes him that. The Congress, if it went against him, would, in my opinion, be violating the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution. If, after he sets forth a policy for the prosecution of this war, Congress should undertake to go against him, we would certainly not be in harmony with the spirit of the Constitution, which makes him responsible for prosecuting this war.

Mr. President, in his labor policy he is guided by only one belief, only one desire, and that is to secure the maximum production in the shortest period of time. Therefore, it is our duty, not only as Members of this body but as citizens of the United States, to build our unity around him. We must fight the enemy, not each other. We may disagree. We can take those problems up later. But we must close all ranks now. There must be unity in this country.

Mr. President, there are things of which we do not approve. They are small when we compare them with the great program which is moving forward already in this country. Already the big bona fide labor leaders, in conference with the President, have announced their policy of urging rapid production, and I congratulate them upon that. I believe they should do that. Now that they have done so, I congratulate them.

The President wants production and he is getting production. If we are to believe the men who are responsible and who are in the best position to know, like Donald Nelson, the Army and Navy chiefs, and the President himself, then most of our program is now or soon will be ahead of schedule. Every day we read of the launching of a ship ahead of schedule. We read today that the United States is now producing more airplanes than Germany, Japan, and Italy combined. We read today that already the United States has surpassed the total Axis output in the production of tanks. Our production is moving forward. One thing that is needed now is complete and total unity in the United States. That can be brought about and will be brought about by the President announcing his labor policy, his production policy, his policy for the prevention of profits, his policy for preventing inflation, and then by the rest of us supporting him in that announcement and carrying out his policy. That I intend to do.

Mr. President, I find no conflict between doing that and opposing abuses and injustices wherever they appear. I know my President well enough to know that Franklin D. Roosevelt does not condone or intend to approve in any manner injustices or abuses wherever they appear. We can be of service by helping to remove abuses, such as the charging of fees for the right to work in a war industry, and that I shall do.

Mr. President, I intend to do everything I can to eliminate the charging of these fees, because in my particular State that practice, more than anything else today, is irritating the people, causing disunity, and causing bitter feelings, all of which are hurting our war effort. I feel it my duty to present my people's feelings and beliefs on this question, and to do everything I can to eliminate that condition and all other irritating things which prevent or hinder complete unity around our Commander in Chief.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service (and withdrawing a nomination), which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. MCKELLAR), from the Committee on Appropriations:

E. M. Basye, of Missouri, to be Work Projects Administrator for Missouri, effective May 1, 1942.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Harper Triplett, to be postmaster at Schellsburg, Pa., in place of Harper Triplett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

CUSTOMS SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond Miller to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry T. Foley, of Yonkers, N. Y.,

to be surveyor of customs, customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

John W. Dye, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

POSTMASTER

Murray Elman to be postmaster at Millburn, in the State of New Jersey.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

CUSTOMS SERVICE

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Raymond Miller to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry T. Foley to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Thomas F. Connell, Weirsdale.

LOUISIANA

Joseph Hugh Goldsby, Amite.
Beckie D. Bradford, Tullos.

PENNSYLVANIA

Homer F. Eshelman, Summerville.

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

To be rear admirals

Alva D. Bernhard
Alan G. Kirk

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be rear admirals

William R. Munroe
John F. Shafroth, Jr.

To be captains

Charles A. Baker	Robert W. Cary
Leon S. Fiske	Benjamin F. Perry
Thorvald A. Solberg	Hubert E. Paddock
Fred M. Earle	William S. Popham
Frank P Thomas	

To be commanders

John P. Heath	Vincent W. Grady
Charles R. Brown	Arnold E. True
Leon J. Huffman	William R. Cooke, Jr.
Peter G. Hale	John S. Crenshaw
Adelbert F Converse	Alex M. Loker
Bernard E. Manseau	William D. Hoover
Harold D. Baker	Raymond A. Hansen
Bradford E. Grow	John C. Lester
Armand J. Robertson	Thomas B. Dugan
Campbell H. Minckler	Omer A. Kneeland
William S. G Davis	Hyman G. Rickover
George D. Miller	Harold F. Pullen
George N. Lyttle	Marion E. Murphy
Jasper T. Acuff	Archibald E. Uehlinger
Harold R. Parker	

To be lieutenant commanders

Robert D. Conrad	Eugene F. McDaniel
Robert F. Martin	Renwick S. Calderhead
Alfred R. Truslow, Jr.	Harry L. Hicks
Frank T. Corbin	David B. Coleman
John Eldridge, Jr.	Myron W. Graybill
Harry H. McIlhenny	William H. Potts
John E. Fitzgibbon	John C. McClaughry
George Knuepfer	William R. Ignatius
Edward J. Drew	William E. Kaitner
Ernest Blake	Leonidas W. Pancoast
HenryJ.Armstrong,Jr.	Harry M. Denty
Benjamin Katz	Joshua W. Cooper
Daniel B. Miller	Francis E. Cromwell
Charles H. Quinn	Granville A. Moore
Anderson Offutt	Edward P. Southwick
Clifton B. Maddox	Harry R. Hummer, Jr.
William White	Thomas C. Green
Eugene S. Sarsfield	John O. R. Coll
Ernest R. Perry	Samuel M. Pickering
George L. Shane	John S. Tracy
Charles M. Tooke	George B. R. Stallings
Ernest W. Lamons	William D. Irvin
Frederic F. Agens	Charles W. Parker
Robert C. Winters	Claude L. Weigle
Jack H. Lewis	Joseph A. Flynn
Edmund T. Napier, Jr.	Milton T. Dayton
Lee W. Parke	Clarence E. Boyd
Edward N. Teall, Jr.	James K. Averill
James L. Shank	Curtis A. Myers
Emmanuel T. Goyette	Albert B. Mayfield, Jr.
Arthur K. Ehle	George A Lange
George L Hansen	Clarence E Cortner
Philip A. Tague, Jr.	Glenn W Legwen, Jr.
Robert A. Johnson	Glynn R. Donaho
William F. Royall	Alston Ramsay
Levi J. Knight, Jr.	Paul D. Gross

To be lieutenants

Edward R. Nelson, Jr.	Frank McE. Smith
Willard J Bain	Warren W. Armstrong
Willie M. Dickey	Alton E. Paddock
Clinton A. Neyman, Jr.	Albert L. Carlson
Donald N Clay	Raleigh C. Kirkpatrick, Jr.
J. C. Gillespie Wilson	
John D Gerwick	Matthew S. Schmidling
James M Wolfe, Jr.	Arthur M. Purdy
John S Fletcher	Philip F. Hauck
William J. Francis, Jr.	Franklin G Hess
John H. Brandt	Carleton R Kear, Jr.
Albert R. Weldon	Thomas D McGrath
Frank E Sellers, Jr.	Richard E. Harmer
William B Wideman	John H Cotten
Roy C. Klinker	Lloyd A Smith
William R. Barnes	Edward B. Schutt

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Robert B. Byrnes

To be medical directors

Bertram Groesbeck, Jr.
Millard F. Hudson
John H Robbins

To be medical inspectors

Dwight J. Wharton
Harvey E. Robins
John F. Luten

To be surgeon

Douglas T. Prehn

To be passed assistant surgeon

Robert V. King

To be dental surgeons

Arthur H. Yando	Gunnar N Wennerberg
Charles C. Tinsley	Theodore DeW. Allan

To be passed assistant dental surgeons

Walter W. Lippold
Kenneth L. Urban

To be paymaster

Roland W. Rickertts

To be passed assistant paymasters

John B. Cline	Fletcher McC. Lamkin
Christian L. Ewald	Constantine C. Mathas

To be chief gunner

Wilbur R. Hunter

To be chief radio electrician

Clifton Shumaker

To be chief machinists

Joe B. Decker
Ralph H. Packer
Frank McDole

To be lieutenant commanders

Carter A. Printup	Claude W. Haman
Paul W Hord	Benjamin Van M. Russell
Willis H Pickton	
Paul A Hartzell	John G. Foster, Jr.
Waldo Tullsen	Harold T. Deutermann
William G. H. Lind	Edwin W. Herron
Thomas C. Thomas	Thomas O. Oberrender, Jr.
Joe W. Stryker	
Eugene E. Paro	Arnold W. McKechnie
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.	Liles W. Creighton
	David C. White

To be lieutenants

Barry K. Atkins	Murray Hanson
John A. Tyree, Jr.	Lemuel M. Stevens, Jr.
Wallace A. Sherrill	Raymond P. Zimmerman
John S. Coye, Jr	
Raymond B. Jacoby	Isthmian L. Powell
Joseph W. Williams, Jr.	Edward W. Abbot

To be paymasters

James R. Hanna
James P. Dowden

To be passed assistant paymasters

Donald W. Twigg	Laurence A. White
Alfred T. Magnell	Howard F. Kuehl
Thomas P. O'Connell	

To be assistant surgeons

Wallace L. Chesbro	Richter H. Wiggall
Talcott Bates	David J. Henry
Otto A. Will, Jr.	Edward F. McGrath
Roger D. Sherman	Ralph L. Christy, Jr.
George L. Basham	Paul P. Pickering

Walworth R. Slenger	Robert M. Wallace
Charles A. Sand	Thomas R. Counihan
Bruce R. McCampbell	Robert H. Parker
Edward W. Pinkham, Jr.	William C. Hamby
	Gilbert C. Campbell
Robert B. Lindsay	Nevin R. Trimbur
Harold A. Smedal	Kenneth N. Roberts
Gustavus D. Bock	John J. Tordoff
Kenneth M. Coyne	John F. Barber
Henry C. Hunley, Jr.	Jerome J. Burke
Lloyd A. Boehm	Frederick A. Ruoff
William H. Requarth	Robert B. Strother
Joseph A. Tyburczy	Herbert Wilson, Jr.
John H. Griffin	James N. Jeter
Merrill W. Etzenhouser	Louis R. Gens

To be ensigns

Raphael A. Zoeller	Gordon A. Bowker
Charles H. Johnson, Jr.	Vernon J. Coley, Jr.
John P. Aymond	Frank V. Andrews
Frank W. Bampton	John E. Parrott
Edgar H. Forrest	Augustus Knight, Jr.
Wade C. Wells	

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be major generals

Ralph S. Keyser
Seth Williams

To be brigadier general

Ralph J. Mitchell

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS

To be captain

Robert W. Rickert

To be second lieutenants

Francis P. McCarthy	Alfred L. Owens
Robert G. Owens, Jr.	Bryan F. Jinnett, Jr.
Thomas J. Ahern	William I. Kent
Philip R. White	Carl O. J. Grussendorf.
Rubin Iden	
Dred F. Parks	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of God, descend upon our hearts and teach us the patience of unanswered prayer, that our doubts may be broken and our souls filled with the pulsing lifeblood of an unconquerable faith. Abide with the patient sufferers, the toilsome workers, and with the faraway sentinels of our free institutions. Blessed Lord, Thou dost call us not to narrowness, not to gloom nor despondency, but to firmness and to the realization of the eternal truth that the majesty of spiritual values can never die.

We pray Thee to give us the passion to spread abroad self-sacrifice, forbearance, and the spirit of unity so essential to the very life of our Nation. When, O Lord, shall cruel feet no longer tread the wine press and the vast requiem of human sorrow cease? Here on our mother-soil have been patterned and inspired those generous ideals of our fathers and we beseech Thee that we may carry them to the torn peoples of this strickened earth As the sword of justice cuts the bonds of oppression and the fires of freedom purge the dens of human slavery, we pray that knowledge and understanding may spread among those who are failing for the lack of vision; grant that all may seek a clearer sky and an unobstructed horizon of the truth We pray that we may be manful, truthful, full of honor, and fearing only that which is evil. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 16, 1942, was read and approved.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Under the order of the House of April 16, 1942, Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement for printing in the RECORD under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of Labor.
5. Department of War.
6. Civil Service Commission.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. Federal Works Agency.
9. Interstate Commerce Commission.
10. The National Archives.
11. The Panama Canal.
12. Administrative office of the United States courts, Chicago, Ill.
13. Administrative office of the United States courts, Savannah, Ga.
14. United States courts, northern district of California.
15. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment No. 2, and agree to a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this bill passed the House and then was brought back to the House for approval of certain Senate amendments which the House rejected.

Mr. SNYDER. We are still in disagreement on Senate amendment No. 2, which is the amendment we stated we would disagree to.

Mr. RICH. If we ask for the appointment of conferees again will the same stand be taken by the conferees in accordance with the verdict of the House when we rejected the amendment the last time with reference to Bull Shoals and another dam in Arkansas?

Mr. SNYDER. There will be no construction work at all for Bull Shoals.

Mr. COLLINS. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. RICH. And we can figure that these conferees are going to stand on the record of the House?

Mr. COLLINS. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. RICH. And we can expect the Senate to yield on this amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. SNYDER, TERRY, STARNES of Alabama, COLLINS, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE of South Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from Hon. Walter Sillers, of Rosedale, Miss., with respect to the cooperation of labor and industry, published in the Jackson Daily News, of Jackson, Miss., on April 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Leon Henderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein, in line with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia just made, a plan I have received from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

A PLAN TO SAVE THE AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, right along the lines of the remarks which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has just made, a constituent of mine has prepared a plan to save the automobile dealers. The plan has been prepared at his own expense after consultation with a

to be surveyor of customs, customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

John W. Dye, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

POSTMASTER

Murray Elman to be postmaster at Millburn, in the State of New Jersey.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

CUSTOMS SERVICE

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Raymond Miller to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry T. Foley to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Thomas F. Connell, Weirsdale.

LOUISIANA

Joseph Hugh Goldsby, Amite.
Beckie D. Bradford, Tullos.

PENNSYLVANIA

Homer F. Eshelman, Summerville.

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

To be rear admirals

Alva D. Bernhard
Alan G. Kirk

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be rear admirals

William R. Munroe
John F. Shafroth, Jr.

To be captains

Charles A. Baker	Robert W. Cary
Leon S. Fiske	Benjamin F. Perry
Thorvald A. Solberg	Hubert E. Paddock
Fred M. Earle	William S. Popham
Frank P Thomas	

To be commanders

John P. Heath	Vincent W. Grady
Charles R. Brown	Arnold E. True
Leon J. Huffman	William R. Cooke, Jr.
Peter G. Hale	John S. Crenshaw
Adelbert F Converse	Alex M. Loker
Bernard E. Manseau	William D. Hoover
Harold D. Baker	Raymond A. Hansen
Bradford E. Grow	John C. Lester
Armand J. Robertson	Thomas B. Dugan
Campbell H. Minckler	Omer A. Kneeland
William S. G. Davis	Hyman G. Rickover
George D. Miller	Harold F. Pullen
George N. Lyttle	Marion E. Murphy
Jasper T. Acuff	Archibald E. Uehlinger
Harold R. Parker	

To be lieutenant commanders

Robert D. Conrad	Eugene F. McDaniel
Robert F. Martin	Renwick S. Calderhead
Alfred R. Truslow, Jr.	Harry L. Hicks
Frank T. Corbin	David B. Coleman
John Eldridge, Jr.	Myron W. Graybill
Harry H. McIlhenny	William H. Potts
John E. Fitzgibbon	John C. McClaughry
George Knuepfer	William R. Ignatius
Edward J. Drew	William E. Kaitner
Ernest Blake	Leonidas W. Pancoast
Henry J. Armstrong, Jr.	Harry M. Denty
Benjamin Katz	Joshua W. Cooper
Daniel B. Miller	Francis E. Cromwell
Charles H. Quinn	Granville A. Moore
Anderson Offutt	Edward P. Southwick
Clifton B. Maddox	Harry R. Hummer, Jr.
William White	Thomas C. Green
Eugene S. Sarsfield	John O. R. Coll
Ernest R. Perry	Samuel M. Pickering
George L. Shane	John S. Tracy
Charles M. Tooke	George B. R. Stallings
Ernest W. Lamons	William D. Irvin
Frederic F. Agens	Charles W. Parker
Robert C. Winters	Claude L. Weigle
Jack H. Lewis	Joseph A. Flynn
Edmund T. Napier, Jr.	Milton T. Dayton
Lee W. Parke	Clarence E. Boyd
Edward N. Teall, Jr.	James K. Averill
James L. Shank	Curtis A. Myers
Emmanuel T. Goyette	Albert B. Mayfield, Jr.
Arthur K. Ehle	George A. Lange
George L. Hansen	Clarence E. Cortner
Philip A. Tague, Jr.	Glenn W. Legwen, Jr.
Robert A. Johnson	Glynn R. Donaho
William F. Royall	Alston Ramsay
Levi J. Knight, Jr.	Paul D. Gross

To be lieutenants

Edward R. Nelson, Jr.	Frank McE. Smith
Willard J. Bain	Warren W. Armstrong
Willie M. Dickey	Alton E. Paddock
Clinton A. Neyman, Jr.	Albert L. Carlson
Donald N. Clay	Raleigh C. Kirkpatrick, Jr.
J. C. Gillespie Wilson	
John D. Gerwick	Matthew S. Schmidling
James M. Wolfe, Jr.	Arthur M. Purdy
John S. Fletcher	Philip F. Hauck
William J. Francis, Jr.	Franklin G. Hess
John H. Brandt	Carleton R. Kear, Jr.
Albert R. Weldon	Thomas D. McGrath
Frank E. Sellers, Jr.	Richard E. Harmer
William B. Wideman	John H. Cotten
Roy C. Klinker	Lloyd A. Smith
William R. Barnes	Edward B. Schutt

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Robert B. Byrnes

To be medical directors

Bertram Groesbeck, Jr.
Millard F. Hudson
John H. Robbins

To be medical inspectors

Dwight J. Wharton
Harvey E. Robins
John F. Luten

To be surgeon

Douglas T. Prehn

To be passed assistant surgeon

Robert V. King

To be dental surgeons

Arthur H. Yando	Gunnar N Wennerberg
Charles C. Tinsley	Theodore DeW. Allan

To be passed assistant dental surgeons

Walter W. Lippold
Kenneth L. Urban

To be paymaster

Roland W. Rickertts

To be passed assistant paymasters

John B. Cline	Fletcher McC. Lamkin
Christian L. Ewald	Constantine C. Mathas

To be chief gunner

Wilbur R. Hunter

To be chief radio electrician

Clifton Shumaker

To be chief machinists

Joe B. Decker
Ralph H. Packer
Frank McDole

To be lieutenant commanders

Carter A. Printup	Claude W. Haman
Paul W. Hord	Benjamin Van M. Russell
Willis H. Pickton	
Paul A. Hartzell	John G. Foster, Jr.
Waldo Tuilsen	Harold T. Deutermann
William G. H. Lind	Edwin W. Herron
Thomas C. Thomas	Thomas O. Oberrender, Jr.
Joe W. Stryker	
Eugene E. Paro	Arnold W. McKechnie
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.	Liles W. Creighton
	David C. White

To be lieutenants

Barry K. Atkins	Murray Hanson
John A. Tyree, Jr.	Lemuel M. Stevens, Jr.
Wallace A. Sherrill	Raymond P. Zimmerman
John S. Coye, Jr.	
Raymond B. Jacoby	Isthmian L. Powell
Joseph W. Williams, Jr.	Edward W. Abbot

To be paymasters

James R. Hanna
James P. Dowden

To be passed assistant paymasters

Donald W. Twigg	Laurence A. White
Alfred T. Magnell	Howard F. Kuehl
Thomas P. O'Connell	

To be assistant surgeons

Wallace L. Chesbro	Richter H. Wiggall
Talcott Bates	David J. Henry
Otto A. Will, Jr.	Edward F. McGrath
Roger D. Sherman	Ralph L. Christy, Jr.
George L. Basham	Paul P. Pickering

Walworth R. Slenger	Robert M. Wallace
Charles A. Sand	Thomas R. Counihan
Bruce R. McCampbell	Robert H. Parker
Edward W. Pinkham, Jr.	William C. Hamby
	Gilbert C. Campbell
Robert B. Lindsay	Nevin R. Trimbur
Harold A. Smedal	Kenneth N. Roberts
Gustavus D. Bock	John J. Tordoff
Kenneth M. Coyne	John F. Barber
Henry C. Hunley, Jr.	Jerome J. Burke
Lloyd A. Boehm	Frederick A. Ruoff
William H. Requarth	Robert B. Strother
Joseph A. Tyburczy	Herbert Wilson, Jr.
John H. Griffin	James N. Jeter
Merrill W. Etzenhouser	Louis R. Gens

To be ensigns

Raphael A. Zoeller	Gordon A. Bowker
Charles H. Johnson, Jr.	Vernon J. Coley, Jr.
John P. Aymond	Frank V. Andrews
Frank W. Bampton	John E. Parrott
Edgar H. Forrest	Augustus Knight, Jr.
Wade C. Wells	

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be major generals

Ralph S. Keyser
Seth Williams

To be brigadier general

Ralph J. Mitchell

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS

To be captain

Robert W. Rickert

To be second lieutenants

Francis P. McCarthy	Alfred L. Owens
Robert G. Owens, Jr.	Bryan F. Jinnett, Jr.
Thomas J. Ahern	William I. Kent
Philip R. White	Carl O. J. Grussendorf.
Rubin Iden	
Dred F. Parks	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of God, descend upon our hearts and teach us the patience of unanswered prayer, that our doubts may be broken and our souls filled with the pulsing lifeblood of an unconquerable faith. Abide with the patient sufferers, the toilsome workers, and with the faraway sentinels of our free institutions. Blessed Lord, Thou dost call us not to narrowness, not to gloom nor despondency, but to firmness and to the realization of the eternal truth that the majesty of spiritual values can never die.

We pray Thee to give us the passion to spread abroad self-sacrifice, forbearance, and the spirit of unity so essential to the very life of our Nation. When, O Lord, shall cruel feet no longer tread the wine press and the vast requiem of human sorrow cease? Here on our mother-soil have been patterned and inspired those generous ideals of our fathers and we beseech Thee that we may carry them to the torn peoples of this strickened earth. As the sword of justice cuts the bonds of oppression and the fires of freedom purge the dens of human slavery, we pray that knowledge and understanding may spread among those who are failing for the lack of vision; grant that all may seek a clearer sky and an unobstructed horizon of the truth. We pray that we may be manful, truthful, full of honor, and fearing only that which is evil. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 16, 1942, was read and approved.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Under the order of the House of April 16, 1942, Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement for printing in the RECORD under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of Labor.
5. Department of War.
6. Civil Service Commission.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. Federal Works Agency.
9. Interstate Commerce Commission.
10. The National Archives.
11. The Panama Canal.
12. Administrative office of the United States courts, Chicago, Ill.
13. Administrative office of the United States courts, Savannah, Ga.
14. United States courts, northern district of California.
15. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment No. 2, and agree to a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this bill passed the House and then was brought back to the House for approval of certain Senate amendments which the House rejected.

Mr. SNYDER. We are still in disagreement on Senate amendment No. 2, which is the amendment we stated we would disagree to.

Mr. RICH. If we ask for the appointment of conferees again will the same stand be taken by the conferees in accordance with the verdict of the House when we rejected the amendment the last time with reference to Bull Shoals and another dam in Arkansas?

Mr. SNYDER. There will be no construction work at all for Bull Shoals.

Mr. COLLINS. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. RICH. And we can figure that these conferees are going to stand on the record of the House?

Mr. COLLINS. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. RICH. And we can expect the Senate to yield on this amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. SNYDER, TERRY, STARNES of Alabama, COLLINS, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE of South Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from Hon. Walter Sillers, of Rosedale, Miss., with respect to the cooperation of labor and industry, published in the Jackson Daily News, of Jackson, Miss., on April 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Leon Henderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein, in line with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia just made, a plan I have received from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

A PLAN TO SAVE THE AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, right along the lines of the remarks which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has just made, a constituent of mine has prepared a plan to save the automobile dealers. The plan has been prepared at his own expense after consultation with a

great many dealers in several States. This man has been an automobile dealer for many years, and I have sent this plan to each Member of the Congress, and I hope you will study the plan.

Having received permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that I am having inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a plan submitted by one of my constituents which would use the local automobile dealers to gather and salvage scrap materials, especially their own worn-out cars and trucks. This would assist many of the dealers, who are being forced to the wall, to stay in business until conditions would again permit the sale of new cars and accessories.

This is the plan that I sent to each one of the Members of the House and Senate a few days ago. I felt it necessary to enlarge on that part of the plan submitted by Mr. Princeton as far as it affects new cars and trucks now held by the local dealers. I urge my colleagues to read my extension in today's RECORD and study the proposal I am making regarding stocks of cars and trucks held by dealers. In this minute, I have not the time to explain my proposal, but the extension will cover this quite thoroughly. Something must be done to save at least a fraction of the thousands of local auto dealers, as a great many have already been forced to go out of business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein several editorials from leading newspapers relating to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and the work of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of which Dr. Butler is director.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of automobiles, already referred to, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Setorias Nicholson on the plight of Greece following the invasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on Wise Unionism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRESSING NEED FOR MORE SHIPS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in his radio address delivered Saturday night on the new radio program, Labor for Victory, Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson submitted a very encouraging report to the Nation. He showed that our production of tanks now exceeds the Axis output, and that we will produce this year the 60,000 airplanes requested by President Roosevelt. This is very good news and should imbue the American people with well-founded optimism.

However, I regret to have to point out the fact that Secretary Patterson's report on American shipping was not so optimistic. He said:

> Many of our ships are being sunk, and their cargoes are going down with them. The need for building more ships in a shorter time is a pressing need.

Mr. Speaker, we can meet the vital need for more ships by constructing cargo ships and freighters out of wood as well as steel. This wooden ship construction program should be launched immediately.

LT. COL. JOHN C. DAMON

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, truth will come to light. I can tell you today on absolute authority that Lt. Col. John C. Damon, the star witness for the Power Trust before the Faddis R. E. A. investigation, is a substantial holder of 6-percent preferred stock in the Utah Power & Light Co.

Utah Power & Light is a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. Arkansas Power & Light is a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. Arkansas Power & Light led the fight against the Government aiding an R. E. A. co-op to build a line to deliver Uncle Sam's power from the Grand River Dam to Uncle Sam's aluminum plant in Arkansas. This is what the Faddis committee was investigating.

Colonel Damon has spent most of his life in the employ of Utah Power & Light, Electric Bond & Share, and other utilities. He is in charge of power in the War Department.

Colonel Damon has actually sabotaged the war program. It appears he is striving to equal to Teapot Dome scandal.

I have called upon President Roosevelt to ask Colonel Damon's resignation, and I believe he will.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not Colonel Damon is a member of any public-utilities corporation. Whether he is or whether he is not, it may be difficult for some people to realize that a man may be conscientious in the discharge of his duty, regardless of the position that he may fill in civil life. It may also be difficult for some people to realize that a man may be capable enough for someone besides the New Deal to wish to employ him. Whatever may be his industrial connections, Colonel Damon in entering the United States Army took an oath of obligation, and I have no doubt that any duties he may be called upon to discharge as an officer of the United States Army will be discharged in conformity with and upon due consideration of the obligations of his oath.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Tuesday, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a bulletin from the Department of the Interior giving plans for the mobilization of Central Valley resources for war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GERMAN PENAL LAW

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have some information that will be of interest to Members of the House, particularly to members of the bar and bench, and to all American citizens generally, since it indicates what would hanpen here if we had the Hitler criminal code.

I want to read to you the present criminal code as it now covers crime in the German Empire, and doubtless covers criminal acts or alleged criminal acts in all conquered territories. This is the criminal code of Germany, enacted June 28, 1935. I want you to note it carefully:

> One shall be punished who commits an act declared punishable by the statute or which deserves punishment according to the fundamental principles of penal law and of sound national feeling. If no definite law can be directly applied to the act, the act shall be punished under the law whose fundamental principles concur most closely with

the act. (Sec. 2 of the Penal Code of the German Empire of 1871, as amended by art. I of the law of June 28, 1935. Reichsgesetz I, p. 839. Quoted from Galcke, Strafrecht, und Strafversahren, Berlin, 1938, p. 8.)

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent Mr. JARMAN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

ELECTRIC LIGHT IN KENTUCKY

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS, NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2406), to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,000,000,000 for the establishment or development of naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land: *Provided*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the matter now pending, it has the unanimous report of the Naval Affairs Committee

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct, and may I state, under the gentleman's reservation of objection——

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Due to the amount involved and the importance of the measure, we should have an explanation of the bill.

Mr VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain briefly what this proposed bill is.

This is an authorization for $800,000,000 for shore expansion in the Navy. This is a departmental bill approved by the Budget. It has passed the Senate and has been unanimously recommended by the Naval Affairs Committee. It has also been approved by the subcommittee on deficiency appropriations, of the Appropriations Committee, and it is in the bill that will come back from the conferees tomorrow So therefore it is highly important that the House act on this bill before the conferees make their report.

The committee has recommended that we strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof a committee amendment, seeking to break down as much as possible how the $800,000,000 is to be spent.

It is proposed to spend $4,000,000 for what is known as fleet expansion; $168,000,000 for aviation facilities; $25,000,000 for lighter-than-air program; $119,000,000 for storage facilities; $100,000,000 for liquid fuel storage; $20,000,000 for Marine Corps; $150,000,000 for ordnance storage; $100,000,000 for personnel training and housing; hospitals and dispensaries, $40,000,000; shore radio facilities, $11,000,000; naval research, $720,000; miscellaneous, $25,000,000; fleet drydock, $36,000,000. In this $800,000,000, $392,000,000 will be for new establishments. The balance of the $800,000,000 goes to maintain present existing facilities of the shore establishment of the Navy. Here is the way the new establishments of $300,000,000, which no doubt the House is very much concerned about, will be spent:

LIQUID FUEL STORAGE

Major installations for fuel oil and Diesel oil are contemplated in the northern New England area, the San Francisco Bay area, and the southern California area.

In addition to the foregoing, aviation gasoline storage is contemplated at new air stations in the northeast Atlantic area, the middle Atlantic area, the central California area, and two new stations in the Hawaiian Islands, $22,043,250.

AVIATION FACILITIES

New aviation mechanics trade schools are contemplated in Tennessee and Oklahoma. New aircraft gunnery schools are contemplated in the Pacific Northwest and the southeastern United States areas. In southern California 2 new Marine Corps air stations are planned, while in the Central Eastern States, 3 Marine Corps glider training stations are contemplated. We are planning 10 operational training bases in the southeast area and 5 lighter-than-air bases for patrol duty outside the continental limits, $130,300,000.

STORAGE FACILITIES

A new inland supply depot is planned for the northeastern United States, while three inland supply depots are planned for the west coast. These are to be located about 500 miles inland in the Pacific Northwest, the Central Western States, and in the Southwest, $85,000,000.

PERSONNEL TRAINING AND HOUSING

Two new major training stations are contemplated, one in the central California-Nevada area and the other somewhere in the east coast area, $60,000,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Two new ammunition depots are contemplated in the midcontinental area, $84,468,000.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES

A new hospital activity is contemplated in the Gulf coast area, $3,710,000.

SHORE RADIO FACILITIES

New radio transmitting stations are contemplated, one in the Boston area, one in the Hawaiian area and one in the San Francisco Bay area, $7,381,000.

Total, $392,902,250.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Referring to the new naval training stations, the gentleman has just said that two are contemplated, one in the Pacific area and one in the Southeast. I wonder if there has been a revision of their program since it was presented to the committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; I may state to the gentleman from New York that when we had our hearing the other day it was stated that four were to be built. Two of them have already been located and designated out of money previously authorized. There are only two that come in this bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have listened very carefully to the gentleman's statement and expect to support this legislation; but, if I understood him correctly, there is no provision for expansion in the Great Lakes area. I want to say that in my opinion that is an error of judgment; and this House and the Navy Department will see the time when they will realize that part of this expansion program should be in the Great Lakes for naval and military reasons with which I hope the gentleman is familiar.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with a great deal of what the gentleman has to say. I may say, however, that these things are being located based upon many reasons, strategic and otherwise. If the Great Lakes works into the picture that will be fine.

I may say that in this $800,000,000 bill not one single item is in it for the State of Georgia; I am not concerned where these things are located provided they are located at the proper places to serve the needs of the Nation.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not want to be misunderstood. I agree with the standpoint of the gentleman and I am not criticizing because there is no item in it for the Great Lakes. At the same time I cannot overlook the fact that 80 percent of the Nation's iron ore travels over the Great Lakes, comes down Lake Superior; and I think this area has been very much overlooked and neglected.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish me to yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I had intended to touch on the matters spoken of by the gentleman from Minnesota. I agree with the viewpoint of the gentleman from Georgia that it is best to locate these facilities where they may serve the needs of the Nation to the best advantage.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope the Navy Department, in locating these new activities will take into consideration and

bear in mind the importance of the proposed location from every standpoint; and if the Great Lakes, the State of Georgia, or any other section can be designated, it is all right, as far as I am concerned; but I am not going on record to urge the Navy Department to put this facility or that facility in some particular place unless it is at the proper place from a Navy standpoint.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. We have quite a number of training stations at the present time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We have only four.

Mr. RICH. We have training schools, although they may not all be near the water. Nevertheless, the Navy Department has a great many training schools. Are we going to do away with these schools and scrap them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; not at all.

Mr. RICH. Or are we going to keep the schools we now have and utilize the facilities to the best advantage without spending money and increasing the size by establishing a lot of new schools that are not necessary?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are not building any new schools. What we are establishing here are training bases. We have four training bases in the United States today. The facilities provided in this bill will augment those to take care of the 30,000 new recruits that will be brought in and trained at each station. The gentleman is correct. We have a great many training schools, vocational training schools; but that is different from what we are doing here.

Mr. RICH. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the training station at New London. Conn. I understand there is one there.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. They wanted to increase the size of the New London facilities by building a new school away from the one they now have which would be at great cost to the Government and, in my judgment, would not be necessary.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is nothing in here dealing with New London.

Mr. LELAND M FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Is this the deficiency bill, covering $19,000,000,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This necessarily is connected with the deficiency bill that will come up tomorrow morning.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. The gentleman is not asking unanimous consent for consideration of the conferees' report?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; this is not a conference report. This has to do with one item of $800,000,000 in the deficiency bill that the Senate and the Appropriations Committee have put in.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. This is for the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For the Navy.

Mr. TREADWAY. Can the gentleman give the House any idea how long it will take to carry out this program or how rapidly it can be accomplished?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This program will go forward very rapidly. It is hoped it will go forward to meet the increased strength of the Navy, both in matériel and personnel. The number of years may be 1 or 2 years. It all has a direct bearing on the expansion of the fleet and the prosecution of the war.

Mr. MAY. I want to ask the gentleman a question; and if he answers as I think he will, I would like to make a brief statement here with his permission. Is this the bill that the gentleman from Georgia called up last week, and to which the gentleman from Massachusetts made a reservation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. RICH. In reference to the construction of these bases, are they going to be constructed by the Navy or under the supervision of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under supervision of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. RICH. In the construction of these things by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, are they going to require that every man who works on this project be a member of some union before he can get a job?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I certainly hope the Navy Department will not restrict the men who want to work on this to men who hold union cards. I want every American citizen to have the right to work for the defense of his country, whether he belongs to a union or not.

Mr. RICH. I wish we had more men like the gentleman in Congress. I hope it will not be made a requirement that a man, in order to get a job on anything that we are constructing for the Government will have to hold a card in one of the major unions. It is un-American, and we should not permit it any longer.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is right.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does this bill have any provision with reference to primary training for pilots in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes; it deals with the establishment of places where that will be carried on.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Where is it indicated that those will be established, what sections?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Probably a base will be located in the State of Oklahoma, the State of Tennessee, the State of Missouri, and the State of Indiana. Let me make just one more statement, then I am through.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The passage of this bill will not preclude consideration of sites in Texas?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. Here is a complete break-down in detailed fashion of how this $800,000,000 is going to be spent. We have checked this minutely by going over every one of these items. The Navy Department, however, does not desire this information to be given to the public for various reasons. They prefer a broad statement along the line that I have just made.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There apparently is not available the committee report as yet on this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The committee report was filed this morning. I may say we could not file it because the House was not in session until this morning from the day we reported it.

Mr. WOLCOTT This is a very unusual procedure in that we are passing a bill authorizing $1,000,000,000 by unanimous consent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think there is any objection to the merits of the bill. If there is any criticism or objection it would be to the procedure in passing a bill authorizing such a tremendous amount of money by unanimous consent. I wonder if the gentleman will put the break-down to which he has referred in the RECORD?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As I just stated, we do not desire to put this break-down in the RECORD because it gives a great deal of information that we do not want to furnish the enemy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thought it was a part of the committee report.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The committee report is along the line of my general statement as to the classes of these places. We have gone over this matter very minutely and we are justified in doing it the way we are doing it, due to the fact this item of $800,000,000 is in the appropriation bill that will come back from conference tomorrow morning. It has been passed by the Senate and has been approved by the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the committee report include classification of the projects?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It includes the classification, and the law itself does. The appropriation bill also shows the classification.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as I understand from the discussion with the gentleman, the committee has placed in the report as much detail as it considers wise, and so as not to give the enemy any information, yet at the same time to inform the House and the country generally how the money will be spent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. May I say also that we have an understanding in both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Naval Affairs that all this construction will be in accordance with this document filed with us on April 8, 1942.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the best news we have heard in this country in a long time was the bombing of Tokyo the other day. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs could give us any information on that proposition.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I regret that all that information must properly come from the Navy Department. It would be improper for me to comment at all on that.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I believe one or two of the gentlemen from Michigan called attention to the fact that certain strategic materials are produced in that section of the country, and they used that as an argument as to why these establishments should be placed along the Great Lakes. May I ask the gentle-

man from Georgia if it is not also a fact that a great deal of electric power will be needed and that it will be necessary to place these establishments where electric power is available?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi that my information is that there is no available power in the Tennessee Valley because every kilowatt has been allocated for the national defense.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman in that connection that there is certainly none in other sections of the country, then, because that is also true there, but we can install generators in some of the dams we have that would increase the output of electric power in the Tennessee River.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's idea that these primary schools have been definitely located? Is it not a fact that surveys are being made now in the Midwest as to possible locations?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Surveys are being made today for a great many of the facilities carried in this bill. For that reason I read out the sections in which the surveys are going on, so that Members of the House may be cognizant of what surveys are in operation.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It is my understanding that a survey is being made in Nebraska now with the idea of developing possible locations for primary training schools. I am sure it is not the gentleman's idea that any statement made here would preclude such a possible location from being determined upon.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. They can look over the whole United States and put them in the proper places.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I heard mentioned the fact that Oklahoma was being considered as a possible location for some of this construction. I appreciate that fact, because in western Oklahoma, in my district, there are no defense projects.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, in a great many other districts there are no projects. We are not building these facilities to put them in any particular man's district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2406 and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $168,780,000; lighter-than-air program, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $119,000,000; liquid fuel storage, $100,000,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $20,000,000; ordnance storage facilities, $150,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $100,000,000; hospital and dispensary facilities, $40,500,000; shore radio facilities, $11,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $720,000; miscellaneous structures, $25,000,000; floating dry dock program, $36,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed $800,000,000: *Provided further*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEXAS A. AND M. COLLEGE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Mr. G. Byron Winstead with reference to Texas A. and M.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the sheriff of Muskingum County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Assistant Secretary Taylor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a summary of the St. Lawrence survey reports, issued by the Department of Commerce in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker. I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent, first, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD; second, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article of Raymond Clapper appearing last week in the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I also renew my request of last week to extend my remarks in the RECORD, which was found to be in excess of the amount stipulated. I have an estimate of $120.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from a group of constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in the Salt Lake Tribune of April 14, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PUYALLUP TRIBE, WASHINGTON, AUTHORIZE CORRECTIONS IN TRIBAL ROLL

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 4578, to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1961, to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object——

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill provides for a fifth permanent judge in New Jersey. There is also pending in the Senate a bill providing for a sixth permanent judge.

There is no question that there is a congestion in the New Jersey district, but, owing to illness and delay in appointment of the judges provided for by law, it has been impossible to determine exactly how many judges are needed in the State under ordinary circumstances. For this reason, for some time past I have objected to the consideration of this bill. I have now discussed the matter with the senior Senator from New Jersey and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], and it would seem best if two temporary judges were appointed to clean up the calendar and leave the determination of how many judges are needed permanently for future decision. If the House will accept an amendment on this basis, I shall interpose no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, do all the Members of the New Jersey delegation agree to this amendment?

Mr. KEAN. I have not discussed it with all the Members of the New Jersey delegation, but I have discussed it with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] who represents the side which would probably have influence in the appointment, and he is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's position to be that he will not object to this bill provided he is permitted to propose an amendment to the effect that there shall be appointed two temporary judges, rather than one permanent judge?

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is correct. The calendar is much congested, and one of the judges has been quite ill. It is quite probable that he will not be able to serve very many years longer, and it seems to me this is the best way to clean up the calendar now. I have talked with some of the senior judges of the district and circuit courts, and they have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will permit a suggestion from me, the information of the Committee on the Judiciary agrees with the information of the gentleman from New Jersey as to the congested conditior of the calendar. The Committee on the Judiciary has made an examination of the condition of the calendar in the gentleman's State and is convinced that you need an additional judge. That is, you need the privilege to appoint a permanent judge in New Jersey. But the Committee on the Judiciary has not considered and has not arrived at the judgment that you need two additional judges. Of course, a temporary judge is simply a judge for life and with a limitation on the power to make the appointment of a successor.

Would the gentleman not be willing to let this bill go through providing for this additional judge, which I believe everybody agrees is going to be needed permanently for the business of New Jersey, and leave it for the committee to determine whether or not there is a need in addition for a temporary judge?

Mr. KEAN. I hate to disagree with the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, but I have not been satisfied that there is a need for a permanent judge.

As you know, there was a considerable delay in the appointment of a fourth judge, and there have not been four judges sitting in New Jersey for a long enough time to determine how much they could accomplish.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Even though he is called a temporary judge, if we put a new judge in there, he is in there for life, subject to good behavior.

Mr. KEAN. That is correct, but it should be remembered that the situation is that one of the judges has been very ill, one of our ablest judges, unfortunately, and probably he will not be able to serve very long.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in order to shorten the consideration, may I make this statement, and the gentleman from New Jersey will have to act upon it. Nobody here, including the chairman, would feel at liberty to agree to an additional judge for New Jersey beyond the one covered by this bill, which judge has not been authorized by the committee. I hope I make myself plain.

Mr. KEAN. I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, is there an amendment pending before the House?

The SPEAKFR pro tempore. No; there is not.

Mr. HART. The gentleman from New Jersey has not offered any amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman could not offer an amendment until there is consent for the consideration of the bill. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This requires three objectors to strike the bill from the calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS WHO ARE NOT CITIZENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6439) to expedite the naturalization of persons who are not citizens, who have served or who hereafter serve honorably in the naval or military forces during the present war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that the elements of this bill are already embodied in the second war powers bill, which has been enacted. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] asks unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 269, to extend the time for amending the petition of the Indians of California under section 4 of the act of May 18, 1928.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in conference with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and also the gentleman from Oklahoma, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. ROGERS]. I think by the time the next call of the calendar is reached we will agree upon this bill, at least so far as I am concerned. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FRED B. WOODARD

The Clerk called the bill H. R. 3759, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to certain counsel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill H. R. 5484, for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPACT BETWEEN ATLANTIC COAST STATES FOR REGULATION OF FISHING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6020) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact (which shall be operative for not more than 15 years from the date of the enactment of this act) relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, negotiated and entered into or to be entered into under the authority of Public Resolution No. 79, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 8, 1940, and now ratified by the States of Maine,

New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, which compact reads as follows:

"The contracting States solemnly agree:

"ARTICLE I

"The purpose of this compact is to promote the better utilization of the fisheries, marine, shell and anadromous, of the Atlantic seaboard by the development of a joint program for the promotion and protection of such fisheries, and by the prevention of the physical waste of the fisheries from any cause. It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of fish or fish products for the purpose of establishing or fixing the price thereof, or creating and perpetuating monopoly.

"ARTICLE II

"This agreement shall become operative immediately as to those States executing it whenever any two or more of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida have executed it in the form that is in accordance with the laws of the executing State and the Congress has given its consent. Any State contiguous with any of the aforementioned States and riparian upon waters frequented by anadromous fish, flowing into waters under the jurisdiction of any of the aforementioned States, may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"ARTICLE III

"Each State joining herein shall appoint three representatives to a Commission hereby constituted and designated as the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. One shall be the executive officer of the administrative agency of such State charged with the conservation of the fisheries resources to which this compact pertains or, if there be more than one officer or agency, the official of that State named by the Governor thereof. The second shall be a member of the legislature of such State designated by the commission or committee on interstate cooperation of such State, or if there be none, or if said commission or interstate cooperation cannot constitutionally designate the said member, such legislator shall be designated by the Governor thereof; *provided*, That if it is constitutionally impossible to appoint a legislator as a commissioner from such State, the second member shall be appointed by the Governor of said State in his discretion. The third shall be a citizen who shall have a knowledge of and interest in the marine fisheries problem, to be appointed by the Governor. The Commission shall be a body corporate with the powers and duties set forth herein.

"ARTICLE IV

"The duty of the said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about the conservation and the prevention of the depletion and physical waste of the fisheries, marine, shell, and anadromous, of the Atlantic seaboard. The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their respective jurisdictions to promote the preservation of those fisheries and their protection against overfishing, waste, depletion, or any abuse whatsoever and to assure a continuing yield from the fisheries resources of the aforementioned States.

"To that end the Commission shall draft and, after consultation with the advisory committee hereinafter authorized, recommend to the governors and legislatures of the various signatory States legislation dealing with the conservation of the marine, shell, and anadromous fisheries of the Atlantic seaboard. The Commission shall, more than 1 month prior to any regular meeting of the legislature in any signatory State, present to the Governor of the State its recommendations relating to enactments to be made by the legislature of that State in furthering the intents and purposes of this compact.

"The Commission shall consult with and advise the pertinent administrative agencies in the States party hereto with regard to problems connected with the fisheries and recommend the adoption of such regulations as it deems advisable.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend to the States party hereto the stocking of the waters of such States with fish and fish eggs, or joint stocking by some or all of the States party hereto, and when two or more of the States shall jointly stock waters the Commission shall act as the coordinating agency for such stocking.

"ARTICLE V

"The Commission shall elect from its number a chairman and a vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers and employees as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect, and shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications, and compensation. Said Commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business. It may establish and maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place but must meet at least once a year.

"ARTICLE VI

"No action shall be taken by the Commission in regard to its general affairs except by the affirmative vote of a majority of the whole number of compacting States present at any meeting. No recommendation shall be made by the Commission in regard to any species of fish except by the affirmative vote of a majority of the compacting States which have an interest in such species. The Commission shall define what shall be an interest.

"ARTICLE VII

"The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior of the Government of the United States shall act as the primary research agency of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, cooperating with the research agencies in each State for that purpose. Representatives of the said Fish and Wildlife Service shall attend the meetings of the Commission.

"An Advisory Committee to be representative of the commercial fishermen and the salt-water anglers and such other interests of each State as the Commission deems advisable shall be established by the Commission as soon as practicable for the purpose of advising the Commission upon such recommendations as it may desire to make.

"ARTICLE VIII

"When any State other than those named specifically in article II of this compact shall become a party thereto for the purpose of conserving its anadromous fish in accordance with the provisions of article II the participation of such State in the action of the Commission shall be limited to such species of anadromous fish.

"ARTICLE IX

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the powers of any signatory State or to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or the enforcement of any requirement by any signatory State imposing additional conditions and restrictions to conserve its fisheries.

"ARTICLE X

"Continued absence of representation or of any representative on the Commission from any State party hereto shall be brought to the attention of the Governor thereof.

"ARTICLE XI

"The States party hereto agree to make annual appropriations to the support of the Commission in proportion to the primary market value of the products of their fisheries, exclusive of cod and haddock, as recorded in the most recent published reports of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, provided no State shall contribute less than $200 per annum and the annual contribution of each State above the minimum shall be figured to the nearest $100.

"The compacting States agree to appropriate initially the annual amounts scheduled below, which amounts are calculated in the manner set forth herein, on the basis of the catch record of 1938. Subsequent budgets shall be recommended by a majority of the Commission and the cost thereof allocated equitably among the States in accordance with their respective interests and submitted to the compacting States.

"SCHEDULE OF INITIAL STATE CONTRIBUTIONS

"Maine	$700
New Hampshire	200
Massachusetts	2,300
Rhode Island	300
Connecticut	400
New York	1,300
New Jersey	800
Delaware	200
Maryland	700
Virginia	1,300
North Carolina	600
South Carolina	200
Georgia	200
Florida	1,500

"ARTICLE XII

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each compacting state until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending 6 months' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the other States party herto."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of said compact, the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, Connecticut, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and for the purpose of the better utilization of their anadromous fisheries, to the States of Vermont and Pennsylvania, to enter into said compact as signatory States and as parties thereto, in addition to the States which have now ratified the compact.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of sections 1 and 2 is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "compact" insert "(which shall be operative for not more than 15 years, from the date of the enactment of this act)."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "of" insert the word "Maine."

Page 8, line 14, strike out the word "Maine" and the comma following the word.

Page 8, line 20, strike out after "SEC. 3" the remainder of lines 20 and 21, and insert the following: "The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission constituted by the compact shall make an annual report to Congress not later than 60 days after the beginning of each regular session thereof. Such report shall set forth the activities of the Commission during the calendar year ending immediately prior to the beginning of such session."

Page 8, after the preceding section, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 is hereby expressly reserved."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "and", and page 2, line 6, after the comma and before the word "which", insert the words "and Virginia" and a comma.

Page 8, line 14, strike out the word "Virginia" and the comma following the word.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, since the bill was reported, Virginia has ratified the compact. Therefore by this amendment it is eliminated from among those that have not ratified, and inserted with those that have ratified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill (H. R. 4743), providing for the naturalization of certain wives and children of citizens of the United States who lost citizenship through service in the Allied forces during the World War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 323. (a) A person who, while a citizen of the United States during the World War in Europe, entered the military or naval forces of any country at war with a country with which the United States was then at war, who has lost citizenship of the United States by reason of any oath or obligation taken for the purpose of entering such service, may be naturalized by taking before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 the oath prescribed by section 335.

"(b) Any woman who prior to September 22, 1922, married any person specified in subsection (a) may, if such woman (1) in good faith entered the United States in the belief that she was a citizen of the United States and (2) had a residence in the United States on May 1, 1941, be naturalized upon taking before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 the oath prescribed by section 335.

"(c) Any alien child of any person specified in subsection (a) whose mother (1) married such person prior to September 22, 1922, or (2) was at the time of the birth of such child a citizen of the United States may, if such child (A) in good faith entered, or was brought into, the United States in the belief that such child was a citizen of the United States, and (B) had a residence in the United States on May 1, 1941, be naturalized upon taking, at any time after reaching the age of 18, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 the oath prescribed by section 335.

"(d) Any alien child of any person specified in subsection (a) whose mother married such person subsequent to September 21, 1922, may, if such child (1) was born prior to May 24, 1934; (2) in good faith entered, or was brought into, the United States in the belief that such child was a citizen of the United States; and (3) had a residence in the United States on May 1, 1941, be naturalized upon taking, at any time after reaching the age of 18, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 the oath prescribed by section 335.

"(e) The methods of naturalization provided in this section shall not be exclusive."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "States", insert the word "and"; and after the word "the", insert the word "first."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "oath" and insert the word "oaths."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "May 1, 1941", and insert "the date of the enactment of this section, as amended."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the word "oath" and insert the word "oaths."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "May 1, 1941", and insert "the date of the enactment of this section, as amended."

Page 2, line 24, strike out the word "oath" and insert the word "oaths."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "May 1, 1941", and insert "the date of the enactment of this section, as amended."

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "oath" and insert the word "oaths."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill providing for the naturalization of certain wives and children of citizens of the United States who lost citizenship through service in the Allied forces during the first World War."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE STRAITS OF MACKINAC

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2133, to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan" approved September 25, 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS WABASH RIVER AT ST. FRANCISVILLE, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6080, authorizing the county of Lawrence, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, Lawrence County, Ill., be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near St. Francisville, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Lawrence County, Ill., all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said Lawrence County, Ill., is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SNAKE OR PIUTE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 622, authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, time and again I have been accused of arbitrarily objecting to Indian jurisdictional bills. On many occasions I have stated that my action was based upon the objections of the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. Now, here is a case where the Attorney General and the Comptroller General submitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs and also to myself a letter objecting to the original bill making suggestions as to amendment. The Committee on Indian Affairs in reporting this

bill struck out everything after the enacting clause and substituted new language which I understand was prepared by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It happens that the new language is a hundred percent in keeping with the recommendation of the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. Therefore I am not offering any objection whatsoever to this amended bill. I think that is evidence in itself that I am not arbitrarily objecting to jurisdictional bills.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, with that explanation, as I am willing to let the amended bill pass as reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I offer a series of amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on that basis I will object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Idaho that consent will have to be given first for consideration of the bill before it is in order to offer amendments.

Mr. WHITE. I am proceeding in the usual parliamentary procedure. I reserved the right to object, and I now offer amendments, since the gentleman from Missouri has made his statement.

Mr. COCHRAN But other Members have the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Idaho that, of course, he may state his position and he may state that he will offer amendments, but amendments cannot be offered until the bill is under consideration by the House.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, sometime ago—in fact, some years ago—those of us who work on this calendar gave notice that we would object to or hold up at least all bills having a minority report. We sought to discourage the practice of putting bills on the Consent Calendar where there was a division of opinion in the committee as to the feasibility of the bill. I notice that this bill has a minority report signed by six members of the Indian Affairs Committee, and for that reason, and that reason alone, I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

RELIEF OF PERSONS IN CONNECTION WITH EXTRACTION OF GOLD-BEARING ORE FROM THE RUCK-A-CHUCKY DAM SITE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4213, for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-A-Chucky Dam site.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is some additional information relative to this bill which I feel should be included in the RECORD, and under this reservation of objection I now make inquiry of the gentleman from California as to the approximate value of the gold which was panned by these workers in that area out in California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the relief of certain workers on a Government project in the State of California that was being constructed by the War Department. The project work was the construction of the Ruck-A-Chucky Dam. The labor employed on that project was taken from relief rolls. They were relief workers, W. P. A. workers, and other types of relief workers. Due to certain physical conditions, a great slide occurred that destroyed temporarily the dam site. The workers were not employed; they were laid off; yet they remained in the vicinity and went to work on certain gold-bearing veins and seams that were uncovered by this particular slide that occurred at the dam site. On this Government project they extracted a total of about $18,000 worth of gold. Between two and three hundred people individually are involved in panning this comparatively small amount. It kept them off relief rolls and at the same time gave the contractors and Corps of Engineers an opportunity to retain the labor to be available when the work could be resumed. The Department of Justice, in order perhaps to clear up the status of the gold with the United States mint, in order that the mint might have a clear record, brought suit of trespass against these W. P. A. workers. This bill has been introduced in order to give title to that gold extracted from the public lands to the workers, and will give the mint the authority to pay them the amount of the bullion which was extracted.

Mr. COLE of New York. Just one further question, if the gentleman will permit, Were these workers who panned the gold employed and on the pay roll of any public or private agency?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. No; they had not been for some 2 weeks.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was not this bill reported out unanimously by the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It was.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no member of the association known as the Ruck-A-Chucky Mine Partnership or any of their agents or employees, or any other persons, shall be held civilly or criminally liable on account of the extraction by them during the year 1940 of gold-bearing ore from lot 19, section 19, township 13 north, range 10 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, or adjacent lands. The Ruck-A-Chucky Mine Partnership and other persons shall be deemed to have obtained full title to such ore at the time of its extraction.

No person, partnership, or corporation, Ward & Ward, or the American Smelting & Refining Co. shall be held civilly or criminally liable on account of the purchase of any part of the gold ore referred to in the first paragraph of this act. The purchasers of such ore shall be deemed to have acquired full title to the ore at the time of its purchase.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "civilly or criminally."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "civilly or criminally."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT JUDGESHIP FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to a consideration of the bill, S. 1961, to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the District of New Jersey, No. 397 on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the gentleman should also request that the proceedings whereby the bill was stricken from the calendar be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that that is not necessary; the bill was returned to by unanimous consent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We cannot return to something that is not there, can we?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr WOLCOTT. If the Chair will permit, is the Chair of opinion that the bill is still on the calendar when it has been stricken from the calendar? I would like this question cleared up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the House by unanimous consent does what it wishes to. By unanimous consent it has returned to the consideration of the bill, which is properly under consideration now if there is no objection to its consideration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In view of the Chair's opinion that the bill was not stricken from the calendar when three objections were made, I, of course, will not object to it, because I have no objection to its consideration.

I wish to state, however, if the Chair will indulge me, that it establishes a very dangerous precedent, because following this calendar frequently requests are made to return to bills; and if we are not going to have any protection whatsoever after bills are stricken from the calendar, protection against any such practice, then, of course, we are now forewarned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the gentleman's protection was to object to returning to consideration of the bill. The Chair is not passing on the question of whether or not the bill was stricken from the calendar. The Chair simply states that by unanimous consent the House may return to consideration of the bill and the gentleman's protection was to object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in order to get the matter properly before the House so that we know what we are going to do from now on, I make the point of order against consideration of the bill because it has been stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman wants to insist on the point of order, that, of course, stops consideration of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to find out whether the Chair's ruling is that the bill was not stricken and that the gentleman from New Jersey does not have to ask that the proceedings whereby it was stricken be vacated before we return to it. That is the only point in question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not pass upon the proposition of whether or not the bill was stricken from the calendar. The gentleman from New Jersey asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That was not the request, if the Chair will indulge me. The gentleman asked to return to that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, of course, that stops consideration of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may suggest to the gentleman that I am going to insist on the point of order. I would suggest further that he ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the bill was stricken from the calendar be vacated and that we give consideration to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot pass on that. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings heretofore had on the bill (S. 1961) to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of the district judge for the district of New Jersey, No. 397 on the Consent Calendar, be vacated, and I further ask unanimous consent that the House return to consideration of that measure.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges," approved May 24, 1910, is amended by adding a new subsection "(d)," as follows:

"(d) One for the district of New Jersey."

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HART: Page 1, line 7, after the words "New Jersey", strike out the period, insert a comma and add: "*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled."

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, my only concern in reference to this matter of the pending judgeship is to have an additional judge supplied to deal with what is a very highly congested calendar. In a hearing held by the Appropriations Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, on the judiciary appropriation bill for 1943, Mr. Henry Chandler, who is Director of the Administrative Office of Courts, was asked by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]:

How are the dockets, Mr. Chandler? Are they pretty well cleared up, and where do you have the most congestion?

Mr. Chandler replied:

The greatest congestion at the present time is in the southern district of New York and the district of New Jersey, particularly in the court which is held in Newark, and in the District of Columbia.

Replying further to a question by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], Mr. Chandler said:

In the district of New Jersey there is a bill pending now to provide for the creation of a judgeship to take the place of a judgeship which was vacated by the resignation of Judge Walker on December 31. Clearly there should be another judge, or possibly two judges, appointed in New Jersey.

There can be no doubt about the present need for an additional judge to take care of the work in the district of New Jersey. My able colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], consulted with me and proposed offering an amendment providing for two temporary judges, which would have been perfectly satisfactory to me. We do need now, and we have needed for some time, at least one judge to take care of the additional work of that court.

That is the purpose of my amendment, and I sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In order that we may have the record clear, the bill S. 1961 as passed by the Senate and as before the House today provides for the appointment of one additional judge, who shall be a permanent judge.

Mr. HART. That is right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman's amendment would provide for the appointment of one judge who will be a temporary judge?

Mr. HART. Precisely.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is the effect of your amendment?

Mr. HART. That is the only effect of it.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I may say that I am in full accord with the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey and I hope very much that it will be agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. My colleagues and myself of the Judiciary Committee who are present accept the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. HART. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4676, to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, approved March 22, 1930 (acts of 1930, ch. 132, p. 405), ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over, within, and under such territory in the Commonwealth as may be acquired for the Mammoth Cave National Park, are hereby accepted. Subject to the reservations made by the Commonwealth in the act of cession, the United States hereby assumes sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such territory.

SEC. 2. The park shall constitue a part of the United States judicial district for the western district of Kentucky, and the district court of the United States in and for said district shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed within the boundaries of the park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in the park shall be subject to the same laws as fugitives from justice found in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

SEC. 3. All hunting or the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any wild bird or animal, except dangerous animals when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying human lives or inflicting personal injury, is prohibited within the limits of the park, nor shall any fish be taken out of any of the waters of the park, except at such seasons and at such times and in such manner as may be directed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such general rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the management and care of the park and for the protection of the property therein, especially for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within the park, and for the protection of the animals and birds in the park from capture or destruction, and to prevent their being frightened or driven from the park; and he shall make rules and regulations governing the taking of fish from the waters in

the park. Possession within the park of the dead bodies or any part thereof of any wild bird or animal shall be prima facie evidence that the person or persons having the same are guilty of violating this act. Any person or persons, stage or express company, railway or other transportation company who knows or has reason to believe that such wild birds, fish, or animals were taken or killed contrary to the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, and who receives for transportation the dead bodies or any part thereof of the wild birds, fish, or animals so taken or killed, or who shall violate any of the other provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations, with reference to the management and care of the park, or for the protection of the property therein, for the preservation from injury or spoliation of timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within the park, or for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in the park, or who shall within the park commit any damage, injury, or spoliation to or upon any building, fence, sign, hedge, gate, guideport, tree, wood, underwood, timber, garden, crops, vegetables, plants, land, springs, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or other matter or thing growing or being thereon, or situated therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subjected to a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both, and be adjudged to pay all the costs of the proceedings.

SEC. 4. All guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or means of transportation of every nature or description used by any person or persons within the limits of the park when engaged in killing, trapping, ensnaring, taking, or capturing such wild birds, fish, or animals contrary to the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior shall be forfeited to the United States and may be seized by the officers in the park and held pending prosecution of any person or persons arrested under the charge of violating the provisions of this act, and upon conviction under this act of such person or persons using said guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or other means of transportation, such forfeiture shall be adjudicated as a penalty in addition to the other punishment prescribed in this act. Such forfeited property shall be disposed of and accounted for by and under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the forfeiture of teams, horses, or other means of transportation shall be in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 5. Upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky shall appoint a park commissioner, who shall have jurisdiction to hear and act upon all complaints made of any violations of law or of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish, and objects of interest therein, and for other purposes authorized by this act. Such commissioner shall have power, upon sworn information, to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with a violation of the rules and regulations, or with a violation of any of the provisions of this act prescribed for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in the park, and to try the person so charged, and, if found guilty, to impose punishment and to adjudge the forfeiture prescribed. In all cases of conviction an appeal shall lie from the judgment of the commissioner to the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, and the district court shall prescribe the rules of procedure and practice for the commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to the district court.

SEC. 6 The park commissioner shall also have power to issue process, as hereinbefore provided, for the arrest of any person charged with the commission within the park of any criminal offense not covered by the provisions of section 3 of this act, to hear the evidence introduced, and, if he is of the opinion that probable cause is shown for holding the person so charged, for trial, shall cause such person to be safely conveyed to a secure place of confinement within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, and certify a transcript of the record of his proceedings and the testimony in such case to the said district court, which court shall have jurisdiction of the case. The park commissioner shall have authority to grant bail in all cases according to the laws of the United States.

SEC. 7. The park commissioner shall be paid an annual salary as appropriated for by Congress.

SEC. 8. All fees, costs, and expenses arising in cases under this act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as are like fees, costs, and expenses in the courts of the United States.

SEC. 9. All fees, fines, costs, and expenses imposed and collected shall be deposited by the commissioner, or by the marshall of the United States collecting the same, with the clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior shall notify in writing the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky of the passage and approval of this act, and of the fact that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the park. Upon the acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior of further cessions of jurisdiction over lands now or hereafter included in the Mammoth Cave National Park, the provisions of sections 2 to 9, inclusive, shall apply to such lands.

SEC. 11. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion to acquire for inclusion within the Mammoth Cave National Park, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, any lands, interests in lands, and other property within the maximum boundaries thereof as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635), notwithstanding the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 871), or any action taken thereunder to exclude certain caves from the park area.

For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property on behalf of the United States, as authorized by this section, there shall be reserved and set aside in the Treasury a special fund of not to exceed $350,000. Said fund shall consist of the annual revenues of the Federal Government from the Mammoth Cave National Park which are in excess of the annual appropriations made for the administration, protection, and maintenance of said park. At the close of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the excess of revenues over appropriations for the preceding fiscal year. Any moneys deposited in said fund are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of acquiring such property, including all expenses incidental thereto. Appropriations made pursuant to this act shall remain available until expended.

The title to lands, interests in lands, and other property to be acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. Any property acquired pursuant to this act upon acquisition by the Federal Government shall become a part of the park and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto.

SEC. 12. For the purpose of developing a proper and suitable entrance road to the Mammoth Cave National Park, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept on behalf of the United States donations of lands, buildings, structures, and other property or interests therein, or to acquire such property with donated funds by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, within an area or areas to be determined by him, but (a) not to exceed 1 mile in width, extending from the exterior boundary of the Mammoth Cave National Park to a point to be selected by him on United States Highway No. 31-W, and (b) not to exceed one-half mile in width on either side of United States Highway No. 31-W and running for a distance of not to exceed 2 miles along said highway. Lands acquired for purposes of protecting such entrance roads shall not be less than 500 feet in width on either side of said roads.

With the following committee amendments:

Page —, line 2, strike out the entire sentence beginning with the word "Any" down through "expended" in line 6.

Page 9, line 4, after "roads" insert the following proviso: ": *Provided*, That only one such entrance road shall be established between United States Highway No. 31-W and Mammoth Cave National Park pursuant to this act."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, in order to inquire of the committee if this bill is satisfactory to those in charge of the Mammoth Cave properties.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. This bill was taken up by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL], in whose district these properties lie, and also the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], who is also interested in the bill. It was satisfactory to the park officials and also to the State of Kentucky, as I understand.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am very much in favor of the bill. Was there any objection to it? Was the committee unanimous in reporting the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The bill was reported out unanimously by the committee.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASE OR SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5394, to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that I intend to offer an amendment when the bill is considered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the gentleman's statement, I wish the gentleman would discuss his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. The amendment is to place in this bill the same provision that is in the Taylor Grazing Act and in the Forest Service Organic Act, to protect the rights of prospectors in regard to mining claims in this area. This bill is very comprehensive. It takes in all grazing districts. I propose to protect the right of the miner and the prospector to go on public lands and locate mining claims and patent them. This will simply put a safeguard in the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When I read the bill I thought it was a very simple one, to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. How does the gentleman seek to change that?

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find beginning in line 8 on page 1 the words "or within a grazing district." This bill thus takes in about 192,000,000 acres of land that has been put into grazing districts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think perhaps we should give more consideration to the bill in view of the gentleman's statement. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, YORKTOWN, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill (H. R. 5861) to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., south of Ballards Creek and adjacent to the east boundary of the naval mine depot, containing approximately 16 acres.

SEC. 2. In the event the Secretary of the Navy shall find that the property has become surplus to the needs of that Department, he is authorized to retransfer jurisdiction and control over the same to the Secretary of the Interior, in which event it shall again become a part of the Colonial National Historical Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6657, to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land in the State of Tennessee for the construction of a scenic parkway to be located generally parallel to the boundary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and connecting with the park, in order to provide an appropriate view of the park from the Tennessee side. The right-of-way to be acquired for the parkway shall be of such width as to comprise an average of 125 acres per mile for its entire length. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. All property acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park upon acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6671, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States and for the use by the Geological Survey in gaging streams, acquire such lands as may be necessary for such purpose by purchase or donation. For the same purpose the Secretary may obtain easements, licenses, rights-of-way, and leases limited to run for such a period of time or term of years as may be required for the effective performance of the function of gaging streams.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF LAND-GRANT REDUCED RATES ON RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6156, to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5503, to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Texas one question to clarify the RECORD?

This bill provides:

That in any condemnation proceeding instituted by or on behalf of the United States, the Attorney General is authorized to stipulate or agree in behalf of the United States to exclude any property or any part thereof, or any interest therein, that may have been taken by or on behalf of the United States by declaration of taking or otherwise.

Will the gentleman, for the purpose of the record, clarify how the United States may, by a declaration or otherwise, take property that may not be subject to condemnation?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The explanation which I think clarifies the bill is that when the Federal Government takes property by declaration, and the gentleman is familiar with that process of taking, I do not at the moment recall any other method by which they can take property without condemnation, but I will make this comprehensive statement to the gentleman. It does frequently occur that the Federal Government does not want all the property taken, such as improvements of timber or some interest of that sort. So this authorizes that in the condemnation proceedings it may be declared or it may be stipulated that property like improvements is not to be taken over by the Federal Government, and the value thereof is to be excluded, I assume, from the judgment which is rendered against the Federal Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is pretty broad jurisdiction when the United States can take private property by declaration without a hearing of necessity, and I think the gentleman and I have had some colloquy about that. My own personal opinion is that it is not constitutional and it is not due process of law to do it, and I wondered how much further this language "or otherwise" went than the language contained in these acts which allow them to take property by declaration.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill does not at all authorize taking. I mean it is clear from the bill that it has nothing to do with the taking.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It has to do with the withdrawal from the taking on the part of the Federal Government of property which the Government does not need and which the private citizen may use to good advantage.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the inference is they have some other process by which they may take it other than condemnation. That was my point.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I rose to say substantially what the gentleman has just said. There is nothing in this bill that gives any authority to take in any way.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Exactly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This bill merely relates to the exclusion of property that was taken that the Attorney General may find is unnecessary in connection with its use, and it would cost, perhaps, a great deal to litigate it out, and this saves time and money to the Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I direct the attention of the gentleman to this situation? There may be on one of these farms a barn or, maybe, a farmer has two farms and he may take a barn that is of no value to the Government, but is

a valuable thing for the farmer to have, and he can move it across a field and put it on his place, but I would like to emphasize what my colleague from Kentucky has just stated, that this bill has nothing to do with a "taking." It has to do with a "nontaking," if I may use that term.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that, but if the gentleman will bear with me, in condemnation proceedings you may exclude any property. But the language here is "property that may have been taken by the United States by declaration or taking or otherwise."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman's illustration about not taking the farmer's barn might not apply here, because the Government might not have been given the authority to take it "by declaration or otherwise." The words "or otherwise" trouble me because I do not think that the provision in the law, if it ever reaches the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court follows its precedents in the matter, will ever hold that the United States Government or the War Department or the Navy Department can take title to property without a hearing. That is not due process of law. This may be purely an academic question, but I want to know whether or not this word "otherwise" contemplates some other procedure that we do not know about by which they may take property without even making a declaration.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Would not this satisfy my distinguished friend? We are dealing, not with the taking or with the "otherwise" in this bill. What we are trying to do is to help the Government to not be in possession of property which it does not need, and to make it possible for the Government to exercise just as little hardship upon the people whose property is being taken as possible.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that the way I interpret this bill is that this relates to condemnation proceedings with respect to property for other than defense purposes, whereby you have to have a finding of necessity before you get title to the property. In those cases you do not have to include in the description of the property other properties which might be taken by "declaration or otherwise," because they are of a defense nature and may be taken under the War Powers Act or some such other act we have passed, authorizing the taking of title by declaration.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does not a situation frequently arise where the Government needs the land but does not have any need for the growing crops or the buildings, and this would make it possible for the representative of the Government to turn back to the farmer his growing crops or buildings which are of value to him, but of no value to the Government?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Furthermore, if the gentleman will permit, even as to the land, suppose under the War Powers Act we passed recently you would make a declaration to take a great boundary of land? There may be a part of that land in dispute with somebody or part of the land that it would not be necessary to use. So this matter could not go to the Supreme Court. It really gives the Attorney General the right to stipulate with the owner to leave out certain property.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I agree with my distinguished friend. We want to have to take as little as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in any condemnation proceeding instituted by or on behalf of the United States, the Attorney General is authorized to stipulate or agree in behalf of the United States to exclude any property or any part thereof, or any interest therein, that may have been taken by or on behalf of the United States by declaration of taking or otherwise

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE EMPLOYMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6634) to facilitate the employment of defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PUNISHMENT OF PERSONS CONSPIRING TO VIOLATE LAWS RELATING TO COUNTERFEITING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4934) to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 7, and Supp. V thereof) is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 178a. If two or more persons conspire to violate any provisions of this chapter, or of sections 205, 218, 219, or 220 of chapter 8, of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 7, and Supp. V thereof, and secs. 328, 347, 348, and 349 of ch. 8), or of the act of August 26 1935 (49 Stat. 866; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 18, sec. 349a), and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for violating such provision."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 271, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1942, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States of America is authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1942, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TEMPORARY ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6818) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] to explain the circumstances under which temporary advancement to Coast Guard personnel may be made.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this provision is already made, as I recall it, for the personnel of the Coast Guard. This bill relates entirely to the Coast and Geodetic Survey officers. It gives to those officers the identical benefits and privileges for promotions that have been given to the Army and the Navy and, as I recall, to the officers of the Coast Guard.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I read the bill, there is a limitation on the type of persons who may receive temporary advancement, contained on page 2 of the bill. There are only three classifications of persons in the Coast and Geodetic Survey who may be temporarily appointed. My purpose of making the inquiry is to find out why temporary officers are limited to those three classes, the War and Navy Departments and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. BLAND. It is in relation to the personnel of the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard. I do not recall just now any other limitation. These officers are taken from the Coast and Geodetic Survey and they go into the Army and the Navy and the Coast Guard for the purpose of performing duties usually performed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. One of the principal duties is in the preparation of charts, and so forth. They would go in at the rank that they held in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the duties which they perform will be performed with officers in the respective services who are of higher rank, and this bill gives them coordinate rank and responsibility during the time of the transfer.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I understand it there are two classifications: First, the officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who may be sent to the War Department, and they may be temporarily advanced.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Second, a person who is appointed to fill the place of a person who has gone to the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. BLAND. He may be advanced.

Mr. COLE of New York. And third, deck officers may be advanced, but they cannot go above the rank of ensign. My inquiry is, Why place a limit on the potential advancement of the personnel in the field and make it available only to those who are taken to the departments here in Washington?

Mr. BLAND. As I understand it, provision was made for those who are temporarily advanced to supply the vacancies in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and that they should be advanced to the respective ranks held by those transferred.

Mr. COLE of New York. Why should a limit be placed on the possible advancement of deck officers at a rank not above ensign?

Mr. BLAND. That is in accordance with the provisions of the other bills; the limitation is in accordance with provisions that already exist in other legislation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Do I understand that members of the Coast Guard cannot be advanced beyond the rank of ensign, temporarily?

Mr. BLAND. My recollection is that it is in accordance with the policy and legislation with reference to the other services. If there is any question about it, I would be glad to look into it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be subject in like manner and to the same extent and with the same relative conditions as are provided for personnel of the Navy in an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941 (Public, No. 188, 77th Cong.), except that temporary appointments and promotions shall be limited as follows:

(1) Commissioned officers in the service of the War Department or of the Navy Department, under the provisions of section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87), may, upon recommendation, respectively, of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, be temporarily promoted to higher ranks or grades.

(2) Commissioned officers in the service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey may be temporarily promoted to fill vacancies in ranks and grades caused by the transfer of commissioned officers to the service and jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments under the provisions of section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87).

(3) Regularly appointed deck officers and junior engineers may be temporarily appointed to the rank and grade of ensign: *Provided*, That the number of deck officers and junior engineers holding such temporary appointments shall not exceed the number of officers transferred to the War and Navy Departments under provisions of section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar for today.

SUSPENSION OF ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency of the situation, I request that we take up the next bill on the calendar, Mr. DIMOND's bill, to suspend certain assessment work on mining claims. It is very urgent. The work must be done by the 1st of June. It will interfere with the national defense program. I think that bill should be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Idaho ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill?

Mr. WHITE. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the first place, any Member can object to the consideration of the bill at the present time. This happens to be my bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. COLE of New York and Mr. HANCOCK objected.

CREATION OF A RECREATION BOARD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5075) to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That there is hereby created in and for the District of Columbia a Recreation Board hereinafter referred to as 'the Board.'

"ARTICLE I—MEMBERSHIP OF THE RECREATION BOARD

"SECTION 1. The Board shall consist of seven members as follows: A representative of the Board of Commissioners selected by that Board; a representative of the Board of Education selected by that Board; the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks ex officio; and four members who shall have been for 5 years immediately preceding their selection bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years each, except the original appointments which shall be for terms of 1, 2, 3, and 4 years, respectively. The appointment of the four citizens shall be without regard to race, sex, or creed, and shall take judicious account of the various parent, civic, and other organizations through which residents of the District voice their civic wishes and advance the common welfare. The two members of the Board representing the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education shall be designated annually by their respective agencies.

"SEC. 2. The members of the Board shall not be personally liable in damages for any official action of the said Board performed in good faith, nor shall any member of said Board be liable for any costs that may be taxed against them or the Board on account of any such official action; but such costs shall be charged to the District of Columbia and paid as other costs are paid in suits brought against the municipality; nor shall the said Board or any of its members be required to give any supersedeas bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatever.

"SEC. 3. Vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term by the agency which made the original selection.

"SEC. 4. The members of the Board shall serve without compensation for such service.

"SEC. 5. The Board shall select from among its citizen membership its Chairman and its secretary and is hereby authorized and empowered to adopt all necessary rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"SEC. 6. The Board shall hold stated meetings and such additional meetings as they may from time to time deem necessary. All meetings of the Board shall be open to the public.

"ARTICLE II—FUNCTIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD

"SECTION 1. The Board shall determine all questions of general policy relating to public recreation in and for the District of Columbia, and shall supervise and direct expenditure of all appropriations and/or other funds made available to the Board.

"SEC. 2. The Board is hereby authorized to appoint a Superintendent of Recreation, which position is hereby authorized and created, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board but not a member thereof, and shall be charged with the general organization, administration, and supervision of the program of public recreation contemplated and provided for by this act. The Superintendent shall be a person of such training, experience, and capacity as will especially qualify him to discharge the duties of the office. He shall possess those qualifications of education, training, and experience in recreation work as well as executive and administrative experience which will assure a thorough knowledge of current theory and practice in public recreation and give promise of the administrative ability necessary to administer a program of public recreation in and for the Nation's Capital.

"The Board, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, is empowered to appoint, promote, demote, and terminate the employment of such personnel as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Superintendent may suspend for cause for a period not exceeding 30 days any employee of the Board.

"All present personnel of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department whose services have heretofore been rated satisfactory shall be retained by the Board with the understanding that this provision does not contemplate the continued employment of individuals whose service is inefficient, and such personnel shall continue to function under existing rules and regulations until

such time as classification and civil-service requirements have been effected.

"The Superintendent and all other regular annual personnel of the Recreation Board shall be employees of the District of Columbia. Their salaries and positions shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, without regard to race, sex, or creed, and the civil-service requirements as agreed upon between the Civil Service Commission and the District Commissioners or any existing agreement between them relative to the selection and change of status of District of Columbia employees.

"Upon recommendation of the Superintendent, the Board is authorized to employ, on a part-time basis at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to civil-service requirements, and without regard to the prohibition against double salaries provided by section 1763, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. Annotated, title 5, sec. 58), such teachers, custodial, and other employees of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education, upon approval by the present employer, as may be necessary to keep in operation and to conduct therein appropriate phases of the recreation program authorized by this act.

"The respective facilities of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education shall, by the agreement of the respective agencies of the Government having control of such facilities, be made available to the Board under the terms of this act.

"The Superintendent is authorized to employ for a 90-day period as full- or part-time employees such referees, umpires, swimming-pool guards and attendants, gymnasium and playground supervisors, and other similar special employees as may be necessary to carry out the recreation program authorized by this act, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to civil-service requirements, and without regard to the prohibition against double salaries provided by section 1763, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. Annotated, title 5, sec. 58): *Provided*, That the retention in the District service of any such employees for a period longer than 90 days shall be subject to the approval of the Board.

"The Board is authorized to accept upon recommendation of the Superintendent the gratis services of such persons as may volunteer to aid in the conduct of any of its activities.

"SEC. 3. The Board shall have power and authority to adopt, conduct, direct, or cause to be conducted or directed, under its supervision, a comprehensive program of public recreation which shall include the operation and direction of games, sports, arts and crafts, hobby shops, music, drama, speech, nursery play, dancing, lectures, forum for informal discussion, and such other physical, social, mental, and creative opportunities for leisure-time participation as the Board shall deem advisable to offer in major recreation centers, playfields, athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, beaches, golf courses, community centers, and social centers in schools, parks, or other publicly owned buildings, as well as other recreational facilities which may be agreed upon between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities. The public properties utilized by the Board for the above purposes shall include those designated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in accordance with a comprehensive plan, as suitable and desirable units of the District of Columbia recreation system.

"Nothing in this act contained shall be construed as affecting any rights under any existing lease or leases lawfully entered into by any agency mentioned or affected by this act, nor shall anything in this act contained be construed as affecting the right of any such agency in the future lawfully to enter into leases of land or premises under its control for recreational purposes.

"SEC. 4. The Board is hereby authorized to create a trust fund similar to that now operated by the Community Center and Playgrounds Department in which shall be deposited all fees and receipts from those activities which the Board may deem it advisable to conduct on a fee basis or any other basis, the moneys in such trust fund to be available to the Board to defray in whole or in part the expense of conducting its activities, the fund to be audited quarterly by the auditor of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 5. The Board shall prepare and submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an annual budget itemizing the appropriations necessary for the performance of its functions and duties under this act, including appropriations necessary for the purchase of books, literature, newspapers, periodicals, technical reference material, trophies, and medals, and as provided in article III, section 4, of this act, the Board's share of the cost of improvement, maintenance, and upkeep of the buildings and grounds used by the Board and which are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education, the Board of Commissioners, or the National Park Service.

"SEC. 6. The Board shall submit to the Commissioners an annual report of its activities, together with recommendations for further activities and development, or curtailment.

"ARTICLE III—RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD TO OTHER AGENCIES

"SECTION 1. All the functions of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department now under the joint control of the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education are hereby transferred to and shall, after the effective date of this act, be vested in the said Recreation Board. The transfer of all such functions shall include transfer of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department, any unexpended balance in trust funds, and the salary of the coordinator now carried in the appropriation of the National Capital Parks.

"SEC. 2. The control of all land, buildings, and other facilities used by the Board shall be in accordance with agreements reached between the Board and the governmental agencies having jurisdiction over such properties.

"SEC. 3. No power or authority conferred by this act shall be construed to abridge the powers of the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or the National Park Service to refuse the use of any ground, building, or facility under their individual or collective control whenever the use of any such ground, building, or facility for recreational purposes would interfere with the use or purpose for which such ground, building, or facility was acquired or created, and nothing herein expressed or implied shall be construed to abrogate any powers vested in the Board of Education by the Organic Act of 1906 insofar as the control of public education and all necessary facilities and personnel is concerned.

"SEC. 4. The maintenance and improvement of all playgrounds and recreation areas and facilities now under the control of the Board of Education, or of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or of the National Park Service, or which may hereafter be acquired by any of said agencies for said purpose, may be provided for by agreement between the Board and the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the National Park Service, respectively. The Board is hereby authorized to transfer to the said agencies such funds, equipment, and personnel as may be necessary to carry said agreements into effect.

"SEC. 5. The Board is authorized to arrange with other governmental agencies for services on a reimbursable basis.

"SEC. 6. All equipment, machinery, supplies, and materials of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department shall, on the effective date of this act, be transferred to the Board.

"SEC. 7. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 8. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its approval."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia if the minority members of the committee have been informed that this would be brought up today, and whether they have any objection to it?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will say in answer to the gentleman from New York that the ranking minority member of the Committee of the District of Columbia [Mr. DIRKSEN], is in full agreement with the action which the chairman of the committee is taking at this time. We discussed the matter at two meetings of the Committee on the District of Columbia and decided that rather than send the measure to conference we would agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. HANCOCK. And that was the unanimous opinion of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That was the unanimous opinion of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and, because the gentleman at this time raises the point, I think I should like to make a very brief statement, because the RECORD should show exactly what we have done in this matter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from West Virginia will explain what the bill does?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I think that is fair to the House and also to the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we want to hear something about it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to direct the attention of the membership to the fact that this measure passed the House of Representatives unanimously on July 14, 1941; that the bill was then considered in the Senate, and lengthy hearings were held by that body, as were held in the House of Representatives. The measure passed the Senate unanimously with Senate amendments on March 30, 1942.

Very briefly, I should like to say that the provisions of the bill would create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia. For many years we have had divided authority between the recreational agencies. There have been overlappings; there have been divisions of authority; there have been conflicts which have occurred to disrupt the program. Under the Commissioners, a new Board of

Recreation will be appointed, to consist of seven members. Those members will serve without pay.

The Senate bill differs only in slight degree from the House bill, and simply goes to the administrative set-up of the board, with which the House committee is in agreement.

Mr RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. These other agencies that are set up, that are overlapping, for this recreational program that is going on in the District of Columbia, will be dispensed with, will they? What are you going to do about them if this bill passes? Will that stop this overlapping?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. There have been these overlappings, these conflicts. We have had a Community Center and Playgrounds Department. That will be eliminated, as will other agencies, and all merged into one Board of Recreation for the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICH. Are they paid agencies that are now set up, that are looking after this recreation program?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They are not paid agencies from the standpoint of the membership but they have had officers acting for them who were paid. We are cutting the cost of the recreational program, because we are centering it in one body with power to act. The survey of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission states that under proper unification the same properties and the same staff could secure one-third greater results. That is what we are attempting to accomplish by this measure.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from West Virginia is in effect the mayor of the District. We look to our mayor as our representative to stop this overlapping, and I presume he is going to stop a lot in connection with the operation of these agencies. The gentleman is well aware that generally whenever a new agency is established the old agency hangs on and we have to support them both. It is my hope that in this new organization we may expect the gentleman, as mayor of the city of Washington, to see that the expense of recreation so far as possible and the overlapping will cease from now on.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, no man, or Member of this body, is more diligent than the gentleman from Pennsylvania in desiring to cut the cost of government not only within the District of Columbia but in the Federal agencies as well. I commend him for his diligence in this matter. I am certain that by and large other Members agree with the position he takes. I believe this is in the interest of better economy and better administration of the recreational facilities of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate amendment?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That there is hereby created in and for the District of Columbia a Recreation Board hereinafter referred to as 'the Board'.

"ARTICLE I—MEMBERSHIP OF THE RECREATION BOARD

"SECTION 1. The Board shall consist of seven members as follows: A representative of the Board of Commissioners selected by that Board; a representative of the Board of Education selected by that Board; the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks ex officio; and four members who shall have been for 5 years immediately preceding their selection bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years each, except the original appointments which shall be for terms of 1, 2, 3, and 4 years, respectively. The appointment of the four citizens shall be without regard to race, sex, or creed, and shall take judicious account of the various parent, civic, and other organizations through which residents of the District voice their civic wishes and advance the common welfare. The two members of the Board representing the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education shall be designated annually by their respective agencies

"SEC. 2. The members of the Board shall not be personally liable in damages for any official action of the said Board performed in good faith, nor shall any member of said Board be liable for any costs that may be taxed against them or the Board on account of any such official action; but such costs shall be charged to the District of Columbia and paid as other costs are paid in suits brought against the municipality; nor shall the said Board or any of its members be required to give any supersedeas bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatever.

"SEC. 3. Vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term by the agency which made the original selection.

"SEC. 4. The members of the Board shall serve without compensation for such service.

"SEC. 5. The Board shall select from among its citizen membership its chairman and its secretary and is hereby authorized and empowered to adopt all necessary rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"SEC. 6. The Board shall hold stated meetings and such additional meetings as they may from time to time deem necessary. All meetings of the Board shall be open to the public.

"ARTICLE II—FUNCTIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD

"SECTION 1. The Board shall determine all questions of general policy relating to public recreation in and for the District of Columbia, and shall supervise and direct expenditure of all appropriations and/or other funds made available to the Board.

"SEC. 2. The Board is hereby authorized to appoint a Superintendent of Recreation, which position is hereby authorized and created, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board but not a member thereof, and shall be charged with the general organization, administration, and supervision of the program of public recreation contemplated and provided for by this act. The Superintendent shall be a person of such training, experience, and capacity as will especially qualify him to discharge the duties of the office. He shall possess those qualifications of education, training, and experience in recreation work as well as executive and administrative experience which will assure a thorough knowledge of current theory and practice in public recreation and give promise of the administrative ability necessary to administer a program of public recreation in and for the Nation's Capital.

"The Board, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, is empowered to appoint, promote, demote, and terminate the employment of such personnel as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Superintendent may suspend for cause for a period not exceeding 30 days any employee of the Board.

"All present personnel of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department whose services have heretofore been rated satisfactory shall be retained by the Board with the understanding that this provision does not contemplate the continued employment of individuals whose service is inefficient, and such personnel shall continue to function under existing rules and regulations until such time as classification and civil-service requirements have been effected.

"The Superintendent and all other regular annual personnel of the Recreation Board shall be employees of the District of Columbia. Their salaries and positions shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, without regard to race, sex, or creed, and the civil-service requirements as agreed upon between the Civil Service Commission and the District Commissioners or any existing agreement between them relative to the selection and change of status of District of Columbia employees.

"Upon recommendation of the Superintendent, the Board is authorized to employ, on a part-time basis, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to civil-service requirements, and without regard to the prohibition against double salaries provided by section 1763, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. Annotated, title 5, sec. 58), such teachers, custodial, and other employees of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education, upon approval by the present employer, as may be necessary to keep in operation and to conduct therein appropriate phases of the recreation program authorized by this act.

"The respective facilities of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education shall, by the agreement of the respective agencies of the Government having control of such facilities, be made available to the Board under the terms of this act.

"The Superintendent is authorized to employ for a 90-day period as full- or part-time employees, such referees, umpires, swimming-pool guards and attendants, gymnasium and playground supervisors, and other similar special employees as may be necessary to carry out the recreation program authorized by this act, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without reference to civil-service requirements, and without regard to the prohibition against double salaries provided by section 1763, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. annotated, title 5, sec. 58): *Provided*, That the retention in the District service of any such employees for a period longer than 90 days shall be subject to the approval of the Board.

"The Board is authorized to accept upon recommendation of the Superintendent the gratis services of such persons as may volunteer to aid in the conduct of any of its activities.

"SEC. 3. The Board shall have power and authority to adopt, conduct, direct, or cause to be conducted or directed, under its supervision, a comprehensive program of public recreation which shall include the operation and direction of games, sports, arts and crafts, hobby shops, music, drama, speech, nursery play, dancing, lectures, forum for informal discussion, and such other physical, social, mental, and creative opportunities for leisure-time participation as the Board shall deem advisable to offer in major recreation centers, playfields, athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, beaches, golf courses, community centers, and social centers in schools, parks, or other publicly owned buildings, as well as other recreational facilities which

may be agreed upon between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities. The public properties utilized by the Board for the above purposes shall include those designated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in accordance with a comprehensive plan, as suitable and desirable units of the District of Columbia recreation system.

"Nothing in this act contained shall be construed as affecting any rights under any existing lease or leases lawfully entered into by any agency mentioned or affected by this act, nor shall anything in this act contained be construed as affecting the right of any such agency in the future lawfully to enter into leases of land or premises under its control for recreational purposes.

"SEC. 4. The Board is hereby authorized to create a trust fund similar to that now operated by the Community Center and Playgrounds Department in which shall be deposited all fees and receipts from those activities which the Board may deem it advisable to conduct on a fee basis or any other basis, the moneys in such trust fund to be available to the Board to defray in whole or in part the expense of conducting its activities, the fund to be audited quarterly by the auditor of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 5. The Board shall prepare and submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an annual budget itemizing the appropriations necessary for the performance of its functions and duties under this act, including appropriations necessary for the purchase of books, literature, newspapers, periodicals, technical reference material, trophies, and medals, and as provided in article III, section 4, of this act, the Board's share of the cost of improvement, maintenance, and upkeep of the buildings and grounds used by the Board and which are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education, the Board of Commissioners, or the National Park Service.

"SEC. 6. The Board shall submit to the Commissioners an annual report of its activities, together with recommendations for further activities and development, or curtailment.

"ARTICLE III—RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD TO OTHER AGENCIES

"SECTION 1. All the functions of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department now under the joint control of the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education are hereby transferred to and shall, after the effective date of this act, be vested in the said Recreation Board. The transfer of all such functions shall include transfer of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department, any unexpended balance in trust funds, and the salary of the coordinator now carried in the appropriation of the National Capital Parks.

"SEC. 2. The control of all land, buildings, and other facilities used by the Board shall be in accordance with agreements reached between the Board and the governmental agencies having jurisdiction over such properties.

"SEC. 3. No power or authority conferred by this act shall be construed to abridge the powers of the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or the National Park Service to refuse the use of any ground, building, or facility under their individual or collective control whenever the use of any such ground, building, or facility for recreational purposes would interfere with the use or purpose for which such ground, building, or facility was acquired or created, and nothing herein expressed or implied shall be construed to abrogate any powers vested in the Board of Education by the organic act of 1906 insofar as the control of public education and all necessary facilities and personnel is concerned.

"SEC. 4. The maintenance and improvement of all playgrounds and recreation areas and facilities now under the control of the Board of Education, or of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or of the National Park Service, or which may hereafter be acquired by any of said agencies for said purpose, may be provided for by agreement between the Board and the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the National Park Service, respectively. The Board is hereby authorized to transfer to the said agencies such funds, equipment, and personnel as may be necessary to carry said agreements into effect.

"SEC. 5. The Board is authorized to arrange with other governmental agencies for services on a reimbursable basis.

"SEC. 6. All equipment, machinery, supplies, and materials of the Community Center and Playgrounds Department shall, on the effective date of this act, be transferred to the Board.

"SEC. 7. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 8. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its approval."

The amendment was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a committee report on the bill H. R. 6927 to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times on the Foreign Language Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two topics and in each to include some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table, the legislative program of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WARTIME CENSORSHIP

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, there are two rather closely related matters in connection with this total war of survival which I believe deserve some attention from either the legislative or the executive branches of the Government, or perhaps from both. I want to make it very clear that in discussing these two matters briefly in the time I have that I do so without any criticism of the Office of Censorship as presently constituted and conducted by Mr. Byron Price. Neither am I indulging in criticism of any of the offices of Government information nor of the individuals who may be directing those offices at this time.

Mr. Speaker, for 15 years I have been a newspaperman. I want to pay tribute to the great bulk of the press in the United States today for the very fine job which I believe it is doing. There is today, however, a very small fringe of the daily press, and some other smaller periodicals and publications that exist for no purpose other than to create disunity and defeatism among our people, which need some very careful attention. I think that perhaps 99 percent of the newspapers, small and large, in the Nation, have complied very fully with the voluntary code promulgated by the Office of Censorship in handling news of the War. I believe they may be expected to continue to do so, because I believe the press throughout the country realizes it is the guardian of that principle of the freedom of the press. Let me say also that I share a very deep devotion to that principle; and nothing I may say here should be interpreted as in any sense reflecting an opinion to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, it is not so much in what these subversive publications publish with reference to the facts of war, with reference to the news that they run in connection with our war effort, that is creating this spirit of disunity and defeatism, as it is certain slants and interpretations that are carried day by day and week by week. These papers, or these publications that are so strongly anti-British that they give a pro-Axis slant to much of their news and to much of their comment, Mr. Speaker, are doing our war effort a very serious injury. By the publication of half-truths and rumors, and by giving space and headlines to statements which tend to undermine the faith of the people in the integrity and strength of the Government, they are giving Axis propaganda an outlet which agents of the Axis Powers could never obtain.

We have the Office of Censorship set up and directed by Mr. Price and under his direction the newspapers are being ask to comply voluntarily with a code insofar as what is published relates to the actual news about our war efforts and about military operations.

Those very few of the daily newspapers and smaller publications which may be on the border line of compliance, and which may meet all of the requirements insofar as actually doing what they are asked to do is concerned, are going a great deal further in their interpretations. In spirit many of them are not complying, in my opinion, with the spirit of that voluntary code of the Office of Censorship. I think a member of this press gallery who sits there every day stated the situation very clearly a few days ago with this simple illustration. He said that a newspaper today, a periodical, a magazine, a radio commentator, or anyone else, who is responsible for the dissemination of news and the formation of public opinion, who fails to consider himself as an American first, and who refuses to consider the obligation that is his as a guardian of the free press and free speech, is in the same category exactly as the man who refuses to turn out his lights or pull down the dark shades during a black-out. Any man has the right, if he pays his electric bills, to burn his lights. However, during an air raid he must forego the exercise of that right or endanger the lives of other people. In times of war it is necessary to forego the exercise of many inalienable rights in order to preserve and perpetuate them.

This element of the subversive press in the United States today, including Father Coughlin's Social Justice, and others which time forbids me to name and discuss in detail here is doing our war effort a great harm. I hope the Department of Justice and any other agency that may be authorized and empowered to take whatever action is necessary against that small fringe will do so very, very quickly.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In determining the sentiment that is being expressed by some of the writers, where does the gentleman draw the line between what is just criticism of things that you think are wrong now, which will aid and assist us in winning this war, and what is propaganda by some of the writers we have today?

Mr. PRIEST. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that is a very hard distinction to make. As I said, I worked for 15 years as a city editor, managing editor, and copy-desk reader. I have done most jobs on a newspaper. Many times I found it was difficult to draw the line of distinction between what was honest criticism, what was constructive criticism, and what was propaganda in its effect. If we accept the statement made by a member of this House press gallery just a few days ago in a conversation with me, when he said, "I am an American first and a newspaperman second," it will clarify the matter considerably and should give us a sort of yardstick by which to measure such matters.

Mr. RICH. That would be all right if we could get all the newspaper writers to do it, but the trouble is now we have a lot of newspaper writers who have sinister motives in connection with certain things they are trying to do, either from a political standpoint or because they want a favor. After a while we will have no free speech at all in this country. We will be controlled by a dictator, and this will be to the detriment of the newspapers because they will be closed up pretty soon, and this due to the fact they have blotted out the things they wanted to say. We have to be mighty careful that we do not get in the clutches of men who are going to take away from us freedom of speech, freedom of action, and the Constitution of the United States, even our religion and everything else.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman, and I was getting to that very phase of the question. I want to make it clear once again that I believe with all my soul in the principle of freedom of the press, and I believe that today we ought to give our people the cold, brutal facts, the tragic facts, about this war. I am coming to that in connection with this matter of information service consolidation in just a minute. I do not have much time for a discussion of it, but there are some things that should be considered.

As I started to say to the gentleman, there were many occasions during the time I worked on a newspaper when I was called by someone or some man came in to see me and said: "You cannot print that." Frequently I answered by quoting a statement made by the distinguished editor of a Catholic magazine. I always appreciated it as a newspaperman. His statement was this: "What God permits to happen, man may be permitted to know." I have used that myself to justify the publication of news. I imagine men in this press gallery have felt similar to that many times.

I want to say a few words about Government information, and this is not said in criticism of any of the offices now engaged in that work. I discovered, and I believe a great many of the Members of this House discovered during their recent visit back to their districts, that the American people today are ready and willing to be told in one, strong, certain voice what is happening, and what their Government wants them to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] have time following.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the two distinguished gentlemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, we all know that at the present time there are several agencies in the Capital already dealing in gathering, assembling, and disseminating Government information. I refer particularly to the special organizations, not necessarily to the information services that are set up as a part of the Government departments. We may get to those a little later. I have in mind the Office of Facts and Figures, the Office of Government Reports, Colonel Donovan's Office of Coordinator of Government Information, and the offices of information that serve the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the War and Navy Departments, and some of the others. I am sure all of these offices are doing the best job possible under the circumstances.

I know all of us have come in contact with this situation recently: We find that many times press releases from those offices conflict insofar as the meat of the message is concerned. They do not always sing in unison, they are not always in full harmony insofar as the actual facts are concerned. That perhaps can be understood if we have time to analyze it, but the point simply is this:

The American people are tired of listening today to one voice, and tomorrow to another voice; of being told one thing today and something else tomorrow. They want, and they need, a very positive, strong, vigorous voice, speaking for the Government. They need that because they need a positive psychology to prepare them for the heavier burdens they must bear, the greater sacrifices we know they must make in the months that are ahead of us. We should shift as quickly as possible from a passive to a positive war psychology. I believe we need, as quickly as possible, either through legislative action or by action of the executive branch of the Government, to consolidate all of the Government information services possible, and to place those services under one strong head. He does not have to be a writer, he does not have to be even a newspaperman or a publicist if he is a good executive, a good administrator, an organizer. But one man should be in charge of our Government information as it relates to the war effort, and that man should have power in his field that is as supreme and final, in my judgment, as Mr. Donald Nelson has in the field of production. The people and the press, I believe, will applaud any move which results in a consolidation of these services. There are other aspects of the case which we might discuss if we went further, but they are matters with which we all are familiar. The economic angle certainly comes in as a strong factor.

During my service on a daily newspaper many times I have swept off great volumes of releases from Government agencies and then depended on my own correspondents or the press associations for my news from Washington and about the activities of Government. That is an angle that should be considered, but,

in my judgment, above that is this more important phase of Government information, the phase of which I spoke a moment ago when I emphasized the importance of the Government speaking in one voice instead of many unrelated and inharmonious voices. This is one time when the people want one strong, clear, powerful, vigorous, certain voice that tells them the cold, brutal facts all the time about what this war is about, the character of our enemies, and as nearly as possible the facts about what is happening every day. No pumped-up propaganda can be as effective as the facts in dealing with our Axis enemies.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When you turn on the radio in the morning you hear one commentator give a list of happenings and in about 10 minutes you hear another commentator making the same comment in almost the same words Then in another 10 minutes you may hear four or five or six other commentators, and everyone is saying the same thing. We shall not need all the newspaper reporters if we do that same thing for the newspapers. I think the newspaper reporters would not quite agree with me, because we would get rid of about half of them.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe the majority of them feel very much as I have expressed it here. I believe they prefer to know what they are writing about, rather than to have one report from one source, and in an effort to verify it somewhere else, to get a different slant on it. I think they would appreciate it very much.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN THE WAR

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, the second surrender of France, the fall of Bataan, the apparent loss of the Indian Ocean, the opening of the offensive against Russia, the gallant exploits of our fliers, all call attention to the increasing war fury of the day.

The President recognizes this urgency in calling this war the survival war.

Washington and the rest of the country, it seems to me, are going about the correction of errors, inefficiency, and general dullness in war efforts in reverse from the proper approach.

There is a line in the Episcopal prayer book that reads in part:

> We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done.

How great would be our increased efforts in the prosecution of this war if everyone could take these words to heart. Officeholder, industrialist, labor leader, taxpayer, military men—all Americans together could find strength in this self-confession. An attitude of "they are all out of step but Jim" can be a stumbling block in the way to victory.

FOREIGN POLICY WISE

This is a war Congress. By our declaration of war here, we dedicated ourselves to the winning of that war, no matter what the sacrifice. Many things were done prior to December 7 that helped to make this country strong for the conflict. The foreign policy, I believe, was the wisest course we could pursue. Without it, the chances of ultimate victory today would be dark indeed. The raising of an army and equipping it, the passage of the Selective Service Act and its extension, were proper steps. The increasing of the size of the Navy, the building up of the air force—all were well-timed and proper. All these things are on the credit side of the ledger for the Congress.

But when we voted for the declaration of war, we also voted to dedicate our full efforts, our sincere judgment, our lives—the entire resources of the Nation to victory. We, of course, cast aside local or self-interests, worry over sectional profits, social gains, or established governmental bureaucracy.

It is true that we have voted $160,000,000,000, as a Congress, for the war. But is this action in appropriating tax money and borrowing money enough?

Is Congress doing its part in this war for survival?

Most of the Members have been at home for a short recess to discuss the vital issues before Congress with their people. I believe that most of them found that there is a growing dissatisfaction, a spirit of unrest, a feeling of disappointment in their war Congress.

MEASURED BY ARMED FORCES

I do not believe that we are giving full satisfaction to the Americans who are ready, willing, and waiting to be pressed into this drive for victory. I do not believe that the Members of Congress are willing to say that we have done an outstanding job as a war Congress—measured in the heroic terms of our armed forces now fighting on the battlefronts of the world.

I am not trying to avoid or duck the responsibility for my contribution to this feeling. We are all guilty. I have made many errors of judgment. I have wasted precious time in nonessential matters. I have failed to be as alert or as well informed on many, many things as I should have been.

We are all guilty. Since December 7 this Congress has not been filling the role of a nation involved in the survival war.

I believe we have missed the bull's-eye on many things that we should have done to aid fully in the conduct of the war:

We missed it on price control.

We missed it on conversion of the Government plant to war.

We missed it on nondefense appropriations.

We missed it on the eve of war on excess-profits taxes.

We missed it on correcting labor difficulties.

We missed it largely on our military kibitzing.

We will miss it on adequate tax legislation.

On price control, I feel everyone now, from the President to the office boy in the Office of Price Administration, knows we passed a weak and ineffective price-control bill. Every housewife knows, as her dollar buys less weekly, that we failed them. Every worker sees, although his pay check may be up from 10 to 20 percent, that he can hardly chin the higher cost of the food and clothing he must buy. Farmers who enjoy higher prices for their own products see these gains melted before the spiral of rising prices.

Almost any man who studied the hearings and was not too greatly impressed by the testimony of the "experts" from downtown, would have realized that only by over-all control on prices, wages, and farm products could we hope to avert the spiral of inflation. Yet inactivity, group prejudice, sectional interest or just plain lack of understanding prevented the Congress from taking the steps that history told us needed to be taken. This experience of the one man in the United States in the last war, Mr. Bernard Baruch, and his recommendations went for nothing.

BY PRESIDENTIAL ORDER

The President, according to published reports, will do most of this job by proclamation. Again Congress, through its own failure to legislate, passes the buck to the executive agencies for those things that it ought to have done on its own initiative and responsibility.

Congress, I think, again missed it on governmental conversion. While almost every other plant essential to the winning of the war has been converted to wartime status, the sprawling, gangling, duplicating bureaus of nondefense agencies have been left virtually intact by a kind-hearted and open-handed appropriating Congress. These nondefense agencies have increased their employees 30,000 in the past year, while defense agencies were scouring the Nation to recruit some 475,000 civilian workers for the war effort.

Publicity and promotion departments, economic specialists by the corps who starred in the made-work days, overstuffed staffs of every description still flourish in wartime Washington as in the days when there were two men for every job.

PROTECTIVE DEFENSE COLORATION

Agencies set up to make work for the unemployed are now converting and overhauling their cumbersome and expensive machinery to take on a protective defense coloration. Some cases are so humorous that it is reminiscent of a cure-all patent medicine that from one bottle will either grow hair or remove it.

Yet Congress has, save for a few reductions, let pass the money for these nonessentials in wartime United States. Our bureaucracy must not be disturbed.

Again the Executive Office of the President has stepped in to try to help the situation after Congress failed to do its duty in making reductions. Everyone knows about the frozen funds in the Budget Bureau There appropriations made by Congress have been withheld from some agencies, reductions made, construction held up. Even the sacred powers of the public purse find substitute stewardship in the Budget Bureau.

When necessary clerical, stenographic, and expert help is further needed for defense agencies, the executive departments, rather than Congress, will have to determine these reductions.

TAX PROGRAM IS FAR SHORT

I believe we have missed, too, on the tax program necessary to sustain our war expenditures thus far. Too little and too late again. The people are crying for taxes to help in this war. They are willing to make any sacrifice necessary. Yet last year, and I fear again this year, the tax bill was delayed. And when it is passed, it will still be far short of even financing a small part of the money necessary to carry on the war and prevent destructive inflation.

The same applies on stopping excess profits or recapturing them. Cases which repeatedly demonstrate the weakness of present legislation are coming to light daily. Unless we recapture these excessive war profits, we not only add to inflation but we also increase our war costs tremendously. Much of our labor difficulty can be traced directly to such profiteering.

Congress has missed again on failure to take some fair and positive action to settle, at least for the duration, our labor difficulties. I realize that the House has passed bills to find them pigeonholed in the other body, but perhaps we have not worked hard enough to find the kind of legislation that all are willing to support and enact.

Surely this shake-down stench of exhorbitant initiation fees, failure to utilize our war plants on an around-the-clock schedule, failure to eliminate labor bottlenecks and prevent restraint of war construction through jurisdictional and interunion disputes and disagreements needs some correction.

IT IS CONGRESS' DUTY

Is not Congress the body charged by our Constitution with these duties? Has not the Supreme Court virtually laid a blueprint before us outlining blind spots in prevailing laws? Is it not our duty to enact legislation that will be positive instead of negative—that will increase production rather than restrict it?

On other legislation, too, we as a Congress, have missed. The items are too numerous to detail, but a few—patent legislation; credit legislation for war-frozen business stocks; legislation on post-war planning; credit legislation for soldiers and sailors. These are but a few. Make out your own list and you will find that our sins of omission are numerous.

Congress is the legislative body of this democracy. Yet much of the legislation originates downtown, is supported by their witnesses, and unless it has their blessing has too little chance of passage. I recognize the need for close cooperation, especially so on military legislation, but domination by nondefense agencies is wrong.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

It is true that on many of these "misses" we have followed the lead and advice of the executive departments. But this does not excuse us from the responsibility of mistakes. It does not excuse us from our failure to act independently as the legislative body of this Nation. We are directed by the Constitution to originate legislation and pass it, and the responsibility rests on the Congress for this duty.

Even our debates and criticisms have been far off the beam. We, as a Congress, seem too ready to try to run the strategy of military and naval affairs and to attempt to direct by remote control our foreign policy. In these fields, the Government has wisely tried to build up a career service, trained and skilled in the delicate decisions that must be arrived at when in full possession of all the facts. Our kibitzing on military strategy and strictly military policy should not be dignified by expressions from the floor.

We have a very definite duty that, save for the actions by our House and Senate investigation committees, is being ignored in most instances. That is to follow through on some of these one hundred and sixty billion dollars appropriated and see that the full capacity of our industrial machine is working on these orders. It is to see that none of the money so badly needed for war is diverted to useless boondoggles by overzealous bureaucrats pursuing hobbies or consuming war money in useless administrative enterprises. It is to see that cases involving failure in construction, planning or fabrication of our war machine are called to the attention of the proper authorities and not used for political or self-advancement.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM NECESSARY

That constructive criticism is more necessary in wartime than in peacetime is true. But to be constructive, it should do the job it is intended to do and that is to correct evils or errors in the quickest and most direct way. Oftentimes I find that an expression of criticism or a disclosure of errors direct to the defense agency or bureau committing them will get sure, quick, and prompt correction, where the criticism was well-founded. Where it was not—or information at hand was inaccurate—a "reason why" answer could close the case. We ought to spend more time criticizing ourselves and questioning ourselves to see if we had some part in failures, inefficiency, or confusion.

I have been guilty of generalizations and oversimplifications in my statements here. They are made in all kindness and understanding of the problems of the membership of Congress. I know the pressure of duties directly related to our service. I know the demands on your time. I realize the effort you all make to give personal consideration to all your mail.

But if the war is to be won, as I pray God and believe it will eventually be, if we are to be spared heavy losses and crippling defeats in its course, I sincerely believe that Congress must gear itself to its war job.

PUT FIRST THINGS FIRST

I believe that overboard must go many of the niceties that have been part and parcel of this job in the past. I believe that items requiring time of the members that do not contribute to defense must be subordinated—that time spent in handling the mail in your offices must be reduced. I believe we will have to put first things first, so that Congress and the rest of the Government will convert itself into full use for the war effort.

I think we will have to forget local sectional interests, completely disband for the duration any blocs, forsake our personal legislative hobbies, yes, and, if need be, change our procedures and rules to really be a War Congress.

The people are ahead of Congress in their willingness to do anything and everything necessary to win the war. Congress has got to lead and not follow in the awful test that faces us.

Criticism of the Congress, of both bodies, will continue until we furnish that leadership. No one can destroy the confidence of the people in their Congress excepting ourselves. We must not permit, through default, this loss of confidence in the two bodies where the people's voice is directly heard.

In the darkest days of the Civil War, December 1862, President Lincoln told his Congress:

> Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We, of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

ALL FACE THIS GREAT TEST

I shudder to think of the task—the terrible responsibility—that faces the 531 Members of these two great legislative bodies. We all know that our Nation has never faced the threat of extinction in its 154 years that it faces today.

But even more than this—the question of slavery of the world's people for the next 150 years is to be won or lost right here in Washington—beneath the dome of this Capitol.

It is the choice between the dark ages with terrible and tragic results—not only for our people, but for the free people across the seven seas.

I deeply believe in a democracy and the wisdom of the people. The founding fathers wisely, I believe, perfected a government with the help of the Almighty and planned for three departments, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. It has worked well under this three independent departmental system. The legislative must not fail in this greatest of all tests. Every Member has this responsibility to hand down to the next generation and those that follow an unimpaired democracy that makes possible the greatest life that freemen have ever known since the beginning of time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the gentleman has shown us many of our shortcomings, and I think possibly there is a great deal of truth in his statement. Does not the gentleman believe we should recapture a lot of the responsibilities belonging to the Congress and exercise our own responsibility insofar as trying to do things is concerned instead of sending them down to the other end of the Avenue?

Mr. MONRONEY. Our duty is to act as a legislative body. This aisle does not divide this legislative body. We have a duty as Members of Congress, regardless of party, to live up to the Constitution and serve the people of this country.

Mr. RICH. That is what I say. We should assume that responsibility and not place it in the hands of any one man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by Dr. Fred Taylor Wilson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, recently I received many clippings from constituents in my district that were cut out of the papers indicating an attack upon me by the now Governor of California. The substance of these statements, as reported in these clippings, is as follows:

That LELAND M. FORD should be defeated because he had the most reactionary record of any man in Congress; that he was antisocial and antilabor; that so far as he was concerned it was "anybody to beat FORD, and you can quote me on that."

After making these statements, he was asked, "Do you consider FORD'S fight against communism as antisocial?" The answer, "Well, the party-line Communists have been a source of trouble for many people."

Of course, this is a free country, which gives every one of us the freedom of our opinions and the freedom to choose our type of philosophy.

There is always a reason inspiring any attack or any difference in opinion or difference in philosophy, particularly in government. What, then, is the concept or inspiration behind this attack? The people of California in this serious hour of crisis and emergency should carefully weigh, more particularly than at any other time in our history, these differences of opinion, and I am going to ask them to do that very thing.

Can it be that my principles, my thought, and my philosophy are in such distinct contrast or collision with those of Governor Olson that they are so distasteful that he cannot sit quietly and therefore must attack them? Everyone who knows me, or knows anything about me, knows that I would never tolerate one single letter of the teachings of Karl Marx nor the encroachment of this philosophy upon our American form of government as we have known it. This goes for every single branch—nazi-ism, fascism, communism, or socialism—in any of their aspects. These people know that I have fought these things from stem to stern, that it was I who fought successfully the Fritz Weidmann set-up in San Francisco, Fritz Kuhn, Harry Bridges, and any and all that stood for any of these philosophies. Is this what he means by being "antisocial, antilabor, and reactionary"? The answer is that I will stand on the record, make the issue clean-cut, and say to the people of California: "I have stated my side. The Governor has stated his. You take your choice."

In making this choice, labor, industry, business, and every single individual will have to weigh what his future is going to be under socialism in any of its forms as indicated above. If being antisocial is antisocialistic, then the term is properly used, for that is true. If his term "antilabor" also includes within its scope of meaning anti-Socialist, then the Governor must be wrong, because no labor union can exist under the Socialist form of government, and I offer as evidence right today Germany, Italy, and Russia.

Why did the Governor confine himself to party-line Communists being a source of trouble? Is he protecting himself by this choice of words from the Communists who claim they are not party-line Communists but might be fellow travelers?

I have repeatedly stated that 95 percent of the rank and file of labor is loyal, patriotic, and thoroughly American. The printed record for 3 years is there and cannot be denied. In that same record I have repeatedly attacked the racketeering, highjacking, communistic labor leader who was betraying the interests and denying representation to the rank and file of the C. I. O. I still stand on that record, and I defy the Governor to take the other side.

The people of California know my fight and position on Harry Bridges. I defy Governor Olson to make his stand publicly known on Harry Bridges, and call upon him to do it here and now. I call upon him to say that I was wrong when in my amendment which passed the House and the Senate we confined and restricted the use of the $100,000,000 carried in the O. C. D. bill to the original purposes for which it was to be used, namely, the saving of life and property and the furnishing of proper equipment to the whole United States for such purposes; also to say I was wrong when we stopped the use of such moneys for such items as roving reporters, coordinators of punching bag, bicycling, wrestling, billiards, pool, and so forth.

I defy him to say we were wrong when I found in the detail of that bill some seventy-odd people "volunteering" for salaries of $8,000 a year, $6,800 a year, and so forth. Unfortunately, his friend, Melvyn Douglas, was caught in this. Upon inquiry by reporters to find his name on the roll, two departments said he was on, two said he was not. The fact is that if nothing had been said every one of these people would have taken this money and put it in their pockets. They cannot do this now, and the Department is being reorganized along the lines for which it was intended.

With reference to Douglas, I challenge the Governor to deny that the assembly of the State legislature passed a resolution condemning Douglas for his radical activities and asking him not to appoint Douglas as a commissioned officer in the National Guard. Does Governor Olson, in his support of Douglas, justify Douglas' refusal to read the Declaration of Independence in a radio skit put on by the American Legion because the skit criticized the Communists?

I will place my record against that of Governor Olson and am not afraid of the ability of the people of California to properly choose between them.

In choosing I am going to ask the people not to forget who was the manager for Upton Sinclair for southern California; to find out was it Governor Olson?

Did he cast the only vote against the appropriation for $97,000 to maintain the National Guard, on the 28th of May 1937, and did he say he would not appropriate one penny for the National Guard?

Did he upbraid the American Legion at Oakland on the 13th day of August 1939, saying their program against subversive activities was absurd?

Did he veto a bill, on July 10, 1939, permitting school trustees to spend public money for cadet uniforms?

Did he permit any known radicals to be employed in the State relief administration?

Did he veto a bill as Governor, compelling public-school children to pledge allegiance to the American flag? And was he overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States in that principle?

Did he have Harry Bridges at his side the day he pardoned Tom Mooney?

Did he say, about the conviction of Ramsey, King, and Connor, murderers of Albert, that they were "convicted on slight evidence," despite what all the courts said?

Citizens of California, find out if Olson did place his hand on the Holy Bible when he took his oath of office as Governor. Pictures are said to show his left hand in his pocket, with his right hand upraised.

Citizens of California, read what Democrat MARTIN DIES, in official RECORD, volume 3, page 2033, and so forth, dated October 1938, has to say about this Governor.

In this hour of need for protection of the State of California, find out what this Governor has actually done to protect strategic industries Did he refuse to set up a proper guard to protect his State in this respect? When we needed the guard so badly, did he carry out the Guard Act of the State legislature of 1942, or did he delay it with a lawsuit at a time when we were trying to avoid a second Pearl Harbor in California?

Judge Governor Olson by his acts and his record, and you will readily see why he attacks me. Thank God, we do not

stand for the same things, and I want the people of California to know it and to know, further, that I am proud of my enemies. A man can attain high standing by reason of the quality of his enemies.

I submit as my record that I was one of the six Republicans who supported the national administration's program on foreign policy and national defense 100 percent. If I am to be called reactionary on this, so is the President of the United States and his administration. Some things I did not like, but inasmuch as our foreign policy is fixed by the President and he appoints the Secretary of State, I refused to crucify or knife his policy at the expense of the American people. Without regard for personal political opinion or party consideration I feel I have voted as an American and acted as one, the very thing we should all do today. The administration is asking for this today.

Can you square this policy with Olson's purely personal, political, partisan attack on me? Are we facing a time when the safety of this country should have first consideration, or should we give consideration to purely personal political ambition of individuals?

I have fought Perkins as Secretary of Labor, I have fought the subversive leaders in the C. I. O., I have fought Fritz Kuhn. I have fought Freytag, I have fought Harry Bridges and his whole group, ever since I have been here, and I am going to continue to do so. What is Olson going to do?

I have fought the encroachment of socialism on the American form of government, together with every appropriation for unreasonable, undesirable, unnecessary, and socialistic expenditures. I took the initiative, and through my efforts were called together the Representatives of the Pacific Coast States, which resulted in the volunteer evacuation of Japanese; drew attention to national defense in all of its aspects for the Pacific Coast.

I have borne in mind that this is a time of crisis in this country, that we must win this war, and every dollar of our money should be devoted to that purpose. It will not avail anything, even for those who are the most ardent supporters of social gains, to have us lose this war, and with it lose not only the social gains they speak about, but all other forms of liberty. These people must realize that the thing we must do is to sustain the American form of government, first, from our enemies from without, and next, from our enemies from within; that if we lose either of these fights we have lost everything.

In general, I am going to ask the people of California to consider: Is this man really Governor, or, fortunately, has he been governed? I say he has been governed. In his program that he attempted to put over he was stopped by patriotic Democrats and patriotic Republicans, who laid aside every consideration but the welfare and safety of that State and defeated Olson in his plan. I, and all other Californians, commend both parties for this, because in that they governed the Governor, and the people of California should be thankful that they did. In the bitter defeat of his program and his un-American partisan bitterness, he has called upon the people of California to defeat me, and would lead people to believe that I am not representing my district. This should be an insult to my district, because he opposed me on the same grounds twice when I ran for supervisor, with the help and aid of Melvyn Douglas. They also opposed me twice as Congressman. On all four occasions, I won in the primaries. Is this evidence, or answer, to Olson's attempt of character assassination of me? On the last occasion I had a majority of 185,000 votes, which was the biggest majority that any Congressman in the United States received. The Democrats in this district, as well as the Republicans, have given me both nominations and I think they will do it again if they vote on the basis of Olson's record as against my record.

People of California, I have not gone out of my way to attack Governor Olson, but have answered him on account of his attack on me. Inasmuch as he has taken the initiative, I am going to ask you to study the record thoroughly, and in this hour of war, trial, need, and crises, to study more carefully than you have ever studied it before, before you cast your vote for Governor of California. If you will do this, you no doubt will come to the conclusion that you could vote for any Democrat or any Republican whose name appears upon the ballot, other than Olson, and you would better the safety and welfare of the State of California immeasurably.

I stand on my record. Olson stands on his. We apparently are diametrically opposed, and I ask you to make the decision you are capable of doing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has been elected several times by an overwhelming majority. Has it occurred to the gentleman that the force of his strength lies in the character of the opposition to him?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I am quite sure of that because, along with this editorial, came a check from a man I had never known, who said, "I do not know what your fight is with Olson, and I do not know you, but here is a check to help you in your campaign."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and also to insert certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, what will now be said with reference to proceedings before the grand jury was authorized to be said by the special prosecutor and the jury. In fact, after calling my attention to a statement I made on the floor on the 13th, last Monday, he requested that I make a further statement.

Last Monday when speaking here I referred to the gentleman as a smear artist. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] requested that I give the name of the person who gave me that information. I declined to do so, but stated—and you will find it in the RECORD—that I was going down before the jury that afternoon and that if I was asked by the special prosecutor to give that name I would do so. I was called down there, and Mr. Maloney asked me how I got my information or where I got it. I told him that I got it from Miss Boyer, who has been with me ever since I came to Washington, who was with me at home, who was a classmate of my son. He wanted to know where she got it. I suggested to him that the only information on that I had was what she said to me, that she had obtained the information from a man named Ahearn, who lived here in Washington. I further suggested to the special attorney that I had asked Miss Boyer to come down with me, and she was out in the corridor and he could call her, and he did.

This morning the special attorney advised me in the jury room that they had called Mr. Ahearn and that he had denied making such a statement to Miss Boyer and that he therefore wanted me to retract and apologize.

Well, now, I am not retracting and I am not apologizing. I am saying this. It now appears by the statement of Mr. Ahearn, made under oath, that he denies that he so advised Miss Boyer. It also appears that, under oath, she said he did. Now, whether they misunderstood each other in their conversation or whether that came out of the clear air, I have no way of knowing. I am giving it to you as I got it.

So, for the RECORD, I am saying this at the request of the eminent gentleman: That Ahearn now denies he made any such statement. Let me go further and state that no one else made such a statement to me. I have no personal knowledge of what Ahearn said or whether he ever said anything. Furthermore, let me say that never at any time have I questioned the good faith of the grand jury or any member of the grand jury. As I appeared before them they looked to me to be average American citizens, which is good enough description for anyone in this day and age. I have never seen, when I have been before them, any indication of a lack of patriotism or any indication of unfairness toward me, or anything of the kind.

The special attorney is something of an advocate. I am not calling in question the motives of the special attorney as special attorney, and I hope he gets that, but as an individual I would say that he is, with perhaps one exception, and that Charlie Michelson, a No. 1 expert smear artist. I suppose he will want to know, although what is said on the floor of the House is no concern of his, because no Member can be called in question before any other body for what is said on the floor, but because that gentleman may have me down there again. And I have

been there twice now, and an hour or more this time, and the clerk to my office has been down there five times, and do not forget that the newspaper said that Miss Boyer was carried on the roll as a secretary, but in reality she was a clerk—just one of those little digs by innuendo, because all secretaries are clerks. I shall read from what I said last Monday. There is not one single thing that this gentleman, Mr. Maloney, either as an individual or as a special attorney, could not have obtained from my office by calling me on the phone or writing me a letter. I hope that statement will satisfy the gentleman and will convince him that although Mr. Ahearn said he never made the statement which was attributed to him, and although we accept for the purpose of argument only his statement as true, nevertheless the record shows that Mr. Maloney—and note what I said—Mr. Maloney, not Special Attorney Maloney, Mr. Maloney as an individual is engaged, intentionally or unintentionally, in a smear campaign. There is no doubt about that. Why do I say that? Let me read what I said from the RECORD, so that there will be no misunderstanding about this being a full and complete correction, because I do not want gentlemen to misunderstand or say that I have not gone the whole road. Here is what I said last Monday:

I suggest that the Speaker of the House appoint a committee to call before it the Special Attorney, Maloney, reporters for the Post, and the grand jury investigators, and ascertain whether or not the present investigation is not being conducted as a smear campaign in an effort to defeat all those who, prior to December 7, might be considered as isolationists; that such a committee inquire as to whether or not the special attorney himself did not, when seeking an extension of the life of the grand jury make the statement that, if he were given 3 additional months he could defeat every Republican candidate for Congress who had been opposed to our entry into war.

I also suggest that the committee investigate and determine whether the proceedings of the grand jury had been secret, as required by law, and whether a reporter for the Washington Post has not, in some unauthorized way, obtained access to the grand jury records.

Is there any good reason why, when in one of the Washington newspapers, there is printed what purports to be a circumstantial account of matters which are under investigation by the grand jury, an investigation should not be had to ascertain how the reporter obtained his information? Such a course would seem to be fair and to be demanded, not only by the House and by the public, but by the reporters for the other papers.

Just why should one reporter be able to print accounts of what happened before the grand jury, while other reporters apparently lack that same information? Is the reporter a mind reader? A crystal-ball gazer? Is he drawing on his imagination, or has he some source of information unknown to the rest of the reporters? Certainly he has never given any indication of being any smarter, any more intelligent, any more persevering, than the reporters for the other papers.

Here is a further statement I made at that time:

Going one step further, What is this man Maloney doing anyway? It was reported to me this morning when I got here that Mr. Maloney had made the statement—and you Republicans ought to take notice of this—he wanted another year, and he finally got 3 months, and at that time the statement was made that if he could get a 3-month extension he would get every Republican, defeat every Republican, who is a Member of this House and who had been an isolationist prior to December 7.

Further I said this:

I ask Prosecutor Maloney: Does he favor the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes? Does he think it adds to the war effort to tell the people that we should surrender our independence and now join in the united states of the world?

He has not answered those questions, and I presume his answer would be no, the same as mine. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, information given to the grand jury is supposed to be secret. I was given permission and was requested to tell what Mr. Ahern had said. That is, the attorney asked me, as also did the foreman of the grand jury. Otherwise the proceedings are secret. Yet I find in the Washington Post under date of April 10—and I think Miss Boyer was called down before the grand jury on the 2d of April—this story:

Omaha editor jailed in Axis agents' probe; refuses to tell who printed seditious card mailed with Hoffman's speech.

He goes on down and gives an account like this:

The roll call of all those who got the reprints in bulk from HOFFMAN is something that only the Michigan isolationist himself can reveal in full.

I think that would be correct, with this qualification—that that testimony from Miss Boyer was given before the grand jury and my query is, How does the reporter for the Post get that information?

Note the reporter, in his smear effort, still calls me an isolationist. He knows very well that since December 7 there are no isolationists, but he wants to continue to smear. Neither he nor his editor apparently care anything about national unity. Or perhaps they both think that we have so little spirit left that, by abuse, they can drive us into silence on all subjects.

We, who prior to December 7 were isolationists; who wanted to prepare this country for national defense; who wanted to retain here at home for our own safety at least some of the implements of war, will do as much—perhaps more—toward the winning of this war than those who were so eager to see an expeditionary force; who were so earnest in their desire that a war be fought by us across the seas; those who since Pearl Harbor have persisted, and still persist, in wasteful, needless spending for nonessential, nondefense purposes.

Getting back now to this question of the secrecy of the proceedings before the grand jury. In this article in the Washington Post the reporter stated that the list of those who had received copies of the speech, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," included at least a dozen. The article then gave the names of nine persons, one in Kansas City; one at Wichita, Kans.; one in Cleveland; one in Washington; one in Hempstead, L. I.; one in Lincoln, Nebr.; another in Detroit, Mich.; another in Brooklyn, N. Y.; another in San Francisco.

Certainly the reporter did not get those names from me, nor did he get them from anyone in my office. Where did he get them? Does he claim that he traveled to those various cities, interviewed the recipients? And how did he know who they were?

Certainly, Mr. Maloney, as special prosecutor did not give out that information. Is it possible that Mr. Maloney, the individual, inadvertently, unintentionally, let it leak out?

I would like the privilege of cross-examining that reporter under oath. I would like that privilege of having him called before a committee of the House and then be given the opportunity to inquire into his activities.

Where did he get that information? Certainly he did not get it from any member of the grand jury. No one on that grand jury would violate his oath about disclosing information of that kind. Where did the gentleman get it? Let Mr. Maloney answer, if he knows. Let his investigators answer. Let those who guard the secrecy of the grand jury room make answer. There is the list of seven or more names who obtained copies of that speech. From whence came that information?

Because there was criticism of the use of that speech, and at the risk of repetition, let me call that to your attention again. There is no claim that the speech contained anything improper. Now get that. They are not criticizing the speech. They are not criticizing the mailing out of the speech by me, because those speeches that went out, except those that went to my district, were not franked out. They were not even in envelopes. They were sent out in the flat. There is no claim that there is any violation of law. There is no claim that there is any violation of any custom or rule of the House. Some of them fell into the hands of a man named Hudson. He remailed them at his own expense, in his own envelopes, and included with them what is known as seditious matter. So throughout the press, especially the lying Washington Post, I am smeared as being pro-Nazi.

I wonder how that really works. I will follow that up. But first of all I want to call your attention to this: When I came back here a week ago today I found on my desk letters, stamps, silver, bills, money orders, and express orders with requests for more than 14,000 copies of that speech. In view of the criticism that was made on the floor, although I realized that failure to send those speeches out would amount to a suppression of free speech and free press to those who requested them, and because of that criticism I took that file and I showed it to a prominent member on the Democratic side, a member whose opinion I value highly. He said to me, "I would not send them out." I said, "Why?" His reply was, "Well, if you had a pocket knife, you would not want that pocket knife to be used to stab someone, would you?" I said, "Assuredly not; there is no question about that. But what would you do? Abolish the manufacture of pocket knives?" "Well, maybe." Then I said to

that gentleman, "If you sent out an editorial which you approved and the recipient of that editorial remailed it in an envelope of his own, with an obscene postcard, would you expect to be held to account for it?" Naturally, there was no answer to that. He said, "Anyway, I would not send them out."

So I consulted another equally prominent Member on the Democratic side, a man of unquestioned patriotism, a man of good judgment He looked over the file and he read some of the letters. There was one from a Methodist Church warden, who said he wanted 10 or 12 copies to give to members of his board. This gentleman said, "Why, by all means send them out. Why not? You are not to blame if they fall into the hands of someone who uses them improperly," as, of course, I am not.

However, I concluded that I would take a course betwixt and between, so last Saturday I dictated a letter and had it mimeographed. I will put it in the RECORD.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] has a special order to follow the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STEVENSON. That will be satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker. I will grant that request.

Mr. RICH. May I make a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1942.

FELLOW AMERICAN: The stamps, cash, check, money or express order, to the amount of —— enclosed with your recent letter requesting ——— copies of "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," is returned herewith.

A campaign is being carried on by a politically powerful group to suppress free speech and a free press and to prevent the people learning all of the facts connected with the effort which is being made by our enemies from within to destroy our independence and our National Government.

Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito are openly waging warfare to destroy us. A powerful, apparently well-financed, group here in this country has so little faith in our institutions, in our Constitution, that they, boring from within, recently by full-page advertisements in metropolitan papers and by petition to Congress, asked that we repudiate the Declaration of Independence, adopt a declaration of interdependence, haul down the Stars and Stripes. Now, while we are engaged in a foreign war, they bring on a domestic conflict over the issue of whether we should change our form of government by becoming a part of a world supergovernment, called a United States of the World—this before the war is won.

In opposition to that movement to destroy our national identity, on the 27th and again on the 30th of January last, talks on the floor of the House were made by me. Later, a woman known to me to be a loyal, patriotic American, came to my office; asked if, by paying the Public Printer's charge, she could obtain copies of those two speeches, which had been consolidated by me to send out to the residents of my district. She was told that she could. She paid for the speeches and, at the request of her associate, they were sent—not in franked envelopes—to the persons designated.

Later, it developed that some of those speeches came into the hands of third persons who, at their own expense, not in franked envelopes, sent them out with publications of their own, which I had never seen; of which I do not approve.

I am no more responsible for this use of my talk than you would be, had you given a convict a copy of a gospel hymn or of the Lord's Prayer and he had included it in an envelope directed to an associate.

Nevertheless, apparently because of the action of these third persons, with whom I have no connection, a clerk in my office has four times, as I have once, been called before a special grand jury. All the information sought by the special prosecutor could have been obtained from me by either a phone call or a letter, and that without waste of time.

The speech, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," contains nothing improper. But, because of the fact that someone evidently sent out, without my knowledge or consent, several copies with material of their own, I am now taking the unusual course of refusing to send out, in quantities, for redistribution, copies of this or any other statement, except to those personally known to me. Hence, you will see why your request is not granted.

However, I am enclosing without charge 10 copies of that speech, and a copy will be mailed to any of your friends who may so request.

I regret that the enemies of free speech, of a free press, have become so powerful that they are able, through misrepresentation and downright falsehood, to make it inexpedient to send on the full number of copies which you desire.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

You see the result. They charge that these speeches if sent out in a proper way might nevertheless fall into the hands of someone who would send along with them some pro-Hitler thought. Hence I have refused to send them out in bulk. Now I just received a phone call from a Miss McCaughlin, of Philadelphia, whose money I returned, who wanted 2,000 copies. She said: "I do not see why we cannot have them." I tried to explain it to her. She said: "I am coming down to Washington to get the copies." "Then," I said, "Have your Congressman come in and introduce you and tell me that you are an honest, loyal, American citizen." If she is a member of the church, an earnest Christian mother, that would not be enough under the restriction some seek to impose, "Or," I said, "bring affidavits from some well-known citizens in Philadelphia who can vouch for your loyalty." Why? Because I am going to give her a speech that is improper? No; because I am going to give her a speech that advocates the preservation of our Union; but I do not want any of my speeches to be used even as gun wads, if they use them that way, by American or British soldiers to shoot over toward Hitler, because he might salvage them as waste paper and use them. I do not want him to get aid even by doing that. I want to avoid every action which might discourage anyone who wants to aid in the winning of this war.

Now, what am I to do when this woman comes down next week and wants 2,000 copies of a talk which pleads for the preservation of our national existance? What condition are we in when one who speaks for his country is smeared because those who are desirous of hauling down our flag want the gag applied to all who speak in behalf of our country and at the same time oppose the surrender of our independence. Do you know any reason why a speech entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes" and which is in opposition to these people who want to betray our Nation now at the outset of the war should not be delivered for redistribution to honest Americans?

Look here. I hold in my hand a return envelope and a circular letter from Charles Davis. Who is Charles Davis? He is the head of the World Fellowship, Inc. That is the gentleman whose circular I put in the RECORD on the 30th day of January and then spoke against his plan to destroy our national identity. He is the man who wanted us to appropriate $1,100,000,000 to right now—not after the war but right now—surrender our independence and form a United States of the World. This is dated April 6. What does he say in it? He says, in part:

You were elected to represent your congressional district, State and Nation, if a Congressman, and your State and Nation if a Senator.

We are making plans for the 1942 congressional elections next November.

General MacArthur says: "Men will not fight and men will not die unless they know what they are fighting for and what they are dying for."

None of us yet know.

What do you know about that? Is he that dumb? Let me read:

PM, since March 9, 1942, has been asking: "What are we fighting for?" To date, no answer. For 2½ years many of us have asked the same question with no answer as yet.

I thought we were fighting for the preservation of the United States of America and, as the President has said, for the extension of the four freedoms to all the world and across the seven seas. That is what I supposed; yet this man says he does not know, he is asking that question. If I ask that question on the floor here how soon would it be before I would be branded by the Washington Post as pro-Hitler? Yet this man asks it. MacArthur apparently was concerned. Though I do not know the date of the quotation, MacArthur and his men know why they are fighting even though Davis and PM profess they do not. "What are we fighting for?" This fellow Davis continues:

To date, no answer. For 2½ years many of us have asked the same question with no answer as yet. Why? Because our leaders have confused us. Have left us in uncer-

tainty. Have given us meaningless generalities. We need a concrete goal worth fighting for when we will fight, 130,000,000 strong.

Then he goes on and advocates the surrender of our independence the formation of this world government right now.

It was in opposition to that kind of claptrap of seditious argument that I made my talk on the floor, and I intend to continue my effort just as long as the good Lord permits me to breathe, because there is no purpose in fighting a war if after the war is over we find we have surrendered our independence hauled down our flag and become a puppet nation.

I suggest to Special Attorney Maloney that he call Davis down here and tell Davis what we are fighting for and investigate why it is that my statements or the statements of any man made prior to December 7, who did not want to get into this war—and do not forget the President told us that every move we made was for the purpose of keeping us out of war—should be criticized by the proponents of internationalism and who now are yelling because the war for the moment is not going as well as we wish. Let the squawkers who were shouting for war forget their professions, their banks, their rostrums, their stores, factories, and mines and devote themselve to the war effort, as those who did not want war, but accept it are doing.

There are many things that a special attorney can investigate. If my statements are used by Hitler, and if your statements are used by Hitler, what about this one. Going one step further with the argument of those who say that because patriotic utterances of mine were misused I am responsible; listen to this last night from New York by Walter Winchell:

Detroit.—An intimate friend of Father Coughlin is Gerald L. K. Smith. He is carrying on similar pro-Axis propaganda, which, appropriately enough, is printed on yellow paper. He is a former member of Pelley's Silver Shirts.

I think Winchell said, "His number was 3223."

But most shocking of all, this pro-Hitler propagandist received the written support of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

A Member of the other body.

Robert McWilliams is now making speeches in the city of Chicago. Perhaps the Federal prosecutor, William Powers Maloney, who is so busy doing a great job, is not down to the McW's yet.

Is Maloney responsible for what McWilliams said? Are Maloney and Winchell teaming together?

I ask the House of Representatives this question: Here is Walter Winchell, an officer in the Navy, a lieutenant commander on the President's staff, is he not? Let him produce the record if that charge is not accurate. Do not forget he is an officer in the Navy Since when were officers of the Navy chosen to criticize Members of Congress? This Walter Winchell an officer of the Navy, announces that a pro-Nazi propagandist has received the written support of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. Is that not good news to Hitler? Will the short-wave stations make the air of Europe vibrate with the false statement of Winchell that a Member of the other body—chairman of the great Committee on Military Affairs—gives written support to a pro-Hitler propagandist? How much longer is Winchell to be permitted while an officer of the Navy to undermine the faith of our people in their representatives? Let the President get rid of this man who is spreading that kind of propaganda.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANDOLPH). Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

POWDERED MILK—THE GREAT ASSET TO OUR WAR PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that one-third of the men who have been rejected from service in our Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Corps, were rejected because of malnutrition and nutritional deficiencies. Our armed forces have been deprived of some 150,000 men for physical defects, and from causes due to under nourishment. General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, has publicly stated that this is a condition that should be recognized as dangerous; and that immediate and positive measures should be taken to overcome this condition.

One industry in the United States that can perform a miracle as a positive measure to combat malnutrition among our people is that of powdered milk. We are feeding over 60,000,000 quarts of separated milk every day to farm animals. This milk can be made into powdered milk, that needs no refrigeration, and it cannot freeze. A quart of it can be packed in a small paper bag of one-tenth the shipping weight of ordinary milk. In compressed form, powdered milk will occupy only a small fraction of the space used in shipping ordinary milk.

Think what this means in transporting food for the men in the service of our country and in the service of our Allies. The cost of shipping powdered milk has been reduced to one four-hundredth the cost of transportation of fluid milk.

On that basis, the distance from the vast dairy regions of the United States to the battle fronts can be reduced 400 times. The dairy farms of our country are thus brought within 15 miles of Bataan, 8 miles of England and Ireland, and only 5 miles from Iceland. When we realize that powdered milk is the most precious body-building food in the world; that a quart of powdered milk contains more vitamins and calcium than 14 cups of carrots, 28 eggs, or 168 slices of bread; that doctors and scientists state that it is one of the greatest means for preventing pellagra; and that the vitamin and calcium content of milk will push back old age more than 10 years—think what it would mean to furnish our armies and the armies of our Allies with this wonderful food as a regular daily ration. What a boon that would have been to our boys in Bataan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. He is referring, of course, to powdered whole milk, is he not?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; at this point. I will refer to separated milk a little bit later.

By compressing powdered milk, 150,000 quarts can be transported in one airplane. Our shipping facilities can be increased 12 times by shipping this body-building food to our men on the battle fronts in all parts of the world, without building one ship; and every single ship added to our fleet transporting compressed powdered milk will be equivalent to 12 ships transporting food to our soldiers under ordinary conditions.

The sunshine vitamin D will play a brilliant part in unlocking this great new milk supply. By the Steenbock process powdered milk may be supercharged with vitamin D at an incredibly low cost. The Steenbock process was discovered by that great scientist and philanthropist of my own State of Wisconsin, who trapped the summer sun, and whom the whole world honors. This will extend the blessings of vitamin D and powdered milk to many millions of people, who have never been blessed with the sunshine of this rare vitamin. Already, I am informed that the Vita-Milk Co., of Sauk City, Wis., right in my own congressional district, has actually enriched powdered milk with this sunshine vitamin on a commercial scale. This process can be extended almost without limit and at little expense. An article appearing in the June issue of the national Kiwanis magazine extolling the virtues of powdered milk under the title, "The Most Powerful Milk in the World," should awaken wide and universal interest in this new food.

POWDERED-MILK INDUSTRY MEANS MUCH TO DAIRY FARMER

This new industry will mean much to our dairy farmers. More money will be made in powdered milk than in any other farm product. Now that Wisconsin and other dairy States face the prospect of milk being dumped in the gutters and elsewhere, during the flush season, attention will be focused sharply on the need of drying facilities. This means that the demand for milk-drying equipment is going to become so intense that great numbers of farm cooperatives and others are going to be left wanting and without drying equipment, as concerns production of powdered milk, unless they put up a concerted effort for lifting priorities on milk-drying machinery.

It is of paramount importance to all dairymen that they realize that powdered milk opens up national and international markets to milk from Wisconsin and other dairy States, on a scale that few men have hitherto dared to dream. Dr. Carlos C. Van Leer of Washington recently stated that powdered milk can be shipped to all parts of the United States, and to all large population centers throughout the country, from all dairy regions at a transportation cost of one four-hundredths the cost of transporting ordinary milk. The implications of this fact are of sensational importance, and should be made widely known in all dairy regions. A nationally known executive in the dairy industry has declared that the dried-milk industry has a great

future and that the surface has just been scratched in this field. I wish this statement could be framed and indelibly written in the minds of everyone concerned with milk production, especially in my own State of Wisconsin because the epic of powdered milk is largely a saga of the Wisconsin pioneering spirit.

SPECIAL INTEREST TO BUTTER PRODUCERS

The story of powdered separated milk is of particular interest to all butter producers. The net profits from the production of powdered separated milk will be important. For every pound of butter produced, about 10 quarts of separated milk remain as a byproduct. As much money is locked up in those 10 quarts of byproduct as there is in a pound of butter. Milk producers who can ship fresh separated milk to drying facilities will double their cash income because they will get two checks for their milk—one for the butterfat, and another check for the separated milk. This is already being done by some farmers. In many instances a dairy farmer can step up his net profits sharply, because he has already paid the cost of producing the separated milk, in producing the butterfat.

This new powdered-milk industry can be set up in many areas in our dairy States. Many industrial plants have been pulled out of the red by efficient utilization of its byproducts. The dairy industry is no exception. Interest in this new industry should be keen on the part of all dairymen who want added net profits and larger milk checks.

The powdered-milk industry has broken all production records in the dairy field even without the benefits of advertising. As our people learn of the virtues and healthful benefits of powdered milk, with its wonderful vitamin and calcium content, and its body-building elements, and that it is our strongest ally in overcoming malnutrition, and winning the battle of transportation, powdered milk will virtually take the world by storm.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, is it more important for our country to compel every man and woman who wants to work to join a union, or is it more important that we have all men work and not shirk in their duty of furnishing arms, ships, airplanes, and the munitions that our armed forces need and need now—"now" means at once—to win this war?

My answer is that we need production, we need ships, ammunition, airplanes, and munitions of war at once, if the war is to be won.

I want to read to you today a letter that came to me from a club in the State of Pennsylvania that was assembled on March 26:

At which meeting it was unanimously adopted to inform you of their sentiments which are expressed in an editorial from a letter to the editor of the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., of February 28, 1942, entitled "Let All Keep Faith," which they earnestly commend for your attention and congressional adoption:

"My only son was born while I was in France during the first World War. He is a member of the United States Marine Corps, sailed from California the 1st of January, and we have heard nothing from him since. We are anxious about him. Thousands of other parents are like us. The President says we do not have enough ships, and that we must build ships in a hurry. Even as he spoke several hundred shipbuilders refused to work because they were not paid double time.

"How can fathers and mothers of boys who are being called upon to sacrifice their lives feel any surge of unity when the President and the Congress permit a bunch of shipbuilders and munitions workers to quit when they get good and ready? Do our boys at the front get overtime and double time in the fox holes of the Philippines? Do our sons who are giving their lives to protect the jobs of these and others like them quit on holidays? Like hell they do!

"One of my friends, a good mechanic, with a family to support, went to get a job in a munitions plant. Every day we hear that such men are needed to turn out munitions for our soldiers, sailors, and marines. But this man was refused a job until he could get a union card. He could not get a union card because he did not have enough money to buy one.

"Is it the idea of our Government that it is more important to preserve labor unions than it is to preserve the American Union? Why can't a free-born American citizen get a job in a plant where the Government needs workers without having to pay tribute to a high-powered labor leader?

"If our sons are to be drafted to give their lives for their country, why should not labor and capital be drafted to supply them with munitions of war? Why should Congress, which has the power to make laws, be so tender to the regard for laborers and management who work and prosper in safety while having an utter disregard for the lives of the boys at the front?

"We don't like it, and we don't mind saying so. Maybe it is time we were electing some Senators and Congressmen who will crack down and compel capital and labor to get into this war. And, come to think of it, this is election year, and we might as well get busy while we have the time and opportunity.

"JOHN C. SHEFFIELD."

That is what that club stated.

I also received in this morning's mail a letter addressed, "To all United States Congressmen":

On March 13 our truck delivered a load to the Apex Oil Products Co., of Minneapolis, and on leaving their warehouse was stopped by representatives of the teamsters' union and taken to their headquarters and held for $31.50 dues. Our driver called us, and by our calling back and having Mr. Hornibrook, of the Apex Oil Products Co., obtain police escort, our driver was able to leave the city and State. We sent our driver back with another load on the 17th, and he had with him on this trip the application and the money to buy a license for the truck. He called Mr. Hornibrook before entering Minneapolis and was informed that the union would not permit our truck to unload at their warehouse, and therefore would have to unload outside the city limits. He was unable to come inside Minneapolis or St. Paul to obtain the license. It now appears that the union shall forbid us to enter Minneapolis, and we shall be unable to operate our truck in Minnesota, and therefore will not need a license.

On March 14 we wired Governor Stassen the following:

"The teamsters' union of Minneapolis has tied up our truck and demands that our driver join the union before they permit him to move. Is Minnesota in the United States, and do your laws permit such outrageous acts?"

Have had no reply from this wire. We would like to operate our truck in Minneapolis and would like to know if the State government has any suggestions how this may be done without paying blackmail to the unions.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly time for the Congress to act. This business of pussyfooting while Rome burns has just about reached the height of absurdity so far as the American people are concerned. The American people back home cannot stand it very much longer. If the Congress does not do something about these people who are putting the union card above the interests of this country, the people of the country will wake up and defeat every Member of the Congress, and I hope they will do that if the Congress does not do something. I do not care whether the Member is on the Republican side or the Democratic, or New Deal side of this House. It is about time that we got action.

We passed a law in the House, but the Senate buried it. I am told that the Chief Executive did not want the law passed. Well, it is about time that the Chief Executive and the other legislative branch of this Government wake up to the peril that America faces. We are at war and we cannot afford to have our men lying in fox holes or on the battle front without furnishing them the guns and the ammunition when they are willing to sacrifice their lives. God knows, it is the business of the Congress, it is the business of the American workingman to furnish the tools for our soldiers to fight with.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Times-Herald there appeared an article by one Willard Edwards headed "Dies committee work blocked by delay in providing funds—COCHRAN group stalling in spite of overwhelming House vote, backers say."

About the only truth there is in this article is quotations from the letter of the chairman of the Dies committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], wrote me, and which he sent to several Members of the House, other than that meetings I have called have been postponed.

The Committee on Accounts is an agent of the House, not a legislative committee, and when the House acts the Committee on Accounts has always taken the position that it is mandatory to vote funds so that a select committee can carry out the purposes of the resolution which the House has adopted. Who am I to tell the House that the Dies committee is not going to function, when the House by an overwhelming majority said that it shall function until January 3 next?

As soon as the House acted on the Dies committee extension resolution I wrote a letter to the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. DIES]. First I called him on the telephone and I asked his office where he was. They could not tell me. For 2 days I tried to get him. Finally they told me he had gone to Texas. I wrote the gentleman from Texas a letter and asked him when he would be back. It seems to me that when a committee of this House spends $385,000 the committee that is responsible for bringing in a resolution voting additional funds to that committee is entitled to know a little about what they have been doing with the money and what they are going to do with the additional money that is to be appropriated. I think that is reasonable.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] wrote me and told me that there was serious illness in his family and he would not be able to be back here. I stated on the floor of the House that I felt that was justification for any Members being absent. Later I read where he is to hold hearings at his home in Texas.

The gentleman from Texas made a lot of statements in that letter he sent me which somebody evidently let Mr. Edwards have.

Mr. Edwards at the outset, after stating that the Committee on Accounts generally meets immediately and votes money for a select committee, uses this language:

In the case of the Dies committee, however, Chairman COCHRAN, a foe of the subversive investigation, has persistently postponed action on a fresh fund for Chairman MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and his group.

He says further:

The committee's previous appropriation was exhausted more than a month ago and employees have gone without their pay since then Investigators are stranded in cities throughout the Nation, without salary or expenses Clerks and stenographers in the Washington headquarters are existing on borrowed money.

I have from time to time advised the Dies committee how much money was left of its appropriation. I have asked the committee chairman to stay within the appropriation until Congress appropriated more money for its use. I knew they were running a deficit. The committee held out sufficient money to pay their March salaries with the exception of two people, who voluntarily said, "We will wait until you give the committee more money." As I say, they paid the March salaries with the exception of two people employed in the office of the committee here. I knew, however, they were running a deficit because they had not been sending in for 6 weeks or 2 months any expense vouchers.

When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] advised me he could not appear before the Committee on Accounts, I wanted to get a little information as to what the deficit was. I asked for that and wrote a letter to the committee. I did not get any answer. I called a meeting of the Accounts Committee, and if I had received that information the Accounts Committee would have acted and the matter would have been out of the way now. I was not going ahead with the meeting of the Accounts Committee until I found out what that deficit was.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] said in his letter to me the chief clerk of the committee or a lady clerk in the office could give me the information. The chief clerk of the committee told me he could not give me that information without the permission of the gentleman from Texas. I read that part of the letter to him over the telephone. Then he said, "We will send it to you." He did in about 2 days. There was about a $7,500 deficit, as I anticipated.

I called a meeting of the committee for tomorrow. Now I have been requested by the ranking member of the Dies committee to postpone that meeting until Wednesday, he saying that he cannot be here tomorrow, but will be here Wednesday. He is out of the city.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I feel either the chairman or the ranking member of the Dies committee should be present, I am going to postpone the meeting called for Tuesday until Wednesday morning at 10:30 and I am so advising all those interested. The meeting will certainly be held Wednesday morning and if the Accounts Committee orders a resolution reported, which I think it will do, the resolution will be called up immediately after the House convenes Thursday.

As far as being an opponent of the Dies committee is concerned, I know the record will show that I have voted for the committee all along, sometimes reluctantly, I will admit. I voted for the McCormack committee and for the resolutions appropriating money for it. I have handled the resolutions that have appropriated $385,000 for the Dies committee, more money than any select committee of the House has ever had in its history. Even if I had voted against the extension of the Dies committee, which I did not do, as chairman of the Accounts Committee representing the House of Representatives I would abide by the mandate of the House of Representatives and bring in some kind of a resolution appropriating additional funds or have some member of the committee bring a resolution if it carried an amount to which I objected.

There has been no unnecessary delay. This committee is functioning today, just as it did during January, February, and March. It is running a deficit, I admit, but it is going to get money if the House approves a resolution, which I know it will do. The Committee on Accounts is going to bring in such a resolution.

I am offering no apologies for the failure of the Committee on Accounts to act. Also I do want to say that there is no friction in the committee. But I insist the committee is entitled to information about what the Dies committee is going to do with the additional money. I have to stand on this floor when that resolution comes in here for 1 full hour, and be bombarded by questions. Where am I going to get information other than from the committee? What I want is to get the information so that I can answer the questions that will be asked here.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says that Mr. DIES was down in Texas sick and could not be present.

Mr. COCHRAN. No; a member of his family is sick, so he advised me.

Mr. RICH. That was a legitimate excuse for his not being here.

Mr. COCHRAN. I feel that it is.

Mr. RICH. The House passed a resolution extending the life of the Dies committee.

Mr COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman is chairman of the Accounts Committee, and the gentleman knows that the Dies committee does not have any funds and is running a deficit. The gentleman knows somebody is responsible for that deficit and if the Accounts Committee does not appropriate the money the Dies committee or somebody over there is going to have to pay the bills or somebody will lose.

Mr. COCHRAN. Who is going to pay the bills, you ask? You know the members of the Dies committee are not going to pay the bills, and no one wants them to. We are going to provide for the payment of the bills.

Mr. RICH. No committee of the House can function if they have not the money to function with, as the chairman of the Accounts Committee knows In the first place, you know and I know that the things that are most dangerous to this country right now are the subversive activities and the activities of fifth columnists.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not in favor of subversive activities. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. RICH. If there is anything going on that we ought to stop, that is certainly what it is.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course; but do not forget the Dies committee is functioning; so is the F. B. I. and the Army and Navy Intelligence Divisions.

Mr. RICH. Your committee is going to meet tomorrow. An appropriation of $300,000 has been suggested, and you know if there is anybody who wants to economize, I am that one. but let us get some action here.

Mr. COCHRAN. You will get some action. You would have had action if we had the information on which to proceed. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee. Would you bring in an appropriation bill until you had information to support it that the House would want?

Mr. RICH. We have brought lots of them in here and we have passed them when we did not know what they were for.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, if the Accounts Committee meets tomorrow, we will bring in a resolution on Wednesday. If the committee meets Wednesday, we will bring in a resolution Thursday. Of course, the Members want some notice as

to when it is coming up, and I want to be in position, when I do bring the resolution in, to be able to answer questions that Members will put to me, and I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be one of those Members who will be on his feet asking questions.

Mr. RICH Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. RICH. I want to pay the gentleman a compliment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Never mind; I do not need them now. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. He has paid me compliments heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to answer the article in the paper and to protect the Accounts Committe, because it is composed of gentlemen who act by mandate of the House of Representatives and act intelligently.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to answer the statement of this writer who says administration forces are responsible for the delay in making the appropriation. There is not a word of truth in that statement. No member of this administration has approached me concerning this additional appropriation.

I have received many telegrams and letters opposing an additional appropriation, but I have advised those wiring and writing that money must be appropriated now that the House has continued the life of the committee. Many individuals and organizations have demanded that they be heard. To them I have said the Accounts Committee is not what can be called a legislative committee; that they should have appeared before the Rules Committee. I have been on this committee for over 15 years, and the policy has always been to hear only Members of Congress. Those Members who have expressed a desire to be heard will be advised when the committee meets, so they can be present if they desire.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, coming down on the train from New York this morning I picked up the New York Times and I read a very interesting story about the *Normandie*. I will give you three lead paragraphs:

As fire fighters finished their work yesterday and salvage crews went back to an increasingly complicated job, naval and police officials were silent concerning the latest fire on the former French liner *Normandie* off West Forty-eighth Street.

The huge ship, taken over for United States military use, caught fire Saturday night for the third time in 3 months. According to the police, a spark from a workman's torch, as on previous occasions, started a blaze in a rear subhold.

Although early reports Saturday night indicated that the fire started in cork insulation in a refrigerating compartment, a Navy spokesman said it began in decomposed stores that salvage workers were attempting to remove.

This is a fire that occurred after the recent congressional investigation which found that the original disaster was due to extreme carelessness. It presents a most distressing picture, most disturbing to the American people, and I think it would be most uplifting to the morale and the psychology of our people if the Government authorities and those in charge of this work would only give us some reasonable assurance that this great ship will not be further destroyed.

I was in New York City yesterday. I made it a point to see the *Normandie*. I stood on the shore with hundreds of others, men and women, boys and girls, all bowed dejectedly, looking at that great ship lying on its side in the muck off the French pier at Forty-eighth Street—a most disturbing scene. I stood alongside an old man. While most of the folks there were very silent, I heard him muttering to himself. I heard him say, "There is something rotten on the *Normandie*," and I was thinking that same thought myself. There is something rotten on the *Normandie*, and it is not decomposed material. That rottenness spells extreme negligence, carelessness of the worst sort, and I think it behooves those in charge of this salvaging effort to go ahead as expeditiously, as carefully and as guarded as possible, to see that we have something left of the world's greatest liner, now in our possession.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If the workmen are going to continue to use blow torches, in reconditioning that ship, does the gentleman not think it would be a good thing to ask the mayor to keep a portion of the fire department there alongside of the workmen all of the time, so that when they do set a fire to it, they could put it out immediately?

Mr. CANFIELD. That might be well. It seems that a scorch-the-ship policy is being pursued and we do not want it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 21, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a meeting on Tuesday, April 21, 1942, at 11 a. m. in room 247, House Office Building, for the purpose of considering private bills.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, April 22, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. In re. H. R 6858 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6885 to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., April 20 and 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1584. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1585. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of William Edward Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

1586. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and approved by the Governor, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the municipal councils in the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1587. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1588. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and approved by the Governor, pur-

suant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the municipal councils in the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1589. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a report of a survey of the Trinity River watershed in Texas based on an investigation authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 708); to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Resolution 162. Resolution authorizing and directing an investigation of the naval defense program; without amendment (Rept No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2032) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 2226. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line; without amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6646. A bill to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6824. A bill to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6926. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6927. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 6948. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6949. A bill to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6950. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6951. A bill to amend subsections (b) and (d) of section 77 of the Judicial Code so as to transfer the county of Butts from the Macon division of the middle district of Georgia to the Atlanta division of the northern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 6952. A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 6953. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6954. A bill to authorize officers and members of the armed forces to accept certain rewards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 6955. A bill to promote the prosecution of the war by exempting from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property for use in performing defense contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6956. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 6957. A bill to make the theft of tires and tubes a Federal offense during any period during which restrictions on the sale or use of tires or tubes are in effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 6958. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the postal service employed in a dual capacity; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6959. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1940, by addition of section 303 (a) to the Code of the United States of 1941 fixing the time that any citizen of the United States may be considered a subject for service training required by the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6960. A bill for the compensation of property owners in territory to be taken for bombing and target ranges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 6961. A bill to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans as a body corporate of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6962 (by request). A bill to extend provisions of the act of March 20, 1933, and Veterans Regulations applicable to World War veterans and dependents to veterans and dependents of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6963. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6964 A bill to authorize the assessor of the District of Columbia to compromise inheritance and estate taxes in cases of conflicting claims of domicile; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr HOBBS:

H. J. Res 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. Res. 469. Resolution providing for the payment out of the contingent fund of the House of $140.75 to William A. Pixley as reimbursement for the value of a camera lost while in the custody of the Capitol Police; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mark Dobbs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6966. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6967. A bill for the relief of Douglas R. Muther; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6968. A bill for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Frank Franklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Carolyn D. Griffin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2690. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution presented by Miss Aurora Sylvia and adopted by the officers and members of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Rhode Island at their annual convention, February 15, 1942, sincerely endorsing all measures adopted by

the United States Government to bring to a final success and victory this war for the preservation of our democracy and the peace of the world, and pledging themselves to the United States regardless of what nation or nations which are now or may hereafter enter into war against this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2691. Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, urging Congress to curtail immediately all expenditures which are not necessary to the prosecution of the war even though such curtailment involves the same sort of sacrifice in governmental fields that the Government now expects in fields of business and personal activity; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2692. Also, resolution presented by Dominique S. Pavou and adopted by the officers and members of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Rhode Island at their annual convention, February 15, 1942, pledging themselves to do everything within their power, even to the sacrificing of their lives, in order that the privileges, opportunities, and liberties afforded them by the United States might be preserved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2693. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Sixty-fourth Assembly District Democratic Club of Los Angeles, Calif., vigorously protesting against the antilabor bills introduced in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Labor.

2694. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of S. I. Acheson, of Moline, Ill., and 55 signers, supporting House bill 4000, relative to the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages in all military establishments and areas adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2695. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Richland, Iowa, urging favorable consideration of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2696. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of R. L. Hibbs, secretary of the Louisa County Better Schools Association, and superintendent of schools, Columbus Junction, Iowa, urging the continuation of the National Youth Administration program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2697. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Minerva B. Marshall and sundry citizens of Franklin, Mass., recommending the enactment of legislation to divert all grains and fruits from the manufacture of distilled, fermented, and malt beverages to the manufacture of materials for defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2698. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Sheet Metal Contractors Association of Wisconsin, requesting Congress to pass legislation immediately prohibiting any discrimination whatsoever against any American citizen employed or seeking employment in any industry turning out, or servicing, or transporting any requirements for which the taxpayers' money is to be expended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2699. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Milton, Wis., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2700. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mrs. H. Carl Nelson and 35 other citizens of Cartersville, Ga., and vicinity, in favor of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2701. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Waco Rotary Club, Waco, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to all-out effort for defeat of the enemies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2702. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the citizenship and patriotism committee, San Francisco Lions Club, relative to the California State Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Israel Goldstein, of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, of New York, and president of the Synagogue Council of America, offered the following prayer:

Lord, who art our refuge in all generations and art near to all who call upon Thee in truth, we pray that the deliberations of the Representatives of the American people here assembled may be informed with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, counsel and strength, knowledge and fear of the Lord. Grant us understanding great enough to pierce the confusion which our foes are striving to bring into our midst by fomenting suspicion and ill will between group and group. Grant us strength equal to the burdens of battle. Grant us faith commensurate with the desperate need for a better world.

We lift our hearts with thanksgiving that a people of diverse strands, we are indivisible in the bond of allegiance; that a people of several creeds, we are of one faith touching our destiny as sponsor and guarantor of the concepts of human freedom.

May Thy protection be vouchsafed unto the Chief Executive of our Nation and unto all who with him are entrusted with the safeguarding of our rights and our liberties, our lives, our security, and our honor, our commonweal of body and spirit—be their places in the halls of government, on the fields and lanes of battle, in the farms, factories, and offices, or in the homes, schools, and churches.

May victory crown our hopes, our labors, and our sacrifices and bring nearer the day when all men shall dwell in safety, everyone under his vine and under his fig tree, with none to make him afraid. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

LT. COMDR. EDWARD H. O'HARE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, because I had the honor in 1933 to appoint Edward H. O'Hare, of St. Louis, to the Naval Academy, the President this morning invited me to be present at the White House at which time he not only presented Lieutenant O'Hare with the Congressional Medal of Honor but also promoted him to the rank of lieutenant commander. The President in his citation praised Lieutenant Commander O'Hare, America's outstanding naval ace, for destroying six Japanese planes which attacked the carrier to which Lieutenant Commander O'Hare was assigned in the Far East.

The Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, who was also present announced he had awarded to the city of St. Louis the Navy E—excellency—because it was the first city in the Nation to fill its quota in the Navy relief drive. St. Louis is the first city to be so recognized.

Lieutenant Commander O'Hare was designated by the Secretary of the Navy to present the Navy E pennant to the city of St. Louis next Saturday. Naturally I was happy and proud, as are the people of my congressional district and the city of St. Louis.

Just prior to presenting the medal the President said:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Congressional Medal of Honor to Lt. Edward H. O'Hare, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in aerial combat, at grave risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty, as section leader and pilot of fighting squadron 3, when on February 20, 1942, having lost the assistance of his teammates, he interposed his plane between his ship and an advancing enemy formation of nine attacking twin-engined heavy bombers. Without hesitation, alone and unaided, he repeatedly attacked this enemy formation at close range in the face of their intense combined machine gun and cannon fire, and despite this concentrated opposition, he, by his gallant and courageous action, his extremely skillful marksmanship, making the most of every shot of his limited amount of ammunition, shot down five enemy bombers and severely damaged a sixth before they reached the bomb-release point.

"As a result of his gallant action, one of the most daring, if not the most daring single action in the history of combat aviation, he undoubtedly saved his carrier from serious damage."

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 23, after the completion of the regular legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ISLAND OF MADAGASCAR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, apparently Vichy France has sold out to the Nazis, but that does not mean that all of the French have sold out, by any means. I believe that the Free French and the millions of those within Vichy France who are determined to be free some day, would welcome the taking by the United Nations of that highly important and strategic island of Madagascar, off the southeast coast of Africa. Madagascar is the key to India, the Persian Gulf, Egypt, and Asia Minor. It should be certainly ascertained that Madagascar is in friendly hands, or it should be immediately occupied before it is too late. For Madagascar to fall in unfriendly hands would be a tragedy of the first magnitude to the United Nations in the fight for freedom.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD regarding the Central Valley water project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARBOR DAY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LACK OF SHIPPING PRECLUDES INVASION OF NAZI EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the twentieth convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, which may slightly exceed the prescribed limit; I ask permission to extend it regardless.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Republican Party for its declared intention of abandoning a policy of isolationism. Had the Republican Party followed such a course 23 years ago the present World War probably would not have occurred.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include certain tables I have compiled relative to parity prices; and also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short verse from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Purple Heart magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an appraisal of Cleveland, Ohio, by Pvt. John O'Connor, of the One Hundred and Thirtieth Infantry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an oration by Albert P. Smith, Jr., one of the national finalists of the Legion's oratorical contest last week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the formation of a Palestinian army.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TAXING MUNICIPAL SECURITIES IS AN ADDED BURDEN TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the House Ways and Means Committee have been giving their attention to the proposal to impose a Federal income tax on income derived from municipal securities.

Numerous delegations, representing towns, cities, and counties throughout the Nation, have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and disclosed the undue hardship that is to follow the approval of such a tax.

In my congressional district, boroughs, cities, and counties are experiencing great difficulty in carrying the normal cost of government, and are forced from time to time to refinance outstanding securities to enable them to carry their obligations.

I am voicing opposition to this proposed tax levy because of the fact that it will place additional burdens on the taxpayers of the Nation. In addition, it is a tax on the income of municipal securities which is destined to become so prohibitive that it will seriously retard the refinancing of existing securities and hamper the raising of funds to finance many needed improvements in municipalities throughout the entire Nation.

Already I have received resolutions from the Board of County Commissioners of Clearfield County and Blair County, Pa., opposing the enactment of the proposal to impose a Federal income tax on income derived from municipal securities.

It is significant that such a proposal tends to further increase real-estate taxes and thus places a burden on those who by their industry and thrift have succeeded in obtaining their own homes.

In opposing this proposed tax I know that I voice the sentiments of the various municipal authorities in my district who are vehement in their denunciation of such proposed method of taxation.

(Mr. MACIEJEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the address by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] today, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TENEROWICZ]?

There was no objection.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr KEOGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have read with considerable interest the rather sensational news articles indicating a need for complete revision of certain subjects of law.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws has for several years sought the facilities to do the type of revision that is necessary. Such revision cannot be piecemeal, cannot best be done during a period of emotional stress but, rather, must be a coordinated, integrated program and, above all, must be a permanent, living program, designed to keep abreast of changing times and a changing world.

The committee is ready to assume that task, without in any way invading the prerogatives of any of the other standing committees of the House, but it must have and does seek the cooperation of the leadership and of the membership of the House. I am certain we shall have that cooperation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program is completed, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY]?

There was no objection.

ISOLATIONISM

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York stated a moment ago that isolationism was sunk at Pearl Harbor. The trouble at Pearl Harbor, Mr. Speaker, was that Admiral Kimmel and General Short acted on the theory that the isolationists had been right all along. This group meeting in Chicago, proven wrong by the relentless course of events, now takes the position shortsightedness should be overlooked and seeks to act in an advisory capacity as to the conduct of this war by our Nation which, had the isolationist view prevailed, our Nation before Pearl Harbor on December 7 would have been absolutely defenseless. Isolationists were dead wrong. Had they succeeded in defeating lend-lease and other administration measures, Britain would have been crushed and we would now be on the defensive and suffering losses on South and North American battlefields.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE SMALL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that finance companies are in a position and in some cases are attempting absolutely to destroy the small automobile dealer. These dealers have made payments on their automobiles and many of them have a very large equity. The Government issued a freezing order freezing the sale of automobiles except for certain essential and defense purposes, but they issued no order prohibiting the finance companies from taking these automobiles away from the dealers. Neither has the Government taken any concrete step that I can find to prevent these companies from absolutely going bankrupt. I introduced a bill providing that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could take over all obligations on these automobiles and finance them to protect the dealer's equity and immediately become subrogated to the rights of anyone holding security on these automobiles. This would take care of these automobile dealers, but there is one other way. The Government could buy these automobiles outright and permit the dealers to close their doors if they cared to and save thmeselves from absolute bankruptcy. My good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made the statement on the floor recently that the Appropriations Committee had made appropriations for all procurement purposes desired by the Army and Navy. Then if the Army and Navy do not need any more of these automobiles for defense purposes, they should permit the remainder to be sold to the public. We cannot stand by and see these dealers ruined and insist on action on the bill, H. R. 6918.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a communication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances, and, first, to include a letter from the attorney general of the State of New York, and, secondly, to include the radio address of a former Postmaster General in connection with the Greater New York fund.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday of this week, after disposition of the legislative program and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, those Americans who have been of faint heart should today give consideration to what happened on the banks of the San Jacinto 106 years ago this afternoon. After 2 weeks of heroic resistance against overwhelming odds, every one of the gallant defenders of the Alamo had on the gray dawn of March 6, 1836, fallen before the forces of dictatorship headed by the self-styled "Napoleon of the West"—Antonio López de Santa Anna, dictator of the Southwest. The wave of tyranny rolled on even as it has rolled in Europe and the Far East in recent months. Just as dictatorship was stopped in Texas 106 years ago today so will the dictators of this day and generation meet defeat. The small Texas army had retreated halfway across the breadth of Texas, but on April 21 the moment for action struck, and the matchless Sam Houston led the frontiersmen to victory over the greatly superior forces of Santa Anna.

I think the parallel is clear. I think the people of al. the democratic nations of the world should rejoice today to know that when dictatorship destroys and overwhelms freemen whether it be at the Alamo or on Bataan, there will always be a San Jacinto where liberty will be avenged.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SUPERVISION AND DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has introduced another Hobbs bill known as H. R. 6915. At the conclusion of my remarks I propose to move that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, where this bill belongs. Time does not permit me to go

into a detailed discussion to point out to the House that this bill is absolutely an immigration bill and not a bill for the Committee on the Judiciary but I can give you a short analysis of the bill to prove my point.

Title I of the bill consists of seven sections, each of which provides for the supervision and detention of an alien against whom there is an outstanding warrant of deportation. Deportation, of course, is regulated by the Immigration Act of 1917, and there is no reason why a provision supplementing or amending this act should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary instead of Immigration. In this title every detail is regulated for the benefit of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Title II deals with detention without bail of persons who were ordered deported. It is an express amendment of the act of 1918 dealing with deportations as well as the act of 1922 and section 20 of the act of 1917. Again these are amendments to the immigration law and should not be handled by the Committee on the Judiciary, but the Committee on Immigration.

Title III deals with the exclusion of aliens of certain classes and is again an amendment to the immigration laws. No reason exists why it should be handled by the Committee on the Judiciary instead of the Committee on Immigration.

Title IV of the act deals with the citizenship of a person born of alien parents and is an amendment to the Nationality Act. Again no valid reason exists why this matter should be handled by the Committee on the Judiciary and not the Committee on Immigration.

I am not quarreling with the gentleman from Alabama or the Committee on the Judiciary. I feel, however, that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any other standing committee of this House, should be given an opportunity to discuss and consider its own legislation, because those committees as a rule know more about legislation dealing with subjects under their jurisdiction.

On November 8, 1941, the original Hobbs bill was sent back to the committee for good, and I thought it was going to stay there for good. Now a new bill is introduced which is more vicious and more obnoxious to the American people, in my opinion. It deals 100 percent with aliens and should be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I move that the bill H. R. 6915, now in the Committee on the Judiciary, be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that that motion is not in order. The gentleman has no right to make such a motion without unanimous consent to discharge a committee from the consideration of a bill and refer it to another committee. If that policy were followed we would have chaos in this House practically all the time.

The SPEAKER. The rule is as follows:

All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, endorsed, with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

The Chair asks the gentleman from New York if his committee has directed him to make this motion.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It has, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's motion has come too late. The bill has already been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and printed, and the motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. On the point that the motion comes too late in that business has been transacted in the House today, the Chair may say that since the reading of the Journal the only business that has been transacted has been 1-minute speeches. The Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order of the gentleman from Mississippi on the ground that he thinks it involves too technical a construction of the rule.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the motion that it is made in violation of the rule under which it is supposed to be presented, in that there was debate by the distinguished gentleman from New York for 1 minute immediately preceding the submission of the motion, whereas the opposition is denied that right by the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not know what the gentleman from New York was going to talk about. The Chair cannot look into the mind of a Member when he asks unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and see what he intends to talk about.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 79, noes 25.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 83, answered "present" 2, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—238

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Plauché
Andersen, H. Carl	Gibson	Ploeser
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Plumley
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gillie	Poage
Angell	Gore	Priest
Arnold	Gossett	Rabaut
Barnes	Graham	Ramspeck
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ind.	Randolph
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Rankin, Miss.
Baumhart	Guyer	Reed, Ill.
Beckworth	Gwynne	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett	Haines	Richards
Bishop	Hall, Leonard W.	Rivers
Blackney	Halleck	Rizley
Bland	Hancock	Robertson, N. Dak.
Boehne	Hare	Robertson, Va.
Boggs	Harris, Ark.	Robinson, Utah
Bolton	Hart	Robsion, Ky.
Boren	Hartley	Rockwell
Boykin	Healey	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Heidinger	Rogers, Okla.
Brown, Ga.	Hill, Colo.	Romjue
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Russell
Bryson	Hobbs	Sanders
Bulwinkle	Hoffman	Satterfield
Burch	Hope	Sauthoff
Burgin	Houston	Schuetz
Butler	Hull	Secrest
Camp	Jennings	Shafer, Mich.
Cannon, Mo.	Jensen	Sheppard
Carlson	Johns	Simpson
Carter	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Cartwright	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Luther A.	Smith, W. Va.
Chenoweth	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Chiperfield	Jonkman	South
Claypool	Kerr	Sparkman
Clevenger	Kilday	Spence
Cochran	Kinzer	Springer
Coffee, Nebr.	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Collins	Lambertson	Steagall
Colmer	Landis	Stefan
Cooley	Lane	Stevenson
Cooper	Lanham	Stratton
Copeland	Larrabee	Sullivan
Courtney	Lea	Sumners, Tex.
Cox	LeCompte	Talbot
Cravens	McCormack	Tarver
Crawford	McGehee	Terry
Crowther	McGregor	Thill
Culkin	McIntyre	Thomas, N. J.
Cunningham	McLaughlin	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	McMillan	Thomason
Disney	Maas	Tibbott
Ditter	Mahon	Tolan
Domengeaux	Manasco	Traynor
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Treadway
Doughton	May	Van Zandt
Drewry	Mills, Ark.	Vinson, Ga.
Duncan	Mills, La.	Voorhis, Calif.
Dworshak	Monroney	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Moser	Wadsworth
Elliott, Calif.	Mott	Ward
Ellis	Mundt	Weaver
Engel	Murdock	Wene
Englebright	Murray	West
Fellows	Nelson	Wheat
Fish	Nichols	Whitten
Flannagan	Norrell	Whittington
Folger	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Forand	O'Hara	Williams
Ford, Leland M.	Oliver	Wilson
Ford, Miss.	O'Neal	Winter
Fulmer	Pace	Wolcott
Gamble	Paddock	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gathings	Pearson	Wolverton, N. J.
Gearhart	Peterson, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gehrmann	Pierce	Youngdahl
		Zimmerman

NAYS—83

Baldwin	Cole, N. Y.	Downs
Boland	Crosser	Eliot, Mass.
Bradley, Pa.	Cullen	Fitzgerald
Buckley, N. Y.	Curtis	Flaherty
Burdick	D'Alesandro	Fogarty
Canfield	Davis, Ohio	Gale
Capozzoli	Delaney	Gavagan
Casey, Mass.	Dewey	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Celler	Dickstein	Heffernan
Coffee, Wash.	Dingell	

Hendricks	Leavy	Pittenger
Hill, Wash.	Lesinski	Ramsay
Holmes	Ludlow	Sacks
Hook	Lynch	Sasscer
Hunter	McKeough	Scanlon
Imhoff	Maciejewski	Shanley
Jackson	Maciora	Sheridan
Kean	Marcantonio	Smith, Wash.
Kee	Meyer, Md.	Snyder
Keefe	Myers, Pa.	Somers, N. Y.
Kelley, Pa.	Norton	Sweeney
Kennedy, Martin J.	O'Brien, Mich.	Tenerowicz
	O'Connor	Thom
Kennedy, Michael J.	O'Leary	Wasielewski
	O'Toole	Weiss
Keogh	Peterson, Fla.	Wickersham
Kirwan	Pfeifer Joseph L.	Wright
Klein		Young
Kopplemann	Pheiffer, William T.	
Kunkel		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Allen, La.	Talle

NOT VOTING—108

Andresen, August H.	Gilchrist	Mitchell
	Granger	O'Day
Andrews	Grant, Ala.	Osmers
Arends	Green	Patman
Barden	Harness	Patrick
Barry	Harrington	Patton
Beam	Harris, Va.	Powers
Beiter	Harter	Rankin, Mont.
Bell	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Holbrock	Rees, Kans.
Bloom	Howell	Rich
Bonner	Izac	Rockefeller
Buck	Jacobsen	Rolph
Buckler, Minn.	Jarman	Sabath
Byrne	Jarrett	Schaefer, Ill.
Byron	Jenkins, Ohio	Schulte
Cannon, Fla.	Jenks, N. H.	Scott
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Scrugham
Clark	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shannon
Clason		Short
Cluett	Johnson, Okla.	Sikes
Cole, Md.	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Pa.
Costello	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Creal	Kelly, Ill.	Stearns, N. H.
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Knutson	Sutphin
Dies	Kocialkowski	Taber
Douglas	Kramer	Tinkham
Durham	Lewis	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	McGranery	Vreeland
Edmiston	McLean	Walter
Elston	Magnuson	Welch
Faddis	Mansfield	Wheichel
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	White
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Woodrum, Va.
Ford, Thomas F.	Merritt	Worley
Gifford	Michener	

So the motion to table the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Short.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Green with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Miss Sumner of Illinois

Mr. Creal with Mr. Michener.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.

Mr. Wheichel with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Lewis with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Day.

Mr. Granger with Mr Tinkham.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Schulte with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Byrne and Mr. Rich.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Beiter with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Kefauver with Miss Rankin of Montana.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Merritt.

Mrs. Byron with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Beam.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Izac.

Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Eberharter.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Faddis with Mr. Thomas F. Ford.

Mr. Harter with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Jacobsen.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Mitchell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was tabled was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE ANTHRACITE COAL REGIONS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission has this day transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 255, adopted by unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress and approved by the President on December 19, 1941, its report on economic conditions in the anthracite coal area, with recommendations as to both short-term and long-term measures of improvement.

In accordance with our mandate, we have sought in our investigations and in the report to—

take into consideration, among other relevant factors, (a) the availability in such regions, for national defense activities, of skilled and unskilled workers, factories, and housing, and other facilities, and (b) possible new and extended uses for anthracite coal and the by-products thereof.

You will note that our recommendations for improvement are directed to both Federal and State agencies, as well as to the anthracite industry. Certain of these remedial measures can be taken by administrative action, but some of the recommendations for long-term improvement contemplate Federal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I might at this time offer my commendations to the members of this commission because of its work and its actions being unique. The members of this Commission went to the anthracite region and held four meetings there and came back to Washington. It held three different meetings in Washington, attended by the full Commission, without the expense of one dollar to the Congress or to the Government.

I also wish to commend those in the different departments who were most helpful in compiling this report. The Commission was very fortunate in having such able assistance.

I sincerely hope the Members will read the report and learn what the conditions are in the anthracite regions.

It is our recommendation that this report be made a public document.

The report is respectfully submitted by the following members of the Federal Anthracite Commission: Patrick J. Boland, chairman; James J. Davis; Joseph F. Guffey; Ivor D. Fenton, Ernest I. Lewis; R. R. Sayers, secretary; Ralph J. Watkins.

INSURANCE OF LOANS BY FEDERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to consider the bill (H. R. 6927) providing for an increase of authorization for the insurance of loans by the Federal Housing Authority.

The bill has a unanimous report from the committee, and there really should be no contest over the passage of the measure so far as members of the committee are concerned, but the gentleman from Michigan and I have agreed to ask for 1 hour of debate on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman include the matter of 1 hour of debate in his request?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; I do so request, Mr. Speaker.

I ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr WOLCOTT] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, can the majority leader advise the House as to what the program for the remainder of the week will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be pleased to advise the gentleman.

Aside from the bill that will come up tomorrow, as to which the gentleman from Alabama has just submitted a unanimous-consent request which has been granted by the House, there is no other legislation that I know of at this time. There may be a conference report called up if the conferees agree, but I know of no other legislation now that is coming up during the remainder of the week.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Has the gentleman reached any decision as to what may come up the first of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a letter addressed to myself by the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 34, 66, 69, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 77, and 78; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "appropriations", insert "and for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9112 of March 26, 1942"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$777,912,000, which shall be available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,333,725,277"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$812,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the matter inserted by said amendment as follows: In line 11 strike out the sum "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000," and in line 14 strike out the word "summary" and insert in lieu thereof the word "statement"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 11, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 45, 68, 74, 75, 76, 79, and 80.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 6868, the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation bill, 1942, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Title I—War Department

Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 16: These amendments relate to form and the House accepts them.

No. 1: The Senate amendment extends the provisions of the House bill (which merges all 1942 appropriations in the several appropriation acts under the same heads), by bringing forward and merging under those heads the unexpended balances of 1940 and 1941 military appropriations and making them available for 1942 and 1943 obligations as well as for discharge of the obligations previously incurred under them for the respective fiscal years 1940 and 1941; the House accepts the Senate amendment modified to make the merged appropriations available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order 9112 of March 26, 1942, for the guaranteeing or making of loans to contractors and thus facilitating the participation of small business enterprises in the war production effort.

Nos. 13 and 15, relating to transportation of the Army: Appropriates $777,912,000, instead of $761,412,202 as proposed by the House and $817,912,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that the amount so appropriated shall be available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations.

No. 17: The House bill provided that limitations on appropriations heretofore made and those in this bill, available for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, which prohibit the payment of persons who are not citizens of the United States, shall not apply to "persons who have lost their citizenship by serving in the armed forces of another nation but who apply and are accepted for service in the Army of the United States." The Senate modified the House provision by striking out the language above quoted and inserting in its place the words "military personnel".

Title II—Navy Department

No. 18: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, making funds appropriated under the heading "Welfare and recreation" available for the hire and use of buildings, grounds, etc., for rehabilitation and recuperation of naval personnel returned from war service at sea or on shore beyond the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, the Canal Zone, and insular possessions.

Nos. 19 and 20: Appropriates $9,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

No. 23: Appropriates $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of training ships for merchant marine personnel.

Title III—General appropriations

Nos. 27, 28, and 29, relating to the Senate: Reappropriates certain unexpended balances of appropriations for the contingent fund of the Senate as proposed by the Senate amendments.

No. 31: Increases from $20,000,000 to $25,400,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount of the contract authority to the Public Roads Administration for construction of access roads under section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941.

No. 34: Strikes out the appropriation of $3,000,000, inserted by the Senate, for a fertilizer and elemental phosphorus-manufacturing plant under the Tennessee Valley Authority. This sum is in the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1943, now pending in the Senate Committee on Appropriations and soon scheduled for consideration in the Senate.

Nos. 35 to 44, inclusive, and 46 to 62, inclusive, relating to the municipal government of the District of Columbia: Appropriates for the fiscal year 1942 for the following purposes in the amounts of the Senate amendments, respectively:

Department of Insurance, salaries, $2,445.

Office of Administrator of Rent Control, salaries and expenses, $5,400.

Contingent expenses, general, $7,200.

Printing and binding, general, $6,500.

Postage, $4,000.

Street cleaning, $20,000.

Community Center Department, Public Schools, $15,000.

Completion of six unfinished classrooms, Lafayette School, $45,000.

Inspections, Health Department, $15,000.

Tuberculosis Sanatoria, maintenance, $40,000; repairs and improvements, $9,173; in all, $49,173.

Gallinger Municipal Hospital, maintenance, $73,700; repairs, $6,500; in all, $80,200.

Municipal Court, contingent expenses, $840.

Jail, maintenance, $4,650.

Workhouse and Reformatory, maintenance, $12,000.

District of Columbia Training School, maintenance, $15,000.

Industrial Home School for Colored Children, maintenance, $5,000.

Militia, payment for accrued leave, fiscal year 1941, $1,409.18.

Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, and 67, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Appropriates $500,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House, for national forest protection and management; appropriates $5,000,000, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $18,100,000 as proposed by the Senate, for emergency forest-fire control, and makes $20,000 of the $5,000,000 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House and $35,000 as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, proposing that the emergency forest-fire control appropriation should be available for maintenance of Civilian Conservation Corps camps, including pay of enrollee, if and when such camps should be transferred to the Forest Service; and appropriates $1,750,000, instead of $1,850,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,565,000 as proposed by the House, for control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases under the direction of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

Nos. 69 and 70: Appropriates $312,900, instead of $324,800 as proposed by the House and $1,565,000 as proposed by the Senate, for fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; and makes $8,000 of such sum available for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 71 and 72, relating to the Department of Labor: Strikes out the appropriation of $90,000, inserted by the Senate, for expansion of the apprenticeship training program; and appropriates $113,250, instead of $76,500 as proposed by the House and $226,500 as proposed by the Senate, for commissioners of conciliation.

No. 73: The House bill, by section 401, proposed the repeal of two provisions requiring the submission of reports to Congress by the War and Navy Departments with respect to contracts in excess of $10,000. The Senate struck out the repeal provision and inserted a new section reenacting in modified form the previous requirements in connection with such reports. The House conferees accept the Senate language modified to confine the report requirement to contracts in excess of $150,000 instead of those in excess of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate, and by reducing the volume of information to be furnished in connection with the subject matter of the contracts by eliminating the requirement for a "summary" thereof and inserting requirement for a "statement" of the subject matter.

Nos. 77 and 78, relating to the limitations on the prices to be paid by Government agencies and the District of Columbia for low-priced, lightweight, passenger-carrying vehicles, provides that the top price to be paid free on board factory, shall not exceed $925 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $862.50 as proposed by the House; and also provides that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in the case of such vehicles for the District, instead of the Director of Procurement, shall determine the price within the limit set.

Amendments reported in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. The subject matter of such amendments, and the action proposed to be recommended with respect thereto by the managers on the part of the House, are as follows:

Nos. 4 and 11: Appropriating $2,218,100 for pay of members of the Army Specialist Corps. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House agree to Senate amendment No. 4 by inserting in lieu of the Senate language the following: "including the pay of members of the Army Specialist Corps appointed subject to the approval of the War Department Personnel Board, $327,331,562: *Provided*, That members of such corps who are assigned to the supply services of the Army may be paid from the appropriations for the work upon which they are engaged: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any member of such corps at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum unless such member is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Amendment No. 11 is a general total concerned with the amount involved in amendment No. 4. If the latter amendment is agreed to as proposed, the House managers will recommend concurrence in amendment No. 11.

No. 21: Appropriating $800,000,000 for public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy: The House managers will recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur therein with the following amendment:

At the end of the first paragraph of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following before the period: ": *Provided further*, That the approximate cost of classes of projects under such sum of $800,000,000 shall be as follows: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $162,780,000; lighter-than-air program, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $119,000,000; liquid fuel storage, $100,000,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $20,000,000; ordnance storage facilities, $150,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $100,000,000; hospital and dispensary facilities, $40,500,000; shore radio facilities, $11,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $720,000; miscellaneous structures $25,000,000; floating dry dock program, $36,000,000: *Provided further*, That the approximate cost indicated for each such class may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed $800,000,000."

Nos. 22 and 24: Making appropriations for the Navy available for the purchase, at a cost not to exceed $25 per man, of civilian clothing to be issued to marines and members of the Coast Guard given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unfitness, or inaptitude. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendments.

Nos. 25 and 26: Making appropriations for the Navy for 1942 and 1943 available to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112, approved March 26, 1942, for the guaranteeing or making of loans to contractors and thus facilitating the participation of small business enterprises in the war-production effort. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendments.

No. 30: Increasing to $10,000 the salary of the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 32: Appropriating $3,500,000 for continuance of construction, and increasing from $13,300,000 to $18,171,000 the limit of cost, of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, at Cleveland, Ohio. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 33: Appropriating $3,770,000 for expenses of the Selective Service System for the current fiscal year. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 45: Appropriating $40,000 for the current fiscal year for collection and disposal of refuse in the District of Columbia. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment to insert in the bill an appropriation of $60,000, payable from District funds, to meet the requirements for the present fiscal year for payment of current pensions under "Policemen and Firemen's relief."

No. 68: Increasing by $4,080,000 the amount in the House bill for the establishment of air-navigation facilities under "Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics." The House managers will recommend that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

No. 74: Relating to renegotiation of contracts and repayment of excess profits under contracts and subcontracts under the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission. The House managers will recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree thereto with an amendment, inserting the following section 403 in lieu of the section 403 proposed by the Senate:

"SEC. 403. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'Department' means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term 'Secretary' means the Chairman of such Commission; and the terms 'renegotiate' and 'renegotiation' include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the term 'contract' includes a subcontract and the term 'contractor' includes a subcontractor.

"(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period or periods when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period or periods when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is found as a result of such renegotiation, to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

"(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department or from any subcontract thereunder, (1) to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits shall

have been paid to the contractor or subcontractor, to recover such amount from such contractor or subcontractor. Such contractor or subcontractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor or subcontractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided that final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of each such Secretary and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purposes of making examinations and determinations with respect to profits under this section.

"(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each Department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount in excess of $100,000 statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail, as such Secretary may require. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor, or by such Secretary as may be mutually agreed to by the Secretaries concerned.

"(f) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

"(g) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"(h) This section shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for three years after the termination of the war, but no court proceedings brought under this section shall abate by reason of the termination of the provisions of this section."

Nos. 75, 76, and 80: Changing section numbers to correspond to Senate action on amendment No. 74. The House managers will recommend appropriate action on these amendments to accord with House action on amendment No. 74.

No. 79: Ratifying the purchases of automobiles heretofore made at prices in excess of the statutory limitation. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment by inserting the following in lieu of the language proposed by the Senate: ": *Provided*, That purchases of automobiles of the lightweight, low-priced class heretofore made by the War and Navy Departments at prices in excess of $750 each but not in excess of those permitted by this section are hereby validated."

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House submit the conference report on the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1942.

It may be noted in this connection that the committee presenting the report is an exceptional committee, in that it consists of 14 managers on the part of the House and 14 managers on the part of the Senate, a total of 28 conferees, constituting the largest conference committee in congressional history.

But the important feature in the consideration of the report is that it is a unanimous report, approved by all members of the committee, from both Houses and both parties, who participated in the conference—and betokens to that extent the unanimity of the country in support of the war program of which it is a part.

With the appropriation of the money provided by this bill we are nearing a milepost in the fiscal provisions for the war. Continuous appropriations will be necessary for maintenance and replacement, depending in time and amount on the wastage of material at the front. Readjustment of the program from day to day to meet constantly changing conditions will necessitate emergency provision from time to time. But with the enactment of this bill basic production has been provided for and is now under way to implement every branch of the service.

In reviewing the results secured from these appropriations it is gratifying to be able to report progress exceeding the most optimistic estimates. The war has resolved itself largely into a race in the production of war equipment and on a conservative analysis of reports from plants and yards on the fabrication of planes, tanks, guns, munitions, and ships we are winning the race.

Among the surprises of the war, along with our underestimation of the resources of the enemy, was our underestimate of our own productive capacity. The prodigious accomplishments of American industry over the last 3 months stagger the imagination. Conversion—the most stupendous industrial revolution in all time—has been completed far in advance of all calculations. Already peace-time plants are in war-time production and moving into high gear. Assembly lines are rolling with steadily gathering speed. Torrents of war material are pouring out in ever-accelerating volume. All schedules are obsolete. "Months ahead of schedule" is becoming a familiar report, and munitions are reaching our Allies sooner than anticipated and in greater volume.

As a result we have already reached the first turn in the war. We have now outdistanced the enemy in production and are turning out in the United States alone more war material than Germany, Italy, and Japan combined. And this does not take into consideration the output of British, Russian, and Chinese facilities. Also, in the last week we have taken the initiative on the front and are carrying the war to the enemy. We have passed from the defensive to the offensive. We are beginning to hand it out as well as take it, and national morale is rising while enemy morale is on the wane.

The smashing drive of American air power along a thousand miles of the enemy's innermost defenses, heretofore considered invulnerable to attack, is the beginning of a systematic offensive which will grow with our increasing output until it reaches overwhelming proportions. The crushing blow at the heart of the Japanese Empire is only the first installment of our debt to Tokyo. America always pays in full. And we shall continue to pay and pay and pay, at that rate and in that manner, until American credit is at par in Tokyo, and Berlin, and throughout the world.

Of course, we cannot expect all the breaks. It is not as simple as that. There will be heartbreaking reverses—especially in these early months of the war. There is much bad news yet to come. But the vast resources of the United States are mobilizing with unexpected speed and power. Our Allies are fighting magnificently, with growing strength and courage, on land and sea and in the air. Time is running in our favor. Every week finds us stronger and the enemy relatively weaker. By the end of the year we will have passed their accumulated reserves and the end will be in sight.

We provide in this bill by direct appropriation and contract authority a total of a little over $19,000,000,000.

In round figures the bill as it passed the House carried direct appropriations

of $18,157,000,000 and contract authorizations of $145,400,000. The Senate added the sum of $905,411,915.18 of direct appropriations and $5,400,000 of contract authorizations. A number of amendments involving money have been brought back to the House for separate votes under our rules. If these amendments are disposed of in the manner the House conferees hope for, the bill will carry a total of direct appropriations of $19,001,197,010.18 and contract authorizations totaling $150,400,000, for a grand total of obligating authority of $19,151,597,010.18. This latter amount is divided as follows:

War Department	$17,394,677,343.00
Navy Department	1,634,751,500.00
Other agencies	122,168,167.18

The largest single item added by the Senate is the sum of $800,000,000 for public works for the Navy Department. The House on yesterday passed the authorization bill for this purpose and we will ask you shortly to concur in the Senate amendment for this sum with an amendment that will make the appropriation conform to the break-down of the authorization bill as the House passed it.

There are a number of amendments which the House will be called separately to vote upon and I will be glad at that time to give an explanation. Items which many Members are interested in, particularly from the West and the Northwest, are the forest-fire-fighting items. The House allowed the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, the sum of $2,000,000 for emergency forest fire control and the Department of the Interior the sum of $324,800 for forest-fire control upon lands under the jurisdiction of that department. The Senate increased the amount for the Forest Service to $18,100,000 and the amount for the Interior Department to $1,565,000. The conferees recommend in the conference report the amount of the Budget estimate for each item, namely, $5,000,000 for the Forest Service and $812,000 for the Interior Department. Members may recall that it has been the practice of Congress to meet whatever bill is incurred by the Forest Service in fighting forest fires on the public domain. We make a token appropriation of $100,000 and allow the Department to utilize the funds in hand and incur a deficiency for whatever is necessary to meet the fire-fighting exigencies. This sum runs annually two, three, four, or five million dollars, depending on the extent and frequency of the fires. The fire-fighting item and these fire control and prevention emergency items, therefore, should not be confused. The $5,000,000 for fire control is an emergency item that is additional to the usual item and work of fighting the fires. In connection with this item the Senate inserted a provision making this money available to pay the expenses of C. C. C. camps, including the pay of enrollees, if any of those camps should be transferred to the Forest Service. That amendment has been eliminated from the bill. The House conferees took the position that the question of continuance of C. C. C. and maintenance of its camps should be determined in connection with the disposition of the C. C. C. for the next fiscal year rather than in connection with an appropriation for the Forest Service.

Another item in which many Members are interested is that of the amount of the contract authorization for access roads to military and naval reservations, war plants, and so forth. You will recall that $150,000,000 was authorized for this purpose in the Defense Highway Act of 1941. Congress has heretofore made available either cash or contract authorization for $124,600,000 of this sum, leaving $25,400,000 of the authorization unprovided for. The House bill carried $20,000,000 of this balance and the Senate raised that amount to $25,400,000, and the conference report carries the Senate figure; so the entire authorization has now been met either by cash or contract authority.

On March 26, 1942, the President issued Executive Order 9112, which authorizes the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission to enter into contracts with any Federal Reserve bank, the R. F. C., or other financing institutions for the purpose of financing any contractor or subcontractor or others engaged in any business or operation which is deemed by War or Navy or Maritime Commission to be in the interest of the prosecution of the war. This order is designed principally to give assistance to small business in financing its participation in war contracts. Provision has now been made in the bill so that the appropriations for the War and Navy Departments shall be available to carry out, without question the intentions of the Executive order. In my judgment, it was not necessary to include this special provision in the bill, but, since the Senate added the amendments, we see no harm in including them.

As the bill passed the House, it contained provision for the repeal of two provisions of law requiring reports with respect to contracts entered into by the War and Navy Departments to be made to Congress when the amount of the contract exceeded $10,000. These two Departments have millions of contracts, and the cost of making these reports was found to be out of proportion to the value of the reports when they reached Congress. The Senate, however, struck out the House repeal provisions and reenacted the provisions combining the two separate requirements into one and making it apply to contracts in excess of $50,000. The House conferees accepted the Senate reenactment with a modification which limits the reports to contracts in excess of $150,000

Mr. BLAND. I have an inquiry as to amendment No. 13. I wish to concur with the gentleman's views. If he prefers to discuss the two items first, I will wait until he has finished.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are glad to have the gentleman's concurrence, and if it is agreeable to him will take up the amendments seriatim as we reach them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman mean that the Forest Service could go out now anticipating future possible danger from fire which might be started due to additional work in lumbering by some inexperienced people in some cases, or by enemy action, and put people on their rolls to prevent damage, or does he mean that it would be necessary for them to wait until something happened and then go out and take whatever steps were necessary to combat the fire and come back to the Budget for further money?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have for the control work the $5,000,000 which we are providing for one department and $812,000 provided for another department. In addition to that, we supplement it by the usual provisions which are always made, under which they can incur a deficiency for fighting forest fires, which in past years has varied from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But they cannot incur a deficiency in anticipation of forest fire danger, can they? They can only incur it in combating an actual fire, after it has started? Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. That has been in use for many years, and has proven both practical and successful. We have each time provided all the money necessary, and this time we provide in addition $5,812,000 under which, as the gentleman says, they can anticipate such needs by carrying on fire control and prevention measures.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am happy to know that the conferees increased the amount that was provided in the bill by the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conferees more than doubled the amount. Instead of the $2,000,000 provided by the House, we have appropriated $5,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that I can visualize conditions taking place in July, August, and September of this year, and particularly in view of the war in which we are engaged, and particularly in view of what some Japanese or somebody else might be able to do in that western country where we have millions of acres of the finest forest timber in the world. A few fires started in the forests will devastate the works. I am wondering if we reach the point where it looks as though we will need additional funds how the gentleman will feel about giving his aid to secure those funds to protect the forests in such event as I am speaking of?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain there will be no difficulty in securing such additional funds as experience proves to be necessary.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I want to congratulate the gentleman for having upped the amount allowed by the House on this important item, and to make the observation that the people of my area and the Pacific slope, in conjunction with the gentleman from Montana, recognize the terrible peril confronting our cen-

turies-old forests at the hands of possible Japanese saboteurs. I, therefore, congratulate the committee and its chairman for recognizing this peril, in upping the amount, and making the statement he has in explanation. It will reassure our people out on the west coast and particularly those engaged in the industry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman and realize fully the force of his position. I trust the forebodings of the gentleman will not be realized. But if additional funds are found to be necessary Congress will be in session and in a position to give the situation prompt attention.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. We in our area certainly appreciate the action of the committee in increasing this amount in view of the lessened ability of the Civilian Conservation Corps to perform this important task. The C. C. C. boys previously rendered wonderful service, in cooperation with the Forest Service. The decrease in the number of camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps makes the hazards more perilous at this time; and I am happy to know that we shall have the necessary funds with which to combat any of these fires.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The provision for the C. C. C. camps was not allowed for the reason that the question of funds for the C. C. C. will come up almost immediately in connection with the regular appropriation bill now pending in the committee; and that matter will be disposed of at that time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. While the conferees raised the amount to $5,000 000, did they realize that the Budget estimate was for $18,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Senate asked for the $18,100,000, but after a conference it was unanimously agreed by both the House and Senate conferees that $5,000,000, which is the Budget estimate sent in by the President, would be sufficient at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman believe it will be adequate for the purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If not, it can be easily and promptly supplemented.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my further felicitations in appreciation of the work of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the action taken in increasing the amount of the forest-fire-control item from $2,000,000 to $5,000,000, and also increasing the item of $324,800 to $812,000 for fire protection of the forest, forest industry, and strategic facilities. I am very certain this will be reassuring to the citizens of the Pacific Northwest and the western coast States as well as the rest of the country. It is true as our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] just indicated, that the estimate of the Forest Service was $18,100,000; but as the chairman has well pointed out, there will be further deficiency appropriation bills from time to time, and if need should arise for additional funds, it will be possible quickly to obtain further funds for this work. I cheerfully accept the assurance of the chairman in that regard. The gentleman will recall that I appeared before both the House and Senate committees and urged the increased appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. The increase in that item was made largely in response to representations from the gentleman himself and the other gentlemen from the West and Northwest who brought the matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my distinguished friend from Washington, who has had such a large part in providing adequate appropriations for this purpose in the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 66, commonly referred to as the McKellar amendment, which limited the expenditure of this money by providing that it should be used, insofar as necessary, for the payment of C. C. C. employees or enrollees, has been completely stricken out by the conferees, I understand.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That amendment was eliminated, due to the fact that an estimate for the C. C. C. is expected in the next week or two, at which time the whole matter will be thoroughly canvassed and provided for in the regular supply bill.

Mr. LEAVY. Just one further question: This $5,000,000 is not necessarily for the national-forest land alone but covers all forest land, both private and State-owned as well?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All forest lands in the Nation.

Mr. LEAVY. And if the situation should be such as some of us in the West fear it may be by reason of war conditions, doubtless additional appropriations would be made to meet the threat of a changed condition.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. It must be realized, of course, that while this fund ostensibly is for the entire United States, the bulk of it will be used in the area most susceptible to conflagration; and if found to be insufficient, it can be supplemented.

Mr. LEAVY. On day before yesterday, I believe, there was a terrible fire in Pennsylvania, a dreadful fire involving some 2,000 acres of land. It was announced to be of incendiary origin. This money would be available to combat such fires as that in a national forest, would it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true, and will be available for the purpose anywhere in the United States.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. May I inquire what action was taken by the conferees insofar as a limitation of profits was concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one of the amendments returned in disagreement for separate vote and if the gentleman will permit, we will take it up when it is reached in its order.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to compliment the members of the committee for restoring the Budget estimate for forest protection. As I understand from the gentleman's statement, if the $5,000,000 in additional appropriations for the other department is found insufficient, they may as in the past make additional expenditures, and those will be covered later in a deficiency bill; so that if we should have a conflagration on the west coast, particularly from enemy action, there will be available funds either in this appropriation or in a deficiency bill to meet the situation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Congress is expected to be in continuous session and will be in position to meet such emergencies as they arise.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the distinguished gentleman in connection with the statement he made at the opening of his remarks if he would go this far: Has that transformation, in his opinion, from peacetime to wartime which has occurred in this country in that startling way been under private management and with voluntary labor, and in the absence of coerced labor or involuntary servitude?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conversion from civil production to war production has now been practically completed, and it is one of the most extraordinary developments in the history of industry. The lag which was anticipated has not been realized. Labor has been promptly assimilated. The plants have turned from civil production to war production overnight, and are now turning out a greater volume than under peacetime regime. For example, the Willow Run plant was on the first of this month employing 86,000 men. By the end of the month it is expected to be employing more men than were employed by the combined Ford plants at the peak of automobile production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is under private management?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under private management. And General Motors reports that the dollar value of first quarter deliveries are this year five times those of a year ago, and this record is being matched in other plants in every center of production in the Nation. This remarkable transformation has been made voluntarily and has been worked out with the warm cooperation of the executives and owners of the plants. The heartening feature of it is that there has been no instance of failure to collaborate and all problems have been amicably solved by mutual consent.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I notice in amendment No. 13 that the House has receded from

its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agreed to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert $777,912,000 which shall be available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations.

The House refused to insert a provision of $56,499,798 which was for the charter of vessels. The Senate included the $56,499,798 which appears to have been for that purpose. The conference agreement eliminates $40,000,000 of that and inserts $16,500,000, but the language that is used in the amendment would appear to make all of the sum of $777,000,000 available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations, whereas it would be my thought that the conferees intended that the sum of $16,499,798, the increase over the House amendment, is intended for the direct charter of vessels.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, who was in immediate charge of the item.

Mr. SNYDER. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. BLAND. My question is whether or not $16,499,798, the increase that was finally allowed by the conferees, is intended for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations, or was it intended to make the whole amount available for that purpose in view of the fact that under the Executive order of the President all ships have been taken over by the War Shipping Administration.

Mr. SNYDER. I may say to the gentleman that up to December 7 there was about $7,000,000 utilized by the Commission in chartering vessels. Furthermore, since December 7 in this rapid adjustment the bills have not come in for a number of ships that have been chartered. You have remaining there approximately nine or ten million dollars to take care of the situation when these bills come in, with the understanding that when the regular 1943 bill comes before the Congress, and it will be shortly, a further study can be made. We are going to start hearings shortly. If there are any additional adjustments necessary for the chartering of these ships to be financed, it will be brought before that committee at that time.

Mr. BLAND. That is all right, but does this language mean that the $777,912,000 shall be available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations or the increase of $16,499,798 will be available for that purpose? It would seem to me, if that is the intent, and that is what was done, the Senate allowed $59,000,000 in round figures, then the conferees agreed upon the elimination of $40,000,000, so that $16,000,000 in round figures would become available. Yet, instead of writing in this language which would have made it clear that that is the case, it states that $777,912,000 shall be available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. The action of the committee, in effect, is to earmark the $16,000,000 for the purpose of charter until the committee brings in its regular bill. Actually the Army can use the total amount as it sees fit.

Mr. BLAND. But it was intended to be earmarked?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct.

Mr. BLAND. That is my thought. That is what I wanted to make clear.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When may we inquire into the provision with reference to limiting profits on war contracts?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one of the items returned for separate vote and will be brought up in its order. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report having been disposed of, we will then take up seriatim the amendments brought back in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House it carried a total of approximately $18,157,000,000. When it passed the Senate it carried a total of approximately $19,062,000,000. In other words, there was added in the Senate something over $905,000,000.

This increase has been reduced in conference, assuming the recommendations of the conferees are followed, by something over $61,000,000.

The total carried by the bill if the recommendations of the conferees are accepted, including contract authorizations, is $19,151,597,010.18.

Of the total increase recommended, as compared with the House bill, amounting to about $844,000,000, $800,000,000 is accounted for by the public works and public utilities construction authorized by the bill which passed the House on yesterday and which passed the Senate sometime ago. Other large items of increase are to be found in the item just discussed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] for Army transportation amounting to $16,500,000; in the item for the Coast Guard permitting the purchase of 5 training ships, amounting to $5,000,000; in the item providing for the Army Specialists Corps, $2,218,000; in the forest fire fighting increases, which also have been referred to, amounting to $3,487,000; in an increase to complete the construction of the aircraft engine research laboratory for the N. A. C. A. in Cleveland, $3,500,000; and in an item for the Selective Service System resulting from the additional registrations of February 16 and April 27, and for the required occupational questionnaires in connection with those registrations, $3,770,000.

Personally, I should have liked to have seen two or three minor items reduced below the point at which they are carried in the recommendations of the conferees. On the whole, however, I think the conferees have done a good job, and I hope the report will be adopted.

There are 15 or 16 items which are technically in dispute and which must be voted on by the House as separate amendments. They will permit further discussion, if desired, when they are taken up individually.

Unless there are some questions, Mr. Speaker, I shall not take further time on the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, an item in this bill provides for 100 new labor conciliators, which ought to be evidence to the people that we still have plenty of labor troubles left.

Last night I heard on the Labor Forum a statement by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and an answer thereto by the chairman of the Committee on Labor, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. Her first point was that the people had been misinformed and did not know that they could work longer than 40 hours. We heard that bogey announced to the Nation on the 23d of March, just about a month ago. I have been home and had meetings in every county of my district, but never once did anybody raise the question or appear not to know what is in the Wages and Hours Act I never once heard the ignorance exposed that has been stressed so much in the address last night in the reply of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Throughout her 15 minutes there was no reference and no answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] about the purpose of the act which he had strongly set forth. The purpose of the act which required time and a half for overtime was to penalize the employer, to force him not to use men more than 40 hours, in order to spread labor. As a member of the Committee on Labor, I heard the hearings on the bill. No reference was made and no answer was given to the presentation by the gentleman from Virginia regarding the purpose of the act.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. A little later, please.

No reference was made in the 15 minutes the gentlewoman from New Jersey was speaking to economy or to the taxpayers of the Nation. That is a very important fault with labor throughout this whole discussion. They talk about the employer as a capitalist and then they talk about labor. But there was not one reference in the 15 minutes of her statement last night about the taxpayers, about the unconscionable debt that is piling up, or about what the taxpayers are going to have to face in the future. Not one single reference was made to that.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] showed that the Navy Department stated that overtime had already cost the Navy $4,000,000,000, quite a considerable sum, in overtime in the Navy alone. This is going to be a long war; everybody says that. The President says it will last 3 years. Most people believe

it will last longer than that. We have just started, yet we have spent $4,000,000,000 in overtime in the Navy alone. Yet we are emphasizing trying to save everywhere we can.

In her closing remarks, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, on whose committee I have served, and for whom I have high respect, said that if the recommendations of the President of the United States had been followed we would have far more tanks and planes over there now.

Now the testimony before this committee from the Army and the Navy on the last day of our hearings on this $19,000,000,000 bill, and this is apropos, was that the Army and the Navy had not asked for anything from the time of this emergency that had not been granted them by the House and the Senate of the United States—not 1 cent. Now how could that other statement be true if the President had had his way and never a budget estimate for defense was denied? The Army and the Navy told this deficiency subcommittee 3 weeks ago that not one item had ever been denied for defense, and yet they go out over the land and in the forum and on the air and say these things which are not so. In their enthusiasm they are extravagant and they have just said it so long that they think it is so or something of that sort.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Wait until I get through and then I will yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield in reference to a statement the gentleman has made?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I will have to yield to the lady from New Jersey first.

I have here a letter that is typical of letters I get from the Army, from the east and the west and the south and the north. This is a major who wrote me and I will not tell anybody, of course, who he is, but he is on the Pacific coast and it is typical of what is going on that we want to avoid if we are going to win this war:

> I could have a book written on silly things that the Air Corps is doing. Steel writing desks, a typewriter for each, tennis courts, low shoes, swimming pools, bowling, and all sorts of things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Wait until I finish this.

> So much to be done and so little time, and spending useful hours on nonessentials, at least nonessentials at this time. Our men want training for war and fighting. Our motto in the QM is more bullets, more bombs, less bull.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the lady from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman has criticized me for not replying to Mr. SMITH.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that a day or so ago I called up the Star, whose guest I was, and asked the editor, Mr. MacKelway, what the subject of our discussion was to be, and he said the 40-hour workweek. If the gentleman will take the trouble to read my extension which I shall put in the RECORD today, he will find that I absolutely kept to the subject and I explained that in the beginning of my talk, while Mr. SMITH did not explain the 40-hour workweek, but did discuss his pending bill.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I beg the lady's pardon, but she did not make any reference to the purposes of the bill or the penalizing of the employer.

Mrs. NORTON. Of course, I made reference to the entire matter. The employer is not penalized.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I listened very carefully.

Mrs. NORTON. I would say to the gentleman to please read my extension of remarks in the RECORD today. I think he will then be a little better informed.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If the lady's extension of remarks contains things she did not say last night, how can others tell from her extension which are revised? Anyone who heard her last night knows what she said.

Mrs. NORTON. Of course, the lady from New Jersey would never expect the gentleman to understand anything that she would say.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, well; all right.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Did I understand the gentleman to read a letter from a major in the Army that said that every man in the Army had a typewriter?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; that is what he said.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That every man in the Army had a typewriter?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Of course, I mean that every officer has a typewriter, while business is being denied them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman did not say "officer," he said "man."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I meant every officer. I was interrupted while reading his letter. Sorry I misspoke.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Now I do not know what the gentleman means.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] and particularly when he mentioned the 40-hour week. I note his argument was that if the Smith bill was adopted that it would definitely set up a real 40-hour week wherein men would not be inclined to work over 40 hours and therefore that would spread employment and put more men to work. This is a facetious argument and seems to be rather a diversion from the real purpose of the bill. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman that a recent survey showed that as the program for increased production proceeds there will be a shortage of labor. In fact, I understand that they expect a shortage of 2,000,000 and that it will be necessary to go into the field of women and young men in order to carry on the full peak of the production load.

The real purpose of the bill is to cut down the pay of the man who works over 40 hours a week. The idea that has been spread throughout the Nation is that it will increase the cost of the war program. I doubt this very much. In fact, I am positive that it will not, even though on first blush it might seem so. If some of these men were paid double time for overtime for 40 hours a week, there would be an incentive for men to work over 40 hours a week. The profits, of course, of the manufacturer would not be as great as if we established a 48-hour week, wherein men would be working 8 hours over the 40 hours for the same rate of pay. If such a thing was put into effect, I am certain it would disrupt the war-production program. It is not the laboring man or the pay of the laboring man that is holding up production at this time.

I note that the gentleman from Kansas stated that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] made the statement that if the President had his way that we would have had far greater production at this time in tanks, guns, airplanes, and war material. I want to compliment the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her statement, because she is stating a fact.

Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a year before the automobile industry in my State made any attempt to convert their machinery to war activity they were requested to convert, and at that time they flatly refused to comply with the President's request. If they had complied with President Roosevelt's request or suggestion at that time, the plants would have been producing war materials instead of automobiles for a full year, which would have brought us up to the peak of production at this time.

I cannot understand why certain gentlemen on the floor of this House are always blaming labor for a slow-down or an interruption in the war program. Let us start from that premise. Who has the biggest stake in the winning of this war? Is it the large manufacturer who would be able to make deals with the enemy? Or is it the laboring man, the labor unions, and labor leaders? If Hitler and his Axis Powers are successful in this war, and God forbid that they ever should be, the first men who would be lined up before the firing squad and shot down would be the labor leaders of this Nation and Members of Congress who have fought vigorously on the floor of this House in the interest of the laboring man of this Nation and those who have fought in the interest of building up a strong defense and strong war program with all-out production to support our fighting troops. The labor leaders, the laboring men and the Members of Congress interested in progressive legislation, therefore, are the parties who have the greatest stake in the winning of this

war, not only because of their patriotic spirit and love of country, but in the interest of saving their own skins. The labor leaders, the laboring men, and members of labor unions are earnestly and conscientiously working in the interest of all-out production. I am not so sure whether that is true about certain other elements. I do not like to suspect their motives, although I have a perfect right to do so.

I am informed that certain automobile factories in my State have not converted machines previously used in those factories to war production, even though 75 to 80 percent of those machines can be used in the war production program. True, new machines might possibly do a little better work, but idle machines do no work other than work for Hitler. I have been told that the machines of those corporations are lying idle because of the fact that the automobile manufacturers—at least some of them—say that it is impossible to convert them to national defense or to convert them to the war program. It should be borne in mind when such arguments are set forth that the purchasing commissions of Great Britain, Russia, China, and our Allies are ready and willing to take these machines and put them into operation so that they may be able to use them in their production program. Therefore, if the automobile companies cannot or will not put these machines to work in this country, then it is my contention that under the lend-lease bill those in charge of the Government program have the authority to commandeer these idle machines "that are working for Hitler," and ship them to our Allies for their use. This, in my opinion, should be done, because every machine in this Nation that is idle is truly working for the Axis. I assure you and charge the fact to be at this time that, if such a gesture was made and those machines were offered to our Allies, to be shipped across the seas to be put into production, you would find that this group would put them into production here in the United States of America, rather than to see them shipped overseas. The reason that these machines are standing idle is that, if and when this war should end, they, the automobile manufacturers, want to be in a position to be able to use those very machines to start production of automobiles again. We cannot let this type of sabotage continue.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that machinery is already in motion, and has been for a long time, by which the Government, in cooperation with these manufacturers, is dealing with that very problem, so as to allocate those machines now under tarpaulins and covered with oil that are lying outside into the hands of manufacturers throughout the country who can use them? Is not the gentleman aware that that effort is going on?

Mr. HOOK. Let me tell the gentleman this: I am aware that there has been some rumor that the War Production Board was supposed to have made a survey of the idle machines, idle plants, and idle manpower of the Nation, and after such survey had been completed that there would be an attempt then to bring them into cooperation with the war program. I have not seen any record of any report of that kind, and the plants are still idle and the machines are not working. Let me call the gentleman's attention further to the fact that there were some 200 lathes recently produced by the Prescott Co., of Menominee, Mich., and those 200 lathes were in that plant for several months. Nobody seemed to know where they were to be shipped or sent. I do not know whether they still are lying idle at Menominee, Mich.

I do know that a survey was made by different union organizations, and anybody that is interested could probably obtain a copy of the results of that survey. I find in checking 1 week's survey of the Chevrolet forge division of General Motors shows that the plant is not operating at anywhere near capacity. It shows that in the steam shop, first shift, out of 80 steam hammers, the following number were being operated:

April 6, 1942: 33 hammers, 3 forging presses.
April 7, 1942: 34 hammers, 2 forging presses.
April 8, 1942: 38 hammers, no forging presses.
April 9, 1942: 45 hammers, 1 forging press.
April 10, 1942: 42 hammers, 1 forging press.

On the second shift there were only a limited number of steam hammers running out of the 80 steam hammers available. The survey showed that on the second shift there were on:

April 6, 1942: 37 hammers, 3 forging presses.
April 7, 1942: 39 hammers, 1 forging press.
April 8, 1942: 39 hammers, 1 forging press.
April 9, 1942: 45 hammers, 1 forging press.
April 10, 1942: 44 hammers, 1 forging press.

On the third shift there were on:

April 6, 1942: 11 hammers, no forging presses.
April 7, 1942: 11 hammers.
April 8, 1942: 12 hammers.
April 9, 1942: 13 hammers.
April 10, 1942: 12 hammers.

In the board shop, where there were 31 board hammers available, the following is the list of the number that was actually running and actually being used:

April 6, 1942: 12 hammers.
April 7, 1942: 10 hammers.
April 8, 1942: 12 hammers.
April 9, 1942: 12 hammers.
April 10, 1942: 11 hammers.

On the second shift there were:

April 6, 1942: 11 hammers.
April 7, 1942: 8 hammers.
April 8, 1942: 11 hammers.
April 9, 1942: 9 hammers.
April 10, 1942: 8 hammers.

Then in the upsetter department, out of a total of 26 upsetters there were only a limited number operating. For instance, on the first shift:

April 6, 1942: 14 upsetters.
April 7, 1942: 12 upsetters.
April 8, 1942: 13 upsetters.
April 9, 1942, 16 upsetters.
April 10, 1942: 13 upsetters.

On the second shift:

April 6, 1942: 12 upsetters.
April 7, 1942: 13 upsetters.
April 8, 1942: 15 upsetters.
April 9, 1942: 14 upsetters.
April 10, 1942: 15 upsetters.

On the third shift:

April 6, 1942: [illegible] upsetters.
April 7, 1942: 9 upsetters.
April 8, 1942: 8 upsetters.
April 9, 1942: 9 upsetters.
April 10, 1942: 9 upsetters.

Thus you will see only half of those available are used. This should give those interested a picture of the real state of affairs. It is not the lack of interest, lack of patriotism, or lack of initiative on the part of the laboring man or the labor unions, but a laxity on the part of management who have the available machines in not operating them in the interest of the war program.

I am informed and charge the fact to be that labor union men provided stickers to be placed in a conspicuous spot on the idle machines with the statement on those stickers: "These machines are working for Hitler." When it was found out that these men were extending their best effort to see that these idle machines were put into production they were threatened by the personnel officer that they would be fired if there was any more activity along those lines. In fact, the statement was made by the personnel officer of the Chrysler plant to members of Local No. 7 of the United Automobile Workers that if there was any more activity along those lines that the union members would be disciplined and, if necessary, discharged.

Gentlemen, an outstanding example of an idle plant is the Ford plant at Iron Mountain, Mich., in my district. It is one of the finest, one of the most efficient plants of its kind in the world. At one time there were 7,600 men employed in that factory, and within the last 6 months it is my understanding that there has been at different times over 4,600 men employed. That plant lies idle today, even though we are screaming for all-out production. I took this matter up with the War Production Board. I was informed by the Board that Ford had plenty of contracts, and they could not understand why, if he was interested in production, that he could not put this plant into operation. The fact remains, though, gentlemen, that the men who were working in that plant are walking the streets idle today beggging for a job, begging to be a part of the great war program, begging to be able to produce goods to help their sons and their brothers who are fighting to the death in the front lines. An idle plant is an Axis agent in this country. This plant is idle notwithstanding what the gentleman from Wisconsin said that there was supposed to be a survey of the facilities of this Nation so as to put the idle plants in operation. There are idle plants throughout this Nation. There are idle men and idle machines. There is no reason for it. The laboring man is ready and willing to work in the war program to the fullest extent of his capacity because it is his sons and

his brothers that are fighting and dying that democracy may live. If there is a lag in production, if we have not met the full peak of production, it is not the laboring man that is responsible, and it is about time that we stop this argument of blaming the laboring man because of lack of production.

There is no doubt in my mind that there will be an effort to sabotage the labor laws of this Nation and to sabotage the Wages and Hours Act, to sabotage the 40-hour week, and you will be led to believe by the spokesmen of those who claim that they are doing it in the interest of labor but, in fact, are the enemies of labor, that the laboring man is not doing his part and must be forced by the whip and the lash. The truth is, gentlemen, that there is nothing behind this program of antilabor legislation other than a question of the amount of pay. The laboring man is entitled to a fair compensation for his efforts. Any man who works over 40 hours a week is entitled to extra pay for that extra time. He is entitled to time and one-half. It is not the additional pay that is the big item but the enormous profits and the red tape that it seems almost impossible to cut that is responsible for any lack of production that we have at this time.

If the War Production Board has completed a survey, I feel that they would be in a position to be able to commandeer the idle plants and idle machinery to put all men to work in our war program. Those who are in a position to know and understand the situation, men such as Donald Nelson, at the head of the War Production Board, the Secretary of the Navy, and many others, such as Paul McNutt, have recommended against any change in the labor laws of this Nation at this time. I trust that this Congress will not bow to the wishes of the Axis agents and interfere with the labor situation at this time. I implore you, as patriotic Members, to vote down any attempt to sabotage the labor laws that are now on the statute books.

Members of labor organizations are buying Defense bonds by the millions and will continue to buy Defense bonds to the full limit of their capacity. If they are allowed to make more money, you may rest assured they will buy more bonds, because there is a stake of life and death. This country belongs to the common man and the common man loves liberty and democracy. He will sacrifice, labor, and sweat and, if necessary, give up his life and the lives of his sons for the protection of those things that we hold so dear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr COCHRAN Mr. Speaker, when this bill went to the Senate it carried a provision, and wisely so, repealing two laws which required the Army and the Navy to report to the Congress of the United States in detail in reference to all contracts involving more than $10,000. That provision was added to an appropriation bill last August, before we were at war. I referred to that some time ago and showed that it would take thousands of employees and hundreds of officers to comply with that request. The Senate refused to accept the House provision. I know the conditions that exist in the Senate with reference to this matter. The Senate put in a provision in lieu of the House language calling for reports on all contracts over $50,000 and placed new language in the bill that would require a detailed report, which also would have taken thousands of employees and hundreds of officers. The best the House could get in this compromise was with reference to contracts over $150,000, and the language of the Senate was modified so as to not to require so much information. That was excellent as far as it goes.

This is no time to ask the War Department and the Navy Department to file reports with the Congress. We can get reports on any contract that we want by the asking Why should we make the Army and Navy go into detail with reference to all contracts over $150,000? I know what I am talking about when I tell you there are 250,000 such contracts in the War Department and over 100,000 such contracts in the Navy Department. The report in the original law called for the information by June 30. How are they going to comply with such a provision at this time? They are not going to do so. If I were occupying the place of the Army and Navy officers, regardless of the provision, I would spend my time fighting this war rather than making reports to the Congress of the United States of this character. Fight the war first and make reports after is my motto.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 9, strike out "$325,113,462" and insert "including the pay of members of the Army Specialist Corps, $327,331,562: *Provided*, That members of that corps who are assigned to the supply services of the Army may be paid from the appropriations for the work upon which they are engaged: *Provided further* That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any member of that corps unless such member is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert "including the pay of members of the Army Specialist Corps appointed subject to the approval of the War Department Personnel Board, $327,331,562: *Provided*, That members of such corps who are assigned to the supply services of the Army may be paid from the appropriations for the work upon which they are engaged: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any member of such corps at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum unless such member is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 5, line 13, strike out "$419,478,462" and insert "$421,696,562".

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 21: Page 13, line 13, insert:

"Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For public works and public utilities, Bureau of Yards and Docks, including the acquisition of necessary land, $800,000,000, which, together with the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under this head, shall be finally accounted for as one fund, which fund shall be available for continuing or completing the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken thereunder, for acquisition or construction of temporary or emergency buildings and facilities at localities within or without the United States, needed by the Navy and specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, including collateral public works items and other expenses: *Provided*, That contracts for work under this appropriation may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

"No part of the appropriations in this act under the Navy Department shall be expended for a permanent type of construction at any shore establishment of any character acquired subsequently to the calendar year 1938, unless such establishment shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy as a permanent establishment, and, in that event, a permanent type of construction shall be used only to meet such permanent requirements as the Secretary of the Navy may approve: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent construction of a type sufficiently substantial for the use intended nor apply to construction projects now under contract or in progress: *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations may be obligated for the construction of quarters, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, for greater amounts per unit than follow:

"Permanent construction:

"For commissioned officer, $10,000.

"For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, $7,500.

"For enlisted man, $6,000.

"Temporary construction:

"For commissioned officer, $7,500.

"For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, $5,000.

"For enlisted man, $3,500.

"The fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract hereafter entered into under this appropriation shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment

of the Senate Numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of the first paragraph of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert the following before the period ": *Provided further*, That the approximate costs of classes of projects under such sum of $800,000,000 shall be as follows: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $168,780,000; lighter-than-air program, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $119,000,000; liquid-fuel storage, $100,000,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $20,000,000; Ordnance storage facilities, $150,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $100,000,000; hospital and dispensary facilities, $40,500,000; shore radio facilities, $11,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $720,000; miscellaneous structures, $25,000,000; floating dry dock program, $36,000,000: *Provided further*, That the approximate cost indicated for each such class may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed $800,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 22 and 24 be considered as one amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered and the Clerk will report the amendments.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: Page 15, line 25, insert a colon after the figures, and the following proviso "*Provided*, That the appropriations under this heading for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the purchase of civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $25 per man, to be issued when necessary to marines given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unfitness, or inaptitude."

Amendment No. 24: Page 17, after line 8, insert:

"Appropriations under the Coast Guard for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the purchase of civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $25 per man, to be issued when necessary to members of the Coast Guard given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unfitness, or inaptitude."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in Senate amendments 22 and 24.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 25 and 26 be considered simultaneously.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 18, line 14, insert:

"SEC. 202. The appropriations of the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942."

Amendment No. 26: page 18, line 19, strike out "202" and insert "203."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments 25 and 26.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: page 20, line 14:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

"The salary of the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be at the rate of $10,000 per annum after the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32: page 26, line 15:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

"For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1942, to remain available until expended, for continuing construction and equipment of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, $3,500,000: *Provided*, That the limitation of $13,300,000 upon the total cost of construction and equipment of said Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory is hereby increased to $18,171,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33, page 26, line 23:

"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

"For an additional amount for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified for the appropriation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, $3,770,000, which amount, together with the said appropriation and $3,500,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, shall be consolidated and constitute one fund: *Provided*, That from the date of the approval of this act to June 30, 1943, the Director of Selective Service, in prescribing per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence for officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and of the reserve components thereof, traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, pursuant to the first paragraph of section 12 of the act approved June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 631), as amended, is hereby authorized to prescribe such per diem rates of allowance, whether or not orders are given to such officers for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, and without regard to the length of time away from their designated posts of duty under such orders."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 45: Page 29, line 20:

"Collection and disposal of refuse, expenses: For an additional amount to enable the Commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, etc., fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $40,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Insert the following paragraph after the matter inserted by such amendment:

"POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RELIEF

"For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1942 to pay the policemen and firemen's relief and other allowances as authorized by law, $60,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 68: Page 36, line 21, strike out "$1,940,000" and insert "$6,020,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 68.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 74: Page 47, line 12, strike out all of lines 12 to 19 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 403. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'Department' means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; and, in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term 'Secretary' means the Chairman of such Commission; and the term 'renegotiate' and 'renegotiation' include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the term 'contract' includes a subcontract and the term 'contractor' includes a subcontractor.

"(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

"(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his

opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department, (1) to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor, to recover such amount from such contractor. Such contractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. After the expiration of this section no suit or action may be maintained in any court to recover from the United States any amount withheld from a contractor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts hereafter made and to all contracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided (in the case of contracts heretofore made) that final payment pursuant to such contract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any other costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any other excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable. Each such Secretary may, whenever he deems it appropriate or in the interest of economy or the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, request the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purposes of making examinations and determinations with respect to profits under this section, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall make such services available for such purposes.

"(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount of $500,000 or more, statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail as such Secretary may require. Such statements shall be made under oath, except for such interim reports as may be required by the Secretary. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor.

"(f) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

"(g) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"(h) This section shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 3 years after the termination of the war."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert the following:

"SEC 403. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'Department' means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term 'Secretary' means the Chairman of such Commission; and the terms 'renegotiate' and 'renegotiation' include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the term 'contract' includes a subcontract and the term 'contractor' includes a subcontractor.

'(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period or periods, when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period or periods when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is found as a result of such renegotiation, to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

"(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department or from any subcontract thereunder, (1) to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor or subcontractor, to recover such amount from such contractor or subcontractor. Such contractor or subcontractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor or subcontractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided that final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of each such Secretary and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purposes of making examinations and determinations with respect to profits under this section.

"(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each Department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount in excess of $100,000, statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail, as such Secretary may require. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor, or by such Secretary as may be mutually agreed to by the Secretaries concerned.

"(f) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

"(g) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"(h) This section shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 3 years after the termination of the war, but no court proceedings brought under this section shall abate by reason of the termination of the provisions of this section."

Mr. Speaker, I ask to be notified when I have consumed 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The Chair will notify the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this provision proposes to limit profits on war contracts.

In every war there have been men who made an unconscionable profit out of the national misfortune. Such circumstances have been so prevalent throughout modern warfare as to become axiomatic. With that in view, there has been a general understanding from the beginning that no one shall make undue profits out of the sacrifices which every citizen is required to make to win this war. There has been in effect a common determination that there should be no fattening of multimillionaires on exorbitant profits coined out of the blood of American soldiers.

There has naturally been a good deal of difference of opinion as to how this should be effected. The problem presents many difficulties. As a matter of fact the consensus of opinion has favored taxation of corporate profits and especially of excess profits rather than the method here presented. But the formulation of legislation for that purpose requires study, and in the meantime the committee, in response to widespread sentiment, submits this formula as a stopgap to serve the purpose, pending consideration by the legislative committees.

The pending amendment provides a method under which the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission may, where they deem it advisable, renegotiate contracts in which they think there have been excessive profits. If, after their study, they determine there has been an unreasonable profit, they may recapture the amount in excess, this amount to be either retained before payment to the contractor or to be recaptured and covered back into the National Treasury.

In brief outline the pending amendment:

First. Is applicable to War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission contracts and subcontracts.

Second. Authorizes and directs to be inserted in each contract and subcontract hereafter made for an amount in excess of $100,000:

(a) Provision for renegotiation of the contract price—which includes the refixing of the contract price by the department head—at times when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty.

(b) Provision for retention by or repayment to the United States of an amount of the contract price found as a result of renegotiation to represent excess profits.

Third. Authorizes and directs the head of each department concerned, whenever he finds excess profits have been or are likely to be realized, on any contract or subcontract, of whatever amount heretofore or hereafter made, if the final payment thereon has not been made before the date of approval of this act:

(a) To require the renegotiation of the contract price, which includes the refixing of the price by the head of the department concerned.

(b) To withhold any amount which is found as a result of the renegotiation to represent excessive profits.

(c) To recover any amount paid to the contractor or subcontractor which is found as a result of the renegotiation to represent excessive profits and authorizes appropriate court action if necessary to make the recovery.

Fourth. Heads of departments concerned are directed in renegotiating the contract price or determining excessive profits not to make any allowances for salaries, bonuses, or other compensation in excess of a reasonable amount nor make any allowance for reserves or for any costs for any amount which is excessive or unreasonable.

Fifth. Adequate provision is made for access to the books and records of contractors and subcontractors for purposes of audit and inspection and for the furnishing by them to the heads of the departments concerned of production costs and other financial statement as may be required. Also, provision is made for the use of the experts of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, by agreement between the department concerned and the Secretary of the Treasury, in the making of examinations, audits, and so forth.

Sixth. The law remains in force for a period of 3 years following the closing of the war, but the expiration date of the law shall not affect or abate any suit pending on the expiration date.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Does the language of the amendment the gentleman suggests and which he is asking the House to adopt lay down any yardstick for use by the Secretaries in determining what are or are not excessive profits?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It leaves it for him alone to determine what is a fair and reasonable profit and the formula by which he may elect to reach that determination.

Mr. TARVER. Why should not the Congress determine what is or is not a reasonable profit instead of delegating that authority to the Secretary?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That phase of the proposition, along with many others, was considered by the conferees, but due to the wide variation in amounts involved, from 15 cents to $15,000,000,000, and in subject matter ranging from contracts for the purchase of a carload of eggs to the manufacture of a four-engine bomber, it was a practical impossibility to adopt any such standard as the gentleman suggests.

May I also say that it was the testimony of the witnesses for the Department who appeared before us that this legislation is not particularly necessary at this time for the reason that they have established in the War Department a Cost Analysis Section and a Price Control Board which have already carried out precisely the functions which this amendment authorizes. They are already voluntarily renegotiating these contracts and securing readjustments and are recapturing excess payments and covering them back into the Treasury. They have renegotiated many contracts, and in no instance has there been any objection on the part of any contractor to renegotiation or readjustment of contract, and already there has been paid back into the Treasury in excess of $95,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, a notable instance of this was the case of the Continental Motors Co., which, after the contract had proceeded sufficiently to indicate the nature and extent of the profits, voluntarily came in and in a brief 3-hour conference agreed to relinquish some $40,000,000 of its profits. Such instances not only reflect credit on the officials of the Government but on the fine spirit of cooperation on the part of the contractors.

As a matter of fact, much that is said and written on this subject is patently unjust to the great body of contractors who are so effectively carrying out our war program. The impression that the average contractor is animated by a desire to profit at the expense of the Government, to exact every dollar that they can secure for the services rendered is unwarranted and unjustified by the facts. The testimony before us was that such cases are exceptions to the rule, and most instances of excessive profit as have occurred were found to be not intentional but due to the inability of officials and executives to determine an accurate basis on which to predicate an equitable agreement.

It is difficult to estimate costs and profits of this character in advance. Corporations are called upon to fabricate products never made before. They involve new construction, new labor and industrial conditions, and new material markets fluctuating under unpredictable war influences. As a result some contracts brought in large profits, while others brought bankruptcy. In other words, until schedules can be established by experience, all war contracts must be tentative, all procedure experimental, and all profits contingent.

But time is the essence. We can appropriate dollars but we cannot appropriate time. The enemy is at our gates. The first need has been to get production started. The usual system of awarding on bids is no longer workable. Hence agreements must be entered into which unwittingly may be unfair to either the Government or the contractor.

The only method of meeting the situation is to make the contracts and then, when by a system of trial and error, we have determined the basis on which reasonable profits may be figured, renego-

tiate as the War Department has been doing so successfully up to this time. That is the plan which we here propose to legalize with the expectation that it will be continued until the proper legislative committees of the House have had an opportunity to devise plans by which, through taxation, we can recover unreasonable profits regardless of the nature of the contract or the character of the subject matter.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman feel that probably the most effective thing that could be done, and certainly the next step that should be taken, is the passage of a most effective excess-profits-tax law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unquestionably. The excess-profits tax is the fairest tax that can be devised. It does not become effective until the contractor begins to profiteer. It taxes only those able to pay and in exact proportion to their ability to pay. It protects the Government and the people from exploitation and at the same time provides needed revenue.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the author of the amendment which initiated this legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the explanation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It is true this legalizes what the Department has been seeking to do in many cases. Is it not also true that the language of the amendment requires pursuance of this method?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The language in this case is mandatory. It requires the Secretary to do what he is already doing voluntarily; it requires the contractor to come in under process of law and renegotiate, as he is already renegotiating voluntarily; and it provides for the mandatory recapture of any excess profits in the manner already being effected. Of course, the only way to be certain that the remedy is enforced equally and on all occasions is to make it mandatory as the gentleman indicates.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], whose committee is now conducting a detailed study of this problem.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House should understand in the very first instance that this is not a profit-limitation proposal that is brought here for our consideration. It is nothing more than what is known as renegotiation of contracts.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate from the standpoint of effective legislative consideration that we find on an important and urgent war appropriation bill an attempt to deal with the highly technical and complicated question of the renegotiation of contracts and the recapture and repayment of excessive war profits. I have always been opposed, and still am, to the attachment of important legislation to appropriation bills. It is a bad practice, which interferes with the orderly and timely passage of the bills, invades the jurisdiction of the legislative committees, and results frequently in hasty, ill-digested, and ineffective legislation.

This bill contains appropriations urgently needed for the Military Establishment in excess of $17,000,000,000; it carries sums in excess of $1,600,000,000 for the Naval Establishment, and minor amounts for other agencies engaged in vital work supplemental to the war effort. While profit control is imperative, our first consideration is to fight this war and to procure the ships, planes, tanks, ammunition, and other equipment and supplies for our fighting forces without delay. We must not fail in that objective even at the sacrifice of cost. This bill is a factor in that problem of expeditious procurement of important war supplies and equipment.

The House itself started this legislation by adopting a profit limitation which I think everyone will agree is unworkable, and if left in the bill would probably have more harmful results than good. I say that in deference to the sincerity of the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota. The Senate struck out the House limitation and inserted a provision seeking to deal with excess profits through renegotiation of contracts. This provision was defective in that it also sought to deal with the problem of excessive profits on a contract basis without regard to the contractors' net profits for the year. It also was unacceptable in that it delegated to the various department heads the absolute and unlimited authority to determine what constituted excessive profits, without providing any standards for the assurance of the contractor and the guidance of the department head.

The conferees are bringing before the House a substitute which amends the Senate provision and leaves the question of excessive profits to be determined entirely by mutual agreement of the contractor and the department concerned through renegotiation of the contract. This is no more nor no less than a restatement of existing departmental practice. Each department head now has the right and considerable authority to require a renegotiation of any contract on which he believes the contractor is receiving excessive profits. As a matter of fact, since investigation into the question of war profits was begun by the Naval Affairs Committee there has been saved to the Navy Department, as a result of voluntary renegotiation of naval contracts alone, over $50,000,000.

Indirect savings through lower prices on new contracts entered into by the War and Navy Departments have been estimated at over $200,000,000 additional. The provision recommended by the conferees is definitely not an answer to the problem of exorbitant profits on war contracts. It may be of some help to the departments in their campaign for voluntary refunding of excessive profits by the contractor, but it will go no further than that.

The Naval Affairs Committee has given a great deal of study to the question of excessive war profits. It now has under consideration a bill which I feel deals more adequately, effectively, and comprehensively with this subject of war profits. These hearings have established that any plan for the recapture of excessive profits on war contracts, first, must contain ample authority to reach excessive profits of uncooperative contractors; second, must establish fair and reasonable standards for the assurance of the contractor and the guidance of the department head; third, must provide uniformity of treatment for all persons under substantially the same circumstances; and, fourth, must allow a fair return to the contractor on an annual basis.

None of the proposals before the House today meet these requirements. The amendment proposed by the conferees, if adopted, will result in the least confusion until such time as an adequate and considered proposal can be brought before the House.

The American people want some action on this question, but I am sure that they want that legislation to be more intelligently and effectively considered than it can be when hurriedly considered in connection with an appropriation bill.

The amendment presented here today can go through. It may do some good. I would not say that it will not be helpful, but it does not solve the problem. It can be amended or repealed when the House comes to deal with the subject in a truly comprehensive fashion. In the meantime this important bill can proceed on its vital mission of furnishing the funds to secure the prompt procurement of much needed military and naval facilities and supplies.

I am therefore supporting the motion of the chairman of the conference committee to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment, recognizing full well that the substitute proposed by the conference committee is not a true profits limitation and will not recapture for the Treasury one penny of exorbitant war profits which cannot now be recovered under existing departmental practice, but also recognizing the urgent need for the money which this bill appropriates. I hope that in the near future this House will be given an opportunity to consider legislation which will meet this problem fairly and squarely.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman's statement is correct—and I may say I am in full accord with him—then why should the House go through the futile motion of adopting this amendment? Why not reject the whole thing rather than have the people of the country believe we are undertaking to legislate on this question, when we are, in fact, not accomplishing anything?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is a very practical question. Here is an appropriation bill involving some $19,000,000,000. The Army and Navy demand that it be passed as speedily as possible. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Appropriations is behind schedule with

the War and the Navy Departments on making this money available. If we try to deal with this question of profit limitation—and it should be dealt with, and it will be dealt with in a few days—if we try to tack it onto this bill, we are liable to run into so many difficulties with the Senate conferees that we will be delaying the war program and delaying the purchase of equipment necessary for the prosecution of the war. Therefore, I think the wise thing to do is let the House know that this is not approaching the subject in the right way. It cannot do very much harm, but one thing is certain, it will not accomplish any profit limitation. In a short time a bill will be before the House dealing effectively with the question, and you will not slow up this urgent appropriation bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

I suppose that the Congress is unanimous in favor of taking profiteering out of the war effort. The difficulty is to find the proper method to accomplish this result and at the same time avoid substantially impeding production. The more the problem is studied, the more difficult it becomes.

Personally, I believe with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that the way to eliminate excess profits is to impose an excess-profits tax. I do not believe, however, that the place to impose that tax is on an appropriation bill, particularly on a bill carrying $19,000,000,000 that is urgently needed by the armed forces of this Nation.

In this connection I quote the following statement by Under Secretary Patterson:

An excess-profits tax—

He said—

may prevent a contractor from holding on to more than a small part of inordinate profits, but it does not prevent the men who are serving in our armed forces, the men who are laboring in our industries, and the general public from gaining the impression that some people are getting rich out of the war. That impression tends to incite others to try to get their share and is profoundly injurious to morale.

I concur in that statement and submit, therefore, that if we can do something here to assure the determination of a fair price at the outset without involving undue delay we should do it. I think we can do it through the medium of the proposal submitted by the conferees.

The House proposal, after examination by the departments concerned, was said to be unworkable, to have the tendency to throw small business out of the war production effort, to have the further tendency to throw us back onto a cost-plus basis, the dangers of which became apparent in connection with the last war, and to impose an enormous administrative task.

The Senate proposal, after consideration by these departments, was said to be more workable than the House proposal, but also to call for a very large administrative task and to be open to the fundamental objection, inasmuch as the heads of the departments were given the absolute authority to determine what was and what was not an excess profit, that it would fill every contract entered into with complete uncertainty, any contractor being subject within a period of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years, or whatever the period might be, to finding that by arbitrary decision all of his profit was taken from him.

The suggestion of the conferees attempts to steer a middle course. It modifies the Senate amendment and it does certain specific things.

First, it requires that all contracts and subcontracts in excess of $100,000 include a clause compelling the contractor to renegotiate the contract price when, in the judgment of the head of the department concerned, profits can be determined with reasonable certainty.

Second, it requires the renegotiation of all such contracts whenever, in the opinion of the department head concerned, excess profits have been realized or are likely to be realized.

Third, it requires the withholding by or repayment to the Federal Government of any amounts found to represent excess profits as a result of the renegotiation.

Fourth, it authorizes the department head concerned to demand the actual costs of production and such other financial statements as the department head may require.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Finally, it eliminates unreasonable salaries, bonuses, reserves, and other costs in the renegotiation of the contract price and the determination of excess profits.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the proposal of the conferees is not in any sense a completely effective limitation of profits. Further steps can and should be taken later.

But it does give to the departments the legal right to compel renegotiation in the light of known costs, and that right does not now exist. It does lay down a procedure in harmony with the practice of the War and Navy Departments operating through cost-analysis sections and price-adjustment boards already set up in the War Department and in process of being set up in the Navy Department. It does provide a system which the Departments state will do no harm and in some respects aid them in doing their work properly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate approval of the recommendation of the conferees as a step in the right direction. I urge its immediate approval in order to make immediately available the funds so urgently needed by the War and Navy Departments which are carried in this bill. I urge its immediate approval, leaving further steps, whether through an excess-profits tax or otherwise, for adoption by way of amendment in the light of the thorough study which this subject properly demands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

OBJECTIONS TO THE COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACT SYSTEM

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the main purposes of the War Department in its desire for new legislation for the adjustment of war contracts, a subject which this conference agreement attempts to cover, is to enable it to break away from the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract. In this I think the Department is to be highly commended. I would like in my limited time to call attention to one form of Government contract which I think, in the interest of good practice and in fairness to the American taxpayers, should be abolished and never again restored to our contractual system.

I refer to the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract.

I am pleased to learn that in advocating the early and complete abandonment of that type of contract I find myself in entire agreement with Judge Robert P. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, who has general charge and supervision over the business end of the war effort. All of the members of the Appropriations Committee and, indeed, all who know Judge Patterson, have the utmost respect for his great ability, his broad vision, and the soundness of his views. With the consent of the House, I shall print with these remarks testimony given by Judge Patterson before our Subcommittee on Deficiencies stating some of his objections to the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracts.

The files of the General Accounting Office literally reek with evidence showing that the practical operation of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract is to impose an unreasonable burden on the taxpayers of America. No more honest, no more capable official than Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, ever lived. In him the Congress and the country have complete confidence. Yet with all of this evidence before his very eyes, there is nothing he can do about it. His function is to see that contracts legally entered into are carried out in strict accordance with the terms of the contract, and his authority ends there. Zealous as is his purpose to guard the United States Treasury and disturbing as some of the practices must be to his economical mind, he is powerless to act.

It is not my intention in making these remarks to criticize anyone. Least of all do I want to be put in the position of censuring the officials who in good faith have entered into these contracts on the part of the Government. I do not censure them. I praise them. I praise them for their patriotic purpose to get production going at top-notch speed at the earliest possible moment. The prime argument for the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system is the speed with which contracts may be executed and production may begin under it, but I submit that what slight advantage may be gained in speed is more than offset by waste, inefficiency, and gross impositions on the taxpayers. It is the system that I am attacking—only the system—and I submit that it ought to be attacked and wiped out, root and

branch. Now that the War Department is making every effort to get away from the system and to relegate it to the realm of horrendous memories, I believe the Department ought to have the encouragement and cooperation of Congress.

As far back as last February my reportorial instinct overcame me and I began to dig into the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system to see how it operates. It seemed to me that the system was wasteful and excessively costly and unduly burdensome to the taxpayers. On February 17 I wrote a letter to Comptroller General Warren, in which I said:

Specifically, I would like to know whether in auditing these accounts—cost plus a fixed fee—there is found any discernible indication that the salaries of relatively unimportant officials have been raised to $9,000 or some other amount that would appear to be much higher than their normal pay—a practice which, if it exists, not only would result in inordinately high salaries being paid on each contract but would increase the compensation of the prime contractor on the cost-plus basis. I feel free to write to you on this matter because I know of your zealousness in protecting the Treasury, and I believe this is one of the possibilities we need to be on guard against. I would appreciate such advice and information as you can give to me.

On February 23 the Comptroller General acknowledged receipt of my communication in the following letter:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 23, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your letter of February 17, 1942, inquiring whether this Office, in the audit of payments to national defense contractors on a cost-plus basis has found indications that officials of such contracting companies have received unwarranted increases in compensation, thereby increasing the cost to the Government of the performance of the contract.

I am having this matter looked into and shall be pleased to advise you as soon as the information is available.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The Comptroller General took plenty of time to investigate and on March 27 he sent me a mass of valuable information, gleaned from the records of his office, and with it a very interesting and revealing covering letter. I direct the attention of the House especially to this covering letter. It was as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 27, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: With further reference to your letter of February 17, 1942, acknowledged February 23, inquiring whether in the audit of payments to contractors engaged in the performance of war contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, this office had found indications that the compensation of officials of the contracting companies had been increased to an amount beyond their normal rates of pay, there is enclosed a partial list of cases which have come to the attention of this office where salaries of officers or employees of such contractors have been increased at least 30 percent over the previous salary rates. This list covers about 30 out of approximately 300 such contracts now in this office. An additional report on this subject will be submitted, if requested by you, as soon as the examination of the records of this office can be completed, in the event you find that this list is not sufficient for your purposes.

I may state for your information that the matter of increasing the compensation of the contractor's officers or employees is generally subjected, by the terms of the contract, to some degree of control by the Government contracting officer or the administrative office under which the contract was made; and that the examination by this office of the disbursing officer's payments to this type of contractor is primarily for the purpose of establishing that the contractor is being reimbursed for only such of its expenditures as are in accordance with the terms of the contract. There is no authority in this office to withhold credit for a reimbursement merely because of a belief that the salary increase in any particular case results in an unjustified or inordinately high salary for the duties performed by the officer or employee, that being a matter for consideration by the contracting officer or the administrative office concerned.

With respect to salary increases of officers in the various aircraft manufacturing companies, such information generally is considered by the industry as confidential and the contracts with the companies usually so provide; and inasmuch as reimbursement is made to the contractor through overhead or indirect expense accounts to which salaries and other expenses have been distributed, detailed information relative to such salaries is not readily available in this office. However, it is probable that data relating to salaries in the aircraft industry could be obtained by you from the departments concerned.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

[Enclosures.]

The report which Mr. Warren sent with his letter speaks for itself. I submit it, as I have indicated heretofore, without criticism of any individual, but rather because of the light it throws on the inherently objectionable nature of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract and because it contains information which I think the country is entitled to have if we are to institute needed reforms as we go along and build up a constructive approach to the war effort.

The report submitted is only a partial one but it contains 28 single-spaced typewritten pages of names of officials and employees who are being paid under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system 30 percent or more than they were paid before. There may have been occasional cases where increases of pay were justified but certainly the taxpayers who pay the bill are entitled to an explanation of why there have been increases all along the line. It is difficult to understand why employees suddenly become so valuable to the Government that they are entitled to double and treble the salary they were receiving just before they came under the blanket of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts.

Increases of salary under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system revealed in the Comptroller General's report reach as high as 700 percent. Seventeen officials in one company whose salaries had previously ranged from $125 to $300 a month, were all boosted to $450 a month.

Nearly 600 in one company received an increase of more than 30 percent.

Extreme increases were: A superintendent from $3,000 to $7,800 a year; another superintendent from $100 to $325 a month; an electrical superintendent from $1,992 to $5,400; a plumbing superintendent from $1,820 to $4,800 a year; a timekeeper from $36 to $92.30 a week; 10 carpenter superintendents who were drawing from $19 to $45 a week, promoted to $60 a week; 30 guards who formerly drew from $360 to $1,200 a year, all boosted to $1,664 a year; gas attendant from $21 to $130 a month; field superintendent from $1,400 to $4,425 a year; carpenter superintendent from $19 to $60 a week; superintendent from $75 to $260 a month; a field superintendent from $1,400 to $4,425 a year.

I submit Mr. Warren's report for the RECORD, as follows:

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Antiaircraft Firing Center, Camp Savannah, Hinesville, Ga. Contractor: A. K. Adams & Co. and W. C. Shepherd, W-6367-qm-2.	Brumbeloe, Joe Harris	Chief cost accountant	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Cartwright, Willard H	Assistant concrete superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Clary, William Allen	Chief tool and rental equipment clerk	do	$65 per week.
	Sutton, J. C	Assistant general superintendent	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Wey, James Phillip	Manager, purchases and utilities	$80.77 per week	$150 per week.
	Bahin, Louis Joseph	Engineer	$69.23 per week	$125 per week.
	Shepherd, A. L., Sr	Superintendent	$60 per week	90 per week.
Advanced Pilot Training School, No. 5, Victoria, Tex. Contractor: American Friedman Bitulithic Associates, W-359-eng-2543.	Miller, J. P., Sr	Project manager	$6,000 per year	$8,996 per year.
	Jeanes, Thomas E	Assistant purchasing agent	$50 per week	$70 per week.
	Evans, Earl J	Estimator	$55 per week	$100 per week.
	Jones, Ivor M	Paving superintendent	$70 per week	Do.
Fort Worth Assembly Plant, Fort Worth, Tex. Contractor: The Austin Co., W-257-eng-240.	Hutcheson, Bill	Clerk	$30 per week	$40 per week.
	McCombs, Ruth A	Assistant purchasing agent	$36 per week	$50 per week.
	Lee, Francis R	do	$30 per week	Do.
	Bearden, Alfred E	Assistant chief of guards	do	$40 per week.
	Grubbs, Derwood I	Lay-out engineer	do	Do.
	King, Ray J	Shift structural steel superintendent	$110 per week	$145 per week.
	Johnson, Willie E	Field superintendent	$60 per week	$85 per week.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Sebring Airfield, Sebring, Fla. Contractor: Cleary Bros. Construction Co., W-436-eng-7505.	King, Fred W	Block superintendent	$55 per week	$85 per week.
	Snyder, Roy F	do	$150 per month	$368.33 per month.
	Drawdy, William A	Watchman	$25 per week	$40 per week.
	Ellis, Vernon	Rodman	do	$50 per week.
Architectural engineering services in connection with construction of 2,000-bed general hospital, including necessary buildings, at Atlanta, Ga. Contractor: Cooper & Cooper, Inc., W-6000-qm-11.	Allen, Fred B	Plumbing inspector	$60 per week	$85 per week.
	Carey, John F	Civil engineer	$100 per week	$140 per week.
	Bogges, Ernest L	Chief civil engineering draftsman	$40 per week	$65 per week.
	Cochran, C. E	Level man	$25 per week	$33 per week.
	Cole, Frank A	Building inspector	$35 per week	$50 per week.
	Grizzard, E. H	Civil engineering staff	$180 per month	$281.67 per month.
	Schlosser, A. W	Building inspector	$175 per month	$260 per month.
	Smith, Cyril B	Construction inspector	do	$346.67 per month.
	Stegall, Charles Edward, Jr	Civil engineering draftsman	$30 per week	$40 per week.
	Williams, Robert Edward	Instrumentman	$1,500 per year	$2,080 per year.
Fort McClellan, Ala. Contractor: Dunn Construction Co., Inc., and John S. Hodgson & Co., W-6119-qm-161.	Underwood, Mark Ware	Superintendent of roads and walks	$2,400 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Lokey, Thomas Oliver	Area superintendent, building construction	$2,600 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Ellington, Claude	Coordinator	$2,300 per year	$3,120 per year.
	Anderson, Robert	Area superintendent, building construction	$2,400 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Johnson, J. L	Principal clerk, insurance	$2,160 per year	$3,120 per year.
	Kilgrow, J. C	Head of pay-roll department	$2,400 per year	$3,900 per year.
British Guiana, South America. Contractor: Elmhurst Contracting Co.: Inc., W-958-eng-53:	Mennis, D. Frank	Office manager	$5,200 per year	$8,000 per year.
	Tyler, Harold N	Chief auditor	$3,600 per year	$5,200 per year.
New York office:	Shearman, Thomas	Traffic manager	$3,100 per year	Do.
	Sherwood, Edward	Office engineer	$3,300 per year	Do.
	Higgins, Frank	Assistant purchasing agent	$2,600 per year	$3,600 per year.
	Vaughn, John	Assistant personnel manager	$1,500 per year	$2,400 per year.
British Guiana office:	Carolean, Roger	Chief clerk	$3,100 per year	$5,200 per year.
	Stanning, George	Quarry superintendent	$3,000 per year	$6,000 per year.
	Finnegan, Howard A	Chief clerk	$3,600 per year	$5,000 per year.
Air Base, Trinidad, British Guiana. Contractor: Elmhurst Contracting Co., Inc., W-958-eng-53.	Banta, Burton J	Tugboat captain	$180 per month	$300 per month.
	Barry, Charles W	Storeroom clerk	$40 per week	$57.69 per week.
	Holland, Lola	Stenographer	$110 per month	$149.98 per month.
	Keebler, Jeff	Chief timekeeper	$36 per week	$92.30 per week.
	Moss, William K	Equipment dispatcher	$200 per month	$312 per month.
Camp Roberts, Nacimiento, Calif. Contractor: Ford J. Twaits Co. and Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., W-6976-qm-2.	Ball, Herbert C	General superintendent	$375 per month	$600 per month.
	Bassett, Harvey F	Traffic manager	$225 per month	$350 per month.
	Hanlin, Richard L	Comptroller	$250 per month	$480 per month.
	Stauffer, Arthur D	Office manager	$450 per month	$650 per month.
	Wheeler, Louis L	Field engineer	$220 per month	$350 per month.
	Volbrecht, Arthur G	Employment manager	$200 per month	Do.
	Manant, John L	Assistant auditor	do	$275 per month.
	Notley, Oscar L	Assistant division superintendent	$275 per month	$400 per month.
	Malven, Jack	General superintendent	$260 per month	$450 per month.
	Soderstrom, Dave	General carpenter's foreman	$225 per month	$350 per month.
	Stitt, Robert	General superintendent	$250 per month	$450 per month.
	Auten, George W	General carpenter's foreman	$200 per month	$350 per month.
	Bradbury, Wilbur E	Superintendent	$280 per month	$450 per month.
	Dutton, Benjamin	General superintendent	$250 per month	Do.
	Murray, Gilbert A	do	$330 per month	Do.
	Stitt, James L	General labor foreman	$190 per month	$300 per month.
	Wade, James S	General carpenter's foreman	$225 per month	$325 per month.
	Thomas, Joseph H	Superintendent	$325 per month	$450 per month.
	Umbarger, Chester W	General carpenter's foreman	$200 per month	$350 per month.
	Abbatte, Jones F	General labor foreman	$160 per month	$275 per month.
	Auten, Floyd	General foreman	$200 per month	$300 per month.
	Marshall, L. W	Assistant superintendent	$225 per month	$350 per month.
	Billingsley, Al	do	$250 per month	Do.
	Stonaker, Roy	do	do	Do.
	Coker, Hugh	General superintendent	$300 per month	$450 per month.
	Tatman, Fred F	do	$200 per month	$350 per month.
	Marshall, Robert C	Plumbing division superintendent	$150 per month	$450 per month.
	Siminoff, Alexander	Plumbing draftsman	$200 per month	$275 per month.
	Brown, Elwood J	Field plumbing superintendent	$140 per month	$450 per month.
	Holman, Ernest	General superintendent	$350 per month	$600 per month.
	Hill, Collis J	Division plumbing superintendent	$300 per month	$450 per month.
	Trainor, Charles E	do	$125 per month	Do.
	Mangan, Bernard M	do	$200 per month	Do.
	Forgeron, H. A	Superintendent of plumbing	$266 per month	Do.
	DowDell, Charles R	Warehouse manager	$150 per month	$250 per month.
	Dayton, Thomas	Division plumbing superintendent	$145 per month	$450 per month.
	Girven, Louis V	Office manager	$200 per month	$300 per month.
	Davy, Robert H	Field heating superintendent	$210 per month	$450 per month.
	Kombrink, Raymond	Assistant purchasing agent	$125 per month	$250 per month.
	Bertelli, Domenick J	Division heating superintendent	$225 per month	$400 per month.
	Huffman, L. R	Division plumbing superintendent	$300 per month	$450 per month.
	Arbogast, Richard E	General manager	$275 per month	$550 per month.
	Evans, Alvin M	Building wiring superintendent	$300 per month	$500 per month.
Lawson General Hospital, Chamblee, Ga. Contractor: Griffin Construction Co., Inc., and MacDougald Construction Co., W-6000-qm-12: Subcontract No. 1, Buckhead Plumbing Co.	Kalb, G. C	Estimator	$2,500 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Lambert, E. C	do	$2,800 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Walter, J. M	Head timekeeper	$2,400 per year	$3,380 per year.
Subcontract No. 2, Dixie Electric Co.	Pirkley, C. P	Superintendent outside distribution	$70 per week	$100 per week.
Lawson General Hospital, Chamblee, Ga. Contractor: Griffin Construction Co., Inc., and MacDougald Construction Co., W-6000-qm-12.	Barth, R. W	Police captain	$145 per month	$190 per month.
	Burke, M. J	Chief of police	$234 per month	$325 per month.
	Bobo, C. S	Head timekeeper	$225 per month	$325 per month.
	Britt, R. W	Assistant division superintendent	$1,620 per year	$3,640 per year.
	Butler, W. M	Assistant superintendent	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Cash, Brady L	Night general superintendent	$60 per week	$125 per week.
	Chrisman, H. T	Clerk, personnel office	$30 per week	$40 per week.
	Hyde, L. J	Fuel checker	$10 per week	$25 per week.
	Schlosser, H. G	Division superintendent	$250 per month	$541.67 per month.
	Zibbell, J. S	Assistant estimator	$40 per week	$55 per week.
Borinquen Field, P. R. Air Base. Contractor: Graham, Anderson Probst & White, W-1099-eng-271.	Cruz, Daniel	Chainman	$16 per week	$26 per week.
	Luke, Irvin H	Structural engineer	$81 per week	$115 per week.
	Medley, Theodore C	Office manager	$40.35 per week	$60 per week.
	Wheeler, H. M	Field to intermediate inspector	$50 per week	$65 per week.
	Matrinzo, Manuel	Engineering aide to surveying party chief	$34.60 per week	$46 per week.
	Bender, Carl R	Architect	$57.65 per week	$75 per week.
	Vadi, Alberto	Draftsman	$24.20 per week	$35 per week.
Advanced Single Engine School, Moultrie, Ga. Contractor: Hardaway Contracting Co., W-436-eng-7492.	Moore, Joe P	Night superintendent	$55 per week	$75 per week.
	Brooks, Howard O	Purchasing agent	$96 per week	$125 per week.
	Mitchell, Martin H	Assistant purchasing agent	$45 per week	$60 per week.
	Schwarz, Julius C., Jr	Equipment supervisor	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Looper, H. A., Jr	Expediter	$45 per week	Do.
	O'Neal, Richard D	Junior personnel agent	do	Do.
	Hussey, John T., Sr	Chief of equipment and time	$60 per week	$80 per week.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
New River Ordnance Plant, Pulaski, Va. Contractor: Hercules Powder Co., W-Ord-402.	Creger, James D	Doctor	$3,600 per year	$5,100 per year.
	Hance, Arthur R	Personnel manager	$2,500 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Skelton, William F	Chief of investigations	$2,100 per year	$3,600 per year.
	Wehrly, Henry A	Electrical superintendent	$1,992 per year	$5,400 per year.
	Buchanan, Robert E	Grading superintendent	$2,340 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Wugant, Samuel G	Assistant general superintendent	$3,800 per year	$5,400 per year.
	Snodgrass, Harry	Grading superintendent	$2,000 per year	$4,200 per year.
	McAllister, Edward E	Personnel manager	$1,800 per year	Do.
	Tecklenburg, Herbert C	Electrical engineer	$2,500 per year	$4,500 per year.
	Abernathy, George D	Assistant master mechanic	$2,400 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Rauner, Augustus F	Plumbing superintendent	$1,820 per year	Do.
	Medley, Marvin C	Grading superintendent	$2,860 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Painter, Harry D	do	$2,300 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Yasko, Karel H	Chief draftsman	$1,800 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Dickerson, Harold A	Area superintendent	$2,000 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Anderson Charles F	Shift superintendent	$1,800 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Ross, George, Jr	Area superintendent	$2,000 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Biddison, Elmer M	do	$1,800 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Fay, George S	Assistant master mechanic	$2,600 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Jones, Henry L	Equipment superintendent	$2,700 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Vorce, Clyde E	Rigger superintendent	$2,000 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Campbell, Cecil B	Area superintendent	$2,838 per year	Do.
	Derey, Harold W	do	$2,000 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Bailey, Clifford D	do	do	Do.
	Stewart, Paul M	Plant engineer	$3,060 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Benson, John O	Assistant supervising engineer	$2,800 per year	Do.
	Shelly, Walter J	Squad leader	$2,300 per year	$3,600 per year.
	Daugherty, William K	Field engineer	$2,800 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Wilson, Louis H	Captain of guards	$2,100 per year	$3,600 per year.
	Colburn, Raymond	Purchaser	$2,400 per year	$4,200 per year.
Camp Hulen, Palacios, Tex. Contractor: Hubbard, Knutson, Mitchell Construction Association, W-6961-qm-2.	Van Eman, C. H	Assistant project manager	$4,000 per year	$5,200 per year.
	Purcell, F. O	General superintendent	$3,000 per year	$7,800 per year.
	Thornton, J. R	Assistant auditor	$3,200 per year	$4,680 per year.
	Horton, E. R	Chief clerk	$2,600 per year	$4,160 per year.
	Rowand, C. S	Paymaster	$3,000 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Horton, H. H	Assistant paymaster	$2,400 per year	$3,640 per year.
	Passmore, H. J	Cost accountant	do	$3,710 per year.
	Ulrich, H. F	Purchasing agent	$4,325 per year	$7,800 per year.
	Jarrell, W. H	Junior estimator	$2,600 per year	$3,620 per year.
	Bruce, H. B	Field superintendent	$3,000 per year	$5,200 per year.
	Agerton, T. M	do	do	Do.
	Boston, Robert F	do	$4,000 per year	Do.
	Camache, L. H	do	$3,900 per year	Do.
	Evans, B. T	do	$3,000 per year	$4,420 per year.
	Schmid, A. D	do	$3,600 per year	$5,200 per year.
	Kelly, George L	do	$4,000 per year	Do.
	Hargrove, T. B	do	$3,000 per year	Do.
	Purcell, L. A	do	do	$4,425 per year.
	Davis, D. D	do	$1,400 per year	Do.
	Jennings, Roy A	do	$2,303.50 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Brewer, G. W	Assistant field superintendent	$3,000 per year	Do.
	Wilmouth, T. S	do	$1,500 per year	$4,420 per year.
	Cook, H. G	do	$3,120 per year	Do.
	Wood, L. H	do	$2,600 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Lay, J. M	Material checker	$1,300 per year	$2,600 per year.
	Gray, D. E	do	$1,800 per year	Do.
	Sanford, C. A	do	$1,000 per year	$1,800 per year.
	Blair, E. Lee	do	$900 per year	Do.
	Katenkamp, L	Time checker	$1,680 per year	$2,340 per year.
	Farris, George C	do	$1,200 per year	$1,800 per year.
	Baugh, H. F	do	do	Do.
	Corbin, D. L	Pay-roll clerk	$1,000 per year	$2,340 per year.
	Howell, Marion	do	do	Do.
	Wales, D. F	do	$1,800 per year	Do.
Camp Shelby, Miss. Contractor: J. A. Jones Construction Co., W-6133-qm-2.	Bland, D. C	Assistant superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Hester, H. E	do	do	$80 per week.
	Graham, George G	Auditor	do	$70 per week.
	Garber, J. F	Assistant superintendent	$60 per week	$80 per week.
	Rice, W. L	Office manager and paymaster	$57.50 per week	$75 per week.
Fort Bragg, N. C. Contractor: T. A. Loving & Co., W-6357-qm-216.	Blackman, D. F	Timekeeper	$900 per year	$1,560 per year.
	McLeod, Oscar J	Construction superintendent	$24 per week	$60 per week.
	Hinson, Lonnie A	do	$18 per week	Do.
	Turner, Henry	do	$28 per week	Do.
	Wainwright, John M	do	$25 per week	Do.
	Drew, Lloyd J	Timekeeper	$90 per month	$130 per month.
	Marcus, Hanmil	Janitor	$12 per week	$20 per week.
	Herring, W. H	Timekeeper	$12.60 per week	$30 per week.
	Griffin, Alton	Gas station attendant	$21 per month	$130 per month.
	Price, Thomas J	Timekeeper	$50 per month	Do.
	Lanier, J. Hardy	do	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Currie, S. T	do	do	Do.
	Buchanan, John Lewis	do	$20 per week	Do.
	Taylor, Herbert L	Project superintendent	$150 per month	$325 per month.
	Stewart, Ralph	General foreman	$100 per month	$216.66 per month.
	Smart, T. W	Project superintendent	$45 per week	$75 per week.
	Bryan, William Jennings	do	$150 per month	$346.67 per month.
	Croom, C. E	Timekeeper	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Harvell, James O	do	$75.40 per month	$130 per month.
	McLamb, Earl	do	$16 per week	$30 per week.
	Kavanaugh, T. A	do	$20 per week	Do.
	Struder, Robert L	do	$15 per week	Do.
	Wells, William C	do	$14 per week	Do.
	Wellons, William Ira	Superintendent	$200 per month	$281.67 per month.
	Holladay, John M	Project superintendent	$140 per month	$325 per month.
	Wilkerson, J. Q	Janitor	$15 per week	$20 per week.
	Granger, Maynard H	Timekeeper	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Carroll, Samuel E	Carpenter pusher	$35 per week	$50 per week.
	McLamb, George	Night watchman	$40 per month	$78 per month.
	Brady, I. E	Superintendent	$35 per week	$60 per week.
	Sykes, Joe	Night watchman	$38.40 per month	$78 per month.
	Manning, J. E	Carpenter superintendent	$30 per week	$50 per week.
	Spainhour, William R	do	do	Do.
	Pressley, Charles W	do	$35 per week	Do.
	Askew, Robert J	do	$30 per week	Do.
	Sherman, G. P	Utility	$96 per month	$130 per month.
	Sechrist, Archie	Carpenter superintendent	$150 per month	$216.66 per month.
	Brady, Isaac E., Jr	Superintendent	$35 per week	$60 per week.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Fort Bragg, N. C. Contractor: T. A. Loving & Co. W-6357-qm-216.—Continued.	Humphey, Jasper	Superintendent	$140 per month	$233.33 per month.
	Kelly, R. F	Concrete superintendent	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	McKethan, Duncan A	Labor checker	$18.50 per week	$30 per week.
	Samford, T. P	Superintendent	$50 per week	$85 per week.
	Jackson, Albert L	do	$45 per week	$70 per week.
	Upchurch, Wesley B	do	$40 per week	$65 per week.
	Owen, James P	do	$75 per month	$260 per month.
	Shaw, Malcolm	First aid	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Coble, E. F	Group superintendent	$60 per week	$80 per week.
	Wilson, Ollie C	Construction foreman	$50 per week	$70 per week.
	Barefoot, Rossie	do	$900 per year	$3,120 per year.
	Powell, N. S	do	$2,000 per year	Do.
	Henke, Adolf R	do	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Payne, Paul J	do	do	Do.
	Pittman, George C	do	$125 per month	$260 per month.
	Hedrick, Fred M	do	$37.50 per week	$60 per week.
	Edwards, J. G	Road superintendent	$169 per month	$260 per month.
	Banks, Russell	do	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Durden, Joe A	Timekeeper	do	Do.
	Ingram, H. M	Project superintendent	$3,200 per year	$4,420 per year.
	Owens, P. D	Group superintendent	$60 per week	$80 per week.
	Sutton, Paul L	Construction superintendent	$215 per month	$281.67 per month.
	Jones, Robert H	Project superintendent	$60 per week	$80 per week.
	Culbreath, D. E	General foreman	$42 per week	$70 per week
	Bass, Edgar F	Timekeeper	$60 per month	$130 per month.
	Ragland, W. W	do	$21 per week	$30 per week.
	Dorsett, C. R	Chief labor foreman	$25 per week	$40 per week.
	Turner, David J	Timekeeper	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	King, Richard Henry	Material checker	$12 per week	Do.
	Harris, A. C	Labor foreman	$60 per month	$130 per month.
	Creel, Frank M	Timekeeper	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Wilson, Daniel C	do	$18 per week	Do.
	Council, Hugh	Project superintendent	$200 per month	$325 per month.
	Kiser, J. B	do	$50 per week	$80 per week.
	Bullard, E. C	Timekeeper	$18 per week	$30 per week.
	Whitner, Jacob S	General heating superintendent	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Capola, Bernard	Superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Crumpacker, W. J	do	$55 per week	Do.
	Solon, Harry	do	$40 per week	Do.
	Hobbie, W. H	do	$30 per week	Do.
	Allen, Harrell	Material	$5 per week	$30 per week.
	Ingram, J. C	Time clerk	$15 per week	Do.
	Barringer, W. V	Superintendent	$100 per month	$325 per month.
	Daver, Harry J	do	$55 per week	$75 per week.
	Snell, Harold	Time clerk	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Gates, John D	Sewer superintendent	$225 per month	$325 per month.
	Smith, E. A	Water superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Baldwin, B. F	Sewer superintendent	$200 per month	$325 per month.
	McQueen, William A	Chief timekeeper	$25 per week	$40 per week.
	Pinkston, Joe	do	$30 per week	Do.
	Ward, Elizabeth	Stenographer	$15 per week	$27.70 per week.
	Cox, Clarence E	Superintendent	$35 per week	$60 per week.
	Fore, M. F	do	$175 per month	$260 per month.
	Parker, W. P	do	$36 per week	$60 per week.
	Snell, William H	do	$125 per month	$325 per month.
	Barden, S. L	Gas station manager	$25 per week	$35 per week.
	Owen, W. W	Project superintendent	$2,500 per year	$4,160 per year.
	Carter, Clarence D	Lumber checker	$1,000 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Deese, F. H	Carpenter superintendent	$36 per week	$60 per week.
	Kidd, C. N	do	$25 per week	Do.
	Samford, A. C	Chief project superintendent	$112 per week	$150 per week.
	Samford, C. C	General superintendent	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Scott, Herbert R	Assistant project manager	$143.08 per month	$216.67 per month.
	Ellington, Corinne	Junior stenographer	$75 per month	$120 per month.
	Sewell, T. M	Purchasing agent	$600 per month	$20 per day.
	Jones, G. F	Assistant purchasing agent	$75 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Whitton, E. L	do	$45 per week	$60 per week.
	Brooks, Maryleigh	do	$75 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Owens, Carolyn	Senior stenographer	$90 per month	$135.20 per month.
	O'Brien, Francis	Junior stenographer	$20 per week	$27.70 per week.
	Bennett, Julia	do	$75–$80 per month	$120 per month.
	Mahin, Elizabeth	do	$75 per month	Do.
	Moore, Leona	Senior stenographer	$95 per month	$135.20 per month.
	Smith, W. E., Jr	Chief estimator	$75 per week	$105 per week.
	Hayes, J. B	Junior estimator	$125 per month	$195 per month.
	Memory, Louise	Senior stenographer	$90 per month	$135.20 per month.
	Askers, John	Paint superintendent	$60 per week	$100 per week.
	Brown, Rufus	Junior stenographer	$11 per week	$27.70 per week.
	Waren, Helen	Telegraph operator	$75 per month	$120 per month.
	Richards, Beulah	Junior stenographer	$70 per month	Do.
	McNeill, Duncan	Messenger boy	$8 per week	$23.07 per week.
	Cook, E. L	Chief paymaster	$35 per week	$70 per week.
	Craig, James C	Assistant paymaster	$150 per month	$260 per month.
	Burner, W. B	Night auditor	$175 per month	$238.33 per month.
	Heartt, C. E	Bookkeeper	$90 per month	$173.33 per month.
	Currie, George	do	$125 per month	Do.
	Sundry, Ed A	do	$30 per week	$40 per week.
	Williams, Edgar T	do	do	Do.
	Moffitt, J. A	do	$25 per week	Do.
	Breedlove, Irvin P	do	do	Do.
	Townsend, Lester B	do	$75 per month	$173.33 per month.
	Knight, Lonnie A	do	$130 per month	Do.
	McDonald, D. T., Jr	do	$125 per month	Do.
	McDonald, James N	do	$91 per month	Do.
	Howard, Naomi	Cashier	$80 per month	$151.66 per month.
	Cummings, Harry	Stockroom clerk	$50 per month	$120 per month.
	Hight, Mattie	Junior stenographer	$17.50 per week	$27.70 per week.
	Horton, Margaret	do	$15 per week	Do.
	Grossett, Grace	Typist	$9.50 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Haugnton, Maude	do	$48 per month	$105.08 per month.
	McLaurin, Mildred	do	$8.50 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Odom, Anna Dorcas	do	$12 per week	Do.
	Peterson, Esther	do	$70 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Sory, Jean	do	$15 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Saunders, Dorothy	do	$50 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Williams, Elizabeth	do	$75 per month	Do.
	McMillan, Minnie W	Telephone switchboard operator	$17.50 per week	$31.20 per week.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Fort Bragg, N. C. Contractor: T. A. Loving & Co., W-6357-qm-216.—Continued.	Hollis, Mary	Telephone operator	$50 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Ward, Vara	do	$60 per month	Do.
	Nease, W. L.	do	$50 per month	Do.
	Murray, William B.	do	$45 per month	Do.
	Parham, Stanley	do	$17.75 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Davis, Woodrow W.	do	$18 per week	Do.
	DeRossett, M. B.	Accountant	$125 per month	$173.33 per month.
	Badgett, R. L.	Bookkeeper	$100 per month	$151.66 per month.
	McCall, Vivian	do	do	Do.
	Bullick, B. G.	Clerk	$60 per month	$130 per month.
	Crowell, David P.	do	$75 per month	Do.
	Currin, Sam	do	$18 per week	$30 per week.
	Gardner, W. C.	do	$10 per week	Do.
	Godwin, Bradley, Jr.	do	$20 per week	Do.
	Gardner, W. H.	do	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Perry, W. E., Jr.	do	$7 per week	$30 per week.
	Slogle, R. B.	do	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Traywick, Henry C.	do	$12 per week	$30 per week.
	Sherman, Mary	Junior stenographer	$90 per month	$120 per month.
	Manuel, Josephine	Senior stenographer	$65 per month	$135.20 per month.
	Bennett, Frances	Typist	$15 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Cumbee, Laura	do	$20 per month	$105.08 per month.
	DeSha, Betty	do	$15 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Kent, Laura	do	$80 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Melvin, Eula H.	do	$17.50 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Smith, Mildred	do	$12 per week	Do.
	Taylor, Roselle	do	$50 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Tillinghast, Bertie	do	$15 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Graham, L. S.	Project superintendent	$35 per week	$75 per week.
	Hester, Dwight	Master mechanic	$20 per week	$60 per week.
	McCrany, Hugh	do	$25 per week	Do.
	Council, W. O.	do	do	Do.
	Whitley, W. C.	do	$120 per month	$260 per month.
	Bean, W. R.	do	$135 per month	Do.
	Dameron, C. C.	do	$30 per week	$60 per week.
	Cogdell, G. J.	Latrine janitor	$7 per week	$20 per week.
	Edwards, M. B.	Master mechanic	$20 per week	$60 per week.
	Kelly, W. H.	do	$120 per month	$260 per month.
	Pensinger, A. B.	Project superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Bolton, Jennings	Property officer	$105 per month	$173.33 per month.
	McNeill, D. M.	Master mechanic	$30 per week	$60 per week.
	Bell, W. C.	Machinist superintendent	$120 per month	$260 per month.
	Dominick, O. H.	Master mechanic	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Edwards, James	do	$92 per month	$260 per month.
	Breeden, Ed	Janitor	$11 per week	$15 per week.
	McKinnon, O.	do	$6 per week	Do.
	Thomas, E. I.	do	$30 per month	$65 per month.
	King, D.	Property officer	$100 per month	$216.66 per month.
	Telfair, R. B.	do	$30 per week	$50 per week.
	Mitchell, J. R.	Janitor	$35 per month	$86.67 per month.
	Harris, Zack	Night watchman	$46 per month	$65 per month.
	Samford, T. P.	Group superintendent	$250 per month	$390 per month.
	Cash, Richard H.	Timekeeper	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Herring, E. C.	do	do	Do.
	Brown, Frank	Janitor	$9 per week	$20 per week.
	Livingston, J. A.	Timekeeper	$75 per month	$130 per month.
	Gurley, George	Project superintendent	$40 per week	$80 per week.
	Heyward, G. S.	Warehouse manager	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Buie, J. R.	Janitor	$10 per week	$20 per week.
	Gainey, Britten	Construction foreman	$140 per month	$281.67 per month.
	Mason, William H.	Lumber checker	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Sweum, Arthur E.	Lumber checker superintendent	do	$151.67 per month.
	Powell, James E.	Lumber checker	do	$130 per month.
	Smith, James L.	do	$75 per month	Do.
	Stedman, Henry R.	do	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Scott, William J.	do	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Reece, J. A.	do	$12.50 per week	$30 per week.
	Whittington, W. L.	do	$50 per month	$130 per month.
	Herring, Edgar C.	Timekeeper	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Daughtry, Willie F.	do	$22.50 per week	Do.
	Brinkley, W. A.	Lumber checker	$60 per month	$130 per month.
	Brown, Fred I.	Equipment checker	$12 per week	$30 per week.
	Earp, Herman B.	Lumber checker	$50 per month	$130 per month.
	McMillan, Daniel P., Jr.	do	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Smith, Troy	Night yard superintendent	$50 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Tyler, Jos. B.	Lumber checker	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Smith, G. R.	Timekeeper	$22.50 per week	Do.
	Feroell, Calven [1]	do	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Holden, Douglas	Guard	$10 per month	$78 per month.
	Dean, E. M.	Superintendent	$45 per week	$75 per week.
	Spiney, W. M.	Assistant superintendent	do	$60 per week.
	Newman, Callie J.	Timekeeper	$17.50 per week	$30 per week.
	King, Delton	Heavy equipment timekeeper	$100 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Henderson, Jack	Road construction superintendent	$30 per week	$65 per week.
	Graham, Lewis	do	$35 per week	Do.
	McNeill, David P.	Assistant road superintendent	$24 per week	$60 per week.
	Taylor, Robert J.	do	$40 per week	Do.
	Barbour, Paul D.	Timekeeper	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Bordeaux, O. L.	Field superintendent	$55 per week	$80 per week.
	Bordeaux, E. M.	Construction superintendent	$36 per week	$70 per week.
	Bordeaux, H. M.	do	do	$65 per week.
	Bordeaux, M. A.	do	do	Do.
	McCall, Alex	do	do	Do.
	Burton, W. R.	Carpenter superintendent	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Adams, Paul C.	Timekeeper	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Plyler, Franklin E.	Machinist superintendent	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Cogdell, George, Jr.	Latrine janitor	$7 per week	$20 per week.
	Sykes, Merritt	Road construction superintendent	$30 per week	$65 per week.
	Tucker, Alvie	Carpenter superintendent	$19 per week	$60 per week.
	Hunnings, Coley E.	do	$25 per week	Do.
	Stevens, Clarence	do	$35 per week	Do.
	Smith, S. E.	do	$20 per week	Do.
	Benton, R. B.	do	$30 per week	Do.
	McCall, D. V.	do	$32 per week	Do.
	Davis, O. B.	do	$20 per week	Do.
	Kennedy, C. C.	do	$260 per month	$260 per month.

[1] This is Ferrell, Calvin Dempsey, Jr., on the affidavit.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Fort Bragg, N. C. Contractor: T. A. Loving & Co., W-6357-qm-216—Continued.	Dennis, R. H.	Carpenter superintendent	$30 per week	$60 per week.
	Stevens, J. B.	do	$36 per week	Do.
	Jackson, Carlton	Concrete superintendent	$100 per month	$216.67 per month.
	Vann, T. C.	Carpenter superintendent	$25 per week	$60 per week.
	Hamilton, Margaret	Typist	$40 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Moore, Hazel	do	$60 per month	Do.
	Neal, Viola	do	$10 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Whiting, Corinne	do	$13.46 per week	Do.
	Sullee, Kathleen	Pay-roll clerk	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Price, Howard	do	$90 per month	Do.
	Jackson, Robert	do	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Durhan, J. H., Jr.	do	$18 per week	Do.
	Mayo, F. B.	do	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Sutton, W. L.	Auditor	$30 per week	$85 per week.
	Nash, C. L.	Head bookkeeper	$185 per month	$260 per month.
	Hudson, G. C.	Freight rate man	$170 per month	$251.33 per month.
	Speed, J. C.	Bookkeeper	$150 per month	$195 per month.
	Eutiler, S. K.	do	$100 per month	$173.33 per month.
	Crawley, W. K.	do	$15 per week	$40 per week.
	Sanderford, J. F.	do	$30 per week	Do.
	Harvey, W. B.	do	$24.22 per week	$50 per week.
	Brandon, D. M.	do	$18 per week	$40 per week.
	West, F. Heywood	do	$150 per month	$216.67 per month.
	Dellinger, Russell C.	do	$95 per month	$162.50 per month.
	Martin, G. N.	do	$15 per week	$37.50 per week.
	Troutman, Paul G.	do	$100 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Stewart, Ada	Junior stenographer	$16 per week	$27.70 per week.
	Wheatley, Betsy	do	$85 per month	$120 per month.
	Ingram, Marie	do	$70 per month	Do.
	White, Sarah Francis	do	do	Do.
	Moore, Margaret	do	$12.50 per week	$27.70 per week.
	Hayes, Dora	do	$15 per week	Do.
	Cummings, Ruth	Typist	$12 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Grey, C. M.	Social Security department manager	$150 per month	$216.67 per month.
	Hinson, Elizabeth	Junior stenographer	$90 per month	$120 per month.
	Bryan, Maude	do	$75 per month	Do.
	Alexander, Ollie	Typist	$50 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Baggett, Edith	do	$7 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Barnhardt, Margaret	do	$17 per week	Do.
	Broadwell, Mildred	do	$50 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Bowman, Carol	do	do	Do.
	Dorsett, Violet	do	Unemployed	$24.25 per week.
	Davies, Claudia	Social Security clerk	$18.50 per week	$30 per week.
	Edwards, Henrie	Typist	$12 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Gurley, Jane	do	$50 per month	$105.08 per month.
	Herring, Mable	do	$80 per month	Do.
	Hayes, Mrs. Robert	do	$15 per week	$24.25 per week.
	Monroe, Martha	do	$11.25 per week	Do.
	Moore, Mary	do	$14.50 per week	Do.
	Ennis, Jas. W.	Lumber checker	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Chenault, L. E.	do	$90 per month	Do.
	Smith, Samuel C.	Clerk	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Todd, Glenn	General clerk	$80 per month	$130 per month.
	Riggs, William E.	Office boy	$13 per month	$25 per month.
	Marks, George R.	Clerk	$11 per week	$24 per week.
	Best, Edgar L.	Timekeeper	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Wall, H. O.	Project superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Toms, Clarence W.	Machinist superintendent	$34 per week	$60 per week.
	Bryant, William R.	Superintendent of lumber checkers	$20 per week	$35 per week.
	Bramble, Robt H.	Lumber checker	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Carmichael, D. A.	do	do	Do.
	Carter, A. L.	do	$60 per month	Do.
	Collier, Robert G.	do	$75 per month	Do.
	Dupree, L. C.	do	$100 per month	Do.
	Faulk, S. C.	do	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Gainey, J. W.	do	$50 per month	$130 per month.
	Cashwell, June C.	do	$22 per week	$30 per week.
	Boney, R. B.	do	$15 per week	Do.
	Stephenson, W. A.	do	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Coggin, June F.	do	$60 per month	Do.
	Best, Claude B.	do	$100 per month	Do.
	Brownlee, F. O.	do	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Davis, W. C.	Timekeeper	$100 per month	$130 per month.
	Beane, J. S.	Night superintendent	$160 per month	$173.33 per month.
	Childress, Jan. K.	Lumber checker	$18 per week	$30 per week.
	Clifton, H. E.	Grav. checker	$50 per month	$130 per month.
	Crumpler, Robert R.	do	$21 per week	$30 per week.
	Godwin, S. C.	Superintendent lumber checker	$100 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Hamm, Marvin K.	Lumber checker	$12 per week	$30 per week.
	Johnson, Nelson M.	do	$50 per month	$130 per month.
	Leonard, Cooper W.	do	$60 per month	Do.
	Norris, Walter T.	Warehouse manager	do	Do.
	Allen, Sidney T.	Timekeeper	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Bradshaw, Marvin	Lumber checker	$75 per month	$130 per month.
	Ballard, Charles B.	do	$15 per week	$30 per week.
	Beale, Charles	do	do	Do.
	Wagoner, H. M., Jr.	Timekeeper	$20 per week	Do.
	Kelly, J. W.	Lumber checker	$10 per week	Do.
	Powell, Ellis M.	Warehouseman	$70 per month	$130 per month.
	Warren, George C.	Lumber checker	$100 per month	Do.
	Hatley, Lewis.	Superintendent	$40 per week	$65 per week.
	Barbee, Marvin	Night garage foreman	$120 per month	$195 per month.
	Huggins, Asberry	Timekeeper	$50 per month	$130 per month.
	McCall, C. L.	Group superintendent	$65 per week	$90 per week.
Pine Camp, Great Bend, N. Y. Contractor: William S. Lozier, W-6474-qm-17.	Upham, Elgin T.	Party chief	$200 per month	$260 per month.
	Dewitt, Paul	do	do	Do.
	Poole, Mertice M.	Secretary	$108.33 per month	$151.67 per month.
	Hurd, Walter	Instrumentman	$45 per week	$60 per week.
	Wallace, Douglas	Rodman—instrumentman	$33 per week	$45 per week.
	Kingston, Heybeck	Coordinator	$200 per month	$303.33 per month.
	Poole, Donald W.	Auditor	$125 per month	$238.33 per month.
	East, Gordon	Rodman	$30 per week	$40 per week.
	Vanderbrook, Roger J.	Instrumentman—party chief	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Clark, Christine	Stenographer	$20 per week	$30 per week.
	Smith, Warren	Rodman—construction inspector	$33 per week	$45 per week.
	Blum, Walter F.	Rodman—sewer inspector	do	Do.
	Peterson, Harry	Building inspector	$30 per week	$50 per week.
	Carlson, Emmett	Party chief	$200 per month	$260 per month.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Tulsa Aircraft Assembly Plant, Tulsa, Okla. Contractor: Manhattan Construction Co., W-057-eng-275.	Catlett, Page	In charge of files—stenographer for directors	$25 per week	$45 per week.
Borinquen Field, P. R. Contractor: McCloskey & Co.. W-1099-eng-270.	Teckmeyer, Harry	Plumbing superintendent	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Phillips, Anne	Senior accountant	$55 per week	Do.
	Hines, H. J.	Electrical engineer	$75 per week	Do.
(Confidential.) Contractor: McWilliams Dredging Co., DA-W-1098-eng-2.	Moreau, P. O.	Personnel assistant, New York office	$60 per week	$85 per week.
	Ames, Frederick H.	Requisition supervisor	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Burke, John	Clerk	$16 per week	$25 per week.
	Anderson, A. R.	Field office manager	$75 per week	$125 per week.
	Bartels, R. P.	Timekeeper	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Watt, R. H.	Pay-roll clerk	do	Do.
	O'Connell, H. A.	Stenographer	$40 per week	$60 per week.
	Potter, Morgan	Purchasing agent	$100 per week	$150 per week.
Gadsden Shell Plant, Gadsden, Ala. Contractor: The Rust Engineering Co., W-6897-qm-1.	Phillips, James L.	Electrical engineer	$250 per month	$400 per month.
	Sandefur, Richard P.	Chief draftsman	$275 per month	Do.
Construction contractor	Moore, Findley C.	General superintendent	$400 per month	$550 per month.
	Rutledge, Oliver M.	Assistant superintendent	$250 per month	$400 per month.
	Cavett, James M.	Chief field engineer	$225 per month	$300 per month.
	Whaley, James H.	Master plumber	$325 per month	$475 per month.
	Jones, Samuel E.	Master mechanic	$216.66 per month	$312 per month.
	Spessard, Cecil T.	Chief tool and equipment man	$195 per month	$260 per month.
	Wilson, Albert L.	Structural iron worker superintendent	$325 per month	$390 per month.
	Hick, Ottis M.	General labor foreman	$200 per month	$281.67 per month.
Utilities Engineering Co. and Juneman Electric Co.	Schreck, G. W.	Superintendent	$260 per month	$400 per month.
Illinois Ordnance Plant, Marion, Ill. Contractor: The Sherwin-Williams Defense Corporation, DA-W-Ord-18 and W-Ord-522.	Abney, Millage	Janitor	$720 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Anderson, Clyde	Medical clerk	$1,380 per year	$1,950 per year.
	Chapman, Harry B.	Junior clerk	$900 per year	$1,352 per year.
	Deaton, Mary D.	Senior stenographer	$1,200 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Faulkner, Robert	Office janitor	$1,040 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Flynn, Harry A.	Junior messenger	$600 per year	$1,040 per year.
	Gallegly, Robert L.	Accountant	$1,500 per year	$2,418 per year.
	Glenn, Billie	Junior typist	$520 per year	$1,196 per year.
	Glover, Elouine	Senior stenographer	$1,000 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Gualdoni, Rose	Junior clerk	$900 per year	$1,352 per year.
	Hamby, Malcolm C.	Junior typist	$780 per year	$1,196 per year.
	Hargraves, Fred M.	Equipment engineer	$3,000 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Harris, Mildred L.	Senior stenographer	$1,200 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Hasting, Harold J.	Office machinist	do	$2,470 per year.
	Hays, Ruth	Clerk-typist	$900 per year	$1,300 per year.
	Heltsley, Haid	Photographer	$1,800 per year	$2,340 per year.
	Heltsley, Pearl	Janitor	$900 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Howell, Marshall	Paymaster	$1,440 per year	$2,418 per year.
	Howell, William A.	Sanitary engineer	$2,700 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Irwin, Oliver W.	Junior messenger	$600 per year	$1,040 per year.
	Johns, Cecil	Assistant messenger	$400 per year	Do.
	Kaut, William	Telephone operator	$1,040 per year	$1,352 per year.
	Knight, Mary K.	Junior typist	$700 per year	$1,196 per year.
	Lawrence, Randal L., Jr.	do	$800 per year	Do.
	Long, Frances E.	Clerk	$1,000 per year	$1,456 per year.
	May, Herman	Fireman	$1,200 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Mercer, Julia A.	Senior stenographer	$1,140 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Milbert, Osmar, Jr.	Fingerprinter	$2,016 per year	$2,860 per year.
	McRoy, Ismay	Junior stenographer	$1,000 per year	$1,456 per year.
	Odum, Aleatha	Junior typist	$600 per year	$1,196 per year.
	Pell, Charles H.	Assistant to purchasing agent	$2,100 per year	$2,730 per year.
	Perry, Jake	Fireman	$1,200 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Richey, Kenneth W.	Medical clerk	$1,440 per year	$1,950 per year.
	Robbins, C. Edward	Electrical engineer	$2,100 per year	$3,380 per year.
	Scott, Lucille	Assistant messenger	$500 per year	$1,092 per year.
	Shadron, Ralph B.	Mileage clerk	$1,200 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Shanks, Annabel	Junior stenographer	$800 per year	$1,456 per year.
	Simmons, J. E.	Mail clerk and mimeograph operator	$300 per year	$1,196 per year.
	Simmons, William E.	Assistant messenger	$700 per year	$1,040 per year.
	Skeleher, Pete C.	Fireman	$1,000 per year	$1,560 per year.
	Sloan, Betty M.	Senior stenographer	$1,200 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Steudel, Richard	Property clerk	$1,600 per year	$2,080 per year.
	Ulrich, Paulean	Senior stenographer	$1,140 per year	$1,638 per year.
	Waters, Clarence	Safety inspector	$1,500 per year	$2,080 per year.
	Waugh, William F.	Buyer	$1,680 per year	$2,314 per year.
	Yost, L. E.	Traffic manager	$3,000 per year	$4,160 per year.
	Anthes, Richard	Guard	$1,020 per year	$1,664 per year.
	Beck, Earl	do	$840 per year	Do.
	Carlton, Andrew	do	do	Do.
	Coad, Elbert	do	$785 per year	Do.
	Davis, Louie E.	do	$528 per year	Do.
	Dunning, William H.	do	$1,040 per year	Do.
	Dycus, Jesse	do	$700 per year	Do.
	Fulkerson, Lloyd	do	do	Do.
	Goddard, Fred	do	$888 per year	Do.
	Green, Lloyd	do	$1,200 per year	Do.
	Hadfield, Frank	do	$950 per year	Do.
	Hanbeck, George	do	$1,040 per year	Do.
	Harrall, Leonard	do	$540 per year	Do.
	Jones, Ralph	do	$577 per year	Do.
	Jones, Samuel	do	$888 per year	Do.
	Littlemeyer, Ben	do	$360 per year	Do.
	Mallady, Edgar	do	$720 per year	Do.
	Martin, Ralph	do	$960 per year	Do.
	Mick, Clifford	do	$1,200 per year	Do.
	Parks, Randall	do	do	Do.
	Payne, W. Lawson	do	$1,100 per year	Do.
	Pharis, Ben	do	$1,000 per year	Do.
	Pulliam, Everett	do	$1,200 per year	Do.
	Summer, Charles	do	do	Do.
	Thomas, Farris	do	$576 per year	Do.
	Thornberry, Chester	do	$900 per year	Do.
	White, James A.	do	$728 per year	Do.
	Will, Charles	do	$936 per year	Do.
	Wilson, Ira	do	$1,000 per year	Do.
	Ziemer, Henry	do	$888 per year	Do.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Kankakee Ordnance Works, Joliet, Ill. Contractor: Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation W-6039-qm-1.	Sias, R. G	Chief timekeeper	$65 per week	$85 per week.
	Piper, J. P	Purchasing agent	$80 per week	$105 per week.
Fort Story Va. Contractor: Tidewater Construction Corporation. W-616-eng-1475.	Bishop William E	Assistant superintendent	$50 per week	$80 per week.
Camp Barkeley, Abilene, Tex. Contractor: Taylor-Byrne-Briggs, W-7006-qm-2.	Anderson, J. L	Business manager	$300 per month	$616.67 per month.
	Franks, H. H	Purchasing agent	$383 per month	$616.67 per month.
	Hessemer, R. R	Cost accountant	$200 per month	$325 per month.
	Morgan, Ira M	Materials superintendent	$350 per month	$500 per month.
	Penix, L. S	Assistant material superintendent	$150 per month	$325 per month.
	Keller, Allen	Equipment engineer	$225 per month	$476.67 per month.
	Williams, Jess	Assistant manager and coordinator	$400 per month	$616.67 per month.
	Prestridge, K. K	Chief engineer	$300 per month	$476.67 per month.
	Goulding, F. B	Assistant purchasing agent	$110 per month	$303.33 per month.
	Byrne, J. S	Line superintendent (electric)	$260 per month	$541.67 per month.
	Wilson, E. A	Superintendent, equipment repairs	$225 per month	$433 per month.
	Grizzard, C. M	General foreman	$175 per month	$303.33 per month.
	Schnorbus, W. B	General electric superintendent	$425 per month	$616.67 per month
	Meisner, J. B	Chief estimator	$300 per month	$433.33 per month.
	Hale, J. W	Rental and procurement	$225 per month	$346.67 per month.
	Jones, F. D	Assistant estimator	$125 per month	$260 per month.
	Holder, Wallace	Superintendent, disposal plant	$220 per month	$433 per month.
	Horton, E. M	Supervisor, investigations department	$200 per month	$260 per month.
	Galston, J. Rex	Supervisor, pay roll	$150 per month	$281.67 per month.
Replacement center, Fort Francis E. Warren, Wyo. Contractor: Royce J. Tipton, Architect-Engineer. W-6560-qm-51.	Osborn, L. C	Section chief	$3,100 per year	$4,800 per year.
	Marge, J. Nesbit	do	$3,200 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Connell, John F	Assistant engineer	$2,700 per year	$3,600 per year.
	Banner, Joseph T	do	$2,400 per year	$4,200 per year.
	Maxwell, C. B	Chief clerk	$3,000 per year	Do.
Cantonment camp, Indiantown Gap, Pa. Contractors: W. F. Trimble & Sons Co., Ferguson & Edmonson Co., the Huffman Wolfe Co., W-6946-qm-2.	McMinn, W. J	Assistant project manager	$4,250 per year	$5,980 per year.
	Helvenston, H. R	Purchasing agent	$5,500 per year	$7,176 per year.
	Stickelmeyer, Walter	Superintendent, heating and plumbing	$3,900 per year	$5,980 per year.
	Harrison, Arthur K	Purchasing agent	$2,790 per year	$4,784 per year.
Camp Wallace, Hitchcock, Tex. Contractor: Wahlfend-Dalton Dellone, W-6063-qm-1.	Swanson, C. L	General superintendent	$300 per month	$650 per month.
	Hanlon, C. E	Assistant superintendent	$250 per month	$325 per month.
	Bailey, P. W	Assistant executive administrator	$278 per month	$433.33 per month.
	Ewalt, Joe S	Assistant construction supervisor	$1,800 per year	$5,200 per year.
	Wagner, K. B	Resident engineer	$2,600 per year	$3,900 per year.
	Winans, L. S	Assistant resident engineer	$150 per month	$250 per month.
	Strieber, A. S	Construction engineer	$3,000 per year	$4,200 per year.
Alaska R. R., between Seward and Anchorage, Alaska. Contractor: West Construction Co., W-896-eng-2644.	Conroy, Peter	Storekeeper	$225 per month	$300 per month.
	Cook, Harry G	Plumbing and heating superintendent	$3,000 per year	$5,400 per year.
	Kippola, Otto W	Assistant buyer	$200 per month	$300 per month.
	Koenig, Walter Edmond	do	$180 per month	$238.33 per month.
	Larsen, Irere Marie	Chief stenographer	$120 per month	$169 per month.
	Lee, Eugene W	Typist	$110 per month	$150 per month.
	Lykken, Halle L	Auditor	$216.67 per month	$350 per month.
	McCulloch, Madalynne C	Typist	$70 per month	$112.67 per month.
	Fries, Walter	do	$108.33 per month	$150 per month.
	Gardner, Robert	Building and carpenter superintendent	$375 per month	$500 per month.
	Hawley, Mary Jane	Typist	$75 per month	$125.66 per month.
	Mims, Percy Gordon	Paymaster and steward	$200 per month	$325 per month.
	Murphy, Elmer William	Storekeeper	$175 per month	$275 per month.
	Pokswin, Florian A	Assistant buyer	$180 per month	$238.33 per month.
	St. George, Ila Rosa	Auditor's assistant	$100 per month	$195 per month.
	Schacht, Arthur H	Assistant general superintendent	$388 per month	$550 per month.
	Sharpe, Ruth E	Receptionist and switchboard operator	$85 per month	$112.67 per month.
	Shupert, Harvey R	Diesel power plant erection superintendent	$300 per month	$433.33 per month.
	Sorenson, Melvin A	Timekeeper	$70 per month	$150 per month.
	Starret, Virginia L	Typist	do	$112.67 per month.
	Tucker, Elva R. (Mitchell)	Stenographer	do	$125.52 per month.
	White, Adele L	Stenographer (part time)	do	Do.
	Williams, George S	Assistant paymaster	$110 per month	$200 per month.
	Haye, Wanda Smith	Typist	$75 per month	$125.66 per month.
	Meiselback, Olga L	Secretary	$125 per month	$169 per month.
	Johnston, Thomas T	Traffic manager	$40 per week	$55 per week.
Camp Grant, Rockford, Ill. Contractor: Holabird & Root, W-6116-qm-1.	Beuter, William A	Inspector	$175 per month	$250 per month.
Construction of barracks and appurtenant structures at Spokane, Spokane County, Wash. Contractor: Clifton & Applegate & Henry Georg, W-869-eng-2100.	Baertsch, Joyce M	Stenographer	$17.50 per week	$35 per week.
	Bowman, Betty J	do	$15 per week	$30 per week.
West Palm Beach Airport, West Palm Beach, Fla. Contractor: Watt & Sinclair & Cleary Bros., W-436-eng-7314.	Butler, John P	Assistant general superintendent	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Wallin, Dan L	Assistant general superintendent of construction	$65 per week	Do.
	Emrich, Philip L	Assistant superintendent	$50 per week	$75 per week.
	Meyers, Harry L	do	do	Do.
Advanced Flying School No. 6, Albany, Ga. Contractor: Cooper & Cooper, Inc., W-436-eng-7389.	Chapman, C. W	Auditor	$60 per week	$85 per week.
	Coleman, Lenard S	Quarry surveyor	$45 per week	$75 per week.
	Veal, John D	Draftsman	$50 per week	$65 per week.
	Lane, T. G	Assistant engineer	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Hicks, R. L	do	do	Do.
	Morrison, J. L., Jr	Chief draftsman	$50 per week	$65 per week.
	Griffin, Grover C	Chief building inspector	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Marshall, William D	Architect draftsman	$175 per month	$281.67 per month.
Ninety-first Observation Squadron, Pine Camp, N. Y. Contractor: John W. Cowper Co., W-138-eng-1631.	Francis, Fred	Resident and office engineer	$300 per month	$390 per month.
Danville General Hospital, at or near Danville, Ky. Contractor: Gilson & Taylor, W-7114-qm-2.	Adams, Vernon	Assistant general superintendent	$50 per week	$100 per week.
Mojave Desert Antiaircraft Firing Range, Camp Haan, Riverside County, Calif. Contractor: Lippincott & Bowen, W-6694-qm-655.	Crowner, Ben E	Chainman	$110 per month	$160 per month plus room and board.
	Wordie, James S	Instrument man	$160 per month	$210 per month plus room and board.
Municipal Airport, Albuquerque, N. Mex. Contractor: Morgan & Shufflebarger, W-911-eng-507.	Tucker, H. L	Estimator	$325 per month	$450 per month.
	Startling, Roy	General superintendent	$90 per week	$126.92 per week.
	Schuster, M. L	Electrical engineer	$216.67 per month	$375 per month.
	Smith, Mortis	Assistant superintendent	$300 per month	$475 per month.
	Busby, Gene	do	$60 per week	$103.85 per week.
	Munz, Fernie	Chief pay-roll clerk	$150 per month	$200 per month.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors' employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—Continued

	Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Seventh Corps Area Training Center, Fort Leonard Wood, Rolla, Mo. Contractor: W. A. Klinger, Inc., W-6969-qm-2.	Dunn, E. W.	Assistant project manager	$6,300 per year	$8,996 per year.
	Miller, W. H.	Assistant general superintendent	$100 per week	$173 per week.
	Mathis, Arthur F.	Superintendent, sewer and water	$5,000 per year	$7,800 per year.
	Boyle, Phil J.	Comptroller	$200 per month	$433.33 per month.
	Harvey, Howard G.	Superintendent, roads and streets	$300 per month	$541.67 per month.
	Gebhard, I. L.	Superintendent, equipment maintenance	$275 per month	$433.33 per month.
	Herring, C. F.	Superintendent, safety and sanitation	$175 per month	$368.33 per month.
	Bowler, J. R.	Assistant general superintendent, building and construction.	$90 per week	$140 per week.
	Beach, G. Oliver	Chief estimator	$2,600 per year	$4,680 per year.
	Lindblom, Harry	Bridge superintendent	$65 per week	$85 per week.
	Adams, James W.	Superintendent, electrical department	$70 per week	$115 per week.
	Bunch, H. T.	Traffic manager	$180 per month	$325 per month.
	Voss, W. H.	Superintendent, time and pay department	$4,000 per year	$7,800 per year.
	Vogt, H. O.	Auditor	$6,000 per year	Do.
	Burnett, Bert O.	Superintendent transportation department	$75 per week	$100 per week.
	Marshall, W. H.	Superintendent, sheet-metal department	$70 per week	Do.
	Askew, W. D.	Chief storekeeper	$300 per month	$498.33 per month.
	Holmes, R. H.	Superintendent, equipment rental	$175 per month	$411.67 per month.
	Amis, P. H.	do	$65 per week	$100 per week.
	Sturgeon, R. A.	Economy building superintendent	$60 per week	Do.
	Curran, Micheal C.	Superintendent, railroad department	$300 per month	$650 per month.
	Wilis, E. Vernon	Purchasing agent	$350 per month	$563.33 per month.
	Knobel, Thomas	Assistant general superintendent, railroad department.	$6,000 per year	$8,996 per year.
	Zack, O. W.	Superintendent, road maintenance	$250 per month	$325 per month.

Mr. Speaker, for further illumination of this subject I present for printing in the RECORD the testimony of Judge Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before our subcommittee on deficiency appropriations on April 15, 1942, as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW. Judge, I understood you to say that unless this legislation on this subject is passed, ultimately you will be driven into a very large extension of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in number.

Secretary PATTERSON. I believe that.

Mr. LUDLOW. And you also enumerated certain objections to the cost-plus-fixed-fee form of contract and said there were others. I wonder if you would tell us more of what these others are.

Secretary PATTERSON. Yes; I would be glad to give my views on that. I have been against those contracts now for over a year and we have cut them out wherever we possibly could. They involve, unquestionably, waste on the project. The contractor is freed from financial responsibility. Everybody takes it easy on those jobs. He does not get as much work out of his employees. His employees will tell him, "What business is it of yours? The Government pays the bills. It is not out of your pocket." It promotes, in my opinion, waste and extravagance. We get into them now because of the pressure of time, but I very much question whether we save even on the question of time, with these contracts.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is just what I thought, Judge. I think you have made a very clear statement about that.

Secretary PATTERSON. Of course the amount of auditing that is done is terrific. We have to watch everything. We have to audit every single item of expenditure.

Mr. LUDLOW. On that point, do you notice a tendency on the part of contractors under that system to jack up the salaries of their employees beyond what those employees had been paid, that they fix a higher basis of salaries for the personnel on which payments to them might be predicated?

Secretary PATTERSON. I would not be surprised about that, but I cannot say that.

Mr. LUDLOW. I have been told that on the average the salaries presented as a basis for these payments under the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts shows in many instances 30 percent and higher above the salaries paid to the same personnel before the contracts were entered into.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LUDLOW. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ENGEL. When I made that study of cantonment construction, I got a list, or tried to get a list, from each contractor, of the employees whom he carried over from his private pay roll to the Government pay roll. The salaries of the employees were given under the private pay roll as well as under the Government pay roll. I found in a number of instances marked increases. I found in one case a man got $9,000 instead of $7,000. But to be fair about it, when they got into these cantonment construction programs, a very great many of these men in the administrative forces were working 12, 14, and 16 hours a day and 7 days a week. But still I thought the salaries were increased beyond what they should have been.

Mr. LUDLOW. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that information has come to me that in a good many instances the salaries have been doubled.

Secretary PATTERSON. I think that freeing the contractor from personal responsibility for all of the risks of the job, so far as it affects his own pocketbook, is an unfortunate thing. We have tried, of course, to get away from cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts as a result of our experience with them.

Mr. WOODRUM. The only reason you ever used them was to save time. Of course, nobody wants them if you have plenty of time.

Secretary PATTERSON. That is true.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain testimony of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, and certain tables compiled by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, it has already been said here this afternoon that the people of the country are nearly unanimous in demanding that profits be taken out of war contracts. I feel just that way. We cannot fail to respond to the demand of the people, the people who are paying for this war.

Now the amendment that has been written into the bill does anything but this. It gives the power to three different departments to fix what is excess profits. There is no standard provided in the language whereby excess profits may be determined. What one person may think is excess profits may appear to another person to be reasonable. In other words, we are delegating the power vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution to three different departments to carry out. This is not the proper thing for this Congress to do. It is not doing our duty. We are again yielding up our power to other branches of the Government. Too much of this has been done already. The people are looking to us for protection. We are their only forum in this field. We must not let them down, and in my opinion that is just what this amendment does. You could drive a yoke of bulls through this amendment in nearly every written line. I am fully aware that to effect legislation, compromises must be made. However, this goes too far in compromising.

I am in favor, Mr. Speaker, of writing something into this bill that will take the profits out of war and mean just that. No person, no corporation, should be permitted to make profits out of the killing of our sons and the destruction of our property in the manner in which they will be able to do if the language of this bill is incorporated in the law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am in the peculiar position of being able to agree with much that has been said in condemnation of this legislation and with all that has been said in support of it. I think that part of the confusion in thinking that has arisen about this whole problem is due to the fact that too much has been expected. The amendment which I first offered when this bill was before us originally only sought to require the filing of cost statements and renegotiation agreements "satisfactory to the Secretary" before final payment was made. The change from a "satisfactory" agreement to one with a 6-percent limit was to avoid the point of order made against the affirmative action required under the first language.

I recognize as well as anybody that in an appropriation bill you cannot write a complete legislative formula to deal with a subject as complex as a limitation of profits. At the same time, if I have any feeling at all as to the conviction of the country, it is that we are not running this war to make profits for anybody.

When this bill came up in the House, it was an $18,000,000,000 measure then. It is a $19,000,000,000 measure now. It seems to me it would be a mistake if we permitted another $18,000,000,000 or $19,000,000,000 to be drawn from the Treasury for expenditure without preserving to the Government the right to renegotiate a contract after all the costs were in and after the risk was eliminated, if it was apparent that the Government was about to overpay the contractor. The amendment as I first proposed it sought to handle that situation. It provided that no part of the funds in the bill should be used to make that payment known as the final payment on a contract until a certificate of costs had been filed and a renegotiation agreement made satisfactory to the procuring agency.

The purpose was to prevent overpayment and to prevent final settlement papers from being issued if the Government knew it was paying too much. It was not an attempt to go into the whole field of profit limitation. It was an attempt to implement and give force to what has been described as the policy of the War and Navy Departments at the present time—to secure renegotiation when they can do it by persuasion. It grew out of the fact that in a discussion with one of the officers who was operating this renegotiation policy, he said, "The trouble is that we do not have anything to require renegotiation where the man does not want to renegotiate." In short, my amendment sought to give the Secretary the power to require renegotiation after costs were known if the original price was obviously excessive.

It is true, and I cited the fact in my remarks when the bill was before the House, as an argument for the amendment I proposed to offer, that the War Department is securing notable refunds by voluntary renegotiation. It is also true that the Navy is securing notable refunds by renegotiation. But in the cases of those who do not want to renegotiate, the departments have been helpless.

The fact that the departments are getting good results by renegotiation on a voluntary basis is not an argument against this amendment but an argument for it. This amendment grew out of the Government's experience and was designed to implement this voluntary policy and give it force.

The section is not as toothless as some of the discussion might indicate. In the first place the Secretary of each department is not merely authorized but is directed to include in any contract over $100,000 a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period or periods when the profit can be determined with reasonable certainty.

It is further provided that in renegotiations the Secretaries shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensations or reserves beyond a reasonable amount. I recognize that the term "reasonable" is a general term, and I am not responsible for that term, but at least a start has been made and the term is no more general or elastic than those used in other war-powers legislation.

Again the Secretary is specifically given authority to require cost statements at such times and in such form and detail as he may require. This provision does not add to the departments any great auditing burden. They may do much or little with these statements but there is a chance to keep tab on costs and to know what is a fair price. This goes back to the purpose of my original amendment which was to preserve an opportunity to negotiate or determine a fair price.

Now, then, I certainly hope that the Naval Affairs Committee, or some committee, does come in and give the Congress an opportunity to redeem the promise that every Member here has made at some time to his constituency, that he is in favor of taking the profits out of war. Let us not suggest to anybody that this amendment really does that. It does not go that far. It merely gives the departments an opportunity to renegotiate before final payment has been made. Under the terms of the Bethlehem decision, when final payment has been made the terms of the contract cannot be renegotiated; excessive payments cannot be withheld or recaptured. This compromise section does seek to prevent the payment of excessive prices and excessive profits. As such, it should do some good toward winning the war.

Last Thursday the Washington Evening Star carried two 2-column heads on the front page, one story above the other. The headline on the upper story read:

Treasury to ring door bells monthly to sell war bonds.

The headline on the lower story read:

Huge pay boosts for executives in war plants cited at probe.

The story under the first head explained that the Secretary of the Treasury was going to take this step to increase the sale of war bonds. The story as developed before the Ways and Means Committee was that something is needed to be done to give an impetus to the sale of war bonds. The Secretary hoped a voluntary system would be sufficient. Sales had dropped, radio reports said that night, from $1,000,000,000 in January to $700,000,000 in February, to $500,000,000 in March. This was accounted for in part because people were paying their taxes, yes, but accounted for also, I am sorry to say, by evidence that some people are making excessive profits out of the war. There it was in the second double column headline:

Huge pay boosts for executives in war plants cited at probe.

It was over an Associated Press story, on evidence gathered by the Naval Affairs Committee, that between 1938 and 1940 salaries and bonuses for executives of corporations working on war contracts had increased as much as 375 percent. The compensation for one man had gone from $557,000 to $776,000. That for another man, from $45,000 to $213,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury cannot ring door bells fast enough or often enough to overcome such sabotage of the sacrifice that others are making. It is no wonder to me that the people are demanding action be taken to prevent payment of excessive prices, profits, and salaries. We may argue here about technicalities of parliamentary procedure and the right way and wrong way to do these things, but the people expect us to act. I was sent an editorial the other day by a country newspaper editor who got the point. This is a woman editor. She publishes a small weekly newspaper in my district—the Belvidere Times. She knows that no woman ever overpays anybody on the theory that she can go into the courts later and recapture the overpayment. She got the point that it was important not to pay too much in the first instance, and she pointed out that nothing is going to be done about any bad labor situation until action is taken to prevent the payment of excessive profits, and she saw clearly that solution of these problems is essential to the prosecution of the war. Let me read you the concluding paragraph of this woman's editorial. It is the answer to the question "Why?" that has been raised here today. I quote:

Nothing could do more to raise the morale of the American people than to bring these two great factions (profiteers and racketeers) under control. Undoubtedly the coming summer months will test our fortitude, and if the American people had this concrete proof that "democracy works" they would carry the war to the ends of the earth with crusading vigor.

There is your answer; that is why this section should be approved, and it is why even more effective legislation to curb excessive profits should be enacted. It is to give the American people concrete proof that "democracy works" so that this war may be carried to the ends of the earth "with crusading vigor."

[Here the gavel fell.]

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 6955

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon by a majority vote the Ways and Means Committee of the House reported the bill H. R. 6955. I ask unanimous consent that the views of the minority and such others as may want to express individual views be filed with the report printed therewith.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil func-

tions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on 10 major faults in Government report writing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There wa sno objection.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested during the course of the debate on this proposal of the conferees that the adoption of the proposal will not solve the problem of excess profits. I can readily understand the truth of that contention. It has also been stated that since this will not solve the whole problem it might as well be left out all together. I cannot agree with that sentiment. If it is true, as has been stated, that the adoption of the language proposed by the conferees will merely legalize and make mandatory the wholesome practice which the War and Navy Departments have recently been carrying out, then that alone would justify including this language in the bill. I feel that it is a step in the right direction, and that if it is followed—as we have been assured it will be followed—by proper and adequate taxation on excess war profits, our result will be finally accomplished. If it is with this understanding that further legislation will follow this proposal, which is a first step, I am in favor of the adoption of the conference report.

I can confirm the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that the flat 6-percent limitation on war profits, which the House adopted in passing this bill originally, was not the best possible provision. We should remember that the gentleman from South Dakota offered a much better provision, but it was precluded by the parliamentary situation and was ruled out on a point of order. When he offered the 6-percent limitation amendment, it was not the best possible proposal, but one which would be permissible under the rules. In my own mind at the time, while figuring that there ought to be some limitation on profits, I felt that the Senate, or the conferees, would arrive at a better solution. The conference proposal before us is a better solution.

I cannot be too emphatic in hoping and working for that further legislation which we have been promised today, which will strike at exorbitant war profits. I know that the American people will not stand for a new crop of millionaires to grow out of this war, and very probably they will not stand for any Members of this body who will stand for the same. Undoubtedly there is much misinformation and wrong impressions regarding both wages and profits being obtained out of our war effort, but it behooves us to consider the American people as a whole first and to see that they have a maximum national safety with the least expenditure consistent with that national safety. This leads me to sanction some profits, both in the form of wages to labor and return to capital, to the extent that it will expedite war production sufficiently in this titanic struggle.

This is not a new consideration with me, for I introduced a bill in the Seventy-sixth Congress on October 2, 1939—H. R. 7557—placing a tax upon excess war profits to the extent of 75 percent of such profits. This was designed, not to take all the profits out of war and thus stifle production, but to attempt to take a large share of the profits out of war as the people rightfully demand. At that time it was not known for a certainty that we would become involved in the war, or I should have been inclined to make the percentage greater. I do not know that the Ways and Means Committee gave much consideration to my excess-profits tax bill in the Seventy-sixth Congress, but I do know that within a few weeks the President came before us personally and in a message asked us to enact an excess-profits-tax measure. As you will remember, that was done.

It is highly pleasing to hear these well-informed Members declare today that many millions of dollars have been saved for the Government by renegotiating contracts heretofore on a voluntary basis. That speaks well for the patriotism of certain big businessmen. It is especially desirable that the public know these facts, so that the public mind will not be misinformed to the extent of regarding all corporation or laborers as greedy and anxious to turn this dire emergency to their own advantage. While we appreciate the voluntary action heretofore, we would be remiss in our public duty if we did not make this renegotiation of contracts mandatory, so as to protect the taxpayer. Accordingly, I feel that the adoption of this conference provision is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has offered a practical suggestion. I hope the suggestion will be followed. His solution is a realistic one and I join with him in pleading with the House that the conference report, insofar as the excess profits amendment goes, be adopted.

I want to take this opportunity to make two observations, both of them relating to the war effort. Our job is to do everything to bring about a successful and speedy prosecution of the war to final victory. From tim to time, and it was repeated here today, expressions have been made which would indicate that we are satisfied with the production schedule we have now reached. I want to quote from a letter from Mr. Donald M. Nelson, addressed to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], under date of March 30, in which Mr. Nelson specifically says that we are far from satisfied. I see danger in smug satisfaction. We have accomplished much. More can and should be done. We will be fooling no one but ourselves by complacency and contentment.

Then I should just like to make a passing reference to the expressions that we hear from some quarters with reference to a solution of post-war problems. I think the very important thing to do now is to win the war. That in itself is a big job, but a job that we will do. The problems of the peace should not interfere with the prosecutior of the war, and there is danger that they may if discord from public discussion is encouraged.

What the post-war problems may be is uncertain. They involve far-reaching questions—political, economic, and social. I believe a greater unity of purpose can be assured at this time by avoiding controversies based largely on conjecture.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report now before the House involves one problem which at first blush seems simple to solve. To decide upon a destination and to chart the course by which that destination may be reached are two entirely different things. The one may or may not be idealistic. The other must be intensely practical. As we have come to realize in far too many instances—and to our grief—execution has all too often not kept pace with planning. Men have rather glibly held out a desirable goal as easy of attainment, with little or no regard for the means available to reach it. We have already had distinctly painful disillusionments.

The problem to which I refer in this case, Mr. Speaker, is the elimination of exorbitant or excessive profits on war contracts. I believe we are in complete agreement that such profits cannot be countenanced, that nothing more than a reasonable return on capital and on ability, bearing in mind the degree of risk involved in both, should accrue to any man or any group of men, as a result of the national peril. The trite phrase—take the profits out of war—should mean just what it says. That we have evidence at hand of the existence of what has been very properly termed "blood money" cannot be said to be a complete surprise. Some factors which have made unconscionable profits possible have been overlooked either by design or by accident. Some profits have been permitted, others have been allowed to accrue. The one results from maladministration; the other from misadministration.

Such factors can and should be dealt with forcefully and fearlessly. But, Mr. Speaker, as these ugly incidents of the existence of parasites are brought to our attention—as our indignation is aroused as a result of these disclosures—we should not lose sight of the fact that the rapid expansion of an industrial defense machine has provided an opportunity for nefarious practices which could have

been more effectively prevented had the expansion been undertaken at an earlier date. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I do not excuse the existence of the parasites, I merely comment on conditions which to some degree account for them. We have been compelled to undertake very hurriedly certain contractual commitments, many of them of an entirely different type than anything theretofore attempted. Whether these commitments could have been made with less opportunity available to parasites and with more protection to the Government, had the suggestions of some Members of the Congress been followed, may still be a debatable question in the House. I know, Mr. Speaker, that to many of us there is no room for debate, however, on that question. We are convinced that such would have been the case. However, the speedy acceleration of the program is a factor that cannot be ignored. Obviously, this factor should be a diminishing one as our experience becomes the greater. In fact it should be reduced to such a minimum that its effect would no longer be felt.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that unconscionable profits of all kinds, whether they accrue as the result of conspiracy and connivance, or as the result of incompetency and indifference, or as the result of power and privilege, or as the result of poor planning and no planning should be brought to an end. They should never have been allowed to start. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we are in agreement on this point. We know the destination which we desire to reach.

Before discussing the course which might be charted, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that some reference should be made to one other consideration, to me a consideration of the first magnitude, the one primary consideration above all others—that in mapping a course nothing should be permitted to interfere with the expeditious and successful prosecution of the war to a decisive and complete conclusion—an all-out war effort for an all-out victory at the earliest possible day. Other considerations are secondary. Working to win the war with no appeasement and with no compromise is primary.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the problem before us appears to be of simple solution. Some are of the opinion that the arbitrary determination of a certain percentage as a profit margin will solve the problem. That determination is but the first step. In fact, instead of being a part of the course to be charted it is practically a part of the destination. At least there is little difficulty in reaching agreement on this question.

But, then, the complex, involved, and intricate problem of all the factors upon which that percentage is based, all the factors entering into the mathematics of business and business relationships bob up before us. I need not detain you today with a recital of these details—prime contracts and subcontracts; contracts to the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth degrees; calendar-year profits, fiscal-year profits, individual-contract profits; salaries, wages, bonuses, taxes; investments, depreciation, obsolescence; and many more, all a part of a complex, involved, and intricate problem. The problem can be solved. Legislation can be enacted to deal with it. We have attempted to make a beginning. As one of the conferees I believe that what has been done is far from a completed job. It will prove to be unsatisfactory in many respects. I am convinced that certain very important and extremely vital factors have not been incorporated. They should be. They will require study. They should have the careful thought of a legislative committee. As zealous as the Appropriations Committee may be of its own prerogatives and powers it has definite limitations. It should not invade the fields of other committees. I hope the action which we have taken may give a sense of direction—may point the way—may even serve as a preliminary map for a more comprehensive and complete chart.

The need for a large part of the appropriations provided for in this bill is imperative. The bill should be enacted without delay. The necessary and proper study of the profits problem which would likely entail extended hearings and debate can, in my opinion, result in a satisfactory solution. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that steps for such solution be taken at once by the best legislative method. In the meantime, we have attempted to implement to some extent at least what I believe to be the demand of the American people, that excessive and exorbitant profits, unconscionable gains by any man or group of men should not be tolerated, and that the Government is chargeable with the duty of bringing to an immediate and abrupt end the waste and extravagance which are always the price of incompetency, inefficiency, and mismanagement, and which invite excesses of every kind.

As the immediacy of the need for comprehensive and complete legislation impresses itself upon me, I am reminded of the words of Justice Cardozo that "statutes are designed to meet the fugitive exigencies of the hour." Excessive war profits come within the category of "fugitive exigencies of the hour."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, to a very great extent the morale of our whole Nation depends upon our being able to show the people that we have ended war profiteering. The job must be done, for if there is one thing that no decent person can stand for it is the spectacle of anyone becoming rich as a result of the terrible suffering of war. I hope and pray an effective limitation can be worked out. There is one way to get at the problem, and one that I believe should certainly be used. It is not easy to apply. I am quite certain, as has been said, that the provisions in this bill will not answer the problem. Neither will a 6-percent limitation on profits per contract mean anything whatsoever, as far as limitation of total over-all profits is concerned. A company might complete six contracts in a year and make many times 6 percent on its investment.

A certain way to get at profiteering is by excess-profits taxation. Probably it is the most sure way we have. Perhaps something else can be done that will help, but the certain thing that will do it is a really effective excess-profits tax schedule. I have been studying that question for a long time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As long ago as September of 1939, when the war first broke out in Europe, the gentleman from Arizona and myself and some others introduced legislation for excess-profits taxation, which, had it been enacted at that time, might have saved us a great deal of the trouble we are now in.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rose to confirm what the gentleman has said, that beginning in 1939 certain Members of this House made an effort in the direction of excess-profits taxation. I believe the gentleman from California had the right idea at that time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Briefly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I trust the gentleman from California will not become confused and think that excess-profits taxation is to take the place of a profit limitation; a profit limitation is plus an excess-profits tax.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I particularly tried to make myself very clear about that in the beginning of my remarks. Excess-profits taxation, however, to be effective depends upon two things. It depends not only upon the rate of tax that is imposed but it depends upon the base upon which the excess-profits tax rests. In other words, it depends upon getting an effective definition of what your excess-profits tax credit is, what your exemption is for the corporation before they begin to pay excess-profits taxes. For my part I should like to see the rate of excess-profits taxation as high as 95 percent, and I so testified before the Ways and Means Committee. In Britain the top rate is 100 percent. The Treasury has proposed a top rate of 75 percent which, if you are talking about excess profits, I do not think is enough if we are in earnest about this matter. But the important thing, and the loophole which now exists in the law comes here: Every corporation can compute its excess-profits-tax credit by either one of two plans: Either they can determine what percentage of their capitalization they earned in the base period of 4 years, in which case they cannot claim more than 7 percent in the case of a small corporation or 8 percent in the case of a large one.

In other words, if their earnings in the base period were 15 percent, or 24 percent, or 40 percent, nevertheless they cannot go above that 7-percent or 8-percent ceiling in claiming their excess-profits-tax credit. The excess-profits-tax credit, of course, is the amount of earnings of a corporation which are con-

sidered "normal earnings" and are subject to normal taxes and surtaxes, but not to excess-profits taxes. But there is another method of determining the excess-profits-tax credit whereby a corporation may compute what its average earnings were in the base period without regard to its capitalization, just the average number of dollars that were earned in the base period; and if they use that method of computation for excess-profits-tax credit there is then no limit to the amount of the base-period earnings that they can claim as excess-profits-tax credit. As a practical matter under these circumstances, I can tell the House that one of the largest motor corporations in the United States whose base-period earnings computed on the average-earnings plan amounted to 24 percent of its capital would be able to make earnings equivalent to nearly 12 percent of its capital after all taxes, even if excess-profits taxes were 100 percent, and even if the Treasury proposals for a 55-percent normal and surtax schedule were adopted. As long as this loophole exists therefore in the average-earnings plan of computing excess-profits-tax credit, the excess-profits plan of taxation will not be effective in preventing war profits much larger than our Nation's present need can possibly justify, as long as the average-earnings plan is in existence big corporations that made large earnings all through the years 1936 to 1939 will be marked for favoritism. Now I have proposed, and so have others, that this average-earnings plan be abolished and that all corporations be required to compute excess-profits-tax credit on the percentage of capital plan with its upper ceiling on how much the credit can be. The argument is advanced that exclusive use of the percentage of capital plan will be inequitable with regard to a corporation that did not capitalize its earnings but which plowed them back into plant or equipment and did not capitalize on the additional plant capacity or facilities. Such a corporation would, it is said, be at a disadvantage due to its small capitalization throwing an extra large part of its earnings in the excess-profits-tax bracket.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman very much.

Now, then, it seems to me that one of two methods should be used in order to correct this situation and enable us to say to the people that we really have an excess-profits-tax law that recaptures for them excess profits. Either we should eliminate completely the average earnings method of computing excess-profits-tax credit and make everybody compute them the same way, so that you could have an upper limit on the amount of excess-profits-tax credit they could claim, which is most essential, for otherwise your excess-profits tax may be based as high as 24 percent of capital to as low as 8 percent, as it is in the case of the percentage of the capital plan. Either eliminate it completely and make it possible for a corporation which actually did take some of its earnings and put them back into plant to count that reinvestment of its earnings in its plant as capitalization whether or not it has been so shown on the books—I would have no objection to doing that, and, indeed, it might be more equitable to do that—or else if you are going to insist on keeping that plan, then the percentage of average earnings in the base period that you allow to be counted for the excess-profits-tax credit should not be 95 percent as it is at the present time but should be reduced perhaps to 80 percent or reduced perhaps to 75 percent, I do not know which; but at any rate so that there would be a sharp differential between the amount of credit that the corporation could claim if it used the percent-of-capital plan on the one hand and if it used the average-earnings plan on the other.

If we are to have a really effective excess-profits-tax program, then we must be able to say that beyond earnings of such and such a reasonable amount the Government gets such and such percentage; and I believe it should be 95 percent in the case of substantial earnings.

I submit these things because I do not think that we should say we are going to throw this job all over into excess-profits-tax legislation unless we analyze carefully what is involved in passing a really effective excess-profits-tax law. We have not done that yet. It must be done in the next tax bill. And may I add this: Is it not far better to tax to the limit excess profits of favored corporations instead of levying either a sales tax, on poor consumers as well as wealthy ones, or a very high normal tax on corporations, which affects even the most modest and necessary earnings?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the idea of profiteering in time of war or in time of emergency is disheartening to the American people. The businessmen of this country and the people of the country have too much at stake to stand for profiteering at the expense of the Government at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a step in the right direction. I hope we will pass legislation that will take all the profits out of war. Six percent should cover all overhead. I am in favor of the pending bill and this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 75 and 76 be considered simultaneously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 75: Page 52, line 15, strike out "403" and insert "404."

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 53, line 4, strike out "404" and insert "405."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 53, after line 20, insert as follows: "*Provided*, That purchases of automobiles heretofore made at prices not in excess of those herein authorized are hereby authorized and validated."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert: ": *Provided*, That purchases of automobiles of the lightweight, low-priced class heretofore made by the War and Navy Departments at prices in excess of $750 each but not in excess of those permitted by this section are hereby validated."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 54, line 1, strike out "405" and insert "406."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and pending that I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been urging the conferees in making conference reports to include in the report the language that they are going to request the House to agree to in lieu of the language in the bill on amendments in disagreement. This is the first time that that suggestion has been fully carried out.

Anyone who has taken this conference report and looked it over has found the language the committee, the House, and Senate have agreed to. Heretofore all we knew about that language was when the chairman of the committee would ask the reading clerk to read it after he submitted his motion. We have had this conference report for 2 days and we have had an opportunity to read it. The result is that we have expedited consideration of the report.

I rise at this time to express the hope that in the future all conference committees will follow the example of this committee, and I want to compliment the chairman of the committee, my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the members of the conference committee, as well as that efficient clerk, Mr. Mark Sheilds, who, in my opinion, knows more about the operations of the Federal Government than

any individual in this country, for bringing in such a complete conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the several votes on the conference report and the Senate amendments, and ask unanimous consent that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report and the Senate amendments may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the subjects discussed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

REGISTRATION OF PERSONS EMPLOYED BY AGENCIES TO DISSEMINATE PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2399) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631, U. S. C., title 22, sec. 233 (a) to sec. 233 (g)), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"It is hereby declared to be the policy and purpose of this act to protect the national defense, internal security, and foreign relations of the United States by requiring public disclosure by persons engaging in propaganda activities and other activities for or on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals so that the Government and the people of the United States may be informed of the identity of such persons and may appraise their statements and actions in the light of their associations and activities.

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. As used in and for the purposes of this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals;

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) an individual affiliated or associated with, or supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of this section 1 (b);

"(3) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and is a citizen of and domiciled within the United States or that such person is not an individual, is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and has its principal place of business within the United States. Nothing in this clause (3) shall limit the operation of clause (5) of this section 1 (b);

"(4) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(5) a domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, subsidized directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (3), or (4) of this section 1 (b);

"(c) Except as provided in section 1 (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' includes—

"(1) any person who acts or agrees to act, within the United States, as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, a public-relations counsel, publicity agent information-service employee, servant, agent, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal;

"(2) any person who within the United States collects information for or reports information to a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits or accepts compensation, contributions, or loans, directly or indirectly, from a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits, disburses, dispenses, or collects compensation, contributions, loans, money, or anything of value, directly or indirectly, for a foreign principal; who within the United States acts at the order, request, or under the direction of a foreign principal;

"(3) any person who assumes or purports to act within the United States as an agent of a foreign principal in any of the respects set forth in clauses (1) and (2) of this section 1 (c); and

"(4) any person who is an officer or member of the active or reserve military, naval, or other armed forces of any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of section 1 (b) hereof, or who is an officer of or employed by any such foreign principal; and proof of any affiliation or employment, specified in this clause (4), of any person within a period of 5 years previous to the effective date of this act shall create a rebuttable presumption that such person is an agent of a foreign principal;

"(d) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' does not include any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the Postmaster General a sworn statement in compliance with section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 553), as amended, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of, the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (2), or (4) of section 1 (b) hereof, or by any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this act;

"(e) The term 'government of a foreign country' includes any person or group of persons exercising sovereign de facto or de jure political jurisdiction over any country, other than the United States, or over any part of such country, and includes any subdivision of any such group and any group or agency to which such sovereign de facto or de jure authority or functions are directly or indirectly delegated. Such term shall include any faction or body of insurgents within a country assuming to exercise governmental authority, whether such faction or body of insurgents has or has not been recognized by the United States;

"(f) The term 'foreign political party' includes any organization or any other combination of individuals in a country other than the United States, or any unit or branch thereof, having for an aim or purpose, or which is engaged in any activity devoted in whole or in part to the establishment, administration, control, or acquisition of administration or control, of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof, or the furtherance or influencing of the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof;

"(g) The term 'public-relations counsel' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in informing, advising, or in any way representing a principal in any matter pertaining to political or public interests, policies, or relations;

"(h) The term 'publicity agent' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in the publication or dissemination of oral, visual, graphic, written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including publication by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or otherwise;

"(i) The term 'information-service employee' includes any person who is engaged in furnishing, disseminating, or publishing accounts, descriptions, information, or data with respect to the political, industrial, employment, economic, social, cultural, or other benefits, advantages, facts, or conditions of any country other than the United States or of any government of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or of a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(j) The term 'political propaganda' includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person (1) which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissensions, or (2) which advocates, advises, instigates, or promotes any racial, social, political, or religious disorder, civil riot, or other conflict involving the use of force or violence in any other American republic or the overthrow of any government or political subdivision of any other American republic by any means involving the use of force or violence. As used in this section 1 (j) the term 'disseminating' includes transmitting or causing to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or offering or causing to be offered in the United States mails;

"(k) The term 'registration statement' means the registration statement required to be filed with the Attorney General under section 2 (a) hereof, and any supplements

thereto required to be filed under section 2 (b) hereof, and includes all documents and papers required to be filed therewith or amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, whether attached thereto or incorporated therein by reference;

"(l) The term 'American republic' includes any of the states which were signatory to the Final Act of the Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics at Habana, Cuba, July 30, 1940;

"(m) The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States;

"(n) The term 'prints' means newspapers and periodicals, books, pamphlets, sheet music, visiting cards, address cards, printing proofs, engravings, photographs, pictures, drawings, plans, maps, patterns to be cut out, catalogs, prospectuses, advertisements, and printed, engraved, lithographed, or autographed notices of various kinds, and, in general, all impressions or reproductions obtained on paper or other material assimilable to paper, on parchment or on cardboard, by means of printing, engraving, lithography, autography, or any other easily recognizable mechanical process with the exception of the copying press, stamps with movable or immovable type, and the typewriter.

"REGISTRATION

"SEC. 2. (a) No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplements thereto as required by this section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) hereof or unless he is exempt from registration under the provisions of this act. Except as hereinafter provided, every person who is an agent of a foreign principal on the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter and every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal after the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, of which one copy shall be transmitted promptly by the Attorney General to the Secretary of State for such comment, if any, as the Secretary of State may desire to make from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this act. The registration statement shall include the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this act:

"(1) Registrant's name, principal business address, and all other business addresses in the United States or elsewhere, and all residence addresses, if any;

"(2) Status of the registrant; if an individual, nationality; if a partnership, name, residence addresses, and nationality of each partner and a true and complete copy of its articles of copartnership; if an association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals, the name, residence addresses, and nationality of each director and officer and of each person performing the functions of a director or officer and a true and complete copy of its charter, articles of incorporation, association, constitution, and bylaws, and amendments thereto; a copy of every other instrument or document and a statement of the terms and conditions of every oral agreement relating to its organization, powers, and purposes; and a statement of its ownership and control;

"(3) A comprehensive statement of the nature of registrant's business; a complete list of registrant's employees and a statement of the nature of the work of each, unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General; the name and address of every foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act, or has agreed to act; the character of the business or other activities of every such foreign principal, and, if any such foreign principal be other than a natural person, a statement of the ownership and control of each; and the extent, if any, to which each such foreign principal is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party;

"(4) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is an agent of a foreign principal; a comprehensive statement of the nature and method of performance of each such contract, and of the existing and proposed activity or activities engaged in or to be engaged in by the registrant as agent of a foreign principal for each such foreign principal;

"(5) The nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received within the preceding 60 days from each such foreign principal, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;

"(6) A detailed statement of every activity which the registrant is performing or is assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or any other person other than a foreign principal and which requires his registration hereunder;

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and, if an individual, the nationality of any person who has within the preceding 60 days contributed or paid money or anything of value to the registrant in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this section 2 (a) and the amount or value of the same;

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding 60 days in furtherance of or in any way in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person;

"(9) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is performing or assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or for a foreign principal or for any person other than a foreign principal any activities which require his registration hereunder;

"(10) Such other statements, information, or documents pertinent to the purposes of this act as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may from time to time require;

"(11) Such further statements and such further copies of documents as are necessary to make the statements made in the registration statement and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(b) Every agent of a foreign principal who has filed a registration statement required by section 2 (a) hereof shall, within 30 days after the expiration of each period of 6 months succeeding such filing, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth with respect to such preceding 6 months' period such facts as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may deem necessary to make the information required under section 2 hereof accurate, complete, and current with respect to such period. In connection with the information furnished under clauses (3), (4), (6), and (9) of section 2 (a) hereof, the registrant shall give notice to the Attorney General of any changes therein within 10 days after such changes occur. If the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, he may, in any particular case, require supplements to the registration statement to be filed at more frequent intervals in respect to all or particular items of information to be furnished.

"(c) The registration statement and supplements thereto shall be executed under oath as follows: If the registrant is an individual, by him; if the registrant is a partnership, by a majority of the members thereof; if the registrant is a person other than an individual or a partnership, by a majority of the officers thereof or persons performing the functions of officers or by a majority of the board of directors thereof or persons performing the functions of directors, if any.

"(d) The fact that a registration statement or supplement thereto has been filed shall not necessarily be deemed a full compliance with this act and the regulations thereunder on the part of the registrant; nor shall it indicate that the Attorney General has in any way passed upon the merits of such registration statement or supplement thereto; nor shall it preclude prosecution, as provided for in this act, for willful failure to file a registration statement or supplement thereto when due or for a willful false statement of a material fact therein or the willful omission of a material fact required to be stated therein or the willful omission of a material fact or copy of a material document necessary to make the statements made in a registration statement and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(e) If any agent of a foreign principal, required to register under the provisions of this act, has previously thereto registered with the Attorney General under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201), the Attorney General, in order to eliminate in appropriate duplication, may permit the incorporation by reference in the registration statement or supplements thereto filed hereunder of any information or documents previously filed by such agent of a foreign principal under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201)

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 3. The requirements of section 2 (a) hereof shall not apply to the following agents of foreign principals:

"(a) A duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such officer;

"(b) Any official of a foreign government, if such government is recognized by the United States, who is not a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, or a citizen of the United States, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such official are of public record in the Department of State, while said official is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such official;

"(c) Any member of the staff of, or any person employed by, a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, other than a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, or information-service employee, whose name and status and the

character of whose duties as such member or employee are of public record in the Department of State, while said member or employee is engaged exclusively in the performance of activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such member or employee;

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 48), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;

"(e) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or of the fine arts;

"(f) Any person, or employee of such person, whose foreign principal is a government of a foreign country the defense of which the President deems vital to the defense of the United States while (1) such person or employee engages only in activities which are in furtherance of the policies, public interest, or national defense both of such government and of the Government of the United States, and are not intended to conflict with any of the domestic or foreign policies of the Government of the United States, (2) each communication or expression by such person or employee which he intends to, or has reason to believe will, be published, disseminated, or circulated among any section of the public, or portion thereof, within the United States, is a part of such activities and is believed by such person to be truthful and accurate and the identity of such person as an agent of such foreign principal is disclosed therein, and (3) such government of a foreign country furnishes to the Secretary of State for transmittal to, and retention for the duration of this act by, the Attorney General such information as to the identity and activities of such person or employee at such times as the Attorney General may require. Upon notice to the government of which such person is an agent or to such person or employee, the Attorney General, having due regard for the public interest and national defense, may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, and shall, at the request of the Secretary of State, terminate in whole or in part the exemption herein of any such person or employee.

"FILING AND LABELING OF POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

"SEC. 4. (a) Every person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act and who transmits or causes to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (1) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons shall, not later than 48 hours after the beginning of the transmittal thereof, send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act to transmit or cause to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons, unless such political propaganda is conspicuously marked at its beginning with, or prefaced or accompanied by, a true and accurate statement, in the language or languages used in such political propaganda, setting forth that the person transmitting such political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted is registered under this act with the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., as an agent of a foreign principal, together with the name and address of such agent of a foreign principal and of each of his foreign principals; that, as required by this act, his registration statement is available for inspection at and copies of such political propaganda are being filed with the Department of Justice; and that registration of agents of foreign principals required by the act does not indicate approval by the United States Government of the contents of their political propaganda. The Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe the language or languages and the manner and form in which such statement shall be made and require the inclusion of such other information contained in the registration statement identifying such agent of a foreign principal and such political propaganda and its sources as may be appropriate.

"(c) The copies of political propaganda required by this act to be sent to the Librarian of Congress shall be available for public inspection under such regulations as he may prescribe.

"(d) For purposes of the Library of Congress, other than for public distribution, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are authorized, upon the request of the Librarian of Congress, to forward to the Library of Congress 50 copies, or as many fewer thereof as are available, of all foreign prints determined to be prohibited entry under the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of all foreign prints excluded from the mails under authority of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230).

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to permit the entry and the Postmaster General is authorized to permit the transmittal in the mails of foreign prints imported for governmental purposes by authority or for the use of the United States or for the use of the Library of Congress.

"BOOKS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 5. Every agent of a foreign principal registered under this act shall keep and preserve while he is an agent of a foreign principal such books of account and other records with respect to all his activities, the disclosure of which is required under the provisions of this act, as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and shall preserve the same for a period of 3 years following the termination of such status. Until regulations are in effect under this section every agent of a foreign principal shall keep books of account and shall preserve all written records with respect to his activities. Such books and records shall be open at all reasonable times to the inspection of any official charged with the enforcement of this act. It shall be unlawful for any person willfully to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to attempt to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to cause to be concealed, destroyed, obliterated, mutilated, or falsified, any books or records required to be kept under the provisions of this section.

"PUBLIC EXAMINATION OF OFFICIAL RECORDS

"SEC. 6. The Attorney General shall retain in permanent form one copy of all registration statements and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda furnished under this act, and the same shall be public records and open to public examination and inspection at such reasonable hours, under such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe, and copies of the same shall be furnished to every applicant at such reasonable fee as the Attorney General may prescribe. The Attorney General may withdraw from public examination the registration statement and other statements of any agent of a foreign principal whose activities have ceased to be of a character which requires registration under the provisions of this act.

"LIABILITY OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 7. Each officer, or person performing the functions of an officer, and each director, or person performing the functions of a director, of an agent of a foreign principal which is not an individual shall be under obligation to cause such agent to execute and file a registration statement and supplements thereto as and when such filing is required under sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) hereof and shall also be under obligation to cause such agent to comply with all the requirements of sections 4 (a), 4 (b), and 5 and all other requirements of this Act. In case of failure of any such agent of a foreign principal to comply with any of the requirements of this act, each of its officers, or persons performing the functions of officers, and each of its directors, or persons performing the functions of directors, shall be subject to prosecution therefor.

"ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person who—

"(1) willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder, or

"(2) in any registration statement or supplement thereto or in any statement under section 4 (a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda or in any other document filed with or furnished to the Attorney General under the provisions of this act willfully makes a false statement of a material fact or willfully omits any material fact required to be stated therein or willfully omits a material fact or a copy of a material document necessary to make the statements therein and the copies of documents furnished therewith not misleading, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) In any proceeding under this act in which it is charged that a person is an agent of a foreign principal with respect to a foreign principal outside of the United States, proof of the specific identity of the foreign principal shall be permissible but not necessary.

"(c) Any alien who shall be convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate, any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder shall be subject to deportation in the manner provided by sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890), as amended.

"(d) The Postmaster General may declare to be nonmailable any communication or expression falling within clause (2) of section 1 (j) hereof in the form of prints or in any other form reasonably adapted to, or reasonably appearing to be intended for, dissemination or circulation among two or more persons, which is offered or caused to be offered for transmittal in the United States mails to any person or persons in any other American republic by any agent of a foreign principal, if the Postmaster General is informed in writing by the Secretary of State that the duly accredited diplomatic representative of such American republic has made written

representation to the Department of State that the admission or circulation of such communication or expression in such American republic is prohibited by the laws thereof and has requested in writing that its transmittal thereto be stopped.

"APPLICATION OF ACT

"SEC. 9. This act shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 10. The Attorney General may at any time make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

"SEC. 11. The Attorney General shall, from time to time, make a report to the Congress concerning the administration of this act, including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 13. This act is in addition to and not in substitution for any other existing statute.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.'"

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Upon the effective date of this act, all powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of State under the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631), as amended, shall be transferred to and become vested in the Attorney General, together with all property, books, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations used by or available to the Secretary of State for carrying out the functions devolving on him under the above-cited act. All rules, regulations, and forms which have been issued by the Secretary of State pursuant to the provisions of said act, and which are in effect, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, revoked, or repealed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its approval, except that prior to such sixtieth day the Attorney General may make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2320) to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 16, after "Interior", insert "and the proceeds paid into the Treasury of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at the point in the RECORD where made, and also to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I shall deliver tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS of Arkansas). Under a previous order of the House, this is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Private Calendar.

PAUL A. LARNED

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, S. 2202, to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to summon Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired (now on active duty), before a board of officers for physical examination to determine if he is incapacitated for full active service in the Regular Army at the present time, and if found physically qualified, the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, Regular Army, said reinstatement to be effected not later than 60 days following the finding of a board of officers that said Paul A. Larned is physically qualified for active service: *Provided*, That no back pay and allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERLE E. RUDY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2978, for the relief of Merle E. Rudy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the laws relating to the classified civil service Merle E. Rudy (6841403), formerly private, Coast Artillery Corps, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the Army of the United States on the 29th day of February 1932: *Provided*, That no pension, pay, bounty, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the enactment of this act by reason of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT M. HOWARD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1563, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determined, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, of Wheaton, Ill., for personal injuries and property damage sustained by the said Albert M. Howard when a mail truck or vehicle operated by the Post Office Department through its agents, servants, and employees collided with an automobile in which he was riding on February 25, 1939, near the junction of United States Highway No. 330 (commonly known at the point of collision as Roosevelt Road) and Fifth Avenue, Maywood, Ill.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, after "Illinois", insert ": *Provided*, That the judgment shall not exceed the sum of $5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BELL GROCERY CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1619, for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $427.50 to the Bell Grocery Co., of Pineville, Ky., to pay 28 months' rent on a warehouse which was used by the Works Progress Administration, and which sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the Bell Grocery Co. growing

out of such transaction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SNURE, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1766, for the relief of John Snure, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Snure, Jr., the sum of $382.21, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered by him in the service of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, and in the service of the Selective Service System, during the period from September 1 to October 13, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AGNES S. HATHAWAY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1776, for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $1,770, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage sustained by her on March 10, 1941, when the automobile which she was driving was struck by an Army truck on United States Highway 24 near Victory Junction, Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE JACKSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1801, for the relief of Eugene Jackson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn., whose post-office address is Route No. 2, Fulton, Ky., the sum of $860, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when the wagon in which he was riding was struck on October 18, 1940, by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck at a point on Route No. 45E about 3½ miles south of Fulton, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIBIANO L. MEER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2175, for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of or otherwise to relieve Bibiano L. Meer, collector of internal revenue, Manila, P. I., for the value of certain series 108, class C, cigar 500's internal-revenue stamps amounting to $250, which were charged to the collector of internal revenue at Manila, and which for some unknown reason were not delivered to him or disappeared from his office, or for which because of an error in labeling he was not allowed credit upon their return to the Stamp Section, Accounts and Collections Unit, United States Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM G. IRVING AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2187, for the relief of Tom G. Irving, Thomas G. Irving, Sr., J. E. Irving, Mata D. Irving, L. T. Dale, and Amelia Dale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to satisfy and discharge of record as to the defendants hereinafter named, without cost to said defendants, the judgment recovered by the United States on June 26, 1933, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona (No. L–908–Phoenix), against Thomas G. Irving, Sr., J. E. Irving, Mata D. Irving, L. T. Dale, and Amelia Dale, as sureties upon the appeal bond given in the case of the United States against Tom G. Irving, such judgment having been rendered against the said sureties by reason of an alteration in such appeal bond which was made by an assistant United States attorney without notice to and without the consent of said sureties, or any of them, and after they had executed such bond.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHRYN O. SWEENEY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 488, for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney, Mary K. Sweeney, Nancy Lee Sweeney, and Alex H. Sweeney (collectively).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kathryn O. Sweeney, Mary Kay Sweeney, Nancy Lee Sweeney, and Alex H. Sweeney (collectively) the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of injuries sustained on February 28, 1937, when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a truck operated by an employee of the United States Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Mary K. Sweeney, Nancy Lee Sweeney, and Alex H. Sweeney (collectively) the sum of $7,500," and insert "the sum of $2,000; to Nancy Lee Sweeney, the sum of $1,500; and to Alex H. Sweeney, the sum of $100."

On page 1, line 10, strike out "injuries" and insert "personal injuries and medical expenses."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "by an employee of the United States Government" and insert "in connection with the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, in Park Ridge, Ill."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others."

LILLIAN LAST

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1736, for the relief of Lillian Last.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lillian Last, of New York City, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Lillian Last on account of the death of her husband, Ben Last, resulting from injuries sustained when he was struck by a Government automobile on April 7, 1939, near Accotink, Va., which said Government automobile was operated in a negligent manner by a Government employee under the supervision of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

On page 1, line 11, strike out "which said Government automobile was operated in a negligent manner by a Government employee under the supervision of the" and insert "said truck being operated by an employee of the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE J. METEYER, LESTER W. ENGELS AND DOROTHY B. ENGELS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2424, for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence J. Meteyer, of Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,124, and to Lester W. Engels and his wife Dorothy B. Engels, of Rochester, N. Y., jointly, the sum of $3,690.70, in full settlement of all of their claims against the Government of the United States for property loss sustained by them as the result of an explosion and fire caused by agents of the Works Progress Administration engaged in resurfacing Falmouth Street, in the town of Greece, Monroe County, N. Y., December 23, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "$5,124" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,624."

Line 8, strike out "$3,690.70" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,517.70."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ESTATE OF TED VAUGHAN (DECEASED)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4462, for the relief of the indigent and dependent heirs of Ted Vaughan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

J. C. LEMON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4941, for the relief of J. C. Lemon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. C. Lemon the sum of $1,228, in full satisfaction of all claims he may have against the Government for the reimbursement of medical and hospital expense in the care of injuries received by his daughter Bette L. McCoy, said injuries being caused by the negligent operation of an Army ambulance, by an enlisted man, while acting within the scope of his duty, on June 26, 1940, at the intersection of San Antonio-Austin Highway and Pat Brooker Road, near San Antonio, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Starting with the words "by the", in line 9, page 1, strike out "by the negligent operation of an Army ambulance, by an enlisted man, while acting within the scope of his duty" and insert in lieu thereof "when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army ambulance."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "Brooker" and insert in lieu thereof "Booker."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the colon (:) after the word "Texas", insert a period (.), and add:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis McCoy the sum of $5,954.66, and to Patricia McCoy the sum of $1,500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Grace McCoy, the wife of Louis McCoy, and for reimbursement of medical and other expenses and for personal injuries sustained by himself and Patricia McCoy when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an Army ambulance on June 26, 1940, at the intersection of San Antonio-Austin Highway and Pat Booker Road, near San Antonio, Tex.:"

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy.".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

E. M. CONROY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5210, for the relief of E. M. Conroy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. M. Conroy, Fort Myers, Fla., the sum of $200. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said E. M. Conroy against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him as a result of a collision at Safford, Ariz., on August 1, 1938, involving his automobile and a truck of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, at the end of line 1, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID CARON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5454, for the relief of David Caron.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David Caron, of Hoquiam, Wash., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries received December 18, 1940, when struck by a motorcycle operated by a member of the military police, the accident occurring on United States Highway No. 99, at Fort Lewis, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARR CHINA CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5625, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Carr China Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GEORGE W. LYLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5713, for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employers' Compensation Commission.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That such medical, surgical, and hospital services, appliances, and supplies, shall be furnished to George W. Lyle by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, under the provisions of section 9 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 743), as amended by section 1 of the

act of June 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 772), and other sections, as the United States Employees' Compensation Commission may find necessary to cure and relieve the injuries sustained by said George W. Lyle while employed by the United States Reclamation Service at Arrowrock Dam, Idaho, on December 5, 1912, to the same extent as though his injuries had occurred subsequent to September 7, 1916, and he had filed a claim for compensation within 1 year and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission had found that his injuries occurred while in the performance of duty: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize payment for any medical or other expenses heretofore incurred.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLENN A. HOSS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5772, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Glenn A. Hoss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to Mr. and Mrs. Glenn A. Hoss, of Hot Springs, N Mex. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and physical disabilities incurred on September 12, 1939, when the automobile in which Mr. and Mrs. Hoss were riding was crushed by a tree felled by employees of the Work Projects Administration near Bernalillo, N. Mex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out "$1,500 to Mr. and Mrs." and insert in lieu thereof "$500 to."

Line 8, strike out the words "property damage and."

Line 10, strike out "Mr. and Mrs. Hoss were" and insert in lieu thereof "he was."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

LACEY C. ZAPF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6457) for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FRED FARNER AND DORIS M. SCHROEDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6748) for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred Farner, Prairie View, Ill., the sum of $3,000 for the death of his daughter Barbara Frances Farner, a minor, who was killed on August 29, 1940, and to the legal guardian of Doris M Schroeder, of Prairie View, Ill., the sum of $3,000, for personal injuries sustained on August 29, 1940, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, when they were struck while standing on a sidewalk in Half-Day, Ill., by a United States Government ambulance driven by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN C. CROSSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 836) for the relief of John C. Crossman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money appropriated for the support of the National Guard for the current fiscal year, to Sgt. John C. Crossman the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries sustained by him while in the performance of his duties at Camp Hulen, Palacios, Tex., August 10, 1933, caused by the explosion of a gasoline lantern: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES C. LOARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 984) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard, of Montgomery, Ala., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for the death of their son, James Ray Loard, who was killed on October 12, 1940, by an explosion at Maxwell Field, Ala.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DR. HENRY CLAY RISNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1147) for the relief of Dr. Henry Clay Risner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Dr. Henry Clay Risner, of Winston-Salem, N. C., the sum of $100 per month for the remainder of his natural life, to compensate the said Henry Clay Risner for physical disabilities from which he is now suffering as a result of his service with troops during the period of the World War, the said service being rendered as a member of the war-work council of the Young Men's Christian Association.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "$100" and insert "$80."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

META DE RENE MCLOSKEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1280) for the relief of Meta De Rene McLoskey.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on War Claims.

LEAH A. BROWNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1336) for the relief of Leah A. Brownell.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on War Claims.

CARL G. ALLGRUNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1578) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and 1919, which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937,

awarding the said Carl G. Allgrunn the sum of $56,043.76 with interest thereon, on which judgment the said Carl G. Allgrunn was paid on or about April 11, 1938, the sum of $119,030.80.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, under the acts of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 394 and 40 Stat. 422), notwithstanding the lapse of time or the statute of limitations, to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention in rifling so-called 75-millimeter guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., which guns were made under contracts with the War Department of the United States Government, which invention is shown and described in his patent No. 1,311,107 issued on or about July 22, 1919. In said adjudication any alleged defense of shop right in the Symington-Anderson Co. or in the United States Government is hereby waived and the said Carl G. Allgrunn shall be considered as having the same status as though he had never been in the employ of the Symington-Anderson Co., it being understood that the court ruled in its decision of December 3, 1928, "The plaintiff (Carl G. Allgrunn) may not recover for the use of his invention by the Symington-Anderson Co." and that by said ruling he was deprived of any pay for such use by the Symington-Anderson Co. or in their shop, and it being further understood that the bonus of $5,000 or thereabouts paid to the said Carl G. Allgrunn over and above his salary, or as a part thereof, and paid to him in common with similar bonuses paid to other salaried employees of the Symington-Anderson Co. is not to be considered as a bar to this claim or any part thereof, and that any further proceedings in said court will be in continuation of the suit filed by Carl G. Allgrunn in said court on or about September 13, 1920, on which final judgment was given February 8, 1937, and that the continuation of said suit under this act is not barred by the judgment given in said suit or the payment of said judgment on or about April 11, 1938, or by any other provision of law.

SEC. 2. The Court of Claims of the United States is authorized to reopen the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn heretofore considered in its decision of December 3, 1928, published at 67 Court of Claims Reports, page 1, for the purpose of considering any newly discovered evidence showing or tending to show that the award heretofore given the said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention in the shops of the Wisconsin Gun Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., and Bullard Engineering Works or other shops was insufficient or was less than the actual saving plus the actual money value of other benefits caused by the use of the invention.

SEC. 3. The Court of Claims, in addition to the calls heretofore authorized by law, is authorized and directed to make a call or calls on the Secretary of War for, and the Secretary of War is directed to furnish, upon such call or calls, papers and information in relation to the following:

(a) Copies of the contracts or purchase orders under which the 75-millimeter and 155-millimeter guns were made and rifled by Wisconsin Gun Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., Symington-Anderson Co., and Bullard Engineering Works.

(b) The estimated cost of the 75-millimeter guns and the 155-millimeter guns made or to be made by the Wisconsin Gun Co., the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Symington-Anderson Co., and the Bullard Engineering Works, as shown by the contracts or purchase orders therefor.

(c) The estimated cost of the rifling of the guns in the old way that were to be made in the aforesaid shops under such contracts or purchase orders, or the total estimated cost of the guns allocated to the cost of the rifling of the guns before the guns were made.

(d) The number of 75-millimeter guns rifled in the shop of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in the old way as shown by War Department records contemporaneously kept or as shown by any cost records or records of settlement.

(e) The number of guns rifled in the shop of the Bethlehem Steel Co. with Mr. Allgrunn's invention, as shown by War Department records contemporaneously kept or as shown by any cost records or records of settlement.

(f) The actual cost of rifling the guns in each shop with Mr. Allgrunn's invention.

(g) The actual saving between the estimated cost of rifling the guns in the old way and the actual cost of rifling guns by Mr. Allgrunn's invention in said shops.

(h) Copies of the contracts or purchase orders which provided that one-third of the saving should be paid to the contractor, and the other two-thirds of the saving should be held by the Government.

(i) The amount of the saving in the cost of rifling the guns by the Allgrunn invention paid to each contractor in accordance with the provisions of the contracts or purchase order or orders or other agreement or promise.

(j) The basis on which any share of the saving in the cost of rifling was awarded to the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the amount so awarded.

(k) The pro rata share of the factory overhead and administrative expense used in each of the shops in determining the cost of rifling the guns or the cost of producing the guns.

SEC. 4. The Court of Claims is also authorized to call on the Secretary of War for, and the Secretary of War is directed to furnish, copies of all papers and information showing the estimated cost of rifling 75 millimeter guns that were to be made by the Symington-Anderson Co. of Rochester, N. Y., and the actual cost of rifling said guns with the invention of Carl G. Allgrunn, said information and papers being the same as were furnished during the year 1940 to the Committee on Claims of the Senate of the United States by the Secretary of War on request of the Senate of the United States or some part thereof, which papers and information were furnished and marked "Confidential" by the Secretary of War and are now held confidential by the Committee on Claims of the Senate of the United States.

SEC. 5. In said adjudication there shall be no discrimination against the said Carl G. Allgrunn because he was not a manufacturer of guns or of rifling heads at the time the invention was used.

SEC. 6. From any decision in said suit, under the authority of this act an appeal may be taken by either party as is provided for by law in other cases.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LIZZIE BERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1744) for the relief of Lizzie Berry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Lizzie Berry, of New Brunswick, N. J., the sum of $100 as burial allowance for the burial of Charley R. Berry (XC-1055920), late a veteran of the World War.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MARY G. PERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2219) for the relief of Mary G. Person.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on War Claims.

AGNES BRODAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3176) for the relief of Agnes Brodahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Agnes Brodahl, the widow of Caspar P. Brodahl (XC-276414), all such installments of money which she would have been entitled to receive if the said Caspar P. Brodahl, who died on February 29, 1928, from disease incurred in the active military service during the World War, had made a valid application for reinstatement of his yearly renewable term insurance in February 1927; if such insurance had been reinstated effective February 1, 1927; and if it had been in full force and effect, with the said Agnes Brodahl as the designated beneficiary, at the time of the death of the said Caspar P. Brodahl. Installments accruing prior to the date of enactment of this act on account of insurance reinstated by this act shall be paid in a lump sum: *Provided*, That the amount paid to Agnes Brodahl, the beneficiary, shall be $2,500.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the words "the beneficiary, shall be $2,500", and insert "as the assignee of the beneficiary, Clara Brodahl, shall be $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JOHN AUGUST JOHNSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4624, for the relief of John August Johnson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on War Claims.

CECILE McLAUGHLIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5496, for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cecile McLaughlin, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained on June 4, 1941, as the result of negligence on the part of an employee on project No. 21367 of the Work Projects Administration, on Johnswood Road, Roslindale, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on

account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES WARREN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5658, for the relief of James Warren.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Warren, the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of injury, pain, suffering, and money loss sustained by said James Warren as the result of a wound he received from a bullet fired by a soldier in target practice, at Fort Monroe, Va., on April 14, 1941, while said James Warren was serving as deck hand on the boat *John T. Powell*. *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions o. this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$750."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MADELEINE HAMMETT ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5854, for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be. and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Madeleine Hammett, of Natchez, Miss., the sum of $5,000; to Olive Hammett, of Natchez, Miss., the sum of $500; to Walter Young, of Natchez, Miss., the sum of $1,000; to the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, the sum of $5,500; to the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young, of Natchez, Miss., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained on August 10, 1941, when the truck in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck near Hattiesburg, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,357.44."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH AND EMMA TREIBER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5910, for the relief of Rudolph and Emma Treiber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rudolph and Emma Treiber, of Munger, Mich., the sum of $500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Rudolph Treiber, Jr., minor son of Rudolph and Emma Treiber, on July 5, 1940, near Bay City, Mich., when an Army truck from Selfridge Field, Mich., collided with the wagon on which he was riding, throwing said Rudolph Treiber, Jr., to the ground and breaking his arm and inflicting other injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Rudolph and Emma Treiber" and insert in lieu thereof "the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor."

Line 8, strike out the language "by Rudolph Treiber, Jr., minor son of Rudolph and Emma Treiber."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor."

LOUIS H. DEAVER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5966, for the relief of Louis H. Deaver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby directed to receive the claim of Louis H. Deaver, of Tuthill, S. Dak., who allegedly was permanently disabled as the result of an injury received in August 1921, while employed as postmaster at Cody, Nebr., and his claim is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), notwithstanding sections 17 to 20, inclusive, as if said Louis H. Deaver were entitled to such benefits under the act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMANDER CATO D. GLOVER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6365, for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Commander Cato D. Glover, United States Navy, the sum of $1,421.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Commander Cato D. Glover against the United States on account of damage to his household effects while such effects were en route from Paris, France, to the United States. The said Commander Cato D. Glover was serving as assistant naval attaché and assistant naval attaché for air at the American Embassy in Paris at the time of the German invasion and was ordered to follow the French Government to Vichy. On or about October 29, 1940, the household effects of the said Commander Cato D. Glover were shipped from Paris by authority of the Navy Department, and arrived in the United States more than 4 months later in a badly damaged condition.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "condition", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1540, for the relief of Harry Tansey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MARY J. CRABTREE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1424, for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000, to Mary J. Crabtree, of Bridgeport, Nebr., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of a fall in the United States post office in Puyallup, Wash., on October 13, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLYDE KINGERY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1757, for the relief of Clyde Kingery.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clyde Kingery, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $3,474.90, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, as the result of his having been struck by a United States Army motorcycle in Tacoma, Wash., on February 26, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINOR CHILDREN OF MRS. JESÚS ZAMORA FELIX, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1765, for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to a legally appointed guardian of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, of Phoenix, Ariz., such payment when made to be in full satisfaction of any claim or claims growing out of the death of Mrs. Felix on June 25, 1941, such death having been caused by an instrumentality of the United States: *Provided*, That the moneys paid by the United States to the said guardian shall be used by him under the direction of the Superior Court of Maricopa County, Ariz., for the support and education of said minor children.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE BRIZENDINE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1899, for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lawrence Brizendine, of Bend, Oreg., the sum of $3,260 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of accrued medical expenses and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of being struck by a United States Forest Service truck, operated by a Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee, near Bend, Oreg., on January 7, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The acceptance by the said Lawrence Brizendine of payment of the sum authorized to be paid to him by the provisions of the first section of this act shall not be deemed to in any manner preclude him from seeking reimbursement from the United States, or to prejudice any claim of his against the United States for reimbursement, for any expense for medical or hospital care which he may hereafter incur as a result of the injuries referred to in the first section of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,260" and insert "$2,060."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM MEISTER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1991, for the relief of Mrs. William Meister.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. William Meister, of Lemay, Mo., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. William Meister on June 21, 1938, when she fell on West Holden Avenue, Lemay, Mo., as the result of stepping upon a small stone permitted to roll in the roadway by employees of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASQUALINA LAZZARO

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1993, for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pasqualina Lazzaro, of Watertown, Mass. the sum of $900, such sum representing the amount lost by her on account of the forfeiture of a bond for the appearance in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts of Guiseppe Magnotta, who had been taken into custody by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and who, after the forfeiture of such bond, was again taken into custody by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and was released by such Service after an examination and investigation of the charges against him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND PRIVATE ACT NO. 446, SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2017, to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of Private Act No. 446, approved July 2, 1940, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. No provision of this act shall relieve any payee from any indebtedness to the United States of America resulting from the disallowances by the Comptroller General of the United States included in the above set forth sums and which are charged against disbursing officers named herein except that there shall be credited in the accounts of Hugh S. Johnson, Administrator of the National Recovery Administration, and Miss F. M. Robinson, his secretary, any amounts charged against them on account of alleged

overpayment for transportation and actual expenses of subsistence or per diem in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK S. MATHIAS AND ELSIE MATHIAS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2116, for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank S. Mathias, of Essex, Baltimore County, Md., the sum of $731.60, and to Elsie Mathias, his wife, the sum of $514.35, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, on Eastern Avenue about 150 feet west of Umber Street, Baltimore, Md., on August 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. J. HOUZE CONVEX GLASS CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2056, for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rules, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MOUNT VERNON, ALEXANDRIA & WASHINGTON RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4251, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria and Washington Railway Co., a corporation, and to award said corporation compensation for losses or damages, consequential, incidental, or otherwise, if any, which such corporation may have suffered by reason of the acts of the Secretary of the Treasury and/or other agency of the United States, done in pursuance of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and the act of January 13, 1928 (ch. 9, 45 Stat. 51, 52), or otherwise, in compelling the abandonment and removal of its terminals, tracks, and structures, within the area between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, and between Sixth Street and Fifteenth Street NW, and elsewhere in the District of Columbia, and in destroying, rendering useless, and valueless its franchise, rights-of-way and/or other easements, its terminals, tracks, and structures, its going business and/or goodwill, and other property rights, if any, regardless of whether or not there was a taking by the United States of the said franchise, rights-of-way, and/or other easements, tracks, structures, terminals, going business, and goodwill and other property rights, and/or whether or not any act of the Secretary of the Treasury or other agency of the United States was lawful or tortious, and to enter a decree or judgment against the United States for such compensation with interest thereon.

SEC. 2. Suit for such claim may be instituted at any time within 4 months after the approval of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, any statute of limitations, or that the same may be a tort action, and such proceedings hereunder shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES L. LAIR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4370, for the relief of Charles L. Lair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles L. Lair, of Spokane, Wash., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred and damages resulting from an accident involving a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps under the supervision of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, at the intersection of G and Garland Streets, Spokane, Wash., on October 18, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "damages" and insert "personal injuries sustained."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGIE KNOX AND ORION KNOX

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4923, for the relief of Georgie Knox and Orion Knox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,134.95 to Georgie Knox, individually, and the sum of $2,500 as guardian of the estate of Orion Knox, a minor, a total of $10,634.95, in full settlement for damages arising from the death of Orion Knox, who died as the result of injuries sustained when the car he was operating was struck by a Government truck operated by a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps on January 13, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Starting with "the sum of" in line 5, strike out all the language down to, and including "a total of" in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof "to the estate of Orion Knox, deceased, the sum of."

After the word "settlement" in line 9, insert "of all claims against the United States".

At the end of the bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased."

FRANCIS CORWIN CIRCLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5070, for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Francis Corwin Circle, of Seaside, Oreg., the sum of $7,500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries suffered on February 28, 1941, about 1 mile south of the Cannon Beach road junction, when the truck in which said Francis Corwin Circle was riding was struck by a truck owned by the United States, Government license No. 94032, and operated by an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps" and insert in lieu thereof "not otherwise appropriated."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESLIE A. COULTER, SR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5275, for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Weslie A. Coulter, Sr., the sum of $10,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of the death of his son, Weslie A. Coulter, Jr., who was killed on September 20, 1940, near Newport News, Va., when a motorcycle which he was operating was struck by a United States Army truck while being operated by an Army employee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JESSIE A. BEECHWOOD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5317, for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Mrs. Jessie A Beechwood of Hamilton, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation and for reimbursement for certain expenses incurred on account of the death of her minor son, Loren S. Applebury, former fire fighter, United States Forest Service, who was fatally injured on August 5, 1940, while fighting a fire in the Bitterroot National Forest: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$500" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. J. McINTOSH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5329, for the relief of J. J. McIntosh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. J. McIntosh, of Bexley, Miss., the sum of $400, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States on account of the damage to his automobile as a result of an accident which occurred on April 12, 1940, near Leakesville, Miss., while the said J. J. McIntosh was on official duty as a census enumerator, when a drunken driver ran into his car, completely demolishing it: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$400" and insert "$300."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY DALEY, GUARDIAN FOR JAMES RAY DALEY AND NORMAN FRANKLIN DALEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5499, for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry Daley, of Bullitt County, Ky., as legal guardian for his minor sons, James Ray Daley, $3,000, and Norman Franklin Daley the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by them near the United States military reservation in Kentucky known as Fort Knox, on the 29th day of February 1940 on account and by reason of the explosion of a shell on "timer" theretofore, by the United States military forces negligently discharged by artillery or negligently permitted to be taken there: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. J. R. BENNETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5565, for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ANNA DANIELSON AND BETTY TIEDEMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5723, for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna Danielson, of North Syracuse, N. Y., the sum of $875; and Betty Tiedeman, of Maitland, Fla., the sum of $153.10, in full settlement of their claims against the United States for expenses incurred and personal injuries sustained on December 13, 1940, near Winter Park, Fla., as the result of a collision of the automobile in which claimants were riding with a Government-owned truck operated by an employee of the Works Progress Administration.

SEC. 2. That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "Works Progress" and insert "Work Projects."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5847, for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Julia Campbell, Pensacola, Fla., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Julia Campbell against the United States for personal injuries sustained on October 28, 1940, in Pensacola, Fla., when a hub cap from one of the wheels of a truck in the service of the National Youth Administration flew off the wheel, ran upon the sidewalk, and struck the said Mrs. Julia Campbell:

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 1, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. A. WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5920, for the relief of E. A. Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. A. Williams, of Comanche, Tex., the sum of $20,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on February 4, 1941, when he was struck by a United States Army truck in the town of Comanche, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$20,000" and insert "$5,540."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD W. AND LUCILLE M. BURCH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5955, for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch, both of Omaha, Nebr., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for the deaths of their minor daughters, Dorothy Evilo Burch and Barbara Ann Burch, who died as a result of injuries sustained by them when they were struck by an Army truck at the intersection of Twenty-fourth and Spencer Streets, in Omaha, Nebr., on July 16, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES GILMORE AND MARION GILMORE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6557, for the relief of James Gilmore and Marion Gilmore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Gilmore, of Santa Clara, Calif., the sum of $3,374.61; to Marion Gilmore, of Santa Clara, Calif., the sum of $1,949.14, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained when a United States Army airplane crashed into the home in which they were living on October 1, 1941, completely destroying all household and personal effects: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,374.61" and insert "$2,362.23."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Marion" and insert "Marian E."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$1,949.14" and insert "$1,479.31."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore."

DONALD WILLIAM BURT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2002, for the relief of Donald William Burt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald William Burt, former sergeant in the National Guard of the State of Washington, the sum of $107.20, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for pay withheld from him for the period January 1, 1941, to February 24, 1941, when, after being inducted into the Federal service on September 16, 1940, he was discharged for noncitizenship on February 24, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"'SECTION 1. That notwithstanding provisions contained in the several appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942, prohibiting the payment of compensation therefrom to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability for such payment for services rendered by noncitizen officers and employees, as are otherwise correct and legal, as are made in good faith, and as are found not to be due to any lack of good faith on the part of the payee.

"'SEC. 2. If credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts in accordance with section 1 of this act, the officer or employee, or former officer or employee receiving payment shall not be required to refund the amount thereof; and any such amount which has been collected from an officer or employee, or former officer or employee, may be refunded to him.

"'SEC. 3. That any person in the armed forces, or employed in a civilian capacity, prior to the enactment hereof, shall be paid for services rendered until January 1, 1942, out of current appropriation or fund otherwise available for the pay of said person, the compensation to which such person would be entitled but for the citizenship prohibition cited in section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That the head of department or agency concerned determines that such person entered said service or employment without fault on his part as to noncitizenship status.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941."

MRS. CLAUD TUCK

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1694, for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,769.75, to Mrs. Claud Tuck, of Lawrenceville, Ga., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred by her and for compensation for the death of her husband, Claud Tuck, who died on June 14, 1938, from injuries sustained on May 23, 1938, when the truck which he was operating overturned while he was engaged in working on a project of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Claud Tuck and Darrell Claud Tuck, a minor: *Provided*, That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to consider this claim under the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, in the same manner as it would if Claud Tuck, deceased, had, on May 23, 1938, been regularly employed by the Works Progress Administration: *Provided further*, That claim hereunder

shall be filed within 6 months after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck and Darrell Claud Tuck, a minor."

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES O. NEVEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 494, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles O. Nevel.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

WALTER B. WILLIAMS, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3201, for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,250 to Walter B. Williams, Jr., of Haddock, Ga., in full settlement of his claim against the United States for personal injuries suffered by him on March 7, 1940, when he was injured as the result of a collision with one of the trucks of the United States Army near Haddock, Ga.

With the following committee amendmend:

Page 1, at the end of the bill, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH DONATELLI AND ROSE DONATELLI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4526, for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli, his wife, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising from the death of Gloria Donatelli, the daughter of the said Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli, who died July 20, 1940, as a result of being struck by a special-delivery messenger's machine: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 2, line 1, after "*Provided*," insert "That the acceptance of the above sum shall be in full settlement and release of any and all judgments against Walter Hill, Jr.: *Provided further*,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CARRIE LAVADA WIGGINS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4554, for the relief of Mrs. Carrie Lavada Wiggins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Carrie Lavada Wiggins, Greenville, S. C., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Carrie Lavada Wiggins against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Julian B. Wiggins, late member of the Governor's officers of the State of South Carolina, who died from injuries sustained in an automobile accident on October 7, 1940, near Greenville, S. C., while assisting an investigator of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Treasury Department, in the seizure and delivery to the custody of the Federal authorities of an automobile transporting non-tax-paid liquor.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "appropriated", strike out the remainder of page 1 and on page 2 strike out all of lines 1 and 2 and down to the word "accident" on line 3 and insert the following: "to the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, the sum of $7,500 and to the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained resulting in their death."

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read a further committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 11, after "liquor", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased."

ALFRED SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4629, for the relief of Alfred Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred Smith a sum equal to the amount he would have received had his claim been filed within the statutory period for injury sustained by him while employed as a bricklayer at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, at Newington, Conn.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Alfred Smith, who allegedly sustained an injury to his scalp in October or November 1938 while employed as a bricklayer with the Veterans' Administration, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES P. CRAWFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5013, for the relief of James P. Crawford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of James P. Crawford, who allegedly was injured and became disabled while in the performance of duty on January 5, 1940, while serving as assistant storekeeper of the Soil Conservation Service at Harrisonburg, Va., received a hernia while lifting a garage door and on January 16, 1940, was operated on in Georgetown Hospital, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "17" and insert "15."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES E. YATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5385, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Yates.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim against the United States of Charles E. Yates, of San Francisco, Calif., for damages on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Charles E. Yates in a collision involving the motorcycle which he was driving and a United States Army truck on March 22, 1941, in the city of San Francisco, Calif. Such suit shall be brought within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The United States District Attorney for the Northern District of California is hereby charged with the duty of defending the United States in any suit instituted under authority of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to pay the amount of any judgment rendered pursuant to this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles E. Yates, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $5,000; to the Motor Facts Sales Co., San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $250; to the National Automobile Insurance Co., the sum of $692.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained, property damage, and medical expenses incurred when the motorcycle driven by Charles E. Yates was struck by an Army truck in San Francisco, Calif., on March 22, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 16, strike out "to the National Automobile Insurance Co., the sum of $692.50."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co."

LILLIAN WOODWARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5389, for the relief of Lillian Woodward.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GERNEY M. CLAIBORNE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5527, for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Gerney M. Claiborne, who was injured in the line of his duty while an employee of the United States Post Office in Knoxville, Tenn., on November 1938, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Gerney M. Claiborne may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "17" and insert "15."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "was injured" and insert "alleges that he sustained an injury to his spine."

On page 1, line 11, strike out "on" and insert "in."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES M. HAYS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5680, for the relief of James M. Hays.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $750 to James M. Hays, of Los Angeles, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of a collision between the car which he was driving and a United States Immigration and Naturalization Service car, said collision occurring on March 2, 1940, at the intersection of Figueroa and Fifty-seventh Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM TIPTON, MRS. WILLIAM TIPTON, AND MRS. EULA NELSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6033, for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Tipton, the sum of $1,000; to Mrs. William Tipton, the sum of $7,500; and to Mrs. Eula Nelson, the sum of $5,000; all residents of Montague, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of painful and permanent injuries received by them on February 15, 1941, when the automobile in which they were riding collided with a truck being operated by the Work Projects Administration and driven by a certified employee of that agency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$770."

Line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Line 10, after the word "received", insert "and property damage sustained."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say, Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the matter with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] and he is in full accord with the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have talked with the gentleman from Texas and he is agreeable to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. V. FORSYTHE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6594, for the relief of M. V. Forsythe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. V. Forsythe, of El Dorado, Ark., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the truck he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 82, 3 miles west of El Dorado, Ark., on September 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF TOM GENTRY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6797, for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Tom Gentry, of Marion, Ill., the sum of $3,008. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said estate of Tom Gentry on account of personal injuries sustained by him when the car in which he was riding collided with an automobile in the service of the Work Projects Administration on November 18, 1939, on West Main Street, Marion, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "1939" and insert "1938."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. DEMUTH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6848, granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DORA THOMPSON

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider No. 731 on the calendar, the bill (S. 950) for the relief of Dora Thompson.

Mr. HANCOCK. I object, Mr. Speaker That bill has not been reached on the calendar and should be taken up in its regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permit the Chair to advise the gentleman from Montana that the bill has not been reached on the call of the calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understood, Mr. Speaker, that the bills following Calendar No. 725 are not eligible for consideration. I may be in error about that.

Mr. HANCOCK. They have not been disposed of, I may say to the gentleman and have not been called.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They are not eligible to be called.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, it is the plan so far as the Democratic objectors are concerned, that all bills on the calendar be called save the three bills, Calendar Nos. 727, 728, and 729, which are omnibus bills.

RACHIB SHRIAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2369, for the relief of Rachib Shriay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation heretofore issued against Rachib Shriay, and that the alien shall not hereafter become subject to deportation for the cause contained in the present warrant. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the quota during the current quota year.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 4, strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and substitute the words "Attorney General."

Strike out lines 11 and 12, and insert "The Syrian quota for the first year that the Syrian quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following three bills, Calendar Nos. 727 (H. R. 6939), 728 (H. R. 6940), and Calendar No. 729 (H. R. 6941) be passed over and not called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Reserving the right to object, these are three omnibus bills, are they not?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall not object, but I would like to dispose of them at the next call of the calendar. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUGUSTUS DOMINQUE TURAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6102) confirming the claim of Augustus Dominque Turand for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392 in report of commissioners dated January 9, 1812.

There being no objection, the bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the rights, titles, and interests of the United States in and to the lands covered by private claim No. 392, report of January 9, 1812, in the name of Augustus Dominque Turand for the Church or St. Jacques, and approved by the old board of commissioners under authority of the act of March 3, 1807, described as section 12, township 12 south, range 16 east, Louisiana meridian, southeast land district west of Mississippi River in St. James Parish, State of Louisiana, containing one hundred and thirty and twenty-five one-hundredths acres be, and the same is hereby, granted, released, relinquished, and conveyed, in fee simple, by the United States to the respective owners of the equitable titles thereto, and to their respective heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely, in every respect whatever, as could be done by patents issued therefor according to law.

SEC. 2. That nothing contained in this act shall in any manner abridge, divest, impair, injure, or prejudice any valid right, title, or interest of any person or persons in or to any portion or part of the lands mentioned in said first section, the true intent of this act being to relinquish and abandon, grant, give, and concede, any and all right, interest, and estate, in law or equity, which the United States is or is supposed to be entitled to in said lands, in favor of all persons, estates, firms, or corporations, who would be the equitable or true and lawful owners of the same by reason of long continuous possession under color of title with claim of ownership, or otherwise, under the laws of Louisiana, including the laws of prescription and limitation, in the absence of the said interest, title, and estate of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "of" preceding the word "January" and substitute

therefor the words "communicated to the House of Representatives on."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "approved" and substitute therefor the words "recommended for confirmation."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "valid."

Page 2, line 18, after the word "who", insert a comma and the following: "had the claim heretofore been confirmed."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392."

DORA THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 950) for the relief of Dora Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to (1) rescind the cancelation of homestead entry Great Falls 073861 of Dora Thompson, (2) restore such entry to a pending status, and (3) extend for 3 years from the date of enactment of this act the period during which said Dora Thompson may submit final proof with respect to compliance with residence requirements applicable to such entry.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LIZZIE BERRY

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that H. R. 1744, for the relief of Lizzie Berry, Calendar No. 676, has already been passed and is now a law. This would be a duplication. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the proceeding by which the bill H. R. 1744 was passed be vacated and that the bill be stricken from the Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair informs the gentleman from Indiana that there are three special orders pending, after which time the Chair could entertain the gentleman's request.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very interesting letter I received from Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of War Emergency, in which I am sure each Member would be interested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial that appeared in the Boston Post, entitled "Roosevelt and Revere."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement issued by the National Automobile Dealers Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore agreed to, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time today, and that I be permitted to address the House on Tuesday next, after the disposition of all business and any other special orders, for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, years ago we learned that an army moves on its stomach. Today we know it also travels on rubber tires or rubber treads. Without this rubber, we can easily lose the war while being the richest nation on earth in point of available supply of raw materials for rubber.

Almost 5 months have passed since we first realized that we must either do without rubber or produce it ourselves. Our own Department of Agriculture knows we can produce rubber from grains and potatoes. Large oil companies also have processes for making of synthetic rubber and have been making some rubber but in the main we are more or less in confusion with little progress toward meeting the vital rubber question.

Last Saturday the press gave a story that rubber, under "lend lease", is flowing to England and from there to Brazil and quoting the columnist:

If you need a rubber tire, send to Brazil and get an English tire. It's the quickest way.

Petroleum and cane sugar interests apparently have united to repress and block the use of farm products, such as corn, wheat, potatoes, and so forth, as sources of raw materials from which synthetic rubber is made. From facts at hand, it appears these interests are being favored in the development of the synthetic rubber program, although it is obvious they can only meet a very small part of our wartime needs.

The base from which most synthetic rubbers are made is ethyl alcohol. The petroleum people get a synthetic alcohol as a byproduct in the manufacture of gasoline. The cane sugar people make alcohol from blackstrap molasses, largely an imported product. Both sources are definitely limited and it is quite generally held that they are insufficient to meet our present requirements.

However, the farms of America can provide an almost inexhaustible supply of agricultural products from which ethyl alcohol can be made. The list of these products is too long to repeat here, but they include all of our surplus grains and potatoes, and so forth.

A week ago I sat in on a meeting of the Gillette committee in the Senate. This committee is making an investigation of the alcohol and synthetic rubber industries. Mr. M. M. Rosten, a Polish businessman, now building ethyl alcohol plants for the Canadian Government in New Brunswick, was before the committee.

Mr. Rosten told the committee that prior to the time the Germans overran his country, the Polish Government had built and operated 1,500 small ethyl alcohol plants and that Germany had 36,000 of them at the beginning of the war. That is where the Germans are getting the fuel to operate their panzer divisions and their air force. That is where both Germany and Russia are getting the bulk of their rubber requirements.

Most of that alcohol in Germany and Poland is being made from potatoes because of the small acreage that they have available for agriculture which necessitates the largest tonnage possible to be converted.

I also want to say that up until about 3 years ago we were buying a great deal of Polish hams and Polish bacon in this country. Many of us criticized that because of the cheap Polish hams and foreign bacon that was coming into this country and competing with the American farmers. I want to give you a little information about that. It was competing, yes, but at a higher price. We now know that it was superior ham and bacon to the American ham and bacon, yet I come from one of the richest hog producing counties in the United States of America.

Why was the Polish ham and bacon able to ship this long distance and compete, and yet command a premium price? Because of a certain process of fermentation, the byproduct of this grain was sold. On every 2,000 acres they had a small distilling plant, and those wet grains were sold back to the farmers as feed. That process produced certain vitamin content. That process is avail-

able to us in this country, but we have not seen fit to avail ourselves of it for some reason or other. Certain vitamins in that process produced not only a superior flavor of pork, hams, and bacon but it also had tremendous effect on the milk production, increasing by an appreciable percentage the production of milk, through those feeds.

Contrast that development with our own situation. I am reliably informed that only 18,000 gallons of alcohol is being allocated daily by our own war chiefs for manufacture of synthetic rubber. This is only 18 tons per day, or less than 8,000 tons per year. Our own normal domestic estimated requirements of this material range from a low of 500,000 tons to 700,000 tons per year. Time is apt to prove that 1,000,000 tons annually will come nearer the mark of our actual requirements for both military and civilian needs.

Aside from the fact the petroleum and cane-sugar industries cannot meet this demand is the further inescapable fact we must have ethyl alcohol in almost unlimited amounts for the manufacture of smokeless powder and other munitions.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House why the Department of Agriculture is allowed to keep all this wheat in storage, allowed to continue this wheat scarcity program, and put on another fake election to give it power to set up wheat quotas for next year, when we are in absolute need of this wheat to make the products you are speaking of, to win this war?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. The answer I got from them, and I heard it again this morning before the Gillette subcommittee of the Senate, which is studying this rubber question—Mr. Moffett, who is chief of this division for the War Production Board, stated that priorities forbid and will not allow the use of any of the materials for storing, granaries, and so forth; that everything is needed for the war; and they say that they have just now discovered that there is plenty of capacity in our own distilleries for the making of this alcohol and also the use of blackstrap molasses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that if the surplus wheat were used, as it should be, to make alcohol, smokeless powder, and other products now vitally needed for war purposes, this would demonstrate the fallacy of the scarcity policy of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Yes; I think so. When we talk about priorities on steel for these bins—we still have 1937 corn stored out in those big galvanized metal tanks. In the Midwest and the West today we have greater saturation of the subsoil than in many years, and all indications point to another bumper crop. I do not know where we are going to store it unless we can use it in the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, if this wheat were actually used properly it would be a benefit to the farmers directly and definitely?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. There is no question about it. I might interpose here that only last November the Reconstruction Finance Corporation set aside 1,000,000 long tons of cane sugar in Cuba for war munitions, and so forth. That was last November. Some was used, and yet later on there was even converted 142,000 long tons of cane sugar and it was reprocessed and made into molasses so as to make alcohol from it.

Luckily, the problem can be solved easily and quickly, if the powers that be will only give the farmers of America a chance to help fill this war-material requirement.

The farms of America can supply untold millions of bushels of extra corn and wheat and other starchy products from which vital materials can be made. A bushel of corn will produce 2½ gallons of 190-proof ethyl alcohol and a gallon of the alcohol will produce 2.2 pounds of synthetic rubber. Under modern manufacturing methods and using corn worth 85 cents per bushel, synthetic rubber from this source costs approximately 22½ cents per pound, or only 4½ cents more than present fixed price of natural rubber or about 52 cents per average tire.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is about time something was done about this.

We know we have to have these materials in almost unlimited volume and the Congress will not be doing its rightful duty if it does not see to it that we get them.

I am convinced that we should take immediate action. And I propose we draw on our vast resources of corn, wheat, and all other vegetable growths from which alcohol can be made. Let us cause to be set up without further delay a large number of small distilling plants in the grain belts and get them to work turning out the alcohol we so desperately need.

Let us process these starchy products in the area where they are grown. That way we will save enough money in transportation charges to pay for these plants in a remarkably short period of time and we will have something left after the war is over. They can keep right on producing either ethyl or anhydrous alcohol to meet the ever-increasing demand predicted as certain to develop by all responsible authorities.

I suggest this because when the alcohol is made from grains certain valuable byproducts, particularly those known as brewers' grains can then be sent back to the farms in wet form for cattle and hog feed, thus effecting material saving in drying, bagging, and transporting such feed for shipment on usual common-carrier facilities.

There is still another factor that should be taken into consideration. In a few days the entire Nation is going on a sugar ration. This would not be necessary if the sugar that is available to us were to be used as food instead of being converted into alcohol.

Sooner or later we are going to have to turn to domestic farm products to meet the insatiable demand war has brought on for explosives and rubber-like materials. Why do we delay? It is going to take all of our resources of these materials to keep our military machine alone unhampered to bring us an early and conclusive victory.

There is room for all in this matter. Let the petroleum people do what they can. Let the sugar interests contribute too, as long as they do not use up vital food supplies. And let us give our farmers the opportunity they are so earnestly seeking to fill in the breech of supply of these most vital war enterprise requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I propose today in the brief time allotted to me to discuss one of the new developments of the so-called Dies committee; and in this connection I deem it appropriate to read to the membership a telegram which was sent to the chairman of the committee during the last 24 hours by one of America's distinguished lawyers, A. L. Richards, who was a former law partner of Charles Evans Hughes, retired Chief Justice of the United States. I read:

APRIL 20, 1942.

Hon. MARTIN DIES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reading over the excerpts from Social Justice quoted by Attorney General Biddle in his recent denunciation of that Axis propaganda organ, I find several which I incorporated verbatim in the series of night letters which I sent you on January 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, 1942.

I had hoped by those letters to convince you that Social Justice was a seditious publication which was being circulated to promote dissension, defeatism, and revolt among our civilian population and to spread disaffection and incite mutiny in our armed forces.

You made no reply to these messages; did not even acknowledge receipt of them.

But I hope you did not throw them in the wastebasket.

I hope that at least you had them filed among the routinary communications from the public to your committee.

In the April 13 issue of Social Justice (the last number preceding the Walker ban on Royal Oak treason by mail) there is a full column of rhapsody devoted to you, concluding as follows:

"In your appreciation of the work accomplished by Mr. DIES, employ some of your leisure moments to write him a letter of encouragement. In fact a million letters brought to his desk would be an answer to those who are bent on destroying him * * *."

Don't believe you will get any million "letters of encouragement." Have too much faith in the country for that. But let me urge that whatever fan mail you get from this source be promptly turned over to the F. B. I. or the Army Intelligence Bureau, so that the names and addresses of the writers may be tabulated and filed away. God grant we are never invaded by the Axis, but if we are, that list might come in very handy.

AUGUSTUS L. RICHARDS,
Greenwich, Conn.

THE DIES COMMITTEE'S BROADSIDE AT THE BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

The Axis was trigger quick to tell the whole world what Mr. DIES said about the Board of Economic Warfare. Note the timetable:

March 29, 9 p. m.: First Monday morning editions appear on Washington streets with DIES charges against the board.

March 30, 8:45 a. m.: Radio Rome broadcasts DIES charges.

March 30, 10:30 a. m.: Radio Amsterdam broadcasts DIES charges.

March 30, 6:45 p. m.: Berlin radio broadcasts DIES charges.

March 30, 8 p. m.: Berlin broadcasts DIES charges.

April 1, 8:30 p. m.: Berlin radio, Debunk program, Broadcaster "Joe Scanlon," broadcasts DIES charges.

The Axis was thus telling the world Mr. DIES' charges before many Americans were able to read those charges in American newspapers. Most Americans do not see an early morning edition of their newspapers appearing on the streets of their cities the night before. Most Americans get their paper at breakfast time. Americans living on the west coast and in the intermountain region were still asleep when the Axis was first broadcasting the DIES charges to the world at 5:45 a. m. western time. Even in Washington the unexpected snow storm deprived most persons of their morning newspapers until after the Axis radio had told countries all over the world what Mr. DIES had charged against the Board of Economic Warfare. So that the Axis had hurried Mr. DIES' charges to neutral and other countries even before the people in our own country knew what Mr. DIES had said.

AXIS CAPITALIZES ON DIES COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES

Two questions:

First. Why were the Axis propaganda machines that eager to capitalize on such criticism of the Board of Economic Warfare?

Second. Should Mr. DIES have done what he did?

The Axis was more than ordinarily anxious to transmit to the whole world any charges against the Board. Three factors provided the unusual value of this affair for the Axis. One was the circumstance that the attack was on the Board of Economic Warfare. The second circumstance was that this particular Board was attacked for being, as the Berlin radio put it, under "Communist domination." The third circumstance was that the Axis propagandists were able to cite as their authority the committee chairman whom they have long favorably publicized to the world more than any other American.

FASCISTS ACUTELY EAGER TO UNDERMINE BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

The Axis is especially in need of discrediting the Board of Economic Warfare. This Board is one of the principal agencies combating the Axis efforts to win other countries to its side and to detach from our side countries which have joined us. Particularly the Axis wants to detach or spread confusion below the Rio Grande—areas so important to our Nation for the production of needed war materials and so dangerous if the Axis could use any of the thousand of miles of seacoast south of the Rio Grande for bases.

The Axis constantly broadcasts to Latin America in Spanish and Portuguese. The Axis is supported by some movements in Latin America aimed to establish Axis control in the Western Hemisphere.

Latin America is especially susceptible to cries about Communist infiltration. That is one of the principal and most commonly used claims in the Axis radio broadcasts to Latin America.

B. E. W. CONSTANTLY DEALS WITH LATIN AMERICA

To counteract efforts by the Axis in Latin America is one of the jobs of the Board of Economic Warfare. The Board licenses exports. The Board has the job of helping to provide Latin America with the exports it needs in order to minimize in those countries the wartime economic dislocations which produce discontent useful to the Axis. The Board also has the job of keeping exports from the many firms in Latin America sympathetic with the Axis. The Board has the job of detecting those Latin-American importers who are "cloaks" for the Axis. The Board has the job of gaining the support of any wavering Latin-American business interests, through its power to grant and deny licenses for exports they desire. The work of the Board is closely connected with that of other American agencies such as, in particular, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and particularly in connection with the work of getting to Latin America the truth needed to expose Axis radio and other propaganda.

Latin America is an example; the Board's economic activities deal with the world as a whole.

No wonder the Axis was Johnny-on-the-spot to use anything for smearing this Board in neutral countries and in countries which they are still trying to detach from our side.

Should Mr. DIES have done what he did? No criticism is here made of Mr. DIES for any essential effort to improve our Government—even though the result may be to give the Axis some propaganda ammunition. Leading officials of our Government have repeatedly said that Americans must be free to criticize the Government.

However, where the effect, however incidental and unintended, of such criticism is to help the Axis, then the critic necessarily labors under certain restrictions. One is the necessity of ascertaining whether he can bring about the correction he seeks in our Government, without any incidental help to the Axis. The second is that he should take ordinary precautions to ascertain that his criticism is needed and is justified.

DIES SHOULD HAVE CONSULTED BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE FIRST

Mr. DIES could, of course, without giving help to the Axis propagandists, have sought correction of the evil he believed he had found in the Board of Economic Warfare. All he had to do was to send his charges to the Board. This is what he should have done, without seeking publicity first. This complaint was made of his action by a number of his colleagues who spoke on the floor of the House Monday afternoon, March 30. Among the critics were several Congressmen who had previously voted for continuing the Dies committee. Among such critics was Mr. JERRY VOORHIS, of California, a member of the Dies committee. He said that he had repeatedly urged such procedure in place of rushing into print with charges against Government agencies. Among those who joined Mr. VOORHIS in criticizing Mr. DIES for rushing his charges into the newspapers were Congressmen O'CONNOR, of Montana; RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; HOPE, of Kansas; and MICHENER, of Michigan.

There was nothing to indicate that it would be futile for Mr. DIES to communicate any sound information to the Board. He had never had any experience to indicate that the Board would not act on sound charges. The Executive Director of the Board, Mr. Milo Perkins, is from Mr. DIES' own State. Mr. DIES must realize that Mr. Perkins would not tolerate on his staff any employee against whom effective charges are sustained. Mr. DIES must also know that the character of the Board membership is such as to insure the requisite action on well-founded charges. The Chairman is the Vice President of the United States. Among the members are Secretary of State Hull, Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, and Attorney General Biddle. Each member of the Board has a special, active, urgent need to have only fit men in a war agency. In addition, a number of these members have their own investigative staffs which they could put to work on any employee whose fitness in the Board's staff is properly put in question. Suppose the Executive Director and Chairman of the Board refused to do anything about a case calling for inquiry and action. Mr. DIES could have reached any one of several members of the Board who have detective staffs which are as well equipped as Mr. DIES' own investigators to run down facts about Government employees. The War Department and the Navy Department have intelligence services usable for this purpose. The Attorney General has the F. B. I. The Secretary of the Treasury has the Secret Service and other detective staffs. The State Department has an intelligence service and the Department of Commerce has investigators. Mr. DIES had eight separate avenues for getting his charges considered, investigated, and acted upon without extending to the Axis one iota of help in its efforts to undermine our Government abroad.

So much for the question whether it was necessary in order to secure action by the Board on proper charges to give incidental and valuable aid to the Axis. Now, about the second question.

WERE DIES' CHARGES MERITED?

Did Mr. DIES use reasonable caution in ascertaining whether his charges were justified? The sum and substance of his letter was that 35 employees of the Board of Economic Warfare, of whom he

named 10, should be dismissed as unfit to work for the Government. This claim he based in turn on the charge that they were members of Communist-front organizations named the League for Peace and Democracy, the League Against War and Fascism, and the China Aid Council. In the case of 1 man Mr. DIES made a further charge that the employee had written an obscene book.

The Axis radio broadcasters emphasized both charges. Mr. DIES does not claim that the employees he named lack the qualifications for the specialists' jobs they hold. His charge must therefore mean that even though they have the highest qualifications for performing the technical jobs to which they have been assigned they should nevertheless not be used in the Government. If one can spell out the DIES contention it must be that these men are Communists and therefore place communism or the interest of the Soviet Union ahead of the interests of the United States.

DIES' ATTACKS ANALYZED

It is unnecessary to consider this basis on which Mr. DIES' charges rest. The assumptions which lead him to that basis are unfounded and a little caution on his part would have made it possible for him to see this. Take, first, the case of men like David B. Vaughan, the Chief of Personnel Management of the Board: Mr. Vaughan was not, as charged by Mr. DIES, a member of the League for Peace and Democracy.

IS IT SUBVERSIVE TO ESPOUSE AID TO CHINA?

Let us take next the assumption Mr. DIES makes with respect to the organizations to which some of the 10 named employees did in fact belong. For example, the China Aid Council. The sole charge against several employees is that they had some connection with the China Aid Council. This council was formed to organize a boycott of Japanese goods in order to cut down the supply of foreign exchange going to the Japanese war machine and to raise funds for Chinese victims of Japanese aggression. The money was sent through a committee composed of Madam Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Sun Yat-sen. Here are some of the members of the China Aid Council:

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the Methodist Episcopal Church of New York, who acted as vice president; the late Bishop Robert L. Paddock, former Episcopal bishop of Oregon, who was not only a sponsor but also on the advisory committee; President Frank P. Graham, of the University of North Carolina; Mary E. Woolley, president emeritus of Mount Holyoke College; Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; T. V. Soong, Chinese Foreign Minister; Mrs. James Roosevelt, who was honorary chairman; Prof. Clyde Miller, of Columbia University; the late Ambassador William E. Dodd; Guy Emery Shipman, editor of Churchman; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Sherwood Anderson, novelist and newspaper editor.

The China Aid Council and other organizations supporting China's cause were brought together under the United China Relief, with Wendell L. Willkie as honorary national chairman; Paul G. Hoffman, president of Studebaker Corporation, as chairman; and Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune, as a member of the board of directors.

LEAGUE AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM

Let us take another of the three organizations to which Mr. DIES objects as Communist fronts—the League Against War and Fascism. The Dies committee received testimony with respect to this league on October 23, 1939, published at chapter 6295 in volume 10 of its hearings. The purposes of the league, as the testimony there given shows, were to advocate an embargo against Japan, Germany, and Italy and to urge the lifting of the embargo which had been imposed on Spain. The questioning by Congressman STARNES at that hearing would tend to indicate that he thought that these were not desirable purposes. Is there anyone who today would question the statement that these purposes were directed against the dictatorship countries, now our enemies, and in favor of the democracies? The League Against War and Fascism included in its national executive committee such men as Prof. George S. Counts, of Columbia University; Rev. William B. Spofford; Prof. Colston E. Warne, of Amherst College; and Reid Robinson, of the International Mine, Milling and Smelting Workers Union, now its president and one of the labor leaders in the forefront of American industrial effort to defeat the Axis. Among those who wrote for the magazine published by this league are:

Hamilton Basso, of North Carolina, well-known author and contributor to magazines; Shelton Hale Bishop, rector of St. Phillips Protestant Episcopal Church of New York; former Congressman Paul J. Kvale, of Minnesota; the famous French writer Romain Rolland, who wrote on Ethiopia, seized by Italy; Sir Walter Citrine, who wrote on the danger of Hitlerism; Congressman Fred H. Hildebrandt, of South Dakota; Rudolph Breda, editor of the Brown Book of the Hitler Terror; Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Alexander F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Sherwood Anderson, well-known author; Rev. Father Luis Sarosola, Catholic historian.

LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY

The third of the organizations mentioned by Mr. DIES, the League for Peace and Democracy, advocated embargoes and other economic pressure against the dictatorships in order to stop further American aid to their armament programs, and in order thus to prevent their attacking the United States. This league was the successor to the League Against War and Fascism.

Among the additional persons who joined the national committee of the league were:

Bishop Cameron C. Alleyne, of Pennsylvania; Rev. Dale DeWitt, of New York; Rev. William H. Jernagin, of Washington, D. C.; Judge Robert Kenney, of California; Rev. Albert T. Mollegen, of Virginia; Rev. Joseph Sefl, of Illinois.

Mr. DIES, however, sought to dispose of the fact that the purposes of the organizations named are purposes of the democracies against the dictatorships and that many of the men and women connected with these organizations are among the finest and most loyal American citizens. Mr. DIES has claimed that these organizations had in their membership some Communists and were influenced and dominated by these Communists.

Mr. DIES has failed, in connection with the named employees of the Board of Economic Warfare, to assert that any of those employees are Communists, or that they had any knowledge to indicate that any organization to which they belonged was Communist influenced or Communist controlled, if they were. Would Mr. DIES drive out of public life such persons as Wendell L. Willkie, or the publisher of Time, or the president of the Studebaker Corporation, or leading college presidents and professors in leading American universities in the North, South, and West, or Members of Congress, because they belong to or are on the mailing lists of organizations which Mr. DIES would brand as Communist fronts? If he would not drive such persons from public life, wherein is he justified in charging that the named employees of the Board of Economic Warfare are unfit to serve the Government and that the Board must deprive itself of the special value it can get from any of these men who are uniquely qualified to do various of the technical jobs required by the Board, as some of these experts unquestionably are? Some of them are better qualified to do certain of these technical jobs than anyone else the Board could get in this country.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TENEROWICZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1942, I took the floor of the House and spoke of a defense housing project in my district. I spoke of a 200-unit project nearly completed. I showed subversive activities at work in my district.

On March 12, 1942, I received a telegram from Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 69 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. In this telegram Mr. White took exception to a statement in a report which I received from Detroit and which I quoted in my speech of February 27, 1942. He ignored the more important facts brought out in that speech, that there is a strong communistic element behind the Nevada-Fenelon defense-housing project controversy. He referred to prominent Americans who have served and who now serve on the board of directors of the N. A. A. C. P., which actively conducts the affairs of the association and formulate its principles. I find no fault whatever with these distinguished American

gentleman or with any other fine Americans, but I do feel sure that if, as Mr. White states in his telegram, these gentlemen conduct the affairs and formulate the principles and policies of the N. A. A. C. P., they would, if aware of the true facts regarding this controversy, actively condemn any communistic affiliation with their organization.

Mr. White calls upon me to offer public apology. He informs me that my sincerity and integrity will be measured by the promptness of my repudiation of this statement. I do not intend to apologize for any statement which I have made or quoted from reliable sources.

However, I do say this—that in looking over the roster of officials of the N. A. A. C. P., I do find names of some individuals who have long records of Communist affiliation.

In speaking of the Nevada-Fenelon housing site and the resulting controversy, Mr. White was morally obligated to his people and to the N. A. A. C. P. to thoroughly acquaint himself with the facts in the matter before entering into a controversy about which he did not have first-hand information.

I have had this matter under discussion both here and in Detroit for approximately 10 months. I met and accompanied nearly all of the committees that came to Washington in this connection, visiting the various housing bureaus and officials.

In order to keep the record straight, I wish to point out a few pertinent facts regarding this matter: Detroit's total population as given by the 1940 census is 1,623,452. Of this population, we have 149,119 Negroes.

At a public hearing in Detroit, conducted by the mayor and the common council, the following fact was established and unchallenged: that 35 percent of the completed Federal housing in Detroit is occupied by Negroes and I quote the following statement made by one of the councilmen at that hearing:

> I will tell you what it is. It is about 35 percent. Is that taking undue advantage of one side?

Mr. White, the Negro press, and the Communists must therefore admit that no advantage is being taken of the colored group in Detroit.

The first objection which I received to this site at Nevada and Fenelon came to me from a Negro, in a letter written to me on June 23, 1941, in which he strenuously opposed the site.

The Negro member of the Detroit Housing Commission, Rev. Horace White, also disagreed with the site selected by the U. S. H. A.

I have in my possession a copy of the original telegram of protest to this site sent on June 25, 1941, to William K. Divers, director of region V, United States Housing Authority. It is a 15-page telegram, 14 pages of which carry the signatures of protesting citizens, both colored and white, taxpayers and homeowners living in close proximity to the project.

The first committee that came to Washington in opposition to the site was composed of two white men and one Negro.

It has been alleged that real-estate interests were back of the protest to the Nevada-Fenelon site. I have no knowledge of this as far as the Nevada-Fenelon site is concerned, although I do know definitely that real-estate interests were involved in another site suggested. In this connection I would like to quote an excerpt from an article written by the Negro member of the Detroit Housing Commission, Rev. Horace A. White, which appeared in the Michigan Chronicle of January 31, 1942:

> In June, the Federal Government asked the Detroit Housing Commission to act as its agent for the construction of 700 defense dwellings. These units were to be for defense workers. The Detroit Housing Commission at that time brought in a site known as the Modern and Dequindre site, which the housing commission unanimously accepted for 200 dwelling units for Negro occupancy as directed by the Federal Government. The Federal agent came out and decided that the Negro project should be at Fenelon and Nevada.
>
> At this time there arose a great deal of opposition from many sources. Also at that time I, Horace White, the Negro on the commission, brought in the idea that the project should be placed at West Eight Mile Road, which raised a lot of opposition from large real-estate holdings in the city of Detroit.

One of our Detroit Negro papers in an article under the title of "Now the Truth Can Be Told," corroborated this statement when it discussed the site at Eight Mile Road and Wyoming.

And so we find large real-estate holdings opposing a site suggested by the Negro member of the Detroit Housing Commission in a neighborhood predominantly colored. The argument about real-estate men playing an important part in this project does not seem to hold water, unless it is that certain real-estate agents—their names known—have been around the immediate neighborhood in an effort to buy up homes "for a song" because of Negro occupancy. The findings of the grand jury fail to corroborate the erroneous allegation made by the Negro papers and carried by the press in general.

Mr. White is alarmed about the communistic element and yet he openly works with it. I shall further prove to him, to certain local Negro leaders and to the Negro press that what I said on February 27, 1942, is true and can be substantiated.

The day after I made my remarks on the floor of the House, I received a 2-page telegram from Patrick Toohey, secretary of the Michigan Communist Party. Following the receipt of this telegram I received a news flash postmarked March 4, 1942, 5:30 p. m., Detroit, Mich. It was mailed in a plain envelope and the upper left-hand corner bore the typewritten address of Room 4, 2419 Grand River, Detroit, Mich. This news flash was a corroboration of Mr. Toohey's telegram, and I ask permission to insert it at this point:

> COMMUNIST PARTY OF MICHIGAN,
> *Detroit, Mich., February 28, 1942.*
> Congressman RUDOLPH TENEROWICZ,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Your statement published in today's newspapers accusing Michigan Communist Party of subversive acts in connection with the Sojourner Truth housing scandal is a web of unmitigated and irresponsible lies and slanders.
>
> It is nothing but a cheap and miserable red herring designed to cover up the vicious conspiracy of the Ku Klux Klan, shady real-estate sharks, yourself, and certain groups having definite pro-Axis sympathies to create turmoil in Detroit, to incite race conflicts, to destroy the unity of the people in the war effort, to violate President Roosevelt's demand that we end "discrimination in all its ugly forms," to compromise the city and national administrations by means of denying the Sojourner Truth homes to the Negro people to whom they properly belong.
>
> Your resort to the discredited Dies committee in an effort to raise the red herring will fool no decent Detroiter any more than your long hostility and opposition to President Roosevelt's anti-Hitler policies. The Communist Party has had no connection or relationship with the Sojourner Truth situation excepting deeply sympathizing and supporting the demands of progressive Detroit and trade-union movements to defeat the fifth column conspiracy by granting the Sojourner Truth homes to the Negro people to whom they belong.
>
> You will have to cook up a better alibi to account for your assistance to a pro-Fascist and anti-American cabal.
>
> PATRICK TOOHEY,
> *State Secretary, Michigan Communist Party.*

In my remarks of February 27 I called attention to a meeting held in Detroit on February 21, at 8 p. m., at which Mr. Patrick Toohey and a prominent member of the Sojourner Truth Housing Committee were the principal speakers. This meeting was held under the auspices of section 1, Communist Party, 2419 Grand River, Detroit, Mich.

Is Mr. White aware of the fact that the N. A. A. C. P. pamphlet On Guard, dated February 1942, was distributed in Detroit along with Communist handbills regarding this housing controversy?

Mr. Speaker, I ask to insert at this point an excerpt from an article which appeared in one of our Negro papers dated March 28, 1942. I quote:

> For the consideration of all concerned, I submit the following questions which many people would like to have answered:
>
> 1. Why hesitate to issue written, itemized financial reports?
>
> 2. How much money has actually been collected, in the small cans—in the big cans?
>
> 3. How much money has been donated and by whom?
>
> 4. Into what post office or bank and in what name was all the money deposited?
>
> 5. To whom has the committee "donated" money and for what?
>
> 6. How far can any group go under socialistic and communistic influence?
>
> 7. How will the surplus money be spent, or shall we say distributed at the conclusion of the Sojourner Truth catastrophe?

This should prove of interest to Mr. White and the N. A. A. C. P.

I call Mr. White's attention to question 6. Is it possible that a part of these moneys collected could have financed the trips of some of these individuals who came to Washington in the cause of this housing controversy? I sincerely believe that the colored group in Detroit is due an itemized accounting and that these questions should be answered and the information given as suggested by the gentleman who wrote the article from which I have just quoted.

In the Michigan Chronicle—Negro weekly—of April 4, 1942, there appeared

a picture of a group of people captioned "Members of the 'Free Earl Browder' Committee." The picture was taken a few minutes before they left for New York to meet with the National Free Earl Browder Committee. There follows a number of names, and I find among them the names of Mr. Harper Poulson and Mr. Jack Raskin.

In my remarks of February 27, 1942, I mentioned the fact that Mr. Raskin's name was included in a list submitted to me by Mr. Baird Snyder, III. Mr. Raskin was listed as the executive secretary of the Civil Rights Federation.

I wish to call your attention to another list which I inserted in my speech of the 27th. That list was also furnished to me by Mr. Snyder and bore the heading "Detroit delegates who met with Baird Snyder, Acting Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, on Tuesday, February 12, 1942":

Joseph A. Craigen, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity.
LeBron Simmons, attorney, National Negro Congress.
Harper Poulson, Detroit Youth Assembly.
Andrew Brown, Council of Social Agencies.
Clifford Moore, Local 663, Teamsters, American Federation of Labor.
Joseph Stambouly, Ford Local Congress of Industrial Organizations, No. 600.
Geraldine Bledsoe, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.
Jack Raskin, Civil Rights Federation.
Boris Shiskin, American Federation of Labor.
John Davis, national secretary of National Negro Congress.
P. L. Prattis, executive editor of the Pittsburgh Courier.

You will note that again we find the names of Mr. Jack Raskin and Mr. Harper Poulson.

I would like to quote from page 7 of the Michigan Chronicle of April 18, 1942, a part of a letter written by Rev. Charles A. Hill, chairman of the citizens committee in reply to Mr. C. E. LaReau, president of the Detroit Bible Institute, 500 West Columbia, Detroit, Mich.:

You infer that there is something sinister at the bottom of this Sojourner Truth Committee by the fact that some of us signed the petition to free Browder, who you refer to as a convicted criminal. Let me say that I signed that because in the face of the evidence I have I am convinced that he is being persecuted because he is a Communist rather than because he violated the passport law.

I think the following excerpts taken from the hearings before the congressional Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, Tuesday, September 5, 1939, are especially pertinent at this point:

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). But your primary objective is to establish communism in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. As a party, that is the primary end.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thing I wanted to clarify, and that is this; you stated a few minutes ago that the one consummation you desired more than anything is a Communist state in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Feeling that way, you naturally encourage and support movements that you think tend in that direction; you made that clear.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

I offer further proof to Mr. White and the Negro press that these subversive elements have been and are at work.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask permission to include in the RECORD certain portions of a resolution of the Communist Party dated as early as May 1938, Michigan, headed by the caption "Win the Negroes for the democratic front for jobs, peace, and progress."

The present status of the Negro people has been perpetuated under the rule of extreme reaction (the Fords, the Knudsens, and their political agents—the Fitzgeralds, Bruckers, Toys, and the Vandenbergs, and particularly the Republican Party).

The Negroes can improve their lot only in joining struggle with the white workers, middle class, and liberal sections of the population combined into a democratic front against reaction.

The Michigan district of the Communist Party has underestimated the importance of work among Negroes.

The fact that we have only 300 Negro Communists in Michigan out of a Negro population of some 175,000 is a reflection of our unsatisfactory work among them. The turnover of Negro members is about 80 percent, indicating that when we do recruit them into the party we do not hold their interest on the basis of helping them to meet their most burning problems and immediate needs. An immediate departure from this unsatisfactory condition is a vital necessity to our party.

Section No. 1 of the east side of Detroit is the main organization of the party that has carried on work among the Negroes. The easy recruiting of Negroes, maintaining an open headquarters of the party during the past year * * *.

The primary task of the party among the Negroes is to rally the organizations of the Negroes and progressive sections of the white population for a united struggle for jobs for Negroes and to participate in such campaigns which originate outside the party and its contacts.

Every effort must be made to win the Negro Ford workers for the union, both those working now and also those on Work Projects Administration.

Contacts among the Negroes must be carefully cultivated, and every effort made to rally the organizations to which they belong in the struggles around immediate issues. Each comrade shall have a mailing list of contacts that he is responsible to keep informed on all campaigns and matters of interest.

The Communist Party endorses and supports the program of the National Negro Congress. We are an affiliate organization of the congress, and our members must use every opportunity to work for and build the National Negro Congress.

To carry out the tasks listed above, it is clear that our party must be firmly built among the Negroes. Special forms and methods must be developed to win and retain Negro shop workers, white-collar workers and intellectuals, Negro women, and youth.

Every section of our party should consider a quota of Negroes to be recruited by the time of the 1938 elections.

Bolshevik determination must impel our party to put life into the decisions of the July 1937 plenum on work among Negroes, particularly toward the establishment of a State fund, for carrying out work among the Negroes of our State. And boldness must characterize the consistent efforts of the Communists to push forward new Negro forces into positions of authority and prestige within our party and to initiate and support a movement to advance Negroes to leadership in the mass organizations of the workers and the progressive sections of the population.

In the September 1939 issue of the Communist James W. Ford has quite a lengthy article concerning the Negroes, and I quote a portion of his statement:

It was left to the Communists, basing their approach on Marxism-Leninism, to begin the movement to unite the Negro people and ally them with the working class and other progressive and democratic forces.

To further show this influence, I quote the following excerpt from a recent article by Attorney Alfred Cassey, associate editor of the Detroit Tribune, which appeared in the Tribune on February 14, 1942, and which is most enlightening:

The great majority of Negro workers who have been organized into the Congress of Industrial Organizations unions have not as yet taken seriously their union membership. These members have had no adequate realization of policies and practices of some of their leaders that were very important to them. Few have realized that the combination of John L. Lewis, as leader of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the leftist members of that organization, who cooperated with him were the most militant friends of the Negro in the labor movement.

The Communists in America flopped to a war policy and became hostile to the leadership of John L. Lewis because he was on the other side. All these men that he had brought into the Congress of Industrial Organizations labor movement and remained faithful and loyal to, listened to a bigger voice, the voice of Joseph Stalin and joined the war party in America. Thus they came to the parting of the ways, two great forces that were largely responsible for the building up of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and who were mainly responsible for the militant stand taken by this organization for a square deal to the Negro in the labor movement.

An article appeared in the Detroit Tribune of March 14, 1942, covering an address made by Paul Robeson and John Davis, president of the National Negro Congress, at the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church. I quote the following excerpts from that article:

Robeson held his audience spellbound as he told of his travels in Europe and of his search for a land where a man would be treated as a man regardless of his race or color and where his son could be educated. He said that he selected Russia because in Russia the color of a man's skin had nothing at all to do with his ability to function in society.

I have always felt that Russia would be the only nation that would sincerely fight fascism and that is why I have confidence in the Red army.

He paid a great tribute to the citizens of Detroit and thinks that this is a great city because it has been the Nation's battleground where capital and labor and the forces of social ideals have been fought.

Mr. Davis leveled his attack on Congressman RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, Democratic representative from Hamtramck, for asking that the Dies committee investigate the forces behind Negro occupancy of the Sojourner Truth project.

Their remarks speak for themselves.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert excerpts from a report received by me from the committee to investigate un-American activities with regard to these two gentlemen:

PAUL ROBESON

Communist-front organization	Association of the individual	Authority
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.	Signer of petition to discontinue Dies committee	Mimeographed sheet attached to letterhead, Jan. 17, 1940.
American Peace Mobilization, anticonscription rally, Washington, D. C., Sept. 13, 1940.	Speaker	Daily Worker, Sept. 13, 1940, p. 4.
	Signer of the statement to the President defending the Communist Party.	Daily Worker, Mar. 5, 1941, p. 2.
National Negro Congress	Chairman, discussion group	Second National Negro Congress, October 1937.
Do	Endorses	Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1936, p. 4.
Open letter to President Roosevelt	Signer, protest against attack on right of Communist Party to use ballot.	Daily Worker, July 23, 1940, p. 1, ch. 6.
Soviet films	Actor	Daily Worker, May 19, 1937, p. 7.
Soviet Russia today	Signer, interviewed	Daily Worker, Aug. 10, 1936, p. 5.
Soviet Union	Visitor	Daily Worker, Dec. 11, 1936, p. 2.
Statement by Negro leaders protesting attacks against Communist candidates.	Signer of statement	Daily Worker, Sept. 16, 1940, p. 4.
Statement urging ballot rights for Communists	....do	Daily Worker, Sept. 23, 1940, p. 4.

JOHN P. DAVIS

Congress of Youth	Signer of call	Proceedings, July 11–15, 1939, p. 2.
	Signer of statement to President Roosevelt defending Communist Party.	Daily Worker, Mar. 5, 1941, p. 2.
International Workers Order	Speaker at convention in Pittsburgh	Daily Worker, Apr. 25, 1938, p. 4.
Do	Sent greetings	New Order, July 1936, p. 6.
National Negro Congress	Chairman, sponsoring committee, national	Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1936, p. 4.
Do	Contributor to officials, proceedings of Second National Congress.	Daily Worker, Feb. 15, 1938, p. 7.
Do	Executive secretary	Equal Justice, April 1940, p. 3.
Do	do	Daily Worker, January 1938, p. 4.
Do	National secretary	Second National Negro Congress, October 1937.
Do	National secretary (received letter from Abraham Lincoln Brigade).	Daily Worker, Mar. 15, 1938, p. 2.
Statement by Negro leaders, protesting attacks against Communist candidates.	Signer of statement	Daily Worker, Sept. 16, 1940, p. 1.
Third National Negro Congress	Speaker	The Communist, June 1940, p. 549.
Do	National secretary	The Communist, June 1940, p. 545.

It is small wonder that Mr. Davis criticized me for requesting an investigation of the subversive activities which are being employed in this controversy to the detriment of the Negro people.

As far back as 1930 in the hearings of the Special Committee to Investigate Communist Propaganda in the United States, former Congressman John E. Nelson, of Maine, made the following statement, which I quote:

Don't you know the Russian Communist Government is paying the expenses of agitators here, including Negro agitators, who are brought from Russia, are taken from America to Russia and trained over there in the Communist principles, which are to the effect that they seek to overthrow our Government and its principles?

I fear and I warn of the active threat by communism to our national unity. The Nevada-Fenelon housing controversy is a striking example. Out of a defense housing project the communistic influence has subtly and insidiously developed an issue—an un-American one. I hope that Mr. White and the Negro press are as cognizant of the danger and as much concerned as I am.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People sent me a release issued by its press service, dated January 30, 1942, together with a memorandum calling my attention to the marked copy of the release in which my name was mentioned in connection with this housing controversy. I ask permission to insert the excerpt to which the memorandum referred:

Nation-wide criticism has been aimed at C. F. Palmer, Defense Housing Coordinator, and Baird Snyder, Acting Federal Works Administrator, for their action in yielding to congressional pressure to deny occupancy of the Sojourner Truth housing project here to Negroes. The New York PM, the New York Post, and the Philadelphia Record all deplored the action, as did the local Polish Daily, the People's Voice.

The project was originally built for Negro tenants, but white groups, including a Catholic priest and real-estate agents, applied political pressure in protest. They were supported by Congressman RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, of the district.

A delegation representing Negro and white organizations was in Washington on Monday, January 26, to confer with officials in an attempt to secure favorable action in behalf of the colored defense workers and their families. They included the Reverend George Hill, State Senator Charles C. Diggs, LeBron Simmons, and Jack Raskin. Walter White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, accompanied the group to the office of Senator PRENTISS BROWN, of Michigan, who emphatically denied the statement of TENEROWICZ that he favored white occupancy. The delegation also conferred with Palmer, Defense Housing Coordinator, where they were accompanied by Leon A. Ransom, member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People national legal committee.

There is to be another project of 800 units constructed here for white occupancy. Aroused Negro citizens are hopeful that some action favorable to them will be forthcoming on this project. Walter White stated in Washington: "Not only the 200 units already constructed, but the 800 additional units now earmarked for so-called white occupancy, should be opened on the basis of need and qualification to all persons and not on the basis of race."

The reference made in the last paragraph of this release to 800 additional units now earmarked for white occupancy is of particular interest in view of the fact that 35 percent of the completed Federal housing in Detroit is now occupied by Negroes.

In this N. A. A. C. P. release mention is made of a delegation representing Negro and white organizations which came to Washington on January 26 to discuss this project. Two of the gentlemen mentioned are conspicuously referred to in the records of the Congressional Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. Is Mr. White aware of their affiliations? Are these the white organizations to which he refers? Again we find this man Jack Raskin in the picture.

The release also speaks of a priest and mentions political pressure being applied. I have seen this statement used so often, and the true facts should be known. The following churches within the immediate vicinity and their membership were represented in the over 25,000 letters, wires, and petitions I have received in protest to this site:

North Detroit Baptist Church.
North Detroit Methodist Church.
Bethlehem Lutheran Church.
Olivet Lutheran Church.
St. Rita's Church.
St. Louis Church.
Corpus Christi Church.
St. Augustine Church.
Queen of Apostles Church.
Our Lady Help of Christians Church.
All Saints Polish National Catholic Church.

Some of the ministers and priests appeared personally at hearings held in January and February of this year before the council and the mayor of Detroit in protest to the Nevada-Fenelon site selected by the United States Housing Authority, and this is a matter of record.

In January 1942, the Division of Defense Housing Coordinator, Mr. Charles Palmer announced that the project under controversy and having only 200 units, would be opened for white occupancy and in lieu of the 200 units, 300 units would be constructed for Negroes. It was then that real political pressure and outside interference were manifested, but not by the Congressman representing the district. The reverse is true. Outside influence did have and still has a

definite bearing on this entire matter. I shall give further proof in substantiation.

The President approved this program and on the 22d of January, the Detroit Housing Commission approved the Government's decision with the stipulation that the new project contain 400 Negro family dwelling units. Apparently Mr. White was not interested in 200 additional homes to be provided for needy Negro defense workers, or, was he as adamant and uninterested in more defense housing homes for Negroes as was a certain Negro committee that met with Mr. Acton in Detroit recently and I quote from the Detroit Tribune—Negro weekly—of March 28, 1942:

They said they wanted Sojourner Truth and nothing else would be satisfactory.

Does not this, on the face of all these facts, look like Mr. White and certain local Negro leaders regard this as an issue and not from a standpoint of more homes for the Negro people?

I believe that I have conclusively shown that subversive elements have been at work in this controversy. Help was solicited from near and far by the local Negro committee. No question was asked as to the background of individuals or organizations solicited as long as their names and their services could be utilized. The Federal housing authorities took no time to investigate the committee and the lists of individuals and organizations submitted by the Negro committees. The opposition of the home owners in the Nevada-Fenelon area was completely ignored.

The heat was applied on Federal housing authorities in Washington from yet another source not previously mentioned. I was astounded and surprised to learn of another agency—a black cabinet—at work in official Washington. If my source of information is correct, we find this group entering into the controversy and I ask permission at this point, Mr. Speaker, to quote the following editorial which appeared in the Michigan Chronicle of Saturday, February 21, 1942:

THE BLACK CABINET

A great deal has been written and much more has been said about the spinelessness of the so-called black cabinet in Washington, that group of Negro advisers to the various governmental agencies and their assistants. The Detroit delegation to Capitol Hill, however, who took the housing fight almost to the door of the President himself, declare unanimously that without the active help of the so-called black cabinet they would have been lost in the vast bureaucracy that the Federal Government has now become.

More than that, it was clear that the majority of these governmental advisers put the welfare of their people above their jobs. Robert Taylor, of Chicago, who is an adviser to the Housing Authority in Washington, threatened to resign his post if his office yielded to the pressure of the southern Congressmen who conspired with Congressman TENEROWICZ to rob Negro workers of defense housing which was built for them. Robert Taylor and his colleagues in Washington are demonstrating that they are no appeasers, no Quislings who are set up to beguile their people into complacency in this crucial time of war and mounting racial prejudice.

Clark Foreman and a host of other whites who are conscious of the responsibilities of a democracy to its people, who dare to stand by their convictions, must not be overlooked. To both the Negro and white officials in Washington who are the guardians of democracy, we owe the full support of our united efforts and our political power. We must strengthen their position and sustain them with our political might, while at the same time we seek to rout the fascist-minded officials and the poll-tax Congressmen who are living in the benighted past, still believing that first tenet of slavery, that God created one race of mankind to rule and another to be hewers of wood and drawers of water.

I know of but one Cabinet, the Cabinet appointed by the President of the United States, and I am wondering who appoints this so-called black cabinet and who are its members.

Are other minority groups to follow the example and form their own cabinets?

Is this so-called black cabinet to decide where all Negro housing projects are to be erected?

How much pressure was exerted on Messrs. Blandford and Keyserling by this agency?

Are these the individuals who have the ear of both Mr. Blandford and Mr. Keyserling?

Must the membership of the House consult this new agency, the black cabinet, regarding any and all racial questions involving their districts?

The Federal blunder perpetrated in Detroit with regard to the selection of the Nevada-Fenelon site by the U. S. H. A. has reverberated throughout the entire country.

When it became obvious that racial friction, resulting after months of bungling, buck passing, and misrepresentation, made it inadvisable to open the project for either Negro or white occupancy, I suggested as a logical solution of the problem the use of the project by the United States Army or Navy. Ascertaining that there was an acute housing need in Detroit on the part of the Navy, I made this suggestion to both the Federal housing officials and to the mayor of Detroit. Neither wished to accept a rational suggestion for reasons known only to them, and their obduracy has given us two serious riots in Detroit in addition to some very adverse national publicity and a deep and bitter feeling of racial animosity that I fear will take a long time to heal. My repeated warnings conveyed to these Federal housing officials by telephone and personal calls prior to the first riot were completely ignored.

Recently the President reorganized the Federal housing set-up. I was glad that he did so, and I sincerely believed that this controversy would be straightened out at last. Mr. John Blandford, Jr., was named as the Administrator of the newly organized National Housing Agency.

I contacted him immediately upon his appointment. I explained in detail what had occurred prior to his appointment, and I hold him of the U. S. H. A. bungling, misrepresentations, and promises made to me and to certain committees. I told him that the F. H. A. had not been consulted originally by the U. S. H. A., and that the F. H. A. had refused all commitments on building in the neighborhood because of Negro occupancy. I told him that individuals who neither lived in the district or knew it—pressure groups and subversive elements—were behind this movement to create disunity. I asked him to listen to the home owners living in the neighborhood. I warned him of the bitter feeling in this matter and of my fear that trouble would ensue if either the white or colored group occupied the site, and subsequent events have proven me correct. At a later meeting with Mr. Blandford I proposed Navy occupancy of the project.

He listened to me and saw some of the many wires and letters of protest which I have received. He then asked me to see Mr. Leon Keyserling, Acting U. S. H. A. Administrator, and told me he would confer with Mr. Keyserling later. I complied with Mr. Blandford's suggestion. I called on Mr. Keyserling, who told me that he had nothing to do with the matter and wished to know why I had come to him. I informed him that I did so at the suggestion of Mr. Blandford. We discussed the situation, and Mr. Keyserling again denied any responsibility. I wish to show that it was definitely the responsibility of Mr. Keyserling and his staff. They were an integral part of the U. S. H. A. and should shoulder the major portion of this bungling and its aftermath.

The Detroit Housing Commission, the mayor, and the city council of Detroit, had openly criticized the Nevada-Fenelon site which was not the site selected by them, and have stated in letters that the responsibility belonged to the U. S. H. A. All letters of protest sent to the mayor went to the Detroit Housing Commission and were answered by the director-secretary who referred the letters to the U. S. H. A. I ask permission to insert an excerpt from one of these letters written July 23, 1941, by Mr. George Edwards, then director secretary of the Detroit Housing Commission to Messrs. Vincent Siluk, et al., St. Louis of the King Church Committee, 18805 St. Louis Avenue, Detroit, Mich.:

I believe you will be interested to know that the choice of the site at Nevada and Fenelon Avenues for a defense housing unit was made by the United States Housing Authority and the Federal authorities on their own responsibility. This action was taken after the Detroit Housing Commission, as agents of the United States Housing Authority in the defense work had recommended another site, and it was taken in spite of the fact that the Detroit Common Council requested that this project be built at the site originally selected by the housing commission.

As a result the only effective disposition of your petition which I can suggest is to refer it on to the proper Federal authorities—in this case, to Mr. F. Charles Starr, regional director in the United States Housing Authority at Washington, D. C.

On November 8, 1941, Mr. Starr wrote a letter to Mr. Hugh McClintock, 18465 Conley, Detroit, in which he stated that the question of racial occupancy would

remain open until construction was completed and tenant selection started. This project is about completed. This information was being sent out as late as November 1941 and was the same information which had been given verbally to committees from Detroit who conferred in August with Mr. Starr; Mr. Von Storch, project advisor of the U. S. H. A.; Mr. Divers; Mr. Clark Foreman, then Director of the Division of Defense Housing; and Mr. William P. Seavers. Six months before this project was first discussed by local housing officials, Mr. C. F. Palmer, Coordinator of the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, had stated that it should be the basic policy of the Federal agency selecting sites for defense housing to secure the opinions, approval, and cooperation of the local housing authorities and/or other responsible public and civic groups including responsible Negro leadership, before final decision and public announcement is made of a site. Mr. Palmer pointed out that such a policy was necessary in order to offset possible local opposition. It is my contention that strict adherence to this policy would have eliminated the present controversy.

In November 1941 I received the following letter from Messrs. Peter J. Bartnik and Martin Morency, of the Conley-Seven-Mile Neighbors Club, which is typical of nearly all my mail on this question:

We the undersigned residents in the vicinity of the Fenelon-Nevada defense project for colored people, represent the Conley-Seven-Mile Neighbors Club. This community is composed entirely of white residents, and furthermore is restricted to all but members of the Caucasian race. Since this project has been started, the Federal Housing Administration has refused to insure any mortgages on any proposed new homes adjacent to it. In our opinion, this will cause a financial loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to property owners, not to mention the racial problem that will be created.

We were encouraged to buy our own homes and led to believe that a Federal Housing Administration approval was an asset to a community. Now that the United States Housing Authority has started this project w feel that we have been betrayed by our Government.

There are many communities in the city of Detroit that would welcome this project as an improvement and not a detriment as in our case. We hope that you will do all you can in your power to change this to homes for white defense workers.

I sent this letter to Mr. Keyserling and I quote my letter of transmittal:

I am enclosing a self-explanatory letter received from Mr. Peter J. Bartnik and Mr. Martin Morency, Detroit, which is typical of hundreds of other letters which I have received regarding the proposed defense housing project on Nevada and Fenelon Streets.

I sincerely hope that the hearing which is to be held in the near future will result in some satisfactory agreement by all concerned.

I received the following reply, dated December 8, 1941, in which Mr. Keyserling chose to evade the question:

Let me acknowledge your letter of November 29, which you have followed up in a telephone conversation with me.

As you know, the United States Housing Authority has no direct responsibility for the management in connection with the housing project on Nevada and Fenelon Streets, and therefore we cannot be of direct assistance.

As I have said to you, I have talked with various people in an effort to get them to hold a meeting and to come to some firm determination on this matter. I think that your idea of following up with these people is a good one.

On the other hand, I quote Mr. George Edwards, of the Detroit Housing Commission, who had this to say:

The United States Housing Authority told us they were not asking our approval or disapproval of the site they selected at Nevada and Fenelon, and said they would take full responsibility.

This is typical of the conflicting statements which have been made throughout the history of this project. Mr. Keyserling wanted me to understand that it was not his concern and no fault of the U. S. H. A. In this connection I quote an excerpt from a recent article appearing in the Detroit Free Press:

Housing officials now concede that the policy adopted by the United States Housing Authority of not permitting projects which "might change the character of a neighborhood" had been disregarded in the Sojourner Truth designation as a Negro project "because of outside interference." By outside interference, one official said he meant Federal influences beyond the control of the Housing Authority.

I believe that I have clearly explained this outside interference in my remarks of February 27 and today, beyond a shadow of a doubt, and to the complete satisfaction of all.

At this point I wish to quote from an article appearing in the Detroit Times shortly after the first riot:

Federal Housing officials today shrugged off virtually all responsibility for the squabble over location and occupation of Detroit's Sojourner Truth homes and blamed the Detroit Housing Commission for the riots which attended the opening of the project.

Errors for which Federal authorities did assume responsibility were blamed on "the incredible dispersion of responsibility under the former administration of Government agencies."

Commissioner Leon Keyserling, of the centralized public housing administration, intimated that President Roosevelt's action in unifying governmental housing agencies was provoked by the Detroit dispute.

"Everything which was done in connection with the project happened before the housing agencies were put together," he said. "The President's order consolidating the Government's housing functions was issued this week and is really only now becoming effective."

Both Keyserling and Charles F. Palmer, Federal Housing Coordinator, denied allegations from Detroit officials that the Nevada-Fenelon Streets site was picked in Washington. Keyserling admitted, however, that "in this case I believe the Federal Works Agency had a hand in picking the site."

This article speaks for itself. Both Mr. Keyserling and Mr. Palmer blame the Federal Works Agency. The former U. S. H. A., with Mr. Keyserling as Deputy Administrator, has shrugged off all responsibility when the opposite is true.

I have already pointed out the fact that in this particular instance there has unfortunately developed a dangerous racial question. I have shown that this controversy could have been averted; that the Nevada-Fenelon site was not wanted by the Negroes originally nor was it approved by the Detroit Housing Commission, the city planning commission, the common council, and the mayor. Rather it has been forced upon one and all by these very officials who are now trying to squirm out of their blundering. The United States Housing Authority, with Mr. Leon Keyserling as its Assistant Director and legal counsel, plus others mentioned and directly responsible to him, are responsible for this unfortunate occurrence and it is no wonder that Mr. Strauss resigned as head of the United States Housing Authority. Is it not ironic to find this same Mr. Keyserling still occupying a prominent place in the President's new national housing set-up?

The tragedy of the entire affair is that because of such blundering, together with outside interference, Detroit finds itself the center of racial friction.

It would appear that from the beginning a successful effort has been made by Government authorities to obscure the question of responsibility. In this connection I would like to quote an excerpt of the mayor's statement appearing in the Detroit News of March 15, 1942:

I do not feel it is fair or proper for the Washington authorities having walked over the original objections of the Detroit Housing Commission, to now say in effect, We had the power and the money; we built the project where we wanted to, but having built it against the judgment of the Detroit Commission—supposed to know the local situation—nonetheless, there it is, and it is up to Detroit alone to carry out our decision without any further help or assistance from us.

By now everyone must appreciate how serious this situation is. It is quite obvious that the professional agitator and all the subversive agencies are working on both sides attempting to create community-wide chaos and confusion by arousing every latent prejudice that may exist. It is, of course, greatly to be desired that an end be made of the matter at as early a date as it can be properly, justly, and adequately done.

The word of a Member of Congress, chosen to represent his people, means nothing to Federal Housing officials. I have always believed in housing and because I continue to believe in it and because of the blunders made and the resulting bitterness in the minds of the Detroit people, both colored and white, it is my opinion that Mr. Keyserling's graceful resignation would be a boon to the housing program. It would give the President an opportunity to show the people of this country that Federal housing, if properly administered, will be of great benefit to the needy people for whom it is intended.

On April 15, 1942, Mr. Blandford, Administrator of the National Housing Agency, sent the following wire to the Detroit Housing Commission:

Detroit Housing Commission: Please proceed as soon as feasible with the established program for the occupancy of the Sojourner Truth Project. The National Housing Agency will join with the Detroit Housing Commission in the technical phases of the

utilization of this project. Please notify the city government of this contemplated action, in order that the city of Detroit may initiate the appropriate measures to effect occupancy under the most satisfactory conditions possible.

On April 18, 1942, we find this grave and serious statement issued by Detroit's very capable police commissioner, Frank D. Eaman, whose resignation was tendered a few hours after Mr. Blandford's statement reached Detroit. It appeared in the Detroit Free Press and I ask permission to insert it at this point, Mr. Speaker.

Another development Friday in the Sojourner Truth case was the statement of Police Commissioner Frank D. Eaman before the common council that Detroit was "facing one of the most serious conditions in many years" in having to take responsibility for moving Negro families into the housing project.

"Probably all police leaves will have to be canceled," Eaman said. "We will probably have to take every policeman off traffic duty and out of the courts. This emergency may be only temporary or it may endure a long time."

Eaman tendered his resignation Wednesday, a few hours after Federal authorities had insisted that Negroes be put into the housing project despite the record of violence resulting from a previous attempt to do the same thing.

In the Detroit Free Press of April 20, 1942, Mr. Charles F. Edgecomb, director-secretary of the Detroit Housing Commission is quoted as follows:

Detroit simply has not enough policemen to prevent disorders if we try to move the Negro families into the houses without help from the State.

After sending the telegram, Mr. Blandford made the following statement:

We are at war. Men of all races and creeds are marching in our armed forces, and are at work in our vast war industries. That is the spirit of American democracy.

By the same token, war workers and their families must have adequate homes, regardless of race or creed, if the country's output of planes, tanks, ships, and munitions is to grow in sufficient volume to win the war.

Sojourner Truth was built for Negro war workers. Leases have been executed. The National Housing Agency today advised the Detroit Housing Commission to take steps to utilize the war houses for that purpose as soon as possible.

In the utilization of the project, the National Housing Agency through the medium of the Federal Public Housing Authority will afford technical assistance to the Detroit Housing Commission. That is a joint responsibility. The maintenance of local law and order is, of course, the responsibility of the city of Detroit. The National Housing Agency has confidence that the officials of the city of Detroit will initiate the appropriate measures to effect the use of these homes under the most satisfactory conditions possible.

I assume that Mr. Blandford's statement is intended primarily for those people who live in close proximity to this housing project. If that is so, I wish to point out the fact that nowhere in the United States will you find more patriotic men and women. They are fully aware that we are at war. As a matter of fact, there are very few homes in the vicinity of this Federal Housing blunder that are not only represented by one or more sons who are marching in our armed forces today, but have many others ready to go.

It is the mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers of these very boys who have been in the picket line for months in protest to Negro occupancy of this project. One of the boys now in the service was in the picket line on the day of the first riot.

The fathers and mothers of these boys have toiled and sacrificed for many years in order to provide homes for them. They relied implicitly on our Government when the F. H. A. informed them of the assistance to be derived in obtaining homes for themselves and their loved ones, when they invested their life savings in F. H. A. homes. Within four or five blocks of this housing project under controversy the Government has over $800,000 invested in F. H. A. loans, and now these people are told by F. H. A. that no further commitments can be made on property in this area because of the U. S. H. A. blunder.

In February 1942 the F. H. A. sent out the following rejection notice on 16 applications for loans on proposed new homes in this area:

The location of subject property does not meet with the requirements of the Federal Housing Administration.

And yet previous loans on new homes had been made by F. H. A. within an area of four blocks surrounding this project to the tune of $800,000.

No one denies that the 200 dwelling units now known as Sojourner Truth was programmed for Negro defense workers but not on the Nevada-Fenelon site.

Mr. Blandford's decision in insisting on the Nevada-Fenelon site, an admitted error on the part of the U. S. H. A., has resulted in the destruction of property values in this neighborhood. This is proven by the action of the self-supporting F. H. A. which has been a godsend and a boon to the low-income class of home owners. This agency has restored popular confidence in home ownership. Through the small-home mortgages insured under title II and the defense housing mortgages insured under title VI, over $250,000,000 has been invested in Detroit.

Due to the bungling on the part of Federal Housing officials, the subversive elements involved, and cognizant of the seriousness of this situation, I have today introduced the following resolution providing for a congressional investigation of this controversy:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to investigate the facts and circumstances relating to the manner and method of selecting sites for defense-housing projects in the Detroit, Mich., area, with particular reference to the Nevada-Fenelon defense-housing project, in order to (1) determine whether or not the United States Housing Authority or any other Government agency has been, or is, acting in accordance with law and the best interests of the community, and (2) fix responsibility for any failure to select defense-housing sites in accordance with law or the best interests of the community.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than July 1, 1942, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or had adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, of Ohio, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PATRICK (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN), indefinitely, on account of important business in his district.

To Mr. GRANT of Alabama (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN), indefinitely, on account of important business in his district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Jacques Hallpern, Max Hallpern, and Sally Hallpern Zaharia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 22, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, April 22, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. In re: H. R. 6858 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to manhaden fishing.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to

extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., April 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6912, to repeal section 404 of title XI of the United States Code, 1940 edition (with respect to composition of indebtedness of local taxing agencies) at 10 a. m. on Monday, April 27, room 346, House Office Building.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments) at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1590. A letter from the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission, transmitting pursuant to Public Law No. 335 (H. J. Res. 255), approved December 19, 1941, the report of the Commission created to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions of the United States together with recommendations for both short-term and long-term measures of improvement (H. Doc. No. 709); to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed.

1591. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Censorship for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $7,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 710); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1592. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VOORHIS of California: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4402. A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; without amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6971. A bill amending act of September 1, 1916; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6972. A bill relating to the payment by certain persons in the armed forces of the United States entitled to be naturalized under title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, of fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6973. A bill relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6974. A bill relating to the assessment of tangible personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6975. A bill to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 6976. A bill to permit the disposal of Civilian Conservation Corps surplus property in such a manner as to expedite the war effort; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6977 (by request). A bill to equalize the war burdens of citizens of the United States and thus provide for the successful prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department to conduct certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. Res. 470. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6690; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. Res. 471. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the manner and method of selecting sites for defense-housing projects in the Detroit, Mich., area; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FORD of Mississippi introduced a bill (H. R. 6978) for the relief of Mack C. Ritchey, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2703. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Retail Trade Board of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, urging the administration to include farm prices and wages in addition to merchandise in any price control which freezes merchandise prices at all levels, and that such a program of price control not only include all these factors but that it be imposed simultaneously on merchandise, wages, and farm products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2704. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Nassau County veterans' relief and executive board of New York, requesting that a United States veterans' hospital be erected on Long Island, N. Y., and the erection of such a hospital be granted by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2705. Also, resolution of the town board of the town of Harrison, N. Y., requesting that the attorney for the town be advised that the town board of the town of Harrison had no right to appropriate or levy upon the taxpayers of the town of Harrison moneys to defray such expenses for aircraft-warning service, as necessary and laudable as they are; that the same appears to this board to be an obligation of the Federal Government, one that it should assume and carry on as a part of the duty which it has to the people of this section to protect its inhabitants, their lives, and property; and that it appears that the Federal Government is well able to stand these expenses, particularly if it abandoned boondoggling and other nonessential services which are now being conducted by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2706. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees formerly covered by the social-security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social-security law for social-security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2707. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, urging the President and Congress to bring out to public view all phases of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey's dealings with the Nazi Government in the synthetic rubber problem for the purpose of taking more adequate punitive action if necessary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2708. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution of the Bergen County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Bergen County, N. J., favoring enactment of House bill 6790; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2709. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Civilian Defense Council, relative to providing San Francisco and its fire department with additional fire apparatus and such other necessary equipment for the protection of the port of San Francisco and waterfront; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2710 By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas Association of Automobile Finance Companies, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6521; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, be pleased to hear the prayer of Thy servants: "Be mindful of Thy mercies, O Lord, which are from the beginning of the world, lest at any time our enemies should prevail over us. To Thee, O Lord, have we lifted up our souls and in Thee do we put our trust. Thou art the God alone who dost work wonders; Thou hast made Thy power known among the nations; with Thy arm Thou hast redeemed Thy people. Deliver us from our enemies and defend us from them that rise up against us.

"O Son of God, look down with eyes of pity on the threatened shipwreck of the world Thou didst die to save. Through Thy mercy, grant to us and to all mankind the grace to search our own hearts and know our shortcomings, so that filled with contrition and penitence for our sins, which are the true cause of our evils, we may live together in faith and hope and charity, awaiting Thy coming in the enjoyment of peace which the world cannot give, but which never fails to those who love Thee and keep Thy commandments."

We entreat Thee, Almighty God, as these days are most critical, graciously be with our most notable President, his official advisers, our distinguished Speaker, and the Congress. We earnestly beseech Thee to give them commanding mastery of the most urgent affairs of state and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms has arranged for the registration of Members of the House between the ages of 45 and 65 in the rotunda of the Capitol next Monday, April 27. Registration will begin at 9 o'clock and continue throughout the day. Since approximately 300 Members of the House and a majority of the Senate fall within this third draft, the cooperation of all Members will be required in order to complete the task in the time allowed. The work will be done by 20 registrars provided by the selective service headquarters, which has restricted the accommodation exclusively to Members of the House and Senate.

In order to facilitate the work and to save the time of the Members, the Sergeant at Arms has procured registration cards which Members may obtain and fill out in their offices. These cards must then be presented by the Members to, and signed in the presence of, the registrars, who will issue registration certificates. These cards may now be obtained in Mr. Romney's private office, and he will be glad to furnish any other pertinent information.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that these cards will then be returned to the district in which the Members are resident?

Mr. McCORMACK. I presume that is so. I am reading a statement prepared for me. I do not want to claim credit for preparing it. I think the inference to be drawn is that after registration the cards will be sent back to the local districts in which the Members live. This is simply for the convenience of the Members.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to me after the speech I made on the floor yesterday afternoon concerning excess-profits taxes to find that the first point in the newspaper forecast of the President's anti-inflation program is very nearly the same proposal that I laid before the House on yesterday afternoon, and which I have been advocating with regard to excess-profits taxes for a long time.

With reference to the second point, concerning limitation of income to the individual, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today and to include a study of that very proposal by Mr. Siegfried, a prominent attorney and economist of Los Angeles, Calif.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of other business today, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on this same general subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of all business on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and include a brief article from Business Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION OF VITAL WAR MATERIALS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the majority leader called attention to some recent correspondence that he has had with the Office of Defense Transportation relative to State trade barriers that it seems are interfering with the transportation of vital war materials. I read with interest the letter inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished majority leader. If the statements contained therein are correct, there certainly should be some legislation enacted to break down these barriers and permit the war materials to go through the various States without interference.

Recently I received a letter from a Wichita concern which recently transported a truckload of oil and grease, or at least attempted to do so, up into Minnesota and were stopped at the State line and charged $31.50 dues, or permit fees, by a truckers' union and had to obtain a police escort to get their truck out of the Minnesota city. The letter to which I refer was placed in the RECORD on April 20 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. While we are passing legislation to strike down these trade barriers we had also better do something about these rackets of charging excessive permit fees and dues that are being practiced against the toilers and truckers who are trying to work, and see that they are not molested.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Rhode Island Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from Mr. Baker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendment numbered 2 of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$128,961,700, no part of which shall be available for construction work upon the Table Rock and Bull Shoals Reservoirs projects in the White River Basin"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY (except as to Bull Shoals and Table Rock Reservoirs projects),
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of Senate numbered 2 to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $128,961,700 for flood control, general, instead of $128,273,700, as proposed by the House, and $152,062,700, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $688,000 over the amount proposed by the House being accounted for as follows:

For completing preliminary work on Bull Shoals Reservoir (Ark.)	$500,000
For Tulsa-West Tulsa project, to protect defense industries from floods	213,000
Additional amount (House provided $1,000,000) for getting authorized projects in readiness for post war commencement	1,000,000
Total	1,713,000
Less amount in H. Doc. 634 for "early initiation" of Table Rock and Bull Shoals Reservoir projects	1,025,000
Net increase	688,000

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY (except as to Bull Shoals and Table Rock Reservoirs projects),
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report just adopted is a reduction of $22,413,000, which was added by the Senate. Of the amount added by the Senate, $16,700,000 was for the construction of a power dam at Bull Shoals, on the White River in Arkansas, and $2,106,000 for the construction of a power dam at Table Rock, on the White River in Missouri. In the House, as you will recall, I opposed these two projects when they were under consideration, and the House on a record vote sustained my position by a very large majority.

The conference report carries a proviso reading as follows:

No part of which shall be available for construction work upon the Table Rock and Bull Shoals Reservoir projects in the White River Basin.

The action the House has just taken, if approved by the Senate, means a saving at this time of $87,500,000, as that would be the ultimate cost before these two projects could be completed.

A great deal has been said from time to time as to how long it would take to complete these projects. I have before me release No. 1637 from the Federal Power Commission, which is a report of Chairman Leland Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, made July 16, 1941. It enumerates several hundred projects, giving the location, capacity, and the year each could be completed. Mr. Olds said that it would be 1945 before Bull Shoals could be completed and 1946 before Table Rock could be completed. As that report was made nearly a year ago, even if the projects were started now Bull Shoals could not be completed until 1946 and Table Rock until 1947.

It seems to me that the Government should, in connection with many national defense plants, install stationary Diesel engines or erect steam power plants to generate the necessary power needed for defense projects if there is a shortage of power where they desire to locate the plant. To follow that procedure would mean a large saving of money when you take into consideration the cost of constructing dams and reservoirs for hydroelectric plants.

I hope the Senate will agree to the conference report, and if it does it will dispose of this controversy.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEASES OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2212) to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the measure?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. A hearing was held at which a number of officers appeared and said it was essential from a national defense standpoint to get early action.

It seems any number of patriotic people, as well as institutions, have leased properties to the Government for a dollar a year. Under existing law only 25 percent of the amount paid under the lease can be spent by the Government for repairs or improvements. Under the dollar-a-year leases the Government can only spend 20 cents for repairs. True, there are other properties where a reasonable sum is being paid under leases. I am sure where a considerable amount is spent or must be spent for repairs, the Army or Navy would buy rather than lease.

The bill provides that the Secretary of War or Navy or head of any Government agency must certify the property is being used for national defense purposes.

The Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Comptroller General, and the Bureau of the Budget ask for the passage of the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517), shall not apply during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President to such leases or renewals of existing leases of privately or publicly owned property as are certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or by such person or persons as he may designate, as covering premises for military, naval, or civilian purposes necessary for the prosecution of the war or vital in the national emergency.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSURANCE OF LOANS BY FEDERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House entered yesterday, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6927, with Mr. COCHRAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides an increase of $500,000,000 in the authorization for the Federal Housing Administration, under title VI of that act, the purpose of which is to insure loans for the construction of defense housing in defense areas, and to bring about as far as may be possible the construction of defense housing by private investment rather than by having such construction done under direct appropriation for the war program.

The first act under which this type of housing was undertaken provided for the insurance of loans in the amount of $100,000,000. Later, I believe, in September of last year—the first act was in March of last year—the act was amended so as to authorize an additional $200,000,000 of insurance by the Administration. It developed that commitments have been made for insurance to an amount that covers the entire authorization under existing law, so that on the 1st of April the Federal Housing Authority notified all agencies and institutions through whom the insurance was extended that the authorization has been exhausted and no further commitments would be made until additional legislation could be passed.

It is expected that during the next year there will be in the neighborhood of 300,000 units of construction and that under the authorization proposed in this bill approximately 115,000 applications can be taken care of and insurance supplied by the Federal Housing Authority.

It is recognized by all that it is desirable as far as may be done that this construction be carried on by private investment. That is the purpose of title VI of this bill.

The rule as to soundness is liberalized, but there is an increase in the assessment fee, for the reason that the risk is larger than under the service authorized under the original act. It is contemplated that there will be larger losses. In any event the burden upon the Government will be far less, necessarily, than could be hoped for under direct appropriations for essential defense housing.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure we all are in sympathy with the purposes of this act and what the gentleman has in mind. We have great confidence in Mr. Ferguson, who is administering this act.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me make this statement before answering the question. This bill comes to the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on Banking and Currency and also has the endorsement of the interdepartmental agencies of the Government that have given it consideration.

Mr. LANHAM. I want to propound an inquiry with reference to title VI as it affects defense housing. The only criticism which I have heard is the criticism that by exorbitant appraisals the effect of this act has been raised from the eighty-odd or ninety-odd percent to 100 percent, and in some instances even a greater percentage than that. It is not the purpose of the committee or the intent of the legislation, as I understand it, for this guaranty to be 100 percent, and if that is being done by exorbitant appraisals, certainly, it is a matter that is deserving of inquiry.

Mr. STEAGALL. The purpose of the bill, of course, is not to go above 80 percent. I cannot say that no mistake has been made in the appraisals in the large number of loans that have been insured under this bill down to this time or under this title of the bill. Of course, that is a matter of administrative detail. In any event, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that if the Administration insure 100 percent and have to make good the entire amount, it would not be any more burdensome to the Treasury than is the case under the other construction methods that are employed for the purpose of providing housing for defense workers.

Mr. LANHAM. That, of course, is a little beside the mark. Mr. Ferguson, as Administrator, has no desire to make it a practice for the appraisals to increase the amount of the guaranty to 100 percent.

Mr. STEAGALL. I have absolute confidence in Mr. Ferguson and in the new National Housing Administrator, under whom these agencies have been placed, just as I had in the Federal Loan Administrator, under whom administration was placed heretofore.

Mr. LANHAM. I simply think it wise that we get an expression in the RECORD as to the clear intent of the law.

Mr. STEAGALL. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY What I want to inquire about is the scope of this work with respect to the areas to be covered or whether it is confined to taking in what are known as defense areas or whether it applies to the whole country.

Mr. STEAGALL. This bill, amending title VI and enlarging the authorization, relates only to the insurance of loans for construction in defense areas, the purpose being to take care of this construction by private investment through the insurance plan, instead of making appropriations out of the Treasury.

Mr. MAY. In other words, what the bill will do will be to enlarge the loans negotiated and handled by the commercial banks and lending agencies.

Mr. STEAGALL. Or other approved institutions; yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman three questions. In the first place, I understand the major purpose of this legislation is to increase the authorization of the total amount of title VI mortgages that can be insured for the reason that up to date the whole $300,000,000 has been absorbed.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the second place, am I correct in the opinion that the amount of any individual mortgage that can be insured has been somewhat increased?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; due to the increased cost of materials and labor incident to the accentuated construction program throughout the country at this time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is my understanding. My third question is, Does such a provision represent a new type of construction? I notice it is primarily for rental purposes, and I wondered if section 11 of the bill introduces a new type of insured mortgage for rental properties, possibly, where there would be multiple dwellings or apartment houses.

Mr. STEAGALL. The purpose of section 11 is not to introduce the insurance of any type of loans, but to provide that insurance for defense housing may be extended under title VI covering the same types of residence construction provided in the original act. It is to bring title VI into harmony with the general provisions of the bill insofar as they are applicable.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But it does extend the application of title VI to property for rental purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to state that I personally believe that is a wise move on the part of the committee, for the reason that I think there are cases where people may be temporarily employed in a certain region and it might not be wise for such people to attempt the purchase of a home.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Therefore I would personally think the committee is doing a wise thing in that respect.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. PACE. What developed in the course of the hearings on this bill with regard to the ability of the contractors to get materials for this type of construction?

Mr. STEAGALL. This is designed to promote construction in defense areas, which, of course, comes under a different category from general construction.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Right along the line concerning which the gentleman has been speaking, does this bill make this type of financing applicable to areas which will in future be designated as defense areas as well as to areas now so designated?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes. The provisions of this bill would apply to any area hereafter designated as a defense area as well as to such areas already designated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In other words, as areas come to be designated as defense areas, the bill will be applicable to them?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Since the original $300,000,000 authorization has been absorbed it means that there will be no Federal Housing mortgages made in any area not designated as a defense area. Is not that the situation?

Mr. STEAGALL. No. This title VI is limited in its application to insurance of construction in defense areas, but this does not set aside or interfere with the normal activities under the permanent plan of the original act, which still remains in effect and which does not refer to defense housing in defense areas.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the $300,000,000 authorization is absorbed and as a consequence there will be no further funds available to take care of that construction under the original plan?

Mr. STEAGALL. No; this is a temporary, emergency provision contained in title VI, and applies only to insurance of mortgages covering construction in defense areas. It does not affect the other plan at all.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOLMES. As I understand it, in these defense areas, whether the money be allocated through financing of private interests and constructed for renting purposes, they are eligible under title VI.

Mr. STEAGALL. Correct.

Mr. HOLMES. That is for renting purposes?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. HOLMES. And in the areas that are defense areas, where there may not be any acute housing shortage, but, however, where an individual, as he has done in the past, wants to build a little home costing $5,000 for himself, he still is eligible under this act, if the can procure the money through the bank.

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOLMES. In other words, he is not thrown out of the picture. Of course, I understand that priorities enter into it. That is, provided he gets priorities, he is eligible to build his own home in connection with defense work

Mr. STEAGALL. He is, but he would not come under title VI. That would be a normal activity as provided in the provisions of the original act.

Mr. HOLMES. Under title II?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will it be within the jurisdiction of the Federal Housing Administration to designate defense areas, or must they be designated under some other authority?

Mr. STEAGALL. Defense areas are designated by the President of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. I notice with reference to these large buildings, apartment houses, and so on, which is a dangerous field, as we all know, that on page 6 of the bill it provides that the mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such time as the Administrator shall prescribe. In other words, the Administrator could say that this mortgage could go on for 60 or 70 years or any time that he should desire. Does the gentleman not think that it should be limited to 25 or 30 years?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is my understanding that the limitation of 25 years applies to other provisions, but the larger construction is more expensive and in many cases more enduring.

Mr. KEAN. I do not see where it is in the bill, and if the gentleman can find it I would be very glad to have him let me know. It is on page 6 of the bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is correct as to the provision to which he refers.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman explain title I?

Mr. STEAGALL. There is only one change in title I. Title I provides for repair loans up to $2,500, and that sum was later enlarged to $5,000 for purposes of defense housing and maturity of mortgages lengthened from 5 years to 7 years.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman knows I have been very much interested in this bill. I simply want to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and his splendid committee for the expeditious manner in which they have brought this bill to the floor.

Mr. STEAGALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What effect will this bill have on private enterprise, if we strike out $300,000,000 and spend $800,000,000 for this housing? Will that keep private industry from going ahead and constructing buildings?

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say to the gentleman that we do not provide for any spending under this bill. The purpose of this bill is to avoid spending by the Treasury. The purpose is to lure private investors into this kind of construction by providing a simple marginal insurance fund, to obtain such loans by private capital.

Mr. RICH. I did not get that last part.

Mr. STEAGALL. I say the purpose of this bill is to induce private capital to engage in this construction that is essential to the defense program, and let the work be carried on by private investment rather than by direct appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. That is right, but you set up this organization or continue it, and private capital that previously went into construction of buildings is now expecting to go into various Government setups that we have, so that it interferes more or less with private enterprise. Why do you have to continue the Government furnishing the capital for construction, rather than banks and private investors?

Mr. STEAGALL. I thought I had made clear to the gentleman that the whole purpose of this bill and of existing law, under which loans are insured, is to induce private capital to make these loans so as to avoid, as to defense housing, having the Treasury make appropriations, for that purpose.

Mr. RICH. That is what we want but——

Mr. STEAGALL. That is what this bill does.

Mr. RICH. I do not know why it is necessary to have a bill if the people of this country are so interested in trying to invest their capital.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say to the gentleman that this bill has to do with defense housing which would have to be taken care of under direct appropriations for the war program if we did not have this method of approaching the problem. But, insofar as we can do part of this by insuring loans and charging premiums for the service, we save the Treasury the necessity of direct appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Now, is there anything here that is going to insure contractors or people who want to get jobs in building this defense housing the right to work if they want to work, such as carpenters, without paying tribute to some labor union of from $50 to $1,000, in order to get a union card so that they can work on these jobs? What provision is made for that?

Mr. STEAGALL. I will say to the gentleman that this bill simply brings this provision of title VI under the operation of the general law. It does not in any way change existing law, but puts this particular title under the provisions of the existing law.

Mr. RICH. Do you not think it is about time that we had some change in existing law so that men in private life today who want to work on a Government project are not confronted with the obnoxious idea that some people have, that they have to go to a labor union, especially these radical labor leaders, where they demand from $50 to $1,000 before that man can work? Do you not think we ought to have some change in

our existing law, since that is the dominating feature?

Mr. STEAGALL. This bill does not provide for direct construction by the Government or direct appropriation by the Government. It provides for construction by private individuals and private institutions that are approved by the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but I want to get some legislation, I want this Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee to bring in legislation. The Labor Committee has laid down on us. They have pigeonholed every bill that has been sent to them. They will not report anything out, so that we have to get some other committee of the House to do it. Why can we not get some other committee of this House to be permitted by those who are in charge, to allow legislation to come in here and let us vote on it, and then send it to the Senate and see that they do not pigeonhole every piece of legislation we send over there, and then let the President down in the White House say to these radical labor leaders, "We do not want every man to join a union"? That is not a qualification of a good American, and it is about time we stopped it. It is about time we had some committee of the House take some action.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will say to the gentleman if he will introduce a bill and have it referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House it will have proper consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has made out a very effective case for this bill. There seems to be little that can be said in addition to what the gentleman has said in his remarks.

The bill was reported out of the committee without opposition. It continues a policy which this House adopted some time ago. At the present time all home construction is stymied by two influences. The first, and probably the most important, is priorities. The second is that the Federal Housing Administration has exhausted its authority to insure home-construction loans in defense areas. For the latter reason it seems essential that this bill should be enacted as quickly as possible in order that this program may continue. We must draw a distinction between homes constructed under this program and those constructed under the so-called Lanham Act. The Lanham Act provides that the construction be done by the Government. It is contracted for by the Government or governmental agencies and paid for by the Government, and rented or resold by the Government. This bill induces private capital to construct homes in defense areas. The difference between the two methods is that, instead of the Government's advancing the money, the Government through the F. H. A. insures the mortgages.

There has been some difficulty in building homes, especially in the northern part of the United States, where more permanent and durable construction is necessary than in the more temperate climates, due to the fact that they have not been allowed under existing law to insure homes of the permanency which is essential in northern climates; and for this reason we have amended the bill by providing, as you will see on page 5 of the report, that the principal obligations which are insured shall not exceed certain graduated amounts. In all of the cases you will notice that the amounts have been raised $1,500. This seems essential and very desirable if we are going to construct the type of houses in northern climates and the colder climates that is contemplated under this act. Also we have authorized an increase in the amortization period from 20 years to 25 years in order to facilitate the sale of these houses to defense personnel. Title VI houses can be built only in defense areas, and they are built in contemplation of the conversion of war plants to civilian construction following the war. We will take, for example, a tank plant built by the R. F. C. or some subsidiary corporation and leased to a company which is making tanks. During the war effort the plant will be making tanks, and there will, of course, be the need for perhaps thousands of homes in connection with this effort. It is contemplated, following the war, if this plant is of permanent construction, that the plant will be diverted perhaps to the manufacture of automobiles; and it is expected that these workmen will remain in the vicinity of the plants and continue to work in the plants following the war. This is why it is deemed safe to amortize these payments over 25 years, and it gives encouragement not only to the construction of homes which will give temporary shelter to these workers, but it encourages the purchase of homes by men working in the plant.

The bill, as I say, was reported out without opposition. I personally am of the opinion that it is very much needed, and needed quickly, if we are going to accomplish the purpose of the act. Building in the United States today except building by the Federal Government under the Lanham Act is almost at a standstill awaiting the enactment of this bill. I hope there will be no opposition to it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks about a more permanent form of construction in the northern climates. Can the gentleman tell me whether included in the bill there is any direct reference to the heating units to be used in these houses?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. The design is passed upon by the F. H. A. engineers and architects, and the plans must meet the requirement of the F. H. A.; otherwise they cannot be insured. I am of opinion that much consideration is given to heating units. The type of heating unit perhaps is not essential, but they do insist, I assume, that some kind of heating unit be included in the plan.

Mr. TREADWAY. The reason I make the inquiry of the gentleman is that I have a constituent who is interested in this feature. He is able to obtain, under priority, a portion of the necessary heating plants but he cannot get the other part. This seems to be rather awkward, that part of the heating apparatus can be secured but not the whole plant.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is a question, of course, for the War Production Board to work out, but I assume that in these war areas and in case of title VI construction there will be no trouble in getting what is necessary in the way of equipment after the F. H. A. approves the construction.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I assume that with this Federal money it will be still easier to secure apparatus, will it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We are establishing the policy; and I understand that this bill not only is being sponsored by F. H. A. but that it has the wholehearted endorsement of the War Production Board, for it is necessary that these buildings be built in defense areas.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, the present law requires that projects be economically sound. The amendment proposed is that the project be an acceptable risk in view of the emergency referred to in this section. Does this mean that under the new law the project does not have to be found to be economically sound?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I cannot see too much distinction in the language; however, I presume that the question of economic soundness is always open to much more controversy that the language proposed in the bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There could hardly be any building that would not be an acceptable risk in view of the emergency; is that not true?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. But I think that the purpose of the act limits that to a large extent, because, of course, it would be absolutely senseless to insure a home which will not stand for more than 5 years, a shack, for instance, and provide for a 25-year amortization period; so I think that the building must be of such a substantial nature as to at least outlive the amortization period.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there any such limitation that it must be a good risk?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not recall any, right offhand. In any event, it is left to the discretion of the F. H. A. and I assume that it could interpret the language which the gentleman read from existing law to mean most anything it wants to, and it could interpret the language in the proposed law to mean anything it wants to, so it will not hold up construction regardless of whether that is in there or not. It gives them a little more latitude, probably, in the specifications and standards than they would have under the language that the gentleman cited.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. What limitation is there upon the granting of these mortgages? Can the gentleman tell us in a sentence what sort of limitation there is upon the decision as to whether mortgages shall be issued? I do not mean as to the amount.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The type of construction? In the first place, it must be within an area which has been designated as a defense area. In the next place it must meet the requirements and specifications of F. H. A. before it will be eligible. I think that gives them rather broad discretion to determine the question of durability, feasibility, and so forth.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there any limitation as to who shall occupy the house, whether it shall be a defense worker?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, sir; not in the bill, because they even contemplate rentals. You can build houses for rental purposes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does it have to be vacant for 30 days? Is there some 30-day limitation in here on rental?

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I understand there was some limitation in reference to the 30-day matter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That may be in the W. P. B. regulations, but I do not know of anything in the law on that. The regulations under which materials are released might provide that they be reserved for defense workers, and defense workers given priority, but I do not know anything about that in the law.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the distinguished gentleman from Michigan believe this answers the views that have been expressed by the national home builders group that has been trying to do something for defense housing and needed relief under title VI?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; they are very much in favor of it. As a matter of fact, home building is at a standstill because F. H. A. has reached the limit of its insurance authority. We are increasing it by $500,000,000 in the hope that will take care of the situation, but we have not any definite assurances that they will not come back in the future to get another $500,000,000. I think this is the most economical way of building defense homes, because the home owner at least has some equity in the home and there will be some inducement for him to protect his equity by either selling to an advantage or remaining in the home during the period of amortization. Of course, as the owner's equity increases, the contingent liability of the Federal Government decreases proportionately.

Mr. PLOESER. Up until now there has been a decided trend against the private builder doing what he wants to do in connection with building defense housing. It has been very detrimental. I believe this has been due to some rulings put out by the War Production Board. Does the gentleman feel there has been a sufficient understanding between F. H. A. and the War Production Board so that there will be the proper kind of coordinated effort here and one will not defeat the other?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think so in respect to this type of home construction. I think construction under title II of F. H. A. is stymied by the War Production Board. Whether it should be or not, I do not know. In my opinion, the War Production Board and F. H. A. are in complete accord in respect to the operation and administration of title VI.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. May I inquire whether the limitation of $3,750 has been removed and an additional sum is permitted under this law?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. The gentleman referred to a limitation of $3,750?

Mr. HAINES. I understood there was a limitation in cost of $3,750 for defense homes.

Mr. BOGGS. The commitment was 90 percent of the appraised value not to exceed $4,000. Perhaps that is what the gentleman has in mind. It has been raised.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Ninety percent of the appraised value, or $4,000. That has been increased to 90 percent of the appraised value, or $5,400.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the percentage of guaranty on Federal housing, 90 percent or 80 percent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Ninety percent under title VI.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it the same on all Federal housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. All construction insured under title VI.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there an 80-percent guaranty on some Federal housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is under title II. There is very little, if any, construction under title II now, because they cannot get priorities on the material.

Mr. STEFAN. And title VI is a guaranty of 90 percent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Insurance of 90 percent.

Mr. STEFAN. The reason there is not so much construction under title II is that they cannot get priorities?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right; they cannot get the materials.

Mr. STEFAN. Does title II involve much higher-priced housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is more economically sound than this but this is an inducement for the workers in our war-production plants to own their own homes. The contingent liability on the part of the Government under this bill would never be as great as the direct liability under Lanham Act construction, because the Government itself takes all the loss there. Under this bill, however, as the equity of the home owner increases the contingent liability of the Government decreases.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not quite understand the gentleman. In what category does the Government take all the loss?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the Lanham Act, as I understand, the Government builds the houses.

Mr. STEFAN. Then we have three categories: the Lanham Act, where the Government takes all the loss; title II, which is an 80-percent guaranty; and title VI, where there is a 90-percent guaranty; and I understood the gentleman to say there is more building under title VI now than under title II.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not believe there is much, if any, construction under title II.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan if I may read from the hearings a statement that I think would clarify the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] regarding the use of this housing under title VI for defense workers?

Mr. Ferguson, in testifying, said:

> Under the priorities you cannot get a priority unless the house does not rent for more than 20 to 25 percent of the man's family income. You cannot get a priority unless you agree to hold that house at its completion for a period of 30 days for sale or rent to a defense worker. In other words, they have 30 days' prior privilege to buy or rent that house. When you file an application for priorities and it is a rental project, you have to agree to rent it for at least a year at that rental.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

I think we had better reconcile ourselves to the fact that regardless of what legislation we pass here in Congress, if it involves the use of material we have given to the President through the War Production Board the authority to amend, modify, or completely nullify acts of Congress. That is a matter to which we must give consideration, perhaps in a separate bill later on to recoup those powers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out the word "section" where it appears in the second and third provisos and inserting in each such place the word "title"; (2) striking out "$300,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$800,000,000"; (3) striking out of the third proviso "July 1, 1942" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1943"; and (4) striking out the third proviso "September 8, 1939" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 27, 1941."

SEC. 2. Section 603 (b) (2) of such act, as amended is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$4,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,400"; (2) striking out "$6,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,500"; (3) striking out "$8,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500"; and (4) striking out "$10,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,000."

SEC. 3. Section 603 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

SEC. 4. Section 603 (c) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence: "If the Administrator finds, upon the presentation of a mortgage for insurance and the tender of the initial premium charge and such other charges as the Administrator may require, that the mortgage complies with the provisions of this title, such mortgage may be accepted for insurance by endorsement or otherwise as the Administrator may prescribe; but no mortgage shall be accepted for insurance under this title unless the Administrator finds that the project with respect to which the mortgage is executed is an acceptable risk in view of the emergency referred to in this section."; and (2) striking the word "section", appearing in the last sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title."

SEC. 5. Section 604 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking the words "this title" where they first appear and inserting in lieu thereof "section 603."

SEC. 6. Section 604 (c) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking the word "section" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title."

SEC. 7. Section 604 (d) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentences: "All such debentures shall be dated as of the date foreclosure proceedings were instituted, or the property was otherwise acquired by the mortgagee after default, and shall bear interest from such date at a rate determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the mortgage was accepted for insurance, but not to exceed 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year. Such debentures as are issued in exchange for property covered by mortgages accepted for insurance under this section on or after the date of enactment of the National Housing Act amendments of 1942 shall mature 10 years after the date thereof. Such debentures as are issued in exchange for property covered by mortgages accepted for insurance under this section prior to the date of the enactment of the National Housing Act amendments of 1942 shall mature 3 years after the 1st day of July following the maturity date of the mortgage on the property in exchange for which the debentures were issued: *Provided*, That any mortgagee entitled to receive such debentures may elect to receive in lieu thereof debentures which shall mature 10 years after the date thereof."; and (2) striking the word "section" appearing in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title."

SEC. 8. Section 604 (g) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out the word "section" in each of the first two places where it appears and inserting in each such place the word "title"; and (2) inserting before the word "unless" the words "with respect to mortgages insured under section 603."

SEC. 9. Section 605 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "section 604" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the words "this title."

SEC. 10. Section 212 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the word "title" the following: "or under section 608 of title VI."

SEC. 11. Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 608. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under section 603 of this title, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages as defined in section 601 of this title (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgaged property shall be held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator. The Administrator may, in his discretion, require such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation. The Administrator may make such contracts with, and acquire for not to exceed $100 stock or interest in any such mortgagor, as the Administrator may deem necessary to render effective such restriction or regulation. Such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the War Housing Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Administrator under the insurance.

"(2) The mortgaged property must be designed for rent for residential use, primarily to war workers;

"(3) Involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed $5,000,000;

"(B) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the reasonable replacement cost of the completed property or project, including the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the property or project, architects' fees, taxes and interest accruing during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incidental to construction and approved by the Administrator; and

"(C) not to exceed $1,350 per room for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use.

The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payment within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) The failure of the mortgagor to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of a mortgage insured under this section shall be considered a default under such mortgage, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Administrator, within a period and in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator of (1) all rights and interest arising under the mortgage so in default; (2) all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagors or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction; (3) all policies of title or other insurance or surety bonds or other guaranties and any and all claims thereunder; (4) any balance of the mortgage loan not advanced to the mortgagor; (5) any cash or property held by the mortgagee, or to which it is entitled, as deposits made for the account of the mortgagor and which have not been applied in reduction of the principal of the mortgage indebtedness; and (6) all records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating to the mortgage transaction. Upon such assignment, transfer, and delivery the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charges for mortgage insurance shall cease, and the Administrator shall, subject to the cash adjustment provided for in section 604 (c), issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage, and a certificate of claim as hereinafter provided. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of the mortgage shall be determined in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of default the amount the mortgagee may have paid for (A) taxes, special assessments, and water rates, which are liens prior to the mortgage; (B) insurance on the property; and (C) reasonable expenses for the completion and preservation of the property; less the sum of (i) an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the unpaid amount of such principal obligation on the date of default; (ii) any amount received on account of the mortgage after such date; and (iii) any net income received by the mortgagee from the property after such date: *Provided*, That the mortgagee in the event of a default under the mortgage may, at its option and in accordance with regulations of, and in a period to be determined by the Administrator, proceed to foreclose on and obtain possession of or otherwise acquire such property from the mortgagor after default, and receive the benefits of the insurance as herein provided, upon (1) the prompt conveyance to the Administrator of title to the property which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the mortgage was insured, and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations; and (2) the assignment to him of all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction or foreclosure proceedings, except such claims that may have been released with the consent of the Administrator. Upon such conveyance and assignment, the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charges for insurance shall cease and the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as provided in this subsection, except that in such event the 1-percent deduction, set out in (i) hereof, shall not apply.

"(d) The certificate of claim issued by the Administrator to any mortgagee in connection with the insurance of mortgages under this section shall be for an amount determined in accordance with subsections (e) and (f) of section 604 of this title, except that any amount remaining after the payment of the full amount under the certificate of claim shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the War Housing Insurance Fund.

"(e) Debentures issued under this section shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date of default as determined in subsection (c) of this section, and shall bear interest from such date.

"(f) The provisions of section 207 (k) of this act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section, except that all references therein to the 'Housing Fund' shall be construed to refer to the 'War Housing Insurance Fund,' and the reference therein to 'subsection (g)' thereof shall be construed to refer to 'subsection (c)' of this section.

"(g) The Administrator shall also have power to insure under this title or title II any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under this title or title II without regard to the limitations upon eligibility contained therein."

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to supersede or be inconsistent with the provisions of the Executive Order No. 9070, dated February 24, 1942, and where necessary for this purpose, the term "Administrator," as used herein, shall be construed to mean "Federal Housing Commissioner."

SEC. 13. Section 2 (b) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) No insurance shall be granted under this section to any such financial institution

with respect to any obligation representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase by it (1) if the amount of such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000; (2) if such obligation has a maturity in excess of 3 years and 32 days, except that such maturity limitation shall not apply if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is for the purpose of financing the construction of a new structure for use in whole or in part for residential or agricultural purposes; or (3) unless the obligation bears such interest, has such maturity, and contains such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator shall prescribe, in order to make credit available for the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $5,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days, representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase by it if such loan, advance of credit or purchase (1) is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure located in an area or locality in which the President shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends which would impede national war activities; and (2) is made for the purpose of providing additional living accommodations suitable for war workers: *Provided further*, That any obligation with respect to which insurance is granted under this section on or after July 1, 1939, may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, but in no event for an additional amount or term in excess of the maximum provided for in this subsection."

SEC. 14. Title VI of the National Housing Act as amended is further amended by striking the word "defense" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the word "war."

SEC. 15. This act may be cited as the "National Housing Act Amendments of 1942."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is only one point that I raise about this bill, and that is the question of priorities with respect to private builders who do not come under the insurance plan of the F. H. A. I asked Mr. Ferguson before the committee whether such constructors, private corporations, or individuals, would have the same priority rating for materials as would those building under the plan of the F. H. A. He answered that question in the positive.

I am well aware that there is probably no discrimination in the law against that being done, but I am solicitous, I am wondering, since there is a great tendency toward encroachment by all Government agencies upon private business, whether it might not be a good plan to insert in this bill an amendment which would assure the man or the concern that does not come under the F. H. A. financing plan the same priorities as those who do finance under the F. H. A.

I think this is a rather important consideration. There are a great many private individuals who, having a little money to invest, a little savings, put those savings into a home, where they may themselves live, or rent and draw a small income. I think we should do everything possible to protect such individuals in the opportunities that may be afforded them in this respect. This is a right that has been enjoyed in this country ever since its existence.

I wonder if the chairman of the committee would not agree to an amendment that would assure builders who do not finance their construction under the F. H. A. plan the same priority rights as builders under the F. H. A. plan receive. It certainly would be harmless so far as the program that is undertaken here is concerned, and, I believe, would give protection to those people who are already in danger of being driven out of business by the Government housing program that is in operation.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that deals with the matter of priorities. That authority is left undisturbed. Any institution that might seek to come under the provisions of this bill and obtain an insurance loan would be confronted by the same problem as to priorities as would a private institution undertaking such construction with no thought of insurance. They would be left in the same category under this bill. There is nothing to prevent the authority from giving priorities to any individual who wants to construct housing for defense purposes in a defense area, whether or not he insures, and there is nothing in this bill that separates the institution that is insuring its loan from the one that is not.

If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, then we would give to an institution or an individual engaged in construction not to be insured an advantage over those engaged in construction to be insured under the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that would be unwise, wholly unnecessary, and undesirable.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to discuss for a moment the point that the Chairman has brought up that this might encourage or give an advantage to the private builder who does not care to come under the F. H. A. plan. If it would do that, I am inclined to think such an amendment would have added value. If there is any possibility at all of getting private enterprise to construct these defense dwellings, it seems to me it would be wise to avail ourselves of this.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, I do not mean that there would be any advantage. I do not think there would be any advantage under the gentleman's amendment or in the absence of it as between construction covered by mortgage to be insured and construction that is not to be insured. When I used the words "given advantage," I meant so far as this law is concerned. There is nothing in this bill about priorities and let us leave it that way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the same power that grants priorities is virtually the same power that administers the F. H. A. After all, this reverts to who administers these programs.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I was going to ask the gentleman a question about priorities and whether if the people who administer this program are interested in the program progressing they will issue priorities to this program that they would not issue to the private builder. Is not that a fact?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. This is all private building.

Mr. RICH. It may be all private building, but the people who have the authority to grant priorities would grant them to the ones coming under this bill and might not grant them if private capital on its own account wanted to go out and build such houses in defense areas.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. It was testified before the committee that we can only build 115,000 houses and we need 285,000, and priorities have been granted for 200,000 houses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, let us get this matter clear. After all, this is not altogether private financing. The Government is in it. The Government is guaranteeing the mortgages involved in this financing and therefore this is not wholly a plan financed by private interests.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. One of the greatest builders in the Detroit district, who has all the money he will ever need, one of the big motor manufacturers, built any number of homes recently and asked for supervision by this very agency that we are talking about today, although he did not borrow a cent, for the simple reason he wanted the approval of their investigation of his construction. There would be no building at all in this country, practically, today at present prices if it were not for F. H. A.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe the gentleman's observations are pertinent to the point under discussion.

Mr. RABAUT. I am referring to private industry that does not seek the mortgage rights, but seeks the controlling rights of F. H. A.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. For the gentleman's information, a subcommittee of the House Building and Grounds Committee held a hearing in New Orleans last week on the housing question and it was testified there by every private builder in that city, where we have an acute housing shortage, that none of them was prepared to build a single house without title VI of the F. H. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 11, after the word "war", in line 23, insert a new section:

"The same priorities for materials used in the construction of dwellings as provided in this act shall apply to private financing not insured by the Federal Housing Administration as applies under this act to the financing of construction insured by the Federal Housing Administration."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6927, to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a resolution of the foreign-born at the inaugural conference of the Harlem Victory Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter which I wrote to the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 10 minutes.

EXCESS PROFITS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the reason I have asked for this time is because I wanted to make a few comments on an article appearing in the Washington Post this morning which forecasts or attempts to forecast what may be included in the President's message on the control of the cost of living.

The most important thing which I think is needed in our country right now is for the people to know for certain that Congress is going to see to it that this war is not used to gain economic advantage by any person or any group of people, and that the principle of equality of sacrifice is applied all around. It is utterly impossible to equalize the burden as between the soldier on the one hand and other people on the other hand, but we ought to at least try. One thing that will help a little is to raise the soldiers' pay.

I feel that some of these proposals that are contained in this article—and I have no right to attribute them to the President, because his message has not been given, so I am speaking only about the article—are matters of great importance.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Yesterday I made a speech about excess-profits taxation, and I am greatly encouraged to find that practically the same things I advocated are included in point No. 1 in this proposed program, as reported in this article. Unless we provide in the first instance for the recapture of excess profits by the Government for the people it is going to be difficult for other sections of the population to understand why we ask a sacrifice of them, as we must do.

TOP LIMIT ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME

The second thing that is proposed here is a ceiling of $25,000 or $50,000 on the amount of annual income that any individual will be able to keep after taxes. Obviously this is a complicated and difficult thing to accomplish. But Great Britain, I understand, has effectively done approximately just this particular thing, and if it can be accomplished by means of our tax structure, then a great many of our worries about bonuses and exorbitant salaries and things of that kind will be answered. This is the place to begin. And the value to our morale of being able to go before the country to say that no one is receiving more than such and such an amount of net income is very clear, I think.

REDUCE SALARIES OF CONGRESS

The next thing I want to say may be something that Members will not like to have me say.

To my mind the most serious mistake that was made by Congress in connection with the inclusion of Members in the so-called pension bill, now repealed, was not the provisions of the bill, but the fact that at a time like this it was evidence of bad leadership to the country. By the same token, if a real honest-to-goodness effort is going to be made to get our country on a war basis with regard to the incomes of everybody, with regard to the control of profit, and with regard to the prevention of advantage being taken by any group, I believe it would be a very fine thing if Members of Congress should provide for a reduction in their own salaries. I strongly and earnestly suggest this action. It would do a very great deal for the spirit of all the people. In saying that I do not mean to say that I do not think the Members of Congress are worth all they get, corresponding to other people, because I do. But I think we are in a position to offer leadership to this country that no one else can do. I want us to do it. It is with that idea in mind that I made the proposal I just made. For the most powerful force in all the world is that of example.

REAL CAUSE OF DOWNFALL OF FRANCE

If we are really willing to do a job, under the leadership of the President, from the top down, we will then avoid the mistake that was made in France. In France, I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever but that the weakness of the nation was occasioned by the fact that the French dictatorship when established under Daladier did crack down on the mass of people but failed to give them the impression that it had the nerve to do so with regard to the rich and powerful of the country.

CONTROL OF ALL PRICES AND WAGES

There is included in this article, in addition, a proposal that there be control of all prices, including retail prices, and that corresponding to that there be a directive to the War Labor Board against further wage increases. This is logical and, if labor knows that the cost of living is not going up, labor will accept it, I am confident. In any case it is important, and very important, that we, as quickly as possible, settle every controversial issue and quit talking about them, so that every effort of the Nation can be put upon the winning of the war.

I happen to be one who believes that our record up to date is a very good record from the standpoint of conversion of industry and production up to this point. But we have to do better, of course, and the issue of this war will largely be decided in the shops and factories of the United States.

I want to say this: The enforcement of price control is going to be exceedingly difficult. I said when the price-control bill was considered by us in the first place that I believed it was perfectly obvious that the first thing that needs to be done, if this is going to have effective prevention of inflation, is to prevent the private manufacture of money by banks. We have not taken that step. Sooner or later—I hope sooner—we will have to. I believe that now even more than I did then. But we are in a situation where we probably have to go to price control. It is a second best; and by no means is it the democratic solution of the problem of inflation and deflation. But, in view of the fact that so large a proportion of our production is being devoted, and will rightly be devoted, to the war, other and better methods probably are not adequate to bring income and supply of goods into adjustment.

If there is an attempt made to carry out an over-all price-control program, then there has to be rationing, and I will tell you why. Because to attempt to enforce price control of retail prices without rationing will mean there will be additional reasons and additional inducements to violate the law which will not exist if there is a limit to the amount that people can purchase. And if a person

can only buy so much of a certain article anyway he is not going to pay more than the price it is supposed to be. But if his purchases are limited, then the possibility of the development of black markets is much greater and there is a likelihood that some people whose resources are greater will get more than their share of scarce commodities. This would be unfair.

I have hoped all along that because we are fighting for democracy we could give as much practical expression to that as possible. I think that could be done in connection with this proposed directive to the War Labor Board about wage increases. I would suggest, for example, that wages of less than 50 cents an hour might be exempted from such freezing until they at least reached that point. The reason I say that is because already the cost of living has increased sharply. In the case of well-paid labor, if we are going to actually prevent the rise of all factors in the cost of living, then I believe it would be fair and no doubt necessary to stabilize wages as other things are to be stabilized. In any case I will stand behind this part of the program if the other parts I have mentioned are effectively carried out. Nevertheless, it seems to me in the case of the really low-paid groups it could be regarded in a different light. Some price adjustments might be necessary but they would have the result only of bringing into better adjustment those goods which war brings less in proportion to other goods than they really should.

I have said I was eager to get all controversies out of the way so we could settle down to our one big job—that of winning the war. I make the following suggestion in the hope it may help to accomplish that purpose. The so-called 40-hour week controversy is now pretty well understood to be a wage question rather than one of hours of labor, upon which of course there is no existing limitation. No one I have talked to advocates a general wage cut at this time. Certainly it would not be good or wise or fair policy. But if the 40-hour week is changed to a basic 48-hour week for the duration of the war, as does, I agree, sound logical, then, since a great proportion of workers are now working 48 hours or more, the net result would be about an 8-percent reduction in weekly earnings. Why could not this controversy be resolved by suspending the 40-hour week for the duration of the war and making the basic workweek 48 hours, but at the same time granting, say, a 5-percent increase in basic wage rates—at least to workers now making wages of less than $1 an hour? Then put into effect the proposed "directive" to the War Labor Board against further wage increases, provided effective control of the cost of living is attained.

In this manner the psychological concern of so many people over this 40-hour-week proposition would be ended without harm to any group. The sum total of wages paid would be about the same as now, and the basis would be effectively laid for settlement now of all controversial issues. That, I believe, is very, very important—the most important single thing of all.

Every hour of every day we must bear in mind that these measures which we may now be forced by the war to take are war measures and hence must be of limited duration—limited to the period of the war. Thought must be given to what comes afterward. It must be part of our task now to be able to tell the young men who fight this war that there will be jobs for them—jobs for them all—and hope for a brighter tomorrow when the war is over. The job of post-war reconstruction cannot be undertaken overnight when the war has been won. But, unless we are ready to do it, we shall have difficulty in eliminating some of these measures of control and restriction over the lives of our people, and we must be resolved that we will do that just as soon as the war is won. I think I have made plain that I am ready to do all things that will advance our winning this war. But my job, and the job of other Members, does not end there. There is this other job, too, and on our giving assurance we can and will do it much will depend.

A PROPOSAL FOR TAXATION

Therefore, if we can devise methods of taxation and control of cost of living which will help to solve the problem of post-war reconstruction, so much the better, particularly if such methods fit in with the needs of the present hour.

I am opposed to a general sales tax on necessities of life. The primary reasons are: First, that we cannot afford to cut down on poor people's consumption of things they really need, and a general sales tax will have that result; and, second, that a general sales tax inevitably will have a tendency to drive retail prices upward and will, therefore, work in the opposite direction from the one in which we are trying to go.

But there are a great many commodities which are definite luxuries, and there are others which, whether luxuries or not, we must do everything we can to conserve for military purposes. With regard to such commodities, therefore, consumption taxes will be a help in bringing about the very curtailment of particular types of consumption, which is so important and will also tend to bring about a greater degree of equity among the people.

It is therefore suggested that with regard to this second category of commodities there be imposed consumption taxes on a scale commensurate with the importance of conservation for military purposes on the one hand and the element of luxury on the other. Such taxes might be pretty severe in the percentage of tax levied—even running as high as 50 or 75 percent in some cases. People who chose to purchase such things would simply be paying for the privilege of such consumption. Revenues would be very large indeed, I believe, from such taxes. But in order to introduce the element of helping to meet the post-war problem, at the time the tax was paid on such commodities, the purchaser would receive a special type of war tax-savings stamp, for half the amount of the tax. Such stamps would be convertible into war tax-savings bonds of convenient denomination. Such bonds should, I believe, not bear interest. But they would be redeemable at any time after the end of the war. Thus a backlog of consumer buying power would be built up which would, after the war, give our economic system an assurance of a strong demand by consumers over a considerable period. Careful analysis of this proposal will, I believe, show that it contains many elements of sound policy for the existing situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MILK SHOULD NOT BE DESTROYED

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to comment on the statements that have been made here in the House with reference to a very important subject; and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] for calling the attention of the House on April 20 to a very important question, namely, the processing of whole and separated milk into a form wherein it can be easily transported to hungry people who need this vital life-giving product.

The American people received a terrible shock when figures were released showing the enormous number of young men who have been rejected for military service because of physical defects. Various reasons have been given for this condition, the outstanding reason given being that of malnutrition.

This condition has forcefully been called to the attention of the American public by Dr. Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, when he admonished large milk companies against the destruction of milk that is so necessary in preserving the health of our people.

It seems a strange thing to me that our Government should threaten a housewife with prosecution who hoards a pound of sugar without reporting it and then takes no action whatever against a large milk outfit which announces it is going to destroy 250,000 quarts of separated milk a day and divert it to other uses. It may be necessary to put a person in jail for improperly representing his sugar holdings, and I am not defending the hoarding of sugar, but along comes a large milk concern to destroy completely the food value of 250,000 quarts per day of milk without fat, enough to feed the entire child population of Utah, Nevada, and New Mexico. Why does our Government threaten to jail a housewife who hoards a pound of sugar and say nothing whatsoever to a concern that would destroy food in such a high-handed manner?

I charge specifically that this plan to destroy milk was announced in open defiance of the Surgeon General of the

United States Public Health Service, exactly 26 days after the American Chemical Society recorded Dr. Parran's statement that milk and milk products should not be destroyed or diverted to industrial uses until we have utilized them to the fullest extent as foods.

I am asking the Surgeon General to make open warfare upon this process of destroying milk at a time when our shipments of powdered milk to our Allies are woefully behind schedule. I am writing him today that, in my opinion, the American people will not tolerate this inhuman process in the destruction of food.

It is my hope that the War Production Board will refuse priority on materials that would be used to construct new machinery necessary in the processing of milk into synthetic cloth.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Am I correct or not—I have been told that there are approximately 61,000,000 quarts of separated milk that are wasted daily which might be converted into this form and be a very effective food for the people?

Mr. GRANGER. I believe the gentleman has the same information as I. I understand that is the situation; it is one that ought to be corrected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And is it not true that the nutritive value of this milk would be perhaps of determining importance with regard to our own people on the one hand and to the people of any other country we are attempting to ship things on the other?

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his observations; I think he is entirely right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PARTISAN POLITICS AND THE WAR EFFORT DO NOT MIX

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, partisan politics and war efforts will not mix. Our primary campaign is now pending in my congressional district and some of the candidates who are seeking the seat I hold are injecting into the campaign purely partisan issues and false charges against me as a Member of Congress which are undermining and destroying unity and concerted efforts in the prosecution of the war. I maintain our job now is to win the war and not to engage in petty politics for selfish purposes. I have supported our Commander in Chief in the war program and our entire war efforts 100 percent, and will continue to do so. Furthermore, before the dastardly attack by the Japanese upon Pearl Harbor I advocated and supported an all-out impregnable national defense and aid to Britain and her allies so far as lay within our power, including all lease-lend appropriations.

Notwithstanding these unwarranted attacks, I will not return to Oregon for the primary election. I will not desert my post here in Congress to campaign against these baseless charges. Far-reaching measures having to do with the successful prosecution of the war are pending here in the Congress. I feel it is my duty to remain on the job here and to do all within my power to help solve these problems and the winning of the war. We are faced with the greatest crisis of all our national existence. We are locked in a life-and-death struggle, with the enemy at our throats. Our boys in American uniforms on land and sea and in the air are being ruthlessly killed on a dozen battle fronts. Loyal Americans should unite to beat off the enemy and save America. It is no time to engage in purely partisan political dog fights for selfish purposes, which some are seeking to inject into the Oregon primary congressional election in my district. It is part and parcel of the attacks being made throughout the Nation against the President, the administration war leaders, and the Members of Congress. These selfish attacks are destroying national unity and are impeding and scuttling our war efforts and are giving aid and comfort to our enemies, who, with ferocious cunning and efficiency, are seeking our destruction. These peddlers of false statements, hate, and disunity are doing as much to defeat America as if they were paid Jap and Nazi propagandists.

It is of small concern to the Nation whether I am reelected to Congress or one of my opponents is selected. It is of great importance, however, that the morale and unity of the American people be maintained in the prosecution of the war to save the life of our Nation. It is important that the President and his war aides and the Members of the Congress be allowed to perform their full duties unhampered by vicious partisan attacks and false charges with respect to their official duties while they are engaged in helping to prosecute the war to victory.

Mr. Speaker, I personally have been too long in public life to be thin-skinned or to resent any examination or criticism of my acts as a public servant and Member of the Congress. These criticisms, however, to which I refer, are not against me as an individual, or the other Members of the Congress as individuals, or the President or his aides as individuals, but are against each of us as public officials engaged in the performance of our public duties. The false charges can have only one purpose and effect, and that is, to break down the morale, destroy the unity, and sabotage the prosecution of the war. Furthermore, they are made by private individuals for purely private personal reasons in the hope that they may thereby obtain a political job, notwithstanding in doing so they help to destroy our own country and aid and abet our enemies. Mr. Donald Nelson, at the head of the War Production Board, in an address to the Nation recently, called attention to the evil effects of false criticisms and charges against our public officials charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war, when he said:

> Beware of the man who instills doubt in your mind. He may not be Hitler's agent, but he is doing that agent's work. Let me repeat once more, groundless fears of a few people could bog down the whole effort.
>
> The enemy is clever at this sort of thing. He has done it successfully before. He knows that this is his crucial test. Unless he can divide this Nation now; unless he can set one group against another; unless he can make us fear each other; unless he can lead us into the same pitfalls he prepared for the people of France and Norway and all the rest of them; unless he can do these things to our people, then he is licked.

Mr. Speaker, the G. O. P. has gone all-out for war victory. The Republican National Committee, meeting in Chicago on April 21, adopted resolutions which put the party definitely and squarely on record as being 100 percent behind the Commander in Chief and the war program. I give full support to these resolutions. These resolutions pledge the party to demand and support the prosecution of an offensive war, relentlessly and without reservation, until the United States and its Allies have won a complete victory from their enemies. These party leaders demand that there be no peace with our enemies except peace with victory, and that appeasement and compromise be banned.

An important stand taken by the committee by unanimous approval is that which recognizes the post-war responsibility of the United States and its obligation to assist in bringing about an understanding, comity, and cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and the ravages of war may not again be forced upon us and upon all of the free and peace-loving peoples of the earth. The adoption of this resolution definitely shows that isolation, so far as the Republican National Committee is concerned, is as dead as the dodo bird. As Senator BROOKS, of Illinois, said at the meeting, "The issue of isolation is dead; it was sunk at Pearl Harbor." With the United States engaged in an all-out war, having as its allies many nations throughout the globe, and fighting on dozens of battle fronts in both hemispheres, it is idle to say that the so-called doctrine of isolationism is an issue in America today. I am in full accord with this position taken by my party leaders.

The committee went on record on a number of other equally important issues confronting the American people in this tragic hour of our national existence, demanding that the Nation call upon American men and women, regardless of party or affiliation, to do the jobs that must be done if we are to win, to do them most efficiently and quickly, and demanding the elimination of all nonessential expenditures, and particularly the many frivolous and nonessential activities, such as those inaugurated by the O. C. D., which require tax dollars and drain the manpower of our country away from war efforts. Among these useless activities referred to by the committee was placed also the 30,000 employees now engaged in propaganda service in the numerous bureaus and departments in Washington and elsewhere duplicating and disseminating misinformation. The committee took a definite stand against excess war profits and the

lack of governmental coordination and organization in our whole war effort.

As a part of my remarks, I include the complete text of the resolution adopted by the Republican National Committee, which is:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Whereas the Republican Party from its origin has been dedicated to the cause of human liberty, and has not hesitated to advocate that cause, or to fight for it, even at the cost of human life; and

Whereas an alliance of lawless and Godless enemies of our civilization have wrecked free institutions in many parts of the world, have enslaved whole nations, have treacherously attacked the soil of the United States, and are conspiring to overthrow the Republic; and

Whereas the people of the United States as other free peoples, who have agreed to call themselves the United Nations, are now engaged in a great war to wipe out those aggressors.

COMPLETE VICTORY DEMANDED

We, the members of the Republican National Committee, assembled in Chicago, April 20, 1942, hereby resolve:

1. We demand the prosecution of an offensive war, relentlessly and without reservation, whatever it may cost in wealth, energy, or human life, until the United States and its Allies have won a complete victory over their enemies.

2. We will recognize no peace with those enemies except peace with victory, and we will never entertain any proposals of peace until such victory be won. There shall be no appeasement or compromise.

3. We realize that after this war the responsibility of the Nation will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States; that our Nation has an obligation to assist in the bringing about of an understanding, comity, and cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and that the blighting and destructive processes of war may not again be forced upon us and upon the free and peace-loving peoples of the earth

TWO-PARTY SYSTEM UPHELD

4. We pledge to preserve the two-party system, to guarantee the continuance of our present American constitutional form of government, and the sacred safeguard provided in our Bill of Rights for ourselves and for future free Americans. We further pledge the preservation of our present system of individual initiative and private enterprise.

5. That through informed and aroused public opinion and through our elected representatives in Congress, we will be a constructive and energetic force in the conduct of the war effort and will urge upon the administration in power whatever measures seem necessary to that end.

6. Specifically we demand: (a) The selection of men and women best fitted to do the job, regardless of party affiliation or economic status, and also the weeding out of inappropriate and unfit political appointments throughout the Government's war machinery; (b) the drastic reduction of all nonessential war expenditures and the conservation of the resources of the Nation to the essential and direct purpose of winning the war; (c) the elimination of nonessential domestic regulations and demand the concentration of our minds and manpower against the enemy.

AID PLEDGED TO NEEDY

7. That the Republican Party pledges itself to seek and to find a solution for the social and economic problems which trouble this Nation, so that no man or class of men shall be penalized or receive less than is his with justice; that equal and free opportunity shall be granted to all, in order that each may earn the legitimate reward of security for himself and for his family.

8. We will vigorously oppose any effort by the administration to use the war emergency as an excuse for the extension in domestic affairs of unsound economic panaceas. We realize that the correction of certain injustices can be made under the pressure of war which years of peaceful effort have failed to bring about, such as, for instance, the discrimination against the Negro citizen in industry, in labor, and in the armed services of the Nation. Such things we do not consider in the realm of social experiment. They are wrongs under the Constitution and we shall work to correct them.

9. Today, in Washington, 30,000 employees are engaged in the propaganda service of the various departments, resulting in duplication and misinformation. We demand that all such services be reduced to a minimum and combined into one agency dedicated to telling the people the truth, within the limits of military advisability. We point out that the publication of bad news should not be withheld for any political reason or from any false notion of its effect on public morale.

10. We declare our conviction that no individual or group of individuals should profit excessively from this war and that there should be equitable distribution of its tragic burdens among our people

11. We demand that our Government coordinate our diplomatic, military, naval, and air strategy so that we shall not be taken by surprise, with further disastrous results.

12. Inasmuch as lack of organization is an outstanding weakness of the present administration, we urge that the formulation of policies to the end that the conduct of the war may be under the unified command and not by divided staff committees.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a very fine statement by W. Henson Purcell, of West Frankfort, Ill., made to his son, Bill, as he left for the Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MISTAKES IN MOVEMENT OF WAR MATERIAL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, every patriotic American is deeply and sincerely interested in doing everything possible to facilitate and expedite the war effort of the Nation. Whatever interferes with the maximum production of the material necessary for winning the war is sabotage and is giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Regardless by what name it is called, whether it is neglect, indifference, ignorance, or inefficiency, the result is exactly the same.

Not to be critical, but rather to be helpful, I call the attention of the House and the country to some statements appearing in a publication called The Detroiter, in the issue of April 20, 1942. This pamphlet is issued weekly by the Board of Commerce of the City of Detroit. These facts should come, and I hope will come, to the notice of the proper agency of the Government in order that conditions of the kind described, reflecting what appears at least on the surface as gross inefficiency, might be corrected and the war effort of the Nation made more efficient. In this week's issue of The Detroiter appears the item that through the Office of Defense Transportation an order has been issued effective May 1, 1942, imposing a prohibition upon moving less-than-carload-lot merchandise cars that contain less than 12,000 pounds in order to save car days. But, says the article, the same Government, through our War Department, specifies routing on war material made in Detroit from Detroit to Fort Knox, Ky., over a route 430 miles longer than the shortest workable route.

Certainly the traffic manager in any industrial plant producing consumer goods in time of peace, if guilty of such gross incompetence as indicated by that statement, would be discharged immediately from his position, and somebody who knew the subject would be employed to take his place. The same rule ought to apply to those entrusted with the responsibility of the moving of war materials in our Government.

Here are other examples of what appears to the average citizen, and I believe will impress the Members of the House in the same way, of gross inefficiency. A bill of lading for a shipment to Bay City, Mich., specified a certain motor freight line, which does not operate to Bay City. Irrecoverable time was lost straightening this out. A vital precision machine tool was made in Detroit for a Cleveland factory. It was needed right now. The Detroit plant worked through Saturday and Sunday, time and a half and double time. Then it took 3 days, over three railroads, to reach Cleveland, 180 miles away. It could have been shipped overnight by truck-trailer, which is preferred for delicate precision machines anyway.

A leading chemical company had a rush order for a carload of material. The material was produced on schedule and loaded on a freight car available on the company's siding—where it stood for 3 days until routing instructions were received.

A lathe manufacturer in southern Ohio loaded and blocked a lathe on a truck-trailer, hauled it 3 miles to a siding, reloaded it on a flatcar, and blocked it down again. Then it made the trip by rail—15 miles. The same truck-trailer could have delivered it in 1 hour easily.

A Detroit firm ships shell cases to Ohio, the haul taking 2 to 3 days by the specified route, when it could be made overnight.

These examples indicate what happens when someone behind a desk in Washington attempts to regulate and conduct the industrial life of the Nation and operates on theory rather than experience and knowledge. I venture the assertion that conditions of this kind do not apply alone to the war effort of the Nation but also to other activities of the Government. In order to eliminate and prevent mistakes so glaring as these pointed out, let men of experience and with a knowledge of the work to be done be called to the Government service.

Traffic bottlenecks such as I have described have hindered our war production. They have resulted from inexperience rather than indifference or lack

of interest. A delay of even 1 day may be serious, and these unnecessary delays are very serious indeed. Men who direct the armed forces of the United States would not tolerate unnecessary delays for a moment. It might not only be fatal to the lives of many men but be fatal to the war effort and defense of the Nation.

Matters of traffic control should be left to those who have had experience and know the subject, and the Government should make full use of their knowledge and experience. I desire to quote a statement appearing in the publication I have referred to, namely, The Detroiter, in regard to this matter. The title of it is "Consignee: MacArthur, Rush."

Industrial traffic managers know how to get material to and from their plants better than anybody else, because they've been doing it for years. They've had to do it efficiently, under sink-or-swim competitive conditions; otherwise they and their companies could never have survived.

They know by experience when to use highway, railway, airway, or waterway to get results—and how and when to shift from one to another quickly in an emergency. They know all of the short cuts and detours, of which there are many. They work with their sleeves up and at close range.

They're anxious to help win the war. They want to contribute their proven knowledge, experience, and ability, but they are being wasted—permitted to use only a fraction of their ability.

On virtually all Government orders, bills of lading—shipping orders—specify the routing. They are provided by Government officials who are handicapped by these factors:

First. These men are possibly hundreds of miles from the operation.

Second. They are unfamiliar with each factory's facilities, subassembly connections, etc.

Third. They are unaware of local emergency situations that are constantly arising.

The industrial traffic managers have no authority to change the specified routing in the least detail, even though following it may mean days of delay, piling up of stocks on loading docks, congestion in freight yards, and a general slow-down of production effort and morale.

The traffic managers of America will gladly accept this responsibility. They'll turn in a grand job, too.

The aid of these men is needed now, but it will be needed a great deal more within a few months. Authorities say that by midsummer all highway, railway, and waterway equipment will be in use to capacity, but our war production will not yet be in high gear. The efficient routing of shipments will then be even more vital. We'll need all of the experience, resources, and brains we can muster.

Give the industrial traffic managers a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DESTRUCTIVE LABOR LEGISLATION NOT NEEDED

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, before the Easter holidays the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], one of the authors of the proposed labor legislation, advocated a short recess, so that Members of Congress could go home and visit with their constituents and learn their views about this kind of legislation.

Personally, I thought this a fine idea, and when this opportunity was afforded me, I did this, only to learn the people were not interested in Mr. VINSON's labor legislation or any other labor legislation at this time, but were all vitally and tremendously interested in winning the war and were opposed to any legislation that might cause confusion or disturb the fine unity of feeling and confidence that now exists between capital and labor.

I found every shop, factory, mine, and mill working to capacity night and day, 24 hours a day, 6 days a week, some even working 7 days a week. Can any man by legislation or drive under the whip and spur exact more?

When I observed the will and eagerness of these men as they stood before blazing blast furnaces, turning out tons of steel products used to fashion war munitions for our boys who are fighting a last battle for democracy, so that you and I and our Government might live, I thought that men who now occupy positions of legislative power must be active and thorough indeed to be worthy of the confidence placed in us, and as such legislators, we should strive for unity and singleness of purpose, and not seek to create chaos and distrust among the laboring people of our country. All that the laboring people ask of Congress is that they be let alone, so they may work and fight against Hitler and the Japs.

If anyone has any doubt about what the American workman is thinking about now, it is suggested they listen to the Wheeling steel workmen's program every Sunday afternoon, 5:30 p. m., over the blue network.

Only within the last few days the newspaper headlines boasted "Auto Industry Rapidly Nears Total Conversion." Yet today we are told here in the House of Representatives of the United States that we should pass legislation that will anger and disturb every working man employed in this great effort for war production. Yes, these men are even challenged to come out and strike. The same men, who only a few weeks ago raved and denounced strikes, now ask and invite them. I cannot and will not believe that the Members of this House will aid them by the passage of the proposed labor legislation, in their desires to bring about more and better strikes.

The whole system of political economy in America is based around the profit system; the right to a decent profit for investment and industry, of course, is essential to its success, but according to some of our legislators, this policy cannot and must not apply to labor.

Of course the profits system can only exist under a democratic form of government. Are we to understand that this democratic government shall only protect and aid investment and industry, and that labor must be under the control of industrial dictatorship?

Is it the belief of this Congress that labor must surrender its earnings and profits to swell the already fattened income of industry? Well, if that is the idea, it is very doubtful if it will work.

If the laboring man in this country ever becomes convinced that he and he alone must sacrifice and pay the price of war and is to be forever denied the right to participate in our profit system, then how can Congress, by the enactment of statutes, compel or induce him to support this policy on the battlefield or in the workshop? If he is to be forever denied the right of citizenship, then that citizenship means nothing to him in his hopes for the future.

Let us not push the labor of this country too far by destructive legislation, in order to secure profits for investment and industry, for fear we may destroy the things we need most to win the war against the dictators—unity and singleness of purpose to fight and fight until victory is ours.

I deny the repeated statements that the young men of America now serving in the Army, favor this legislation. If the gentlemen who make these statements are speaking for the squawking silverspoon group, who never in their whole lives earned an honest dollar—yes. But if they attempt to speak for the other 90 percent of our Army, who sprang from the ranks of labor, sons of the sinews of toil, it is as grotesque as it is false.

Does anyone seriously believe that men who enlisted from the mines, mills, workshops, and factories of America are desirous that a supine or reactionary Congress destroy every vestige of protection labor has secured for itself from a reluctant Congress during the past 50 years? Of course not.

Does anyone believe that these sons of toil desire to deny to their fathers and brothers left at home, the right to contract with their employer, the amount of wage they shall receive, and hours of employment? Of course not.

Does anyone believe that this 90 percent of our Army want to return home only to learn that every protection of their job was taken from them while they were away fighting for liberty on foreign battlefields? Can you visualize such a homecoming? Are some so blind they insist upon fighting a second civil war for the same underlying causes as the first?

Labor peace is not only possible, it is here. Union labor, industry, and Government have agreed that there shall be no strikes and there are no strikes existing.

But the gentleman from Virginia—coauthor of the bill—if quoted rightly by his most favorable press, is disturbed by this peace and unity and declares "Let's pass a law that will make 'em strike. Let's find out whether the union is running this country."

Thus he makes of this bill not a salutary effort to prevent strikes, but issues a challenge to come and create as many strikes as possible—unity and preparedness be damned.

Is anyone in America so unsophisticated as to believe that American labor will submit tamely to these taunts and insults, if supported by legislation passed by the Congress of the United States?

Never in the history of the United States were there so many people acting

under patriotic motives. Every fellow who is seeking to restrict labor and put it in a strait jacket during the period of the war is only seeking to do this in the name of patriotism, regardless of the fact that even in 1934 he opposed the National Labor Relations Act and every bill since that time that mentioned labor.

Every person who is seeking to restrict, hamstring, and lasso business likewise claims he is doing this in the name of patriotism and war.

Let us cut out the stalling and admit we have always believed in the way we are now voting and working.

How Congress can believe it can deny either of these great and powerful groups of Americans their rights under our present laws, against their consent, and still maintain unity of purpose among those affected, is beyond me. Maybe some of those insisting upon such legislation can enlighten us. If ever Congress needed knowledge on this subject, it is needed now.

It seems to drive some men to the verge of insanity to learn that for the first time in our history 10,000,000 members of labor unions are receiving and earning a fair living wage.

The real intent and purpose of the sponsors of this kind of legislation is to prevent the right of labor to organize. Why do not they meet the issue squarely by the introduction of a bill that will meet this issue, and not attempt to accomplish this end by subterfuge?

Instead of trying to forge bonds for labor and shackles for business, we should be trying to create unity and not discord and hatred among our citizens.

We should be supporting our great leader, his Army and his Navy, in trying to win the war, instead of spending our time in denouncing him, his leaders, and appointees, whoever they may be.

We cannot win this war by hate or usurpation of power. The Constitution grants to the President the right to conduct this war. But these attempts to stir up hatred and discord among our citizens is nothing new. It is as old as Brutus. Yes; it is as old as human perfidy. Oppression always comes in the name of liberty. Let us stop fighting labor. Let us use all our energy, wealth, and power to win this war. Let us fight the Japs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin entitled "Forests Are a War Front."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARE for 2 days (May 1 and 2) on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., April 24, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6912, to repeal section 404 of title XI of the United States Code, 1940 edition (with respect to composition of indebtedness of local taxing agencies), at 10 a. m. on Monday, April 27, room 346, House Office Building.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments) at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1593. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1594. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 21, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Meherrin River, N. C. and Va., with a view to determining whether improvements in the interest of navigation and flood control are advisable, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 15, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1595. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2042. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments in United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2043. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments in United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6955. A bill to promote the prosecution of the war by exempting from State Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property for use in performing defense contracts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr CARTWRIGHT: Committee on Roads. H. R. 6908. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; with amendment (Rept. No 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr HUNTER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6953. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union

Mr McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R 6979. A bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6980. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital and domiciliary facility at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6981. A bill to amend subdivision 1 of section 302 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, by providing for a 15-percent increase in wages for all persons employed on projects of the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2711. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of Miss S. Jennie Fisher, of Shamokin, and sundry other citizens, requesting passage of Senate bill 860 prohibiting sale of alcoholic liquors among the land and naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2712. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 23 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of New York, signed by Mary Ware Dennett, chairman, World Federalists, New York committee for a democratic world government, calling for a convention of representatives of all free peoples, to frame a world federal constitution under which this country may unite in the establishment and maintenance of order through democratic world government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2713. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., favoring enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of daylight-saving time superimposed upon the war time now in effect throughout the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2714. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the San Francisco Civilian Defense Council, resolving that the necessary Federal Government authorities be requested at the earliest possible moment to provide San Francisco and its fire department with additional fire apparatus and such other necessary equipment as will properly and adequately protect said port and water front of San Francisco against said increased fire hazards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2715. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce relative to the Division of Industry Operations, War Production Board, establishing a priority procedure for various business establishments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Very Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, by whose mercy's grace we are led to yield ourselves utterly to Thee in moments of devotion: Do Thou now inspire us with an infinite desire to seek repose and hope among the things eternal. Guardian of our happy hours, which Thou dost feed with heavenly dew, teach us, we beseech Thee, to save from each swiftly passing moment some ray of light sufficient to illume the pathway of the life that Thou didst give to crown at last with everlasting day.

Keep us from selfish pining o'er the share of human pain and ill that we must bear, making us mindful only of the sufferings of others, that we may lose the selfish longings and the vain regrets of days agone in the love which is of Thee and which, indeed, Thou art. We humbly offer our petitions in the Name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 20, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REGISTRATION OF SENATORS AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the information of Members of the Senate, I wish to announce that, through the courtesy of Colonel Halsey, our efficient Secretary, arrangements have been made for the registration of those Senators between the ages of 45 and 65, in the rotunda of the Capitol next Monday, April 27, 9 a. m. to 4:30 p. m.

Cards will be provided for each Senator which can be filled out in advance, but the card must be signed in the presence of the registrar and handed in person to the registrar in the rotunda on Monday.

This service necessarily is limited to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1801 An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving; Thomas G. Irving, Sr.; J. E. Irving; Mata D. Irving; L. T. Dale; and Amelia Dale;

S. 2202 An act to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases; and

S 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased;

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck; and

S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 11, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 75, 76, and 80 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4, 21, 45, 74, and 79 to the bill and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its

disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 68 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1147. An act for the relief of Dr. Henry Clay Risner;

H. R. 1578. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and 1919, which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937, awarding the said Carl G. Allgrunn the sum of $56,043.76 with interest thereon, on which judgment the said Carl G. Allgrunn was paid on or about April 11, 1938, the sum of $119,030.80;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 2369. An act for the relief of Rachib Shriay;

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 2978. An act for the relief of Merle E. Rudy;

H. R. 3176. An act for the relief of Agnes Brodahl;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-A-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4251. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 4370. An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4743. An act providing for the naturalization of certain wives and children of citizens of the United States who lost citizenship through service in the allied forces during the first World War;

H. R. 4923. An act for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased;

H. R. 4934. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood;

H. R. 5329. An act for the relief of J. J. McIntosh;

H. R. 5385. An act for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin;

H. R. 5499. An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley;

H. R. 5503. An act to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings;

H. R. 5627. An act for the relief of Gerney M Claiborne;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madelline Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 5861. An act to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of E. A. Williams;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch;

H. R. 5966. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6080. An act authorizing the county of Lawrence, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6657. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6671. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 6818. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6927. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1942, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1541) for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following report and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL ANTHRACITE COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE ANTHRACITE AREA

A report from the Federal Anthracite Commission, signed by PATRICK J. BOLAND, chairman, and other members of the Commission, addressed to the President of the Senate, submitted pursuant to House Joint Resolution 255, on economic conditions in the anthracite area, with certain recommendations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

LEGISLATION BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Three letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Whereas the workmen of Puerto Rico, the same as the workmen of the United States, are willing to make the greatest sacrifices in order to contribute to the success of the defense plans impelled by the administration of President Roosevelt, for safeguarding democracy in the world; and

"Whereas, given the spirit of loyalty and of patriotism which prevails among the working masses of Puerto Rico we consider it feasible to give to the administration and to all the war enterprises the maximum effort and cooperation of a voluntary basis, without in any way impairing the gains which our labor legislation represent: Now therefore

"The Senate of Puerto Rico resolves:

"1. To solidarize itself with the policy of President Roosevelt, of the War Production Board, and of the labor organizations, preferring the voluntary renunciation of labor of the right to strike and of the limitations of the working day.

"2. To declare that the voluntary renunciation to which the preceding paragraph refers shall not affect the right which the laborers have to earn the highest wages that may be compatible with their financial and cultural needs and with the present state of emergency.

"3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the presidents of the American Federation of Labor and of the Committee of Industrial Organizations."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Comus, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WALSH:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish the 40-hour-workweek provision of law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A memorial of sundry citizens, members of Progressive Lodge, No. 462, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, of Lowell and vicinity, in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish the 40-hour-workweek provision of law or the enactment of other legislation which may be detrimental to the interests of labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of members of Local Union No. 634, International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, of Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish the 40-hour-workweek provision of law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of Leavenworth County (Kans.) Post, No. 144, the American Legion, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a Service Corps to be a part of the Service of Supply under the War Department, to be composed of men who are ineligible to become members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Cottonwood Quarterly Meeting of Friends (representing five congregations), convening at Emporia, Kans., favoring diversion for the duration of the war of sugar, molasses, and other similar products from the manufacture of beverage alcohol to the uses of the defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Miami County, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

DEFERMENT IN THE DRAFT OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, a letter embodying a resolution addressed to me and signed by citizens of Washington County, Kans., urging the deferment of farm labor needed in agriculture.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Whereas we are interested members of agriculture production, deeply appreciate action of Congress in seeking draft deferment to those skilled in farming and essential to the operation of a particular farm;

Therefore we, the undersigned farmers and businessmen, do hereby earnestly and respectfully request the United States Senate and our House of Representatives in Congress to extend their consideration to the farm-labor consideration.

You are urged to appeal to the United States Congress for the enactment of legislation which will authorize the local boards to grant farmers deferment. At the present rate of taking them into the service it is exhausting the farmer rolls from a highly productive community such as this is.

It is a mistaken idea that one man can take care of 300 to 400 acres of farmland. It would b impossible for a man to give a farm of such size the attention required to produce the maximum yield.

Asking for your influence for early and speedy legislation to remedy the situation,

Respectfully,
ERNEST SCHRAMM.
HENRY SCHRAMM.
(And sundry other citizens of Washington County, Kans.).

DEFENSE SPENDING—RESOLUTION OF WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB, OTTAWA, KANS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution concerning defense spending adopted by the Women's Republican Club of the Second Congressional District of Kansas. The resolution is signed by Clara B. Staadt, as chairman, and four other committee members.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

As members of the Women's Republican Club of the Second Congressional District here assembled this 17th day of March 1942, of Ottawa, Kans., we do hereby suggest the following resolution:

Whereas we believe the main objective at the present time is to win the war; and

Whereas we believe the present administration is spending large sums of money unwisely for nondefense activities,

Now, therefore, we, the Women's Republican Club of the Second Congressional District, at Ottawa, Kans., the 17th day of March 1942, do recommend that our Representatives in the Congress of the United States insist our money be spent for actual defense needs which will lead to ultimate victory for the democracies.

CLARA B. STAADT, *Chairman.*
MRS. FRANK D. BELINDER.
MRS. JOHN SEITZ.
GLADINE HARRIS.
LUCILLE F. MCCREATH.

RESOLUTIONS, ETC., FROM KANSAS CONCERNING PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by Pottawatomie Grange, No. 1502, regarding the conduct of the war, and signed by Mr. Ray Moody, member of the executive committee of the grange.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREELEY, KANS., *April 13, 1942.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Be it resolved that the Pottawatomie Grange, No. 1502, go on record as strongly opposed to the 40-hour-week; that the United States discard it for the duration; and be it further resolved that we endorse a 48-hour week, or longer, if necessary, until the war is won; and that capital and labor stop this pussyfooting over these war contracts, and we sincerely believe that if capital and labor will not cooperate willingly to draft them, the same as our soldiers; and that copies of these resolutions be sent to both of our Senators, to our Congressman, to the master of the National Grange, and to the President of the United States.

RAY MOODY,
Member of Executive Committee,
Pottawatomie Grange, No. 1502.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred a petition regarding labor and the conduct of the war signed by Mr. L. E. Cranston and 33 other residents of Augusta, Kans.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

KIWANIS CLUB,
Augusta, Kans., April 16, 1942.

To the Senators and Representatives from Kansas, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of Kansas, address this letter to you because at the present time we feel deeply alarmed over the safety of our country. You are our legally elected representatives and alone possess the power to voice our sentiments in the councils of the Nation. This being the case, we want you to know how we feel about certain things.

First. We feel that both Congress and the President have been too slow to settle the labor question. We want every factory in America to work 7 days a week and 7 nights a week in order to produce ships, guns, tanks, planes, and other supplies that are needed by our armed forces. No individual or group is bigger than the Nation as a whole, and we think that the Government should establish fair and honest wage levels, stop all strikes, and see to it that all important industries work to the limit of their capacity.

Second. We think that all money necessary to carry out a successful war should be appropriated and spent in a proper manner, but we think all unnecessary expenses should be immediately curtailed or abolished. We are perfectly willing to give up all we possess to win this war, but we do not consider it patriotic or even sensible to waste money on

nondefense projects which could be dispensed with.

Third. We think that any individual, no matter how big or little, who hinders the successful organization of the entire forces of this Nation against its enemies should be promptly removed from office. We want speed. The Germans and Japs are conquering the world faster than anyone ever dreamed was possible.

At a time like this, we expect you to be true leaders and not politicians. Instead of the Government wanting the people to wake up, we, the people, want the Government to wake up. Our enemies say this is a war to the death. If so, we do not propose to be the side which dies.

In the name of our loved ones and of our country, we sign:

L. E. CRANSTON
(And sundry other citizens),

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to present and have appropriately referred a petition, identical with the petition just presented by me, regarding labor and the conduct of the war, signed by Mr. Robert A. Brown and 15 other citizens of Arkansas City Kans.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COMMON COUNCIL OF HARTFORD, CONN.—PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Court of Common Council of Hartford, Conn., at a meeting held on April 13, 1942, and sent to me by John A. Gleason, town and city clerk.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That whereas misguided Congressmen who prior to the national emergency have consistently voted against all progressive legislation are promoting a change in the wages-and-hours law; and

Whereas it is established by the testimony of Donald M. Nelson that overtime pay is not affecting war production; and

Whereas any lowering of living standards will seriously affect the morale of American workers engaged in all-out production: Be it

Resolved, That this court of common council request our Congressmen to accept the recommendation of Donald M. Nelson and refrain from legislation which would destroy standards of which the American people have been so proud and for which labor and the sons of labor are now fighting.

SLOW-DOWNS IN DEFENSE PRODUCTION—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL DEFENDERS ASSOCIATION, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter which I have received from John Kenny, of 640 Franklin Avenue, Hartford, Conn., together with copy of a resolution adopted by the National Defenders Association, Inc.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENDERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., April 15, 1942.

The Honorable FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the directors of the Colt Chapter, National Defenders Association, Inc., held in Hartford, on Wednesday, March 11, 1942, the enclosed resolution was unanimously passed and we herewith respectfully submit a copy for your consideration and approval.

Our purpose behind this resolution is to eventually attain maximum production of everything that is so vital and necessary to our Nation at this time.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN KENNY,
Commander.

The National Defenders' Association, Hartford, Conn., in meeting assembled passed the following resolution:

"Whereas Mr. Nelson and Mr. Knudsen in radio broadcasts and press releases have mentioned that slow-ups in defense production of airplanes, guns, and ships have been blamed by labor on management and in some cases by management on labor, and yet other cases by labor and management on Government officials.

"(1) Be it hereby resolved that we, the National Defenders' Association, Inc., Colt's Chapter, of Hartford, Conn., in meeting assembled, recommend the passage of a Federal statute compelling any United States district attorney, in any Federal district wherein slow-ups in defense production is apparent, to open an investigation on evidence being presented to him which he deems sufficient to warrant investigation of the plant involved.

"(2) He shall be empowered to subpena witnesses, either management or employees, or the Ordnance officers in the district, who may have actual knowledge of the conditions existing in the plant in question He shall also be authorized to call a Federal grand jury to complete his investigation and submit the findings and facts there revealed to a Federal judge in his district.

"(3) Such investigation of any defense plant shall become the first order of business on the docket in said district. Any manager, superintendent, supervisor, foreman, or three employees, of any Ordnance officer submitting an affidavit revealing conditions in a defense plant that seem to interfere with production shall be sufficient cause to open said investigation. The penalty for perjury or the refusal to testify by anyone called as a witness in such an investigation shall be threefold the penalty of any other action at law.

"(4) Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Knudsen, Congressmen and Senators of this district, and to the Attorney General."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2292. A bill for the relief of Vernon E. Deus; without amendment (Rept. No. 1265).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1972. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard, and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; with amendments (Rept. No. 1267).

By Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2404. A bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics; with amendments (Rept. No. 1268).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 2414. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1269).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2451. A bill for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270); and

S. 2469. A bill for the relief of William Edward Fleming; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271)

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is now occupying the chair, I report from the Committee on Appropriations, in his name, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1266) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2473. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2474. A bill authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the construction and operation of plants for the production of alcohol for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2475. A bill to provide reimbursement for the loss of taxes on certain real property acquired by the United States for military or naval purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2476. A bill to provide for the renewal of veterans' 5-year level-premium term policies of insurance for an additional 5-year period; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2477. A bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. REYNOLDS also introduced Senate bill 2479, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2478. A bill to facilitate the prosecution of the war by providing for Federal regulation of sizes and weights of motor vehicles operating on certain highways; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 144, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MEAD:

S. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution relating to the exercise of the elective franchise by members of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

DOUGLAS MacARTHUR DAY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution, which I request be read by the clerk and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating June 11, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance, was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas June 11, 1942, will be the anniversary of the graduation from the United States Military Academy of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; and

Whereas General MacArthur has inspired the peoples of all of the United Nations by his brilliant and heroic leadership of the defending forces in the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas it is fitting that the anniversary of the graduation from the United States Military Academy of one whose career serves as an inspiration to all the members of the armed forces, to the entire American people, and to other free peoples everywhere, should be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That June 11, 1942, is hereby designated as Douglas MacArthur Day.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe June 11, 1942, with suitable patriotic and public exercises as Douglas MacArthur Day.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1147. An act for the relief of Dr. Henry Clay Risner;

H. R. 1578. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and 1919, which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937, awarding the said Carl G. Allgrunn the sum of $56,043.76 with interest thereon, on which judgment the said Carl G. Allgrunn was paid on or about April 11, 1938, the sum of $119,030.60;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 3176. An act for the relief of Agnes Brodahl;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 4251. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 4370. An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4923. An act for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood;

H. R. 5329. An act for the relief of J. J. McIntosh;

H. R. 5385. An act for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin;

H. R. 5499. An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of E. A. Williams;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch;

H. R. 5966. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder; and

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2369. An act for the relief of Rachib Shriay; and

H. R. 4743. An act providing for the naturalization of certain wives and children of citizens of the United States who lost citizenship through service in the allied forces during the first World War; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 2978. An act for the relief of Merle E. Rudy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-A-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6657. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6671. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey, to the Committe on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the calendar.

H. R. 6080. An act authorizing the county of Lawrence, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.; and

H. R. 6818. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 6927. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4934. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

H. R. 5503. An act to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1942, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McKELLAR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6430, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1943, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 20, line 23, before the period, to insert the following: ": *Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding $150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof."

On page 72, at the end of line 19, before the period, to insert "*Provided further*, That commencing July 1, 1942, all proceeds derived by the Board of Directors of the Authority from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Authority, and from any other activities of the Authority, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States monthly, and shall not be expended until subsequently appropriated by the Congress."

CATALOG OF BEVERLEY R. ROBINSON COLLECTION OF NAVAL BATTLE PRINTS (S. DOC. NO. 200)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a Senate document a Catalog of the Beverley R. Robinson Collection of Naval Battle Prints.

This collection at the present time consists of 518 naval battle prints and 7 miscellaneous items. Of the prints there are now 281 at the United States Naval Academy, and they are so listed in this catalog. The remainder are divided between the Harvard Club of New York and Mr. Robinson's New York house. Mr. Robinson has willed his entire collection to the Naval Academy Museum, and has provided for a trust fund to care for the collection and to add to it from time to time. In his will he has also stipulated that none of the prints at the Naval Academy shall leave the academy grounds except for repairs or for loan exhibition purposes customary between museums. The collection is a very valuable and excellent one, and I know the Senate will signify its acceptance of this exceptional gift by having the catalog printed as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the catalog will be printed as a Senate document.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy will visit the academy on May 1. The Coast Guard has been transferred from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department. Ex-officio I am designated as a member of the Board of Visitors. I desire the consent of the Senate to withdraw from the Board of Visitors and that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. WALSH] may be designated in my stead as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy for the present year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. MALONEY. Does that establish a precedent? Is it not the custom to appoint the members of the Board of Visitors from the Commerce Committee?

Mr. BAILEY. I was designated, but I have the right to resign and to have some other Senator designated in my stead. I did so last year and I am doing so this year.

Mr. MALONEY. I am in complete accord with the purpose of the Senator in his desire to have appointed the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, but last year a member of the Commerce Committee was appointed.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no question about the right to have designated some Senator other than a member of the Commerce Committee. In the past Members of the Senate other than members of the Committee on Commerce have been designated.

Mr. MALONEY. Is there any danger of jeopardizing the powers of the Commerce Committee in this connection?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think so. Very frankly, since the Coast Guard has been transferred to the Navy, I rather think that it is good practice, so long as that transfer exists, that the Commerce Committee shall recognize that legislation concerning the Coast Guard should go to the Naval Affairs Committee. Otherwise we should have the Committee on Commerce undertaking to deal with matters affecting a branch of the Navy. We can settle that question later. At the present moment I am not prepared to go to New London, and I cannot think of a better thing for the Senate, the academy, or the Coast Guard than to have the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs go in my stead.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that is entirely correct, and I am pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is going. I find comfort in the fact that the able chairman of the Commerce Committee says that we will settle the other matter later. I should not want to have it assumed now that legislation dealing with the Coast Guard, which up to now has been under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, by this one move is transferred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. With the understanding that that question will be taken up later, I am pleased to approve the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. BAILEY. In justice to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I will say that this suggestion arose with me. In matters of legislation he has shown me every courtesy since the transfer was made, and I have undertaken to be equally courteous to him. There is no difficulty about that. I am satisfied that he and I can work out an agreeable arrangement.

Mr. MALONEY. No one has greater confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs than I have. I am pleased to approve the Senator's suggestion. I am proud of the friendship of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I am glad he is going; but I am anxious that we give careful consideration to any proposal to transfer all legislation dealing with the Coast Guard from the Commerce Committee to the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, since that matter is disposed of and the Senator from Massachusetts has been designated in my stead, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is not in a position to serve as a member of the Board of Visitors this year. He is one of the Senators appointed by me, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce. The law governing the filling of vacancies on the Board is contained in Fifty-third Statutes at Large, page 1044, and is as follows:

Whenever a member or an ex officio member is unable to attend the annual meeting as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, another member may be appointed in his stead in the manner as herein provided but without restriction as to month of appointment.

In accordance with the foregoing provision, I appoint the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] to fill the vacancy in the Board caused by the inability of the Senator from Alabama to attend the meeting on May 1.

AVIATION AND MILITARY AND NAVAL PREPAREDNESS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have been reviewing the incidents relating to military and naval preparedness in this country since the last World War.

In going over my files I find that there has been a tremendous lag in public understanding of our needs for military and naval protection. Men now high in authority only a few years ago scoffed at the idea that we needed a two-ocean navy.

I have recently received a letter from Walt Clyde, one-time managing director of the Aviationist, published at Detroit, Mich. Mr. Clyde has sent me a copy of a letter I addressed to him November 9, 1927, in which I presented my views on aviation which seemed to be quite in advance of the views ordinarily held at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13, 1942.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The other day, in going through some old files, I ran across a very interesting letter from you, a photostat of which is enclosed.

There would be no war if your advice of 15 years ago were heeded.

Yours sincerely,

WALT CLYDE.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 9, 1927.

WALT CLYDE,
Managing Director, the Aviationist,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. CLYDE: It is a pleasure to reply to your letter of November 7, asking for my views on aviation, because it is a subject in which I am vitally interested. I have traveled a great deal by air, and I am strong for anything that will aid in the development of aviation. I firmly believe it has a great future and that the day is not far distant when the airplane will be as common amongst us as the automobile is today

About a hundred years ago an intellectual German said that all the great ages had been ages of creative faith. As far as mechanics is concerned, we have been living, and are still living, in such an age. We are not startled by any new discoveries. What would surprise us would be to find that several years had gone by without a new discovery being made.

The airplane is our latest great invention, and as yet it is only in its infancy. It is the most wonderful of infants, the liveliest and daring ever known; but when the airplane comes of age it will have many surprises in store for us. We don't know what it is destined to accomplish; we are only certain its accomplishments are destined to be wonderful.

It was a Briton who invented the steam engine, another Briton who invented the locomotive, and still other Britons who invented the great machines which have revolutionized the industrial world. But the invention of the airplane belongs to us, and its perfection will also doubtless belong to us.

The nation which owns the air in the future will be able to conquer the world. One of America's most distinguished naval officers and historians wrote several interesting and beautiful volumes on the influence of sea power on history. But there can be no question that when aerial navigation is perfected, the warships of the world are doomed.

It is my hope that war is doomed, because no good comes, nor can come, from it today. All conquests in the future should be peaceful ones, but peaceful conquests involve as much energy as a conquest which issues from the thunder of guns. The airplane should be one of the instruments of such a conquest. It is the last word in speed. Evidently the last word in mechanics has not been spoken, and let us hope it never will be. We don't know what the future has in store for us. Up to about 400 years ago few, if any, believed in progress. It was the discovery of America that put the idea of progress into men's minds, and it was the invention of one great machine after another that made the idea stick. The invention of the airplane has shaken all the doubt out of us. We are begihning to perceive that the most daring dream is not, as was formerly thought, a perishable, intellectual monument to human folly, but an earnest of future achievement. We live and learn; we dream and achieve. Aviation has had a brilliant past, but I predict for it a more glorious future.

Most cordially yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO GRADUATES OF OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL AT ABERDEEN, MD.

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President at the graduation exercises of the Officer Candidate School at Aberdeen, Md., on Saturday, April 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him in Baltimore, Md., on April 10, 1942, before the Maryland Committee for Representative Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Wave of the Future—Emancipation," delivered by him before the Business and Professional Women's Club at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

TODAY'S CRISIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Today's Crisis," delivered by him in Milwaukee, Wis., on April 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. BARKLEY, on behalf of Mr. WAGNER, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Jefferson Day dinner of the National Democratic Club, Saturday, April 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GRISWOLD, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE KANSAS YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, at the State convention of the Kansas Young Republican Club at Wichita, Kans., April 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT PRICE VICTORY?—INTERVIEW OF SENATOR WAGNER BY THEODORE GRANIK

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio interview of Senator WAGNER by Theodore Granik on April 17, 1942, on the subject What Price Victory? which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT PRICE VICTORY?—DIALOG BETWEEN L. METCALF WALLING AND THEODORE GRANIK

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a dialog on the subject What Price Victory? between L. Metcalf Walling and Theodore Granik, broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System on April 10, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME SITUATION—ADDRESS BY ALBERT L. WARNER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the wartime situation, delivered on April 10, 1942, by Albert L. Warner, Columbia Broadcasting System news analyst, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPELLING THE FOG—ARTICLE BY CHARLES MICHELSON

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Dispelling the Fog," by Charles Michelson, director of publicity, Democratic National Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY SLATTERY BEFORE ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harry Slattery, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, at a luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce Members' Assembly at St. Louis, Mo., on April 6, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CREDO OF FAITH AND AN AMERICAN DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE—ADDRESS BY DR. ARCHIBALD HENDERSON

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two documents, entitled "A Credo of Faith" and "An American Declaration of Interdependence," read by Dr. Archibald Henderson, of the University of North Carolina, at the conclusion of an address delivered by him on March 10, 1942, at the Town Hall, New York City, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNITY AND VICTORY—EDITORIAL FROM WINSTON-SALEM JOURNAL

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Winston-Salem Journal of February 23, 1942, entitled "Unity and Victory," which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN POLICY

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 22, 1942, relating to the recent meeting of the Republican National Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN OLD ATTACK RENEWED—EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of April 10, 1942, entitled "An Old Attack Renewed," which appears in the Appendix.]

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 6868.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 34, 66, 69, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 77, and 78; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "appropriations", insert "and for carrying out the provisions of

Executive Order Numbered 9112 of March 26, 1942"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$777,912,000, which shall be available for the direct charter of vessels in emergency situations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,333,725,277"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$812,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the matter inserted by said amendment as follows: In line 11 strike out the sum "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000", and in line 14 strike out the word "summary" and insert in lieu thereof the word "statement"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 11, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 45, 68, 74, 75, 76, 79, and 80.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I see no reason why we should not at this time consider the conference report if it is agreeable to the two leaders and to other Senators.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, the able Senator has a right under the rule to proceed with the consideration of the report, and, so far as I know, this is a very appropriate time to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from Tennessee ought to proceed with the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House has agreed to the conference report. I am willing to answer any questions that may be asked, or, if the Senate should prefer, I shall be glad to make a statement in regard to the report.

Mr. McNARY. I quite agree with the views of the able Senator from Tennessee and our very able leader that we should consider the conference report. When the bill was before us some time ago, the particular item of controversy was the limitation of profits. I think the able Senator from Tennessee should detail what occurred as a result of the conference and what is now in the bill covering that very important point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that provision is not embraced in the conference report but will be acted upon separately.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not appear in the conference report itself, but the House had to pass on it.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask if this is a complete report?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it is a complete report. The House has agreed to it, and it now comes to the Senate for its approval. I shall be glad to explain it.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the House agreed to the amendment adopted by the Senate so that that part of the bill is settled?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is settled.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any further action to be taken upon it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate has to take action upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was our amendment. Was any change made in it; did the House amend it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House amended it. The Senate has to agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, and the Senate probably wants information concerning it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the report come before the Senate properly, and it may then be considered. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 21, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 75, 76, and 80 to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "including the pay of members of the Army Specialist Corps appointed subject to the approval of the War Department Personnel Board, $327,331,562: *Provided*, That members of such corps who are assigned to the supply services of the Army may be paid from the appropriations for the work upon which they are engaged: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any member of such corps at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum unless such member is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the first paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following before the period: ": *Provided, further*, That the approximate costs of classes of projects under such sum of $800,000,000 shall be as follows: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $168,780,000; lighter-than-air program, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $119,000,000; liquid-fuel storage, $100,000,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $20,000,000; Ordnance storage facilities, $150,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $100,000,000; hospital and dispensary facilities, $40,500,000; shore radio facilities, $11,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $720,000; miscellaneous structures, $25,000,000; floating drydock program, $36,000,000: *Provided further*, That the approximate cost indicated for each such class may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $800,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RELIEF

"For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1942 to pay the policemen and firemen's relief and other allowances as authorized by law, $60,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 403. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'Department' means the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, respectively; in the case of the Maritime Commission, the term 'Secretary' means the Chairman of such Commission; and the terms 'renegotiate' and 'renegotiation' include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price. For the purposes of subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the term 'contract' includes a subcontract and the term 'contractor' includes a subcontractor.

"(b) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period or periods, when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such Secretary and the

subcontractor of the contract price of the subcontract at a period or periods when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, (B) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price of the subcontract which is found as a result of such renegotiation, to represent excessive profits, and (C) a provision for relieving the contractor from any liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so retained by or repaid to the United States.

"(c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department or from any subcontract thereunder, (1) to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits, and (3) in case any amount of the contract price found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits shall have been paid to the contractor or subcontractor, to recover such amount from such contractor or subcontractor. Such contractor or subcontractor shall be deemed to be indebted to the United States for any amount which such Secretary is authorized to recover from such contractor or subcontractor under this subsection, and such Secretary may bring actions in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover such amount on behalf of the United States. All amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This subsection shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, provided that final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract has not been made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such unreasonable compensation has been or is being paid, or whether such excessive reserves have been or are being set up, or whether any excessive and unreasonable costs have been or are being incurred, each such Secretary shall have the same powers with respect to any such contractor that an agency designated by the President to exercise the powers conferred by title XIII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, has with respect to any contractor to whom such title is applicable. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of each such Secretary and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purposes of making examinations and determinations with respect to profits under this section.

"(e) In addition to the powers conferred by existing law, the Secretary of each Department shall have the right to demand of any contractor who holds contracts with respect to which the provisions of this section are applicable in an aggregate amount in excess of $100,000, statements of actual costs of production and such other financial statements, at such times and in such form and detail, as such Secretary may require. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The powers conferred by this subsection shall be exercised in the case of any contractor by the Secretary of the Department holding the largest amount of such contracts with such contractor, or by such Secretary as many be mutually agreed to by the Secretaries concerned.

"(f) The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such Department as he may designate, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

"(g) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"(h) This section shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 3 years after the termination of the war, but no court proceedings brought under this section shall abate by reason of the termination of the provisions of this section."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That purchases of automobiles of the lightweight, low-priced class heretofore made by the War and Navy Departments at prices in excess of $750 each but not in excess of those permitted by this section are hereby validated"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the conference report involves a large appropriation, more than $19,000,000,000, largely for aircraft and other implements of war.

An amendment was offered on the floor of the House of Representatives which reads as follows:

SEC. 402A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or naval establishments, designated as "final payment" to any contractor who fails to file with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation of contract and reimbursement of profits in excess of 6 percent.

Mr. President, that proposed limitation of profits was one of the most important discussed in the debates in the Senate, and one of the most important matters before the conference, and I am sure Senators are all interested in it. If it is satisfactory, I shall first discuss that provision, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

When the bill came before the Senate it was urged by the departments affected, namely, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, that the House provision limiting profits was impractical and unenforceable, and would stop production. Of course, no one wanted to see production stopped. Under those circumstances, I asked the representatives of the three departments concerned if they would not go back to their offices and prepare an amendment dealing with the question of profits which would be workable, which would not prevent or retard production, and which would be satisfactory to the departments themselves.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have never known of greater cooperation in the consideration of an important matter than that afforded by the representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, who were before us concerning this subject. They acted effectively and with expedition. Two or three days later, perhaps the next day, they got together and very carefully prepared an amendment which they thought would take the place of the provision for a limitation of profits which would be workable and which would not slow down production. The amendment in the conference report is substantially and really the amendment prepared by the representatives of these three departments, and I think I can say it has been very well prepared.

In substance the amendment provides that in dealing with contracts involving over $100,000, whenever the head of a department believes that excessive profits have been earned by a contractor, the contract will be renegotiated, so far as the question of price is concerned. It goes further than that, however, and provides that from now on every contract shall contain a renegotiation clause, so that automatically it may be reconsidered at any time by the department concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. It is true that the amendment did not at first cover contracts already entered into, but they are included in the report. Some suggestion was made that as to contracts already in existence it would not be constitutional to make such provision. I do not think such a contention is tenable, but, in order to take care of that question, we added a provision later on that if any part of the act shall be held to be unconstitutional such holding shall not affect the remainder of the act. That provision is contained in the report.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the process of renegotiation to which the Senator refers, what is the objective? Is there any criterion or yardstick?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no yardstick except as to excessive costs. Let me read the amendment to the Senator. The first subdivision covers definitions, and it is not necessary that I read that. The second subdivision reads:

(b) The secretary of each department is authorized and directed to insert in any contract for an amount in excess of $100,000 hereafter made by such Department (1) a

provision for the renegotiation of the contract price at a period or periods when, in the judgment of the secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty; (2) a provision for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of (A) any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits and (B) an amount of the contract price equal to the amount of the reduction in the contract price of any subcontract under such contract pursuant to the renegotiation of such subcontract—

This applies not only to contracts but to subcontracts—

as provided in clause (3) of this subsection; and (3) a provision requiring the contractor to insert in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 made by him under such contract (A) a provision for the renegotiation by such secretary and the subcontractor.

In other words, it is left to the Secretary of War, as to military contracts; the Secretary of the Navy as to naval contracts; or to the Maritime Commission as to maritime contracts——

Mr. VANDENBERG. To determine what is an excessive profit?

Mr. McKELLAR. To determine what is an excessive profit. The contention that there should be a percentage limitation was not agreed to, because it was believed by these three departments that if a general percentage reduction were established, it would slow down production.

We took a great deal of evidence, we had the representatives of the departments before us, and they acted with perfect candor, it seemed to me, and after hearing them all, and considering every phase of the question, the House conferees took the matter back, and the House voted on it. I believe that this provision relating to the renegotiation of contracts will save the Government enormous sums of money.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the conclusion of the Government department as to what is an excessive profit become binding on the contractor, or must there be an agreement between the department and the contractor?

Mr. McKELLAR. The contract has to be renegotiated, but it will be seen that the head of the department has a tremendous——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Leverage?

Mr. McKELLAR. Leverage; and I believe he will exercise it properly in all cases; indeed, I think it will mean the saving of tremendous sums.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it has already had that result, through the renegotiation of other contracts; but what I am trying to establish is the fact itself, and the fact is, as I understand, that the identification of an excessive profit will require the consent of the contractor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment I shall yield. I wish to answer the Senator from Michigan by saying that, while I cannot give names, since the provision was agreed to in the other House—and, of course, everyone knew it would be approved by the Senate, because the Senate had already adopted it—one contractor having two contracts with the Government, I am informed, has already agreed to pay back $50,000,000. Under those circumstances, it seems to me that this provision may result in quite a large saving.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator that there is great advantage in the provision the conferees have brought in, and that there will be substantial results flowing from it. All I am trying to say, in conclusion, is that it does not actually settle the war-profits question, however, and we still confront the necessity of finding a rational ceiling for wages, profits, prices, and everything else, if we are to avoid losing the economic war at home long before we win the military war abroad.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that I go all the way with the Senator, but I will say to him that it was argued when the bill was before the Senate, as the Senator from Michigan will recall, that this provision would impinge upon the proposal to come up hereafter before the Committee on Finance in fixing taxes upon concerns engaged in war contracts. Instead of that being true, it seems to me that it will be absolutely necessary for the Committee on Finance to bring forward a bill providing for the very thing we suggest here. There is no conflict between us at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Louisiana. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether the amendment adopted by the Senate armed the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission with the authority, in the renegotiation of a contract, to determine what excess profits there are, and whether it gave the United States Government the right to retain any excess profits found by these officers, or the right to sue for excess profits found to exist by the officers concerned?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true.

Mr. OVERTON. That is what the Senate amendment provided?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true.

Mr. OVERTON. The substitute amendment proposed by the conferees takes that authority from the Secretaries, denies the Federal Government the right to sue for any excess profits which the secretaries may find, and gives the Federal Government the right of recovery, either by retention or recapture of excess profits, only when the contractor himself agrees that there has been an excess profit. There must be a meeting of the minds. A contractor himself must admit, by signing a renegotiated price agreement, that he has made excess profits, before the Federal Government has any right either of retention or of recovery.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. That amendment was made in the conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I question the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is in part correct, and in part not entirely correct, as I shall explain; but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I only wished to suggest that the words "to negotiate" are ambiguous. Ordinarily they would seem to imply that a renegotiation could not be reached unless both sides should agree. Section 403 (a) provides:

the terms "renegotiate" and "renegotiation" include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price.

So it seems to me clear that this proposal is to give absolute power to the secretary to reopen any contract and to fix any price he sees fit to fix.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say a word, and then I will yield to the Senator.

The committee was convinced that the word "renegotiate" would imply such authority in the first place; but we sought to remove all doubt by putting in the definition of "renegotiation" the power to fix the contract price. So it seems to me that while there must be a negotiation in every case between the contractor and the Government, in the end the Government has the right to fix the amount of profit and to withhold excess profits. In my opinion the result is one of the most helpful measures which we could pass.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think there is any doubt whatsoever as to the construction placed by the conferees on the proposed substitute. As the Senator will recall, in the conference it was insisted that the authority of the Secretary to determine what excess profits existed should be taken away from him, and that no contractor should be made liable unless he himself agreed that there was an excess profit. So, in order to achieve that result, this one clause was inserted throughout the provisions of the substitute——

Mr. McKELLAR. From what section is the Senator reading?

Mr. OVERTON. It occurs throughout the section. It is provided that there shall be a provision in each contract for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of—

any amount of the conract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits.

That was substituted for the words:

any amount of the contract price which is deemed by the Secretary to represent such excessive profits.

It was proposed in the conference that after the word "found" there should be inserted the words "by the Secretary." That proposed amendment to the substitute was rejected because it was the purpose of the conference that there should be no recovery on the part of the Federal Government unless the contractor himself agreed, in a contract of re-

negotiation, that excess profits had been obtained by him or were likely to be obtained.

Mr McKELLAR. I distinctly remember that the Senator from Louisiana offered an amendment to insert the words "by the Secretary." In my judgment, those words were left out because they were immaterial. They would leave the contractor out entirely. He ought to be included. Provision was made to renegotiate and to refix the price according to the definition of "renegotiation"; and we felt that the practical effect of what we adopted would be to give the Secretary the right, in the end, to force his way He would have the whip hand. No contractor would disagree over a matter if he knew that that would end his business. In my judgment, the provision is very much better as it is than it would be if the words "by the Secretary" were inserted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is now saying that the Secretary would have collateral powers of persuasion to affect the conclusion. Of course, that is undoubtedly true; but what is the textual fact in respect to the conference report? My original question has been answered both ways.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not answered it both ways.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The question is, Is the consent of the contractor necessary in order to identify an excessive profit? The Senator from Louisiana says "Yes." The Senator from Ohio says "No." The Senator from Tennessee says "Yes and no." What is the answer?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not say "Yes and no." I say that the practical effect of the provision would be, first, to cause a renegotiation and an agreement, if possible. In the event there should not be an agreement, under this provision the Secretary would be required to take further steps. What would he do? He would fix the amount of the excessive profits and would withhold payment. Then it would be a matter for the courts to decide. It will be remembered that when the amendment was originally before the Senate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] called attention to the fact that the bill contained a provision which would prohibit a contractor from going into the courts. As a result of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, that provision was stricken out. When it was stricken out, the language was left in such shape that the Secretary could pass upon the question, and if the contractor did not like the decision of the Secretary, he could go into court and endeavor to have it overruled.

The Senator from Michigan says that I answered "Yes and no." I think the Senator is mistaken. If I answered "Yes and no," I was mistaken. I am not in the habit of answering "Yes and no" to anybody. I answered in accordance with my understanding. In this case I know I am right, because if the Secretary holds, with respect to any contract, that a certain amount of profit should be regarded as excessive, he has the right to enforce his decision by withholding payment from the contractor, and the contractor may then go into court and have the matter settled.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The answer is that the consent of the contractor is not required to identify an excessive profit, although one of the conferees says it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is required to negotiate. Two negotiators may differ.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just as the conferees seem to differ at the moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but the Secretary has the right to pass upon the question in the way I have explained.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to quote the exact language of the substitute amendment suggested by the conferees in that connection. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to what I am about to read. I think there will be no question whatever as to what the answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Michigan should be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean that the Senator from Tennessee is mistaken in his construction?

Mr. OVERTON. In my opinion he is mistaken.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Louisiana was one of the conferees on this bill, was he not?

Mr. OVERTON. I was one of the conferees. It is not a question of what the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Louisiana thinks. The language is so clear as to remove any doubt whatsoever as to the construction which should be placed upon it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it does not remove the doubt of the Senator from Tennessee I do not know why it should be expected to remove the doubts of the taxpayer, who must live under this formula.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from Michigan will withhold any comments until I can place before his clear and analytical mind the exact provision, he may arrive at an independent judgment, which I am sure will be correct. The language to which I refer is:

> (c) The Secretary of each Department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such Department or from any subcontract thereunder, (1) to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price, (2) to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits.

He may not withhold any amount representing excess profits unless those excess profits have been found as a result of the renegotiation between the contractor and the Secretary. So it is perfectly obvious that it must be by mutual consent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that the Senator's statement is very persuasive; yet he seems to be overruled by the majority of his colleagues who joined in writing the formula. I was wondering if we could not give the ultimate taxpayer a little more assurance as to what are his rights and whether the Senate cannot know whether it is limiting profits.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think there is any doubt about the right of the contractor. If the contractor is displeased with what is done he may go into court and sue the Government for the money. That is provided in this bill or in other laws. If the Government is dissatisfied it can retain the alleged excessive profits. The Secretary can withhold payment. It is a very effective measure. It seems to me we are quibbling over the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. I do not believe there would be a particle of trouble about the enforcement of the act. The House did not feel so. The House conferees did not feel so. The representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission do not think so. They think that the provision is workable. It comes before us with practically unanimous agreement. Remember, those words were not in the bill when it passed the Senate. The Senate ironed out the question. I think the Senator from Michigan voted for this provision when the bill was before the Senate. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, for whom I have the greatest respect, and for whose legal ability I have the greatest admiration, was offered in the committee. It was not in the bill as it passed the Senate. We have not taken out something which the Senate adopted in this respect. As I remember, this provision received the unanimous approval of the Senate. It has received the unanimous approval of the House, by reason of the agreement to the conference report. I believe it received the unanimous approval of the conferees. It comes back to us in the form in which the Senate passed it. I believe that the fears of the Senator from Louisiana and of the Senator from Michigan are beside the point and will not be found to be of importance in the actual administration of the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I again agree with the Senator that the provision will be relatively useful in some aspects.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am still not clear as to what it means conclusively. Whether we understand it or not, it will be helpful.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. However, I am driven to the final conclusion that by no remote stretch of the imagination have we settled the question of limiting profits on war contracts by this particular formula.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be so. I cannot say. Nobody can predict what

the effect of an amendment of this kind will be; but the very fact that one contractor has already paid back $50,000,000, or has agreed to do so, is persuasive that it might be effective in doing what we all want to do, and that is to save the Government from excessive payments on war contracts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The payment the Senator identifies also suggests that there is involved in this enterprise a vast reservoir of profits which needs a very careful combing over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed it does; and I desire to say to the Members of the Senate that, in my judgment, this is a far-reaching amendment; that it will do invaluable good in the war effort; it will save the country enormous sums, and will be of the greatest benefit to the American taxpayer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment, if the Senator will wait. I promised the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] that I would yield to him, and I promised the Senator from Connecticut that thereafter I would yield to him.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to ask only one or two questions. Is any definition of excess profits contained in the report?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; and there ought not to be. We do not want to put in the bill anything that will slow down production. It is one thing to prevent or recover any excess profits, but we do not want to slow down production. The Departments were of the opinion that this provision would not slow down production, but would save excessive profits. That is why we have agreed to it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then, as I understand, decision as to the question of excess profits is left entirely to the conscience of the Secretary. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The conscience of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it not a fact that the fixing of excess profits will be done according to the consciences of the various Secretaries?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If they, in their judgment and conscience, find that excess profits are being made, then they will levy a tax and collect the excess profits. Will not that be a delegation of the taxing power of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I do not think so at all. The departments have had delegated to them the power to make contracts, and we may fix the terms under which they may make the contracts.

I yield now to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to subclause (c) of section 403.

The Secretary of each department is not only authorized, but he is directed, whenever he deems excessive profits have been realized, to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price. Is not that so?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. At that time, obviously, they may agree or they may fail to agree. If they do agree, then subclause (2) comes into effect in the event the contract has not already been completed. Is not that so?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator has correctly interpreted that provision. It is true that the contractor or subcontractor may be required to renegotiate the contract price but subclause (2) is not dependent on that. To withhold part of the contract price is within the power of the Secretary. The provision is a direction to him to withhold it; and I think that provision is quite as important as the first one. I think it is quite as important to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is found, as a result of such renegotiation, to represent excessive profits.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator to bear with me further, because I think we can straighten out the matter down to the point about which I really wish to be certain.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. If a contract has already been completed, all except the final payment, subclause (2) becomes operative, because the Secretary would be authorized and directed to withhold from the contractor any amount of the contract price which, as a result of the renegotiation, might be agreed to be excessive. Is not that so?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true; he has the right to withhold. The provision does contain that language.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me call the Senator's attention to clause (c), subclause (3). If the contract has already been completed, if payments have already been made, and if there is a renegotiation as to what may be excessive profits derived under the contract, in such case the Secretary is authorized, as a result of the renegotiation, to recover the amount previously paid to the contractor. Is not that so?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. So that subclause (3) becomes operative only in cases in which payment has already been had, and subclause (2) becomes operative only in cases in which payment has not as yet been completed. Is not that so?

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the intention, of course.

Mr. DANAHER. So that under subclause (1), when the Secretary is authorized and directed to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, if they agree, then subclause (2) becomes operative in withholding cases, and subclause (3) becomes operative in recovery cases; but if they do not agree, resort will be had to subsection (a) of section 403, in which the term "renegotiation" is defined to mean a fixing of the price by the Secretary of the Department. Is not that so?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. In that event, is not the Secretary bound to go into court to sue to recover the price over and above what he defines to be a reasonable one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; because the Secretary would simply withhold it.

Mr. DANAHER. No; I mean, if the payment has already been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the payment has already been made, he is authorized to go into court and sue to recover it.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct; and the Secretary is authorized to recover on the basis of what he may determine to be excessive; is he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; what he fixes or determines to be excessive.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's understanding that at that time the contractor has a right to offer in a court whatever defenses are proper—in computing profits, for example, to offer those elements of cost which he contends are not excessive?

Mr. McKELLAR. Beyond controversy, he has such right.

Mr. DANAHER. When the bill first was brought to us from the Senator's committee, it would have denied that right.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would have denied that right; and it was upon the motion of the Senator from Connecticut, as I recall, that that provision was stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. We amended it so that the contractor had a right——

Mr. McKELLAR. So that the contractor had a right to sue, and the Government had a right to sue.

Mr. DANAHER. And there is not any longer any question in anybody's mind that the contractor does have a right to go into court to determine whether a proper measure of damages, let us say, has been applied in a particular case?

Mr. McKELLAR. None whatsoever.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator only one other question, and I will conclude. The termination date of 3 years from the termination of the war has been retained by the conferees; has it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure we retained it. I shall have to refer to the report for a moment to be absolutely sure; but I am quite sure we retained the 3-year limitation.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it in subsection (a)?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is in subsection (h), which reads:

> This section shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 3 years after the termination of the war.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator a further question. Have the conferees retained the provision which would require the adoption of regulations, to be prescribed by the President, which will be uniform in each of the departments?

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that that matter was not touched upon in the original amendment, nor by the conferees.

Mr. DANAHER. I invite the Senator's attention to subclause (f), and ask whether that language is in the form the Senate adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator is entirely correct about that:

> The authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each department, in accordance with regulations pre-

scribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, may be delegated, in whole or in part, by him to such individuals or agencies in such department as he may designate—

One of the three—

and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion.

I will say to the Senator, in regard to that provision, that it was changed somewhat; and the idea of the provision was this: Of course, the President himself cannot pass upon those questions; the authority had to be delegated; so it is provided that it may be delegated to the officials in the departments who can best do it.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator one other question. Is it not a fair inference to draw, with reference to all of section 403, that no contractor can now tell whether or not he has a contract?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that is so. The result of section 403 is this: The contractor has a contract in which it is provided that if his contract with the Government results in excessive profits, that provision of the contract may be renegotiated and readjusted. In order to make it perfectly fair, so that every contractor may know what he has, that provision is to be written into every single contract, so that he will have a contract just as the law permits it to be.

Mr. DANAHER. So far as future contracts are concerned, there can be no question that we have that right.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. But so far as the 3,000,000 outstanding contracts now in process of execution are concerned, a very different situation prevails.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such contracts are in a different situation, and, of course, if the determination is wrong in any way, the contractor will have a right to go before the courts and have the matter adjusted.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Referring again to this controversial section (c), the Secretary is given power—

to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits.

Will the Senator tell me, found by whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. The provision does not say.

Mr. TAFT. It does not say. That is why I asked whether the Senator can interpret that provision. Does it mean found by the Secretary?

Mr. McKELLAR. Unquestionably.

Mr. TAFT. Or does it mean found by agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. In my judgment, the Secretary will agree with the contractor whenever it is possible; but when he makes a finding, a contractor who is dissatisfied with it will have to exercise his right to go into court.

Mr. TAFT. It does not do a contractor any good to go into court.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, it does, if he has a just case. If the Secretary of War, for instance, has held certain profits to be excessive when they are not in fact excessive, of course, the contractor has a right to go into court, and I think he will get relief.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why. The Secretary is given absolute discretion to find what are excessive profits. He may say that 1 percent is excessive, or any amount over 1 percent. No right is here given the court to overrule the Secretary of War as to what may be excessive profits.

Mr. McKELLAR. What we intended to do, Mr. President, was to frame a workable provision under which the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission would take up such matters. They will appoint boards to look after them. I imagine they will agree with contractors, perhaps, in 999 out of 1,000 cases, certainly in 99 out of 100 cases. I have not the slightest doubt that that will be done. We thought we ought to have the contractor consulted at every step that the Secretary or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission should take in the matter. We have written a provision which we think is workable, and which we think will save the Government enormous sums of money. We think it can be done without, as these officials say, retarding production, which was an important question which was in the mind of the committee at all times.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Referring to the provision that now appears in the conference report as to the right to go into court—the Senator has brought it before us heretofore—I should like to ask the Senator at what stage a contractor in a renegotiated proceeding may go into court.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my judgment, whenever he disagrees with the Secretary of War, in the case of a military contract, he may go into court. If the Secretary refuses to pay him, he may sue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky; and I apologize to him for not having yielded earlier. Senators were on their feet all around me, and I asked him to let their questions be answered first.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator owes me no apology.

We discussed the substance of this Senate provision at length when the bill was before the Senate. What I should like to ask the Senator is, What change was made in the House? I have been unable, by reading it, to identify the language.

Mr. McKELLAR. Practically no changes were made. Such as were made were so inconsequential that I hardly recall them. The House accepted the amendment practically as adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been no substantial change?

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no substantial change.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Unhappily the accoustics of the Chamber is such that we have been unable to hear all that has been said. I apologize if I ask the Senator about something concerning which he has already imparted information, but the language, of course, in the amendment is very general in character.

Mr. McKELLAR. It necessarily had to be, because we did not want to retard the production of war materials or the building of ships in this country.

Mr. PEPPER. Is there anything in the record of either the debate in the Senate as the Senator recalls it or in the discussions of the conferees that indicates anything in the nature of a standard or a principle which might guide the Secretaries in the administration of this proposed law?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no provision as to 6 percent or 8 percent?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator, I take it, has reference to a standard fixing a percentage of profits that a contractor may be permitted to make?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is nothing of that kind at all. That was eliminated from the bill, and does not now appear in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the same thing apply to the salaries and bonuses which might be paid to their officers by firms that have contracts?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are taken into consideration, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I am aware of the provision in the amendment, but there, again, the language is general. It says "excessive." No allowance is to be made to a firm for any excessive bonuses or salaries paid. So there again the language is general.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read to the Senator what is provided:

(d) In renegotiating a contract price or determining excessive profits for the purposes of this section, the Secretaries of the respective Departments shall not make any allowance for any salaries, bonuses, or other compensation paid by a contractor to its officers or employees in excess of a reasonable amount, nor shall they make allowance for any excessive reserves set up by the contractor or for any costs incurred by the contractor which are excessive and unreasonable.

That language is general, but it does provide a general measuring rod for the Secretaries to use in determining what is excessive, and refers particularly to the claims which have been so often made by contractors of amounts they are obliged to set aside as reserves. The Senator will recall, from the newspapers, the large amounts that have been paid to officers of corporations as bonuses or in the form of excessive compensation. All those things are to be taken into consideration by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and by the head of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. PEPPER. I know, of course, the reasons why it has been necessary to leave this language rather general, and I am aware of the difficulty of trying to meet every situation with a stringent statutory provision or regulation. I have before indicated that it is my belief, and it may be the opinion of other Senators, that no firm doing any defense work for the country should sustain any loss, provided it exercises reasonable prudence in its activities; and I suppose everyone is willing to see a reasonable margin of profit derived.

Mr. McKELLAR. Reasonable profits, of course.

Mr. PEPPER. But I thought that, since these discussions may be looked to by the Secretary to see if there was any principle enunciated by the Congress that might guide them, probably it is the opinion of the committee that handled this legislation that, while no contractors will sustain any loss provided they have been prudent and cautious and intelligent in their conduct in carrying out their contracts with the Government, at the same time it is the spirit of this legislation that margins of profit shall be cut to the bone, and that shall apply also to the salaries of executives who are the heads of the contracting firms.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly anything in the nature of excessive salaries would be considered by the Senator, and also by the Secretaries, as a violation of the spirit of this legislation?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. I wish to say to him, and to the other Senators present, that, figuratively, I want to take off my hat to the officers of these three departments. I do not think I ever knew officers of Government departments at any time in our history—and this is the second great war that I, as a Member of the Senate, have been through—to act with a greater desire to do their duty in seeing that the Government's interests were protected and that nothing would be done which would retard production of war materials in our country. There has been a general desire on their part to bring about such results. I wish I could name them, but I will not attempt to do so, because to name some and omit others might not be right. I include all who appeared before our committee or who conferred with us and who took part in preparing the provision which is now before the Senate. I think they acted as finely as any officers of the Government I have ever known. I again desire to compliment them in the highest degree for their splendid work.

This amendment is not my amendment. It was prepared at my request and the request of the committee by the officers of the several departments themselves.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to propound a further question in the nature of a statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. We have heard a great many businessmen in this country denounce the Congress and the administrative heads of the Government for not requiring the wages of workers in defense factories to be reduced to the level of the wage of the private soldier, which they emphasize is only $21 a month. We have not seen fit to reduce wages to that point, although many of us who count ourselves as faithful friends of labor as there are in the Congress, are willing to see them subjected to reasonable ceilings in order that inflation might not come to the country; but I think it appropriate that some of the executives who have been getting salaries of $100,000 a year or $150,000 a year, and, perhaps, bonuses on top of that, should remember how much salary General MacArthur is getting, and, if they advocate that the wage of a worker should be reduced to the level of the wage of a soldier, they might, to say the least, subject themselves to the salary of the generals of the Army, remembering that the Members of Congress get $10,000 a year, and the President of the United States gets only $75,000 a year.

So I hope that the fine officials to whom the Senator has just paid tribute will reexamine the salaries of all the officers of firms engaged in defense work and prune them down to a very modest figure—and I mean a modest figure—consonant with the emergency we face, so that when we address a demand to any part of the citizenry, they will see that we have been fair to all, which is what everyone has a right to expect.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I believe these officials are going to do their duty. I am not speaking of some of them but of all who appeared before us and testified. Frequently when I said "We want to see that these contractors are treated properly but we all want to see that the Government's interests are protected, and that the contractors shall not receive excessive compensation on their contracts," they agreed to that every time, and were willing to do anything that was reasonable, as they evidenced in their participation in the preparation of the amendment which is now before the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, who, I think, rose first, and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, if the Senator from Florida has concluded.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to say merely a word, in conclusion. I think this legislation offers perhaps the wisest approach that can be made to the subject, because I believe Mr. Nelson said one day that most of these men are patriotic, fine citizens, and if they are protected against loss, and know they are protected against loss, if they are prudent in their activities, they are not so much insistent upon any particular margin of profit. This bill has in it a flexibility so that the administrative officials can give them real protection against loss and at the same time give them a little margin of profit. Therefore, it may prove—and that will depend upon circumstances in the future—to be the wisest and best approach that can be made to this problem.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I wish to say something that I omitted. I hardly know how I can say it without calling the names, but not only did these three Departments—the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission—cooperate, but the W. P. B., through its head, joined in the preparation of this amendment. So, I think that organization should be included in my remarks about the other Departments.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the difficulty, for the moment, in the conduct of the war appears to me to be that many want to win the war on the basis of profits. The debate this morning has had to do with how much a contractor should receive. I want to take the time of my colleagues in the Senate only briefly to refer to those who are not making profits but who are doing the fighting, the suffering, and the dying in carrying on the war.

It has been my privilege to visit my home State, New Mexico, during the last 3 weeks. I did not stay in any one particular city or locality, such as my home city of Albuquerque, but I went all over the State. While the contractors in Washington and the laborers throughout the country were discussing as to how much they should make a day, or the profit which should be reaped on a $60,000,000 contract, the mothers of the State of New Mexico were furnishing 2,300 of their sons to the Army in the Philippine Islands so that they could fight under the leadership of MacArthur and Wainwright in order that profits could be made in the city of Washington.

I desire to refer to the ones who are doing the fighting, who are undergoing the actual suffering, who are dying, and, then, I shall ask the Senate whether we are not wasting too much time considering whether a contractor should make 2 percent or 10 percent, or whether a worker should belong to a particular organization in order to be enabled to do his share in the war effort.

Before proceeding to that point I should like to say that I am sure the Members of the Senate will be glad to know that I called on our colleague, Senator HATCH, at his home in Clovis, N. Mex. As is generally known, sometime ago Senator HATCH suffered an accident and was severely injured. I can tell the Senate now, from personal knowledge, that he is in a fair way to complete recovery, and expects to join us in this body within the very near future. I saw Senator HATCH about 9:30 in the morning on the day that Bataan fell.

As I have stated, 2,300 of New Mexico's boys were inducted into the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery service. Several years ago our National Guard, being composed of boys from Western States, was a cavalry unit, but our State, with a vision of progress in warfare, transformed our National Guard into an antiaircraft unit, and for 3 or 4 years the guardsmen have been training along those particular lines.

For reasons well known to the War Department, that unit was sent to the Philippine Islands before Pearl Harbor, and was located there at the time of the

attack on Pearl Harbor, on the 7th of December, and the attack on the Philippine Islands on the 8th of December. Since then they have been under the leadership of General MacArthur, and lately under General Wainright.

Traveling between the little city of Clovis and the little city of Roswell, both of which have furnished to this particular unit at least 200 of their sons, I turned on the radio, and that was when I heard about Bataan. My only reason for saying these things is to show that the American people are on the alert; throughout the country they know the Nation is actually at war, and I desire to tell my colleagues exactly how those who have relatives in the Philippines are taking this matter of war and suffering.

I arrived at Roswell, which is a small city with rural surroundings, composed of fine people from Texas, Oklahoma, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, many Southern States, and even some from New York and Maine, and another population of different racial stock, but Americans nonetheless. Their sons were in the Philippine Islands, and they had just received the terrible news. One could feel the silence in the streets, could feel the anguish of the mothers, the fathers, the relatives, and the friends. They had loved ones over at Bataan taking everything the Japs could give them.

Eventually I went to the little city of Carlsbad, which also has about 200 of its sons in the Philippine Islands. The reaction there was exactly the same, one of solemnity, one of suffering in silence.

By the time I reached the little town of Deming, close to the Mexican border, the city which furnished the officers of the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery, including Colonel Sage, Colonel Cain, Major Colvard, and 200 of the city's sons, the reaction was different. By that time the people had had time for emotion. It was time for tears, it was time for the handkerchief, it was time for pleading.

It was my good fortune to be invited by Mrs. Colvard, the wife of the medical officer attending to those boys in the Philippines, into her home. She had a large group of women in her home that evening. Remember, they had just received the news. They did not know whether their own loved ones were dead, captured, or possibly could not be found. It would have inspired anyone, the strongest hearts, men made of steel, to see the reaction of the wives and the mothers of those boys. Then we in Washington worry about whether a contractor is to receive 2 percent or 10 percent. They were not worrying about that; they were worrying about their loved ones.

Let me tell the Senate how those people take the news. The city of Deming is close to the Mexican border. It is settled by two racial groups, the descendants of the best of the Anglo-Saxon of the East and the South, and the descendants of the best of the Spaniards and the Mexicans—all Americans. The sons of those Americans were also in the Philippine Islands, and Mrs. Colvard—bless her soul—said, "Senator, will you not go tomorrow morning and visit the homes of those poor people?" It was in an atmosphere entirely different from that of the folks to whom I have been referring. I saw sights which would inspire anyone to die if necessary. The only spiritual consolation was to have a mother burning three candles for the sons she had in the Philippine Islands. Possibly through neglect of our own Government that mother herself could not speak the language of her country. One good lady about 5 feet tall—bless her soul—rather dark, who could speak Spanish to perfection, said to me, "Senator, I could not buy a 10-cent stamp, I could not pledge myself to a dollar, but if my son has to die in order to keep freedom and liberty in this country, he can go, and I will not say a word. Gladly shall I give my son." Is any contractor making such a sacrifice? Is a laboring man calling for $12 a day giving such a sacrifice? We have not seen them suffer, but we have seen the fathers and the mothers suffer.

I called on a Catholic priest, who said, "Senator, it is wonderful to see groups praying and making novenas." That was all they could do, not worrying about profits, not worrying about whether they should belong to the cooks union in order to do their share of work, but willing to die, if necessary, for the good of the country.

Those are things which inspire; and this was the report I wanted to bring back to this body from the State of New Mexico.

I went to Albuquerque, another city which furnished many hundreds of boys. Hon. Sam G. Bratton, a former member of this body, at the head of the organization to pass a kind word around to the mothers and the fathers, and the relatives and the friends of the boys over there, had a meeting last week at the Elks Club. It was affecting. Yes, there were tears; yes, handkerchiefs; yes, pleading; but no complaint, except this, "Tell us all. It is all right if our boys have to die; but tell us the truth; let us know where they are; let us know whether they are dead or not; let us know whether they are alive or captured. Tell us the truth, and there will be no complaint."

I do not mind saying that I met Mrs. Martin Riley on the corner of Fifth Street and Central Avenue, Albuquerque. I have known her for many years. I know her boy. He is a doctor in the Philippine Islands with his particular unit. She cried, and I cried. I happen to belong to that race of people who, like the Irish, are rather emotional. I remember the boy in his childhood. I know the mother. Why should we not all cry—but strong tears, tears of patriotism, tears of loyalty? I think the country is farther ahead in this war than is Washington.

I thank the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have no desire to oppose the adoption of the conference report. The bill carries appropriations aggregating more than $19,000,000,000, which are sadly needed by the Army and the Navy. My purpose in rising is to explain why I did not sign the conference report as one of the conferees.

The only controversial amendment in the whole bill was the amendment dealing with excess profits on the part of contractors having war contracts with the Federal Government. I wish to say at the very outset that there was no one connected with the conference committee who took a deeper interest in undertaking to solve this problem than the able Senator from Tennessee, who was chairman of the conference committee. From the beginning he showed a very earnest and patriotic desire to do something which would effectively limit excessive and unreasonable and unconscionable profits which from time to time have been made by those who are dealing with the Government under these war contracts. It was his earnest desire to provide a measure which would be effective.

My reason for not agreeing to the substitute amendment proposed by the conferees is that it does not grant one item of authority to the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission which is not already possessed by those officials. It does not give one additional right to the Federal Government which it does not already possess. It does not afford any remedy on the part of the Federal Government against any contractor who is making unconscionable profits which the Federal Government does not already possess. So, while it does not do any good, at the same time I think I can say it does not do any harm. It is merely a restatement of practices which are now being engaged in by the heads of the departments concerned.

The amendment which was adopted by the Senate was an effective amendment; it did give authority to the Secretaries which they do not now possess; it did give rights to the Federal Government which the Federal Government does not now possess. The amendment adopted by the Senate gave the Secretary of each department the right to provide in each contract for the renegotiation of the contract price. It also provided that the contract should contain a clause for the retention by the United States or the repayment to the United States of any amount of the contract price "which is deemed by the Secretary"—I repeat those words—"which is deemed by the Secretary to represent excess profits."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I gather from what the Senator from Louisiana states that he is disappointed at the provisions of the amendment he has been discussing because there is no yardstick; there is no way for an administrative official or for the public to know where legitimate profits begin on war contracts and what are and may be construed to be excessive

profits. In general, is that the Senator's position?

Mr. OVERTON. No; that is not the contention I am making. The contention I am making is that this amendment does not give any authority to the Secretary which the Secretary does not already possess.

Mr. WALSH. Let me put it this way: Does the Senator know of any existing law which attempts to determine profit limitations, so that the public and the administrative officials may know what is the line of demarcation between legitimate profits and excess profits?

Mr. OVERTON. There is no law providing any yardstick in that connection.

Mr. WALSH. Let me ask another question: Has the Senator, as a member of his committee, had the experience which I have had of finding the executive officers of the various departments apparently—and I think sincerely—desirous of fixing a limit upon profits, and agreeing with efforts to do so, but unable to furnish any practical proposals which would squarely meet the issue?

Mr. OVERTON. We undertook to solve that problem in the amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, by vesting authority in the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission to determine what are excessive profits. It may be said that that is an improper enlargement of authority, since the Secretary represents the Government, which is one party to the contract, and that one party to the contract should not have the right to determine what are excessive profits. The answer to that is that in the absence of any yardstick—and I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is very difficult to establish a yardstick by statute—there ought to be some tribunal to determine what are excessive profits, and to determine it speedily. Therefore, the Senate proposed to vest that authority in the Secretaries—constituting a tribunal to determine what are excessive profits.

The other answer is that if the contractor is aggrieved he has his remedy in the courts.

Mr. WALSH. I think we all appreciate the extreme difficulty of drafting legislation dealing with the subject. It has been disappointing to me to find that the officials who are actually making the contracts—those who have had experience under war contracts and those who have knowledge of large profits—have not been able—I do not say they are unwilling—to give us concrete suggestions.

My committee has proposed some amendments and sent them to the Departments, and invariably there has been some criticism, which is understandable, to the effect that such proposals might interfere with the production of war materials. I have not been able to get any constructive suggestion from the Department heads in an effort to solve this problem.

I do not say that in criticism. It is partly due to the fact that the department heads think that this subject is our responsibility. I wish to make it clear that the whole discussion of this subject, in which we are all so vitally interested, has been made difficult for the Congress by reason of the absence of suggestions from the administrative officials and their enthusiastic support of some amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think that the substitute amendment proposed by the conferees would be at all effective. I think it would accomplish absolutely nothing, and I shall undertake to show why in a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I regret to say that I share the Senator's opinion that it would not be effective. It would not be strong enough, and it would be disappointing to the American public, although in view of my own experience I think the committee deserves to be commended for making an effort, even if a weak effort, to limit war profits.

Mr. OVERTON. There was a very earnest effort on the part of the Senate committee, the House committee dealing with the subject, and the conference committee, to undertake to solve the problem. I am simply taking the position that the problem is not at all solved. The solution, if any, still remains to be found.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator say that this provision would not change the law at all?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken, because undoubtedly at the present time there is no provision of law for the renegotiation of a contract or the price contained in a contract. This language does provide for legal renegotiation of a contract. That is the main feature of the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is not necessary for the Congress to vest authority in the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission to undertake the renegotiation of a contract. They already have such authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. They say they have not.

Mr. OVERTON. They are doing it now.

Mr. McKELLAR. The evidence before the committee was that they have no legal authority for it. The Senator recalls the testimony of those gentlemen.

Mr. OVERTON. They have no mandatory authority. They have no directions from the Congress to do so; but they have the authority to renegotiate contracts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Necessarily they have that authority. The Secretary of War can go to a contractor and say, "I think there are excess profits in this contract. I want to renegotiate it." Can he not do that?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly he can. I differ with my colleague.

Mr. McKELLAR. The contractor can sue the Government to recover the contract price. If there were fraud in the contract the Secretary could defend on the ground of fraud. However, there is no present law—and I challenge the Senator to find any—which provides that the Government has the right to renegotiate the price fixed in a contract.

Mr. OVERTON. This amendment does not give such authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to present my argument. I should like to present it. I shall be very glad to yield, but, if I am interrupted every time I make a statement, without an opportunity to make the argument, of course I am at a disadvantage. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Missouri; but when I make a point I should like to give the reason for it. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will withhold any interrogation at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. I was referring to subparagraph (b) of the proposed amendment. Subparagraph (c) undertakes to vest authority in the Secretary in the case of all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, to renegotiate the contracts. So it undertakes to give authority to the Secretary of the Department to require the contractor to renegotiate the contract price, and then to withhold from the contractor or subcontractor any amount of the contract price which is, as the Senate amendment had it, "deemed by the Secretary to represent excessive profits," but, as the substitute amendment has it, "which is found as a result of such renegotiation to represent excessive profits." Wherever in the substitute amendment there is any provision for renegotiation or for recovery or retention of excess profits by the Government, they must be such excess profits as are found to be excessive as a result of the renegotiation. Therefore the right of the Federal Government to withhold or recover excessive profits depends entirely on the act of the contractor in signing a renegotiated price contract. If the contractor says, "I refuse to sign the renegotiated contract," it makes no difference how much excess profits he is making; the Federal Government is without any authority whatsoever to modify the contract or to recover the excess profits, although they may amount to 100 percent or 1,000 percent, because they do not result from the renegotiation of the contract price. I think that the amendment inserted by the conferees destroys the effectiveness of the Senate amendment.

That view was taken in the House. The able Representative from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who has made a considerable study of the question of excess profits, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will no doubt agree, saw at once the ineffectiveness of the substitute amendment proposed by the conferees, and he made a statement to that effect. I should like to quote from it. The statement which he made to the House was not disputed by any Representative. It was not disputed by Mr. CANNON, in

charge of the conference report. This is what Mr. VINSON said:

The conferees are bringing before the House a substitute which amends the Senate provision and leaves the question of excessive profits to be determined entirely by mutual agreement of the contractor and of the department concerned through renegotiation of the contract.

I repeat, "by mutual agreement." There must be a mutual agreement between the contractor and the department concerned. Continuing, Mr. VINSON said:

This is no more nor no less than a restatement of existing departmental practice.

That is true. We know that for some little time the departments have been undertaking to renegotiate contracts, and in some instances have been successful; but the renegotiation of the contract depends entirely on the consent of the contractor to reduce the price. If the contractor will not, as a result of the renegotiation, enter into a contract reducing the price, then the renegotiation is at an end. The amendment now before the Senate contemplates that there shall be no finding of excess profits, and no recovery or retention thereof, unless they result by reason of a renegotiation of the contract price. That makes the whole effort on the part of the Congress to deal with this question in this manner absolutely futile.

Continuing to quote from Mr. VINSON:

Each department head now has the right and considerable authority to require a renegotiation of any contract on which he believes the contractor is receiving excessive profits.

Mr. VINSON further said:

The provision recommended by the conferees is definitely not an answer to the problem of exorbitant profits on war contracts. It may be of some help to the departments in their campaign for voluntary refunding of excess profits by the contractor, but it will go no further than that.

That caused Mr. TARVER to make this observation:

If the gentleman's statement is correct—and I may say I am in full accord with him—then why should the House go through the futile motion of adopting this amendment? Why not reject the whole thing rather than have the people of the country believe we are undertaking to legislate on this question, when we are, in fact, not accomplishing anything?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I have no desire at all to defeat this amendment, but I do not wish the public to think that the Congress of the United States has dealt effectively with excess profits by the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was about to say that, while it is true that that was Mr. VINSON's language on the floor of the House, yet the House, with practical unanimity, disagreed with Mr. VINSON and passed the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know that the House disagreed with Mr. VINSON.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House passed the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senate will, with practical unanimity, and probably unanimously, vote for this conference report, and so will I; but I will do so not because we have met this problem face to face, or because we have done anything toward solving it. I will vote for the conference report because, first, it will not do any harm, while it will not do any good; and, second, because we have a $19,000,000,000 appropriation tied up with this attempt at legislation on the part of the Appropriations Committee. So I am not opposing the conference report, and I am not going to oppose the particular substitute amendment we are now discussing.

Mr. President, I have two purposes in rising at this time: First, I wanted to pay a deserved compliment to the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who, as well as the other conferees, has worked very hard upon this problem, and who I know has undertaken to do all he could do to have prepared an amendment which would meet with the approval of the various governmental departments, and which he could reconcile with his own views as to what should be done. At the same time I regret that I must disagree with the Senator from Tennessee in the conclusion he reaches; and I wish to point out, so far as I can in my feeble way, that this amendment accomplishes nothing toward an effective control of excess profits. In fact, it is absolutely nugatory toward accomplishing its much-vaunted and heralded objective.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I entirely agree with the Senator that, from the legal standpoint, no contract can be renegotiated except as the result of an agreement between the contractor and the Government. However, will not the Senator concede that there is a positive advantage in affirmatively saying, as we do say in this measure, that any contract written in the future shall contain a provision that it is subject to renegotiation? There is no such law now. That is an advantage. If the measure becomes law, in the future a contractor who makes an original contract will know that if his profits are excessive he will be called upon to renegotiate the contract.

Mr. OVERTON. That is true; it has a persuasive effect.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that. The second point is that, following enactment of the measure, renegotiation will be by law directed, which again appears to me to be a positive advantage, instead of having no law at all.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The measure does not take away any of the extra-legal powers which the Departments have had heretofore.

What were the powers which the Departments had to compel the renegotiation of contracts? First, they could say to the contractor—as was done during the last World War by the head of the War Industries Board, Mr. Baruch: "You are making too much money." The contractor would say, "What are you going to do about it?" It would be pointed out to him that he was engaged in other business, and that he would have great difficulty in obtaining priorities for materials needed in his other business unless he did right by the Government in this instance. That power still exists, and is very persuasive.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly; they have that power, and they are exercising it now in the War Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but I say it is better to write it into the law, instead of doing things in an extra-legal way.

A second point is that the Government may owe a contractor money, but it may take its time about paying the money. That is a second persuasive influence upon him.

Another point is that a contractor may have one contract but he may have difficulty in obtaining another one. That is another extra-legal influence.

Then, after all, we have in Congress two very excellent committees—the Truman committee of the Senate and a similar committee of the House—to which, if all other means fail, the departments may very properly make reports to the effect, "Here is a contractor who is making unconscionable profits; he will not renegotiate the contract, and we think the country should know about it."

Those are extra-legal powers which the departments may exercise. Such powers would be in no manner changed by the pending measure; but we affirmatively say to the contractor in the original instance, "We are making this contract with you with the understanding that if your profits are unreasonable you will agree that there may be a renegotiation." On the other hand, the officials of the department who made the contracts are directed; and I think that is a positive advantage.

I think the Senator goes too far when he says we have done nothing; that it is just as though our action were a waste of time and effort. That is not true.

Mr. QVERTON. I think the argument of the able Senator supports my view, because he goes outside of the amendment in order to show what the secretaries of the different departments may do. They may say to a contractor, "You are going to be badly treated on priorities." They may say, "We do not expect to give you any other contracts." None of that is in this amendment.

Mr HAYDEN. I understand; but the Senator goes so far that I am afraid he will convey to the country the impression that really nothing is done. If the Senator is consistent, he should not vote for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because he says we are doing nothing. Why do a foolish thing?

Mr. OVERTON. We are doing something. We are appropriating $19,000,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator must agree that some good will come out of this, or he should vote against the conference report.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not expect to vote against the conference report on a

bill which carries an appropriation of $19,000,000,000 for the Army and the Navy. I think the Appropriations Committee tried to do something they had no business undertaking to do, and that is legislatively to determine so important a question as this in the Appropriations Committee, because supply bills have to be hurried through. This one was hurried through. We had no time to give this amendment under discussion the serious thought and hearing to which the subject matter is entitled. The able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is the head of a committee which I am quite sure will have an opportunity legislatively to consider this problem; and I am making this statement in order that such a committee as that which the Senator from Massachusetts heads, and other committees, will not think for a moment that we have at all solved this problem or that we have made one step toward its solution. It still remains wide open, and ought to be taken up by the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, or some other standing legislative committee.

PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, an injustice is being done to the farmer in much of the current discussion of inflationary price increases.

The public should understand that only recently has it been possible for agriculture to attain the price level which at the beginning of the present administration was considered the desirable goal for normal times; that prices of farm products at the outbreak of the European war had fallen much farther than those of industrial products, and present percentage increases thus are naturally much greater; that prices of some of the most important crops actually remain below parity; and that the parity basis for other commodities has been recognized as unfair.

I am as much against injurious inflation as anyone. I recognize that in the present war emergency prices must be controlled. It is important, however, that we do not lose our sense of perspective. Our comparisons should take into account all the circumstances respecting price movements.

The index figure of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for wholesale prices of all commodities has not quite reached 100, the 1926 base level, which the present administration in 1933 promised to restore. The index figure for wholesale prices of farm products is a little above 100, while that for industrial commodities is a little below. The index for farm products is somewhat lower than in 1925, 1928, and 1929, and is about 20 percent below the average for 1917, nearly 30 percent below the average for 1918, about 35 percent below the average for 1919, and more than 30 percent below the average for 1920.

It is unfair to stress the increase in prices of farm products since the beginning of the present World War in the fall of 1939 in view of the fact that these prices were then abnormally low.

The index of wholesale prices of farm products dropped to about 60 in August 1939, the month before the beginning of the present conflict. The index for all other commodities than farm products and foods remained in that period above 80. In the early months of 1942 the two indexes have been close together, but the percentage increase from 1939 has been much greater for farm products, because in order to regain their normal level they had farther to climb than did industrial products. It is a well-known fact that in unfavorable times prices of agricultural commodities drop far below the average; and unless they go above the average in good times, the farmers never will be able to emerge from bankruptcy.

The figures of the Department of Agriculture show that during the past few months the prices received by farmers for all their products have averaged about parity, as computed under the formula of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. On the strength of this showing the public has been given the impression that all farmers, regardless of the nature of their crops, are in a highly favorable position. An analysis of the figures does not bear this out.

Prices of the important cash crops of corn, wheat, and other grains have averaged not much more than 80 percent of parity. Cotton has been below parity. This means that the money received by the farmers for these commodities will not buy the same amount of industrial products that it would buy in the base period of 1909 to 1914. Furthermore, the gap has been widened by recent very burdensome increases in labor costs to farmers. Unfortunately, the parity price formula takes no account of wages.

On further examination of the figures of the Department of Agriculture on prices received by farmers, it is found that the high average is accounted for in considerable part by prices above parity for livestock and wool. It has been recognized by competent authorities that the use of the 1909-14 base was unfair in the case of these commodities inasmuch as prices were abnormally low. In the case of wool, for example, the agitation against a continuance of a duty for several years prior to the 1913 Tariff Act and its transfer to the free list in that law were responsible for starvation prices throughout that period. If the years 1919–29 had been selected as the base for wool, as they were for tobacco, the present parity price would be at least as high as the ceiling which has been imposed by the Office of Price Administration. Similarly, prices on livestock would not be much, if any, above parity if a fairer base had been chosen.

While I voted against the conference report on the price-control bill because of the failure to deal with the wage question, I believe that the provision relating to farm prices provides adequate protection to the consuming public. None of the four alternative standards—110 percent of the parity price; the market prices on October 1 and December 15, 1941; and the 1919–29 average price—assures the farmer more than a fair return upon his investment and labor.

Taking all the facts into consideration, it is impossible to conclude that the agricultural portion of our population has profited unduly from the war situation or that it will be able to do so under existing controls. It is true that the position of the farmers has greatly improved, and in consequence the burden upon the taxpayers for subsidies can be lightened.

The inflationary trends are a menace to all the people, including the farmers. It will be to the interest of all that controls over prices should be exercised. In this process, however, the farmers should receive fair treatment.

Mr. President, the farmers are anxious to do their part in the war program. They are, however, confronted with many difficulties. The higher prices do not compensate for increased labor costs, nor for the difficulty of securing enough labor and necessary farm machinery.

The difficulties confronting the farmers of Idaho are stated by Charles Monlux, one of the leaders of the Idaho State Grange, in an interview appearing in the Idaho Statesman, of Boise, in its issue of April 18. Mr. Monlux commented on fears expressed by Milford J. Vaught, chairman of the Idaho Farm War Board, that the farmers and stockmen of the State would not meet the 1942 food-production goals. Mr. Vaught gave estimates as to additional acreages which he believed should be planted in Idaho.

Mr. Monlux, in commenting on Mr. Vaught's statement, said:

> Why does he not tell the reasons why farmers cannot put in a full production? Labor costs are getting prohibitive and many farmers cannot get help at any price. High wages paid by the Government and war agencies are taking most of our labor from us. Our boys are drafted for the war and they refuse to ask deferment because they do not want to be classified as slackers.
>
> On top of that trouble, there is a big scarcity of farm machinery. Cultivators, wagons, and tractors are hard to get. I am not kicking about it, but when you are asked to increase your acreage many of us have to buy more machinery or get more farm help. There are no people more anxious to help in the war program than our hard-working farmers, and yet we are hamstrung in our efforts and then criticized as if we are slackers.

These comments by Mr. Monlux show that the farmers are working under great handicaps. Something must be done to provide more labor and farm machinery. Nothing is more important in the war program than to assure a constant supply of food and clothing for ourselves and our Allies. While production of war materials must take precedence over everything else, the whole program will be endangered unless the needs of agriculture are given adequate consideration.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendments of the House of Representatives to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Ohio desire to address himself to the pending question?

Mr. TAFT. I intend to speak on the amendment limiting profits.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to speak briefly; I shall not elaborate what I had intended to say this morning, but my statement is pertinent to the conference report. I think we should give consideration to the underlying question of profit limitations in a way that promises some actual results.

I do not agree with what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] said that the particular provision in the conference report as to the limitation of profits is useless. I think it has certain virtues, and I think it will serve certain good purposes. I think that everyone will agree that it will not solve the main question of profit limitations, and it does not attempt to do so, except to exclude from contracts already negotiated, or contracts hereafter to be negotiated, excessive profits. I think the country is minded to limit war profits, and I have heretofore stated on this floor that in my judgment, a proper limitation can be put on war profits in connection with a tax bill.

I have given a great deal of study to the subject and I have reached the conclusion that, through excess-profits taxes alone, as we have approached that problem, we cannot completely answer the question of exorbitant profits on war contracts. My suggestion relates itself to the taxing power, and I think should be properly incorporated in a tax bill.

The problem has been approached at all times from the standpoint of putting a direct limitation on profits, and that has led to all kinds of confusion. First, it is necessary to determine whether there shall be put a limit on profits in the case of each individual contract. Obviously, that cannot be effectively and wisely done. Second, there arises the question of what the contractor has left after the attempt has been made to limit his profits. So I suggest—and I think it should be incorporated in the tax bill, but it might very well be carried in separate legislation—that a profit limitation, or, what I would rather call an over-all war-profits tax, should be based upon the following principles:

All war contracts, direct and subcontracts, should be included. It is not necessary to go down to the suppliers or material men, because under any effective price-control law their prices will be controlled anyway, and, also, many material men may be unable to determine whether their product is going into the war effort or not. It is easy enough, however, to determine the prime war contractor and it is easy enough to determine every subcontractor if the war contractor is required to put the number of his contract on the subcontract.

Let me repeat that profit limitation legislation should be based upon the following principles. First, all war profits, direct and subcontracts, should be included; second, the aggregate profit on all war contracts should be limited to a fixed percentage of the aggregate contract price over the period of the war, or, at least, over a 3- to 5-year period.

I am not suggesting that the aggregate profit on all war contracts should be limited to 5 or 6 percent or to any lower figure, because that is a matter for careful study and one which ought to have painstaking consideration of the Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, and the Military Affairs Committee; but I am perfectly willing to say that the aggregate profit on all war contracts should be limited to not exceeding 6 percent, and, possibly, to not exceeding 5 percent. My point is that the aggregate profit on all war contracts, direct and subcontracts, should be limited to a fixed percentage of the aggregate contract price over the period of the war or, for example, at least, 3 years.

Third, tentative computation and payment of any excess should be made at the end of each income-tax taxable year, with the application of various averaging devices, with a final adjustment at the end of the war period.

Fourth, the aggregate cost of performing such contracts should be the cost for income-tax purposes, plus the Federal income and excess-profits taxes paid with respect thereto; so that the profit will be taxable net income minus the taxes thereon.

I know very well that we enter a field of controversy when we say that the cost of performing the contracts will be the cost for income-tax purposes, but we may, I think, act in an arbitrary way in order to avoid interminable accounting processes and great expense to the industry and the Government alike. By and large, the cost for income-tax purposes is substantially accurate.

There is no other way, in my judgment, after considerable study, to approach the problem, because if a limitation is fixed before taxes, it is impossible to determine exactly how each contractor will come out. For obvious reasons, the result will not be equitable. Also, we are directly invading and materially interfering with the financial program of the Treasury and with the problems of the taxing committees of both Houses of Congress.

Fifth, in the case of a contractor performing nonwar work as well as war contracts, the taxable net income should be allocated between the two in accordance with a prescribed allocation formula, that is to say, on the basis of gross receipts from sales. In that way the impossible accounting problem and cost determination can again be avoided.

I do not assert, and would not assert, that the method here suggested of using cost for income-tax purposes and of making the allocation in the case of contractors who do both war work and nonwar work is, in every instance, technically accurate or correct; but if the problem is approached as a practical one, if we are to do anything with it, we must adopt arbitrary formulas which are as nearly correct as we can get, in order to avoid excessive costs and interminable delays on the part of both the contractors and the Government, with the consequent slowing down of production.

The excess-profits tax and proper profits limitation in my judgment will solve the problem, and I would prefer to call profits limitation a profit limitation after taxes, because I do not believe it will be possible to approach the question in any other effective way.

Mr. President, we had the choice, when the Excess Profits Tax Act was adopted, of continuing the Vinson-Trammell Act, which was not perfect, but which might have been perfected. It had a great many virtues. But, instead, we adopted the Excess Profits Tax Act. In figuring excess profits, the primary, the essential question is, what is the credit? That is to say, above what point do we begin to impose the excess-profits tax? We have adopted the average-earnings credit and the invested-capital credit, the two, with various and sundry relief provisions for cases of especial hardship.

It must be confessed that neither the average earnings credit nor the invested capital credit will in every instance measure a true excess profit.

What I am suggesting is that we forget our troubles about the excess-profits tax and forget the worry about whether we will have the two credit bases, the average-earnings base and the invested-capital base, forget them entirely, because if we take either of them, or both, there will be cases in which the war contractor will get unconscionable profits. Mark my words, we cannot quite meet the situation through the excess-profits tax alone. Therefore, it seems to me that, as the Congress, we should enact a sound tax system; we should fix fair and just normal and surtax and excess-profits rates applicable to all the taxpayers.

There is very good reason for singling out war contracts, because in these days war contractors are the ones who will make the profits. On the contrary, many corporations which will be called upon to pay some excess-profits tax probably will make less profit than usual, because of priorities and restrictions, because of the impossibility of getting materials on which to work. Therefore, we should maintain a sound system both with respect to the normal and surtax and the excess-profits tax applicable to all, and then, on all war contracts, prime and subcontracts, place a profits limitation, as I have imperfectly indicated.

Let Congress fix the limitation, and no one can justly complain, if we allow a reasonable profit.

Moreover, this proposal will retain the incentive to save on the contract, and it will also stimulate the desire of the contractor himself to retain the management and control of his business.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yields?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to say, in the first place, that I wish to associate myself with the position so ably taken by the Senator from Georgia. I think this matter should be handled as a tax matter. I think it should have been handled as a tax matter in the first place. I think it is unfortunate that it was initiated in the House of Representatives in violation of the rules of both the House and the Senate by putting legislation on an appropriation bill. I believe that we have succeeded in putting ourselves, by this conference report, in the position of the 20,000 men of the King of

France, who marched up the hill and then marched down again, because I think the conference provision means precisely nothing at all.

I agree in large measure with the suggestion the Senator from Georgia has made for the adoption of a general policy which should be enunciated in a tax bill, and, in connection with the point on which he just touched, does not the Senator also think that somewhere along the line power should be lodged in some governmental agency as to contracts for war materials let by the United States Government, to protect the Government against such gouging as the Senator and I both heard testified to a few years ago by the executive of both a great steel company and a great shipbuilding company, when he testified that, in addition to getting a princely salary during the 2 years when the United States was engaged in war, he had also received bonuses of $3,500,000, in round figures, during the 2-year period?

The Senator has just spoken of the fact that there should be an incentive to a contractor to retain possession of his own business, and I agree with the Senator entirely in that; and when we speak of a contractor, it may mean a very large corporation. Does he not also think there should be an incentive to the contractor to run his business at the lowest possible cost, without running up costs, and participating by receiving a bonus of three and a half million dollars, as was paid to one official, and vast bonuses to other officials?

Mr. GEORGE. I agree thoroughly with the Senator. The point I make is that if we approach this problem from the standpoint of profits limitation on the profits after taxes are paid, then we are in a position to say that we are going to cut off those profits anyhow, and they will not be allowed to go beyond a certain point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator entirely in his views about taxing these extraordinary profits—indeed, all extraordinary profits. Those receiving them should be made to pay the highest rate, and that will be done, I am sure. I endorse that view entirely.

I do not think the amendment under discussion in any way affects the matter the Senator has been discussing. I think his views and the amendment are in entire consonance, and in my judgment the amendment will be of assistance in bringing out the facts so that the Finance Committee of which he is the very able chairman, will be better able to tax those who are making the high profits. I think the two are complementary, one with the other.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is merely a step in the right direction. I am sure that when the Senator brings in the bill from the Committee on Finance, it will be of tremendous advantage to our Government and to our people.

Mr. GEORGE. I have said that the most careful study I have been able to give to this problem has convinced me that the excess-profits tax, as we now have it, and as we undertake to apply it, will not meet all situations. I therefore think that either in the tax act or in a separate act, and I believe preferably in the tax act, we can have a complementary provision which will deal with the profits on all war contracts, and let the Senate and the House say what they shall be. There is no other proper standard.

The committee has done its best in this case, and it has left a very large and wide discretion, of course, in the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission; but I am far from saying there is any conflict. On the contrary, there is no invasion of the responsibility of the Treasury or of the taxing committees of the two Houses.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the question before the Senate seems to be a very controversial one, and seems to me to be quite complicated. As I understand, those who have been authorized heretofore to make contracts under which unconscionable profits have been made in many cases are to continue to make contracts, and if excess profits are made, then a negotiation will take place between the Secretary of the department affected and the contractors. It has been admitted that there is no definition in the bill of what constitute excess profits. If the Secretary and the contractor agree, the Secretary will then have authority to levy the tax and recover the excess profits for the Treasury. That is as it appears to me. If I am not mistaken, the Secretary affected may deduct from the bill owing the contractor what is found in his conscience to be excess profits.

Mr. President, it seems to me that is a delegation of the taxing power of the Congress to the various Secretaries who are in charge of these contracts, and if there is not a record vote, I desire the RECORD to show that I am opposed to that method of levying taxes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to go on record against the substitute amendment, and will vote against it if a vote is taken. In view of the fact that there may not be a record vote, I wish to be definitely recorded as against it.

It seems to me that the provision designated as section 403 (a) in the conference report is subject to every objection that has been applicable to any of the other provisions, plus the fact that it is completely ambiguous. Here is a provision dealing with literally billions of dollars, which is to be operative for years to come, and we cannot on the floor of the Senate agree what it means. If the courts are to decide the question, they will take years to determine what it means. It relates to the most essential feature of the business system, and to more than half of all the business in the United States.

Whether the provision means granting to the Secretaries arbitrary power, or whether it means nothing, is a subject upon which members of the committee themselves cannot agree. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] feels that it means nothing, and that nothing can be done unless a contract is renegotiated and a new agreement reached with the consent of the contractor. If that be the fact, the whole contract does not mean anything.

I do not agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I agree that the provision is ambiguous. I agree that there are all sorts of possible interpretations. I agree that the question may be litigated for years to come; but it seems to me it is a rather complete delegation of the power, which Congress ought to exercise, over practically the entire business of the United States.

As I read the provision, it provides for renegotiation. Every contract may be reopened on notice from the Secretary. A man who had a contract would no longer have a contract. He must renegotiate. Perhaps he has spent millions of dollars. He would be tied up. He could not stop. He would have to reach an agreement if he expected to obtain any money at all from the United States Government. He would have no contract. If this provision should be enacted no company or individual in the United States could ever have a contract with the United States Government. We should be abandoning the theory of contracts. Any contract might be voided by the Secretary tomorrow, at his discretion. I think that is clear.

Obviously the contractor would be at a disadvantage. The Government would not have to agree to any price. The Government could take over his plant if it did not like what he was doing. I think it is pretty clear that even if there were no other provisions, all contracting with the United States Government would come to an end with this provision. Renegotiation is defined as including the refixing by the Secretary of the department of the contract price. So I believe that even under the direct terms of the bill the Secretary would have authority to change any price to any figure he might deem proper.

My principal objection to the provision is that not only would it delegate completely to individuals—the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission—in their individual discretion, the question of what price shall be paid on any contract, whether they have agreed to any other price or not, but also for 3 years after the war—probably for 8 years from this time—without previous notice to any contractor, the Secretary might suddenly walk into the office of any business concern in the United States and say, "I think you made an excessive profit on this contract back in 1941 and 1942, and you will have to repay to the Government millions of dollars."

As I read the bill it gives power to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, whoever he may be at that time, to bankrupt every concern in the United States which has had any war contracts. That would mean two-thirds of all the companies in the United States of any size whatever. There is no limitation, and no standard whatever is prescribed by which the judgment of the Secretary may be controlled.

It is said that the contractor may go into court. Some Secretary of War appointed 5 years from now may decide

that 6 percent was too much; that after all, in a war contract, in view of all the sacrifices, 1 percent was sufficient. He may demand that everything over 1 percent be returned. I see no provision here which would enable any court to say that the Secretary was not correct in such an interpretation. There is not the faintest suggestion of a yardstick for excessive profits.

It is said that the procurement officers of the Army and Navy have approved this provision. I understand why they have approved it. They have approved it because it is a complete delegation of power to them to decide what ought to be done with every contract, and on what basis they shall proceed. It may not be a uniform basis. A new Secretary of War may say, 2 or 3 years from now, "I think 2 percent was reasonable," while the Secretary of the Navy is saying that 5 percent is reasonable. The Chairman of the Maritime Commission may adopt an entirely different basis, or he may adopt no basis at all. He may say that 1 percent is reasonable on a certain contract, and 5 percent on another contract.

That seems to me to be a perfectly unjustifiable and dangerous delegation of authority by the Congress to individuals, and one which, in my opinion, would entirely remove the incentive motive. Perhaps it ought to be removed; but I do not think that is the present intention or policy of Congress. We all want to prevent unreasonable profits; but it seems to me that with respect to labor, the farmer, and the businessman, there is still the belief that there is a purpose to be accomplished by keeping some incentive to individuals to proceed in behalf of the war effort.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Should it not be said in justice to the War and Navy Departments that they were very firmly opposed to any action of this character, and yielded only at the importunities of those who felt that some legislation was essential? I do not like to leave the record indicating that the Army and Navy have sought any such extraordinary powers as the Senator has appropriately criticized.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all, but I think that the Army and Navy officials are to be blamed, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], for not having submitted a practical plan for limiting profits. They have not worked out any plan to limit profits, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] proposes to do. I see no reason why they should not have done so. If there has been criticism of excessive profits, it is because the officials made the contracts which resulted in excessive profits.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator from Ohio will recall that when this matter was before the Senate on a former occasion the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the Committee on Finance, took the position that the proper place to deal with this question was in the tax bill which will be forthcoming soon. At the time I rather expressed my adherence to that theory, but, inasmuch as the House had put a provision in the bill rigidly limiting profits to 6 percent under all circumstances, the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and all others concerned with making contracts were confronted with the condition that, although they opposed anything of the sort in this bill, it was already in the bill. There was no way to get it out. It had to go to conference. The best thing to do was to try to work out an acceptable substitute. The departments did not initiate this proposal. They did not approve of legislation in this bill on the subject, but inasmuch as it was already in the bill they had to deal with it in a practical way. This compromise or substitute is the result. I think it is fair to the departments to say they did not suggest that this bill contain any such provisions. I still believe that it would have been wiser not to inject it into this particular appropriation bill, but it was in it, and we had to deal with it. We thrashed it all out on the floor of the Senate 2 or 3 weeks ago and wrote out the substitute which has been substantially agreed to by the House and by the conferees.

Mr. TAFT. That begs the question. I am saying that it should not have been agreed to by the House or by the conferees. That is the argument which I wish to present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we frequently disagree with the other House. When a provision for which we are not responsible is in a bill, we have a situation dumped on our doorstep, and we have to deal with it. In the beginning we might not have been willing to deal with it in this manner. Notwithstanding the fact that we have agreed to the conference report, I still very seriously doubt whether on an appropriation bill the question of profits can be appropriately and adequately dealt with. I think we can still reach it in the tax bill, which will be enacted in the near future.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely agree with the Senator; but I feel that if the Senate had stuck by its principles and insisted that the question should not have been dealt with in an appropriation bill, it would not have been so dealt with. The House could not have refused to pass the $19,000,000,000 appropriation bill in order to legislate on a subject which is infinitely complicated, and will necessarily take 2 or 3 months properly to work out.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it fair to assume that if the Finance Committee in any tax bill adopts a policy with respect to excess profits it may to some extent serve as a guide for the very extraordinary powers which may be exercised under this provision?

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps the Senator was not present when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] spoke. I think he made it clear that excess profits for purposes of taxation are a different thing from excess profits on war contracts. The Senator from Georgia stated that, in his opinion, there should be a separate provision, and that it should be in the tax bill. I hope he will introduce it in the tax bill, and that this provision may be repealed. The only solution which I can see to the problem if this provision is adopted is for the Senator from Georgia to work out a substitute provision.

I was very much interested in the proposals which he made. I do not care to analyze them at the present time, but I feel convinced that something can be done. No problem is insoluble. I very much hope that he will introduce a provision which will repeal the provision which is now before the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator from Ohio will suffer another brief interruption, I should like to ask him a question. Does the Senator think it is at all likely that such a repealer can be enacted? After all, once a law is placed on the statute books, especially a law dealing with a difficult problem such as this, it seems likely to stay there.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct; but I hope he may be wrong, if the Finance Committee proposes a sensible provision.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think my colleagues know that this is a subject in which I have been greatly interested. I hope I may be pardoned if I find myself very much confused about this particular draft, when two such able lawyers as the senior Senator from Louisiana and the senior Senator from Ohio disagree so violently about this particular provision. I think it helps to emphasize the Senator's point that this kind of legislation should never be attempted on an appropriation bill, especially an appropriation bill which is so urgent as is this one.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I feel that this is a delicate and difficult problem, and one which requires action. I think the Congress has been derelict in postponing action on the question. However, I do not think this is the way to go about it. I think we shall always get unfortunate results when we attempt to deal with such questions in appropriation bills. That is why we have in the rules a provision that general legislation shall not be attached to appropriation bills. I realize that the House has entered the field, and, of course, as the Senator from Kentucky says, the Senate has a right to go on with it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to add only a few words. The result of this complete delegation of authority to the Secretary of War is twofold. In the first place, it may accomplish nothing, as has been urged. It is very natural for officials to feel that the problem is well taken care of if the power to take care of it is delegated to them. In effect, that is the position of the officials who were called before the conference committee.

They said, "If you will just leave it to us we will take care of it."

That course has two objections. In the first place, they may be too mild. They have not yet limited the profits, and they may not limit the profits at all. There is nothing in the bill which compels them to do so. They may simply ignore profits. They may think that 10 percent, 20 percent, or some other limitation is proper. So those who wish to be sure of obtaining a limitation on profits cannot do it through this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. In a moment I shall yield. On the other hand, we may find very radical officials who would carry the thing to such an extreme as completely to destroy incentive, and completely, as I say, threaten at least the bankruptcy of a large part of the business of the United States.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think it is only fair to say that the only way in which this measure can fairly be appraised is to see how it works; and there should be some requirement that the Secretaries within a relatively short time make some report to the Congress or give us some evidence of the manner in which they are administering it.

However, the question I desired to propound to the Senator was whether he does not think that if the President should come out next Monday, or at some near date, with a recommendation that individual incomes in this country during the war be limited to a figure not to exceed $25,000 or $50,000 a year, such a limitation would go a long way toward solving the problem of profits?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think that would be a very unfortunate provision, and I have no real belief that the President will propose anything of the kind. If we limit incomes to $50,000, I see no reason why we should not limit them to $25,000, or to $15,000, or to $10,000, or to $5,000. Once that figure is reached, I cannot see any possible basis why we should stop anywhere short of, perhaps, $2,500 or $2,000, which I believe is the average income.

It is argued that anybody can live on $50,000 a year. Well, anybody can live on $2,500 a year, so far as that is concerned. I think that what is left of individual incomes should bear some relation, however slight it may be, to the incomes which the individual presumably has acquired through perfectly proper means, perhaps through his own efforts or the efforts of his family.

I think it would be a step toward a completely communistic set-up if the other principle should be adopted. I am willing to go high enough, to 90 percent or anything you please, in the higher brackets; but I think it is a wrong principle to say that no one shall have more than a certain amount because he can live on that amount. Possibly he may have assumed all kinds of obligations and debts and interest payments based on the income he had. It is not a question of living. If it is a question of what one can live on, we can all live on $2,500 a year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact, however, that we all know that all the men who are in the service are not receiving an income which has any relationship to the income they were deriving before they went into the service?

Mr. TAFT. I think there may be some relationship. I have introduced a bill to provide allowances for dependents. If those allowances are not sufficient, they ought to be made sufficient. There should be some relationship between what such persons shall receive and their requirements, something with reference to the actual obligations they had assumed before they went into the service.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator no doubt has observed the bill which I think has already been introduced by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] who has been a pioneer in this field.

Mr. TAFT. Not quite a pioneer, because I introduced a similar bill 5 weeks ago.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Senator's pardon, I should have divided the honors or perhaps should have given priority to the able Senator from Ohio. However, what I started to say was that, as I recall that bill, I think the maximum allowance for dependents of men in the service is probably $40 a month. Let me ask what is the maximum allowance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado, but first I may say, in the interval, that I think the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado is a better bill than mine, though it is substantially the same.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to know what the maximum is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator is not quite correct in regard to the maximum amount provided in the bill which I introduced the other day, which had the War Department's approval and the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. That is the reason why we were so slow in having it introduced, because we had to go through those preliminaries, while the Senator from Ohio did not go through them with respect to his bill.

The amount provided in the bill introduced the other day by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and myself is $20 for a wife, to be matched by $20 taken from the soldier's pay; also, he will get an additional $10 for each child, and, in addition to that, he or his dependents may receive, if they happen to be parents, $15 for one parent or $25 for both parents.

Mr. PEPPER. Probably it would rarely occur that the total amount of benefits would reach or exceed $100 a month. Is not that so?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct; it would rarely occur. The bill applies only to private, privates first class, corporals, and sergeants. It does not go beyond that. The Senator is correct, however, in his conclusion that probably in no case would the amount of benefits exceed $100 a month.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that it seems to me the particular program which has been worked out violates all proper principles of legislation; that it leaves a complete and arbitrary discretion over the entire business life of the Nation to a few individuals who now hold office, and who may hold office for some time. I think it would be very unfortunate if this provision should become law.

EQUALIZATION OF WAR BURDENS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, first I wish to have the privilege of introducing, at the request of the American Legion, a bill designed to equalize the war burdens of citizens of the United States and thus provide for the successful prosecution of the war.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2479) to equalize the war burdens of citizens of the United States and thus provide for the successful prosecution of the war was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, ever since the inception of the American Legion that organization has been requesting the Congress to enact universal-service legislation to be effective in wartime and to allow for the participation of every citizen in the war effort. The American Legion had no universal-service bill in the Seventy-sixth Congress or in the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, because it did not feel it should confuse issues connected with our preparedness. Also, during that time certain sections of the universal-service plan were being enacted into law, wholly or in part, or such sections were placed in effect by Executive order.

One section of the Legion's plan requested the drafting of manpower for service in the armed forces. That has been accomplished through the Selective Service Act. Another section provided for the granting of priorities in the production of war matériel. That, too, is now in effect. Another section of the Legion's plan sought to prevent excessive war profits. That subject is under consideration by the Congress, particularly by the House Ways and Means Committee, at this time.

Formerly the American Legion met with considerable opposition whenever it urged the enactment of its program, one feature of which, I might mention incidentally, involved the deportation of alien Communist Harry Bridges, of the Pacific coast; but, unfortunately, Mr. Bridges proved more powerful and more influential than the American Legion. I may add in parentheses that I recall that during the discussion of one of our defense bills I proposed an amendment for the deportation of Mr. Bridges; but, unfortunately, the Congress of the United States did not see fit to follow me in that respect. Nevertheless, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate the great American Legion upon its effort to rid this country of alien enemies, and to do all that it possibly can, as it is doing now, in building up our offensive and defensive program.

Today, however, public sentiment is demanding enactment of the various phases of the Legion's plan. The American Legion, believing the time is now opportune, has requested me to introduce the bill which I have just intro-

duced for consideration, and has respectfully requested that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

The following is a digest of the bill:

The American Legion believes that with the enactment of this measure the Nation will have taken a long step toward equalizing the war burdens of our citizens and thus providing for the successful prosecution of the war, in which we are all vitally interested, and which we shall win.

Section 1 provides that the President, by proclamation, shall control all prices. Of course, we now have an act which provides some control, but the American Legion believes we should take steps to control all prices.

Section 2 allows the President to adjust any prices under section 1 which have been established by proclamation, including wages.

Section 3 grants to the President broad authority to promulgate rules and regulations under which "all or any class of persons" may be brought into the service of the Government for the duration of the war. This establishes a means whereby everyone may participate in the great war effort.

Under section 4 the President is authorized to determine and proclaim the classes of public services, real property or rights, the classes of dealers, exporters, importers, manufacturers, or producers who must operate under a license. This is partially in effect today, but additional authority is needed to insure that all phases of American life shall cooperate fully in the war effort.

Section 5 grants to the President authority to create the necessary agencies to carry out the intent of the act.

Section 6 provides severe penalties for the violation of the act.

Today on all sides we hear the cry from thousands of our citizens that they want to do something to aid in the successful prosecution of the war. The American Legion believes that enactment of the bill introduced by me today will provide an answer to those good citizens who are demanding an opportunity to share in the burdens of the current war.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND VICE NEAR MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. President, I have before me, and have had for some time, a number of letters from prominent, fine citizens of the State of Virginia, which they have requested that I bring to the attention of this body; but I have not heretofore done so for the reason that the proper opportunity has not presented itself.

Therefore, I now wish to read a letter dated March 12, 1942, from Norfolk, Va., addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. The letter is as follows:

NORFOLK, VA., *March 12, 1942.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I am writing you not personally, but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

At the 11 o'clock service on Sunday, March 15, 1942, of the Brambleton Avenue Methodist Church the congregation requested the pastor to write you, stating that those present desire you to present to the Senate of the United States the action of the congregation in favor of the prompt passage of Senate bill 860, or of protective legislation for our service men from the liquor and vice traffic, similar to that which was enacted in 1917.

You are also requested to present this action to the Senate that it may be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

ALFRED R. MAYS,
Pastor of the Church.

I have just taken occasion to ascertain whether our distinguished and able colleague the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is in the Chamber, for the reason that he has been vitally interested in legislation of this character because of his deep concern for the boys who serve in the armed forces of this country at home and overseas.

A similar letter has been received from Rev. J. H. Carroll, pastor of the Phoebus Methodist Church, at Norfolk, Va.

Likewise, I have received a similar letter signed by F. M. Wood, of Norfolk, Va., a similar one signed by Charles N. Johnson, of Norfolk, Va.; a similar one signed by W. C. Clark, of 1716 Hamlin Avenue, Norfolk, Va.; a similar one signed by W. D. Nye, 4709 Colonial Avenue, Norfolk, Va.; a similar one signed by George E. Watson, of 617 Marshall Avenue, Norfolk, Va.; a similar one signed by L. R. Mukens, 2834 Victoria Avenue, Norfolk, Va.; and a similar one signed by R. L. Bulman, 508 Clay Avenue, Norfolk, Va.

I also have a letter from Boykins, Va., under date of April 8, 1942, reading as follows:

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The congregation present at a union service at the Baptist Church at Boykins, Va., on April 5, requested us, as pastors of the churches represented, to write to you, not personally but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

The congregation present voted to request the Senate of the United States to pass legislation similar to that adopted in 1917, to protect the armed forces of our country from the liquor and vice traffics. The congregation desire that you present their action to the Senate of the United States, and to see that it is incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your attention will oblige.

Yours sincerely,

L. F. CALLAHAM,
Pastor, Methodist Church, Boykins, Va.
J. FELIX ARNOLD,
Pastor, Baptist Church, Boykins, Va.

Then, there is a postscript which reads:

Acknowledgment of this communication will be appreciated.

COMMUNISTIC INFLUENCES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. President, at this time, appropriate or otherwise, I wish to state that yesterday a report submitted to the Governor of the State of New York asserted that 503 Communist teachers, or teachers under Communist domination, have been found in the educational system of New York City, most of them managing to remain snugly in their berths through indifference or for one reason or another. The report seems to have been submitted by the Coudert subcommittee to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman and the legislature in Albany, N. Y.

The article from which I now take occasion to read, Mr. President, was published in the columns of the New York Herald Tribune, on the front page, issue of Thursday, April 23, 1942, which is today. The article is headed:

Coudert says city schools shelter Reds.
Coudert's subcommittee lays Communist trend to 503 city teachers.
Accused boards of failing to act.
Charges unfair pressure on Dr. Colligan to quit as president of Hunter.

I assume by the use of the word "Hunter" that Hunter College is meant.

Mr. President, in the minds of some and according to the attitude of some, it is promotive of disunity; indeed it is traitorous for one, during these critical hours, even to make bold to employ the word "communism" in any conversation or in any forum, but I do not so consider it. I believe that American citizens at all times, regardless of circumstances, are not only privileged but it is their bounden and sworn duty to protect their own country and to give to their own country their time and attention before they devote their time and attention or funds to any other country upon the face of the earth.

Mr. President, although it may be considered as traitorous and unpatriotic for me even to mention the word "communism" here today, I shall say now that I have no apology whatever to make to anyone for embracing the present opportunity to speak in defense of and in behalf of our country. I recall that years ago I read somewhere a remark which I shall attempt to quote. I may not quote it correctly, but with at least approximate accuracy. During the trials and black days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said that if ever our Nation shall be destroyed it will be destroyed from within and not from without. Since my early days in school I have recalled that statement. I have likewise felt that if ever our Nation was destroyed it would be destroyed perhaps by enemies engaged in the tactics of boring from within. Particularly now when the eyes of all Americans are cast upon foreign shores, and we, therefore, cannot view with the same clearness the things that are happening upon our own soil is the statement of Lincoln apropos.

Mr. President, despite the fact that in the minds of some and according to the attitude of some, it is traitorous for one even to mention communism at this time, I shall embrace this opportunity to attempt to bring to the attention of this body an isolated case, in a sense, but, nevertheless, one of hundreds of cases which may be pointed to throughout the length and breadth of our land, as indicating that communism is attempting now in America to bore from within. I feel at liberty certainly to bring this instance to the attention of the Senate without being denounced as a traitor, without it being said that I am creating disunity in this country, inasmuch as the Herald Tribune, of the city of New York,

one of the greatest metropolitan newspapers in all the world, which boasts of its tremendous circulation, has been privileged to do so.

In other words, Mr. President, in view of the fact that a great American newspaper has had the audacity to employ even in print the word "communism," I myself feel at liberty to comment upon the article which the Herald Tribune has been so bold as to make publication of. I read from the article, as follows:

The assertion that 503 Communist teachers, or teachers under Communist domination, have been found in the city's education system, most of them managing to remain snugly in their berths through indifference of the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education, was made yesterday in a 385-page report submitted by the Coudert subcommittee to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman and the Legislature in Albany.

Albany, of course, is the capital of the Empire State of this Union.

The report further declared that a majority group of the Board of Higher Education applied extraordinary pressure by undemocratic methods to force the resignation of Dr. Eugene A. Colligan as president of Hunter College, because of a feeling that he was not "a liberal."

By the way, the word "liberal" is in quotation marks.

The resignation was demanded, the report said, by three board members, Ordway Tead, chairman, John T. Flynn, and Lauson H. Stone.

The board of education, which is headed by James Marshall, was particularly censured for failing to take any action in the case of Charles J Hendley, a teacher in George Washington High School and president of New York Teachers Union, local 5, which was expelled from the American Federation of Teachers. He was characterized as a "utensil of communism" although it was emphasized there has never been any direct proof that he is a Communist.

The subcommittee is part of a joint legislative committee, headed by Assemblyman Herbert A. Rapp, of Genessee, and Senator Frederic A. Coudert, of Manhattan, appointed to investigate public-school systems throughout the State, especially in regard to subversive activities. The subcommittee confined itself to New York City.

I continue to read from the article which I have heretofore mentioned. I respectfully call to the attention of the Members of this body this paragraph, which I emphasize:

"There is no doubt whatever," the report said, "that there are hundreds of Communists and intentional fellow travelers in the school system. Their machinations and conspirative tactics are well known. This committee has exposed 69 individual teachers as Communists by legal evidence. It has in its files information and evidence tending to implicate 434 others, including 96 teachers who signed Communist Party nominating petitions in the year 1939 alone."

That, Senators, was from the report of a committee, I assume, delegated by the proper legislative authorities of the State of New York, and submitted to Governor Lehman, the chief executive of the Empire State. It is not my statement; it is not a hearsay statement given to me; it is a direct statement made by gentlemen of prominence and integrity, duly qualified representatives of the people of the State of New York, in reference to the inroads being made by communism in the State of New York, which is, of course, one of the greatest States of the Union.

I take occasion to say that it is not my statement because, had it been known by some that I had made that statement instead of reading it from the report of the committee, they would have encouraged the American people not to believe it. They would have said that because I made the statement it should not be believed, since I am the enemy of the Communist Party because I once took occasion to introduce a bill in this body prohibiting any Communist, any Fascist, any Nazi Bundist, or any American who had been deprived of his American citizenship as a result of conviction of a felony, from serving as an officer or as an agent in any labor organization in this country. As a result of the introduction of that proposed legislation, the Communists and their sympathizers in America dislike me very much.

I took occasion to read from the report because once upon a time, not so long ago, I introduced a bill in the Senate providing that the Communist Party in the United States of America should be outlawed, and as a result thereof, of course, the Communists do not like me at all.

It is perfectly natural that the Communists should dislike me because I confess that I am their enemy, and that I have been doing everything I possibly could against the Communists, and I shall continue to do so, regardless of the circumstances. It is natural that they should be against me because when we had before us a certain bill I offered an amendment to the bill to deport one of their members, Mr. Harry Bridges, of the west coast, and I had the backing of the great American Legion in my efforts to bring about the deportation of Mr. Bridges.

But unfortunately the influence of Mr. Bridges and the influence of the Communist Party members outweighed the influence of the American Legion, and as a result, when the matter was brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States, the bill failed of passage, and Mr. Bridges remains with us.

Mr. President, I continue to read the clipping referring to the report of the committee of the Legislature of the State of New York:

The report went on to say that 17 teachers have been convicted in disciplinary proceedings of "perjuriously denying party membership in their testimony before our committee; 18 others have been suspended, of whom 11 are waiting trial; 7 have resigned, and 6 were not reappointed. Our teacher, Morris U. Schappes, was convicted of first-degree perjury.

That is followed by a subheadline, reading as follows:

Says all denied membership.

That is not surprising to me, because I do not believe I have ever heard of anyone admitting membership in and affiliation with the Communist Party, with the exception of Mr. Earl Browder, and Mr. Browder is now in the penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga. Incidentally, in that connection, we all know that virtually every newspaper in the United States has carried advertisements to the effect that great mass meetings are being held throughout the length and breadth of our land for the purpose of creating sentiment for the release of Mr. Browder, who is the head of the Communist Party in the United States of America. Whether he will be released of course I cannot say, and I would not dare to venture to say that he would not be released, because, despite the pressure brought and the influence of the great American Legion, we were unable to deport Mr. Harry Bridges from this country.

I read the subhead again:

SAYS ALL DENIED MEMBERSHIP

"Yet the fact remains," the report continues, "that in 16 months of inquiry, not one teacher admitted being in the party when he testified.

"This is the most important single fact developed in the investigation."

Time and time again the report refers to the "Communist conspiracy of silence, perjury and subordination"; to the party tactics of enrolling members under fictitious names and to the pretense of not keeping any records of members. This makes evidence extremely difficult to obtain, the subcommittee said, and added: "If a solution is to be found it must be based on a thorough understanding of the Communist movement, its aims, philosophy, and tactics and the methods it employs in attempting to subvert the schools."

The report noted that the law provides no civil penalty for contempt of a legislative committee, as it does for contempt of court, for which offenders may be fined or imprisoned. The most that can be done at present to a witness who refuses to testify before a legislative committee is to commit him until he agrees to testify.

CALLS FOR PENALTIES

"It should not be possible for a subversive organization to cause its members to engage in an organized campaign of mass obstruction and delay," the report declares. "The Supreme Court should be authorized to fix penalties analogous to those which it is empowered to apply in cases involving civil disobedience of its own process.

"The committee is firmly of the belief that the legislature will have occasion to investigate subversive activities again in the future. To fail to enact the legislation above recommended would be to invite further difficulty.'"

The case of Dr. Colligan was, perhaps, the most spectacular evidence adduced against the majority of the board of higher education.

"Dr. Colligan's qualifications as an able and efficient business administrator were not questioned by any of the members of the board—not even by those who wanted to dispense with his services," the subcommittee asserted. It quoted some board members as saying the antagonism against him was based on dissatisfaction with some of his appointments.

"A more probable theory," the report said, "would appear to be indicated by a concession made by a leading member before the committee that there was a feeling on the part of the more recent appointees on the board that Dr. Colligan's outlook on educational matters was not a 'liberal' one."

THREAT IS CHARGED

The report charged Mr. Tead, Mr. Flynn, and Mr. Stone, representing the majority, summoned Dr. Colligan to a meeting on June 19, 1939, and demanded his resignation, and informed him that "unless he agreed to resign, the salary of the president would be dropped from the budget at a meeting of the Board of Higher Education to be held the following night." Dr. Colligan, it was further charged, was threatened with the loss of his pension unless he resigned.

Under this pressure, the report said, Dr. Colligan appeared with a letter of resignation the next day. It was not acceptable, whereupon Mr. Flynn, according to the report, went to another room and prepared Dr Colligan's letter of resignation on grounds of illness. The letter, the report said, was postdated November 1, 1939, and the resignation was to take effect September 1, 1940.

Mr. Tead meanwhile had written a letter of instruction to Dr. Colligan, the report said, telling him to apply for a leave of absence for 1 year, from September 1, 1939, to September 1, 1940, and assuring him it would be granted. At the same time Mr. Tead ordered Dr. Colligan to submit the post-dated resignation.

The Colligan case was never brought formally before a full meeting of the board, the report said, until these preliminary arrangements had been made. The report said that Mr. Tead, Mr. Flynn, and Mr. Stone explained that they had been asked by Dr. Colligan to withhold from members of the board how his resignation had been brought about. It added: "The making of any such request is denied by Dr. Colligan."

FLYNN REPLIES TO CHARGE

This and other parts of the report brought immediate repercussions last night. Mr. Flynn, reached at his home at 35-01 Edgewater View, Bayside, Queens, emphasizing that he was speaking for himself alone, said:

"A majority of the members of the board believed Dr. Colligan should not be reappointed I joined in that belief What should the board have done? Throw Dr. Colligan out? Brand him? Or tell him in a civilized way what the attitude of the board was? That is what we did He did not have to resign. He could have submitted the matter to the board which would have ousted him.

"He chose the way which was least harmful to his reputation The reason back of our action was not that Dr. Colligan was not a liberal The chief reason was that he did not possess the intellectual qualifications to administer a great college and provide it with educational leadership

"The charge that Dr Colligan was threatened with loss of his pension is absolutely untrue. He was told specifically that the members of the board who opposed reappointing him had not wished to deprive him of his pension rights in any way

"I notice Senator Coudert says I wrote the letter of resignation for Dr. Colligan and assigned ill health as the cause. As a matter of fact, Dr Colligan asked that he be permitted to assign ill health as a reason. That was his own idea."

Mr. Stone declined to comment and Mr. Tead was in Boston on business.

DR. LOMBARDO'S PROTEST

In support of Dr. Colligan was Dr. Lombardo, of 7601 Twelfth Avenue, Brooklyn, one of the six members of the board who refrained from voting on the acceptance of the resignation He characterized the background moves of the resignation as "unprecedented action of individual board members, acting in concert without the knowledge of any of the membership, and without any implied or specific authorization or any vote of the board."

The procedure, Dr. Lombardo said, was "arbitrary, high-handed, and undemocratic in many ways" and was "predicated on a deliberate falsehood, involving a so-called leave of absence for illness, which was followed in short order by a 'voluntary' resignation." Dr. Lombardo said his own requests for an explanation were received in "stony silence, indicative of a craven disregard not only of the rights of Dr. Colligan but also of the rights of each member of the board."

ABOUT BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Regarding Brooklyn College, of which Dr. Harry D. Gideonse is president, the report said that "evidence in the committee's possession, but not publicly p[illegible]nted, leads the committee to believe that the Brooklyn College unit (of the Communist Party) comprised not less than 30 members of the faculty and the administrative staff. Each of the individuals identified was questioned in private, and each denied any knowledge of membership in the party. The committee is persuaded that most, if not all, of these denials were perjurious."

To this Dr. Gideonse replied last night: "I challenge anybody to bring in legal evidence we can use against Communists at Brooklyn College. I believe the committee is performing a great disservice to the community and to the school system if it raises charges it cannot prove in a court of law. No one is more eager to get at the true facts than I. Unless the committee can produce results, it should remain silent."

President Marshall, and other members of the board of education who were reached, declined to comment on the charges of negligence in the Hendley affair and of adopting a passive and "dangerous attitude."

In conclusion, this is the statement of Mr. Hendley from the office of the Teachers' Union:

HENDLEY STATEMENT

From the offices of the Teachers' Union, 13 Astor Place, Mr. Hendley issued a statement, which said: "Senator Coudert has not presented one case of subversive activity. In all the cases of the teachers who were suspended there was no evidence of anything subversive in their teaching."

Mr. Hendley denies absolutely any communistic activity. He further states:

Moreover, Coudert was blind to all the pro-Fascist activity of the Coughlinites and the Christian Front that impinges upon the schools. I charge that Coudert is unwilling to investigate really subversive activity.

In this connection I wish to say that when communistic activity is alleged, and when a fight is made against the Communists, regardless of who the individual is who makes the fight, their only excuse and their only weapon is to say that the man who makes the charges is blind because he himself is a pro-Nazi- or a pro-Fascist.

The statement concludes:

The Teachers' Union is engrossed in its effort to do its share in winning this war. Coudert's charge that the union is dominated by Communists who are engaged in subversive activity is just plain political hokum which is being exploited at a time to prevent us from the real business at hand for all loyal Americans.

The article concludes with a statement in regard to an appropriation for the committee.

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendments of the House of Representatives to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, getting back to the question before the Senate I wish to inquire of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] with respect to Senate amendments numbered 71 and 72, relating to the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor. It seems to me that there is no more important function to be performed right now than the services of this body of men under Dr. Steelman, head of the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor. The House provided an appropriation of $76,500, which was increased by the Senate to $226,500, or an increase of $150,000, because the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor now has about 1,200 disputes to handle. That does not mean strikes. It means disputes of all sorts which are sought to be settled by conciliation and negotiation. The Conciliation Service has only 120 men to handle the 1,200 disputes. The Senate committee—very properly, I think—added $150,000 to the appropriation, which made the total appropriation $226,500. It seems that the conferees simply divided that amount in half, which I suppose was an arbitrary way of arriving at some figure, and reported $113,250, which is precisely half of $226,500, and only $35,000 or $40,000 more than the amount allowed by the House. Can the Senator tell me why it was that the amount was reduced so materially, in view of the great need?

Mr. McKELLAR. In the conference the House conferees were apparently unanimous as to two items. One was the item immediately preceding, of $90,000, for the Department of Labor. They objected strenuously to it, and at first would not even listen to any compromise. The only way in which we could obtain a compromise on the second item was for the Senate to yield on the first item. The Senate yielded on the first item, and the best we could possibly get from the House in conference was half of the $226,500 which the Senate had provided.

I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that these items are necessary, but we met with the firmest kind of opposition. Under the circumstances there was no other way to settle the question than the way in which we settled it. I want the Senator to understand that the Senate conferees stood out strongly for the items as adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize the Senate conferees' situation, but I cannot help but express my regret that it was necessary to reduce the amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also regret it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee agreed to the amount as it was fixed by the Senate, and the members of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee composed the House conferees on this bill. The amount was reduced by the full committee of the House after the subcommittee had agreed to the amount of $226,500. In view of the fact that the same members of the subcommittee who originally agreed to it in the House were members of the conference committee, I am frankly a little surprised that they insisted on the reduction.

Mr. McKELLAR. They not only insisted, but they insisted most strenuously.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the situation. I realize that the Senate conferees had to make some compromise. However, in view of all the controversy and the furor which has been in the public mind recently in regard to the settlement of disputes in labor organizations

and between laboring men and their employers under the aegis of the Government of the United States, which has by law sought to encourage conciliation and arbitration and negotiation as a means of settling labor disputes in order that they may not result in the cessation of labor, and in view of the fine work which has been accomplished by the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, I regret, and I want to express my regret, that I am afraid that acting under the influence of the furor about which I have just spoken, the Members of the other body were not willing to give to the Conciliation Service the appropriation which is so essential at this time to enable them to have the number of conciliators necessary in order to settle these disputes amicably to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate for including this item when the bill came to the Senate recently, and for the Senator's efforts in behalf of it now; but I think it is regrettable that the House compelled the Senate to yield so substantial a part of the appropriation we provided for this essential service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. All I can say is that we got the best we could. That is all there is to it. All of us know the situation in conference committees—we have to give and take.

Mr. President, in order to complete the parliamentary progress of the bill under consideration, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 21, 45, 74, and 79.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, still further to complete the parliamentary progress of the bill, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 68.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that completes the bill.

Mr. President, I understand that when the Senate adjourns today it will adjourn over until Monday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Vice President may be permitted to sign the bill during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I intended to obtain the floor before the conference report was passed upon, merely for the purpose of having inserted in the record of the debate a tentative amendment dealing with the question of profits pending before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. The debate has very extensively covered the subject of the manner in which excess profits shall be dealt with, especially in the case of war contracts. While the tentative amendment has not been passed upon by the Treasury Department, so far as I know it is acceptable to them, since it was drafted by them at the request of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment printed in the RECORD in connection with the debate, for the purpose of examination and study by the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after subchapter E of chapter 1 the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER F—INCOME FROM GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"SEC. 770. IMPOSITION OF TAX

"(a) Imposition: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, on the net income of every person which is derived from Government contracts completed within the taxable year, a tax equal to 100 percent of the amount of such net income which is in excess of — percent of the total contract prices of such contracts. For the purposes of this section, net income derived from such contracts which is in excess of — percent of the cost of performing such contracts shall be considered to be net income in excess of — percent of the total contract prices of such contracts.

"(b) Contracts exempt: Subsection (a) shall not apply in any case in which the total contract prices of Government contracts completed within the taxable year do not exceed $25,000.

"SEC. 771. MEANING OF TERMS USED

"(a) General rule: Except as otherwise provided in this section, the terms used in this subchapter shall have the same meaning as when used in chapter 1.

"(b) Government contract: As used in this subchapter, the term 'Government contract' means—

"(1) Prime contract: A contract with the United States for the design, survey, production, manufacture, processing, assembly, construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, maintenance storage, repair, alteration, conversion, distribution, supply, or acquisition by the taxpayer of any article or any portion thereof and any contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act to promote the defense of the United States; and

"(2) Subcontract A contract entered into with a prime contractor for the design, survey, production, manufacture, processing, assembly, construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, alteration, conversion, distribution, supply, or acquisition of any article, or any portion thereof, other than an article or portion thereof which as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, is (A) not owned by the United States, (B) not acquired by the United States under a contract with the United States, (C) not for the use of the United States, and (D) not paid for by the United States pursuant to a contract with the prime contractor.

"(c) Prime contractor: As used in this section, the term 'prime contractor' means a person entering into a contract with the United States.

"SEC. 772. DETERMINATION OF NET INCOME FROM GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"For the purpose of determining the net income derived from Government contracts completed by a person within any taxable year—

"(a) General rule: There shall be allowed the deductions which are provided for in section 23 and which are allowable to such person for the periods of performance of such contracts, but such deductions shall be allowed only to the extent that they represent items connected with income derived from, and necessary for the performance of, such Government contracts; and

"(b) Allocation of costs: The proper method of apportionment and allocation of deductions to gross income derived from Government contracts and to other gross income shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary

"SEC. 773. RETURNS

"Every person subject to the tax imposed by section 770 shall, for each taxable year in which one or more Government contracts are completed, make a return stating specifically the total contract prices of such contracts, the amount of gross income derived therefrom (regardless of the taxable year in which received), and the deductions allowed with respect to such gross income, and such other information for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subchapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe.

"SEC. 774. REFUNDS AND CREDITS

"Such portion of any other tax under the Internal Revenue Code as is attributable to the inclusion in gross income of the amount of tax required to be paid under section 770 shall be credited or refunded to the taxpayer in the same manner as an overpayment of such other tax.

"SEC. 775. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"All provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of the taxes imposed by chapter 1 shall, insofar as not inconsistent with this subchapter, be applicable in respect to the tax imposed by this subchapter."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendment numbered 2 of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$128,961,700, no part of which shall be available for construction work upon the Table Rock and Bull Shoals Reservoirs projects in the White River Basin"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
D. D. TERRY (except as to Bull Shoals and Table Rock Reservoirs projects),
ROSS A. COLLINS,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to object, but I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma what happened to the Bull Shoal and Table Rock Reservoir projects.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Missouri, let me say that the bill does not contain references to any specific project.

Mr. TRUMAN. I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senate committee added to the appropriations contained in the bill approximately $20,000,000. It was understood in the hearings and in the report that the money, if appropriated, would be used to start construction of the Bull Shoal Dam and the Table Rock Reservoir, located in Arkansas and Missouri, respectively, and to start projects located at other points in the United States.

There was one item for dredging a river in southern Louisiana; another item for the completion of a levee on the Arkansas River in my State of Oklahoma; another item was to increase the lump sum available for the Board of Engineers to make complete surveys of projects, and to have such surveys filed so that when the war is over, and when men are thrown out of war industries, and when the boys come back from the front, we shall have surveyed projects which can be advertised for contracts and can be started immediately.

In the conference, the House Members were adamant. It seems that in the House certain votes were had on certain proposals, and some of those votes were adverse to some of the items mentioned in the report accompanying this bill. A vote was had, as I understand, on the projects in Missouri and Arkansas, and the vote was approximately 2 to 1 against including those projects in the report. So, when the conferees met, all save one Member of the House conferees were against the inclusion of any sum whatever to start construction of either of these two projects.

After 2 days of discussion, we found that the House conferees were becoming stronger all the time against the items; so the Senate conferees had to come to some agreement, and we had to get the best we could, which was to leave out of the bill the appropriation to start the construction of either of the two projects.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma has put forth every possible effort in behalf of these two projects; but I desire to say that at the present time in the Mississippi River Valley—which includes the Arkansas River, the White River, and all its tributaries—there is a very decided shortage of power. Power is now very much needed for defense projects which have been located in that area. In the vicinity of the city of St. Louis, in the vicinity of Kansas City, and in the vicinity of Little Rock, the power from these projects, were it available, would meet the now pending shortage.

I understand that the principal reason for the objection to these projects in the House was that they might injure the fishermen's paradise on the White River. At the present time I think the national defense program is of much more importance than a few fish. Furthermore, I may say that it has developed that the fishermen were at fault in objecting to a dam on the Osage River, because the fish have very much increased on the river since the dam was built there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to join in what my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN] says about this matter. Before I do so, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the consideration which was given to these projects by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], by the full committee, and by the Senate. I realize, of course, that in the case of a bill of this magnitude, an appropriation bill of this size and this vital necessity to the Government, neither House can indefinitely hold up the bill against the wishes and the expressed position of the other House; but, if the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me, I should like to say a few words about these projects.

Mr. President, these projects come to the Congress at this time with perhaps the most urgent recommendation as defense projects of any projects in the whole United States from the President of the United States, from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, from the Resources Commission, and from the Federal Power Commission. I speak now of the Bull Shoal project in Arkansas and the Table Rock Reservoir in Missouri. Possibly I first should explain that they are really one project, because they could only function together in the most effective way. They are recommended by General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers, as possibly the best example of a dual-purpose defense project in the United States. That is to say, at this time, when agricultural production is one of the most vital objectives of our people as a defense activity, they would save and reclaim 7,000 square miles of the finest alluvial land in the United States and make certain production from that area. In addition to that, they would develop a great amount of electrical power and energy located within a very easy distance of the great field which produces 95 percent of the bauxite of the United States, the material from which aluminum is made, and which has easily adjacent great fields of magnesium and of cinnabar, which are very vital defense materials. Although not immediately adjacent, they are within easy striking distance by transmission lines of the great industrial districts of St. Louis and Kansas City. They are even closer to the lead and zinc mines of southeast Missouri and southwest Missouri, where there is now employed as much electrical energy as can be developed for the purpose of reclaiming zinc from the slag piles which have already been accumulated. They are very closely adjacent to the great city of Springfield, Mo., which has a very large labor pool which might be employed.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN] and I have been informed during the past few days by responsible Government officials that defense industries which they would like to locate in the St. Louis district, by reason of transportation and labor and other advantages, cannot be located there because of a possible shortage of power. It seems to me that we cannot afford to reject a project for developing power in this country at a time when districts all over the United States otherwise suitably located for the establishment of defense industries are being turned down because of the lack of power.

Of course, it is said that these establishments could not come into full production, could not reach peak production, until the end of 1945; and I believe that to be true. A great many Members of the House and Senate, in perfect good faith, have asserted that we ought not to spend anything for any establishment which will not come into production in the next 2 or 3 years.

Nobody hopes more than I do, Mr. President—nobody prays more fervently than I do, Mr. President—that we shall not need power production or any other facility for defense purposes after the end of 1945. I hope and pray that this war may terminate in our favor long before that time; but I do not think any of us, either in this House or in the other House, can afford to proceed upon the assumption that this war will end next year or within the next 2 years. I think we ought to make provision for the complete defense of the United States on the basis of a long, hard war.

As I have said, Mr. President, I realize we cannot hold up this bill at this time; it is an important appropriation bill; but I believe that the United States Government ought now to adopt the policy of developing all the power resources and all the flood-control resources that will reasonably be able to increase the production of food or the production of munitions within the next 3 or 4 or 5 years.

I simply wanted to take the floor, not only to thank the Senator from Oklahoma and the conferees for the position they have taken but to give notice that this matter is not being settled here today by the adoption of the conference report, and that such vitally necessary projects as these which we are now considering wil' be considered again in the future.

Let me say further, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have always taken the attitude—and I take the attitude now—that in this period of emergency and during this war I will not vote for a public project of any sort which is not recommended by the very best authority as being absolutely necessary as an emergency defense matter. I have supported the Bull Shoal and Table Rock projects because I think that the complete record of the testimony of the Army engineers and all other officials and experts concerned has led to the conclusion that those projects should be supported.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall say just this further word: The particular project known as Bull Shoal has been authorized by the Congress; it has been estimated for by the Budget Bureau. The House subcommittee recommended the construction of the project and reported an appropriation to start construction. It was on the House floor itself that a motion was made to strike the item from the

bill. So, when the vote was taken, the House conferees considered themselves bound.

In the event that the administration still desires the construction of this project, no doubt a supplemental or renewed Budget estimate will be submitted to the Congress, in which event on the next supplemental deficiency bill which comes along and which will be before us soon no doubt, we will have a chance to consider this item; and at that time, as one member of the subcommittee on the deficiency bill, I shall take the same interest in seeing that it is considered by the Senate, and I shall give it my support.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield for a moment further, I desire again to thank him, and I should like to make it plain that in anything I have said I have no desire whatsoever to criticize the House conferees. There had been a vote, in fact, there had been two votes, in the House of Representatives, and the House conferees, naturally, considered themselves bound. If I had been a House conferee I should certainly have considered myself bound.

The matter originally came up because of an error in the computation, evidently in the Budget Bureau, because the estimate for the two projects slightly exceeded the congressional authorization. That point was first made in the House, and the project was defeated largely on that ground. Having stricken out the Table Rock item, and the argument having been made that Bull Shoal and Table Rock projects were so closely tied together as to be really one project, the House then proceeded to strike out the item for Bull Shoal. I believe the recommendations of the President, of the Federal Power Commission, of the Corps of Army Engineers, and of all other experts who have testified on this subject, to be so overwhelming that, on reconsideration at a later date, the House of Representatives may change its views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none and the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL SHORE ACTIVITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2406) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $168,780,000; lighter-than-air program, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $119,000,000; liquid fuel storage, $100,000,000; Marine Corps training facilities, $20,000,000; ordnance storage facilities, $150,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $100,000,000; hospital and dispensary facilities, $40,500,000; shore radio facilities, $11,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $720,000; miscellaneous structures, $25,000,000; floating drydock program, $36,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $800,000,000: *Provided further*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the Senate provided an authorization of $1,000,000,000. The House reduced the amount to $800,000,000, which is the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. Therefore I move that the House amendment be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1961) to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey, which was in line 7, after "New Jersey", to insert ": *Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled."

Mr. BARKLEY. On behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF DEALERS IN AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER RATIONED ARTICLES

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. BROWN and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. I promised to yield to the Senator from Michigan and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 1272) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be made the pending business, with the understanding that it will be taken up on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF FLYING HOURS OF CIVILIAN PILOTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have a bill from the Committee on Commerce for the consideration of which I desire to ask unanimous consent. I do not like to intervene and interfere with the bill which the Senator from Michigan desires made the pending business, but, if the Senator from Florida will conclude, and the Senator from Michigan will give me an opportunity to have the bill to which I refer reported, I believe that my bill may be disposed of.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I defer my remarks for the present.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I will withhold my request for unanimous consent so that the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6799) to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I inquire if the Department recommends the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If, by unanimous consent, I can make a brief explanation, I believe I can resolve any doubt about this bill. I may say that I first talked to the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, and the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon, before I asked for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill provides that the present limitation on the hours of flying by civilian pilots may be increased by the Civil Aeronautics Authority on the recommendation of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is the purpose of the bill, I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to say, in addition, that the limitation of 85 flying hours a month has been the most prized possession of the air line pilots. They have a very strong and a very fine organization, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Probably there is no occupation in the United States which requires a higher degree of skill, greater courage, and more stamina than that of civilian pilots. After considerable trouble and debate, they procured what they regarded as the most valuable charter of their rights, which is a limitation of 85 hours a month on their flying time. At present the law requires that a pilot be not permitted to start unless it is certain that he will be able to finish his flight within the prescribed maximum. Much as they prize this legal protection of their rights and of the lives and safety of their passengers, in view of the present emergency, the Airline Pilots Association, themselves, have not only agreed but have come before the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce on civil aviation and urged the immediate passage of this bill, because, they said, the situation was such that the law should be put into effect immediately.

The bill has the approval of the War Department, of the Navy Department, and of the Commerce Department, which has jurisdiction over the matter.

The bill provides simply that the limitation of 85 flying hours a month shall be increased to 100 flying hours a month, with the further provision that if a pilot has started on his flight, or is about to start his flight, on proper showing, a permit can be given him to conclude the

particular flight, the matter to be determined in each case.

I call attention to this fact particularly because these men, highly skilled as they are, brave as they must be, laboring under great nervous strain as they do, have come forth in support of and urged the passage of this measure with the understanding that they will get no extra pay, no overtime pay, no extra consideration of any sort for this additional contribution which they are willing to make in emergency cases for the defense of the United States. It seems to me when they urge the passage of this measure that there ought not to be a voice in Congress against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill reported by the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF DEALERS IN AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER RATIONED ARTICLES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request pending. I yielded temporarily to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio has the floor temporarily, I think I should say that, through the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan, his request for unanimous consent was temporarily deferred for the consideration of the bill reported by me, because I did not wish to have my bill interfere with the request of the Senator from Michigan that his bill be made the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I renew my request that the bill reported by me from the Committee on Banking and Currency (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States be made the pending business, with a view to being taken up on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I am not clear whether granting this request would be in derogation of the agreement entered into with respect to the special position on Monday of Senate bill 2054.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no special position on Monday with regard to that bill. It is Tuesday.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say that it is expected that the independent offices appropriation bill will be considered on Monday.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WAR-LABOR CONFERENCE—ATTITUDE OF MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a controversy has arisen regarding the exact nature and scope of the agreement entered into between the employers and labor representatives in December last. On the 15th of January the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] inserted in the RECORD a description of that conference and exactly what had occurred. I have been requested by the management representatives to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which they wrote to the senior Senator from Utah, who was, I think, the conciliator of the conference, on January 28, stating their position and their disagreement with the position taken by the Senator from Utah on the 15th of January, as shown in the RECORD of that date.

They requested that this letter be inserted in the RECORD, but I find it has not been inserted, and in order that their position may be stated, and without myself approving or disapproving the argument which they make, about which I know nothing, I ask that the letter of January 28 addressed to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] by Charles R. Hook and 11 other employer representatives be inserted in the RECORD, together with their subsequent letter of April 8 to the senior Senator from Utah. I do this at the request of Mr. Charles R. Hook, president of the American Rolling Mill Co., of Middletown, Ohio, in order that their arguments may be given proper publicity with the other material which has already been inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1942.

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Our attention has been called to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1942, where, beginning at page 3725, you inserted a memorandum report of the deliberations of the War-Labor Conference convened by the President on December 17, 1941.

It seems to us that the recital of what took place at the conferences leaves the representatives of management in a position where their attitude may be subject to unjustifiable criticism. For instance, the memorandum says, "Upon the morning of Thursday, December 18, the representatives of management presented a proposed declaration of principles but did not suggest the creation of any specific machinery to settle industrial disputes."

Inasmuch as you did not insert in the RECORD any draft of the proposal put forward by the representatives of management on December 18, the implication from the foregoing statement is that the representatives of management failed entirely to recognize the need of specific machinery. This, however, was not the case. The fifth point in the proposals made by the representatives of management on December 18 read as follows:

"5. We recommend creation of adequate and appropriate national machinery for the purpose of applying the foregoing principles and coordinating all existing Federal agencies dealing with labor disputes. We stand ready to discuss the details of such machinery and the methods of appointment of those who are to administer it."

It is clear, therefore, that we fully recognized the need for such machinery and supported its creation. We felt that it was far more important in the early stages of the conference to get agreement on basic principles and to let the discussion of specific machinery follow. It was our feeling then that there was no question of the ability of those present to agree on administrative machinery. Experience had already demonstrated, however, that machinery in and of itself is secondary, otherwise the National Defense Mediation Board would still be functioning. We felt the experience of that Board showed how essential it was that there first be agreement on the principles to be applied by whatever agency may be established for administration.

Later on in the memorandum it is stated that when the conference reconvened at 2 p. m. on Friday, December 19, "representatives of management brought to the full conference a proposal which substantially reiterated the declaration of principles previously put forward, and proposed a War Labor Board of 11 members." This, in our opinion, is not a correct statement in that the proposal which was brought forward by the representatives of management on Friday afternoon was substantially different in many respects and represented concessions of a material character to the viewpoint of the labor groups as set forth in their joint proposal submitted on Thursday afternoon.

Further in the memorandum it is stated that when disagreement over the closed shop issue seemed insoluble the conference agreed to recess until Monday, December 22, and "that the representatives of management should attempt at that time to present a proposal to the full conference."

This statement is subject to exception in that it implies that the representatives of management agreed to present a proposal with respect to the matter in disagreement, which is not correct, because the position of the representatives of management was, as it had been from the beginning of the conferences, that the closed-shop issue was not a proper subject for arbitration. No commitment to modify that position was intimated by the representatives of management.

A final statement in the memorandum is to the effect that when the conference reconvened on Tuesday, December 23, "The moderators then presented to the conference the President's letter, which was accepted as the basis of agreement by the entire membership of the conference." We cannot agree that this is a correct statement of what transpired. The President's letter was presented to the conference, but it was not in any sense presented for acceptance or rejection, and it cannot be accurately said that it was accepted as the basis of agreement by the entire membership of the conference. Insofar as it provided that all issues, including the closed-shop issue, might be proper subjects for arbitration, it was contrary to the position for which the representatives of management had contended from the outset of the conferences and were still contending when the conference adjourned. No formal action was taken after the President's letter was read except an adjournment, and certainly no action was taken which might indicate that the representatives of management had abandoned their very serious objections to reference of the closed-shop issue to arbitration. As proof that our viewpoint had not changed, we attach hereto a copy of the release which we issued the evening of December 23, 1941, after the adjournment of the conference.

In view of the position which we maintained throughout the conferences and the objections, which we feel time will prove to have been well taken, to arbitration of the closed-shop issue, we cannot refrain from pointing out to you at this time what we conceive to be inaccuracies in the memorandum report of the deliberations of the conference of which we were members.

Inasmuch as the memorandum report has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we respectfully request that the present communication also be inserted in the RECORD, with attention being directed to the RECORD of January 15, 1942, pages 372–375, inclusive.

Very respectfully yours,

Charles R. Hook, Thomas R. Jones, Roger D. Lapham, Rueben B. Robertson, Charles E. Wilson, W. P. Witherow, Lawrence D. Bell, W. Gibson Carey, Jr., C. S. Ching, Donald Comer, Robert M. Gaylord, Paul G. Hoffman.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 8, 1942.*

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: On January 28, 1942, the undersigned addressed to you a communication, copy of which is enclosed herewith. In this letter we called attention to certain inaccuracies in the memorandum report inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1942 (RECORD, pp. 372–375, inclusive).

We requested that our letter of January 28 be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with appropriate reference to the earlier item.

Up to the present time we have received no response to our letter, nor has it, so far as we are advised, been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May we now renew our request that the RECORD be completed as indicated?

A response to the present letter may be addressed to Mr. Charles R. Hook, at the American Rolling Mill Co., Middletown, Ohio.

Very respectfully yours,

Charles R. Hook, Rueben B. Robertson, W. P. Witherow, C. S. Ching, R. D. Lapham, W. Gibson Carey, Jr., Thomas R. Jones, Paul G. Hoffman, C. E. Wilson, Robert M. Gaylord, Donald Comer, Lawrence D. Bell.

THE ITEM VETO

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, today the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] reported the independent offices appropriation bill without including the amendment regarding the item veto which I submitted several weeks ago at the suggestion of the President of the United States. At the same time I presented a notice respecting the suspension of the rule so that the amendment could be offered on the floor when the bill is taken up next Monday.

In the interim we have had a very complete legal study made of the subject, and I have been forced to return to my original theory that the item veto can only be established by a constitutional amendment. Therefore I am withdrawing the notice which I gave respecting a suspension of the rule, and I am concentrating the consideration of this issue before a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary headed by the able Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], substantiating the proposition that the item veto, in which everyone knows I heartily believe, can only be accomplished by constitutional amendment.

I present a list of 39 States which have made provision for the item veto, in each instance the item veto having been established by the process of constitutional amendment. I ask that this list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEM VETOES—CITATIONS TO STATE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Alabama: Article V, sections 125, 126.
Arizona: Article V, section 7.
Arkansas: Article VI, section 17.
California: Article IV, sections 16, 34.
Colorado: Article IV, section 12.
Connecticut: Amendments, article XXXVII.
Delaware: Article III, section 18.
Florida: Article IV, section 18.
Georgia: Article V, section 1, paragraph XVI.
Idaho: Article IV, section 11.
Illinois: Article V, section 16.
Kansas: Article II, section 14.
Kentucky: Section 88.
Louisiana: Article V, section 16.
Maryland: Article II, section 17.
Massachusetts: Amendments, article LXIII, section 5.
Michigan: Article V, section 37.
Minnesota: Article IV, section 11.
Mississippi: Section 73.
Missouri: Article V, section 13.
Montana: Article VII, section 13.
Nebraska: Article IV, section 15.
New Jersey: Article V, section 7.
New Mexico: Article IV, section 22.
New York: Article IV, section 7; article VII, section 4.
North Dakota: Article III, section 80.
Ohio: Article II, section 16.
Oklahoma: Article VI, section 12.
Oregon: Article V, section 15a.
Pennsylvania: Article IV, section 16.
South Carolina: Article IV, section 23.
South Dakota: Article IV, section 10.
Texas: Article IV, section 14.
Utah: Article VII, section 8.
Virginia: Article V, section 76.
Washington: Article III, section 12.
West Virginia: Article VII, section 15.
Wisconsin: Article V, section 10.
Wyoming: Article IV, section 9.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that the item veto which we are seeking to establish with respect to Federal legislation, permitting the President of the United States some judicial discretion when a general appropriation bill is presented to him for his signature, exists in every State in the Union except Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont. The matter will be pressed before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, today marks the twenty-third anniversary of the foundation of the Turkish National Assembly.

Twenty-three years ago today, at the invitation of the late great leader of Turkey, Kemal Atatürk, representatives from almost every section of Turkey convened at Ankara and began deliberating on the ways and means of defending the independence and territorial integrity of Turkey. In a sense, on that momentous occasion, were laid the foundations of new, young, and vigorous Turkey. It was the beginning of the transformation of Turkey into a true national state, in which citizens must think politically as Turks whatever the racial and religious differences.

In the years that followed, this representative body of Turkey, under the able leadership of the great Atatürk gradually effected a thorough and radical revolution. In rapid succession many important reforms were effected: The religious courts were abolished, the dervish orders and other similar anachronisms were cleared away almost overnight. Monogamy was made the law of the land, the Christian calendar was substituted for the Moslem calendar, Roman letters were substituted in place of the Turkish script.

The astute Kemal Atatürk had perceived that the progressive Turkish people, who had been in constant contact with western civilization, were ripe for these innovations.

As a former member of the Turkish Cabinet, Hamid Subhi Bey, once said:

> We have turned down these antiquated institutions because they had already been torn down in our hearts. You can do nothing with institutions which are still in the hearts of the people.

Kemal Atatürk, as has been true of his distinguished successor, the able President of Turkey, Ismet Inonu, always had his finger on the pulse of the people. Atatürk could not have done what he did, nor could he have assured its continuation, unless he had been supported by his people and unless his people had been worthy of profiting by the reforms which he and the National Assembly had made. Thus, under the leadership of Kemal Atatürk and Ismet Inonu, the Turks have made greater strides forward than any other people in the years following the World War.

Today Turkey hopes against hope to remain out of the war, devote itself to peaceful activities, and consolidate its social progress. But spring is here, and during this war spring has been synonymous with Nazi offensives.

Turkey is an answer to the quest of German strategists for a route to the Middle East. No nation occupies a better strategic position. Turkey is the key to three continents. Through its domination of the Dardanelles, it straddles the waterway which leads to the vast interior of the Eurasian Continent. It is the last barrier to the Near East—the culmination of the Germanic dream of "drang nach osten."

Hitler would give the bones of many Prussian grenadiers to control the modern republic which the genius of the Kemal Atatürk and Ismet Inonu raised on the ashes of the old Ottoman Empire. In Hitler's possession, Turkey could give entree to the oil fields of Iran and Iraq. Turkey could be a highway to the eastern littoral of the Mediterranean and Suez. Moreover, Turkey's 18,000,000 inhabitants are viewed by the Nazis as an inexhaustible reservoir for Germany's slave labor.

German offensives invariably are preceded by diplomatic and propaganda barrages. Thus Nazi Propaganda Minister Goebbels is up to his old tricks again. Dr. Goebbels' aim is to intimidate, soften, bribe, fool, or cajole Turkey into submission. Every stock-in-trade trick, stratagem, or wile of Nazi propaganda is now being used in Turkey.

Even before the world got its first taste of the blitzkrieg in the invasion of Poland, Hitler had laid his plans to capture Turkey from within. Following the success he had achieved in assassinating Austria, Franz von Papen was assigned to Ankara for a repeat performance.

Franz von Papen labored with all the Nazi arts of mingled threat and seduction to lure Turkey into the Nazi cobweb. But Franz von Papen has failed to deceive or overawe Turkey. The oily von Papen has to deal with such astute statesmen as Refik Saydam, the Prime Minister; Chukru Saratsoglou, the Foreign Minister; and President Ismet Inonu, who know how to combine moderation and tact with persistance and firmness. These able statesmen, while they have kept the amenities of diplomacy, have not hesitated to root out all Nazi fifth-column activities.

Anticipating Nazi attempts to bribe Turkey with territorial offers at the expense of neighboring countries, President Ismet Inonu made it clear on several occasions that Turkey has no territorial claims in any direction. "Turkey," said Inonu, "does not covet an inch of territory outside its frontiers."

The German Army is seated firmly next to Turkey's European borders and German air power—or what is left of it after the Russian debacle—threatens the Dardanelles, but the government at Ankara refuses to yield.

Blustering Nazi threats no longer strike terror to neutrals. Hitler's day of winning bloodless wars seems about over. And wherever he fights he finds the going increasingly hard.

The secret of our firmness—

Declared the President of Turkey some time ago—

lies in confidence in our own rights, in our respect for those of others, and in our resolution to defend the motherland.

Our country—

Said Inonu—

has decided to defend our independence, security, and land. This is our greatest pride.

Meanwhile, American lend-lease material has been bolstering Turkish defenses. Already Turkey has received from this country heavy artillery, light and heavy ammunition, tanks, trucks, and planes. The high morale of the brave Turkish Army will now be matched by modern equipment. Berlin rages at the acceptance of lend-lease supplies by Turkey. For Turkey to prepare to defend itself is, from the Nazi point of view, a challenge. But as the President of Turkey once remarked:

Any country which has no intention of attacking us * * * does not need to take offense at our preparations and cannot blame us for wishing to protect our rights.

The unequivocal decision of the Turks to take a stand against aggression and to defend their country "with honor and dignity," as President Inonu put it a few weeks ago—this decision of Turkey is, next to the passage of the lend-lease bill, the entry of the United States into the war and the Nazi defeat on the Eastern front, the most serious setback of the war to Hitler. It closes a possible gap in the powerful ring of steel that is being forged around Nazi-infested Europe.

In their determination to defend their own independence and territorial integrity, the Turks are rendering a great service to the cause of human liberty.

The United Nations will remember at the peace conference table that in this global war, the issue of which is freedom versus slavery, the honorable Turks have chosen the path of honor, dignity, and liberty.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature, that committees be authorized to report, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive the messages from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Albert H. Ladner, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1941, vice John M. Morin, deceased

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I send to the desk favorable reports of nominations from the Committee on Military Affairs of general officers, and also routine nominations in the Regular Army of the United States, together with the nomination of Lt. Col. James Harold Doolittle, now of the Regular Army, to be brigadier general. With reference to the last-mentioned nomination, General Marshall today, while we were at the War Department, requested the courtesy of the Senate in immediate consideration of the nomination. I merely ask that the nominations be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Lt. Col. James Harold Doolittle, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States;

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of E. M. Basye to be Work Projects Administrator for Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harper Triplett to be postmaster at Schellsburg, Pa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 27, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

James P. Pope, of Idaho, to be a member of the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1942. (Reappointment.)

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Lt. Col. James Harold Doolittle, Army of the United States, to be a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward H. O'Hare, United States Navy, to be advanced 30 numbers in rank for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle, pursuant to the provisions of section 1506, Revised Statutes.

MARINE CORPS

Herman Hansen, Jr., a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, to rank from the 20th day of August 1940.

Joe B. Russell, a citizen of North Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of August 1941.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of February 1942:

Richard L. Boll, a citizen of California.

Lucien W. Carmichael, a citizen of Mississippi.

Walter W. Hitesman, Jr., a citizen of Louisiana.

John L. Hopkins, a citizen of California.

James G. Kelly, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Charles D. Harris, a citizen of Michigan.

George O. Ludcke, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.

Donald R. Kennedy, a citizen of California.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Arthur H. Allbright, Birmingham, Ala., in place of W. C. Green, resigned.

Thomas J. Millican, Brilliant, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Willard D. Leake, Jasper, Ala., in place of W. D. Leake. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Samuel D. Wren, Red Bay, Ala., in place of S. D. Wren. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

ARKANSAS

William Edgar Bradley, Alma, Ark., in place of W. E. Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Joseph D. Gault, Dardanelle, Ark., in place of J. D. Gault. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Bess M. Nobles, Dierks, Ark., in place of B. M. Nobles. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Jettie Douglas Hodges, Leachville, Ark., in place of Buren Flannigan, transferred.

Jo Etta Carolan, State Sanatorium, Ark., in place of J. E. Carolan. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Clare A. Partridge, Mentone, Calif., in place of E. T. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

Alva A. Fields, Modesto, Calif., in place of A. A. Fields. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Herbert C. Halterman, Rodeo, Calif., in place of K. A. Creedon, resigned.

Anna Mae O'Keefe, Summit City, Calif. Office became Presidential April 1, 1941.

COLORADO

Fred A. Eickhoff, Elbert, Colo., in place of F. A. Eickhoff. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

FLORIDA

Jefferson Gaines, Bocagrande, Fla., in place of Jefferson Gaines. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Paul E. Mahan, Hobe Sound, Fla., in place of P. E. Mahan. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

GEORGIA

Ruth D. McClure, Acworth, Ga., in place of R. D. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Dan L. Gibson, Albany, Ga., in place of D. L. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

Leighton W. McPherson, Columbus, Ga., in place of L. W. McPherson. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Troy Howard Vickers, Crawfordville, Ga., in place of T. H. Vickers. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Wylie West, Decatur, Ga., in place of Wylie West. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Lawrence J. McPhaul, Doerun, Ga., in place of L. J. McPhaul. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

B. Clayton Blanton, Thomasville, Ga., in place of B. C. Blanton. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Roy Thrasher, Tifton, Ga., in place of Roy Thrasher. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

ILLINOIS

Ruth Fosdick, Proving Ground, Ill. Office became Presidential October 1, 1941.

IOWA

Cecilia R. Mead, Oto, Iowa, in place of L. W. McCleerey, removed.

John J. Herkenrath, Portsmouth, Iowa, in place of Amelia Sondag, resigned.

KANSAS

Walter Koon, Clearwater, Kans., in place of V. F. Young, transferred.

George E. Hull, Eureka, Kans., in place of D. R. Marriott, removed.

Frank M. McAdam, Moran, Kans., in place of O. S. Lambeth, resigned.

Anna C. Linscheid, North Newton, Kans., in place of Dorothy Stucky. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1941.

KENTUCKY

Stanley H. Jones, Fort Knox, Ky., in place of S. H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

Lula Sharp, Sharpsburg, Ky., in place of Lula Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Myrtle B. Milam, Wallins Creek, Ky., in place of M. B. Milam. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

LOUISIANA

Alice D. Brown, Doyline, La. Office became Presidential October 1, 1941.

MAINE

Norman W. Hulit, Cumberland Center, Maine, in place of N. W. Hulit. Incumbent's commission expired August 6, 1941.

Rachel Gates Haskell, Dixfield, Maine, in place of W. W. Eustis, removed.

Charles P. Lemaire, Lewiston, Maine, in place of C. P. Lemaire. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

H. Edward Rice, Orono, Maine, in place of F. H. Parady, resigned.

MARYLAND

Philip J. Kurtz, Belcamp, Md. Office became Presidential October 1, 1940.

Charles A. Bechtold, Fort George G. Meade, Md. Office established.

Michael J. Byrnes, Frostburg, Md., in place of E. J. Donohue, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mary E. Joseph, Truro, Mass., in place of M. E. Joseph. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Ervin C. Dunckley, Frederic, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

John T. Burke, Ishpeming, Mich., in place of H. R. Sjolander, deceased.

Rolland P. Lee, Millington, Mich., in place of C. E. Bishop, removed.

Alphonsus E. Murphy, Shepherd, Mich., in place of E. L. Ashworth, retired.

MISSOURI

Fred King, Queen City, Mo., in place of L. R. Saxbury, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Marie H. Pill, Califon, N. J., in place of F. F. Burd, deceased.

Peter J. Egan, Montclair, N. J., in place of P. J. Egan. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

John A. Werner, Albuquerque, N. Mex., in place of J. A. Werner. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

NEW YORK

Walter J. Merritt, Margaretville, N. Y., in place of C. C. Faulkner, deceased.

Frank D. Hurd, Napanoch, N. Y., in place of F. D. Hurd. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1939.

Edna L. Quinn, Rush, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

John A. Martin, Saugerties, N. Y., in place of S. F. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1940.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie B. Morton, Carolina Beach, N. C., in place of W. H. Blair, resigned.

Robert F. Loftin, Troutmans, N. C., in place of W. A. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

OHIO

Helen B. Owen, Lowell, Ohio, in place of B. E. Bowden, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Deaton, Howe, Okla., in place of J. A. Deaton. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

William R. Blackwood, Harborcreek, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

PUERTO RICO

Julia Chacon de Vidal, Ensenada, P. R., in place of J. C. de Vidal. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

RHODE ISLAND

Ralph Campbell, Wickford, R. I., in place of W. C. Kingsley, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary P. Mishoe, Greelyville, S. C., in place of Fred Mishoe, retired.

Lindsay C. McFadden, Rock Hill, S. C., in place of L. C. McFadden. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

TEXAS

I. J. Burns, Brady, Tex., in place of A. B. Reagan, retired.

Joseph Morris Woolsey, Yoakum, Tex., in place of J. A. McFadden, deceased.

UTAH

Roger W. Creer, Spanish Fork, Utah, in place of R. W. Creer. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

VIRGINIA

Carroll A. Gathright, Goochland, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Henry C. Browning, Meadowview, Va., in place of A. W. Aston, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Hazel P. Chester, Richmond Highlands, Wash., in place of W. H. Ross, removed.

Ethel M. Eke, Tumwater, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

WEST VIRGINIA

John L. Cook, Lorado, W. Va., in place of Roscoe Cook, removed.

Warren W. Smith, Reedsville, W. Va., in place of L. G. Emerson, transferred.

WISCONSIN

Andrew Noble Lawton, Brodhead, Wis., in place of E. D. Bush, removed.

Gerald A. Peterson, Sharon, Wis., in place of C. J. Morris, transferred.

Boyd H. Gentz, Verona, Wis., in place of S. S. Gordon, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

E. M. Basye to be Work Projects administrator for Missouri, effective May 1, 1942.

POSTMASTER

Harper Triplett, Schellsburg, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O eternal and merciful Father, open our eyes to that life which is born of God, that fears may be torn away and our souls may beat a pathway through the tides of conflict and confusion; Oh keep our vision clear and our inner eye unblind. We rejoice in the Father's thought and teaching; He knoweth the way we take and there are no lone coasts where He is not. Therefore we pray that we may not glory in man, but in Him who is destined to restore the world to its true order and heirship and lift it above the greans and weights of iron, stone, and stubble.

O God of bounty and mercy, to Thy almighty protection we commend our beloved country and the brave men who have gone and will go forth to vindicate its honor, to maintain its dignity, and to uphold its noble principles on which it has been founded. Give to them firm hearts which no tribulation can crush or quell; give them upright hearts which no insincere intention can warp; give them pure and ever-watchful hearts which no unworthy affection can lure from Thee and we will praise Thee with continual thanksgiving. In the blessed name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some resolutions of the Conservation Commission of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a congratulatory letter from the President of the United States to Hon. Francis P. Matthews, supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the Knights of Columbus.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION FOR DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have called me and asked when the resolution appropriating money for the Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities will be called up. The Committee on Accounts ordered me yesterday to report a resolution appropriating $110,000 for the expenses of that committee, which includes the deficit; this to carry on its activities up to January 3 next.

It was my purpose to call the resolution up today, but in view of the agreement made by the majority leader that no controversial legislation would be called up for the remainder of this week, may I say now that if the Speaker will recognize me on Tuesday next, I will call the resolution up then.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is this a controversial measure?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know. That remains to be seen. If the gentleman had heard the Members of Congress, some of whom voted for the extension of that committee, oppose the appropriation, I think he would say it was controversial.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered last Saturday by the Chief of Engineers, General Reybold, at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the completion of the Intercoastal Canal from the west coast of Florida to that point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

ATTITUDE OF MY PEOPLE ON LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr MACIORA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, I have received petitions bearing the signatures of approximately 5,000 residents of the State of Connecticut stating their position on pending labor legislation.

These petitioners have stated, very logically:

> Legislation to outlaw strikes, to register unions, to abolish union security and time and one-half for overtime will not increase production.

The signers have neither the time nor the means to conduct a pressure drive. They are too busy producing materials for victory to spend time in effective organization. Their earnings are no more than sufficient to meet rising living costs and increased taxes. They are exercising their constitutional right to petition Congress on a matter of legislation. I feel honored that they have chosen to present their petition through me.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bills of the House—H. R. 6736, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, and H. R. 6868, the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND]?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman advise us as to what may come before the House on Monday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, next Monday will be District day, and on next Tuesday there will be called up for consideration, I expect, a resolution out of the Accounts Committee in connection with an appropriation to extend the Dies committee. Beyond that I have no program to announce at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board relative to electric power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a character study on the life of Mr. Justice Douglas by Mr. Neuberger of my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

TRANSCONTINENTAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, every year for the last 6 years, I have been presenting to the House my bill on superhighways or transcontinental highways.

A few days after I presented the bill in 1937, in commenting the Indianapolis Star said:

As for invasion from overseas, that could not happen without warning such as would give us opportunity to mobilize without $8,000,000,000 military roads.

Mr. Speaker, if we had built these roads through W. P. A. and other agencies in 1934 to 1940, they would have paid for themselves by this time and our national defense set-up would be 25 percent stronger and more flexible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a prayer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered over the radio in my home city last Sunday.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GLEN WAGNER

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement in regard to a young man by the name of Glen Wagner, of Detroit, a student at the Michigan State College at Lansing. He has just won the national intercollegiate oratorical contest at Minneapolis, in competition with 50 other colleges represented in the finals.

It was through the National Youth Administration that he was able to remain in college. He has just volunteered for the Army, and will complete his senior year in June and then go into the armed forces of the United States.

He will speak on the subject America Answers, which is the subject that won him this oratorical contest. It was written by himself. It is only 10 minutes in length. He will deliver that speech in the lobby of the Speaker's office at 12:45 today. I know it will be well received. Wherever he has delivered this talk it has been received with enthusiasm, by different civic clubs, Rotary clubs, commercial clubs, and others. I hope each and every Member here today will take time to go into the Speaker's lobby at 12:45 and listen to this brilliant young American. It will show you definitely what the National Youth movement has done for the youth of America when he gives you that address, America Answers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

AUTOMOBILES AND RATIONING ORDERS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Under Secretary of Commerce Wayne C. Taylor. I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the inclusion of his statement will cost $112.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT IN NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Senate on Friday night will consider a reapportionment of the congressional districts of New York State. There appeared in the New York Times yesterday the following:

Chairman Recux, of the Reapportionment Committee, called Representative GUY L. MOSER, of Pennsylvania, in Washington, chairman of the House Census Committee, and came away from the telephone convinced that Mr. MOSER felt that Washington would act if the State did not.

I do not believe our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania could have made any such statement. A statement of that sort would be highly absurd. This Congress has never dictated to the various State legislatures or to the State governments how the congressional districts should be apportioned and divided. It would be quite unconstitutional to do so, despite a provision in the Constitution which really limits congressional jurisdiction to determining the number of Representatives to be allotted to each State.

I do hope the members of the New York State Senate will not hearken to the statement that may have been made by this gentleman, who is styled chairman of the New York Legislature Reapportionment Committee.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. CELLER. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that Congress has nothing to do with redistricting a State. That is a matter for the States themselves. I have been the ranking Democrat on the committee for years. I have gone into that question many times and I know that Congress does not have the power to redistrict a State.

THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an interview which appeared in today's Washington News, with Col. J. O. Flikke, which speaks of the heroism of the nurses in Bataan and Corregidor, and also to include a letter written to me by a former nurse as telephone operator and including a form letter sent by the Chief Signal Officer of the American expeditionary forces, November 12, 1918, to her as one of our women telephone operators, who did such splendid work during the World War. Also a letter from the retired head of the Army Nurse Corps during the World War, Maj. Julia C. Stimson, in which she speaks of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman kindly give me a very brief outline of the measure? In my opinion this is highly important. It is important to our national defense

effort in connection with minerals and protection of mineral rights and I sincerely trust there will not be any objection to the consideration of the measure at this time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman from California.

The purpose of the bill (H. R. 6604) is to suspend the assessment work that is annually required upon unpatented mining claims.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is this the bill the gentleman spoke to me about a few days ago?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is the same bill; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I then stated that if it was agreeable to the Republican members of the gentleman's committee and the Republican leadership, it was all right to bring it up.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am very glad to have the gentleman call my attention to that. This is the bill I referred to when I spoke to the distinguished majority leader.

It is a bill to suspend the assessments I have referred to until 1943.

This is the situation in the West, and particularly in a State like Montana. In Montana we have not any defense industries. Our manpower has been taken out of the State by the inducement of high labor pay in defense industries in States other than Montana and Idaho and Washington. Also, many of our young men have enlisted in the Army or have been drafted. Consequently we are without labor to do this necessary work. We are also unable to obtain priorities for the necessary tools and appliances with which to do the work now.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing up this bill. In our particular district, as the gentleman knows—Oregon, Washington, and California—we have the very same condition that the gentleman is describing, and a great many people have written me urging that legislation of this type be enacted, because they cannot acquire the tools nor get the manpower to do the assessment work, and consequently they stand to lose very considerable investments and lots of labor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. I have heard many compliments about the bill but we have not heard what it does in reference to the suspension of assessments until 1943. What does that mean and what does the bill actually do?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that it simply preserves the status quo or the condition of the rights of the man with an unpatented mining claim.

In other words, he is not required to do that work or pay out money, $100, until the 1st of July, 1943, if this bill is passed. This gives him the right to still hold his rights because, in the first place, he cannot secure the labor and in the second place he cannot get the materials and cannot get the tools.

The reason it is imperative to call up the measure now, I will say to the gentleman, is this. If the bill is not passed right away it will be necessary for these people who have held these unpatented claims and have done the assessment work probably for years and yet have not secured patents, to go ahead and try to do this work before the 1st of July of this year, because we have no suspension of the payments up to the 1st of July of this year. This is the reason it is imperative to bring up the bill for consideration at this time in order to pass it on to the Senate in time.

Mr. RICH. Because these men have not received a patent? Is that the fault of the patentee?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It might be the fault of the person who has the claims or there may be several faults involved, but that is the custom out West until they develop these claims to the point where they know they have got the necessary minerals to justify the expense of getting a patent and all that sort of thing.

Mr. RICH. What does it cost to get this patent?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Sometimes it is pretty expensive to do that.

Mr. RICH. For instance, what does it cost to get a patent on a 160-acre block?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot give the gentleman just the exact figures. The cost for securing patent would be $5 per acre on lode claims and $2.50 per acre on placer claims plus additional cost of making mineral surveys. Surveys vary so that it would be difficult to give an estimate. I think that is as close as we can come to answering your question.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE. Is there any limit on the number of claims in the bill now?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. I particularly wrote that limitation into the bill. It is as follows:

Provided further, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 lode-mining claims held by the same person, nor to more than 12 lode-mining claims held by the same partnership, association, or corporation: *And provided further*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation.

Mr. RICH. Then, no one, even if he has these claims, can go beyond 120 acres? Is that for each claim, or the sum total?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The sum total.

And provided further, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres in all.

Each placer claim is for 20 acres.

Mr. RICH. So that there is no individual or combination of individuals who can take advantage and take out a lot of these claims, and even if the Government now wanted to develop them, it could go in there and develop them. And these fellows are going to do some work on these claims—they are not going to let them lie idle, are they?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No. They did the work on them last year, but the trouble is doing it during this year and the coming year.

Mr. RICH. I would like to make one further observation. We have to watch very carefully these mineral claims out there, because you are mining a lot of silver. Silver is worth in the open market today 35 cents an ounce, but we pay you fellows 71 cents an ounce. In other words, we are giving you 36 cents premium on every ounce of silver that you mine, and that is an awful drain on the taxpayers of this country. So we want to be careful that you gentlemen do not get your heads further underneath the tent, or the first thing we know you will have something around our necks, and we will have to be careful that we do not hang. I want you fellows out west to remember that the silver act that we now have is not correct, and that it ought to be changed, and the quicker we do it, the better it will be for Uncle Sam.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman that in the good old silver days we produced a lot of money, but it was used all over the gentleman's State, and in other States to put up these great skyscraper buildings in the city of New York and elsewhere.

Mr. RICH. Oh, I thought that still was a great country out there today.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is; but it would be a great deal better if we had paid more attention to silver.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is talking now about William J. Bryan and his 16-to-1 proposition?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Bryan was right and the great trouble with him was that he was ahead of his time.

Mr. RICH. And if we had him today, we would have some little degree of sense in our monetary economy. As we are today, all we have is the most ruthless squandering of Government funds ever known in the history of the world, and if you are not careful, you are going to break us down, and we are going to go bankrupt, and if we all go bust, then we cannot finish this war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, we will all go bust together.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman from Pennsylvania intimates that we lose money when we purchase silver. It all depends on what we do with it after we purchase it, and I want to say at this point that at the present time there is $1,765,000,000 of silver seniorage lying in the Treasury of the United States unused, which might be as well used to pay for the war as to sell a lot of interest-bearing bonds for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Let me just say a word right here in that respect. The gentleman is fair——

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. You are about the fairest man on the floor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can say the same thing about the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. While we have a lot of silver, and the gentleman has referred to that, has the gentleman ever taken the Treasury statement and noticed this $22,678,856,571.12 of gold that we have buried down at Fort Knox, Ky.? If you can tell us what good that is, I would like to have you do it. They say they are going to use silver for conducting electricity. I notice my good friend from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is here. They are going to take a lot of that silver out there and make wire out of it. That will be some use to which we can put silver, but what are you going to do with all this gold? That is one thing that Hitler and the Nipponese are trying to get, that pile of gold down there. We ought to distribute it to our American people and let them have it, and then we will know where it is. After a while it is liable to get away from us.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We will have plenty of time to take care of the gold business after we take care of this bill.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. Every Member of Congress from the West is deeply indebted to the distinguished and industrious gentleman from Montana for the determined fight he is making for this bill that means so much to the thousands of prospectors of his State and the West. No district or State has an abler or more faithful representative in this body than does the district represented by the gentleman from Montana. I gladly join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in what he has just said. It is good to have such sentiments coming from the Republican side. The effect of this legislation will not even remotely touch the production of either silver or gold. This legislation merely provides that a person who has made a mining location, either placer or lode, be relieved from doing the $100 worth of assessment work per claim during this year. If it is not enacted, and he cannot do that assessment work, it means that some other individual, either in good faith or in bad faith, will jump his mining claim. This will result in a lot of litigation, great delay, and difficulty in the discovery and production of such metals as tungsen, nickel, lead, zinc, and copper, those metals that we need so badly to prosecute this war. During the last war we suspended assessment work on mining claims, and we are only asking to do that now because it is impossible to employ the labor to do that work. This legislation is very essential and again I congratulate the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Is it not a fact that the claim laws date back to the act of 1872 and it has been the practice and the procedure in obtaining and holding mining claims under location for that length of time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Many of the owners of those mining claims are poor men, prospectors, men who have put in a life's work and savings in order to develop the mineral resources of the country that will later become of value to their country and their localities. It is that class of people we are endeavoring to protect by this bill—people who cannot obtain the labor and cannot obtain the supplies and do not have the money to perform the $100 worth of assessment work.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. Is the income-tax provision left out of this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We took that out at the suggestion of the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I said in our Committee on Mines and Mining, there is a call from small mining men of Arizona for this measure. I feel that it is more needed now than during the depression and that no reference should be made to income tax. This bill should be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, during the year beginning at 12 o'clock m. July 1, 1942, and ending at 12 o'clock m. July 1, 1943: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply in the case of any claimant not entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal income tax for the taxable year 1942: *Provided further*, That every claimant of any such mining claim, in order to obtain the benefits of this act, shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock m. July 1, 1943, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act; which notice shall state that the claimant, or claimants, was entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal income tax for the taxable year 1942: *Provided further*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 lode-mining claims held by the same person, nor to more than 12 lode-mining claims held by the same partnership, association, or corporation: *And provided further*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "States", insert a comma and the words "including the Territory of Alaska."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "year" and insert in lieu thereof the word "years."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the figures "1942" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1941."

Page 1, line 11, strike out all of said line after the comma following the word "Provided" and all of lines 1 and 2 on page 2 and all of line 3 on said page down to and including the comma following the word "further."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "meridian", insert the following: "July 1, 1942, and."

Page 2, line 8, after the word "act", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a colon.

Page 2, line 8, strike out the words "which notice shall" and all of lines 9 and 10 and all of line 11 up to and including the colon following the figures "1942."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question with reference to the income-tax feature of this bill and if he will explain that? We did not have any notice of what that was.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the first place, the bill originally provided that the exemption of not being required to make assessment work would not apply to any person who was qualified to pay an income tax. The Committee on Mines and Mining wanted that stricken out for the reason that since that had been written into the law before, the amount that was exempted to an individual has been lowered to such an extent—in fact, down to $750 for a single person—that it was not fair. Consequently we took that out. Now the moratorium applies to everybody.

Mr. RICH. Do you think you should make the law apply to any citizen or individual regarding the income tax that does not apply to everybody?

Mr O'CONNOR. Well, we took that provision out.

Mr. RICH. So it is now uniform for everybody?

Mr O'CONNOR. Exactly. That was the purpose of the amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to insert therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Mississippi is not going to charge everybody in the electric-power business with being a fifth columnist; certainly he could make no such statement. There are lots of men in the power business just as honest as the gentleman from Mississippi, or I, or any other Member of Congress.

I remind the gentleman from Mississippi that it was his own administration that stopped the Rural Electrification Administration from continuing; they made it so they could not get the copper wire they needed, because the copper was needed to win the war on the Japs. The administration is responsible for not permitting the rural-electrification program to go ahead; that cannot be blamed on the power companies.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I have only a minute, but there is no one to whom I would rather yield than my friend from Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, as I have just pointed out, and as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] has pointed out, those influences that were trying to stop the Rural Electrification Administration from constructing those lines in Texas and Arkansas, lines that are necessary for national defense, were inspired by the Power Trust; and one of their men who helped to inspire the fight on the R. E. A. was on the Federal pay roll, and he was also connected with a private power company.

Mr. RICH. The administration had to cut this activity out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two distinct subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EASING UP ON THE OIL MONOPOLY

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the Pipe Line cases, adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court in 1914, the petroleum pipe lines of this country were declared to be common carriers and therefore subject to the Commerce Act and the Elkins amendment. One of the most stringent provisions of the Elkins Act is that forbidding the "giving, granting * * * accepting or receiving * * * rebates by any means or device whatsoever."

It will be recalled that the immense growth of the old Standard Oil Trust was due almost entirely to railroad rebates.

UNITED STATES BRINGS SUIT

On April 8, 1938, there was filed with the Attorney General of the United States a complaint alleging violation of the rebate sections of the Elkins Act by the common-carrier pipe lines. The complaint reads as follows:

Hon. HOMER S. CUMMINGS,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL CUMMINGS: I wish to draw to your attention the Elkins Act, United States Code, title 49, section 41 (1 and 3), making the giving or acceptance by common carriers of rebates unlawful. The language of the act is clear and unequivocal:

"And it shall be unlawful for any person * * * to offer, grant * * * accept, or receive any rebate whereby any such property shall by any device whatever be transported at a less rate than that named in the tariffs published and filed by such carrier. Any person * * * who shall knowingly * * * directly, or indirectly, by or through any means or device whatsoever, receive or accept from such common carrier any sum of money or any other valuable consideration as a rebate or offset against the regular charges for transportation of such property * * * shall in addition to any penalty provided by this act forfeit to the United States a sum of money three times the amount of money so received or accepted and three times the value of any other consideration so received or accepted, * * * and the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed * * * to institute in any court * * *."

The common carrier pipe lines, by the "means or device" of returning to their shipper owners rebates disguised as dividends are, in my opinion, granting rebates within the purview of the law.

Should a complaint against these common carrier pipe lines be necessary in order that proceedings to enforce the law be instituted, I am prepared to make such a complaint.

Trusting to be favored with prompt attention to this matter, I am,

Respectfully,

——— ———.

Copies to Interstate Commerce Commission.

These pipe lines are owned almost exclusively by 21 major oil companies; for many years their combined net earnings, paid out to their parent-company shipper-owners in the form of corporate stock dividends, have approximated eighty to one hundred million dollars annually, and the above-quoted complainant alleged that such "dividends" was a forbidden means or device for the giving and acceptance of rebates.

As a result of this complaint, after thorough study of the law and ample confirmation of the facts, the Department of Justice, on September 30, 1940, instituted in United States district courts three test suits to determine the applicability of the provisions of the Elkins Act.

These suits are known in the Department of Justice as "the Elkins Act cases," and named Standard Oil of Indiana, Phillips Pipe Line Co., and Great Lakes Pipe Line Co. as defendants.

DISTURBING RUMORS HEARD

Preparation for the trial of these cases continued in the Department of Justice for nearly a year, when rumors were heard that they would never go to trial, but would be settled by consent decree.

Hearing these rumors, the original complainant addressed the following letter to Mr. Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, under date of October 7, 1941:

MY DEAR MR. ARNOLD: I have heard and read repeated reports to the effect that the Elkins Act test cases are to be settled by consent decree.

It is to be hoped that such reports are foundationless and that these suits will be carried forward to a final adjudication by the courts in order that the entire oil industry will be placed on a common basis with respect to transportation costs.

A consent decree permitting integrated companies to continue obtaining their transportation at cost, whether or not such cost involves a fair return on invested capital, would be a travesty on justice and place the seal of approval of the Department of Justice on a continuing violation of the letter and the spirit of the law, and I believe Congress would so regard it.

Temporary suspension of the antitrust suits against the major oil companies during the emergency is understandable, but here again there is much talk of a consent decree.

Every lawyer with whom I have discussed consent decrees expresses the same opinion, which is that they are a polite method of whitewashing the defendants and giving them the privilege of continuing their complained of practices under a modified or more subtle guise.

I trust these rumors have no foundation in fact.

The attached copies of an exchange of letters with you in April 1938 explains my interest in the matter.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

To this letter Mr. Arnold replied as follows, under date of October 9, 1940:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1941.

WALTER GORDON WILLIAMS, Esq.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: I have your letter of October 5, 1941, regarding rumors that the Elkins Act cases will be settled by a consent decree.

At this writing the Department has not committed itself to any settlement of these cases. I wish to add that, should any formal offer of settlement be submitted to the Department by the oil companies, I intend submitting the same to the proper congressional committee for its consideration and approval before referring it to the Attorney General. Doubtless you are aware that under Executive Order 6166 of June 10, 1933, the compromise of any claims arising under these Elkins Act cases can only be effected by the Attorney General himself.

Sincerely yours,

THURMAN ARNOLD,
Assistant Attorney General.

On October 11, 1941, Hon. Karl A. Crowley, until 1938 Solicitor of the Post Office Department, wrote the Attorney General, Hon. Francis Biddle, on the

same subject, and on October 22, 1941, the Attorney General replied as follows:

OFFICES OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 22, 1941.

KARL A. CROWLEY, Esq.,
Fort Worth, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. CROWLEY: Thank you for your letter of October 11, 1941, and for your expressions of satisfaction with the policy of this Department with respect to the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

For some time negotiations have been carried on between the Department of Justice and representatives of the oil companies looking toward a settlement of the litigation now pending against the oil companies under the antitrust laws and the Elkins Act. I assure you that in these negotiations the Department has given full consideration to the facts which you have called to my attention in your letter It is the intention of Assistant Attorney General Arnold to submit any plan which may be suggested for the settlement of this litigation to the proper congressional committee for its consideration before the Department officially accepts the plan.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

That is a novel arrangement whereby the Department of Justice submits to a committee of Congress the merits of a case pending in litigation in the United States District Courts, and secures the consent of a Congressional committee before it enters into any proceedings. That is what the Department of Justice said it would do, and said it in writing and repeatedly.

NO COMPROMISE PLEDGED

It will be noted that both the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorney General in these letters pledged that no compromise of these Elkins Act cases would be entered into by the Department of Justice unless such compromise were first submitted to and approved by a "proper committee of Congress."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What committee do they have reference to?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Apparently they have reference to the Senate Committee on Commerce of which Senator GILLETTE happened to be a member, or the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Contrary to these promises, the Department of Justice, in what can only be considered a clandestine manner, compromised these Elkins Act cases by entry of a final judgment, without warning, without advance public notice, and without consultation with any representative of the people in Congress, in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, on December 23, 1941, 2 months and a day after the Attorney General had stated no such action would be taken without the approval of Congress. This unprecedented action has many unusual features which deserve careful scrutiny and consideration.

The original bill of complaint in the test cases was superseded by another—remember only 3 were sued originally—and in this new bill of complaint all 21 major oil companies, and their 59 subsidiary and affiliated common carrier pipe-line companies, were made defendants, instead of the original 3. The purpose of this was to make the terms of the consent decree applicable to all shipper-owned pipe-line companies and to their shipper owners. At one fell swoop all those oil companies which might, upon due trial, have been found guilty of violating the Elkins Act were to be accorded identical treatment and exoneration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Before the gentleman proceeds I would like to get this clear: Does the gentleman state that these suits were brought against only 3 companies but that a short time before the consent decree was entered into the other 18 major companies which owned pipe lines were made parties to the suit, just before the decision? Was that done?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. It will be interesting to the gentleman from California to know that the very day on which the consent decrees were handed down a complaint against the 21 companies was filed; so that the whole amazing arrangement was entered into within 24 hours without notice to anybody; and the consumers and the Government and the people of the United States were deprived of their remedies and the collection of huge penalties.

THREE BILLION DOLLARS INVOLVED

The next arresting feature is the sum total of the fines and penalties which the courts might have imposed had these cases come to trial. The law provides a penalty of three times the amount of the rebates given or received during the 6 years preceding the bringing of legal action to enforce the law. Thus the pipeline companies faced possible judgments of approximately one and one-half billion dollars and their shipper owners an equal amount, or $3,000,000,000 in all.

The greatest amount of money involved in any litigation in American history was involved, yet the Department entered into a consent decree within 24 hours after suing. Who is running this Government—the oil monopoly or the American people? Are we to have the oil monopoly running the Government, whether the Democratic Party and the Republican Party is in power, or are the people going to run the country? Patriots talk about looking for sources of money as a means whereby to help win this war. Why did the powers that be exculpate the major oil companies, the richest combination of capital in the history of the world, aggregating 14,000 millions of dollars, but they exempted them in 24 hours and without notice to the public or the court in advance?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman one further question, but I will wait if the gentleman desires.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. If you will, please.

The next significant feature of the situation is, Did the Government have an air-tight case? This question is ably answered by an article in the Cornell Law Quarterly and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 8 1940, and entitled "Pipe Line Divorce by Legislation and Litigation," written by Dr. Forrest R. Black, professor of law, attached to the Department of Justice, who spent well over a year in studying the law applicable to the case. From available information it is not too much to assert that the Department of Justice believed it had a "copper-riveted case."

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS HANDLING CASE COULD NOT STOMACH SUCH SUPINE SURRENDER

Another striking feature of this matter is that the two attorneys of record in the three test suits refused to sign the new bill of complaint or the consent decree and that one of them immediately resigned from the Department of Justice.

But the most striking, and at the same time most significant, feature of the whole situation is the evident attempt of the Department of Justice to "cover up."

This is revealed by the following exchange of correspondence:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 26, 1941.*

Hon. THURMAN ARNOLD,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ARNOLD: Early this week the Washington Times-Herald carried the story that you had filed a bill of complaint charging all the major oil companies with violation of the Elkins Act but this good news was dampened by a story in the Washington Star that a "final judgment" had been rendered by which the pipe lines were limited to a 7-percent return on invested capital.

Without intimate knowledge of the facts it appears to me that some final disposition has been made of the case but I cannot believe this to be true in the light of your promise to me, under date of October 9 (copy enclosed) that no consent decree would be considered without congressional approval.

If any conclusive action has been taken, I would appreciate your fully advising me as to the facts; agreement to a consent decree would imply that you felt some inherent and fatal weakness in the Government's case and disclosure of this weakness might serve to support new legislation by Congress.

I cannot conceive it possible that this litigation would be compromised if the Government stood even a fair chance of exacting the huge penalties provided for violation of the Elkins Act.

I would appreciate it, if a consent decree has been filed, should you inform me what, if any, approval of such decree was received from any member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to which you promised to submit the matter.

Trusting that you appreciate my motives in requesting full details of the matter and wishing you the compliments of the season, I am

Respectfully yours,

———— ————.

To this letter Assistant Attorney General Arnold replied as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 1, 1942.

DEAR MR. ————: I have your letter of December 26, 1941, with reference to the pipeline litigation.

On December 23, 1941, a complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia The defendants filed answers denying the substantive allegations of the complaint. A final judgment was entered on the same date. A press release summarizing the contents of the complaint and the judgment was issued simultaneously, and a copy of the same is enclosed.

The provisions of the judgment were discussed with Senator GILLETTE, and the judgment was entered with the written consent of the Attorney General.

Very truly yours,

THURMAN ARNOLD,
Assistant Attorney General.

From this latter letter the impression is readily gained that Senator GILLETTE, and presumably Senator GILLETTE's committee, had considered and approved the terms of the consent decree.

SENATOR GUY GILLETTE FULMINATES AT DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR ITS ACTION

That any such impression is manifestly not in accord with the facts is readily shown by the statement on the floor of the Senate on January 6, 1942, by Senator GILLETTE, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 19, issue of that date, reading as follows:

ANTITRUST SUITS AGAINST PETROLEUM COMPANIES

Mr. GILLETTE Mr President, in the 2 or 3 minutes which are to elapse before the Senate is to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives on the request of the majority leader, I desire to refer to one matter.

Mr. President, there is a disease which some unfortunate persons in this country have which the oculists term "gun-barrel vision." As the disease progresses, the field of vision of the victim becomes more and more restricted, and it is as if he were looking down a gun barrel and seeing nothing but that tiny field. The longer I live in Washington, the more I am convinced that we have in our bureaus here persons who are afflicted with official gun-barrel vision, and who are able to see nothing but the little problem at the end of the bore down which they are looking.

From time to time there has been presented, and is now pending in the Senate, proposed legislation dealing with the whole field of the petroleum industry, initiated by the late lamented Senator from Idaho, Mr. Borah. For 2 years the Department of Justice has been assembling evidence for the purpose of instituting suits against the major oil companies for recovery for violation of the Elkins Act. From time to time on the floor of the Senate I have referred to the attempts being made to dovetail this necessary action by the Department of Justice and the legislative action with the needs for national defense in the field of motor fuel.

Last summer there were instituted by the Department of Justice some test suits against the major oil companies for recovery of the triple penalty for violation of the Elkins Act. Those suits were held in abeyance until the 23d of December, when there were filed in the courts here in the District of Columbia suits against the major oil companies for the recovery of substantially one and one-half billion dollars as the triple penalty for violation of the Elkins Act; and the Department of Justice attorneys who had been preparing the cases had reached the conclusion that they had a dead open-and-shut case.

On the 23d of December these cases were filed, but at the same time there was filed a consent decree which limited the amount of recovery after the 1st of January for violation of the Elkins Act to 7 percent on the invested capital, as determined by the filings with the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was provided, however, that in addition to the 7 percent, any additional profits would be paid into a fund which could be utilized by the owner-operators for such physical expansion as they saw fit to engage in or to expend money for; but there were waived on the part of the Government the penalties of one and one-half billion dollars, for which we had a dead open-and-shut case. This was done at a time when we are trying to collect money for the national-defense effort. It costs $21 a month to pay a private in the Army, $252 a year. An army of 6,000,000 men could be paid for a year with the amount the Government threw away.

That is all I desire to say at this time, Mr. President; but I wish to have attention called to what is being done by some of those in the Government service who have official gun-barrel vision.

Senator GILLETTE's excoriation is no less than the facts in the situation fully warrant.

CONSENT DECREE GAINED NO ADVANTAGE FOR UNITED STATES

But worst of all is the fact that the consent decree abolishes no single part of the complained-of violations by these oil companies of the laws of our land.

By the terms of the consent decree the complained-of violations are permitted to be continued, but under a slightly different guise; instead of paying all their net profits to their major oil company shipper-owners, under the terms of the consent decree the common carrier pipe lines are now permitted to pay, as dividends, rebates in reality, only 7 percent on invested capital—but the rest of their fabulous earnings can be devoted to any legitimate corporate purpose—verily a distinction without a difference.

This consent decree is tantamount to nullification of the supreme law of the land; it violates the integrity of the administrative branch of our Government and deserves thorough investigation by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that I had a talk with Thurman Arnold personally on several occasions, and I called his attention to the fact that the sycophants of the oil monopoly in the United States were repeatedly boasting of the fact that the Department of Justice in due course would enter into a consent decree and that they would, as usual, win out.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the consent decree that was entered into would be res adjudicata, that is, in favor of these companies heretofore violating the Elkins law which were not included in the issues that furnished the foundation for the consent decree? In other words, would it foreclose in the future any further prosecutions against these oil companies for the violation on their part of any of the provisions of the Elkins law not included in the issues furnishing the foundation for the consent decree?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I am happy that the gentleman brings up that question because I am convinced that the execution of the consent decrees by arrangement with counsel of the major oil companies of the United States with respect to securing payment of fines and penalties for unlawful rebates is res adjudicata against the Government and estops the Government hereafter from attempting to collect a sum variously estimated at from one and one-half to three billion dollars. Here we are looking for sources out of which we can get sufficient money to help defray the cost of the war to the plain taxpayer, and relieve him in part from the enormous burden of the war. Here was a source of revenue, well nigh fabulously limitless, which the Government voluntarily waived by entering into a consent decree.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. First of all, I want to say that I appreciate the gentleman's courage in presenting these facts to the House. May I ask him what possible reason he believes could be assigned for the action that was taken? In other words, what I am trying to get at is this: Was it because otherwise there would be some interference with production or just what was the reason?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman will recall that 2 years ago there was a rumor about the Congress that these suits would either not be instituted or if instituted would be perhaps dropped.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman who is next will consent to this, if it is agreeable to the House, because I have talked to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say that there are four or five other special orders.

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that I am one who has a special order, and I have no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to have the gentleman take more time, if it will not come out of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman will be recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I am very happy that the gentleman from California propounded that question, because the gentleman will recall that 2 years ago he and I were interested in the possibility of these suits being dropped. At that time we dropped resolutions into the hopper of the House in which we took a stand to the effect that it was our opinion that the suits should not be dropped. It may be coincidental, but the facts are that, though the then Defense Commission had urged the cases be nolle prossed, the Department proceeded to build up the law and the evidence. Perhaps as authors of the resolutions we can hug to ourselves the comforting belief that we played a part in stiffening the spine of the Department, on the basis of the legal

maxim: Post hoc ergo propter hoc. However, after Pearl Harbor the oil companies brought sufficient pressure upon the powers that be to persuade them, apparently, that the continuation of these suits against them would impede the war effort and that they, patriotic as they putatively were, would feel very hurt if the Government proceeded with antitrust prosecutions against them and sought to collect penalties.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman believe there is any logical reason why the production of petroleum and oil and all the other byproducts could not go forward quite as well if the pipe lines of the Nation were in reality common carriers divorced from ownership by the producing companies, as it could under any other circumstances? Can the gentleman see any possible obstacle that that situation would present?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I have always favored the Gillette-Borah bill, which provided for the divorcement of the major oil companies from ownership and operation of pipe lines. The pipe lines are the juiciest form of profit into which the major oil companies drain their gross receipts. When they are able to tell the S. E. C. and other agencies that they make a very low return upon their invested principal, of course, they drain all of their gross receipts into these pipe-line companies. It is a device by which they can avoid the payment of fair corporate income taxes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no doubt that the gentleman is giving us some very valuable information. From the gentleman's statement I gather that the only beneficiaries under the suit in which a consent decree was entered were the oil companies.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. That is correct. As usual, the Government was outmaneuvered by the major oil companies of the Nation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, we would not want to imply in any way that there was any sort of collusion in the institution of these suits, or that there was in mind the idea of relieving the oil companies from charges of violating the provisions of the Elkins Act in the past.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The effect of it is to give a judicial determination to an acceptance of something which is palpably a violation of the law.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And the oil companies are the beneficiaries of it?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The oil companies are the beneficiaries of it. In effect, they are told to "Go thou and continue to do likewise," but to call it by another name; that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, or a skunk cabbage by any other name would be equally odoriferous. "So go right ahead and use this new little financial device, and you can avoid prosecution."

A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE SHOULD SMOKE OUT THE FACTS

In conclusion, it seems to me that the House of Representatives should appoint a committee to investigate this situation and ascertain what influences were brought to bear and what it was that brought about the ending of this suit. I have introduced a resolution to that effect today. I believe a special committee should investigate this situation and subpena the Deputies Attorney General of the Department of Justice and question these men under oath, and ask them whether or not they consented to the entering of the consent decree and to supply all pertinent factual data, advices, and so forth. I predict here and now that every one of them will tell the congressional committee categorically, if they are subpenaed, that it was over their violent protest that this surrender was made on the greatest suit and the greatest opportunity this Government has ever had to break up a major monopoly, and the greatest opportunity this Government has ever had to collect a tremendous sum in penalties.

I have nothing against Mr. Thurman Arnold. He is a good friend of mine. I do not say that he is responsible for this act. Something tells me he is not responsible. Something tells me that perhaps Mr. Biddle is not responsible. Nevertheless, of course, they consented to it, though mayhap with reluctance. Their reasons for so acting officially should be officially ascertained.

Personally, had I been there I would have resigned before I would have become a party to this action. I believe it is the absolute duty of the Department of Justice to proceed to trial of this kind of an action and permit the people of America to find out what is going on in these United States, whether the major oil companies of the Nation have this country by the throat or whether we, the Congress of the United States, control the operation of such corporate giants as this oil octopus.

Oil is going to play a very prominent part in this war. Anyone who has ever read the Life of Sir Henry Deterding, who was the originator, dictator, and controller of the Shell oil empire knows that oil and its manipulation of governments played a very disturbing but tremendous role in the history of the world for the past 75 years.

The advocates of this far-reaching consent decree probably will offer the defense that this unheard of action was taken because we have at last come to grips with a foreign enemy; should this excuse—for it cannot be a reason—be offered, it is heaping insult on injury, for can any sane-minded person doubt that a break-down of our internal laws is any less dangerous than a break-down of international law?

Are we on the one hand to enforce, with all the power at our command, our laws against alien enemies and on the other hand fail to prosecute our own citizens who willfully and consistently, over many years, flout our Federal statutes? Are we to throw a "Heil Hitler" pervert into a concentration camp and give big businessmen who conspire against our law with such deadly effect a "God bless you; go and sin some more!"?

When Judge Pine, the Federal district judge before whom the new bill of complaint and this consent decree were taken, grasped the import of the documents he was heard to remark "Ah! the Christmas spirit I perceive!"

What a Christmas spirit! to remit to the greatest law violators of all time fines aggregating a very sizable part of our national debt and executing a license to continue their criminal pursuits, safe from any future prosecution!

The Department of Justice calmly and definitely throws down the sewer an opportunity to put in the Public Treasury at the very least $1,500,000,000 while at the same time nullifying the laws of the land and failing to protect the rights of the little man in the oil business who has practically been exterminated because of the fact that the Elkins Act has not been enforced—such lack of enforcement, now perpetuated by this consent decree, permitting the oil monopoly to obtain transportation at cost while the little oil man is compelled to pay a transportation profit.

Our leaders, from our great President down to our country editors, daily counsel against words and acts which may in the slightest degree impair the morale of this country; the last thing we want, or should have, is the slightest loss of faith in the democratic institutions of America.

But here we have a situation which not only impairs our belief but, what is of far greater moment, actually points to what are in effect subversive activities on a vast scale—the sabotaging of our laws, the granting of immunity from prosecution for violations of the law on a scale heretofore undreamed of.

It should not be necessary for this Congress to waste the taxpayers' money in conducting a public investigation of this break-down of our laws; instead, the Department of Justice, not only to establish its own clean hands in the matter but to reestablish public confidence, should come forward with a frank and complete statement of every and any fact having a bearing on the situation.

The greatest undermining of public confidence to which we are subjected is the charge, repeated over and over again, that big business is running this war; on that subject I have nothing to say at this moment, but this I do say, with all the earnestness at my command:

The Department of Justice, in agreeing to this monstrous thing, has confirmed in the public mind the old saying, "You cannot convict a million dollars." If that is true, let us abandon this war, make peace with the Axis Powers, draw up a new Constitution, appointing an American Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin, preferably a Standard Oil man, and abandon all pretense of democracy.

If it is not true let us find it out before it is too late and our people turn on us for violating our oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain quoted letters and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I wrote to the Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration and the reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOUTH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are still startled with admiration by the immortal and heroic defense of Bataan. We are delighted with the achievements of our Navy in the south Pacific and the feats of daring and heroism exhibited by the aviation branches of the respective services, but we are fully conscious that these feats are not as easily accomplished as they read, nor do they go hand in hand with glory and flag waving. We know fully too well the sufferings and privations the brave men of MacArthur's army endured in those long months. Men whose bodies were wracked with the pain of malaria, whose bowels were shattered with the germs of dysentery, and who crawled through tropical vegetation with their burning bodies to push aside the scum in some tropical swamp to get a drink of its putrid water in an effort to lessen their high fevers. We know of the long, unceasing vigils of the men at sea; their feelings of anguish, but never of despair, when meeting a numerically superior and better equipped adversary. We can feel in some degree the intense privations suffered by the men of the air forces in their bombing trips of heretofore unheard distances, and while we are amazed at the privations suffered and the degree of endurance generated by these American men, we at last have discovered what it is that keeps them going, their enthusiasm and morale high.

It is the fact that they hear from time to time on the short-wave radio that the Great Lakes Naval Training Station baseball or basketball team, or Norfolk naval base's boxing squad, or that one of the Army cantonments' ping-pong group have met in mortal combat and defeated Lollipalooza Teachers College. These brave fighting men, who are making it possible for us at home to live in what amounts to luxury when compared to their state, must feel when they see their comrades of the squad, the battery, the ship, or the plane torn to pieces by disease or shell, writhing in their death throes, that all is not in vain when our big-league pitchers, catchers, or punch-drunk professional fighters are giving their all on the field of combat in some training-station competition.

Our fighting men do not need their morale raised, nor will it be raised by professional athletes who enter the service without any training whatsoever and immediately take commissions or ratings over men who have given as much as 10, 15, and 20 years to the service and who cannot advance because there are only a certain number of ratings and commissions in each service, and these are now being given to the heroic defenders of home plate and the pitcher's box.

I am not criticizing the efforts of Commander Tunney, of the Navy, for I know his own record as a fighting man in the last war was unsurpassed, and I further know that his patriotism at the present time is of the best, but I do criticize the system that has caused many boys in all branches of the service from my congressional district to write to me and ask "how come" that Joe Palooka, of the Pittsburgh Pirates, can get a chief petty officer's rating, or that Knockout Glutz, former star six rounder of the Hometown A. C., is being given a noncommissioned rating without any previous military or naval service. Why should these men who have made for the major part splendid livings from the public in the field of professional sport be given soft berths at training camps or training centers? It is done in the name of morale, but whose morale? The morale of these professional athletes themselves, who are determined that they shall serve without the dirt, grime, and discomfort of other men who have given themselves unselfishly?

Let these professionals follow the example of Hank Gowdy, of the old Boston Braves; Eddie Grant, of the New York Giants, whose monument stands in center field of the Polo Grounds in honor of his having made the supreme sacrifice, and other professional athletes who did not seek morale jobs, but rather went into the service with combat outfits. That great little shortstop, Rabbit Maranville, in the last war did not seek to serve in the morale division, but served in an active unit of the fleet, the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, and I heard him say that of all the thrills that he ever received in a life that was completely studded with thrills nothing ever approached the farewell that was given him when he was discharged. The entire ship's crew lined the rail and give him three cheers and a Navy.

Surely, the morale of our men who are in the combat service would be raised to a much higher degree if they were able to say now that in their crew, or in their battery, or in their squad, was Joe So-and-So, the great Cleveland pitcher, or Johnny So-and-So, the great left-handed fighter. Surely, these men would feel that it was an army of democracy and not an army where favoritism was shown to those who had certain physical attributes. These men who are taking commissions and ratings for athletic proficiency are in many cases merely physical specialists in a single sport. I could point out at least 20 or 30 who have neither the background nor the knowledge to qualify them as physical education experts. A man may be the world's best ball player, or the world's best fighter, and I know that Commander Tunney will not deny this, and still know nothing about physical education. Yet many of these unilateral athletes are being classed as physical educators.

Let them take their skills and fine bodies and let them mix with the men in the combat forces. Their proficiency as fighters, as ball players, and as other experts will give impetus to the company, regimental, and ship athletic squads that will generate an enthusiasm among the combat forces far more valuable than that engendered in a training base. There is a very small permanent garrison at any training base. Men are constantly coming and going, and there is very little question of morale, but among the active forces barracked and stationed for long, tedious periods of time, with very little recreational and emotional outlets, the presence of the sport expert, particularly when he is one of their group, would be far more beneficial than having the 1942 intercollegiate championships go to one of our training bases.

I am not criticizing many of our athletes who have entered into the service without reservation, without any desire for soft snaps or easy berths. I am criticizing those who, while they wear the uniform and take the plaudits of the multitude, have engineered themselves into feather beds where they are exempt from the many menial, tiring, back-breaking, and morale-shattering duties that are common to the ordinary enlisted man. Men whose boast will be when their children ask, "Daddy, what did you do in the war?" will quickly respond, "I pitched a two-hitter for Great Lakes in the immortal game against Norfolk. Do not pay any attention to Johnny Jones; his dad only did enough to get the Distinguished Service Cross."

I sincerely hope that our armed services will recognize that this kind of favoritism is a morale crusher for the patriotic men who are now doing battle for this country and who are willing to do any task, whether it entails glory or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE 40-HOUR WEEK

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss at this time the following questions in the hope of contributing something to the solution of a most intricate problem:

First. Will the suspension of the wages-and-hours law eliminate the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime in defense industries?

Second. Does the 40-hour week with time and a half for overtime affect the production of our factories or the number of hours worked on production of war material?

Third. Has a worker a property right in his contract for employment with his employer through his union which

contract provides for the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime?

Fourth. Can that property right be taken from the worker under the Constitution:

(a) By compensating him for it?

(b) Without compensation for the loss sustained?

Fifth. Can the thousands of union contracts between employer and employee be suspended during this emergency by eliminating the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime?

I desire to discuss these problems not as one who is supporting or opposing either labor or industry, but rather as one in search of the truth trying to solve a most intricate problem.

SUSPENSION OF WAGES-AND-HOURS LAW WILL NOT ELIMINATE THE 40-HOUR WEEK OR TIME AND A HALF FOR OVERTIME

From 8,500,000 to 9,000,000 workers are engaged in production of war material. The vast majority of the work is being done by organized workers who have a contract with their employers through their union which provides for the 40-hour week and that time and a half overtime be paid for services rendered over and above that 40-hour week. Ninety-five percent of these workers do not depend on the wages-and-hours law to protect them from either long hours or low wages. Suspension of the wages-and-hours law in itself would not affect them. The wages-and-hours law was designed and intended to protect the low-paid worker who works long hours for low wages and who does not have the benefit of labor contracts above referred to. The only result of suspending the wages-and-hours law would be to take from the comparatively small group of lowest paid unorganized workers the benefits of the law. It would undoubtedly drive them into the ranks of organized labor.

Let us assume that there were two factories, one of which was working 40 hours a week, with time and a half for overtime, under a union contract; the other factory was working 48 hours on straight time. It would not be long before the workers of the second factory would be organized in order to have the benefits of the 40-hour week that the first factory enjoyed. The mere suspension of the wages-and-hours law would not solve the problem.

THE QUESTION INVOLVED IN THE 40-HOUR WEEK IS NOT A QUESTION OF PRODUCTION, BUT A QUESTION AS TO HOW MUCH WE ARE TO PAY FOR PRODUCTION

The question involved in the suspension of the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime is not a question of production nor of the number of hours worked. According to Mr. Metcalfe Walling, who has charge of the administration of 40,000 public contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act, factory after factory is working from 48 hours a week on up. A recent survey by the employment and occupational outlook branch of the Bureau of Labor Statistics published in March 1942 showed that in more than half of 14 selected war industries surveyed workers averaged more than 48 hours per week in February. It showed further that the entire machine-tool industry averaged 55 hours per week, while 9 plants averaged 70 hours a week per wage earner. In no case have I ever heard or read of a worker refusing to work the number of hours that the Government or factory asked him to work. The abolition of the 40-hour week would not add 1 hour of production to our war-production program. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that the existence of time and a half for overtime will produce many more hours of production than you could possibly obtain under straight time.

Many a worker compelled to work 48 hours or more on straight time would at the end of his 40 hours have some kind of ache or pain and go home, whereas that same worker receiving time and a half for overtime would work in spite of that ache or pain to obtain that overtime. I am not speaking of a fancied ailment, but I am speaking of a real ailment. It is just human nature that with the incentive of overtime payments a worker will work more hours than he would under straight time. We all know that a contented and happy worker will produce more than a discontented, unhappy worker. I firmly believe that a worker who is happy and contented, with joy in his heart, will produce more in 40 hours or in 48 hours than a disgruntled, unhappy worker would produce during the same period of time. The question involved is not a question of production. The question involved is purely and simply a financial one, as to whether or not we are going to pay time and a half for services by the worker in excess of 40 hours a week.

THOUSANDS OF UNION CONTRACTS BETWEEN EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYERS WOULD HAVE TO BE SUSPENDED TO ELIMINATE THE 40-HOUR WEEK AND TIME AND A HALF FOR OVERTIME

First. Mr. Metcalfe Walling, in charge of the Public Contracts Division under the Walsh-Healey Act testified before the Labor-Federal Security Agency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee about a month ago that there were some 48,000 defense contracts which come under the Walsh-Healey Act and which are being checked by the Public Contracts Division under that act. Numerous contracts have been let since and, of course, some contracts have been completed. It has been estimated that there are 40,000 active prime contracts for war materials that come under that act.

Second. The Walsh-Healey Act only applies to contracts in excess of $10,000. There are thousands of defense contracts in addition to the above which are in a sum under $10,000. A study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Labor Department at the time the Walsh-Healey Act was being considered, shows that out of every 10 contracts, 1 was in excess of $10,000 and 9 under $10,000. This ratio has undoubtedly been reduced since the war because of the tendency to let contracts in large sums. While there are no official figures, it has been estimated that the ratio is about 3 to 1. If this is true, then we would have approximately 120,000 defense contracts which do not come under the Walsh-Healey Act because of the fact that the sum involved is less than $10,000.

Third. In addition to the above there are thousands of defense subcontracts which do not come under the Walsh-Healey Act. Maj Gen. O. P. Echols of the Air Corps testified before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on March 23 of this year that from 30 to 70 percent of the amount of prime contracts were sublet to subcontractors; that such subcontractors sublet to other subcontractors until it ran into third and fourth subcontracts. Under Secretary of War Patterson testified recently that in some cases they had subcontracts to a seventh degree. None of these subcontracts come under the Walsh-Healey Act and no one seems to know just how many subcontracts there are. The United Press under date of April 11, quoting War Production officials, stated that from 40 to 60 thousand subcontracts had been let by prime contract holders. These figures are in my judgment very conservative. I believe we are safe in assuming that 50,000 subcontracts have been let by prime contractors.

Fourth. Summarizing we find that there exist today the following contracts and subcontracts upon which defense workers are working and upon which they are receiving time and a half for services over and above 40 hours a week:

(1) Number of contracts coming under the Walsh-Healey Act	40,000
(2) Number of contracts under $10,000 which do not come under the Walsh-Healey Act	120,000
(3) Number of subcontracts which do not come under the Walsh-Healey Act	50,000
(4) Total number of contracts and subcontracts on which defense workers are working	210,000

In addition to the above contracts we have hundreds of contracts and subcontracts for the construction of cantonments, industrial plants, and so forth, in which the workers also have contracts for the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime. A recent bill contained an appropriation for four and a half billion dollars for Army construction alone and approximately $150,000,000,000 has thus far been appropriated and authorized for national defense. Practically this entire amount has been obligated and is being done under union contracts between employer and employee providing for time and a half over 40 hours a week.

In the determination of the unit cost of these contracts by negotiation or by competitive bid, every element of cost was entered into. Let us go on with the negotiation of a contract and assume that you are the manufacturer and I am the Government representative. When we get down to figuring costs, you as the manufacturer would say, "You are asking me to increase production 10 percent. To obtain that increase in production, I will have to increase my working hours from 40 hours a week to 44 hours and pay for 46 hours a week under my time-and-a-half contract with the

union. This 10 percent increase in production will cost me 15 percent increase in labor cost." I would reply, "Very well, we will charge against the unit cost 15 percent increase in labor cost." You as a manufacturer would then close the book. I would stop you and say, "Wait a minute, that is not the whole story. While you are increasing the cost of labor 15 percent to get 10 percent increase in production, you are obtaining that 10 percent increase in production with the same capital investment, the same fixed items of overhead, such as administration, real-estate taxes, fire insurance, and so forth. You are obtaining that 10 percent increase in production with the same depreciation which in the case of a new defense plant may be 20 percent a year, and therefore to be fair you should offset against your increased labor cost the amount you are saving by obtaining this 10-percent increase in production." Ten factories working 44 hours a week would produce as much as 11 factories working 40 hours per week eliminating the capital investment, overhead, depreciation, and so forth, of 1 factory in 11.

The Labor Department has found that in some cases these items of overhead, depreciation, and capital investment more than offset the increased cost of the time-and-a-half clause contained in the union contracts. The suspension of these contracts between the worker and employer which provide for the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime would be obviously unfair unless we reduce in each case the unit cost of each article manufactured in an amount which covered the item of time and a half in that unit cost. What we are trying to do is save money, and unless we reduce the contract price of the manufacturer in the same amount as we reduce the wages of the worker by taking away his time and a half for overtime, we would be merely taking the money away from the worker and giving it to the manufacturer.

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that we suspended the 40-hour-week union contracts and took away from the worker his time and a half for overtime. We would have to renegotiate every one of these 210,000 contracts and subcontracts and cut from each one of these 210,000 contracts and subcontracts the amount which had been allowed in the original negotiation for overtime. These contracts are in various stages of completion; some are 99 percent complete, others are 99 percent incomplete. Let us see just what we would have to do. Let us take as an illustration the several General Motors contracts and assume that General Motors have 30 contracts in various stages of completion, and you and I were auditing and renegotiating those contracts. The first contract, let us assume, was 87 percent complete. We would have to take the cost of completing the 13 percent; we would then determine what part of that 13 percent was labor. We would then have to determine what part of that labor was overtime which we would take away from the employee and offset against that overtime, the amount of saving to the manufacturer because he had obtained increased production with the same capital investment, the same depreciation, and the same items of fixed overhead. The balance would then be offset against the contract. The next contract might be 81 percent incomplete, the next one 45 percent, and so on and each subcontract and prime contract would have to be refigured on that basis. The prime contractor would have to refigure his subcontract with the subcontractor, the subcontractor with the second subcontractor, and so on down to the sixth and seventh subcontractor. You can imagine the confusion and work that such a program would entail if every one of the 210,000 contracts and subcontracts would have to be renegotiated and relet upon this basis. When you got all through, the worker would swear that the manufacturer had robbed him, the contractor and subcontractor would swear that the Government had robbed them, and everyone would be dissatisfied.

The large majority of industries engaged in war production are also engaged in the production of nondefense material under contracts with other nondefense contractors or distributing agencies. Lieutenant General Knudsen testified before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee last November that it was hoped that, by 1943, 65 percent of the productive capacity of our factories would be engaged in the production of war materials. It has been estimated that 8,500,000 of 35,000,000, or about 25 percent, of the nonagricultural workers are engaged in war production. The industries which are now producing war materials under the contract with the Government are as a rule also producing nondefense material under contract with nondefense industries or agencies. Thousands of contracts are now in force producing nondefense items in this way. These nondefense contracts have been negotiated in the same way as the defense contracts, with the cost of time and a half for services rendered over and above the 40-hour week included in the unit cost of each nondefense article manufactured. Is it proposed to suspend the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime contained in union contracts generally so as to affect defense and nondefense production contracts, or is it proposed that the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime provision in such union contracts be suspended only insofar as such union contracts affect defense production? If the clause in union contracts providing for time and a half for overtime is suspended generally, the question presenting itself is, Would you renegotiate these thousands of contracts for nondefense material that exist today? If you renegotiate these contracts and took from the worker the amount he would otherwise earn under the time-and-a-half clause, to whom would you give that money? Would you give it to his employer? Would you reduce the unit cost of the article the employer is manufacturing in the same amount you reduced the union contract? If so, would you also reduce the unit cost of such article to the person or corporation for whom such nondefense article is manufactured? Just who would benefit by such reduction in the cost of producing such nondefense articles?

I am assuming, of course, that the law would be constitutional which would take from the worker without compensation the property right he has in the contract whereby he sells his labor to his employer. In my opinion, of course, such proposed law would be unconstitutional. Thousands of factories engaged in war production are also engaged in nondefense production. If you suspend the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime on defense contracts only, the manufacturer will be confronted with a peculiar situation where a part of his factory will be working under union contracts providing for the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime, while that part of his factory devoted to defense production will be working on straight time. You would find workers working part time on nondefense contracts receiving time and a half for overtime while the same workers, working for the same employer, would be receiving straight time on defense contracts. It would mean keeping two pay rolls by every factory, one for defense production and the other for nondefense production. The confusion and delay that would result would not only be costly in terms of dollars and cents, but would undoubtedly retard and delay war production. A law which would suspend union contracts providing for the payment of time and one-half for services over and above 40 hours a week on defense contracts would only result in the shifting of labor from defense to nondefense work in order to obtain the benefit of time-and-a-half-pay schedules on such nondefense work.

THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE INVOLVED IN THE SUSPENSION OF THE THOUSANDS OF UNION CONTRACTS IS NOT IN THE AMOUNT OF DOLLARS AND CENTS INVOLVED, BUT IN THE FACT THAT THERE IS INVOLVED A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE UPON WHICH OUR VERY GOVERNMENT IS FORMED

Let us assume, for the sake of illustration, that a school teacher had a contract with her school district to teach a school for a certain period of time; that the contract provided she be paid $1,500 a year, $1,200 for teaching day school and $300 for teaching night school. Obviously, the school district could not compel her to teach both day and night school for $1,200 a year; and should the school district refuse to pay her the full amount of the contract, she could, of course, recover at law the full unpaid balance. She has a property right in that contract which, under the Constitution, cannot be taken from her except by due process of law and by compensating her for her loss. Union contracts between employer and employee provide for a definite wage for a definite number of hours of work.

Every worker who has a contract through his union with his employer

could recover against the employer in case the employer violated that contract. Thus, if he had earned during any one year $1,200 straight time and $300 a year overtime, the employer could not pay him with $1,200, and should he attempt to do so he could recover the other $300 in an action at law. The worker has a property right in that contract and the overtime part of that property right is worth $300. That property right cannot be taken from him under the Constitution except by due process of law and by compensating him for his loss.

The next question involved is, Can the Government suspend these union contracts with their employers, or any part thereof, and can the Government take that property right away from the employee? There is no doubt but what during the war emergency the Government can take that property right or any property right away from a citizen, but the Government must, under the Constitution, take it under due process of law and must compensate the worker or the citizen for the property right taken. This, however, would not solve the problem because of the fact that we are trying to save money for the Treasury, and should the Government take that property right from the worker and reimburse the worker for his loss out of the Treasury, we would be losing money instead of saving money and simply relieve the employer of a part of his obligation in his contract with the employee.

Frankly, what the proponents of legislation to suspend the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime propose is to reduce the amount of compensation that the worker is obtaining under a contract that he has with his employer without compensating the worker for such reduction. Now, let us assume that the Government could and would take the property right which the worker had in the contract—selling his labor to his employer—away from him without due compensation. What would the result be? This is the fundamental question at issue. This Republic was founded upon the principle that every citizen has a right to own property, that no citizen can take property or a property right away from another citizen except by due process of law, and that the Government itself cannot deprive a citizen of his property or property right without due process of law and without compensating him for the property so taken. The principle is the same whether it applies to a wage contract a worker may have who receives the lowest pay, involving perhaps 15 or 20 cents per hour, or whether it is a contract which involves the salary of some bank or corporation president receiving two or three hundred thousand dollars a year.

The principle is the same, whether it involves the property right of a worker in his contract for the sale of his labor which may amount to a few dollars a week or whether it involves the property right the factory owner himself may have in the factory in which that worker is employed. The principle is the same whether it involves one dollar or a million dollars. If the Government can take without compensation the property right the employee has in a contract to sell his labor to his employer, then the Government can take without compensation the property right the employer has in the factory itself in which that worker is employed. The ownership of every home, every industry, every piece of property, tangible or intangible, real or personal, and every mortgage on that property, depends upon that principle. Every bank deposit reloaned by the bank and every life-insurance policy depends upon the right to own property.

There are 54,000,000 workers of all types in America. These workers are employed in the factories, mines, on farms, in transportation, and other branches of civil employment. Most of them are home owners. They own personal and real property. They believe in property rights. They have been taught in our schools, churches, and in the home to respect property rights. They have been taught that the right of property ownership is one of the fundamental principles upon which this Government was founded. These 54,000,000 workers constitute the bone and sinew of this Republic. They are America. It is because of the fact that these workers and workers like them during the 150 years of our constitutional history have believed in certain fundamental principles upon which this Government was founded; that those property rights have been and are being maintained. Once you shake the faith of these millions of workers in these principles, the right to own property is a thing of the past.

The only thing that millions of these workers have to sell is their labor. The right to sell that labor to them is sacred. Upon such right depends their ability to support their families. From eight and one-half to nine million of these workers are engaged in the production of war materials. Many of these, together with millions of others, are being paid wages the amount of which is determined by a union contract between their employer and themselves through their union. They have a property right in that contract by which they sell that labor to their employer. That property right to them is sacred. They will fight for it and so long as they are fighting for that property right, they will fight for property rights of whatever nature such rights may be. Once you have taken that property right from them without compensation, you have shaken the faith that these millions of workers have in constitutional government itself and in the America in which they have believed. Once you have abolished the right of property, there is no stopping place. It is the end of democracy and the beginning of totalitarianism. When the home owner, the factory owner, the thousands of stockholders in industry, and every citizen who believes in the right to own property views this question on this basis, he is forced to the conclusion that the maintenance of this principle is far more important than any savings that could possibly be made by taking away the property right the employee has in his contract to sell his labor to his employer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Yes; I yield.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in order that the gentleman from Wisconsin may not lose any of his time, I now ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important article entitled "The Mind of Japan" by Mr. Bradford Smith. This article exceeds the normal limit and I have an estimate from the Public Printer, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NO ONE SHOULD PROFIT FROM OUR WAR EFFORT

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, with each day we find that the cost of living and the cost of all commodities is spiralling upward, that the purchasing power of the dollar is diminishing, and that, as a result, pressure is being exerted from all sides, in private industry and in the Government, for an increase in wages and salaries to cope with these high costs. Added to this, Congress shortly will have to act upon another tax levy.

The people of this country are willing to make sacrifices, to pay any amount of money necessary to attain victory. But we Americans are a practical people. Even in this hour of patriotism, in this crisis, that inborn characteristic frugality of our ancestors is deeply impressed—we want to make certain that we get a hundred cents worth for every dollar spent in the cause to defeat the Axis.

When our defense program was started about 2 years ago, all our industries were engaged in peaceful pursuits. It was no easy task to get some of them to convert to the manufacture of war tools. A large number of plants converted only after Pearl Harbor. And when we embarked upon our armament program, neither industry nor Government had any way of knowing what the eventual manufacturing costs for planes, tanks, ships, guns, and other machines of war would be.

Many of these items have never been manufactured before—at least not in the large quantities we require. The job, however, needed to be launched at once. So much to do; so little time to do it.

True, some corporations did quibble unnecessarily over their contracts with the Government agencies. Some of the Government departments became entangled in their own red tape. But that is water over the dam.

The hearings before the several congressional committees are now bringing forth the cost of production of armaments. With our American efficiency beginning to function, we find that it is usually lower than had been anticipated. Several large companies have returned the surpluses rather than accept them as profits; others have agreed to a reduction in their contract prices.

This voluntary demonstration of good faith is applauded by all. However, the people are duly incensed when they hear of a private secretary in a war production plant who had earned up to $4,000 per year over a period of 22 years and who received $39,000 the following year.

The people are righteously indignant when they learn that executives of some companies with large war contracts are so valuable to their fellow men that their compensation, wages, and bonuses increase as much as 1,300 percent. They are justly outraged when informed that a magnesium manufacturing plant in Nevada stands to make a profit of $2,000,000 in 1 year on an admitted investment of only $50,000.

I was happy to note that recently, Thomas J. Watson, the president of the International Business Machines Corporation, has voluntarily requested that his bonus be reduced from 5 to 2½ percent and totally waived all profit from the manufacture of munitions. His new contract, according to his request, will be retroactive, to cover 1941. It is no paltry sum that Mr. Watson voluntarily waives, for his bonus amounts to between three or four times his $100,000 per year salary. My hat goes off to Mr. Watson. Let us hope that the heads of other concerns holding war contracts will follow his good example. There can be no excuse for executives insisting on bonuses on contracts for war goods. The savings realized through the repayment into the Treasury of the surpluses thus accumulated will reduce greatly the ultimate cost of the war and likewise, the size of our national debt.

We shall do exceedingly well if the taxes collected in this fiscal year will be sufficient to cover one-third of the total we have spent. We must appreciate that our spending is being accelerated daily. This war is being carried on with borrowed money for the most part. The more we spend on nonessentials and activities in no way contributing to victory, the more we shall be obliged to borrow for war purposes. The people back home understand these facts. They want us to do first things first—and the first job before us is to win this war and win it as quickly as possible. This means that many Government activities which might be very desirable in peacetime should, if they do not contribute materially to our war effort, be curtailed or suspended for the duration. The Nation looks to us for leadership in that direction; let the Government set a good example by leading in the elimination of business as usual for the duration.

This is a total war against war. We are all in alike—to win all or lose all; to share equally its cost and burden. We must expect and be prepared to give up certain social gains for the duration, which means of necessity accepting a lower standard of living until victory is won. These sacrifices must be borne equally by employer and employee, industry and labor, rich and poor, men, women, and children. It is a small price to pay when one considers what we are fighting for and what we stand to lose if we do not win.

No one person or group of persons should be permitted to profit because of the war, and no private industry or management in industry should be allowed to make extra salaries, bonuses, and profits. Neither should labor get unusually high wages or profit excessively from work made necessary by the terrific demands for war production.

We fully sympathize with labor's strong fear that many employers, under the heat of the war effort, would like to make labor the goat by lengthening hours and drastically reducing overtime costs so that they might enjoy more profits. Labor must be assured that not one cent of the saving made at its expense in this crisis goes to increase the profits of industry or into handsome salary increases or bonuses of the management. These savings should revert to the Federal Treasury; they will reduce the war costs and future taxes. When labor is satisfied that neither industry nor management is going to or can realize excessive profits from the war effort, and that the cost of living is reasonably stabilized, then it will more likely be willing to forego high overtime wages for producing the instruments of war that will bring victory.

Several months ago Congress made into law a measure that bore the phony label price control. Leon Henderson said even then that it would not prevent inflation. I am very happy to learn that now steps are being taken to correct its deficiencies. Let us stabilize wages and salaries—raise those that are out of line and bring down those that have gone sky high. Let us control the prices of commodities through each step to the finished product that will finally be sold to the consumer, thus removing all undue inequities and hardships. We cannot control prices unless we control all prices. Higher wages are not worth anything if they buy less. Higher farm prices are not worth anything if the cost of farming goes up at the same time. It is not sufficient merely to freeze prices as of a certain level or certain date. There should be an adjustment of prices on all commodities to their real values. Many have skyrocketed out of all proportions, and others have failed to keep up. In the stabilization of prices let us not be unmindful of the fact that an effective control of profits is likewise essential. We have waited much too long in bringing about effective price and profits control. We must act quickly—act now. Immediate action will create greater unity, better cooperation, and hasten victory.

At present the excess-profits tax ranges from 35 to 60 percent. If we are to hold to a policy that no one should profit from the war, then there is no reason why this tax should not be stepped up to 95 or even 99 percent. However, profits cannot be controlled by means of taxation alone. An effective system of profit control and limitation is necessary.

Steps need likewise to be taken to prevent corporations from spreading their profits among their executives and employees in the form of unwarranted wage increases and bonuses in order to bring the corporate net income out of the high tax brackets. Such payments should be recaptured and properly dealt with.

In this connection it might be mentioned that patents and cartels with foreign monopolies have presented not only a bottleneck in our war effort but have been a means of exhorting huge unconscionable profits in the form of royalties. Though it is generally believed that, under the war power, the President has the right to use, without license, any and all patents on file in the Patent Office, nevertheless, in order to further our war effort, one of the several pending bills that covers the subject matter should be adopted. The royalties on such patents should be held at a minimum, and there should be no unconscionable profits for the patent holders or their assigns.

It is important for all of us to remember that we must win this war or become the slaves of the Axis. We shall win only if we work and pull together. The worker in the plant should know that, like his fellow citizen in arms, he is not working for his employer alone, but for himself, his family, and his country, individually and collectively. The same applies to individuals making up industry, agriculture, and every other walk of life. Wars are won by men trained and properly equipped. Valiant men without armaments or modern armaments without men cannot win. Both of these factors in full coordination are needed to win the war. Let us have confidence in God, in ourselves, in our leaders, in our country, and the life and liberty it represents. Let us all work toward one goal—the defeat of Hitler and the Axis—and victory will be ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, there is still considerable misinformation being loosely flung about rather promiscuously regarding the fortification of Guam.

First, let me state that the fortification of Guam was never before Congress to be voted upon.

An item of $5,000,000 for dredging the harbor and aviation facilities at that isolated outpost, 5,500 miles from San Francisco, the closest point on the American Continent, was eliminated in the House on February 23, 1939, by a heavy vote of 205 to 168. I was one of the 205. This item was included in the annual Navy authorization bill calling for an expenditure of $52,000,000 for our Navy. I voted for the passage of this bill as amended, as I have voted for every other bill which provided for the defense and protection of our country.

The record of the debate on the Guam item shows that this $5,000,000 amount was eliminated for three reasons:

First, it seemed like a useless expenditure of money to waste $5,000,000 on harbor and other facilities that might eventually fall into the hands of an enemy and be used against us, unless the island was to be fortified; secondly, it was feared that such a move might be misinterpreted and offend Japan; and, third, the fortification of Guam was not intended.

The fortification of Guam would have cost from one hundred and forty million to one hundred and fifty million dollars and a long time to complete. The British spent $400,000,000 and years fortifying Singapore which fell to the Japs and fell fast.

Here is a break-down of how the $5,000,000 expenditure eliminated by the House in 1939 would have been spent. It was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1939, by Representative PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, of Virginia, for many years a Member of the House Naval Affairs Committee:

Breakwater	$2,200,000
Dredging outer harbor mooring area	800,000
Dredging inner lagoon and connecting channel	1,070,000
Dike	120,000
Pier	120,000
Grading filled area	70,000
Seaplane ramps	120,000
Seaplane parking area	120,000
Seawall	90,000
Gasoline storage	160,000
Power service	30,000
Water supply	50,000
Roads and walks	20,000
Small boat pier and boathouse	15,000
Equipment and storage	15,000
Total	5,000,000

At the time Mr. DREWRY inserted this chart, he also said, in part, and I quote:

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot get very much excited about this bill. It has been repeatedly stated that there is no intention at the present time of fortifying this island. There is nothing in the bill itself to show any intention of fortification. The President of the United States has been put on record as having stated there was no intention in his mind to ask for the fortification of it. The leading experts of the Navy and those in charge of naval operations have also stated there is no intention of fortifying this island.

On February 21, 1939, Representative VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and in charge of the bill, said during the debate on this Navy bill, and I quote:

Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition the committee has gone into this matter at great length and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

Later he said, and I quote:

I repeat again, nothing in this bill authorizes fortifications at Guam. We hope the necessity will never arise.

On February 3, 1942, Senator WALSH, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee was quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as saying, and I quote:

A proposal to improve the harbor at Guam, not to fortify it, was defeated in the House; and I think the RECORD should show that the Navy Department never really asked for the fortification of Guam.

Later he said, in part, and I quote:

No direct request for an authorization for the fortification of Guam was ever put before the committees of the Senate or House.

So you can readily see that the fortification of Guam was never a question. The President, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, did not ask for it; the Navy Department did not ask for it; the Budget Bureau did not ask for it; the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee did not ask for it. In fact, not a dime was requested of Congress for this purpose.

President Roosevelt, in a radio broadcast February 22, 1942, said, and I quote:

Those islands, hundreds of them, appear only as small dots on most maps. But they cover a large strategic area. Guam lies in the middle of them—a lone outpost which we never fortified.

Under the Washington Treaty of 1921, we had solemnly agreed not to add to the fortification of the Philippine Islands. We had no safe naval base there, so we could not use the islands for extensive naval operations.

Immediately after this war started the Japanese forces moved down on either side of the Philippines to numerous points south of them—thereby completely encircling the islands to the north, south, east, and west.

So you can see the President referred to Guam's remote situation when he stated, and I quote:

Guam lies in the middle of them—a lone outpost.

Some of these hundreds of islands, which came into the possession of Japan after the first World War, had been heavily fortified by the Japanese. It was argued that, encircled by a vast chain of Jap forts, it would have been impossible to defend Guam even if heavily fortified, and it would have been a death trap for any garrison stationed there.

So you can see that those who say that this Congressman voted "against" fortification of Guam or that Congressman voted "for" fortification of Guam do not know what they are talking about. Plainly speaking, they are talking through their hats.

I wish every Member of this House would read a résumé of this Guam situation which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. This appears on pages A1517, A1518, and A1519 of the RECORD of April 14, 1942, and covers the entire situation thoroughly.

There was an item of three million laid before the House for the improvement of Guam in a later bill, for which I think everyone voted. I know I voted for it myself, and I think everybody else did; but my point is that the question of fortifying Guam, putting guns there and all that sort of thing, was never before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] for 15 minutes.

INDUSTRY IN CONNECTION WITH THE WAR

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent remarks of Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, regarding the difficulty of securing able men in the capacity of executives because of the constant criticism regarding the character of their services are all too true. When Mr. Nelson blames the Congress for this criticism he is only partly right. Far too much of it does come from a certain element within Congress, but much, and, indeed, the most dangerous part of it, comes from members of executive departments. A persistent campaign designed to smear industry and its representatives, both within and without the Government, is being waged.

In connection with that, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] recently made some remarks in which he referred to a certain Lt. Col. John C. Damon, in connection with the recent Arkansas power controversy. I shall have more to say soon regarding this Arkansas power controversy. In those remarks he made the statement, and I quote him:

I can tell you today on absolute authority that Lt. Col. John C. Damon, the star witness for the Power Trust before the Faddis Rural Electrification Administration investigation, is a substantial holder of 6-percent preferred stock in the Utah Power & Light Co.

Mr. Speaker, I went to the trouble to look up the extent of Lieutenant Colonel Damon's holdings in the Utah Power & Light Co. and I found that in May 1917 he purchased $600 worth of 7-percent cumulative preferred stock in the company, for which he was at that time working. In September of that year he severed his connection with the Utah Power & Light Co., to serve in the Army of the United States. He has held the stock since. The par value of the outstanding stock of the Utah Power & Light Co. is $25,000,000, of which Lieutenant Colonel Damon holds only $600 worth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the gentleman from Arkansas is a mighty poor

judge of proportions, when he calls $600 a substantial proportion of $25,000,000.

Social reformers, who have been entirely too powerful in Washington for the past decade, are responsible for the feeling that anyone who has ever been a success in a business way should be regarded as an absolute menace to the public welfare. These socialites, as well as many Members of Congress, do not seem to be aware of the fact that it is possible for a man to earn an honest living or indeed any kind of a living, unless he is on the public pay roll. They, as well as many Members of Congress, do not seem to know that there are men, who because of their ability to successfully manage industry not subsidized from the pockets of the taxpayers, and make this industry return dividends to stockholders, who because of their investments are entitled to dividends, are in positions where they earn their salaries.

These feather-brained, neophytic Utopians believe the proper way to run a government is with men who are long on theory and short on brains, and devoid of experience. This aggregation of impractical visionaries with empty heads, ne'er-do-wells with empty pockets, college professors with sophomoric ideas, and prodigal sons with an aversion to work are fighting to establish a system wherein sloth and inefficiency is rewarded with promotion and men of little ability and irresponsible tendencies are installed in strategic positions. In order to do so they must create a condition wherein experience is scoffed at, ability is rejected, and anyone who has achieved a worth-while position in industry is regarded as a dangerous enemy to humanity. To them their objective of eliminating all taxpayers by eliminating industry is an objective more vital than the elimination of the dictators, which threaten our very lives. Therefore, they lose no opportunity to strike at anyone not in their social order, regardless of his value in the battle of production.

Donald Nelson has my sympathy. He is honestly trying to produce the matériel necessary to the success of our war effort with the most bizarre organization imaginable. I have had considerable experience with the War Production Board which leads me to the following classification of its personnel, which I divide into five groups.

First. The career government employee, who believes that the coming of the other four groups have prevented him from reaching his rightful place in the sun. He believes they have prevented him from being promoted from an $1,800 or $2,400 job to one paying $7,500 or $9,000. Consequently, he is out to knife everyone within reach.

Second. The impractical, theoretical college professor, whose inexperience leads him hither, thither, and yon, who gets in most everyone's way and in everyone's hair. I heard of one such who, since he had been a professor of animal husbandry was placed in charge of construction machinery. One day being asked about a bulldozer, he replied that such matters did not come under his department, since he had nothing to do with cattle.

Third. The labor leader who has strong-armed and muscled himself into the picture. He is not at all representative of the leader of labor who works in the interest of honest labor, but is one mainly concerned in creating for himself a place in the sun. He goes about with a chip on his shoulder criticizing, hampering, and throwing a monkey wrench now and then.

Fourth. The former member of the executive force of some industrial concern, who has been severed from the pay roll of his former employers and placed on the public pay roll. He has been accustomed to earning his money and most likely knew considerable about his branch of a particular industry. There, however, he had had a free rein and was unhampered by the impractical ideas of such a large percentage of his associates. Furthermore, in the world which he knew, ability begot confidence, not suspicion.

Fifth. There is the dollar-a-year man who has been loaned to the Government by industry, which is interested in winning this war. They may, and often are, called in for a short time for a particular job. They do not vish to sever their connections with industry for various reasons. Frequently they are making a distinct sacrifice by their service. That, of course, is something those who have never had to meet a pay roll cannot understand. There has been a flood of general criticism about these men, mostly by those who have never had any connection with any organization more industrial than giving away taxpayers' money to the "gimme gang." For all the general charges that they are here for the purpose of getting all they can for their particular organization, no specific charges and no proof has ever been produced. It is reasonable to suppose that they are at least as patriotic and as public-spirited as their parasitic accusers and are certainly a great deal more experienced and able.

Now, just how Mr. Nelson or anyone else can get results from such a heterogeneous aggregation is more than I can see. If the few experienced and able men are driven out, I am sure he cannot.

We have a war on our hands and we hope to win it. As I view the matter, production is a vital factor in that war. Industry is just as much interested in winning this war as is anyone else. They want to help. Certainly their assistance is worth something. If they are to be cracked on the head every time they open their mouths, by the hammer of some crackpot socialite, parasite, or termite more interested in sabotaging our social order than in winning the war, they cannot operate efficiently. If our industries cannot operate, we shall lose the war.

The people of this Nation have long been demanding a recess on partisan politics during the emergency—and very rightly so. They should even more so demand a complete discontinuance of socialization during the emergency. All such matters should be frozen until we have more time to give them careful consideration. Unless they are, our entire social order may be dictated to us by a power whose ideas of social reform is to liquidate all social reformers, blindfolded, hands tied, and backs to the wall.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Democratic Party from the State of Pennsylvania, and of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, acted as chairman of a subcommittee of that committee, has rendered valuable service in that capacity. He also served in World War No. 1 and is now a colonel in the Infantry Reserve. He knows what he is talking about. I take it this criticism of his is offered as being something of an aid to the administration in solving the problems now confronting us.

Mr. FADDIS. I am offering it as my idea in the possibility that someone will at least investigate enough to find out if there is any truth in the statements I have made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RECOGNITION OF FREE FRENCH GOVERNMENT

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on November 21 last I introduced a concurrent resolution which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This resolution was as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is respectfully requested, if not inconsistent with the policies of the United States in relation to foreign affairs and if otherwise appropriate, to accord to the National French Committee, known as the Free French Government, the recognition of the Government of the United States.

This resolution by its wording recognizes the constitutional authority of the Executive in such matters, which I have no desire to infringe. That authority, however, in no way prevents the Congress from giving such expression of its views as is contained in this resolution.

It was first introduced at the time when General Weygand's removal from the command in North Africa had indicated only too clearly the course which events might be expected to follow. Today the government of unoccupied France is in the control of a man who can clasp the hand that is imbued with the blood of his fellow citizens, slaughtered without trial.

I believe that this Congress would be false to all the traditions of its ancient friendship with the French people if it did not express its unwillingness to continue relations with the present government at Vichy; and I urge that the Committee on Foreign Affairs give immediate consideration to my resolution, and report it to this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. SMITH of Ohio were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PETITION TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore submitted the following request:

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas asks leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of petition No. 1994 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, signed by Joseph P. Wilson, no adverse report having been made thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a speech given by Mr. Glenn Miller in the office of the Speaker this noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6912, to repeal section 404 of title XI of the United States Code, 1940 edition (with respect to composition of indebtedness of local taxing agencies), at 10 a. m. on Monday, April 27, room 346, House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m. April 28 and May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for ther purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1596. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 30, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Illinois River, Ill., with a view to ascertaining the damages by seepage and other factors to the levee and drainage districts bordering the river, and to individual landowners within said districts, by the prosecution of the existing navigation project, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 10, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 711), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 304. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department to conduct certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war; without amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6804. A bill to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6899. A bill to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; without amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6982. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6983. A bill to suspend the operation of the antitrust laws and Federal Trade Commission Act in certain instances requisite to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6984. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6985. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. BYRON:

H. R. 6986. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 472. Resolution to create a special committee to investigate the consent decrees entered into by the Department of Justice in certain cases; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 6987. A bill for the relief of Mollie Wiener Goldfein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6988. A bill for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 6989. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clarence W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6990. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6991. A bill for the relief of William Edward Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 6993. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marlin Croft, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Grigorios or Gregory Tsotsoros; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2716. By Mr. JONES: Petition of 60 farmers of Darke and Mercer Counties, Ohio, affirming their belief in the American principles of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, pledging that they will refrain from the acceptance of any Government Agricultural

Adjustment Administration payment for the growing or nongrowing of any crops, livestock, etc., requesting that money paid for crop conservation and pay roll under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program be retained by the Treasurer of the United States to be spent for guns, planes, food, and other necessary equipment for winning the war and for the men in active service in the United States armed forces. Also setting forth their belief that the farmer should raise more foodstuffs and should refrain from taking money for doing so; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2717. By Mr. MACIORA: Petition of the Labor Nonpartisan League of Connecticut, signed by 5,000 workers in Connecticut industries declaring that Connecticut labor in war industries will not strike during the emergency; that Connecticut labor will cooperate fully to increase production; and that a change in the present labor laws will not increase production, but will only cause disunity and strife; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2718. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, relative to the State Guard, adopted April 2, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2719. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Sheet Metal Contractors Association of Wisconsin, urging enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination against any American citizen employed or seeking employment in any industry turning out, or servicing, or transporting any requirements for which the taxpayers' money is to be expended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1942

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Very Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite source of truth and justice, who hast made us what we are and dost ever rule and govern us: We commit ourselves to Thee, believing in Thy gracious purposes concerning us, trusting that our aspiration after goodness is but the echo of that transcendent goodness which is the distinctive revelation of Thyself. Is it not Thy shadow wherein Thou art conveyed to us, for often, when in the light of day Thou hast been far from us, the gathering gloom has seemed to bring Thee nigh? Again we are baffled and perplexed, and Thou beginnest to be murmured in the soul, as when far inland in the stillness are heard the distant voices of the sea. So do we thank Thee for the burden of the mystery of that wisdom which shall make us strong for duty and patient in trial, the wisdom out of whose fullness our wandering steps shall be guided into the way of everlasting peace. In our Saviour's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 23, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Rosier
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Hughes	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Bulow	Kilgore	Smith
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Wallgren
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONTROL OF THE COST OF LIVING
(H. DOC. NO. 716)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In certain ways the present world encircling war presents problems which were unimaginable during the first World War.

The theaters of combat today cover vastly greater areas. Many more millions of human beings are involved. The new factors of mechanical power, in the air and on the land and on the sea, have produced radical changes in basic strategy and tactics.

In this new war the nations resisting the Axis Powers face an even greater challenge to their very existence. They fight more powerful, more sinister foes; but their understanding of the magnitude of the task and the very firmness of their determination make victory certain in the long days to come.

In some other ways, however, the circumstances of today parallel those of 1917–18. Now, as in the last war, the common enemy has had all the advantage at the outset. Now, as then, bitter defeats and heavy losses must be endured by those who are defending civilization, before we will be able to establish the vital superiority in men and munitions which will turn the tide.

The United States was far better prepared for actual war on December 7, 1941, than it was on April 6, 1917. For over 2 years, by a succession of congressional acts, we had carried out or initiated safety measures for our own defense in growing volume and importance. There were the revisions of the neutrality laws, the adoption of the selective-service law and the lend-lease law, and the great increases of our Army and Navy and the instruments of war which they needed.

After Pearl Harbor, the American people adopted a national program of war production which would have been called fantastic by most people 2 years before. It has required the shifting of the major part of American industry from the products of peace to the weapons of war.

Inevitably, but with the full approval of the Nation, this enormous program is dislocating industry, labor, agriculture, and finance. It is disrupting, and will continue to disrupt, the normal manner of life of every American and every American family. In this we repeat the pattern of the first World War, although on a vastly greater scale.

During that earlier war there were certain economic factors which produced unnecessary hardships; and these hardships continued long after the signing of the Armistice. I use the word "unnecessary" because it is my belief that a very great deal of the suffering which was caused then can be avoided now.

These economic factors relate primarily to an easily understood phrase which affects the lives of all of us—the cost of living. Because rises in the cost of living which came with the last war were not checked in the beginning, people in this country paid more than twice as much for the same things in 1920 as they did in 1914.

The rise in the cost of living during this war has begun to parallel the last. The time has definitely come to stop the spiral, and we can face the fact that there must be a drastic reduction in our standard of living.

While the cost of living, based on the average prices of necessaries, has gone up about 15 percent so far since the autumn of 1939, we must now act to keep it from soaring another 80 or 90 percent during the next year or two—to hold it somewhere near the present level.

There are obvious reasons for taking every step necessary to prevent this rise. I emphasize the words "every step" because no single step would be adequate

by itself. Action in one direction alone would be offset by inaction in other directions. Only an all-embracing program will suffice.

When the cost of living spirals upward week after week and month after month, people as a whole are bound to become poorer because the pay envelope will then lag behind rising retail prices. The price paid for carrying on the war by the Government, and therefore by the people, will increase by many billions if prices go up. Furthermore, there is an old and true saying that "that which goes up must always come down"—and you and I know the hardships and heartaches we all went through in the bad years after the last war, when the Americans were losing their homes and their farms and their savings and were looking in vain for jobs.

We do not intend, after this war, to present the same disastrous situation to those brave men who today are fighting our battles in all parts of the world. Safeguarding our economy at home is the very least that our soldiers, sailors, and marines have a right to expect of us civilians in Government, in industry, on the farm, and in all other walks of life.

We must therefore adopt as one of our principal domestic objectives the stabilization of the cost of living, for this is essential to the fortification of our whole economic structure.

Relying on past and present experience, and leaving out masses of details which relate more to questions of method than to the objective itself, I list for the Congress the following points, which, taken together, may well be called our present national economic policy:

1. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must tax heavily, and in that process keep personal and corporate profits at a reasonable rate, the word "reasonable" being defined at a low level.

2. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must fix ceilings on the prices which consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers pay for the things they buy; and ceilings on rents for dwellings in all areas affected by war industries.

3. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work.

4. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

5. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must encourage all citizens to contribute to the cost of winning this war by purchasing War Bonds with their earnings instead of using those earnings to buy articles which are not essential.

6. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must ration all essential commodities of which there is a scarcity, so that they may be distributed fairly among consumers and not merely in accordance with financial ability to pay high prices for them.

7. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must discourage credit and installment buying, and encourage the paying off of debts, mortgages, and other obligations; for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War Bonds.

I know that you will appreciate that these seven principal points, each and every one of them, will contribute in substantial fashion to the great objective of keeping the cost of living down.

It is my best judgment that only two of these points require legislation at the present time, for the very good reason that the Congress has already passed laws with respect to the others which seem adequate to meet the national policy enunciated.

I assure the Congress that if the required objectives are not attained, and if the cost of living should continue to rise substantially, I shall so advise the Congress, and shall ask for any additional legislation which may be necessary.

In the first item, legislation is necessary, and the subject is now under consideration in the House of Representatives. Its purpose is to keep excess profits down and, at the same time, raise further large sums for the financing of the war.

On this subject, I believe that the objective can be attained through tax processes. We are now spending, solely for war purposes, the sum of about $100,000,000 every day of the week. But before this year is over that rate of expenditure will be doubled. This means that a sum equal to more than half of the entire national income will be spent in the war effort. Almost the whole of these billions is being and will be spent within the United States itself.

Profits must be taxed to the utmost limit consistent with continued production. This means all business profits—not only in making munitions but in making or selling anything else. Under the proposed new tax law we seek to take by taxation all undue or excess profits. It is incumbent upon the Congress to define undue or excess profits; and anything in excess of that specific figure should go to the Government.

One of our difficulties is to write a law in which some clever people will not find loopholes, or in which some businesses will not be equitably included. I have suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives that some blanket clause could well cover, by a special tax, all profits of any kind of business which exceed the expressed definition of the legal profit figure.

At the same time, while the number of individual Americans affected is small, discrepancies between low personal incomes and very high personal incomes should be lessened; and I therefore believe that in time of this grave national danger, when all excess income should go to win the war, no American citizen ought to have a net income, after he has paid his taxes, of more than $25,000 a year. It is indefensible that those who enjoy large incomes from State and local securities should be immune from taxation while we are at war. Interest on such securities should be subject at least to surtaxes.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will pass a new tax bill at the earliest moment possible. Such action is imperative in the comprehensive all-out effort to keep the cost of living down—and time is of the essence.

The second item, relating to price control, is, with the exception of farm prices, adequately covered by existing law, and I have issued instructions to put this into effect immediately. It is our effort to be fair in all phases of price control; and if our future experience reveals inequality or unfairness, corrections will, of course, be made.

In respect to the third term, seeking to stabilize remuneration for work, legislation is not required under present circumstances. I believe that stabilizing the cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales.

Organized labor has voluntarily given up its right to strike during the war. Therefore all stabilization or adjustment of wages will be settled by the War Labor Board machinery which has been generally accepted by industry and labor for the settlement of all disputes.

All strikes are at a minimum. Existing contracts between employers and employees must, in all fairness, be carried out to the expiration date of those contracts. The existing machinery for labor disputes will, of course, continue to give due consideration to inequalities and the elimination of substandards of living. I repeat that all of these processes now in existence will work equitably for the overwhelming proportion of all our workers if we can keep the cost of living down and stabilize their remuneration.

Most workers in munition industries are working far more than 40 hours a week and should continue to be paid at time and a half for overtime. Otherwise their weekly pay envelopes would be reduced.

All these policies will guide all Government agencies.

In regard to item 4, prices of farm products: For nearly 9 years it has been the policy of the Government to seek an objective known as parity—or, in other words, farm prices that give the farmer an assurance of equality in individual purchasing power with his fellow Americans who work in industry. Some of the products of the farms have not yet reached the stage of parity. Others have exceeded parity. Under existing legislation a ceiling cannot be placed on certain products until they reach a level somewhat above parity.

This calls for the second legislative action which I have mentioned. Under a complicated formula in the existing law, prices for farm products—prices which housewives have to pay for many articles of food—may rise to 110 percent of parity or even higher. It is the fault of the formula. In the case of many articles this can mean a dangerous increase in the cost of living for the average family over present prices.

In fairness to the American people as a whole, and adhering to the purpose of keeping the cost of living from going up, I ask that this formula be corrected, and

that the original and excellent objective of obtaining parity for the farmers of the United States be restored.

It would be equally harmful to the process of keeping down the cost of living if any law were passed preventing the Government from selling any of its own surplus farm commodities at the market price. As a national policy, the ceiling on farm products—in other words, the maximum prices to be received by the producers of these products—should be set at parity.

With respect to item 5, the purchase of War Bonds, the American people know that if we would raise the billions which we now need to pay for the war and at the same time prevent a disastrous rise in the cost of living, we shall have to double and more than double the scale of our savings. Every dime and dollar not vitally needed for absolute necessities should go into War Bonds and stamps to add to the striking power of our armed forces.

If these purchases are to have a material effect in restraining price increases they must be made out of current income. In almost every individual case they should be big enough to mean rigid self-denial, a substantial reduction for most of us in the scale of expenditure that is comfortable and easy for us. We cannot fight this war, we cannot exert our maximum effort, on a spend-as-usual basis. We cannot have all we want, if our soldiers and sailors are to have all they need.

I have been urged by many persons and groups to recommend the adoption of a compulsory plan of savings by deducting a certain percentage of everyone's income. I prefer, however, to keep the voluntary plan in effect as long as possible, and I hope for a magnificent response.

With respect to item 6, rationing, it is obviously fair that where there is not enough of any essential commodity to meet all civilian demands, those who can afford to pay more for the commodity should not be privileged over others who cannot. I am confident that as to many basic necessities of life rationing will not be necessary, because we shall strive to the utmost to have an adequate supply. But where any important article becomes scarce, rationing is the democratic, equitable solution.

Item 7, paying off debts and curtailing installment buying, should be made effective as soon as possible now that money is becoming more plentiful. Those who comply with it will be grateful that they have done so, when this war is over. Elimination of private debts and an accumulation of savings will provide a form of insurance against postwar depression. The Federal agency responsible for the control of credit for installment buying is taking appropriate action.

Indeed, as to all the items which do not require legislation, the executive departments and agencies whose functions and duties are involved, are at work as expeditiously as possible in carrying out this whole broad policy.

The result will mean that each and every one of us will have to give up many things to which we are accustomed. We shall have to live our lives with less in the way of creature comforts than we have in time of peace. Our standard of living will have to come down.

Some have called this an economy of sacrifice. Some interpret it in terms that are more accurate—the equality of sacrifice. I have never been able to bring myself, however, to full acceptance of the word "sacrifice," because freemen and women, bred in the concepts of democracy and wedded to the principles of democracy, deem it a privilege rather than a sacrifice to work and to fight for the perpetuation of the democratic ideal. It is, therefore, more true to call this total effort of the American people an equality of privilege.

I firmly believe that Americans all will welcome this opportunity to share in the fight of civilized mankind to preserve decency and dignity in modern life. For this is fundamentally a people's war, and it must be followed by a people's peace. The achievement of victory in war and security in peace requires the participation of all the people in the common effort for our common cause.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1942.*

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

During the recess of the Senate the President pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 201)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1943, totaling $203,451,885, together with a proposed provision pertaining to an item of appropriation contained in the Budget for 1943, all in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AND REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, and also the Annual Report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Library.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (3), and Agriculture (6); The National Archives (3), the General Accounting Office, the Federal Works Agency, Executive Office of the President, and the Federal Security Agency, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Williamsport, Pa., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, and members of the congregation of Trinity Methodist Church, of Ottawa, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MEAD:

Memorials, numerously signed (forwarded by Harry B. Martin, secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Assembly, Elmira, N. Y.), of sundry citizens of Elmira, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation detrimental to the interests of labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BURTON:

The petition of Rev. C. L. Strecker and sundry other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. Helen Sidmore and sundry other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO INTOXICATING LIQUORS—PETITION

Mr. MEAD presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from Mrs. B. F. Palmer and sundry other citizens of Scio, and vicinity, in the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be

printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator.

DEAR SIR: We, whose names are hereunto affixed, being duly qualified voters, respectfully request and urge you to work and vote, to have submitted to the States for ratification, the Sheppard dry enabling amendment, Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, giving Congress power to restrict or prohibit the whole beverage liquor traffic, in the United States.

MRS. B. F. PALMER,
Scio, N. Y.

(And sundry other citizens of Scio, N. Y.)

THE WAGE AND HOUR LAW—RESOLUTION OF COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Court of Common Council of the City of Hartford, Conn., on April 13, 1942, and ask consent that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE TOWN AND CITY CLERK,
Hartford, Conn., April 14, 1942.

This certifies that at a meeting of the court of common council held April 13, 1942, the following resolutions were passed, by roll-call vote of 16 to 0, and were approved by his honor the mayor, April 14, 1942.

"*Resolved*, That whereas misguided Congressmen who prior to the national emergency have consistently voted against all progressive legislation are promoting a change in the wage-and-hours law; and

"Whereas it is established by the testimony of Donald M. Nelson that overtime pay is not affecting war production; and

"Whereas any lowering of living standards will seriously affect the morale of American workers engaged in all-out production: Be it

"*Resolved*, That this court of common council request our Congressmen to accept the recommendation of Donald M. Nelson and refrain from legislation which would destroy standards of which the American people have been so proud, and for which labor and the sons of labor are now fighting."

Attest:

JOHN A. GLEASON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF ADA (OKLA.) CHAPTER, NO. 150, VETERANS OF INDUSTRY OF AMERICA, ENDORSEMENT OF RECORD OF THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at Ada, Okla., the Veterans of Industry adopted a resolution which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, as the official representatives of a constituent chapter of the Veterans of Industry of America, or V. I. A., of the great State of Oklahoma, have followed with pleasure the heroic support given by Hon. JOSH LEE in the United States Senate to the national administration and our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the effort of Senator LEE to aid in promoting well-nigh all of the humanitarian program of our great President; and

Whereas we have noted with pleasure that Senator JOSH LEE has generally taken the side of the underdog in most of his efforts to place upon the statute books of the Nation laws which have been intended to bring relief to those who have most needed help in the struggle of life; and

Whereas we have observed that Senator LEE has not only stood by the working classes, but he has given careful attention to the needs of the aged citizens of our Nation who have reached the point where they can no longer hope to have employment by which to provide earnings for the necessities of life, but who have nevertheless spent their younger years in an endeavor to do their part in the upbuilding of the Nation during the years of pioneering in this new land: Therefore be it

Resolved by the officers and members of the board of directors of Ada V. I. A. Chapter No. 150, at Ada., Okla., That we do hereby fully endorse the record of Hon. JOSH LEE in the Senate of the United States Congress and recommend him for renomination and reelection to a second term in that office; and we do so without intending any reflection whatever upon the character and standing of any other candidate for that honorable office.

Submitted to and approved by Ada Chapter, No. 150, in a regular open meeting this the 14th day of April Anno Domini 1942.

J. M. Massey, chairman; W. H. Hilliard, vice chairman; Franklin Bourland, Mrs. Ollie Cook, Edna French, members, one absent member.

Attest:

A. J. HENDERSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of and ask consent to present three resolutions adopted by the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission. These resolutions relate, first, to the contemplated appropriation concerning defense forest fire fighting control; second, to the use of surplus C. C. C. equipment now located in closed camps; and third, to the possibility of further reduction of C. C. C. camps. I ask that these resolutions may be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

Resolution of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission relating to a contemplated appropriation concerning defense forest fire control; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolution of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission relating to not making of further reduction of Civilian Conservation Corps camps; and

Also a resolution of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission relating to surplus Civilian Conservation Corps equipment now located in closed camps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF THE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following reports of the Committee on Military Affairs were submitted:

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Dayee Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2446. A bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274).

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2477. A bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength; with amendments (Rept. No. 1275).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2480. A bill for the relief of W. V. Coile; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2481. A bill authorizing employees in the Veterans' Administration and other Government agencies to accept or reject quarters and subsistence furnished by the Government; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2482. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California over certain naturalization proceedings in the case of John Charles Thorn; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 2483. A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2484. A bill to safeguard the health of persons in military service by requiring that registered pharmacists be placed in charge of Army dispensaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2485. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:

S. 2486. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a building for, and for the operation of, the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2487. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to requisition motor vehicles driven at speeds in excess of the rate of 40 miles per hour; and

S. 2488. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, from $700,000 to $1,000,000, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1943, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 45, line 11 (in the item for Forest management), to strike out "$556,500" and insert "621,500"; and

On page 45, line 20, in the item of Forest survey, to strike out "$202,629" and insert "$250,000."

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 4, in line 3, before the period, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the salary of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be at the rate of $12,000 per annum effective on the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 20, line 23, before the period, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding $150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 72, at the end of line 22, before the period, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That commencing July 1, 1942, all proceeds derived by the Board of Directors of the Authority from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Authority, and from any other activities of the Authority, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States monthly, and shall not be expended until subsequently appropriated by the Congress."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 74, in line 13, after "247)", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the said construction fund shall be available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 79, after line 25, insert the following:

"Disposal of surplus commodities: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of such section 32, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, there are hereby reappropriated, to be available until June 30, 1943, the budgetary reserves of the appropriations made for carrying out the provisions of such section during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. The funds reappropriated by this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any funds appropriated by such section or any other funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such section: *Provided*, That so much of such section as prohibits the devotion to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof of any amount in excess of 25 percent of the funds available under such section shall not be applicable to amounts devoted to a stamp plan for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities from funds made available hereby and by such section, and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, not in excess of 25 percent of the funds made available hereby and by such section may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof under plans other than a stamp plan."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 79, after line 25, insert the following:

"Disposal of surplus commodities: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of such section 32 and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, $53,000,000 together with the budgetary reserves of the appropriations made for carrying out the provisions of such section during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. The appropriation made by this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any appropriation made by such section or any other appropriation made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such section: *Provided*, That so much of such section as prohibits the devotion to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof of any amount in excess of 25 percent of the funds available under such section shall not be applicable to amounts devoted to a stamp plan for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities from funds made available hereby and by such section and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, not in excess of 25 percent of the funds made available hereby and by such section may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof under plans other than a stamp plan."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT—CORRECTION OF ASSOCIATED PRESS ARTICLE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I want to take a minute or two of the

time of the Senate to correct the records of the Associated Press.

On Thursday evening, April 23, with several Members of the Senate and House, I spoke briefly at a dinner meeting of the National Small Business Conference. In reporting the meeting an Associated Press reporter quoted me as having said that "it is all very well to talk about economy in government, but in wartime government has to be 'expensive and extravagant.'"

The quotation, which was printed in the press of my State, reads as follows:

Senator MALONEY (Democrat, Connecticut) said it was all very well to talk about economy in government, but in wartime government had to be "expensive and extravagant."

I did not say that. I did not say anything like that, and I hold exactly the opposite view. As a matter of fact—and my colleagues who were present would so testify—I expressed the feeling that there was extravagance in certain places, and that extravagance should be curtailed. I do not now want to take up the time of the Senate to discuss the matter, but for a long time past, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, as well as here on the Senate floor, I have endeavored to curtail nondefense spending.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say, with respect to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut, that I attended the dinner to which he referred, and that the Senator made no such statement as that which was attributed to him in the press.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement.

EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on many occasions I have called the attention of Selective Service officials and others in charge of selecting men for service in our armed forces to conditions existing in South Carolina.

It is with extreme regret that I must admit that a number of our people are illiterate, and another large number of our people have not attained a fourth-grade education. Hence, in the selections for the armed service of our country many of our people have been rejected because of lack of education. However, these people are efficient and capable.

It has been no fault of theirs, nor has it been any fault of the people of South Carolina, that this condition exists. The principal reasons for it are the small per capita income and the poverty that have existed in our State in the past. This poverty is reflected in a lack of appropriations properly to educate our youth.

Statistics show that the number of our youth in comparison to per capita population is among the largest in the Union, while our per capita wealth and income are at the bottom.

It is my opinion that Selective Service and other organizations of the United States Government should give attention to this problem. This I have requested, and I shall continue to use my efforts, with the hope that the proper aid and support will be given to the education and use of so many of our citizens who at the present time cannot qualify for service.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by a distinguished South Carolinian, Mr. Robert Quillen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT QUILLEN

When we take our car to the dealer's garage, it is serviced by a young Negro. He is built like Joe Louis and probably weighs more. He works with the grace and skill of an expert, never wasting a motion, for he has the inborn sense of rhythm peculiar to his race. Whether repairing a puncture, changing tires, oiling the car, or giving it a coat of wax, he does the job quickly and dependably.

He had no special training, but simply picked it up—which means that he learned by doing, which is the best way to learn. It also means that he is smart.

Yet this young man, sound and sensible and a joy to any employer, is rejected by the Army as unfit for service. He can't read or write.

Thousands of such young men, especially in the South, have been deferred for the same reason. They are a privileged class because they didn't go to school.

Some genius has ruled that men who haven't the equivalent of fourth-grade schooling are not intelligent enough to obey orders.

Among the deferred are many white youths from tenant farms. Most of them are good shots. They are physically tough. They can make traps, repair guns, do rough carpentry, and ordinary blacksmithing. They are good at improvising—at making things do. And they are not illiterate because of stupidity, but simply because they didn't go to school. A regiment of them, properly led, would lick its weight in wildcats. You will find some mention of their kind in the history of the Civil War.

That war was a mere skirmish compared with the job we face now. This is a life-or-death struggle, which is harnessing the whole world's energy, and the side that can endure most and hold out longest will come out on top.

Before this summer ends, we'll find ourselves dangerously short of manpower. The shipbuilding program alone will require 800,000. We dare not leave a single man idle.

In fact, we must enlist every man and woman, boy and girl, who is physically and mentally sound. If a man isn't doing war work, and is fit to carry a gun, some woman must take his job.

This is not an exaggeration or a theory.

It is hard, grim, live-or-die fact. For all our great effort in the last war, we didn't even supply our own needs, and this time we must supply all of our Allies. It is the greatest chore in all history, and we must do it while building an unbeatable Army and Navy and air force.

The illiterate, if mentally sound, can learn to be soldiers. Why reject a good Jap killer because his grammar is faulty?

SALE OF UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS AND DEFENSE STAMPS—STATEMENT BY COL. EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Col. Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary of the Senate, in promoting the sale of United States Savings Bonds and Defense Stamps.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America's history is America's glory. In the immortal words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death," and Abraham Lincoln's utterance, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth," rings the spirit embodied in the hearts of all Americans today. Commodore Perry thrilled America with his statement, "We have met the enemy, and they are ours," and John Paul Jones voiced the stamina and courage of his country when he said, "I have not yet begun to fight."

These sentiments of the pioneers and patriots of our country were but the forerunners of the patriotism and loyalty that surge through our hearts It is this sacred feeling we have for our country and the great reverence we have for our Government that prompt all of us to contribute our best in whatever way we can. Those of us who do not actually participate in the armed services may give substantially by purchasing War Savings Bonds, which, like national unity, will assure security and preserve for us, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt has so fervently and appropriately said, "Liberty under God."

THE ITEM VETO

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this morning I made a statement before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in respect to my pending constitutional amendment dealing with the item veto. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I recently presented to the Senate a strong letter from the President of the United States in which he expressed his great desire that the right of item veto should be established by law—that is to say, the right of the Chief Executive to discriminate between items in general appropriation bills and to use his discretion in rejecting items which thereupon would return to the Congress for a two-thirds vote if subsequently validated. The need for the item veto has been reemphasized by the legislative habit of attaching general legislative riders to general appropriation bills. This latter practice obviously robs the Chief Executive of an opportunity to use his independent Executive judgment upon such general legislation, as certainly contemplated by the Constitution, except as he is willing to jeopardize general appropriations upon which the very continuity of government itself may depend. President Wilson was forced upon at least two occasions in World No. 1 to take this precise hazard, but he subsequently commented that the risk was far too great and that an opportunity for Executive discretion ought to be created by law.

There have been two schools of thought regarding a legitimate approach to the problem. One school believes that a constitutional amendment is required, because the existing constitutional veto provisions define a right of veto related only to bills as a whole. The other school of thought has argued that this Executive discretion, which is not the creation of a new Executive power but merely the efficient implementing of an existing Executive power, can be created by simple statute. In President Roosevelt's letter to me (which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on p. 2153), he associated himself with this latter school of thought; and I undertook to

test the issue by immediately offering the equivalent of an item veto amendment to the pending independent offices appropriation bill. I also filed a notice to suspend the Senate rules so that this proposition might be submitted to the Senate as a whole, although it was a paradox to offer it in the form of a rider when it is, in fact, directly aimed at riders.

The Senate Appropriations Committee rejected my statutory amendment. Meanwhile, my own further investigations have driven me to the irresistible conclusion that the statutory process cannot be invoked for this purpose. In the interim, the Senate legislative counsel has made an exhaustive investigation of the matter and reports to me that there is no shadow of a pretense to sustain the creation of the item veto by direct statute or by direct legislative action. Therefore, we are driven to the method of constitutional amendment; and I am forced to return to my own previous viewpoint as expressed in various constitutional amendments which I have introduced for this purpose during the last 6 years. I have accordingly made a statement to this end on the floor of the Senate, which will be found at page 3784 in the proceedings of April 23, 1942. In this statement I have pointed out that while the item veto exists under State government in 39 out of 48 States, it has been created in every instance by a provision in these State constitutions. All of these 39 State provisions are identified in my statement on page 3670 of the RECORD. I may add that wherever an attempt has been made in the States to create any sort of an item veto by direct statute, the State courts have checked such process as being unconstitutional. While I am not a lawyer myself, I cannot escape the conclusion that our only recourse in establishing the item veto is by constitutional amendment, and this conclusion is further justified by the historical fact that practically every effort in Congress to establish the item veto since President Grant first sought it has been by the process of constitutional amendment. I am therefore urging that your subcommittee proceed with least possible delay to bring my item veto constitutional amendment through the Judiciary Committee to the floor of the Senate for speediest possible action.

I refer again to the highly significant fact that 39 Governors of 39 States possess the right of item veto. Thus, it certainly lacks any serious innovation so far as the American system of government is concerned. The only States without an item veto are Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont. It has been repeatedly used in the States to the advantage of the public weal. Perhaps the most famous user of the item veto was Gov. HIRAM W. JOHNSON during his incumbency as chief executive of the State of California. It is interesting to note in passing that the item veto probably first appeared in the constitution of the Confederate States.

Entirely aside from the question of "riders" on general appropriation bills, the item veto is necessary if the President of the United States is to be held responsible for any effective economy in governmental expenditures and if he is to have any practical means of exercising effective discretion in respect to the appropriation of public funds. The average general supply bill contains literally thousands of unrelated items which obviously vary in their degree of validity. The Congress has an opportunity to pass upon the relative validity of each item. It can vote the item up or down. But the President must say "Yes" or "No" to the entire omnibus. He must sanction the bad (if any) in order to achieve the good. Since the continuity of government itself depends upon these general supply bills, the President may have to jeopardize the continuity of government itself in order to attack a questionable item. He usually hesitates to do so—and his hesitation is ordinarily justified. Therefore, the existing process clearly is not in the interest of public economy. It is not in the interests of the taxpayers. Conversely, the constitutional amendment which I propose is in the interest of economy and is in the interests of the taxpayers. This contemplation takes on infinitely increased importance at a time when appropriation bills are infinitely larger than they have ever been in the history of the country, and when the need for conservation is more pressing than ever before—a prospectus which is not calculated to change for a long time.

I wish to refer in conclusion to the question of delegation of power. It is well known that I am one of the most jealous Members of the Senate in the matter of retaining all of the congressional prerogatives assigned to us by the Constitution. But I insist that the item veto does not create a new Executive prerogative; it merely implements an existing prerogative and permits it to operate more efficiently in the spirit of the Constitution and in the interests of the public welfare. It does not create one single additional affirmative Executive power. It only permits the Executive to require of the Congress that it shall review any item which the President deems objectionable and to revote it by a two-thirds majority. The presumption in almost every case will be that an item which cannot withstand this scrutiny ought not to pass. Furthermore, from what we all know about our own legislative habits, I think it may fairly be said that the theory of the item veto will contribute to orderly legislative procedure within the clear intent to the American system of government.

I respectfully request earliest possible action upon this proposed constitutional amendment which is now pending before your subcommittee. If a hearing is deemed desirable—although there is little or nothing I can add to this brief—I am entirely at your service.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Jewish Fund, New York City, November 30, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE WAR

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Kiel, Wis., April 18, 1942, on the subject These Critical Days and the Problem of the War, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY—"REPUBLICANS—HEED THE NATION'S CALL"

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Ashland, Wis., April 16, 1942, on the subject Republicans—Heed the Nation's Call, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CHARLES M. HAY ON AMERICA'S WAR EFFORT

[Mr. GUFFEY, on behalf of Mr. TRUMAN, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Charles M. Hay, of St. Louis, before the Wisconsin Victory Conference, April 16, 1942, on the subject What's Right With America's War Effort? which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME PRAYERS BY BISHOP McAULIFFE AND RABBI FELDMAN

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two wartime prayers, one by Most Reverend Maurice F. McAuliffe, D. D., Bishop of Hartford, and one by Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, of Temple Beth Israel, which appear in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Herald Tribune dealing with the importance of giving Negroes a fair chance in the Army and Navy, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S Hathaway;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving; Thomas G. Irving, Sr.; J. E. Irving; Mata D. Irving; L. T. Dale; and Amelia Dale;

S. 2202. An act to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

MINOR CHILDREN OF MRS. JESÚS ZAMORA FELIX, DECEASED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of

Representatives to the bill (S. 1765) for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased, which was, in line 14, after the word "children," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF DEALERS IN AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER RATIONED ARTICLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain commodities rationed under authority of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the unfinished business before the Senate is Senate bill 2315, a bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

The bill was introduced by the chairman of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for himself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The bill as recommended to the Banking and Currency Committee is substantially the bill which the committee reported.

The bill is primarily designed to provide relief for dealers in automobiles, tires, and such other articles as are rationed at the present time. However, it is so drafted, and its language is such, that it would provide relief to dealers and those who finance dealers in all articles heretofore or hereafter rationed by any Government authority. In substance, it provides a loan, upon a very liberal basis, to any dealer who has such goods on his floor.

The loan is authorized, it is not expressly directed; but the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is the agency which would handle such loans, gives assurance that loans will be made in all necessary cases. We did not make an express direction because of the fact that there are many small articles of comparatively minor value held by dealers which could be made the basis for a loan application which ought to be handled by ordinary financial institutions. However, if the quantity of goods is substantial the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will make the loan.

The main relief provided in the bill, in addition to loans on all rationed articles, is that when goods remain on the floor of a dealer—and I think we may talk particularly of automobiles, because they are the main subject of the pending legislation—for 18 months or longer from the date of the rationing order, which in the case of automobiles was January 1, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as a Government agency, is required, at the option of the dealer, to purchase the goods or make a loan upon them to the amount of the full retail value of the goods, including transportation and such other costs as go to make up the retail price. The fair retail value or price, on what might be called the f. o. b. basis, would be fixed by the Office of Price Administration. The transportation costs from the point of manufacture to the place where the goods are then located, and such other costs as would be fairly included in the price, are the basis of the purchase or loan. The great majority of rationed goods will be disposed of. Every one knows that in the case of automobiles a very greatly liberalizing order was made last week, and there will probably be a further liberalization along that line; but if after 18 months any dealer is left with rationed goods on hand, the Government, in effect, must take them over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. When must the Government take over the automobiles?

Mr. BROWN. Eighteen months after January 1, 1942. That would be July 1, 1943, if they have not theretofore been disposed of. The Government will take them over at the full retail price at the point where the automobiles are located.

Mr. McNARY. The bill applies to new cars?

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It does not apply to second-hand cars?

Mr BROWN. No.

Mr. McNARY. Or tires?

Mr. BROWN. I think it would apply to new tires.

Mr. McNARY. And to new and unsold automobiles?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and to all other new and unsold articles which are subject to rationing orders. For example, if a rationing order on cook-stoves were issued on July 1, 1942, 18 months thereafter they could be taken off the hands of the dealers under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that the bill as originally drawn not only authorized, but directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to proceed with this program. I notice that the direction has been stricken out. I recall that once before we authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help with business loans, and nothing of any particular import ever happened. What is the implication in withdrawing the direction and leaving merely an authorization?

Mr. BROWN. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to purchase the articles after 18 months. The word "authorized" is not contained in that section. The language is—

> Such purchases and loans shall be made—

There is no question that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to make such purchases.

With regard to the loans which are contemplated in section 5h, the reason a loan is authorized rather than directed is that an administrative difficulty is involved. If an article of very small value were rationed, in which the dealer had invested a small sum such as $5, $10, or $15, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be required to go to the expense of making a loan on an article of that small value if the word "directed" were contained in the statute.

In the testimony there was ample evidence directly from the Federal Loan Administrator, Mr. Jones, that he would consider this section a direction insofar as any substantial amount in value of goods in the hands of a dealer is concerned. The committee reported the bill unanimously. I may say that the committee felt that the word "authorized" would be better than the word "directed" in that respect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator's interpretation is correct. Of course, it would be most unfortunate if dealers could not depend upon the subsequent commitment.

Mr. BROWN. I may say that the general counsel for the American Automobile Dealers Association was present when we wrote the language of the bill, and he was satisfied with that language, and with the statements made by the Federal Loan Administrator before the committee. Those statements are contained in the transcript of the hearings.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator's interpretation is conclusive. It seems to me that his explanation of the text is not so conclusive, because the words "and directed" are stricken out immediately preceding the order to purchase. So the elimination applies to purchases as well as loans. Then when we reach the subsequent section describing "such purchases and loans" I assume that those simply refer to whatever purchases and loans are made under the additional authority. It seems to me that there has been stricken out the direction in respect to purchases as well as loans.

Mr. BROWN. I am satisfied, from a reading of the entire bill, that the intent clearly set forth is, first, that the loans for the temporary period shall be authorized; second, that the purchase or loan, after the goods have remained on the floor for 18 months from the date of the rationing order, is directed, and not merely authorized. I may say that the sponsors of the bill who are present are in agreement with my position in that respect.

Furthermore, we were given ample assurance by the Federal Loan Administrator that where merely the authority is given it will be exercised in the most liberal manner. We were all friends of the bill. The friends of the bill who were present were satisfied with that assurance.

I may state further that this language has been carefully gone over by the House committee, which has, in effect, adopted the language of the Senate bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill is a very salutary measure and, in my humble opinion, has been too long delayed. The only question I have about it is whether the period of 18 months in the case of automobiles which stand on the floors of the dealers is too long a period. I have had contact with a good many automobile dealers in my State. I had a personal meeting with them a few days ago, and they told me that in a period of 18 months the tires on the cars will substantially deteriorate. The use of the cars for the life of the tires is contemplated subsequent to the 18-month period. They might have been on the floor of the dealer for an appreciable time even before the rationing order went into effect.

It is possible that a car might have been on the dealer's floor for 3 months before the rationing order went into effect. Under the terms of the bill 18 months would necessarily elapse after the rationing order went into effect. That would represent a total of 21 months. So the tires would go into use in the hands of the private owner after having stood for 21 months on the floor of the dealer.

Mr. BROWN. A tire might deteriorate in its use value; but so far as price is concerned, there is no question that the dealer would receive the full retail price for the car, plus the tires, in perfect condition.

Mr. PEPPER. I realize that; but why would not a period of a year in respect to automobiles be satisfactory?

Mr. BROWN. We had considerable discussion in the committee over whether we should make the period 1 year or 2 years, together with some other differences of opinion between us. After the Senator from Michigan had talked with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], with Mr. Bishop, the representative of the American Automobile Dealers' Association, and with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], a member of the Small Business Committee, we rewrote section 4 and fixed 18 months as a reasonable period.

The Senator understands that 3 months of that period have already passed. In other words, the automobile rationing order was made January 1, 1942. Therefore, there are only 15 months remaining. At any time after that 15 months' period has elapsed the dealer may obtain from the R. F. C. the full retail price; and it was felt that that was a fairly reasonable compromise between differing views. I may also say to the Senator that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], who has long been intimately connected with the automobile business and I think knows more about this subject matter than any of the rest of us, was a major factor in the consideration of this bill in the committee; and he likewise agreed that the 18 months' period was satisfactory, in view of the fact that 3 months, indeed almost 4 months, have already passed. On the first of May it will be 4 months.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Let me make a further comment, and then I will conclude. I have always understood, since I have been driving an automobile, that tires deteriorate relatively as rapidly when they are not in use as they do when they are experiencing reasonable use.

We are no more severely pressed in the scarcity of automobiles than in the scarcity of automobile tires. This rubber is going to be standing idle on the floors of the dealers of the country. If a man does not have an opportunity in 12 months to sell a car which is on his floor, it is not moving in private channels, and it ought to be taken over by the Government, and the tires either taken off it and put to some other use without waiting for another 6 months of idleness to pass, or the car itself, with the tires on it, should be put by the Government to some other use that would be in the public interest. I wonder if it has not been the experience of the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] that the tires do deteriorate when idle comparably to the way they deteriorate when they are experiencing reasonable use.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, there is no doubt of that. If kept on unreasonable time, tires deteriorate in greater degree without use than they do by use; but, if they are properly stored, 24 months is not an unreasonable time. We tried to get the period fixed at 1 year, but there was objection to that on the part of Mr. Jones. We were confident that the matter would work itself out within 12 months.

Mr. PEPPER. I am interested in that statement. It was Mr. Jones, mind you—it was the lending agency, Mr. Jones, the Senator has now disclosed—who did not want the period to be a year. The Senator from Iowa and the members of the committee wanted it to be a year, because of the consideration the Senator from Iowa has just indicated. It looks as if we ought to have greater regard for the dealers and the conservation of the rubber supply than for Mr. Jones' idea, if he had a contrary idea about the lending period.

Mr. HERRING. We were more concerned with getting a definite date for the dealer, so that he would be assured that at a certain time he would get his retail price for the car and his carrying charges. We were concerned with his getting that; and it was for that reason that we yielded the 6 months, and, in consultation with the representatives of the American Automobile Dealers Association, we agreed that 18 months was a reasonable time.

Mr. PEPPER. What was Mr. Jones's reason for wanting to make the period 18 months instead of 12 months?

Mr. HERRING. I do not know. The Senator will have to ask him.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I think the general tenor of his remarks indicates a misapprehension of the situation. There is nothing to stop the Government of the United States from buying these cars in 2 months, 4 months, 6 months, or any length of time. The Government may buy them at any time by paying the price the Government and the dealer agree upon.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. The only point in subsection (4) is that the dealer is absolutely guaranteed 100 percent of the retail price, plus transportation costs, at the end of 18 months, if he has not theretofore disposed of his car.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, right on that point——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask why the committee chose the language "the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator * * *." Why is it necessary to send the dealer all around town looking up one agency after another, and finally succeeding, after weeks and weeks and weeks, in getting a decision, when it might be done directly? If Mr. Jones can make loans and take over these automobiles, he certainly should be able to know what the fair retail price is.

Mr. BROWN. It is my judgment that the fair retail prices are already fixed, and that they are contained in price orders which have been heretofore or will be hereafter published. If the Senator from Georgia were eligible to buy a Mercury or a Ford or Chevrolet or a Cadillac, when he got his purchasing order, he would find that the price had already been fixed by the Price Administrator.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand that it is fixed; but, as this bill is written, a man would have to get the Price Administrator to fix the value before he could get a loan, would he not?

Mr. BROWN. No; I do not think he would have to get the Price Administrator to fix the value. The bill provides that he shall fix the retail price.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, he would have to get the Price Administrator to fix the retail price before he could either sell the car or borrow on it; would he not?

Mr. BROWN. There can only be certain definite factors involved: the f. o. b. Detroit price, plus transportation——

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, I know the Senator thinks there can be only certain relative factors involved, but we are putting an additional burden on a business that has already been outrageously treated by the Government. Why do it? Why not merely say "the retail price"?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that we were faced with the language which was stricken out in the committee, appearing in subsection (4), on page 3, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9:

plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

We felt that we were going a long way when we said to the dealer, "You do not have to take a second-hand car. You do not have to take any chances with financing an automobile. You do not have to make any arrangements with a

finance company. If you cannot sell an automobile on terms which you consider favorable during the 18 months' period," and only 14 months are now left, "we, the Government of the United States, will absolutely guarantee you 100 percent of the established and fair retail price, plus transportation costs"—because the language contained in the bill is for the commodity, wherever located.

It seems to me that that is going a long way. There were some members of the committee who felt that we were going too far, and that we were being a little too liberal; but I recognize what the Senator from Georgia has just referred to—that is, the fact that this particular group of businessmen probably has been hit harder than any other group in the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, certainly; and there never was any reason for it. There is no basic philosophy at all back of it.

Mr. BROWN. I do not want to argue that question with the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not, either.

Mr. BROWN. But we are faced with a condition.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that we are faced with a condition. What I want to know now is why the committee wants the retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator to control the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when it is making a loan or taking over the product. If the Price Administrator has fixed the price it is an established price, and he will have to deal with that price anyway. We need not write it in here. When we put it in here we are simply making the businessmen of the country go to another Federal agency and spend days trying to get a ruling from the Price Administrator.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that counsel for the American Automobile Dealers' Association sat with us during the latter part of the hearing and when we went into what was substantially executive session, in which the testimony was not all taken down, and he was fully satisfied, in behalf of the automobile dealers, with this arrangement.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but I am still asking the Senator why is it necessary that the Price Administrator fix the retail prices? Is there any special reason?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; because I think there is a standard price that has been fixed.

Mr. GEORGE. If it has been fixed, it is fixed.

Mr. BROWN. I think that is the case.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not make any difference how it is fixed. If it is fixed by law, it is there; it is written; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would have to regard it. I do not see why this additional burden should be added.

Mr BROWN. It seemed to us to be better to have a fixed and established price as the basis rather than a haggling between the R. F. C. and the dealer based upon the many charges that are set forth in the language that is stricken from the bill from line 6 to line 9. We thought we could cover it all by simply saying "the fixed and established price" of a Chevrolet automobile, for instance, plus the charges of transportation from, we will say, Michigan to Georgia—a fixed and established price against which no one could have any complaint. I say again that in the committee everyone seemed to be satisfied with that provision.

Mr. GEORGE. I was asking for information, and I shall move to strike out the words "as fixed by the Price Administrator," because they seem to me to be wholly useless. I think that when we recall the experience of the past we are bound to know that it takes a long time to get a ruling; sometimes it takes a day to have a telephone conversation started.

Mr. BROWN. I may misconceive this matter entirely, but I understand at the present time—and I am so informed by the gentleman at my right, who is very familiar with the situation—that the price of a Ford, the price of a Chevrolet, the price of a Cadillac have already been fixed and established, and no new price-fixing orders are contemplated. Those prices are already established.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, why not simply say the established price, and not say as fixed by some other agency, because we are not going to accomplish anything by it except another interminable red tape process?

Mr. BROWN. I do not think it would ever have to be referred to the Price Administrator. I think every automobile dealer knows what the fixed price is, just as the dealer in every other article knows the priced fixed for it.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand that the Price Administrator has fixed the price of automobiles. Rationing orders have been issued; restrictions have been applied; but I do not understand that he has fixed any price. If there is an established price, we might as well say so, it seems to me.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that price regulation No. 85 fixes a ceiling upon the prices of all automobiles.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps it does.

Mr. BROWN. I will be pleased to place that price regulation in the RECORD.

Mr. GEORGE. Why not say, then, "as fixed by price regulation No. 85," or whatever it may, and not force the dealer to go to another agency, because it will be simply a useless thing for him to do, and will take a great deal of time.

Mr. BROWN. I fear that if I should yield to the Senator in that respect we would have such a situation that the price of an article which ought to be changed could not be modified. The price fixed would not be the price on one car but would be the universal price applicable all over the United States. I think that it may be necessary to change the price of some of these automobiles, and, if we simply stated that price regulation No. 85 should govern we would be freezing into the law the regulation, which was not, perhaps, in the first instance intended to be permanent.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to take the Senator's time, but I wanted to know if there was any special reason why, when we are authorizing one Federal agency to make a loan, we go further and say that it shall be based upon the findings of another Federal agency, when that is precisely the heart of the trouble with the whole production program at this time.

Mr. BROWN. I can see the Senator's point, but I do not think it applies here, because we base it upon prices that already have been established.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. SMATHERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. BROWN. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I should like to say that there are two factors which influence me with reference to the language concerning which the Senator from Michigan has reported. One deals with the question propounded by the Senator from Florida. Mr. Jones told us, when he testified before the committee, that he had every reason to believe that the situation would and could be worked out entirely satisfactorily within the period of 18 months. It was Mr. Jones' testimony that it could be worked out within that period.

As to the second point made by the Senator from Georgia, I would recall to the mind of the Senator from Michigan the fact that when we adopted the Price Control Act we provided the basis upon which prices should be established. Any dealer who chooses may take an appeal from any ruling fixing a price. Moreover, a price, when fixed, must be accompanied by a statement of the considerations upon which it was fixed—all of which has, thus far, been done in accordance with price order No. 85 to which the Senator from Michigan referred. So, after we canvassed the situation fully for many long hours, both on the floor and in conference, when that bill was worked out, we set up a mechanism which does apply, which has worked—and is working—and within the skeleton outline of which it can be expected that we will proceed in the future. It is because of the factors already created by and known to the law that I personally feel that the language which the Senator from Michigan urges should be adopted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to say that I agree most heartily with what the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] have said in regard to this matter. Leon Henderson, the great Administrator, surrounded with the experts of the country, took such action that, in my State, a farmer could not buy a truck to use in his farming operations; he could not buy tires for use on machines used on the farm. It is all because Henderson's department is still wrestling with a policy, and I think the shorter time he is given to act the better off the country will be.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I do not want to be diverted from this bill; I am one of those who had hoped that we would have a general price order much earlier than we have gotten it. I understand it is to be issued either today or tomorrow. When Senators see that order—and I have had what might be called a slight preview of it—they will be amazed at the amount of work that was

necessary in order to prepare a price-ceiling order which covers retail prices and wholesale prices upon practically every commodity that is handled in the sale of goods in the entire United States.

The price-control bill became a law on January 30. It has taken the months of February and March and the better part of April in order to prepare this price-control over-all order. One with any slight contemplation of the economic picture in the United States must realize that the mere detail of writing down the price, wholesale and retail, of every commodity that is sold in the United States is a tremendous task. I wish it could have been done sooner, and I became impatient from time to time at the failure of the price-control office to prepare and issue this general price order, but it will be issued in a matter of hours rather than a matter of days, and I think when it is issued, the people will realize that it involved a tremendous task.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let us get away from the question of automobiles for a moment. The Senator has stated, very correctly, that this bill applies to all articles that may be rationed. What would be the effect of section 4 in its application, for instance, to articles which have been in a dealer's possession and because of being shelf-worn or outmoded, or for any other reason, are unsalable? Under this provision, would the R. F. C. be required to take them off his hands at a fair retail price fixed wherever the article may be located?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that was a question which disturbed me a great deal. I try to think in a dimensional way about this subject and not have my mind solely trained upon the automobile question or the tire question, for there are a great many commodities involved. If the Senator will look at subsection (b) on page 3 he will find that—

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe additional terms and conditions with respect to such purchases and loans as it deems to be necessary and consistent with the purposes of this section.

I think possibly as to shop-worn articles which have remained unsold for a long period of time, some authority is there vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I may instance, for example, galluses made of rubber, a very necessary article, and, of course, subject to the rubber-rationing order. They deteriorate rather rapidly, but with regard to the regular stock of the merchant, which he is unable to move by reason of the stringent and drastic, and, I may say, heretofore unexampled, order of the Government due to the emergency we confront, we want to lean to the side of liberality toward him. I think that is the idea of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is the author of this bill. Therefore, if we make any mistakes, we want to make them in behalf of and on the side of the dealer in these goods and articles.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator has indicated the spirit which characterized the action of the committee, and I know it does. In that case, why not allow an amendment to be inserted right at the end of line 11, for example, at the conclusion of paragraph 4 on page 3, in the following words:

> Any dealer may require the purchase of such article or articles held by him at any time after 12 months from the date of the rationing order.

If that were the law, if at the expiration of 12 months from the issuing of the order, a dealer did not think he could sell an article, and if he had not been able to sell it, he would have the option of having the Government take it over. I cannot see how the Government could sustain any injury, because for the space of the interim the Government money is out, and the article is kept out of commerce, and in the case of tires that is a disadvantage. Would the Senator be willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. BROWN. In view of the fact that the committee fully considered the 12-month period and fully considered the 2-year period, and compromised, with the assent of representatives of the dealers who were present, who were fully satisfied with 18 months, I feel that it would not be appropriate for me to consent to any such amendment.

I wish to read to the Senator from Florida a statement which I repeat with some personal misgivings, but I do it because of the fact that we had a rather strenuous battle in the committee over this subject matter. I may say the Committee on Banking and Currency battles things out pretty thoroughly in the committee, and after a discussion among the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], Mr. Jones, and several members of the committee, which I would not say was acrimonious, but which was certainly intense, the following colloquy occurred. Mr. Bishop, representing the dealers, said:

> If I might make a suggestion, the expiration of the period of the commitment is May 31. I would be willing, and I think my group would be willing, to have the time changed to a year and a half.
>
> Senator BROWN. I was going to propose a compromise here which I have worked out. I would like to have the committee see what they think of this. Commencing on line 25:
>
> "Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located."

Which is now the language of the bill as amended. Then this occurred:

> Senator TAFT. It sounds all right to me.
>
> Senator HERRING. It sound all right to me.
>
> Mr. JONES. That is perfect. It sounds all right to me.

All these gentlemen were contending vigorously with each other—the R. F. C. representative, the representative of the American Automobile Dealers' Association, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a very difficult gentleman to convince at times, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], who knew more about the subject than anyone else, and when, after 2 days of hearings, they agreed upon the language, I think the Senator from Florida should accept it.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Michigan had sat, as the Senator from Florida did, with a group of 25 or 50 automobile dealers in Florida, and they gave him contrary advice and petition, I am sure the Senator would expect me to pay more attention to the practical advice of these Florida dealers than to that of my able friend, the Senator from Michigan. After all, of the group to which the Senator has referred, the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] was the only one who might be called an automobile expert, unless the Senator from Michigan has that virtue, and he has stated here, as I understood him, that if it were a matter of preference, a year would be preferred over 18 months.

If the Senator wants to give the break to the dealer, I do not see any reason why the dealer should not have an option, at the end of 12 months, to call on the Government to take over the article, if he has not been able to sell it by that time. He has had his floor space used for 12 months by a rationed article which he has not been able to sell, he is paying interest every day on the money, and this bill would make him pay interest probably 6 months longer, because if he could not sell the article in 12 months, it is not very probable he would be able to sell it in 18 months.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I am a member of the committee, and I went into the committee hearings with my mind pretty well made up that a year was the proper time to fix, and I think Senators will recall that I expressed that view in the committee.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator even had misgivings about the reporting of the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; and I reserved my right not to be bound by what the committee did. But after I had consulted others whose judgment I was willing to take, and had heard the statements and the arguments which were presented, I became firmly convinced that the language now in the bill, providing for a period of 18 months, is better and fairer than that providing for a year. So I am satisfied with the bill as it is, and I shall support the change which was made.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that during the interim, the 18 months, the dealer

will be allowed to sell only under the rationing provision.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. The rationing provision itself is pretty stringent. With all the pressure brought to bear on us not to make purchases, to do nothing but contribute what we have to the prosecution of the war, it looks to me as if forcing the dealer to use his space for the storage of articles and preventing him from disposing of them would be unjust.

Let me give an illustration. I was in Savannah some time ago and accidentally drove into a warehouse, a place half as big as this Chamber, though the roof was not quite so high. It was chock-full of brand-new tires. I said to the proprietor: "What are you doing with these tires?"

He said, "I have in the neighborhood of $20,000 invested in these tires and cannot sell one. They are deteriorating every day, and I am paying insurance, storage, and interest on the money."

I just took that as being an accident. Then I went to my own home city and had occasion to try to get some nails, to be used in the erection of some garages. I was told by a dealer that he could not sell me nails, and he said, "Come in and I will show you something." I found that his place of business covered about the same space embraced in the warehouse to which I just referred, and it was stacked clear to the ceiling with $22,000 worth of brand new tires. He was paying insurance, storage, and interest on the money involved.

For the life of me I cannot see that there is any common sense in preventing the distribution of materials fit for just one use, which never will be of value for anything else, which in a comparatively short time will not be worth half what they are now worth. When one is out of them, he is out.

Mr. BROWN. So far as concerns the tires about which the Senator is speaking, the policy now, I take it, is that all the $22,000 worth of tires which the gentleman in Savannah has he may turn over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at cost to him, that is, the entire cost to him, I take it, the wholesale price, plus the cost of transportation, plus any other reasonable charges, and then to that amount is added 10 percent. He may do that now, without the benefit of the pending bill. So he is entitled to a flat 10-percent profit on the tires which he has in stock, over and above all fair and reasonable expenses.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator means above all overhead to him?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. So I think the problem is adequately taken care of.

Mr. PEPPER. But he cannot do that with the tires on automobiles.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that if one buys a new automobile which has a spare tire, the Government confiscates the spare tire.

Mr. BROWN. But pays for it.

Mr. SMITH. Here we are, 4 months in actual war, with all our boasted wealth and resources, rationing sugar, rationing gasoline, rationing everything. Where is our boasted production of raw materials, and our capacity for fabrication? It does not make sense that with all our wealth we have to go hungry, barefooted, and naked. Why is it necessary? The people are asking that question. We had better begin to deal in a kind of liberal way with the people, who, up to the present, have run the Government. The Government is running the people now, and must of necessity do it during the war; but I am amazed that, with all our boasted wealth and resources, we are put on starvation rations right now, one man saying "You cannot have an automobile tire," another saying "You cannot have gasoline." I understand there is a plethora of gasoline in the West, but that we cannot have it in the East because adequate transportation is not available. Mr. President, where are our boasted facilities for transportation?

I desired to have some factories established to make the essential elements of nitrates. "No," I was told, "You cannot get the wherewithal to build them. You cannot get the steel. You cannot get this and you cannot get that."

I know that no Senator present is more anxious for the country to win the war than am I. I am willing to make any kind of sacrifice necessary to that end; but why should our effort be aggravated by nonessential things? Let us as a body get together and investigate what is essential and what is not essential. We are delegating our powers to a great number of men who may know as much as we do—I hope and trust to God they do—but the situation is becoming aggravating. It hits at the very foundation of our Government. Our problem is how we are to get our people mobilized, how we are to get our stuff to the markets, and how products are to get from the market to us, in view of all the restrictions which are placed upon them. We are making Washington the great commercial center of America, and a few men are appointed to dictate the terms under which we shall commercialize our products.

Mr. President, I think some of us cannot see the forest for the trees. I am afraid that is what is the matter with us.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, with reference to what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said a moment ago, I will say that I have the order before me, and I wish to read to him the pertinent parts of it. The order, No. 85, was issued on February 2.

MAXIMUM RETAIL PRICE FOR NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

On and after February 2, 1942, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale, or other commitment, no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver, or transfer a new passenger automobile with standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, at retail, at a price higher than the maximum retail price for the automobile, which shall be the sum of the following items:

The manufacturer's list price at the factory—

That is commonly known as the f. o. b. price—

as of October 15, 1941—

I may say there are only two automobile manufacturers who have changed their prices since that time, and those two changes have been taken care of in the order. Plus—

(b) The Federal excise tax.

(c) An allowance for transportation, which shall not exceed the actual rail freight charge for the transportation of the automobile from the factory to dealer at carload rate.

(d) An allowance of 5 percent of (a) and (c) above, or $75, whichever is lower, which includes the charge for handling and delivery.

Plus an amount equal to 1 percent per month, or $15, whichever is lower, for each calendar month, or the greater part thereof, after January 31, 1942, which elapses prior to the sale of the automobile to the purchaser.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not aware of the terms of the order.

Mr. BROWN. They are very liberal, would not the Senator say?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Rigid restrictions are in force, and the manufacture and sale of automobiles have been practically stopped. I did not know that a price order had also been issued. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Senator's interpretation, and that is the committee's understanding, is, as I now understand, that the Price Administrator will not be called on to redefine the fair market value?

Mr. BROWN. Not at all.

Mr. GEORGE. Or the retail price?

Mr. BROWN. Not at all.

Mr. GEORGE. The reference in the measure is to established prices?

Mr. BROWN. Prices already fixed.

Mr. GEORGE. Through that particular agency?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. If that is true, it is all right.

Mr. BROWN. That was the understanding all of us had.

Mr. GEORGE. If the committee so interprets the provision, then it is all right. There can be no objection to it. But if there must be a redefinition——

Mr. BROWN. I would fully agree with the Senator from Georgia in that respect. We are referring to price schedules already issued of a general nature.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I wish to confirm what the Senator from Michigan states. It was our understanding that the basis should be the list price, plus the transportation charges, as fixed in this order——

Mr. BROWN. Plus 1 percent per month in addition to these prices, for each month the car is held, or $15, whichever is lower.

Mr. HERRING. Yes. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] the fact that if the dealer wishes the cars to remain over the full period he may make his loan, and keep his cars if they are not allocated by the Priority Board. At the end of the 18 months he is assured of the full retail price, plus the transportation charges. He is accustomed to turn over his stock of automobiles every 60 or 90 days. Nevertheless, business now is not as usual, and I know the automobile dealers are just as willing to do their part as is anyone else. It was not intended to give them the full retail price and let them sell their cars in 3 or 4 months.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator regard this language as sufficiently flexible to allow the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy these cars at this price in a period shorter than 18 months if it should determine to do so?

Mr. HERRING. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. There is no question that the Senator's statement is accurate.

Mr. PEPPER. At the same price as fixed in subparagraph 4?

Mr. HERRING. At cost price plus 1 percent a month to carry the automobile.

Mr. PEPPER. Suppose the Loan Administrator should determine for the purpose of conserving the rubber on the cars, we will say, and putting them into the most immediate and necessary use, that at the end of the 12-month period he would like to take over these cars.

Mr. BROWN. He could make an agreement with the dealers to do so at any price they would agree upon. There is no question about that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is all right.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, price order No. 85 is very long and very detailed. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks all of page 27, all of page 28, and on page 29, down to "1360.56. Notices to be posted", be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE SCHEDULE NO. 85: NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

TITLE 32: NATIONAL DEFENSE

Chapter II: Office of Price Administration

Part 1360: Motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment

The complete diversion of automobile manufacturing facilities to war work has brought the production of passenger automobiles to an end. Rationing Order No. 2 of the Office of Price Administration restricts the sale of new automobiles to those persons who can show a need related to the public interest. This schedule establishes maximum wholesale and retail prices for new passenger automobiles as a measure of coordination with the rationing program.

Prices announced by automobile manufacturers at the beginning of the 1942 model year represented an average advance of 14 percent over 1941 prices. At the request of the Office of Price Administration, each manufacturer agreed not to change the announced prices without prior consultation with the Office. This schedule serves to formalize that agreement.

An investigation undertaken by the Office of Price Administration with respect to retail prices showed a general upward trend although there was a wide variation in prices among dealers. The rise in price had been effected not by an increase in the list price but by means of an advance in charges for handling and delivery for services to be rendered after delivery, and for transportation. This schedule fixes the maximum amount which may be charged at retail, based on the list price established by the manufacturer, and the maximum charges which may be added for transportation and handling and delivery.

Because dealers and manufacturers may be obliged to carry their inventories over an abnormally long period due to the rationing program, the prices established are subject to monthly adjustment upward to compensate for the added burden.

Accordingly, under the authority vested in me by Executive Order No. 8734, it is hereby directed that:

1360.51. Maximum wholesale prices for new passenger automobiles:

(a) On and after February 2, 1942, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale or purchase, or other commitment, no manufacturer, distributor, or exporter of new passenger automobiles shall sell, offer to sell, deliver or transfer a new passenger automobile to any person at a price higher than the maximum price. The maximum price shall be the highest price prevailing for the same make and model between October 1, 1941, and October 15, 1941, for the same class of purchaser, except that, in the case of the Packard Motor Car Co. and the Crosley Corporation the maximum price shall be the highest price prevailing on the effective date of this schedule.

(b) In the event that the automobile is without equipment which was standard on October 15, 1941, the maximum price shall be reduced by the wholesale value of the equipment removed.

(c) To the maximum price may be added an amount equal to 1 percent of the list price of the automobile, or $15, whichever is lower, for each calendar month or greater part thereof, after January 31, 1942, which elapses prior to the sale of the automobile by the manufacturer, distributor, or exporter.

1360.51 to 1360.61, inclusive, issued pursuant to authority contained in E. O. Nos. 8734, 8875 (6 F. R. 1917, 4483).

1360.52. Maximum retail price for new passenger automobiles: On and after February 2, 1942, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale, or other commitment, no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver or transfer a new passenger automobile with standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, at retail, at a price higher than the maximum retail price for the automobile, which shall be the sum of the following items:

(a) The manufacturer's list price at the factory for the automobile with standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, as shown for each make and model of automobile in appendix A hereof, incorporated herein as section 1360.61.

(1) If the automobile is without equipment which was standard on October 15, 1941, the list price shall be reduced by the retail value of the equipment removed.

(b) The Federal excise tax.

(c) An allowance for transportation which shall not exceed the actual rail freight charge for the transportatior of the automobile from the factory to dealer at carload rate.

(d) An allowance of 5 percent of (a) and (c) above, or $75, whichever is lower, which includes the charge for handling and delivery, for which the dealer shall render all of the services customarily performed in order to prepare the automobile for delivery to the purchaser and all of the factory recommended get-ready and delivery operations.

(e) An amount equal to 1 percent of the list price of the automobile, or $15, whichever is lower, for each calendar month or greater part thereof, after January 31, 1942, which elapses prior to the sale of the automobile to the purchaser.

1360.53. Less than maximum prices.—Lower prices than those set forth above may be charged, demanded, paid, or offered.

1360.54. Evasion:

(a) The price limitations set forth in this schedule shall not be evaded either by direct or indirect methods in connection with the sale, delivery, or transfer of a new passenger automobile, alone or in conjunction with any other consideration or by way of any commission, charge for transportation, for equipment, for handling or delivery services, or by the removal of parts or equipment from an automobile.

(b) No buyer of a new passenger automobile shall be required, as a condition of the sale, to agree to purchase any equipment other than standard equipment as defined by the manufacturer, or any after-delivery services. The price demanded for any such equipment or services shall be separately listed on the invoice or bill of sale given to the buyer, and on any price tag, display sign, or other advertising used by the dealer in connection with the sale or display of a new passenger automobile.

The State and local taxes imposed on the transaction and payable by the buyer, and the charge imposed under section 1360.52 (e) hereof, shall also be separately listed on the invoice or bill of sale.

Nor shall any buyer of a new passenger automobile be required, as a condition of the sale of a new passenger automobile, to agree to make payment over a period of time, nor to finance the purchase of the automobile through any lending agency, nor to agree to a transfer to the seller of a used car, in part payment of the purchase price.

1360.55. Records and reports:

(a) Within 20 days of the effective date of this schedule, each manufacturer shall file with the Office of Price Administration a list of standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, for each make and model of passenger automobile manufactured by him.

(b) Every manufacturer, distributor, or exporter of, or retail dealer in, new passenger automobiles after the effective date of this schedule shall keep for inspection by the Office of Price Administration, for a period of not less than 1 year, complete and accurate records of each sale of a new passenger automobile, showing the date thereof, the make and model, the name and address of the buyer, the price paid, and the make, model, model year, and valuation of any automobile which may be accepted in part payment of the purchase price, and any other consideration which may be accepted in payment of the price of the new passenger automobile.

(c) Persons affected by this schedule shall submit such reports to the Office of Price Administration as it may, from time to time, require.

Mr. BROWN. That, I would say, covers the substantive part of price order No. 85, without going into the tremendous detail which is contained in the remainder of the order, and which would require a great deal of printing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to add on the subject of the 12 months that that was actually suggested by the representative of the Automobile Dealers Association himself. It was not suggested in the first instance by the Senator from Michigan. I asked Mr. Bishop the question:

Do you think it should be 1 or 2 years?

And his answer was:

It is a question of policy what that term should be. It seemed to us that 1 year was reasonable, and it coincides with the expression of the Rationing Administrator. * * * I think 2 years is too long. I would not be averse to seeing a reasonable compromise between 1 year and 2 years, if that would be more satisfactory under the circumstances.

And again on page 49 of the hearings he said:

If I might make a suggestion, the expiration of the period of the commitment is May 31. I would be willing, and I think my group would be willing, to have the time changed to a year and a half.

So it was entirely his own suggestion, as the compromise after discussion, and it seems a reasonable period.

Mr. BROWN. I may say when I read the excerpts from the record, in connection with which I referred to my good fortune in getting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the R. F. C. Loan Administrator, and Mr. Bishop together, that I did read first Mr. Bishop's suggestion along that line, which I may say to the Senator from Ohio had been in my mind, but had not been expressed definitely, and when the expression was made I leaped at it as an opportunity to compromise these differences, which resulted as I have stated.

Mr. TAFT. I also should like to call the Senator's attention to the record on the question of the elimination of the word "directed." It must be remembered that this provision applies to all kinds of articles, and it is a pretty stiff direction to say that as to any article which is rationed or "frozen," the Administrator must do certain things. The direction may not fit in all cases. We know what we want to do with respect to automobiles. The following colloquy took place, as set forth on page 35 of the hearings:

Mr. JONES. On the first page, line 10, we would eliminate the word "directed."

Senator TAFT. That is, if a policy is fixed in this bill, you would go ahead; you would have a little more freedom, perhaps, in making your adjustment if a legislative policy were established?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

I took that as a commitment on his part that if this bill were passed without the word "directed" he would regard it as a legislative policy which he would follow. There might be questions as to exactly how it should be done, but he would not avail himself in any way of the fact that the word "directed" was stricken. We can therefore assume that that policy will be definitely established, even though the word "directed" is not included.

Mr. BROWN. And the members of the committee who were likewise members of the Small Business Committee accepted that understanding and statement on the part of the Federal Loan Administrator, Mr. Jesse Jones.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I regret to intrude upon the Senator's discussion. I was unable to be present during the latter part of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, and, of course, was not familiar with the amendment until I came on the floor today. After listening to the explanations which have been made, I feel in accord with the Senator who has presented the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe that the amendment meets with the approval of the representatives of the automobile industry generally. I have not heard any objection. I have been in touch with them, and I believe they are entirely satisfied with the way the bill was worked out before the committee. Therefore I shall not interrupt the Senator, who is presenting the bill in such an able manner.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that the bill differs in no substantial manner from the form in which it was originally introduced by him. The Senator from Montana is certainly entitled to great credit for the manner in which he has presented this matter to the people of the country and to the Senate. I refer particularly to the problems of the small businessman, which are intensified with respect to automobile dealers, and which will be intensified with respect to dealers in other articles. Probably such dealers will not be affected to the degree that automobile dealers are affected, but nevertheless the general effect will be most unfortunate. It must be remembered that this bill is not only an automobile dealers' bill. The Senator's bill will provide relief for all dealers whose business is affected by rationing orders.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 5g thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5h. (a) In order to prevent and relieve distress among dealers in articles or commodities which are rationed in connection with the war effort, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting directly or through any of its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity the sale or distribution of which is rationed under authority of the United States, subject to the following terms and conditions:

"(1) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of articles or commodities which have been rationed in a manner and under circumstances which have resulted or are likely to result in a substantial number of dealers being unable, in the ordinary course of trade or business, to sell within a period of 6 months from the beginning of such rationing the stocks of such articles or commodities which they have in stock."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 14, to insert "a substantial part of"; and in the same line, after the word "whose", to strike out "principal", so as to read:

(2) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of, or for the purpose of aiding or assisting, dealers a substantial part of whose business consists of dealing in and servicing rationed articles or commodities of one or more kinds.

(3) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the words "aggregate of", to strike out "one year" and "18 months"; in line 6, after the word "price", to strike out "plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity", and insert "as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located", so as to read:

(4) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "shall" and insert "may", so as to read:

(5) Such purchases may be made from and such loans made to such dealers or credit agencies furnishing credit for such dealers, and may be made upon the request of any dealer having title to the rationed article or commodity or having the right to acquire title thereto upon the discharge of his credit obligations with respect thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, after the words "expiration of", to strike out "1 year and 30 days" and insert "19 months", so as to read:

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe such additional terms and conditions with respect to such purchases and loans as it deems to be necessary and consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not be required to purchase or make a loan upon the security of any article or commodity which is not in a salable condition, or which has suffered substantial damage or deterioration as the result of negligence or lack of proper care. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to sell at public or private sale, with or without competitive bidding, any article or commodity acquired by it pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That, until the expiration of 19 months after the beginning of the rationing of such article or commodity, no such sale shall be made except to a dealer in such article or commodity. In the event any such sale is made to another department or agency of the Government, such other department or agency is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to pay for such article or commodity any price not in excess of a fair retail market price as of the date of such sale.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make such agreements or arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this section, including agreements to pay to those from whom it acquires articles or commodities a portion of the proceeds realized by such Corporation from the sale of such articles or commodities. For the purposes of this section, an article or commodity shall be deemed to be rationed whenever its sale to the general public in the ordinary course of trade or business has been restricted or prohibited by any regulation or order made for the purpose of aiding in the more effective prosecution of the war effort or for the purpose of conserving the supply of such article or commodity.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments which meet with the approval of such members of the committee as I have been able to consult. Both of them have been added to the House bill which I understand will be reported to the House tomorrow.

The first amendment, in substance, provides that no authority, limitation, or restriction contained in the bill shall be construed to limit, modify, or otherwise affect any of the powers now vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The general counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation believes that this amendment is necessary in order to protect existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) No authority, limitation, restriction, or other provision contained in this section shall be construed to limit, restrict, modify, or otherwise in any way affect any authority or powers now or hereafter vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or in any corporation created or organized by or at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. The second amendment provides that in connection with these loans there shall be no recourse to the dealer. I myself have accepted the amendment. I have consulted with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is agreeable to it. It seems to me that under all the circumstances it is fair that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should depend upon the automobiles, and not upon the personal obligation of the dealer. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 1, after the word "care" and before the period it is proposed to insert *"And provided further*, That if, upon the sale of any article or commodity acquired pursuant to the terms of any loan contract entered into hereunder, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any subsidiary corporation thereof shall not recover, by reason of any limitation upon sales price imposed pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, the full amount of any such loan, no recourse on account of such deficiency shall be had against the borrower."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was called from the Chamber while the Senator was discussing the amendment on page 3, in line 6. I understand from the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that some explanation was made to the effect that striking out the language in lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, which provided for a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carriage charges, and other expenses, was really not intended to eliminate the consideration of those items. I find the following specific statement on page 2 of the report filed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan:

The general rule provided by the bill is that purchases and loans thereunder shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on a basis which will enable dealers to secure for an article or commodity not less than cost (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable one incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

The question is whether striking out those factors in the bill means that that sentence should also be stricken out of the report so far as the meaning of the bill is concerned.

Mr. BROWN. No. The first sentence in the report after the heading "Terms of relief" refers to the loans contemplated rather than the purchases. In that respect it was felt that each of these items should be detailed in the statute, because we have no price-fixing order to cover those items. When it comes to the purchases which are provided for in subsection (4) on page 3, by striking out the language referred to and fixing the retail price according to the terms and conditions fixed by the Price Administrator we thereby include every item which the Price Administrator includes in his statement, which I inserted in the RECORD during the absence of the Senator, I believe, which items include not only the f. o. b. price at Detroit, for example, on a Ford automobile, the transportation, which is the rail freight in carload lots, and the servicing charge of $75 for each car, which is generally agreed upon between the industry and the Price Administrator; but in addition, in the calculation of the retail price, 1 percent a month, or $15, whichever is lower, for each month the dealer keeps the car on the floor. So there is no question that this language was stricken out merely for the purpose of preventing duplication. If we should include the language "plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs," and so forth, and then refer to the Price Control Administrator's order, we should be referring to the subject matter twice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not quite understand the standard which governs the Price Administrator.

Mr. BROWN. The Price Administrator has already issued his order on retail prices of automobiles. As to the prices, there was no difficulty between the Price Administrator and the dealers' representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That order has already been issued.

Mr. BROWN. That order has already been issued, and it has been inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not an order which he may change at any time?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. We must take that chance. However, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that there is no danger that the order will be changed, except in accord with a change in the factory f. o. b. price. That is the basis for the price order. After this agreement was made the prices on Packard automobiles, and perhaps on one of the Chrysler models, were raised, and the Price Administrator immediately changed his price order in accordance with the fundamental f. o. b. Detroit price.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that I am quite satisfied that it would be the intention of the Office of Price Administration to take into consideration the various factors; but as I recall existing legislation, there is no legislative standard to guide him in fixing those prices.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; he has adopted quite definitely the period October 1–15 in his price-control order respecting automobiles; but, as the Senator knows, as no automobiles are being manufactured, there has been no change in that price. I assure the Senator, with all the confidence I possess in respect to this bill, that he need have no fear upon that subject matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are so many circumstances which enter into a complicated problem of this kind—circumstances which cannot be foreseen—that it seems to me to be highly necessary that we should carefully scrutinize the language of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My attention was called the other day to a circumstance which illustrates how difficult it is to foresee everything which may happen. The order with respect to freezing sales of automobiles, for example, provided that no 1942 automobiles could be sold. This incident occurred: A young man living in my State bought a 1942 automobile late in 1941. He was engaged in the ranch business, and in using the automobile he was not at all moderate, I suppose, in his driving, to put it mildly. In any event, when he was called for the draft this year, the automobile had traveled more than 20,000 miles. The tires were practically worn out, or at least they were no longer new tires. He was buying the automobile on the installment plan. He went into the Army. His mother did not want to purchase the car, it was of no use to her, so the finance company repossessed this 1942 automobile which had traveled over 20,000 miles. The finance company in turn had recourse to the dealer who had sold the car, and required the dealer under the old contract to pay the amount due on the car. Now the car is in the possession of the original dealer; but, because it is a 1942 car, it cannot be sold.

Obviously, that is a situation which is not fair. It is not just, and some correction should be made, and I assume that eventually some correction will be made.

In circumstances of that kind, however, when we find these factors which are of the greatest importance to that automobile dealer stricken out, and the matter left to the discretion of the Price Administrator, one naturally rises to question. I am satisfied from what the Senator says that he is convinced that automobile dealers will have these factors taken into consideration in their applications for loans.

Mr. BROWN. I am sure that when the Senator reads the price order which I have had inserted in the RECORD he will be satisfied, too. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has just discussed the question of the price order which has been inserted in the RECORD. Let me ask a question. Does the Senator believe that the price order will limit or narrow the factors which have been stricken out?

Mr. BROWN. No. Every factor included in the language which was stricken out is included in the price order, plus a definite amount for an additional carrying charge—1 percent per month of the wholesale price, or $15, whichever is lower.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the amendment broadens rather than narrows the factors which are included, which are all-important in connection with this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I think it does. I think it not only broadens them, but it clearly defines the make-up of the charges, to the satisfaction of the automobile dealers themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. And the only question involved would be that of changing the order, which probably would not happen? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; in view of the fact that no cars are being made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). If there be no further amendment proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Rosier
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Hughes	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Bulow	Kilgore	Smith
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Wallgren
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. DANAHER. I will not ask for recognition until action is had on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to have the motion put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6293.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

FISHERIES OF ATLANTIC SEABOARD—INTERSTATE COMPACT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the forbearance of the Senator from Utah for a moment, as I am due at a conference committee meeting to be held at 2 o'clock. With the Senator's permission, and by virtue of his consideration thus extended, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider at this time Calendar No. 1307, House bill 6020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to reserve objection, and ask if I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose indicated by him, will the regular order be displaced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not if it is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Then I should like to accommodate the Senator from Connecticut, and will be happy to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill requested by the Senator from Connecticut, which the clerk will report by title?

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6020) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries—marine, shell, and anadromous—of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Commerce, through the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has reported Order No. 1308, Senate bill 1972, a bill which I introduced and which sought the approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the utilization of the fisheries along the Atlantic seaboard. However, the other House passed House bill 6020, and it is now on the calendar as Order 1307. Since action would normally come first on the House bill, and since it is preferable because certain protecting amendments were adopted by the House which I believe to be highly desirable, I respectfully ask that the Senate act upon House bill 6020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill is already before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut to explain the bill, and particularly to explain in what respect, if any, the House bill differs from the bill which has been approved by the Senate Committee on Commerce. I may say that it would appear from the calendar that the House bill has never been considered by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. If, therefore, there are any differences between the two measures, it ought to be made clear to the Senate what they are, and that they would have the approval of the Senate committee.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. BILBO. As chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill before the Commerce Committee, I will say that the full committee had the House bill before it when passing on the Senate bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut, and we incorporated in the Senate bill all the amendments which had been adopted by the House. Therefore in effect the Senate bill as reported by the committee in full is identical with the House bill which is now on the calendar, and the Senate committee has endorsed the House bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his very real helpfulness.

Let me say further to the Senator from Wyoming that on page 2 of the House bill has been added the State of Virginia, which the Senate bill originally did not include, and on page 8 of the House bill there is a reference, as I recall to the amount of the additional contributions to be made by each of the States in order to create a fund under which the act will become operative. Those are the only changes the Senate Committee on Commerce approved. So far as I know there is no objection from any source to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courtesy.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, just a word of explanation as to the parliamentary situation respecting House bill 6293 before I proceed to discuss the provisions of the bill. The House of Representatives has passed two bills on the same general subject, one relating to a women's corps in the Army, and the other to a women's corps in the Navy. The bill affecting the Army was passed with a provision that the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps should be set up outside the Army. Then the House passed the bill providing that the Women's Reserve Corps in the

Navy should be set up in the Navy. The action in regard to the Women's Reserve Corps in the Navy is the later action of the two.

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported the House bill providing for the establishment of a Women's Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army but not as a part of the Army. I shall offer a substitute for that bill, the spirit of which can best be explained by reading the title as it is proposed to be amended.

Amend the title so as to read: An act to establish a Women's Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

I make this explanation because there is pending, and it becomes the proper order of procedure, an amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] to the bill as reported by the Senate committee. The amendment is the nondiscrimination amendment, which is generally offered to military bills, and provides that there shall not be discrimination because of race, religion, and so forth. If the substitute which I shall offer is accepted for the bill the Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported, the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey would not be necessary, because the setting up of the Women's Auxiliary Corps within the Army would be in accordance with the rules governing the Army of the United States at the present time, which rules prohibit the type of discrimination mentioned. There are, of course, colored units in the Army of the United States, and there undoubtedly will be colored units in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

Mr. President, with this explanation, I must ask the Chair how I should proceed.

Mr. McNARY. I understand from the remarks of the able Senator from Utah that the bill which he has moved to consider, which motion has been agreed to, has been modified, by expansion, to include the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is hardly correct.

Mr. McNARY. Then I have been misinformed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill having to do with the Navy has not come to the Senate as yet, but it has passed the House.

Mr. McNARY. In any event, the Senator states that a substitute is to be offered in lieu of the bill now pending?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. What has necessitated that? Is it a change in the substance of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The change, in a general way, is simply this, that the bill as reported provided for the setting up of the women's unit outside the Army. The women in the unit would not have Army rank, they would not have Army privileges, they would not have Army enlistments.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy, but he is not arriving at the point of my inquiry. Does the Senator desire to change the substance of the bill by the adoption of the substitute, or does he wish to offer an amendment? I make the inquiry because the able junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] has an amendment he wishes to offer. Does the Senator wish to offer his proposal as an amendment to the pending bill or as a complete substitute?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As a complete substitute for the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. It is necessary to do that in order to meet the Senator's objective?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is.

Mr. McNARY. Then, in the absence of the able Senator from New Jersey, I shall offer the amendment which was offered to the original bill, unless its substance is included in the substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. One word of explanation as to that. Personally I shall not object to the amendment, but I should say that I think the proposed substitute amendment itself covers the provision, because the nondiscriminatory prohibitions are already in the rules governing the Army. If, however, the Senator from Oregon wishes to be sure, I have no objection in the least to accepting the amendment, or allowing the amendment to be added to the proposed substitute.

Mr. McNARY. I think it probably should be taken to conference, in order that the conferees may study the whole matter. I am advised by the secretary of the able Senator from New Jersey that he would like to have me offer the amendment. Therefore, I must do so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That will be perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I am interested in the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. I had prepared an amendment similar to it, but I am quite satisfied with his amendment being offered. I think it should be agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. If the substitute amendment is before the Senate, I wish to offer to it the amendment to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is not yet before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I present the amendment, to be offered to the proposed substitute when it is before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would a motion to offer my proposal as a substitute for the bill be in order at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I offer and ask to have stated an amendment in the nature of a substitute for House bill 6293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

There is hereby established in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States a section to be designated the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, female citizens of the United States may enlist in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and upon such enlistment shall be subject to all applicable laws and regulations pertaining to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and such other regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That no member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be called upon to engage in combat: *Provided further*, That the total authorized strength of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall not exceed 150,000.

SEC. 2. The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps may be officered by women who shall be appointed and commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the act of September 22, 1941 (Public Law 252, 77th Cong.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the amendment just stated the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] offers an amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Utah it is proposed to insert at the proper place the following: "*Provided*, That in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, as I have stated, I had intended to offer an amendment similar to that proposed on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], but since his amendment has been offered, I shall not offer mine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not inquiring particularly about the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, to which I have no objection, but I am inquiring what is involved in the Senator's general substitute, which seems to take this proposed corps out of its detached status as contemplated by the House measure, and put it directly into the Army service. What is involved in the differentiation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Nothing is involved in the change because no start has been made in either procedure. The result will be that a start will be made by allowing the reserve corps of the Army of the United States to take enlistments of women and build up the Army auxiliary corps in the regular way in which the Army reserve is built up and then call them into active service after preliminary training. It will make for less confusion; it will make for better discipline; it should make for better training. It will make for better treatment of any women who might become sick or might be injured, because they will be taken care of in accordance with the regular military procedure.

The proposal provides also for bringing women into the Army in such a manner that their status cannot be questioned in any way, thus making it easier to bring about proper articulation and coordination and proper discipline in the Army and its different branches.

Personally, I think the substitute amendment will make for a very much stronger unit, and will give to the women the greater dignity to which they are entitled in connection with the service they are to be asked to perform.

The only limitation put upon them is that they will not be called upon for combatant service; but in the complex war

we are fighting today, who can draw the line between combatants and noncombatants? The women who are serving, for example, in listening stations will probably be part of a combat force. There is just no way of avoiding it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that in the House bill the reference to officers seems to be in the nomenclature of first officer, second officer, third officer, and so forth. I apprehend that under the Senator's substitute we would have colonels, and captains, and the regular military ranks.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. In the bill passed by the House, in working out the titles of the various officers, the course was followed of giving them exactly the pay given majors, captains, and lieutenants. Under the Senate committee bill, if a woman is made a colonel, she will be commissioned and called a colonel in the Army, and will be subject to all the rules governing colonels in the Army of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did the substitute go before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it did not. The Senator from Utah consulted several members of the committee. He apologizes for the way in which the substitute is brought before the Senate now, but as was explained in the beginning, it is being pressed by the Army at the present time, and it has been shown that the passage of House bill 6807 by the House of Representatives, which would establish the Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy, was the last word of the House in regard to whether these women should be in or out of the service. Of course, if they are in the service in the Navy, they should be in the service in the Army. I should want them in the service anyway. So far as the Senator from Utah is concerned, he has been very much in favor of the substitute, was in favor of what it provides even before it was written, and I believe we will have a greater, finer, better respected, and better operated women's unit if it is made part of the Army.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. As I recall, the bill originally introduced in the House did not place the proposed organization in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. And the general thought was that they were not to be placed in the Army, for reasons presented.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is very true.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It appears that during my absence—I do manage to go away once in a while—action has been taken different from that originally taken in the committee. As I understand, the Senator has stated that the committee as a committee has not taken action on the proposed substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I am wondering to what extent the members of the committee who have been consulted have been familiar with all the provisions of the substitute, and to what extent the committee as a whole agrees to it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So far as the committee is concerned it already has all the information that anyone has with respect to the substitute, because the women's reserve organization will operate just as reserve organizations for men operate. No expanded information or new information is needed with respect thereto. General Marshall will immediately proceed to set up a small unit of women's reserves. Then he will call them into active service and training, and expand the unit up to 25,000 persons in the first year.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Have we had an expression from General Marshall of his own views with respect to the substitute?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah has had an expression, but the Senate has not.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I assume the Senator from Utah would advise us what that expression was.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The substitute meets not only with the War Department's approval but with the general's approval, and—I can be modest for a moment—was actually worked out by the War Department and not written by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In the presence of this emergency I have always been agreeable to the proposals made by the Army, because the Army has got to win the fight.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Has the amendment I offered been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not been acted on.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. May I ask the Senator from Utah, if the substitute which is proposed is adopted, will it take the place of House bill 6293?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. I have been necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I am not as fully informed as I should like to be, but I wish to be on record as being opposed to this very unusual procedure of creating, without committee study, or very much debate, a unit of women in the Army. I do not know of anything of that sort ever before having been proposed. We have not the slightest idea, and we cannot have, of the possible consequences if this proposal should become law. We would take 150,000 women to begin with, and put them into the active armed forces of the United States, with possible consequences that we cannot now anticipate. I do not know what might be done about it at this late hour, for there seems to be little apparent opposition to the measure, but I think we ought to be afforded the chance to give study to this proposal.

Mr. President, it is shocking to me to think of taking women and putting them into the Army of the United States without the slightest idea of the full meaning of the bill and without committee study. I myself am opposed to House bill 6293 as it stands; but this measure is so much more far reaching that I think it ought to have committee study. I make this brief statement in the hope that the measure may at least be referred to a committee before we attempt to take action on it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Connecticut will not feel that way about the measure; but, if he does, it cannot be helped. Of course, there has been study of this matter. What would the Army of the United States do with 150,000 women who were attached to the Army of the United States?

Mr. MALONEY. That is what I should like to know.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In an indirect way, the Army would have to provide for them the same sort of facilities it provides for the men of the Army. It is proposed to make these women a unit in the Army of the United States, having all the rights and privileges of hospitalization, sick benefits, and of proper care.

Mr. MALONEY. Will special hospitals be provided?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not necessarily special hospitals, but hospitals arranged as they are arranged now. Having women in the Army is not a new thing, as the Senator knows.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to know what the women are going to do in the Army. I realize that we have women in the Nursing Corps in the Army, but what are these women to be called upon to do?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They will be called upon to do practically everything but engage in combatant service.

Mr. MALONEY. In the field?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Anywhere. They can be sent anywhere, of course.

Mr. MALONEY. Do I understand that these women will do everything in the Army that Army officers and enlisted men do, except shoulder guns?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In the armed service, Mr. President, there are many things of serious importance which women can do. For example, in the British Army at the present time the listening posts are operated almost entirely by women. Women are proving themselves to be just a little more efficient in that work than men are. When the lives of the people in whole counties depend upon getting the right kind of reports with respect to the coming of airplanes, it is time for us to choose the best persons we can get for that kind of work. The Army of the United States already has about 6,000 such women employed, carrying on work at listening posts. These women are entitled to the privileges and benefits referred to. The fact that they are women does not make any difference. Women are already in the service as nurses, assistant nurses, stewards, and assistants in hospitals.

Mr. MALONEY. In a civilian capacity?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In a civilian capacity, yes; but the Senator must understand how much better it would be, when they are sent out into the field, if they are sent in units, if they go as soldiers.

They would, of course, serve on a voluntary basis. There is no compulsion

involved. Women will enlist; they will be trained, and when they do their work they will be given the same honor that the men get for their work. I think we in the United States are at last recognizing what we failed to recognize for so long. Women in the last war did valiant work in hostess houses, as nurses, and in a hundred other ways; but still they have nothing to show for it. That is hardly fair.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator tells me that they have nothing to show for it. What does the Senator hope to get for the women by his proposal?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A woman may get a ribbon. I do not discount what it means to be able to wear a ribbon upon one's breast; and the Senator from Connecticut does not discount it either. To have an honorable discharge from the Army of the United States is one of the greatest benefits, one of the greatest blessings, and one of the greatest privileges that can come to a citizen of the United States. If women do the same work as men to obtain an honorable discharge they ought to be entitled to it. That is all the proposed substitute would do. It would make it possible to take women who sacrifice and give their time and their talents, and after the war is over put them on the same level as their brothers.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know that I am now in a position to offer very definite or specific criticism of the proposal, but I want to lay emphasis upon the fact that it is shocking to me. I do not think it is fair for the Senate to accept the proposed substitute without further study. Of course, I have a very deep appreciation of the value of an honorable discharge, and what the Senator from Utah referred to as a ribbon, or a decoration; but I do not quite readily understand how women can be given a special dignity by taking them into the armed forces of our country. I understand that women in the British Empire have performed valiant services, but I do not know of any instance when they have gone into the field.

Accepting the exact language of the distinguished Senator from Utah, it is proposed to send the women, who would be recruited under this proposal, into the field of battle to do everything that a soldier might do, except to shoulder a gun. Probably—though God forbid—there will come a time when women will have to go as far as the Senator indicates he would have them go; but I am not ready to take that step, at least not today, Mr. President, and I am very hopeful, at least until such time as a committee of the Senate can study the matter very carefully, that the Senate will not accept the substitute proposal.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that in the first World War women were employed in the Army to do various clerical jobs and other jobs which otherwise would require the services of men taken from the front. For a long time the Army selected women in France and in other countries, but the results were not satisfactory. Finally the British, from their women's corps, in which women performed the same duties, loaned us several thousand women—perhaps 9,000—to do the very same kind of work that women will do if the bill is passed. So there is no real difficulty about what kind of duties they will perform, and the necessity for having them.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there probably is no difficulty now, but after these women are members of the Army there might be a difficulty. In the last war they served in a civilian capacity. In such a capacity, if they find the work distasteful, they can go home. They can perform all the things which they are needed to perform in a civilian capacity now. There is sufficient patriotism among the women of America to do the civilian work which they can do and which they did in the last war; but I am not willing to delegate to some individual who may have charge of this corps the authority to direct women, as members of the Army, to go wherever soldiers are called upon to go, and if the substitute should become law these women, as members of the Army, could be sent everywhere except in the front lines with a gun. Probably what the able Senator from Utah has in mind is proper; but I for one do not want to vote for it until I have an opportunity to know more about what it would do. In my judgment it is too broad a suggestion to be accepted on the basis of a 5-minute discussion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the Senator does not mean what he says about a 5-minute discussion, because the Senator from Utah has been very frank. I hope that he will not be charged with trying to "put something over" in the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not mean any such thing. I am certain of the conscientiousness of the Senator. I am sure that he has studied the proposal and perhaps he can tell us why it has not been considered by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have already told that four or five or six times. I have explained the whole thing over and over and over again.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry. I did not hear the explanation. I apologized when I came into the Chamber for my early absence.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to explain it again. We are charged with the task of presenting a bill which the War Department wants, which the commanding general wants, and which he says he needs. He says, "I must get started on this. Can you not have it enacted today?" I do not know how to be any more exact in my language. The commanding general says, "We have need of these things."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Every woman who takes the place of a noncombatant solider releases that soldier to take his place as a combatant. The term "noncombatant" does not mean merely one who is not in the front line trenches.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I want to answer the question which the Senator put a minute or two ago. He said that the women could be sent everywhere except into the front line trenches. They would not be assigned to the combatant service at all. They would not be assigned to the line service, which may be ordered into combat.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may correct a misapprehension?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I said that, as I understood the Senator's explanation, women could be sent into the front line trenches. I did not charge that such a provision was in the bill. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If a person becomes a major in the Army of the United States, he does what he is told; but his commanding officer will not tell him to do anything which is not strictly in line with his duty. That is the way the Army operates.

Mr. MALONEY. I insist that according to the language which the Senator used in explaining the bill, women could be sent everywhere.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; everywhere except in the combat service. The Senator from Connecticut interprets "combat service" to mean the front line trenches. Women might be caught in the midst of battle. The people of Washington might be caught in the midst of battle if an air raid should occur tomorrow. If an air raid should be made over a listening post where women were serving, or over a telephone exchange where women were serving, or anywhere else where they were serving, they would be caught within the combat area, but they would not be combatant troops.

We must take into consideration what war actually means. Wearing the insignia of the Army entitles a man or a woman to certain consideration in case of capture. Sad to relate, many Americans have been captured. Both men and women have been captured; and they find themselves at a great disadvantage as war prisoners because they cannot wear the insignia of the soldier, and have not the letters "U. S." on their collars. My heart goes out to women in such circumstances. A member of an army who is captured in wartime is governed by a law which has been recognized since Civil War days, and which has been pretty generally lived up to; but a captured civilian is not so treated. Those taken at Wake Island and other places are discovering that if they had the uniform they would be better off.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. A moment ago the Senator said, in explaining the need for haste, if I understood him correctly, that Army authorities—and I am assuming he means high Army officers—have asked him to try to get this proposal accepted, because they need it in order to get going.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was last week when they said, "Can you not have

it enacted today?" I have not seen anyone today.

Mr. MALONEY. Did not the Senator wonder why those officials, who believe women are urgently needed in the Army, did not take the matter up with the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A bill which passed the House of Representatives and was reported by the Senate committee has been on the calendar for a long time. As I remember, it was placed on the calendar on February 9. Nothing has been done. One of the reasons why nothing has been done has been the very problem we are discussing. The question was whether to have them in the Army or to have them assist the Army. On the 20th of April the House of Representatives, in passing the Women's Auxiliary Reserve Act for the Navy, answered that question and put the women who become naval reservists in the Navy, with all the right, privileges, and obligations of members of the Navy.

Mr. MALONEY. When the Navy bill comes before us for consideration I shall offer the same opposition, and I hope to be better prepared. It is not yet before us. With the lapse of all this time, I cannot understand why the military authorities, who are so much concerned with this proposal, did not have the time or the inclination to go before the Military Affairs Committee in order that this substitute proposal might there be studied.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the main difference between the House bill and the substitute is in the fact that the House bill is quite an elaborate bill, consisting of 14 pages, in which an effort seems to have been made to set up rules, regulations, and various details about the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps outside the Army, whereas the Senator's substitute, to state it briefly, does not authorize the President to set up such a corps, but directs it. It establishes the Women's Auxiliary Corps in the Army, subject to the regulations which may be made by the Secretary of War concerning its government. Is that about the substance of it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the bill which was passed by the House. The Army regulations were followed exactly. The pay and duties in the various grades would be identical. The units would be exactly the same as they are in the Army. The proposed substitute is a very much better method in every way, and it would not create a great many new grades.

Mr. BARKLEY. Bringing this organization within the purview of the Army would make it unnecessary to go into great detail as to its organization, control, regulations, and so forth. It would go into the Army, and be subject to Army regulations.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The machinery is already set up for its work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not also true that the original House bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs on March 18, more than a month ago?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On February 9.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was passed by the House on March 17, and apparently reported to the Senate on March 18. I think that is the date. At any rate, that does not matter. Is it not true that all the time since then, when the matter of bringing it up for consideration has been under discussion, it has been delayed from time to time in order that there might be evolved what was thought by some to be a more workable substitute for the House bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This problem has been constantly in mind. The first idea was to take the women into the Army. We have again come around to that idea.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator's substitute is really not a new matter which has not been discussed by the committee. As I understand, the whole subject has been discussed; and, while the committee did not meet formally and report the substitute offered by the Senator, the committee is entirely familiar with it and with the whole subject. Except for that formality, it has the approval of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. Of course, the proposed substitute follows the law as it operates today in regard to the Reserve. The only additional thing that will happen is that the Secretary of War or the commanding general will order those in charge of the Reserve Corps of the United States to accept enlistments of so many thousand women in the Reserve Corps for certain duties. After training they probably will be called into active service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator from Utah whether any of the high Army officials appeared before any committee, either in the House or the Senate, and gave testimony as to the necessity for this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. For the substitute?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. With respect to the original bill; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the substitute amendment offered by the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not with respect to the substitute, but we have the word of one general——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not doubt that the Senator has discussed this matter with high Army officials, but I am wondering why it is that during all this time no one has appeared before any committee, either in the House or Senate, and given testimony as to the necessity of the substitute which is now offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I doubt whether that would be necessary, considering the purport of the substitute.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I have full realization of the purport of the substitute and what it would do. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] stated a moment ago, if there is anyone whose statements I would take on faith it is the Senator from Utah. However, we are asked to accept the substitute without a line of testimony from anyone in the Army or the Navy as to the necessity for forming a corps of this kind. I am of the opinion that it is probably necessary; but it seems to me that during all this time somewhere along the line someone could have come from the War Department or the Navy Department and given the Senate some testimony upon which it could rely in reaching a decision on such an important matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, we may be talking about two different things.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the Senator's amendment to House bill 6293.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The substitute, but the hearing was held on the original measure, House bill 6293.

Mr. LUCAS. Was anything said about the Senator's amendment in the hearings on the original measure, House bill 6293?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; to the extent that the opinion was expressed that it would be better if the members of this corps were in the Army.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator a further question. On page 2 of the Senator's amendment, it says:

Provided, That no member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be called upon to engage in combat.

In view of the fact that if this amendment is adopted the women who will be called upon to serve in this emergency will not be called upon to engage in combat, will their status after the war so far as pensions and congressional benefits are concerned be the same as that of any other individual who has served in the armed forces?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It will be exactly the same as that of anyone who has served in the armed forces.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that in the House, hearings were held on the House bill. When it came to the Senate, the Military Affairs Committee held hearings on the House bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. During those hearings, certain Army officers expressed the belief that it would be better if the members of this corps were in the Army instead of independent, as set up in the House bill; but, notwithstanding that, the committee reported the House bill and it has been on the calendar of the Senate for some weeks.

Of course, the Senator from Utah knows, as all other Senators know, that it is not customary to hold hearings on a bill after it has been reported from a committee. Therefore, no additional hearings were had on this legislation after the committee reported it to the Senate. In the meantime, an effort has been made to draft what some members of the Military Affairs Committee, and probably some members of the Army, felt was a simpler and more workable

provision; and that has resulted in this amendment in the way of a substitute which the Senator has offered. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct, and then, if the Senator will carry further what would happen if my substitute were accepted, the substitute would go to conference, and, of course, the bill would be perfected there.

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly; and the fact that this amendment is offered as a substitute, providing that this corps shall be a part of the Army, obviates the necessity of going into a long legislative detail with respect to how the corps shall operate, their control, and every thing else. In other words, they are taken in as part of a set-up which is already in existence, subject to the same rules and regulations, except as to combat, and all other privileges enjoyed by other members of the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sure we shall find it very much more simple and better.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. I never have had the privilege of serving on that committee, and I do not pretend to have any expert knowledge, even as a layman, with regard to proper organization of the armed forces of the United States; but I am a humble Member of this body, and so far as I am concerned I want the RECORD to show that I emphatically disapprove of the methods which are being employed here in avoiding any committee consideration of this proposal.

Everyone knows that it is a far-reaching proposal. At least, I know that much about it. In all the years this country has been in existence and we have had armed forces, we have never taken such a step as this. The House of Representatives gave prolonged consideration to this proposal, and passed a bill which was entirely different from the one which is now proposed to be passed at the instance of my very good friend the senior Senator from Utah.

I do not want to have any part of the responsibility for taking this step unless and until those who are responsible and who are the experts of this country on the proper organization of the armed forces have come before a duly constituted committee of Congress and made a record in writing in which they endorse this proposal. If the men who are behind the proposal are willing to come here and go on record for it, so far as I am concerned I shall follow their advice and their recommendation. The only need for haste in this matter that I have been able to perceive, that seems plausible, arises from the fact that the House has already passed a bill which does the same thing in general terms so far as the women's section of the Navy is concerned; but that bill is still in the Naval Affairs Committee, still receiving committee consideration. For some reason it has not been reported in any great haste. Although I am not a member of that committee, I therefore must assume that they are giving it some serious consideration, and that there may be involved some problems upon which they have not come to any resolution of conflicting ideas.

Mr. President, I am as much in favor of recognition for members of the opposite sex in the law and in our civic and public life and in our economy as is any other Senator in this Chamber; but we are proposing here to give rank and position to women who are going to have to do obviously a different type of service than that which many of the present personnel of the Army will have to do. That is inherent in the Senator's proposal. He does not propose yet to put women into combatant service; so some male officers obviously will be carrying on combat service, while women who are in noncombatant service will have the same or higher rank than the men who are officering troops that are actually in combat service.

Perhaps that is a proper way to organize the Army; perhaps that is good for morale; I do not know; but I do not want to have any responsibility for such a step until the commanding general of the Army or some officer he may designate to represent him, comes before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and gives testimony as to his reasons for wanting this step to be taken.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that this bill and the pending amendment be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, of course, it would run into repetition for me to speak against the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin. I still hope, however, that the motion will not prevail. I can at least say that the so-called difficulty in regard to command, of course, is not a difficulty at all, because there is a well-understood theory in regard to command running through the Army at all times. It is not merely a matter of rank that governs. It is a matter of station in the rank; it is a matter of branch of service, and things of that kind. There will be no confusion under the substitute. There might be great confusion under the bill as it has been reported.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is a most conscientious Member of this body. When he offered his substitute for a bill which has been discussed in the House and has been considered by the Military Affairs Committee, it occurred to me that it ought to have not merely committee consideration, but if the women of this country want the bill, it ought to be a matter of record, and if the heads of the Army and Navy want the bill it ought to be a matter of record; and it ought to be here in fully stated form, so that the country may know what we are doing.

As I understand the substitute, it is simply a proposition that there be formed a new unit in the reserves which can be brought into active military service, subject to but one proviso, and that is that the women in this unit shall not participate in actual combat. I did not understand the substitute to say "combat service" although it may say that.

I do not know what women want this proposed law, but I should like to know. I do not know whether the Army of the United States as it is now officered, engaged in the greatest task in its history, want this measure. I should like to know, and I should like to have it a matter of record. It may be that the bill should be passed. It may be that this unit should be created at once. I assume that the Senator from Utah is convinced that it should be, and perhaps the whole Military Affairs Committee is so convinced; but I frankly submit that the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate ought not to bring here a bill of this character without a written record based on hearings.

That is a very reasonable proposition. Certainly those of us who do not know anything about the bill ought to have full information before we are called on to vote upon a measure of this kind. I do know, Mr. President, that if a unit in the reserves is formed and subsequently brought into active service, we shall simply have another unit in the Army of the United States. It may be that they will be excepted from actual combat service; but all the other applicable provisions of all of the military laws, pension systems, and everything else will apply, except such pensions as are based upon injuries and disabilities received in actual combat.

I think this bill ought to go back to the Military Affairs Committee. I think, moreover, that committee ought to hold a hearing, for I believe this subject should be fully explored.

We are doing many most extraordinary thins. Is it necessary? Is it proper? Does the womanhood of America that is representative of the women of America require this kind of recognition? If so, it is the first such requirement in the history of this Nation. I do not know, but it does not seem to me to be fair or right or advisable to put this kind of legislation on the statute books without a full record, without an actual hearing, at which all the facts may be developed.

It is true also, Mr. President, that if the substitute amendment should be adopted, and should go to conference, the conferees could write almost any sort of a bill they desired to write, and a conference report would be brought back to the Senate which would have a privileged status. Under what seem to me to be very lax rules of procedure, if the Senate should adopt the substitute amendment, which strikes out everything except the enacting clause, anything would be proper, anything would be possible in a conference report which would come before the Senate in a privileged status, so that practically the legislative hands would be tied and we must either vote it up or vote it down.

I certainly would give to women every recognition on earth for any type of service which they may perform, and would compensate them and grant them honors on an absolute parity with men who are performing like service or like duties,

but I do think that a distinction should be made when it comes to the formation of units in the Army and Navy of the United States without adequate, full and exhaustive hearings, which units may be incorporated into the armed services of this country, may be commanded to go wherever the officers at the head of the Army and Navy direct them and may be commanded to do whatever they may direct them to do, with the single exception of not engaging in combat service. Not only that, but they will not be free to go and come as they will; they will not be free to remain in the service in a civilian status; they will not have leaves of absence save when somebody in command over them wishes to grant leaves of absence.

Perhaps it is all right to do it; but certainly it seems to me that it ought not to be done until we have gotten all the information we can obtain and until we have had some expression from the people of the United States, even, I dare say, beyond the wishes of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Secretary of War, and even beyond the wishes of the military heads in a matter of this kind. It seems to me that a hearing ought to be had, and it ought to be an exhaustive hearing.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the proposed legislation, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs, was well considered. I myself sat in the hearings; I believe I heard every witness testify, and the table was surrounded by Senators who took great pains to understand this kind of legislation not merely because it was needed but also because it was brand new; it was a novel idea in our system of national defense, and great interest was shown. It is my recollection that when we agreed we were unanimous in reporting the bill.

In the bill, it seems to me, the central idea is found in section 12, which provides—

> The Corps shall not be a part of the Army, but it shall be the only women's organization authorized to serve with the Army, exclusive of the Army Nurse Corps. Nurses may be enrolled in the Corps but nothing in this act shall be construed to affect or change the Army Nurse Corps as now established by law.

In my opinion, that provision characterizes this organization as a unique feature in the prosecution of the war.

Concerning the necessity for such a measure, let me observe only one thing—and I believe the Senate will agree with me that for that one thing, if for no other, this proposed legislation is necessary—and that is that we now confront a new type of warfare. It comes through the air, and it comes with such rapidity that one must have warning of it long before one can see it. So, at strategic points in the continental United States and in our outlying possessions we have established a new ear, as it were, which is called a filter station, to which there come all the radio communications and signals which can be obtained by the transmission of the human voice and by the transmission of sounds caused by the vibration of engines. The information obtained in that manner is vital to the safety of our country, and is a strategic factor in the prosecution of any battle.

Now it is found that actually women are better qualified to operate these delicate instruments and to interpret these sounds than are men. So the significance of that one fact is sufficient to call for some sort of legislation which will put women who are engaged in this vital function under command and under discipline so that they may not leave when the baby cries. At present, about 8,000 women are engaged in this and similar services, but they are on a purely voluntary basis. Their noble work is effective, probably because they are consecrated to the cause, but it may be interrupted at any time at their own will; it cannot be held in strict coordination with the strategy of battle and the strategy of defense.

I believe that one who listens to officers who have had to do with this type of warfare, and hears them describe the kind of service women would be called upon to perform, must be convinced, as the committee was convinced, that there should be an organization which would not be footloose and free to go and come, but which would be responsible and would be under command.

The committee did not take the long step which would be taken if we should adopt the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Utah. For my part, I was so interested in the early consideration of this matter that I sat here a long time listening to ascertain, if I could, the full meaning of the proposed substitute, for this is the first time I have seen the substitute. One thing, however, is perfectly clear about it, and that is that it reverses the principle of the bill which the committee reported. The essence of the bill reported by the committee is the setting up of a female organization that could not be a part of the Army while the proposal of the Senator from Utah reverses that idea and creates a section of the Army that shall be known by a certain name. It makes no difference what it is called; it makes no difference that the members of the organization are exempted by the terms of the amendment from combat. It will be noted that it is nothing but combat; it is not combat duty.

So, Mr. President, although I deeply regret that the Senate is not passing this very day on the original bill which was reported by the committee, for time is as important as can be, yet, rather than vote upon this amendment with no study and no report by the committee, I shall favor the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate on the motion, because, so far as concerns the argument that the matter has not had committee consideration, that is true, and that has been explained. I think it fair to the Senate, however, to read from a report of the Committee on Military Affairs which has been on the Senate Calendar for some time a letter from General Marshall, in support of the movement for a women's auxiliary corps, written in support of the contemplated proposal. General Marshall said:

> Urgent military business renders it impossible for me personally to present to your committee my recommendations regarding pending legislation to authorize a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.
>
> In my opinion this proposed organization would provide a sound and practicable method for meeting military requirements with respect to the employment of women. The percentage of our people employed in essential war industry is steadily increasing and I think it can be assumed that all of our available manpower and womanpower will be required, either in uniform or industry, to win this war. There are innumerable duties now being performed by soldiers that actually can be done better by women. Timely recognition of this situation and legislative action which will enable the Military Establishment to absorb and utilize its proportionate share of the available womanpower will contribute materially to the successful accomplishment of the task before us.
>
> The efficient use of women for noncombatant service with the Army requires systematic organization and training of this personnel under military supervision and control. In order that the available means may be applied to meet the existing military needs, I earnestly request that your committee support the legislation now being considered to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The point I make is: In what better way can we bring the personnel under military supervision and under military control than by putting them in the military service? Are they not entitled to it? Should we not take into consideration that fact, which has been heretofore mentioned?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. What authority was the Senator citing? Was that a letter from the Chief of Staff, or from the Secretary of War?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A letter from Gen. G. C. Marshall, Chief of Staff.

Mr. McNARY. When was the letter written?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The date is not set forth in the report.

Mr. McNARY. Does the letter appear in the report on the House bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was a letter written to the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs at the time the committee had under consideration the House bill.

Mr. McNARY. It referred to the House bill, and not to the substitute now before the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; and it had reference to the proposal before it was put in the form of a House bill. I merely wish to make the point that military control and military supervision were all the time in the mind of at least General Marshall, and I think that if the Senator will read the report of the Secretary of War, he will find that it was in his mind as well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was the letter to which the Senator is now referring sent to the House? Was it before or after the House considered the bill which was sent to the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was sent to the House before the House committee had reported the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know why the House did not follow the suggestions of the letter?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know. I think the original idea was to set up the Women's Auxiliary Corps as a branch of the Army. That is what I have been told.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the House give consideration to the letter to which the Senator is now referring?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Oh, yes; the committee used the general's letter in the report to the House, and the Senate committee used the same letter in its report to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Notwithstanding the suggestions made, the House apparently did not follow the suggestions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to point out that not only did the House fail to follow the suggestions outlined in the letter of General Marshall, but the substitute offered in the Senate contains this provision, on page 2:

Provided, That no member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be called upon to engage in combat.

That goes ever so much beyond the suggestion of General Marshal, if I read it correctly. This language verifies my earlier thought, and clears up for me the question of how far women might be called upon to go. They could be directed to do anything in the Army except to shoulder a gun. There was some question about that in the mind of the Senator from Utah during our earlier colloquy, but a reading of the bill clears it up definitely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the request made to me privately by the Senator from Oregon, I shall withdraw my motion pending disposition of the amendment which he has offered, and as soon as that shall have been disposed of I shall seek recognition by the Chair to renew my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When this question shall be decided, and the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin shall be acted upon it will merely mean that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be sent back to the committee for its consideration. Will that bind the committee?

Mr. MCNARY. It would not bind the committee; it would simply make complete the document to be sent back to the committee at the desire of a majority of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following at the proper place in the proposed substitute:

Provided further, That in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move that the pending bill and all amendments thereto be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1086, Senate bill 2240, to establish a women's Army auxiliary corps for service with the Army of the United States, be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAJ. PAUL A. LARNED

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask for its consideration. I first request that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army is hereby rescinded.

Resolved further, That the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in passing the said bill is hereby vacated.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

DONALD WILLIAM BURT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2002) for the relief of Donald William Burt, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That notwithstanding provisions contained in the several appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942, prohibiting the payment of compensation therefrom to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability for such payment for services rendered by noncitizen officers and employees, as are otherwise correct and legal, as are made in good faith, and as are found not to be due to any lack of good faith on the part of the payee.

"SEC. 2. If credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts in accordance with section 1 of this act, the officer or employee, or former officer or employee receiving payment shall not be required to refund the amount thereof; and any such amount which has been collected from an officer or employee, or former officer or employee, may be refunded to him.

"SEC. 3. That any person in the armed forces, or employed in a civilian capacity, prior to the enactment hereof, shall be paid for services rendered until January 1, 1942, out of current appropriation or fund otherwise available for the pay of said person, the compensation to which such person would be entitled but for the citizenship prohibition cited in section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That the head of department or agency concerned determines that such person entered said service or employment without fault on his part as to noncitizenship status."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941."

Mr. WALLGREN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CLAIM OF ALBERT M. HOWARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a bill which has been passed by the Senate. All it seeks to do is to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment in a case involving an automobile accident. Albert M. Howard of Wheaton, Ill., is the claimant. He seeks to recover judgment for personal injuries and property damage sustained as the result of the automobile accident.

The bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives, and it has been returned to the Senate with an amendment, in line 14, after the word "Illinois", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That judgment shall not exceed the sum of $5,000."

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment, and that conferees will be appointed. The House of Representatives frequently takes action similar to this. It is commonly known among the lawyers of the Senate, as well as laymen, that no one can tell definitely what the damages, from the standpoint of personal injury, may be to any individual in any automobile wreck. The damages to Mr. Howard might be $1,000, they might be $5,000, they might be $10,000, depending upon the facts and circumstances surrounding the automobile injuries. It seems to me it is bad practice with respect to any claim that is passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives for the House to return the bill with that character of a limitation upon the amount that the claimant might recover for an injury sustained. Therefore, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce the Senate conferees later.

Subsequently, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1226. That is the last bill called on the last call of the calendar, but objection was made at that time, which I understand has been withdrawn. I therefore ask that the call of the calendar begin at No. 1226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1226.

TRANSPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The bill (S. 975) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by amending certain provisions of part II of said act, otherwise known as the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, was announced as first in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I introduced the bill some time ago. It has been considered by the Interstate Commerce Committee. Hearings were held by a subcommittee, and the wording of my bill as it was originally introduced was changed. The bill is an endeavor to allow certain growers of products of the soil the same privileges in the matter of the transportation of their products as are allowed corn or wheat farmers. I see no particular objection that could be brought against the bill for the reason that it allows a man to transport the product in the first instance only after it is grown. In other words, a greenhouse owner or one who grows trees would not be left free from the provisions of the interstate commerce law after his product actually got into the trade, so to speak. The purpose of the bill is to allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to license the producer, and let him use his truck in the transportation of that which he grows. Does that cover the question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the bill go over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SELF-LIQUIDATING REVENUE BONDS OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 5962) to ratify and confirm act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FARM LOAN BOARD—ACT NO. 70 OF SPECIAL SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII, 1941

The bill (H. R. 6166) to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSTRUCTION STAFF AT THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 6641) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHOENIX CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATES

The bill (H. R. 4981) for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUARDIAN OF CHARLES JIRINEC

The bill (H. R. 5433) for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY F. LASSLY AND G. F. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 5857) for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALVIRA MANFREDI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,000", and on page 2, line 1, after the word "Department", to insert "and to the Department of Hospitals, city of New York, the sum of $107, in full settlement of its claim for medical and surgical service rendered Alvira Manfredi."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SAN FRANCISCO MOUNTAIN SCENIC BOULEVARD CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 244) for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment to insert at the end of the bill a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co. the sum of $15,500, as compensation to said company for the value to the United States of that part of a certain road constructed by the company within the Coconino National Forest in Arizona which will be used by the United States for the protection, administration, and development of said national forest: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE C. DEWEY

The bill (H. R. 1154) for the relief of George C. Dewey, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE R. SWETT

The bill (H. R. 4331) for the relief of Alice R. Swett, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE R. SWETT AND THE ESTATE OF ROBERT S. SWETT

The bill (H. R. 4408) for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARK COUNTY LUMBER CO.

The bill (H. R. 6063) for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IDEAL SERVICE STATION

The bill (H. R. 736) for the relief of Ideal Service Station, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. QUILLINAN

The bill (H. R. 3476) for the relief of James A. Quillinan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OLIVE Z. RESSLER

The bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD KEATING AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of Edward Keating and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF VERNON CLEMONS, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 809) for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,835.50" and insert "$2,335.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TOMMY HUDDLESTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5596) for the relief of Tommy Huddleston, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the

word "amended", to insert "and supplemented by the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF ROMANO EMILIANI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, before the word "taking", to insert "alleged"; in line 7, after the name "United States", to strike out "of approximately nineteen hundred acres"; on page 2, line 1, before the word "taking", to insert "alleged"; and at the end of the bill to insert the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the court shall determine the exact amount of land alleged to have been taken, and compensation therefor, if any, shall be fixed at a sum per acre not in excess of the amount per acre of adjacent land as previously fixed by the Joint Land Commission, which had been constituted pursuant to articles VI and XV of the 1903 treaty between the United States and Panama."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. CECILE HERZOG AND LUCILLE HERZOG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant), which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$3,750", and in the same line after the word "and", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,250."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. MARILLA C. GRAY

The bill (S. 2190) for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marilla C. Gray, of Dadeville, Ala., as successor in interest to the Dadeville Cotton Oil Co., of Dadeville, Ala., the sum of $4,298.95, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the production of cotton linters produced by said company during the period January 1, 1919, to July 31, 1919, inclusive, pursuant to a contract with DuPont American Industries, agent of the United States Ordnance Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SALE OF LAND TO MARMET, W. VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2109) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 4, line 24, after the word "America", to insert "its assigns and permittees, and there is likewise hereby excepted and reserved to the United States of America the perpetual easement and right to flood such part or parts of each of the two tracts of land hereinabove described as may be necessary so to do from time to time in the interests of navigation and flood control."; on page 5, line 22, after the words "shall be", to insert "the sum of $3,300, being"; and on page 6, after line 1, to insert "The deed of conveyance of such tracts of land to be executed by the Secretary of War shall contain appropriate provisions to provide for a reversion of such tracts of land to the United States in the event the grantee shall fail to use or shall cease using them for such purposes or shall alienate or attempt to alienate any part of them."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the town of Marmet, West Virginia, for the consideration, and subject to the reservations and conditions hereinafter contained, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two tracts of land situated on the west side of the Great Kanawha River, at lock and dam numbered 2, in Marmet, West Virginia, and described as follows:

Tract numbered 1. Beginning at an iron pin in the eastern right-of-way line of the old county road at the southwest corner of the A. J. Baker land (now the property of the United States); thence, from said point of beginning, and running along and with said eastern right-of-way line, north twenty-six degrees fifty-seven minutes west one hundred and seventy-one feet to an iron pin in said line; thence, continuing along and with said eastern right-of-way line, north twenty-three degrees fifty-eight minutes west two hundred and eleven and five one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in said right-of-way line at the southerly corner of the lands of Mary B. Meyers and the northwest corner of the said A. J. Baker land; thence along and with the Meyers-Baker boundary line north sixty degrees thirty-two minutes east one hundred and twenty-one and eighteen one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in the intersection of the westerly right-of-way boundary line of the Charleston Interurban Railroad Company; thence and running with and along the said Charleston Interurban Railroad right-of-way line south twenty-four degrees thirty-two minutes east two hundred and sixteen and thirty one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in said right-of-way line; thence continuing with and along said right-of-way line south twenty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty-six and fifty-two one-hundredths feet to the point of intersection with the boundary line between the said A. J. Baker land and the H. H. Smallridge and industrial center subdivision of the town of Marmet; thence with and along said Baker-industrial center boundary line south sixty-one degrees twenty-three minutes west one-hundred and twenty-three and eighteen one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing one and seven one-hundredths acres, more or less, and designated on United States Army Engineers' plat, "Kanawha River Locks and Dam numbered 2, real estate, United States Engineer Office, Huntington, West Virginia, March 1935 (file numbered 023–L2–11/1)", as "3–B."

Tract numbered 2. Beginning at the point of intersection of the eastern boundary right-of-way line of the Charleston Interurban Railroad Company and the northerly boundary line of the A. J. Baker land, and on the right-of-way line between said Charleston Interurban Railroad and the West Virginia State Highway Route Numbered 61; thence, from said point of beginning, and along and with said Baker line, north sixty degrees thirty-two minutes east four hundred and twenty and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point in said Baker line; thence, south twenty-nine degrees twenty-eight minutes east three hundred and thirty-eight and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to the intersection of the north line of a fifty-foot street (now unnamed); thence, with the line of said street, south sixty-one degrees twenty-three minutes west three hundred and seventy-nine and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point in said street line; thence, north eighty-seven degrees thirteen minutes west seventy-four and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet, to a point in the right-of-way boundary line between the said Charleston Interurban Railroad Company and the West Virginia State Highway Route Numbered 61, said point being eighty-nine and seven one-hundredths feet distant, in a northwesterly direction, from the southerly boundary line of the A. J. Baker land; thence, running with and along said right-of-way boundary line, north twenty-seven degrees west seventy-seven and forty-five one-hundredths feet, to a point in said boundary line; thence, continuing with said right-of-way boundary line, north twenty-four degrees thirty-two minutes west two hundred and sixteen and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing three and three hundred seventeen one-thousandths acres, more or less, and being a part of the portion of the nine-acre Baker tract designated on said United States Army Engineers' plat as "3–A."

There is expressly excepted and reserved to the United States of America an easement of way for all right-of-way purposes whenever the same may be required, on, over, in, and across each of the two tracts hereinabove described, for the use and benefit of the United States of America, its assigns and permittees, and there is likewise hereby excepted and reserved to the United States of America the perpetual easement and right to flood such part or parts of each of the two tracts of land hereinabove described as may be necessary so to do from time to time in the interests of navigation and flood control.

(b) The two tracts of land described in subsection (a) of this section are parts, and come out of, that certain lot, piece, and parcel of land containing nine and fifty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, which was acquired by the United States through a condemnation proceeding had in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, sitting in the city of Charleston, West Virginia, on November 9, 1933, and styled United States of America against A. J. Baker and others, a copy of the final decree in such proceeding being recorded on November 18, 1933, in the office of the clerk of the county court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, in deed book numbered 390, at page 527 thereof, to which reference is made for a more complete description.

SEC. 2. The consideration to be paid by such town of Marmet for the two tracts of

land, the conveyance of which is authorized by the first section of this act, shall be the sum of $3,300, being 50 per centum of the current appraised value thereof. Such two tracts of land shall be held and used by the grantee for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and for similar and related municipal purposes. The deed of conveyance of such tracts of land to be executed by the Secretary of War shall contain appropriate provisions to provide for a reversion of such tracts of land to the United States in the event the grantee shall fail to use or shall cease using them for such purposes or shall alienate or attempt to alienate any part of them.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS

The bill (S. 2427) to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1940 (Public, No. 700, 76th Cong., 3d sess., ch. 501), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on approval and shall remain in force during the time when the United States is at war."

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DISBURSING OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 506) to require the issuance by the General Accounting Office of a quarterly certificate of settlement of money accounts to United States property and disbursing officers of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That hereafter the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government shall be settled by the General Accounting Office within a period of not to exceed 3 years from the date of expiration of the period covered by the account. A copy of the certificate of settlement in each case shall be sent to the disbursing officer involved and such settlement shall be final and conclusive after the expiration of 3 years from the end of the period covered thereby and no further charges or debts shall be raised in such accounts thereafter except as to moneys which have been or may be lost to the United States due to fraud or criminality on the part of said disbursing officers: *Provided*, That all unsettled, suspended, or disallowed items heretofore raised in the disbursing accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government at a date more than 3 years subsequent to the date of expiration of the period covered by the account to which they pertain shall be passed to credit by the General Accounting Office in the absence of any fraud or criminality on the part of the disbursing officer involved: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit recovery from any payee of public moneys illegally or erroneously paid to such payee or to preclude the recovery from the disbursing officer or his surety of any balances found due the Government under a settlement made within the period of 3 years as herein provided: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deprive any disbursing officer of his right at any time to clear his accounts of questioned items in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes."

TITLES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND DEPARTMENTS OF INSTRUCTION AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 2422) to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain officers and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to prescribe from time to time the titles by which each of the several departments of instruction and offices of professor now or hereafter established at the United States Military Academy shall be known.

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the status, rank, precedence, pay, allowances, or eligibility for promotion or retirement, or otherwise to operate in any case or on any account to the prejudice of any of the professors at the United States Military Academy.

MEDICAL STATEMENTS

The bill (S. 2368) to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Any member of any reserve component of the land or naval forces who is on active duty or who may be assigned to active duty and who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes such active duty, and any person so ordered into the active military service of the United States who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes the period of service required under this joint resolution, shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such active duty or such period of service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is assigned to such active duty or ordered into such active military service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such active duty or service; and upon the completion of the period of such active duty or service, each such person shall be given another physical examination."

SEC. 2. Section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Any person inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 3 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service; and upon the completion of his period of training and service under section 3 (b), each such person shall be given another physical examination."

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5143) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "Board", to insert "the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "land", to insert "now or hereafter owned by the Corporation and", and in the same line after the word "connection" to strike out "therewith" and to insert "with any such office building."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill provides for the exemption from taxation of buildings and land in the District of Columbia owned by the Home Owners' Land Corporation and certain named Allied governmental corporations. It also contains a provision for the exemption of land and buildings which are auxiliary to the main office building, and which are used in connection with the business in the main building. One amendment would add a new agency, namely, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration recently created by Executive order. The other amendment proposed to the bill is merely a clarifying one. It makes clear and emphasizes the fact that these buildings and lands which are used as auxiliaries to the main properties must also be owned by the United States Government, otherwise the contention might be made that since such properties are used for an auxiliary purpose, even though they are owned privately, they would still be exempt from taxation. Of course, such a situation as that was never contemplated, and therefore this amendment emphasizes the fact that not only the main building but also any other buildings, lands, and appurtenances used in connection therewith are exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, provided that in all cases such buildings and lands belong to the United States Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senate considering Calendar No. 1303 or Calendar No. 1304?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1303.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought that bill had been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BILBO subsequently said: Mr. President, after receiving further information from the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] I withdraw my objection to Calendar 1303, House bill 5143.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 1303, House bill 5143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have heretofore been agreed to. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES AND MAKING OF CONTRACTS BY THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "paragraphs", to strike out "2 and 3" and insert in lieu thereof "1 or 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

VERNON E. DEUS

The bill (S. 2292) for the relief of Vernon E. Deus was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,377 as hereinafter provided, in full satisfaction of a judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on January 27, 1942, in civil action No. 7786 against Vernon E. Deus as a result of injuries sustained by Fred Walker, Jr., on June 24, 1940, while he was being detained at the guard room of the Senate Office Building: To Fred Walker, Sr., $80.50; to Fred Walker, Sr., as guardian for his minor son, Fred Walker, Jr., $1,250; and to the clerk of such court as costs in such civil action, $46.50: *Provided*, That such payments shall be made only upon the said Vernon E. Deus being relieved from all liability on such judgment: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such civil action, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriation for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the previous understanding, the bill will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN DECORATIONS, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2404) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 2. (1) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Legion of Merit, which shall have suitable appurtenances and devices and not more than four degrees, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to (a) personnel of the armed forces of the United States and of the Government of the Philippines and (b) personnel of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations who, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, shall have distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

(2) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Medal for Merit, which shall have distinctive appurtenances and devices and only one degree, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States be, and they are hereby, authorized during the present war and for a year thereafter to accept from the governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems, as may be tendered them, and which are conferred by such governments upon members of their own military forces, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution: *Provided*, That any such officer or enlisted man is hereby authorized to accept and wear any decoration, order, medal, or emblem heretofore bestowed upon such person by the government of a cobelligerent nation or of an American republic.

SEC. 2. (1) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Legion of Merit, which shall have suitable appurtenances and devices and not more than four degrees, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to (a) personnel of the armed forces of the United States and of the Government of the Philippines and (b) personnel of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations who, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, shall have distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

(2) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Medal for Merit, which shall have distinctive appurtenances and devices and only one degree, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the 'Legion of Merit,' and the 'Medal for Merit'."

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2414) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the figures "1942", to strike out ": *Provided*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 lode mining claims held by the same person, nor to more than 12 lode-mining claims held by the same partnership, association, or corporation: *And provided further*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, during the year beginning at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1941, and ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 2414 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 2414 was passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask that House bill 6604 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the House bill which has just been laid before the Senate has some very distinct advantages over Senate bill 2414. It applies not only for this year, up until June, but takes in next year. It is a 2-year bill instead of a measure merely covering the year 1942 up to July 1. That is a very distinct advantage, and I think the Senate should pass the House bill rather than the Senate bill. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 6604 be substituted for Senate bill 2414 and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate 2414 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago we substituted House bill 6604 for Senate bill 2414 and passed it. The House bill came over just before we took action, and we did not have time to observe all the provisions in it. I now find that the House bill which the Senate passed contains a provision to which the Committee on Mines and Mining gave great consideration, and in the committee an amendment was offered to strike it out. I therefore ask unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which House bill 6604 was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of House bill 6604.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like a minute in which to read the bill. We have a report on it from the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I may say that after conference in the cloakroom we have been able to remove the difficulty in connection with the House bill. On page 2, line 11, after the word "corporation", I move to strike out down to and including line 17.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly explain what the request would accomplish?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This has to do with a bill requiring assessment work on mining claims. Due to priorities, the miners cannot obtain the supplies and tools with which to do the assessment work and, furthermore, they have great difficulty in securing labor. The object of this bill is to relieve them from that burden until July 1, 1943.

The particular amendment which I have just offered was very thoroughly considered by the Committee on Mines and Mining. The committee agreed upon the amendment. We found in the House bill the provision which was eliminated from the Senate bill by the committee. If we eliminate the particular language I have moved to strike out, then the bill can go to conference between the House and the Senate, and the whole matter can be worked out, if there is any necessity for working it out, in conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand, from what the Senator says, that the purpose of the amendment is to accomplish economy of time and of service of men? Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is to save those who have mining claims from doing assessment work which they are unable to perform because of the labor situation and because of the priority situation.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is different. In other words, it voids forfeiture because of nonperformance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is there not also another point involved in the bill, which is that many of the men who have been inducted into service are owners of mining claims, and, of course, taken away from the sections of the country where their claims are located, they are absolutely unable, by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, to perform their assessment work?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true, and I thank the Senator for bringing out that point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not also true that a similar bill was passed at the time of the last World War?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. Not only was such a bill passed at the time of the last World War but during the depression a similar bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after "corporations", it is proposed to strike out the following: *"And provided further,* That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than six placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY W. LIVINGSTON

The bill (S. 2451) for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $164.23, to reimburse Anthony W. Livingston, first sergeant, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a storm on February 16, 1942, which flooded Government quarters occupied by him at the United States naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WILLIAM EDWARD FLEMING

The bill (S. 2469) for the relief of William Edward Fleming was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $138.45 to reimburse William Edward Fleming, pharmacist's mate, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a hurricane on January 15, 1931, which badly damaged Government quarters occupied by him at Ofu, Samoa: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwith-

standing. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

STUDY OF WAR AND POST-WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was about to move to proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1134, Senate Joint Resolution 131. I should like to call it to the attention of the Senate. It is a joint resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the Congress to make a study of war and post-war problems. It was favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. It contemplates only that there shall be set up a joint committee of the two Houses, appointed by the respective Presiding Officers, which can work as a study group, along with the National Resources Planning Board and the representatives of such executive agencies as might be levoted to the same task, in accumulating data upon post-war conditions. The joint resolution has been on the calendar for a considerable time, and I had hoped that perhaps the leader might not object to the Senate considering disposing of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press his motion at this time. In the first place, I think that in providing for the creation of a committee to look into post-war matters we must take into consideration the fact that in the executive departments there are already committees working on that problem. There is also the question whether it is wise to have a joint congressional committee, free from any outside membership, rather than a committee such as the O'Mahoney committee, which looked into matters in which both Houses and the executive departments participated.

A number of suggestions have been made by Members of the Senate looking toward the creation of some sort of post-war committee, but I doubt very much if the Senate is ready to act at this moment on a comprehensive proposal of that sort. Because of other matters, and because of the fact that we have been in a sort of recess, I have not had an opportunity to give the subject the attention it deserves in trying to work out a comprehensive solution.

In view of the fact that Senators generally have not given very careful study to the proposal, I do not think the Senate ought to take up at this hour, on this day, a measure providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, especially in view of the fact that it might involve duplication of work already being done by other organizations in the executive departments. It might be possible to work out a plan by which all those efforts would be coordinated, so as to avoid duplication and having the same ground covered by half a dozen different committees.

I am informed that there are in existence in various branches of the Government, and in some voluntary outside organizations, a dozen or more committees of one kind or another looking into post-war problems. I should like to have the question investigated a little further, and not precipitate action here today looking to a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress.

To be perfectly frank, it has been my experience and observation that as a rule joint committees of the two Houses do not do the best work in a great many matters. We have tried that plan in connection with Government reorganization. We had one meeeting of the joint committee. It adjourned and each committee went its own way. We did the same thing with respect to policies. So I think it would be unwise today to precipitate this matter. I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator and with other Senators and look into it to see if we cannot get the low-down on what is being done and what ought to be done in making some sort of investigation, collection of facts, and preparations for post-war legislation, which will have to come along later.

I hope the Senator will not press his motion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I gladly accede to the wishes of the leader; but I wish to direct his attention to this statement:

In October 1941 I introduced a Senate resolution on this subject. It received the favorable report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. At that time I thought that the most effective way to approach the matter was by a Senate committee. However, I spoke to the leader about the matter, and he indicated that it might be desirable—or I understood him to indicate that it might be preferable—to have a joint committee. Consequently I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 131.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator understood me to favor a joint committee of the two Houses alone, he misunderstood me. I did not have that in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. What I wish to call the leader's attention to is the fact that I reintroduced the thought in the form of a provision for a joint committee of the two Houses. In fact, the measure on the calendar is a joint resolution on the subject. That, too, was favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. It was then placed on the calendar. The subject is before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in the form of a Senate resolution, and it is on the calendar in the form of a joint resolution providing for a joint committee. The joint resolution contemplates that any committee set up shall work in conjunction with any other agency, legislative or administrative, which may be working on the same subject.

I should appreciate it if the leader would let some of us who are interested in the subject confer with him about it, in the hope that we may be able to get something going which has a legislative representation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that a joint resolution is on the calendar, making necessary the action of both Houses?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. No. I have introduced two measures. The first was a Senate resolution, which is now before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, after a favorable report from the Committee on Education and Labor. The second form is a joint resolution which is now on the calendar, also with a favorable report from the Committee on Education and Labor

Mr. BARKLEY. What I am anxious to avoid is duplication of work and diversity of report. We might find ourselves in the midst of confusion later when the war is over and we are undertaking to deal with post-war problems if we should have three or four committees at work and they should all make separate reports and recommendations. I think it would be infinitely better to have all the work done by the various committees coordinated, so that whenever a report was made it would be a single report, and would be authoritative.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I am striving to achieve. It is specifically provided in the joint resolution that it shall be the duty of the committee to work with other committees devoted to the same purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is one thing to work with other committees, and quite another thing to make a single report. The other committees might make their own reports, and this committee might make its report.

Mr. PEPPER. I am perfectly willing to give it an identity with those committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there is no particular hurry. I think we can save time and accomplish more by trying to dovetail all the activities looking to post-war legislation, rather than provide a congressional investigation of the subject.

Mr. PEPPER The other committees are already in existence. My idea is that we are not doing anything on it now, and they are actually going ahead with their investigations. My idea was that we should begin to coalesce, and that there should be some legislative representation along with the others.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that a year and a half ago other Senators, whose names I need not mention, contemplated the introduction of resolutions of one kind of another to work out some solution of post-war problems. Because of the international situation, and because of the urgency of other legislation, they were persuaded not to press this matter at that time. In view of the fact that they were interested and were on the verge of introducing measures on the subject, I think it might be well to confer with all those who are concerned and interested. It is a subject to which we must give attention.

I do not think we can afford to wait until the war is over before we undertake to do what we shall eventually have to do. At the same time, I think whatever we do should be comprehensive and authoritative.

Mr. PEPPER. That is my principal desire.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the recommendation contained in the President's message of today, that farm prices on which the ceilings are above parity be reconsidered by Congress with a view of reducing them to parity, and in view of the very general misunderstanding of the reasons and necessity for a ceiling somewhat in excess of parity in order to secure parity by farmers the prices of whose commodities are fixed upon the exchanges, I desire to submit a very brief statement on the subject. I have had very little time to prepare it, but I wish at least to make a preliminary statement at this time.

It is agreed that farmers are entitled to receive parity prices without legal interference through price-control devices, if under fair-trade conditions the market price goes that high. It is true, however, that if a price ceiling is fixed by law at the parity price, there would be no reasonable chance for farmers to sell their entire crops of cotton, wheat, corn, and other grains at the full parity price. They would, therefore, of necessity be forced to accept less than an average of parity. The reasons for the result stated are obvious and are well known in trade circles.

The market prices of cotton and a number of other agricultural commodities are ascertained by daily trading on the commodity exchanges. If there are more buyers than sellers, the price advances. If the sellers predominate, the price declines. When a cotton merchant or a cotton mill buys a quantity of cotton, prudent business management calls for hedging sales on the exchange to insure against loss as the result of declining prices. Investors and speculators who believe the price will advance, and thereby produce a profit, buy the hedges. If the annual crop is 12,000,000 bales and the annual consumption is 10,000,000 bales, who buys the entire crop of 12,000,000 bales during the 4 or 5 months of the marketing season? Consumers buy their current requirements, and traders who believe that a profit will accrue by holding the cotton buy the rest of it.

When the market price is at or near parity, who will buy the cotton or the hedges? If the mills cannot sell hedges, they can, with prudence, buy cotton only as needed for current use. Without buyers, every offered sale will drive down the price. Until the price goes low enough from the ceiling of parity price to attract buyers there can be no futures sales. Without that reduction in the price, and without a margin wide enough to encourage speculators and investors to buy, there would be no market for cotton except in quantities sufficient to supply the immediate needs of the mills; and the same rule, of course, would apply to wheat, corn, and all the other grains, and all agricultural commodities whose prices are fixed on the commodity exchange. Such a situation would produce unhappy results as follows:

First. The farmers would not get an average of parity prices.

Second. Farmers would be deprived of a market for a large part of their crop during the marketing season. They would be obliged to sell at reduced prices or to hold their cotton until the supply at reduced prices is exhausted.

Third. It would result in mortgage and other lien foreclosures, or cause long delays for creditors.

If an all-time market for cotton is maintained, there must be fluctuations in prices. If a price ceiling is fixed for cotton or these other commodities, the fluctuations will all be below that price. If parity is the ceiling point, practically all cotton will be sold below that point. A maximum price fixed by law at the parity level would mean either a price to the farmers lower than that price, or closing the markets for the sale of cotton except as needed for prompt use. Such a situation is unthinkable, and would torpedo the economy of the cotton belt.

If cotton, wheat, corn, and other grain producers are to be given a chance to get parity prices and parity income, there must be reasonable flexibility in price ranges above parity prices, as well as below those price levels. If inflexible ceiling prices are to be fixed by law, without having adequate floor prices, then a fair and reasonable margin must be provided between the parity price and the ceiling price. There is a difference of opinion among sincere farm leaders on what that margin should be. Congress decided that with a floor of 15 percent below parity provided by the Government loan plan, 10 percent above parity as a ceiling would permit the price to fluctuate between these two levels, and the price then would be governed by the trade law of supply and demand.

It is generally agreed that when a surplus of any commodity exists, there can be no inflationary price for that commodity. The object of the price-control act is to prevent inflationary prices. There exist in this country large surpluses of cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco. There is no sound reason for including any commodity in a price-control law so long as there are large surpluses in the ever-normal granary.

Another important reason from the farmer's standpoint for objection to a price ceiling at the parity price is the fact that parity income is more important than parity unit prices. The mere fixation of a price per pound for cotton establishes only one of the income factors. The other is volume—price times volume. Last year, in the face of rapidly rising prices of everything the farmer buys, there was a reduction in production of cotton of about 20 percent from that of the year before. A price ceiling fixed at the parity price per unit would leave the producers 20 percent short in income. Parity income calls for parity price on the average quantity produced.

Dr. Stine, an outstanding economist in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, has furnished me with a definition of parity income, as distinguished from parity price. It is as follows:

> Parity income takes into account quantities and prices for all products of the farm. Costs are deducted, and the net income for farming is compared with the net income from other sources in terms of per person living on farms, and per person not on farms. Parity prices indicate the exchange relation in terms of prices per unit between the products of the farm and the items farmers buy for production and living. In this there is no allowance for changes in volume of production nor in volume of purchases of goods.

If an inflexible price is fixed at 18.35 cents, which is the present parity price, how would the cotton farmers' income compare with the income of industrial labor whose wage scale is positively fixed except as it increases from time to time by overtime pay and new raises in pay rates?

Present so-called parity prices for agricultural commodities do not truly represent parity between agriculture and industry. I expect later to have more to say on that subject. This country cannot have lasting prosperity until a real balance in earning power between these two groups is established. The debt paying and purchasing power of farmers should be readjusted upward. That can be done now only by increasing the daily, weekly, and annual earnings of the agricultural workers.

Farmers do not favor a runaway inflation. Neither do they favor drastic limitations on the prices of their products with no compensatory limitation on other factors which increase the prices of things they buy. They ask only for fair treatment after considering the prices of things they must buy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted on April 25, 1942:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. CONNALLY), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John Davies, Jr., of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

Daniel Gaudin, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a sec-

retary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

John W. Dye, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. VAN NUYS from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry C. Blanton, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri;

Sterling Hutcheson, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia;

Robert L. Ailworth of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia;

William Thomas Dowd, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina;

Ford S. Worthy, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina, and

John White Stuart of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stephen W. Brennan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Frank Cooper, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Davies, Jr., of Ohio, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Gaudin, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Dye, of Minnesota, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert H. Ladner, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment and promotion in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William J. Korth, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Utah, in place of Ira N. Hinckley.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William H. Bartley, of Miles City, Mont., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont. Reappointment.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Beirut, Lebanon, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Laurence W. Taylor, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Robert L. Ghormley to be a vice admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of September 1941.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 24th day of April 1942:

Frank G. Johnson
William F. Malnate
Roger C. Rowse

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Davies, Jr., to be a consul of the United States of America.

Daniel Gaudin, Jr., to be a consul of the United States of America.

J. Webb Benton, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

John W. Dye to be a consul general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Albert H. Ladner, Jr., to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Arthur H Allbright, Birmingham.

NEVADA

William Marl McGhie, Caliente.
Meryl J. Larson, Manhattan.
Edith Stone, McGill.
Julia E. Whipple, Montello.

OKLAHOMA

Woodrow R. Chambers, Cardin.
Vivian P. Waddill, Milburn.
Bessie F. Pryor, Olustee.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Robert Patrick Campbell
Paul Celestin Le Golvan
Walter Cecil Twineham
Herbert Edward Block
Frederick Whiting Timmerman
Abraham Chartock

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Lyman Lincoln Judge

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Robin Bruce Epler
Second Lt. Julius Porter Faris, Jr.
Second Lt. Donald Haynes Heaton
Second Lt. Albert Howell Snider
Second Lt. Jesse Duncan Thompson
Second Lt. Harry White Trimble
Second Lt. Wharton Clayton Cochran
Second Lt. John Frederick Harris
Second Lt. Harold Edward Nankivell
Second Lt. Harold Wesly Norton
Second Lt. Edgar Thornton Poole, Jr.
Second Lt. Clyde Arnold Thompson
Second Lt. George Henry Pittman, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Charles Nathaniel Sawyer, Signal Corps.
Gilbert Richard Cook, Infantry.
Max Weston Sullivan, Infantry.
Franklin Cummings Sibert, Infantry.
Archibald Vincent Arnold, Field Artillery.
Stephen J. Chamberlin, Infantry.
John Traylor McLane, Cavalry.
William Horace Hobson, Infantry.
Raymond Oscar Barton, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonels

Leo George Clarke, Adjutant General's Department.
Hugh Carlton Dorrien, Infantry.
Shirley Randolph Hurt, Field Artillery.
James Carl Horne, Infantry.
Werner Watson Moore, Quartermaster Corps.
Fremont Byron Hodson, Infantry.
Robert Theodore Zane, Air Corps.
Irving Compton, Infantry.
Rudolph William Broedlow, Infantry.
Albert Edmund Rothermich, Infantry.
Stowe Thompson Sutton, Infantry.
James Ainsworth Brown, Infantry.
Elliott Raymond Thorpe, Infantry.
Douglas Sugg, Infantry.
Milo Cooper Pratt, Quartermaster Corps.
LeRoy Allen Walthall, Air Corps.
Lucas Victor Beau, Jr., Air Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Edward Allen Noyes
Charles Woodward Riley
Charles George Sinclair
Charles George Hutter
Frederick Henry Petters
Robert Parvin Williams
Edwin Brooks Maynard
Harvard Clayton Moore
Arden Freer
Paul Adolph Schule

To be majors

Roland Keith Charles, Jr.
Joseph Julius Hornisher

To be captains

Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr.
Wilbur Dwight Dice
Ralph Everett Reiner
Francis Patterson Wells
William Nelson Donovan
Norman Clemm Veale

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

Richard Jackmond Burch
James Perry Williams

CHAPLAIN

To be major, United States Army

Frederick Herbert Moehlmann

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Emil Fred Reinhardt
Ira Thomas Wyche
Gustav Henry Franke
Mark Wayne Clark
Lewis Blaine Hershey

To be brigadier generals

Ralph Corbett Smith
Geoffrey Prescott Baldwin
William Richard Schmidt
Jerome Jackson Waters, Jr.
Augustus Milton Gurney
Rex Webb Beasley
Charles Gardiner Helmick
Russell Gilbert Barkalow
William Glenn Livesay
William Archibald Campbell
William Carey Lee
Hume Peabody
Frank O'Driscoll Hunter
Harold Lee George
William Eugene Farthing
Shepler Ward FitzGerald
Walter Francis Kraus
Isaiah Davies
Philip Edward Brown
Donald Angus Davison
Harold Mark McClelland
John Ernest Dahlquist
Clayton Lawrence Bissell
Claire Lee Chennault
James Harold Doolittle

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, in Thy name we come, believing that Thou wilt surely judge the wrong and establish the right. In a deep and all-inclusive faith we know that neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creation shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Heavenly Father, grant that this day, with fidelity and courage, we may overcome difficulties and bear valiantly our responsibilities; enable us to catch the strain of the Man of Galilee in disinterested and self-denying service. Teach us, O Lord, that he has not learned the vital lesson of life who fails to conquer fear. In our labors, in our devotion to duty, in the broad outlook upon the needs of our country, may we find the title of our place and honor. Grant that differences and discord may melt into patriotic cooperation and fuse into such purposes which shall give unity and inspire a full-toned citizenship. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 23, 1942, was read and approved.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

APRIL 23, 1942.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special authority agreed to today, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate the accompanying messages.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House, under special authority granted April 23, 1942, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) entitled "An act making appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) entitled "An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 21, 45, 74, and 79 to the foregoing bill; and that it recedes from its amendment numbered 68 to said bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on April 24, 1942, examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted to him on April 23, 1942, he did on Friday, April 24, 1942, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 15, 1942:

H. R. 5686. An act for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black.

On April 20, 1942:

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

On April 24, 1942:

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Jacques Hallpern, Max Hallpern, and Sally Hallpern Zaharia.

DISPLAY AND USE OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 303, to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this resolution? And what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. HOBBS. My request is that this resolution may be taken up for immediate consideration. I have conferred with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]. There is no objection from either side.

The vote of the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous.

This resolution is the codification recommended by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Flag Code Committee, and is in substance, one that has been promulgated for 20 years. The War and Navy Departments have been consulted. It simply codifies and emphasizes existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does it do?

Mr. HOBBS. Nothing more than to establish for the use of civilians approved rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag, without penalty for violations. This does nothing except to promulgate for the information of the public the correct and proper uses of the flag.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is not new legislation, but simply a codification put out for the information of the general public.

Mr. HOBBS. This is new legislation, giving the official sanction of Congress to existing and widely approved rules for the respectful and patriotic use of the flag.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANCOCK. This bill reconciles certain small differences which exist between rules set up by various patriotic societies interested in the proper display of the flag and proper respect for it.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is simply declaratory and is designed to be a guide for the uniform and approved use of the American flag.

Mr. HOBBS. That is all.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there any provision in this resolution which attempts to take the flag off of art calendars, patriotic pictures, and the like?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all.

Mr. JENSEN. Not at all?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. HANCOCK. It establishes standards for the use of the flag itself and not to representations thereof. These standards are recommended by numerous patriotic organizations. The committee which considered the bill is of the unanimous opinion that there should be an authoritative guide for the display of the American flag, which can best be accomplished by an act of Congress.

Mr. HOBBS. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

(b) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement.

(c) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, last Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

(d) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

(e) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

(f) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

SEC. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (1).

(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out. When displayed either horizontally or vertically against a wall, the union should be uppermost and to the flag's own right; that is, to the observer's left. When displayed in a window, the flag should be displayed in the same way; that is, with the union or blue field to the left of the observer in the street.

(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, whether it is displayed in or outside the chancel of a church, or on or in front of a speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience.

(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant hauling the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads of flagstaffs in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

SEC. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America, the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REGISTRATION FACILITIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that registration in connection with the selective service is now taking place in the rotunda and will continue until 4:30 this afternoon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS OF THE WAR EFFORT (H DOC. NO. 716)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In certain ways the present world encircling war presents problems which were unimaginable during the first World War.

The theaters of combat today cover vastly greater areas. Many more millions of human beings are involved. The new factors of mechanical power, in the air and on the land and on the sea, have produced radical changes in basic strategy and tactics.

In this new war the nations resisting the Axis Powers face an even greater challenge to their very existence. They fight more powerful, more sinister foes; but their understanding of the magnitude of the task and the very firmness of their determination make victory certain in the long days to come.

In some other ways, however, the circumstances of today parallel those of 1917–18. Now, as in the last war, the common enemy has had all the advantage at the outset. Now, as then, bitter defeats and heavy losses must be endured by those who are defending civilization, before we will be able to establish the vital superiority in men and munitions which will turn the tide.

The United States was far better prepared for actual war on December 7, 1941, than it was on April 6, 1917. For over 2 years, by a succession of congressional acts, we had carried out or initiated safety measures for our own defense in growing volume and importance. There were the revisions of the neutrality laws, the adoption of the selective service law and the lend-lease law, and the great increases of our Army and Navy and the instruments of war which they needed.

After Pearl Harbor, the American people adopted a national program of war production which would have been called fantastic by most people 2 years before. It has required the shifting of the major part of American industry from the products of peace to the weapons of war.

Inevitably—but with the full approval of the Nation—this enormous program is dislocating industry, labor, agriculture, and finance. It is disrupting, and will continue to disrupt, the normal manner of life of every American and every American family. In this we repeat the pattern of the first World War, although on a vastly greater scale.

During the earlier war there were certain economic factors which produced unnecessary hardships; and these hardships continued long after the signing of the armistice. I use the word "unnecessary" because it is my belief that a very great deal of the suffering which was caused then can be avoided now.

These economic factors relate primarily to an easily understood phrase which affects the lives of all of us—the cost of living. Because rises in the cost of living which came with the last war were not checked in the beginning, people in this country paid more than twice as much for the same things in 1920 as they did in 1914.

The rise in the cost of living during this war has begun to parallel the last. The time has definitely come to stop the spiral. And we can face the fact that there must be a drastic reduction in our standard of living.

While the cost of living, based on the average prices of necessaries, has gone up about 15 percent so far since the autumn of 1939, we must now act to keep it from soaring another 80 or 90 percent during the next year or two—to hold it to somewhere near the present level.

There are obvious reasons for taking every step necessary to prevent this rise. I emphasize the words "every step" because no single step would be adequate by itself. Action in one direction alone would be offset by inaction in other directions. Only an all-embracing program will suffice.

When the cost of living spirals upward week after week and month after month, people as a whole are bound to become poorer, because the pay envelope will then lag behind rising retail prices. The price paid for carrying on the war by the Government and, therefore, by the people, will increase by many billions if prices go up. Furthermore, there is an old and true saying that that which goes up must always come down—and you and I know the hardships and heartaches we all went through in the bad years after the last war, when Americans were losing their homes and their farms and their savings and were looking in vain for jobs.

We do not intend after this war to present the same disastrous situation to those brave men who today are fighting our battles in all parts of the world. Safeguarding our economy at home is the very least that our soldiers, sailors, and marines have a right to expect of us civilians in Government, in industry, on the farm, and in all other walks of life.

We must therefore adopt as one of our principal domestic objectives the stabilization of the cost of living, for this is essential to the fortification of our whole economic structure.

Relying on past and present experience, and leaving out masses of details which relate more to questions of method than to the objective itself, I list for the Congress the following points, which, taken together, may well be called our present national economic policy:

1. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must tax heavily, and in that process keep personal and corporate profits at a reasonable rate, the word "reasonable" being defined at a low level.

2. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must fix ceilings on the prices which consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers pay for the things they buy; and ceilings on rents for dwellings in all areas affected by war industries.

3. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work.

4. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

5. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must encourage all citizens to contribute to the cost of winning this war by purchasing War Bonds with their earnings instead of using those earnings to buy articles which are not essential.

6. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must ration all essential commodities of which there is a scarcity, so that they may be distributed fairly among consumers and not merely in accordance with financial ability to pay high prices for them.

7. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must discourage credit and installment buying, and encourage the paying off of debts, mortgages, and other obligations; for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War Bonds.

I know that you will appreciate that these seven principal points, each and every one of them, will contribute in substantial fashion to the great objective of keeping the cost of living down.

It is my best judgment that only two of these points require legislation at the present time, for the very good reason that the Congress has already passed laws with respect to the others which seem adequate to meet the national policy enunciated.

I assure the Congress that if the required objectives are not attained, and if the cost of living should continue to rise substantially, I shall so advise the Congress, and shall ask for any additional legislation which may be necessary.

In the first item legislation is necessary, and the subject is now under consideration in the House of Representa-

tives. Its purpose is to keep excess profits down and at the same time raise further large sums for the financing of the war.

On this subject I believe that the objective can be attained through tax processes. We are now spending solely for war purposes the sum of about $100,000,000 every day of the week But before this year is over that rate of expenditure will be doubled. This means that a sum equal to more than half of the entire national income will be spent in the war effort. Almost the whole of these billions is being and will be spent within the United States itself.

Profits must be taxed to the utmost limit consistent with continued production. This means all business profits—not only in making munitions but in making or selling anything else. Under the proposed new tax law we seek to take by taxation all undue or excess profits. It is incumbent upon the Congress to define undue or excess profits, and anything in excess of that specific figure should go to the Government.

One of our difficulties is to write a law in which some clever people will not find loopholes, or in which some businesses will not be equitably included. I have suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives that some blanket clause could well cover, by a special tax, all profits of any kind of business which exceed the expressed definition of the legal-profit figure.

At the same time, while the number of individual Americans affected is small, discrepancies between low personal incomes and very high personal incomes should be lessened; and I therefore believe that in time of this grave national danger, when all excess income should go to win the war, no American citizen ought to have a net income, after he has paid his taxes, of more than $25,000 a year. It is indefensible that those who enjoy large incomes from State and local securities should be immune from taxation while we are at war. Interest on such securities should be subject at least to surtaxes.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will pass a new tax bill at the earliest moment possible. Such action is imperative in the comprehensive all-out effort to keep the cost of living down—and time is of the essence.

The second item, relating to price control, is, with the exception of farm prices, adequately covered by existing law, and I have issued instructions to put this into effect immediately. It is our effort to be fair in all phases of price control; and if our future experience reveals inequality or unfairness, corrections will, of course, be made.

In respect to the third item, seeking to stabilize remuneration for work, legislation is not required under present circumstances. I believe that stabilizing the cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales.

Organized labor has voluntarily given up its right to strike during the war. Therefore, all stabilization or adjustment of wages will be settled by the War Labor Board machinery, which has been generally accepted by industry and labor for the settlement of all disputes.

All strikes are at a minimum. Existing contracts between employers and employees must, in all fairness, be carried out to the expiration date of those contracts. The existing machinery for labor disputes will, of course, continue to give due consideration to inequalities and the elimination of substandards of living. I repeat that all of these processes, now in existence, will work equitably for the overwhelming proportion of all our workers if we can keep the cost of living down and stabilize their remuneration.

Most workers in munition industries are working far more than 40 hours a week, and should continue to be paid at time and a half for overtime; otherwise their weekly pay envelopes would be reduced.

All these policies will guide all Government agencies.

In regard to item 4, prices of farm products: For nearly 9 years it has been the policy of the Government to seek an objective known as parity—or, in other words, farm prices that give the farmer an assurance of equality in individual purchasing power with his fellow Americans who work in industry. Some of the products of the farms have not yet reached the stage of parity; others have exceeded parity. Under existing legislation a ceiling cannot be placed on certain products until they reach a level somewhat above parity.

This calls for the second legislative action which I have mentioned. Under a complicated formula in the existing law prices for farm products—prices which housewives have to pay for many articles of food—may rise to 110 percent of parity, or even higher. It is the fault of the formula. In the case of many articles this can mean a dangerous increase in the cost of living for the average family over present prices.

In fairness to the American people as a whole, and adhering to the purpose of keeping the cost of living from going up, I ask that this formula be corrected, and that the original and excellent objective of obtaining parity for the farmers of the United States be restored.

It would be equally harmful to the process of keeping down the cost of living if any law were passed preventing the Government from selling any of its own surplus farm commodities at the market price. As a national policy, the ceiling on farm products—in other words, the maximum prices to be received by the producers of these products—should be set at parity.

With respect to item 5, the purchase of War Bonds, the American people know that if we would raise the billions which we now need to pay for the war and at the same time prevent a disastrous rise in the cost of living, we shall have to double and more than double the scale of our savings. Every dime and dollar not vitally needed for absolute necessities should go into War Bonds and stamps to add to the striking power of our armed forces.

If these purchases are to have a material effect in restraining price increases they must be made out of current income. In almost every individual case they should be big enough to mean rigid self-denial, a substantial reduction for most of us in the scale of expenditure that is comfortable and easy for us. We cannot fight this war, we cannot exert our maximum effort, on a spend-as-usual basis. We cannot have all we want, if our soldiers and sailors are to have all they need.

I have been urged by many persons and groups to recommend the adoption of a compulsory plan of savings by deducting a certain percentage of everyone's income. I prefer, however, to keep the voluntary plan in effect as long as possible, and I hope for a magnificent response.

With respect to item 6, rationing, it is obviously fair that where there is not enough of any essential commodity to meet all civilian demands, those who can afford to pay more for the commodity should not be privileged over others who cannot. I am confident that as to many basic necessities of life, rationing will not be necessary, because we shall strive to the utmost to have an adequate supply. But where any important article becomes scarce, rationing is the democratic, equitable solution.

Item 7, paying off debts and curtailing installment buying, should be made effective as soon as possible now that money is becoming more plentiful. Those who comply with it will be grateful that they have done so, when this war is over. Elimination of private debts and an accumulation of savings will provide a form of insurance against post-war depression. The Federal agency responsible for the control of credit for installment buying is taking appropriate action.

Indeed, as to all the items which do not require legislation, the executive departments and agencies whose functions and duties are involved are at work as expeditiously as possible in carrying out this whole broad policy.

The result will mean that each and every one of us will have to give up many things to which we are accustomed. We shall have to live our lives with less in the way of creature comforts than we have in time of peace. Our standard of living will have to come down.

Some have called this an "economy of sacrifice." Some interpret it in terms that are more accurate—the "equality of sacrifice." I have never been able to bring myself, however, to full acceptance of the word "sacrifice", because free men and women, bred in the concepts of democracy and wedded to the principles of democracy, deem it a privilege rather than a sacrifice to work and to fight for the perpetuation of the democratic ideal. It is, therefore, more true to call this total effort of the American people an "equality of privilege."

I firmly believe that Americans all will welcome this opportunity to share in the fight of civilized mankind to preserve decency and dignity in modern life. For this is fundamentally a people's war—

and it must be followed by a people's peace. The achievement of victory in war and security in peace requires the participation of all the people in the common effort for our common cause.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1942.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from a Michigan paper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks some correspondence I have in my hand.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including with them excerpts from an article appearing in Look magazine of April 7, 1942, entitled "Wendell Willkie Answers Eighteen Blunt Questions."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Hon. Edward M. Curran, United States district attorney for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART]?

There was no objection.

LEON HENDERSON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I say that I applaud the message of the President in the main. It does not, however, go far enough for me, particularly on the labor question. I still think legislation is necessary, and I believe the country feels this way about it.

This man Henderson, whom the President has chosen to administer price-fixing laws has been an interesting study to me.

In manner he is gruff, blustering, and domineering. In attack he is bold and ruthless. Under attack he is stubborn, defiant, and unbending.

He is a total stranger to the art of diplomacy, and yet he succeeds. He succeeds in the hard way. He starts out by making everybody mad with him, provoking a fight, and then wins out.

I saw him in his fight with the great Committee on Banking and Currency of this body and later with a committee in the Senate. In both instances he won. He won in his fight with the Congress and the country, and he won by the force of his informed intellect.

He believes in himself, in the accuracy of his information and the soundness of his judgment. He literally compelled the Congress and the country to accept him and his price-fixing scheme. My hat is off to this glutton for work and punishment. The devil fascinates me and I have no more brickbats to throw at him. His is a nasty job and he is quite the kind of a person that does best this kind of a thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes after disposition of whatever is on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TREADWAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by the General Electric Co., of my home city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a column by Mr. George D. Riley in the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a private soldier in the United States Army to a friend which expresses in eloquent language the thought that his folks back home are well worth fighting for, and that every true soldier is glad to do his part in this great conflict.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell to the workers of the Otis Elevator Co. at Yonkers, N. Y., on April 16, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The time has come, I believe, to face facts. There has been too much wishful talking, too much blinking away the truth. I could come here this afternoon and indulge in pleasant generalities, and pat you on the back and praise you for the job you are doing, and praise our soldiers on all fronts for the job they are doing, and we'd all leave here feeling not only happy but secure. I don't intend to do that. There is nothing for us to feel happy about at this stage of the war. There is very little security for freemen in the world today. If we are going to win this war, we must face the truth no matter how it hurts. I intend to give you the truth as I see it.

Our enemies have been preparing for 10 years, while we talked about preparedness. Their leaders have played a crafty game; they built great arsenals in secret while they assured us that they wished us no harm. They proclaimed their friendship for us while they planned our destruction. Their envious eyes sized up our wealth while they schemed to strip it from us.

While we followed the ways of peace, while we explored new frontiers of freedom, and while we walked careless and unheeding on new paths of democracy, they were preparing for war.

They prepared with the vigor and the singleness of purpose which we in America do not yet understand. In Germany and in Japan war preparation means the complete and utter domination of every hour of the time of every man, woman, and child by the state. It means self-sacrifice for everyone such as we in America have never known. It means the united effort on the part of industry, management, and the armed forces, such effort as we never have attained, but must attain if we are going to win.

We can't fight that sort of preparation with half measures or with half our hearts. I know that it is difficult for all Americans suddenly to change their ways of living and their ways of thinking to meet the situation that confronts us today. We have been a peaceful nation, living in the false security of our belief that we could get along without adequate protection in a greedy world. We placed our faith in the isolation of our geographical situation and in international good will—a myth. It was faith ill placed. Some of us believed that if we went on building a better life here for ourselves, jealous nations would let us alone in our prosperity. We all realize now how short-sighted we were. We are willing to admit that we were wrong. But are all of us yet willing to assume the sacrifices that will be necessary to achieve victory?

The sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors we take for granted. They are part of the tradition of our fighting men. But in this total war no line is drawn between the sacrifice of the soldier and the worker, the sailor and the farmer. Hitler blasted that line out of the London sky.

I'm not one of those people who say glibly that American inventiveness will win the war, or that American production will win the war, or that American labor will win the war. They all can help. And they all will have to help to the uttermost of their endurance—but it's the men in the front lines who will win this war.

But they can't win it without the complete, wholehearted, unselfish cooperation of every American back home. And those of us who are back home—secure because of those others fighting on the fronts—are going to have to give up many of the things that we now take for granted in order that the soldiers and the sailors will have enough with which to fight. The people at home will have to exhibit the same spirit that our flyers in China have made a symbol of valor in the whole East, the same loyalty that our sailors show carrying the arms and the ammunition to Europe and the eastern sea, the same skill, the same stout-hearted courage that have made Bataan a bright and stirring word on the pages of history.

I know some of your problems in the shops. I'm an engineer. I don't take lightly the job you've done, or the job you're doing or will do. I know that the quality of your workmanship has a definite bearing on the outcome of this mighty struggle.

But let us not delude ourselves. You and I, here at home, no matter how we strive, no matter how we sacrifice, no matter how we endure, are not doing and never can do the job that our soldiers are doing in the field. We owe it to them to redouble our efforts, to forget ourselves, to turn to and produce more every hour of every day than we ever believed it possible to produce.

We must convince ourselves that this job of turning out the arms and ammunition for our fighting forces is not just another job. Unless we do it supremely well, there aren't going to be any jobs at all, as we know jobs; there aren't going to be any closed shops and there aren't going to be any open shops. Hitler and the Japs aren't in the least interested in the 40-hour week or the 50-hour week or the 60-hour week. They're not interested in little business or big business.

They despise that bungling, debating institution we proudly call democracy. They despise freedom, human decency, the rights of the individual. They despise all the things for which we stand, all the splendid things on which we have built our Government, all liberty of action and of thought. They would kill all that we hold good; they would enslave us, every last one of us; they would black-out our freedom and institute the rule of the whiplash and the reason of the yoke.

Are we going to let them do that? We are not.

I'm not talking to labor only, this afternoon. I'm talking to labor and industry and management—and they all will sink or swim together. It is manifestly unfair for management to meet on the golf links this spring to discuss what it's going to do about labor. And it's unfair for labor to take advantage of these dire times to talk about what it's going to do about management.

And until we've won this war, we had all better forget there is a thing called golf, and stick right to the job. The 24-hour day applies to the front office as much as it does to the back shop.

I'm telling you, this war isn't anybody's "pink tea," and until all of us realize that, we're not going to win.

I could give you some encouraging statistics. But I'm not going to. Hitler's listening. But I can say that in our production of light tanks we're away ahead of schedule. Not only ahead of schedule but, ton for ton, we're building better tanks than anyone else in the world. That's no military secret. Hitler knows all about it. He got the news from his own General Rommel after our light tanks met his Nazi medium tanks in Libya and kicked the blitz out of them.

I can say, too, that in our production of certain types of planes we are ahead of schedule. But we're not turning them out fast enough, even now. Our production isn't synchronized. It does no good to turn out plane motors until we turn out a propeller to match each engine, a plane to match each propeller. And it does no good to make any of these things unless we have the ships to take them where they're needed. And we don't have the ships. We'll have to work a lot harder than we're working now before we get them.

It's going to take time to build ships. But we must be sure not to slow down other production; when the ships do start to slide off the ways they'll be ready to carry what you are making now.

One other matter occurs to me. I know that it seems manifestly unfair to ask you to speed up production today when you know that a material shortage may throw you into idleness the latter part of the week. In normal times it might be a smart idea to slow down.

But these aren't normal times. Whatever you make today, 1 hour from now, no matter how small a part of what implement of war, that job on which you work today may save some American's life. He's waiting for it, out there on one of our distant fronts. If you get it out this afternoon, that little piece, an hour ahead of schedule, may catch a ship that's loading now. And it may get into the hands of some young fellow you know who's off there in the war—some boy from your neighborhood—or from this shop, or your brother, or your son. It may reach him just in the nick of time to save his life and help him save his country.

Remember that, each hour of each day as you labor. Not a single minute dare we waste. I begrudge these minutes lost to production. Lives hang on these minutes, and lives of American soldiers are more important to every one of you than anything else.

As I said in the beginning, I could come in here and wave the flag and send you all home feeling fine. But you'd rather have me come here honestly and realistically, bringing you the plain truth. It doesn't pay to wait for miracles either in warfare or in industry. The only miracles we know today are made of brains and brawn, of sweat and blood.

Yes; you'll have to tighten your belts. Industry will have to tighten its belt. But that's all right. There are a lot of soldier belts tightened today on five continents. You're going to have to work harder; all of us are. You're going to have to forget ease and comfort and entertainment, for not one of these things ever won a war. It's not going to be a hardship to give them up, either. What do you and I know about hardships?

We may think we have long hours. We may think we have tough jobs. But we can wash our faces and go home at night, can't we? We don't have to lie in a stinking trench. And nobody's shooting at us while we work.

Every time you think that you're on a tough spot, remember the men of Bataan. They were too busy protecting this job of yours to think of profits or wages, overtime or investment or anything else. And all they asked in return was that you make the guns and the shells with which they could fight.

We all, every one of us, must pledge our hands and dedicate our lives to the task of making Bataan a symbol of pride and glory and victory as well as a symbol of sacrifice.

We can't turn back the pages of history. But we can write new pages. And I pledge for the Army that with your help, your all-out help, your sweat and your fatigue, and our blood, we will write that new page so that all Americans and all free men and women everywhere, in all time to come, will read with pride the heroic saga of the second battle of Bataan.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by President J. Rion McKissick, of the University of South Carolina, on the occasion of the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the Baptist Church of Swansea, S. C., of which Rev. Edgar W. Davis, is pastor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution by the city council of the city of Ottumwa, Iowa, on the subject of surcharges by the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a column of comment from the pen of Bob Davis of the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter written me by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, I asked and received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "The Mind of Japan," but I neglected to state the amount it would exceed the normal amount allowed to be printed in the RECORD. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer stating this will take three pages of the RECORD and cost $135. In view of the fact that I have been very sparing in the use of space in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert this article in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects, in one to include a message from a group of English teachers to American teachers, and in another to include a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson, and in a third to include an address by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on four subjects and to include in the first an editorial from the Washington Star; in the second, a telegram from Hon. E. O. Thompson, chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas; in the third, a letter from Hon. Olin Culberson, member of the State Railroad Commission of Texas; and in the fourth, a letter from Mr. H. P. Nichols, an executive of the East Texas Oil Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a program sponsored by the Navy Department in honor of the Fulton-Sylphon Co., of Konxville, Tenn., and that in the event it exceeds the normal allotment it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article on patriotism from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by William Allen White published in the Kansas City Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of protecting the right of soldiers and sailors to vote, and to include therein an opinion by the Rhode Island Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

RAISING THE PAY OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the bill to raise the pay of our fighting forces has passed the Senate and it will soon be acted upon by the House. We, the Members of this House, know what sacrifices American men and women are making for America and all the ideals for which America stands. I know that we all share the feeling there is nothing too good for America's soldier heroes. The uniform and the service insignia are badges of honor which have earned the respect of friend and foe. The American soldier is no longer a trainee who will receive his schooling and then return to civilian life to await his Nation's call. His Nation's call has sounded. He is now a fighting man, learning to defend himself and to inflict disaster upon his enemy. He is working at war, on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week.

We are spending, it is true, and our spending is rapidly reaching alarming figures. But we must not pinch pennies when our military guardians are concerned. The increase in pay which we will give them is certainly not an attempt to place a value on their service. We can never place a value on that service. The historians of another day and thankful posterity will evaluate the deeds and the service of these spirited fighting men. We can only, in our limited way, attempt to provide them some modicum of exchange with which to purchase certain necessities and items that will help them obtain some slight relaxation and some slight relief from nerve-wracking days and nights. This pay increase is but an evidence in concrete form of our respect for these men and their needs; an evidence that we wish their comforts and needs be met.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Richard L. Neuberger on the road to Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and to include certain excerpts in each one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say relative to the remarks just made by my colleague from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] that this matter was brought to my attention some days ago by a telegram from Hon. William A. Smith, a member of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. I investigated the matter on that same day. A license was issued on that day to the county of Los Angeles to manufacture arm bands itself or by anyone it wanted to do it, provided that they were the authorized band. Furthermore, I was furnished with a list of four different manufacturers in Los Angeles County who were already licensed to manufacture arm bands at not exceeding 5 cents apiece. So, as a matter of fact, it is necessary to get all the facts on these matters, and I am certain from information that I have since received that the matter has been straightened out. It is obviously necessary that the thing be handled in such a manner as not to have charges like the gentleman has mentioned, but I am convinced that such charges will not be made, and, furthermore, that our county is in position to go ahead and make any arrangement it sees fit to make.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow it may be in order to consider the bill H. R. 6995, known as the bill for the aid and relief of automobile dealers, that the debate be restricted to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that this is a unanimous report of the committee, and that both sides of the committee are anxious to have it disposed of as early as possible.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's information is correct. There is no opposition to the bill. This comes with a unanimous report, and the majority leader, as well as the minority leader, has been conferred with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr FISH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be sound and much needed legislation. Therefore it is not necessary to apply for a rule, which is the ordinary procedure. I hope that this may be taken up by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the President of the American Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLOYD P. MORITZKY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

CARROL D. WARD

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2192) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask certain consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6328) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the word "pay", insert ", out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Just what is this?

Mr. McGEHEE. The words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" were left out by the House committee and were inserted by the Senate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

HOWARD L. MILLER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5887) for the relief of Howard L. Miller, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,360" and insert "$2,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. P. CORLEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

AMENDING ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6804) to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subparagraph (d) of paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"(d) Owners of passenger vehicles for hire, whether operated from a private establishment or from public space, other than those licensed under the two preceding subparagraphs and under subparagraph (i) of this paragraph, shall pay a license tax of $25 per annum for each such vehicle used in the conduct of their business."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 31 of section 7 of said act is further amended by adding the following two new paragraphs to be lettered (i) and (j), respectively, and to read as follows:

"(i) Owners of ambulances for hire and owners of passenger vehicles which, when used for hire, are used exclusively for funeral purposes shall pay a license tax of $25 per annum for each such vehicle used in the conduct of their business. Licenses used under this subparagraph shall date from July 1 in each year.

"(j) No person shall engage in driving or operating any vehicle licensed under the terms of subparagraph (i) without having procured from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent a license which shall only be issued upon evidence satisfactory to the Director of Motor Vehicles, under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, that the applicant is a person of good moral character and is qualified to operate such vehicle, and upon payment of an annual license fee of $5. Such license shall be carried upon the person of the licensee or in the vehicle while engaged in driving such vehicle when such vehicle is being used for hire. Application for such license shall be made in such form as shall be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. Each annual license issued under the provisions of this subparagraph shall be numbered, and there shall be kept in the

Department of Vehicles and Traffic a record containing the name of each person so licensed, his annual license number and all matters affecting his qualifications to be licensed hereunder. No license issued under the provisions of this subparagraph shall be assigned or transferred."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend existing law of the District of Columbia so that ambulance and funeral cars may be placed in a different class from that in which they are at the present time. A person who seeks a license to operate an ambulance or a funeral car, under the provisions of this bill, merely has to show that he is of good moral character and qualified to operate said vehicle. At the present time the operators of ambulances and funeral cars are required to have the same rules applied to them as apply to the operators of taxicabs in the District of Columbia. They are required to be familiar with all points of interest in the District of Columbia and to wear certain badges of identification. We believe that those requirements are unnecessary and that the change presented in this bill is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6899) to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917," approved May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 120), and acts amendatory thereto, shall not apply to the custodial employees who are in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia by reason of any provision, decision, or construction of said section, or acts amendatory thereto, when such employees are performing work required of them in school buildings during the time these buildings are used for nonrecreational official purposes by any Federal agency or department of the District of Columbia government other than the Board of Education, in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education governing the use of school buildings and grounds, including their use for day or evening schools and for nonrecreational purposes; and nothing therein contained shall be deemed to prevent any custodial employee from receiving in addition to his pay, salary, or compensation as an employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia any other pay, salary, or compensation for services which may have been rendered subsequent to May 31, 1941, or which may hereafter be rendered to any Federal agency or department of the District of Columbia government other than the Board of Education, during its use of school buildings under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to receive additional compensation when performing services for other District or Federal agencies.

Let us take, for example, the Civil Service Commission. That Commission has funds with which to pay the expenses for examinations held in the District of Columbia. As those examinations are held in the schools extra time is required on the part of the custodial force, but under existing law those custodians cannot accept any additional compensation. We believe that this measure is desirable. It has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6953) to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (b) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Tax on corporations: There is hereby levied for each taxable year upon the taxable income from District of Columbia sources of every corporation, whether domestic or foreign (except those organizations expressly exempt under paragraph (d) of this section), a tax at the rate of 5 percent thereof: *Provided, however*, That income derived from the procurement of orders for the sale of personal property by means of telephonic communication, written correspondence, or solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District is not from District of Columbia sources: *Provided further*, That income from the sale of personal property to the United States is not from District of Columbia sources unless the taxpayer is engaged in business in the District and such property is delivered for use within said District."

SEC. 2. Section 46 (g) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Any corporation receiving income from District sources or engaging in or carrying on any business in the District without first having obtained a license so to do, and any person engaging in or carrying on any business for or receiving income from District sources on behalf of a corporation not having a license so to do, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $300 for each and every failure, refusal, or violation, and each and every day that such failure, refusal, or violation continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. All prosecutions under this subsection shall be brought in the police court of the District on information by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants in the name of the District: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to mere collection by an agent of income of a corporation not having the license required hereby."

SEC. 3. Section 46 (h) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The term 'business' as used in this act shall include the carrying on or exercising for gain or economic benefit, either direct or indirect, any trade, business, or commercial activity in the District: *Provided, however*, That such term shall not include the procurement of orders for the sale of personal property by means of telephonic communication, written correspondence, or solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District; nor the mere submission of bids or the mere acceptance of contracts for the sale of personal property to the United States."

SEC. 4. (a) The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

(b) The amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of this act shall be effective as of January 1, 1942.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the present District of Columbia income tax levies a tax upon incomes from District of Columbia sources of domestic and foreign corporations, and requires every corporation engaged in business or commercial activity in the District to obtain a license to do so. It is the purpose of this legislation to exempt from the tax income from the sale of personal property where orders therefor require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District, and to exempt from the licensing provisions of the act corporations which merely obtain orders for the sale of personal property by telephone, mail, or personal solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District and title passes without the District. Many Members of Congress brought this matter to our attention and it was upon their request that the committee considered this legislation and proposed it.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. The amendment to the present bill, I understand, was brought about because the committee has been deluged with letters asking for the revision of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true; many Members from at least eight or nine States have approached us and have said they believed that only corporations actually maintaining offices here and residing within the District should be taxed; that these others should not be taxed, for it was a barrier between the

States and the District of Columbia that was not wholesome.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in connection with this bill certain correspondence and telegrams relating to this subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a bill was passed making it compulsory for both local and foreign corporations not only to take out an annual vendor's license, but also to pay a 5-percent corporate income tax on sources of revenue received from within the District of Columbia.

I think the present law is far-reaching and unfair and creates an undue tax hardship on foreign corporations, and sets up a trade barrier between the District of Columbia and the States.

Mr. Speaker, I received many letters from manufacturers in North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, Georgia, and Maryland, protesting against this unjust and unfair tax. They feel that after paying the Federal, State, and county taxes, they are being penalized and asked that some action be taken. Therefore I introduced H. R. 6953 and ask the House for its immediate adoption.

This bill would tax merchandise where the title to the goods passes in the District. In other words, only those corporations will have to pay the tax who bring goods into the District in their own trucks, as the title would then be transferred in the District. Corporations who ship their goods via a common carrier transfer the title to the carrier when the merchandise is accepted by them. Only those corporations who pay the tax will have to pay the license fee.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein an interpretation of this bill which I received from the corporation counsel, Mr. Richmond B. Keech. I also insert two telegrams, one from Mr. W. G. Ewald, secretary of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, and one from Mr. J. Morton Lehman, representing the furniture manufacturers, in approval of this bill.

CORPORATION COUNSEL,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 21, 1942.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: Pursuant to your telephone request of this afternoon asking that I advise you as to the effect of the bill substituted for H. R. 6871, please be advised as follows:

This measure, to the best of my information, will result in a loss of revenue to the District of Columbia of approximately $185,000 per annum, plus an unknown additional figure.

Under the terms of the bill a foreign corporation which has a representative in the District of Columbia soliciting orders, the acceptance thereof being out of the District and title to such property passing from the purchaser to the seller without said District, would not be subject to the District of Columbia tax. Furthermore, the District would obtain no tax from the sale of personal property to the United States, unless the seller is engaged in business in the District of Columbia and the property sold to the United States is delivered for use in said District.

The practical effect, so far as sales to the United States Government are concerned, is that foreign corporations not engaged in business in the District of Columbia would pay no tax, and even those engaged in business in the District of Columbia would only pay a tax upon the income from sales of such property for use in the District.

Foreign corporations which merely obtain orders for the sale of personal property from persons in the District by telephone, mail, or personal solicitation (which orders are accepted without the District) would not be subject to the tax unless delivery is made into the District in some manner whereby title to the goods passes in the District. Generally, title would pass in the District in cases where delivery is made into the District in the delivery equipment of the seller, or c. o. d., or draft with bill of lading attached. In substantially all cases where sales are made by corporations not engaged in business in the District the parties can arrange for delivery in a manner whereby title will pass without the District, thus relieving the seller of the District income tax.

Very truly yours,
RICHMOND B. KEECH,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

BALTIMORE, MD., *April 23, 1942.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Baltimore Association of Commerce is of the opinion that pending bill H. R. 6953 would provide for a satisfactory amendment to the District of Columbia corporation income tax law and urge your favorable action for early passage of this measure.

W. G. EWALD, *Secretary,*
Baltimore Association of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1942.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Building, Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 6953 is satisfactory to the furniture interests which I represent. We feel that this bill cures all defects complained of in H. R. 5591, and we would appreciate your efforts for a speedy passage of the amended bill.

J. MORTON LEHMAN.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, after line 23, insert:

"SEC. 5. Article III of title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"'SEC. 16. In all cases where the assessor claims that a decedent was domiciled in the District at the time of his death and the taxing authorities of a State or States make a similar claim with respect to their State or States, the assessor may, with the approval of the Commissioners, compromise and settle the taxes imposed by this title.'

"SEC. 6. The amendment made by section 5 of this act shall apply to estates of decedents dying before or after its enactment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this completes the legislative program of the District Committee today.

CONSIDERATION OF THE LAND-GRANT BILL

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time for the House to consider the bill (H. R. 6156) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, commonly known as the land-grant bill.

I may state in this connection that I have in mind if the request is granted, to notify the House a day in advance of the time it will be called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman at this time also fix the time for general debate on the bill?

Mr. LEA. I would suggest that general debate be limited to an hour, to be divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman include that in his request?

Mr. LEA. I will. Mr. Speaker, I so modify my request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman is going to notify the House when the bill will be brought up, and that he will also notify the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. LEA. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when does the gentleman plan to call the bill up?

Mr. LEA. I intend to call it up at the convenience of the House; I thought possibly Wednesday; but I should want to consult with the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader before deciding that.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman now contemplates that it will be Wednesday.

Mr. LEA. I hope so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time for the House to consider the bill H. R. 6156, to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; and that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively and respectfully to the message of the President of the United States. In my opinion, the note he strikes is pretty well justified by the situation which obtains.

However, in my judgment, the American people are entitled to know all the truth. Nothing else will save them or can make and keep them free. This is no time for half truths.

They are entitled to know that strikes in essential defense industries have directly and terribly impeded the production of necessary war matériel, and that an attitude of tremulous inactivity in expediting the positive ending of further delays from such sources has contributed and still contributes to the possibility of

our defeat and will continue under the set-up to which the President refers, for that is so.

They are entitled to know that a lot of blank-check appropriations made for national defense purposes have been sidetracked and used for purposes for which they were not intended by Congress, which situation now requires the lowering of the standard of living.

There is a multitude of other things they are entitled to be told. They should be shocked into a realization of what confronts them instead of being hypnotized by a lot of words or palliated by half truths.

If the big stick is ever to be used to advantage in this war, it must be swung effectively soon, or it will be too late.

There has been a lot of attempted coverage of shortcomings by efforts made to distract and to divert the attention of the people from the real issue. This should stop. It will have to be stopped, and there is no other answer to our internal economic situation. Our great enemy is found on the home front.

The New Deal program of the last 7 years is the big goat that has butted our defense efforts into insensibility. Make no mistake!

Do not be misled by false prophets or by the scribes and pharisees who now sit, for the time being, at the tables and desks in the inner sanctum of the temple of our Government. Now is the time for action. The people are fed up with all the conflicting orders and statements and promises emanating from high sources, inspired or not, corroborated or repudiated, as trial balloons to test popular sentiment, about which there never could, can, or should be any question.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in disagreement with a lot of stuff and nonsense which paid propagandists, New Deal advocates, and misguided people generally, are putting in the papers these days.

Some very good people have swallowed the bait, hook, sinker, and line. Strange as it may seem, yet it is too true. Let's be realists for a few minutes. Why should we allow or permit our careless reading of headlines to convince us against a better judgment, based on careful consideration of the facts that have contributed to perpetuate our form of government, thus far.

This is a total war in which we are engaged, fighting to preserve our democratic, representative form of government, a war of survival, a war for our lives and liberty. So I ask you, in the words of St. Matthew, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his own soul?" That question should ring in the ears of every patriotic citizen, when confronted by the suggestion that his right to exercise his prerogative to vote, should be adjourned.

Any attempt to take advantage of the war to cover derelictions by proposing first, that all congressional elections be suspended; later by suggesting that there be no political campaigns for the duration—because they would destroy unity—is pure propaganda.

Let us be realistic. Of course we must win this war, but what are we fighting for if not to preserve and to conserve our form of government and to insure to posterity a continuance and perpetuation of the liberties we have enjoyed.

In order to do these things we must not tolerate a continuance of a program which puts saving social gains above saving the country. To stop such people, so-minded, from accomplishing such a purpose, we must be on the alert. The public must be advised and informed fully as to what is going on, and facts and figures must be factual. Responsibility for what has happened and is happening must be pinned on those individuals and groups who are and were responsible.

Tremendous expenditures are required to win the war. The great burden which the extravagance of the present administration has imposed upon the American people would be borne more cheerfully and bonds and stamps would be sold more successfully, and in far larger amounts and to greater extent if the people only knew their money would not be wasted. How can they?

Many, many millions, even billions, could be eliminated from Federal expenditures without affecting our war effort and without crippling the essential operation of the Federal Government, if the administration would give up its self-perpetuation policy.

In this emergency the pleas of special groups, fostered by the New Deal, for non-essential expenditures, which in the aggregate are staggering, must be and will have to be denied. The spending of lavish funds for such unnecessary purposes should be no longer judged on the basis of their merits as social experiments. It is time for us to know that we must take account of the serious predicament of this country. We are losing, not winning the war. We must cut every non-essential, non-defense expenditure, out, or to the bone.

Let me say the administration is not cooperating to that end, despite all its propaganda to that effect, for which we are paying. It is an incontrovertible fact that this administration is alone responsible for the fact that its fiscal policies have brought us to the present war with an almost incomprehensible, staggering public debt which even posterity may view with alarm, if it can ever be paid.

Read your history. Do you think for a minute that the American people will tolerate any such program as this which the wishful thinking of those most interested to keep themselves in power would like to put over? I do not. I know better.

So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to be chained, gagged, bound, restricted, or interfered with as to my right to make critical, constructive suggestions which I think may help to win this war, and put a stop to a program which this administration seems to persist in determining to continue, war or no war, in order to perpetuate itself in power at the expense of the people, piling bureaus on bureaus, like a second-hand furniture store, at a time when it should be concerned only with cleaning house in order to win the war.

I do not propose to let them get away with their camouflage, which does not hide from me the real intent and purpose they undertake artificially to conceal.

I will gladly, as in the past, support the Commander in Chief so long as he acts in that capacity, but if and whenever he tries to play party politics while, through Facts and Figures and other agencies, he sings another song, set to the key of not giving up a thing, refusing to acknowledge any mistakes, persisting in attempting to justify the New Deal philosophy, which delayed our preparedness and is responsible for much of our trouble—internal and economic—then I shall say what I think about it.

Every American is bound to discharge his duty as a citizen, and this is his and her country. It will belong to him and to her, and to the people, so long, and only so long, as they are not deprived of the opportunity—fully, freely, and without fear or favor—to express themselves at the polls. That is axiomatic.

Election at and during wartime? Of course, there should be and there will be one. Let the majority rule. Let the people speak. We are fighting primarily for that opportunity, or else what?

David Lawrence, Archibald MacLeish, or anybody else to the contrary, who undertakes to cooperate to favor the theory that the American people should be suppressed in or deprived of the exercise of their blood-bought prerogative to express themselves in peace or war, through the ballot, is off on the wrong foot, if Lincoln was right—and he was right—when he said:

> The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution but to overthrow men who would pervert the Constitution.

So was Chief Justice Holmes, who said:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

President Wilson went even further. Said he:

> We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy.

The suggestion of Mr. MacLeish, of Facts and Figures, that "the free election of a free people could be used by enemies of the people's freedom" will not stand the gaff of cold-blooded analysis by anyone who relies on actual facts and figures. The statement is a figment of imagination, and, to be brutally frank, is nonsensical and dangerous. What do we care what anybody else thinks? It is our freedom we are trying to conserve and in our own way.

This is our war to win. It is time to fight an aggressive war—not to be waiting to find out what somebody may think concerning how we go about doing it. Our publicity should be pugnacious.

Now is the time for a tremendous political and propaganda offensive on our part, as Dorothy Thompson has said. It should be defiant and aggressive. Let the people speak at the polls. Then

Messrs. Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito will have no question as to what America is determined to do to them at whatever the cost and no matter how long it takes.

All question as to our lack of unity to win the war will vanish with the smoke of our internal exercise of our right here in America to say what we think. That right we propose to continue to enjoy and to exercise to the discomfiture of everybody who has been or still is in any way impeding our effort to win the war.

There will be no right of appeal from the verdict the people will render; nor will recommendations for mercy have an effect.

This is a fight to the finish.

As Mr. DITTER, of Pennsylvania, said, in substance, the other day, such a statement regarding adjournment of elections sounds like a command; as if, so to speak, somebody were trying to crack the whip; as though it were an unyielding order, uncompromising, "forbidding the people the right to express their will either by voice or vote."

This country was not framed on that theory and to knuckle to any such proposition is to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage. I am opposed to the proposition, lock, stock, and barrel, and for so many reasons I cannot take your time to enumerate them. They must occur to you.

It is obvious that if we cannot choose those who represent us; if we are to acquiesce in a program because to oppose it would be an expression of our dissatisfaction with it; if the people are not privileged to say what they think, then this is the beginning of the end of the America our forefathers fought to establish, and the dream of Milton, who said:

> Methinks I see in my mind a noble puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks. Methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam; purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means.

is a nightmare, for the people will have been deprived of their essential, fundamental rights that make them great.

I will be no party to connive at dealing such a death-blow to democratic, representative government. If that be treason, make the most of it.

It has been said that politics is the science of government, and the people are the scientists. They are realists. This is true despite the hallucinations of a lot of people who think otherwise. This proposition to postpone proper criticism of what the elected officials of the people have perpetrated is going to be a dud and a boomerang. It is doomed when the people wake to realize what some are trying to do to them. The people pay the bills, fight the war, and will save the country. They have a right to demand an accounting of their servants, to know the reasons why—or why not.

I regret to reiterate that the rank and file of New Deal bureaucrats seemingly have but one purpose in mind, one motive which is compelling as against each and every situation which confronts them. That what I am to say may not be taken as a generalization; I will say there are some exceptions. That is not a partisan statement. I could call to substantiate my statement many Members of Congress across the aisle from me, who would say more than I shall.

Regrettable though it is, the fact is, the impelling motive which determines the decisions of a majority of New Deal bureaucrats is found in a solution of the preliminary question predicated on whether or not their decision in the premises will help the New Deal program, and also at the same time retain for them their jobs.

"Win or lose the war, I must not lose my job," is the thought too often uppermost in the minds of too many.

Any effort or suggestion to adjourn free elections or to prevent free expression by a free people of their informed and intelligent judgment on public questions is an attempt to intimidate, to suppress the people in the exercise of their right to protect and to save the very freedom such an order, if obeyed, would destroy.

No, gentlemen, the American people are too smart to be caught in that trap of pure political propaganda, so skillfully baited. The people still think for themselves, thank God, and they propose to win the war, and to make the war worth winning, by preserving their own freedom by ballots and bullets. They will stand for no suppression or denial of that right.

So let us have a going-over at election time. Let us put the blame and responsibility and give credit where it belongs.

Let us have an election by all means, and the campaign to precede it. Let us not try to win a war by depriving the people of an opportunity to speak their minds in Congress and elsewhere. It will not work.

History talks louder than most people think; it repeats itself. The inspiration for the proposition not to talk about the New Deal's mistakes, mismanagement, wasteful extravagance, and grave responsibility comes from high New Deal sources. So much the worse. So much the more reason for not being fooled into acquiescence to such a program.

Let the people speak and we will win the war. To bind, gag, and deprive them of their constitutional right will destroy rather than create unity, and lose the war. It is an attempt, unwarranted and inexcusable, to establish, under a camouflage, a dictatorship de luxe for the duration.

I will have none of it.

To suggest an adjournment of politics is to advocate an abrogation of our citizenship.

I shall fight such a program to the last ditch, and in so doing will have with me a preponderant majority of the American people in my attempt to save what little is left guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring before the House again a subject which has been uppermost in the minds of not only the Members of this body but of the American people generally, and in increasing measure in recent weeks.

All of us are uncomfortably aware of the Treasury's recent announcement that the sales of defense stamps and bonds are lagging. This despite the fact that the tempo of American production is sharply rising and the consequent fact that national income is also increasing at a marked rate. With the sharp increase in national income also we know that the total of available or purchasable consumer and durable goods is sharply dropping, as our war-production program bites more and more deeply into all types of production for civilian use. In other words, the inflation gap about which Leon Henderson and the economist advisers warn us is widening at an alarming rate. Billions of dollars of surplus purchasing power are stacking up. More will be stacking up every day. What, then, has happened to cause this sag in the purchase of stamps and bonds?

There is a glib explanation offered to the effect that the first wave of patriotic fervor following Pearl Harbor is ebbing. There is the other glib theory that Americans are discouraged under the successions of serious set-backs which we have suffered in the field. Neither explanation holds water. American patriotism and determination to win this war is not the "flash-in-the-pan" variety. Do not tell me that the average American wanted to win this war only for the first or second month after Pearl Harbor. Do not tell me, either, that there is a real American anywhere who is not more grimly determined today than ever, despite the reverses and disappointments suffered to date, that we can, we must, and we will win this war.

Stamp and bond sales have not bogged down because 130,000,000 Americans have lost interest in this war, or lost the will to win it. The sales curve is dipping solely and only because the American people are disheartened and disgusted with the way our domestic war effort is being mismanaged and misdirected. The American people are disappointed and angry, not because we have lost a few of the opening battles under the shock and surprise of aggression, but because national management refused to display the same spirit of grim determination and sacrifice that the people themselves feel. My mail, day after day, proves where the trouble lies. Time after time letters from my constituents say, "No more bonds so long as the Government dilly-dallies on this important question"; "Why should we buy bonds and make sacrifices if the Government refuses to stop boondoggling, political manipulation, social gains as usual?"; or, "Why should the people scrimp and save and sacrifice so long as the Government insists upon throwing money away faster than the people can possibly save it?"

There is not a Member among the 435 in this House who has not had the same complaints dropped on his desk

dozens of times during the past few weeks.

There is the answer to the Treasury's shameful story that the American people's enthusiasm for War Bonds and stamps is waning. There is the proof that the American people are protesting the lackadaisical attitude of Government in this emergency. There is the proof that it is not the people, but Government itself which is complacent in the face of the gravest peril which ever beset us as a Nation. And I warn you here, ladies and gentlemen, that no matter how brilliant may be our military strategy, no matter how effective our direction of foreign policy, we face the grave risk of losing this war right here at home, unless we wake up, clean house, and provide an effective, economical administration, stripped of every nonessential, and geared to fight this war to the quickest, safest, and most economical victory possible.

How have we been fighting this war to date? Why, with labor relations in the worst possible sort of fog because Congress has yielded time and again to pressure from the President, in his desire to keep labor securely in his own vest pocket. The result is continuing unrest and confusion which not only contributes to disunity, but which injures organized labor above every other group in America.

How else have we been fighting this war? Why, without a semblance of a national system of controls to prevent inflation. Just now, a year and a half after the first factors of inflation begin to drive us out of gear nationally, the President finally is about to approach the problem anew, after several months in which the administration generally has stubbornly refused to consider any overall, effective system of controls. As a part of this failure, for which this body must accept a major share of the blame, we are still bickering and stalling the dreaded job of writing an adequate war tax bill, which the people themselves have long since asked for, and which we know very well must be a part of any effective protection against inflation.

But even these things are probably not the most discouraging aspects of Government's failure in this emergency. Probably even worse has been Government's eternal and everlasting carelessness, extravagance, even possible outright corruption in the tremendous expenditures which are bleeding the country now and stacking up unthinkable burdens of debt for generations to come.

There is simply something about the attitude of bigger and better and faster expenditures with apparently no thought for values or consequences which must kill the soul and spirit of the average American who knows that he must carry the load.

Examples are legion. Any Member of the House could recite instances by the hour without ever repeating himself to show how Government is at work night and day deadening the American spirit. Specific examples have become so numerous, in fact, that single items standing by themselves simply lose all meaning. A couple of items, however, occur to me as worth mentioning here. These, of course, are no better or worse than a thousand others which could be used as illustrations.

Take the current rivers and harbors bill as a classic example of Federal pork-barrel extravagance at its very worst. The evils of the pork-barrel and log-rolling have been with us from the beginning of Federal Government, despite continuous criticism. Deplorable as these practices are in the very best of peacetime prosperity, when the Nation can best afford this type of wastefulness, they are simply indefensible and outrageously offensive in times of stress. Yet here, right in the midst of America's gravest crisis, we have actually reported to this body what is perhaps the most outrageous pork-barrel bill in all American history.

Key project in this omnibus measure is the St. Lawrence waterway, long favored by the administration, but frequently rejected by competent engineers, and long since turned down by the United States Senate when presented to that body as part of an international treaty. Those rejections, remember, were for sound, practical reasons back in peacetimes, when America could afford, if it saw fit, to boondoggle away its rich surplusses of money, materials, and energy. Now, with every last dollar of our wealth, and every last measure of our material resources and manpower desperately needed for the sole and immediate purpose of fighting this war, that project, together with some 235 other public-works items, has actually and seriously been reported to this House for consideration.

A project which never would win public approval on its merits in peacetime is now being offered in the name of national and international defense. And the purpose of loading this project into the omnibus rivers and harbors bill is purely and simply to win votes from reluctant Members who may be weak enough to vote for it on the pork-barrel principle of gaining approval for other items in the general bill in which they are directly interested. Thank goodness, the membership of this House and of the Senate will not prove as weak as the administration supporters of the bill have hoped.

This is no attempt to establish the case against the St. Lawrence waterway. That case has been established and strengthened again and again, despite the fact that the administration has devoted tremendous energy to the task of selling this project to the American people.

The case is so well known, in fact, that very few people, either in the United States or Canada, want to undertake the project, at least for the duration. But, granting that the proponents of the plan were right in their estimates of its value, the more nearly they were right, the more serious would be the damage to American railways and highway transportation systems, and consequently to the millions of men and women who earn their livelihood in the service of our existing transportation systems. The more nearly these proponents are right about the St. Lawrence power potential coming into use at an early date, the more certain would be the direct damage and loss to the American coal mining industry and the millions of coal miners who would be adversely affected.

As a matter of simple fact, the proponents are fantastically wrong about the St. Lawrence waterway and its potentialities. The money, the materials, and the manpower simply are not available to undertake the project now, unless we are to be foolish enough to sacrifice the constructive accomplishments we can immediately depend upon for the vague, footless, idealistic estimate of assets which might possibly accrue from the St. Lawrence some time between 1946 and 1950.

If a bird in hand is worth two in the bush; if a plane, a weapon, or a ship today may be worth a dozen next week or next month, then we will consider the St. Lawrence waterway and the odd assortment of projects represented in the Rivers and Harbors bill only when we find ourselves again with surpluses of wealth, materials, and manpower.

The point is, however, that we actually do have this Rivers and Harbors bill ahead of us on the calendar. The crying shame is also that there may be several separate items buried in that bill which, standing on their own feet, are justified as immediately essential to our war effort. Do you think for a minute that that thought has not occurred to your constituent, the average American? Do you think that your constituent is going to be particularly happy about the fact that you are whittling away to get a fancy dam across "Mud Creek" back home if he sees that you are figuring on getting that dam by deft log rolling which might seem amusing in normal times, but which shows up as a definite brake on the national effort in wartime?

This, therefore, is a definite appeal to the committee on Rivers and Harbors. For goodness sake, tear this current bill down. Get ruthlessly practical and strip out the deadwood and underbrush in this current measure. Then bring back the few projects which are honestly and immediately necessary to the war effort and let us authorize them promptly.

What I suggest here is not directed as a criticism of this particular committee. I mention the Rivers and Harbors bill only because it is a typical product of the complacency and irresponsibility which has frequently marked the action of this Congress, to the bitter disappointment of the American people.

How can this Congress honestly object to the criticism which is being heaped upon it when deference to the Executive in all things has become such an apparent habit that news stories commonly speak of delays on legislation as caused by this or that committee waiting upon instructions from the President? As an example, last Saturday's papers reported that the Appropriations Committee is holding up action on appropriations for the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, pending the President's decision with respect to these agencies.

Has Congress so completely abdicated its duties of policy making that it will not take the initiative in abolishing nondefense and nonessential agencies without

instructions from the President? If so, then the odius term "rubber stamp" is richly deserved by those in Congress who are responsible.

Never in a thousand years has the legislative function been so dangerously threatened.

Totalitarianism has destroyed it completely in country after country. Even in the few United Nations still clinging to the democratic principles legislative bodies are functioning only in a limited way. In the United States alone the legislative principle is free to operate. Will we further jeopardize it here, or will we protect and strengthen it by accepting our responsibilities fully as the Constitution directs and as the American people desire?

Remiss as we have been here, however, the more serious public complaints lie against the executive departments and agencies, where waste, extravagance, bungling, and glaring carelessness are costing the American people hundreds of millions, yes, even billions, of dollars.

So widespread and so tremendous are these utterly inexcusable losses that single examples, offered by themselves, cannot begin to tell the story. I would, however, like to show you just a few exhibits from the records of my committee's investigation now in progress at the Louisiana ordnance plant. I have just a handful of pictures here, which I hope all of you will examine carefully.

Here, for instance, are two taken of little sentry houses, just 10 feet 2 inches by 10 feet 7 inches, with an extended, or canopy type, roof over a small gateway. The first of these is costing $3,363; the second, $3,409. Note this picture of a little pumphouse. Note the size and the very simple type of construction. This is one of five such shanties estimated to cost $5,670 each.

Now look at this four-car garage building, just the simple sort of a frame building without interior finish that is typical of home garages. Estimated cost on this is $9,425. In line with this, notice this picture of a two-car grease rack. Here is an ordinary shed, just 31 by 40 feet, with wooden ramps, that cost $17,099. And so it goes on up the line, through this little office building at $21,793, this small laboratory at $36,128, this employment office at $64,403, and this police and fire station at $74,082.

The buildings pictured here, all of them, are the simplest sort of cheap frame construction with very ordinary inside finish, or even without any interior finish. This is the type of construction which you or I would expect to buy privately at certainly no more than one-third such costs, and probably as little as one-tenth in some cases. In fact, the Government and the contractors doing this type of work speak of it as 5-year construction.

Why in the world, then, is the contractor in this case permitted to install copper eave troughs and downspouts in such construction? Upon the records of an investigation which is still incomplete, 5,500 pounds of copper have thus been used—5,500 pounds of a metal that has practically become precious, so desperately is it needed in our war effort. The same reckless waste has been made of steel, the committee's investigators reporting times without number the lavish use of reinforcing steel in concrete construction where there is utterly no excuse or justification for it.

Even with all this reckless waste, however, the fantastic prices on this construction work simply stagger the imagination. Perhaps the best way to illustrate the extent of the extravagance is to quote directly from the comparison made by a committee witness. The following is taken directly from the record:

To show you graphically what you can build for a high cubic-foot cost, this particular building which you have all looked at—employment building, exhibit 5—cost 87½ cents a cubic foot completed.

Now, when the distributable items are added on to that, that cubic-foot cost will doubtless go up to nearly $1, because there are going to be many thousands of dollars added to it.

Now, then, you are more familiar with the United States Supreme Court Building, which is a monumental affair, and is one of the most elaborate and well-built in the United States.

It contains the finest of marble, and it contains a great amount of fine painting and sculpturing and friezes, and the cubic cost of that United States Supreme Court Building, after taking out the architectural and engineering service fees, was $1.10 per cubic foot, and that amount included a profit to the contractor. One dollar and ten cents per cubic foot to build the United States Supreme Court Building, when it costs nearly $1 a cubic foot to build a temporary wooden frame building.

In addition to that comparison, we made one with the New House Office Building; and the New House Office Building cost, including air conditioning, 75 cents; without air conditioning, it was 73½ cents per cubic foot. As you can see, it is far less per cubic foot than that temporary building there.

Certainly, no further comment is necessary.

Even that is not all the story. Our investigation develops the fact that by the contractor's present system of audits, there are other funds allotted for construction which may even legitimately add another 46 percent to the cost of any or all of these buildings.

Enough for buildings. Now look at these exhibits of road construction. [Indicating.] Here is the road type known as 1–A. This type of roadway, of which this illustration is typical, is costing $98,170 per mile. The road is 30-foot paving, without proper grading and subgrading, and with what inspectors have termed a hopeless lack of drainage.

Here are two pictures of type 1–B roads. Look at the rutted muck and the standing water on this 44-foot-wide piece of roadway, which has cost $81,827 in its present state and which will cost $94,488 per mile when completed. Look at this close-up view of a 1–B roadway, 20 feet wide, which cost $42,949 per mile. Here again note the rutted muck, the standing water. The committee's investigator reports that he actually had to have high rubber boots to get around these roads, and said of this particular road:

Entire road a positive quagmire.

You will be interested in these two pictures of the central pay office, a structure you would describe as a tar-paper shanty. This shanty, together with the so-called parking lot pictured, cost $14,683. Again note the mud and water. The building cost $2,235; the lot cost $12,448. In this connection, let me quote a witness appearing before the committee:

And where the expenditure of $12,448 for that parking lot is, I am unable to answer.

Can such unthinkable expenditures result merely from gross carelessness or mismanagement, or is it impossible for even the most extravagant government to waste money at such a terrific rate unless there is also fraud and collusion involved? I am not ready to make such a charge in this case, but there are some very peculiar circumstances surrounding the construction of this Louisiana ordnance plant. As an example, since our committee's investigation started, there has been a hurried revision of auditing practices resulting in a reduction of some of the most outrageous charges.

Worse, three Government inspectors assigned to the job began to turn up some very embarrassing evidence about construction practices used there, particularly the construction of roadways. In fact, one of these Government-employed inspectors reported to the Army engineers in writing that officials of the contracting company were engaged in a conspiracy to keep pertinent information relating to the work from the Army engineers. After a period of a few weeks, and with their investigations and report far from complete, they were removed from the project. The pretext was that their removal resulted from an existing agreement between the contractor and responsible officials that former employees of the contractor would not serve as official inspectors or investigators on the project.

The investigation those men began, however, remains unfinished, and no move has been made to put new men on the job to see that the work they started is completed.

What has happened and is happening at the Louisiana ordnance project is probably no better or no worse than the conditions on many another fixed-fee contract would prove upon close scrutiny. We probably will not know the real story until the war is over, so tremendous is the program, and so inadequate is our administrative machinery and executive personnel for the job. It can certainly be said, however, that tremendous wastes have resulted, and are resulting, from fixed-fee contracts. The fixed fee is a little better, perhaps, than the cost plus fixed percentage of profit, under which the contractor is given an incentive to waste money; but the records will show that the lump-sum construction contract sharply cuts the costs to the taxpayers.

Certainly there are times when it is impracticable or impossible to follow the competitive-bid routine in this emergency. It is proper that the procurement services should have discretionary authority to negotiate contracts under such circumstances, but certainly the executive officers should feel bound to be doubly careful in protecting the taxpayers' interests in such contracts. Unfortunately, I am afraid, however, that

the contracting officials too frequently become careless and indifferent about their tremendous responsibilities.

Freedom with the taxpayers' money has always been more or less of a habit of Federal Government, but carelessness and extravagance have developed to shocking proportions in this administration. Under the pressure of emergency and the necessity of spending unimaginable sums for the war it is unfortunately true that carelessness and extravagance grow steadily worse.

Here are the main factors that are bogging down bond sales and burdening the American spirit and will to win. I repeat that the American people have an unshakable determination to win this war, and that they are not only willing but anxious to go all out individually and collectively to win.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House during the past summer, several witnesses appeared in support of the St. Lawrence legislation and unhesitatingly assured the committee that the diversion of men and materials from our defense efforts to the construction of the project would have no appreciable effect on our preparations for the defense of the country.

These arguments, like so many others that were then advanced, from the peacetime perspective, even though then of doubtful validity, have been absolutely nullified by this country's direct participation in the World War. Notwithstanding that fact, occasionally Members of Congress insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from such testimony and from other studies based upon considerations of pure peacetime domestic economy, apparently on the theory that such statements tend to support the assertions of their sponsors that the project should be approved by Congress. Present conditions require the total elimination of such considerations and a reappraisal of the project from the sole point of view of its probable effect on our war efforts.

I want to call attention, particularly, to the labor phase of the situation in the light of a press release issued by Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt under date of April 20. This statement calls attention to the fact that the War Manpower Commission has been created for making certain that the manpower we need for war production will be available when and where it is needed.

The press release pointed out that:

> The Commission has been charged by the President with the formulation of plans and programs and the establishment of basic national policies to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war, and the issuance of such policy and operating directives as may be necessary.

That the Congress is directly interested in this subject matter is indicated by the fact that among other functions it will be the duty of the Commission to formulate legislative programs designed to facilitate the most effective mobilization and utilization of the manpower of the country.

Mr. McNutt stated, among other things, that 18 industrial workers are required to equip a single fighting man; that we will need 13,000,000 additional war-production workers during the next year, 10,500,000 of whom must be skilled and semiskilled workers.

The statement reveals that there is already a serious deficiency in the number of skilled workers available for industry. These shortages are currently critical in many occupations. For example, the ratio of demand and supply for ship carpenters is 7 to 1; for aircraft riveters, 4 to 1; for marine machinists, 22 to 1. Plans of the War Manpower Commission call for the expansion of our industrial training as fully as possible.

Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, in charge of the survey and preparations for the building of the St. Lawrence project, in his testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee stated that an average of 10,000 men would be needed on the job. Of these, 8,000 were described as being skilled or semiskilled.

Insofar as any occupational detail was given to the committee, General Robins said, for example, approximately 700 carpenters would be needed, 300 concrete finishers, 130 electricians, 150 hoisting engineers, and 70 machinists. That men in appreciable numbers for many other highly skilled trades would be required to build the St. Lawrence project may be readily assumed from a review of the class of workers employed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, as shown by its annual report for 1941.

This report includes, among others, the following craftsmen employed in substantial numbers. Blacksmiths and helpers, bulldozer operators, crane and derrick operators, gas mechanics and helpers, power-shovel operators, sheet-metal workers and helpers, steamfitters and helpers, tractor operators, and many others of like character.

Can we afford to divert machinists to a project which by the reckoning of its most optimistic supporters could not contribute in the slightest respect to our war efforts before 1946 if it were commenced at once? What may be said with respect to carpenters and machinists may be said with equal force regarding many other classes of skilled workers which it would be necessary to divert from our most important war efforts to a project of questionable value from any and every point of view.

Nor is this the only phase of the labor question which challenges our attention. The farm-labor report issued by the Department of Agriculture under date of March 16 discloses a serious and rapidly increasing shortage of farm labor. One that threatens the food supply of our civilian population and the curtailment of our contribution to the needs of our Allies. This situation is being brought about not only by the induction of farm labor into our armed forces but by an abandonment of farm work by men who have been and are being attracted into the much more lucrative field of war production.

The latter condition is more acute in the highly industrialized Northeastern section of the United States. The farm labor supply of January 1, 1942, was for the greater part of the State of New York, 40 to 49 percent below normal and for certain parts of New York, 50 percent or more below normal.

From January 1, 1940, to January 1, 1942, the farm labor supply in substantially all of the State of New York declined from 40 to 49 percent.

The farm labor report stated, in part:

> Reductions in the labor supply available to farmers in 1942 will not be uniform in various sections of the country. The reductions will be greatest in the highly industrial sections, such as New England, Middle Atlantic States, and East North Central States where the reductions have been cumulative despite priorities unemployment. In other areas where new war industries have been or will be established, sharp reductions in the labor supply available for farm work may be expected to occur.

Administrator McNutt deprecates severely the practice of "pirating" of employees from one essential war industry to another to make up for individual existing shortages of skilled labor.

The proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project would have us set up another enormous "pirate" to not only wean labor away from vital war-production plants, but inevitably to induce workers to leave their all-important agriculture and dairying pursuits now extensively carried on in northern New York and elsewhere in that region.

One must inevitably reach the conclusion that the great bulk of semiskilled and ordinary labors on the St. Lawrence project would be recruited from the already rapidly diminishing supply of farm labor.

In this connection, the fact should not be overlooked that for every worker on the St. Lawrence project, there would have to be an average of two and one-half to three workers in the plants and factories turning out the material that would be needed to build and equip the project.

There are many sound and persuasive reasons why the St. Lawrence project should not be instituted to compete with our war efforts. The present and alarmingly perspective shortage of labor is by no means the least important of the many facts demonstrating the absurdity of approving its construction.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. He has rendered a remarkable service, not only to the Members of the House, but

to the American people in giving us the data and the figures which he furnished in connection with expenditures in our war effort.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that in the expenditure of the funds that we have turned over to the Army, the Navy, and the other branches of the Government that it is their responsibility now, since the Congress appropriated the money lavishly to them, to see that this money is spent wisely and judiciously?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no doubt but what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. The people will demand this.

Mr. Speaker, for several months I have been working diligently in an effort to get our Government and our larger distilleries to use more of the hundreds of millions of bushels of the surplus grains which we have in this country in the manufacture of industrial alcohol, rather than our sugar.

More than 2 months ago I talked to Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, and to my amazement I learned that less than 10 percent of our industrial alcohol, sorely needed in our national defense program, was being made from surplus grains. Sugar, of which there is now a claimed shortage, was being used to manufacture the rest, in spite of the fact that we are an importer of sugar and an exporter of grains, of which we have a surplus running into the hundreds of millions of bushels.

Accordingly, on February 9, 1942, I introduced in the House a resolution asking for a complete investigation and survey of the possibility of substituting surplus grains for sugar in making ethyl alcohol for industrial purposes and also to inquire into the status of sugar stocks. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and I regret to say that to date I have been unable to dynamite it out of this committee.

However, with the publicity this action received, I am happy to say that the powers that be in Washington woke up to the fact of the necessity of using some of these surplus grains for making alcohol. But while the use of grains for alcohol has increased somewhat in recent months, it is entirely insufficient, and every effort to divert our surpluses into this channel must be made immediately.

It has been estimated that total alcohol requirements for the year will reach 275,000,000 gallons. The use of 50,000,000 bushels of our surplus wheat for this amount of industrial alcohol would permit the release of about 300,000 tons of sugar for domestic consumption. About 2½ gallons of alcohol can be obtained from a bushel of wheat.

With 987,190,000 bushels of wheat on hand January 1, 1942, with this year's crop coming on, and with surpluses of corn and other grains correspondingly as large, think of the tremendous amount of alcohol vital to our defense program which could be manufactured.

Americans normally use about 6,600,000 tons of sugar a year, this amounting to about 103 pounds per person. These figures increased slightly in 1941, principally because of hoarding.

Last year American cane and beet growers produced 2,250,000 tons of sugar, and it is estimated production in 1942 will be 2,900,000 tons. Cuba will produce about 4,500,000 tons, of which nearly all will be purchased by the United States. Other sources, including Hawaii and Puerto Rico, will furnish about 1,350,000 tons.

That means that, roughly, 8,750,000 tons will be available, but there is the transportation factor to consider, among others.

But it all cannot be shipped; we must consider our Allies, and our domestic needs, even on a rationed basis, must be met.

Considering all these factors, it has been estimated that we must get along on about 4,000,000 tons, so it can be seen that the supply is under the normal demand unless some drastic steps are taken.

Therefore, it is absolutely essential that the use of these mammoth surpluses of grains for manufacturing industrial alcohol be stepped up immediately.

I want to point out that ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have been working for increased quotas for our domestic sugar-beet growers. I have consistently urged that the growers of beets in the United States be permitted to produce a larger proportion of the sugar consumed in this country. However, I was vetoed on every move, and the present so-called shortage is a direct result of this short-sighted policy.

Let me point this out: There is plenty of sugar available in the world today, it is admitted by the best of authority. The principal trouble is transportation. Cuba has thousands of tons of sugar cramming her warehouses to the very ceilings, according to sugar authorities, but ships cannot be secured to carry it to the United States.

It is simply a question of either devoting more ships to transporting sugar to this country or devoting those ships to the job of taking our troops and food and tanks and planes to the four corners of the world where we are fighting this war.

I am sure that every American citizen, if they never got another ounce of sugar, is more than willing to see our ships devoted to transporting our men and equipment to the fields of battle and not diverted to transporting sugar.

Therefore, in view of these facts and the short-sighted policy of limiting our own producers and favoring those of foreign nations and our off-shore possessions, our current supplies and our available supplies must be carefully preserved.

The use of the hundreds of millions of bushels of surplus grains in this country in the making of industrial alcohol for smokeless powder and for other vital defense purposes will take care of much of this so-called shortage.

If such an investigation as I have asked for were permitted, a lot of master minds in our Government might have some tall explaining to do. Over the protest of the domestic beet-sugar producers and Congressmen from the sugar-beet producing States, including myself, these Government officials and others forced a reduction of sugar-beet acreage of from 17 to 20 percent last year. Cane, which would have yielded 300,000 tons of sugar, was left to rot in Puerto Rican fields because processing was prohibited, according to the New York Sun of January 20, 1942. I, on the other hand, vigorously urged that American quotas be lifted to permit larger output. But we were opposed by Government leaders, who insisted that the United States had ample sugar supplies for all needs and who kept on insisting this right up until the time the plans to ration sugar were announced.

Mr. Speaker, I see in front of me one of the most distinguished Members of the House, and I cannot help but remark at this moment that this gentleman worked with this unofficial committee day after day to secure an increase of price and production of sugar beets in this country. I refer to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. I may say that I am personally familiar with the excellent work of the gentleman from Montana who consistently urged, year after year, week after week, and day after day, the removal of any limitation upon the beet-sugar production of this country. I should add that last year and in several preceding years the entire Colorado delegation, composed of our four Congressmen and two Senators, conferred with the officials of the Department of Agriculture and with the sugar section thereof and earnestly entreated that this limitation be not imposed or that it be reduced. May I say further that we pointed out exactly what would occur in the way of shortages in sugar and rationing thereof as was manifest from the lessons of history. But we were assured we were mistaken. We suggested that there would be a shortage of ships to carry sugar from the Philippines and even from Cuba and other countries nearer the continental United States, but our predictions were not taken seriously. However, everything that we predicted and everything that the gentleman from Montana predicted has come true. I do not question the sincerity of the Government officials at all.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the gentleman does question their judgment?

Mr. LEWIS. I do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right and I congratulate him.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We do not raise any sugar in Pennsylvania, but I do remember the time when the gentleman from Colorado and some of his colleagues were interested in trying to get the quota lifted in Colorado. This is also true of gentlemen from Michigan. I tried my best to get the Department of Agriculture to permit the American farmers and the American laborers to raise the sugar that we consumed in our own country, but we achieved no result. I think the gentleman from Montana is hitting the nail on the head when he says that we ought to use the surplus agricultural commodities that we have to manufacture the

alcohol that is necessary in our war effort rather than use the sugar that we have. I was under the impression that the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee several weeks ago did that very thing. May I ask whether the gentleman has any information that would lead him to believe that we are getting more alcohol out of grain than we are out of sugar?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. I would like to have the gentleman from Montana answer that question if he can. Are they now using more grain for the manufacture of alcohol than they did 3 or 4 weeks ago?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I recall very distinctly the gentleman's able efforts in trying to accomplish the very thing that the gentleman from Colorado referred to and that which is the subject of my speech. We of the West have always felt that we have a good and sincere friend in the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I will now attempt to answer the gentleman's question. It is a difficult question to answer, but the best I can find out is that the use of grain for industrial alcohol is not being increased substantially.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine work he has done in regard to the sugar situation. I have attended a good many of those meetings myself. Of course, in my State we have a very large acreage of land suitable for growing sugar beets, and we are growing a large percentage of them. We have endeavored in the past to have the quota lifted so we could participate to a larger extent.

May I ask the gentleman this question. I had an inquiry today from a constituent asking why it is that we are paying some $47,000,000 to sugar producers not to raise additional sugar at this time, when we do not have enough sugar to go around. What is the gentleman's answer to that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will try and answer the gentleman's question. The $47,000,000 is provided for as a processing tax and is paid into the Treasury. Thereafter it is paid to the beet growers. This is a good feature of the Sugar Act. However, our restrictions of production of sugar beets does not make sense in view of the fact that we raise less than one-third of the amount of sugar consumed in this country. The Democratic platform and the Republican platform both promised the American people to give as much as possible of the American market to the American producer, but neither party has kept faith with the people.

I have, time after time, pointed out that our American sugar-beet growers were being discriminated against, in favor of growers in Cuba and in other countries. Ever since I came to Congress I have been on an unofficial committee composed of western Congressmen and Senators, including Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, Senator Wheeler, of Montana, Senator Schwartz, of Wyoming, Senator Adams, who is now deceased, Senator Johnson, of Colorado, Senator Clark of Idaho, and others, and our purpose has been to attempt to bring about an increased acreage for our beet growers. However, it took a world-wide war to get the quota restrictions lifted so that our American producers could grow all the beets they desire. And this still will not be sufficient to supply the American market.

Nearly 2 years ago, on June 20, 1940, I pointed out on the floor of the House that if we were to assume the position of the world's bread basket then we were just as likely to become the world's sugar bowl, as sugar is an essential food and may be stored indefinitely without loss.

Even now, with the lifting of all restrictions on sugar production this year, producers will be unable to increase their acreage substantially. There is a matter of refining facilities. Present sugar-beet factories can handle only so many tons of beets each season. Therefore, the producers are limited in their acreage to the amount of beets which can be handled by existing facilities. The sugar-beet growers and processors, before going ahead and planning huge increases in production, also look to the Government and ask for assurances that if this production is increased during this time of war, they be allowed to maintain these increases after peace is declared and they not be cut off at the pockets and be forced to let additional factories and newly developed land stand idle. To date these producers and refineries have not received these assurances.

And even if these factories were to be constructed, they could not be completed in time to handle this year's crop.

A more vigorous fight not only by the people themselves but in the House and in the Senate must be made for increased production of sugar beets, especially in the irrigated areas of the West. Sugar beets are our best cash crop in Montana. We have an abundance of rich, fertile soil on which to produce these beets. We have plentiful supplies of water for irrigation.

Our sugar-beet growers must be permitted to not only sustain their present production both during wartime and after but must be permitted to increase their production in the future so that the demands of the American market can be met by American farmers. If they are permitted to do this, you may rest assured that they will more than meet their share of our tremendous war-tax burden.

PREVENTION OF INFLATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a petition signed by several thousand residents of my district sent to me by the chairman of a Stop Inflation Committee.

The preamble to the petition urges four objectives, as follows:

1. An effective ceiling be fixed on all war profits.
2. An effective ceiling be fixed on prices of all agriculture commodities and manufactured products.
3. An effective ceiling be fixed on wages, with just regard to living costs.
4. An effective ceiling to be fixed on rents in all areas.

Coming as it does on the same day as the President's message to Congress on this subject in which he outlines problems that confront the Nation as well as suggestions as to their cure, this petition is of more than ordinary interest.

The President went into detail in reference to the rises in the cost of living which fall heavily upon the low-income group. He pointed out that the rise in the cost of living in this war has begun to parallel the cost of living in the last war, and says that the time has definitely come to stop the spiral. Further, he insisted that we must face the fact that there must be a drastic reduction in our standard of living. Although he holds the increase in cost of the necessities of life at 15 percent, since the autumn of 1939, he points out that if something is not done there will be a further increase of 80 or 90 percent during the next year or two, and then he says:

When the cost of living spirals upward week after week and month after month, people as a whole are bound to become poorer, because the pay envelope will then lag behind rising retail prices. The price paid for carrying on the war by the Government and, therefore, by the people, will increase by many billions if prices go up. Furthermore, there is an old and true saying that that which goes up must always come down, and you and I know the hardships and heartaches we all went through in the bad years after the last war, when Americans were losing their homes, and their farms, and their savings, and were looking in vain for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the President did not only cover the four objectives as suggested in the petition that I received, but he added three additional ones. His list follows:

1. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must tax heavily, and in that process keep personal and corporate profits at a reasonable rate, the word "reasonable" being defined at a low level.
2. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must fix ceilings on the prices which consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers pay for the things they buy; and ceilings on rents for dwellings in all areas affected by war industries.

The President urges Congress pass a new tax bill as soon as possible. He then calls attention to the fact that legislation is not required under present circumstances to stabilize remuneration for work. He feels that stabilizing the general cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales. Then he says in his message:

3. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work.

4. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

5. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must encourage all citizens to contribute to the cost of winning this war by purchasing War Bonds with their earnings instead of using those earnings to buy articles which are not essential.

6. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must ration all essential commodities of which there is a scarcity, so that they may be distributed fairly among consumers and not merely in accordance with financial ability to pay high prices for them.

7. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must discourage credit and installment buying and encourage the paying off of debts, mortgages, and other obligations, for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying, and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War Bonds.

The President points out that, insofar as the items he enumerates do not require legislation, he will see that the executive departments and agencies whose functions and duty are involved are to work as expeditiously as possible in carrying out his whole broad policy.

Then, speaking as to the result, the President said:

Organized labor has voluntarily given up its right to strike during the war. Therefore all stabilization or adjustment of wages will be settled by the War Labor Board machinery which has been generally accepted by industry and labor for the settlement of all disputes.

All strikes are at a minimum. Existing contracts between employers and employees must, in all fairness, be carried out to the expiration date of those contracts. The existing machinery for labor disputes will, of course, continue to give due consideration to inequalities and elimination of substandards of living. I repeat that all of these processes, now in existence, will work equitably for the overwhelming proportion of all our workers if we can keep the cost of living down and stabilize their remuneration.

Most workers in munition industries are working far more than 40 hours a week, and should continue to be paid at time and a half for overtime. Otherwise, their weekly pay envelopes would be reduced.

The result will mean that each and every one of us will have to give up many things to which we are accustomed. We shall have to live our lives with less in the way of creature comforts than we have in time of peace. Our standard of living will have to come down.

I firmly believe that Americans all will welcome this opportunity to share in the fight of civilized mankind to preserve decency and dignity in modern life. For this is fundamentally a people's war, and it must be followed by a people's peace. The achievement of victory in war and security in peace requires the participation of all the people in the common effort for our common cause.

Mr. Speaker, we find from what the President says that Congress must enact additional legislation. He assures us that the agencies under his control will perform their duty where no legislation is necessary. It is up to us to perform ours, and I express the hope that there will be no delay in the Congress considering the vital questions that the President advances at the earliest date possible.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. Certainly we must stabilize everything. Many of the suggestions that were made were very valuable, but you will now have to bring into the House legislation to cut down the prices that have been set on the farmers' commodities in order to carry out the President's request.

The memorial to which the gentleman referred as coming from 5,000 persons in his district stated that you should stabilize wages. Nothing was suggested in the President's address that would change any of the legislation we have on the books in that regard. Certainly the people of the country have been looking forward to the President's address hoping it would contain some statement of that kind.

Certainly, every strike in any industry, regardless of what it may be, which furnishes ammunition, ships, airplanes, or anything else that is needed by the boys who are sacrificing their lives at the front, must from now on be arbitrated.

We should not have a strike for even a moment and we should not have a slowdown. If labor is going to agree that we have no slow-downs and no strikes and will carry that program out, then there will be some truth in the statement that we do not need any legislation. If that is not the case then it is going to be just as essential that we have legislation to correct conditions of that kind as it is that we have legislation with respect to taxes or legislation for cutting down the prices of farm commodities.

If we are going to win this war, and we are going to win it, we have all got to put our shoulders to the wheel. We have all got to sacrifice and we are all going to do everything that is essential to the end of winning the war. This is the biggest question that faces the Nation today, and the man who is not going to do his duty or is not going to bend every effort to this end—it is just going to be too bad for him.

I hope they control prices and I hope we may have no fabulous incomes, because the situation now means a sacrifice for everybody and everybody has got to come right down to it. If we cut down these fabulous incomes that some people have that will hasten the day when we win this war because it will give more confidence to the fellows at the front, and we have got to back those fellows up and we have to give them all the confidence we possibly can.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe that the gentleman will agree that the law that Congress passed with reference to an attempt to control inflation has simply been impotent insofar as getting results are concerned. In other words, I do not know of a single thing that the American people have to use, such as food, clothing, drugs, rents, and all that sort of thing that has not been raised since we passed that act. Am I not right about that?

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is; yes, but with respect to agricultural commodities which the Government owns, I do not believe the farmer or anybody else has the right to say they cannot be sold now. It is the President's duty to sell them or ask for such legislation, and I believe we have got to pass that kind of legislation. For instance, take the cotton farmer as an illustration. We have oodles of cotton and millions of bales of cotton, and now is the time to sell that cotton. We do not want to hold that cotton for a great, high price and then get the farmers to plant more cotton and after a while have all of it on our hands.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman. If the Government sells the cotton and sells the wheat and the corn on the open market, which the Government controls, for what they will bring, such action will destroy the entire economic structure of this country insofar as the farmer is concerned, and break him.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean now?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, if you put it all on the market.

Mr. RICH. Well, put it on the market judiciously and wisely. The cotton farmer has said that if they get 15 cents a pound for cotton they are satisfied, but none of them come here today and say that 15 cents is a good and fair price.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If you state that as a question, I would not agree with that statement. I do not know much about cotton, but I know selling wheat as suggested would demoralize the price of wheat.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the completion of the legislative program and following any previous special order, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I was rather interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. During the discussion of the agricultural appropriation bill the very suggestion that the gentleman made that we were to take the Government-owned commodities and place them on the market and the Agricultural Commodity Credit Corporation was to be allowed to operate for the purpose of practically controlling the market, that was voted down. That was the President's suggestion at that time and it was voted down. I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania recognizes the foresight of the President at that time and

has at least recognized that this administration has at least advanced one idea that meets the approval of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I want to call attention also to the fact that at this time strikes are at a minimum In fact, there are no strikes, condoned by organized labor, at this time. Labor has voluntarily given up the right to strike since Pearl Harbor. Labor has cooperated in this program and I invite the gentleman's attention to the RECORD of Tuesday of last week. In the automotive industry we have idle machines and idle men and I pointed out the fact that the Chevrolet forging division of General Motors, taking the days of the 6th 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th of April, had 80 steam hammers available for operation and should have been working full time and full strength. During all that period according to a survey there were not over 40 of these steam hammers in operation. Not because of the lack of manpower or skilled labor but for some other reason not disclosed.

I pointed out the fact that there were idle machines, and that the automotive industry claimed they could not be converted to war-production program.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. Not at present, please; I have only a few minutes.

They are lying idle, with tarpaulins over them, while three great purchasing agencies of Russia, Great Britain, and China are crying for those machines. If they cannot put those machines in operation, if they cannot convert them, then give them to lend-lease and send them over there to those countries where they can be put in operation. If that was even proposed, those machines would go into operation. If you put the machines into operation the laboring men of this Nation will operate them for an all-out production. Labor has proven if you give them machines and give them the facilities, that they will produce. They are not only producing by machines, but they are giving their sons on the battlefields. Labor is patriotic and is doing a swell job of cooperation.

Of course, the Standard Oil Co. officials are busy having resolutions passed calling for the passage of the Smith-Vinson antilabor bill, accusing labor of holding up the war effort. In view of the recent revelations concerning the Standard Oil Co., I do not believe that we should take seriously any advice from a company whose actions were anything but cooperative. In fact, the records show that the Standard Oil Co.'s activities were proven to have been one of the major moves that slowed up our war efforts. Their actions bordered on treason.

Reports are to the effect that George Cleere, manager of the Standard Oil Co., held a mass meeting in Montgomery County, Ala., at which he introduced a resolution calling for support of the Vinson-Smith antilabor bill.

I think that it is not out of order to presume that the Standard Oil Co. representatives are still active in trying to slow down our war-production program, because I know of no weapon that would be more effective in slowing down and disrupting our war program than the passage of this Vinson-Smith antilabor bill. I trust that the membership of this House will take cognizance of the fact that it is those who themselves have been found wanting that are crying out against labor. I hope none of the membership will join up with an organization which has collaborated with the Nazis. The record speaks for itself. Labor has and is producing. The Standard Oil Co. has not. Take your choice. A vote for the Vinson-Smith antilabor bill will be following the advice of the Standard Oil Co. representatives, who have been anything but patriotic.

A vote against the Vinson-Smith antilabor bill will be a vote for patriotism as expounded by the American laboring man who has never been found wanting. The laboring men are producing on the home front and their sons are producing on the battle front. That is America at its best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PATENTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. RICH. I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 2 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In view of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] has said, I have here the following dispatch:

SOUTH PLAINFIELD, N. J., April 25.—A Government spokesman warned today that the Army may take over the Cornell-Dubilier Corporation plant here unless the 2,200 workers, on strike since Thursday, return to work today.

Alexander Smalley, of the War Production Board's Labor Division, who came here when Washington learned of the sudden walk-out, said "The War Production Board's objective in this matter is solely to get production moving once more. I have reason to believe that if production is not proceeding normally by Monday the Army will move in."

The plant manufactures vital communications equipment. The workers struck when negotiations for wage increases over the present minimum of 38½ cents an hour broke down.

So that apparently there are strikes going on today and you have them frequently.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 28 of this year the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] introduced a bill which would unquestionably and beyond the shadow of a doubt empower the Government during the period of this war to make as wide use as possible, or as needed, of any patented process which may be useful in war production. On that same day I made a 1-minute speech in which I urged that action be taken on that bill, and taken immediately, and I commended the gentleman from Tennessee on his action. I renew what I said then. It seems to me that if there is anything that is completely irrational it is for our war program to be held up in the slightest degree because of a patented process which somebody controls and prevents other manufacturers and other workers from producing as much of that particular thing as we need for the prosecution of the war, and if the Government does not have that power, or if there is any question whether it has or not, let us leave no doubt in anybody's mind, but have the House of Representatives act upon it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on N. Y. A. and its activities in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter that I have written to a constituent of mine, a prominent lawyer in the State of Idaho.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KUNKEL for tomorrow, Tuesday, on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving, Thomas G. Irving, Sr., J. E. Irving, Mata D. Irving, L. T. Dale, and Amelia Dale;

S. 2202. An act to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322

of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, April 24, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia;

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m. April 28 and May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1597. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary Act of 1941 (Public Law No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law No. 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1598. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title II of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 and the Fire and Casualty Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1599. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6484. A bill to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6995. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6996. A bill to provide for the transfer to certain States of Farm Security Administration facilities and equipment which are used for the purpose of providing shelter, medical care, and sanitary facilities for migrant farm labor families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6997. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 6998. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a building for, and for the operation of, the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6999. A bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7000. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7001. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7002. A bill to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combatting malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 7003. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for inclusion in grazing districts; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7004. A bill to amend the act of March 7, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof; the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and civilian employees of the executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. Res. 473. Resolution to investigate power-trust lobbying and other activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Res. 474. Resolution authorizing appointment of select committee to inquire into the proposed gasoline rationing in the country; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SCHUETZ introduced a bill (H. R. 7005) for the relief of Alex Krause, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2720. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Martin Christen, secretary, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, requesting that the Beer Drivers' and Stablemen's Union No. 227 go on record to endorse House bill 6486; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2721. Also, petition of the division of forestry, Department of Natural Resources, Sacramento, Calif., requesting that the National Director of Selective Service, Hershey; the State director of California, Donovan; and the draft boards to grant deferment to the trained employees of the State division of forestry who are absolutely essential to the effective operations of the division of forestry in protecting the natural resources of

California until such time as they can be replaced; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2722. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council of New York City, opposing the Smith bill, the Hobbs bill, and all other antilabor bills introduced in Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

2723. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Brotherhood of Teamsters and Auto Truck Drivers, Local No. 85, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, San Francisco, Calif., relative of House bill 6486, postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2724. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 members of the World Service Society of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Port Huron, Mich., urging that strikes and profiteering be outlawed during the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, hope of every nation, whose infinite pity alone can soothe the tragic pathos of our world: Help us, Thy children, to rise above all fret and fear into the atmosphere of serenity and calm, as, casting all our care upon Thee, we feel the girding of Thine everlasting arms. Grant to us a clearer vision of the truth, a deeper sense of right, that will enable us, through Thine overwhelming power of goodness, to further the noblest interests of mankind.

Restore to every home in this beloved land the practice of parental tenderness, together with the spirit of filial devotion, that from the altars of life's highest, holiest relationships may rise a sacrificial flame of true devotion to the larger claims of service to our Nation. Help us, then, to face these days, just now so difficult and dark, with a courage born of perfect trust in Thee, with a faith made radiant with the hope of a world redeemed, in which men, as they journey on, shall take the hand of Him in whose companionship they find their full fruition, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 27, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller; and

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Caraway
Andrews	Brooks	Chandler
Austin	Brown	Chavez
Bailey	Bulow	Clark, Idaho
Ball	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Burton	Connally
Barkley	Butler	Danaher
Bilbo	Byrd	Davis
Bone	Capper	Downey
Doxey	McFarland	Shipstead
Ellender	McKellar	Smathers
George	McNary	Smith
Gerry	Maloney	Spencer
Gillette	Maybank	Stewart
Glass	Mead	Taft
Green	Millikin	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Norris	Tobey
Herring	Nye	Tunnell
Hill	O'Daniel	Tydings
Holman	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Hughes	Overton	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Kilgore	Reed	Walsh
La Follette	Reynolds	White
Lee	Rosier	Wiley
Lucas	Russell	Willis
McCarran	Schwartz	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury (2), War, Justice, and Agriculture (7); and the Civil Service Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Negroes at Jackson, Miss., protesting against racial discrimination in employment in connection with war industries in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for retention of the 40-hour workweek provision of law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for continuance of the National Youth Administration program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Leavenworth (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring suspension of the 40-hour workweek provision of law for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Miami County, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF AGGIEVILLE GRANGE NO. 1906, MANHATTAN, KANS.—PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by Aggieville Grange, No. 1906, of Manhattan, Kans., making some legislative suggestions which I consider timely and worthy.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGGIEVILLE GRANGE, No. 1906,
Manhattan, Kans.

Since the liquor traffic has succeeded in establishing itself in and near the cantonments of our country to make drinkers of our draftees; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress to pass a bill forbidding the sale of alcoholic liquors in and near the naval, land, and air forces of the United States of America.

In view of the fact that we are being rationed in sugar and asked to conserve our resources in every possible way that we may make the greatest contributions possible to the winning of the war, which we gladly do: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be asked to restrict the use of all sugar and grain now being used in the manufacture of alcohol for beverage purposes.

A. R. COGSWELL, *Master*,
LOUISE CHANDLER, *Secretary*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 2459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276).

By Mr. WALSH from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2285. A bill to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank of certain officers of the Navy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1277);

S. 2452. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1278);

S. 2453. A bill to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279);

S. 2455. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280);

S. 2456. A bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1281);

H. R. 6874. A bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282);

H. R. 6913. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13–18, inclusive, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283); and

H. R. 6932. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1284).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs;

H. R. 4476. A bill providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; with amendments (Rept. No. 1285).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2489. A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2490. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. BONE, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE):

S. 2491. A bill to amend the patent laws, to prevent suppression of inventions, to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; and

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TAXES—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. HANES

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of taxes delivered by Hon. John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in New York on April 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPIRITUAL STRENGTH OUR GREATEST NEED

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by 37 citizens of Virginia declaring that spiritual strength is the greatest need in the crisis which now confronts us, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAINTENANCE OF UNINTERRUPTED OPERATION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the 20th instant, the question before the Senate at this time is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054, the title of which will be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate very kindly and generously agreed by unanimous consent that this motion be in order this morning. As suggested a week ago, I withheld making the motion on the specific request of the President of the United States. In the meantime, the President has sent a message to Congress, and I understand he will make an address to the country over the radio tonight in which he will develop some aspects and phases of his message in a fuller degree.

I still adhere to the view that Senate bill 2054 is a desirable one, and should be enacted. However, it is not my disposition this morning to press for immediate consideration. As I understand, the bill will remain on the calendar, and my motion can be made at any time when I can obtain recognition. It is not my disposition to make the motion this morning for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to withdraw the motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest to the Senator that inasmuch as the motion was made the pending question he should withdraw it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not understand the motion was pending; I understood the unanimous-consent agreement was that it would be in order for me to make the motion this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consideration of the Senator's motion was postponed until today.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not realize that the motion had actually been made. Under those circumstances, of course, I shall have to express my desire to withdraw the motion for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to withdraw his motion.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the motion is withdrawn I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me to be vitally necessary that some labor legislation be enacted by the Congress. While I am not particularly strong for consideration of the Connally bill, I think it would be very unfortunate

to send out word to the country that the Senate has, in effect, indefinitely postponed consideration of the labor problem. I think we are going to be blamed, very properly and very strongly, if we take that attitude.

While I should not like to refuse unanimous consent to postpone the motion which is now the order of business before the Senate, it seems to me that it should be postponed to a day certain, if we are to hear from the President tonight, and that it should not be put off indefinitely but should come up some time early next week, perhaps on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has a right to withdraw the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the action just indicated by the Senator from Texas is not to be construed, as I understand it, as a request for indefinite postponement of his motion. The bill is still on the calendar, and it will occupy the same status it now occupies. The Senator from Texas can make the motion at any time he thinks it advisable to proceed to the consideration of the bill. I think that no purpose would be served at this time by postponing the motion to another day certain, because of the situation which now exists in the production program, and in view of the address to be delivered by the President, and the attitude he assumes upon this subject.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas for the broad-minded, generous, and patriotic attitude which he is assuming in regard to this matter. We all appreciate the Senator's sincerity, and we all appreciate the fact that he has had no selfish interest to serve, either in advocating the proposed legislation originally, in seeking its consideration by the Senate, or in pressing action in regard to it. Speaking for myself, and I think for a majority of the Members of the Senate, I congratulate the Senator from Texas upon his reasonable, generous, and, as I believe, proper attitude at this time regarding the proposal.

I take this occasion also to congratulate the Senator from Texas upon another matter. I do it wholeheartedly and most sincerely. All of us here have known for years the very charming, gracious, and beautiful lady who has yielded to the irresistible importunities of the Senator from Texas and has become his partner in holy matrimony. I wish for him and her long life and happiness and the enjoyment of everything that so handsome and worthy a couple ought to enjoy during the remainder of their lives.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for his fulsome eulogy of my beloved wife and the Senator from Texas. I am indeed grateful for his comments respecting my official as well as my private affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wish I had the wit and the facility to express my feelings in the way in which our leader has expressed his to the Senator from Texas with regard to both matters which have been before us today.

I thank the Senator from Texas for not pressing his motion at this time, and I wish to make a request of him, that since he has made the announcement that his bill will remain on the calendar and can be called up at any time, and since I think he knows—and if he does not know, I should like to inform him now—that as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor I should like to speak against the motion when it comes before us; I should like to have some little notice so that I may be present, and may not be caught in an unexpected moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to give the Senator notice. I assure the Senator that I have no disposition to call up the motion without his having notice, and I recognize that, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator is entitled to every consideration in respect to the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator knows that it is reasonable for me to make the request, because he must know how hard it is to prepare an argument to resist a motion which he is to make.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is because of the merits of the motion, and not because of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I to understand that the Senator from Texas has information that the President will enunciate a labor policy in his speech tonight, and for that reason the Senator is asking that his bill be deferred until that is done?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas arrived back in the city only this morning, and has not had any intimate contact with the White House for several days.

I understand that the speech of the President tonight will at least elaborate a bit more fully some aspects of the program which he announced in his message. I do not have that information directly from the White House, but from sources which I think can be relied upon.

As to the details of any labor policy the President may present, I cannot, in all sincerity, give the Senator from Virginia any assurance. I understand the President did in his message deal with the matter of wage levels, and advanced the theory that possibly there should be a stabilization of wages, and a ceiling. Of course, that relates to labor, but as to the other aspects of the labor situation, I have to state to the Senator from Virginia that I have no information.

Mr. BYRD. My reason for making the inquiry is that a week ago the Senator from Texas asked for the postponement of the consideration of his bill because the President would present to Congress his views with respect to a labor program on the part of the Government. The message sent to the Congress yesterday had practically nothing in it with respect to any labor program which is different from the one which has already been established by the administration.

I desired to ask the Senator from Texas whether he would be willing to defer consideration merely, leaving his bill as the pending business for consideration until the President shall make his speech tonight, and then let us decide tomorrow whether the matter should be deferred, because if the special order which the Senator from Texas now has for his bill shall be abandoned and the bill put back on the calendar, it will mean the death not only of his bill but perhaps of other labor legislation which may be desired to be brought before the Congress.

A number of Senators have informed the Senator from Texas from time to time that they propose to offer amendments to his bill, and have been cooperating with him in the effort to have his bill considered, and I think it is rather remarkable that the Senator from Texas should desire to withdraw his bill, in the sense that it will lose its preferred position, unless the President of the United States has in mind presenting to Congress some views in the immediate future with respect to the labor situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia is mistaken in assuming that the bill now has a preferred status.

Mr. BYRD. It has a preferred status on the motion to ask for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is only in this status; the Senator from Texas moved to proceed to consider it, and that motion is pending. The bill is still on the calendar and will remain on the calendar if the motion is withdrawn, just as if it were not withdrawn.

Mr. BYRD. I read from the calendar for today:

SECIAL ORDER, APRIL 28, 1942

Motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to proceed to the consideration of S. 2054, a bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. That certainly gives a preferred status in the sense that it requires us to proceed to a consideration of the legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it does not. It is merely a motion to consider.

Mr. BYRD. A motion to consider taking up the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. A motion to consider it. The Senate must agree to a motion to consider a bill before it can be taken up in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. But it at least loses its preferred status with respect to being a special order, whether the Senate will consider taking up the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not a preferred status. It does not lose anything. The Senator from Texas withdraws his motion to proceed now to consider the bill. He can renew that motion at any time he sees fit to do so.

Mr. BYRD. It loses its preferred status insofar as consideration of the bill at a specified time is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all. If the Senator would come in tomorrow and make a motion to proceed to consider that bill it would have the same status as it does now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Or if any other Senator would make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or if any other Senator would make the motion; yes.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to know for what reason the Senator from Texas has proposed to withdraw his motion, unless he has information that some labor policy or program is to be presented by the President. Why is the Senator not willing to proceed to the present consideration of his bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall answer the Senator from Virginia. The Senator is in error when he said a moment ago that if this motion is not voted on today it will mean that this bill is dead, and all other labor legislation is dead. That is not true at all.

Mr. BYRD. Time will tell.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Virginia is fudging on time, because he is proceeding to tell what will happen, without waiting on time to tell.

Mr. BYRD. That is the judgment of the Senator from Virginia and the judgment of many other Members of this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator from Virginia that I understand the parliamentary situation to be just as the Senator from Kentucky has stated it. This bill is on the calendar, in its regular place on the calendar. Whenever I, or the Senator from Virginia, if he desires, or any other Senator, gets the Chair to see him and recognize him, he can make a motion to proceed to the consideration of this bill, even if we were in the middle of the consideration of another bill. Is not such a motion always in order? Suppose we were considering one bill. While we were doing so the Senator could make a motion to proceed to the consideration of some other bill, which, if agreed to, would have the effect of laying the pending bill aside, and taking up the new bill. Am I not correct in that statement? I may be in error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair, and I thank the parliamentarian. [Laughter.] My reason for that remark is that the parliamentarian nodded to me before he had any conversation with anyone else. [Laughter.] I was sure that was the rule, having been here for some years.

I think the Senator from Virginia does not quite appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Texas. I do not believe the Senator from Virginia means to question the sincerity of the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas introduced in the Senate nearly a year ago, in June, a bill very much like this one, except that it did not freeze labor conditions. The Senate passed that bill, and it went to the House and was ignored.

I reintroduced the bill in November, I believe it was, or sometime last fall, with the freezing conditions in it. It went to the Judiciary Committee, when some Senators thought I ought to have sent it to the Committee on Education and Labor. I meant no reflection on the Committee on Education and Labor, but I thought it was a bill which ought to go to the Judiciary Committee, because it related to the taking over and confiscation, in a limited sense, of plants, and I thought that since the Judiciary Committee had considered other legislation of a similar character it ought to consider this proposed legislation.

This was not done in any hasty manner. We proceeded in a regular way. We had a subcommittee appointed. We held long and exhaustive hearings. The Senator from Texas has never surrendered his views on the bill, and he does not surrender them now.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator from Texas——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Let me make a few desultory remarks. [Laughter.] The Senator from Virginia ought to realize, though, that the Senator from Texas is the author of this bill, and is a Senator on this floor, and is a member of the administration, in a sense. We are trying to get along with this war. We are trying to have leadership. The President of the United States is not only the civil President, but he is the military Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. He is charged with responsibility. We can make all the speeches we want to, but the President of the United States is charged, under the Constitution, with the responsibility of prosecuting this war. I do not want to be in the position of getting into a controversy and an argument with the President of the United States about something which may work out under his policies better than under somebody else's policies.

Mr. President, there are dozens of labor bills before the Senate. The Senator from Virginia says many Senators desire to present amendments to my bill. Of course, I know they wish to present amendments, and if the Senate were simply to consider my bill alone I do not think there would be any trouble in the Senate passing the bill. Senators have all sorts of amendments, and that is where arises the very difficulty which the Senator from Texas is now facing, and the very objections which the President of the United States probably has to this bill coming up now, because he knows that every sort of amendment, every imaginable kind of amendment is going to be offered, and we shall have a great deal of debate, endless debate, which will stir up a great deal of dissension.

That is the situation the Senator from Texas is in. I still believe in my bill, and I should like to see it enacted into law. But I have another duty to perform. I have the duty of trying to go along in this war effort. We had the testimony of Mr. Nelson a few days ago that we were over the hump as to production; that production matters were proceeding satisfactorily; that we were getting more ships, more planes, and more arms. We had the testimony, as I understand—I was not present at the time—of Judge Patterson from the War Department, in charge of production, along the same line. We also had the testimony of Mr. Forrestal, of the Navy, along the same line.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we had all that testimony before the Senator from Texas, on Monday, a week ago, agreed to bring his bill up this morning for consideration, that is to say, for decision as to whether the Senate would proceed with the consideration of it. I do not question the sincerity of my distinguished colleague in any way. I love him, and am devoted to him. I simply wanted to know what he has in mind now. Is the President going to send another message to Congress about labor? Does the Senator expect the President to elaborate tonight about a labor policy or program? If so, I am entirely willing to see the proposed legislation deferred. I simply wish to ask the Senator this question: So long as the President of the United States is opposed to the consideration of this bill, will the Senator then defer the consideration of it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not prepared to say that I will do that; no.

Mr. BYRD. What has happened since the Senator's motion, made a week ago, to change the situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator. The Senator now wants me to tell him what kind of statement the President is going to make tonight. Why does not the Senator call up the White House, or go there and talk to the President, take him by the hand, and find out? [Laughter.] I do not know what is going to be in the President's statement, in all frankness, having been out of the city for a few days. I have not been here; I have not had the opportunity the Senator from Virginia has had, since he has been right here in this city.

Mr. BYRD. On what basis and for what reasons is the Senator asking today that his bill not be considered under the pending special order which he worked diligently to obtain?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Virginia has heard what the Senator from Texas said. He sits right next to me. The Senator from Virginia is not deaf. I am in a very difficult position, I will say to the Senator. The Senator knows that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator was in a difficult position last week, Monday a week.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that the Senator from Virginia has been making speeches here for a long time about this labor situation. I do not know if he has introduced any bill with respect to it. Has the Senator?

Mr. PYRD. I have submitted amendments to the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right. The Senator from Texas is affording the Senator from Virginia the only opportunity he would ever get or ever have, for consideration of his amendments, if this motion is presented—and he can present it himself if he wants to. Yet the Senator from Virginia is complaining about the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. I am not complaining except I want the Senator to call his bill up for consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why, the amendments of the Senator from Virginia, instead of having a marble tomb, would be sleeping under a plain wooden slab except for the opportunity the Senator from Texas gives him to have them considered in connection with his bill.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator is not giving an opportunity for consideration of amendments, because he is not pressing his bill for consideration. This is a very vital situation which confronts the Senate. The country expects the proposed legislation to be taken up. The Senator from Texas has time and time again said he wants to take it up. What has happened in the last week to change the mind of the Senator? Has he received any information that a labor program is going to be presented, or what is the reason for his proposed action? The Senator stated a week ago last Monday he did not want the bill presented for consideration that day, because the President said he intended to present to the Congress—and the Senator from Texas said he had conferred with the President—a labor program. It has not been presented yet. I am asking the Senator what information has he today about it? It is very easy to ridicule those who have made a sincere effort to remedy this labor situation and strike situation. The Senator from Virginia may have been wrong in his effort to improve the armament production.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. I was not criticizing the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia had made a conscientious effort to remove these interferences which have existed to production of armaments in this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator from Virginia that I am not trying to ridicule him at all. I am simply remarking, however, that I am giving him the only opportunity he ever will get, and he ought to be helpful rather than hostile.

Mr. BYRD. Maybe this will not be the only opportunity, but it was the opportunity the Senate understood it was to get. I have discussed time and time again with the Senator that amendments were to be offered to the bill, and he was not opposed to those amendments to the bill; in fact, he appealed to those who were not in favor of the principle of his bill to support his bill because they would have the opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Texas told me that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I am not enthusiastic about this bill simply to seize plants. That does not settle the labor controversy which exists in this country. The Senator from Texas has said "You should support my bill because it will give you an opportunity then to offer amendments to it."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. So I do not think the Senator from Texas has a right to complain about the matter, because I have been entirely frank with him in connection with the whole procedure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely. Mr. President, I do not mean to criticize the Senator from Virginia, but he has been going full blast and torpedoing me here right in the side. I still have nerves and I am sensitive to major attacks. I am not attacking the Senator from Virginia. I have tried to be frank with him.

Mr. BYRD. I want to ask the Senator——

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that, of course, the President of the United States has influence with me. I do not always vote with him, as the Senator from Virginia knows, but we are now in war, and he is the President, he is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, and I am trying to help him, and I think he is going to try to help us. The President has not gone as far as I should like to see him go in these labor matters. I have been against strikes. The Senator from Virginia will probably recall that I spoke in his city on January 8, 1941. He will remember that I there and then publicly denounced strikes in munition plants, and said I was against them. He knows that I have proposed legislation from time to time. He knows that I have not changed my view at all. Mr. President, I have not changed my views at all on the subject. But there are other considerations, and others who are entitled to consideration, and I am trying to do the fair and the decent thing. If the Senator from Virginia does not like it, I cannot help it. I have told him all I know. I do not know whether the President is going to come out with a labor policy tonight or not. I hope he will make his position more clear. However, I cannot tell the Senator what he will say. If that does not satisfy the Senator, he will have to remain unsatisfied.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator willing to let his motion remain a special order of business and simply postpone consideration of it until tomorrow?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think that would serve the purpose very well. The President of the United States is going to speak to the country tonight. How can we know within a few hours what the country thinks? The people themselves will not know. I think we ought to give the President an opportunity to speak to the country and see what the reaction from the people of the United States is to be to his message and his policies.

After all, this Government belongs to the people back home. It does not belong to us. It belongs to the people of the United States. I do not pretend to know all there is to know about the labor question, I may be all wrong. I do not know. I do not think I am. The Senator from Virginia knows that there are a dozen different plans and a dozen different schools of thought as to how the labor problem ought to be met.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says that the Government belongs to the people. He is absolutely correct. Does he not believe that the majority of the people of America want something done with regard to labor legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so. They want something; but even in the Senate there are about 40 different groups.

Mr. BYRD. Why is the Senator so afraid of bringing these matters before the Senate for full and frank discussion and debate? He has never been afraid in the past.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not afraid to bring them up.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated, as one of his objections to consideration of the bill at this time, that dozens of different plans would be offered to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. One must not only have an inclination, he must have votes in the Senate. I want support for what I do. What good would it do to bring up something and get hell beat out of you? [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator proceeds with his motion, I am sure the Senate will consider his bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the Senator's thought. In the past I have known the Senator to have thoughts which were not fulfilled.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just as all of us have.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator agree to defer consideration of his motion for 1 week, so that we may obtain the reaction from the country with respect to the President's address, and in order that his motion may retain its present position as a special order of business?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have had experience with deferring things for a week, and it has not always proved entirely satisfactory, as the Senator can see. My bill will remain on the calendar; and not only I, but any other Senator, may make a motion to proceed to take it up. If the Senator from Virginia wishes to make such a motion, he can do so.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose the Senator from Virginia should now make a motion to take it up, would the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] oppose it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know. I presume he would.

Mr. BYRD. He would probably do the same thing at any time I might make a motion to take up the bill from the calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Virginia knows that the Senate cannot be made to do something which a majority of Senators do not want to do. If the Senator from Kentucky can obtain more votes than can the Senator from Virginia on a motion or issue, the Senator from Virginia will get licked. I know the Senator knows that.

Mr. BYRD. Why does the Senator from Texas think that the Senate does not want to consider the proposed legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think many Senators do. I know of many others who do not. I have been in contact with many Senators. I think that a great many of them who would vote to take up the bill would not like to do so today. I think Senators who would probably vote for it next week, or would have voted for it before this controversy arose, would say, "I am for the bill, but this is no time to bring it up. If it is brought up now, I will have to vote against it." The Senator knows that. He has been in politics a long time. He knows that every Senator must consider his associates and supporters.

I am trying to make the best possible disposition of this matter. If I withdraw the motion, the bill will still remain on the calendar. I may feel the inclination to make the motion at some future time, depending upon conditions and developments. However, I do not care to say that I intend to make it next Tuesday, because we might then have the same situation we now have. Any Senator may make the motion. I do not have to make it. Any Senator who can catch the eye of the Vice President—and he has two good eyes [laughter]—and can obtain the floor, can make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill; but, frankly, in the face of the present situation, with the President preparing to make a radio address tonight I do not care to press the matter and be apparently in an attitude of hostility to the President of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] serves notice that he proposes to speak against the bill when it comes up. I wish to suggest to him that that is unnecessary. The Senator from Texas has done so beforehand.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I shall not quarrel with him, even though he smite me. [Laughter.]

Does any other Senator wish to make a few remarks? If not, Mr. President, with the statement I made a little while ago that the bill will remain on the calendar subject to a motion to take it up at any time, I withdraw my motion at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is unanimous consent required to withdraw the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not for this purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Even after the motion has been made a special order, unanimous consent is not required to withdraw it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true. The Senator has the right to withdraw his motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me observe for the benefit of the Senator from Virginia that not only is unanimous consent not required to withdraw the motion, but unanimous consent is not required for any Senator to make a similar motion to consider my bill in the future whenever he desires.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce while Senators are present that it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] wishes to make a few remarks on another subject, after which I shall move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION AND COMMITTEE ON AVIATION AFFAIRS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement showing that in the years 1941 and 1942 the total amount appropriated for airplane construction amounted to $22,963,000,000 in round figures.

I send to the desk two resolutions and ask that they be read. After they are read I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 238 and S. Res. 239) were read as follows:

Senate Resolution 238

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that there be established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Aviation, which shall be administered by a Cabinet officer, known as the Secretary of Aviation, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 239

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate is amended by inserting, between the paragraph relating to the Committee on Military Affairs and the paragraph relating to the Committee on Mines and Mining, the following new paragraph:

"Committee on Military Aviation, to consist of 17 Senators."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it will be noted that one resolution suggests the creation of a separate Cabinet officer known as the secretary of aviation. I am putting the matter in this form because the bill of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], Senate bill 1635, has been pigeonholed. The second resolution would amend the Senate rules and create a Committee on Aviation Affairs.

It seems almost unnecessary to bring to this great body a recapitulation of the facts which demonstrate clearly that the air arm will be the determining factor in this war.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. There we constantly talk about building ships of the sea. We had better have a committee where we can talk about building ships of the air.

Until this war broke out and it was demonstrated that ships of the air are more important than ships of the sea, this Nation had given very little consideration to the importance of an air navy. We had prophets like Billy Mitchell, whose stature has grown with the passage of time, and whose prophetic vision—disregarded at the time—has made him a symbol of America's future domination of the air—domination if we have his vision and do not let lesser minds dominate the picture.

He, along with others, fought courageously and unselfishly to prepare America to meet a new kind of warfare, and to make America safe from assault from the air. Billy Mitchell and others fought against bureaucratic and rut-minded military leaders, and sacrificed themselves in that fight. Theirs was a fight to awaken America. They failed. It may be too late if we fail now.

General Mitchell was only one of many who saw the need, but who were literally "cashiered" for their vision. They saw the need of air supremacy and the significance of a navy of the air. It must be remembered that when Billy Mitchell was court-martialed the publicity which was given was definitely for the purpose of telling men who had air vision that they had better stop their tactics or they would be retired or exiled. Let us remember that. The rut-minds ruled then. They must not continue to groove our action.

We now hear much of isolation, and of the attack upon men who did not want to get this country involved in war. If there ever was an isolationist group of men who had their eyes closed to realities, it was those men who would not and could not see the importance of aviation. Blindness is the worst form of isolation.

Mr. President, that condition still exists, in spite of recent history. We know now, after the fall of France with its Maginot line, the fall of Singapore with its half-billion dollars of defense, the fall of Poland, the occupation of Norway, the subjugation of the lowlands, the occupation of Crete, that the air arm dominates on land. On sea, the lesson of the occupation of Norway shows that the air arm also dominates the sea.

Do you remember Churchill saying when Hitler invaded Norway:

> I consider that Hitler's action in invading Norway is as great a strategic and political error as that committed by Napoleon when he invaded Spain. He will now have to fight during the whole summer against powers possessing vastly superior naval forces and able to transport them to the scenes of action more easily than he can.

But Churchill found he was mistaken in this. His naval forces were obliged to withdraw in haste from the Kattegat and Skagerrak to escape destruction by Hitler's air arm. Churchill's air arm could not participate because it did not have the necessary range. When the British evacuated Narvik, they lost their aircraft carrier *Glorious* and other ships.

It was not the Navy that saved the British at Dunkerque; it was the flying lads of Britain in their Spitfires and Hurricanes. In this fight these planes were "within range." It was the airplane that saved Britain, the fighters of the R. A. F.; and Britain was not knocked out, because Germany was not properly prepared to do so. It was a failure in aviation, not of aviation. America now must not repeat the blunder.

We recall the battles of the Mediterranean when the British met the Italian Fleet and destroyed part of it. The Italians did not have air protection. But when the German bombers struck back into the Mediterranean the British Fleet suffered tremendously. Do we remember the story of the *Bismarck*, the ship which the Germans thought was beyond sinking? Again aviation proved what it could do.

Hitler's taking of Greece was another victory because of the air arm; and, of course, Crete fell because of the invasion from the skies. Even after all these experiences, the British still seemed to cling to the "old man of the sea" idea.

Since Japan has come into the picture we remember the story of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*.

We have yet to learn all the details of the sinking of our own ships by the dive bombers of the Japs. Apparently there are still folks in high positions who

cannot comprehend the meaning of these facts. Men get so much in a rut that they become specialists in only one line of thinking, blind to other important factors.

Mr. President, recently a great book came to my desk. It is called Victory Through Air Power, by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky. I think it should be read by every American, and I believe every Representative and Senator should digest its message. We must not be blind leaders. When the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch.

In the concluding paragraph of that book Major de Seversky says:

> I speak for all my colleagues in the aeronautical legions of the land, our gallant pilots, designers, engineers and manufacturers, the aerial strategists and the humblest aeronautical mechanics—and especially for the millions of American young people born into the air-power age and attuned to its dynamic rhythm—when I say that we airmen feel frustrated by the artificial restraints. We are eager to serve and ready to act when our beloved America says the word.

Mr. President, listen: These men say they "feel frustrated by the artificial restraints." When such an authority as Major de Seversky speaks, can we fail to stop and take notice? All of us have been living in glass houses.

For thousands of years, war has been a matter of fighting on land and sea; and now, when all at once we change to fighting in the air, it is difficult for the average mind to change and see the significance and the importance of the new arm. But there are prophets in Israel. General Mitchell was one. Major de Seversky is another. We should heed these prophets. Therefore, it seems all-important to me that now, when we are spending billions for airplane defense and offense—think of it; over $22,000,000,000 appropriated for airplanes in less than 2 years—we who are the elected leaders of the Nation should have a committee here in the Senate studying this subject. I repeat: Over twenty-two billions have been appropriated in less than 2 years.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very much interested in the Senator's remarks, because he is touching on a subject to which I have given study for 9 years here in the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Let me interrupt at that point and say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada—I think he was not in the Chamber when I began—that one of the resolutions I introduced was for the purpose of getting an expression of intent on behalf of the Senate because the bill of the Senator from Nevada had been pigeonholed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I appreciate the mention of the legislation which was proposed by me. Let me say that it is regrettable that our established agencies having national defense in their hands refuse to listen to suggestions coming from those who are just as much interested in national defense and in winning the war as they are, and refuse to accept ideas notwithstanding the fact that their soundness and the need of their acceptance are so manifest that one would think a child would accept them.

The fact of the matter is that since the day of Billy Mitchell we have gone to sleep in refusing to accept Mitchell's doctrine. Had Mitchell's doctrine and Mitchell's idea of unified air force been in existence, there never would have been a Pearl Harbor. The fact that we did not have a unified air force, the fact that the umbrella of air defense which we should have had was not covering our fleet in Pearl Harbor, gave opportunity for the slaughtering of our sailors and our soldiers and the destruction of units of our Navy at Pearl Harbor.

Let me say a further word while I am interrupting the Senator. Unless we bring about a unified air force to take care of our land and sea war activities, I have grave fear that this war will last longer than it should last, although I never have any fear that we shall not be victorious in the end.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution, and I agree with much that he has said.

Mr. President, I am not speaking on the subject of a unified air force. I feel, as Major de Seversky has said, that after we have seen that the Army and the Navy have obtained the planes they need, the important thing then is to see that they have an independent air force that can strike effectively. Major de Seversky brings out in this book the thesis, which I do not think can be contradicted, that the way to fight this war is not to fight it on all the tentacles, but to strike at the heart of the monster. He shows that we now have planes that can travel 7,800 miles without refueling. He knows that Hitler has them. We may expect, any day, a reprisal raid on the Atlantic coast. The important thing, however, is for America to become air-minded, awakened to the new world in which we are living.

This prophet, Major de Seversky, shows how the World War could be won, as I said, by striking at the heart of Japan, making it unnecessary to fight on a thousand fronts, as we are about to do.

Already, as I have said, we have airplanes that can travel 7,800 miles without refueling. Why should not this great body, the Senate of the United States, have a committee on aviation affairs? Are we simply creatures of some overlord in this matter? We have had in mind the thought of the Navy and the Army, and all that time we have had our Navy and Army committees. Now this thing has become so tremendously big that in 2 years we spend $22,000,000,000 for airships; and yet the strategy involved, the style of planes, the judgment of the leaders in that new field are matters with which we have little or no contact, except as it is incidental to matters coming before the Senate Naval Affairs and the Senate Military Affairs Committees.

Have we not a responsibility? Are we simply going to pass that responsibility off to the Executive by voting the money? To me, Mr. President, this matter is so important that we should not delay another day in going into this subject fully and completely, and particularly by creating a committee on aviation affairs. My resolution calls for that, and I ask that it be not pigeonholed. Certainly it is a matter which requires consideration because of the present safety and the future safety of America.

On the subject of having a Cabinet member who shall be known as the Secretary of Aviation, I think that is all-important also. The mere appointment of General Arnold by President Roosevelt does not meet the situation, and I say that with every respect for General Arnold and his record. Men who could not see, and would not see, the importance of this arm in the defense of the Nation in the past, who are rutted in their own particular vocation because of years of training, however outstanding they may be in military or naval affairs, lack the power to provide guidance and direction to the Government in aviation affairs in this period when we are just opening up this field of conquest of the air.

Mr. President, the life of America is at stake, and no one can read this book of Major de Seversky's without realizing it. I had read many of the articles contained in the book when they were previously printed. He is a great American; not one like you and me, Mr. President, who were born here, but one who chose to make America his home. He has a fine background. He has had honors conferred upon him, including a medal presented to him by President Roosevelt. A man of his specialized aviation experience would be the kind to sit in the Cabinet as Secretary of Aviation, particularly now when world air strategy is all-important. World air strategy is something we never thought of in previous wars.

Recently Walter Lippmann, who had apparently also read this book, speaking about the "men who are fixed in a groove," made an interesting statement.

Since I came to the Senate I have frequently talked on the subject of "men who are fixed in a groove." I call it the "rut mind." We all have a tendency to get that way. Those in the legal profession, unless they are careful, become lawyers, and nothing else, and men in the medical profession become doctors and nothing else; and so on. Likewise, an Army man, tied to the land because of his background of many years, and a Navy man, tied to his ships that go over the water possess "rut minds." They have been the leaders, and, Mr. President, you and I know, if it had not been for that gallant little island called Britain, if she had not had her R. A. F. fighters, what would have happened to the west coast and the east coast of America? Some seem to think that the men of the Army and Navy can change overnight, but they cannot do so, because they never had air vision. We are appropriating a vast amount of money, but it is not simply a question of the number of planes; it is a question of air strategy and of the kind of planes. Goering missed the mark when he attacked Britain. He could have taken Britain easily if he had had the right kind of planes, but the Spitfire and Hurricane outfought the German planes, and, as a result, Goering lost seven or eight hundred planes. A

few of those Spitfires happened to be the omen of God for Britain in that day.

Let me read what Walter Lippmann, speaking of "men who are fixed in a groove," said:

> The toughest obstructionists to deal with in Washington are not corrupt and they are not lazy and they are untouched by defeatism; what really needs saying about them is what an Oxford professor once said of a paper read by a student: "It was empty, magniloquent, abstract, flatulent * * * I could have wept salt tears. But I couldn't do anything else; the young man wanted a clean heart and a new spirit, not a little top dressing."

That is what Walter Lippmann said about those who are leading the procession. He also says:

> We have come to an epoch when the destiny of the world will be determined by the mastery of the air.

Oh, if all of us could realize that fact and not just talk it. We spend day after day talking about domestic problems. We had an experience along that line this morning. And yet the destiny of America and of the world depends upon the mastery of the air. Mastery of the air will not be obtained by mere numbers, but by quality planes of different classes and kinds. Master minds of the air alone have this knowledge, not sea-minded and land-minded men. Strategists of the air are what are needed.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. There session after session we vote billions of dollars for ships such as the *Bismarck*, which went down when a bomb hit it—ships which take many days to sail across the ocean, when an airplane takes a few hours. Yet the idea of ships dominates our thinking and our approach to this war. Master minds of the air are in position to lead in the strategy that America must undertake.

Listen again to what Lippmann says. He reaches the same conclusion that Major de Seversky reached:

> That until there is a specific strategy for taking and holding the skies—

That is it—"a specific strategy for taking and holding the skies"—

> our plans must remain two-dimensional in conception and therefore, notwithstanding the physical participation of aircraft, seriously, if not fatally, handicapped in an epoch of three-dimensional warfare.

Most of us are still thinking in terms of two-dimensional warfare.

Oh, but I hear some one say, we have appropriated all this money. That is not sufficient. Merely appropriating money will not do the job. We have got to have the men who comprehend the job and the bigness of this global war, and what is necessary to put our opponents out of business.

Therefore, after the Army and Navy have the aircraft that are necessary, it is imperative that America have an air force capable of fighting and bombing the enemy; an air force commanded and developed by airmen who are as thoroughly at home in the air as are soldiers on the land and sailors on the sea. We have the finest group of youngsters in the world; they are making the finest fliers, man for man; they can outfight and outmatch any of those of other nations; but, because we have been lagging behind in our development of air strategy in a global war, we need men in the conduct of the war who are not tied to the sea or tied to the land.

We must see to it that the power which will govern the future will be in America's hands, and we must see to it also that in the field of strategy old outmoded ideas shall not take control. When I say "We" I mean the Senate of the United States cannot "pass the buck." If we do, we will wake up some day and regret it. We have a job to perform, and our job is to create a committee on aviation. The Senate, as a coordinate branch of government which votes the money, must realize that it is essential that it have a thorough understanding of what is involved. This can only come to pass if we create a Committee on Aviation Affairs in the Senate.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me state that I, myself, do not necessarily regard the creation of a department of military aviation as the ultimate answer to our military problems.

Frankly, in my judgment, the ideal method of dealing with our military affairs would be to have one Cabinet officer vested with complete unified military control of the entire conduct of the war. Under him there might be an Under Secretary of Aviation, an Under Secretary of the Army, and an Under Secretary of the Navy. Their efforts would be integrated through the unified command of one cabinet officer, under the President. That is, however, so momentous a change that its adoption would perhaps be impossible at this time.

Accordingly, in my proposal suggesting the creation of a department of military aviation, I am merely advancing the necessity for centralizing in one head the authority and control of our vast military aviation program—a head who is air-minded and capable of applying air strategy to world affairs.

It is absolutely vital that our war organization in Washington be reorganized to recognize the new emphasis which must be placed on aviation if this country is to survive. This is a time when we must realistically recognize that the direction of our war effort is entrusted to an outmoded, antiquated, outdated system, a system which is predicated on the simple assumption that wars are fought only by an army and by a navy.

When I talk about this rut mind, or, as Lippmann calls it, the "groove mind," I am talking about a condition that exists patently everywhere. The British have not as yet completely awakened. They have suffered defeat after defeat; they incurred the loss of two of their large war vessels, the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*, in the Indian Ocean, under conditions similar to those in which others of their ships have been sunk. The point is that we must have men who understand aviation as their primary job, who live it and sleep it and think it, contrary to those who think in terms of land and sea, men who live in the air and can see the world in which they are flying in a matter of hours, for that day is coming. The danger to America now and in the future is so tremendous, as I said, that we cannot "pass the buck."

I ask, Mr. President, that the resolutions be referred to the appropriate committee or committees. I express the hope that immediate action may result and that the resolutions will not be pigeonholed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Resolution 238, submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and Senate Resolution 239, also submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks certain excerpts from previous speeches delivered by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts are as follows:

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, over Columbia Broadcasting System on the evening of October 17, 1939]

The War Department has recommended the smallest possible number of planes necessary for our defense. They will be ample only with one provision, and that is that our factories shall be allowed to sell enough planes to foreign countries so that the factories may be placed on a mass-production basis, so that the mistake of 1918 will not be repeated. Obviously we shall need fewer planes actually in the air if we can get more when we need them, and get them in a hurry.

I am convinced that that is even truer today than it was last February.

When dictators decide to make war, their decision is based upon only one question, and that is whether or not they are able to destroy the other nation. The arguments which prevailed at Munich were the comparative number of warplanes of the contending nations. The only language dictators understand is spoken from the mouths of cannons with tongues of fire. Therefore I favor enlarging the capacity of our factories and thereby strengthening our guaranty of peace. (Printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 85, p. 345, October 18, 1939.)

[From article by Ernest Lindley, the American Defense Problem, inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 22, 1940, by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin]

The power of the German land forces is not our imminent concern. The power of Germany in the air is more important to us. German naval power may be a life-and-death matter to us.

German air power may be indicated by the fact—or belief of our best-informed people—that the German production of military planes now exceeds 3,000 planes per month and will reach 6,000 per month by fall. The German production at present is believed to exceed the total world production outside Germany. Ours this month is about 600 planes, and we won't reach 1,200 until about December. The Germans have a vast reserve of fully or partly trained pilots. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., May 22, 1940, p. 3135 (Appendix). Article reprinted from Washington Post of May 22, 1940.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on the floor of the U. S. Senate on May 31, 1940]

If we fail to train our youth with modern weapons, which means something more than simply loading a gun and firing it, we will fail in our responsibility to this and future ages. The lessons we must learn from overseas are too apparent. They are in the field

of equipment and training. It was the mechanized units, the supermechanized units, coupled with the use of mass bombers and quick transport of troops fully mechanized and equipped, that made the blitzkrieg possible. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., May 31, 1940, vol. 86, p. 7286.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of the U. S. Senate on June 21, 1940]

I say it is time for us to develop an air force in this country and get away from those who can see only today and yesterday, but not tomorrow. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., June 21, 1940, vol. 86, p. 8769.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2107.)

I do not necessarily concur in every phase of Colonel Knox's foreign policy, but I am impressed by his dynamic plan for the formation of an aviation unit to recruit 10,000 volunteer pilots. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., July 10, 1940, vol. 86, p. 9395.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on August 23, 1940]

We need * * *.

(b) An air force to supplement the Navy and the land forces, adequate to repel in the air any attack on this continent from the air.

* * * * *

We need, of course, to step up our ability to produce ships, planes, mechanized equipment for the Army, etc.

The war overseas has taught us that the airplane is most effective when used to support naval units and ground troops. The Army needs planes; the Navy needs planes—planes of long-range type, bombers, attacking planes, etc. So we come to the conclusion that our first line of defense in the Western Hemisphere is a water line—our Navy. An adequate navy and adequate flying fortresses are what we must first obtain.

Our second line of defense is the airplane—observation planes, bombing planes, dive bombers, attack planes—plenty of them for the Navy and plenty for independent attack service. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., August 23, 1940, vol. 86, p. 10794.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on September 14, 1940]

That brings up the second line of defense, which is the air fleet. We have found that the Navy must have a supplemental arm in the air. However, we are inadequately prepared in that respect. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., September 14, 1940, vol. 86, p. 12169.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on February 14, 1941]

We cannot close our eyes to the realities. We certainly know that there are big stakes in this war game; but if Japan should fall for the seductive influence of Adolf Hitler and commit an overt act along the line I have suggested, then I tremble for the consequences to Japan and to the world.

I want to know what our Government knows about the situation. I want to know what kind of a supplemental air arm we have to our fleet in the east. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., February 14, 1941, vol. 87, p. 999.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on April 3, 1941]

Mr. President, are we permitting the same closed minds—minds that were closed to the arguments of Billy Mitchell—to remain closed to this matter of life and death, these fighting planes, the superiority of which is vital not only to our flyers but to the future of America? I repeat what I have said before on the floor of the Senate: Beware of the closed mind, the "ruttist" mind. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., April 3, 1941, vol. 87, p. 2691.)

[From speech made by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on May 20, 1941]

If, by the official vindication of the name of this great soldier, we will make the road a little easier for the present-day "Billy Mitchells" who are fighting antiquated tactics, caste controls, and red-tape methods, that official vindication will not have been in vain.

The ideas and the beliefs which Billy Mitchell held so tenaciously in the face of brass-hat opposition have been demonstrated as correct. Mitchell has been vindicated, and his ideas today stand as a living memorial which we cannot add to nor detract from. It remains only for us to make certain that his memorial will continue to live through the men—the independent thinkers, the independent adventurers and explorers and inventors—who will follow him.

* * * * *

We have only to look to the skies to see the mighty air fleet that is the answer to the question of whether Billy Mitchell was right. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., May 20, 1941, vol. 87, p. 4239.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, before the Central Retail Feed Association convention, Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., on June 9, 1941]

I say to you today that the necessity which General Mitchell saw more than 15 years ago for the establishment of a separate air branch is more imperative than ever before.

Mitchell was a farseeing man. He commanded the American Expeditionary Forces' air forces in France. He was convinced that the airplane would be a decisive factor in all future wars. More than a decade and one-half ago he advocated aerial torpedoes, parachute troops, troop-transport planes, heavy-gun combat planes, and air bases in Alaska. (Printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., June 19, 1941, vol. 87, p. A2946) (Appendix).)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on July 29, 1941]

The ideas and the vision of Billy Mitchell were accepted by another gentleman on this globe, and that was Mr. Goering, in Germany. In every detail he carried out the methods Billy Mitchell attempted to teach to the brass hats in this country, and the result was the predominating air force which has given Germany the victory on every battlefield so far except in Russia.

The significant thing, I repeat, is that the men who now realize they had no vision, the men who because of their lack of vision, have made it possible for our own country to be unprepared, still persist in their blindness. The result of such blindness may be of great damage to this country, as it has been in the past. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., July 29, 1941, p. 6414.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on the floor of the Senate on August 7, 1941]

We have to be realistic. I wish to say that from information I have after talking with some of our air generals, we are going places with our increased capacity in the building of bombers and fighting planes, with our developing 40,000 men a year in the Air Service, and it is a mighty satisfactory thing to know that America is going to be able to look after herself if need be. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., August 7, 1941, vol. 87, p. 6851.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on the floor of the Senate on October 16, 1941]

We still have men in positions of leadership who seem to be unaware of the air ocean and the significance of the navies in the air.

In this article, Mr. President, Major de Seversky restates the truth, the significant truth, that it was the Royal Air Force controlling the skies over the English Channel and over the islands that stemmed the tide of Nazi invasion of Britain. The British evacuation from Dunkirk was also due to the British domination of the sky over that operation. The Major brings out very conclusively the point that America's need is long-range air power. * * * But to go back to the Major's discussion for a few further words, the Major disagrees with Colonel Knox's recent statement which is mentioned in full in the article; and, while I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and believe there will always be need for a surface Navy, the thing I desire to emphasize now, because this distinguished writer on the subject makes it so clear in his article, is the fact that we are living in a changed world, and, above all, the ocean of the air is the important factor; and we have more than ever to realize that whether we get control of the air depends upon the leadership we have, the men of vision who are not simply walking the decks of naval craft, and still believing, as they have done through the years, that the ships of the water are the important factor.

* * * I am of the opinion that the Major establishes a good case in his article when he calls for America to wake up, when he requests that Americans get a new understanding—ah! this is important—of the physical world in which we are living and when he states:

"In this era of air power, America must integrate itself with the new force, and every American psychologically must become an aviator if we want to preserve our precious heritage of free institutions." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., October 16, 1941, p. 7932—article mentioned by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, Air Power Ends Isolation, reprinted in full at conclusion of remarks by Senator.)

[Excerpt from article entitled "Air Force Is Answer," by Al Williams, inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin]

"Japan must be bombed."

Don't tell me a national defense system can't be revised in wartime. The British did just that when they severed the Royal Flying Corps from control of the British Army and the Royal Naval Air Service from the British Admiralty during the last war.

Realistic Englishmen coordinated England's two air services into the present Royal Air Force. We will follow that example some day, and it should be now. (From the Washington Daily News of December 22, 1941, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Senate, December 22, 1941, p. A5689, 77th Cong., 1st sess.)

[Excerpt from remarks by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin, on the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell]

The domination of the air we must have and retain, and we must put a premium on the men of foresight and invention—men who are big enough to get out of the rut today, to cut out red tape and put efficiency into the picture. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 30, 1941, 77th Cong., 1st sess., p. 10128.)

[Excerpts from remarks by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin]

Mr. President, I am hoping that the tens of thousands of flyers who are soon going to take to the ocean of the air to win victory for America will form a great air corps called the Billy Mitchell air division, and thus carry into the battle for the liberation of the world the vision and the spirit of a great and a martyred American. (From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 252.)

Some of us have been reading articles by experts in relation to the coming power in the air. One expert demonstrated conclusively that a few years hence the airships of one nation riding the ether will be able in a few hours to fly across the intervening seas, and if the nation has control of the air, put out of business every industry in the nation they attack. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 1049.)

We need men in positions of command who do not lean toward one angle or the other, but who see the whole problem from the perspective of the Army the Navy, and the Air Corps. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2107.)

STRIKES IN WAR PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES—MAN-DAYS LOST

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the statement has frequently been made of late that there are practically no strikes in the country, but every day the newspapers state that strikes occur here and there. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, there have been more man-days lost by strikes since Pearl Harbor than in a similar period 2 years ago. In January, February and March of 1940, 923,647 man-days were lost by strikes. In January, February, and March of 1942, 1,265,000 man-days have been lost, an increase of more than one-third above the same period 2 years ago.

Every strike that has occurred since Pearl Harbor has affected our national defense program, as all industries now are essential either to the production of war materials or to the maintenance of our civilian population.

During the month of March there were 240 strikes, with a loss of 450,000 man-days of work.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have obtained from the United States Department of Labor, giving the number of man-days lost due to strikes since January 1940. For the year 1940 a total of 6,700,872 man-days were lost, and for the year 1941 a total of 22,885,757 man-days were lost. If strikes continue for the remainder of 1942 as they have for the first 3 months, is appears that the total of man-days lost in 1942 will be equal to or exceed the man-days lost in 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U. S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, February 1942]

	Man-days idle during month or year
1940:	
January	246,674
February	289,992
March	386,981
April	441,866
May	665,688
June	484,007
July	585,651
August	706,308
September	780,570
October	915,014
November	739,807
December	458,314
Total	6,700,872
1941:	
January	659,285
February	1,129,556
March	1,553,260
April	7,106,126
May	2,182,693
June	1,468,856
July	1,305,136
August	1,756,377
September	1,885,224
October	1,888,644
November	1,450,000
December	500,000
Total	22,885,757
1942:	
January	390,000
February	425,000
March	450,000

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several naval nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters (favorably reported); and

Bernice B. Lyons, to be postmaster at Vinton, La., in place of S. A. Fairchild, retired (adversely reported).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs (favorably reported):

Rear Admiral Robert L. Ghormley, to be a vice admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of September 1941; and

Several officers for appointment, and sundry citizens for appointment as second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen W. Brennan to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry C. Blanton to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sterling Hutcheson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ford S. Worthy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Ailworth to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John White Stuart to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 30, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Capt. Lyal A. Davidson to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 30th day of November 1941.

Capt. Charles A. Pownall to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of December 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen W. Brennan to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Harry C. Blanton to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

Sterling Hutcheson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Ford S. Worthy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

Robert L. Ailworth to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

John White Stuart to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Ruth D. McClure, Acworth.
Dan L. Gibson, Albany.
Leighton W. McPherson, Columbus.
Troy Howard Vickers, Crawfordville.
Wylie West, Decatur.
Lawrence J. McPhaul, Doerun.
B. Clayton Blanton, Thomasville.
Roy Thrasher, Tifton.

KANSAS

Walter Koon, Clearwater.
George E. Hull, Eureka.
Frank M. McAdam, Moran.
Anna C. Linscheid, North Newton.

MICHIGAN

Ervin C. Dunckley, Frederic.
Rolland P. Lee, Millington.
Alphonsus E. Murphy, Shepherd.

TEXAS

Ramiro R. Gonzalez, Benavides.
George C. Lain, Kopperl.
James Thomas Coleman, Livingston.
Joe H. Victery, New Willard.
Laura A. Bruening, Westhoff.

WASHINGTON

Hazel P. Chester, Richmond Highlands.
Ethel M. Eke, Tumwater.

WISCONSIN

Andrew Noble Lawton, Brodhead.
Gerald A. Peterson, Sharon.
Boyd H. Gentz, Verona.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King of kings and Lord of lords, behold the passions of men. To any who are in distress, to any whose consciences oppress and cloud their souls with guilt, lift up Thy voice of righteousness and triumph. As Thy life carries with it eternal sympathy and succor, as a Divine Saviour, bestow Thy compassion and grant Thy forgiveness. We praise Thee, that Thou didst bring to mankind, with all its sorrows, struggles, and aspirations, the gulf stream of the world's hope and salvation.

Grant that a stalwart faith may throb in the blood of our daily lives, making them heroic and eager by the divine essence of spirituality which enters into the commonest deeds. May we be Thy disciples in the way of self-denial, bearing some cross and ending in the quiet joy of self-forgetfulness; thus we may grow into the higher life in which our hearts go out lovingly to our fellow men and to the beauty and glory of the world. Teach us the deepest meaning of the wonderful, precious sacrifice of the Christ, revealing the heart of an infinite, holy God—the Strong baring His shoulder to carry the burdens of the weak; the Highest stooping to save the lowest; and the Holiest coming to ransom the world. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of George Quillinan;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.;

H. R. 6166. An act to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.;

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5143. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 5295. An act for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani;

H. R. 5449. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant);

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston;

H. R. 5845. An act for the relief of Alvira Manfredi; and

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 506. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes;

S. 2109. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes;

S. 2190. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray;

S. 2292. An act for the relief of Vernon E. Deus;

S. 2315. An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States;

S. 2368. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder;

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy;

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution relative to the bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased; and

S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1563) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government,"

for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Department of War.
4. Executive Office of the President.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. General Accounting Office.
8. The National Archives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "The Foresight of President Roosevelt."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. WILLIAM D. LEAHY

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday in Vichy, France, there passed to her eternal reward Mrs. William D. Leahy, wife of the American Ambassador to France. Mrs. Leahy had previously undergone an operation from which she was apparently recovering and, only the night before she died had made plans with her husband to return to the United States. Mrs. Leahy is survived by Admiral Leahy and a son, Lt. Comdr. William Harrington Leahy now on duty in London. Since 1897 Admiral Leahy has served our country faithfully and well.

In my opinion, Mrs. Leahy gave her life in the service of our country because, in spite of all kinds of difficulties and advanced years, she traveled with her husband to his post in war-torn France. In France, as in other parts of the world, in which Mrs. Leahy lived, in connection with her husband's naval services, she took an active part in welfare work, and one of her last public acts was to make a large donation to the Red Cross.

Mrs. Leahy was born in California and was married to Admiral Leahy in San Francisco in the year of 1904. Her knowledge of foreign languages was a great asset to her husband in his naval and diplomatic duties.

In his hour of great trial and anguish Admiral Leahy has my deep and sincere sympathy and, I am sure, the sympathy and affection of every Member of Congress, all of the men and women in the armed forces, and millions of other grateful Americans.

This lovely lady died nobly in the service of her country—while her country was at war—which prompts me prayerfully to hope that God will hasten the fulfillment of the prophecy of His prophet, Isaiah, who said:

> And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall there be war any more.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter and a resolution from a labor union on the 40-hour week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a quotation from the Hillsboro Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR DAY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, June 13, 1942, will mark the anniversary of the appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the United States Military Academy as a cadet from the State of Wisconsin. Because of what General MacArthur symbolizes to the people of the United States of America and the Allied Nations fighting for democracy in this war, I am offering a joint resolution today asking that the President issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States of America to observe June 13, 1942, with suitable patriotic and public exercises throughout the land as Douglas MacArthur Day.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LONGEVITY CREDIT FOR ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4869) to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "Reserve", where it appears the second time, insert "and."

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out ", and the Army Reserves" and insert "of the United States."

Page 1, line 6, after "service", insert "since June 30, 1925."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "deserve or" and insert "Reserve,".

Page 1, line 8, after "Reserve", insert ", and the National Guard: *Provided*, That warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States shall not be credited for this purpose with time served in the inactive National Guard not in the active Federal service."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Committee on Naval Affairs has authorized the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to call up that bill. We have unanimously agreed to the Senate amendments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota explain the bill and the amendments.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House a month or more ago and has been passed by the Senate, with certain perfecting amendments, simply rearranging the wording of some amendments which were adopted in the House to include the Army and National Guard.

The bill has for its purpose granting longevity credit to enlisted men in the Reserve on the same basis as it is credited to officers. Another amendment places a limiting date of June 30, 1925, because that is the date from which officers get longevity credit in the Reserve. It simply puts the enlisted men on exactly the same basis as officers in the Reserves.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Does that still leave out those who served in the last war who since then have not kept up their Reserve status and, of course, are not now entitled to longevity consideration under the present law, as I understand it?

Mr. MAAS. If they had not been in the Reserve they would not be eligible for longevity credit, anyway. If they reenter the Reserve now they will get credit for their active World War service. That is correct.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is what I wanted to know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 or 3 weeks I have had considerable experience with the War Production Board set-up. I find myself in accord with the objective sought by this Board; I think the objective is one with which the American people are in accord, because they are willing to be controlled and have various scarce materials conserved. They are willing to make any necessary sacrifice to win this war. Never in my life have I experienced the kind of treatment that has been accorded me in the various War Production Board set-ups; they do not seem to know how to handle matters without long delays; you cannot find the head of a department

and when you get there you find you have to go seek another, and so on.

Apparently this House has simply overlooked taking the kind of action which will put them in harness. I think one trouble is that too many of the officials are without business experience. Another is that virtually all of the officials are from the large cities and either do not understand or do not care about small-town business and rural problems. If the War Production Board is to do the job before it they must gear themselves up to wartime speed and cut out about nine-tenths of the present red tape.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received in the mail a letter from the Reverend Walter W. McNeil, vicar of St. John's Episcopal Church, at Jackson, Wyo., in which he says:

> You might be interested to know that each evening at 6 o'clock our church bell rings for about a minute, reminding the people of the community to pause for a minute and remember their loved ones who are in the armed forces, and to pray that we may be worthy of a just and durable peace. The men away know this, and it binds us all more closely together.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a splendid practice for the churches of all communities to have a fixed time each day when the bell of the church would ring as a reminder to the people of our responsibility for those in the armed forces. It would help to keep us conscious of the need for doing our part toward backing up these men by the purchase of Defense stamps and bonds and by giving of our services wherever we can.

In my own State I propose to recommend to the pastors of the various churches that the hour of 6 o'clock be uniformly adopted for a brief ringing of church bells, calling the people to a moment's pause for remembrance and silent prayer. I am sure that the newspapers of Wyoming will gladly give publicity to the idea and proper credit to Reverend McNeil for initiating it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have of late heard within and without Congress much criticism of Mr. Jesse Jones and the R. F. C. It is charged that they have deserted small business.

Such charge is as unjust as it is unfounded. It might be well for those who indiscriminately hurl charges at the R. F. C. to ponder the record. It has immeasurably benefited small business.

Over 53 percent of all its business loans have been $10,000 or under; over 37 percent have been $5,000 or under.

That does not show disregard of small business. On the contrary, it shows a studied purpose to aid.

Of a total number of 9,937 loans, 3,730 have been for $5,000 or under.

Let these carping critics apologize or at least cease their unfair attitude. I herewith submit a most enlightened record:

Size of business loans as of Mar. 31, 1942

(Number of loans and participations authorized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to business enterprises, excluding commitments outstanding and all national defense loans)

[Includes banks' share in sales of participations, inasmuch as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorizes and disburses full amount in each case]

Size of loans	Number of loans and participations	Percent of total	Amount authorized
$5,000 and under	3,730	37.6	$8,680,826.28
$5,001 to $10,000, inclusive	1,571	15.8	12,610,825.87
$10,001 to $25,000, inclusive	1,908	19.2	34,272,194.83
$25,001 to $50,000, inclusive	1,114	11.2	43,630,673.13
$50,001 to $100,000, inclusive	803	8.1	62,886,051.91
$100,001 to $200,000, inclusive	424	4.3	63,647,073.66
$200,001 to $500,000, inclusive	280	2.8	89,556,172.70
$500,001 to $1,000,000, inclusive	63	.6	46,704,896.24
Over $1,000,000	44	.4	123,067,398.45
Total [1]	9,937	100.0	485,065,113.07

[1] Includes $11,158,294.58 representing banks' shares in sales of participations.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place a portion of the R. F. C. record into our own RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three resolutions by the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LIBERTY BELL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 and 1940 a group of Members of the House organized themselves into what was known as the Conference on Unemployment. In the summer of 1940 we issued a final report and suggested a program, from which I would like to read two items, the fourteenth and fifteenth points. First, the fourteenth point read as follows:

> (14) Passage of legislation to provide for development of strategic and critical metallic and nonmetallic materials within our own borders. The purpose of such legislation, aside from relieving unemployment, is the encouragement of private enterprise to relieve this Nation of its dependence upon foreign countries for vital military supplies, many of which are essential to national defense.

The fifteenth point was this:

> (15) The encouragement through appropriate legislation of the cultivation of agricultural products heretofore not grown in the United States, such as rubber, and of new industrial uses for agricultural products.

It was in the summer of 1940 that this group of House Members issued this report, and I think it is no more than fair to them to draw to the attention of the Members of the House the matter published in this little booklet.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter on pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

APPEALS BY UNITED STATES TO CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS

Mr. McLAUGHLIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the Circuit Courts of Appeals in certain cases.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address which I delivered at the Benjamin Franklin High School dedication exercises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and Lieutenant General Drum, commanding officer of the eastern defense area, have emphasized a number of times that the city of New York is a bull's-eye for the enemy as a target. Up until this time, however, the city of New York has not derived any benefit from the act of Congress which appropriated $100,000,000 for equipment essential to air-raid wardens, auxiliary fire fighters, and plane spotters. The city of New York has not received a dollar's worth of much-needed equipment, it was revealed by Mayor La Guardia yesterday.

I cannot understand why we are so lax in finding out what has been done with the money which we have appropriated to protect the civilian population and to give the air-raid wardens the tools and the proper implements to cope with air raids. The mayor of the city of New York, who has always been very conscientious in protecting the people of New York against any and all types of danger and who through his work with the Office of Civilian Defense knows what is necessary to assure this protection to the people of our city, has publicly protested against this lack of equipment. Let us hope that the proper authorities in Washington heed his warning in time and supply New York, as well as the rest of the country, with the necessary equipment to fight air raids.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, my experience with the Priority Division of War Production Board is exactly the opposite of that stated by the gentleman from North Carolina. I, too, have had much business with them in recent days. For instance, we had to cut over in our country from a situation where we used many, many sacks for taking care of wheat and other crops. We had to provide elevator and crib facilities to take care of those crops on the farm. We had to get priorities on nails, hardware, and other things, but I found the Priority Division of the Board most cooperative and most helpful. This is due to the untiring and competent liaison officer for the House, Mr. W. J. Hays.

They are undertaking a tremendous task and Members should not complain, but, on the other hand, should help the Board. I have noticed that if you conform to the requests they make, then they will take up your request, put it before the Board and you will get action. I am getting trucks, I am getting elevators for my people so that they can take care of their crops. I think the Priority Division of the War Production Board is doing a wonderful work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution providing funds for the Dies committee is the first order of business today. Following that there will be the bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency for whose consideration unanimous consent was granted yesterday, with debate to be limited to 1 hour. This bill is known as the bill for the aid and relief of automobile dealers.

Tomorrow there will be considered a bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (H. R. 6156) to amend section 321, title III, part 2, of the Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, commonly known as the land-grant bill.

Other than that, I have nothing to advise the House of at this time that will come up for the remainder of the week. The probability is that on Thursday I shall ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet the following Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not yet know about the program for Monday or Tuesday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no further program to announce at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short essay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the appropriation of $110,000 that I understand the Committee on Accounts is reporting to the House for the purpose of carrying on the activities of the Dies committee. I am going to ask the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], the chairman of the committee, to yield to permit me to offer an amendment under the parliamentary procedure—the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has control of the time—and it is up to him to say whether he will yield for that purpose. I do not know whether or not he will so yield, but my amendment, if I have a chance to offer it, proposes to cut this amount to $35,000. I understand commitments have been made which might require this amount. I want to see everybody who has been hired by the committee and done any work for it paid and clean the matter up and let the committee remain in status quo for the duration of the war. I think it will serve a better purpose if the committee just be quiet for a while.

Information obtained by this committee should be turned over to the F. B. I. or the Department of Justice, or the Intelligence Department of the Army or Navy, to the end that the Department of Justice could take suitable action and the information should not be given to the newspapers. It only wises up law violators and the enemies of our country to proceed in this fashion.

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned last night when I read the announcement of the withdrawal of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM. You may have differed with him regarding foreign policy, but you admired the fierce sincerity, strong integrity, and the manifest patriotism of this distinguished son of New England. Rooted deep in the history of that great area, GEORGE TINKHAM'S forebears on both sides have given him the brave characteristics that have been so admired by the world—those gifted qualities of a manly sense of duty, perseverance, and intellectual valor that have given our people its supremacy in the stern art of labor.

His departure from this House and from our Committee on Foreign Affairs will deprive us of a great American, whose sincerity, whose patriotism, and whose wide and cosmopolitan travels have given us on that great committee an insight and an adventure that those in succeeding Congresses will miss.

He reads much, he is a great observer, and he looks quite through the deeds of men.

Those lines of Shakespeare remind me of my colleague. This is, indeed, a hurried minute in which to pay tribute to a great American.

[Here the gavel fell.]

AUTOMOBILE AND TIRE RATIONING

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the present automobile and tire rationing program bears all the earmarks of being designed and administered by persons

who may have good intentions, but absolutely no knowledge of the retail automobile business. If there is anyone connected with it who has ever been an automobile dealer, I have not yet been able to find him. The program looks as though it had been set up by a group of New York subway straphangers. The present rationing policy is nothing more or less than a Government-imposed bankruptcy sale, for the benefit of a very select few chosen ones, who obtain certificates and then go from agency to agency loudly proclaiming their political influence while looking for the dealer who is so hard pressed for ready cash that he is forced to make a sale at below his own cost.

Reports from 51 dealers in my district show that they have 3,359 cars and trucks on hand, and at the present rate of doing business, the last of these vehicles will be sold and delivered in 1954, 12 years from now. New cars, with their tires, batteries, and upholstery rotting, are being stored in open fields for lack of warehouse space or money with which to pay for storage space in a warehouse. The higher priced cars cannot be sold at all, for there are no buyers. Citizens of Glendale, Calif., have been forced to throw garbage in the streets while the Washington Office of Price Administration leisurely decides whether or not the municipality of Glendale can obtain 3 trucks, with specially built bodies for handling garbage, which have been ready for delivery to them since last December.

When the baby has the colic, give him candy; it may shut him up, but it will make him sicker. H. R. 6995 is another typical New Deal all-day sucker. But oh the pain when the succor has been sucked dry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of an order issued by the War Department relating to political activities of military personnel on active duty, which I think ought to be in the RECORD for the information of those interested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Post, entitled "Too Little, Too Late."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 475) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American activities in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $110,000, in addition to the unexpended balance heretofore appropriated for this purpose during the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Wait until I make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, as all know, the House, by a very substantial majority, on a record vote, extended the life of the so-called Dies committee. Following that action it becomes necessary for the Committee on Accounts to consider an appropriation for that select committee to carry on its activities. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in a letter addressed to me, copies of which he sent to other members of the committee, and I think some Members of the House, requested an appropriation of $300,000 to carry on the activities of the committee from now to the end of the Congress, which expires in January.

A strange situation developed after the House acted on that resolution. The Committee on Accounts received hundreds and hundreds of letters from all over the United States and also resolutions adopted from various organizations requesting the committee to deny any appropriation whatsoever to the Dies committee. The Committee on Accounts has always considered action by the House as a mandate to bring in a resolution that will enable such a committee to function.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think in all fairness the gentleman should also mention there were a considerable number who wrote in endorsing the Dies committee and its organization.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course the gentleman is correct, and I will add there were a considerable number favoring a large appropriation, but the majority were in opposition. It was by no means one-sided.

The Committee on Accounts is not a legislative committee. It has long since adopted the policy only to hear Members of Congress in reference to resolutions pending before it. It has never permitted outsiders to appear. Its meetings are executive sessions. Every Member of the Congress who requested to appear before the committee while this resolution was under consideration had an opportunity to do so. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], members of the Dies committee, appeared before the committee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was unable to attend. I postponed meetings several times, hoping he could appear. Sickness in his family, he advised me, kept him in Texas.

I may also say Members of Congress who desired to oppose the appropriation were given an opportunity to do so. In fact, they consumed most of the time. Strange to say, some Members of the Congress who voted to extend the time or the life of the Dies committee came before the Committee on Accounts and wanted us not to appropriate any money whatsoever. In other words, they vote on the floor of the House for a resolution to extend the life of the committee and then want to come downstairs and ask the representative of the House, the Accounts Committee, to deny an appropriation for the committee to function.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is the gentleman in accord with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] did with reference to the information he secured in connection with certain persons employed in a certain bureau headed by Vice President WALLACE, giving that information to the press and to the public without first giving it to the Department of Justice or to the Vice President of the United States, the head of the bureau referred to? Are you in accord with that policy? This was one of the reasons that changed my mind about the continuance of the Dies committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not here to discuss anything the Dies committee has done. That was the duty of the Rules Committee. I am here today to give the House an opportunity to vote on a resolution——

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman——

Mr. COCHRAN. Wait a minute—to vote on a resolution for the Dies committee to function. I am not condemning the Dies committee in any manner, nor discussing its activities. I consider that passed when the House voted to extend the life of the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why does the gentleman condemn anybody who changes his mind after having voted to continue this committee, when he finds the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] engaged in the practices which to my mind are more harmful than helpful——

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the gentleman's viewpoint and he can have that viewpoint.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have that viewpoint. I feel we should all have one objective and that is unity of action and purpose in winning the war.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In view of the fact that there was a roll call on the continuation of the life of the committee, certainly the Members should welcome

a roll-call vote on appropriating funds to carry it forward.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

It is for the House to decide if there is to be a record vote. Certainly I have no desire to prevent one.

I want to give you a little history of the appropriations for this committee. The Dies committee was authorized in 1938, January 9. We have appropriated $385,000 since that time. This resolution will make the total appropriations $495,000.

As I have said, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] requested $300,000, and your Committee on Accounts has recommended $110,000.

Now, in answer to the gentleman from Montana, I will say that the Accounts Committee has instructed me not to yield for an amendment to this resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for another question?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield to me to offer an amendment to reduce this amount to $35,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. I have just said that I have been instructed by the Accounts Committee not to yield for an amendment, and I will abide by the instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then the gentleman declines to yield for that purpose? I want to offer that amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is the gentleman going to yield some time for debate?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am going to yield time to those who have asked for it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, has the Committee on Accounts ever recommended an appropriation as large as $385,000 to any committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. This is the largest appropriation that any committee of the House has ever had. It covers the period from June 9, 1938, to January 3, 1943.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman tell the House who is paying for the printing of the Dies hearings and the reports and other matters that they have printed? Is that coming out of the funds appropriated to the Dies committee, or is the Congress or the Government or the American people paying additional sums for the printing of all the material that has been sent out in the last 4 years?

Mr. COCHRAN. The charge for reporting the hearings is paid out of this fund. The cost of printing comes out of the general printing fund.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the cost for printing covers about $80,000 or $90,000 besides.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know, I could not agree with the gentleman, but I doubt very much if it is that much. I do not control that appropriation; the Clerk of the House handles it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The last figure I got was $70,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, unless someone has a question to ask, I have nothing further to say, except that the Accounts Committee is following the mandate of the House by bringing in this resolution. It is up to the House now to decide what it desires to do.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that during the life of the original McCormack committee, from about 1934 to 1936, we were the pioneers of this investigation. We worked hard; we had fine investigators; and all we ever got from this Congress was $30,000. We got along for over a year and a half on that amount, and then we returned some of the money to the Treasury of the United States. I believe there is not a Member on this floor who can question the fine work of the McCormack committee, because when we got through, we actually presented constructive propositions, and we were responsible for the passage of the Registration Act, requiring the registration of agents of foreign nations, and with the help of this law the Department of Justice today is able to procure convictions of enemy agents in every city in this country. The McCormack committee did not have as many investigators as the Dies committee has had, but we did a good job for that amount of money, for a year and a half. The Dies committee has already gotten $385,000, and you are now going to give them another $110,000. I say $385,000, and this does not include the salary of reporters in the District of Columbia, which the committee does not have to pay out of its own funds, and it does not include the money spent for the printing of a great number of publications which in my opinion have absolutely no value other than to keep the Dies committee before the public eye. The American people are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for the printing of such publications. It seems to me that the activities of the Dies committee in the past have given us no reason to suppose that in voting for another appropriation we are protecting our country against subversive activities and sabotage. The committee has done very little constructive work along these lines, and the Department of Justice and the F. B. I. are doing all the work which the Dies committee was supposed to do. Thank the Lord we have a J. Edgar Hoover and a Justice Department to rely upon in these critical times.

I have no use for communism, but to call people Reds without giving them an opportunity to be heard is unfair and unbecoming a congressional committee. I have nothing against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I admire him and I admire every member of that committee. They started off all right, but, in view of the fact that they have not submitted to this Congress, or the last Congress, or the Congress before, any constructive legislation that would destroy the fifth or the sixth columns in this country, I think we should pause a moment before granting them this amount. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we stop wasting the taxpayers' money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted for a continuation of this committee, but when I read in the newspaper what you all read, what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] did with information that he received as to certain Communists in the employ of the Government, and how he gave it to the newspapers instead of giving it to the Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, who heads the committee attacked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], or the Department of Justice, I regretted my action in so voting. I regard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] very highly. His patriotism cannot be questioned, but I do not like the way he is doing. I think he is one of the greatest orators I have ever listened to. I have seen him nearly sweep this House off its feet. I also think he has done a lot of good work and dug up a lot of good information, but there are different ways of handling this information. If he has secured information of value to our country during these times, and it is the kind of information that should be given to the Department of Justice, then that is where it should be given, not to the newspapers first.

Furthermore, this committee does not function as a committee. It is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He ignores the remainder of the committee. The public does not know who the other members are. I know I might just as well talk against the wind as to talk against this resolution, because it will be passed. Arbitrarily I have been denied the right to offer an amendment to this resolution. We must either vote it up or down; and, of course, I know it will be passed. But I will express my views in the hope that they might be helpful.

Maybe it would not be important whether the entire committee functioned or not if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] proceeded along the line expected of him by the House who voted his authority; but what has he done? The record indisputably shows that he has gone down to the State of Texas and there proposes to hold his hearings. I certainly have no objection to the State of Texas. Next to my own State of Montana, it is about one of the best in the Union. Does this procedure conform to the practice and dignity of the House of Representatives, whose place of business is at the Capitol in Washington, D. C.? Every Member of this House has a part in this procedure. It is not Mr. DIES' committee. It is a committee of the House. It is your committee and my committee. We cannot blink what is going on. We cannot evade our responsibility by being blind. Nobody will doubt but what we are faced with the most critical crisis that ever confronted our country. We cannot and must not be

a party or give our official sanction to any words or action that would tend to divide or disunite our people. Divide and destroy is Hitler's method. Of course, you may go back further in history and find that that has always been the hand and plan of the conquerors of other nations. We have a common purpose with the nations who today are opposing the Axis forces. As so well pointed out by the Attorney General, we have the F. B. I. and the Navy and Army Intelligence Services. They are experienced investigators. Among them are few, if any tyros. Let us not bungle the job. I quote from what the Attorney General said, as quoted by the Associated Press:

Attorney General Biddle said yesterday—

This was the 18th of this month—

in connection with plans of Representative DIES, of Texas, to hold hearings at Jasper, Tex., on Nazi spy activities, that "I think it always a pity to have amateur investigations of espionage."

Asked at a press conference about DIES' announced intention, the Attorney General said:

"We have three large investigative services—the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Navy and Army Intelligence Services. They have been cooperating perfectly and are in daily contact. I think it is always a pity to have amateur investigations of espionage, whether by Mr. DIES or anyone else. It needs trained, coordinated, responsible action."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit that, despite the House vote last March for continuing the life of the Dies committee, we must pass on this appropriation in accordance with the times and circumstances in which we find ourselves and on the question of the usefulness of the Dies committee itself in the winning of this war. I say that, despite the vote on the Dies resolution in March, we are duty-bound to vote down this appropriation if we find that the Dies committee impedes the war effort. I am directing my remarks especially to those who voted for the Dies resolution last month and I call their attention to certain irrefutable and uncontradicted evidence which proves conclusively that this committee on its record has been and is interfering with the successful prosecution of our war against the fifth column.

I submit proof to you that its efforts and its activities are contrary to the best interests of the war effort.

Surely, as responsible Representatives of the people, if we feel that the aims and actions of this committee are contrary to the best interests of the war effort, then it is our solemn duty to vote against any appropriation, despite the action of the House during the month of March.

I call to your attention an article which I have in my hand, published in a newspaper called Enterprise, of Beaumont, Tex., dated April 18, 1942. As far as I know this is the only paper in which this news story appears. It is published in Mr. DIES' district. In this article Mr. DIES is quoted as saying as follows:

If anyone's an amateur in this business—

Get this, please, because it is very important—

If anyone's an amateur in this business it's the Federal Bureau of Investigation. My committee has been making investigations for 4 years, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation only admitted a year ago that there might be a fifth-column problem in the United States. Before that they ridiculed the idea.

Mr. Biddle has never been sympathetic to our committee, but he never hesitates to get his evidence from us and he keeps 3 Federal Bureau of Investigation men permanently stationed in our committee's office. We have on record 1,145 requests from the Federal Bureau of Investigation for evidence. Conviction of 984 persons the last 12 months came as a result of being exposed by the Un-American Activities Committee.

They didn't give us any credit for it, but anyone who wants to make an investigation will see that the convictions were on our evidence.

I have made an investigation. I communicated with the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has informed me that this statement is entirely untrue — absolutely untrue. Further than that, there is now in the possession of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover a letter or a telegram, I do not remember the form, in which Mr. DIES has informed Mr. Hoover that he has asked the Beaumont Enterprise to retract this statement which is contained in this article.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You will note that Mr. DIES also states in the same article that the F. B. I. had three of their men permanently stationed in the Dies committee office. The Department of Justice has informed me that this statement also is absolutely untrue. That statement has also been retracted by Mr. DIES himself, according to the message sent to Mr. Hoover. In the same news article Mr. DIES reiterates his intention to do the committee's business on his own ranch, deep in the heart of Jasper, Tex. This information shocked the American people. It should shock the American Congress.

Now, what does this latest antic of Mr. DIES mean? It means throwing a monkey wrench into the law-enforcement agency which is conducting our war against the enemy Axis agents and fifth columnists in the Unitd States. If the chairman of the committee can recklessly make those statements and then retract them after the damage is done at a time as perilous as this, then I say this $110,000 is not a contribution in the furtherance of our war effort, but I say it is a contribution against the best interests of our war effort. It is a contribution to disunity, to division, and, above all, to the undermining of our Nation's war machinery.

Let us look a little more closely at the Dies allegation contained in this same article that 95 percent of the convictions obtained by the F. B. I. against German agents were obtained as a result of the activities of the Dies committee. As I have stated, the Department of Justice brands it as completely false. Mr. Dies is now forced to retract it.

The Dies committee was created to investigate un-American propaganda. The grand jury which has been sitting in Washington for the past few months has called before it many important and notorious witnesses. It has indeed been investigating un-American propaganda and un-American activities. Yet not one of these witnesses before this grand jury was ever summoned before the Dies committee for exposure. The grand jury heard evidence about the far-flung system of un-American publications which are being circulated in this country. Yet not one of the editors, owners, or backers of these un-American publications has ever been summoned before the Dies committee for exposure. In fact, the very existence of this special grand jury is eloquent testimony to the fact that the Dies committee in its 4 years of existence and with its $385,000 has failed miserably to do the job assigned to it, and it is other Government agencies which are now efficiently engaged in ferreting out these enemy agents and their domestic lackeys.

In this same issue of the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, Mr. DIES is quoted as saying that he could find only five editorials throughout the country which expressed approval of Vice President WALLACE's rebuke of the Dies committee. This strikes me as being on the humorous side. The chairman of a committee whose job is one of investigation can only find five editorials which support Mr. WALLACE, whereas a phone call from my office to the Division of Press Intelligence reveals that even a quick check of editorials in leading newspapers shows 64 as vigorously attacking the Dies committee for its smear of the Board of Economic Warfare. I am afraid that Mr. DIES' research in the field of editorial comment is on the same level as his committee's research on un-American activities.

We are now considering whether to appropriate an additional $110,000 for the work of the Dies committee.

If we do so, there will be a great rejoicing in at least two quarters of the enemy camp.

There will be rejoicing in Berlin, which will congratulate itself on the fact that it will continue to have the opportunity of making use of the statements and work of the Dies committee, its chairman, and its investigators. In another speech I have shown you how the Goebbels short wave radios quote Mr. DIES' statements with approbation. The Nazis will also be happy to know, for example, that the $7,200 investigator for the Dies committee, J. B. Matthews, is still around. For they have found his statements most useful. In fact, as I revealed before the Committee on Accounts, Herr Goebbels' personal publication, Contra Komintern, which is used to spread Nazi propaganda within Germany and throughout the world, found the testimony of Matthews before the Dies committee of such importance to them that they printed it in full, devoting large sections of three issues of this publication to it. Contra Komintern would regret to see the Dies

committee deprived of an appropriation since, as the chief publication medium for the Nazi total espionage system, the magazine has made ample use of the words of the chief investigator for the Dies committee. Its boss, Mr. Goebbels, would likewise regret to see Mr. DIES deprived of this appropriation and thus lose the usefulness of the American public official frequently and favorably quoted by him in his radio propaganda attacks against America.

And there will be rejoicing in our own country among such groups as the Ku Klux Klan, which in various States has openly joined with the Nazi Bund in attacks upon our American institutions. The Imperial Wizard of this pernicious, un-American gang will consider his work well done if the Dies committee receives an appropriation. On January 27 of this year, as reported in The Fiery Cross, official organ of the Ku Klux Klan, this Imperial Wizard ordered all Klan members to campaign for the continuation of the Dies committee, since, said he:

> The committee has rendered a great service to our country.

The great service to which the Imperial Wizard referred was the fair and courteous treatment which the Dies committee accorded the head of this subversive organization.

Therefore, again I say that to appropriate $110,000 for the work of this committee is to appropriate funds against the best interests of our war effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel to make with our friends who do not like the Dies committee. They probably feel they have a just grievance. Certainly they have the right to criticize. I have the conviction, however, that the Dies committee has rendered a very valuable service to the country, and I am glad to say so. It is possible that the committee has done an injustice to some by classifying them as Communists, fifth columnists, and so forth. If this is so, it is to be regretted, but it was not malicious or with intention to embarrass. We all make mistakes, but we make no mistake to say the country as a whole is heartily behind this committee. The people feel that this committee has rendered a great service.

Replying specifically to the argument of the gentleman from New York, which was to the effect that the work of this committee is no contribution to the war effort and might as well be suspended, it might be said that the activity of the "new orderites" is no contribution to the war effort. If they should cease their efforts to make over the country, then we might suspend the investigations being carried on by this committee; but they are still boring away and as long as they are active in behalf of making over America there is work for the Dies committee to do. I hope this House will evidence its appreciation of this committee by voting overwhelmingly for the resolution which the chairman of the Committee on Accounts offers.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since the Dies committee was extended on March 11, three events have happened which make me feel that it would be unwise to give them the appropriation that has been recommended: First, there was the reckless and largely unsubstantiated attack by the chairman of the committee upon a vital war agency. Second, there was the announcement of the chairman of that committee that he personally was going to smash the Nazi spy ring—I quote him—by holding hearings in Texas. As has been pointed out here today and as has been pointed out by the Attorney General counterespionage is desperately serious business and is being handled and should be handled by the trained and responsible agencies of the administrative branch of the Government. Third, in these last 6 weeks a number of newspapers and at least one national magazine have given the country what we have a right to expect the Dies committee to give us. They have printed exposés of the most dangerous fifth-column operation now in this country on behalf of our enemies. They have named the names of organizations and of those filthy sheets called "the vermin press" by one of the reporters, which are really trying to contribute to disunity and defeat here in America. The Dies committee has not done anything about these real un-American activities at all. For these reasons, regardless of our vote in March, it seems to me that the record of the last month of the Dies committee and its chairman is such as to justify a denial of further appropriations.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] to make an observation.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my record in opposition to the work of this committee is very clear. I appeared on the floor and argued against the extension of the life of the committee, and I appeared before the Accounts Committee in opposition to the appropriation. I am still opposed to it, and for one particular reason: We are now at war. This committee may have served some purpose during peacetime, but now that we are at war, we need unity among our people. The work of this committee, and particularly of its chairman is having the opposite effect; it is disuniting our people, it is arraying class against class, and force against force. This does not help our war effort, and in fact, is impeding it. Our people must be united, at this time, particularly. We have law-enforcement agencies in this country, the Department of Justice and the F. B. I., that can do the work this committee is attempting, and do it much better without publicizing any particular individual, and without building up anybody. This bureau is in charge of J. Edgar Hoover who has done a marvelous job, and I am sure he will continue his good work. Certainly, it is better to have a man of this type directing the work of tracking down subversive groups and others guilty of sabotage and pro-Axis activities, than for it to be done by any amateur group, no matter how zealous they may be. For this reason I urge you to vote down the resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Accounts bases this amount upon a deficit of about $10,000 and an additional $100,000. The committee feels this will be sufficient to enable the committee to function as it has in the last 3 or 4 months, and should last until January 3, 1943, when the life of the Dies committee expires.

Mr. Speaker, every Member who has asked for time has been recognized. It is now the duty of the House to vote on the resolution as I will not use any additional time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 109, noes 31.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 291, nays 64, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—291

Allen, Ill.	Buck	Dewey
Allen, La.	Burch	Dirksen
Andersen, H. Carl	Butler	Domengeaux
	Camp	Dondero
Anderson, Calif.	Canfield	Doughton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cannon, Mo.	Douglas
	Capozzoli	Drewry
Andresen, August H.	Carlson	Duncan
	Carter	Durham
Andrews	Cartwright	Dworshak
Angell	Casey, Mass.	Eaton
Arends	Chapman	Edmiston
Barden	Chenoweth	Elliott, Calif.
Barnes	Chiperfield	Elston
Barry	Claypool	Engel
Bates, Mass.	Clevenger	Englebright
Baumhart	Cluett	Faddis
Beam	Cochran	Fellows
Beckworth	Coffee, Nebr.	Fenton
Belter	Cole, N. Y.	Fish
Bell	Collins	Flaherty
Bender	Colmer	Flannagan
Bennett	Cooley	Ford, Le'and M.
Bishop	Cooper	Ford, Miss.
Bland	Copeland	Fulmer
Boehne	Costello	Gamble
Boggs	Courtney	Gathings
Boland	Cox	Gavagan
Bolton	Cravens	Gearhart
Bonner	Crawford	Gehrmann
Boren	Cunningham	Gerlach
Boykin	Curtis	Gibson
Brooks	D'Alesandro	Gilchrist
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ohio	Gillette
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.	Gillie
Bryson	Day	Gore

Gossett	McKeough	Sasscer
Graham	McLaughlin	Satterfield
Grant, Ind.	McLean	Sauthoff
Gregory	McMillan	Schuetz
Guyer	Maas	Scott
Gwynne	Mahon	Scrugham
Hall,	Mansco	Secrest
Edwin Arthur	Mansfield	Sheppard
Hall,	Martin, Iowa	Short
Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.	Simpson
Halleck	May	Smith, Maine
Hancock	Meyer, Md.	Smith, Va.
Hare	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Wis.
Harris, Ark.	Mills, La.	Snyder
Harris, Va.	Monroney	South
Hart	Moser	Sparkman
Harter	Mott	Spence
Hartley	Mundt	Springer
Healey	Murdock	Steagall
Hébert	Murray	Stearns, N. H.
Heidinger	Nelson	Stefan
Hess	Nichols	Stevenson
Hill, Colo.	Norrell	Stratton
Hinshaw	Norton	Sullivan
Hobbs	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sumner, Ill.
Hope	O'Hara	Sutphin
Howell	Oliver	Taber
Hull	O'Neal	Talbot
Hunter	O'Toole	Talle
Imhoff	Pace	Tarver
Jacobsen	Paddock	Tenerowicz
Jenkins, Ohio	Patman	Terry
Jenks, N. H.	Patton	Thill
Jennings	Pearson	Thom
Jensen	Peterson, Ga.	Thomas, N. J.
Johns	Pittenger	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	Plauché	Thomason
Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser	Tibbott
Johnson, Ind.	Plumley	Tinkham
Johnson,	Poage	Treadway
Luther A.	Powers	Van Zandt
Johnson, Okla.	Priest	Vincent, Ky.
Jones	Randolph	Vinson, Ga.
Jonkman	Rankin, Miss.	Voorhis, Calif.
Kean	Reece, Tenn.	Vorys, Ohio
Keefe	Reed, Ill.	Wadsworth
Kefauver	Reed, N. Y.	Ward
Kelly, Ill.	Rees, Kans.	Wene
Kilburn	Rich	Wheat
Kilday	Richards	Whelchel
Kinzer	Rivers	Whitten
Kleberg	Rizley	Whittington
Knutson	Robertson,	Wickersham
Lambertson	N. Dak.	Wigglesworth
Lane	Robertson, Va.	Williams
Lanham	Robinson, Utah	Winter
Larrabee	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott
Lea	Rockefeller	Wolfenden, Pa.
LeCompte	Rockwell	Wolverton, N. J.
Lewis	Rodgers, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Lynch	Rogers, Okla.	Youngdahl
McCormack	Rolph	Zimmerman
McGehee	Russell	
McGregor	Sanders	

NAYS—64

Baldwin	Haines	Mitchell
Bates, Ky.	Hill, Wash.	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Holbrock	O'Connor
Bulwinkle	Hook	O'Leary
Burdick	Houston	Pheiffer,
Burgin	Izac	William T.
Celler	Jackson	Pierce
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, W. Va.	Rabaut
Crowther	Kee	Ramsay
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Sacks
Dickstein	Kennedy,	Scanlon
Dingell	Martin J.	Schulte
Downs	Keogh	Shanley
Eberharter	Kirwan	Sheridan
Eliot, Mass.	Klein	Smith, Wash.
Fitzgerald	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Fogarty	Leavy	Traynor
Folger	Lesinski	Wasielewski
Forand	McGranery	Weaver
Ford, Thomas F.	McIntyre	Weiss
Gale	Maciora	Wright
Granger	Marcantonio	Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Arnold

NOT VOTING—75

Blackney	Creal	Harness
Bloom	Crosser	Harrington
Bradley, Mich.	Culkin	Heffernan
Buckler, Minn.	Cullen	Hendricks
Buckley, N. Y.	Dies	Hoffman
Byrne	Disney	Holmes
Byron	Ditter	Jarman
Cannon, Fla.	Ellis	Jarrett
Case, S. Dak.	Fitzpatrick	Johnson,
Clark	Gifford	Lyndon B.
Clason	Grant, Ala.	Kennedy,
Cole, Md.	Green	Michael J.
Kerr	Patrick	Smith, Pa.
Kocialkowski	Peterson, Fla.	Smith, W. Va.
Kramer	Pfeifer,	Starnes, Ala.
Kunkel	Joseph L.	Sumners, Tex.
Landis	Ramspeck	Sweeney
Ludlow	Rankin, Mont.	Tolan
Maciejewski	Rogers, Mass.	Vreeland
Magnuson	Romjue	Walter
Mason	Sabath	Welch
Merritt	Schaefer, Ill.	West
Michener	Shafer, Mich.	White
Myers, Pa.	Shannon	Wilson
O'Day	Sikes	Woodrum, Va.
Osmers	Smith, Ohio	Worley

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Michener for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. O'Day against.

Mr. Shafer of Michigan for, with Miss Rankin of Montana against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Creal with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Green with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. West with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Byrne.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Worley.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Merritt.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Disney.

Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Myers.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL A. LARNED

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army is hereby rescinded;

Resolved further, That the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in passing the said bill is hereby vacated.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK?]

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the announcement I previously made about business on tomorrow, I want to announce to the House that an appropriation bill out of the Appropriations Committee to construct defense housing in the District of Columbia, which I understand is noncontroversial, will be brought up for consideration on tomorrow, also.

RELIEF OF DEALERS IN CERTAIN ARTICLES OR COMMODITIES RATIONED UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6761; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2315, for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States, may be considered in lieu of the House bill, the bills being identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is calling up H. R. 6761?

Mr. STEAGALL. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the gentleman is calling up H. R. 6761.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The bill that I understood was to be called up is a bill reported out of the committee, reintroduced yesterday, H. R. 6995.

Mr. STEAGALL. If I have the number wrong, I am glad the gentleman called my attention to it. I merely referred to the original number, and I thank the gentleman. I asked unanimous consent to consider the Senate bill, S. 2315, which is identical with the bill reported to the House by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the bill H. R. 6995 is identical with S. 2315 as it passed the Senate yesterday.

Mr. STEAGALL. Quite correct. The bills are identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill S. 2315, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is identical with the bill reported to the House by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The difficulties which automobile dealers and others find themselves, resulting from orders of restriction, rationing, and freezing in order to carry out the emergency program of the Government, difficulties which seem to be recognized on all hands, call for such relief as can be afforded only by legislative enactment. It is the purpose of this bill to permit loans and purchases for the relief of this class of our citizens, who have stocks of commodities on hand which they are not permitted to sell. Yet expenses, rents, and all incident to expenses of handling these commodities, accumulate continuously. This in brief is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has given considerable study to the problem confronting small business concerns. In view of the splendid work he has done in connection with the bill and his familiarity with it, I shall not discuss the measure further at this time. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are now considering is S. 2315. It is the same as my bill, H. R. 6995, in the House. It passed the Senate on yesterday. If you will turn to page 3696 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, Monday, April 27, 1942, you will find where the discussion on the bill commences. The bill was thoroughly and fully discussed in the Senate.

As introduced in the House, the bill was not exactly like the bill that was pending in the Senate. The Senate made some changes in committee and the House Committee on Banking and Currency made some changes in committee. Yesterday the Senate accepted the amendments the House committee had adopted, and the House committee had theretofore accepted and adopted the amendments agreed upon by the Senate committee, so the bill H. R. 6995 is identical with the bill S. 2315 that passed the Senate on yesterday.

COMMITTEES ON SMALL BUSINESS

This bill is an outgrowth and result of the work of the Committees on Small Business in the Senate and in the House. Both of these committees have been working on these problems for several months. The House Committee on Small Business, composed of Representatives BULWINKLE, KELLY of Illinois, FITZGERALD, HALLECK, LEONARD W. HALL, PLOESER, and myself, chairman, gave extensive hearings to the automobile dealers and tire dealers. There were automobile dealers here from every State, hundreds of them. We heard every representative of the automobile dealers who desired to be heard, and even heard individual dealers not connected with any association who desired to express their views. They left here with the feeling that they would receive sympathetic consideration from this Congress, and they have received it. They are entitled to that consideration, because the automobile dealers and the tire dealers were the first to feel what the President of the United States called yesterday "equality of privilege."

The automobile dealers came before us and said, "We are not complaining, we are not protesting, we are not objecting. If it is necessary to put us out of business, it will be perfectly all right. We believe this war comes first. It means in many cases the destruction of our businesses, it means taking away our lifetime savings, it means everything to us, but the war comes first. We are willing to make any sacrifice that is necessary for us to make in order to contribute our part toward the winning of this war."

I have never known a group to manifest a finer spirit of patriotism than the automobile dealers and others who are affected by the drastic regulations which it was absolutely necessary to make in order to conserve the civilian supply of automobiles, tires, and other commodities, and also for the purpose of converting the huge, immense automobile factories into factories to make the war products necessary to the prosecution of this war.

Many people were not convinced at first that this rationing was necessary, but I believe every informed person today is absolutely convinced that the fair and sensible and right thing was done in the rationing of automobiles, tires, and other commodities affected by this bill.

Since these regulations were introduced, 44,000 automobile dealers in the United States of America have had their stocks of cars absolutely frozen. Their money has been invested in these cars. Many of the dealers have not only paid for the cars by securing loans from banks but are paying interest on the money they have borrowed to pay for these cars. They are paying for the upkeep of the cars and are servicing them and keeping them in proper condition. They are keeping them well stored and preserved and protected from the hazards of the weather. I believe they are rendering a real Government service.

People who are doing that at their own expense and at their own risk, and most of whom will be put out of business, should certainly receive the sympathetic consideration of the Congress of the United States, and that is exactly what this bill is intended to do. It is intended to give them an opportunity to get their money out of these automobiles.

This does not mean the Government will lose. The Government will not necessarily lose 1 penny, but it is possible for the Government to lose some money.

This is not a bill for the relief of the automobile dealers, because it is not a relief bill. It should not be considered in that category at all. It should be considered as a bill to grant what the Constitution of the United States says, in a small measure at least, compensation to one whose property has been taken by reason of laws passed by Congress. So it is a bill for security or compensation and not a bill for relief.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman says this is not a bill for relief, but in section 5h (a) it is stated:

In order to prevent and relieve distress among dealers.

How, then, can the gentleman say this is not a relief bill?

Mr. PATMAN. In this bill the word "relief" is used, but I am telling the gentleman now it is not a relief bill as one might refer to a W. P. A. bill or something like that. I refer to it as a bill to grant compensation to automobile dealers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO What rate of interest will these dealers have to pay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not believe the interest rate is fixed by the bill, but the rate will be reasonable, we are assured.

Mr. DONDERO. There is nothing in the bill about that?

Mr. PATMAN No; but it will be a very reasonable rate, as the R. F. C. has the policy of making the rates low.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman in the course of his discussion make clear just exactly what subsection 1 and subsection 4 of section 5h (a) really mean?

I confess that after reading the debates in the Senate and reading these two sections, I am very much confused, and I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his understanding as this bill is written that an automobile dealer with a stock of cars on his hands may wait 18 months from and after January 1, 1942, before relief can be extended to him under the terms of this act.

Mr. PATMAN. No; loans may be granted before that time.

Mr. KEEFE. At what time?

Mr. PATMAN. But the R. F. C. is not compelled to make any loans or any purchase before 18 months from January 1, 1942.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I understand the language of the bill is to the effect that the R. F. C. may make loans in advance of the 18-month period.

Mr. PATMAN. They may make loans now or as soon as this bill becomes law.

Mr. KEEFE. But they are not compelled to do it until after the dealers have had those stocks on hand for 18 months

after the rationing order went into effect?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. How does the gentleman interpret paragraph 1 relating to the 6 months?

Mr. PATMAN. That is in relation to the article rationed. The word "automobile," I do not believe, is used here. This refers to all commodities that come within the terms of the bill, and the 6-month provision relates to a definition of the rationing order that would cause the article to come within the terms of the act.

Mr. KEEFE. Would the gentleman consider the automobile freezing order as "rationing," as defined in this act?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely; I think the gentleman's interpretation is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell me just what the condition of the tires in these stocks after 18 months have elapsed and they have been sitting around in storage will be?

Mr. PATMAN. Necessarily, they will not be as good. But, of course, most of the cars will be moved in months.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. As I understand this measure, it proposes that the R. F. C. will make loans to automobile dealers in order to let them carry their stocks and protect them over a period of months.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MAY. I thought the committee would bring in a bill that would lift these restrictions and allow them to sell their stocks on hand to their customers and save the Government from having to lend money and let them take care of their own business which they could do. We are not manufacturing cars and they would find a ready market.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree that that would be a convenient and easy way, and, maybe, the most economical way, but there are other factors to be considered, and the main factor is one with which the gentleman has as much to do as any other man in Congress today, and by reason of those factors it is not considered wise to do what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. MAY. Is it desired by the War or Navy Departments to have some of these cars, and if so, why do they not buy and pay for them?

Mr. PATMAN. They will be doing that every day, I think.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman, I believe, has a good bill, and I am for it. I notice on page 4 of the bill there is a provision that in the event the property itself does not bring sufficient to pay off the loan with interest, there will be no deficiency claim against the borrower.

Mr. PATMAN. That is conditioned upon but one thing, and that is if a price is fixed by the Price Administrator which would interfere with it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think that is a very good provision.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes. You see, if a borrower abuses the security or permits it to deteriorate unnecessarily, he could be charged with that, but if there is a loss solely by reason of the price fixed by a Government official, then that difference should not be held against the man obtaining the loan.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman that I am very much in favor of his bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman whether I am correct in my interpretation of that 6 months' provision about which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] asked. As I understand it, the purpose of the bill is to limit its operations to commodities in the case of which it would not be possible for the dealer in that commodity to dispose of stocks that he has on hand within a 6 months' period. In other words, if sugar dealers were being rationed, it would be natural to suppose that retail dealers would sell all the sugar they had on hand at the time the rationing began.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So it would not affect them but would affect people like automobile dealers.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; and tire dealers and dealers in refrigerators, and things of that sort.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would also like to ask the gentleman the relation between paragraph 3 and paragraph 4, because paragraph 3 states that "such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him," while paragraph 4 states——

Mr. PATMAN Wait—"plus a reasonable allowance," and so forth.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Plus certain charges, that is right, but paragraph 4 puts it on the basis of a fair retail price. Why do you have both of those provisions and what is the relation of one to the other?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will notice that paragraph 4 relates to the 18 months' provision, where it is compulsory after 18 months, and it is separate and distinct from paragraph 3, which is optional between now and 18 months.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I have great admiration for the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], but when I first read this bill it directed the R. F. C. to make these loans.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Afterward the direction was eliminated, and it was made permissive. In the light of the experiences that we have all had, it seems to me that making it permissive vitiated the purposes that the gentleman and I had in mind to help those industries.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know the point the gentleman is making. I concede that when the bill was introduced in the House and in the Senate it carried a provision that the R. F. C. was directed to make these loans, but the hearings developed certain testimony that caused both committees to unanimously change their minds, because this applies to everything, not only automobiles, refrigerators, and tires, but to everything—something in the future, and we do not know what it will apply to. Therefore we are not willing to tie our hands on something we cannot see in the future, and we left it up to the Administrator, and authorized him, with the understanding that he would consider this a mandate of the Congress and absolutely carry it out in letter and spirit.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Just one other question. Among those who asked for this change was the Chairman of the R. F. C., Mr. Jones?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. He would be the logical one to point out to us the defects, and he did point them out, and every member of the committee agreed with him.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I shall vote for the bill, but with great misgivings, because of the change I refer to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I commend my colleague for what he and his committee have done in drafting a bill to meet the needs so prevalent throughout the United States. I ask this question: What time limit is placed with reference to the sale or the disposition of these cars?

Mr. PATMAN. Eighteen months. In other words, if they are not disposed of within that time, the Government will purchase them or make loans upon them.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman stated to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] awhile ago, as I understood, that loans could be made today.

Mr. PATMAN. When this bill passes; yes.

Mr. PACE. As I read the bill, it says that to become eligible you must have a commodity which is not normally moved within 6 months.

Mr. PATMAN. No; one that will not normally move within that time. For instance, sugar, as suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], will normally move quickly to consumers in 6 months. Therefore the bill would not apply to it but would apply to automobiles which have been rationed which would not move so quickly.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I rise simply to compliment the gentleman from Texas upon bringing this bill into the House. It is very much needed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman, but it is the Committee on Banking and Currency that does this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the position of the dealer who has his cars frozen for this year's carry? How is he going to be relieved of the amount of money to be expended?

Mr. PATMAN. That is to be taken into consideration. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman sits down, I would like to know how this bill will relieve small factories, iron workers, and furnace factories that manufacture different kinds of articles?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the gentleman has a different bill in mind. The bill he refers to is the one which the House committee is now considering, and the one that the Senate has already passed, to set up a corporation for smaller manufacturing concerns. I think that bill will be in soon. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. Personally, I am somewhat disappointed in this bill because I believe it contains some inconsistencies and possibly some incongruities. I believe that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authority at the present time to do everything that this bill contemplates in its present form. However, Mr. Jones, before the Senate committee, announced that if this policy were reenunciated he would consider it—and I am quoting the substance of his remarks and not verbatim—a mandate to carry out the legislative policy. That statement has been interpreted by Mr. Bishop, of the American Automobile Dealers' Association, to be an unequivocal promise on the part of Mr. Jones that the automobile dealers would get relief under this bill, and, although they would have preferred to have the bill directive instead of being a mere authorization, they have accepted the statement made by Mr. Jones, and, if they are satisfied, we should be satisfied.

During the hearings I brought up the question and I asked Mr. Bishop about these different things. The testimony is from page 30 on, in part II, of the unrevised committee print of the hearings. In part, it is as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Bishop, as I understand the Senate bill, as reported out, the purchase or loan of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be made on the basis which will enable him under certain conditions to receive not less than a fair retail price as fixed by the Price Control Administrator for such article or commodity. Now, that preserves in the Office of Price Administration the authority of completely nullifying the purpose of this act, does it not?

Mr. BISHOP. That would be possible; yes, sir.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In section (a) the Senate has authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, either directly or acting through its subsidiaries, to purchase and make loans upon the security of automobiles and other articles, but they have stricken out the word "directed" from the bill.

With the exception of authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy these automobiles, what difference is there between this set-up and the present set-up of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? At the present time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as I understand it, is authorized to make loans to automobile dealers for this purpose. Of course, they contemplate that they can take title to the car if they do not pay their loan. So in practice what difference is there between the present situation and the contemplated situation?

Mr. BISHOP. There is this difference only, it seems to me: Mr. Jones stated without qualification before the Senate committee yesterday that if Congress through an authorization expressed a public policy as to what his agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, should do, that they would carry through; and that if as the bill was reported out by the Senate, if that is adopted expressing as the policy established by Congress, and automobile dealers and others within the purview of this bill should have this relief——

Mr. WOLCOTT. You think that it would be stronger with that word left in?

Mr. BISHOP. Of course, it would be much stronger if the word "directed" were there. But on the unequivocal statements of the Secretary yesterday on the adoption by Congress of a policy as to how this work out should be made, it seems to us that it would be done

Mr. WOLCOTT. He is authorized to purchase or make these loans. And then in subsection (5) on page 3 the Senate has removed the mandatory features in line 11 and changed the word "shall" to "may," so that he does not have to purchase or loan on the request of any dealer. What was the purpose of making that change?

Mr. BISHOP. That was taken out for the same purpose—that Mr. Jones stated that it was not necessary for his agency to be directed; that if his agency were authorized by Congress to carry out a policy, it would be done.

Furthermore, it was expressed yesterday that while it is known today what the coverage of this bill is, circumstances may arise in connection with the necessity of rationing that other articles might come under here which would embarrass the agency.

For example, one Senator pointed out the situation where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation might be called upon by a dealer to purchase one bicycle, and the relief in that situation would be so limited that it would not be necessary, as it is in the broader situation, and that the expense of handling such a situation might be prohibitive to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Those are the two considerations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is the National Automobile Dealers' Association satisfied to have the language in line 10, on page 1, changed to a mere authorization instead of directing, and with the idea of trusting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to do that, and to have the word "shall" changed to "may" in line 11, page 3, subsection (5)?

Mr. BISHOP. Yesterday I made the statement before the Senate committee, representing my group, that we were opposed to the elimination of the word "directed" and the change of the word "shall" to "may," but that in view of the unequivocal statements of the Secretary on the record of that hearing it was inconceivable that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would refuse to follow out the authorization of Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Congress has authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to small industries and small businesses. Congress has authorized the Federal Reserve bank to make loans aggregating $139,000,000 to small business. Because those loans were not being made, we found it necessary to introduce a new bill reenunciating the legislative policy in the hope that because of that they would go ahead and make these loans, because, of course, we are as deeply concerned over small business as we are concerned with the automotive industry.

The automobile dealers are in the most peculiar situation. It seems to me—and doesn't it to you?—that Mr. Jones has authority at the present time under existing law to make these loans if he considers it advisable to do so?

Mr. BISHOP. Yes; I believe that that is true.

The only thing which impels me to go along with this bill is because it is satisfactory to the people who are most vitally concerned. In section 5 (h) you will notice that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity. Then, in subsection 4, on page 2, it says:

Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

The Senate version of this bill is as follows, and frankly I cannot find in the bill any language which substantiates the Senate version as expressed in the debates on yesterday. The Senate was told, and we will have to accept it, that loans may be made 2, 4, 6 months or up to 18 months after the rationing order takes effect. The rationing order took effect January 1, 1942. So the automobile dealers believe that at the present moment the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make such loans and purchases. Now, that is undoubtedly true, but the Senate has interpreted subsection 4 on page 2 to mean that after the 18-month period has expired, then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to make those loans and purchases. I cannot find in the following language "such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which," and so forth, any directive language except as it is qualified by the word "such", the first word in the sentence, which refers to the loans which they are only authorized but not directed to make. If they do make those loans the language in subsection 4 directs that they shall be made according to a certain formula, but there is nothing in the bill; and I want the American Automobile Dealers Association to understand that at the present time, notwithstanding any debates in the Senate and notwithstanding any statements which have been made before the committee, there is nothing in this bill which directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans or to purchase automobiles or any other product.

Now, it seems to me that the American Automobile Dealers' Association should not be disillusioned, but that the success of this relief measure is wholly dependent upon the charity of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in interpreting this act broadly enough to give them the relief which they think they are getting under this bill. It is only because they are satisfied with this bill that I am willing to go along with it in its present form.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. It seems to me that it is the legislative intent of this body to relieve small businessmen who have been caught by virtue of the rationing orders, and we are not concerned whether or not the Government makes a profit out of that deal or loses money. What we are trying to do is to rescue these small-business people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my attitude.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Therefore, it seems to me it should be our legislative intent to give directive force to this legislation and not permissive force.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can understand how difficult it might be to direct them to do something without giving them some discretion. By simply putting the word "direct" in there will not accomplish the purpose of the act, because you are likely to open up the door to thousands and hundreds of thousands of lawsuits, because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, unlike the Federal Government, can be sued without its consent. But I believe language can be drawn to make mandatory the announced policy of the Congress in respect to this act without subjecting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to a multiplicity of suits.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell me on what basis these loans are to be made? Take an automobile dealer who has on hand 40 cars upon which he has paid in one-fourth of the purchase price.

Mr. WOLCOTT (reading):

> Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

Further confusion arises from the fact that after the automobile has been held for 18 months, all he gets is a fair retail price as determined by the Price Administrator; and that is one of the incongruities of the bill to which I refer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can the gentleman show me any place in the bill where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized or directed either to purchase or make loans prior to 18 months after the article has been acquired by the dealer?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. I may say that I interpret this bill broadly to mean that they can make purchases and loans at any time beginning with the enactment of this law, but that if the car or other article has been in the stock of one or more dealers for more than 18 months, a different formula is set up than that for the loans and purchases made previous to the expiration of 18 months. That is modified somewhat by the section on page 4, which states that they cannot sell it under 19 months excepting to dealers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I hope that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will interpret this bill in such manner as to give all of these dealers the relief which they think they are going to get, because I think we should make it very clear that it is the legislative policy to help the automotive dealers either to liquidate their stocks or to be put in a position where they can carry them at a reasonable profit so that their contribution to the war effort will not be wholly out of proportion to that expected of the general public.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened with interest to the gentleman's discussion of this bill, but to clarify this situation so this RECORD will indicate what this Congress has in mind in enacting this legislation, do I understand that the gentleman's contention is that as specifically referred to automobile dealers and stocks, automobiles that have been frozen, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the terms of this bill may make a loan immediately upon the passage of this bill, provided as set forth in section 1 the conclusion is to be drawn that that dealer cannot dispose of his stock within a period of 6 months in the normal and ordinary conduct of his business?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe that is the correct interpretation.

Mr. KEEFE. And if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation so determines as to an individual dealer they may make a loan, or they may not make a loan; and if they decide to make a loan, the loan may be in the amount set forth in subparagraph 3 on page 2 of the bill which gives reasonable cost plus reasonable allowance for the items set forth in the paragraph?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that case the cost would not be reflected in the retail price, but it would be in the wholesale price to the retailer plus the transportation cost and other items.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it the gentleman's interpretation and the interpretation of the committee that if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has failed, neglected, or refused to make a loan to a dealer, that at the expiration of 18 months from the date of the freezing order, January 1, 1942, the language of this bill, or some agreement, or some interpretation made of it in the Senate will lead us to the conclusion that such dealer may demand a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? And that if such loan is made it shall be on the basis of a fair retail price as then fixed by the Price Administrator?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman has placed the same interpretation on the bill that I have placed upon it, although it differs somewhat from the Senate's interpretation. I think what they intended to do in this bill originally was to fix a retail price after 18 months plus these charges contained on page 2, because the original bill as introduced stated that they would pay a retail price after the 18 months plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, and so forth. Your committee originally accepted the formula where if the dealer held the automobile for longer than a year he would be paid his retail price plus these allowances; but they struck out these allowances. They have extended the period from 1 year to 18 months and substituted a price as fixed by the Price Control Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to permit me to make a brief statement?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield briefly.

Mr. KEEFE. Namely, that I am in complete accord with what the gentleman has said: That there must be some very violent assumptions indulged to find language in the bill as written that will purport to carry out the attempt that has been expressed as being in this bill. I personally cannot see it there at all.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I understand the purpose of the act it is entirely to relieve the distressed automobile dealers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Automotive dealers and all other dealers who handle rationed goods.

Mr. TREADWAY. It has to do with automobile traffic. Does the gentleman from Michigan consider that under all the circumstances this is the best relief they can expect in the way of legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then why can we not amend the bill to give much better conditions?

I cannot too strongly urge upon this House the necessity of enacting legislation which will relieve the automobile dealer from the situation in which he finds himself by reason of Government restrictions. I attended the first and several subsequent sessions of the Small Business Committee and have given a great deal of time and attention to the matter of aiding the automobile dealers in my district. It is common knowledge among us that the small business man has received scant consideration from the Government until within the past few weeks and I hope that Congress will make up for lost time in this direction.

The plight of the automobile dealer is well set forth in the following letter which I received from one of them in my district:

> The Government quota of new cars authorized for sale for the period ending May 31 for Franklin County, Mass., is 64, or approximately 21 cars each for the months of March, April, and May.
>
> Two doctors have applied for new cars and have been refused by the local board. These two owners' cars are 1940 models and have seen 2 years of hard usage. The refusal was based on the fact that these cars were not older than 1937 models and have not been driven 100,000 miles. I know of no doctor who keeps a car more than 2 years and the largest percentage of new-car buyers are

owners of 2-year-old cars. No new cars have been released on the March quota.

There are few new-car buyers available and it is going to be a difficult task to dispose of the number of new cars that are authorized for sale on Government quotas. Stocks of new cars purchased prior to January 16, 1942, should be unfrozen and allowed unrestricted retail sale.

Dealers are desperately in need of their working capital which is frozen in new cars, and being compelled to hold these cars for an indefinite period increases the cost to the consumer (which I doubt very much they will pay), is no benefit to the Government, and a severe hardship to the dealer. The gross profit on the few cars that we would be able to sell would tend to reduce the red figures for our year's operation.

We are not expecting business as usual. We are not finding fault with the rationing of tires as we know the situation is critical, but it is only natural to hope to survive in order that we may be able to resume business after this emergency, and we have been in the automobile business for 34 years.

We accepted new cars that were shipped January 16 with the knowledge that they were to be held until 1943 as a future stock pile. We, however, feel that we are not unpatriotic in expecting that Government quotas of new cars should be disposed of without restrictions by local rationing boards.

We would be only too eager to invest all the gross profits on any new cars sold this year in Government bonds if we could eliminate the expense of carrying this inventory and have available our working capital, now frozen by Government action, to carry on for the duration. The situation is critical and we will thorcughly appreciate your assistance.

I fully concur in the statements contained in the above letter and hope that very definite relief may be provided by proper legislation at an early date.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The American Automobile Dealers' Association seems to be satisfied with this bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. If it suits them we are expected to accept it as the representatives of the American people?

Mr. WOLCOTT. After all, this legislation is introduced here primarily to help the 44,000 automotive dealers who find themselves in this peculiar situation. I believe if this bill is satisfactory to them and if they have confidence in the administrators of this bill to the extent where they feel justified in making the statements they have in respect to it, that we are justified in accepting it.

Mr. TREADWAY. They particularly represent those who are interested in this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and in my extension of remarks I will insert excerpts from the testimony in that regard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. What I want to clarify is this: It was the request of the automobile dealers that they get these loans. The original bill as introduced carried with it a direction to the R. F. C. to make them, is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I am interested in the statement made that the automobile dealers are satisfied. I can recollect very clearly before the committee the statement of the automobile dealers that up to the present time the terms laid down by the R. F. C. in giving them loans were so unsatisfactory that they could not proceed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not want to argue that with the gentleman. The point is they have the authority to do it now, and they have not been doing it in the past. I may say to the committee that there are between 600,000 and 700,000 new automobiles in the hands of these 44,000 automobile dealers. Since the freeze order went into effect on January 1 there have been only 15,000 sales. Unless something is done to relieve the automotive dealers, in addition to this bill, unless the restrictions are raised to allow them to distribute these automobiles a little faster, it will take from 6 to 8 years to unload the stock which they have. You can figure it out for yourselves. Of course, these stocks never will be unloaded because as soon as this war is over people are going to wait until the new models come out and we are going to find a backlog of what will then be old automobiles, which will then be in an unsalable condition. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the terms of the bill, cannot take them if they are in an unsalable condition.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. So it largely depends upon the Administrator of the R. F. C. whether or not these automobile dealers get relief?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. I think the whole thing depends on the way the act will be administered.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is the committee advised of any plan of administration by the R. F. C. in the event this bill passes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, not in detail.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it the gentleman's idea that the bill will be administered through the administration in Washington or through its agencies all over the country?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume it will take advantage of all the machinery which is available, including, of course, its office all over the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this legislation will help to solve the problem facing many small businessmen today, automobile dealers, especially, because of necessary rationing.

I am not very hopeful, however, that this will be accomplished as this bill is not specific enough in its provisions. When doubt rises here today as to what certain paragraphs mean, we can well foresee the future in its administration.

The clean-cut solution to this problem is for our Government to purchase all stocks of automobiles, refrigerators, electric appliances, in fact, any and all articles whose sale is forbidden without permit. This would give our businessmen cash with which to go into other lines of business or into small war subcontracts.

We should not expect our automobile dealers to keep automobiles for 18 months and then only be able to loan upon them. These cars will become obsolete, the tires and parts will deteriorate. Taxes mount up, interest mounts up, and capital is tied up. All of these put together means bankruptcy in the end.

Surely our Government can take all frozen stocks off of dealers' hands, pay them cash for these stocks, automobiles or what not, and then arrange for the proper storage and sale eventually. The United States can carry such a load; the auto dealer, radio man, refrigerator salesman cannot carry it. They are willing to do their part, but they should not be asked to do the impossible. The load must be spread over the entire Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the bill now before us. While this bill is broad enough to cover a number of articles or commodities that are rationed, it is primarily for the relief of the automobile dealers of our country.

I am not entirely convinced that this bill which we are today passing is the best and most complete answer to the problem of the automobile dealers of our country. On the other hand, I am aware that this problem is most difficult and far reaching; that it involves automobile dealers in all the States, in many different sizes of towns and cities, and automobile dealers in many different types of local economy. I also realize that it is futile to wait for a chance to vote for the perfect bill; therefore I shall support this measure.

Wartime is a difficult time for many people. Our citizens are called upon to bear heavy and harsh burdens, but it occurs to me that perhaps the automobile dealers have been dealt with more harshly than the general average of our population. If there is any group that is entitled to some legislation by this Congress, to relieve their situation, it is the automobile dealers. The automobile dealers—and by that I mean the wholesalers, the jobbers, the distributors, the salesmen, garage owners, and all of those engaged in distributing automobiles—are responsible for building this great automobile industry in our country. If they had not provided the outlet for our factories that produce automobiles, the industry could have never grown as it did.

The automobile men that I know might be termed "small business men." They do not represent big business, nor do their employees represent big labor. They have, however, played an important role in every town in our country.

They are a class of businessmen which the defense program has not helped. The great factories have been converted to war plants, and thus they go on. That way big business is taken care of. The laboring men in our automobile factories with their powerful organizations have seen to it that they got a share of our war-production work. Thus big labor has been taken care of.

The picture has been quite different for the automobile people in the towns throughout the United States. Garage owners, the jobbers, the wholesalers, and dealers have not been awarded any war-production work to speak of. The employees of these jobbers, wholesalers, and dealers have not been able to find work, in many instances, in war production. So again I say, if there is a group in the United States which are entitled to consideration by this Congress it is the automobile dealers. I am happy to support this bill before us today, and only wish that we could do more for this group.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step, as I view it, in the effort to extend justice and aid to the small businessman. It does bring him hope, and under the provisions of the measure before us it is the first concrete evidence he has had that the Government is going to come to his aid. In my view it is certainly not a full answer to the problems of the automobile dealer and the tire dealer, and other small businessmen who are being affected so desperately by the freezing and rationing orders that have been decreed by the administration. I should have liked to have seen this move come earlier, also.

Early in January of this year the Small Business Committee of the House, of which I am a member, invited the National Automobile Dealers Association to present their case to our committee. A public hearing was held and hundreds of dealers attended. I think it fair and in order to mention that in my estimation no more patriotic group of men ever assembled in our Capital City. They were disposed, also, as was evident from the beginning of the hearings, not to ask anything selfish, but simply that the committee understand their real plight; and that the Congress address itself to their problems. They asked no special favors; they knew that in their case, perhaps, it was inexorable that their particular business should feel a severe pinch, and they accepted the fact. Their whole attitude was to volunteer their best efforts for a united war effort, and the only thing that they asked was that the Government consider their problem as sympathetically as possible.

It is natural that these dealers were greatly disquieted by the fact that they have had many thousands of dollars tied up in new cars, which they could not sell or dispose of except under arbitrary Government regulations, while at the same time showroom rentals, finance charges, taxes, and a host of overhead expenses went on. They wanted, and were entitled to, an answer to the grave question which contronted each and every one of them; just when and how they could liquidate the automibiles that were frozen by Government order without the exaction of unreasonable sacrifices. Naturally, they could not expect that they should be left continuingly in a position of dire uncertainty.

Government officials were also witnesses at this hearing and from the testimony given by them I believe the dealers had a right to assume that relief would not be in a distant day but would be forthcoming practically immediately. That was the clear implication of the testimony by some of these witnesses. I am of the opinion that many dealers went home with the definite idea that their situation would receive immediate attention and relief.

The fact of the matter is that nothing has really been done up to the time of this proposal. There has been a broadening of the rationing orders but without any real relief being afforded. Dealers have on hand automobiles that cannot be disposed of for years, under present conditions. Without the relief contemplated under this bill, bankruptcy and ruin would stare them in the face.

I am going to support the present bill as it stands, even though, in my estimation, it does not go far enough. I would prefer the adoption of a policy whereby the Government would purchase from the dealer those cars that he has on hand, if the dealer so desires, with a reasonable profit to the dealer. Under the proposal before us, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is expected, in a measure, to go some distance toward relieving the plight of these dealers, and inasmuch as the National Automobile Dealers Association is sanguine to believe that this measure will help out much, and they are praying for its early passage, I am willing to do anything that I can to hasten it along.

Everything I have said about the car dealers applies to the tire dealers, who also, in a very large group, appeared before our committee. Their situations, fundamentally, are identical.

Other small business men will have their articles and commodities frozen and rationed as time goes on. Their plight will be the same. This bill will give all of them some measure of relief.

I trust that the pending proposal may be considered as a forerunner of other measures that will be solicitous of the situation that small business finds itself in today. Certainly, it is not only our duty, but vitally necessary that we encourage it by every reasonable assistance, so that small business may be sustained and also encouraged in its desire to play an increasing part in the war production effort.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

H. R. 6995 FOR THE RELIEF OF DEALERS IN ARTICLES AND COMMODITIES RATIONED UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, H. R. 6995, which has for its purpose the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under the authority of the United States. Early in the year I attended the hearings of the unofficial committee, which had under examination this whole subject of relief for our citizens who have suffered great injury by reason of the freezing orders in connection with the rationing of commodities needed for war purposes. Those that were particularly hit were the automobile dealers and the dealers in tires and other automotive equipment. Many of these dealers in my own district have urged me to support legislation of this type for their relief, and I have from the outset been desirous of securing the enactment of such measures as will prevent, as far as possible, the closing of these small-business concerns.

On April 22 last I received from James H. Cassell, of the Oregon Automobile Dealers Association, a telegram reading as follows:

Car dealers of State will appreciate it tremendously if you will support Patman financial relief bill, H. R. 6761, at House Banking and Currency hearings beginning 22d. Bill calculated to permit dealers to liquidate stocks of new cars without too great sacrifice. Dealer situation more precaricus than ever and they'll all go broke if relief does not come soon. Thanks.

I appeared before the Committee of the House on Banking and Currency and urged the early approval of this bill, and I am glad to know that not only is the House considering it but that the Senate has likewise considered and approved a bill which, according to my information, is in all respects similar to the one now before us and that the amendments adopted by the Senate have been or will be incorporated in this House bill.

It is my information that there are 70,000,000 people in the United States who are directly or indirectly affected by the automobile industry, and it certainly behooves us to enact legislation that will prevent the freezing of this entire industry. We know that the orders heretofore promulgated have been of such a nature that they have practically put out of business all of these dealers. They have large stocks of cars and equipment on hand which they are forbidden to sell under the rationing program. These cars are costing substantial sums for storage, insurance, depreciation, and overhead for maintaining the place of business in which the merchandise is kept for sale.

Mr. Chairman, we will not know until this bill becomes operative and we have had an opportunity to determine from actual experience whether or not it will meet the demands of the situation. The National Automobile Association has given its approval of the measure and is urging its enactment, and it has been stated on the floor here today by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that the Government departments having in charge the rationing program have given their approval to the bill. I therefore urge the passage of the bill and trust that it will receive the support of this House so that it may become a law without further delay.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support this bill because it seems to be the best that can be obtained at the present time. I am far from satisfied with its contents, and there are some provisions in it which are difficult to understand. There is no definite provision which will compel the R. F. C. to make these loans, and I am also somewhat disturbed about the 18-month feature.

It is essential, however, that legislation be enacted as quickly as possible which will offer some measure of relief to the thousands of automobile dealers who face liquidation of their businesses. You will recall that the original Government order prohibiting sales of new automobiles came on January 1 this year without warning. The first order tied up all new automobiles in dealers' hands for 15 days. This order was later extended to include all of the month of January and then later extended to include the month of February, and then extended to include March and April.

So all this time these automobile dealers have been forced to sit by and see their business disintegrate and to see their losses mount up without any cash funds being provided to enable them to meet their obligations.

This delay and confusion is inexcusable. No action has been taken despite the fact that solemn assurances of Government officials had been given to the effect that the Government would not ask the dealers to incur losses resulting from this freeze order.

Hundreds of automobile dealers throughout the country have already been forced out of business because of the regulations. To those who are still struggling to maintain their establishments, the freeze order of the past 4 months, plus the failure of the rationing program to function effectively and return even partially their operating expenses, has seriously depleted the capital structure of these dealer organizations. In many instances, these enforced losses amount to actual confiscation of business.

The automobile dealers of America fully realize that we are at war, and they are prepared to make any reasonable sacrifice in this emergency. They are, however, entitled to fair and equitable treatment, because they represent a very integral part in our domestic economy and in the maintenance of an important phase of our transportation system, and not be victimized and put out of business by Government edict when such action is unnecessary and when such a sacrifice is needless.

I assume that this legislation has the approval of the National Automobile Dealers Association, and I am going to support it because I feel it is not only a duty but an obligation upon this Congress to protect and preserve an important part of our business structure. These dealers are clearly entitled to help from the Government in this situation which has been thrust upon them without warning and because of conditions beyond their control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 4½ minutes, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the fine work the gentleman from Indiana has done on this bill, I yield him 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, when the original freezing order on new automobiles was issued on January 1 of this year, about everybody was shocked by it. And that includes not only the dealers but many persons who desired to buy new cars.

For the dealers particularly was the order a matter of great concern. Many of them had large stocks of new cars on hand. Small dealers, of course, had a lesser number of cars than large dealers, but for all those cars represented a substantial part of their assets. In addition, their overhead expenses were large and represented a continuing charge. Except for certain savings in personnel, many of those charges remain fixed today. And, as everyone knows, many of the dealers had large and expensive showrooms which, without cars to move to the public, today represent a dead loss.

There was so much interest in the problem of the dealers that our Select Committee on Small Business, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is the chairman, and of which I am a member, called a meeting to hear them and get their suggestions as to what might properly be done. That meeting was held in January and was attended by upward of 500 dealers from all over the country. Many of them made statements before our committee. It must be said to their credit that they all exhibited the highest patriotism and complete willingness to make any sacrifice necessary to the most effective prosecution of the war. While some of them may have had some doubts as to the necessity for all parts of the orders entered, they did not question them. On the contrary, they were emphatic in their complete willingness to go along with any necessary requirement.

However, they did urgently ask that the Government take such proper steps as might in some measure alleviate their difficulties and particularly afford them some relief from some of their most pressing financial problems.

In order to get the complete picture, our committee also called representatives of the different governmental departments to testify. From the testimony, I understood that some action would be taken looking to the financial relief of the dealers. I understood that some plan would be worked out under which the Government would take the cars off a dealer's hands in the event he wanted such done.

But it is also my understanding that such action has not been taken; at least no satisfactory action has been taken. Hence, this bill which we are now considering. And it should be clear that if this bill is passed and becomes law, it is the intention of the Congress that the Government shall afford such relief to the dealers by making the loans as provided for or buying the cars as provided for after the expiration of the time fixed in the bill. I also understood such assurance has been given to the Banking and Currency Committee.

It is true that in the original bill proposed the automobile dealers association did want a directed, mandatory provision, or so recommended. But it likewise is my understanding that in consideration of the definite assurances that were given by the R. F. C., that the congressional intent as expressed here would be carried out, it was deemed advisable not to insist upon a direct, positive requirement, and with that I am not in disagreement.

Just a word as to theory which I think underlies and supports this bill. Here is what has happened. The Government steps in and freezes and rations new cars in the hands of the dealers who own them. The Government tells the dealers to whom they can sell cars. The classes to whom cars can be sold include only those engaged either directly or indirectly in war or Government work. In plain words, the Government has taken these cars from the dealers for a public use.

In my considered opinion, such freezing and rationing approximates the exercise of the right of eminent domain. It is in reality a taking. Now, such a taking clearly requires that just compensation be paid to the person from whom the property is taken. That is just what this bill undertakes to do, and I think that is all it undertakes to do. Certainly it would not be fair for the Government to freeze these cars, thereby in effect taking them from the dealer, and at the same time require him to remain in charge of them, storing them and keeping them at his own risk and expense. Assuming the necessity for the Government taking these cars for public use, and there is no denial of that necessity, then certainly the least the Government can do for the dealer affected is to enable the dealer to carry the cars, or take them off his hands at his option, thereby enabling him to shrink up his establishment if possible and stay in business if possible to afford the service which is so necessary to the maintenance of the cars now on the road.

While this measure, if enacted into law, will provide substantial relief to many automobile dealers, it is far from being the complete answer to their many problems. I suspect that most of them would much rather sell the automobiles they have on hand direct to persons in their communities who have need of them and who can qualify under such rationing orders as the Office of Price Administration may see fit to impose or continue rather than sell them to the Government.

In that connection it might be well to recall that when the automobile dealers were first before our Select Committee on Small Business it was represented that the cars then on hand would be rationed in such manner that they would all be sold under such rationing orders within 12 months. That such a goal would not be achieved under the rationing orders originally promulgated and until recently maintained is now clear to everyone.

That there has been a lot of resentment, both in the Congress and in the country, about the way that the freezing and rationing of new automobiles has been handled cannot be denied. To be perfectly frank about it, there has been a feeling that the drastic orders which have hamstrung and, in many cases, bankrupted dealers were imposed with little

factual information as to possible results. In any event, initial tests of the rationing order have shown it defective in a number of ways.

It is undoubtedly true that when a freezing order is to be entered about the only thing to do is enter it and then look around to see what may finally be done. But those in charge of the order should not be too deliberate and slow about taking that look. I just hope that the easing of the rationing order on new automobiles which is now being effected will accomplish the desired results. Such results would not be at all unpopular in Congress. They certainly would not be unpopular with the dealers and, finally, they would not be unpopular with the public itself.

Now, one thing more. There has been some discussion—and there may be more—about what the term "fair retail price," as it appears in section 4, means with relation to new automobiles. As bearing on that, consider the following: The Office of Price Administration has issued price schedule 85, fixing a maximum retail price for new automobiles. It provides that the maximum retail price that may be charged for a new automobile shall be made up of four factors: First, factory list price; second, transportation charge; third, a handling and delivery charge of 5 percent of the factory list and transportation, or $75, whichever is lower; and, fourth, 1 percent of the list, or $15, whichever is lower, for each month after February 1, 1942.

This is the formula which O. P. A. has established for sales at retail to the public of new automobiles. This must represent the fair retail price in the opinion of the Price Administrator, as he obviously would not set a price which he believed to be in excess of a fair price for sales at retail. There have been and will be no more new automobiles produced since this order was made and before the 18 months expires since the freezing order was made on January 1, provided that the war has not ended. Therefore it is improbable that the Price Administrator would lower this price, as these automobiles will become more valuable as the supply gets smaller.

Therefore, under section 4 it will not be necessary for the Price Administrator to fix another retail price for new automobiles, and if any cars are tendered to R. F. C. under section 4, it would naturally follow that R. F. C. would pay the prices set out in price schedule 85. This price schedule is clearly in the minds of the Members of Congress in the consideration of this bill. The report of the debate in the other body yesterday shows that price schedule 85 was introduced showing the interpretation there of what the term "fair retail price" in this bill means as it is applied to automobiles.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it is well repeatedly to point out that this is not limited to automobiles. While the automobile situation motivated this bill and this legislation, nevertheless it applies equally well to the tire dealers who are in just as serious straits as the automobile dealers, and it will likewise in the future apply to any dealer in any other commodity affected by rationing orders.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, during the past 4 months the automobile dealers of my congressional district, in unison with their brethren numbering some 44,000 throughout the United States have suffered untold hardship through the freezing order that has curtailed car sales and left them with capital tied up in stocks of new automobiles from which they are unable to retrieve their investments.

While patriotic appeals are heard for national unity and the entire Nation girds itself for every conceivable sacrifice, the automobile dealers of the Nation emerge as the forgotten men in the industrial and business life of their respective communities. They have suffered their huge losses with a patient attitude while witnessing their business organizations torn asunder by the lack of employment for their trained personnel. Many skilled mechanics, storeroom and sales employees trained in their particular vocations have been forced after years of honorable and faithful service to turn their talents in other directions and seek employment in any manner possible to retain their self-respect and provide a living for themselves and dependents.

It is an indisputable fact that the automobile dealers and their families have demonstrated their patriotic impulses beyond a shadow of a doubt, yet we must be practical in recognizing that such a patient attitude endured beyond reason cannot help but bring chaos and total destruction to an important field of business in the commerce lanes of the Nation. The stark specter of bankruptcy is stalking the footsteps of these thousands of automobile dealers and is certain to sound the death knell to this enterprising and resourceful group of American businessmen.

It is my earnest and sincere contention that if Congress hesitates to afford just and equitable relief to the distressing conditions so prevalent in the automobile business and affecting these dealers who represent every community in the Nation that we will be guilty of the unpardonable sin of turning a deaf ear to the harrowing plight of a great segment of American business life.

NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION FAVORS THE BILL AS WRITTEN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the National Automobile Dealers Association is 100 percent behind this bill. I am authorized and, in fact, the officials of that association have asked me to say they are in favor of the bill as it is written now.

The question of being authorized or directed is not disturbing them because they believe the R. F. C. will carry out the intentions of Congress as expressed in this bill.

There are 70,000,000 people in this country dependent upon automobile transportation every day—70,000,000 out of 132,000,000. Therefore, it is necessary that we keep these cars going just as long as possible, and in order to keep these cars going it is necessary to keep these dealers going and these repair shops going, and this bill is offered for the purpose of keeping these dealers in business just as long as we can and encouraging these repair shops to stay open as long as possible.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. Am I correct in my interpretation that this measure only applies to new articles and does not apply, for instance, to second-hand cars?

Mr. PATMAN. Generally it does not apply to second-hand cars. It applies to new cars.

It is the hope of the committee that no amendments will be adopted to this bill, since it is the desire of the Banking and Currency Committee to encourage its passage and speed it to the White House. If it passes as it is now, it will go directly to the White House and no further legislative action will be required.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Senate bill.

Mr. STEAGALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Senate bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 5g thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5h. (a) In order to prevent and relieve distress among dealers in articles or commodities which are rationed in connection with the war effort, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting directly or through any of its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity the sale or distribution of which is rationed under authority of the United States, subject to the following terms and conditions:

"(1) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of articles or commodities which have been rationed in a manner and under circumstances which have resulted or are likely to result in a substantial number of dealers being unable, in the ordinary course of trade or business, to sell within a period of 6 months from the beginning of such rationing the stocks of such articles or commodities which they have in stock.

"(2) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of, or for the purpose of aiding or assisting, dealers a substantial part of whose business consists of dealing in and servicing rationed articles or commodities of one or more kinds.

"(3) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

"(4) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

"(5) Such purchases may be made from and such loans made to such dealers or credit agencies furnishing credit for such dealers, and may be made upon the request of any dealer having title to the rationed article or commodity or having the right to acquire title thereto upon the discharge of his credit obligations with respect thereto.

"(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe such additional terms and conditions with respect to such purchases and loans as it deems to be necessary and consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not be required to purchase or make a loan upon the security of any article or commodity which is not in a salable condition, or which has suffered substantial damage or deterioration as the result of negligence or lack of proper care: *And provided further*, That if, upon the sale of any article or commodity acquired pursuant to the terms of any loan contract entered into hereunder, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any subsidiary corporation thereof shall not recover, by reason of any limitation upon sales price imposed pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, the full amount of any such loan, no resource on account of such deficiency shall be had against the borrower. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to sell at public or private sale, with or without competitive bidding, any article or commodity acquired by it pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That, until the expiration of 19 months after the beginning of the rationing of such article or commodity, no such sale shall be made except to a dealer in such article or commodity. In the event any such sale is made to another department or agency of the Government, such other department or agency is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to pay for such article or commodity any price not in excess of a fair retail market price as of the date of such sale.

"(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make such agreements or arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this section, including agreements to pay to those from whom it acquires articles or commodities a portion of the proceeds realized by such Corporation from the sale of such articles or commodities. For the purposes of this section, an article or commodity shall be deemed to be rationed whenever its sale to the general public in the ordinary course of trade or business has been restricted or prohibited by any regulation or order made for the purpose of aiding in the more effective prosecution of the war effort or for the purpose of conserving the supply of such article or commodity.

"(d) No authority, limitation, restriction, or other provision contained in this section shall be construed to limit, restrict, modify, or otherwise in any way affect any authority or powers now or hereafter vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or in any corporation created or organized by or at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the committee.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 3, line 5, after the word "than", strike out "the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located" and insert "its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business) plus a reasonable allowance for storage, insurance, and financing."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order: The gentleman is attempting to amend the House bill, when we are considering the Senate bill, and I suggest that he make his amendment conform to the Senate bill.

Mr. KEAN. We have never had any copy of the Senate bill.

Mr. PATMAN. There is one right here.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so amended.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it should be after the "than" on page 3, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the amendment is now offered in correct form.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, the whole paragraph, if my amendment should be adopted, would read as follows:

Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing, an amount not less than its cost to him, to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business, plus a reasonable allowance for storage, insurance, and financing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my sympathy for the automobile dealer, in the problems with which he is faced. It is my belief that when the Government not only stops the production of an article, but also prevents the sale of the article which a dealer holds in stock, he is certainly entitled to some form of relief, but we must not let our sympathies warp our good judgment. The wording of this bill as introduced troubles me. As the war continues, not only will automobiles be rationed, but thousands and thousands of other articles must and will inevitably also be included in the rationing program. This bill as written on page 3 provides that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at the end of 18 months shall buy any rationed article from the owner at the fair retail price fixed by the Price Administrator. It is true that this legislation only authorizes, and does not direct, but it lays down a pattern which Congress expresses as its will and it seems to me that it establishes a dangerous precedent for the future.

Today all are being asked to make sacrifices to win this war. Should we guarantee to anyone a profit on the sale of any article? Should the Government pay a dealer a profit on an article which it purchases to help him out? Is not the most which he should expect be that the Government will bail him out and see that he has no loss on articles which it has prevented him from selling?

Now, looking at it from the dealer's point of view, what if the goods frozen should deteriorate or become obsolete through no fault of the owner who has been prevented from selling it by the Government? Is this owner not just as much entitled to "cost plus carrying charges" even though the O. P. A. names a fair retail price much lower than his cost? It seems to me that if we pass this legislation without my amendment, while justifiably trying to aid the automobile dealer, we may have enacted provisions which will haunt us in the future and which we will have cause to regret. My amendment will be fair to the owner, fair to the Government, and would not set a dangerous precedent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment. I am opposed to this amendment. It is not known how far it will go. The bill says that the price will be the price fixed by the Price Administrator. That was deliberately written into the bill so as to encourage dealers to dispose of their stocks before the expiration of the 18 months, if possible. If you write some guaranteed cost provision into this bill you will give some dealers no inducement whatsoever to sell their cars, but will give them every inducement to hold them until after the 18 months and turn them over to the Government.

Now, the gentleman's amendment does give them a guaranteed price—a price that is the reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade and business. Does that include his overhead? What are the items to be included in that? I do not know. It is possible the price may be greatly in excess of the price fixed by the Price Administrator. It may be less. We do not know. It says:

In addition to the reasonable cost, plus a reasonable allowance for storage, insurance, and financing.

In other words, if a concern owns its own finance company, owns its own insurance company, owns its own storage, they have enormous storage space for thousands of cars to be stored, there is no inducement or incentive to sell those cars, but there is every incentive to keep those cars where they are, because they get paid for the storage, for the insurance, and for the financing by their own finance company. So the gentleman's amendment is very vague in two ways. One is as to how low the cost may be. The other is it may be so exceedingly high as to damage someone else, including the Government. So it is indefinite. Let us make it definite by having the Price Administrator fix the price, and we presume he will fix a reasonable price. Then the dealers, not knowing that price in advance, will have every inducement to try to make these trades before the end of 18 months, and sell the cars themselves.

So I suggest the gentleman's amendment is not a good one in conformity with the views he has presented. It is too vague and indefinite. Nobody knows.

It has a tendency to cause dealers to keep their cars and unload them on the Government at the end of the 18 months, rather than to try to make sales in the meantime.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. Does the gentleman regard it as an unwise and thoughtless thing to nullify the power conferred upon the Price Administrator under the existing law as it will be applied to the various articles that may be rationed, and to which this bill would be applicable?

Mr. PATMAN. The chairman is exactly right. This is a fundamental change in existing law. Let us not change this bill. Let it remain as it is, and let it go to the White House today, because these dealers are going bankrupt, hundreds of them, every week by reason of the act of our Government, over which they had no control.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the best word I can figure out to describe this piece of legislation to relieve the automobile dealers is the word "fuzzy." It is fuzzy on the outside, it is fuzzy around the edges, and fuzzy in the middle. Any piece of legislation that even members of the committee cannot accurately interpret is "fuzzy." The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said, if I understood him correctly, that this 18-month provision was in there for the purpose of encouraging dealers to sell their cars before the expiration of 18 months. I presume the gentleman will say now that the Office of Price Administration will now commence to ration cars, so change the rationing order, that the dealers can sell all their cars within the 18 months. At the present time there is not a Chinaman's chance of any dealer in the United States selling his cars, under the present rationing order, within 8 or 10 or 12 years. If there is any way you can tell me how those two things rationalize with each other, I would like to know.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman take into consideration the effect of the recent order that has been issued relative to those being eligible to receive cars?

Mr. HINSHAW. Where is that order published? I have not seen it yet.

Mr. PATMAN. It was published in all the newspapers last Sunday.

Mr. HINSHAW. I did not see it and I read the papers carefully. I know the dealers in my district have so many cars they will not be able to sell them in years, under any rationing orders that now exist. If they are going to permit dealers freely to sell their cars within 18 months, then perhaps I can go along with the provision of subsection (4), but under present circumstances there is no possibility of it. It is up to the local rationing boards to decide to whom and when these cars will be sold. At the present time, the dealers are in a buyer's market, any buyer who can get a certificate from a rationing board can go out among the various dealers in his own area and shop for a price and get it; frequently a price that represents a great loss to the dealer.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Do you know what the provisions of the order that goes into effect tomorrow are?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have not seen them.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Roughly they have taken the existing order and have broadened it. They have simplified it. They have cut out a lot of the restrictions heretofore made.

Mr. HINSHAW. Have they permitted dealers to sell all of their cars that are worth over $1,000, without restriction?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Here is what they have said: They say in order to get a new car your old car must have been of 1939 vintage or earlier. It must have 40,000 miles on it. The previous order was 100,000. And they could be sold to anybody who is directly or indirectly connected with the war effort.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; there is another provision for those engaged in the war effort—and who is not? Every farmer is engaged in the war effort, every retail dealer in foodstuffs is engaged in the war effort, every man, woman, and child in the United States is engaged in the war effort. If you allow that language to be interpreted as it should be, then why have any rationing restrictions at all on automobiles? I just do not see this thing. I think it is wrong at the start and wrong at the finish. You could say to a dealer, for example, that he can sell any car worth over $1,000, to anybody but there is hardly anybody in the United States except the War Department who will buy an automobile at those prices today. Every such car is frozen, every car worth over $1,000 or $1,200 is frozen in the hands of the dealer where it is today.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman would not say the Automobile Dealer's Association was cockeyed, would he? They have O. K.'d this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think they are wrong. I think they will be mighty sorry before they get through living with this bill.

I can point out a few examples in my own district, and that is the only place I know about. The rest of the Members have districts of their own. I can point out the fact that there are trucks in my district that are specially designed with special bodies for a special purpose. The rationing board down here in Washington that decides these things does not let them be delivered. Take the city of Glendale, Calif., that orders three garbage trucks with special bodies, has them ready for delivery last December. People are throwing garbage into the streets because they cannot get those trucks to haul away garbage. For goodness' sake, what is wrong? Why can they not get their garbage trucks which have been ready for delivery since December? Should some one or two men in Washington decide whether they should get them?

I say this whole rationing program so far as automobiles are concerned should be changed. Every man, woman, and child in this country is engaged in this war effort in one way or another.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Register for Tuesday, April 28, 1942——

Mr. HINSHAW. That is today, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; page 3097 contains the Executive order relative to the rationing of automobiles. I merely call it to the attention of the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, 5 minutes is not enough time to talk on this vitally important subject. One of these days I intend to ask for a special order and talk for a half hour.

I can see every good reason for restricting the production of automobiles and turning the plants to the production of articles used in war. And I can see good reason for priorities in the purchase of present stocks of automobiles and trucks to those who need them most. But the Office of Price Administration has not stopped there. Let me draw the picture briefly.

With 700,000 cars in dealers' hands today, the O. P. A. has so scared the buyers that there are practically no buyers, even among those who could use cars. It has become such a bad situation that people having cars, used cars, are beginning to flood the used-car market, and that is fast becoming a thin buyers' market.

Why? Because the O. P. A. has shut down, first on tires and now on gasoline. Who wants to buy a car, either new or used, when tires cannot be had and gasoline is to be rationed? If this keeps up you can relax all the restrictions on new-car sales and still there will be almost no sales. It is absurd. The whole situation is an absurd creation.

American life has come to be built around the automobile. People have been encouraged to enjoy the suburban life, to get out and away from the big cities. Workers in the Lockheed aircraft plant in my district—52,000 of them—live an average of 10.6 miles from that plant, according to a recent survey. They live in the open spaces, many thousands of them. Their wives and children must travel miles to stores and schools, and public-utility transportation has not been designed or built to serve these people.

Then comes the rubber rationing to throw consternation among them and all of the 360,000 people in my district. At the same time, information comes to my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that there is enough used rubber available to completely bridge the gap from present crude stocks of natural rubber to the time when synthetic rubber is available in adequate quantities. But nobody seems to pay any attention to the reusing of used rubber stocks for tires. Why not?

Then comes the gasoline-rationing order. Transportation facilities are being built rapidly to take care of the needs of our people. Any gasoline shortage

due to the tanker situation is being rapidly taken care of. Then why frighten the people into thinking that the temporary gasoline shortage is permanent? Why? To fool the people into conserving rubber against a rubber shortage that need not exist if only used rubber is reused. The whole business is a self-created nightmare. It need not be. It could and can be avoided if only a few brains are used. But there seems to be an enormous vacuum in thinking. There are men in this Government who know the truth—honest, intelligent men. And there are others who blast forth with orders and newer orders that confuse the whole picture. Too many agencies are concerned with the same subject matter, and each wants to appear authoritative. Hence the muddled thinking. I respectfully suggest if one genuine automobile man and one genuine tire man were given full authority to work this problem out it would be found that the problem is not nearly as bad as some would have us think. In the meantime, new cars are rotting for lack of sales—an inexcusable waste.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the committee took time to study the amendment just offered by the gentleman from New Jersey they would be heartily in favor of it for several reasons, one being that there is a possibility that the automobile dealers will get more at the end of 18 months than they would under the language of the bill as it is now written, because, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it gives them a price at cost to them plus the storage, and insurance, and financing charges which might greatly exceed the retail price. The retail price as established by the Price Administrator might be much lower than the cost of the automobile to the dealer plus his storage charges, his insurance, and financing charges. There is, however, perhaps a more important reason why this amendment should be adopted, and it is as follows: The Office of Price Administration was never authorized under any act of the Congress to fix a retail price. We are launching upon an entirely new program here. The Price Control Act provides that under certain circumstances in accordance with certain formulas, the Price Administrator may set a ceiling on prices. There is nothing in the language of that act or of any act we have passed except this proposed language which allows anyone to fix a price. This not only authorizes the Price Administrator to fix a price on automobiles, but it authorizes him to fix a price on refrigerators, washing machines, ironers, and all this other equipment which is rationed today. It states to him:

"In addition to the powers which are granted to you to fix a ceiling on prices, you may now fix the price," an authority which he never has had and which he never should have. It was intended in the Price Control Act that prices would be allowed to fluctuate under a certain ceiling and that no one autocratically or otherwise might have the authority in this Government to say, "You shall set the price on a commodity at a certain figure." It is all right to say to Mr. Henderson that he has authority to set the top price on an automobile at $1,400, but it is not right and it is not in keeping with the spirit of the Price Control Act to say to Mr. Henderson, "You can set the price at $1,400 and they shall pay no more or no less."

The language in the bill as it was introduced did not contemplate any action by the Price Administrator at all. It said that under these circumstances the dealers would get a fair retail price plus a reasonable allowance for transportation cost, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in handling any such article or commodity. It was amended by the Senate committee to strike out that language which I have just read and to substitute for it without too much thought apparently the language:

> The fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

I am sure that the author of that amendment, having had charge of the price-control bill in the Senate and having sat as chairman of the conference on the price-control matter, if it had been called to his attention that we were authorizing the Office of the Price Administrator to set a price instead of a ceiling, never would have approved this language, and if for no other reason at all than to prevent an agency of the Federal Government setting a price on commodities, the gentleman's amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that not only the Banking and Currency Committee that considered this bill but every Member of the House is sympathetic with the situation that the small businessman finds himself in today. I do not know of any one of the small business man group that has been hit any harder than the automobile and tire dealers. I hold in my hand a survey that was made in my district by some of the automobile dealers as to the situation that exists in my particular district. I believe this survey would represent conditions in the average congressional district.

Of the questionnaires that were sent out to ascertain the condition of these local dealers, there were 47 communities that answered and 131 different automobile dealers that answered these questionnaires. I want to particularize for the benefit of the Price Administrator and the House the situation that exists in one town of Minnesota, Mankato, in my district, which is a town of approximately 19,000 population.

In that town there are 12 automobile dealers. Nine out of the twelve of them answered the questionnaire. These 9 dealers had on hand at the time this questionnaire was sent out in January 261 cars and trucks. I would estimate that in that 1 town there are between 350 and 360 new cars and trucks, and I mean new cars and trucks and demonstrators. The pay roll of the 9 of the 12 dealers for the year 1941 was practically $257,000. On October 1, 1941, they were employing 174 people in the 9 of the 12 dealers. On January 30, 1942, the employees had dropped from 174 to 114, and I presume that the drop in employment between that date and today is greater.

In these questionnaires that were sent out it was estimated that 90 percent of those auto dealers who answered stated that they would have to go out of business, assuming this rationing program would be continued. That is, these automobile dealers would have to close their doors and go out of business completely.

This bill perhaps is of some help. Personally, I do not believe it anywhere near answers the problem. There is one thing this Congress cannot do and Mr. Henderson cannot do, and that is to stop the depreciation upon the tires, trucks, and cars. They are going to depreciate, and 12 months from now many of the tires upon those cars will begin to disintegrate. You will find that mechanical depreciation applies to some limited extent on the cars and trucks.

I say that the answer to the problem is to make some reasonable disposition of these cars. Either put them in a Government pool or put them partly in a Government pool and partly in a dealer pool. Get them out of the hands of these dealers who are taking the depreciation.

Mr Chairman, 5 months have elapsed since the freezing order was made. I made some investigation shortly after the freezing order went into effect, and I was both assured and hopeful that some further and other comprehensive and sensible plan would be offered to permit these dealers to make disposition of the cars on hand. I am frank to say that if anything expeditious is to be done it is going to have to come from the Congress. We all want to do what is right in the present drastic situation; we want to cooperate with our Government in its war effort; we want to protect and provide our Government with the cars and trucks that it needs in the war effort; but it is imperative that we also must take into consideration the importance of dealing fairly, justly, and quickly with those dealers who have everything they possess tied up in their automobiles and in their tire stocks, which they are largely prevented from selling and disposing of by the freezing order of January 1, 1942. The tires and cars are meanwhile depreciating; the dealers' rents, taxes, and overhead continue; and while this bill is a little help, I have no false delusion that it is anywhere near the answer to either the problem of the small business man and auto and tire dealer or to the Government or to the public as well.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the language of the price-control law. The original legislation proposed used the word "ceiling" and provided for the establishment of ceilings; but the

language finally embodied in the bill which became law authorized the establishment of "maximum prices." So that the provision of the existing bill to which the amendment is directed using the word "price" is undoubtedly the proper language.

Mr. Chairman, there is a widespread recognition of reference to the necessity for this legislation, and it is important that it be not delayed. The Price Administration made known to the Committee on Banking and Currency that the officials of that administration recognize the justice of this measure. It is demanded in fairness to the automobile dealers of the Nation and to others who may find themselves facing like difficulties and problems.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. In case the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under this bill, purchases the cars of a dealer, is it the intention to continue to store those cars in the garage of the former owner?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is expected these cars will remain stored where they are in the hands of the dealers. It is also expected that only a part of supplies on hand now will be financed under the provisions of this bill. There are other methods being employed in efforts to solve this problem. It is not expected that all of the automobiles of the country will be taken over under the provisions of this bill. Many of them will remain where they are and will be fed into the market because the effect of restrictions will not continue as it has up to this time. May I express the hope that this bill be passed without amendment, that its final enactment be expedited?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if he can state to the House whether or not the Office of Price Administration wants this bill in its present form?

Mr. STEAGALL. I had assumed the gentleman was present when an official of the Price Administration testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency and gave endorsement to this bill. His name is Mr. Potter, and he represents the industrial branch of the Price Administration organization.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I did not so understand. I listened to that testimony, and in my opinion, they were opposed to this provision of the measure.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. KEAN. I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken. I have talked to some of them on the telephone since.

Mr. STEAGALL. I cannot say about what was said to the gentleman over the telephone, but I called the Price Administration and asked them to send down a man who was familiar with this branch of the service. They sent down Mr. Potter, who handles the industrial relationships of that organization. That is what he stated to our committee.

Mr. KEAN. They stated they were in favor of the principle of the bill to aid the automobile dealers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEAN) there were—ayes 29, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6995) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald entitled "The Headache Boys and General MacArthur."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out all after "corporation" down to and including "corporation" in line 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, will the gentleman be kind enough to tell the House just what the significance of the Senate amendment is?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In answer to the gentleman's question, I may say that the Senate struck out the limitation provided in the House bill in the following language:

And provided further, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation.

The Senate eliminated that language by the amendment it adopted yesterday, and passed the bill as amended.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House adopts the Senate amendment, inasmuch as in my opinion the provisions of the House bill were not wise to begin with. They were placed in there by the committee somewhat in the manner of a compromise, because one of the departments was opposed to the bill. In my opinion, to place any limitation on the placer-mining claims would possibly forestall the development of some claims and some mineral deposits that would be very valuable to the Nation in this crisis. In other words, the topography of the country in various sections differs so that in some places one or two claims would be sufficient to carry on an adequate development while in other places a large number of claims might be necessary. I fully agree with the Senate amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I add to what the gentleman has said that placer-mining involves the mining of very low-grade ore sometimes as low as 15 to 25 cents per yard, and requires considerable space upon which to operate. A placer-mining claim embraces 20 acres, to be exact. I, of course, favor the bill that I presented to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and I would have preferred to have the bill passed as it passed the House with that restriction. After all, though, legislation is usually the result of a compromise.

I feel confident, after talking with the distinguished member of the Senate from one of the Western States concerning the amendment which the Senate wrote into my bill that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to have the members of the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Senate recede from their position and consequently I am constrained to accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] be per-

mitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial in regard to General Grant, a citizen of my home town

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very brief article from the Hastings Daily Tribune, of Hastings, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] be permitted to extend his remarks twice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Kerrhard Co., of Red Oak, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that we are in a war that is not a push-over. In order to win this war we must, all of us, drive one way, the American way, to bring about success in the final analysis. In order to do this, Mr. Speaker, we must have unity among ourselves, not only in the Congress of the United States, which has so splendidly shown a united front since Pearl Harbor, but we also must have such cooperation from the American people in every section of the country.

I regret to say that this unity in certain sections is not what we have a right to expect, because of racial intolerance which is becoming a grave danger. This intolerance is being fostered by certain groups that are seeking to destroy this country of ours, by creating disunity and discord among our people. In certain sections and communities of the country they have publications which spread vicious defeatist propaganda designed to undermine the peoples' faith in and support of our Government's war efforts. Such publications are financed by various subversive groups.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot have any unity if this is to continue and we must waken all of our people to the fact that unity is essential to success in this war.

In certain sections that I have visited you still have agents of nazi-ism and fascism, and I can name a number of States and a number of communities where this is true. In time of war we should give a blank check to the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, and a blank check to the Department of Justice and the Secret Service and the Intelligence Service of both the Army and the Navy to ferret out these so-called subversive groups and stop the publication of a number of little periodicals which spread poison and promote a spirit of intolerance among our people throughout the country.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the men who died at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Wake Island, and Guam, if they were alive today to tell the story, would make the same appeal to the American people that I am hoping to make today.

To illustrate my point further, a number of times I have called the attention of this House to certain subversive groups which, unfortunately, the Dies committee did not see fit to study or investigate. I will name one of them. We have a so-called Count Vonsiatsky, who is married to money and has an estate in Thompson, Conn., and he has an organized group to do what? Theoretically—to overthrow the present Russian regime. Practically, however, he has become the liaison officer of native and foreign Fascists and his house is a meeting place for Fascist groups. His organization has spread to all sections of the country and only recently have I discovered that he is registered as a foreign agent.

There are a number of Vonsiatskys who are registered as foreign agents to spread their philosophy of destruction, whether it is against the United States or some of our allies. This should not be allowed and in time of war registration is not enough. In time of war we should put a stop to all of these foreign organizations no matter how innocent their purposes may appear to be, with respect to advocating something that is foreign to the principles of the American people. We should stop this kind of propaganda whether registered or not. You can go down to the little place of Yorkville, in my city, and when you reach about Seventy-fifth or Eightieth Street it begins to smell of nazi-ism. The Department of Justice only recently acting on some information they had went into a number of homes and, sure enough, they were celebrating Hitler's birthday. They found ammunition and they found every kind of propaganda that is poisonous to the American people. You can go down to some portions of New Jersey and you will find groups and flocks of so-called Nazi sympathizers who are ready, if they have the opportunity, to destroy us, and I venture to say here and now that if and when the time comes and we happen to strike at Germany from offensive positions, you will get more sabotage in this country than you would expect because we have taken too many things for granted. I remember, going back to 1934, under the McCormack committee, we had the thing under control. I remember that my good friend and colleague, U. S. GUYER, was a member of that committee, but we could not then awaken the American people to the dangers that have been pursuing us since 1933, when Hitler took command of the German people.

Believe me when I tell you that I stood on this floor and named at least 5,000 subversive groups and individuals, and I venture to say not one of these groups, or more than one-half percent of them, have ever been investigated by the so-called Dies committee. This is no time for tommyrot or pussyfooting. This is war, and we in Congress ought to make it our business to give more aid to our Attorney General and give more power, if necessary, to the Department of Justice to destroy these elements throughout the country.

Another observation I make, Mr. Speaker. You take some groups and in their hearts they are Fascists and against this Government. They organize themselves into a so-called mushroom newspaper in a community and then go down to the post office and make application for second-class mail privilege. When it is found out that the organization is against our form of government, or our Army and Navy, then, when we come to look for the individual at the top, we cannot find him. It is my strong recommendation that during the war period all so-called mushroom tabloids throughout the country that are in control of irresponsible groups of people, who in that way at the command of the Nazi Government spread this propaganda, should be stopped. I recall, Mr. Speaker, about 3 or 4 years ago I came across some correspondence between a Fascist group or a Nazi group and the Remington Arms & Ammunition Co. I tried to locate my file which contains evidence that the Nazis were negotiating for ammunition and arms for their organizations in this country. I venture to say that if a proper investigation were made by any committee of certain interwoven interests of the German Government in this country, we would expose facts that would startle the American people.

The law that we are now working on, which was the first bill passed by the McCormack committee to register foreign agents with the State Department, is all right, but it is my best judgment that during the time of war we ought to disband such organizations and stop them from advocating any foreign philosophy which we know is not for the best interests of the American people. Go down the line and you will find a number of great big industries that have received millions and billions of dollars in war work and defense work, but that are still discriminating against certain groups of people in this country, be they white or black. Go through some of our industries, and I have an idea of one or two where the contract is cost-plus, and you will find men there sitting back who

are told not to work so hard. What kind of a citizen would tell any worker that he is working too hard at a time when the United States needs so much material for the defense of ourselves and our Allies? On the other hand, we have certain groups, professional pay-roll guys, who advocate a division between the Soviet Union and this country because they do not like the form of government there. Take your own Dies committee—and I am not making any personal aspersions, but as I said in the early part of the day, while having great respect for that committee, yet it has outworn its usefulness, it is an old coat, an old suit, and we ought to change the style. Attacking the Soviet Union at this time is not for the best interests of our people. I do not believe in their form of government. They can keep that form of government over there, but Russia is one of the best Allies that this country ever had, and by all means she should be supplied with the best lease-lend material, because they are doing a swell job. If you have followed the history of this war, you will know that they are already drafting boys and girls in Germany at the age of 11 and 12 years, and you will find that much of the manpower of the German Government has been absolutely wiped out by the Russian Army and the other Allies. By all means Russia is a great Ally, and we should not as Members of Congress or as a congressional committee attack Russia, because she is doing a real human job.

Mr. Speaker, going back to my discussion of subversive publications, I believe that more of these publications ought to be removed from our mails. Because of my investigation over a number of years I have found that people who get a second-class permit for mailing purposes through our post offices are indirectly the so-called subversive groups, delivering this mail which is nothing but propaganda against the democracies. I think during the time of war the mail should be gone over more carefully. I do not think the freedom that the mail has had during peacetime should apply during wartime. At least, the people who ship out publications ought to be people of responsibility who should be able to go before the postmaster and present their case and show that they are legitimate American organizations and that their activity is not adverse to the interest of the United States.

Yes; there is much to be done. But so far it has not been done. Sometime ago the House passed a bill to give the Attorney General power to cancel the citizenship papers of certain professional Nazis and Fascists who only obtained those papers for the purpose of protecting their own skins. That was a bill in the right direction. I am sure it is not going to be abused. I was asked about it a number of times, as to whether the Attorney General would pick up innocent people. I am not disturbed about picking up innocent people, because that is not the intention of the Attorney General or of the United States.

There are certain people that we can name who have obtained their certificates of citizenship, who came here for the sole purpose of furthering the program of Hitler, to divide us amongst ourselves. Let us wake up. Let us put a stop to this peacetime freedom that should have been curtailed long ago.

Now, it seems to me also, Mr. Speaker, that we should be more friendly with each other. We are all in the same boat. This war must be fought by all of us, with a better spirit among the American people, because all Americans are equal. We might get a better sale of bonds and stamps if that were true, because too many people are being discriminated against in one form or another and unable to earn the money with which to purchase bonds and stamps. I know of numbers of cases where that is so. Out of curiosity I issued letters of introduction to some constituents who happen to be outstanding Americans of my faith. When they applied for jobs, the first question fired at them was, "What is your religion?" The second statement was, "We have no room for you." Those are men who were born here; men whose children are fighting in this present war and some of whom fought in the last war. I have known of many cases where colored people were deprived of employment because of their race and, what is even more disgraceful, were discriminated against while wearing the uniform of the armed forces of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the beginning of my discussion, I hoped to give some more attention to the question of subversive publications and what they are doing to this country.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Some of them appear innocent enough and merely advocate governmental changes, which might be subversive, but cannot be considered treasonable. However, the line of demarcation between what is subversive and what is treasonable has grown dimmer from day to day. In view of the necessity of making our war effort all-embracing and laying aside all activities which do not promote our war effort, it is necessary to brand such publications with the strongest condemnation possible.

Treason is a crime of such horrible nature that the fathers of our country saw fit to insert into the Constitution of the United States, the following words: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."—Article III, section 3.

Judged by this standard, which is a part of the fundamental law of the land, Social Justice and other such publications definitely deserve to be labeled traitorous, and I hereby charge them with treason to the United States, by reason of their giving aid and comfort to the enemies of this Nation.

Many years ago the Supreme Court of the United States was called upon to construe the meaning of the treason clause of our Constitution. At the time the Supreme Court made its early decisions, a war was usually conducted in a punctilious manner and antagonists were fighting on fair terms with one another. Such, however, is no longer the case; at present wars are steeped in totalitarian fashion, and before actual conflict there are many ways in which the enemy can "soften up" a nation by creating a fifth column.

The Hitler method of fighting consists of first dividing a country against itself, breaking up its power of resistance, spreading panic and then machine gunning and bombing from the air until a nation finds itself incapable of offering resistance, and is crushed completely, before attaining a chance to fight.

Hitler and Hirohito have been conducting a war against us by the organization of fifth columns under various names, which have created on our soil, both moral and material propaganda, and which are destroying our power of defense by fair means or foul.

Our Monroe Doctrine was violated by the enemies of our Nation who are seeking, by any means, to establish a foothold on South America, and thereby obtain a base for an attack on the Western Hemisphere.

The activities of Social Justice and the other publications, closely parallel these ideas which attempt to cause division among our ranks and to give aid and comfort to the enemies. Before this country became involved in war with Japan and Germany there was the attitude of men like Coughlin, Pelley, Gerald K. Smith, Winrod, and others, that we should concentrate on our defense, should give no attention or consideration to the distressed democracies, keep our fleet at home and get along without an army since it was unnecessary and no one had made hostile movements against the United States.

After Pearl Harbor this faction did not change in the slightest. They still contended that we had no business fighting, unless our country was invaded, and though Pearl Harbor was attacked and though Pearl Harbor is part of our territory, it is too remote, in their opinion, to be of any concern to us. After all, why should we defend the Hawaiian Islands, they ask; they only became part of the United States, at the close of the last century. Why should we defend the Philippines, are they not far away in the Pacific Ocean? And also there will be no need of defending Alaska because we only acquired it some 70 years ago, and if Japan should invade the west coast, we may retire to the East, and should the Germans invade the East we could retire to the West. Likewise, if we are invaded on both coasts why we could stick our heads in the sands of Arizona, like an ostrich, closing our eyes to all dangers and taking a position like Candide, feeling that no one can harm us.

These publishers have become the living voices of Dr. Goebbels; in fact, if one reads Social Justice, particularly its articles published in the last few months, one is forcefully reminded of the out-

pourings of the German Minister of Propaganda. You find there the same accusations that Goebbels preached for 14 years against the stupidity of the democracies, the troubles the world is put to because of the Jews, and that all the misfortunes of the world are due to the Jewish race. Such is the tenor of all the articles which appear in Social Justice, and the final claim was made very recently to the effect that Germany declared war on Poland and the rest of Europe because Samuel Untermeyer started to boycott German goods in 1933. For both stupidity and malicious thoughts the articles of Social Justice and other magazines of the same class stand unique. Strange as it may seem, there are many people in this country who are properly taken in, just as there were many people in Germany who followed the line of Goebbels when he claimed that Jews were bad for the country.

Although it was necessary for me to enlist among the subversive publishers the name of Father Coughlin, I want it understood that I have the highest regard for the Catholic Church, to which many of my constituents belong, and I do not consider Father Coughlin as being in any way representative of Catholic preaching, either generally or specifically. As a matter of fact, anyone familiar with the utterances of Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII will clearly see that antisemitism is not one of the practices of the Catholic Church. When Mussolini started to play at the antisemitic game of Hitler and Goebbels, he was severely rebuked by the Pope in that he was disregarding the principles of the Catholic Church.

On April 3, 1942, the following statement by Monsignor Hickey clearly repudiated, on behalf of the Detroit archdiocese, Father Coughlin's activities and clearly disavowed any connection of the Catholic Church with Father Coughlin's sheet:

[From the New York Times of April 3, 1942]

The Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit disavowed today any connection with the magazine Social Justice, founded by the Reverend Charles E. Coughlin, Royal Oak radio priest.

The archdiocese assumes no responsibility for the magazine directly or indirectly, according to a statement by the Right Reverend Edward J. Hickey, chancelor of the archdiocese.

Monsignor Hickey's statement was included in an editorial which appeared today in the Michigan Catholic. It was headed "An authoritative confirmation," and declared:

"Current controversy on the editorial policy of the local weekly, Social Justice, in relation to American morale, has brought from some Catholic papers in the country the emphatic statement that Social Justice is not a Catholic paper. We had thought that this was clear to all our readers.

"The receipt of some inquiries, however, has led us to ask the archdiocesan chancery for authoritative confirmation on this point. From the reply of Msgr. Edward J. Hickey, chancelor of the archdiocese of Detroit, we quote the following:

"'A Catholic paper is, by definition, one that is published under the supervision of proper church authority. Social Justice is not under such supervision and is, therefore, not a Catholic paper. Moreover, for nearly 2 years back—since Father Coughlin's latest withdrawal from responsibility for Social Justice with the issue of May 27, 1940—no priest of this diocese has asked or received permission to contribute to Social Justice and no priest of this diocese has been authorized to associate himself in any capacity with its publication or circulation, or, to the knowledge of this office, has actually done so. In a word, the archdiocese of Detroit has no responsibility direct or indirect for Social Justice magazine.'"

Social Justice magazine is published in Royal Oak and according to a statement issued some time ago by Father Coughlin, is owned by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Coughlin.

It was one of the leading isolationist publications in the country prior to December 7, 1941. Since the United States entered the war it has been charged by Catholic and secular papers with being variously anti-British, anti-Roosevelt, anti-Jewish, anti-Russian, and obstructionist.

I call further attention to the fact that in the New York Times of March 30, 1942, the following editorial appeared, quoting the Florida Catholic, a religious weekly published in St. Augustine, which is the oldest Catholic diocese in the United States:

The last issue of the Florida Catholic, a religious weekly published in St. Augustine, oldest Episcopal seat in the United States, contains a blistering denunciation of the "disloyal activities" of "that un-American paper misnamed Social Justice." The Florida Catholic does not mince words in expressing its opinion in this country, but the fact that it was founded by Father Coughlin and sold at the doors of some churches on Sunday makes useful and timely the indignant repudiation of the church and of Catholic journalism by a weekly which is the diocesan organ of Bishop Joseph P. Hurley, until 1940 an official of the secretariat of state of the Vatican.

"Social Justice is not a Catholic paper," the editorial asserts. "It does not reflect Catholic views. It does not acknowledge or obey any Catholic authority. Indeed, it has on various occasions made bitter attack on those authorities. Despite its mock concern for the welfare of our country, despite its peculiar brand of piety, this magazine is both unpatriotic and un-Christian."

In the April 13 issue of Life magazine an article was published entitled "Voices of Defeat." In this article attention is called to the fact that this country abounds in a large number of publications which, while not treasonable, are certainly seditious.

I have no desire to bore you by citing further the names of all the organizations or publications which have been spreading this doctrine of sedition, but let me tell you about a few of them. In Chicago apparently there are a number of organizations which seek to organize our national strength with the idea of thwarting our war effort and conducting anti-American propaganda of all kinds.

One such organization, We the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc., claims a membership of 15,000 in 32 States. This organization apparently is organized to impeach the President and to appease Japan on the theory that the Japanese are reasonable people and would surely make a deal with the United States.

Another Chicago organization is called the Citizens Committee, which also seeks to appease our enemies and to reach an agreement with Japan and Germany. Their publications have been circulated among the Members of Congress as well as other men in public life and the American people generally, and have been distributed under many names. We have, for instance, The Defender, by Gerald B. Winrod, Publicity by E. F. Garner, The Galilean by Pelley, now most fortunately out of publication, and The Cross and the Flag, by Gerald L. K. Smith, and many others.

I had occasion at one time or another to call attention of the House to these publications and their publishers. Public opinion has finally been aroused. I wish to commend the stand taken by the Attorney General in stamping out this menace to our war effort. I feel that such efforts on the part of the Attorney General will cut out this cancerous growth, which is a menace to our country, and I believe that only courageous treatment of this problem by Congress will bring about a sensible solution of this vexing question.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to be complacent. This is a question of self-preservation. We must expose people and publications that play into Hitler's hands by using Goebbel's methods to create disunity, distrust, and unrest among our people. Only if we are united can we win this war, and we must win it to preserve our heritage as a democratic nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

A NATIONAL VETERANS' CEMETERY SHOULD BE PROVIDED AT ONCE FOR THE NORTH PACIFIC COAST AREA

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues will recall, I have been urging for a long time the construction of a national veterans' cemetery by the United States in or near Portland, Oreg., to provide burial facilities for deceased veterans in this great Northwest area. The time has now come making it absolutely necessary that plans be devised and definite action taken for the immediate construction of this cemetery; otherwise there will be no burial facilities in a nationally owned and maintained cemetery available for the burial of deceased veterans in this large area.

I introduced H. R. 950, a companion bill to S. 793, which was passed by this House and is now Public Law No. 388, Seventy-seventh Congress. Under this law the Secretary of War is directed to acquire a site and construct a national veterans' cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

After the approval of this law and on February 21, 1942, I wrote the following letter to the Secretary of War:

I enclose herewith Public Law No. 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, recently passed by the Congress, authorizing you as Secretary of

War to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. I also enclose statement made by me which gives some detailed information showing the imperative need of early establishment of burial facilities for deceased veterans in the Northwest area of the United States.

As disclosed by this information and as you no doubt know, there are totally inadequate burial facilities in that area, and with the casualties of the war in which we are now engaged this emergency will only be increased. The veterans in that district are greatly concerned over the gravity of the situation and are urging that immediate steps be taken to establish the cemetery under the provisions of this act.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me of the expense which would be involved in the undertaking and if it is not possible to proceed at once with the establishment of the cemetery. If for any reason the establishment of the cemetery cannot be undertaken now, I will be glad if you will advise me of the steps to be taken to obviate the difficulties.

On February 19 I addressed an inquiry to the Secretary of War requesting information as to burial space available for veterans in this Northwest area under Federal control, and under date of March 3 he advised me as follows:

Reference is made to your letter of February 19, 1942, in which you state that burial facilities for veterans in the Northwest area of the United States are inadequate for present needs, and request a statement as to what funds are required to carry out the mandate of Public Law No. 388, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The nearest burial space now available for deceased veterans of the Portland, Oreg., area is in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, which is within a few miles of Crow Agency, Mont., approximately 700 miles by rail from Portland. The next nearest burial facilities are in the Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif., approximately 755 miles by rail from Portland.

It is realized that the distances involved would make the interment of the remains of Oregon veterans an expensive proposition for their families, and particularly so if the members of the families desired to accompany the remains and be present at the interment. On the other hand, the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland would cost approximately $200,000 for land, development, and improvements thereto.

Mr. Speaker, as shown by this letter from the Secretary of War, the nearest national veterans' cemetery to Portland is now 700 miles, which means that from other portions of the territory the distance is from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, and particularly the Territory of Alaska. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana, and the Territory of Alaska, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

There are in the State of Oregon 41,219 World War veterans, 41 Civil War veterans, 47 Indian war veterans, 2,673 Spanish-American War veterans, and 398 peacetime veterans. In the State of Washington there are 64,999 World War veterans, 46 Civil War veterans, 65 Indian war veterans, 4,169 Spanish-American War veterans, and 747 peacetime veterans. Idaho has 15,457 World War veterans, 11 Civil War veterans, 19 Indian war veterans, 672 Spanish-American War veterans, and 103 peacetime veterans. Montana has 20,610 World War veterans, 5 Civil War veterans, 75 Indian war veterans, 892 Spanish-American War veterans, and 148 peacetime veterans. The figures for Alaska are a total of 2,500. In the above States there are a total of 142,285 World War veterans, 103 Civil War veterans, 206 Indian war veterans, 8,406 Spanish-American War veterans, and 1,396 peacetime veterans. The total number of veterans in the above Territory is 154,896.

The average age of the World War veterans is 48, Spanish-American War veterans, 66; Civil War, 96; Indian war, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day, Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day; Civil War, 3 a day; and Indian war 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are approximately 4⅔ deaths per day. This figure does not take into consideration the peacetime veterans or officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, since mortality figures covering these groups are not available.

Most of the remains of deceased veterans in the above-mentioned States would only have to be transported within a radius of 400 to 500 miles to this Portland cemetery, with the exception of Alaska, which is some 1,200 miles away. At the present time, if a veteran wishes to be buried in a national cemetery, his body must be sent to San Francisco, which would be a distance of from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, or even further from Alaska.

We also have in this northwest area four veterans' hospitals, besides the one at Portland—one at Walla Walla, Wash., 248 miles from Portland; Boise, Idaho, 479 miles from Portland; Roseburg, Oreg., 196 miles from Portland; and a new Army hospital located at Vancouver, Wash., 8 miles from Portland.

Another factor that must be taken into consideration is there have now been established numerous Army and Navy camps in the Northwest in carrying out our war effort. There are pursuit bases established at the following locations in the Northwest: Portland Columbia Airport, McChord Field at Tacoma, Pendleton, Spokane, a large munitions dump at Hermiston, Army camps at Fort Stevens, Camp Clatsop, Camp Murray, Camp Lewis, Navy stations at Tongue Point at the mouth of the Columbia River, and a large Navy and Coast Guard personnel located in the Puget Sound area. The approximate number of Army and Navy personnel today serving in the armed forces of the United States from these States and Alaska would run well over an additional—I am not allowed to give the number by reasons of national safety—men who in case of death would be entitled to burial in a national cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers, sailors and marines are fighting on many battlefronts throughout the world. Unfortunately many of them already have paid the supreme sacrifice and placed their lives on the altar in the defense of our country. Their broken bodies will soon be coming back to their homes to find a final resting place in the soil from which they sprung. The least that a grateful nation can do in commemoration of the heroic service of these brave men and women is to accord them decent burial in the vicinity of their homes where their relatives and friends may participate in the final service.

There are no facilities now available in the Northwest for burial of deceased veterans in a cemetery maintained and operated by the Federal Government. It is as much a part of our war effort to provide burial facilities for the casualties of the war as it is to provide food, care, and protection for them while they are fighting for the defense of our country. A grateful nation can do no less than make provision for the care of our dead who have given their lives that the rest of us might live.

Recently, at my request, Col. Charles C. Reynolds, of the Quartermaster's Department, inspected the proposed site for this cemetery at Portland, and I am informed found it to be admirably situated and in every way suitable for a national cemetery and available for the purpose.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that immediate steps be taken to acquire the site and that the plans for the cemetery be completed without delay so that actual construction work may be done at an early date, to the end that burial facilities will be available in this Northwest territory for those who are giving their lives in the national service at this critical time of our history.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide the necessary funds to carry out the purposes of Public Law No. 388, I introduced H. R. 6570, which appropriates $200,000, which should have the approval of this body and be enacted into law at once as a war measure, so that these burial facilities may be made available at the earliest possible date. I urge and hope that the Appropriations Committee of the House will give early consideration to this bill and report it out with approval for early passage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions from a group of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STARNES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN), on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 506. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2109. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2190. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2292. An act for the relief of Vernon E. Deus; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2368. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased; and

S. 2002. An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 29, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., April 28 and May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

MEETING OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will be held at 10:30 o'clock Wednesday, April 29, room 353, House Office Building, for the purpose of considering H. R. 6522. It will be an executive session.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1600. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the use of appropriations for travel and transportation for the transportation of dependents of officers and employees of Government agencies from zones of military operation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1601. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1602. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government of useless executive papers; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1603. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 18, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Six Mile Creek in Logan County, Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 717); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 475. A bill to provide for the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6995. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 4280. A bill to codify title I of the United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. House Joint Resolution 294. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur lock; without amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6843. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manfred Sakel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7006. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law No. 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7007. A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 7008. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7009. A bill to facilitate the prosecution of the war by providing for Federal regulation of sizes and weights of motor vehicles operating on certain highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 7010 (by request). A bill to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7011 (by request). A bill to provide for a Deputy Federal Works Administrator and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. Res. 475. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Litchfield brothers, of Aurora, N. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.: to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2725. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of the members of Ebenezer United Presbyterian Church, of Centertown, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2726. Also, petition of senior high-school students, protesting against power-dam erection on Clarion River destroying Cooks Forest; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2727. Also, petition of Anna G. Brennan and other signers, citizens of Sharon, Pa., opposing the Baldwin bill (H. R. 6806); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2728. Also, petition of sundry residents of Stoneboro, Pa., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2729. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Resolution adopted by the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Bellflower, Calif., and signed by H. C. Vinacke, president, and Sarah Woolman, secretary, requesting that the Congress of the United States of America enact such law or laws as will prohibit the manufacturing, brewing, distilling, and sale of any and all alcoholic beverages at any time or place within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2730. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council of New York City, adopted on April 25, 1942, at its general council representing 200,000 American workers; to the Committee on Labor.

2731. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2732. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Rev. J. Lynn Pace, Independent Bible Church, and members of the local Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2733. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mary L. Sawyer and sundry residents of Mansfield, Mass., urging enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2734. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Scio, N. Y., favoring Senate Joint Resolution No. 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2735. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 2567 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, relative to decentralization of Government departments and with particular reference to the Maritime Commission locating in San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2736. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. H. Corson, of Williamsport, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2737. Also, petitions of Ira G. Springman, of Montoursville, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the Army and Navy of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, for each new day we ask Thy presence and Thy benediction. Neither cast down by disappointments, nor elated by successes, we pray that we may possess our souls. Thou dost call the heavy-laden who sink beneath a load of sorrow, and they shall find rest to their souls, a peace, a calm, a spirit of ease; in this strength is realized that love which is at the heart of all.

We pray that we may light our lamps at the flame of eternal truth that the highest good in the universe may come our human way. Blessed Lord God, in every walk of life we would enthrone Thee, whose name is Wonderful Counselor. Vitalize our service by revealing to us that nothing is foreign to our Father in heaven which is essential to man. Giving the cooling freshness of water in the chalice of love, feeding hunger-bitten lips, clothing wind-chilled bodies, these will unconsciously weave for the soul a robe of righteousness which will outshine the gold at sundown. "Inasmuch as ye did unto one of the least of these, My brethren, ye did it unto Me." In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 28, 1942.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As it will be impossible for me to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., on May 2, I suggest that you designate someone else to attend in my place.

Thanking you, I am
Cordially yours,

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 38, Seventy-fifth Congress, as amended by Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] to fill the vacancy thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communications:

APRIL 28, 1942.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under date of January 7, 1942, pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I appointed certain members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the calendar year 1942.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN having declined to serve by reason of official business, I hereby appoint Hon. HENRY W. JACKSON in the place and stead of Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN.

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND.

APRIL 29, 1942.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regret to advise that I shall be unable to attend the meeting at the Coast Guard Academy, New London,

Conn., May 2, 1942, because of having to go to Mobile to vote.

I have advised Chairman BLAND of this and suggested that he appoint someone in my place.

With every good wish,

Cordially yours,

FRANK W. BOYKIN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, April 26, entitled "Thanks, Mr. O'Toole."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered at Jersey City on Sunday last by the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein resolutions adopted by the Arkansas Federated Women's Club on April 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CAPT. HEWITT T. WHELESS AND LT. COMDR. CORYDON M. WASSELL

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues who heard the President's radio address last evening were thrilled by the simple account of the heroism of Capt. Hewitt T. Wheless, of Texas, and Lt. Comdr. Corydon M. Wassell, of Little Rock, Ark., the former as the pilot of a bomber in a fight with 18 Japanese Zero fighter planes, and the latter as a Navy doctor in evacuating severely wounded men under the heavy machine-gun fire and bombing of the Japanese invaders of Java.

I am sure that Texas is proud of her native son, as Arkansas is proud of Corydon M. Wassell. I have known Dr. Wassell ever since we were boys, and I have always felt that if the opportunity should ever be presented to him he would quit himself well.

Mr. Speaker, it does not fall to the lot of many men to receive from their Commander in Chief in a Nation-wide broadcast their citations for gallantry in action under fire, as was the case last evening. According to President Roosevelt, the official report said that Dr. Wassell was "almost like a Christ-like shepherd devoted to his flock." No mortal could ask higher praise. No mortal could receive higher.

The Nation and the State of Arkansas join with Dr. Wassell's mother, Mrs. Albert Wassell, in great pride in the deed of heroism which he performed in the Battle of Java.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Capt. R. G. Trampe showing how the National Youth Administration is aiding the war effort.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE C. I. O. AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HELPING ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE CONSTITUTION OF POLAND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Thursday, immediately after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk the House permit addresses of Members on the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of the Constitution of Poland on the 3d of May. A number of Members have talked to me about it. I have consulted with the leadership, and it is desirable that we recognize this important day in the history of Poland for this period. It is requested that 1 hour's time be allotted for this purpose and that the control of the time be vested in my hands for disposition on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to understand the request just a little bit better. Does the gentleman have in mind any particular time?

Mr. DINGELL. One hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Suppose some one got up and made a similar request for all the countries of the world, would we give over the time that we ought to spend for the important business that we have facing our own country for that purpose? I am not going to object to this request, but I am just wondering in my own mind how far we may go with this. Is it a precedent; and if so, how far will this precedent go?

Mr. DINGELL. Answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania, may I say that the request is specific. It is intended that the program continue after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk. Insofar as legislation is concerned, it will not interfere with any important business of the House. Moreover, there is a desire on the part of Members on both sides of the aisle to take part in this celebration. All interested parties might make a similar request on behalf of other countries if they so desire.

Mr. RICH. Suppose a Member got up and stated that he wanted an hour on something similar to this for Finland, what would be the disposition of the House?

Mr. DINGELL. That would be up to the House. The gentleman knows as well as I do that if anyone was small enough to raise an objection against struggling Finland, perhaps he would subject himself to the consequences.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object because I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with the request of the gentleman from Michigan—I think Poland is a country that stands out in history as a great liberty-loving country and we should pay some tribute to their constitutional anniversary.

The SPEAKER. Is there obection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

PAY RAISE FOR THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the twelfth time in the last 12 months I appear before the House and urge the immediate passage of the Army pay-raise bill, which passed the Senate recently. As you will recall, the bill provides for a raise in pay from $21 to $42 a month of every man in the armed forces of the United States.

The President referred to the necessity of freezing wages and salaries, but he made no mention of any necessity for freezing the pay of the boys in training. I hope that the House will give early consideration to this bill, which should have been passed a long time ago. Remember the dependents of the boys in training. Money should be sent home to them. It

will not be available for the home folks if the boys have just enough to cover their bare needs at camp. Therefore, by this action, we will benefit everybody concerned, and I hope this raise goes through as soon as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from the Galveston News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some comments on a very pertinent subject by Paul A. Strachan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent having to do with C. C. C. camps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short radio address by Mrs. James R. Spraker on the American Creed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us should realize that there is a very important election on wheat quotas on Saturday of this week. They are voting in all wheat regions. In order to be effective this has to carry by a two-thirds majority. If it does not, the whole wheat program goes down. There will be 630,000,000 bushels surplus wheat on the 1st of July and a new crop coming on. Millions of bushels with no buyers. This vote on wheat quotas must carry or there will be thousands of bankrupt wheat farmers, who will carry down merchants and banks. I do not know of a greater disaster that could occur to the farming world than to have the wheat quotas defeated on Saturday. There is a determined effort to bring about the defeat of these quotas in order to discredit the whole Triple A program. Those having wheat-growing districts should warn constituents of the danger.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Secretary Wickard in Oklahoma yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the earliest possible consideration by the House of Senate bill 2250, a bill already passed by the Senate, which sets up the Smaller War Plants Corporation and aims at the mobilization of small business in order that it may not only survive but become an important factor in war production or in the production of essential and necessary civilian supplies.

In my judgment, this measure merits the earliest attention of the House for four reasons: First, because, I think, it is vitally important to our economy that small business be protected and preserved into the future; second, because it can mean conversion of small business establishments at a much more rapid rate than has been done up to now; and third, because it will give financial support and expert technical help to small business; and fourth, because it is obvious that if we are to effectively meet the problem of rising costs of living, anything we can do to encourage the increased production of necessary consumer goods without interference with war production will be of most constructive importance.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by our able colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] that the Committee on Banking and Currency heard testimony today on this bill from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board. The gentleman from Georgia tells me that Mr. Nelson testified strongly in support of this bill and that he stated that it would give to the War Production Board, through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, powers and ability to deal with the problems of small business which it does not now have. I am greatly encouraged to have the gentleman from Georgia tell me he believes the bill will be reported by the committee with little or no opposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the report of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein "America's Invocation," by W. Luther Pickens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ALBERT M. HOWARD

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, with a Senate amendment and agree to the request of the Senate for a conference on the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, KEOGH, and PITTENGER.

ESTATE OF ROMANO EMILIANI

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WEISS, KEOGH, and PITTENGER.

TOMMY HUDDLESTON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5596) for

the relief of Tommy Huddleston, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "amended", insert "and supplemented by the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNON CLEMONS, JR.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 809) for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,835.50" and insert "$2,335.50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALVIRA MANFREDI

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,000."

Page 2, line 1, after "Department", insert "and to the department of hospitals, city of New York, the sum of $107, in full settlement of its claim for medical and surgical service rendered Alvira Manfredi."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, KEOGH, and PITTENGER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

WAR HOUSING AND WAR PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some arrangements with the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] as to the time of general debate. I am frank to say that on this side we have no requests for time and if the gentleman will agree to it I shall be pleased to make arrangements for 15 minutes on the side.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thought the understanding was that we would start out with 45 minutes on a side. I have requests for about 35 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to one hour and a half, 45 minutes of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and 45 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 308, with Mr. HART in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended," approved April 10, 1942 (Public Law 522), namely:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by the act of April 10, 1942 (Public Law 522), $12,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to be available for necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and to be subject to the provisos applicable to the appropriation for national defense housing contained in Public Resolution No. 106, approved October 14, 1940.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

War public works: To enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by the act of April 10, 1942 (Public Law 522), $17,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and to be available for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the employment of persons at the seat of government and elsewhere, printing and binding, and purchase and exchange (not to exceed $5,000), hire, repair, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided*, That the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses shall not exceed $787,500: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, upon request of the Federal Works Administrator, is authorized to detail temporarily a commissioned officer of the United States Army, on active duty, to the Federal Works Agency, without loss or prejudice to his status as such officer, to perform the functions of the office of chief engineer in the office of the Administrator of such Agency; and any commissioned officer so detailed shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowances as such officer, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and allowances and the salary of the office of such chief engineer, and the travel and subsistence expenses of any officer so detailed shall be paid from appropriations available to such Administrator on the same basis as authorized by law and by regulations of the War Department for officers of the United States Army.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on April 10, 1942, the President signed an amendment to the Lanham War Housing Act, authorizing an appropriation of $50,000,000 for war housing and war public works in the District of Columbia and adjacent territory. Under that authorization the President submitted two estimates—one for $30,000,000 for the National Housing Agency, for the construction of housing facilities, in the District of Columbia and in adjacent counties in Maryland and Virginia, and one for $20,000,000 to be administered by the Federal Works Agency, for the construction of community facilities in and near the District of Columbia. As we are all aware, there has been a heavy influx of workers to Washington from all parts of the country. In the month of February alone, 10,000 workers were added to the Federal pay roll in the District of Columbia, increasing the number from 223,000 in January to 233,000 at the end of February. That is approximately twice the number of Government workers resident in the District of Columbia at the peak of employment in the first World War. Of course that has made a heavy burden upon all the public facilities in the metropolitan area for transportation, schools, hospitals, water facilities, roads and streets, and especially on housing. With that in view, the committee, after considering the estimates and hearing testimony recommends to the House an appropriation of $12,000,000 for dormitories and seventeen and one-half million dollars for war public works. The $12,000,000 is recommended for housing instead of the $30,000,000 submitted in the estimates, and the seventeen and one-half million dollars is recommended for community facilities instead of the $20,000,000 transmitted in the Budget estimate. It was believed that the $12,000,000 asked for dormitories for single workers should be allowed in full. The proposal for family dwellings, both temporary and permanent, was denied for the time being, owing to the fact that the testimony was not sufficiently explicit to convince the committee of the need for the sum carried in the Budget estimate.

The entire subject was so exhaustively debated during the recent consideration of the authorizing statute that there is

no occasion for further discussion of the subject at this time, and if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts I will yield at this time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the author of the authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is before us has to do with title IV of the act to expedite defense housing in congested defense areas. The original purpose of this legislation was to provide for such necessary housing in congested industrial areas, such as those where shipbuilding and munitions plants are established, to the extent that housing was not already available and could not be furnished by private capital. This particular title IV of this act, to which this bill relates, has a different purpose. It is its purpose to look after civilian defense workers in the metropolitan areas of the District of Columbia. This was made necessary, though aside from the original purpose of the act, by reason of the great influx of Federal workers into this area in connection with our program for national defense. An estimate was sent to the Congress of $50,000,000 for this purpose, the $50,000,000 to include both the necessary housing and the necessary public works, or so-called community facilities, made necessary by this additional housing and by the crowded conditions in Washington.

The House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds held extensive hearings on that measure. Those who appeared before us made out a case with reference to at least the eventual necessity in this emergency for this sum for the purposes indicated. Mr. W. E. Reynolds, who is the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, has appeared before our committee many times, and in his judgment we have great confidence. He said that $50,000,000 would be the minimum for the necessary construction and public works in this area. A representative of the War Department said that by July of next year there would be 40,000 additional workers added in the War Department, and there would not be facilities available for them.

May I reiterate and stress what has been the policy of this committee and the purpose of this law? It is to provide in these congested defense areas for temporary defense housing to meet the additional needs brought about by the migration of workers to places essential in our defense program. We have not wished construction done except to take care of that excess that cannot be done by private capital and to the further extent that housing is not already available. For permanent construction, for which there is permanent use, certainly private capital could and should be utilized. It is the purpose to recoup, after the emergency, as much of this money for the Federal Treasury as possible by the disposition and sale of the various instrumentalities of these activities.

When this bill went to the Senate, the Senate increased it by $20,000,000, making an authorization of $70,000,000, but the House conferees did not agree to the increase. We held additional hearings to inquire into the necessity for such increase.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. In the conference report which was adopted the sum was kept at the figure authorized in the House bill. Since those hearings were held in the House, there has been a reorganization of the Federal housing agencies, seeking to get them under one management and to coordinate their efforts and activities. Public works remain under the charge and control of the Federal Works Agency, which formerly had control of both housing and public works. New personnel have come into the National Housing Agency, and, naturally, they have been confronted with a serious situation by lack of former familiarity with the history of the legislation and the construction under the legislation. They appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, and it is evident from a perusal of the hearings that they realized they were facing a new situation with which they have not been fully acquainted and concerning which, very naturally, they do not have all the available information. Certainly no censure can attach to them in this regard.

Under those circumstances the Committee on Appropriations has recommended in this measure that for the present there should be expended out of the amount authorized only the sum necessary for the temporary dormitories for the single workers coming into the area, and an amount essential for necessary community facilities, extension of water mains, sewers, light, hospitalization, and so forth, which will be required.

We of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are not taking any present exception to the action of the Committee on Appropriations in this regard. The full amount will eventually be required. This construction herein provided for will at least give those in charge an opportunity to proceed with urgent and necessary temporary living space for these unmarried Federal workers, and enable the authorities to become better acquainted with the general needs of this metropolitan area.

I wish to call attention, of course, to the fact that the authorization remains, and that under that authorization as the situation develops, further appropriations may be made.

I should like to bring to your attention one thing which I think is rather serious and which is complicating living conditions in this metropolitan area. I have before me recent news articles printed in each of the two daily papers of the city of Fort Worth where I reside, giving statements from the Civil Service Commission to the effect that housing is available in Washington, and insisting that stenographers and typists come on to the city, that they cannot be down in the congested business district, but that there is plenty of housing available for them. Consequently, hosts of workers are coming here, for whom there is no employment perhaps, and we have had information to the effect that in many of these agencies today they are not yet ready for them and that they sit and twirl their thumbs with little work to do. In our hearings we stressed the fact before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that such preliminary investigation as was necessary of these various applicants touching their qualifications could be held where they reside or in proximity to the places of their residence, and that they should be brought to Washington only as definite places were available for them and the work ready to be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. I think it is highly important, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of propaganda cease. It is going to make it more and more difficult for those of us who legislate, and it is going to make this situation even more serious for many of the workers who are being brought here.

I called attention at the very beginning of our hearings to this situation and to these articles that are going out from the Civil Service Commission, and I asked that during those hearings someone appear before the committee to explain the statements made by the Civil Service Commission with respect to available housing in an effort to stop this propaganda urging the young men and young women from all over the country to come to Washington, where we know that conditions are crowded, where we know that living expenses are excessive in comparison with other sections of the country, and where, perhaps, under the circumstances it is merely possible for such workers to exist without these temporary dormitories on the salaries which would be paid.

I think we would relieve our housing situation very materially in this metropolitan area if we could stop that solicitation of workers around the country to come here even in advance of any determination of their qualifications to serve if and when the positions are available.

I believe from the hearings that we held that there is and will be as we become more and more crowded in the further ramifications of our national defense program a necessity for this authorization; but at the same time it is likely that the immediate needs for single workers can be met by the amounts which have been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I notice on pages 2 and 3 of the report that private enterprise has indulged in considerable and expensive construction. Is there any disposition on the part of private enterprise to buy from the Government dwelling units the Government has built after they are constructed?

Mr. LANHAM. The law provides for sale; and sale can be effected at any

time. It has been the thought of the committee, however, that most of the housing should be temporary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am aware, that closes the debate on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this bill carries two items of appropriation: The first, in the amount of $12,000,000, to enable the new National Housing Administration to provide housing in or near the District of Columbia for employees determined by the N. H. A. to be essential to national defense and to require residence in or near the District; the second, in the amount of $17,500,000, to enable the Federal Works Agency to provide public works and equipment in connection with this housing in or near the District.

I am in accord with the bill as reported by your committee and shall support it in that form. It is $20,500,000 below the amount of the Budget estimates. I want to make two or three observations in this connection, however, Mr. Chairman.

The testimony in respect to housing was furnished by the officers of the new National Housing Administration set-up. Several times on this floor I have pointed to the situation existing in the housing field, emphasizing that we have had no less than 12 separate agencies operating in the field of national defense housing—a situation which has seemed to me highly undesirable.

I have hoped, therefore, that with the new set-up, aimed at the coordination of the housing agencies of the Government, real progress would be made, both in terms of efficiency and economy. I still entertain that hope, Mr. Chairman. It is too early to be critical of the new set-up. I want to mention in passing, however, that to date the new organization seems to have been unable to make any real saving, either in terms of personnel or in terms of dollars, and to emphasize what has already been pointed out—that the justification of this agency before your committee, particularly in respect of the permanent housing suggested, was just about as weak as possible. I think that is the general opinion of your subcommittee.

The program recommended, as you will see from page 2 of the report, grows out of an over-all estimate of 178,300 housing units, of which 153,300 units are said to be available under previous legislation. The request submitted was for 19,000 units—15,000 of them for single occupancy in the form of dormitories and 4,000 of them in four-family dwelling units—at an estimated cost of $12,000,000 and $18,000,000, respectively. Your committee has allowed the item of $12,000,000 for the temporary dormitories and has denied the item of $18,000,000 for the more permanent type of housing.

The testimony of the officials of the Federal Housing Agency, as I have said, was most unsatisfactory, particularly in reference to the permanent buildings. They could not tell us where they were to be located; they could not tell us what type of building was to be constructed; they could not give us any satisfactory reason why we should resort to permanent construction. I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, state that the intention of his committee in framing the authorization law was to rely on temporary construction insofar as possible.

Those testifying had no assurance that they could obtain the necessary priorities. They suggested costs which seemed to be excessive in the light of experience in other parts of the country. The whole basis for their request appeared debatable, particularly in reference to the estimate of the additional Government workers which may be anticipated here in the District of Columbia during the calendar years 1941 and 1942.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Can the gentleman inform the Committee who is to have charge of this? What particular department of the National Housing Agency is going to have charge of the construction of these units?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand the construction is to be in the hands of the Federal Works Agency, which, of course, has had considerable experience in this line.

This agency, by the way, presented the testimony in regard to the so-called public works, or public facilities, which are covered by the second item in this bill. They assured us that every item to be constructed under community facilities will be an item regarded as essential to the war effort. They assured us also that local contributions will be obtained in every instance insofar as possible. Personally I welcome both assurances, because there is considerable doubt in my mind as to whether or not some of the items included in these public facilities can be fairly said to be essential to the war effort and because there is also considerable doubt in my mind if greater care is not necessary in order to secure adequate local cooperation and in order, insofar as the District of Columbia is concerned, to see that expenditures under the normal appropriation bill and expenditures under this bill are properly coordinated.

Mr. Chairman, during the last 2 days the President has laid before the Congress and the country a seven-point program regarded as essential in the war effort, as essential also in the fight to eliminate the scourge of inflation, which personally I believe we have invited for many years under the course pursued by the present administration.

The program is put on the basis of equality of sacrifice. Every Member of the Congress no doubt believes in the principle of equality of sacrifice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I want to point out, however, Mr. Chairman, that as I read the program I find no evidence whatsoever that the Federal Government itself is to set the example or share in that self-sacrifice.

For years, Mr. Chairman, we have seen agencies, authorities, boards, and commissions of every description, often overlapping or duplicating in functions, created by the Federal Government. The general testimony today is to the effect that many of these agencies could and should be greatly reduced in size in the interest of efficiency. Instead of concentrating on important fundamentals, it appears that we are about to attempt to control and regulate every detail in our entire national economy. I for one do not believe that this can be done.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. When this bill came before the gentleman's committee, it had a total of $50,000,000, did it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is true.

Mr. STEFAN. That is, in two categories. The gentleman's committee cut that down to what? What is the present total?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Twenty-nine million five hundred thousand dollars, a reduction of $20,500,000.

Mr. STEFAN. It is now $29,500,000?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. The biggest cut was made in the permanent construction item; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That item was eliminated pending further study and more evidence.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the House how these new dormitories are going to be allocated? What preference is going to be given to the newly arrived war workers in securing a place in which to live?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The testimony was very unsatisfactory on that point. It was stated, as I recall it, that it would be governed partly by date of arrival and partly by the salary paid, but there was no assurance given that the new construction under this appropriation would not be open to those already located in other residences.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman tell the House whether or not this will result in an exodus of people already living in apartments and rooms all over the city of Washington in order to take advantage of these new buildings to be constructed? In other words, what is going to happen to the new people who are coming in?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am very much afraid, if the matter is not better thought out than at the time of the hearings, that result may follow. The new

construction will apparently be open to those who are already housed.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has taken a great deal of interest in the hearings, and I assume he has been there all the time when these witnesses came before the gentleman's committee. Was there any data given to the committee as to the number of rooms that are vacant in the city of Washington now and how the present zoning law is affecting people who are coming into the district and who cannot get a room in which to live because of the stringency of the zoning law?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The testimony was that there were 34,000 people located in available rooms during the past year, and another 25,000 this year, making a total of 59,000 in all.

From the testimony before us, I do not think that the possibilities to be secured from proper changes in existing zoning restrictions have been properly explored, and I think they should be.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's committee does not know how many vacant rooms there are in Washington that could be taken advantage of by people coming to Washington. Does not the gentleman know that on account of the stringent zoning laws many of his constituents have been driven away from the residential districts because of the enforcement of some of these zoning laws?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand there is a bill now pending before the House which has in view a proper change in the restrictions to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. STEFAN. But the gentleman did not get any real information as to how many vacant places there are that could be taken advantage of?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Based on the testimony, I am afraid I cannot give the gentleman any further information.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say that the hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds indicated a vacancy of 1 percent, which I understand is below normal. I should like to say also that this law provides that the housing is for employees of the Federal Government and these dormitories will be occupied by employees of the Federal Government, necessarily by newcomers, except in those cases where now there are three or four young ladies or three or four young men living in a single room. Of course, they should be taken care of.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I know that the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has gone to great lengths in exploring the possibilities of additional rooms, but may I say to the gentleman that I have evidence that some of my constituents who have come here have been ordered out of houses because of the stringent zoning law here, houses in which they want to live. I hope the Cochran bill will be passed by the House to give them some relief. I know it will relieve the congestion that now exists in the city of Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, the matter of zoning brings up a different question.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; of course.

Mr. LANHAM. The testimony before us is that the office that was built down here to give information with reference to available housing had listed 1,800 rooms as available, and just as soon as they were thrown open there were calls for 1,700 of them. Consequently, the vacancies here are not considerable, and many of those vacancies are undesirable.

Mr. STEFAN. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that quite a few people who have homes in Washington would like to open those homes to some of our constituents who are coming here, but they cannot do so because of the zoning law.

The $29,000,000 carried in this bill is not play money That is a lot of money. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts tell me whether or not all of this is an outright grant, or what part of this money is recoverable by the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of the $29,500,000, $17,500,000 is for community facilities, so-called, and, as I understand, it is largely on a 100-percent grant basis, although there may be some eventual recovery through the water that is used.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The balance of $12,000,000 is for the temporary construction which, of course, when constructed is to be put on a rental basis.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact, however, that outside of the revenues from water that will be sold to these various houses, this entire sum represents a 100-percent grant, with the exception of the rentals that will come in later on after these houses are rented? In other words, it is a 100-percent grant.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say with reference to the community facilities that are revenue-producing that the law provides for payment back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will look in the hearings, he will find that in answer to my question Mr. Snyder said that outside of the water revenue all of this is a 100-percent grant.

Mr. LANHAM. Just what those facilities may be and just what ones will be revenue-producing I am unable to say, but I can say that those that are revenue-producing must make their repayment to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] that the particular facilities are listed on page 4 of the report and that my understanding is substantially in accord with the understanding of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] as far as the testimony before our committee is concerned.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice on page 2 of the report that the bill provides for construction in two counties in Maryland and two in Virginia. May I inquire whether the committee has given consideration to the use of part of the grounds, say, at the Soldiers' Home, or such locations as the vacant block across the street south of the Old House Office Building, and so forth, instead of going out into these other States? Has the committee considered the fact that when we send tens of thousands of Federal employees across the line into Virginia and Maryland, where they pay income taxes and taxes on their personal property, Massachusetts, Missouri, and other States have to make up the taxes they should pay into the District?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that I do not think there is any definite knowledge as to where this construction is to go. That was one of the unsatisfactory parts of the testimony, particularly in regard to the permanent construction.

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the gentleman think the areas I have mentioned should be used, rather than going outside of the District?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The basic law provides for housing in or near the District of Columbia. That is the reason these four additional counties have been included in the survey.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is a great mistake to go out of the District when we have locations in the District.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the inquiry of my colleague from Missouri as to the exemption from taxes, which he said would be paid by the respective States, the gentleman is aware that under the authorization act provision is made under which the Administrator can make payments to local authority in lieu of taxes just as is provided in the Community Facilities Act throughout the United States under the Federal loans and grants. The tax payments are included pro rata in the rentals charged and in that way the communities affected do not lose in their tax bases by the Federal Government holding the property.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. I have been very much interested, as always, in the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I understood that in this case he was speaking about waste in overlapping agencies and the failure to eliminate unnecessary, nonwar expenses. Will the gentleman be a little more specific in that regard and state where in this bill there is a failure to follow that very excellent formula and principle, because I should like to be able to join with him in getting rid of that sort of thing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I answer the gentleman by concluding the thought which I have in mind.

I have here a chart appearing at page 94 of the hearings on the authorizing legislation H. R. 6482.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This chart shows that the civil employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government at the peak of the World War back in 1918 amounted to 120,000.

It fell to about 68,000 at the beginning of the present administration in 1933. Today the chart shows a figure of about 230,000 and it estimates for the end of the calendar year about 280,000. In other words, the estimate for the end of the calendar year is about 233 percent of the peak figure in World War No. 1 and about 400 percent of the figure at the beginning of the present administration in 1933.

Now, the general thought I was trying to bring out is simply this: Obviously the war-housing problem here in the District of Columbia ties directly into this general picture. Obviously the Government cannot build housing for every worker and his family who comes here temporarily. Obviously the Government should not try to build or furnish housing for any nonessential worker and his family. Hand in hand with the housing program here in the District should go a definite program for the elimination for the duration of the war of any nonessential agencies, for the streamlining of any and all agencies that are essential, for the decentralization of any agencies that can be placed elsewhere to make room for the essential agencies and for the elimination of every dollar of nonessential expenditure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Personally I believe that nothing could be more helpful in connection with the fight to avoid inflation than a clear-cut example of economy, efficiency, and self-sacrifice by the Federal Government itself.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds held very extensive hearings through a subcommittee with reference to the matter of decentralization and those hearings are available in two volumes. The committee has also been stressing from the beginning the elimination and the coordination of some of these housing agencies, and I understand that the creation of the new National Housing Agency was very largely to effect that purpose.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sure the committee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], would have the same approach to the matter that I have been advocating.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fact that the locale and the application of the funds and the structures to be provided by these funds are limited to the District of Columbia, yet the pending bill has a rather interesting implication as we look at the war effort in the large and at some of the problems that are going to be generated by this and other legislation, as well as some of the dislocations of which we have got to take account later.

Obviously our first job is victory, a speedy and complete victory, and everything has to be done that is necessary to bring about a speedy and complete victory. I have said so often that, in my humble judgment, the design for victory consists of a pattern that will embrace the efforts of not one army but five armies. In the first, of course, will be that contingent of young Americans who are out on the pitching line. Second, another army consisting of farmers who till the soil and provide the food wherewith the Army is able to carry on its functions. Third, you have the production army, those who are supplying and fabricating the instrumentalities of war that there might be every adequate facility and equipment for the prosecution of this conflict. Then you have the home-front army, that vast segment of people who are maintaining the vigil so that when the boys come back, be it 1 year, or 2 years, or 3 years, or longer, we can still say that here is the ark of the covenant and we have held it intact. And, finally, you have the administrative army, and that, of course, includes everyone from the Commander in Chief on down in the executive branch to the humblest stenographer in the humblest and most obscure agency in the Nation's Capital. It includes also the Congress of the United States.

Now it is for that administrative army for which some kind of housing provision must be made. It is a part of the war effort, and, of course, we are going to have concentration such as you have never witnessed up to the present time, and until some way is found to remove and to decentralize more people, obviously, there must be a roof over all heads and there must be facilities that will nurture and make provision for those who come to the Nation's Capital as a part of the war effort.

You will notice in the hearings provision has been made on the assumption that there will be 183,000 persons who will have come to this city for this purpose before December of 1942. Now, then, we have our choice in the dilemma. Either there must be more expeditious activity in getting agencies out of Washington, so as to make available larger increments and space or we will have to build housing. In this wealth of confusion we have done a certain amount of good work in the field of decentralization, but, in my judgment, it has not gone far enough. I say rather modestly that several years ago when I first proposed the idea of decentralizing agencies, the idea was not so captivating either in Congress or elsewhere, until the advent of the emergency. We find, however, now, that the stamp of approval has been placed on the idea of decentralization in the very fact that the War Department now permits the so-called corps areas to completely execute and process contracts up to $1,000,000. They have realized that they operate most effectively through decentralizing, and the very fact that the Veterans' Bureau will soon send 1,200 people out of Washington indicates that that work can be done elsewhere. We are up against a real, varied proposition, about which there can be no temporizing, and so I express the hope that the Commander in Chief, in his capacity as Chief Executive, will take further cognizance of this congestion, and undertake further decentralizing and remove other agencies, and in proportion as they do, more space will be made available in Government buildings, and more housing facilities will be made available, and that will somewhat ease this present problem. But I recognize also that notwithstanding all that, some space is necessary. So this bill will provide for 7,500 dormitory units. That is rather interesting.

Let us take a look for a moment at the implications that follow this. There is something more than just meets the eye, because after you have completed 7,500 dormitory units, even for single persons, do not forget that there must be fire protection and consequently fire mains, and they cost money. Then there must be fire hydrants. And when the necessity for these housing facilities are passed, the hydrants will be there, and the water mains will be under the ground. Do not forget, further, that there must be provision for garbage service, traffic services, streets, and police protection for these people and all those things that are a part of community instrumentalities, including, of course, schools, where you are dealing with families. There is also superimposed on this community the necessity for making life reasonably convenient for these people who work hard and who are entitled to a few recreational facilities. If you want an example, take a look at the movie houses in Washington. Go downtown most any evening for the early show, and you will find a line a block long waiting to get in. Those are the folks who come from your district and from mine, and about the only recreation they have is to lose themselves for a while in the illusion of unreality through some adventurous picture. Every facility is being taxed. Go to the restaurants in Washington. You must get there before 5:30 o'clock in the evening or after 9 o'clock; otherwise, like little Tommy Tucker, you will have to sing and stand for your supper.

There is a burden on the Nation's Capital today, and some provision must be made if for no other reason than the fact that in proportion as these facilities are available, you add to the efficiency of the worker.

I had an experience yesterday afternoon going to Temporary Building A, away down along the Tidal Basin. I could not get a taxicab to come back. We could not get a bus. We finally did get a bus, but it took 50 minutes to come from Temporary Building A to Pennsylvania Avenue. There are other temporary buildings down there designated as Temporary A, B, and C. There is a tremendous number of workers in those buildings, and every day they must go through that kind of inconvenience and transportation difficulty. So what is the answer? More transportation. The Capital Transit Co. will be called upon to expand its facilities if we build housing out in Suitland or over across the river in Arlington or over in Fairfax County.

But adequate transportation provision must be made if the war effort is going to be efficient, because you cannot be riding people on a bus for an hour to work and an hour from work, and all of the other expenditure of ineffectual time, and say that you have an effectual war worker, whether it is an executive or a humble typist of junior grade.

Those are some of the implications of this housing problem as time goes on. We have to meet them. Ultimately the conflict must come to an end.

Some day there will be a tenseness in the atmosphere as we anticipate an armistice which will be followed by an effective peace treaty. Then there will come a great demobilization of people who have come not only to Washington but to Philadelphia, to the navy yards, to the arsenals, and to the areas where war work has brought concentration and congestion. Then, of course, there will remain the housing in Washington, D. C. There will be some dormitories. There will be private housing, thousands and thousands of units which have been built and which are being built at the present time to accommodate the great immigration of workers who are working for Uncle Sam. Then what? Well, it will be a good time before we enter too far into the field, to plan so that foresight and hindsight will have a speaking acquaintance with each other before it is over. So I say to the deficiency subcommittee I think they have done a very good job in this bill. There was a demand for 4,500 dwelling units. That has been taken out. The bill, as reported, will provide for 15,000 people in 7,500 dormitory units.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the conflict is over there will be losses. Let us not delude ourselves about that, but at the same time let us be able, if it is at all possible, to minimize those losses if we can, either through construction costs or otherwise.

The question was raised by the gentleman from Nebraska about people who might move out from Washington and take some of those places after the emergency is past. Obviously, it is limited to Government workers, but I am not at all insensible to the fact that there is going to be dislocation in this city as in other areas, and after a while those old homes that date back so far probably will not have the same rental usefulness for the same amount of money that they did in other days when life was rather sweet and normal in the United States Capital—and then what? Then we get the impact upon the real-estate tax structure of the United States Capital. You get other effects of like manner. We must then undertake a real job of facing rehabilitation in this town when it is all over—when an iridescent "V" is splashed against the sky to indicate that we have won an early, speedy, and complete victory. Then, when the demobilization begins, comes the problem of rehabilitation—putting all the pieces together here. There will be many headaches before we get through.

I think the subcommittee has exhibited genuine foresight in the matter of trying to hold this down as nearly as possible and yet not detract from the effectiveness of the war work or the necessity of providing housing units for the single workers who come in.

I saw a statement in the paper today to the effect that it is rather singular to make provisions for single folks coming in and not for families. Perhaps it is possible to avoid bringing more families to Washington, for, after all, when we do, and there are children in the schools, it means additional facilities in the community, for which all preparation must be made; and if the War Production Board, the Army, the Navy, the Civil Service Commission in the recruitment of necessary personnel to carry on the war effort can find single folks, I think they make a distinct contribution to the problem that is here and make a contribution to the country in the form of economy and efficiency.

Finally, let us get on with the business of decentralization. Let us send more war-production work to Chicago, to Philadelphia, to Boston, to New York, Peoria, Pittsburgh, and elsewhere. Let us decentralize some of the Federal agencies that are carrying on nonessential war work wherever it can be done. I urge upon the Chief Executive now that he go ahead with this problem and see whether or not additional agencies can be removed.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. The gentleman has sensed the thought I was going to express. Under the undoubtedly correct principle that first things should come first does not the gentleman believe that a survey as to which agencies can be moved out should first be made and that decentralization should be carried to its logical limit before we embark upon a vast housing project in Washington?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does not take any more surveys. Things become a great welter of surveys and statistics. The thing to do is to get a little action. Point the finger at the agency that is nonessential and say, "You move." That is all the President has to do. The rest of it will take care of itself, because a bureau has already been set up in the Budget Bureau, where they have a decentralization officer who can take care of that matter.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Of course, I am looking at this matter from the standpoint of my home city, New York, where there is a plethora not only of housing accommodations but office accommodations. We are only 1 hour and 20 minutes by airplane and 4 hours by train. These bureaus can easily be moved into the city of New York where they can be taken care of overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman; he is exactly correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened with intense interest to the observations of the gentleman who is not only an able member of the Appropriations Committee, but a very diligent member of the House District Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I note that he once again calls upon the President of the United States to decentralize not only the war agencies but civil agencies as well. The gentleman has done that in the past, and I know the theory upon which he proceeds. I think it would be well for the House at this time to be reminded of that which perhaps they are already cognizant to a certain extent, that there is a joint committee not surveying again and again but actually coming to the point of announcing within the next few days where approximately 2,000 workers now engaged in governmental agencies will be dissipated to other communities of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is correct; and perhaps the number can be augmented as time goes on; but I may say to my friend from West Virginia that we have conducted extensive hearings on this matter and have all the material assembled that is necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I too realize a definite need for an appropriation covering the housing needs in the District of Columbia; but I want to call the committee's attention to conditions which we declared existed a number of months ago when we brought before the Members of Congress conditions that did not meet with our approval in the housing program. The program is now handled by the National Housing Agency under the distinguished gentleman, Mr. John Blandford. I firmly believe that Mr. Blandford is going to do a good job. I hope, however, that when this bill gets over to the body at the other end of the Capitol, with all due respect for the distinguished Appropriations Committee of the House which reported this bill, that the Senate will determine from Mr. Blandford who is going to handle this money and do this construction. We still have, I think, 10 or 12 different agencies handling housing. When you attempt to check up something that does not meet your approval in housing construction you find that it is almost impossible to place the blame, and you cannot run it down; so I trust that Mr. Blandford, in his wisdom—and I believe he does have wisdom—will see that certain corrections are made, will designate a certain group in his office or department to have complete charge of constructing these various units and hold them responsible for any irregularities. A number of times, in the Committee on

Public Buildings and Grounds, on which it is my privilege to serve under the able and capable leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], we have discussed various housing agencies and especially the Alley Dwelling Authority. We have raised the point of order and questioned whether the Alley Dwelling Authority has the right to do the things they are doing. I contend that their field is that of slum clearange, yet we find them building defense housing units. The same can be said of a number of agencies, which results in an overlapping of authority and responsibility. So I trust that Mr. Blandford will submit a clear picture to the Senate so that when this bill comes back to the House, the matter of who is going to handle this money and be responsible for these various projects will be cleared up and become part of the record.

Another thing I hope can be cleared up is the right of private capital, where it is available, to construct these homes whether in the District of Columbia or my own district. So far the experience has been that private builders cannot get priorities and for this reason private capital cannot be used to construct these homes. In other words, let us soon arrive at the place where there will be less Government competition with private industry. Private industry, builders, and property owners are held down and cannot build, yet the Federal Government will come along, get the necessary equipment and priorities, and do the work that private capital and industry should and are willing to do.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HAINES. Is it the gentleman's experience that private capital will build homes for rental purposes?

Mr. McGREGOR. I shall be pleased to answer the question of the gentleman. The testimony before our committee—and I will verify that by a telegram to our very distinguished Member the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], which said that a billion dollars was ready for low-cost housing units for workers, that private interests will be glad to furnish that money if they can have the same rights and priorities as the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Chairman, my hope is that when this bill goes to the Senate there will be a clarification not only of the rights of private capital and industry, but also the rights of the worker who has his own money, but who, under the present rules and priorities, cannot go out and build a house of his own in which to live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 308, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended," approved April 10, 1942 (Public Law 522), namely:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by the act of April 10, 1942 (Public Law 522), $12,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to be available for necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and to be subject to the provisos applicable to the appropriation for national defense housing contained in Public Resolution No 106, approved October 14, 1940.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

War public works: To enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by the act of April 10, 1942 (Public Law 522), $17,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and to be available for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the employment of persons at the seat of government and elsewhere, printing and binding, and purchase and exchange (not to exceed $5,000), hire, repair, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided*, That the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses shall not exceed $787,500: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War upon request of the Federal Works Administrator, is authorized to detail temporarily a commissioned officer of the United States Army, on active duty, to the Federal Works Agency, without loss or prejudice to his status as such officer, to perform the functions of the office of chief engineer in the office of the Administrator of such Agency; and any commissioned officer so detailed shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowances as such officer, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and allowances and the salary of the office of such chief engineer, and the travel and subsistence expenses of any officer so detailed shall be paid from appropriations available to such Administrator on the same basis as authorized by law and by regulations of the War Department for officers of the United States Army.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. May I ask him if the Federal Works Agency has requested the assignment of such an engineer from the War Department to the Federal Works Agency for the purposes set out in the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say that the Federal Works Agency has made such request; also, there is a letter in the hearings from the Secretary of War indicating that the request meets with no objection from the War Department.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 308, making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, had directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 321, TITLE III, PART II, OF THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the consent granted by the House on Monday, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6156, to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Pfeifer
Barry	Gillette	Joseph L.
Bender	Grant, Ala.	Plauché
Blackney	Green	Powers
Bolton	Healey	Ramspeck
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Rankin, Mont.
Buckler, Minn.	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Buckley, N. Y.	Jarman	Romjue
Burdick	Jarrett	Sabath
Byrne	Jenkins, Ohio	Sacks
Byron	Johnson,	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Lyndon B.	Schuetz
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, W. Va.	Schulte
Celler	Kocialkowski	Shafer, Mich.
Chiperfield	Kramer	Sheridan
Cluett	Landis	Sikes
Cole, Md.	McGranery	Smith, Pa.
Costello	McLean	Smith, W. Va.
Creal	Maciejewski	Starnes, Ala.
Culkin	Magnuson	Steagall
Delaney	Mason	Traynor
Dies	Merritt	Vreeland
Ditter	Michener	Walter
Douglas	Moser	Wasielewski
Eliot, Mass.	Murray	Weiss
Ellis	O'Day	Whelchel
Fish	Oliver	Wilson
Fitzpatrick	Osmers	Worley
Flannagan	Patrick	
Gavagan	Peterson, Fla.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF LAND-GRANT REDUCED RATES ON RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6156 with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, between 1850 and 1870 the Government made 75 grants to railroads to promote their construction in the United States. The total acreage finally given to those railroads was approximately 130,000,000. The general plan was to convey to the railroad alternate sections on each side of its line for specified distances to aid in financing its construction. The total length of these railroads was 21,500 miles. In distance that equals more than 7 roads across the continent from one side to the other.

There were a great variety of provisions in these land grants as to the burdens assumed by the railroads in the way of reduced rates for Government traffic. So much confusion arose out of these different rules applying to the different roads that Congress in 1892 tried to establish some coordination by providing that shipments for the Government should pay not exceeding 50 percent of the regular commercial rates. That is roughly what it provided.

The last of those grants was made 72 years ago. All those grants were made between 72 and 92 years ago.

At the present time this legislation has been modified until the 50-percent rate is applicable alone to military and naval transportation of freight and personnel. Under other provisions in the Interstate Commerce Act carriers are permitted to provide reduced rates or free transportation by contract with the Federal Government, with the State governments, and with the municipalities of the country.

The proposal here is that the Federal Government, as to military and naval transportation, shall pay the same rate as other shippers. There is no question involved here as I see it, as to what the law is. I assume that the Federal Government has the legal right to impose these reduced rates on the railroads for its own shipments. If the Government attempted to impose such rates on carriers for private shippers, they would be unconstitutional, because they would be confiscatory.

Now I want to read briefly to you some reasons for this proposed legislation. In the first place, I wish to quote from Mr. Eastman, who for a long time was Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and who is now the Director of Defense Transportation. Mr. Eastman recommends this bill. I quote from Mr. Eastman:

> As I say, these land grants did accomplish the primary purpose. They made the lands that were worthless without transportation facilities very valuable to the Government and to the people of the country. It seems clear to me that the Government got an excellent bargain from the land grants, quite regardless of the matter of the reduced rates for the carriage of persons and property.

I quote further from the testimony of Mr. Eastman on his recent appearance before our committee, and I may say that the committee after hearing the testimony voted unanimously to bring this bill before the House:

> It seemed to me entirely fair that such relief should be given, because the real quid pro quo for these land grants, in my judgment, was the opening up of the country. That is why they were given, to enable the railroads to be built, to open up the western territory, particularly, and they accomplished that result, and the Government, and everybody else, profited and benefited very largely from the construction of the railroads for that purpose.
>
> The Government had a direct financial benefit through the increase in the value of the large amounts of public land which it retained.
>
> Now, that is the principal reason why, to my mind, it is fair that these land-grant rates should be eliminated, because the Government and the whole country have already got very substantial compensation for the land grants. They accomplished their purpose of getting the railroads constructed and opening up the country.
>
> Another is that while these land grants apply only over a comparatively few railroads, for competitive reasons they have been equalized by the other railroads to a very great extent, so that many of the reductions are now suffered by railroads which got no land grants at all.
>
> Furthermore, it seems to me that the Government ought to pay the same rates for carriage of traffic as are paid by its own citizens, who really make up the country. If you analyze this down far enough the land-grant reductions, to my mind, are really a burden upon the citizens of the country generally, because there is an obligation on their part to provide adequate earnings for the railroads.

One important reason, as I see it, why this bill should pass is that the conditions of today are entirely different from what could have been anticipated at the time the land-grant legislation passed. These land grants helped to build a marvelous empire. Congress at that time, as the debates and the committee reports will show, was highly pleased with what it accomplished in the way of building up the West, the South, and the Central West. The Government made a practice at that time of offering public lands for sale, in the first place, at $1.25 an acre and they were held at that price for a number of years. Then the price was gradually reduced to attract purchasers. The price would finally be placed as low as 12½ cents an acre. The object was to get settlers.

The Illinois Central was the first railroad given a land grant. In part of the territory through which the Illinois Central operated the land was offered to the public at 12½ cents an acre and still it was difficult to sell. The Illinois Central had a history similar to that of the other land-grant railroads. For many years it ran in the red. The Illinois Central was, perhaps, the best located of any of these grants to begin with, but for 9 years it had a deficit each year.

The land-grant award measured at the value of the lands then involved was $6,000 a mile, and therefore many of these roads that ran in the red for a number of years did not gain anything in the end. In fact, a large number of these roads went through reorganizations and bankruptcies. Those who originally received these grants are now out of the picture.

It must be remembered that these roads were constructed to go out and develop traffic where there had been no traffic. It was a hazardous investment, and in many cases it turned out that the road was not able to pay its expenses for many years to come.

To illustrate the conditions under which these grants were made, I quote from a report of a committee of this House made 6 years after the Illinois Central was given its grant. This was a special committee appointed by the House which made this report:

> No better example can be given of the benefits resulting from the construction of railroads to both public and private property than that of the Illinois Central Railroad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield himself enough time to answer a question?

Mr. LEA. I would like to complete the statement, if I may.

> On the line of that road the public lands had been offered for sale for many years without finding a purchaser and were at last reduced to the lowest minimum price, 12½ cents per acre. Even this reduction was not sufficient to induce their sale; but after the Government had given away one-half to assist in building the road, the other half was readily sold for $2.50 per acre. * * * These lands are now totally without value, no matter how fertile they may be and, to the Government, worthless. By giving away one-half for the construction of proposed roads the Government will thereby attach a value to the remainder; and whatever that value may be will be the amount the Government is gainer by the transaction.

They did not have the conception that they were making any gift to the railroads. It was an investment on behalf of the people of the United States to develop this great territory in the West, the Central West, and the South.

Now referring, briefly, to the changed conditions, in 1850 the total expense of running the United States Government 1 year, including the post-office charges, was a little over $44,000,000. Now this year, or going back before the war, the cost amounted to billions of dollars a year.

Transportation for military purposes at the time these grants were made amounted to practically nothing. In 1939, before the Transportation Act was passed, there were 139 agencies of Government shipping over the railroads at Government rates. Originally, there could have been no conception of such an increase of liability as was assumed by these roads.

When this question was discussed before the House a few years ago, Mr. MARTIN, once a beloved member of this Committee, told this House that he lived in this land-grant territory, and he declared that the exaction of these rates under the changed conditions was unconscionable. The harshness of these rates may be impressed upon you if I remind you that if this 50-percent rate was a maximum charge against every railroad in this country, there would probably not be 10 percent of them that could run for 3 months on their income. Those rates would not yield the necessary cost of operating a railroad over any considerable time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I want to ask the gentleman what is the taxable rate on the railroads per mile and how it compares with the value of the land when they got it?

Mr. LEA. I could not give the figures, but the tax is undoubtedly far out of proportion to the value of the land when it was acquired.

We have some people who attack this problem with the argument about the total the railroad may have received in the 70 years or longer since the lands were acquired. They refuse to counterbalance that argument against the benefits the Government and the country received from this development during those 90 years. If that argument is good for one side, it is also for the other. If we are going to balance the benefits which the railroads received, you should charge against that account the value of what the country has received. The benefits to the country in those 90 years greatly exceed anything the land-grant railroads received.

Mr. MAY. In other words, unless the railroads are given the relief provided in this bill, the 25-percent reduction must be made up by the taxpayers in the form of some kind of subsidy.

Mr. LEA. That is true and in the western territory unless some such provisions are made some of those railroads may finally be abandoned. For 5 years during the depression period, over one-half of these railroads were running in the red. Six of them are in the possession of the courts today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. How much additional will it cost the Government to transport the raw materials to the factories and the finished products from the factories in the manufacture of $150,000,000,000 of war material?

Mr. LEA. Prior to the war it was estimated that the total cost to the Government was about $7,000,000. Of course, the war has greatly increased the transportation and, incidentally, greatly increased the burdens on the railroads, and a charge that should apply to the country is placed on the backs of these railroads. It has been estimated that in December the Government transportation on military account amounted to $12,000,000. I do not know if that estimate be correct.

Mr. ENGEL. How much will it cost the taxpayers in additional charges?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], who is one of the ablest and also one of the finest men in this body, has made a splendid statement as to the purposes and objectives of the bill. I do not know whether I can add much to what he said, but possibly I can clarify some of the questions involved and perhaps state some things in such a way that they will be a little better understood. A number of Members have spoken to me about the bill and have expressed an interest in it. If I can, I want to clear up some of the questions in their minds.

In the first place, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, these grants of land were made beginning back in 1850 and continuing on to 1870. It is a matter of some interest to me that a grant was made to my State of Indiana and to the neighboring State of Ohio in 1827 to aid in the construction of the Wabash Erie Canal.

The grants of land I think totaled about 130,000,000 acres. Mr. Eastman, who knows as much about this whole subject as anyone, has determined that the lands so granted were worth 97 cents an acre. That makes around about $130,000,000 of land that was granted to the railroads. Since those grants were made, and these roads have been built, it has been determined that the Government by reason of the reduction in the rates has effected a saving of something like $155,000,000; so, without regard to the taxes that the railroads have paid on these grants of land, or of carrying charges on them, or administrative expenses in connection with it, the Government has saved $25,000,000 more than the value of the land that was granted. Therefore, if the reductions that were to accrue to the Government were to be compensation for the land granted, then I say the Government has already been compensated.

But the fact of the matter is the real consideration, the quid pro quo as Mr. Eastman calls it, for the grants of land, was the return to the Government and the people that followed the opening up of this great expanse of territory. Inevitably the land that is retained by the Government increased in value as the roads were built. The result of the building of the roads has been the opening up of this great empire which now stretches from coast to coast. I say that was the primary reason for the making of the grants, and it has always seemed to me that that is a sufficient consideration for the granting of the land without the addition of this other proposition of granting the reduced rates to the Government.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. If I can continue with my statement for a moment, I shall then be glad to yield. There are some other matters that ought to be considered. Due to the competitive situation between the railroads, many of the railroads that did not have land grants have had to reduce their rates in order to meet the rates of the land-grant railroads. So it seems to me that that has created a discrimination. Some may urge that this is a railroad bill, that it is designed primarily to benefit the railroads. Let us take a look at that. It is the duty of the whole country to maintain its transportation system, and whatever revenues are necessary to make our transportation system must move from the people themselves. Does it not follow inevitably that if the Government insists upon and gets the 50-percent reduction in the rates on its traffic, that the roads must be maintained and operated by higher rates charged against the private individual shippers who are using the roads? I have heard some of my friends who live in the intermountain country challenge this legislation. I do not know whether they are motivated by a feeling of antagonism to some of the things that are charged against the railroads, but I point out to them that if the Government had to pay a full rate as a shipper on the roads, then if the Interstate Commerce Commission does its job as the law expects the Commission to do the job, the private shipper from the intermountain country sending his wheat to the areas of consumption, will get a cheaper rate, and why? Because the Government is one of the great shippers, and will be paying its fair proportionate part of the charge and that will be spread equitably over the whole country.

Now, whatever the Government saves under these land-grant rates is taken out of one pocket and put into another pocket, because the people, who are the Government, have to maintain the transportation system.

Most of these land-grant railroads are in the sparsely settled sections of the country where rates are high, where shippers are constantly complaining of the rates being too high. My view of it is that the passage of this legislation will more adequately spread over the whole country the responsibility and the burden of maintaining those roads and they must be maintained and will relieve the shippers in those particular areas of a part of the burdens that they are now carrying.

In support of that position I would like to read the first paragraph from a letter of commerce counsel and special assistant attorney general of the State of

North Dakota, writing for the chamber of commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., in which he says:

The small business man and farmer would greatly benefit by the outright repeal of the land-grant rate provisions in the above described measure. If the United States Government will pay the same freight rate charge as the small business man and the farmer, it will be doing its fair share in contributing to the support of the railroads and lift some of the burden from the shoulders of agriculture and industry.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is there any assurance that the Interstate Commerce Commission will start leveling down all rates to compensate, in some degree, for that reduction?

Mr. HALLECK. In answer to that, I cannot assure the gentleman of that. All I can say is that in my view the Interstate Commerce Commission is charged with that responsibility. I think clearly that the passage of this legislation will at least afford an avenue by which a start may be made in that direction, and as far as I am concerned, I hope that they undertake to do what I have been talking about.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Have they assured the committee that they will attempt to do it?

Mr. HALLECK. That seems to me to be implied.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The Appropriations Committee has appropriated approximately $150,000,000,000 for war purposes. In that appropriation is contained freight rates for carrying raw materials to the factories and the finished products from the factories. Also the fares for the transportation of millions of troops. That appropriation was made upon the present cost of transportation. How much of a deficiency will we be required to provide in case this bill is passed, in order to take care of the difference between what it will cost under the old rates and the new rates?

Mr. HALLECK. Now, I will answer the gentleman's question that best I know how. My recollection of the hearings is that the reductions that are currently applying run about $25,000,000 a year. As I remember it, that was the statement of Mr. Eastman.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I have answered the gentleman as far as I think it can be answered, and I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it not true that there was evidence before the committee by representatives of substantial railroad organizations that in the event this bill was passed there probably would be a reduction in rates to the shippers?

Mr. HALLECK. That has been my understanding of it, and I think that that will follow without any question.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it not also true that a vast number of shippers' organizations as well as farm organizations throughout the country are supporting this legislation?

Mr. HALLECK. That is undoubtedly true. The Farm Bureau wrote a letter on it. Shippers' organizations all over the country also.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I was impressed with the gentleman's argument with respect to the rates from the Mountain States to the consuming sections of the country. If this bill is passed, will it not inevitably result in lower freight rates for the farmer who produces wheat, and enable him to market his wheat that he cannot market now on account of the rates?

Mr. HALLECK. I think that follows without any question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe in the last Congress we passed similar legislation transferring back certain lands which these railroads held. What is the relation between this proposed legislation and the former?

Mr. HALLECK. The omnibus transportation bill, if I remember correctly, contained a provision by which lands in controversy would be given up if the land-grant rates were to be eliminated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed, if I may.

When Mr. Eastman appeared before the committee this last time he stated definitely that he was appearing there not as the representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but as Coordinator of Defense Transportation. He pointed out two or three very definite reasons why, from the standpoint of the effective prosecution of our war effort, this legislation should be adopted. He said one of them was that under the law Government agencies are required to find the cheapest route by which to transport freight.

They undertake to follow the rates where these land-grant rates apply. It is a highly intricate system, as the chairman has pointed out, there are many different provisions in these different grants. The result has been that the routing of most of it is done at Washington. Shippers hesitate to take responsibility for determining the route. Mr. Eastman stated that in many instances the land-grant rate system had worked great delay in the movement of traffic necessary to prosecute the war effort.

Another thing he suggested was that frequently in less-than-carload lots freight could move through freight forwarders and freight truck lines more expeditiously than by rail, but that again the Army, the Navy, or other departments of the Government would be required to use slower transportation in order to take advantage of the land-grant rates. In other words, if they could use these other systems of transportation which could be done if this bill were passed, the movement of those things vital to the prosecution of the war would be carried on more expeditiously.

He also suggested that in the event it becomes necessary for him to route traffic to avoid bottlenecks and to avoid congestion he would run into a terrific obstacle in the matter of these land-grant rates. In other words, if you had an equalization of the rates so that the most direct and the quickest route could be taken he would be in a position then to route the traffic to move it rapidly and to avoid congestion.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman knows of course that many railroads such as the Great Northern and the Milwaukee Railroad, are not what is known as land-grant railroads. Does the gentleman feel it is fair to such railroads to permit a land-grant railroad to retain the land it still owns as a result of grants from the Federal Government to it and at the same time absolve itself from its contract with the Government to transport Government freight, and so forth, at 50 percent of the usual freight rates?

Mr. HALLECK. My view is that during the past 70 to 90 years the Government has received adequate return for the lands granted. Further, that the initially added money to the roads will shortly result in general decrease in rates. Therefore, the railroads will not really profit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose in this brief time to discuss the merits of this bill but rather to discuss an amendment I propose to offer in the consideration of the bill later on.

Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say whether this is a good bill or a bad bill. I must confess I cannot get enthusiastic about this legislation in view of the fact that there was a contractual relationship that was entered into between the Government, on the one hand, and the railroads, on the other, by which the Government agreed to convey a vast empire of lands to the railroads, and the railroads in turn were to grant the Government the right of transportation over those roads as was generally understood then free of charge.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will permit a correction; free of toll, not free of charge.

Mr. COLMER. Free of toll, which the Supreme Court later—and I think this is what the gentleman had in mind—ruled gave them a right to run their own rolling stock over these roads. So that a concession was made then; and then again the railroads came back to the Government and wanted additional and further concessions. In the Transportation Act of 1940 they received an additional concession and then prior to that Congress made a dogmatic, arbitrary definition that it should be carried for 50 percent. As I say, I have no thorough conviction about all that because I have not had an opportunity to go into it as fully as I might, except to say that now

if I were called upon to vote on this bill I would have to vote against it; but as I said before, I want to call your attention specifically to an amendment I propose to offer that would require the railroads to turn back whatever lands they have left that they have not disposed of to the Government when the Government gives up its right to reduced tolls.

I may say, further, that in doing this I am not acting purely upon my own initiative, for this amendment is sponsored by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior and was prepared by the Department of Agriculture. The amendment therefore reflects the views of at least that portion of this administration if not of the administration itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the gentleman inform us how much land the railroads now have in their possession?

Mr. COLMER. There has been some difficulty in arriving at the number of acres of land that the railroads now own. In 1939 the best the Department of Agriculture could ascertain, there were some 20,662,192 acres of this land. It is now believed that the value of this land is, in round figures, $9,000,000.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. How much of the original 138,000,000 acres of land were sold by the Government? Was it all sold by the Government, or was any of it sold by the railroads?

Mr. COLMER. I understood it was sold by the railroads.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his presentation and his study of this question. In all my career in Congress I never saw such a one-sided proposition as made by those who have taken the floor on this question. I want to remind the gentleman that the Northern Pacific has 20 miles on each side as a land grant, every alternate section. It was extended 10 miles on each side for 2,100 miles from Ashton to Portland. I would like to know if some of these gentlemen who appear to be on the side of the railroads appreciate and understand the amount of oil land that is now producing oil in the State of Montana, the amount of coal land and other land that the railroads hold.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, but it is not a question of being for the railroads or for the Government. It is a question of doing justice in this matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am compelled to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman proposed amendment somewhat confuses me. In the report it is stated:

The Transportation Act of 1940, in substance, required that land-grant roads, in order to secure the benefits of the exemption provided in that act, must release their claims against the Government to any lands or interest in lands or compensation for failure to receive lands, which they had not reduced to possession. Under that provision about 14,500,000 acres of land were relinquished to the Government.

Is that number of acres of land included in the 20,000,000 acres of land the gentleman mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. COLMER. I cannot give the gentleman the data he would like to have.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Has any estimate been made of the mineral value of these lands owned by the railroads, which they would still own if this bill becomes law in its present form?

Mr. COLMER. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that this matter was called to my attention only late yesterday afternoon and I have not had an opportunity to go into that. I have here a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House written yesterday by the Secretary of Agriculture, signed by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, which sets out all the things I would like to say in the brief time I have for the proposal that I am making now. The Secretary of Agriculture goes ahead in his letter to the Speaker, which I have permission to quote from, and which I am going to make a part of my remarks and points out some of the things that I have attempted to point out here briefly and, in addition, a great many other things I will not have an opportunity to present.

Mr. Chairman, the letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to the Honorable Speaker of the House concerning this matter is as follows:

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
United States.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By Report No. 1910, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, dated March 18, 1942, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce submitted to the House the bill H. R. 6156, with recommendations for its enactment. This Department had not been requested to report upon the bill, and since it has now passed beyond the stage of committee action, and since this Department desires to present certain views in relation to the measure, it seems appropriate to thus bring the subject to your attention.

The bill would relieve the land-grant railroads from their present contractual obligations to transport at one-half the regular tariff rates "military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use, or to transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty." In other words if the bill were enacted the relief of the land-grant railroads from the legal and contractual obligations to transport Government freight and personnel at less than tariff rates, which were prescribed by the several acts of Congress under which the land grants were made, apparently would be complete and final.

In essence then, enactment of the bill would constitute a waiver by the United States of legally established contractual rights under which it now saves probably several million dollars per year. Some years ago such a waiver was rationalized as a simple and probably least expensive means to preserve the financial solvency of the land-grant railroads, but current circumstances would indicate that even under the existing land-grant obligations the solvency of the railroads is not now in jeopardy. When the bill S. 2009, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, which culminated in the Transportation Act of 1940, was under consideration by the Congress the then prevailing situation, which was less favorable than the present situation, apparently was regarded as not warranting more than a partial waiver of contractual rights by the United States.

The Transportation Act of 1940, waived the half-rate rights of the United States as to nonmilitary freight and personnel but retained them in relation to military and naval freight and personnel. Reciprocally, the land-grant railroads were required to waive all further claims to lands of the United States under their grants, but were allowed to retain all granted lands for which patents had been issued or were pending. Under the bill, H. R. 6156, the United States would waive the remainder of its contractual rights to less than full tariff transportation, but the railroads would waive nothing.

Aside from the general public policy aspects of the proposal, this Department's interest in the measure arises out of the existence within the national forests of almost 4,000,000 acres of lands granted to and still owned by the railroads and not used for purposes of operation. As odd-numbered sections, these lands extend through large parts of a considerable number of national forests and directly affect the protection, development, and management of the even-numbered national-forest sections. The grant lands are of the same character and types as the interspersed national-forest lands and the preservation and conservative use of their water, timber, forage, wildlife, and recreational resources is equally dictated by all considerations of public interest.

As private property, the grant lands are subject to uncontrolled exploitation of their natural resources for considerations of private profit rather than of permanent public interest. The one alternative is their acquisition by the United States, in order that the public objectives and services of the national forests may be realized in fullest measure and at least cost. But such Federal acquisition normally would require the payment of full compensation for the lands; possibly as much as ten or twenty million dollars. That, however, is only a part of the picture. Similar conditions exist in equal or greater degree in other types of Federal reservations, such as Federal grazing districts, reclamation withdrawals, etc. In 1937, the land-grant railroads still owned almost 20,000,000 acres of granted lands.

It seems appropriate to point out that the capital value of the rights which would be waived by the United States under the terms of H. R. 6156 is markedly in excess of the reasonable market value of the grant lands which remain in the ownership of the land-grant railroads and which are not directly involved in the operation of such railroads. As a matter of fact, the annual reports of the railroads demonstrate clearly that such lands make little cash return and frequently entail costs in excess of revenues; whereas the waiver of the Government's half-rate rights would result in large and immediate increases in railroad income. Reconveyance by the land-grant railroads to the United States of all grant lands still owned by the railroads, or subsidiaries thereof, would seem to be fully justified by principles of reciprocity and equity.

This Department, therefore, is strongly of the opinion that the bill H. R. 6156 should be amended by the addition of further sections to the effect that the provisions of its initial section shall not be applicable to any land-grant railroad unless or until said railroad has

conveyed to the United States all lands granted it by the United States except those sold to third parties for value and those actually used in the operation of the railroad. A draft of an amendment of the kind proposed by this Department is submitted herewith, and its consideration by the Congress is strongly recommended.

This subject has been brought to the attention of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who by letter dated April 11, 1942, has advised this Department that the enactment of H. R. 6156 providing for permanent repeal of section 321 (a) of part II of title III of the Transportation Act of 1940 without provision for reciprocal action by the railroads concerned would not be in accord with the program of the President. We were further advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of our views on this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

RAILROAD GRANT LANDS STILL OWNED BY RAILROADS AND NOT USED FOR OPERATION

Explicit and current data as to granted lands which continue to be owned by the railroads to which granted, or by subsidiaries thereof, are difficult of determination. The best sources of information are certain annual reports to the stockholders, and data compiled by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A study of these data was made by the Forest Service in 1939, and a current restudy now indicates the acreages set forth below. No claim of absolute accuracy is made, but the figures are believed to be approximately correct as for the periods up to 1937 or 1938 to which they relate. Since those years, according to the understanding of the Forest Service, a considerable acreage of the indicated lands may have been disposed of to purchasers for value and no longer be owned by the railroads; but records of the lands thus sold are not available to the Forest Service.

Subject to the foregoing explanation, the situation is roughly as follows:

Railroad	Lands believed to be owned, as of 1937 or 1938 or 1939	Part thereof inside national-forest boundaries	Estimated value thereof
	Acres	*Acres*	
Northern Pacific Ry.	5,803,849	1,936,412	$5,000,000
Southern Pacific R.R.	8,702,310	1,330,000	3,793,000
Union Pacific R. R.	931,000	14,377	23,500
Santa Fe Ry.	4,554,000	213,000	300,000
Great Northern Ry.	102,649	(?)	(?)
Chicago & North Western Ry.	145,892	----------	----------
Canadian Pacific	315,845	----------	----------
Seaboard System	22,804	----------	----------
Southern Ry.	67,620	----------	----------
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	16,223	----------	----------
Total	20,662,192	3,498,789	9,116,500

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the argument for this bill has taken a rather peculiar slant. In part, this bill is represented to be a measure designed to relieve the farmers as to some of their freight rates. It is also stated that if we pass this bill and compel the Government to pay from ten to twelve million dollars more per month for its freight charges the railways of the country will thereafter reduce the freight rates on farm produce, just as though a railroad out in the land-grant country did not run in two directions, did not have very important industrial and other terminals, and would confine all the benefits of the bill to the farmers whenever they desired to reduce the rates. That argument is absurd.

Another argument is that the railroads are in bad shape, the Government is financing them, and for that reason we ought to grant this increase in rates in order that the railways may no longer come to the Treasury, or at least not so frequently, for additional funds. Those two arguments just do not reconcile each other so far as this bill or any other similar bill is concerned.

The increased rates they propose to get from the Government are going to be held by the railroads, and certainly the farmers are not going to get any benefits. Out in the Middle West, from long experience we know that the farmer is the last man who gets a freight-rate reduction from a railroad.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. What additional cost will the Government have to pay for freight rates on transported articles if this bill is passed over what it now has to pay?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Eastman estimates that before the war the Government had a reduction of approximately $25,000,000 a year. The Government would have to cough up $25,000,000 more in case we pass this bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Do I understand, then, if we pass this bill, the Government will have to pay $25,000,000 in additional freight rates over what it now has to pay?

Mr. HULL. The reduction in December alone was over $8,000,000. Your committee says it will be many times seven or ten million dollars. In other words, the Government will have to pay approximately $150,000,000 per year, in addition to the present rates on freight.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The report, on page 4, states this:

> Shortly before the present war it was estimated that the difference in rates accruing to the advantage of the Government between regular and land-grant rates would amount to between seven and ten million dollars a year. Under present war conditions, though the amount, of course, is uncertain, the difference may amount to that much per month.

Mr. HULL. Yes; in other words, approximately $150,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Government would have to make up between $7,000,000 and $10,000,000 a month.

Mr. HULL. I am not a railroad baiter. I am not opposed to financing the railroads. I am not opposed to giving them what is their just due in this emergency, and I want to see them treated justly, but this bill is not just for the emergency; it is perpetual.

If this bill passes, it is the culmination of an endeavor that started way back in 1892 and has been constantly carried on since—to whittle down, little by little, the advantages the Government obtained under the land-grant contracts.

A few weeks ago we had up here the farm security bill. We wanted to put back $20,000,000 the committee had cut out. You remember what the action was. The argument was that nondefense expenditures had to be cut down. The House cut out the much-needed $20,000,000. Here is another nondefense expenditure, so far as all practical purposes are concerned, and now we are asked to increase the freight charges of the Government by $150,000,000. It does not seem right to me.

I do not have the time to go into the railway land grants further than to say this: The period between 1848 and 1868 was one of the most notoriously corrupt eras in our Government, as far as the railroads and many other large organizations were concerned. In the ensuing years there was an effort by the State and National Governments alike to control the very railroads they had built by these land grants. The value of the land grants is estimated at over $400,000,000. The land-grant railroads still have 21,000,000 acres of those grants, including million of acres of rich timberland and mineral and oil lands. Certainly there is no just reason to burden the Government with extra freight charges of $150,000,000 in this time when we need all available revenues and much more to prosecute the war. I am against this bill and I hope that it will be defeated by a large vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin with one exception. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin or anyone else in this House or in the Government can give you any idea as to what this legislation is going to cost the Government if it is enacted into law.

We have not yet passed the Army supply bill. The Budget estimates have not even come down to us, but I think I can tell you right now that you are going to vote for the largest appropriation this country has ever known when that bill comes in, and it will not be less than $35,000,000,000. What for? To prosecute this war.

What the Army buys is going to be carried mostly by the railroads, especially to the west coast, and many land-grant railroads are in the western part of this country; do not forget that. When you come to talk about $35,000,000,000, most of it going for supplies, you have some idea of what is going to be moved by the railroads. You cannot go through the Panama Canal. You are not taking freight through the Panama Canal; you are shipping it to the west coast by rail, and everything that is made in the East and in the Middle West goes over those railroads.

The railroads today are doing the biggest business they ever did in history. Not only freight but passenger trains are running in sections. I have seen trains going from here to New York and from New York to Washington with three sections, one going right after the other,

with 14 and 15 cars in each section due to the traffic. The railroads do not have enough equipment to move all the freight.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. On the gentleman's own statement, as I understand, there is another appropriation bill coming up carrying about $35,000,000,000 for supplies. In view of the fact that every other industry is being put out of business and the railroads will handle nothing but Government traffic, you will bankrupt the railroads if you make them carry all that traffic at these rates.

Mr. COCHRAN. No; not by any means. The report does not show it, but the hearings show that the Army is against this bill, the Navy is against this bill, the Coast Guard is against this bill, and the Treasury is against this bill; and try to find, if you can, a clearance from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT The gentleman knows that the railroads of the Nation are a very important part of our national defense system. A moment ago the gentleman mentioned the railroads were today hauling to capacity. Does the gentleman realize, as a result of a policy followed by Government, freight is routed over land-grant railroads to escape the use of non-land-grant roads and in so doing miles upon miles are added to the direct route simply because the Government insists the freight has to move over land-grant railroads? Surely the gentleman understands these added miles simply places an added burden on the railroads of the Nation.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will see that the representative of the Quartermaster General says just the opposite. He says we are not doing that, but getting the supplies to their destination as fast as they possibly can. He states that in the hearings. I read it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentleman, I repeat again it has been the policy of the Government to circumvent non-land-grant railroads and add mileage to the shipments by sending same over land-grant railroads.

Mr. COCHRAN. That might have been the policy, but I say that the opposite is shown in the hearings in the testimony of the representative of the Quartermaster General. The gentleman may read it in the hearings.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Can the gentleman tell us why, at this particular time, we should pass this bill and change the policy of the Government which has been in effect for 50 years, especially when the railroads are now hauling more than they have ever nauled before, and when we should be trying to save the Government money? The bill, if passed, would cost the Government $125,000,000 more a year.

Mr. COCHRAN. I say, let us take the $125,000,000, or whatever it might be, and use it for supplies to fight this war with and win the war—ships, planes, tanks, and so forth. This legislation is permanent; it is not temporary. You are taking advantage of the situation. This is a bill for the relief of the railroads, to enrich the treasuries of the railroads at the expense of the people of this country. That is what this bill is. We cut appropriations for normal activities to save money to use for prosecuting the war, and here you provide for spending well over a hundred million. That does not make sense. This is no time for such legislation.

As I said, your Army is against it; your Navy is against it; your Coast Guard is against it; your Treasury Department is against it; and you cannot find a clearance from the Bureau of the Budget. If you can, I yield to the chairman of the committee to show that clearance.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEA. A representative of the War Department appeared before the committee and refused to say whether they were against it or for it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Not if I can read. The officer, Lieutenant Colonel Lasher, representing the Quartermaster, said—and I have it here on page 18 of the hearings—I read:

> Basically, the War Department is opposed to the passage of this legislation, due to the increased cost which would be imposed upon the War Department if the land-grant status were repealed.

There is the answer in the hearings to the gentleman's contention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of misinformation being passed around here this afternoon by people who ought to know what it is all about. I hold up before you here a little map showing the land-grant railroads of the United States. Most of them are located in the Middle West and up and down the Mississippi Valley. There is one of them, as you will note, way up here along the northerly borders that stretches out to the west coast and a few in this section in the Southwest. Whoever says there is a lot of land-grant railroads in the far West should take a look at this map before he says anything further. Most of them are right down through Minnesota to Florida and right down the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot yield, because I have a few things I want to say. This is my time and I want to use it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is a lot of mileage in that one railroad, though.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is true, but if the gentleman will kindly read the bill, he will find that it says "notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to the provisions of section 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such acts," and so forth.

Do you know what section 22 says? Section 22 says as follows in the first sentence:

> Nothing in this chapter shall prevent the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates for the United States, State, or municipal governments.

Let me show you how this works. Suppose you want to ship some freight from Pittsburgh to San Antonio, Tex. Somewhere in that route there is a little section of land-grant road maybe. It may be that that land-grant piece is two or three hundred miles away from the route to be selected. What price is charged for the freight? Suppose it is 2,000 miles. If there is 400 miles of land-grant anywhere near that road, there is a 10-percent reduction in the total rate, although it may be 50 percent on the 400 miles of land-grant road. Do you think that the land-grant road actually stands that reduction of 50 percent over its portion of the route? It does not do anything of the kind. That 50 percent that is applicable to the 400 miles is spread over the entire 2,000 miles and each railroad in that whole route takes its 10-percent cut on its rate; not the land-grant road alone but every road in that route. The land-grant road does not take a 50-percent cut. Do not be fooled about that.

Furthermore, when the Quartermaster Corps or the Coast Guard figures out a shipment, we will say, going from Pittsburg to San Antonio, Tex., it may be that there is not one iota of land-grant railroad on the route by which they want to ship this freight. So what do they do? They figure out a route that will run way around Robin Hood's barn and take in some land-grant road in order to find the lowest price on the freight or the route that has the most 50-percent reduction in it and the least full-price mileage. Here is a book that is used by the Quartermaster Corps for figuring rates. Here is one which I am just picking out at random, St. Louis, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. That particular route carries a rate reduction of 39.548 percent There is 703.45 total miles and 557.10 of it is land grant. That 39 percent is not applicable to the 557 miles, it is applicable to the whole 703 miles, and every railroad that participates in that freight shipment has to take a deduction of 39.548 percent. That simply means that so far as the land-grant roads are concerned, they may not carry any of the freight or they may carry some of it, but the rate reduction is asked for and obtained by the Government by whatever route it ships the freight, and a railroad that never had a dime's worth of land-grant route is taking a reduction because some other connecting road has it. The whole situation is different than it seems to appear to some who have spoken. I am telling you frankly that that is the situation. The best thing to do is to rely on section

22 which permits a horizontal cut on all Government freight rates all over the country. The testimony in the hearings shows that the average reduction of rate on account of land grant is around 7 to 10 percent. Suppose they took a 10-percent reduction on all the rates. That would then make up any loss that might be incurred by the cancelation of this provision and at the same time do away with a couple of hundred employees down here who do nothing but figure rates.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. On page 22 of the hearings the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] asked the following question:

It is a fact that the War Department does ship over circuitous routes in some instances?

Colonel LASHER. Not unless there is a very particular reason, such as congestion of the direct route, or some other particular reason. Circuitous routes are avoided wherever possible.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, that is exactly right. The rate is figured on the circuitous route. The freight is shipped direct, but the rate may be figured on the circuitous route. That is where the most land-grant reduction can be made, and it may be that there is no land-grant road in the route finally shipped over. That is the trouble.

Mr. MAY. In other words, the burden is placed on the roads that have no land grant?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; and on the people who use those roads, the farmers and the shippers and the merchants, who have to pay an additional rate because the Government gets a reduction on its freight, because, after all, you have to earn a certain amount of money to pay wages and overhead expenses.

Mr. LEAVY. It seems to be admitted that the railroads still have 20,000,000 acres left.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand 14,000,000 acres have been turned in and that is all wiped off the books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, my viewpoint on this legislation in addition to the long hearings we have had on this bill in the committee, has been arrived at by practical experience as a procurement officer in the Treasury Department, before wartime, of course. The facts are that especially in peacetime in some Government departments there is a shipping over circuitous routes which is uneconomical. Maintaining land-grant rates maintains unjust discrimination against the railroads that did not get land grants and penalizes the shipping public to maintain privileged rates for Government departments redounding in many instances to the financial benefit of many industrial concerns to the detriment of their competitors' interests. The general picture was clearly explained by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. There is an unfair competitive advantage between the railroads, working against the railroads that did not get land grants, but the main thing is that whatever the benefit a particular Government department might get in shipping over a land-grand route, that cost is passed on to the paying public, and the proper place to put legislation of rate reductions is in the over-all picture. I do not believe there is anything that I can add to what was so well stated by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle a moment ago. This is a burdensome, crazy system that needs to be straightened out. This system of privilege and discrimination should be abolished. I am for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this subject has been pretty well covered and I doubt if I can add much to it. I hear members suggesting and contending that the land-grant roads have no right morally to ask for what some term "an abrogation of a contract." Let us look back for just a moment. This thing started 70 years ago. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and others who have spoken before me have outlined the policy of the Government at that date. It was not to help the railroads primarily, but it was to help the whole country that the policy was adopted. The railroads were helped and the country was helped. The railroads got so much land, worth, according to the testimony, 97 cents an acre. It was worth a total of about $125,000,000. But since then the roads have given a benefit financially to the United States Government itself of $155,000,000.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Eastman testified, and it is found on page 4, that the land sold by the railroads and now held is worth between four and five hundred million dollars.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am speaking of the value of the land when it was handed over to the railroads. If I misspoke myself, I desire to correct my error.

In other words, at the time the land was given it was worth $125,000,000 or $130,000,000. That was a part of the contract. The railroads meantime have given back to the Government $155,000,000; so the Government has come out ahead. Now it is contended that the contract should carry on indefinitely, but the situation has changed to such an extent with respect to the tremendous increase in Government freight that any such conract, continued indefinitely, becomes absolutely an unconscionable contract. Suppose the Government finally became the only shipper—it has now become the shipper of 25 or 30 percent—would it then be contended that these land-grant roads should continue carrying all Government freight at a 50-percent reduction? It is unthinkable. It is an unconscionable construction of a contract. The contract has been just about balanced when you bring it up to date.

The Government has all its money back. The railroads have done their part. The lands have been settled. Now a new situation has developed. It has to do with so-called military freight; that includes every bag of cement shipped by a cement manufacturer over a land-grant railroad for the building of a powder plant. The shipping of these millions of military tons was not contemplated 5 years ago, much less 70 years ago. Must we continue indefinitely to make this small percentage of the roads carry this enormously increasing burden? In common fairness, we ought to see that this thing becomes a national burden. It should not rest upon a small number of people. It should rest upon all the people, and that is the real purpose of this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 321 of title III, part II, of the Transportation Act of 1940, be, and the same is hereby amended by striking out the following: "except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty;", so that said subsection, as so amended, shall read as follows:

"SEC. 321. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to the provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such act of any persons or property for the United States, or on its behalf, and the rate determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as reasonable therefor shall be paid for the transportation by railroad of the United States mail: *Provided, however*, That any carrier by railroad and the United States may enter into contracts for the transportation of the United States mail for less than such rate: *Provided further*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5), shall not hereafter be construed as requiring advertising for bids in connection with the procurement of transportation services when the services required can be procured from any common carrier lawfully operating in the territory where such services are to be performed."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: Page 2, at end of bill, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2 The amendment provided by section 1 of this act shall not apply with respect to any carrier by railroad which has received, or whose predecessor in interest has received, a grant of land from the United States to aid in the construction of any part of the railroad operated by it, unless and until such carrier and landowning subsidiaries shall have filed, within 1 year from the date of this

act, with the Secretary of the Interior, in the form and manner approved by him, deeds conveying and releasing to the United States all right, title, and interest in all lands previously granted by the United States to such carrier or its predecessors in interest, except such lands as may have been sold prior to the date of this act by any such carrier to an innocent purchaser for value or otherwise disposed of in good faith.

"All lands reconveyed to the United States pursuant to this section which are situated within the exterior boundaries of reservations created by or under authority of acts of Congress shall become parts of such reservations and shall thereafter be subject to any applicable provisions of law requiring payment to the State or county in which the lands are situated of a share of the receipts from such lands; and if any such payment for any year with respect to such lands shall be less than three-fourths of 1 percent of their fair value when reconveyed to the United States, as determined by the head of the agency charged with their administration, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make an additional payment to such State or county out of any money appropriated for the purpose so that total payment with respect to such lands shall equal three-fourths of 1 percent of their fair value. If any of the lands shall not become subject to the provisions of any other law requiring payment of a share of the receipts from such lands to the State or county in which they are situated, the Secretary of the Treasury, after the close of each fiscal year, shall pay out of the receipts derived from such lands or out of any other money appropriated for the purpose to each county in which the lands are situated an amount equal to three-fourths of 1 percent of the fair value of such lands when reconveyed to the United States, as determined by the head of the agency charged with their administration. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make the payments provided for in this section."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I addressed myself a few moments ago. It is the amendment sponsored by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, prepared in the office of the former, and has the backing, as I said before, of that part of the administration, if not all the administration.

Very briefly, the amendment does two things: It states, first, that if the railroads want to abrogate the contracts they entered into, they shall in turn convey to the Government whatever lands they have left—that is a fair proposition—lands they have not disposed of. The second provision of the amendment is that for payment of three-fourths of 1 percent of the value of that land to the Government in lieu of taxes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. My time is too short.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman any information as to what this will cost the Government?

Mr. COLMER. I have not any estimate of that.

The second provision of the amendment is to take care of the tax situation. It is equitable and ought to be done.

Let me point out to you a phase of this thing in which I am particularly interested: Most of this land is distributed throughout lands already owned by the Government in national-forest reserves and other forest activities of the Government. If the railroads want to avail themselves of this provision, then they ought to come in with clean hands and say, "We will give you back that part of the land we have not already disposed of."

Here is what you are going to be faced with. You are going to be called upon at a later date to appropriate money to buy back from the railroads these blocks of land to fill out these forest preserves. Thereby you are going to have to pay for the land that you gave the railroads to carry out their part of the contract on hauling the Government freight. This is an unfair proposition. As I said a moment ago, the Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out the justice and the wisdom of this amendment at some length in a letter to the Speaker of this House. All we ask in this amendment is that the railroads surrender that small portion of this land which they have not already disposed of and not any portion of it that they are using for railroad purposes, but these idle lands, to surrender them back to the Government if they want to get out of their contracts.

They say it is an unconscionable contract. Is there anything unconscionable about that?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. My time is too limited.

I submit, Mr Chairman, this is a reasonable proposition, and that all we ask for in this amendment, as I said in the beginning, is the return of the unused portion of these lands.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is there any provision in the gentleman's amendment to repay the railroads for any improvements they may have put on these lands, money they may have spent on them since they acquired them?

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will read the amendment which was prepared by the Department of Agriculture, he will see that none of the lands that are used by the railroads are included in this.

Mr. HALLECK. I recognize that, but they might have put improvements on other land that is not being used specifically for railroad purposes. The gentleman's amendment would require them to yield that land back, together with improvements.

Mr. COLMER. It is not the purpose of this amendment or the Department of Agriculture or anybody interested to take away from the railroads any improvements they have made, but to get back these lands a lot of which they are going to have to purchase back otherwise, if the railroads do not want to continue to carry out their contract.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all have great respect for the gentleman from Mississippi, who just preceded me and who is the author of this amendment. The gentleman from Mississippi is one of those, I am sure, who object to legislating on the floor of the House because of the possibility of errors creeping into the legislation. I have just been up to the Clerk's desk and read the amendment and copied down portions of it. This, in substance, is the heart of it:

They must give back all lands previously granted except such land as may have been sold in good faith.

Under that amendment they would have to give back the right-of-way and everything else the railroad owns. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] if he will not read the amendment and find if what I have stated is not true. It does not except land used for right-of-way or railroad purposes, as I read the amendment. I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi does not want the railroads to give back their rights-of-way along with the rest of the property. The gentleman said a moment ago that he had not had an opportunity to study the amendment in connection with existing law. I think it is a pretty dangerous thing to accept an amendment like that without careful examination.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I wish to correct the gentleman. I did not say I had not had an opportunity of studying the amendment; I said I had not studied it as fully as I would like to have.

Mr. HINSHAW. That means the same thing.

Mr. COLMER. I challenge the statement that it would convey back from the railroads their roadbeds.

Mr. HINSHAW. I quote the gentleman, in brief, the language of the amendment. It says:

All lands previously granted except such lands as may have been sold in good faith—

Which includes rights-of-way.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman read all of the amendment?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; but I do not want to take it out of my time. I read the whole thing at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. COLMER. I challenge the statement that it would attempt to take back the railroad right-of-way.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first two paragraphs of the amendment may be read to the House by the Clerk, and that it not come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire amendment be read without it being taken out of the gentleman's time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Colmer amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, I will give the gentleman from Mississippi an opportunity to controvert the statement I made a moment ago.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the courtesy extended by the gentleman and in answer may I say that in the first place I still contend that there is nothing in the amendment that would require them to convey back the right-of-way or any property that is used by them. In addition to that, I call the gentleman's attention to the further fact that this land was conveyed entirely separately and as a bonus to the railroads in outlying districts and in no connection with the railroads, and the right-of-way was not involved at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is the gentleman absolutely certain of that fact?

Mr. COLMER. Is the gentleman absolutely certain to the contrary?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have read a number of the land grants and I know that the gentleman in certain cases is wrong.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman point out one case where I am wrong?

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr HALLECK. The gentleman is a member of the committee, as I am a member of the committee. I do not recall of any such proposition as this being presented to the committee at the time it was under consideration there. I might suggest to the membership generally that that committee is one committee which is consistently careful and diligent to hear the suggestions of all persons in interest. Certainly this is a rather poor time to be bringing in a proposition like this, which is susceptible of so many questions, even as this discussion just had indicates that there is a serious question, without giving the legislative committee in charge of the bill a chance to decide upon it and pass upon it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know that the gentleman from Mississippi agrees with that statement 100 percent and that actually it should have been gone over in committee just as other things were gone over.

Mr. COLMER. I do not agree with that statement 100 percent, because I call the attention of the gentlemen from Indiana and California to the fact that in the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker to which I previously referred it is stated:

> This Department has not been requested to report upon the bill, and since it has now passed the stage of committee action and since the Department desires to present certain views in relation to the measure, it seemed appropriate to thus bring the subject to your attention.

In other words, the Department was not given an opportunity to report.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman expect every department of the Government to be given an opportunity to report on every bill introduced in the House of Representatives?

Mr. COLMER. It is my understanding that the department affected has that courtesy

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one more little statement in addition to what has already been said, and I wish to say this to the gentlemen who have districts located in sections of the Mississippi Valley where these land-grant railroads run in an easterly and westerly direction. It was brought out in the hearings that owing to the land-grant reduction on short-line hauls in that area it was not possible for the motortruck companies to compete with the railroads in the matter of rates in many instances.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that evidently some confusion has come up resulting from the gentleman from Mississippi referring to the Department of Agriculture. May I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this bill only applies to the military part of the Government, not to the other departments. The others were taken care of in the Transportation Act of 1940.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is correct. Fourteen million acres were returned to the Government at that time.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The suggestion has been made here as an inducement that if this passes there might be a reduction in freight rates. Why was there not some reduction after the Transportation Act of 1940 passed when we released every other department of the Government from this reduction in rates, but, to the contrary, an increase in freight rates was asked and secured?

Mr. HINSHAW. A great many railroads of the United States were very deeply in the red and a lot of them were in bankruptcy at the time. Immediately thereafter there came a 10-percent increase in railroad labor wages, which had something to do with it.

There were a few other conditions that arose following that. Since then an application has been made for an increase in rates. I will tell the gentleman this, that if he allows the Government to have such a deep cut in certain of the rates of the railroads where land grants occur, then if the railroads cannot meet their bills and pay their wages, and so forth, he and his former producers are going to have to pay more in freight rates.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi amounts to a proposed rescission of the contract 70 years after it was made, with intervening rights of all kinds.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why, of course. There is no one in the House who knows anything about, for example, a homestead, that would say that the man who received a homestead from the Government and improved it could not sell it after 5 years for such price as he could get for it, regardless of what he may have paid for it. It is a lot of foolishness to talk about rescinding a contract at this time because there happens to be some increase in value.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily to elaborate a bit further on the colloquy I had with the distinguished gentleman from New York, who is one of the fairest and ablest Members of this House.

Mr. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, who testified before the committee, said:

> That gives, I think, all of the available facts in regard to land grants, and in that report it is estimated that at the time the land was granted its average value was around 97 cents an acre. The railroads realized out of that land, principally by sale, but also estimating the value of the land still remaining in their possession, somewhere between four and five hundred million dollars.

That appears on page 4 of the committee hearings.

Mr. Eastman testified also that in 1938 the Government had received in benefits approximately $155,000,000. In 1937, according to Commissioner Mahaffie, it amounted to about $7,000,000 per year. So I submit to you that the Government has not yet been reimbursed by any means.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUTH. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. LEA. I presume the gentleman recognizes that the price as stated by Mr. Fastman was the amount estimated to be received by the railroads over the 90-year period and not the value of the property at the time the contract was made.

Mr. SOUTH. My time is so limited that I prefer to let the statement speak for itself, since I read it in considerable detail. I cannot yield further to the chairman unless he will get me some more time. I will be glad to yield if I can get additional time.

Mr. LEA. I would be glad for the gentleman to have an additional minute.

From what page was the gentleman reading?

Mr. SOUTH. I read from page 4.

Mr. LEA. The gentleman does not mean to say that Mr. Eastman said that these lands were worth $450,000,000 when they were transferred to the railroads?

Mr. SOUTH. For the information of the chairman and of the Committee, I will read his statement again and let the statement speak for itself. I am reading the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 4 of the committee hearings, from Mr Eastman's testimony:

> The railroads realized out of that land, principally by sale, but also estimating the value of the land still remaining in their possession, somewhere between four and five hundred million dollars.

Mr LEA. The gentleman means up to date, does he not? The gentleman ac-

knowledges that that is the interpretation of it?

Mr. SOUTH. The statement speaks for itself.

Mr. LEA. It is not the original value of the land.

Mr. SOUTH. I did not say it was. The statement is self-explanatory.

Mr. LEA. Then would not the gentleman recognize that if you accept that figure as a benefit to the railroads you should accept the improved value of the territory as a benefit to the country?

Mr. SOUTH. The railroads and the Government entered into a voluntary contract, and the Supreme Court has held that it was a valid contract, whereby the Government agreed to convey to the railroads and did convey to them approximately 134,000,000 acres of land. The Government was to receive in exchange for these lands two things: First, the construction of railroads into this undeveloped country, and that was indeed a valuable right; and second, free transportation of all Government properties over these roads.

Later the courts held, and I think equitably so, perhaps, that that was a bit harsh, and ruled that the Government should pay 50 percent of the usual rate. Since that time, and for many, many years the land-grant railroads have been hauling Government property at 50 percent of the regular rate in return for the lands which they had received.

Mr. LEA. Does not the gentleman recognize that the Supreme Court held that in the majority of cases the railroads agreed to give free tolls to the road, which was interpreted to mean that the Government had a right to transport traffic with its own engines and locomotives and cars, but not be given free freight? In 1892 that method of 50 percent was finally adopted as the method to harmonize the system.

Mr. SOUTH. If my delightful and very able chairman says those are the facts, I accept them as such, but the fact remains that a valid contract was entered into between the Government of the United States and certain railroads whereby the railroads agreed to haul the property of the Government free, and later the courts held that it ought to be on a 50–50 basis. That is, that the Government should pay one-half the regular rate. We are gradually taking from the Government all rights and benefits received under the terms of these contracts, and are getting nothing in return.

Now, what does the War Department say about it? Lt. Col. Edmund C. R. Lasher, of the Quartermaster's Department, testified, beginning at page 18 of the hearings:

> Basically the War Department is opposed to the passage of this legislation, due to the increased cost which would be imposed upon the War Department if the land-grant status were repealed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. I desire to ask the gentleman a question if he will yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Notwithstanding the statement which the gentleman read from the committee report as to the value of the lands sold by these railroads, I wonder how much faith should be placed in the evidence of the witness McGinnis, the representative of the War Department, who testified as shown on page 110 of the hearings:

> The three great Pacific systems—the Southern, the Union, and the Northern Pacific—in their own financial statements as presented in Poor's Index, for the years 1902 and 1912, show that those three railroads received in actual cash from the sale of land grants to them by the Government almost a billion dollars.

That statement shows the reception of approximately double the amount stated in the quotation from the committee report by three railroads alone. I wonder if the gentleman, as a member of the committee, will explain what faith and credit ought to be attached to that evidence.

Mr. SOUTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. So far as I know, the witness is familiar with the subject about which he testified, and no effort has been made to discredit him or his testimony.

Let me say further that Mr. Eastman testified that if you want this as a war measure he sees no reason why the Congress could not enact a law suspending the provisions of the land-grant rates for the duration, and 6 months thereafter.

I submit to you that while I did not attend these hearings, I have read them carefully. I am a member of the committee, and I have a very high regard for every member of it. They are doing what they think is right. In 1940 I made a fight on the provision when you were taking all the rights except the one here sought to be removed, and I think I predicted then that it was being done piecemeal; that they would be back getting the rest of it later on. I was the only member of the committee who saw fit to oppose that measure, and this is said in all fairness and in all charity, but let me say again you are handing over to the railroads at this time a bonus that the Government is not able to hand over to them, and it is a voluntary surrender of valuable rights accruing to the Government resulting from a valid contract.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the many interruptions may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTH. Let me repeat: The railroads are retaining all of their benefits, including valuable oil lands now held by some of them. But the Government is not to get back even the lands now held by them. And to my friend who said that the railroads had handed back some of this land, let me say to you that it was only the lands where the title was in dispute, and they have not given back 1 acre where they had a clear title to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, sometimes we become too kind-hearted and beneficent. It is true the railroads are doing a good job. I am not hostile to the railroads, but I would suggest to you they are making much more money in the last year or two than they made in the preceding year, whereas the great automobile companies and most other corporations are making less. Let us not get too charitable with one set of industries and throw the burden on somebody else. Somebody has to pay the taxes and the costs of this war. The railroads are profiting today more than most industries. If you do not believe it look at the security markets and the earning reports coming out daily.

Mr. Chairman, suppose the railroads had made a bad bargain, which I contend they did not do, would it follow that the Congress ought to undertake to make it up in the form of a direct gift, or subsidy? Suppose the railroads had made a good deal, which I think they did, would they have come in years later and handed the Government a gift? Certainly not. I hope this proposal will be defeated, and that it will not be up for consideration again unless a much stronger case than has ever been made is presented.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. LEA. May we not agree upon time for closing the debate and all amendments thereto? Can we not agree on 30 minutes, which would be, of course, only about 3 minutes for each speaker?

Mr. ENGEL. We want 5 minutes each.

Mr. LEA. Could we not agree on 40 minutes of debate, which might be a little less than 5 minutes for each Member? I would like to have about 3 minutes to conclude the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I specifically asked the chairman for time in general debate, which he could not give me, but he assured me there would be liberal debate on the amendments. I think we are at least entitled to 5 minutes each. The members of the committee get all the time, and I am not complaining about that, but we have had certain members speak here twice and get extensions of their time, and we ought to have some time on this important amendment.

Mr. LEA. What the gentleman has said with regard to requesting time in general debate is true, and I would like for the gentleman to have 5 minutes for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent

that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] objects.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], a member of the committee, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about this amendment, but before that, because it bears upon the amendment, permit me to clear up something which seems to me to be important. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made the statement that the value of land transferred was $130,000,000. If I know anything about contracts, and if I know anything about dealings between individuals, or between an individual and the Government, the value of the consideration at the time it passes is the measure properly to be considered. In other words, it is not right or fair to undertake to charge the railroads with what they might subsequently have received from this land, and why? Because they added to the value of the land that was acquired by them, because of the money they spent. Beyond that, if we want to put that in the calculation, would it not likewise be fair to charge against the Government on its side of the equation the increased value of the land that came as a result of the construction of the railroads, when they opened up that country? So I say it is entirely fair to say that the value of the land was $130,000,000, and on that basis the Government has been paid back in full, and $25,000,000 more. No one knows what improvements may have been made on this land subsequent to the time it was acquired by the railroads. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] knows, most of the land was acquired at a very nominal cost from the Indians, and at the time it was granted to the railroads that it was worth very little.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Briefly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Less than 15 years ago when I was a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, we passed a bill granting to the Mandan Indians 10 cents an acre for land they turned over to the Government back in 1880—the best land in North Dakota.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the theory of our committee in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today has been this, that these grants were made in good faith. The railroads were constructed, the country was opened up, and the national interest benefited, and more than full compensation has been returned to the Government for the land granted. If that is true, why should we adopt an amendment which requires the railroads who have not disposed of the land they acquired in the grant to deed it back to the Government? I have no quarrel with the departments of the Government, the Forest Service, if they want to get more land for national forests or any other purpose, but it seems to me that if this amendment be adopted, it would be a rank discrimination against those railroads that have not disposed of their land in favor of those railroads that have disposed of their land.

There is talk here about taxes. The amendment seeks to carry some amount of money to be paid in lieu of taxes. Who knows whether or not that will be adequate to compensate the local municipalities for the taxes they will lose if this land goes back in its ownership to the Government and the railroads no longer have to pay taxes on the land? In short, I cannot urge too strongly that this whole matter of land-grant rates has been before the Congress, and more specifically before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for years. It was under consideration at the time 3 years ago when we had before us the omnibus transportation bill. It is not necessary for the committees of this House to send down to the departments to have them come up here and express any views they may have in respect to particular legislation. I have not found, by and large, that any of the departments have been slow or reluctant to make their views known.

A question was raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] about a statement made before the committee by a man named McGinnis. That man McGinnis by his own statement said, "I am a land-grant rate clerk in the transportation division of the United States Army. However, I am not here to represent the Army or my department or from any other official source. I am on leave today."

Now, then, you read his testimony, and you will see that that land-grant rate clerk undertakes to take Mr. Eastman apart. He challenges statements made by Mr. Eastman, statements based not alone on his personal information, but on careful and complete studies made by qualified members of the departments. Personally, I think Mr. Eastman knows what he is talking about.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to impress upon the committee that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has no application at all to the bill before the committee. Under the Transportation Act which was passed several years ago all other departments of the Government, including the Department of Agriculture, were taken out from under the land-grant railroad rates. The only thing that this Congress left was the military and naval supplies, and nothing else applied to it at all. The truth of the matter is I do not know where or how the Department of Agriculture got it, but they should have examined the law before sending that letter down here.

Mr. Eastman himself made this statement:

> But my understanding of the matter is that in the Transportation Act of 1940 the land-grant reductions were eliminated as far as the Government traffic was concerned, except military and naval traffic, and this would complete the elimination of the land-grant reductions.

I am calling this to the attention of the committee so that when they vote upon it they can see that it has no power and should not have been introduced.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this measure that seems to have been overlooked. In the first place, the Government acquired all this land from the Indians, sometimes by questionable methods, but always at rock-bottom prices. At the time the Government acquired all this land from the Indians it was worthless. The buffalo roamed over the prairies. The only industry was beaver trapping.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry I cannot yield. I only have 5 minutes.

The land had no market value. It was less than 15 years ago that Congress made a settlement with the Mandan Indians of North Dakota for a triangular piece of land that extended from Fargo to Devils Lake, thence east to the Red River of the North, for 10 cents an acre. That is about what the land was worth out in that country. Then Uncle Sam, with his usual foresight, hit upon the plan of interesting people to build railroads, to develop what is now known as the bread basket of the world, the great Middle West and the far West. The railroads went in there and gambled. They had to go abroad to raise the money, mainly in Holland.

The railroads went in there and they made that land worth something, while the Government was sitting back with millions and millions—yes, hundreds of millions—of acres of land that it subsequently sold for $1.50 to $2.50 an acre. Why? Because the railroads had made that land worth something. So I presume if we add up and strike a balance, you will find that the railroads have contributed to the value of that land, through their building, hundreds of millions of dollars that the Government subsequently received and placed in the Treasury.

Now, it is pretty small potatoes for this House to object to the passage of a piece of legislation like this that will do tardy justice to an agency that has done more to make America great than any other single one.

Consider this question from any point of view, and fairness and equity require us to repeal those acts of long ago which imposed a burden upon the railroads for the Government grants of land.

There was, in fact, no value given away by Congress in granting lands for the construction of railroads in advance of traffic and ahead of settlement. Speaking in support of an act to make the first grant of land for railroad construction in the State of Illinois in 1850, Senator Walker, of Wisconsin, said:

> Does the Government grant anything? Not one penny is granted because just so many acres as Congress gives away it doubles the price so that, consequently, as much money is received from the land as would have been received if none was given away.

It will be recalled that the grants of land consisted of alternate sections. On each side of the line the Government retained for itself alternate sections, the price of which it doubled. And the Government was able to sell the land at the enhanced price.

It was thought by the statesmen of that period that the Federal Government

was receiving and would receive sufficiently higher prices for these lands to compensate it fully for the value of lands granted. In passing the laws requiring a reduction in rates and fares to the Government Congress did not consider that any financial obligation attached to these land-grant rates and fare provisions. Senator Foote, of Mississippi, in a debate on the grant of lands to the Illinois Central Railroad, said:

> The Government bestows with one hand and gains in the other. It bestows liberally and gains liberally. It is more than compensated for its liberality.

It is true, however, that the Government has been directly paid for the value of these lands at the time of grant. The sum total of acreage is about 130,000,000 acres. During the period of grants—1850–70—the Government realized on the average per acre for the land sold about 94.5 cents per acre in the States where grants were made, so that the value of the grants was about $122,850,000. While the figure is not accurately known, it is estimated that the amount represented by reductions in rates and fares on Government traffic prior to the present war was from one hundred and fifty-five to two hundred million dollars.

The Government and the people of the country, over and beyond any consideration of a financial transaction, have been paid many times over indirectly, for the extension of these roads made development of the country possible. The natural resources of the great Northwest were made available to the people of the country by the construction of railroads supported by land grants. The rapid increase in the value of farm land, of manufactures, of production of ore and coal, all reach back directly to the construction of these railroads. The indirect results have justified beyond the imagination of men the wisdom of those who encouraged the construction of these railroads into the wilderness through the grants made by the Federal Government.

The stated purpose of the grants of land to the railroads, to which these provisions are attached for reduced rates and fares on Government traffic, was to secure the construction and the continued operation of railroads in the Middle West and reaching on to the Pacific coast. There was a provision in the grants made by Government that the railroads should be constructed to meet the test of high standards, that they should be equipped and that their operation for the service of the country should be continued.

The railroads were constructed and in large part by the stimulus given by these grants of land. The railroads were equipped, they began operations and they have continued operation in the service of the people of the country to this day, through good times and bad, through storm and fair weather. They have improved themselves. They have made themselves more efficient. They have met the demands of commerce. They are the sole transportation agency that can lay claim to being in fact common carriers in that they accept all traffic, at all times, for any destination.

The purpose, therefore, of these grants of land with the provisions attached has long since been accomplished. The provisions for reduced rates and fares to the Government never contemplated the conditions that have developed since they were made. At that time it was thought that the Government traffic would consist of men, material and equipment for outposts along the road in order that the danger of attack by Indians might be prevented and in order that foreign aggressors might be withstood. The country was settled. Peace was restored. We became a single nation. The military needs of that time are no longer the military needs of today.

If, therefore, no real value was given away in the Government grants of land, if the Government has been repaid financially through reduced rates and fares, if the Government and the people of the country have been repaid many times over through indirect benefits and, since the purpose of the grants has long since been accomplished, there is no valid reason why the provisions for reduced rates and fares should be continued.

The fact is, as a practical matter, that these reduced rates and reduced fares to the Government became a demoralizing element in the entire rate structure of the country. With the multiplication of Government agencies during the depression, with the buying up on the part of the Government of great supplies to be shipped from one point to another, scores of agencies demanded and received reduced rates and fares on commodities that moved in the general stream of commerce and were wholly beyond any thought or intent of the original legislators. Wheat, fruit, cotton, livestock, purchased by Government agencies and shipped by railroads, become Government traffic and subject to reduced rates.

So great was the demoralization, so far extended was the application of these reduced rates, that Congress found it wise to restrict the application of the provisions for fare reduction to military and naval traffic. This was prior to the present conflict.

Now we find that in the midst of war the Government itself is extending its activities. The Federal Government has become the greatest of all shippers. More traffic than the original legislators ever dreamed of is now moving as military and naval traffic and amenable to the reduction of rates and fares. The railroads report that for the month of December 1941 the reduction on Government naval and military traffic amounted to $6,046,338 for freight alone and $1,988,116 for passenger traffic. This is a total of practically $8,000,000 within the period of 1 month. For the 4 months, September to December, inclusive, 1941, total reductions reported from 101 roads of class I in freight charges and passenger fares on military and naval traffic amounted to $17,643,000.

Such a burden was certainly never contemplated by the legislation originally passed. The contractual relationship established by these provisions of law has proved to be inequitable to the railroads. They should therefore be repealed.

This opinion is supported by the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the various State commissions, by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, by farm organizations and groups of shippers.

The reasons why all these organizations support the repeal of those provisions requiring rate and fare reductions are that no costs are escaped by the people of the country due to their existence. The transportation agencies must be supported by the shippers of the country. If certain shippers pay too little, others must pay more. The only fair and just principle is to have all shippers pay alike. That has been the object of legislation on matters of regulation. It is a fundamental principle of equity.

The provision requiring reduction of rates and fares does not aid in the present war emergency. On the contrary, as testified to by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, efficient transportation by railroad is interfered with by these very provisions. Traffic is sent by longer routes in order that it may move as many miles as possible over land-grant mileage. The selection of such routes, the accounting for shipments, all require much time and effort on the part of those dealing with Government transportation. It seems clear, therefore, that in wartime, as in peacetime, the land-grant provisions should be stricken from the statute books.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to determine on just what basis the proponents of this legislation would ask you to support it, because there have been so many different versions of it presented this afternoon.

Some of the proponents of this legislation have insisted that the present law required the circuitous routing of freight. Others have told us that it did not. Others have said it worked a burden upon the other railroads that were not land-grant railroads. Obviously the proponents are not together on many phases of this legislation, but they do all come to us and tell us that there was a bad trade made, from the standpoint of the railroads, about 70 years ago, and that, therefore, they want to rescind. And the reason they suggest for wanting to rescind is that they made a bad trade. The fact that the United States Government made a good trade never seems to enter into consideration. The fact that the United States Government made a trade which was profitable to the people of America has not had any consideration at all at the hands of the proponents of this bill. I do not know why the United States Government is not entitled to make a good trade and to retain the benefits of a good trade once in awhile. I do not know why the United States Government should have to sacrifice every time it makes a good trade. I cannot understand why the United States has to give up the advantages of that good trade it made in order that the stockholders of some railroads may add to their bank rolls.

Yet that is the plea that has been presented to you by a half dozen proponents of this legislation. "Oh," they say, "the way it has worked out shows that the railroads made a bad trade. Now, why should we hold them to that trade?" All right, all that the gentleman who offered

this amendment, which is substantially the same amendment I offered here 2 years ago—all that he asks is that they rescind that trade on equitable grounds; that you not simply rescind it on one side but that you rescind it on both sides. The railroads still have some of the goods they got when they made the trade; the railroads still have some of the land. All that is asked is that before we relieve the railroads of that trade that they be required to give back the advantages they still hold. It is not retroactive, it does not go back and take anything they have parted with, but it does ask them to pay back what they now hold; and I submit to the Members of this House that a fairer proposition was never made.

I have one more proposition I want to call to the attention of the House in the very brief time I have to discuss this problem. It has been suggested here by several of those who were seeking to give some reason for voting for this bill—some plausible reason that they could try to use as a defense when they got home for having given a legacy of this kind to the railroads of this country—at the expense of a people already struggling under the burden of financing a world war—they say if we pass this bill the railroads would give a rate reduction, but we got a rate increase, not a reduction, when we passed similar legislation 2 years ago, and if the railroads do not have to give this reduction to the Government the taxpayers will have to make up the difference. In this connection I call your attention to the history of the State of Texas. When the Republic of Texas came into the Union the State retained its public lands. Texas gave 32,000,000 acres of public land, 32,000,000 acres in addition to this 130,000,000 that the Federal Government gave—we made this grant to railroads to build roads within the State of Texas; and we put in it no provision such as the Federal Government had the foresight to include.

We required no agreement for a reduction in rates. If it is a fact as claimed by the proponents of this bill that you could get lower freight rates if the railroads did not have to give the Government the advantage of reduced rates, why does not Texas have the lowest rate in the Union? But the facts are that Texas has the highest freight rates in the Union even after having given 32,000,000 acres of public land to get those railroads and not requiring a thing of the railroads except to build. Our State should have followed the example set by the Federal Government and required that the roads make some reduction in rates. The reduced freight rate the Federal Government has secured is reflected throughout the other 47 States of this Nation, the State of Texas alone being the one that having vast areas of public land gave 32,000,000 acres of it to the railroads but did not put this sound provision in its laws and has not received one thin dime of benefit. But it can at least be said for Texas legislators that they had no experience to guide them. This House has the advantage of having seen both systems work side by side. The system of requiring rate concessions has admittedly saved the Federal Government many millions of dollars. The system of requiring no rate reductions has brought the State of Texas the highest rates in the Union. How can any intelligent Member of this House who places the welfare of the United States above the welfare of the railroad bond holders seriously urge the Federal Government to give up the system that has paid dividends to the people, and accept the system that has resulted in the highest rates?

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have tried to ascertain just what this bill, if passed, is going to cost the United States Treasury. I was rather amazed to learn that the committee which brought this bill to the House was unable to give any very definite information. The gentleman from Indiana said, in answer to my query, that it would cost approximately $25,000,000. The following statement appears in the committee report:

> Shortly before the present war it was estimated that the difference in rates accruing to the advantage of the Government between regular and land-grant rates would amount to between seven and ten million dollars a year. Under present war conditions though the amount, of course, is uncertain, the difference may amount to that much per month.

In other words, according to the committee report, it will cost the Treasury from seven to ten millions a month, or from eighty-four to one hundred and twenty millions a year.

On page 41 of the hearings we find the following testimony by Mr. Fletcher, who was the head of the Association of Railroads:

> In December—

He said—

> the rate deductions amounted to $6,046,338, nearly twice what it was in November; and the passenger deductions run up to nearly $2,000,000, which is close to four times as much as it was in November.

We have appropriated and authorized approximately $150,000,000,000 for defense purposes. In December we had not begun to send out shipments. You will recall that the President said that up to February 1942 we spent about two and one-half billions of the $48,000,000,000 appropriated for lease-lend purposes.

If only 1 percent of the $150,000,000,000 involved freight sent over land-grant railroads, it means that it is going to cost the Treasury of the United States an additional $150,000,000. If it is 2 percent, it will cost $300,000,000, and if 3 percent it will be $450,000,000. I will be candid to say that it is my best judgment that this bill will cost the Government somewhere between $200,000,000 and $500,000,000 for the duration of the war. I am very conservative in that estimate.

The Appropriations Committee in determining the amount to be allowed for defense purposes in this $150,000,000,000 provided for freight rates, passenger rates, and various transportation costs. We included in the appropriation the cost of that transportation, whether of troops or of material, and based that cost upon the present rates of transportation. Your committee and various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee have already been presented with requests for increased sums due to the 10-percent increase in freight rates. Every department that comes before us, as the gentlemen of the committee know, states that they must have increased amounts because of that 10-percent increase in rates.

I would like to have someone tell me what it is going to cost. It seems strange that after we passed the 10-percent increase in freight rates to take care of the increased pay of the employees that we have to pass this bill. It seems to me that that 10-percent increase should be adequate for the railroads. I do not know much about what the railroads are making or what they are not making, but every paper I have picked up recently shows a definite increase in the profits of the large railroads throughout the country. I for one am not willing to vote for this bill during this emergency. I am not willing to take from two hundred to six hundred millions of dollars out of the United States Treasury and put it in the pockets of these railroads at a time when they are carrying more freight and passengers than they have in the history of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first I want to make a correction in a paragraph I read this afternoon. On page 4 of the report it is stated:

> Shortly before the present war it was estimated that the difference in rates accruing to the advantage of the Government between regular and land-grant rates would amount to between seven and ten million dollars a year.

I misread that sentence and said it was between seven and ten million dollars a month. Later on, however, in the same paragraph there is this language:

> Under present war conditions, though the amount, of course, is uncertain, the difference may amount to that much per month.

There is no question but what the railroads are more than meeting a serious, critical problem in the United States today. They are doing a mighty good job in the transportation of all kinds of goods, both civilian and military, and they are to be complimented for their splendid work. Railroads and their employees are living up to expectation.

My good friend and colleague from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] spoke about the railroads getting land from the Indians as low as 10 cents per acre and developing habitable territories through the countries which they traversed. What the gentleman said reminds me of how some very valuable land running into hundreds of thousands of acres and

some running into millions of acres of land that were of very little value—scarcely enough to pay the taxes—were taken from the Crow Indians in violation of a treaty with the Crows by the United States Government not at 10 cents per acre but taking them for nothing and turning these lands over to one of our railroads.

As I said a lot of this land is really worthless today and would sell for very little, but on the other hand this railroad received very valuable lands in this grant. Many acres were and are covered by very valuable timber and many acres also contained valuable mineral deposits. The value of all cannot be determined. This railroad conveyed back to the Government pursuant to an agreement all lands in dispute but still has large acreage of what we call land-grant land.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am sorry; I have no time.

Mr. KNUTSON. The railroads have given all those properties some value.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, it is the settling-up and improvement by the people that have given land the value, not so much the railroads. Of course, railroads were and are necessary, and we are all interested in them.

Now let me remind the Members of the House that the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the same committee of the House of Representatives in 1940 gave weeks and weeks of time and study to what is known as the Transportation Act. The hearings were voluminous and covered the case thoroughly. Both the committees of the Senate and of the House did a mighty lot of work in connection with the transportation bill, and after long and arduous study and work these committees reported a bill to both Senate and House, which we passed, which contained the exception that is now sought to be taken out by this bill:

> Except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States for military or naval and not for civil use, for the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States.

This act was passed in 1940. Conditions have not changed much since then, excepting that we are actually at war. In other words, the railroads at that time were already being called upon, as the fellow says, to deliver the goods and were doing it. The two committees and the House and Senate no doubt thought at that time that the agreement made between the land-grant railroads and the Government as to the transportation of military or naval properties should be carried out. Now the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House comes in with a bill, with hearings covering approximately 150 pages of testimony, and asks for the repeal of this exception. I doubt if scarcely any Member of the House outside of the committee saw the bill or the report or hearings before the bill was called up for consideration today. My own opinion is that the bill should not be passed at this time but should be recommitted to the committee, to be given more careful and deliberate thought, to the end that the Government's interests, as well as the railroads, will be more equitably protected. The bill then may be called up again.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is recognized.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time I cannot possibly develop any particular phase of this subject, but I do want to bring before the House the history of one grant, the greatest grant of all of them, and I refer to the Northern Pacific grant. This railroad passes through my district and goes on to the coast. In Spokane we have the Northern Pacific Railway Co., a land-grand railroad, and the Milwaukee & Great Northern, non-land-grant railroad. They are all doing quite well. The Northern Pacific Railway Co. owns at present 5,600,000 acres of land that it got by virtue of this grant. It has heretofore disposed of millions of acres of granted lands, and has this amount of land left. The actual value of this vast expanse of land is difficult to estimate. It is a safe assertion that it is worth many millions of dollars. This is a part of the consideration given by the Government to secure the carriage of its freight and passenger business for 50 percent of the regular tariff. To relieve the railroad company of its responsibility to haul Government freight and passengers and yet permit them to keep the consideration is indefensible.

The N. P. R. Co. defeated the grant originally made. The original grant by Congress was to the effect that they must sell this land granted in blocks of 160 acres to any bona fide applicant for not to exceed $2.50 an acre. However, the railroad company went through a receivership and became the Northern Pacific Railway Co., whereas when the grant was made it was the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States and in a 5 to 4 decision this railroad was relieved of the responsibility that existed to sell this land at not more than $2.50 per acre in tracts of 160 acres, and they refused sales of the better lands. They still hold 5,500,000 acres of grant land, spotted through the national forests and on the public domain, and some of the sections of timber contain the finest stands of white pine that grows. The timber alone is worth $75,000 on a single section in some cases. It is in the heart of the national forests, railroad company owning every other section. The Government is now affording fire protection and pest control and every sort of protection, building roads and trails, and at great public expense, generally preserving this valuable estate because they have this checkered ownership.

Why should not the Northern Pacific at least be required to convey back that consideration which they took and which they have shifted about until they have gained an undue and unconscionable advantage? Why should they not convey it back, if they ask to relieve themselves of the responsibility they assumed when they entered into this contract 80 or 90 years ago? That is all we ask here. It is not right to permit them to be relieved of all responsibility and also keep the consideration.

If, on the other hand, you say that it is not going to cost so much, then let me say to you that from the patriotic viewpoint this is wartime and freight and passenger hauls have increased tremendously. It is nearly all Government haul. Why not now, when every road is loaded to capacity, let the matter stand until the war is over? Then, if a hardship actually exists, we might see fit to grant a request such as we have here. There is no hardship now existing. We made a tremendous concession a year ago when we passed the act and took back only lands in dispute, and relieved the land-grant roads of the requirement to carry Government freight and passengers in peacetime. They patriotically stated they would not ask full rates in wartime, and yet here they are today, demanding increased charges of Uncle Sam, variously estimated at somewhere from one hundred and fifty to two hundred millions of dollars a year. With all roads making a profit at this time it does not seem consistent with the public interest to seek to load this added burden on the backs of the American people. To me it is totally unjustified.

I fought to have all these land-grant roads return lands in their possession last year. The situation is far worse now. This amendment grants some relief to the public. It should be adopted. If it is defeated then certainly the bill should be defeated. The railroads have no more right to take the property of the United States Government, agreeing to perform a certain service, and to refuse to perform and also keep the payment received. We all would condemn such conduct between individuals. It is just as wrong, and even more so, when the Government is involved, particularly when the Government is in a life-and-death struggle for existence, as it is at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the contract to which this bill relates was the product of those feverish 30's, 40's, 50's, and 60's, when land speculation and wildcat banking and shinplasters seemed to be the order of the day in the country.

Now an agency of the Government known as the Congress proposes to take the initiative in rescinding this contract—rescinding it with the railroads on the other end of the contract in entire agreement. That may be entirely all right, but I confess to you very frankly that I do not propose to vote to rescind that kind of a contract until some type of equitable procedure is applied so that the lands which the railroads now hold may be reconveyed to the Federal Government.

I do not agree with the last portion of the Colmer amendment. I think it is unfortunate that it was introduced. If

he had placed a period at the end of that paragraph dealing with reconveyance to the Department of the Interior, I think it would be entirely proper. Even then the House is entitled to more facts before this measure is enacted.

As gentlemen have pointed out, much of this land is underlaid with petroleum. Some of the finest timber stands, as related before the Committee on Agriculture, dot a great deal of this land. Certainly those natural resources are not there as a result of any activity or endeavor on the part of the railroads. Is it not fair, then, that we put the Federal Government in a proper position by insisting that the 14,000,000 or more acres of land that still seem to be outstanding and that are not used in the normal operation of the railroads be returned to the Federal Government?

How much is involved? There is not a scintilla of evidence to show how much oil, how much timber, how much gold, how much coal, how much natural resources or how much other wealth that was never created by the railroads may be involved. For aught I know, and I am just guessing, there may be $1,000,000,000 or more involved here.

One cannot be so pontifical about it. I think the proper thing to do is to send this bill back to the committee by a motion to recommit, and let them consider the question of how much land is still outstanding that could be returned, and what the value is, so that at least we have a good, sound, factual basis on which to predicate any action by this House. I shall either vote for such a motion to recommit or, I frankly admit to you, I must vote against the bill in its present form.

Mr. LEAVY. If the gentleman will yield for a correction, there are 20,600,000 acres in the possession of the railroads, instead of 14,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know. There is no disclosure here as to the value of the land, the capital interest that is involved. Certainly the House is entitled to far more information before it passes on this important question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, if this were a law case, the proponents would not have a leg to stand on. This they admit, but attempt to justify the bill because of what they are pleased to call equity. Cardinal maxims of equity, however, enjoin that he who seeks equity must do equity, and must come into equity only with clean hands. The railroads that are back of this bill, which, for the second time in 2 years, asks us to approve their welshing on their contract with the Government, come with their hands behind them, and in those hands are 20,000,000 acres of land. This land is the residue of 130,000,000 acres they admit receiving from the Government as full payment for the land-grant rate reduction in favor of the Government. Oh, but they say the lands deeded us were worth only 97 cents an acre when the deeds were made. The answer is simple and easy. No such appraisal nor consideration was recited in the deeds. The consideration was not cash, but a perpetual guaranty of reduced railroad rates to the Government. Hence the value of the lands was their real value, including timber, oil, and many other minerals, the value of which was proven by sales of part of this acreage for more than $500,000,000 at least, and probably three times that sum. Therefore, they do not come here with clean hands when they make no offer to do equity by surrendering the fruits of their contract, which they still have and could give back to the Government.

Over and above that, however, let me say that it seems to me that proof is not made in the hearings that the railroads are hauling Army or Navy freight or passengers at a loss. As I read the hearings, there is no proof of that fact in the evidence. Somebody has said that times have changed in 70 years. Let me ask you if times have not changed since December 7, 1941? It seems to me that in this time of war we should not impede the war effort by taking from a Treasury, terribly overburdened, and which has been running in the red for years, $120,000,000 a year and give it to railways that are more prosperous than they have been for 12 years.

Mr. Chairman, there is no such rush to pass legislation of this kind that we need to bring it to the floor by unanimous consent. There is no reason to pass it now. The evidence shows that it has not Budget approval. It has the active opposition of the Treasury of the United States. It has the quasi opposition of the Army and the Navy and the other departments of our Government that are fighting this war. The Department of Agriculture asks this amendment. I submit, in all candor, that it ought to be recommitted in order to give this great Committee of the House a chance to consider the matter further, iron out difficulties, and establish the case for any such bill by adequate proof, if that be possible.

No one attempts to justify unfair competition enforced upon railroads by discriminatory rates. But this does not establish the equity claimed for this bill.

Let us recommit it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in 3 minutes I can merely indicate how I feel both with regard to this bill and with regard to the amendment which is being debated. I would feel like endorsing this amendment in a little different form, but I object to it now in two respects: In the first place, the language is ambiguous. That matter, although it has been discussed, has not been cleared up. I believe the way the amendment reads it would mean that the railroads would have to transfer back their rights-of-way. It may be my poor interpretation of the English of the amendment, but with due respect, I must complain about the suggested language of the amendment, although I agree with its idea.

I notice that this amendment would not transfer back to our public domain the land which the railroads have had, but, instead, would provide that they be transferred to and incorporated within the Indian reservations, the national forests, or national parks, or monuments within the exterior boundaries of which they lie. Now, these railroad lands were taken originally from the public domain. I think in all fairness and logic, if they are to be returned to the Federal Government, they ought to be returned to the public domain. There are cases where it is not necessary or wise to merge all the railroad lands into Indian reservations. There is much more in this point than I have time to indicate.

Now with regard to the bill itself. About 3 years ago I felt sympathy for the railroads, in the midst of the depression, when a multiplicity of new governmental agencies were overburdening the land-grant railroads and all other railroads. When a similar bill was up, I supported it. That was at a time also when the railroads were having a hard struggle with the competition which they were having then from trucks and other automotive transportation. In the House on July 26, 1939, I was glad to recognize the debt which the development of this country owes to our railroads. Later, when we passed a bill to increase freight rates, I was glad to do that, for costs were mounting and labor needed increased pay at that time. I think both of those measures were logical.

However, I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who has just preceded me, that now is not the time for the measure before us. The chief instrument of this country in carrying on the conduct of this war is transportation. The chief arteries of heavy transportation across our country are the rails today. For that reason, if the railroads are ever going to be an adequate benefit to the country in time of war, now is the time. I feel we would be harming our war effort by passing this legislation, doubling the cost of military transportation, just at the time it is most needed in national defense. Certain railroads have increased their earnings in 1941 over 1940 from 50 percent to 500 percent. In this death struggle for America it is no time for anybody to profiteer. This is not the time for such a bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] for 3 minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I can say what little I have to say in a very few minutes. I took a good deal of interest when the bill on this same subject was up 2 years ago, and voted against it. It is not difficult for me to find myself in opposition to this legislation. The idea is certainly preposterous—coming in now during this late part of the afternoon and asking the House of Representatives, with no more information than the committee has been able to give us, to pass a bill that would involve a subsidy to railroads from $120,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year indefinitely. I cannot understand how a committee of this House can think they are doing their duty in bringing in a bill of such importance—such sweeping and

vital importance—in this war period. This afternoon we have heard a good deal about the difficulty of the railroads and that many of them were in the hands of receivers a few years ago, but it was because they manipulated their stocks; because they watered them and overcapitalized two or three times their real value. In the country that I represent they took as land grants the very cream of the wheatland and of those great forests. They were taken by the railroads in alternate sections, and then they got through the lieu land law, which allowed them to change their poor lands and take more of our forests, section after section. Now they come in this afternoon and ask us to pass this unwarranted subsidy. I am opposed to it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as I stated a moment ago, I think the language of this amendment is not ambiguous, but in order to meet the objection raised by gentlemen, I ask unanimous consent to change the period at the end of the first paragraph of the amendment to a comma and add the words "or such lands as are needed for the fiscal operation of the railroads."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Let us have that read so that we can understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the section of the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read the section of the amendment as proposed to be modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hate to object to the gentleman's amendment, but it is so important in all of its aspects that I do not think this change should be made at this time. Would not the gentleman be willing to withdraw the amendment altogether and have the matter inserted in the Senate so that it can be properly considered?

Mr. COLMER. As I understand the gentleman, he was apprehensive that this might require the railroads to convey back their roadbeds, and so forth.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. I wanted to clear that up out of deference to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, as to this particular amendment, it is subject to the criticism, first, that it deals with only a part of the lands retained by the railroads. It requires a deed to the Government and then adds a provision for taxation against the land deeded back to the Government, the taxes to be paid out of the Treasury if the income from that land in the hands of the Forest Service does not pay the amount claimed under that tax. The railroads now pay taxes on these lands. Then it is subject to the further objection that the railroads which received the lands and sold them are in a better position than the railroads which have been unable to sell their lands and still possess them. The railroads have paid taxes and carrying charges on these lands for decades. In many cases they have received little or no return. To take these lands still held by the railroads and require no repayment from the roads which cashed in on their lands would be an inequality of treatment.

If the question of the value to the railroads of those lands after the roads received them is to be a test, then there should be some logical system of considering the value of the land and what the rule or yardstick for governmental action should be. It seems to me that the only logical or practical method is to consider the matter from the standpoint of what the lands were worth at the time the grant was made.

Let me make one reference to this question of cost. Nobody could tell how much it would cost to pass this bill, because it simply depends for the present on how great the war transportation will be or how long it lasts. The Interstate Commerce Commission reported to our committee that in 1937 the cost to the Government was about $7,000,000 a year, but of course in wartime it would be much greater. Suppose it did amount to $150,000,000 a year. The whole value of this land when the railroads acquired them was only $130,000,000. To compel the railroads now to furnish $150,000,000 of transportation, or half that amount under an obligation like this, would be unjust. The great expense of maintaining this war is a burden that must rest upon the people of the United States and I submit it is not fair to place upon the backs of a limited number of railroads the burden of carrying that which belongs to the Government, representing all the people of the United States.

Now we have here today, and from some of the departments, the proposition that simply because it is going to cost the Government something to do this, we should not do it. I hope the time will never come when this House, calmly considering a proposed piece of legislation, will refuse to do the right thing simply because it costs something; it is not the right position to take. It is convenient to be economical, it is a duty to be just. The committee approached this question from the standpoint of doing what we believed to be right. We do not believe that even now it is right for the Congress to compel any limited number of railroads in the country to bear the expense of $70,000,000 or any other large military expense that does not rightfully belong to them but to the people of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 51, and noes 64.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LEA and Mr. COLMER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 58 and noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DWORSHAK: Page 2, following line 20, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The foregoing amendment to section 321 of title 3 of the Transportation Act of 1940 shall not apply with respect to any carrier by railroad which has received, or whose predecessor in interest has received, a grant of land from the United States to aid in the construction of any part of the railroad operated by it, unless and until such carrier and land-owning subsidiaries shall have filed, within 1 year from the date of this act, with the Secretary of the Interior, in the form and manner approved by him, deeds conveying and releasing to the United States all right, title, and interest in all lands previously granted by the United States to such carrier or its predecessors in interest, except such lands as may have been sold prior to the date of this act by any such carrier to an innocent purchaser for value or otherwise disposed of in good faith, or used in actual operation of said railroads or necessary accessories."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment embraces the first paragraph of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], which has just been rejected.

I believe the Members of the House during this debate have had the feeling that there is no justification for the Government to waive its rights to reduced rates for transporting personnel and property for military and naval uses without some reciprocal action by the railroads. I also believe that many Members were not in thorough accord with the second part of the rejected amendment, which set up an entirely new and radical tax formula.

Within the national forests there are almost 4,000,000 acres of railroad-grant lands, not used for operation and chiefly valuable as watersheds or sources of timber supply. To make the national forests most effective and to permit of their most economical protection, management, and utilization, such railroad-grant lands eventually should be vested in Federal ownership. Normally, that would require payment to the railroads of the cash values of the lands, or some other compensatory arrangement of equivalent value.

Going back to the Transportation Act of 1940, you will recall that the Federal Government waived the reduced-rate rights as to nonmilitary freight and personnel, but retained them in relation to naval and military freight and personnel. Now, under the present bill, the Government proposes to waive all of its rights to freight reductions and reduced rates for personnel for military and naval purposes, without asking any compensable waiving of rights by the railroads. As has been pointed out, perhaps this land is only worth 97 cents an acre, or 50 cents, or 12½ cents, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] contends. However, Mr. Eastman, in the hearings, pointed out that the increased

revenues under this bill would be worth $25,000,000 annually to the railroads, because of the increased rates. If that be true, and today the railroads retain patented lands of approximately 20,000,000 acres, of which 4,000,000 acres are within our national forests, then the railroads should be willing to waive their rights and to reconvey those 20,000,000 acres to the Federal Government, because the roads would make more in increased revenue in 1 year than it is claimed this land is worth.

As private property, the grant lands are subject to uncontrolled exploitation of their natural resources for considerations of private profit rather than of permanent public interest. The one alternative is their acquisition by the United States in order that the public objectives and services of the national forests may be realized in fullest measure and at least cost. But such Federal acquisition normally would require the payment of full compensation for the lands; possibly as much as ten or twenty million dollars. That, however, is only a part of the picture. Similar conditions exist in equal or greater degree in other types of Federal reservations, such as Federal grazing districts and reclamation withdrawals. In 1937 the land-grant railroads still owned almost 20,000,000 acres of granted lands.

I ask support of my amendment on that basis, because we cannot afford to permit the checkerboarding of our national forests with this land held by private ownership. Under this proposed legislation the railroads should be willing to reciprocate and to return to the Federal Government the grant lands which are not used in actual operation of the railroads.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were—ayes 39, noes 49.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 2, after line 2, add the following:

"SEC. 2. This act shall be in effect during the present war emergency and 6 months thereafter, and no longer."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill, but in order to make it as little obnoxious as possible I have restricted it to the time of the war effort. My purpose, of course, is that we should not be in too much of a hurry to give away hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of valuable lands with the mineral, timber, and water rights that attach thereto. Even if you are in a hurry to give these rights away, at lease take sufficient time to consider it, and you can accomplish that by limiting the time during the period of the war effort. There cannot be any objection to that. Such a procedure will be fair to the people, the shippers, and the railroads. Thereby we shall retain what there is for the future. I think we ought not to proceed in a headlong manner to give away, to the detriment of future generations, lands as valuable as those we are conceding under this act. I was amazed to read the hearings before the committee and find no reference whatever to the value of the lands that are still held, to the contracts attaching to some of the lands that might now be under contracts, to the balance of purchase price, to the improvements, to the mineral rights, the timber rights, water rights, and any other rights that may attach thereto.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. Is it not a fact that the railroads of this country carry on their books as part of their assets these land grants at a certain value?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I imagine they do.

Mr. JOHNS. Yes; they do.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Certainly; and we ought to have in the RECORD what the value is for tax purposes, and where they are located. It seems to me the committee ought to go into all these things. I would prefer to vote to send the bill back, to recommit it to the committee to get this information, and I shall make a motion to that effect when the proper time comes. In the meantime, however, if this bill is going to carry, at least let us limit the period during which it is in force, and reserve for the benefit of the people valuable rights which, under this bill, are given away.

It seems to me only fair that if the railroads are released from the terms of their contract, then, in all equity, they should return to the people whatever benefits they still hold under their contracts. It certainly would be a breach of trust for us to give away valuable rights and take no action to safeguard future generations from these losses.

In the last analysis, this amendment does not affect anyone's permanent rights, it gives ample time to ascertain much needed information which we do not now have and confers, temporarily at least, whatever benefits may result. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I concede that the passage of this legislation is of greater value during the war period than after because of the probable large volume of traffic that would be carried by the railroads at a 50-percent rate. The President's Defense Director of Transportation has recommended legislation, particularly on account of its war value. On the other hand, after the war is over we face this situation: In 6 years of the depression over half of all the principal land-grant railroads in the country ran in the red. At the present time 6 of the 17 principal land-grant railroads of the country are in the possession of the courts; so that from the long-time viewpoint this legislation is important as well as for war purposes.

The Interstate Commerce Commission recommended legislation like this in 1938. In specific support of this bill the Commission at the hearings this year unanimously approved a statement in part as follows:

> The increase in Government shipments in recent years has made this reduction from the normal rates assume important proportions. No good reason appears why such reduction should continue. After all, the country must support whatever transportation system it uses. The Government as a shipper may well pay reasonable rates. We recommend appropriate amendments to existing statutes to remove the requirement for land-grant reductions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last words.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my difficulty in connection with this bill is that I do not know where the additional revenue that will be derived by the railroads from the Army and Navy as a result of its passage will go. We have received sincere but more or less vague statements from some members of the committee to the effect there might be a reduction in rates to some other shippers. But we have no certainty at all that that will happen. And if it does not, the only result of the bill will be higher costs to the Government and hence to the people and a windfall for these railroads.

I feel that it is pertinent, therefore, to indicate some of the figures on earnings of land-grant railroads. This comes from the Wall Street Journal, Pacific coast edition. Only three railroads are indicated, so I will only give you those three.

The first is the Santa Fe, a splendid road for which I have a great affection, having ridden on it many times. The Santa Fe, in 1940, earned $12,000,000. In 1941 it earned $30,236,000, or an average earning of $9.90 per share.

The Union Pacific, in 1940, earned $19,445,000. In 1941 it earned $28,857,000 or $11.19 per share.

The Southern Pacific, in 1940, earned $9,000,000, and in 1941, $34,758,000, or $9.16 per share.

These railroads are not at present having any great difficulty in making both ends meet. They do not need this windfall. It seems to me that we should at least provide that if one part of this contract is to be abrogated, then the other part should also cease to exist by taking back the land the roads still hold. In addition to that, we should have assurances that the passage of this legislation will be of benefit to other shippers. That could, it seems to me, have been made mandatory in the bill, but it is not.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California, chairman of the committee, and one of the very finest gentlemen I know.

Mr. LEA. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to how much these railroads earned from 1930 to 1938?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry, I cannot. I have no doubt they were low as were the earnings of everyone in the whole country.

Mr. LEA. Over half of them were in court most of that time.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Commenting on the question asked the gentleman by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, may I say that they were in no worse shape than the other industries and utilities corporations and all others in that period?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Precisely; or the farmers or workers, may I add. It seems to me that we have a peculiar situation, because we are asked here to provide for the abrogation of a contract which will in effect mean a large amount of income to the railroads, without any correction of the contract to correspondingly benefit the people as a whole.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that the two railroads the gentleman named, the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe, made a great increase in income last year over the two land-grant railroads, and that the Union Pacific land-grant reduction has already expired? The non-land-grant railroad did not make as much as the two land-grant railroads?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It made more per share. It did not show as big an increase.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Are those figures before or after the payment of taxes?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. These are the Wall Street Journal figures on net income and earnings per share.

Mr. HALLECK. Does it indicate whether it is before or after the payment of taxes?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I assume they are after the payment of taxes. I have read carefully the introductory paragraphs in the paper and will say I cannot find a clear statement on that point. The very great increase in earnings is evident in any case.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to rescission of the contract, and indicated that if the contract is to be rescinded, the land still held by the railroads should be returned. Would it not follow as a matter of fairness that the railroads which have disposed of land which they had acquired by grant should pay back to the Government the money they received for the sale of those lands?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is too difficult a thing to try to carry out, that is all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH] is recognized.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk to the effect the railroads are hauling certain Government property at less than cost. Let me remind you that they have not only been paid but they were paid in advance. If they will pay the Government one-half of 1 percent for the use of that money since they began receiving it in 1850, you will find an entirely different picture.

Someone has said that this would result in shipping war materials over long and circuitous routes. Let us see what the War Department says about it.

Lt. Col. Edmund C. R. Lasher, Quartermaster's Department, War Department, testified:

> Basically the War Department is opposed to the passage of this legislation, due to the increased cost which would be imposed upon the War Department if the land-grant status were repealed.

Which I read during my other brief remarks.

He testified further at page 19 of the committee hearings:

> So far as the routing is concerned, the traffic does not move over the circuitous routes, but does move over the more direct routes, or the usual routes that any traffic would move over.
>
> We have the equalization agreement whereby practically all railroads in the United States, in competition with the land-grant railroads equalizes the land-grant rates in order to get the business. Presumably if there were no money in the business, they would not hasten to equalize the land-grant rates. * * *
>
> In other words, we would not let the fact that a certain road is land-grant deter us from obtaining the most expeditious service.

Mr. Chairman, the more you look into this matter the more you must see that it has not been sufficiently developed, if it has any merit, which I seriously doubt. This bill ought to be recommitted or it ought to be defeated outright.

You are handing the railroads something that they have not earned. The Government is giving up rights for which it paid American dollars in the form of valuable lands and this is just a gradual way of siphoning away what is left of the consideration which the Government was to receive and retain permanently.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is one consideration that has been decisive to me in making up my mind on this bill. The last of these land grants was made 70 years ago, at a time when there was no Federal regulation or control of railroad rates. It was possible then for the United States Government to make a bargain with the land-grant railroads so that it would get a 50-percent cut on whatever the traffic would bear, and the railroads would make their money otherwise. The Government could really get a bargain.

Years after the last of these grants the Interstate Commerce Commission was established, and the Government started to regulate and control railroad rates. That regulation and control has increased ever since. Only a year ago we passed a very comprehensive bill covering the whole subject. Whereas at one time it might have been possible for the Government to profit, to make money out of this thing as one party to a contract, regardless of the effect on the other party, that is no longer possible.

The only question that faces us now is this: Shall the shippers of the country pay half the cost of certain military shipping or shall the people of the whole country pay the whole cost? If we continue the present 50-percent reduction, then the Interstate Commerce Commission will add that amount, directly or indirectly, in determining the charges made to all shippers. If the Government pays the full cost of shipping military supplies, then all the people will pay it instead of part of them.

To me that is a conclusive reason why we are justified in rescinding this contract. The whole conditions of the contract have changed. One party to the contract now controls the prices the other party to the contract must charge. The Government cannot say to the railroads, "Go out and raise the money to cover this 50-percent reduction wherever you can raise it." The Government itself has the responsibility for deciding where and how the railroads shall make up the difference.

For instance, this so-called 50-percent reduction is not sustained by the land-grant railroad alone on any one shipment but is spread out over that entire haul, and only its proportionate mileage share of that reduction is paid by it. The rest is carried by non-land-grant railroads. There is no way in which the Government can make an ultimate saving here which will be solely at the expense of the land-grant railroad.

The only question that faces us now, since the Interstate Commerce Commission controls the rate situation, is whether to permit them to control the full rate situation, and have the Government, all the people, pay directly the cost of hauling military supplies, or to have part of this cost borne by the people who pay for the hauling of nonmilitary supplies. That is the simple proposition before us at this time. The Interstate Commerce Commission is not perfect. It may not immediately and exactly apportion these costs and these reductions. The question is, Shall they be given the power to do this?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a motion to recommit. I think in behalf of that motion to recommit the chairman of the committee made a far more eloquent address than I possibly could. He indicated the difficulty of working out some of the equities as between a railroad that still owns its land-grant lands and another that has disposed of them. He indicated the difficulty of finding what he thought might be an equitable yardstick in order to dispose of the question.

There has been little, if any, tangible evidence to show the value of the lands

that are still being held. There has been little evidence to show the value or the estimated value of the mineral rights and the petroleum that may underlie these lands. There has been virtually no evidence to show the estimated value of the timber stands that dot some of these lands of the Northwest.

It occurs to me, therefore, that a great deal of additional facts should be presented to the Congress before it can adequately dispose of this problem.

Perhaps this is the proper approach, but I for one feel rather uncertain of my own conclusions of the matter. For that reason I feel that the bill ought to go back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study. Consequently at the appropriate time I shall offer a simple motion to recommit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I almost hesitate to trespass upon your time, but there are a few things I feel compelled to say.

The suggestion is made that the bill should be recommitted because we have not determined the value of the lands that are still owned by the roads. Let us keep this in mind: If you do not pass this bill, these railroads are still going to have these lands.

The land is one question. The continuance of reduced rates is another. I have said from the beginning that the only issue, insofar as the equation and the equities are concerned, is the value of the land at the time it was granted to the railroads as compared with the consideration that moved from them.

If you are concerned about the lands they now hold, to do complete equity, on the theory of rescission, you would have to require all of the railroads who were granted lands which they have since sold to pay back the money they got for the lands.

I have regretted the fact that this debate seems to have gone off on the tangent this bill is just something for the railroads. Maybe at first blush it might be urged that it is, but if you will read the hearings, if you will see there the recommendations of the Farm Bureau, the shippers' organizations all over the country, and the representatives of small business and of big business, you will find there the insistent demand that these land-grant rates be wiped out, to the end that equity be done to the shippers of this country. They are the ones who will ultimately profit.

The pending amendment would limit it to the duration of the war. I have been working on the matter of these land-grant rates since long before the war came along with all of its transportation to lend a temporary prosperity to the railroads. Before that prosperity came, many railroads were granting the 50-percent reduction to the Government, at the very time that people all over the land were asking the Government to dig up the money to help bail out the railroads. It would be as though I went to my brother who was operating a little grocery store which was going into the red and demanded of him that he furnish me groceries at wholesale, instead of paying the fair retail price. The Government, as a shipper, should pay its fair share along with private shippers to maintain our transportation system.

My view of it is that on the equities these land-grant rates should be wiped out. We have been moving in that direction. It is recognized by the people in the railroads, by representatives of railroad labor, by shippers, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by Mr. Eastman, the Defense Transportation Coordinator.

I can see no reason why this measure should be sent back to the committee. The committee listened to everyone who wanted to be heard. We held hearings for 3 or 4 days. We went into the matter exhaustively. All of the issues that should be properly considered in determining this measure have been passed upon.

Now, finally, this is a shippers' proposal. This is not a matter of just what is going to happen to the railroads. The people of this country must maintain a transportation system, and whether we take money out of one pocket and pay full rates on what the railroads haul for the Government or whether we say we are going to continue to get a reduction that must be taken out of the private shipper, it is the same thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. SAUTHOFF), there were—ayes 32, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion by moving that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back with a recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I make a point of order against that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to recommit is in order when we go back into the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6156) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 6156) to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 99, noes 62.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. ELLIOTT of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AWARD OF NAVY E TO HUBBARD & CO.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I had the privilege of attending a program at which a defense plant in my district was awarded the all-Navy E. This award was made to Hubbard & Co., of Pittsburgh, and is the first instance of the bestowal of this singular honor in my congressional district. It was a well-merited recognition of the outstanding contribution of both the management and the workers of the company toward the Nation's war effort. The record made in producing essentials for the prosecution of the war is indicative of the determination of the American people to forge ahead to victory. I was much impressed by the acceptance speech, on behalf of the employees and management, of Mr. Joseph V. Smith, vice president of Hubbard & Co. It was a short speech, but to me it expressed the thought and the spirit which permeates every loyal American, be he employer or employee, rich or poor, lowly or famous.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting this speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of an address by Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, at the annual meeting of the South Carolina Bar Association in Columbia, S. C., March 27, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposal of legislative matters and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a radio speech recently made by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ARNOLD, for 10 days, on account of hearings of Tolan committee and other official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of James A. Quillinan;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.;

H. R. 6166. An act to approve Act Numbered 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1491, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 30, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., Friday, May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1604. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

1605. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 25, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of the reports on the Illinois and the Des Plaines Rivers, Ill., with a view to determining if the existing project for the Des Plaines River should be modified in any way, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 5, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6972. A bill relating to the payment by certain persons in the armed forces of the United States entitled to be naturalized under title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, of fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; without amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6502. A bill to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. R. 7014. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of mail handler; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER:

H. R. 7015. A bill prescribing the death penalty for certain acts of aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7016. A bill to amend Public Law No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 199, second session, title III, priorities powers, section 2, subsection 2 (C); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 7017. A bill to eliminate expenditures in connection with activities of the Government which are not essential during the present war; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 7018. A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 7019 (by request). A bill to authorize the use of appropriations for travel and transportation for the transportation of dependents of officers and employees of Government agencies from zones of military operation, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7020. A bill amending Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGAN:

H. R. 7028. A bill to amend section 31, as amended, of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 476. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the petroleum requirements of the United States Navy on the east coast of the United States and the sources of supply and methods of transportation of petroleum and petroleum products for the east coast; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 477. Resolution to provide for expenses of study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 476; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 478. Resolution that the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 7021. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Keffer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7022. A bill for the relief of Jane Thayer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7023. A bill for the relief of George A. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7024. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lee Hauser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 7025. A bill to make Younghill Kaug eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7026. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California over certain naturalization proceedings in the case of John Charles Thorn; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7027. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2738. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of R. L. Valentine and sundry other citizens of St. Ansgar, Iowa, and vicinity, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2739. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Clear Lake, Iowa, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2740. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Barbers Union, Local No. 148, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2741. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Union Label Trades Department of the State of New York, opposing any proposed legislation tending to again bring out prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1942

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Zebarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art our eternal life, live Thou in us that we may live not in the narrowness of self-content, but in the breadth of sympathy and understanding that will quicken in others the wholesome and beneficent determination to live above the cares that drag men down. Cleanse Thou the heart of this Nation, that we may assimilate from the divers elements of life's changing scenes, something of rare use and beauty that will sanctify the common tasks of every day's most quiet need.

Come Thou as true, unerring wisdom to all who need guidance in thought and action, especially to Thy servants here assembled; come as an inspiring faith to all who walk in darkness or uncertainty; come as a supporting strength to those with burdens heavy and grievous to be borne, and if there be any such as have not sought Thine aid, save them from the blight of the unasking and unkneeling soul, for the sake of Him who hath showed us how to love and hath taught us how to pray, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 28, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 28, 1942:

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the District of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving, Thomas G. Irving, Sr., J. E. Irving, Mata D. Irving, L. T. Dale, and Amelia Dale;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1942:

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer; and

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army is hereby rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in passing the said bill is hereby vacated.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WEISS, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were ap-

pointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.;

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston; and

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4869) to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased;

S. 2002. An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941;

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of James A. Quillinan;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.;

H. R. 6166. An act to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to personnel of the land forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the Archivist for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

TRAVEL FROM MILITARY ZONES OF DEPENDENTS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of appropriations for travel and transportation for the transportation of dependents of officers and employees of Government agencies from zones of military operations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURTON:

The petitions of Grace L. Mosher and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ashtabula; of Mrs. Elmer Shank and sundry other citizens of Miami County; and of John C. Campbell and sundry other members of the Uniontown Parent-Teachers Association, Belmont County, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Topeka and Overland Park, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance.

"STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
"IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
"*January Session, A. D. 1942.*

"Resolution 146

"Memorializing Congress of the United States of America to defeat proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes

"Whereas the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington is considering the 1942 revenue bill as submitted by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau; and

"Whereas in said revenue bill an increase in the Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 3 cents per gallon, which is a 100-percent tax increase over the present levy, has been proposed; and

"Whereas an increase in the Federal lubricating-oil tax from 4½ cents to 10 cents per gallon, which is a 144-percent tax increase over the present levy, has also been proposed; and

"Whereas in addition to the above-proposed Federal taxes there now exists in the State of Rhode Island a tax on gasoline of 3 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas gasoline and lubricating oil are acknowledged necessities to businessmen, farmers, defense workers, and, in fact, to all persons engaged in the pursuit of a legitimate livelihood, and should not be singled out for special taxation along with luxuries and nonessential commodities: Be it therefore

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to defeat such proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of Rhode Island, and that the latter be urged to use their best offices to prevent the enactment of any legislation which will increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes."

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT—PETITION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred a petition regarding labor and the conduct of the war, signed by Mr. E. H. Pugh and 93 other citizens of Independence, Kans.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned taxpayers, citizens of the United States, your constituents, demand that: Legislation be enacted to abolish the union closed shop for the duration of the war, permitting any qualified American citizen to work on defense work without paying tribute to labor-union racketeers. Also that industry having defense contracts be required to operate 24 hours per day on a 7-day week, and that waste and graft be eliminated from all war effort, both National and State, also that time and one-half and double time be eliminated, with 6-percent profit to industry maximum allowed.

E. H. PUGH,
FRED C. SANDERS,
(And sundry other citizens of Independence, Kans.)

PRIORITIES AND PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr REED. Mr. President, I also present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred a petition regarding priorities and Senate bill 860, signed by Mrs. Nellie W. Bender and 79 other citizens of Holton, Kans.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of Jackson County, Kans., hereby petition our legal Representatives in Congress to use their influence to change the order of classification and priorities which prohibits owners of trucks used for the delivery of milk and other food products from buying tires, thereby compelling discontinuance of these deliveries of essential foods and permits persons and corporations owning and operating trucks delivering beer and other alcoholic beverages to buy tires in order to contine deliveries and operations. We further petition that during this national emergency all manufacturing and distribution of alcoholic beverages be denied all priority rights.

We also petition the passage of Senate bill 860.

Mrs. RATIA KLUSHMIRE,
H. B. LYONS,
(And sundry other citizens of Holton, Kans.)

EFFICIENCY OF VOLUNTARY HOSPITALS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have in my hand some correspondence from the Secretary of the Western New York Hospital Council, which I shall ask to have made part of my remarks in the RECORD, and that it be brought to the attention of the committee of the Senate having to do with legislation affecting our hospitals. This correspondence includes some resolutions adopted by the American Hospital Association, resolutions having to do with the voluntary hospitals of the United States, hospitals which account for more than 60 percent of all hospital admissions in our country.

I wish to pay my respects to the American Hospital Association and also to the voluntary hospitals of the United States for the splendid work they are doing in furthering the national defense effort at this time. Like all our hospitals, like the medical and the nursing professions, they are rendering valiant services to the country.

I want this correspondence made part of my remarks, and I should like to have it brought to the attention of the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the correspondence and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
March 14, 1942.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEAD: We are handing you, attached, copy of letter written to Bert W. Caldwell, executive secretary of the American Hospital Association, Chicago, Ill.; also copy of the resolutions of the American Hospital Association of February 14, 1942.

The hospitals composing this council feel confident that this matter so vitally affecting the voluntary hospital system will receive very earnest consideration at the hands of their Congressmen.

Very sincerely yours,
WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
ALICE J. MACK, *Secretary.*

WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
March 14, 1942.

BERT W. CALDWELL, M. D.,
Executive Secretary,
American Hospital Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. CALDWELL: Referring to the Social Security Board's plans for the partial payment of the hospitalization of beneficiaries, at the rate of $3 per day cash:

At a special meeting of the Western New York Hospital Council, held at the Buffalo General Hospital, Buffalo, N. Y., March 11, 1942, action was taken—

"That this council approves the resolutions of the American Hospital Association of February 14, 1942; and

"That a letter be written to the secretary of the American Hospital Association, voicing this approval; and also, that a copy of that letter, with a copy of the American Hospital Association's resolutions, be sent to our Congressmen in this area."

Very sincerely yours,
WESTERN NEW YORK HOSPITAL COUNCIL,
ALICE J. MACK, *Secretary.*

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1942.

Resolved, That the voluntary hospitals of the United States, which account for more than 60 percent of all hospital admissions, are a national asset of incalculable value.

That the efficiency of these institutions is traceable in large part to their freedom of action under local control.

That the independence of voluntary hospitals and of hospitals under city, county, and other local community control should not be jeopardized by Federal legislation.

That programs seeking to widen the use of voluntary hospitals, and their more perfect adaptation to the needs of the workers of the country through voluntary contributory plans, merit Government consideration and support.

That a full opportunity should be given to the voluntary hospitals of the country, through the American Hospital Association, to study proposed legislation affecting hospitals before such legislation is offered to the Congress.

Resolved, That these resolutions be brought to the notice of the President of the United States, the Social Security Board, and the Members of the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6802. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (this bill had been recommitted) with amendments (Rept. No. 1292).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1298);

S. 2279. A bill for the relief of O. R. Maxfield; with amendments (Rept. No. 1286);

S. 2318. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288);

S. 2354. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289);

H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Ferd W. Meile; with amendments (Rept. No. 1287);

H. R. 5275. A bill for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290); and

H. R. 5658. A bill for the relief of James Warren; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Floyd Odom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293);

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Cleaver Kelley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1296);

H. R. 4723. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1297);

H. R. 5468. A bill for the relief of J. Furman Richardson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294); and

H. R. 5563. A bill for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2319. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 27, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving; Thomas G. Irving, Sr.; J. E. Irving; Mata D. Irving; L. T. Dale; and Amelia Dale;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2492. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2493. A bill to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 2494. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of Raleigh Edward Hughes as a lieutenant, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2495. A bill extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2496 A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2497. A bill to amend Public Law 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 199, second session, title III, priorities powers, section 2, subsection 2 (C); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 2498. A bill relating to the payment of 6 months' pay to a dependent relative of an officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army when the designated beneficiary dies prior to the death of such officer or enlisted man without another beneficiary having been designated; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2499. A bill to amend Title II of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 and the Fire and Casualty Act;

S. 2500. A bill relating to the assessment of tangible personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2501. A bill to authorize the Assessor of the District of Columbia to compromise inheritance and estate taxes in cases of conflicting claims of domicile;

S. 2502. A bill relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2503. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUDIT OF ACCOUNT FOUND DUE THE CHEROKEE SCHOOL FUND

Mr. LEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 240), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Comptroller General of the United States is requested to audit the account found due the Cherokee school fund as stated in the first item of the account rendered by the United States (Slade-Bender) on April 28, 1894 (House of Representatives Executive Document No. 182, 53d Cong.), and to readjust the same in accordance with the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, dated December 2, 1895, as set forth in Senate Document No. 16, Fifty-fourth Congress; and, after crediting the United States with the amount appropriated thereon June 30, 1906, to report the balance, if any, then remaining due and unpaid.

INCREASED USE OF INLAND WATERWAYS FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 241), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of means by which the inland waterways of the United States may be more fully utilized, with a particular view toward providing for increasing the use of existing waterways for the transportation of petroleum products and other articles and commodities. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation, with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE AND ADDRESS TO THE COUNTRY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the full statement which I issued following the President's recent message to Congress and his recent address to the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At long last we are on our way toward being effective to the end that we do not lose the economic war at home before we have a chance to win the military war abroad. But we cannot rely upon wishful thinking at any stage of the game. We now have reasonably complete price ceilings by law. We shall soon have totally effective profits ceilings by law. The third vital factor still demands kindred attention. We must have wage ceilings by law—with reasonable provisions for correcting maladjustments. The chain will never be any stronger than its weakest link. Labor has infinitely more to gain from total success for this program than from any exemption which destroys it. Agriculture will not resist parity when it sees that parity is the mandatory rule for all. The President is eternally right when he says that all seven points in his program are indispensable to each other. But I believe he is wrong to leave any part of the achievement to chance. There must be no hole in the dike. I fear he is wrong in still avoiding compulsory savings for War-Bond purposes, but the country can prove him right by stepping up its voluntary purchases, although even the Treasury's announced aims in this connection are only about one-third of its necessities. I know the President is wrong in not adding an eighth point—maximum nondefense economies in the operation of Government and the demobilization of useless, overlapping, and often socialistic bureaucracy. But he is everlastingly sound when he relies upon the total cooperation of the American people to win this war whenever they have total information as to what is required of them.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF CONSTITUTION DAY OF POLAND—JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR BROWN AND SENATOR SMATHERS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement issued by him and Senator BROWN on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the Constitution Day of the Republic of Poland, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Seven-Point Program," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of April 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the President issued a proclamation designating May 22 for the tenth annual observance of National Maritime Day. This is the first time the observance of this day finds our Nation at war, and it is fitting that the people of the Nation should join in paying tribute to the heroic men of the merchant marine and those stout hearts who are laboring unstintedly in the Nation's shipyards to build merchant vessels which are essential to ultimate victory against our enemies.

I wish, Mr. President, to take just a minute or two to pay tribute to our seamen. In 1938, upon the death of the former chairman of the Committee on Commerce, my honored friend, Senator Copeland, I became chairman of the committee to investigate conditions in the maritime industry. There was at that time a great deal of rumor and discussion tending to bring seamen into more or less disrepute on account of subversive influences. I think the facts of our experience in the last 6 months tend fully to allay those rumors. If there are subversive influences in the maritime industry amongst the seamen, they certainly have not appeared in this time of stress and trial. The seamen have gone down to the seas in their ships; they have been under fire on our coasts; they have conducted themselves in a manner worthy of the highest traditions of American patriotism. I have heard nothing of difficulty and nothing of complaint from them or those who love them; on the other hand, I bear witness to the fact that they are carrying on magnificently under fire, night and day.

In this connection I wish to call attention to some other facts. There is justifiable alarm in our country as to our progress in building ships. All of us realize the importance of transportation across the seas, and we know the size of our program. Some complaint is heard because we are not launching ships at the rate of three a day; but it takes 4 months to build a 10,000-ton deadweight

ship, and if we lay keels at the rate of one a day, which we will soon be doing, we can entertain the hope of producing ships and placing them in commission in 120 days, and at the end of, say, 4 or 5 months, we can test this production much more soundly than we can now do.

Meanwhile, let me say, there are 2,000,000 American citizens engaged in the production of merchant ships and materials and fittings to go into them. They are at work; they are doing their jobs. They are being pretty well paid; but, it is my judgment, that they are entitled to be pretty well paid. After all, their incomes will not be much greater than the average, and they are doing an indispensable work. More than 500 industrial plants throughout our Nation are working with the 60 shipyards to produce these vessels. More than 50,000 sailors are manning the merchant ships and are facing the constant menace of enemy submarines and bombers, so that this great arsenal of the democracies may, through the life line of shipping, provide the sinews of war to the United Nations on every world-wide front and the means of carrying on to our own men of the armed forces.

Let me say one other word. I had to deal with the Maritime Commission for many years; indeed, since its foundation, since 1937, I have dealt quite intimately and almost constantly with the Commission and with its head, Admiral Land, who is also the Shipping Administrator.

There is a tendency to complain; and I would not find fault with that. There is a great deal more to hearten us than there is to dishearten us. There is a great deal more to praise than to blame. I do not think it would be worthy of me if I should not say that in these 5 years of tireless and indefatigable and highly intelligent effort Admiral Land has completely won my confidence. I do not know of a more unselfish, a more devoted, or an abler public servant than Admiral Land; and I could pay a similar compliment to his colleagues. I think that, all things considered, we are doing pretty well, and I do not think that any activity of our war effort is being handled in a better way than the shipping activity, under the leadership of Admiral Land.

Mr. President, I ask that proclamation of the President to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY, 1942

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas on May 22, 1819, the steamship *The Savannah* sailed from Savannah, Ga., on the first successful transoceanic voyage under steam propulsion, thus making a material contribution to the advancement of ocean transportation; and

Whereas the Congress by joint resolution approved May 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 73), designated May 22 of each year as National Maritime Day and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such National Maritime Day; and

Whereas we of the United Nations are engaged in a war for the preservation of our liberties against the powers of aggression; and

Whereas it is fitting that public recognition be given to the patriotism and courage of the officers and men of the cargo ships in the victory fleet, and to the men in the shipyards and factories whose labor and genius go into their construction:

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe May 22, 1942, as National Maritime Day by displaying the flag at their homes or other suitable places and do direct that the flag be displayed on all Government buildings on that day.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 27th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1942, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-sixth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and to say to him that the high compliment he has paid to the Maritime Commission, to the shipping industry, and to American seamen for their heroism is but another evidence of his splendid interest in the work of his committee. The committee over which he presides has taken cognizance of this splendid work, and the proposed legislation which has been favorably acted upon by our committee, some of the measures having for their purpose the granting of rewards to the heroes of the American merchant marine, is further evidence of our interest in this all-important question, and the careful consideration it is receiving under the leadership of our chairman.

THE SENATE "COW BLOC"

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as half of the Senate "cow bloc," I want to discuss very briefly the misfortunes that have overtaken the other 50 percent of the "cow bloc," namely, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. These misfortunes are concisely described in a story written by the Washington correspondent of the Topeka Capital, a daily newspaper owned by my colleague the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], which was reprinted in my own newspaper, the Parsons Sun, at Parsons, Kans., and which reads:

BOVINE STORK PLAYS MEAN TRICK ON SOLON

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The United States Senate in its time has had a number of "blocs." One of the latest is the "cow bloc," composed of Senator CLYDE M. REED, of Kansas, and Senator RUFUS C. HOLMAN, of Oregon. They both brag about their Guernsey herds.

But hard luck has camped on the Holman doorstep, perhaps one should say in the Holman cowsheds. When Senator HOLMAN comes into the Senate with a particularly long face colleagues in the know put on long faces themselves and ask in hushed voices:

"Is it another one, Rufus?"

And Senator HOLMAN responds sorrowfully: "It is."

The Holman Guernsey herd numbers thirty-some cows. And in succession these cows have produced offspring—19 in a row, count 'em, 19 bull calves.

A dairyman can appreciate this, if you cannot.

Only we dairy farmers can fully appreciate the anguish of mind and spirit suffered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon over the succession of misfortunes that have attended his efforts to produce more milk and make more butter and cheese to help win the war.

MAJ. PAUL A. LARNED

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2202, a bill to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army. The request is made so that a correction may be effected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was heretofore ordered to be engrossed and read a third time is reconsidered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to transfer to the active list of the United States Army, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Paul A. Larned, now a major, United States Army, retired (now on active duty): *Provided*, That prior to his restoration to the active list he shall have been found physically qualified for active service in the Regular Army by a board of officers, his name to appear on the active list of the United States Army next below that of the lowest ranking member of the class of 1907, United States Military Academy, now on the active list: *Provided further*, That he shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or, at any time thereafter, be promoted: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the passage of the bill an explanation of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The reasons for the suggested change are as follows:

(1) "Reinstate," the verb employed in S. 2202 as drawn, is not precise, because it implies previous separation; therefore, "restore" should be substituted.

(2) The primary purpose is transfer to the active list. The physical examination is necessary. Therefore, the substitute subordinates everything else in the bill to the first phrase "is authorized to transfer."

(3) As S. 2202 is drawn, it might handicap Major Larned for the following reasons:

1. The retirement age is 60. Since Major Larned will be 57 this summer, he would be compelled, under S. 2202 as drawn, to retire in 3 years.

2. If S. 2202 were passed as drawn, Army regulations applicable to Major Larned's retirement would operate to retire him at the age of 60 in the grade of major because he would be transferred to the active list in the grade of major, and because, in 3 years between 57 and 60 he could not gain active commissioned service to qualify for promotion.

3. The Pay Adjustment Act, as applied to Major Larned at retirement, if S. 2202 were passed as drawn, would probably base his retired pay upon the status he had when retired, because he would revert to that status when relieved from active duty.

The substitute is intended to precisely conform to the existing law and Army Regulations, and at the same time authorize the President to transfer Major Larned to the active list in a definite grade higher than when he retired, namely, lieutenant colonel.

This is not quite equal to the grade for his age, but it is high enough so that one can reasonably hope for gain in grade corresponding to age in 3 years so that he could retire at 60 with the normal grade for that retirement age.

You will note that the substitute conforms to the law and regulations in other particulars, namely, that he is placed as an additional number in the grade of lieutenant colonel, and that he is placed next below the lowest ranking name of his class in the Military Academy now on active duty. Further, that it provides that no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of the passage of the act.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6430, the so-called independent offices appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PATROL OF COAST LINES BY CIVILIAN PILOTS FLYING SMALL AIRPLANES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the Axis Powers have cut our line of supply of tin and rubber. They have not cut our production of gasoline, but they have sunk tankers and merchant marine supply ships right within sight of our shore. We are on the verge of denying our people the supply of, or right to use, gasoline largely because we have not been able to stop these attacks on our shipping in our own waters.

Every lesson of the war points to the power and effectiveness of aircraft. It was from the air that we suffered our greatest naval defeat and humiliation at Pearl Harbor. It was from the air that we lost our planes and airfields in the Philippines. It was from the air that our warships were sunk near Java. It was from the air attacks that the French found that the Maginot line was inadequate in modern war. It was from the air that the British found a force against which the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* could not successfully defend themselves. Yet our tankers and merchant ships go down day after day, with little or no air protection above them.

We have thousands of small airplanes already manufactured and frozen idle on the ground. We have thousands of patriotic, courageous, and competent civilian pilots grounded in our own country. These planes and pilots, unfitted for foreign military service, are capable and competent to provide a constant umbrella over these slow-moving tankers and merchant ships.

By April 16, 1942, the United States had announced the sinking of 131 vessels within close reach of our shore. A total of 857 crew members of these vessels were reported killed, many of them having died in burning oil. The reports announced 1,084 missing and 3,593 rescued. The monetary losses of these ships and their cargoes was certainly well over $100,000,000.

Ships are the most critical materials of the war, not only from the American standpoint, but for the United Nations. Food and military munitions are piling up awaiting available ships. These losses have averaged over one a day since the war began. They have offset any shipbuilding—actual building of ships—since Pearl Harbor. Announced rates of building are at one and one-fourth ships a day at this time. In other words, the production of ships is only keeping pace with sinkings, and the country has not made any gains in production of the 8,000,000 tons of ships ordered for this year. We are straining the sinews of the steel and shipbuilding industries to produce the vessels and neglecting to apply a remedy which is so readily available.

The great majority of the sinkings are within a stone's throw of the shores. Some have been so close to shore that spectators on the beaches and shore highways were in grandstand seats for these sinkings. Recently, survivors were rescued by row boats.

Every one of these ships sunk means a loss of almost a full day's production for the entire steel and shipbuilding facilities of the Nation. Tankers on which the enemy is concentrating are the most vital type of ship required. Rationing of fuels on both coasts is based on these losses.

We all assume that the Army and Navy have been doing the best they can with the forces available for coastal patrol to halt the sinkings. The results—continuing daily—show that additional help and lots of it, is badly needed.

The help is available—men, equipment, aircraft, and pilots and the necessary skill in administration. It is not now being used. Utilization of these resources need not disturb the main war effort in any way.

We should take into military service under Army or Navy direction and supervision, enough of the country's light aircraft, and men who have been sportsmen pilots, to operate a 24-hour a day continuous air umbrella along the entire Atlantic coast line.

This "umbrella" should be flown in small, slow airplanes—the only kind of planes that should be used for submarine hunting. They should be armed with one or two depth charges and a two-way radio. They should be flown by sportsmen pilots whose flying skill and knowledge of the capabilities of light airplanes are today lying idle and wasted.

The men are ready to go at once. Details of the projected air antisubmarine patrol in light ships have been worked out. The aircraft are available in almost countless numbers. I understand new planes are now frozen by Government order at a dozen different aircraft factories. The pilots are doing a little flying, but chiefly they are wondering why we are continually losing ships at sea when they know that, if used, they could virtually bring sinkings to a halt in a belt extending from Maine to Florida and 50 miles to sea. Creation of a safety zone of these proportions would protect the coastal traffic we now are losing.

One thousand pilots could do the job. Actually, the country has 100,000 licensed pilots, of whom probably two-thirds have the experience in the air that would qualify them to perform this kind of patrol work. Obviously, the field from which to draw pilots is large. Most of these men are individuals who would not be called to combat, ferry, or instruction duties in the ordinary course of affairs. Used on the patrol, they would release to other duties the highly trained and skilled personnel now attempting in inadequate numbers and with improper types of craft to maintain an air patrol. These men are needed on our fighting fronts—in the Pacific and other theaters of war.

Ground personnel for the light plane patrol should be mostly unskilled. One or two trained mechanics at each base—not more than 150 all told—could supervise the maintenance, service, and inspection of the patrol airplanes.

It should be a volunteer service. The men should be made Army or naval special reservists and placed on temporary active duty, or some other method used to place them under Army or naval supervision. A great knowledge of types of boats, naval procedures, and so forth, is not required. Once the patrol is set up this kind of training could be given.

But primarily the men should be given to understand that any submarine they see will be an enemy sub and should be both reported by radio and attacked. If American submarines must operate along the coasts they can stay out of the patrolled zone or notify the particular units watching the areas where they will maneuver.

The kind of airplanes that could do this job better than any others are types

such as the Piper Cub Cruiser, the Rearwin Cloudster, the Stinson Voyager and 105, the Luscombe, Aeronca and Taylorcraft types. Their speeds are ample—since all will cruise at 80 miles an hour or better. Their range is ample, since most of those mentioned have up to 4 hours of flying—while 2 hours at a time would be the recommended duration for any single patrol flight. Their load-carrying capacities are such that in addition to one pilot they could easily carry two-way radio, ample fuel and lubricants, and up to 350 pounds of depth charges or bombs. Their slow speed is their big advantage. All these airplanes can fly at 60 miles an hour in complete safety. They are easy to fly, land at less than 40 miles an hour; they can be operated from improvised airports with safety by day or night. They all are equally adaptable for either pontoons or wheels. Their initial costs range from $3,000 down to $1,500.

Hundreds of these types of airplanes are now available—ready to fly at once. At one factory, the Piper factory, I understand more than 750 airplanes are staked out, frozen by orders from the Government which prevent their sales to others than those engaged in war work. This factory's capacity is 300 a month alone, and there are at least 6 other plants where suitable types are made. The Civil Aeronautics Authority has closed up to 60 percent of all the Nation's airports, due to demands for an elaborate guard and dispatching system, and more than enough airplanes for the patrol could be commandeered from the closed airports in a few central States. Illinois, among others, could supply the entire requirement of planes for the patrol.

Let us take one of these planes, the Piper Club Cruiser, for an example. Here are the performances, weight, range, and other characteristics:

This plane is a standard type found throughout the United States. It weighs 760 pounds empty; will carry a 700-pound load. It will fly as fast as 95 miles an hour and as slow as 45 to 50. It has a 75-horse power engine that consumes only 5 gallons of fuel an hour. In addition to a pilot and 25 gallons of fuel, plus adequate lubricants, it will carry a pay load—in this case a military load—of 380 pounds.

This 380 pounds can be divided into 300 pounds of depth charges and 80 pounds of radio and a rubber boat.

Engines for these little airplanes are among the most reliable in aviation. They are made in large numbers by a wide variety of companies. They are available and they can easily be maintained. They give assurance of running for long periods of time, an assurance that is required for pilot morale in over-water operations. Cost of operating the engines is less than $3 per hour, compared with $3 a minute for high-powered military engines in service types now being used for this work.

A minimum of instruments is necessary. These little planes can fly slowly enough so that great skill in blind flying and blind navigation is definitely not required by their operators. No planes can operate well in fog, nor can submarines well attack boats in dense fog because of lack of visibility. If caught at sea by fogs that form, the little planes can be flown down close to the water until they reach shore. Safe landings can be made on beaches or into shallow water, if necessary.

I am informed racks to carry depth charges already have been designed and built for these little planes. Such racks can be installed in 4 hours per ship. No complicated bombsights will be required. The home-made type is sufficient, as used by these pilots in their peacetime flour-bag bombing competition. Obviously, the Navy would supply the bombs and depth charges, and the Army or Navy should supply personnel to service the charges at each base and to man ground radio stations for the patrol.

Definite choosing of patrol fields along the eastern coast should take into account the local terrain, existence or absence of airports, weather factors, and other items. Survey work to pick these locations and get them into shape for patrol flying would require only a short time.

Where necessary, pontons could be fitted and natural harbors, sheltered bays, and so forth, could be utilized as bases.

Highways and trucking would make supply problems easy in solution. Refueling can be done from drums or 5-gallon cans. That is being done, and has been done.

In considering the patrols special techniques for their flying could easily be worked out. The point is that the little planes, used in recommended numbers, would cover the patrol zone so frequently that no given spot would escape the eyes of observers—except in extraordinary weather conditions—for periods of longer than a few minutes. In other words, an airplane would be over any given spot in any point on the zone at frequent intervals. The present patrols cannot approach this record for frequency, and speeds of patrol planes are so great that observation is cursory at best. There are vast stretches of coast line that cannot conceivably be covered with the present limited equipment and men.

If there is any refueling of enemy submarines from coastal points or from coastal boats, it certainly would be halted under this system. No point, however remote, would be left unguarded, either by day or night. Activities necessary for refueling submarines would certainly be spotted.

On such a patrol there would undoubtedly be losses of planes and men. There would be losses forced by weather, by accidents, and by limitations in experience and skill. The patrol would of necessity be a volunteer service. Inquiry among the pilots in Illinois shows that sufficient men to provide for the operation of the entire patrol could be recruited in a few days by asking for volunteers in Illinois and adjoining States. I understand that some 500 pilots in my State have shown their willingness to serve their country in any capacity, and specifically in this one.

There would constantly be observers in the air who would cover the entire zone, 50 miles to sea, at frequent intervals. It would be an armed patrol, able to strike at enemy submarines. It would be able also to call up the Navy's regular forces—by air or sea—to assist. There could be no extended attacks on surface vessels without having three or four patrol planes quickly arriving on the scene with their depth bombs, and radios calling up heavier attack units.

A submerged submarine is defenseless against an aircraft, and this point is the crux in the tactics that would be used. Suppose a patrol plane should sight a submarine. If the submarine were on the surface, the patrol ship would circle and immediately call for heavy Army or Navy units. If the submarine should crash dive upon sighting the patrol ship, the patrol pilot could dive on the submarine, fly down to within 10 feet of the water above the diving submarine, and drop its depth charges. No practice or great accuracy would be required to put charges within killing distance of the submarine under those conditions. Under the recommended patroling system, several of the patroling aircraft could be called to the scene where any one of them had sighted a submarine within a few minutes after the first alarm sounded.

There could be no repetition of the bold, daylight attacks which have already occurred, prolonged over a period of 20 minutes to 2 or 3 hours.

For night operations slightly different techniques could be used. Every vessel leaves a visible wake in traveling over the surface of the sea. Wakes are visible for miles to air patrols. Submarines on the surface, or surfaced enough to have periscopes out, leave wakes. These could be seen at night from the air.

Probably the best system would be constantly to cover each of our own vessels proceeding through each zone during the night. Vessels operating north or south—along the Atlantic coast for example—would be known. They would be picked up at dusk and planes would fly a constant patrol over them throughout the hours of darkness. Additional methods and alternative methods and devices could be adopted or developed to fit any special conditions or situations, as experience teaches.

In the World War of 1914–18 the British operated just such a patrol as is suggested here, around the coasts of England. It was flown in ships with performance almost exactly comparable to that of the types suggested here. This patrol broke up the submarine menace around the British coasts at that time. Pilots who flew that patrol objected to it after the first few weeks because submarines disappeared, submarine activity ceased, and the patrol became a monotonous one.

At this time the Army and Navy are conducting patrols with a wide variety of planes. A few civil air patrol ships have been used in a cautious patrol which went only 15 miles to sea and carried only radio. A large number of the Army planes now used have been armed only with machine guns, which are almost completely impotent against submarines. Also both the Army and Navy planes which have been used have been high-speed planes whose observation was limited, and there have been only a very

limited number of bases from which they could be operated.

Submarine warfare off our coasts has become a critical affair. It is as much a crisis as was Dunkirk, when British yachtsmen, tugboatmen, and others took their boats, pleasure launches, antique ferry boats, and everything else that would float to carry back to England a few soldiers. No one asked the skippers whether they were civilians or naval officers.

The sportsmen pilots of our entire country are as ready and willing to risk their own lives as were the British; and they can do as effective a job. We believe they should have some sort of regular service supervision over them.

From the minutemen of Lexington through the Indian wars to Dunkirk, to the guerrilla fighting in Serbia, Russia, and elsewhere in conquered nations, there are numberless precedents for using men from civil life as direct auxiliaries to military forces.

We talk of civilian defense, plan blackouts, and appoint block captains to teach us how to hide from the flying sons of our enemies when and if they fly thousands of miles to destroy our cities and war production plants and facilities, but we ground our own civilian pilots and planes while our enemies sink our ships within sight of our shores.

Why freeze our civilian planes and pilots to the ground while our ships and our tankers go down and our American sailors burn in oil within sight of our shores?

On March 31, 1942, I introduced Senate Resolution 233, asking for the appointment of a special Senate committee to investigate and encourage the advanced training in the preliminary essentials of future airmen in our high schools and other educational institutions throughout the land. Promptly the United States Commisisoner of Education answered that the Government would institute such training on a vastly increased scale. I commend that action; and I again urge the appointment of a special committee to determine to what extent this work is being done and will be increased.

I further urge that we investigate and encourage the establishment of a vastly enlarged specialist civilian corps of already trained pilots with already available planes to search out and destroy enemy submarines and provide a constant umbrella of air protection to our men and materials within sight of our American shores.

TRANSPORTATION BY BARGE LINE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] has rendered a very valuable service in bringing to the attention of the Senate the subject which he has discussed. I should like to say a few words on the subject of transportation.

Our ships and tankers are being sunk off our coasts. We anticipate a tie-up of railroad transportation by fall. It is simply not in the picture for the railroads to handle the troops and supplies which will be piling up in the fall. We have spent many hundred million dollars on our inland waterways and intercoastal canals. We have developed a 9-foot channel from New Orleans to Minneapolis, near the Canadian border. We have developed a channel on the Missouri River up as far as Sioux City. We have developed a channel from the Mississippi up the Illinois River to Chicago and up the Ohio River as far as Pittsburgh. In this emergency we are not using these great highways, which are so safe from U-boats. If there was ever a time when we could get our money's worth for developing these waterways, it is now.

I have some statistics on the cost of transportation by barge, by pipe line, and by railroad. We have to use all three methods of transportation; but the cheapest of all transportation is the system of barge lines on the rivers. It has been proposed to build a pipe line from the Texas fields to the Atlantic coast. The estimated cost of such a pipe line would be between $60,000,000 and $100,000,000.

We could, a year ago, build for about $20,000, a steel barge 195 feet long, 35 feet wide, and 11 feet deep which would carry 6,600 barrels of oil. Thirty-four barges could handle the maximum daily capacity of a single pipe line, and the cost would be only $680,000. Further, oil barges can be constructed rapidly, entailing no such vast construction program as is involved in the case of a pipe line, or in building railroad tank cars.

Towboats are presently available, but undoubtedly in an enlarged program additional towboats would have to be built. However, they can be built at a very nominal cost. One such towboat could handle a tow of 14 barges, each barge having a capacity of 6,600 barrels. They could be taken up the Mississippi River from the oil fields of the South to the Ohio River, and to every city along the Ohio River as far as Pittsburgh. They could be taken up the Illinois River, where there are no submarines, to Chicago and towed over the lakes, or the oil could be put in tankers on the lakes and shipped as far east as Pittsburgh. There are two pipe lines at Pittsburgh through which the oil can be pumped to the Atlantic coast.

As to the cost, I have the official figures on the cost of barges. Oil can be hauled on a system of barges for one-half the cost of sending it through a pipe line. The cost of handling oil by barges is much less than the cost of hauling it by rail or by truck.

I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks the figures which I have before me be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Oil now moves by water from Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana fields through the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh, and thence to the Atlantic seaboard consuming centers. Another route is through the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Chicago, thence by lake to Buffalo, N. Y., and from there by barge canal to the seaboard.

From the national defense standpoint, the maximum utilization of our inland waterways is imperative. These waterways, because they lie in the interior, are protected, and hence far less vulnerable to attack. Further, they are not subject to sabotage and breakdowns, as are pipe lines. Other nations have long since realized these truths and are utilizing their inland waterways to the maximum, not only during wartime but in peacetime.

Facilities constructed for inland-waterway use can readily be utilized in an all-out national defense effort, not only on our rivers but, if necessary, in our coastal and lake harbors as well. With the passing of the emergency the additional facilities which should be built for war purposes would readily be absorbed by industry seeking the low-cost form of transportation for this commodity.

I have called this matter to the attention of the Maritime Commission, but they have been denied priorities on steel. However, there is one thing they can furnish and that is wood. Such barges could be made of wood and could haul gasoline or crude oil just as well as could steel barges. While a steel barge could be built last year for about $20,000, a wood barge could undoubtedly be built for approximately one-half that amount. As is very often done on the Mississippi, a large towboat can tow 14 barges. Two thousand tons can be carried by each barge, or 20,000 tons in 10 barges. That would be the equivalent of 10 railroad trains of 100 freight cars each, and all that could be pulled by 1 towboat which makes 10 miles an hour and can run day and night, making 240 miles in 24 hours. Such barge transportation can be carried on all through the interior of the United States, from the Gulf to the Canadian border, and can reach all our large cities from Chicago to Pittsburgh. The barges could go along our Atlantic and Gulf coasts on the Intercoastal Waterway; and on that waterway the oil could be hauled perfectly safe, away from submarines, and at the lowest possible transportation cost.

Those who have charge of the transportation of oil from the interior of the country to the Gulf coast, and who have been sending it from there to the Atlantic coast in tankers which have been sunk, it seems to me have neglected their duty. Their attention has been called to the fact that they can use inland waterways. Transportation by barge on the inland waterways is much cheaper than transportation by tankers, much cheaper than transportation through pipe lines; and in view of the fact that such barges can be built of wood, it seems to me that those who have charge of the transportation of oil, coal, or any other heavy commodity are neglecting their duty in not immediately applying their energies toward supplying a form of transportation which would take care of the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, and the entire interior of the country, without any danger of sabotage or of having ships or tankers sunk by submarines.

I am now calling to the attention of the Senate, as for more than a year I have called it to the attention of the Maritime Commission and of the Secretary of the Interior, who wanted a pipe line constructed, the fact that for very much less money, and with a resulting greater capacity for the transportation of oil to the Atlantic coast, the method I have suggested could be used, and should be used. The Senator from Illinois has called attention to the need for a special committee to investigate the proposition he advanced this morning. I believe that some action by the Congress may be necessary in order to force upon the executive departments some consideration of the method of transportation I have just discussed.

EXHIBIT A

OIL FOR ATLANTIC SEABOARD FROM SOUTHWEST CAN BE TRANSPORTED AT LOWER COST VIA THE INLAND WATERWAYS THAN BY PROPOSED PIPE LINE

The facts are:

1. Threatened shortage of oil tankers has brought forth suggestions that pipe lines be constructed from southwestern oil fields to Atlantic seaboard points to avoid possible oil famine.

2. Estimated cost of constructing single pipe line from Texas to New York ranges from $60,000,000 to $100,000,000. Not considering steel shortage, priorities etc., time of completion estimated at 2 years for single line.

3. A pipe line has limited transportation capacity, estimated at 225,000 barrels per day at maximum efficiency.

4. Mississippi River (including intracoastal canal to Galveston) and Ohio River have been completed at an expenditure by the Government of hundreds of millions of dollars. It has unlimited capacity for transporting oil and is now used extensively by private operators for that purpose.

5. While present facilities (oil barges and towboats) may be adequate for use in ordinary times by private operators, these facilities fall far short of meeting increased demands arising out of the present emergency. However, the existing plant in most instances could be quickly augmented through priority construction of comparatively inexpensive barges, placing far less burden on critical materials and manpower than the construction of an expensive and experimental pipe line. Having a completed waterway with adequate dockage facilities and experience in handling oil by barge, the problem merely reduces itself to adding barges to the existing plant as a railroad would add boxcars to its trains.

6. Cost of steel oil barges ranges up to $20,000 each, which cost might be materially reduced when produced in quantity. The capacity of an average oil barge (195 feet by 35 feet by 11 feet) is 6,600 barrels. Therefore 34 barges could handle the maximum daily capacity of a single pipe line and the cost would be only $680,000. Further, oil barges can be constructed rapidly, entailing no such vast construction program as in the case of a pipe line. Towboats are presently available, but undoubtedly an enlarge program would involve a consideration of the need for added power. The waterway has been completed, the right-of-way is there for use, with unlimited capacity, lacking only expansion of equipment.

7. Comparative cost of transporting oil by various forms of transport for the year 1939 is given below:

	Per ton-mile
Crude pipe lines	$0.00477
Gasoline pipe lines	.00527
Company ships	.00050
Company barges	.00259
Chartered ships	.00106
Foreign ships	$0.00151
Canadian ships	.00264
Company trucks: Package and bulk	.06853
Outside trucks:	
Bulk	.03697
Package	.02621
Railroads:	
Carloads	.01640
Less than carload lots	.03890
Chartered barges	.00680

From the above it is clear that the ton-mile cost of directly operated barge facilities is one-half of such cost by pipe line.

8. Oil moves by water today from the Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana fields via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh, thence to Atlantic seaboard consuming centers. Another route is via the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers to Chicago, thence by lake to Buffalo and New York Barge Canal to the seaboard.

9. From a national-defense standpoint the maximum utilization of our inland waterways is imperative. These waterways, because they lie in the interior, are protected and hence far less vulnerable to attack. Further, they are not subject to sabotage and break-downs, as would be true of pipe lines. Other nations have long since realized these truths and are utilizing their inland waterways to their maximum.

Facilities constructed for inland waterway use can readily be utilized in an all-out national-defense effort not only on our rivers, but, if necessary, in our coastal and lake harbors as well.

With the passing of the emergency the additional facilities would readily be absorbed by industry seeking the low-cost form of transportation for this commodity.

At the present time there are three all-gasoline pipe lines operating from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pittsburgh district. These three are: The Tuscarora Line, owned by the Tuscarora Oil Co., Ltd., and serving the Pittsburgh district from Bayonne, N. J., to the Keystone pipe line, a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co., from the Pittsburgh district to Marcus Hook, Pa., and the Susquehanna pipe line, owned by the Sun Pipe Line Co., a subsidiary of Sun Oil, Pittsburgh district, Bayonne, N. J. It is being contemplated at the present time to reverse these lines and bring oil from Wood River, Ill., to the Pittsburgh district by barge and transhipment via pipe line to the seaboard.

BASIC MAGNESIUM, INC.—UNCONSCIONABLE PROFITS IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my statement of April 9 that the Defense Plant Corporation has entered into an agreement with Basic Magnesium, Inc., of Cleveland, Ohio, for construction of a $73,000,000 magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., that is "so sinister as to indicate that some officials in our Government are guilty of malfeasance in the performance of their duties."

In reaffirming the facts as before stated, I am mindful of an allegation filed April 23 by Jesse Jones with the Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

I now state that Mr. Jones, who is accountable for the Defense Plant Corporation's affairs, has resorted in his statement to evasion, subterfuge, distortion of facts, and an attack on the investigators of the case.

Mr. Jones' attempt to saddle the responsibility for Basic Magnesium profiteering on the War Department and the now defunct O. P. M. will meet with as little success as did his effort to blame the President of the United States and the British and Dutch Governments for Mr. Jones' own failure to provide the Nation with rubber.

My statement was based on the testimony of witnesses sworn to tell the truth at hearings in Las Vegas, conducted on March 23 and 24 by the Truman committee.

My statement was based on record and fact. However Mr. Jones may try to confuse the issue, the fact remains that Basic Magnesium will receive $300,000 to supervise the construction of the plant, $560,000 per year as an operating fee, $280,000 per year on royalties, and $1,000,000 in the event of the sale of the plant. All this was testified before the Truman committee as possible return on an admitted investment of less than $50,000.

Nothing Mr. Jones can say can dispute the fact that extortionate salaries are being paid from the taxpayers' money to the officials of the company, salaries as high as $36,000 a year.

D. W. Stewart was paid $15,000 by Eells when employed by Basic Refractories, but when he was transferred to Basic Magnesium and his salary was paid from public funds he was given $20,000 a year, an increase of $5,000.

Mr. Howard P. Eells testified under oath that H. C. Lee, who was employed by Eells' company in Cleveland at a salary of $7,800 per year, was transferred to Basic Magnesium, Inc., at $12,000 per year, an increase of $4,200.

W. W. Patnoe was transferred by Eells from Basic Refractories to Basic Magnesium. His former salary was $10,000, but now that Eells is handling the taxpayers' money Mr. Patnoe is receiving $13,800, an increase of almost $4,000 a year.

All these huge increases in salaries are to be paid from public funds—these same increases being approved by Jesse Jones. It is interesting to note how valuable the services of these men become upon being paid out of the taxpayers' money.

That this unusual contract provides for extortionate profits is graphically borne out by the fact that the personal salary of Howard P. Eells is $50,000 per year, or equal to the entire assets of Basic Magnesium, Inc., when the contract was signed. This amazing salary is not the only income or interest of Mr. Eells. He receives $18,000 per year as president of Basic Refractories. Although Eells is in supreme command, he has not spent more than 60 days at the plant since the contract was signed in August of 1941. Is it any wonder that such miserable progress has been reflected in the construction of the plant?

Nothing Mr. Jones can say can dispute the testimony of the project manager of Basic Magnesium, who stated, at the hearings, that the project is only 9-percent complete. The testimony of the project manager clearly indicates that Mr. Howard P. Eells, Jr., is grossly inefficient and incompetent.

If a man built an expensive home with a garage adjoining, and if the builder attempted to justify his delay by pointing out that the garage was 60-percent finished, I doubt if it would be considered that the house was ready to be occupied.

When it was pointed out by the Truman investigating committee that the plant is only 9-percent complete, Mr. Jones countered that the settling basin and the preparation plant are 60-percent complete. General Knudsen, sent out by the War Department because Mr. Jones was admittedly dissatisfied with the progress of the plant, reported that the first unit was 40-percent complete. Mind you, I said the first unit. There are 10 units to this vital magnesium-producing plant. If one unit is 40 percent complete, then 10 units are, in reality, 4 percent complete. With the garages, the plant is 9 percent complete

Howard Mann, project manager, in an attempt to justify to the committee the miserable showing of the management of Basic Magnesium, placed the blame on organized labor. While it is obviously a futile and weak excuse, is it not just what we would expect from this $36,000 executive?

Although, as I have said, Mr. Jones states that the Defense Plant Corporation engineers were not satisfied with the construction progress, and as early as January caused engineers of the War Department to investigate the project, yet as late as March of 1942, no change in management had been effected. Could it be that Mr. Jones, who has contracted for the expenditure of $63,000,000 of public funds—now grown to $73,500,000—finds himself obligated to defend the extravagance and incompetence of a typical promoter?

Does Mr. Jones mean that the members of the Truman committee—who have no personal interest in this case—are so deficient in intelligence as to be unable to grasp the significance of that testimony and come to the conclusions they wrote into their preliminary report? I quote from that report:

> The subcommittee considers it of prime importance that these huge plants constructed with Government funds be built around the most economical processes available, to the end that they may compete commercially after the war. Care should be taken that their cost of operation should not be so high that they could not meet postwar commercial competition. * * *
>
> The facts disclosed at Las Vegas created the impression that Defense Plant Corporation is paying tremendous fees for "know how," which so far has delivered miserable progress, the metal-producing units being only 9 percent complete although the contract was signed August 13, 1941.

After taking note of this miserable progress, I am inclined to believe that the Defense Plant Corporation, instead of paying for "know how," is paying for "do not know how." I quote further from the report:

> The subcommittee is prepared now to urge most strongly that Defense Plant Corporation refuse to accept any such exorbitant royalty terms as proposed by Basic Magnesium, Inc. * * *
>
> This proposed lease appears to the subcommittee as one of the most flagrant attempts at war profiteering to come to its notice. * * *
>
> The subcommittee is of the opinion that a plant, especially one of this magnitude, ought not to have been commenced until after the Defense Plant Corporation had reached an agreement as to the terms of the license under which it was to operate and as to the cost of the raw material (magnesite ores) from which the magnesium was to be produced. * * *
>
> These terms seem to put a premium on mismanagement and incompetency.

I would be derelict in my duty if I did not bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and insist on action being taken to place this plant on an immediate and permanent production schedule.

There are two vitally essential factors in the production of magnesium:

First, an economic process;

Second, raw material.

At the time of signing of this contract neither of these was insured, and even to this day there is serious doubt as to the agreement on the cost, quality, and quantity of the ore supply.

While Mr. Jones states that it is a fixed policy for the Defense Plant Corporation never to reimburse an operator for funds expended in obtaining a contract, Mr. Eells testified under oath that the sum of $211,000 was being repaid Basic Magnesium by the Defense Plant Corporation. Mr. Jones and Mr. Eells should get together on their statements.

Mr. Jones has ignored the recommendations of the committee, and has insulted the legislative branch of the Government, which he seemingly relegates to a position inferior to his own.

Mr. Jones said that my statement was "unworthy of a United States Senator." We have not reached, and never will reach, the time in our national life when it becomes unworthy a Member of the Senate to draw to the attention of the people extortionate salaries and war profits which come from public funds. In fact, it is the duty of every Senator and Representative to protect the interests of the taxpayers.

I am thinking of the people of Nevada and of the country at large, the people who must work a lifetime to maintain their families in respectability, the people who are depriving themselves and their children of life's necessities in order to pay their taxes and to buy War Bonds and Stamps. Think how many 25-cent Defense Stamps it will take to pay the $36,000 salary of the project manager of Basic Magnesium.

The welfare of this Nation in this world crisis is the one vital element in the fight to preserve our liberty.

I repeat, as I said on April 9 in addressing this body, that I shall not hesitate to exercise every resource at my command to prevent or bring to light war profiteering during this conflict.

I am informed that the Truman committee will continue hearings on this matter at an early date.

When the facts are all finally in the record, I am sure that the committee's findings will be acclaimed at the bar of public opinion as a great contribution to clean government.

I intend to address the Senate further on this matter in the future.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and fo other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee explain the effect of the committee amendments, and the reasons for the committee's action?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. I suppose the Senator from Wisconsin desires that I explain some of the more important items of the bill; I do not suppose he wants me to discuss all of them.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as we all know, in the independent offices appropriation bill there are a great many diverse items. Several questions were raised in the committee, and, at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will try to single out the more important ones. One grew out of the building known as the Information Building, at the corner of Fifteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. That was settled in this way: The building had already been constructed; the President had a perfect right to have it erected, and there could be no question about that; but the

amount provided by the other House for the Office of Government Reports was reduced by the Senate committee from $1,475,000 to $1,075,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Let me suggest to the very able Senator from Tennessee that, as we reach the items, they be discussed in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would much prefer to proceed in that way.

Mr. McNARY. I find it difficult to follow an explanation along general lines.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I did not intend to request the Senator from Tennessee to make a general explanation of all the items in the bill on which the committee has taken action, but I wanted him to make an explanation of the committee amendments which have to do with the National Resources Planning Board, since they constitute the first group of amendments on which the Senate will be called upon to act.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be glad to do that, and I think it is better to let the explanation be made as the items are reached.

For the National Resources Planning Board $688,845 was provided by the House of Representatives.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator recall what the Budget Bureau recommended?

Mr. McKELLAR. I can give the Senator the figures in a few moments. The amount provided by the House of Representatives was cut down by $268,000, so as to provide an appropriation of $400,000.

The National Resources Planning Board wanted to go into the defense-housing business. It will be noted from the amendment at the bottom of page 5, line 21, that the committee thought that the Board ought not to go into the housing business. Congress by legislative act had only recently consolidated the various housing authorities into one, and the President, about the same time or a little later, entered an Executive order consolidating housing activities. So it did not seem to the committee to be necessary that the National Resources Planning Board should go into that particular business; and so that provision was stricken out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I must confess, Mr. President, that I have been so completely absorbed in the hearings of the Patents Committee, in which I was so kindly invited to participate by the chairman of that committee, although I am not a member of it, that it has been utterly impossible for me to read all the testimony in connection with the pending appropriation bill, although I have to admit that I had ample notice that it was coming up. The Senator, however, knows the circumstances under which we labor. We become tied up and absorbed in one matter and cannot do more than one thing at a time—at least, I cannot do so. I make that explanation because I have skimmed over the testimony this morning and do not find anything in it indicating that there has been any desire on the part of the National Resources Planning Board to go into the housing business in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read to the Senator what the House bill provided:

National defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed $50, and not to exceed $100,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709, or classification laws, $400,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for printing and binding.

The committee thought that that was entirely outside the province of the Resources Planning Board, and, for that reason, the provision was eliminated by the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator stated that the committee struck it out because the Board was going into the housing business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is nothing here that provides that the Board shall go into housing activities.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can see from the item I have just read what they were going to do. They could do almost anything under heaven. I think they claimed at the time, if I remember the testimony aright, that they were going to plan for conditions after the war; they were preparing plans for building which might be undertaken after the war.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it seemed to the committee that such a program might well be postponed for the present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I rose to interrupt the Senator's explanatory statement because he stated that the reason for the elimination of this appropriation was that this organization was going into the housing business, and I could find nothing in the record and nothing in the text of the bill upon which to justify such a statement. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from Tennessee, inadvertently, made the statement about housing when he meant national defense.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; that is what I thought, and I merely wanted the record to be cleared up.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is another item in connection with this subject, a proviso—

That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board.

That is a provision which has been in the law heretofore, and the committee thought it should be in the act now proposed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What is the effect of the proviso?

Mr. McKELLAR. To be perfectly frank about it, we could not say at this time how the enlarged and increased activities of the National Resources Planning Board could be of any great value to the war effort, and our principal desire has been to eliminate, wherever it was possible to do so, expenses in connection with the activities which were not primarily for war purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that it is probably very difficult in the present temper of the Senate, to resist successfully an amendment by the committee which proposes to make such a substantial reduction in an appropriation bill. I also know that there has been much derision of planning in general, and many derogatory statements have been made about it; but the function of the Resources Planning Board prior to our entry into the war was, insofar as possible, to gather, assimilate, digest, and present in usable form, all the scientific and statistical information essential to the foundation of a sound national policy for the utilization, conservation, and replenishment of the natural resources of this Nation.

When this country was discovered, and prior to the time when the white man began to utilize its natural resources, it represented one of the greatest examples, if not the greatest example, of the beneficence of the Creator in providing the essential materials for the building of a civilization.

In the development of our natural resources without planning, and because largely of the rapid increase in population, we were profligate. Thomas Jefferson was one of the first men to observe that the farming practices in vogue in his day were leading to soil erosion. He recognized, as have most others since that time, I think, that soil is one of the most precious assets a nation can have.

Under virgin conditions it takes Nature about 400 years to create 1 inch of topsoil. It has been some time since I have looked into this matter, but the most recent figures I have available indicate that a conservative estimate is that in this country wind and water erosion are resulting in the loss of about 3,000,000,000 tons of topsoil annually. Once the topsoil is gone, the land becomes uninhabitable, and we have only to go into some of the older agricultural sections of this Nation to find the gaping holes which are already evident along the hillsides. In the South there is one county which is practically entirely eroded.

It was with an appreciation of the fact that we had been profligate in the

exploitation and utilization of our natural resources that the National Resources Planning Board was created. The State from which I come, and which I have the honor, in part, to represent in the United States Senate, was once one of the greatest timber States in the Union. Once it had enormous wealth in the form of lands which were in the public domain, school lands, land-grant areas, Indian lands; but the policy of both the State and the Federal Governments at that time was to permit the development of the lands regardless of the effect upon the resources, and the record shows that unfortunately both State and Federal Governments often closed their eyes while millions of board feet of timber were stolen from the public domain.

One Indian reservation in my State once had a magnificent stand of virgin timber. In years gone by a certain company obtained a contract to take the dead and down timber from that reservation; but when they got through there was not a stick of merchantable timber standing on stumpage in the reservation. I digress too greatly, but I cite this as an evidence of what may happen because of the wastage of natural resources. The company which I have in mind not only stripped the timber, but burned the dead and down timber and the slashings, and in large measure made the soil untillable for years to come. Once they had stripped this great natural resource from the land in the northern part of my State, they moved on to more virgin fields and left behind for the overburdened taxpayers of the communities affected the problem of caring for their citizens, who once had had economic opportunity as a result of the timber exploitation, but who found when the land had been denuded that their economic foundations had been swept away. Literally thousands upon thousands of dollars, if not hundreds of thousands, have been poured down the W. P. A. sluice into those counties in order to maintain and to keep from actual malnutrition and undernourishment some of their residents.

Mr. President, I confess at the outset that I have not had the time to prepare for an adequate discussion of this matter today, but, if my memory serves me correctly, the best estimate of the ultimate effect of the manner in which our timber resources have been utilized and exploited is to the effect that, up to the time when we embarked on defense effort, despite all the money that has been invested by the present administration in forestation and reforestation, at the then existing level of the consumption of timber, within 125 years there would not be a stick of merchantable timber standing within the confines of continental United States. Other Senators are likewise familiar with our utilization of other resources.

Therefore, Mr. President, to draw an analogy between Government and private business, I say that our natural resources are the great assets of the corporation of the United States of America; and upon them the civilization in which we live and the standard of living for this and for oncoming generations depend.

It is true that new fields are being opened up by research which indicate that we may be able, with the progress of science and invention and the advance in chemical methods, to find suitable and practical substitutes for some of our natural resources, but I think it is safe to say that until such substitutes are adequately developed, the assets of the United States of America are chiefly represented in its great people and in the natural resources upon which the people must depend for the maintenance of their standard of life.

Mr. President, in the light of the situation which I have briefly depicted, the President of the United States created an organization to study the problems involved in the preservation of our natural resources and to make recommendations to the Executive and to the Congress looking to their conservation and restoration.

Other Senators may not like the kind of work this board has been doing and is now doing, but, in my opinion, for the Appropriations Committee to abolish the only agency we have that is making any effort, so far as we know, looking to a comprehensive and continuous study of the utilization, conservation, and restoration of our natural resources, is a tragic mistake.

Furthermore, as I understand, the President of the United States has designated this board—insofar as the executive branch of the Government is concerned—to coordinate, arrange for, and actually to execute planning for the post-war period. Perhaps the Congress, if it should take this matter up de novo, might decide upon some other kind of organization but the fact remains that so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, this is the agency designated by the President to carry on what I regard with the exception of winning the war, as perhaps the most important subject we have to consider, for, Mr. President, I state the man is blind indeed who does not appreciate that once this war comes to an end the Nation will face the most critical, the most complex, the most difficult problems that have ever confronted a civilized people in the written history of the world.

When we can see ahead to a day when it will be no longer an exaggeration to say that we may have a national debt which will be equal to the total wealth of the United States, I think it must be realized that we are out on an uncharted financial sea. So far as this Government is concerned, to stretch the analogy until it breaks, we are in the situation of financial and fiscal navigators who have lost all their charts and sextants and who find that the stars in the heavens have all slipped out of place.

We are going to build up in this country the most gigantic industrial plant the world has ever seen. It will make the so-called surplus of industrial capacity which in part produced the economic problems with which we have been wrestling since the last World War and before we became involved in the present war, pale into insignificance.

Mr. President, we are proposing, to all intents and purposes—and I have no doubt that in the end somehow we will reach that goal—to underwrite the entire productive machinery of this war. We are in the business now of building plant capacity to bring about that result. The huge concentration of war contracts is producing what may now be called a defense migration. In order that these huge plants may be properly manned, men and women are moving great distances from their present habitations. They are filling and congesting various areas to such an extent that we have spent astronomical figures for so-called defense housing. Have Senators any idea, can they grasp the nature of the problems which will confront us when that machine begins to slow down after this war shall have been ended?

We are expanding agriculture again in connection with the food-for-victory program. It was the expansion of agriculture, in order to meet the comparatively limited demands of the last war, which helped to create the dark days through which agriculture, generally speaking, has passed since 1920. We have been studying the agricultural problem ever since the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] first introduced the McNary-Haugen bill. I do not think any student of the agricultural problem would undertake to say that as yet we have found any solution for it. Nevertheless, the war must necessarily intensify that problem, because now our exports are no longer confined to the basic commodities. They embrace fats and oils and the concentrated forms of dairy products, so that the entire agricultural industry is bound to be bulged out of shape just as manufacturing industry will be bulged out of shape. When the time comes when no more lend-lease money is being spent, when the time comes when the abnormal demands of the Army and the Navy cease, cannot Senators envisage the nature of the problem which will confront us? Can they not see something of its form and shape and magnitude, even though they cannot see it in all its terrible aspects?

The proposal of the Appropriations Committee is to put an end to any planning for the post-war period so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the amount is cut down to $400,000. It is not eliminated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The appropriation with respect to the national defense activities is entirely eliminated.

Mr. TAFT. But there is still an appropriation of $400,000 provided for the post-war program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the more accurate statement, and I appreciate

what the Senator from Ohio has said in correcting me. I refer to page 39 of the committee hearings, to what is evidently a prepared statement which Dr. Merriam put in the record, from which I read, as follows:

AMOUNT OF HOUSE REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF BOARD

1. The House reduced the defense appropriation for our work next year from $700,705, recommended in the President's Budget estimates, to $400,000. We do not know what part of our defense activities the House committee thought should be abandoned or curtailed. We believe that all of the war and post-war planning activities on which we are now engaged should be continued and expanded.

DEFENSE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1942

2. The defense funds available to the Board for the current fiscal year total $775,000, and the Budget request for next year was $700,705. Our current funds are made up of $400,000 appropriated in last year's independent offices bill plus an allocation of $375,000 from the President's emergency fund. It may be that the House committee prefers to have the Board rely on further allocations from the President's emergency funds. We would prefer to have our work financed through the customary appropriation procedures of the Congress.

The fact is that the Budget Bureau recommended $775,000 for national defense activities. That amount was reduced by the other House to $400,000, and the Senate committee has eliminated that altogether. Some $700,000, as I understand from the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], was recommended by the President for the current and post-war activities of the Board. The House reduced that amount to $668,845, and the Senate committee has reduced it to $400,000. So certainly one of two things is bound to happen: Either this work will not be well done in any field, or it will be curtailed, and the Board will not be able to carry on adequately its normal activities, so far as natural resources and post-war planning are concerned.

Mr. President, no other Senator is more anxious than am I to do whatever is humanly possible in wartime to prevent the decline of the legislative arm of the Government. I think the survival of democracy is involved in our preventing the shriveling and wasting away of the legislative arm of the Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that the subject of post-war planning, as the Senator has envisaged its need when the war is over, is a very large and appropriate subject for consideration by the whole Nation, but it is striking that the legislative branch of the Government is doing little of the post-war planning. It is being done by the executive branch.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was just coming to that, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I just stated that I am as anxious as is any other Senator to, insofar as possible, prevent the decline of the legislative arm. I know it cannot be done entirely because the legislative branch in time of war, unfortunately, has to delegate vast power. That is the situation which confronts us; we have to delegate power, and it has been done in every war in which we have ever been engaged. In that direction, however, I do not want anything done which does not have to be done.

So far as the Congress is concerned, it has no agency; it has no staff; it has no way in which it can make such a study. I think it should have. I should be glad to support legislation to create a joint economic staff for the House and Senate to cover the entire field, just as we have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to assist the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee in handling one phase of our fiscal problem, namely, taxation. However, we do not have such a staff in the economic field, and I see little prospect of getting it. Certainly the Appropriations Committee is not recommending it.

My only point is that if we accept these amendments we paralyze, or at least drastically impair, the activity of the only organization in the Government which is making a study of the situation which will confront us when the war is over. If we ask Army and Navy representatives they tell us frankly that they are not concerned with that subject. It is not in their field. So it is with other branches of the Government. They are busy with their own problems, just as we are. If we had a committee, let us say, on natural resources planning, post-war planning, or whatever one may choose to call it, every morning the members of that committee would probably find themselves, as I am now, confronted with the choice of three or four important committees, all meeting simultaneously, and would have to decide which committee to attend. That is not the kind of atmosphere under which contemplative intellectual effort can be continuously carried on. If we had a staff we could direct it, and the staff could probably carry on such a study for us; but we do not have it.

I think it would be a tragic mistake for a country confronted with what everybody acknowledges to be the greatest problems that any country has ever faced, on the basis of so little testimony and so little consideration, to take a meat ax and chop down or badly slash activities which are studying some kind of a program with which to meet the terrible problems of the post-war period. It does not follow that Congress must adopt such a program, but somebody will be charged with the responsibility of formulating such a plan; and some kind of a plan should be available on which those who may be here when this war is over may start to gnaw.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish briefly and in a general way to endorse the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin. Nobody has spoken to me about this appropriation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Inasmuch as the Senator has raised that point, let me say that no one has spoken to me. I did not know anything about it. I confess that I did not even know that the amendment was in the bill until I arrived here at 12 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure of that. I myself did not know until I arrived on the floor of the Senate today that the committee had recommended a reduction in the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. Nobody has spoken to me about it, and in the very brief remarks which I shall make I shall not be speaking for anyone except myself.

Mr. President, we all realize that the immediate task ahead of us is to win the war; and I think that, without regard to party, religious differences, color, or condition, we are all enlisted for the duration in the effort to win the war. Nevertheless, we cannot make ourselves oblivious to the fact that when this war is over some kind of a world will result. There will be economic, political, social, religious, spiritual, financial, and perhaps military problems. We all know that when this war is over and the United Nations have won, as we all expect that they will, the task which will confront humanity will be almost beyond the ken of men who now think and live in the midst of the effort to win it.

We cannot afford to wait until we shall have won the victory to decide what we are to do in regard to the readjustments which will be necessary in order to preserve what we are now fighting for in this great war.

Nobody has said anything to me about this appropriation. I have not been asked by any member of the National Resources Planning Board to say anything about it or to vote against the amendment of the committee reducing the appropriation; but I have certain general convictions on the subject which lead me to the conclusion that we cannot afford to ignore the problems which will face this country and the world when we shall have ceased our military and naval operations and the treaty of peace shall have been written and ratified, and we again come to a period of reconstruction, as we did following the last war, when we failed to meet the situation which has been so eloquently described by the Senator from Wisconsin, and which I think all of us realize we must face.

Various resolutions have been introduced in the Senate and in the other House providing for the creation of committees of one kind or another to make an investigation of post-war conditions. None of those resolutions has been adopted. Some of them provide for a Senate committee to look into the subject, some for a House committee, and some for a joint committee.

The President has set up a sort of interdepartmental organization to look into post-war conditions and make suggestions as to remedies, possibly in the way of legislation dealing with the subject. When this war is over and we shall have won our victory—and it will not be over until we shall have won our victory—perhaps eight, ten, or twelve mil-

lion men will come back out of the Army and Navy to resume their positions in the civil life of our country. That is a suggestion which applies only to the United States. Out of all the armies of the world perhaps thirty or forty million men will come back. Nobody can tell now. During this war our economic, social, and political structure is undergoing readjustments which twist and warp the normal life of our Nation and of the world. Somebody must be thinking in advance. Somebody must be planning ahead—not necessarily planning in a way which we must follow, or with suggestions to which we must adhere; but, unless we are utterly foolish, somebody must be looking ahead to plan what kind of a world we are to have when this war ends, and what must be the social, political, financial, industrial, and economic solutions of the problems which we shall face.

Personally I have great respect for the National Resources Planning Board. I do not know anybody on it except Mr. Delano. So far as I now recall, I have no personal acquaintance with anybody else on that Board or employed by the Board; but I do know that Mr. Delano was brought to Washington by Woodrow Wilson, who was President during World War No. 1. I know in a general way that he and those who are associated with him have no axes to grind, no selfish motives to promote. They are not interested in a job for themselves or for anyone else. They are interested in the future of this country. I have confidence in their disinterested outlook and approach to the problems which face this Nation and the world.

I do not know whether the proposed reduction in the Budget estimate is justified. No one has said anything to me about it. No one has called me on the telephone about it. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee; and, of course, with my physical, temporal, and intellectual limitations, I cannot keep current on the hearings and testimony before every committee in the Senate with reference to legislation and appropriations.

I make no criticism whatever of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that as a whole and individually the committee did what it thought was its duty to do. I realize the pressure on Members of the Senate, on Members of the House, and on Congress as a whole to reduce what are called nondefense appropriations. Nevertheless, I realize the difficulty of differentiating between defense and nondefense appropriations. We cannot abandon the ordinary processes of Government because we are at war; we must keep them going. I think that when the Bureau of the Budget estimates a certain amount as either necessary or desirable for an agency of this sort, which is projecting itself into the future to some extent, trying to visualize what we shall be up against when this war is over, trying to devise remedies which it will submit only for our consideration when the war is over, we are at least justified in inquiring specifically as to the necessity and reason for the proposed reduction in a very modest appropriation of this kind.

I have not as yet made up my mind how I am going to vote on this amendment of the committee. Perhaps it is justified. I am always anxious to support the action of the committee, and I realize that the members of the committee are just as patriotic and as sincere as I am; but I cannot help expressing some disturbance to my mental operations because of the reduction of an amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for what I regard as an essential activity in trying to forecast what will finally be the solution of the problems which will face this country when we have devoted ourselves financially, economically, industrially, socially, and religiously, to say nothing of politically, to the first consideration that confronts all of us, namely, the winning of a great victory for the forces of democracy, and when that has been done the preservation of that democracy and the handing down to our descendants the liberty and a liberalism which will justify the enormous sacrifices we are to make in winning that victory.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I was simply going to ask the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Tennessee to take note of one or two facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to reply to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want the Senator from Tennessee to reply to the Senator from Kentucky; but if he will yield to me for a moment, I should like to call to his attention and to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, without particularly taking issue with his observations, one or two facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall take only a minute or two.

The National Resources Planning Board is one of the agencies being studied by the committee of which I happen to be chairman, and of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] are the other members. The committee was created by the Senate to look into overlapping and duplication and other matters of that kind, to see how we could make the Federal Government machine a little more definite and direct and less wasteful. Of course, our studies are not yet completed, but they are nearing a stage of completion. We have heard from every department of the Government, and I think we can make some suggestions in our report—some of them not very sensational, but worth while, and which I think will save a good many million dollars.

Coming down to the National Resources Planning Board, the functions of that Board, as the Board states them to the committee and as the law sets them forth, are as follows: They are to study housing, transportation, health, welfare, employment, and the consumption process. All these functions are already being performed by the National Housing Agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Board of Investigation and Research of the Transportation Agency. Likewise, the Office of Defense Health and Welfare is making a study, the Public Welfare Agency is making a study, the Works Progress Administration is making a study, the Social Security Board is making a study, the Railroad Retirement Board is making a study, the Department of Labor is making a study, the Federal Trade Commission is making a study, the Department of Agriculture is making a study, and the Office of Price Administration is making a study. Each of them is making a study of the post-war effect and what we should do about it.

Superimposed on those 13 different, individual studies is the study being made by the National Resources Planning Board. The point I want to make is that the problems which this Board is supposed to study are already being studied by other departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. As to the studies made by the other boards and agencies mentioned by the Senator, some of which are particularly confined to the war situation and not to the long-time future prognostication of remedies and situations of that kind, let me ask to what extent they are differentiated from the National Resources Planning Board, which is more or less of a permanent organization looking far ahead to planning for situations which may exist long after the war.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand the Senator. I should say that the boards I have named are studying the problems which will be presented not only during the war but after the war, and what should be done about them. For instance, take the railroad problem: The Interstate Commerce Commission is considering the problem of keeping transportation in being during the war and the problem of what will be the effect on transportation after the war, so that they will have specific recommendations to make with regard to the railroads. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that, in my humble judgment, there is not a group of men in America who, unless they would give the subject their full time, to the exclusion of everything else except meals and sleep, could even faintly in one board develop the rehabilitation program which will be necessary for this country when the war is over.

The subject of transportation alone would require examination and investigation for months in order to meet the problems which will arise, such as re-equipping the railroad manufacturing plants, so that, after making shells, they may return to making boosters for locomotives, and all manner of similar things.

My brief examination into these matters convinces me that we must not be carried away by the titles of the boards or by the caliber of the men who head

the boards. Mr. Delano is one of the best, in my judgment, and what I am saying is no reflection on him. The fact is that the boards are largely names. They will not and cannot, in the nature of things, put together a plan to handle a subject that has so many diverse ramifications. These studies are already being made.

The functions of the Science Committee of the National Resources Planning Board, which is one of its branches, appear to be a complete duplication of those performed by the National Defense Research Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office of Emergency Management. That is an actual committee. Think of it! In the Office of Emergency Management is a committee called the National Defense Research Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office of Emergency Management.

The function of planning and developing the National Roster, recently transferred from the Civil Service Commission to the newly created Manpower Commission, is likewise alleged to be a function of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, through its National Defense Research Committee.

I am in no position to say, and I should not want to take the responsibility now of saying, that the entire appropriation ought to be stricken out; but in another 30 days I hope to be able to show that there are any number of Government agencies that are duplicating the work of other agencies, with a resultant tremendous waste of money, at a time when our debt is going to sky-high proportions, and when every dollar will be needed sooner or later in order to carry the load of credit which the impact of this war will put upon the Nation.

Therefore, I am hopeful that the Senate will agree to the committee amendment, and that it will be taken to conference, where there can be further examination into the matter. It may be only a couple of hundred thousand dollars here and there, or $5,000, which are drops in the bucket; but, in my judgment, the nation which has the most drops left in the bucket will be the nation which will have the reserve punch to hit the other fellow, and to achieve victory in this war. We cannot afford to begin wasting our drops now. This is an all-out war. It is going to take everything we have.

I simply wanted to bring this duplication picture to the attention of the Senate, because I think it illustrates how we can reduce appropriations without at all hampering the proper performance of functions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further for a moment, let me say that I appreciate what the Senator from Maryland has said. I have no criticism of him and, of course, no criticism of the Board, which is composed, I believe, of very excellent gentlemen. I have no information from them. I realize that, no doubt, there is duplication in various agencies of the Government looking toward future determination, consideration and solution of problems which we shall face when the war is over.

What I said awhile ago was the expression of my general attitude toward the things that we must confront in the days which are to come, but I do not want, in order to save a few dollars, though I am subject, of course, to information and conviction on that subject, to cripple or handicap any important agency that is dealing with this subject in undertaking to serve the American people. I am still open-minded, I will say to the Senator, on the particular matter we are now discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear the Senator from Kentucky say that, because I agree very strongly with him that Mr. Delano, Dr. Merriam, and the other members of the Board are delightful gentlemen; but the Committee on Appropriations felt that it was its duty to cut down appropriations not necessary to the war effort. We thought it was essential to save when we could. This appropriation comes directly under the rule which was applied to all the other reductions made in this bill. We have nothing in the world against the Board. As I have said, the members of the Board are delightful gentlemen; but we came to the conclusion that this particular work could well be postponed for this year, and perhaps next year, until we know something more about what is going to be the result of the war. I desire to quote from Dr. Merriam, who is vice chairman of the Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my remarks a while ago I stated that I did not personally know the members of the Board other than Mr. Delano. I do know Dr. Merriam; I have collaborated with him in many labors which I hope may some time result in good to the country. I have a very high regard for him, and I did not mean by my remarks to indicate that I did not know Dr. Merriam. It may be that I am better acquainted with the other members of the Board than I realize.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am very much interested in what has been said by the distinguished majority leader and other Senators. Here is a recognized duplication of effort. When in the world are we going to begin to remove these duplications? When we reach a place where we may begin, are we going to have some assistance from the administrative bodies, or is the Congress of the United States going to be required, by main strength and awkwardness, if I may put it that way, to go ahead without any assistance or cooperation and do the work itself?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that this is typical of the reductions made in the bill, and if this reduction fails—and it may be necessary to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it—we might just as well say, "Come in, gentlemen, take what you want," for it will be useless to do otherwise.

I said this particular work could be postponed. Let us see if the Senate thinks that it could be postponed. They are making a research. I quote from the testimony given by Dr. Merriam, who came before the committee. Research is being made by the Board, for instance, into—

1. The right to work, usefully and creatively, through the productive years.

The appropriation was asked for further investigation and report on the research work these gentlemen are doing. The committee thought that further research into the right to work, usefully and creatively, through the productive years, might be postponed for a year or two until the war is over.

2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service.

That is the second line of research work they are to undertake and to report on. We thought that might be postponed until the emergency is over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. And particularly now, when the same functions are already being performed by two or three other agencies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Precisely.

Mr. REED and Mr. VANDENBERG addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. Let me make the statement myself. Precisely; they might be postponed when other agencies are doing exactly the same kind of work and making the same kind of reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, who, I think, rose first, and then I will yield to other Senators.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from Tennessee has said, that somebody, for example, the Senator from Maryland, who is a member of the special committee making inquiries of the activities of the various governmental administrative agencies, might tell us how many agencies are doing the same work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Right on that point——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out that there are many agencies engaged in such work. For example, the Department of Labor is constantly comparing wage scales in different sections of the country in different activities, such as carpenters and bricklayers, with the cost of living; the Office of Price Administration is doing the same thing; the

Bureau of Agricultural Economics is comparing the cost of 50 or 150 or 200 basic food commodities with wages. So, all through the Government, various agencies are doing the same thing, although one could do the whole job and transmit its findings to the others.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask a question right there.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is true there are duplications, and that there are many agencies that are overlapping in some of the work which is being performed, but I should like the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Tennessee to tell me why this particular agency was picked out for a reduction in its appropriations instead of some other?

Mr. McKELLAR. This was the first one before us; we did not have the others before us in this bill. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am undertaking to reduce all unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to read that one of the objectives is to study thrift.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My understanding is that the Senator from Tennessee prefers a little more thrift now and a little less study of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that would be wise. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the Scriptures back him up in his efforts, for therein is the injunction, "Avoid vain repetition."

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is fine to quote the Scriptures in this case, but if they were quoted more frequently in the Senate probably the country would be better off.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I should like to add to what the Senator from Maryland has said that last night I examined a statement filed for the Inland Steel Co. in connection with the application of their organized labor for an increase in wages, and there I found a most complete statement of wages in every line of industry in this country.

Mr. TYDINGS. By whom was it made? Was it made by the Labor Department?

Mr. REED. It was made by a professor of economics in the University of Chicago, and introduced on behalf of the Inland Steel Co., but it was a very complete statement based upon the research of the Bureau of Labor and the National Industrial Conference Board. Studies of that kind are being made all the time. Why in the world should this figurehead of a body that has performed no useful service that I have ever heard of, go ahead wasting their time and the taxpayers' money as has been pointed out by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Already they have made a report which is contained in a large volume which must have cost a great deal of money.

I quote further from Dr. Merriam. The Board would also investigate—

> The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care.

Each one is a duplication of research work that is now being made.

> 4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment, and accident.

I take it there cannot be any doubt that we have reports from various departments on each one of those items.

> 6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police.

At a time such as this, when we need money so badly to defend ourselves against the two most warlike nations that ever existed upon the face of the earth, I do not think we ought to be spending the Government's money for such purposes as to conduct research into "the right to come and go, to speak or to be silent." We ourselves ought to be the judges of such things.

> 7. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact.

That might be postponed for a little while. I am sure we should not appropriate the people's money for such a purpose at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. The next item is:

> 8. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness.

O Mr. President, how far are we to go in this research? Why should we spend the people's money on such research?

At first I thought it would be better to strike out the whole appropriation as unnecessary, but out of abundance of caution, so as not to do anything contrary to the best interests of the country, we reduced the appropriation, and I think what we have recommended should remain. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has anticipated what I was about to suggest. I think it would be very wholesome if a motion were made now to strike out the whole appropriation. Certainly a strong case has not been made for the appropriation. The activity is full of duplications and, after all, half a million dollars is not to be sneezed at.

Mr. McKELLAR. We cut the appropriation down to $400,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I entertain precisely the same thought the Senator from Maryland has expressed. Unless the chairman of the subcommittee, having the bill in charge, feels it unwise, I shall make the motion to strike out the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not do that. Whatever may be said of our committee and of any of its members, we have tried to do our conscientious, patriotic duty in eliminating expenditures which we regarded as unnecessary. I am sure there is not a man within the sound of my voice who has heard the debate today, who would not say that at least the reduction we have recommended should be agreed to. I hope the Senator from Kansas will go along with the committee, because we have tried to be conservative, we have tried to be reasonable, and we desire to do the right thing.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, let us vote on the amendment, and stop talking about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I shall be glad to have a vote, if the Senate is willing.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that, of course, I shall go along with the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. REED. I usually do. However, unless the committee thinks it unwise, I stand ready to make a motion to strike out the whole appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand the Senator's view about the matter, but I hope he will go along with the committee. I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, on page 5, line 4, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 5, line 4, after the word "expenses," to insert "not to exceed $50,000."

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Bankhead	Holman	Rosier
Barbour	Hughes	Russell
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brown	Kilgore	Smathers
Bulow	La Follette	Smith
Bunker	Lee	Spencer
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Taft
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Caraway	Maloney	Tunnell
Chandler	Maybank	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Wallgren
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, on page 5, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 5, line 14, after the word "laws", to strike out "$668,845" and insert "$400,000", a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MURDOCK (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Utah was called). It is with very deep and sincere regret that I announce the absence from the Senate today, of my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], because of the unexpected and sudden death of Mrs. Thomas last evening. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is detained on business of the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] on this question. If present, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 20, not voting 23, as follows:

YEAS—53

Andrews	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Gerry	Reed
Bailey	Gillette	Reynolds
Ball	Glass	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Shipstead
Barbour	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McKellar	Tobey
Capper	Maloney	Tunnell
Chandler	Maybank	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Vandenberg
Davis	Millikin	Van Nuys
Doxey	O'Daniel	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—20

Aiken	Hughes	Nye
Barkley	La Follette	Pepper
Bilbo	Lee	Rosier
Caraway	McFarland	Schwartz
Danaher	Murdock	Wallgren
Green	Murray	Wiley
Hill	Norris	

NOT VOTING—23

Bone	Guffey	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hayden	Truman
Brooks	Herring	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Wheeler
Connally	McNary	White
Downey	Overton	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 20, to strike out:

National-defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed $50, and not to exceed $100,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709, or classification laws, $400,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for printing and binding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Government Reports," on page 7, line 3, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$1,475,000" and insert "$1,075,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 8, after the word "binding", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$18,730."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

The appropriations herein made for the Office of Government Reports shall not be supplemented by funds from any source aggregating in excess of $600,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the end of line 13, to reduce the total appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, from $5,135,325 to $4,060,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 11, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$7,500"; in line 16, after the word "examinations" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed $130,356 for"; in line 18, after the word "Commission", to insert a comma and "and including actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of members of the Board of Legal Examiners serving as such while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States"; on page 12, line 17, after the word "stamps" and the semicolon, to strike out "$5,861,527" and insert "$5,000,000", and on page 13, line 14, after the word "force", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Legal Examiners created in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order No. 8743 of April 23, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 14, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed $412,020;", and in line 17, after the word "binding", to strike out "$7,491,908" and insert "$7,446,128."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, at the end of line 17, to reduce the total appropriation for the Civil Service Commission from $120,195,935 to $119,288,628.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 18, to strike out:

THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

The unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the "Conversion of inhabited alleys funds," established pursuant to the provisions of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, together with all accretions during the fiscal year 1943 to said fund under the provisions of said act and of the United States Housing Act of 1937, shall be available until June 30, 1943, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee make some explanation of the committee amendment beginning in line 19, on page 15, and ending in line 2, on page 16.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say, Mr. President, that I have a letter from the president of the Washington Housing Association expressing regret that this amendment was reported by the committee. Not having been present at the time the matter was discussed, I should be happy to have the Senator explain it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to give the facts about this matter. The

Senator from Wyoming will remember that the Alley Dwelling Authority was created several years ago, and has built a great many houses in alleys—about 85 in all, as I remember. I may be mistaken as to the number. Those buildings cost the Government $865,000—not quite $1,000,000. The Alley Dwelling Authority has completed its job, insofar as the alley dwellings are concerned. They are not building any more houses. They are collecting the rents and making repairs. After the committee had struck out this item, officers of the Alley Dwelling Authority came to the committee and made the statement that they would collect this year in the neighborhood of $50,000 rent, and they had on hand about $90,000. One of the arguments they made was that this work did not cost the Government anything at all. They said they did not know why the Congress should be interested in the matter because it did not cost the Government anything.

I asked one of the officers what he thought about the Government's interest in the $865,000 it had invested. He said he had not considered that. It is simply the case of the Authority having run away with the idea that it should have control of this matter, and that there is no use to interfere with it.

Mr. President, it developed, however, that there was a real necessity for the retention of three persons, I believe, one with a salary of about $2,500, and two others with salaries of $1,500 each. The Authority has one man actually in control of one apartment house, to whom they pay $1,500, and he ought to be retained. They have another apartment house in which a part-time man is kept. After discussing the matter with the officers of the Authority, it was thought that three men should be retained. I cannot say that the representatives of the Authority agreed, because they wanted to retain the whole business. They wanted to use $90,000 to collect, say, $60,000 in rents, but, in the opinion of the committee, that was not necessary. I think, however, that the committee probably should not have stricken out the whole provision but should have allowed for the three clerks, whose salaries will amount to about $5,500, and then the balance, amounting to $12,000 in all, for improvement, repairs, or matters of that kind. I am quite sure that would be satisfactory to everybody. While I am not authorized by the committee to offer this amendment, on my own behalf I should like to offer a substitute so that the collection of the rents may be carried on and they can be paid into the Treasury of the United States as general receipts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That seems to me to be quite satisfactory.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Did the representatives of the agency give any specific reasons why they thought they ought to have the unexpended balance, aside from the argument that the Government was not interested? Did they give any reasons?

Mr. McKELLAR. Their reason was that they had been doing some defense-housing work locally—surveying and other things—and they wanted to continue it. I do not know whether they can continue it, or whether they have the right to do so. However, if the amendment which I have suggested is agreed to, the rents can be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States as general receipts. That ought to be done. With the explanation I have made, I take the liberty of offering an amendment to take the place of the matter proposed to be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, after line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

For the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act, $12,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources after July 1, 1942, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the "Conversion of Inhabited Alleys Fund," established pursuant to such act, shall also be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. Do I correctly understand that the amendment just agreed to relates to the collection of rents on the buildings erected with the first $865,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the Alley Dwelling Authority has a great many operations not relating to that particular project and that it will require considerably more than $12,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The other activities will not be affected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission", on page 16, line 17, after the word "services", to insert a comma and "traveling expenses not to exceed $52,110"; on page 17, line 12, after the word "thereunder", to strike out "$2,300,000" and insert "$2,000,000", and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,401,500" and insert "$1,218,260."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 20, after the word "expenses", to insert a comma and "including not to exceed $112,140 for traveling expenses," and on page 18, line 10, after the word "binding", to strike out "$2,667,619."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, at the end of line 13, to reduce the total appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission from $4,991,219 to $4,678,759.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee who is the Goodwin Watson who is mentioned specifically on page 18?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are now considering committee amendments. The subject of the Senator's inquiry will not come up until later, if any Senator should care to bring it up. As I understand, the House inserted the provision referred to because of evidence that Mr. Watson was a Communist, and that the House had tried in other ways to get rid of him, but could not do so. It, therefore, inserted this provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish to go into the question out of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can consider it later. I have the record before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Loan Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 18, line 21, after the numerals "1939", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$241,575"; on page 19, line 1, after the word "periodicals" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers (not exceeding $500); not exceeding $1,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies or associations concerned with the furtherance of the work of the Agency, when specifically authorized by the Administrator;", and in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Electric Home and Farm Authority," on page 20, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$150,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand, the Electric Home and Farm Authority is in process of liquidation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. HILL. It has been in process of liquidation for 6 or 8 months, has it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. Mr. Jones, the head of this activity, has an amendment which I had intended to suggest if the committee amendment should be agreed to. The suggested amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That necessary expenses in collecting monthly installments on contracts and repossessing appliances in case of default, not to exceed $2.50 per year per contract, shall not be considered as administrative expenses.

Mr. HILL. That is the very matter about which I wished to ask the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I expect to offer that amendment when the matter comes up.

Mr. HILL. This agency has a surplus in its funds. It is not taking any money out of the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is just another one of those cases——

Mr. HILL. Is the statement as to a surplus true or not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is just another one of those cases in which the manager of an activity which is making money says, "We are paying our expenses out of our income. The Congress ought not to be bothered about that." In times like these we have to bother about such things in order to keep the Government running properly.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator. I think the Senator's suggested amendment would make it possible for this agency to collect the money which it is now collecting in a more businesslike and efficient way than without the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Jones prepared it, and I believe he is correct, because he is a very able businessman. That is the reason I intend to offer the amendment when we get to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 20, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 23, to strike out:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Export-Import Bank of Washington, administrative expenses: Not to exceed $270,535 of the funds of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, established as an agency of the Government by Executive Order No. 6581 of February 2, 1934, and continued as such agency until January 22, 1947, by the act approved January 31, 1935, as amended by the act of September 26, 1940 (Public, No. 792), shall be available during the fiscal year 1943 for all administrative expenses of the bank, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding, lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $500 for periodicals, newspapers, and maps; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; not to exceed $25,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations for special services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; transfer of household goods and effects, as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; rent in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the bank or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Home Loan Bank Board", on page 22, line 11, before the word "travel", to insert "not to exceed $189,000 for"; on page 23, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,500,938" and insert "$1,250,000"; and in line 15, after the word "hereof" and the colon, to strike out "*Provided further*, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1421–1449)" and insert "*Provided further*, That such sum shall be so apportioned and distributed by the Board over the fiscal year 1943, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year, as to (1) constitute the total amount that will be required for such expenses during such fiscal year and (2) prevent expenditures which will necessitate making additional sums available for such expenses during such year; and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the Board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Housing Administration", on page 24, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,041,343" and insert "$14,621,499"; and in line 19, after the word "elsewhere", to insert "not to exceed $759,376 for."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment on page 24, line 8, which reduces the total amount of money appropriated for the Federal Housing Administration by some $400,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to explain it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to talk to the Senator about that amendment, in connection with the amendment in line 19 on the same page, and also the amendment on page 26, line 14.

I have no desire to oppose the amendment in lines 8 and 9 on page 24, where the total amount of the appropriation has been reduced; but I think that the reduction has been made in the wrong place, according to the information which I have received from the Federal Housing Administration.

The Senator will observe that in line 19 on page 24 there is a provision that not to exceed $759,376 for traveling expenses shall be appropriated out of the $14,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. We made a 20-percent reduction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The Federal Housing Administration advises me that while it would be greatly handicapped if a 20-percent reduction were made, a 10-percent reduction would not seriously interfere with its activities, for this reason: The Senator realizes that Congress has by law increased the per diem allowance for subsistence from $5 to $6. Also the Interstate Commerce Commission has authorized a 10-percent increase in railroad fares, which must be paid by those who travel for this agency as well as by others.

The Housing Administration feels that it can save enough in other places in its appropriation to avoid asking for the restoration of the House figure, but that the attempt of the committee to save out of traveling expenses would handicap it because of the increase in the per diem subsistence allowance made by Congress and because of the increase in railroad fares under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I was about to suggest to the Senator that, instead of the $759,376, which would represent a 20-percent reduction, he agree to a figure of $854,296, which would represent a 10-percent reduction. It would not result in an increase of the total appropriation, but it would take into account the increase in the per diem allowance and also the increase in the railroad rates necessarily paid by those who travel. I think that would be a fair adjustment of the matter. I hope the Senator from Tennessee may accept the suggestion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have consolidated 8 or 10 housing agencies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Sixteen of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were 8 or 10 large ones, and some smaller ones. Undoubtedly they ought to be able to get along with less travel pay and less expenses of all kinds. That consolidation took place after the bill was under consideration. We could let the matter go to conference and have the head of the department come before us. If there is a real reason for not making the proposed reduction, perhaps some other arrangement can be made; but rather than have this item put in jeopardy in conference, it would be better to let it go in as it is.

There is another reason: The Senator understands that every department and agency of the Government is objecting to any reduction of its travel pay. They are objecting to any reduction in what the House has allowed them, or what they have heretofore been receiving. So we want to treat all alike; and I do not think we should undertake to make distinctions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the House has passed a bill, purely for war purposes, increasing from $300,000,000 to $800,000,000 the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans. That has been done in order to induce the utilization of private capital for the building of houses in defense areas, in order that the Government itself will not have to build such houses.

I have before me a letter from the city of Henderson, Ky., where a defense plant is located. The situation there is only typical of the situation elsewhere. Nearly 200 families will be brought into Henderson because of the defense plant located there. There is not a vacant house in Henderson to house any of the 200 families. Someone has to build the needed houses. We do not want the Government to do that if it can be avoided. The House has passed a bill—and I think tomorrow the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency will report it to the Senate—increasing by $500,000,000 the authority of the Federal Housing Administration—purely for war purposes; we should keep that in mind. That will not mean taking any money out of the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the Federal Housing Administration has been one of the agencies which have made

money. It has turned back and is turning back money into the Treasury. It does not pay out any money from the Treasury. It does not build houses; it insures.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it has paid any money back into the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure about the bookkeeping. At any rate, the Federal Housing Administration is making a profit from its operations. It insures the loans. It does not invest any money in building houses.

In order to accommodate the influx of population in defense areas, so declared by the Government of the United States, it is desirable to induce the investment of private capital in the construction of houses in scores of communities throughout the country in order to take care of defense housing problems. The House has passed a bill, which I think will be reported tomorrow by the Committee on Banking and Currency, increasing by $500,000,000 the authority of the Federal Housing Administration—not the United States Housing Authority, but the F. H. A., with which all of us are familiar. In other words, the bill makes provision for it to insure the construction of houses, for war purposes only, to the extent of $500,000,000 more than it now has the authority to insure.

Of course, I do not know what the Senate will do with that bill, but I presume the Senate will pass it. The bill was passed practically unanimously by the House, and I think it will be reported to the Senate tomorrow.

If the bill is passed, it will mean that the Federal Housing Administration will have to increase by about 160 percent its operations in the insurance of housing facilities in the country. Of course, that will mean that it will have to widen its activities. I realize that a lump sum of nine-hundred-thousand-odd dollars, which is the amount which the Bureau of the Budget recommended in this bill for travel expenses, sounds like a very large amount; and yet the Federal Housing Administration must bring information to the residents of communities and cities, as well as to private capital which we are seeking to induce to enter upon the construction of houses in the defense areas so that we shall not have to provide money out of the Treasury for the construction of such houses.

In view of the increase we have made in the allowance for per diem subsistence—an increase from $5 a day to $6 a day, which is a 20-percent increase—and in view of the increased cost of transportation throughout the country, it seems to me that a compromise of a 10-percent reduction is fair. Either that must be done or the agencies must make an unusual curtailment in the traveling expenses of their agents and representatives. Such men must go to the various communities and take information to the people interested in housing projects. Among all the agencies which have been set up by the Government, I think the Federal Housing Administration has been one of the most useful and successful. It is not now costing the Government anything out-of-pocket. It is paying its own way. The proposed reduction would really amount to a reduction in the amount which the Federal Housing Administration might spend out of its own revenue, and not out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has fallen into the same error into which all the bureaus have fallen. They say that if they are in charge of an activity which is making money there is no cost to the Government. They contend that they are making money and that they should be free to spend what they please out of it. I cannot agree to that argument.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do no accept that suggestion.

I know how easy it is to condemn someone by calling him a bureaucrat. I do not think the officials of the Federal Housing Administration can be brought within that category. I am now talking only about the item for traveling expenses. I know that in my own State—and I presume every Senator knows this to be true as to his own State—from the beginning until now it has been necessary for the Federal Housing Administration to bring information to the attention of those who are interested in the construction of houses. In the first place, information had to be brought to those who desired to build houses. They had to be told how they could proceed—borrow the money from a bank or from some lending institution which in turn would be insured by the Federal Housing Administration against losses of certain types. Operating under that cooperative plan of the F. H. A., the banks, and the individuals, they got into the business of construction of houses.

All of that requires education; it requires personal contacts; it requires a description of the plan—not only or necessarily by pamphlets and advertisements in newspapers but by little group meetings which are being held and were held and may again be held in communities, especially communities in the defense areas; I know of scores of communities in which are being built plants for the construction and manufacture of tanks, airplanes, powder, synthetic rubber, and other commodities necessary for winning this war—communities in which, in order to induce the utilization of private capital for the building of such houses, it is necessary to advise the persons interested in undertaking such construction of the procedure, of their rights, and of the results of their operations. Otherwise, the Government will have to pay for the building of such houses, and we shall be called upon for an appropriation for that purpose.

I think it is extremely desirable that private capital be induced to enter that construction field; and that is what the item under discussion is intended to facilitate.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The Senator has overlooked another necessity for travel expenses; and that is that when houses are built the loans have to be insured by the Government, and before they are built an inspector must go out to see that the site selected is in a proper part of town, so that the risk will be a safe one. Also inspectors are required to ascertain that the houses have been built. So a very large part of the expense is directly incurred in protection of the Government in its capacity as an insurer of loans in connection with the building of such houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly that is true. Let me point out an example. A few moments ago I mentioned Henderson, Ky., where a year ago the Government located an ammonia plant, to be built by the Allied Chemical & Dye Co., and to be paid for out of the funds of the United States Government, under a contract. As I say, the plant will be operated by the Allied Chemical & Dye Co. Henderson is a city of approximately 20,000 persons. The plant was located there because Henderson is close to the coal fields. The coal is carried in barges down the Ohio River and unloaded on the banks of the river. The site selected was chosen because of the easy access to the plant itself. The ammonia is made from a certain type of coal, which is obtained in eastern Kentucky and in western West Virginia.

It was located there because of its proximity to the raw materials and because of the cheap transportation; but that community was not prepared to house the extra employees to be brought there in order to operate this institution.

Under the housing bill which is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is to meet tomorrow on that bill, if they report it, $500,000,000 could be added to the insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration. Obviously, its employees will have to do more traveling in order to inspect these housing facilities and in order to carry them on.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. In order to provide the insurance that they have been providing heretofore, and in view of the increased possibility of activity on the part of the F. H. A., it seems to me that a 10-percent reduction is not an unreasonable figure on the side either of the committee or of the F. H. A. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think if the Senator's premise were correct, his reasoning would be unanswerable, but I do not believe the Senator has the true picture of the increased activities of the Federal Housing Authority.

The Federal Government has stopped all private building. The priorities situation has interfered with the building of new homes. One has to obtain priorities before he can secure material with which to build a new home.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does not apply to any of these defense areas, though.

Mr. TYDINGS. As a matter of fact, the evidence shows that there is less building going on in the United States today, notwithstanding defense home building, with the private building of

homes being curtailed, than there was with the building of private homes going at full blast a year or two ago, and there was no defense housing activity in the picture.

So I do not believe the Senator's conception of the facts is an accurate one. If what he said were true, and presented a true picture, naturally there would be greater need for travel allowance, but the fact is that when individual or a group of small individuals' homes were insured in this or that locality, it took more inspection, because there was no uniformity to the operation, whereas when the Government enters on a housing proposition there is a certain amount of uniformity about it, and when one house is insured on an approved plan they are all insured, because they are more or less all the same, whether as to facade, chimney, windows or what not. So that private building per se, the building of homes for civilian populations in New York or Buffalo or Baltimore or Washington or wherever it may be, is practically at a standstill; but there is a great deal of building of homes in defense areas where they are needed. Therefore, as there are fewer homes being built than under the former dispensation, it stands to reason that there is less money needed for travel mileage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is true, as the Senator has said, that the activities of the War Production Board have curtailed the building of private houses by private individuals, as a rule, but that very situation has been brought about because of the necessity of building more houses in some communities in order to shelter persons who are engaged in national defense work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it might be more in keeping with the facts to say that a part of it has been caused by the building of defense homes. The real reason for the shortage in the building of private homes is that wiring, certain forms of steel, heating plants, and many other items that go into private homes, are no longer available to the purchasing public, but are only available in defense activities. That is the reason the building of private homes has been curtailed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may have been too all-inclusive in my suggestion that the reason why we have curtailed the building of houses for private individuals is to concentrate upon the building of houses in defense areas, and I accept the suggestion that at least it is in part due to that situation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, with reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland, I should like to state that in certain communities one cannot get nails with which to build ordinary necessary structures even on the farm.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not dispute that at all; there is no controversy upon that point, but there is one thing I do not think any of us can deny and that is that in the areas where plants have been constructed or are now under construction for the production of war materials, where the local housing facilities are not sufficient to accommodate the people who will be brought there to manufacture indispensable war materials, either private capital must build the houses or the Government of the United States must build them.

We cannot establish in a particular location a $30,000,000 plant for the manufacture of TNT or powder or aluminum or tanks or anything else and put people out on the streets; they have got to have housing accommodations. If such accommodations do not exist in the community, they must be built by someone, and there are only two sources from which the money can be derived to build such housing accommodations: One is the Government of the United States—and we want to avoid that, if it is possible—and the other is private capital.

While it is true that building has been curtailed and almost completely eliminated for ordinary purposes throughout the country, I think we are bound to admit that building facilities must be accelerated in the communities where there is a new defense activity moving—where a factory is to be established. I have in mind several places——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. I have in mind several places—one of two in the State of Tennessee, one or two in the State of Kentucky, and one or two in the State of Mississippi—where because of the geographical location, transportation, and other considerations there have been established very extensive plants for the manufacture of certain products necessary to the war. Such plants are being erected in communities where there are absolutely no housing facilities whatever; some of them in communities in rural sections where, in the nearest town proximate to the location, there must be additional housing facilities provided. We must either build them by the Government or offer some inducement to private capital to construct them. This is one of the ways. While the housing agencies have been consolidated, construction of houses by private capital in these defense areas is yet under the jurisdiction of the Federal Housing Administration, in order to avoid expenditure out of the Treasury, so that their activities have not only not been curtailed but will be increased. That is why the Congress is, in the next few days, going to pass a bill increasing their authority to insure housing loans by about $500,000,000. It is obviously necessary that the representatives of the Federal Housing Administration should go into those communities to contact personally those who will be interested in putting their own money into such housing. Therefore, I do not think that a 20-percent decrease in the traveling expenses of these employees is justified, but I do think that a 10-percent reduction would be fair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to state two things to the Senator. First, under the priorities now being enforced by the War Production Board, even the building of a high school has been prohibited for the time being because of the lack of steel and other commodities which the Government needs more vitally for the war effort. I know that to be true. The second thing I should like to say to the Senator is that if we adopt his amendment and go to conference the margin which the conferees can consider will be between no reduction and a 10-percent reduction; but if we take the committee amendment and go to conference, the margin before the conferees will be between the committee's 20 percent and nothing.

I wish to say to the Senator that, as one of the conferees, if the Federal housing bill shall come before us, as I assume it will, and if more mileage money is needed than the committee amendment provides, I shall be glad to support an increase; but with private building stopped pretty much over the country because of the shortage of furnaces, of electric wiring, nails, and other materials, I do not believe, in the total picture, as much building will be done for the whole Nation as was done before we had the priority system, which made building material not available. I will be glad to carry out that agreement in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize, of course, that there is a wider margin in conference where there is a 20-percent reduction than where there is a 10-percent reduction, but I wish the Senator would keep in mind that this suggestion in no way changes the reduction in the total amount. The Federal Housing Administration feel that while they can undergo a saving of four-hundred-odd thousand dollars, it has been provided in the wrong place.

The Senate committee has recommended a reduction of the appropriation of $15,041,343 provided by the House to $14,621,499, and out of this item has provided that not to exceed $759,376 may be paid for traveling expenses; and another item, on page 26, involving $180,000, has been stricken out. The officials of the Housing Authority say they can make saving enough somewhere else to take care of the reduction without a total increase in the appropriation that has been provided by the committee.

I wish the Senator from Tennessee and other members of the committee would accept the suggestion and take it to conference. It does not involve any total increase; it merely involves a shift of the saving in the two items in the bill to some other activity in which they can make up enough in savings to take care of the increase I have suggested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Ferguson, the head of this activity came to see me about the matter and told me frankly what the Senator has stated here today. By the way, I wish to say for Mr. Ferguson that he is one of the most pleasant gentlemen I ever met.

Mr. BARKLEY. And a very competent administrator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I imagine he is. I should judge so from the way he talked and the way he acted. He seemed to be a very conservative man and a very reasonable man. I was impressed with him.

The best way to handle this matter is to let it go to conference, and let us work it out there; and I told Mr. Ferguson that if it came to a vote in the Senate and the Senate voted against it, the conferees' hands would be tied. If it goes to conference as it is, their hands will not be tied, but we can work out a reasonable proposal between the two Houses. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky, as the majority leader, to let the provision go as it is, and let us work out a reasonable proposal.

I was very much impressed with the attitude, with the demeanor, with the ability, and with the sincerity of purpose of Mr. Ferguson. I am rather inclined to think that there was something in what he had to say, but I think the matter should go to conference, and I wish the Senator would let it take that course.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Kentucky made the statement a moment ago that a bill with regard to housing would soon be presented before the Senate. He had reference, of course, to the F. H. A. bill about to be reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The hearings on that bill have just been completed. The committee will meet tomorrow morning, and every reasonable effort will be made to expedite the passage of the bill.

The members of the committee have become convinced from the hearings that the necessity for the building of houses is imperative. It is useless to employ workers if there are not suitable and convenient homes in which they can live with adequate transportation facilities. Some of the large industrial plants now being built, like the one in Michigan, for instance, are built on the prairies, and it is absolutely essential that houses for that plant should be erected and should be erected quickly, preferably by private, not public, funds. I think it would be a pity for the Senate to impose any unnecessary restrictions. I am satisfied that Mr. Blandford, Mr. Ferguson, and their associates are going to be careful and efficient in these matters, and I certainly would not at this time impose any restrictions which are not obviously necessary.

Whether the Housing Authority will have to spend a large amount or a small amount for traveling, I do not know, and no one else can know at this moment, but we must realize that the Housing Administration has a big problem to work out. Their problem is a vital one, and they must get to work on it as quickly and effectively as possible.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and who is practically in charge of the proposed legislation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am in charge of the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his remarks, because he confirms what I suggested a moment ago, that in all probability that bill will be reported tomorrow by the committee, and I think it will pass the Senate. It will increase the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans by about $500,000,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Tennessee and of the Senator from Maryland. I always like to support the action of a committee when I can. I feel that that is my duty here, so far as I can do it; but when I am brought face to face with a situation such as that now confronting us, I realize that no person has the last word, that no one is infallible, and that no committee is infallible on this subject.

If the Senator from Tennessee will accept the amendment—I am in a compromising mood—while I personally should prefer the $854,000 instead of $759,000, because it involves no increase, that representing a 10-percent decrease instead of the 20 percent carried by the committee, without taking time to figure out the exact amount in dollars, would the Senator accept a 15-percent reduction, instead of 20 percent?

Mr. McKELLAR. Personally, I should have no objection to that. Is the chairman of the committee agreeable to the suggestion?

Mr. GLASS. We are spending the difference in talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to insert the exact figure, which we can supply a moment later, I suggest the amendment.

Would the Senator be willing to agree to an amendment on page 26, where the committee has eliminated altogether $180,000 where I had suggested that $100,000 be substituted instead?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is for propaganda purposes; it is for advertising. I do not know why this instrumentality of the Government should engage in that activity. We will take it to conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Eighty thousand dollars of it would go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. When we get a little further on in the bill we will find what "public relations" really means. "Public relations" means a propaganda service for certain officials. I hope the Senator will not make a request for that. I am willing to accept the 15 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee has made a hundred percent reduction in this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. It should be that; the activity never should have been permitted. The idea of the Housing Authority having to spend $180,000 for advertising what it is doing. It is a wasteful extravagance, and it should not be allowed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee has eliminated in the amendment on page 26 $50,000 which has been allocated by law to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been allocated by law; the money has to be appropriated, and our committee did not agree to appropriate it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Fifty thousand dollars has been carried in the appropriations to enable the Bureau of Standards to make investigations and standardize projects under the Federal Housing Administration, upon the request of the Administrator. So that would still leave only $50,000 available, instead of $180,000, for carrying on educational work in the District of Columbia by the F. H. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Educational work. It is nothing in the world but propaganda and advertising.

Mr. BARKLEY. "Propaganda" is a broad term.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps "advertising" is not so broad.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator and I indulge in a good deal of propaganda when we go out into the country and make speeches for something in which we believe.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are indulging in some now.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difference is that the Senator's propaganda and my propaganda are always wise and legitimate and proper, whereas propaganda on the part of others may be questioned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was about to point out to the Senator from Kentucky that this matter should go to conference, for the reason, as he himself has stated—and I think he is well within the facts—that the principal part of the building that is to be done hereafter is to be defense building, in connection with defense plants. It is really a governmental activity. The need for propaganda and the need for advertising, which existed before the war, when private individuals were building homes, and we wanted to encourage home building, has disappeared. So that $180,000 is not needed to tell the people about it today, because they cannot get the materials with which to build, even if we should tell them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland having agreed to the 15-percent proposition in the other amendment, if this amendment shall go to conference with the $180,000 for information and educational purposes, will Mr. Ferguson and other representatives of the F. H. A. be permitted to present the matter to the conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be very glad to have them do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I, myself, might desire to go before the committee in an informal way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to have the matter handled in that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that understanding, I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think it is a good idea that the conferees get together on these items, because I am sure, from what I have learned of the situation, that our conception of education and propaganda is entirely erroneous. The educational work the Housing Administration is doing is very essential, and directly connected with the national defense, because of priority orders and limitations and restrictions on construction of homes. The Housing Administration is educating the people on the construction of homes by the use of substitute materials and equipment not within the banned categories. I believe they are doing an excellent job, and, in view of the fact that they turned over a surplus of $13,000,000 as a result of their educational work, I believe they really should be encouraged.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Federal Housing Administration has done a good job in the matter of educating the people, and coming in contact with them. It is not propaganda in the disagreeable and offensive sense in which we use that term. We know that the average person, even the average bank, the average lending agency in this country, does not know all the intricacies and the finesse of cooperating in the making of these loans. Many of them do now, because of experience in the operation of the F. H. A. It is not an offensive effort; the Federal Housing Administration is not going out with a lot of ballyhoo in an attempt to sell insurance on loans. It is merely educating people as to their rights and banks as to their obligations and the way in which they can cooperate to facilitate these housing activities.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief two-page résumé of the activities of the Federal Housing Administration on these two points, as well as the reasons advanced for retaining at least a part of the appropriation proposed by the committee to be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A competent information service is essential to the effective functioning of the Federal Housing Administration, now engaged chiefly in providing housing for workers in war industries.

This is especially true at this time, when the Federal Housing Administration program is expected to provide the bulk of the 200,000 houses recently allocated by the War Production Board for construction by private industry with private capital.

At this very moment the Senate is about to begin consideration of the bill, already passed unanimously by the House, to enable the Federal Housing Administration to put this war housing program into effect through title VI of the National Housing Act.

This bill is designed to encourage the production of thousands of houses for war workers by private industry and private capital operating under the Federal Housing Administration program without further burdening the Treasury at this time.

Yet, if the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee is sustained, the Federal Housing Administration would be unable to spend, out of its own revenue, one nickel to inform the country how to make use of this vitally important measure. Nor would such action save any money for the Government's war expenditure, since the funds involved would not revert to the Treasury but would simply be tied up in the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, of which the Government, through the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner, is only the custodian.

It should be borne in mind that the National Housing Act is not self-operating. It has no compulsory features. The Federal Housing Administration cannot compel anyone to operate within the provisions of the act. Its successful operation depends upon the wholly voluntary cooperation of all elements in the home-construction industry, in home financing, and by the public generally. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain this cooperation without continuing information and educational work so that those who use the law may be kept informed of action by Congress on amendments and of changes in rules, regulations, and policy, especially under the rapidly fluctuating conditions of the war.

The Public Relations and Educational Divisions were set up as the most effective and economical means of carrying on this necessary work. They are expending their energies, not in broadcasting high-pressure selling ballyhoo but entirely in the preparation and dissemination of information deemed necessary to the successful administration of the acts of Congress.

These two Divisions save money for the Administration for two principal reasons:

1. They concentrate the preparation and dissemination of information in the hands of trained experts and thus relieve other officials who, because of their lack of experience, probably would do it less competently.

2. By placing proper information before interested groups, particularly builders and home-financing institutions, they eliminate, at the source, much unnecessary work, especially in the submission of faulty applications which have to be rejected. (Rejected applications are always costly to the Administration.)

The Federal Housing Administration is an organization with 4,500 employees and some $5,000,000,000 of insurance on its books. An agency of such dimensions within the Government, doing business in every part of the United States, cannot hermetically seal itself against public inquiry. Even if all further expansion were suspended for the duration of the war, questions about it would be asked constantly, and the best facility for answering such questions is a trained informational service of the kind maintained by the Federal Housing Administration, which costs less than 1 percent of the Federal Housing Administration's budget.

Mr. MEAD. I feel sure that the appropriations will be retained, in some part, at least, if the agreement suggested by the majority leader shall be carried out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on page 24, line 19, I submit an amendment to the committee amendment, to strike out "$759,376" and to insert in lieu thereof "$806,837."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the committee amendment on page 24, in lines 8 and 9, has not as yet been disposed of. When that shall have been agreed to, the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment will be in order.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 24, lines 8 and 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment on page 24, line 19.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "$759,376" and insert in lieu thereof "$806,837."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 14, after "(12 U. S. C. 1701", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That not exceeding $180,000 of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the amount made available hereby for administrative expenses may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards to carry out specific projects of the Administration, upon the request of the Administrator, for studies of the properties and suitability of building materials with particular reference to their use in low-cost and low-rent housing, including the construction of such experimental structures as may be necessary therefor, and for printing, binding, and disseminating the results of such studies" and insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for the purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation", on page 27, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$450,443" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home Owners' Loan Corporation", on page 29, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,153,712" and insert "$12,000,000"; in line 9, after the word "thereunder", to insert "not to exceed $580,000 for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 6, after the word "hereof" and the colon, to strike out "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the amount made available hereby for administrative expenses may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards to carry out specific projects of the Corporation, upon its request, for studies of the properties and suitability of building materials, with particular reference to their use in low-cost and low-rent housing, including the construction of such experimental structures as may be necessary therefor,

and for printing, binding, and disseminating the results of such studies: *Provided further*, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461–1468)" and insert "*Provided further*, That such sum shall be so apportioned and distributed by the Board of Directors of the Corporation over the fiscal year 1943, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year, as to (1) constitute the total amount that will be required for such expenses during such fiscal year and (2) prevent expenditures which will necessitate making additional sums available for such expenses during such year; and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the Board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665): *Provided further*, That no part of the amount made available hereby for administrative expenses may be used for the maintenance of regional offices."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understood, with reference to the amendment on page 30, the Chief Clerk was reciting the proposed committee amendment to strike out beginning in line 6 and ending in line 21. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, Mr. President, the next question would be on agreeing to the committee amendment commencing in line 21, on page 30, down to and including line 10 on page 31, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Am I correct in understanding that we have not yet acted on the language proposed to be inserted in the proposed amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action has been taken on that language.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 30 beginning in line 9 and ending in line 10 on page 31 was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. As I read that proposed matter to be inserted, commencing in line 21, on page 30, down to and including the word "year", in line 3, page 31, it is a portion which may be divisible properly from the remaining portion, commencing in line 3, page 31, with the words "and a failure", down to and including line 10, on page 31. Is the language proposed to be inserted divisible?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the amendment is subject to amendment, and any portion of that language can be stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. I then make a point of order against so much of the language as appears on page 31, beginning in line 3, and which reads—

and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665)—

on the ground that it comprises legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, that is the point of order I make. I respectfully ask that the Chair not rule on the point of order at this time, but that action by the Chair be deferred until we shall have concluded the other committee amendments in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to that part of the language which was read by the Senator from Connecticut being stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the Chair not rule, if it may appropriately withhold a ruling, until the Senate shall have acted on the other committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I am concerned, I am willing that the language read by the Senator be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that is the point the Senator from Connecticut makes——

Mr. DANAHER. That is the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And if there is no objection by the Senator from Tennessee to that language being stricken out, the language will be stricken out.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Chair prefers to act at this time, very well; but I was simply asking that the Chair defer making the ruling at this time, until the remaining committee amendments shall have been acted upon. I wanted to have the point of order noted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment is amended by striking out the language read by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and, without objection, the committee amendment, as amended is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reconstruction Finance Corporation," on page 31, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,335,292" and insert "$10,310,792"; in line 20, after "(5 U. S. C. 821–833)" to insert "not to exceed $207,000"; and in line 22, after the word "reference", to strike out the comma and "and not to exceed $1,500 for periodicals and newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 33, line 1, after the word "including", to insert "not to exceed $166,500 for"; in line 15, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$2,303,125" and insert "$2,000,000", and in line 16, before the words "shall be", to strike out "$1,217,500" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 10, after the name "Federal Power Commission", to strike out "$2,506,265" and insert "$2,203,140."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, at the end of line 4, to reduce the total appropriation for the Federal Power Commission from $3,067,520 to $2,764,395.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission", on page 35, line 13, after the word "rentals", to insert "not to exceed $124,380 for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "Act", to strike out "$2,252,224" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, at the end of line 3, to reduce the total appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission from $2,302,474 to $2,050,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Public Buildings Administration", on page 38, line 10, after the word "services", to insert "not to exceed $225,000 for"; in line 11, after the words "traveling expenses", to strike out "including expenses (not exceeding $1,000) of employees directed by the Federal Works Administrator to attend meetings of technical and professional societies and educational exhibits in connection with subjects related to the work of the Public Buildings Administration"; on page 39, line 2, after the word "dissolution", to strike out "$1,226,540" and insert "$1,000,000", and in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$707,090" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 7, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$17,656,500" and insert "$19,656,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Elimination of grade crossings", on page 48, line 3, after the word "crossings", to strike out "$22,000,000" and insert "$16,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 7, to strike out:

PUBLIC-LANDS HIGHWAYS

For the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, under the provisions of the act of June 24, 1930 (23 U. S. C. 3), $500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is a part of the sum authorized for the fiscal year 1943 by section 7 of the act of September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 869).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, at the end of line 3, to reduce the total

appropriation for the Public Roads Administration, from $88,500,000 to $82,700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Housing Authority", on page 49, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,526,930" and insert "$4,277,132"; on page 50, line 6, after the word "elsewhere" and the semicolon, to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed $243,993"; in line 6, before the word "transfer", to strike out "purchase of two passenger-carrying automobiles"; in line 11, after the word "appliances", to strike out the semicolon and "not to exceed $5,000 for the purchase and exchange of lawbooks and other books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; not to exceed $2,500 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, at meetings or conventions concerned with the work of the Authority; not to exceed $15,000 for the preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; not to exceed $25,000 for employing persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, for special reporting, engineering, technical, legal, and other services determined necessary by the Administrator, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and in line 24, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(a) the amount used by the Authority in connection with its informational service functions, including press and related activities, photographic displays, exhibits, and other educational or descriptive pamphlets or materials, printing, binding, and reproduction of materials involving informational service functions, shall not exceed $90,000, and (b)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 7, after the figures "$120,000", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the committee amendment on page 51, beginning in line 7, and reading as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions.

It will be noted from the committee amendment on page 50, beginning with line 24 and ending on line 5 on page 51, to which the Senate has just agreed, that the House had appropriated $90,000 for the purpose of informational services. In addition to disposing, as it were, of the funds for this informational service, the amendment which is now under discussion further provides that no funds herein appropriated can be used to give any informational service. I am just wondering why it is that the committee saw fit to select the United States Housing Authority for such treatment, and did not put in a like provision similarly affecting the T. V. A., the R. F. C., the H. O. L. C., the S. E. C., and other like organizations?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will notice that in line 4, page 51, there was no limitation at all put on the $90,000, and the whole provision was stricken out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but that $90,000 was to be used to maintain the informational service now in existence. Now you have dispensed with that service, and I am not quarreling about it.

Mr McKELLAR. There is no limitation on it. So we will have to put some limitation on it beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Mr. ELLENDER. But you are not putting any limitation on it. You have prevented it altogether by eliminating the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment, if any other department of Government desires information from the United States Housing Authority, that information cannot be furnished by the Housing Authority if it is to be publicized at all. It will simply mean that any department which desires information from the United States Authority will be obliged to send its own forces to get the information.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not see why such a limitation should be imposed, especially in view of the fact that the $90,000 that was utilized in the past for those informational services has been entirely stricken from the bill. I do hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, beginning in line 7.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say a word or two about the amendment. With respect to the $90,000 which was stricken out, the United States Housing Authority could have used any amount it pleased, or it could have used all of it for information service. Information service does not mean information. It means publicity. The Congress some time ago provided a limitation on publicity. Up to that time every activity or agency of the Government was setting up a publicity division. They all had publicity divisions. I think without exception one of the first things an agency did was to establish a publicity division. That proceeding became very unpopular, and they changed the name to "informational division." It is precisely the same thing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator unwittingly made a statement which the language in the bill does not altogether support. The Senator said that there was no limitation on the amount of money herein appropriated which might be spent for informational services. As a matter of fact, if he will read, commencing in line 7, the proviso says:

Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions.

That means that none of it may be used for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is just the point I was making. Suppose some other department of Government should desire to obtain information from the United States Housing Authority, and that the United States Housing Authority should use its own force to obtain the information. As I understand the amendment, that information could not be publicized by the department desiring it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, it could. If the Senator has an amendment which will make it absolutely certain beyond peradventure that the Housing Authority may give information when called upon to do so, that is all right but there should be no publicity.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Maryland has just pointed out, the language is as plain as it could be:

Provided further, That no part of the funds made available under this paragraph shall be used for informational service functions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit, I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the Senator knows, the 16 housing agencies, of which the U. S. H. A. is one, have been consolidated. They have not been completely transferred, but there is a movement on foot to transfer them. The President has issued an order, and we are hoping that some time the actual transfer will take place.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the transfers have virtually been made.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is not correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, United States Housing activities are under the National Housing Authority at present, and the United States Housing Authority is one of the few agencies which will be retained in order to carry out the functions of the National Housing Authority.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am attempting to tell the Senator is that the actual transfer has not as yet taken place. The committee of which I happen to be chairman was appointed by the Senate to make inquiry into housing, outside the Executive order. The work of transferring the agencies cannot be done by the stroke of a pen. It requires a great deal of relocation of functions and reallocation of work, floor space, and so forth. I am not saying that in a critical way, but one of the agencies which has temporarily, at least, stopped taking on new work is the United States Housing Authority. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is, it has stopped taking on new work under the original act, because of lack of funds.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The agency itself is now being used by the National Housing Authority for the purpose of carrying on defense housing throughout the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot quite agree with that statement. Of course, what it has already done must be administered. Payments to the municipalities over a period of 60 years must be made, and collections from the municipalities must come back. The point I am making is that its field for new work is temporarily at a standstill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The United States Housing Authority is now completing 85,000 units which are in process of construction.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, as I have just pointed out, the agency is being used by the National Housing Authority to build defense housing throughout the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am trying to say to the Senator is that it has been interested in providing defense housing rather than slum clearance housing, which was its original function. It has been utilized, along with the Farm Security Administration and every other housing activity, to provide houses quickly in communities which need them; but its normal functions are now at a standstill. Therefore, the need to go out and sell this idea to the communities of the United States during this emergency does not exist. It would be a waste of money to appropriate such a sum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why was it necessary, then, for the committee to strike from the bill on page 51 the $90,000 which was set aside for the purpose of establishing the informational service? That is what was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly. We wanted to save the $90,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, it is sought to prevent the agency from using any of the remaining appropriation which we are now making to give out information which may be publicized.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the object.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if Mr. Mellett desires to obtain information on the United States Housing for publicity purposes, as I understand the amendment, that information cannot be furnished by the office force of the Housing Authority.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; let me explain. When this agency was engaged in its normal activities it became necessary to publicize its plan, and to explain, in pamphlets, over the radio, through motion pictures, and otherwise, how it proposed to work. Temporarily all its original function has been arrested. It has been devoted primarily to defense housing, and not to slum clearance per se, as was envisioned in the beginning. Therefore it is not necessary to tell Baltimore, Detroit, or New Orleans about the old plan for the time being; and it not being necessary, the committee wants to save the $90,000. That is all that is involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we not saving it when we delete it from the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is strange. Whenever an appropriation bill came up in the past for the maintenance of this agency, has not the committee set aside a specific sum for informational service?

Mr. TYDINGS. We have done so in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House did so in this case. The House set aside $90,000 for that purpose. The Senate has been asked to delete it. We have deleted it and thereby reduced the appropriation in the sum of $90,000. In addition, what you are now suggesting under the amendment which I am challenging, as I read it, is that "not one single dime of the rest of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of giving information which will be later used by the newspapers, or for other publicity purposes."

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The Senator is not well informed on the subject. The intention, as is clearly shown by the testimony, is that the head of the U. S. H. A. may furnish Mr. Mellett with any statistics which he wants; but this money may not be used by the head of the U. S. H. A. to print his own pamphlets and disseminate them to the public.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose he should desire to give an interview to a newspaper which wanted to obtain some information and——

Mr. TYDINGS. He could give an interview. That would not cost anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose it should become necessary for the employees of U. S. H. A. to obtain facts which the newspaper desired. Could any funds be utilized to give such information?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Let me say to the Senator that this amendment was reported more than a week ago. Has the Senator received any complaint? Every other agency has complained when its appropriation has been reduced. This is one of the very few which has not complained. In the case of other agencies whose appropriations have been reduced 25 cents, their representatives have been around to see why the reduction was made. So far as I know, there has not been any complaint with respect to this item.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; there has been no complaint with respect to the slashing of the $90,000, and I am not complaining about it now.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no complaint about the language used. I do not recall the slightest complaint. I am wondering why there should be any.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language may have been inserted in the bill after the hearings, when there was no opportunity for complaint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, in lines 7 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 23, after the numerals "1944", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the amount made available for administrative expenses may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards to carry out specific projects of the Authority, upon the request of the Administrator, for studies of the properties and suitability of building materials, with particular reference to their use in low-cost and low-rent housing, including the construction of such experimental structures as may be necessary therefor, and for printing, binding, and disseminating the results of such studies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 11, after "(42 U. S C. 1410)", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office", on page 54, line 10, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed $145,845"; in line 12, after the word "books", to strike out "lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals" and insert "and lawbooks", and in line 16, after the words "miscellaneous items", to strike out "$498,000" and insert "$481,795, of which amount not to exceed $100,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 22, after the figures "$112,000", to insert a comma and "of which amount not to exceed $12,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, at the end of line 24, to reduce the total appropriation for the General Accounting Office. from $16,936,490 to $16,920,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 55, line 8, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed $85,358", and in line 9, after the word "services", to strike out "$2,908,012" and insert "$2,898,528."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 21, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $133,249 for", and in line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$850,052" and insert "$835,247."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 13, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $122,315", and in line 14, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$510,955" and insert "$497,365."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 3, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $29,457", and in line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$133,780" and insert "$130,507."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 25, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $99,588", and in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$475,000" and insert "$463,935."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 15, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $22,302 for" and in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$652,405" and insert "$649,927."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 25, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed $189,000", and on page 59, line 8, after the word "Act", to strike out "$3,586,240" and insert "$3,565,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 20, after the name "Interstate Commerce Commission", to strike out "$9,116,444" and insert "$9,040,749."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 4, after the word "expenses," to insert "including not to exceed $52,650 for traveling expenses," and in line 10, before the words "of which", to strike out "$238,165" and insert "$232,315."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, at the end of line 12, to reduce the total appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission from $9,557,809 to $9,476,264.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 60, line 20, after the word "reports", to insert "not to exceed $59,328 for", and on page 61, line 12, after the words "in all", to strike out "$8,993,328" and insert "$8,986,736."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the name "Cleveland, Ohio", to strike out "$3,000,000," and insert "$7,071,000, to be immediately available, and", and in line 25, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the limitation of $13,300,000 upon the total cost of construction and equipment of said aircraft engine research laboratory is hereby increased to $13,971,000."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee give us the factual information upon which the proposed increase in the appropriation was based?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a giant aircraft engine research laboratory is located at Cleveland, and a supplemental Budget estimate for this amount was sent to Congress by the President and by the Director of the Budget. The following explanation is made by the Director of the Budget:

There is presently available to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics toward the construction of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory, at Cleveland, Ohio, an unexpended balance of approximately $3,500,000. The amount required to meet obligations to June 30, 1942, is approximately $7,000,000. This necessitates an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 of $3,500,000.

The supplemental estimate for 1942 also provides for increasing the authorized limitation of cost for the construction and equipment of the above-mentioned research laboratory from $13,300,000 to $18,171,000. This increase in limitation of cost is made necessary because of (a) a general increase in construction and equipment costs due to war conditions; (b) the construction of the project on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis rather than a lump-sum basis as originally contemplated; (c) the necessity for acceleration in the completion of the project made necessary by the existence of a state of war; and (d) the fact that previous estimates were of necessity based upon incomplete designs.

The increase in the Budget estimate for 1943 from $3,000,000 to $7,071,000 is to provide the funds necessary to complete the construction and equipment of the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory in that fiscal year under the increase in limit of cost mentioned above.

The foregoing supplemental estimates of appropriation are made necessary by contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943.

This is a war measure, of course. The research laboratory, especially as to aircraft engines, is a matter of prime importance, as it was represented to us. The committee thought so, and reported the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for the explanation. My inquiry was prompted because of a certain reason. Let me preface the statement of the reason by stating my personal willingness to increase this appropriation to five times the amount proposed for this research laboratory or for any other research laboratory. However, I wish to state to the Senate that within the past 2 weeks four different designs for airplane engines have gone through my office, and I have put the respective persons concerned in contact with the proper agencies of the Government. Within the last hour and a half I took to the appropriate naval authorities some gentlemen who have designed a new type of aircraft engine.

All these research laboratories—and we have many of them—are performing a proper and necessary function. However, if they are merely reaching up into the blue, and are accomplishing nothing, a question properly arises in the mind of every one of us as to whether they are performing the necessary duties and functions for which they were created. In view of the fact that from outside these laboratories scores of proposals are coming to the service agencies for their use, a doubt arose in my mind as to whether the research laboratories were absolutely and properly performing the functions for which they were designed. It was that thought which prompted my inquiry as to whether the proposed increase is based on a factual situation that warrants the increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 61, lines 23 and 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics from $15,018,328 to $19,082,736.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Archives", on page 62, line 25, after the word ""public" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed $4,400 for"; in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "including not to exceed $1,000 for the expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the furtherance of the purposes of the said acts"; and on page 63, line 6, after the words "motor vehicle", to strike out "$1,134,325" and insert "$1,032,725."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, with reference to the proposed reduction in the appropriation for The National Archives, I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from North Carolina spoke to me about that.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say that I am in full sympathy with the work of the committee, and I wish to commend it for its efforts to bring about a reduction of expenditures. I am fully committed to that policy; but in this particular matter it seems to me that we are likely to make a mistake. It is proposed to reduce the appropriation for The National Archives by $102,000, reducing it to $1,032,000—about 10 percent or a little less—without giving any reason.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the subcommittee did not pass on this item, but when it came to the full committee a member of the committee moved that the item be reduced by $100,000; and a motion to that effect was carried, I think, unanimously.

The National Archives is a splendid institution, and I have no doubt that it is doing good work; but it was thought that $100,000 could be saved. It was felt that much of the work represented by the item could be postponed for the duration of the war. That is why the reduction was recommended by the committee.

Has the Senator in mind an amendment relating to the item, or what is his suggestion about it?

Mr. BAILEY. I am hoping that the Senate will reject the committee amendment. I can make a suggestion, but I wish to place the facts before the Senate. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement; he has stated the case. The amendment came before the full committee, after the subcommittee had failed to suggest any such amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subcommittee proposed the amendment at the bottom of page 62, in line 25, and at the top of page 63, in lines 1, 2, and 3; but the proposed reduction in the appropriation for The National Archives was discussed in the full committee, and it was believed that The National Archives could get along very well with $1,032,725.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the point to which I wish to address my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state to the Senator in a moment the amount of the appropriation last year for The National Archives.

Mr. BAILEY. We are told that in the committee it was said, "Here is an appropriation of a little more than a million dollars, and we can cut off more than a hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the appropriation last year was $1,065,822. So the Senator can see that the difference between the amount appropriated last year and the amount of the present proposal is about $30,000.

I suggest to the Senator, if he is particularly interested in the item; that I

am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, as one member of the committee, to have the amount made what it was last year—that is to say, $1,065,000.

Mr. BAILEY. That would be some help, but I wish to place the facts before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not disputing the Senator from Tennessee. What happened is now very evident to all of us. A motion was made in the full committee, notwithstanding the subcommittee and the House could see no necessity or reason for a reduction of $102,000. So far as it appears to the Senate, the motion was made on general principles, without having in mind anything in particular except the thought, "Here is a chance to save $100,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Senator does the committee an injustice, and he does me an injustice.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I agreed to the amendment, and it was recommended because it was pointed out that last year The National Archives had received an appropriation of $1,065,000, and it was not believed that that amount should be increased while the Nation was in the war. I simply wish to say to the Senator that I hope he will be willing to compromise, just as the Senator from Kentucky did a little while ago in a very admirable way, and let this item remain at the same figure it was last year. I hope very much the Senator will do that.

Mr. BAILEY. I am quite agreeable to all suggestions, but I am trying to state the reasons for my position, in order to get the facts before the Senate. I am not disputing any matters of fact with anyone. The Senator from Tennessee has aided me very greatly in his statement that the committee thought that, on account of the war, we might reduce the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not reduce the appropriation, but simply appropriate the same amount which was provided last year.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand now that the thought was, "On account of the war they might as well have the same as they had last year." It happens that last year, on account of the war, we increased the appropriation for the National Archives by $75,000, in round numbers.

The effect of this amendment is to wipe out that increase. So we are saying today that The National Archives is not entitled to this money on account of the war, but last year we said on account of the war it was entitled to it. It may be a singular thing that The Archives need an extra appropriation on account of the war; but the Congress found it to be a fact last year; the Director of the Budget found it to be a fact; the President of the United States found it to be a fact; and it is the fact.

Now, let us see about that. The National Archives is a comparatively new institution. In the first instance, it is a great space-saving institution. It has now 300,000 cubic feet of space for records which are in other departments and which are causing to that extent crowded conditions in those departments. If The Archives shall be given a chance, it will take these records from the Navy, the War, the State, and other Departments, and put them where they belong, in The Archives Building, and there will be a saving of 300,000 cubic feet of office space. I think that would be a saving to the Government of over $100,000. That would justify leaving the appropriation provided by the House.

There is another factor about which I wish the Senate to know. The Archives is not a defense activity, but the Federal Government could not operate without its past records. It is a most singular fact to me, and I think it is official—at any rate I can vouch for it—that 20 percent of the Reserves recruited in the Navy during the last 6 months were recruited from records in The Archives.

Furthermore, the maps of the cities of the world which unfortunately our country may be under the necessity of attacking are in The Archives. They have left the State Department. The State Department seems not to have known it, but The National Archives found them and has supplied that source of information.

I have before me a letter from the Navy Department. I shall not read the entire letter, but I shall ask that it be printed in the RECORD in full. It was addressed to The Archivist under date of April 27, and I quote from it as follows:

As you probably are aware, during the quarter, January–March 1942, the Bureau of Navigation alone made 35,000 requests for services on The National Archives. These services for the most part were indispensable calls for records of former service men who have been reenlisting in the Navy since December 7, 1941.

Since last October approximately 17,000 square feet of Navy Department space, most of it A-1 office areas, have been cleared for vital activities by the transfer of Navy records to The National Archives. The rapidly expanding naval program makes it essential that this outlet, transfers of records to The National Archives, continue to be available and to a greater extent than in the last 6 months.

I now ask that the letter in full be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
April 27, 1942.

THE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES,
The National Archives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently it has become apparent that facilities provided by The National Archives will be curtailed if the proposed reduction of funds therefor during the next fiscal year is effected. Meanwhile this office has formulated plans for a continued and increased use by the Navy Department of National Archives' facilities during the coming year.

As you probably are aware, during the quarter, January–March 1942, the Bureau of Navigation alone made 35,000 requests for services on The National Archives. These services for the most part were indispensable calls for records of former service men who have been reenlisting in the Navy since December 7, 1941.

Since last October approximately 17,000 square feet of Navy Department space, most of it A-1 office areas, have been cleared for vital activities by the transfer of Navy records to The National Archives. The rapidly expanding naval program makes it essential that this outlet, transfers of records to The National Archives, continue to be available and to a greater extent than in the last 6 months.

Assumption of the storage, maintenance, and service on these records by National Archives' personnel is a substantial relief to the hard-pressed personnel in the Naval Establishment. That part of the Navy Department personnel which was assigned to The National Archives after December 7, 1941, to assist in essential and large-scale arrangement and service on Navy records should be relieved by National Archives' personnel not later than July 1, 1942.

Little headway has been made in relieving the records congestion in navy yards and other shore establishments, including records of ships deposited therein. It is earnestly desired that The National Archives will be enabled to provide several field representatives to assist in the prompt elimination of valueless records as provided by law and the provision of secure storage and ready availability of valuable records at these points.

These matters are brought to your attention to emphasize the fact that those divisions and facilities in The National Archives which the Navy Department uses daily are in effect extensions of the Department itself. This office has a very real concern in the continuance and, in certain important aspects such as assistance in the field, the extension of those facilities.

Very truly yours,

EMMETT J. LEAHY,
Director of Records Coordination.

Mr. BAILEY. So I am saying it is a matter of economy to leave this appropriation as provided by the House bill. If we reduce it, The Archives will not be able to make available 300,000 cubic feet of space for the Navy and War Departments. Every Senator knows the value of that space, and how pressing the need for it is.

Furthermore, The Archives will not be able to meet the inquiries made upon it. The demands for information upon The Archives since the war began in December have increased from 40,000 a month to 90,000 a month. Those departments are not asking idle questions. They are going to The Archives for information because that is where the information is kept; but if there is not a sufficient force provided to answer the questions, there might as well be no Archives.

The whole argument seems to me one of necessity and economy. I think we will save money rather than lose it by letting this appropriation remain as provided by the other House and not reducing it. If the officials of The Archives had had an opportunity to come before the subcommittee, they would have explained this item. They went before the House committee, but they had no opportunity before the Senate committee. I am not complaining about that, and they are not complaining, but, if they have a sound economic cause, if they will really save money for the Government, then, it is not economy merely to knock out $100,000 because $100,000 is here.

I have other letters. Here is one from the Tennessee Valley Authority expressing appreciation and interest.

Here is another from the Federal Trade Commission from which I will quote:

In compliance with the directions given by the President, the Federal Trade Commission has had to solve the problem of making available in its building more than 50,000 square feet of space for the accommodation

of agencies directly concerned with the war effort.

Partial solution of the problem rested on the emergency removal from this building of nearly 6,500 cubic feet of records.

The records were transferred to The Archives.

If we are going to stop that process, we will leave these records jammed up in the various departments, crowd more departments out of Washington, and crowd more departments wherever they may be. We have a place in The Archives, but we propose to lose that space or not to make it available.

Here is a letter from the Office of Price Administration under date of November 15 expressing appreciation for material and information furnished in connection with wood and similar products. There was missing a pamphlet which they considered of the utmost importance. They had failed to obtain it elsewhere, but they got it from The Archives.

Here is the testimony from the Department of Justice.

Here is a letter from the National Mediation Board; and here is another from the Federal Trade Commission, to which I referred a moment ago.

I have a letter here from the Interoffice Communication, signed by Mr. Almon R. Wright, Acting Chief of the Division of State Department Archives. He says:

In the past week members of the staff of the Division of State Department Archives have succeeded in uncovering a group of consular inspection reports to which are attached a number of maps of cities throughout the world in which consular posts have existed. Since representatives of the Board of Economic Warfare have made frequent requests and have displayed much interest in materials of this type, we communicated our "find" to them. Yesterday, the 24th, representatives of the intelligence unit of the Army Air Corps and of the Board of Economic Warfare came to view the maps in question. Great interest was displayed, and I was informed by Mr. Elias J. Drexler, extension 2940, Commerce Department, that this group of records and maps was one which the intelligence people of the Army, of the Board of Economic Warfare, and of the air force had been seeking for 4 months. Apparently, the Department of State had been unable to afford these agencies any information about this collection.

To cite an illustration of the use of these maps, the following may be of interest:

Dr. W. B. Poland, of the Board of Economic Warfare, said to have been adviser on railroads to the Chinese Government, told us of his recollection of a vital point in the main railroad line from Manchuria to a Korean port. He was unable to tell just where this point was, but wished to see any maps which might be of some value in his inquiry. A large map of the region of Korea and Manchuria was produced. From this he gathered that the vital point was located at a certain city.

And so on.

So, Mr. President, with regard to the whole economic effort, and our war effort, we are necessarily related to our past experience. We have the experience accumulated in The Archives but men are needed there to make it available to us and to the Government departments.

We created The National Archives for the purpose of clearing out the space which had been occupied by the great accumulation of records during nearly 160 years of our existence, and if we can get those records out of the various departments and put them where they belong, in The Archives, we will save 300,000 square feet of space.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. One word, and then I shall yield.

How large a space is 300,000 cubic feet? Yesterday I was tendering to Mr Reynolds, who is in charge of the matter of moving governmental activities from Washington, a building in the city of Asheville, a magnificent city hall building 10 stories high. I have been in that building, but I will not undertake to describe it beyond saying it is a magnificent building. I would have said it contained 300,000 square feet of space, but I was informed that it contained only 80,000 square feet. Three hundred thousand cubic feet, of course, is nearly four times that large. By putting these records in the keeping of The Archives, we can save for the activities of the Government in Washington the space of nearly 4 buildings as large as the magnificent city building at Asheville, which the Government is thinking of taking over because it cannot carry on all its activities here.

Mr. President, I have made my argument, and I hope that the Senate will let this $102,000 remain in the bill as the President recommended, as the Congress itself approved, as the House approved, and as the subcommittee approved. All the evidence is that it was stricken out without a hearing, and mainly because all of us are bent upon saving money. But if we are to save money in that way, I can take every appropriation and say, "Well, it is a million dollars, let us cut off $100,000." That is not economy, and that is not the way to go about getting economy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have the figures in the committee room, but I do not have them here. I was wondering whether the Senator had figures as to the number of employees already in The National Archives.

Mr. BAILEY. No, I have not; but I do not think there is an excessive number. I have never heard anything to that effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not the figures, but I was just making a calculation, that if we took this appropriation as reported by the Senate committee, and allowed every employee $2,000 a year, it would provide for over a thousand employees.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator is under a misapprehension.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I do not think I am.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not a matter of employees. If the Senator will go to that building, as I take it he has done, he will find it is a magnificently equipped structure. There is a tremendous amount of activity and machinery there for the preservation of records. It is not altogether a matter of employees, clerks, and assistants.

I am not prepared to say what proportion of the appropriation is for clerks, but I do say this money is needed in order to have people there who will take the documents out of the departments and make room, and who will be prepared to furnish the departments proper information when called upon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not desire to infer that all this money is spent for employees; but a considerable amount of it is. A few days ago the Archivist was in my office. He came there for the purpose of saving records which the committee investigating overlapping and duplicating agencies of the Government had obtained and which we are now going over very carefully in order to ascertain whether we can make some constructive suggestions. He wanted to save all those records, and he pointed out that he had the records of the Taft committee, which made the last governmental survey.

As I understand, most of the appropriation will go to employees, and when the files are moved from a department to The Archives Building, they are moved by the Navy Department, or by the War Department, or by some other department, and all The Archives employees have to do is to show them where to locate the material.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to correct the distinguished Senator. That is not what the officials and employees of the Archives do. It is not a matter of bringing a bundle of records from somewhere and saying "stick them in this pigeonhole." That is not the work of The Archives. Every record has to be carefully examined with a view to its value, whether permanent or temporary. If it is of permanent value, it must be so treated that it can be preserved. It is a proceeding requiring great care and study of the documents, paper by paper. That is of the utmost importance, and it must be done by specialists. Let us not get the idea that The Archives is merely a dumping place.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator did not allow me to finish; he interrupted me. Everyone knows, of course, that the purpose of The Archives is to preserve the records of the Government; but let me point out to the Senator that the very records on which he bolstered his case, namely, the records of the sailors and soldiers of the last war, are not, per se, permanent records. When one of those records wears out, a new card is made, and it does not follow that the cards are treated with a certain kind of shellac. The files moved from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Veterans' Bureau are taken to The Archives Building and stacked up there in place of in the department where they had been located. That is all there is to it. They are all alphabetized, are all broken down into certain groups, and the key goes with The Archives.

The Senator pointed out that in one case—just think of it—6,500 cubic feet of records had been taken from one department and brought to the Archives Building. I am no mathematician, but I took the cube root of 6,500 cubic feet, and it is a space about 18 feet long, 18 feet wide, and 18 feet high. If we are to

bolster the case by citing such a small space as that in The Archives Building, we had better stop.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish, and then I shall yield. I waited for the Senator to finish.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator would like to appear to be fair. I should say he would like to be fair, but when he states that I bolstered my case on the basis of 6,500 cubic feet, he was certainly unmindful of the fact that I predicated the case upon 300,000 cubic feet, and simply used the 6,500 as a small piece of further evidence in a letter from the Navy Department. He would not misrepresent the facts, I know, but if I did not correct his statement, it would stand from the testimony of the distinguished Senator from Maryland that this case rested upon a little matter of 6,500 cubic feet, and he, himself, will state that it does not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Even if we take the 300,000 cubic feet, we would not have a very large area of floor space; and we erected the building in order to have a place where we could store records. I do not think that is any argument at all for an increase. It was assumed when we built the building we would take the records there and place them in the building, and that the personnel we would employ to do that would look after the records, and put them in the right place after they got there.

The keeping of The Archives essentially divides itself into two categories—keeping those records which will be used, those which are current, and keeping those which are antiquated. When records are antiquated, they are taken away, and sealed, and put in a place by themselves. The files to which the Senator refers as coming from the Navy are not antiquated. In my judgment, it would have been almost wise to send the Navy files back, for if they had 35,000 inquiries, they could have dispensed with any number of clerks in The Archives Building, if the files had been retained in the Navy Department. It seems to me that not much of a case has been made out for $100,000.

To conclude, I would not labor the point. The National Archives is a fine institution, but it is not possible to find a department of the Government as to which an intelligent man cannot make out a splendid case for not cutting a single penny from its appropriation.

Mark you, we are only 5 months in the war, that is all. It may well last 5 years. Like every one else, I hope it will be over tomorrow, or next week at the latest; but we may have a long war on our hands, and only a month ago we passed a war powers bill, properly giving the administration the right to go into the Federal Reserve banks and put its note down and take back five, ten, fifteen, twenty, fifty, or a hundred billion dollars of printed money, not bonds we will sell to the public, not bonds which the banks will buy, not bonds which the insurance companies will buy. The Government may not have time to wait, it must have the money to keep functioning. So we inserted a provision permitting the Treasury of the United States to borrow from the Federal Reserve banks on its I O U any amount of money, without limit, it might require.

I voted to put some ceiling on the amount when the Senator from Ohio offered an amendment to that effect; but the men who asked for that power were looking ahead to the day when it might be pretty hard to find purchasers of Government securities who would furnish an amount sufficient, with money raised by taxation, to pay the cost of the war and of the Government.

A new tax bill will soon be coming along. Think of it, a man who makes $800 a year will have to go down in his pocket and give the Government $8. A married man with an income of $1,600 likewise will have to pay to the Federal Government a direct tax, in addition to all his other taxes; and this is only the start.

Next year we shall have another tax bill, mark my word, which will be even more drastic than the forthcoming one.

Mr. President, I should like to accede to The Archivist's request. He is interested in his little activity, as we are all interested in our activities, but I am here to say that unless Congress begins to save money right now we shall rue it before this international situation is over. We cannot continue running the Government as we did in times of peace and at the same time not only finance our own war effort but the war effort in part of Russia, Great Britain, China, Australia, the Dutch East Indies, the free Belgians, and the free French, the Czechoslovakians, and all the others we are financing in whole or in part. If we are to embrace that sort of a world war effort we must look around and find places where reductions can be made. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will not accept any increase in the appropriation for The Archives, because I think $1,000,000 a year now for The Archives is a great deal of money in the midst of a war in which our interests are at stake in every particular.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and myself I submit an amendment to House bill 6430, the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 74, line 9, after the word "statutes", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the sum of $20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of towboats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, and other fuels over the inland or coastal waters of the United States."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senate's attention to the manner in which appropriations for The Archives have been increased. In 1936 the amount appropriated for that institution was $475,000; in 1937 it was $615,000; in 1938, $717,000; in 1939, $789,000; in 1940, $864,000; in 1941, $932,860; and in 1942, $993,340.

The present bill appropriates over $1,000,000 for The Archives. Surely they should not complain at the treatment they have received. In a period of 7 years the appropriation for The Archives has been increased more than 100 percent. Under those circumstances, it seems to me the committee amendment ought to be agreed to, and I hope it will be.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude simply with a correction of two statements. With respect to a statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I will say that I have a note which I am satisfied is from Mr. Page, the administrative secretary of The National Archives, which says:

We pay all expenses for moving records to The National Archives.

I think we can take that as a matter of fact.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator some questions about that statement? What does that statement, "We pay" mean? Do employees of The Archives go to the Navy Department and gather up the records there?

Mr. BAILEY. They pay all the expenses of moving. The Senator is a good lawyer. I know he knows it does not mean that they gather up the records, but they move them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Where are the records located when they are moved? Are they placed on the ground floor so The Archives can send a truck and get them? To move the records referred to would not involve more than a couple of thousand dollars a year.

Mr. BAILEY. If I were to try to interpret it I would say that "moving to" means getting the records to the back door. If I move to Washington and get to Washington, that is all that can be said about it. That does not include going to a hotel.

Now, with respect to another matter of fact. My distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee called attention quite solemnly to the increases in the appropriations for The Archives that have been brought about in the last 6 or 7 years. The Archives have not appropriated any money to themselves. All these increases came by way of acts of Congress, and came from the Committee on Appropriations, and with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I take it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only that, but I introduced the bill and did everything in my power to secure the passage of the bill establishing The National Archives, and finally it was passed by the Senate and by the House. How could anyone be more friendly toward the institution than I am? I did my best to create it, and with the help of my fellow Senators and Representatives it was created. I am thoroughly responsible for it. It is a great institution. We ought to uphold it wherever it is possible, but that does not mean to give it carte blanche to come before the committees and be given whatever they request in the way of appropriations. I think they could well go a little slow in these days when the Government is in such straits for money.

Mr. President, I wish to say here and now in this public place that the Secretary of the Treasury is doing a wonderful job; I think he is doing as efficient a job as anyone in connection with the Government of the United States. He has sold something like $5,000,000,000 of Defense Bonds in the last 11 months. I honor him and respect him for doing that; but this is no reason why he should use money in his Department extravagantly, and if he came here and asked for an extravagant appropriation—an appropriation that is not necessary—I would be against it. I feel it my duty to take such a position. Heaven knows, I do not want to make myself unpopular with people in the various bureaus and departments. Why should I do that? What does it mean to me more than to anyone else to take such a stand? My only reason for taking the stand I am taking today is a patriotic desire to help my country. I do not want to have men in Washington criticizing me whenever they see me simply because I am not willing to give whatever they desire for their particular departments, for their particular activities. It is no personal pleasure for me to have differences with officials in the various departments. But we have got to win the war. That ought to come before everything else. That ought to be our first idea. We ought to make everything subservient to that one principal effort at this time—to win the war. To that end we must use all our sinews of war, all our money, so far as possible. As the President said the other night, we should save all money possible to put into War bonds. At the same time we should not permit lavish and extravagant expenditures by various departments and activities of Government.

I wish to say in conclusion that the item in question is a very small one, and if we were not at war I would not have a word to say against an increase of this sort. I did not do so until after the war began. However, with the war before us, with the necessity for money that is confronting us, there is but one position for me to take as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and that is to seek to cut down all nondefense appropriations so far as it can be reasonably and fairly and justly done. That was the sentiment which animated every member of the Committee on Appropriations. Its members did not have any other view. They did not want to get into trouble with the various officials of the departments, we do not want anything of that sort, but we have a duty to perform. It is our duty to cut down useless and extravagant appropriations. The departments and other governmental activities ought to join us in that effort. In the last few days I have been appealing to members of the various departments to join us in trying to save, and I want to say that for the most part they feel that way. They are doing the best they can to bring about economies, and I think we ought to do our duty in that respect.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, when I yielded to my distinguished friend, little did I suspect that my feeble remarks would be capable of provoking such flights of oratory, such protests to heaven. I wonder now what I could have said, I wonder what secret chord I touched that aroused the muse, that called us forth to battle, to the blowing of bugles, the prayer to God—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield gladly, but I hope I do not move the Senator to oratory again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say that the Senator's marvelous personality, his great genius for argument, and for discussion on the floor, made me doubt whether I ought to oppose him at all. Indeed, I tried to compromise with him to keep from opposing him, but the Senator would not accept a compromise. He has argued his point, and has argued it strongly, and it was for that reason that I replied. I hope the Senator will forgive me.

Mr. BAILEY. I am very grateful to the Senator, and I forgive him, but I still cannot explain what it was I said that provoked these flights of rhetoric.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought we might as well speak plainly.

Mr. BAILEY. The matter is a serious one. I appreciate the Senator's offer of a compromise. I would rather take a vote on the merits of this question by a show of hands. I think the case has been fully stated on both sides. We have the matter fully before us.

If Senators think we should dispense with the appropriation which we made because of the war, it is all right with me. I simply read the record, obtained the facts, and was persuaded that this effort at economy was uneconomic. I leave it to the Senate, and ask for a show of hands, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 62, beginning in line 25, and on page 63, in line 6. On this question a division has been demanded.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 63, at the end of line 9, to reduce the total appropriation for The National Archives from $1,146,725 to $1,045,125.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission", on page 64, line 4, after the word "use", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$200,000"; in line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "$200,000 of said sum" and insert "and"; and in line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "and $700,000 to be available for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission", on page 64, line 18, after the word "newspapers" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed $270,000 for"; and on page 65, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$5,380,000" and insert "$4,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, at the end of line 7, to reduce the total appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission from $5,440,000 to $4,910,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission", on page 70, line 1, after the word "elsewhere", to insert "not to exceed $16,200 for traveling expenses", and in line 9, before the words "of which", to strike out "$810,000" and insert "$808,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, at the end of line 25, to reduce the total appropriation for the Tariff Commission, from $825,000 to $823,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority", on page 71, line 14, after the words "steam plant" and the semicolon, to insert "the construction of a system of public-use navigation terminals on the Tennessee River"; in line 22, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers"; in line 23, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "purchase"; in line 25, after the word "elsewhere", to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed $615,236"; on page 72, line 4, after the word "field", to strike out "$136,100,000" and insert "$172,220,112"; and in line 5, after the word "That", to strike out "this appropriation and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1942,' and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of sec. 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943, to remain available until June 30, 1943, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942': *Provided further*, That."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is understood that the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments will not be taken up this afternoon. I suggest that the other amendments be disposed of and that the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments will go over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission—State Marine School Act of March 4, 1911", on page 74, line 20, after the figures "$50,000", to insert "the State of Maine, $60,416.66, of which amount $10,416.66 shall be available immediately;", and on page 75, line 6, after the words "in all", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$360,416.66."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, at the end of line 8, to increase the total

appropriation for the United States Maritime Commission from $980,380,000 to $980,440,416.66.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 81, line 20, after the name "United States", to insert "This section shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of those passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 23, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That all necessary expenses not exceeding $150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That necessary expenses in collecting monthly installments on contracts and repossessing appliances in case of default, not to exceed $2.50 per year per contract, shall not be considered as administrative expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few days ago, I discussed with the Senator in charge of the bill a circumstance which I think can be corrected by the amendment which I shall offer, which I think will meet with the approval of all Senators.

In this bill travel pay is defined in most cases as "not exceeding $16,000," "not exceeding $4,000," or "not exceeding" some other sum. However, there are half a dozen cases in the bill in which travel pay is allowed and no provision for the amount of it is fixed. Theoretically, the whole appropriation could be used for travel pay. I have prepared an amendment to bring the whole bill into line. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Where in this act appropriations have been authorized to be expended for traveling expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the Budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Budget Bureau approved for travel pay in the break-down of the appropriation would be the maximum which any agency could receive, when there is no limitation. I think the Senator from Tennessee has stated that he is agreeable to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I think it is in line with what we have already done, and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask unanimous consent to offer. The reason why I ask unanimous consent is that I have doubt as to whether it is in order. The amendment is, on page 4, line 3, before the period, to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the salary of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be at the rate of $12,000 per annum effective on the date of the enactment of this act."

The reason for offering this amendment is that Mr. Smith, the present director, now receives $10,000. Those in comparative positions receive $12,000, and this request has been made in order to conform to the general principle which has been established. The request comes from the White House, and I think it is perfectly proper and just. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Tennessee for a moment. In considering the legislative appropriation bill which is now on the calendar, I find that appropriation has been made for practically all standard periodicals, such as trade magazines, as well as for newspapers. The daily newspapers of the country and most of the leading weekly newspapers, are bought by the Congressional Library.

In times of peace it has been the practice to make an appropriation available for every agency of the National Government for periodicals and newspapers. All those periodicals, with very few exceptions, are in the Library of Congress, bought by the Congress for the very purpose of being available to those agencies.

Tomorrow at an appropriate time I hope to offer an amendment to strike from these appropriations the authority to buy magazines, periodicals, and newspapers. All an agency has to do is to obtain the magazine, periodical, or newspaper from the Congressional Library. The present practice is for every agency to buy magazines and newspapers; and, while it is only a small thing, it is a waste. It is not good business administration. We ought to save $30,000 or $40,000, which we can save, in my judgment, by adopting the amendment which I shall offer.

I shall therefore move that the words "for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals" wherever they appear in this bill be eliminated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had not thought anything about that suggestion. Of course, the same rule might be applied to the Senate and the House. We could all go over to the Library of Congress and read the newspapers which come to our reading room, the Marble Room; but it would be a waste of considerable time if all of us had to go over to the Library of Congress to read magazines and newspapers. There might be a considerable waste of time if the agencies downtown had to hotfoot it over to the Library of Congress. I do not know to what extent they read newspapers, but I presume some of them try to keep informed about what is going on in the world. It may be part of their duty to read certain periodicals and to keep themselves informed.

At first blush it strikes me that probably more time would be wasted than could be compensated for by the money which would be saved if we should require everybody in the various agencies of the Government who has occasion to read a newspaper or a magazine to go to the Library of Congress. If they all availed themselves of that privilege, the Library would require increased appropriations for that purpose, unless the prospective readers stood in line waiting to find a newspaper or periodical available. There may be something in the Senator's suggestion; but at first blush it strikes me as likely to cause more trouble than would be compensated for by the money which might be saved.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the amendment is adopted, it will be in conference.

I see no reason in the world why the Congress should furnish the department heads with daily newspapers. There may be an occasional case in which some legal notice must be printed, in which event the agency might want a copy; but everybody knows that when legal notices are inserted in newspapers it is part of the trade practice to give the one inserting the notice a free copy of the newspaper, or perhaps half a dozen copies. Neither can I see why the Government should buy periodicals for heads of departments. I think it is a vicious practice.

It may be a small thing, but that is not the point. The point is that small things become important. In any well-regulated government every kind of waste ought to be eliminated, for little bits of waste here and there make up total expenditures which often are so heavy for the people to bear.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I do not know to what extent the Government buys newspapers for its departments. I do not suppose that is done. If an agency has a research department or a reading room for the assembly of employees, or for research purposes, I imagine that

only in such instances are periodicals and magazines purchased for the benefit of the department. Certainly the Government is not buying newspapers for a Cabinet officer to read, or a magazine for a Cabinet officer to read, or for the Administrator of the Social Security Board or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to read; but it might be a hardship if those whose duty requires them to keep informed, especially on technical matters, were required to go to the Library of Congress every time they wanted to read a magazine.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the amendment I shall not propose to strike out the words "books of reference," but I shall propose that there be stricken from the appropriations the words "periodicals and newspapers." Why the Bureau of the Budget wants periodicals and newspapers I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not, either; but perhaps they could shed some light on the matter if they were asked about it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why the National Resources Planning Board wants newspapers and periodicals I do not know. The Office of Government Reports needs them, and we have given them plenty of money with which to buy them.

It is their duty to provide the agencies of the Government with pertinent news matters, and I know that from time to time they sent Senators and Representatives clippings in which their names appear; but it seems to me I could get all such clippings myself without empowering the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars that I would prefer to have spent for relief, or for rural rehabilitation, or for slum clearance, or for something that would add to the sum total of human happiness. I would rather have the money spent for such purposes than to be provided with a room-full of newspaper clippings.

What does the American Battle Monuments Commission need periodicals and newspapers for? It also says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel says it has to have them. The Board of Tax Appeals says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Civil Service Commission says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Federal Communications Commission says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Electeral Loan Agency says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Electric Home and Farm Authority says it has to have periodicals and newspapers, and so forth. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board says it has to have newspapers and periodicals, but in that connection they cannot spend more than $500 a year for newspapers and periodicals. The Federal Housing Administration cannot spend over $1,500 a year for magazines and newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is all right to limit it, but I understand that the Senator's amendment would bar them from having anything at all for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that the Federal Housing Administration could buy a greater number of magazines and newspapers for $1,500; it could almost keep one magazine going completely with that amount of money.

Not only that but the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation says it cannot function without having $250 for periodicals and newspapers. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation says it has to have periodicals and newspapers. The Federal Power Commission says it cannot operate without newspapers and periodicals; the Federal Works Agency says it has to have newspapers and periodicals; the Federal Trade Commission says it has to have newspapers and periodicals. The Public Roads Administration has to have a lot of things; I am satisfied that they need maps, and so on, but they seem to need an enormous amount of periodicals and newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator——

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish reading the list, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that money for such purchases of newspapers and periodicals is contained in the appropriation for every one of the departments and agencies, let me point out that the bill has been pending since the 23d of January.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the members of the committee seek to inquire from the various agencies as to justification for such expenses? It might be that if they were called on to explain the matter they could justify it; but, as I understand, they were not called upon, and now we have no explanation as to why the expenditures are advisable or why they are proposed to be made.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator makes a strong point there, and I cannot take issue with him, for the reason that I did not discover how widespread is the purchase of newspapers and periodicals in the Government until I happened to scrutinize the reports which our committee has been receiving, and learned of the enormous amount of money, thousands and thousands of dollars, into which all these items pyramid.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not criticizing the Senator's attitude.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I think we have to assume that the men who are responsible for the conduct of the various departments of the Government are as reasonable as we are. We hope we are, at least, and we try to be. There may be a justification. I certainly would be sympathetic to any reasonable justification that they can make, because I should not want to bring about even a small saving in money that would handicap a department in keeping in touch with developments, which must be done by means of periodicals and publications of various kinds, and even books. I do not imagine that the head of any department requires the department to buy his personal newspapers which he can read at home at breakfast, or when he goes to lunch, or after he goes to bed at night—as I frequently do; I do not have much time to read other newspapers than the Washington and New York and Kentucky newspapers, much as I would desire to read them all. Time forbids. However, it is not a bad service every now and then for someone to send me a bunch of clippings showing what a number of people in the Middle West or on the Pacific coast think about what we are doing here. I think it is a matter about which we should be careful, so as not to handicap or hobble Government agencies too much.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that the one reason I think it important to make the point against such purchases of newspapers and periodicals is that originally only newspapers were purchased, then the Congress inserted in the appropriations the word "periodicals." Now the words "photographs and photographic equipment" have been inserted; and provision for all kinds of sound-recording equipment has been inserted. In one department—I will not name it for the time being—there are machines that cost $3,000 apiece. Nine of them are idle at this very moment—nine machines worth $27,000 are idle at a time when another department of the Government needs such machines badly. The machines were bought with funds from the rather loosely worded appropriations which we have gotten into the habit of passing without any examination into them. I believe we can save many millions of dollars out of things such as those I have mentioned. Indeed, a million dollars that we can save today will be a load off the backs of the people and will be a load off the burden the returning soldiers and sailors will have to bear when they come home from this war.

I think we ought to strive to eliminate every bit of waste we can, on the same principle that when a man saves a few tin cans and turns them in to the administrator who is in charge of tin, that is only a very small contribution, but it is his contribution and the other man's contribution that will give us enough tin to carry on through the war. I think that the Senate would do very well to imitate those savings.

So I should like to see such an amendment agreed to, and taken to conference so that we could find out whether there is extravagance along this line. If the agencies need magazines and newspapers, I, as one of the conferees, would withdraw objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not understand that the Senator wanted action on the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I only wanted to explain it and have it pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I wanted to add to the category of newspapers I read, Maryland newspapers as well as New York and Kentucky newspapers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say that sometime ago we passed a law—I cannot find it right now—that forbids the head of a governmental department or agency to buy newspapers or periodicals with any funds appropriated by Congress. There must have been an abuse some time in the past, so that it became necessary to enact such legislation.

Subsequent to the passage of that law, gradually over a period of years we have

let every one of the agencies return to that practice, and we have specifically authorized them to buy newspapers and periodicals. So, while we have a law on the statute books saying that none of them shall buy newspapers and periodicals, we have, one at a time, given every agency of the Government the right to buy them. That is how we stopped something and then drifted right back again, fully, into the old fault. The amount involved may be small, but I am convinced that if we are going to have economy it will be accomplished by the saving of little sums which will make big sums, rather than big sums themselves.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not offer the amendment at this time?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; not now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received from Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, a memorandum dated April 27, 1942, reading as follows:

Executive Order No. 9112, of March 26, 1942, authorized the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to make or guarantee loans to finance contractors engaged in business or operations for the prosecution of the war, and thus facilitate the participation of small business enterprises in the war-production effort.

Both the Navy Department and the War Department procured amendments to H. R. 6868 (Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942), making appropriations to the said departments available to carry out the provisions of the said Executive Order No. 9112 (see first paragraph of title I—War Department, and sec. 202 of the enrolled enactment, H. R. 6868).

It appears desirable, therefore, that the Maritime Commission likewise have express authority to expend its funds for the purpose of carrying out the said Executive order. It is suggested that this objective can be secured by an amendment to the bill H. R. 6430 (Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942) by an amendment, as follows:

Page 74, line 13, before the word *"Provided"*, insert the following: *"Provided further*, That the said construction fund shall be available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112, of March 26, 1942:"

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

I think that is a perfectly proper amendment and that it should be agreed to. I submit it and ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 74, in line 13, after "247)", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That the said construction fund shall be available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is one matter to which I should like to recur. The amendment on line 9, page 70, was agreed to. The House appropriated for the Tariff Commission $810,000, which was reduced by the Senate Committee on Appropriations by $1,800 only. The amendment is entirely agreeable, and there is no question raised about it.

On the floor of the House, the House reduced by a full 10 percent the appropriation recommended by the Budget Bureau for the Tariff Commission. The Budget Bureau recommended $900,000, and the House committee accepted the recommendation. That figure was less than the appropriation last year. The appropriation has been gradually going down for the last 5 or 6 years. On the floor of the House the appropriation was reduced by 10 percent. I have conferred with the Senator in charge of the bill, and have suggested, and now urge, that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the reduction may be only 5 percent from the Budget Bureau's recommendation rather than 10 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the motion I made to strike out the words "newspapers and periodicals" wherever they appear now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion goes over until tomorrow.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would be the effect of our considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have no effect on the Senator's motion.

Mr. GEORGE. While, of course, the work of the Tariff Commission has been circumscribed by the war and by international conditions, the Commission is now called on to do some very highly confidential work for the War Production Board, for the Army and Navy Munitions Board, and for the office of the Price Administrator, as well as for the Board of Economic Warfare. The latter organization, which is most important, is not setting up a commodities staff, but is using entirely the Tariff Commission's staff.

I am making this request especially so that the matter may go to conference, not for a restoration of the full amount but for a restoration of half the amount cut out by the House. Unless consent shall be granted and my suggestion prevail, there will be nothing in the conference in regard to this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. What is the motion of the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. I am asking unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 70, line 9, was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the amount of $808,200 be increased by $45,000. That would put in conference the question of cutting the amount asked for only 5 percent, instead of 10 percent. The House made a cut of 10 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not had time to go into the matter, but if the Senator is willing to permit us to take it to conference and see what we can do, without our making any promises, we can take that course.

Mr. GEORGE. I should appreciate the Senator taking it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the vote by which the amendment on page 70, line 9, was agreed to be reconsidered? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I now offer an amendment to the amendment, that the amount of $808,200 be increased by $45,000, to $853,200.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. It will be necessary to correct the total in line 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk is authorized to correct the total.

FRANK SHEPPARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3767) for the relief of Frank Sheppard, which was read the first time by title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Sheppard, of Lewisburg, W. Va., the sum of $300, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Frank Sheppard, on account of personal injuries suffered by him on August 24, 1939, when, while sitting on the front porch of his home at the town of Lewisburg, W. Va., he was struck by a heavy stone thrown by a blast set off by employees of the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on February 26 this year the Senate passed Senate bill 2220, for the relief of Frank Sheppard, appropriating the sum of $300 for injuries received when he was struck by stones from a blast caused by employees of the Work Projects Administration. The bill went to the House and was there tabled, and an identical House bill was passed. Senate bill 2220 had been approved by the Committee on Claims in the Senate, and passed the Senate. The House bill now before the Senate is identical with the Senate bill which was passed. Mr. President, I do not like the practice of the House shelving a Senate bill, which passed first, but this is a bill which merely compensates Frank Sheppard for the damage and injury caused by the accident, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3767) for the relief of Frank Sheppard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

Carlton J. H. Hayes, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Beirut, Lebanon, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan.

Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

Laurence W. Taylor, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATION ADVERSELY REPORTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernice B. Lyons to be postmaster at Vinton, La., which had been adversely reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the request of one of the Senators from Louisiana, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATIONS FAVORABLY REPORTED

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Ghormley to be vice admiral.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 1, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30, 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. William Holmes Crosby, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Alex Brown, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Charles Mathews Swindler, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Frank Coffin Holbrook, Field Artillery (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 30, 1936.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. Everett Clifton Hayden, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. John Barkley Pattison, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 14, 1941.

Second Lt. George Major White, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. William Jonreau Williams II, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. John Edward Nitsche, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

Second Lt. Alfred George Hayduk, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Thomas J. Millican, Brilliant.
Willard D. Leake, Jasper.
Samuel D. Wren, Red Bay.

FLORIDA

Jefferson Gaines, Bocagrande.
Paul E. Mahan, Hobe Sound.

LOUISIANA

Laverna O. Ramsey, Pleasant Hill.

MISSISSIPPI

Walter Darracott, Aberdeen.
Bonnie H. Curd, Pace.
Thelma Z. Landry, Waveland.

NEW JERSEY

Marie H. Pill, Califon.
Peter J. Egan, Montclair.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary P. Mishoe, Greelyville.
Lindsay C. McFadden, Rock Hill.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Robert L. Ghormley to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Herman Hansen, Jr.
Joe B. Russell
Richard L. Boll
Lucien W. Carmichael
Walter W. Hitesman, Jr.
John L. Hopkins
James G. Kelly
Charles D. Harris
George O. Ludcke, Jr.
Donald R. Kennedy

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Alcuin Heibel, O. S. B., Mount Angel College, Mount Angel, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, acknowledging ourselves Thy creatures, we ask the continued blessings of your kind providence upon our Nation. We are grateful to be citizens of these United States. Guide our President, enlighten the minds of our legislators in their deliberations so that they may conclude unselfishly and wisely during these critical times in our Nation's history.

Grant, O Lord, that we may always have the decency to revere Thy holy name and to respect the dignity of a human person. May we keep our Government so arranged that it may always benefit and protect all the people, not as classes or antagonistic groups, but as one family in the peace of Christ. Give to all of us, and especially to our chosen leaders, the grace to realize and always remember the essential unit of our American society in the family in which parents are acknowledged as the representatives of God with the natural right and duty to take a guiding part in the education of their children. O Divine Master, in this world cursed by the selfish ambitions of proud individuals, by the international hatreds born of human greed, let us recall Thy lessons in justice, charity, and tolerance. Grant that our American religious, social, and economic life may always be based on the 10-point moral code of God's Commandments, for only thus can our American liberties and responsibilities be preserved in their original purity and intent.

Please, God, help us all to keep America American in its finest aspirations and highest ideals. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2404. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit, and the Medal for Merit.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Civil Service Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Brown, of the Independent Petroleum Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 1 hour.

CONSTITUTION OF POLAND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker's remarks be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to pay tribute to the people of a great nation, a nation that was born of blood and sacrifice and through the years has kept the lamp of liberty burning despite the efforts of despots to extinguish it—Poland.

It is fitting that we should pay our respects to this brave and patient people, who just now are ground down beneath the heel of Nazi tyranny, because their history is inextricably interwoven with our own, and today we share a common destiny.

We Americans, of whatever racial background, have a great deal in common with the Poles. They, like ourselves, are lovers of liberty. The history of Poland has been one of constant struggle against oppression, against the efforts of greedy neighbors to divide the land among themselves. Poland has been dismembered in the past—she has been crushed and humiliated—but always she has risen again. And though today she writhes beneath the heel of the Nazi master, Poland will rise again.

In almost every war that has been fought in behalf of freedom, Poles have taken part. There is no American schoolboy who is not familiar with the names of Kosciusko and Pulaski, Polish heroes who fought with such consummate courage in the army of George Washington during our own Revolution. Kosciusko fought throughout the Revolution, then returned to his own native land. Count Pulaski gave his life for America, dying in action at Savannah.

Poles have fought in every war which America has waged since then. Always they have been at the forefront of battle.

On next Sunday, May 3, the Polish people throughout the world will observe Polish Constitution Day. On this day, which means so much to the Polish Nation, thousands of Poles, fighting in the armies of the Allies, and millions more, held in virtual slavery by their ruthless conquerors, will pledge anew their determination to fight on until the forces of evil have been routed and the world again is free. Poland's battle today is our battle, and our battle is Poland's. In the days of the past, Americans and Poles have stood shoulder to shoulder in the battle for human liberty. Today they are again brothers in arms in the greatest struggle in history, in which human liberty is on trial and the fate of civilization itself is at stake.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May the 3d, marks the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the adoption of the famous Constitution of Poland. I rise on this occasion to pay my respects and to transmit greetings to the democratic, peace-loving, and progressive people in the land of my forefathers. As an American, I am privileged to offer encouragement to the Polish Government in exile and to the valiant Polish soldiers fighting on the principal battlefields of the world for freedom, for democracy, for God, and for country. Battered and bruised, robbed of her God-given freedom, plundered of her last grain and sou, Poland lies helpless and in chains. Fettered as she is by her traditional, treacherous, and undying enemy, Poland, by the will of God, shall rise again, revitalized and strengthened by the martyrdom which she suffered for Christianity, democracy, and civilization.

When the seat of the barbarian shall have tottered and fallen and Berlin shall have been reduced to a shambles, and the vanquished armies of Germany shall have returned to the destruction and havoc which they so fiendishly visited upon other peoples and invited upon themselves, Warsaw and Poland, cleared of the invader, with all of their people shall rejoice as they welcome their triumphant heroic soldier legions and assume their rightful place among the peace-loving nations of the world. The 3d day of May, the Independence Day of Poland, shall once again be celebrated midst peace and plenty.

Poland, Mr. Speaker, has been referred to by historians as the bulwark of Christendom, henceforth she shall be known too as the citadel which saved civilization. Let me say here and now for the benefit of those who may be uninformed that Poland, throughout the centuries, has always been the haven of the oppressed and the refuge for the unfortunate. While she has never waged a war of aggression, she has, more than once, without a price, raised her sword in the defense of her neighbors. History has never credited Poland with even a fair share of the glory which was her due. Jealous and treacherous neighbors, in their libelous misrepresentation of her glorious and historic exploits which high light the pages of history, robbed her of her just due.

Ungrateful and covetous combinations of her neighbors conspired and executed their treacherous plans of murder, plunder, and enslavement. Poland has repeatedly suffered at the hands of the Germans, who waxed fat upon the booty which they plundered. After World War No. 1, there was scarcely a piece of iron or copper the size of a man's fist, or an excess foot of steel rail, which was not used for German troop transport, remaining in all Poland. Dairy cattle and livestock of all kinds were commandeered and shipped to Deutschland and the plundered people left to starve. Someone said during Poland's recent 20 years of existence, in proof of her youthfulness and virility, that during the first World War the tide of battle swept over an area 13 times the size of Belgium so many times as to make survival among children of tender age and old folks next to impossible. Countless lives in high- and low-age brackets were sacrificed to Mars upon the altar of war—a war not of their making and one in which they had no interest.

As sure as there is a God in the heavens and as certain as is the rise of the sun in the morn, the day of reckoning and of retribution is coming. The guilty will pay this time, even unto the tenth generation. They shall be made to rebuild all they destroyed and to haul back the plunder while shackled to a wheelbarrow. They shall thereafter be made impotent to wage war upon Christianity, freedom, and civilization. Mr. Churchill once said, in a trans-Atlantic radio address:

> There are 85,000,000 malignant Huns, some of them doubtlessly curable, all of them killable.

If they do not unconditionally lay down their arms, then, for civilization's sake, they must risk the consequences. Moreover, there must be no negotiated peace. There shall be no wasting of time on treaties which would be scrapped when they have served Germany's purpose of delay and of preparation for the next war, which, if it is to come on schedule, should drench the world again before 1967.

Reestablish the constitution of the 3d of May, reestablish Poland—a strong and invincible Poland—and you will make of her the guardian of peace, and in her keeping will be vested the key to permanent stability.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan upon his remarkable and eloquent speech regarding the Polish people, a magnificent people, with a great history and noble traditions.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday next is the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the adoption of a democratic constitution by the people of Poland, 2 years after our own Government was formed and started operation under a constitutional form of government.

It is only fitting and proper that in these times this body, the greatest legislative body in the world, should pause to properly honor that great event and to pay tribute to the Government of Poland, which still exists, although the land of that Government and the people of Poland have been overrun and temporarily conquered. When we pay honor to the Government of Poland we honor the brave and liberty and religious loving

people of Poland. Poland has had a great history, going back through the ages. History records that on at least one occasion many generations ago the great men of Poland saved Christianity from the pagan hordes that had overrun Europe. History is replete with the heroism and bravery of the noble people of Poland, and history also records they are imbued with a deep love of liberty and that they are an intensely religious-minded people. I refer to them as an intensely religious people, not having in mind any particular creed.

We know their experiences of the past few years, of the vicious hordes of destruction and paganism under the leadership of a merciless and destructive mind, using a flimsy pretext to invade and conquer that country and its fine people. We know of the great contributions made to the progress of our own country by those of Polish blood and of Polish origin; and of Pulaski and other great Poles of the revolutionary days, who denied liberty on the part of themselves and their own people, came over to the Western Hemisphere to fight for the Colonies of those days in their battle for independence, as a result of which we are citizens of the great country that is ours today.

America sympathizes with the people of Poland. America goes further. America is determined to do everything within its power to bring about that victory which will mean the reestablishment of Poland as an independent nation, with the right of the people of that country to go forward in an effort to obtain those national aspirations that will be consistent with their own best interests and for a future decent world.

We in America are proud of the Americans of Polish blood. Americans are not a race. The people of America, those who live in America come, or their forebears came from other lands. We of this generation are of racial origins that come from every country under the sun, and we are a people of various religious strains; but we are held together by one love, one common love that all decent men and women stand for, and that those who have never had it strive for, the love of liberty, the possession of the individual rights guaranteed us by the Constitution, the right to possess the dignity and the personality of a human being. That is the common love that holds all Americans together.

The people of Poland, as history clearly shows, are actuated and prompted by the same love of liberty that holds the various racial groups of America together and welds us together, not as a race, but as a people. One of the racial groups that played a prominent part in this welding and in the progress of our great country is the Poles. We honor them, we respect them, we value them. We also honor and respect the great contributions made by those of the Poland of today. The Poland of the past was Poland the battlefield of Europe, up and down, but never defeated.

A people may be conquered, but as long as national spirit remains that people, even though conquered, constitutes a nation, a potential nation ready to spring forward when the opportunity presents itself. In this conflict the people of Poland are still a nation though temporarily conquered and their sovereignty absorbed by the conqueror; nevertheless, the national spirit exists and the potential nation of Poland is there ready to spring forward when the opportunity presents itself. The people of Poland, working underground or otherwise, will continue to cooperate with our country and the other nations engaged in this conflict in defeating the common enemies. So I am glad to join with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], an outstanding American of Polish descent, but an American first, last, and always, thinking of America first, as all of us should, no matter what our racial origins, but having in our hearts love for the land of our forebears.

I am glad to be invited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to express myself as I have on this occasion and to join with him and others who will follow me in paying tribute first to the brave people of Poland, assuring them that our country, when victory has crowned our efforts, will be dedicated to seeing that Poland is again reestablished a sovereign nation; and, second, to honor those fine persons of Polish blood of this generation who are playing their parts in American life and in this crisis as outstanding Americans; and to the Americans of Polish blood of past generations who have made their great contribution toward the progress of the wonderful country we possess today. This great America is our country by inheritance. This generation of Americans is on trial. Are we going to be the first generation of Americans that failed in its trust? We shall not be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] in the observance of this notable event in the history of Poland, the anniversary of constitution day. We have had occasion to review time and again the glorious part the sons and daughters of Poland have had in the battles, the literature, and the statesmanship of the United States of America. I wish to pay my tribute to Poland because of the unconquerable bravery of her people. I want to offer a word of encouragement in this dark hour. As has been related, the Diet of Poland adopted a constitution on May 3, 1791, 2 years after the Constitution of the United States was adopted. It was not a constitution of a republic but a constitution of freedom, establishing a monarchy under its limitations and provisions. It stood only until 1795, when Poland was again overrun.

The history of the Polish people has been a tragic one in many respects. It has been a noble and inspiring one in many respects. The Polish people have been overrun by superior numbers; they have been overwhelmed by stronger enemies; they have been defeated and rendered helpless, apparently, so many times in their long history that, as we contemplate these series of rises and falls, we discover there is something in the soul of Poland which cannot be conquered. There is a quality, a determination, a love of liberty, a bravery, a capacity to suffer and to endure, a will to progress onward and upward, which no enemy, no matter how physically strong he might be, has ever been able to crush out of the heart of Poland. A people like that may be defeated time after time. They are never conquered. They are not conquered now.

They may seem helpless; millions of them may be confined behind barbed wire in concentration camps; other millions may have been starved by their oppressors, as we are told they have been; even though all of these horrible things be true, no one who knows the history of the Polish people, no one who studies the accomplishments of the Polish people in the various countries to which they have gone, including the United States of America, can doubt that in the soul of the Polish people is an unconquerable spirit which cannot be throttled; which cannot be killed; which cannot be starved into submission, or terrorized into inactivity. In the forces of the Allies in different parts of the world, the sons and daughters of Poland are fighting, with their hearts aflame with the burning determination that the oppressors and despoilers of Poland shall know the righteous wrath of the Polish people. Here in the United States of America, seemingly the last great stronghold of liberty in the world, the sons and daughters of Poland, with hearts aflame, are working for the liberation of their fatherland and their people.

I need not say to the people of Poland that the heartfelt prayers of all liberty-loving people in the world are ascending for them today. They know that. We can take our greatest assurance that Poland will rise again to a new strength as a people, and a country, because of Poland's history. It shows that, no matter how many times the Polish people may be cast down, no matter how many times the Polish Nation may be partitioned, the Polish people rise again to liberty and recover their nation and go marching on in the phalanxes of freedom. The freedom-loving people of the world are determined to rebuild Poland as a free nation.

So Poland struggles on. Poland hopes on. Poland dreams on. Poland works on, and Poland will rise again to add more glorious pages to her already glorious history.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

WHAT CONSTITUTION DAY MEANS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is to be observed in this country, I am happy to say, with radio programs, with speeches, with group rallies, with music. The 3d of May is Polish Constitution Day—a day which has for our Polish allies in the war the same signifi-

cance that the Fourth of July has for all patriotic Americans.

The Polish Constitution was adopted on May 3, 1791. It was a democratic constitution, and showed the influence of the American and French Revolutions—the winds of freedom blew through it. For the first time many liberties were guaranteed the common people.

Constitution Day means more to the Poles than the birthday of a document. It is a symbol of a nation that refuses to die. Four years after the adoption of the Constitution in 1795 Poland ceased to exist as a nation. During the long century and a quarter of Poland's captivity, its territories split among three great, imperialistic powers, the 3d of May represented to patriots the dream that Poland would live again as a nation.

Poland did live again, only to be struck down by Hitler's mad aggression. This year in the United States, where so many descendants of Polish patriots are now valuable and loyal citizens, it is particularly significant that Constitution Day should be observed and that the brave heritage it represents should be celebrated.

Poles have been captives before. They are determined and we are determined that they will be freemen again. Gentlemen, I give you Polish Constitution Day, the birthday of a nation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable emotion that I rise, not only to eulogize the history and traditions of a great country but also to pay my respect to the memory of many friends and comrades who have loyally given their lives in the past months and few years, and to salute those of my former comrades who are still fighting for their country.

Nominated by the Federal Reserve Board in 1927, I left the United States Treasury for Warsaw, Poland, and there with my family spent 3 years as American financial adviser to that new state. It was there I learned, working with the Polish people, among them and as a part of them, their great character, their great courage, and what they stand for. I saw with my own eyes a great country devastated by not 4 years of war but by 6 long years of war, which continued until August 1920. I saw that country regain its economic strength, forge ahead, always mindful of the traditions of her past, always looking forward to take her place in the history of the world as a great nation.

Poland has always taken her place in the world, even back as far as 1683, when she sent her armies to raise the siege of Vienna, when Europe was about to be overrun by Turkish hordes. She took her place later on as the achiever of the first liberal constitution that was ever given to a Central European country. Bounded, as she was, by envious, autocratic neighbors, her country was despoiled by three partitions until she disappeared as a unit, about the time that our great country achieved its liberty; but, for 125 years Poland fought on and was again reestablished as a nation by the Treaty of Versailles.

During those days following the Treaty of Versailles—until recently overrun by a hostile force—she achieved greater and greater success. I believe that Poland, though fallen to these Nazi hordes and invaders, will rise again like a Phoenix from her ashes and stand beside us and the other democracies of the world and go forward to even greater heights and greater history.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Michigan for the privilege of saying a word on a subject so near my own heart.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH].

Mr. MCKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for the privilege of adding a few words in tribute to the great people of Poland in connection with the pending celebration of their Constitution Day.

The love of liberty on the part of the Polish people is exceeded only by their love of God. When we understand their love of God, we can better appreciate their love of liberty. Their sufferings, caused by their devotion to their religious convictions, automatically strengthen their will to militantly fight for their liberty. Their century-old struggle to secure and maintain their freedom is an inspiration to all other liberty-loving peoples in the world to fortify their determination to secure freedom from oppression and persecution.

It is this love of liberty that makes easy an appreciation of the valiant defense which the Polish people offered against Hitler and which so incensed the Nazis that they have singled out the people of Poland for persecutions of a satanic nature. The inhuman treatment imposed upon the people of Poland has shocked the sensibilities of all civilized nations.

It is this spirit, born of their age-old struggle to secure and maintain their liberty, that makes more determined the will of the peoples of the still free united nations to prosecute the war until the liberty previously enjoyed by the conquered peoples of Europe is again, first, restored, but, more important, maintained by an enduring peace based on moral justice.

It is to this high purpose that we, in company with our allies, have dedicated our efforts, as best described by President Roosevelt, to establish the "four freedoms" throughout the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] had to say about his personal experiences in Poland. I am reminded of experiences I had in that country back in the winter of 1919–20. I was there twice on business connected with the then Polish Government, and I had an opportunity to learn for myself the intelligence and the determination with which the Poles attacked the problem of the economic rehabilitation of that war-destroyed country.

In order that you may know the conditions which existed there, I need only to remind you that Poland all down the centuries has constituted one of the great battlegrounds of all Europe. Armies have fought back and forth across that country since time began almost. This was especially true of the World War. The Germans and the Russians fought back and forth and back and forth across Poland time after time. Whenever one army was driven from the country, naturally it took with them everything that could be of any possible use to the retreating forces. All that could not be moved but could be used by the successful forces was destroyed. Consequently, one of the most beautiful farming countries I have ever seen was completely denuded of farm stock of every kind, of food, of everything which enabled a farmer to exist. As a result, when riding from Paris to Warsaw and passing through what I believe was one of the most beautiful agricultural sections I have ever seen, I noticed with amazement that hour after hour as I rode through that wonderful country I did not see the first sign of life, except those gathered at the railroad stations hoping to secure transportation to some city, where only the bare necessities of life could be had.

When I reached Warsaw I discovered, very much to my amazement, that bread lines were everywhere. One could not walk a half-dozen blocks in any direction from the center of that beautiful city without finding bread lines with long lines of half-starved men, women, and children waiting for their daily rations.

I was amazed then, as I still am when I look back to those days, to note that the people in the bread lines were not completely devoid of hope regardless of how desperate their situation was. It is true that they had no money; they had no work; they had no food other than that they were waiting for, but they were not hopeless. Why? Because Poland had been recreated. Poland was again a land of the free. Her people could again hold up their heads and look to the future unafraid. This feeling completely possessed the people of that country, and as a result there is no example in history where any people so completely destroyed economically as were they, who showed the same determination and the same intelligence and who earned the same success, made the same progress toward economic rehabilitation as was made by Poland following that period.

We in Michigan know something of the Polish race. They are a deeply patriotic people. We are privileged to have within our borders hundreds and hundreds of thousands of citizens of Polish extraction. In Bay City, my home town, during the days leading up to our active participation in World War No. 1, we had a demonstration of the quality of Polish patriotism. In my county between 20 and 25 percent of the citizens are of

Polish extraction. When the third draft came, Bay County's quota for that draft was only 9 men. The reason was that we had had many hundreds of volunteers prior to that time. Whenever a man volunteered from a county, that county was given credit for that enlistment when the succeeding quotas were called for.

The amazing thing to me, and to everyone who knows of it, I believe, is that while the citizens of Polish extraction constituted only 20 or 25 percent of the total population of the county, that 20 or 25 percent had furnished 75 percent of those who had volunteered previous to that time. That is a record which will stand as a lasting tribute to the patriotism of the American citizens of Polish extraction.

Mr. Speaker, knowing the Poles as I do, knowing their determination to live as a free nation, I prophesy that those hundreds of thousands of Poles who are now fighting in the ranks of those opposed to the Axis Powers will form a nucleus around which Poland will again rise and take her proper place in the great family of nations.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MACIORA].

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that a strong bond has existed since colonial days between the United States and Poland.

Our Constitution was adopted September 17, 1787; the Constitution of Poland a few years later, May 3, 1791.

Polish patriots laid down their lives that the Constitution of the United States might come into existence; that the yoke of oppression might be broken. And, by the same token, American patriots in the forces of the United Nations are fighting today, laying down their lives, to the end that lovers of liberty in Poland and elsewhere throughout the world may once again enjoy the benefits of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is altogether fitting that this Congress should pause today to extend the hand of fellowship to Poland. The anniversary of the Polish Constitution occurs next Sunday. It is not the first time that this great event in her national life—comparable to our own Fourth of July—has found her country torn and pillaged by forces who detest liberty and all that liberty stands for.

Men may die. Physical properties may be destroyed. Man-made institutions may crumble. But the spirit of a brave people can never be crushed. Out of the shambles of invasions, oppressions, pillaging, and partitioning, Poland has risen time and again down through the years. Poland will rise again.

Twice in my span of life I have been privileged to observe from afar gallant Poland ignoring overwhelming odds, resolutely refusing to submit to the yoke of tyranny; now, as always in her brilliant history, preferring to die in defense of honor rather than to live in dishonor.

Wherever liberty and justice has been in the balance, sons of Poland have been found. This Congress has repeatedly paid deserved tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski by dedicating one day each year to honor the memory of that gallant Pole who died at George Washington's side in the heat of battle for freedom.

Of no less distinction in our Revolutionary War was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, who willed his entire estate to Thomas Jefferson to buy freedom for the enslaved and educate them in democracy.

Whole speeches could be made on the contributions of individual Poles to the creation and development of the United States.

Dr. Alexander Kurcjiusz founded and conducted the first high school in the United States, at what was then New Amsterdam, now New York City.

Olbracht Zaborowski was one of the first judges in the territory which became New Jersey.

In 1774, Jacob Sadowski surveyed and led a group of 40 persons in the settlement of Harrodsburg, the oldest city in Kentucky.

Karol Sadowski was the first engineer to map the coast of New England.

Joseph Truskolaski was the surveyor commissioned to lay out the lands of Louisiana and Utah.

Karol Radziminski helped establish the border line between the United States and Mexico.

Leopold Boech founded the first technical university in the United States.

Long before the *Mayflower* touched the shores of New England, the 400 Polish settlers who were with John Smith at Jamestown were laying the foundations for the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

In the Civil War, 4,000 Poles served with the Union forces. In the Confederate Army were 1,000 more.

Thaddeus Strawinski died at his post when Fort Sumter was fired upon and the War between the States began. The first officer to die on a Civil War battlefield was Konstanty Bledowski.

When the United States acquired its northwest outpost of Alaska, Wlodzimierz Kryanowski became its first Governor by Presidential appointment.

Of the first 100,000 men to enlist for service in the World War, 40,000 were Poles or of Polish extraction.

The first United States soldier to pay the supreme sacrifice in the World War was Sgt. John J. Czajka.

The first German soldiers to throw down their arms in the World War became the prisoners of two Poles wearing the uniform of the United States.

This recital could go on and on. Our history is studded with the gallant deeds of the men of Poland.

In the fields of music, literature, and science they have always been in the forefront.

Naturally, then, the United States and our entire liberty-loving populace today looks sympathetically upon Poland in her dark hour.

But there is comfort in a review of Polish history as Polish Constitution Day nears. There is comfort, too, in the obvious signs of a turn for the better in the world conflict which rages today. Poland has withstood the attack. She can, and will, hold out.

Poland will live!

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I join gladly in these well-merited tributes to the great Polish people on this celebration of the adoption of their free constitution in 1791. The Polish Constitution of 1791 was a part of that marvelous spiritual awakening of the period which was born out of the regenerative spiritual forces resident in all races of men who rebel against oppression and slavery. This great spiritual force manifested itself in the French Revolution, in the American Revolution, and in a thousand forward movements, the benefit of which we are now reaping.

The Polish people have been the most oppressed, the most tragic in their suffering, of probably any civilized people on the continent of Europe. As they have been hammered out and tested in the fires of affliction they have developed a quality of character, a religious faith, a self-dependence, a passion for freedom, an industry and a courage, which marks them among the choice peoples of the world.

We have millions of them here in America as our fellow citizens, and they have added enormously to our strength and to our progress.

In 1917 President Wilson expressed the hope that after the war Poland should become a united, independent, and autonomous nation. After all these years we are again in another war, perpetrated upon Poland and the rest of us by the same evil forces that created the first World War. The answer of America at this hour is that some day we are going to implement the hope of Woodrow Wilson and see to it that Poland does become an independent, a united, and an autonomous nation.

In my State we have a great engineering triumph known as the Skyway, connecting the cities of Newark and Jersey City. That skyway was named, I believe, at the suggestion of Governor Moore, the Pulaski Skyway, in honor of the famed Polish hero who laid down his life at Savannah in defense of our country's liberties. I say to the Polish people of my State and of the country, as they fix their eyes upon that material monument to one of their noble heroes, and see the stream of American life pulsing over it, let them turn away for a moment and see the smoke belching from a hundred factory chimneys, and hear the sound of riveting and building in the shipyards, and feel the power and pulse of a mighty people preparing the instruments by means of which, under God, we shall free not only ourselves but Poland and the world, we hope permanently, from the curse of tyranny and slavery. This is the Polish hope, this is the American hope, and in that respect, as in many others, we are spiritually one.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago the people of Poland adopted a constitution that was patterned largely after that which the American people had adopted several years previously.

This constitution was born, as have been many other constitutions, from the travail and the suffering and oppression that Europe had undergone for centuries. For hundreds of years the people of Europe had groped in darkness looking for a ray of light that would point out to them the road to a better life. It was only when George Washington and those who served and suffered with him in the War of the Revolution struck the shackles from the American people—irons that had been forged by tyrannical kings across the sea—that Poland and the other peoples of Europe saw the light that countless generations had longed and prayed for.

We owe a great debt to Poland. She sent us some of our best-trained soldiers to help free the Thirteen Colonies from the tyranny of George III. Among these was Gaspar Pulaski, who fell in battle and whose blood consecrated American soil. Then there was Kosciusko, another great general and hero and a tactician of the first magnitude. Poles also were active in helping to preserve the Union in the dark days when Father Abraham was at the helm. Poland has been in the forefront in the arts and sciences; but the greatest debt that the Christian world owes to Poland is the salvation of Christianity. We are prone to forget that it was John Sobieski and his gallant Poles who drove the infidel hordes back when they sought to overrun Europe and supplant the Cross of Christ. They were turned back at the gates of Vienna never to return, and it was he who firmly established the cross of Christianity on that continent and throughout the world.

For 150 years the history of Poland has been one of tragedy, of oppression, and bloodshed. Her soil has been consecrated by the blood of heroic defenders who made the supreme sacrifice in repelling invaders. Poland has long been one of the battlegrounds of Europe. Many of Napoleon's battles were fought in that unhappy land, as have been the wars of other would-be conquerors.

I know the Polish people well, having lived among them the greater part of my life, and I admire them tremendously. I admire them for their faith, their courage, their honesty, their industry, their thrift, their loyalty, and their friendship. I join with thousands of other Americans throughout the length and breadth of the land—yes; with the liberty-loving peoples in all lands—in hoping that when this war is over and the terms of peace shall have been written, Poland may be reestablished in all her glory, secure against future aggression, so that she may be free to live in peace and to develop her manifest destiny. By all the laws of gratitude, justice, and service to liberty, she has earned in the fullest degree that small measure of recognition at the hands of the victors. May Almighty God shed His blessings on Poland and all other ravished lands where the torch of freedom has temporarily been extinguished.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the Polish people of Baltimore will turn out in great numbers as they have in the past to celebrate the Polish Constitution Day on May 3.

The Polish Constitution was the first liberal document of its kind. It is more like our Constitution than any other country's. Many times Poland has been dismembered—recently on the east by the Communists and on the west by the Nazis. However, neither of these philosophies ever permeated Poland.

It is easy to understand that Poland could not stand by and submit to Hitler crushing her because the Poles are a great people. They have a glorious history. Europe's civilization is much in debt to the Polish people. They have made a glorious contribution to the advancement of our civilization. Yet, today, we see the heel of the aggressor on the heart of Poland. Everything the Polish people hold dear—religion, liberty, peace, security—the aggressor brutally destroyed.

The Poles are a peace-loving, God-fearing people, and I am happy to be a Member of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses and glad that I have always supported President Roosevelt, because I believe that under his leadership Poland and the other countries attacked and destroyed by Hitler will be liberated and Poland will rise again and continue to have its freedom.

I live among the Polish people and know that not only in Baltimore but all over the United States they are doing their part in our armed forces, defense plants, buying War Bonds and stamps, and making every sacrifice.

I consider it a great pleasure and privilege to be a member of the National Polish Relief Committee, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States I have supported all legislation brought before the House which would grant relief to the suffering people in Poland.

The Poles of America are patriotic and are firm in their support of President Franklin Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief, under whose leadership America will win for the civilized world.

Like the Polish people, the people of Italy and Germany are war tired and hungry and are ready to rebel. They would welcome the defeat of nazi-ism and fascism.

An American army made up in a good measure of Americans of Italian descent would be welcomed with open arms in Italy, and it would be a victorious march from Naples to Rome, with the destruction of Mussolini.

And when we are ready to land on German soil, I am confident that we can get an American army of German extraction and the people of Germany would rise en masse to welcome it as their liberation from Hitlerism.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during the years 1924 to 1928 it was my privilege to travel throughout the length and breadth of Poland and to know some of its outstanding leaders. I am more than happy to pay my tribute to that great country on this significant occasion.

The genius of the Polish people is recognized by all. In the field of literature, in the field of music, in the field of science, in the military and other fields they have made an outstanding contribution to the pages of history.

We, as Americans, have enjoyed our full share of that contribution. We, as Americans, are fortunate in having in our midst over 3,000,000 people of Polish descent contributing to the daily life and progress of the Nation.

Poland has been referred to in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as "the most ambitious experiment in a representative form of government since the days of the Romans" and as "the first experiment on a large scale down to the appearance of the United States."

The two nations have had much in common in their love of liberty, their love of justice, and their love of peace. Their friendship has expressed itself in mutual aid in time of need, notably in the Revolutionary War when General Kosciusko and General Pulaski came to our assistance; notably, also, in and after the World War when our own national leaders contributed so greatly to the rebirth and rebuilding of Poland.

Poland has had a magnificent history, a history which influenced the entire continent of Europe for many centuries. Though subdued and partitioned by the forces of three empires for a period of 146 years, the indomitable spirit of Poland reasserted itself as an independent nation in 1918. Overcome once more by the forces of aggression and tyranny, I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Poland will rise again to play a brilliant role among the nations of a post-war world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for giving me an opportunity to add a few words on the anniversary on May 3 of the adoption of a democratic constitution by the Polish Government. It has been my privilege to know many hundreds of persons of Polish extraction, and I know of no group that has a more fierce or more burning desire for freedom and independence, both as a nation and as individuals. No person or group of persons, no nation, history shows, ever fought more determinedly and with more resolution over many, many years to maintain and reestablish freedom in their beloved country.

Not so very long ago I had the extreme pleasure of attending an executive meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, at which meeting was present Gen. Wladislaw Sikorski, Prime Minister of the Polish Government, and commander in chief of the armed forces of Poland. Of course, the matters discussed there and the information gained by the members of the committee is confidential, but I say this much, that the heart of every person having Polish blood, as well as the heart of every freedom-loving person in the universe, would

have rejoiced and have been thrilled to know with what heroism the leaders of that country and the Polish people generally are carrying on in the face of the cruelty and the persecution of their oppressors, and to know of the resolute determination which they are displaying in fighting with every resource still remaining to them to once again regain their freedom. It would be idle for me to recount to you the many reasons I could give, but I am firmly convinced that the people of Poland can be solidly depended upon to continue to fight until the world is again liberated.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence, and I look forward to that happy day, when Poland will again take its stand along with the other free nations and help maintain that freedom throughout the universe for all time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether there can be much added to the illustrious and glamorous speeches which have been delivered by my able colleagues here today in behalf of a deserving and patriotic people. As was ably stated, the Polish Constitution was adopted on May 3, 1791, which is only 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. The Diet of Poland at that time, through the influence of the American and French Revolutions, adopted this democratic constitution, and established what is commonly known as a constitutional monarchy. The constitution stripped from the nobility many powers and transferred them to the people—guaranteeing to them the rights of a free people. After having enjoyed those rights, the Polish people became imbued with the spirit of democracy they had fought for down through the centuries in the interest of freedom. They now feel the tyranny of Hitler, and throughout the world—in every section of the world—where people are fighting for freedom, you will find the Polish people, both native Poles, from Poland, and naturalized Polish-Americans in this Nation, fighting side by side with those who are interested in the crushing of nazi-ism and tyranny. They shall fight and keep on fighting until Poland rises again as a free nation along with the rest of the democratic nations of the world.

When the peace is written and Hitlerism, with its pagan ideologies, have gone the way of Attila the Hun, the Polish people and the Polish nation will have a major part in establishing a lasting independence to all oppressed people. Long live the kind of patriotism and democratic spirit that is shown by a liberty-loving and God-fearing Polish people. We who love liberty and justice salute you.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to sincerely join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the great people of Poland upon the anniversary of their Constitution Day. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for his courtesy.

Many of the Members who have spoken today have expressed with deep feeling and emotion their own personal experiences in Poland. History records the glorious achievements of the people of Poland—the history of Europe as does the history of my own State and district. The record of their achievements is far more eloquent than words of mine might picture. Whether it be in the arts or crafts or the sciences, whether it be upon the battlefields of their native land or the battlefields of Europe or of America, or whether it be in the development of the frontiers of our country, the Polish people have made a glorious record.

In my State of Minnesota and my district there are many people of Polish and Czechoslovakian descent and, while I have not had the opportunity of visiting Poland, it has been my privilege to live among many people of Polish and Czechoslovakian descent whom I am glad to call warm personal friends. I can say of these people that we have no finer group of intensely patriotic, industrious and peace-loving citizens. I know how deeply the present tragedy of Poland and the similar tragedy of Czechoslovakia has affected our citizens of Polish and Czechoslovakian descent, with their ties of blood and affection, as it has been also the acknowledged tragedy of all of us who love democracy and freedom and who loathe oppression and tyranny. In our capacity for understanding the tears of a sympathetic America mingle with the tears of Poland in her dark hour.

Our two nations have much in common in love of liberty. Our friendship has expressed itself through the centuries. In the Revolutionary War, General Kosciusko and General Pulaski fought with Washington for our freedom. The Christian world is indebted to Poland for the salvation of Christianity for it was Sobieski and the gallant Poles who stopped the infidel hordes from overrunning Europe and their attempts to destroy the Christian church.

It is fitting today that we extend to the Polish people our personal and national affection upon this occasion.

In Poland's hour of travail the prayers of America join with those of Poland's citizens in petitioning that Divine Providence restore to her place amidst the nations of the world a free Poland, a happy Poland, and a restored Poland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY].

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, from the religious cry of Sursum Corda to the political slogan Polonia Restituta, Polish history has been studded with names who fulfilled those ambitions. Today a pronounced Democrat leads them in exile. By profession and education an engineer, by choice a soldier, and by unanimous acclaim a statesman, Gen. Ladislas Sikorski stands at the head of the Poles in exile. Today he carries aloft the post-war banner that was once held by Ignace Paderewski, and to him go the hopes of every freedom loving democrat in the world. We salute him as the typical personification of the ideals of Polonia Restituta.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for such additional time as may be necessary to accommodate the requests of Members to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before stating the request of the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair is constrained to call attention to the fact that other special orders have been arranged on the calendar. With that notice, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to my colleague from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the anniversary of the founding of the Polish Constitution. Wherever sons and daughters of Poland gather on Sunday this historic event will be celebrated.

Poland's Constitution ranks as a great document along with our own Constitution and our Declaration of Independence. Like our Fourth of July, the 3d of May marks the establishment of the first real freedom of a liberty-loving people.

Poland today has suffered adversity. It has fallen under the tyrant's heel, but through the indomitable national spirit of her people she will rise again. In the face of suffering, persecution, and exhausting war Poland's spirit carries on. The land may be devastated but the tyrant can never quench the spirit of these people who share with Americans everywhere a traditional love of freedom.

America and Poland have much in common. Both have fought in the past for freedom's cause. Both are fighting today for the preservation of that freedom. Both are writing enduring pages of history as great liberty-loving nations. They will win this conflict as they have won in the past. America salutes her gallant ally on this significant occasion.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to my distinguished friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us owe a debt of appreciation to our colleague, Hon. JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, for securing this time and causing the House of Representatives to pause in its busy deliberations and pay tribute to our sister republic on the occasion of the anniversary of the establishment of the Constitution of Poland. Once again the fair land of Poland is held in subjection by the cruel forces of evil and destruction. This is not a new experience for a freedom-loving people who have down through the centuries demonstrated that the freemen will live and freedom will endure despite the havoc of war, the brutality of despots, and the inhumanity of dictators. Poland may not be permitted to openly celebrate the anniversary of the founding of her Constitution, but rest assured there will be gatherings where freemen will celebrate. In the homes of her peasants, in the caverns, on the hillsides, and in the valleys of her fair land. In her churches and elsewhere Poland will pray for deliverance and will remember that they have a Constitution and that they are a free people. It has ever been such in all lands

where oppressors have sought to extinguish the light of freedom. Poland has had her Gethsemane before and she has had her Easter morn. In God's own time she will once more see a resurrection and her place firmly established among the free people of the earth.

As I listened to the beautiful tribute paid to Poland today by men who had the privilege of visiting that ancient country in the days of peace, when they heard the laughter of happy children, the songs of a free people, and enjoyed the world-famed hospitality which the people of Poland lavished on strangers within her gates, I deeply regretted that privilege was not mine. However, I do know something about the sons and daughters who left Poland to establish their homes in America. During the influx of immigration in the early nineties I witnessed many of these substantial emigrants come to my city of Cleveland, Ohio. Poor but honest, in many cases having no earthly possessions except the clothes on their backs and a home-made handbag. Soon they were working in our industries. They became the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. They settled in our neighborhood. They practiced the virtue of thrift, built their homes, built their schools and churches. They sang the songs of the old country, they sang the songs of the new country.

The old folks sacrificed and saved to educate their children, and today we have among our leaders many fine Polish-Americans who are leaders in the spiritual, the business, and the professional life of our community. Their fine American boys are now in the armed forces of our country fighting for world freedom. Someone has said that suffering refines an individual, spiritually at least. In the case of Poland, I sincerely believe that loyalty and allegiance to the Roman Catholic faith, throughout the centuries, has given her courage and strength to overcome the suffering endured. The world owes a debt of gratitude to Poland. She has been, in fact, the savior of Christianity as history records.

Would the youth of America look for a model of a patriot and a Christian? Then let him read in the Georgia Historical Quarterly, a publication sponsored by the historical society of the State of Georgia and published in September 1929 an account of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died for this country at the siege of Savannah. A quotation from that will suffice:

Major Rogowski speaks:

"For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. Seeing an opening between the enemy's works, Pulaski resolved, with his legion and a small detachment of Georgia Cavalry, to charge through, enter the city, confuse the enemy, and cheer the inhabitants with good tidings. General Lincoln approved the daring plan. Imploring the help of the Almighty, Pulaski shouted to his men, 'Forward!' and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him, the earth resounding under the hoofs of our chargers. For the first 2 minutes all went well. We sped like knights into the peril. Just, however, as we passed the gap between the two batteries, a cross-fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I looked around. Oh! sad moment ever to be remembered! Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground. I leaped toward him, thinking possibly his wound was not dangerous; but a canister shot had pierced his thigh and the blood was flowing from his breast, probably from a second wound. Falling on my knees, I tried to raise him. He said in a faint voice, 'Jesus! Maria! Joseph!' Further I knew not, for at that moment a musket ball, grazing my scalp, blinded me with blood, and I fell to the ground in a state of insensibility."

This act portrays a true Christian gentleman. It dignifies the strength of the Polish people, who through centuries of oppression in their bitter struggle for independence never left the faith of their fathers. They remained steadfast and are today loyal to the Roman Catholic faith, which sustained them in their darkest hour. Pulaski gave evidence of this faith when he was mortally wounded at the Battle of Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, we who have the privilege of living with and fraternizing with the American sons and daughters of Poland know that their allegiance is first to the Stars and Stripes. Great organizations like the Alliance of Poles of America, the Polish National Alliance, and the Polish Roman Catholic Union reflect the patriotism of a people who love liberty and will die for its preservation. I am proud to salute the ever-living Republic of Poland. On this occasion America shares the suffering of her subdued people today. America will rejoice with her liberation tomorrow.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, limitations of time will not permit me to state in full the sentiment and feelings which I share in common with many other Members of this body on this occasion. At a time when our thoughts are directed toward the anniversary of the establishment of constitutional government in Poland, one cannot fail to be emotionally moved when surveying the history of such a great and noble people.

On May 3, 1791, a short time following the ratification and adoption of our own Constitution, the liberty-loving people of Poland adopted a similar charter of liberty. A review of the history of this great nation and its people discloses a consistent and determined application of this great charter of liberty to the lives of the Polish people. Torn as they have been by devastating wars down through the centuries, a people in whose hearts there constantly burned a consuming passion for liberty have time and again rebuilt their nation and dedicated its people to the highest development of the arts and sciences of music, literature, and peace, and of agriculture, industry, and finance. In the present tragic hour of Poland's national history its people still cling to their ancient faith, and, guided and encouraged by the free people of the world, there can be no doubt but that out of the sorrow and suffering presently being visited upon these brave people a new Poland will again arise to take her proud position among the Christian nations of the world dedicated to the cause of preserving individual liberty and peace.

No citizen of America can overlook the magnificent contribution that has been made by Polish people in the development of our own great country. In the district which I am honored to represent in the Congress of the United States there live many people of Polish extraction and descent. I have had long and intimate contact with many of these fine people. Without exception, they love their church, their homes, their families, and are industrious and patriotic in discharging their duties of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I esteem it a great privilege to be permitted in this brief moment to extol the virtues of a great people. I am certain that the God whom they have worshipped for so many centuries will guide them through the present harrowing crisis, and that in the years to come we may receive in this country renewed and continued inspiration from the sacrifice which they have made in the cause of human freedom.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that in the multifarious activities of this great legislative body in the last stronghold of liberty in the world, we should take a brief hour to direct our attention to the past, the present, and the future of Poland.

Poland, as a nation and a people, lies bleeding, suffering, starving, prostrate under the heel of a ruthless, brutal despot. And yet prostrate Poland, remembering May 3, 1791, lifts her eyes to the stars, renews her soul with her hope and faith in the power on high, and her indomitable will for life and liberty pulses anew through the heart of her.

On this day—in this very hour—thousands upon thousands of patriotic Polish Americans have their hearts and their thoughts turned across the seas to the country of their nativity, or that of their fathers, and anew in their hearts is born the determination, the undying zeal, the unquenchable will, that Poland shall rise again more noble, more glorious, stronger than ever before.

Wherein, Mr. Speaker, lies the reason for this hope of Poland's restoration? It lies in the past history of Poland herself. History tells us that on May 3, 1791, 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the Diet of Poland adopted a constitution which clearly showed the influence of both the French and American Revolutions. The Polish Constitution of 1791 was not the culmination of, but an incident in, the history of a nation and a people who had been submerged and suppressed, who had risen and thrown off the yoke of oppression, who had been overwhelmed time and again by vastly superior forces, but who had never been overwhelmed, defeated, or even daunted in their unquenchable love of liberty and their unchangeable determination to be a people free to shape their own destiny. The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, had a short existence. Again assailed, invaded, divided up, Poland had ceased by 1795 to exist as a separate and distinct nation. I do not intend in the brief moment I have here today to enumerate the Polish heroes, such as Kosciusko and Pulaski, both of whom are American heroes as well as Polish heroes. Other speakers will pay them tribute. I do not intend in my brief time at this moment

to try to voice any adequate tribute to one who will forever stand among the greatest of the musicians the world has ever produced—Paderewski. Other speakers will do that. I want, Mr. Speaker, to direct my tribute to that unquenchable fire in the soul of the Polish people which has impelled them, when overrun, defeated by superior power, divided, abused, brutally oppressed, to begin in that same hour to plan their own liberation and to struggle to that end. It is today an inspiration to every liberty-loving human of every nationality in the world to know that under the very eyes of their brutal oppressors, the Polish people now have a secret organization which is awaiting the day when it may successfully strike back against Poland's oppressors and overthrow those brutal tyrants who crush her.

No people with the soul of the Polish people; no people with the courage of the Polish people; no people with the love of liberty of the Polish people; no people with the great spiritual urge to progress of the Polish people; no people with the capacity to endure suffering which the Polish people possess, can ever be conquered. They may for a time be subdued; they may for a time be laid prostrate in defeat; they may for a time be starved and herded into concentration camps, but they cannot be conquered because theirs is an unconquerable spirit, and spirit is not something of flesh and blood, it is a quality of the soul. Oppressors may believe they have conquered the soul of Poland, but as surely as the sun rises and sets in this world, the day will come—and pray God it may not be long delayed—when the Polish people will rise again, overthrow their oppressors, and help to reestablish liberty and progress, happiness, and prosperity among those people who, like themselves, have been despoiled by marauders and international bandits claiming to be liberators of their peoples.

So then, Mr. Speaker, my profound admiration and respect go out to the Polish people in this hour of their suffering. If any word of mine could reach their ears, I would say to them "Despair not; lift your eyes to the stars; let your souls rise to the heights of your hopes; dream your dreams of liberation because as surely as justice is the ultimate power in the universe, May 3, 1791, shall be repeated for you. You shall know freedom again. The legions of your loyal sons and daughters in the fighting forces scattered throughout the world and working, here in the vast stretches of free America, already are loosening your bonds. In a day not too far distant, your oppressors shall know the bitter regret that comes to those, as it has always come to those, who seek to oppress and destroy the Polish Nation and the Polish people."

All hail, then, Poland, a Poland which, risen, shall be stronger, nobler, greater in the cause of liberty because of her sufferings and her sacrifices.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL].

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, Poland has given to the world a people who are strong of character, honest, industrious, and devoted to the ideals of freedom of the press, speech, and religion. Hundreds of thousands of patriotic Americans of Polish descent have contributed to the advancement of the arts and sciences and to service in the Government of our country. Milwaukee has risen to an eminent position in this Nation due to a great extent to the substantial citizens of Polish descent who have taken a keen interest in civic affairs and have in conjunction with our other good citizens made our city the best governed city in this country. My father, who was a physician in Milwaukee, learned to like and admire those Polish people to whom he ministered. I well remember driving around with him as he made his sick calls in the Polish section of Milwaukee and hearing his continual praises of the honesty and integrity of the people of Polish descent. My associations with those who have a racial heritage from Poland have caused me to admire them as sound, substantial citizens. I feel confident that the spirit of Poland will never die. It may be suppressed for a while by ruthless aggression, but that flame of liberty in the hearts of all Poles cannot be snuffed out.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, a century and a half has elapsed since the people of Poland adopted their famous constitution on May 3, 1791. Like our own Constitution, it provided for three coordinate branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. It had much in common with our Constitution. It varied in some details as, for instance, a provision that the King of Poland should preside over the upper chamber of the Diet.

It further provided for freedom of religion in a period of intolerance. In a few years its people carved out a glorious history for their nation. Many of them have come to our shores and settled throughout the United States. In my own district they have established themselves as leaders in our communities. They have worked hard, prospered on farms, in business, and in industry.

In this tragic World War, Polish aviators have established an unsurpassed reputation for bravery and skill in the air. Many thousands are serving valiantly on widely dispersed battle fronts.

In the United States the record of Americans of Polish extraction is equally proud. These youths have been enlisting long before their names were reached on the draft rolls. I have just read a list of our own honored dead who have recently fallen in battle. A large proportion of the names were the same that one reads in a history of Poland.

Today Poland's future is entwined with that of our own country. Fighting shoulder to shoulder the armed men of these two nations and their allies will secure the all-out victory necessary to the reestablishment of Poland as an independent nation and lasting peace to all the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER].

WHY POLAND WILL RISE AGAIN

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, the 3d of May, will be the one hundred and fifty-first Constitution Day of the Polish Republic, and, to the great sadness and indignation of us all, it finds Poland enslaved. We all know the indignities practiced there—the persecution of religion, the degradation of the Polish people, the insults to Polish womanhood, the transportation of armies of people to work at forced labor in Germany.

The fact is that there has never been barbarism with the same cold, clear aim as this. Hitler was determined in the first place—although he seems to have changed his mind now that his own manpower has begun to run out—to obliterate the Poles or to reduce them to a race of serfs. He was doomed to defeat before he began, because the Poles can take it.

The Poles can take it. Hitler has outlawed Polish books, Polish music, he has closed Polish universities, and the Polish language may not be taught in the schools. But the national spirit will survive these prohibitions. The Poles were a captive people throughout the last century and managed to maintain their national integrity, their dream of independence.

Under the earlier oppressor also it was illegal to teach Polish in the schools. But behind locked doors, behind curtained windows, Polish parents taught it to their children. School teachers, at the risk of imprisonment, held secret classes so the language might survive. It is related in the biography of Mme. Curie, the great woman scientist, that as a young girl in Poland she was one of these patriotic teachers. Mme. Curie, as we all know, helped to make the miracle of radium possible. She died, as did her husband, a martyr to the cause of alleviating human suffering. A few years ago the women of America gave a gram of radium to the Radiological Institute of Warsaw in memory of its Polish discoverer. What has happened to the radium since the war? The Nazis have stolen it.

How can Hitler conquer a nation that survived a century of oppression without changing its determination to be free? Resistance against the oppressor is a tradition; it is born in the blood. Poland will rise again.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my genial friend from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent a district in which is located the greatest industrial democracy in the world, the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Corporation. When at the turn of the nineteenth century George F. Johnson founded this great democracy, it was dedicated to a square deal among his workers. Hundreds upon

hundreds of Polish families migrated from abroad and came to the triple cities of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott to help in and to contribute to the building of this great enterprise. During that time they enjoyed in Endicott-Johnson alongside workers of Anglo-Saxon, Irish, Czechoslovakian, Bohemian, Italian, and Lithuanian parentage the rights which the workers in other parts of the country gained only after great struggle.

Today on every train that leaves for the great training camps of the country, in every contingent from my district, the sons of Polish men and women are going along with all the others to do their bit in this great war against aggression. So today I take this opportunity to pay tribute particularly to the Poles of my section who have done so much to make the community that I represent loyal, American, and patriotic, and who have contributed their all to the defense and the offense of our cause.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for this opportunity to join with other Members of the House in paying tribute to the Polish people at this time.

There is not much that I can add to the encomiums which we have heard here today. The Polish people richly deserve every word of approbation that has been uttered on the floor of the House.

My first acquaintance with the Polish people came from the pages of American history. I recall my early days in school and the story of the Revolutionary War. Among the many outstanding heroes were Generals Kosciusko and Pulaski. They rendered a signal service to the Americans at that time. They were typical of the Polish people. They were men of courage, men of character, and outstanding in their love for liberty and their hatred of oppressors.

When I made my home in Minnesota I found a great many Polish people in the Eighth Congressional District. I became acquainted with them. I found them to be hardworking and industrious. They are good, loyal American citizens, and discharge their duties and obligations to the community and to the country in a way that entitles them to the highest commendation.

On this one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland they are thinking of the people of Poland. Others of different nationalities are doing the same thing.

All of us wish to convey to those people who have been overtaken by tragedy and who are now under the control of the oppressors, a message of sympathy and a message of hope at this time. It is our wish that Poland may again become a free and independent nation. We trust that out of this world conflict the oppressed people in other lands will be restored to their homes and that their countries may again be reestablished. Hope springs eternal in the human breast, and today may I say that I join with my other colleagues in the fine sentiments that they have expressed about Poland and that I also trust that the time is not far distant when the people of that country will again be reunited.

I subscribe to the philosophy that truth must ultimately prevail over error. I believe that in the war now raging all over the world this philosophy will prove correct and that despotism and oppression will be defeated.

> Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
> God's eternal years are hers,
> But error wounded writhes in pain,
> And dies among her worshipers.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, neither Americans nor the world at large today need any proof of the simple courage and bravery of the Polish people. With their beloved and dearly bought country in ruins about them, their most glorious monuments and institutions destroyed, or debased by one of the most cruel tyrannies the modern age has ever experienced, still the Polish Nation lives in the hearts of its people.

Today I want to pay a brief tribute to the Polish people for the example of stanch faith they are maintaining in the principles for which all liberty-loving peoples of the world are fighting and sacrificing.

When the full record of the Nazi barbarities is written, we will know more of the horror which swept the Polish people and we will be thrilled again to know more of how they met a terrible catastrophe, touching every man, woman, and child of Polish blood. Any sacrifices we may make for our own beloved America cannot but pale before those so bravely made and being made today by the Polish people in their own country and in exile.

We thank them today for their magnificent example. Even to think of their battle strengthens the will of Americans to carry on for ultimate victory.

The Polish love of victory had great expression in America's own fight for freedom in 1776, when Pulaski, Sobieski, and Kosciusko devoted their lives and fortunes to the American cause.

Later, hundreds of thousands of Poles came here seeking liberty and greater opportunity and enriched American life with their thrift, enterprise, and patriotism. My own city of Buffalo numbers thousands of citizens of Polish descent, and we are proud to voice our appreciation for what they have done for our common community.

Above all, we Americans today thank the Polish people especially for their splendid dedication throughout the generations to the cause of human liberty, regardless of the terrible price they have paid and are still paying to maintain it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from expressing my highest appreciation of and love for the people of Poland and those of Polish extraction who dwell among us.

Poland has not been conquered. Poland seemingly has been crushed to earth, but Poland is true, and truth, though crushed to earth, will rise again.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for the opportunity to express at this anniversary time my personal sense of gratitude to the Polish people for their courage—for their stand throughout the centuries for those things which mean freedom and beauty to all the world.

We in Cleveland have reason to be grateful to Poland. To us have come many of her people. They have settled in and have taken upon themselves the duties of citizenship with intelligence and understanding of the meaning of freedom. They contribute much to our life.

Many have spoken here today of Poland's amazing history—of her suffering, her indomitable soul, and the glory of her refusal to have the fire of her spirit dimmed. Many have told us of the freedom that has been hers—that she will so surely have again. I want to speak for a moment about what she has given all mankind through music. How many of her children there are who have contributed to keep alive beauty that is, after all, the interpretation of the law of life. Uncountable numbers have sat breathless while the great Ignace Paderewski played. How many of these same people revered him with deep understanding when he became President of the Poland he so truly loved. Others there are—many of them—whose music gives inspiration to all who hear it. Many there are who thrill to the story of courage that is Poland.

In Cleveland we are particularly proud that the conductor of our beautiful symphony orchestra, Artur Rodzinski, came to us from Poland. We rejoiced when it was made possible through the marvels of radio that our orchestra under his baton could recently interpret the martial music of Poland, with all its understanding of suffering and anguish and glory that only soldiers know, to our men in Bataan and other Philippine outposts.

So it is with sincere appreciation of Poland's contribution to beauty and to freedom that I join with all of you in expressing the certainty that the Poland that is so thrillingly alive in the hearts of the world today will be a strong force for freedom in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our colleague the gentleman from Michigan for affording us this opportunity to give expression to our sentiments toward that fine country, Poland, and her people. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], as a Member of this House, has himself displayed those splendid qualities characteristic of the Polish people.

I have a very, very limited number of Polish people in my own congressional

district. However, more than 120 years ago the State Legislature of Kentucky, in order to show its appreciation for the wonderful services of the great Polish patriot, Count Pulaski, who gave his life for our country and our freedom in the Revolutionary War, named one of the finest counties in my district for him, and also named a town in that county for him.

I have always greatly admired the Polish people for their contributions to science, art, and literature. I have been intrigued with their tragic struggle through the centuries to maintain their freedom. I indulge the hope that at no distant date the Polish people and the Polish Nation will be restored to their freedom and to their rightful place in the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing so dramatic or so glorious as the underground war that is being waged against Hitler and his armies by the subdued nations of the continent of Europe. In this secret and risky business of underground war against their oppressor Poland plays a leading part. Its people retain their patriotism. Because they do, they are resisting the German conqueror by delaying production in their factories, by destroying crops, and by circulating through secret newspapers news of what is happening outside of Poland favorable to the destruction of Germany and her army.

Some ingenious Pole in a spirit of patriotism has rewritten the Ten Commandments to apply to Poland, and I shall read his revised edition, which has been circulated in printed form among the loyal people.

I. Thou shalt have no earthly love above me.

II. Thou shalt not take the name of Poland for thine own glory, career, or reward.

III. Remember that thou shall give unto Poland without hesitation thy possessions, thy personal happiness, and thy life.

IV. Honor Poland, thy motherland, as thine own mother.

V. Fight persistently with Poland's enemies to thy last breath, to the last drop of blood in thy veins.

VI. Struggle with thine own complacency and cowardice.

VII. Be without mercy to them that betray the Polish name.

VIII. Always and everywhere boldly admit that thou art a Pole.

IX. Suffer none to have doubts as to Poland.

X. Let no one insult Poland, belittle her merits and greatness, her achievements and majesty. Thou shalt love Poland above all else, save only God. Thou shalt love her more than thyself.

A people who can so pledge themselves surely cannot finally lose their freedom.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, ever since John Sobieski and his Polish army saved western civilization at the gates of Vienna 300 years ago the world has owed a debt of gratitude it shall never be able to pay to Poland. Wherever there is a struggle for liberty the Pole is where the hell of battle plunges.

Ever since that day of Vienna the admiration of the earth has been divided between the ravishing beauty of the music and art of Poland and her romantic struggle for liberty.

Twenty-five years ago a great idealist was President of the United States. Woodrow Wilson dreamed that the Almighty had flung into his lap the opportunity to hammer the swords into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks. He said that the Yugoslavs, the Czechoslovaks, and the Poles should again breathe the pure air of liberty. The fact that he was not able to make that dream permanent was the great tragedy of his life and made him the great casualty of that war.

In this war in which we are now engaged we have in this country an illustration of something that has happened but once or twice in the history of this country, and that is that on the subject of the war there is only one party in this Congress and in the United States. The great parties have joined in a relentless war to achieve a complete victory for liberty. When that time comes, then the Pole will again enjoy the free air of liberty. Until that end is attained we have no other issue and on that we are all agreed—just keeping in our minds always, the first, foremost, and paramount objective of all—the speedy winning of this war.

Then, never again will the craft of another Frederick the Great, as of old, partition Poland between Prussia, Russia, and Austria and thus enslave Poland. Then Poland shall enjoy her well-earned freedom and generation after generation of Poles shall recount her victories for liberty as we today celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of her constitution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as a boy I was always impressed and inspired by the history of Poland. The Poles were of great assistance in the establishment of this Nation and the principles under which we have become one of the preeminent powers of the earth.

I am wondering how many of the Members of the House and how many of the people of the United States know that our standard of value, our unit of monetary value, the dollar, came to us from Poland. The story is that there was a silver mine in Poland in St. Joachimsdale, and the owner mined silver and minted a coin which was put into circulation and into business there, and they were called Joachimsthaler. Passing on to Germany, this name was shortened to "thaler," which in the Low Countries became a "daler." Then they went into England, and there they were called a dollar, and from that name we get our standard dollar of 412½ grains of silver as our monetary unit of value.

I think it appropriate at this time to remind the House of this bit of history about our money and the part the Poles played in giving us this unit of value. If you are interested in pursuing the subject further, I suggest you read the articles written by John Hays Hammond, the famous mining engineer, and printed in Nation's Business, the official organ of the United States Chamber of Commerce, some 10 years ago under the title "Cheap Silver Means Reduced World Buying Power," in the issue for October 1930.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan for granting me this time. It so happens that I have never had the privilege of traveling the lands of Poland, as has been experienced by some of the former speakers, and neither do I have any amount of Polish people in my district, but I was impressed very much when I came on the floor by the experience I have had this morning in listening to these tributes paid to Poland. All the world knows of the sacrifice and the heroic fight that the Polish people are putting up so that they may perpetuate freedom throughout the world for the democracies. So in the Senate Office Building this morning, before the Gillette committee, which is studying the rubber situation, there was unfolded a story most dramatic of a great Polish scientist who has recently come to this country and who appeared before that committee this morning. He was a manufacturer of synthetic rubber in Poland. Synthetic rubber is the product which we so vitally need. Before the committee was told the dramatic story of how he lost his plant, lost his business, and was put in a concentration camp, and then was shipped down to Italy with instructions to help the Italians and show them the secret processes of making rubber. It was not revealed just how it happened, but through good Polish friends they got this scientist out of there and brought him down to Rio de Janiero, and then he was brought here and is now engaged in demonstrating beyond the shadow of a doubt how rubber, which we so vitally need to win the war, can be provided at a cost of about one-fifth of the plant cost as compared with rubber produced from petroleum and at one-third of the cost of plant operation. This source of rubber will come from grain alcohol. So Poland has sent, through her ambassador, aid to all of the Allies who are fighting to preserve democracy by showing the way to provide us with one of the things we have been most worried about, and I, in my humble way, am glad to pay my tribute to heroic Poland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, liberty-loving Americans spontaneously join the Polish people in the celebration of Constitution Day of Poland on May 3, next.

Situated in the heart of continental Europe, in most disadvantageous surroundings, Poland's heroic fight for the

principles of freedom has for centuries been the inspiration of all apostles of free institutions.

Poland's contribution and sacrifice of military genius to America's struggle for independence fills us with a never-to-be-forgotten debt of gratitude.

Poland's offspring, nurtured in this tradition and transplanted here have naturally, and as to the manner born, taken a leading part in the development of this great Nation. Both in my State and district Americans of Polish extraction have made outstanding contributions to the life and welfare of commonwealth and community.

Once again Poland is crushed under the heel of the tyrant and the oppressor but the time will surely come when, with the help of the Nation which she befriended in its infancy, she will again stand forth and we hope permanently in the glorious freedom which has been her ideal throughout the centuries. A few weeks ago it was my pleasure to meet her great Prime Minister and commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, and I could not help but sense the inspirational leadership that has always helped the Polish people when crushed to rise again. It is my hope and prayer and faith that Poland will rise again and on her own soil, under her own leadership to celebrate Constitution Day as a permanently free and independent people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was unaware until I came on the floor a few moments ago that today's session of the House was to be dedicated to an expression of our admiration for the Polish people, our sympathy for their sufferings, and our determination that this great people shall again take their proper place among the nations of the world. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity afforded by my friend from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to add my tribute to those which others have been paid this afternoon.

Although I have never had the advantage of visiting Poland, there are a great many people of Polish descent living in my home city whom I am glad to call warm personal friends. I know their pride in the land of their forefathers and their love for it, and I know their loyalty and devotion toward this the land of their adoption. I do not think of them as a distinct and separate group living among us, but as Americans like the rest of us, all of whom have the blood of Europe in our veins. It is no disloyalty to America for one to hold the country of his ancestry in affectionate regard.

The world knows and acknowledges its debt to Poland for its contributions to science, music, and literature. Americans know how much the Poles who have come to these shores have enriched this country in industry, in agriculture, in the professions, in government, in the arts and sciences, and in sturdy character. We know the story of Casimir Pulaski, who gave his life fighting for our independence, and of Thaddeus Kosciusko, Washington's friend and adviser; and we know that in all our wars the boys of Polish blood have fought bravely and loyally side by side with other American boys in defense of our common country. They are doing it today, and we are proud of them because we claim them as our own. Polish boys fight in our armies; they play on our football and baseball teams; and if there be any man who doubts their strength or courage, let him ask those other boys who have served with them in the grim business of war or competed and played with them on the peaceful fields of athletics.

Poland has had a troubled history. Throughout the centuries it has struggled for national existence against powerful and cruel neighbors. Americans pay tribute today to the character of the Polish people who are now a part of us, and join with them in the fervent wish that the Republic of Poland with our help may again expel ruthless invaders and become an independent, peaceful, and happy nation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, in extending felicitations to Poland and to the Polish people living in the United States, I want to say that my own city of San Francisco feels honored that our municipality has been selected as one of the cities in the United States to house a Polish General Consulate.

Recently the Honorable and Madame Wladyslaw Sokolowski, representing the Polish Government, have taken up their residence in San Francisco. We feel, with these charming people in our midst, the relationship between the far West and Poland will become ever closer.

It is a privilege to join with my colleagues in this signal tribute in the House of Representatives to the great Polish people and their great contribution to democracy.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I had something I wanted to say here this afternoon, but I was called out on business and have been unable so far to finish it. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ALL HONOR TO POLAND AND HER BRAVE PEOPLE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Today Poland celebrates the anniversary of the adoption of her constitution. In this dark hour, after more than 2 years of persecution, wholesale murder, and destruction by Hitler's hordes, the spirit of the gallant people of Poland is unconquered. They have suffered untold agony, but they by their heroic example have shown the rest of the world that brutal might may temporarily check them, but the spirit of that burning desire to be a free people can never be subdued. It was the spirit of love of freedom that caused many great Polish statesmen and patriots to offer and give their lives for our beloved country.

I know these people and their real inborn spirit and desire perhaps as well as anyone here present today. I was born amongst them in East Prussia or that part of Germany that had not long before been a part of Poland. All the names of the cities and villages were then still Polish. The order had just been issued by the Kaiser to change them to German, and prohibited the use of the Polish language in schools and churches. Germans like ourselves were sent in there to take over and operate these formerly owned Polish farms. I believe that the effect of seeing these people who had been the real owners of these lands being made the servants or slaves of the German Government caused my folks to seek a haven in this country. The impression I got as a child living with these conquered people has never been forgotten. My father and mother were loved by these Polish people, because they knew that they were not treated as slaves or even servants; they and their children were always welcome in our home, and I and my brother and sister played with their children in their homes. I learned to talk Polish fluently but very often some German official or school teacher would punish me along with the Polish children for talking Polish.

I got so I hated everything connected with the government. The fact that when we met some small-town official we were compelled to doff our hats and stand at attention infuriated me. In spite of the punishment I received all too frequently I refused to refrain from mingling with the Polish children, in fact it made me more determined to be with them, because I knew that they were certainly as good as I was.

Yes; that is the spirit that dominates our Polish friends today, and it will never be broken. Here in America these same formerly persecuted people have brought with them and retained the spirit and willingness to fight for and preserve freedom. No finer people can be found anywhere. They are honest, dependable, and above all else loyal to their friends and their country. I feel certain that these dark clouds will soon disappear, and that the bright light of freedom is very near. In conclusion let me congratulate the Polish people for their foresight when long ago they adopted their constitution, which like our own gave them that freedom that will again be the inspiration to other persecuted people like them who are now under the heel of the dictators. Truth and freedom will always prevail and never can be conquered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join in this great event, honoring the birthday of the first Constitution of Poland. I was one of the privileged to travel through that country on several occasions, and I witnessed the struggle of the Polish people to restore themselves to their proper place in the world. The Polish people in this country have demonstrated over and over again their loyalty, their fidelity, and their friendship for humanity. The people of Poland have struggled to regain the democracy which

has been lost to them on several occasions since 1772, when Poland was first partitioned by her neighbors, but what has happened to Poland in 1939 will go down in the blackest pages of history, recording the rape by the Nazis of that great democracy. I am told by people that at this very time all sorts of crimes and outrages are being committed by the Nazi Government in the occupied portion of Poland. God knows that the Polish people have suffered vastly more than any other nation in the world, and so I pray that the time will come when through God we will be able to avenge all of the rotten and dastardly things that Hitler has committed upon the women and children of Poland, and I hope and pray that the time is not far distant when the Polish people may be restored to their place in the world.

Poland was the bulwark of European civilization for hundreds of years, at the period when the German Empire was seeking to spread its tentacles throughout central and eastern Europe. Poland stood in the vanguard of protection of the small communities of that part of the world which resisted the might of the German Empire as well as the attacks coming from the east by the forces of Genghis Khan, which sought to enslave Europe in a Mongol empire.

When Germany, goaded by its early Hitlers, expelled a large number of Jews, it was the Polish King Casimir the Great who welcomed them into his own country. Thereafter, the story of Poland was the story of a nation which sought to establish within its borders a democratic government and which, by reason of its position, at the crossroads of the East and the West, acted as the defender of European civilization against Turks and Tartars.

It was the Polish King, John Sobieski, who, in 1683, saved the city of Vienna from the Turkish invasion, thus preventing the collapse of the then German Empire.

The German rulers of today are repaying Poland for her generosity by seeking to destroy every vestige of Polish independence and by seeking to eradicate this valiant race from the face of the earth.

I am sure that all liberty-loving persons in the world will watch with sympathetic concern the struggle of Poland to reclaim its independence.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I just came into the chamber. I am very appreciative to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] yielding to me that I might voice my sentiments on this occasion.

I wish to say for my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that his devotion to his people has been something that has endeared him to me. I was with him in Europe when war broke out 2 years ago. Previous to that time he had made an extended trip into many parts of Poland. He feels to a marked degree, for which I admire him, the tremendous suffering that those people have endured. He has told me about it on many occasions and I know he is somewhat provoked that I should talk about it here, because the last thing he would want me to do would be to praise him for his loyalty, but I am happy to do it. I am happy to do it because he deserves it. He is a wholehearted person, sympathetic almost to a fault, and devoted to the principles for which he stands. I salute you, my colleague, for your devotion, and I think it a grand thing that he has asked for this time in order that the Members could come here today and say something in behalf of an afflicted people.

Detroit boasts much of its Polish population. The first man ever raised to the dignity of a bishopric from my own University of Detroit was the Polish priest and scholar, Bishop Plagens. Two of the Catholic bishops of Michigan today trace their origin to Polish Christian homes. Their leadership and patriotism are unsurpassed. The recent lieutenant governor, Leo Nowicki, is an outstanding leader, a graduate of the University of Michigan, cum laude. Likewise, I could mention a number of Members of this House. From my own State of Michigan there are three outstanding gentlemen of Polish extraction in Congress at this time: Representatives DINGELL, LESINSKI, and TENEROWICZ. George Sadowski, previously a member of this body, was one of the first in recent years to carry the Democratic banner to the Senate of the State of Michigan. These statements of mine proclaim their leadership. "By their works ye shall know them." As a race, they have done much for the development of the great State of Michigan, nor has their effort been lacking in the progress of the automotive industry in the city of Detroit, now rightfully called the arsenal of democracy.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker—

America is freedom's paradise on earth.

Our land looks thus to a Polish lad who came to our shores in 1939, a few weeks before his homeland was blitzkrieged by the Nazi war machine.

The newcomer came to America to finish his education. He found a home with people in my neighborhood in Paterson, N. J. Today he wonders if his father and two brothers, left behind in Warsaw, are still alive. His description of America was given to me last Memorial Day when I saw him saluting our flag, and I asked him what he thought of the country where he had found asylum.

Today this lad seeks to fight alongside American youths, to conquer those who have enslaved his people and would extend their conquest world-wide.

For 3 years I have eaten American bread and inhaled American air, and believe me, it feels mighty good.

He recently wrote the President.

By fighting with the armed forces of America I hope to show at least in small measure my gratitude to this country and to see that the institutions of freedom I admire so much are not destroyed.

This lad breathes the spirit of old Poland which has contributed so much to our United States.

I am glad to salute the brave Polish people on this anniversary of their constitution, and I am certain that with all their suffering they must realize history almost cries out the message tyrants' days are numbered, and wherever people are inherently and sincerely liberty loving liberty will be theirs.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the many requests for permission to address the House which have been unfilled, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TENEROWICZ], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] may be given 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may be privileged to revise and extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the program outlined for today. I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to the Members of the House for having expressed themselves on this occasion of the birth of the Constitution of Poland.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute. I have consulted the three gentlemen who have special orders, and it is agreeable to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time, and I do appreciate the cooperation of my colleagues in granting it, for the purpose of making an announcement.

I am today dropping into the hopper a bill to amend the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. For the last several weeks a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, consisting of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], and myself as chairman of that subcommittee, has been working on this particular bill. While my name is attached to it, I want it understood that equal credit belongs to those two other gentlemen who have worked so long and patiently in the preparation of the bill.

We have had great help from Major Partlow and Major Longfellow, of the War Department, and Mr. Breining, Assistant Administrator of the Veterans'

Administration, as well as valuable suggestions from the American Bankers Association, the American Bar Association, the Legal Aid Bureau, and many other persons interested in this particular legislation. I invite your attention to this measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from The Adjutant General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from State Representative Thomas T. Gray to Mr. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, concerning the gasoline rationing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by one of my constituents, winner of a contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders for today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the April edition of the magazine Columbia entitled "America Fights for God-Given Rights," which contains comments upon and excerpts from addresses by the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, and Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and others, broadcast over station WEAF in New York on March 22.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune Leader Press of April 28, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a very interesting item appearing recently in Business Week entitled "Boston Plan," showing a constructive approach made by leaders of public organizations, labor and business organizations, toward a voluntary solution of industrial and labor difficulties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the professional drys of this country who do not mind taking a nip themselves before they go to bed are once again endeavoring to foist upon the country the rule of Capone and Dutch Schultz. They have caused to be introduced into this House legislation that would bar the use of intoxicants by the armed forces. If these people believe in democracy let us hold a plebiscite among the members of the armed forces alone; let them vote as to whether or not they shall be entitled to the same recreational opportunities as civilians.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of bills on the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when is the gentleman going to have that calendar called? We have reported some important bills we would like to dispose of.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman knows, the Private Calendar has been called more times during the past year than it has been in many sessions. The only business for next week, if I may take a little time, will be the District appropriation bill, which will be called up either on Monday or Tuesday. Of course, bills on the Consent Calendar will be called on Monday. Calendar Wednesday business will be dispensed with. I know of no other business now for next week. I do not want to say definitely now that there will be no other business, but I know of none at this time. In connection with bills on the Private Calendar, of course, the Private Calendar was called recently.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are a number of omnibus bills which we have committed ourselves to report out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They will take up the best part of the day.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer not to have an omnibus bill taken up next week.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is agreeable to me except I would like to some day some time next month.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assure the gentleman that I have it definitely in mind. The gentleman will agree, of course, that the calling of the bills on the Private Calendar has not been dispensed with very much during the present session of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ENLISTMENT OF CERTAIN ALIENS IN THE CAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the celebration of the anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, may I call to the attention of the House that there are a number of aliens who have entered this country since war broke out and even before—men outstanding in their particular fields of endeavor and vocations; men who are raring to go—anxious to put their skill, their knowledge, and their very lives at the disposal of the democracies. These men are begging to be allowed to join the armed forces of the United States. In a number of instances to which my attention has been called, however, they are encountering difficulties just because they are aliens—and in some cases classified "enemy aliens."

There are thousands and thousands of aliens who have no more use for the Nazi or Fascist forms of government than any one of us. These people would gladly become citizens immediately, if they had the opportunity, but under our statutes they have to wait a period of 5 years. They are ready and willing to fight on the American side—for the ideals and ideas for which they have suffered immeasurable miseries and heartaches. The Army has been a little slow in absorbing a lot of these men who have very valuable qualifications, as far as knowledge of foreign languages and enemy territory is concerned.

According to a little survey I have made during the past few years, among this group of aliens there are outstanding scientists, doctors, chemists, engineers, and other men who fled the Axis countries, whose families and friends have been destroyed by the Axis powers, whose property has been confiscated and whose women have been raped. Their hate of the Axis partners and everything they stand for is based upon personal injury and suffering. These people are eager to revenge their loved ones and to free the world of fascism and nazi-ism, the brutality of which they have experienced themselves. Why do we brand the victims of oppression enemy aliens? Why do we humiliate these poor people who have escaped the persecution of the Axis countries and have come here to join forces with all who are willing to fight against the ruthless destroyers of civilization? I believe that we ought to remove the stigma of being classified "enemy aliens" from many law-abiding, sincere, and fine people whose only "crime" is that they were born in a

country that had the misfortune to fall easy prey to a Hitler or Mussolini. We should make use of their talents and training to fight our common enemy. They know the countries fighting against us, they know the areas, and they would be a great help to our American soldiers. I have every reason to believe they would make good soldiers. They are ready and willing to lay down their lives for this country and for democracy because they, better than anyone else, know what our fate would be if the dark forces of barbarism and destruction were to be victorious.

The Army and Navy may fear that they may be fifth columnists or sixth columnists, but believe me when I say to you, after the survey I have made, I am more than satisfied that there are hundreds and thousands of these fine men who are ready to serve and die for this country.

I appeal to the American people, I say to the Army and to the Navy, that all these technical restrictions now in effect should be relaxed, as we need manpower. This is not a war like the first war. This is going to be the war of wars for some time to come and we hope that it will end all wars for all time to come. We need all the manpower, we need all the brains, we need all the technical help we can get, and we have it right in our own country if we will only take advantage of these people, if we will only relax a number of technical regulations that have no place on our statute books at this time when we are fighting a desperate battle for the preservation of humanity and civilization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

IT IS THE PEOPLE WHO MUST WIN THIS WAR

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the country has learned somewhat more of the stark facts of the war in which we are engaged from the message sent by the President to the Congress and its further amplification in the President's radio address.

We now know the men of our Army and Navy are fighting all over the world. We now positively know what we have suspected for a considerable time—that the American people must pay the price and must make the sacrifices in "blood and sweat and tears," to use Churchill's words, and in "hard work and sorrow and blood," to use Mr. Roosevelt's words.

There was proposed by the President in his seven-point program to be carried out in the battle against threatened inflation, a plan which will give to the people great encouragement. It will achieve nothing except disheartenment and bewilderment unless he sees to it that the seven points of the economic policy are vigorously, intelligently, and honestly carried out. Unless it is, inflation will proceed apace and the people of this country will be ruined by runaway prices.

If it was not apparent before, it must now be plain to the American people that it is not the President, nor the Congress, nor the Army and Navy alone who can be relied upon to win this war. It is the people themselves who, as always, must not only do the fighting and the dying and the paying, but who must put the great, all-decisive strength of public determination behind the program enunciated by the President to combat inflation, and behind the efforts now being poured into production and delivery of the machines and munitions of war to the armies and navies of the Allies.

The information revealed in the President's message to the Congress, and in his radio address to the Nation, is not new, but seems so to the Nation because heretofore the question of the world-wide distribution of our fighting forces in the Army and the Navy has been largely a matter of rumor rather than of official declaration.

Whatever the feelings of the American people may be so far as the "blood and sweat and tears" involved are concerned, there must be, if we are to keep faith with our men in the fighting lines, one unified determination on the part of all the American people to see to it that the equipment and supplies necessary for our fighting forces and those of our Allies to achieve decisive victory are delivered to them in sufficient quantities in time to do the job. Anything short of that, no matter what the promises, no matter what the excuses, no matter what the conditions may be, would be a base betrayal of the boys we have sent out to risk their lives, their bodies, and their minds in the service of their country. The time has passed for any excuses. The time has passed for allowing anything whatsoever, any interest or any accidents, to interfere with the production and delivery of the machines and munitions of war.

The American people must and will keep before them, also, this further fact:

Just as it would be a base betrayal of our fighting forces for us at home to fail to produce and to deliver to them the fighting equipment and supplies they so desperately need, so, too, it would be a base betrayal of those fighting forces if we at home permit, in their absence on their missions to other parts of the world, our American way of government and our American way of life, to be overturned either through inflation or through the machinations of any misguided groups who might believe they could improve upon our American constitutional form of government, our American free enterprise system of economy, or our American liberties in our American way of life. The men of the American fighting forces when they return home must find that kind of a United States of America they went out to defend. The American people must see to that. The American people will see to that.

Meanwhile there must be no profiteering by producer employer, worker, speculator, or officeholder, and that means profiteering in money, in property, or in political or economic power. The one sole aim and purpose of the Nation must be to win this war decisively and as quickly as it can be done, while keeping our American Government and our American system of economy and of life intact. Anybody who pursues any other course, with any other idea than this, is a traitor to his people and his Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MONETARY POLICY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today is pay day in the Capitol of the United States. It is very interesting to go into the office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House and then go over to the disbursing office of the Senate and see all the young folks, the clerical help employed about the Capitol, lined up and drawing down their pay, cashing their Government checks, and being handed out cash for those checks.

When we stop to think of the operations of the Treasury's fiscal policy, it is interesting to see that most of the money that is being paid to these folks, being paid to the Senators, and being paid to the Members of the House, is silver certificates, in $1, $5, and $10 denominations, that are redeemable in silver dollars, silver that is costing the Government, so the magazine Time said in an article I have just read, and that is borne out by the record of the Treasury, about 50 cents. In other words, instead of its costing the Government $10,000 a year to maintain one Congressman in Washington, it costs the Government in actual cash about $5,000 a year. That is a very interesting situation.

Today when the Sergeant at Arms was himself on hand I took occasion to draw a little check in the amount of $16 in drawing down some of the pay that is due me for serving here in this capacity. The Sergeant at Arms handed me a brand-spanking-new $1 bill, a $5 bill, and a $10 bill. On each one of these bills is inscribed "Redeemable in silver."

It was such an interesting fact, and so well refutes the constant barrage of propaganda put out against the Government's silver policy, that I took occasion to have a photographer on hand, a gentleman with a flash bulb and a camera, to take a picture and give ocular evidence that there was such a policy in operation by the Government, and that we are being paid with money "as good as gold," these silver certificates, flowing through the channels of trade and business, in every pocket and every till in this country where money is handled, certificates on which the Government is making a profit and on which the good people of the United States are making a big saving every day in the form of interest that they would have to pay if this money were retired and replaced by Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refute this specious propaganda that is being put out against one of the best pieces of money ever invented, the American silver dollar, a monetary unit which we got from the good people of Poland, as I mentioned in my remarks a few minutes ago. I take this occasion to answer a pronouncement by 65 members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. They have just made a pronouncement under date of April 20 against the silver-

purchase program of the Government and against this kind of money, on which the Government is making a profit and on which the people are making a huge saving in interest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks there may appear in toto, with all the signatures attached, this communication from the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, and also the tables giving the seigniorage on silver, taken from page 80, March Bulletin of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy is as follows:

SIXTY-FIVE MEMBERS URGE CONGRESS TO REPEAL THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT OF JUNE 19, 1934, AND THE DOMESTIC SILVER PURCHASE LAW OF JULY 6, 1939

APRIL 20, 1942.

We the undersigned members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, again urge Congress to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934, and the domestic silver purchase law of July 6, 1939.

The former has never been sound in principle or practice, the common arguments for it were neither valid nor admirable, and its results have in the main been harmful to both the United States and certain foreign countries.

The latter act has been an indefensible subsidy to the domestic producers of silver and has forced the Treasury to pay approximately twice the world market price for this domestic silver with the consequence that the Treasury has greatly overvalued the silver which it holds.

Both acts have disturbed the silver markets of the world, have drained silver from industry and other countries' treasuries to our Treasury vaults, and have been important factors in the expansion of our money supply at a time when such expansion has been unnecessary and undesirable.

It is gratifying to note that both Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and Chairman Eccles of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are recommending the repeal of these laws. In January of this year, Secretary Morgenthau stated to the House Appropriations Committee that "So far as I am concerned, I will be glad to see Congress strike all of the silver legislation off the books." In the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in March and at a press conference in February he again made similar statements. Chairman Eccles, in a letter to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG on March 30, this year, stated that his views on this matter are generally in accord with those expressed by Secretary Morgenthau. Chairman Eccles pointed out in this letter that he had held these views for several years, and added: "In view of the war situation, it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that so far as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort."

On April 20, 1934, the executive committee of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy issued a statement opposing the enactment of the pending Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

Substantial majorities of the full committee signed pronouncements in opposition to the Government's silver program as follows:

May 25, 1936: Recommending abandonment of the silver-purchase policy and that Treasury silver be disposed of as advantageously as possible;

June 14, 1937: Advocating repeal of the silver-purchase program;

December 28, 1937: Urging, among other things, repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934;

December 23, 1938: Urging that Government subsidy to silver interests be ended and that the Silver Purchase Act be repealed:

May 15, 1939: Urging enactment of the Townsend bill repealing the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; and

September 30, 1941: Recommending, among other things, repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and of the act of July 6, 1939, providing for the purchase of domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce—approximately twice the market price.

We agree with Secretary Morgenthau's statement of January that if the Government's silver program were repealed "* * * it would be helpful at this time. I think it would be well received."

Signed: Eugene E. Agger, Rutgers University; Benjamin M. Anderson, Jr., University of California in L. A.; Charles C. Arbuthnot, Western Reserve University; Don C. Barrett, Haverford College; Benjamin H. Beckhart, Columbia University; James Washington Bell, Northwestern University; Ernest L. Bogart, University of Illinois; Frederick A. Bradford, Lehigh University; William A. Brown, Jr., Brown University; J. Ray Cable, Washington University; Wilbur P. Calhoun, University of Cincinnati; Neil Carothers, Lehigh University; Edward H. Collins, New York Herald Tribune; Garfield V. Cox, The University of Chicago; William W. Cumberland, Wellington & Co., New York; Charles A. Dice, The Ohio State University; D. W. Ellsworth, E. W. Axe & Co., Inc., New York; William D. Ennis, Stevens Institute of Technology; Fred R. Fairchild, Yale University; Clyde Olin Fisher, Wesleyan University; J. Anderson Fitzgerald, The University of Texas; Herbert F. Fraser, Swarthmore College; Roy L. Garis, Vanderbilt University; Arthur D. Gayer, Queens College; Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn College; Earl J. Hamilton, Duke University, with reservations as to second paragraph; Lewis H. Haney, New York University; F. C. Harwood, American Institute for Economic Research; Hudson B. Hastings, Yale University; William F. Hauhart, Southern Methodist University; Frederick C. Hicks, University of Cincinnati; John Thom Holdsworth, The University of Miami; Edwin W. Kemmerer, Princeton University; William H. Kiekhofer, The University of Wisconsin; David Kinley, University of Illinois; William H. Kniffin, Bank of Rockville Centre Trust Co., Long Island; Frederic E. Lee, University of Illinois; J. F. Leonard, University of Southern California; James D. Magee, New York University; Arthur W. Marget, University of Minnesota; A. Wilfred May, New York City; Mark C. Mills, Indiana University; Margaret G. Myers, Vassar College; Melchior Palyi, The University of Wisconsin; Ernest Minor Patterson, University of Pennsylvania; Clyde W. Phelps, University of Chattanooga; Charles L. Prather, Syracuse University; Howard H. Preston, University of Washington; Leland Rex Robinson, 76 Beaver Street, New York; R. G. Rodkey, University of Michigan; Olin Glenn Saxon, Yale University; Joseph A. Schumpeter, Harvard University; Walter E. Spahr, New York University; Oliver M. W. Sprague, Harvard University; William H. Steiner, Brooklyn College; Charles S. Tippetts, Mercersburg Academy; Alvin S. Tostlebe, The College of Wooster; James B. Trant, Louisiana State University; Rufus S. Tucker, Westfield, N. J.; Russell Weisman, Western Reserve University; William O. Weyforth, The Johns Hopkins University; Nathaniel R. Whitney, The Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati; Edward Wiest, University of Kentucky; Max Winkler, College of the City of New York; Ivan Wright, Brooklyn College.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House and especially for the enlightenment of all these 65 economists, there is inserted below a table appearing on page 80 of the March Bulletin of the Treasury Department, containing the record of seigniorage made on the silver purchases under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

Seigniorage on silver

[Cumulative from Jan. 1, 1934—In millions of dollars]

End of calendar year or month	Seigniorage on silver and minor coins	Sources of seigniorage on silver bullion revalued [1]						Potential seigniorage on silver bullion at cost in general fund [2]
		Miscellaneous silver (including silver bullion held June 14, 1934)	Newly mined silver (proclamation of Dec. 21, 1933)	Newly mined silver (act of July 6, 1939)	Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934	Nationalized silver (proclamation of Aug. 9, 1934)	Total seigniorage on silver revalued	
1934	4.5	48.7	0.4	----------	51.1	28.5	128.7	132.6
1935	18.5	48.7	16.8	----------	226.2	34.5	326.2	274.9
1936	46.1	48.7	36.0	----------	302.7	34.7	422.1	397.5
1937	63.7	48.7	58.0	----------	366.7	34.7	508.1	541.6
1938	69.5	48.7	74.9	----------	457.7	34.7	616.0	758.8
1939	91.7	48.7	87.3	4.2	530.7	34.7	705.6	950.6
1940	122.2	48.7	87.6	25.7	562.7	34.7	759.4	1,055.8
1941	182.1	48.7	87.6	48.3	580.4	34.7	799.7	1,089.0
1942:								
January	188.5	48.7	87.6	50.2	581.3	34.7	802.5	1,094.2
February	192.4	48.7	87.6	51.6	582.1	34.7	804.7	1,096.3

[1] These items represent the difference between the cost value and the monetar. value of silver bullion revalued and held to secure silver certificates.

[2] The figures in this column are not cumulative; as the amount of bullion held changes, the potential seigniorage thereon changes.

Basis: Daily Treasury Statements.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to know is, what is it worth to the banks to keep silver money out of circulation? And in connection with that I should like to know what is the profit to the Government and the saving to the American people in using silver money in transacting business?

Now I am going to read you my reply to these eminent economists of the leading institutions of higher education in this country, analyzing and making response to this communication put out to the country, the President, and the Congress for their guidance:

To the Members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy:

GENTLEMEN: In considering the recommendations of your committee of 65 economists to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934, and the domestic silver-purchase law of July 6, 1939, made in your communication of April 20, presumably addressed to the President, the Congress, and the country, you state: "Its results have been harmful to both the United States and certain foreign countries." How has it been harmful? Do you seek to imply that $2,024,000,000 in the form of silver dollars and silver certificates, $1, $5, and $10 bills, redeemable in silver dollars now in circulation in the channels of trade and business, is harmful to our national economy or to the American people?

For fear that some of the details of the Treasury fiscal operations may have escaped the notice of the members of your economists' committee, and, to be more specific, let me point out to you, gentlemen, first, that on the day your communication was issued, April 20, there were $1,962,101,367 in silver certificates outstanding, which, as you know, are redeemable in silver dollars (April 20 daily statement, U. S. Treasury), and in addition there were 62,327,405 silver dollars in circulation (March 31 Treasury Statement, United States money in circulation)—money issued by the Government interest free and in use throughout the country in handling the Nation's business—the kind of money that your members have steadily opposed; money which you say is harmful and should never have been issued, and now could best be replaced by unredeemable Federal Reserve currency, the other kind of money which business or the Government would be required to borrow from the bank at interest to get it issued and must continue to pay interest to the loaning banks to keep it in circulation.

In making your recommendations, it would be interesting to know if the members of your committee have calculated the difference in cost on the item of interest between the expense of using Federal Reserve money and the use of interest-free silver money to which your members object so strenuously, or in this connection has your committee considered the profits accruing to the Government in purchasing domestic and foreign silver and revaluing it and putting it into circulation as money in paying current Government expense. For fear that by some mischance all of your 65 members may have overlooked some of these small items, there is presented the record of seigniorage taken from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury (Treasury Bulletin, March 1942) which I submit for your files and infomation in event you desire to have the actual facts, to wit:

On page 80 of this bulletin we find the following totals of seigniorage on silver:

(2) Total seigniorage on silver revalued less minor coins (January 1, 1934, to February 28, 1942), $804,700,000;

(2) The total seigniorage on minor coinage (January 1, 1934, to February 28, 1942) $192,400,000, which represents the actual gain to the Government on this silver by revaluing it and putting it out as money.

This still leaves the Government with a surplus of unused silver amounting to 1,364,566,969.7 ounces on hand in the general fund, as appears on Treasury statement of even date with your communication (April 20), surplus silver that can be revalued and put into circulation as money under existing law in the form of silver certificates or silver dollars by the Secretary of the Treasury amounting to $1,764,288,605.24 when revalued for use as money.

By consulting the Treasury statement, you will find that this silver has been taken into consideration by the Treasury in computing the seigniorage as appears in the last column of the table on page 80 of the March Treasury bulletin, headed "Potential Seigniorage on Silver Bullion at Cost in General Fund," amounting to a total of $1,096,300,000. When you add up these three seigniorage items, which is the difference between the cost of the silver to the Government as bullion and its money value when issued by the Treasury in paying Government expense, you have a grand total of $2,093,400,000 seigniorage, making a tidy profit of over $2,000,000,000, which has and will accrue to the Government if the Treasury will use all the silver as money it has bought under the "objectionable" Silver Purchase Act since 1934. Leaving out the item of potential seigniorage: To date the record discloses the Government has made on the silver used as money, a total in seigniorage, amounting to $997,000,000 and has, in addition, enough silver left over to make another $1,096,300,000 in seigniorage as disclosed in the last Treasury bulletin, and you 65 eminent economists and educators in our leading institutions of learning object to our Government making this little profit in the present emergency, at a time when every monetary thread in the national financial fabric is strained to the utmost.

When you consider the cost in the form of interest the people would be required to pay by retiring the silver money now in use and replacing it with Federal Reserve notes, think of what your plan would add to the expense of doing business.

In order to determine the full amount that business has saved by our Government refusing to follow the money plan you have urged in your repeated recommendations, we must get the figures on silver in circulation year by year since the silver-purchase program went into effect in 1934 and calculate the interest on its equivalent in Federal Reserve money. I hope your committee will do that for your own information and the good of the American people.

In this time of emergency and mounting tax load on business what valid objection is there to issuing the balance of silver the Government has on hand as money and putting this currency into circulation in paying current Government expenses? Inflation. Your committee will say pointing to all the danger to our national economy and the disastrous effect on the living standards of labor—if we increase the volume of cash—money of ultimate redemption in the channels of trade and business. If this is true, it may be that another fact has escaped the notice of all of your committee. If I may call this fact to your attention, the record discloses that on June 30, 1942, a little less than a year ago at a time when credit was vastly expanded in financing our national-defense program, there was Federal Reserve notes in circulation in the amount of $7,001,520,625, and at the same time there was 1,349,488,385.7 ounces of surplus and idle silver in the Treasury which the Secretary of the Treasury could have revalued and issued as money in paying the Government's current expenses. Now less than a year later on March 31 we find the Federal Reserve has increased its currency in circulation to $9,056,131,060, an increase of over $2,000,000,000 and we still have the unused surplus silver left in the Treasury; to be exact the amount as of the date of your communication was 1,364,566,969.1 ounces. The money in circulation has been inflated all right but not by revaluing and using our idle silver. Money material which represents real profit to the Government now on hand and ready to be turned into $1, $5, and $10 bills and put into circulation in paying Government expense just as is being done every day with the new silver that is coming in, these newly engraved silver certificates "as good as gold" being paid to the Members of Congress and their clerical help are eagerly accepted in transacting business everywhere when the Government employees put them in circulation.

In view of these incontrovertible facts and the heavy load of interest piling higher and higher on business everywhere, it is unfortunate, distressingly unfortunate, that the true situation and the real facts concerning the profits and the saving that the American people are deriving from their silver-purchase program is so confused, and so little understood, particularly by the educational leaders in this country. Surely in this critical hour when so much depends on the stability of national economy and the security of the monetary foundation on which both public and private credit must rest, the patriotism of our economist and educational leaders should direct their efforts first to understanding and presenting the true facts concerning money and then to advising and assisting those in charge of directing the affairs of our Government in establishing and maintaining a stronger national economy to safeguard the financial integrity of our Government and the business security of the American people by effecting any saving and obtaining any profits available in any quarter.

Gentlemen, be patriotic; lend your knowledge and your ability to your country; help the Members of Congress representing the people to right the financial ship of state and provide an equitable, workable, adequate monetary system to lift business and the American people out of this morass of debt and ease this crushing burden of interest and taxes.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 27, I made a statement on the floor of the House in which I said that present conditions required the total elimination of all considerations with regard to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project except those which have a bearing upon the probable effect which the approval of the St. Lawrence legislation would have on our war efforts.

In that statement I pointed out the drastically detrimental effect the project would have because of the diversion of essential manpower from our war needs.

On the following day my colleague and good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], urged that the omnibus rivers and harbors bill be brought before the House and passed. In his statement he said among other things:

In the prosecution of this World War we need every transportation agency available. * * * All of us better give consideration to the fact that we need all of these river and harbor improvements in connection with the

effort of America to win the World War. The menace of the U-boats off our shore has decided this matter.

* * * everyone knows that there is an acute shortage of vessels at this time. Oil and gasoline for the eastern seaboard cannot be had because there are no boats to carry it from the production centers. Other agencies of transportation are inadequate.

And further—

As time goes on the need of this legislation becomes more and more real. It is needed as a part of our program for national defense and the winning of the World War.

Of course, everyone knows that the gentleman's special interest in the rivers and harbors bill arises from the fact that it contains provisions ratifying the St. Lawrence agreement with Canada, a project dear to his heart and one for the approval of which he has made a most gallant if futile fight.

I am happy to learn that the gentleman apparently agrees with my premise that such legislation, if it is to be seriously considered at all, must have at least some semblance of justification as a war measure.

I concede without reservation that in the prosecution of this war we need every transportation agency available, but the St. Lawrence waterway is not available and could not be made available if it were approved at once before 1946. This is not my own view of the matter. I think it would take longer, but the assumption is based upon the testimony of General Robins, who stated that with the "best of luck" and being granted full priorities, the project could be completed in 4 years. Even this optimistic forecast gives us no assurance that the waterway could be utilized for the purposes of navigation in 1946. Under the terms of the agreement with Canada, that country is not required to complete its portion of the waterway before December 31, 1948, and even that date may be extended if the exigencies of the war required it.

This point has been stated, reiterated, and stressed, both in and out of Congress and in the public press, for the past year, but up to the present time there is no indication that Canada would be agreeable to a change in the agreement which would accelerate the construction of the waterway so as to permit its use at an earlier day.

Even if the St. Lawrence waterway as now proposed was completed and in operation at the present time, it could not and would not be used to relieve the shortage of vessels which now exists.

While many plans have been proposed and are now being considered to overcome the loss of tankers as a result of the depredations of U-boats in the Atlantic, no one has come forward as yet with the suggestion that it would be practical to undertake to transport petroleum and its products from Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and other oil-producing States to the Atlantic seaboard by way of the circuitous, time-consuming and impractical St. Lawrence route. This, notwithstanding that at the present time, the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River can accommodate larger vessels than any other waterway that has been suggested as an alternative to the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean for that purpose.

The necessity for speed and more speed in supplying our allies and our own A. E. F. is being repeatedly emphasized. Ocean going vessels, which might be utilized in shipping war materials between the Great Lakes and overseas ports by way of the St. Lawrence are now being used exclusively on the sea. Even if the waterway were now a reality and not a mere plan and if the type of vessels that its 27-foot channels would accommodate, were available, it goes without saying that they would be used between our ocean ports and foreign destinations rather than operated through the slow, tortuous channels of the St. Lawrence River and the numerous locks and other channels of the seaway.

Who would argue that munitions and food should be held in transit for 6 days moving from Chicago to Montreal when they might be sent by rail to New York in less than 60 hours. No one in authority has yet said that there is a present or potential transportation shortage between the Great Lakes area and the Atlantic seaboard.

Conceding momentarily, for the purpose of argument, that such delay would not be an important or persuasive factor, where would we get the vessels to operate this service?

As I pointed out to the Congress in a statement made on April 9, 1942, and found on page A1355 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Maritime Commission has contracted for the completion of our cargo-ship building program calling for 2,300 ships by the end of 1943. None of these boats is the type that could be used advantageously in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence world-wide movement.

It the St. Lawrence waterway were to be completed according to present plans, it could not accommodate ships with a salt-water draft of more than 24 feet. While there is to be found in the testimony concerning the St. Lawrence some slight difference of opinion on this subject, I believe that my statement is entirely conservative and is supported by the great weight of authoritative opinion.

For its substantiation, I call your attention to a statement to be found in the Army engineers' report on one of the other projects in the Rivers and Harbors bill. The statement was made with respect to a project about which there is no controversy and therefore no incentive for argument on the subject. On page 15 of House Document No. 215, Seventy-sixth Congress, concerning improvements of the mouth of the Mississippi River, the Army engineers state:

Three feet of water is desirable under the keel of a ship for proper handling.

The oceangoing cargo vessels now being built for the Maritime Commission range in draft from 37 feet 4 inches to 45 feet 6 inches. Even though it may be argued that these vessels could enter and leave the Great Lakes partially loaded, no one will seriously contend, when shipping is our principal bottleneck, that they should not be used to their fullest capacity or that shipments should be delayed by requiring them to enter the Great Lakes for cargo.

No one in charge of production or transportation for war purposes has as yet said, so far as my knowledge extends, that the transportation features of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway would in the slightest degree, even if they were available, contribute one iota to our war efforts. Nor do I anticipate that anyone qualified by experience to speak on the subject, would make such a rash assertion. Certainly no such statement could be expected from the man who has been chosen to supervise our all-out efforts to thwart those who would place the yoke of nazi-ism upon our shoulders.

Mr. Donald Nelson has been quoted repeatedly as accentuating the need for unlimited speed in our production of the necessary materials to win the war. Speed in transportation, to move those materials to the many far-flung points where they are so desperately needed is just as essential as speed in their acquirement.

I have just come into possession of a transcript of a conference of business paper editors and publishers with War Production Board officials held in Washington on February 13, 1942. This transcript entitled "Converting Industry" has been issued by the War Production Board. In it, Mr. Nelson is quoted as having said to the editors:

We are expected to build a great armament program, to make up in a year or two—not more than 2 years—for all that the aggressor nations have been doing during a period of 10 years, and to build an armament program that will not alone meet their rate of production, but also make up for the reserves which they have built up during this period of time because of the determination and the will they have had to get the job done. * * *

We have to prevent now, not next year, an enemy from keeping on extending to a point where it may make it absolutely impossible for us to win this war. I think today we are really face to face, and looking it right squarely in the face, that we, great nation that we are, one of the greatest, of course, of all time, all throughout history, may not be able to win this war. * * *

Every weapon that we produce today or tomorrow is worth 10 that we are going to produce in 1943. Every airplane that we produce today is worth I don't know how many times one that we are going to produce in 1943. This 1942 is the critical year of the existence of this United States.

My good friend from Minnesota may be willing—though I do not think for a moment that he is—to have our most important, if not our only important, job interrupted by the diversion from our war efforts of the men, money, and materials necessary to dig a ditch along the international border so that conceivably, in 1946 or thereafter, ocean vessels may enter the harbors of the Great Lakes in which he is so much interested.

If the gentleman from Minnesota has in mind the further utilization of Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities, I join with him most heartily in that suggestion, but, as I pointed out to this House on April 9, the shipyards in the Great Lakes are now building merchant and naval vessels in substantial numbers.

In addition to the 16 ore carriers to be built for the Maritime Commission, according to Marine News, it had on order or under construction prior to

March 1, 8 coastal tankers, 18 coastal cargo ships, 9 coastal steamers, and 14 tugs. There are still unemployed facilities in the Lakes for the building of many types of vessels needed for war purposes, and these may be used if the Navy and the Maritime Commission choose to use them.

While the gentleman from Minnesota made no special reference to the St. Lawrence project in his speech of April 28, we all know how dear to his heart that particular project is. But the gentleman goes much beyond the St. Lawrence waterway. He endorses the entire omnibus rivers and harbors bill as being "needed as a part of our program for national defense and the winning of the World War."

Mr. Speaker, of the 236 projects in the rivers and harbors bill, no more than 36 of them bear any approval on the part of those in charge of our war efforts as having any relationship to national defense.

The gentleman has pointed the way to the accomplishment whatever may be necessary to protect the interest of this country insofar as river and harbor developments are concerned, when he referred to the manner in which provision has already been made by Congress for the building of the new Soo Canal, one of the projects originally included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

If there are other projects in the bill necessary or desirable to improve the position of this country in its war on our aggressors, let us bring those measures forward, consider them and pass them, but let us not beguile ourselves with the illusion that this is the proper time to consider whether "mud-creek" or other boondoggling and unnecessary improvements should be seriously considered.

I am happy in the thought, supported by a strong conviction, that the views of my friend from Minnesota are not shared by the great majority of my colleagues in the House.

Many advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway contend the project is necessary in order that ships, needed in the war, might be built on the Great Lakes. Marine News of March 1942 published a list reporting a ship construction record. I include the list for the information of the House and at the same time to point out to the proponents of the seaway, that at the present time, a full program of combat ships is now in full progress.

Ship-construction record—Great Lakes

[From Marine News, March 1942]

Company	Plant	Number	Length	Character	Built for—
American Ship Building Co.	Loraine	8	220	Mine sweepers	U. S. Navy.
		2	614	Bulk freighters	Pittsburgh Steamship Co.
		6	605	do	U. S. Maritime Commission
Barnes Duluth Ship Building Co.	Duluth, Minn.	8	212	Coastal tankers	Do.
Burger Boat Co.	Manitowoc, Wis.	6	135	Wood mine sweepers	U. S. Navy.
		2	110	Wood subchasers	Do.
Walter Butler	Superior, Wis.	18	250	Coastal cargo	U. S. Maritime Commission.
Calumet Shipyard & Drydock Co.	South Chicago, Ill.	5	88	Tugs	Do.
Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.	Chicago, Ill.	1		Floating drydock	U. S. Navy.
Dachel-Carter Shipbuilding Corporation	Benton Harbor, Mich.	2	136	Mine sweepers	Do.
		2	110	Wood subchasers	Do.
		4	100	Aircraft rescue	U. S. Army.
Defoe Boat & Marine Works	Bay City, Mich.	4	220	Mine sweepers	U. S. Navy.
		20	165	Sub chasers	Do.
		4	132	Tugs (seagoing)	U. S. Maritime Commission.
Erie Concrete & Supply Co.	Erie, Pa.	3		Steel freight lighters	U. S. Navy.
Foster Boat Works	Detroit, Mich.	2	110	Subchasers	Do.
Froemming Bros.	Milawukee, Wis.	4	185	Armored target ships	U. S. Army.
Gar Wood Industries	Marysville, Mich.		175	do	Do.
Globe Ship Building Co.	Superior, Wis.	5	185	Seagoing tugs	U. S. Maritime Commission.
Great Lakes Engineering Co.	Detroit, Mich.	3	614	Bulk freighters	Pittsburgh Steamship Co.
Do	Ashtabula, Ohio	10	605	do	U. S. Maritime Commission.
H. C. Grebe & Co.	Chicago, Ill.	2	135	Mine sweepers	U. S. Navy.
		5	65	Harbor tugs	Do.
Hacker Boat Co.	Mount Clemens, Mich.		175	Armored target ships	U. S. Army.
Inland Waterways Co., Inc.	Duluth, Minn.	2	110	Wood subchasers	U. S. Navy.
Lake Superior Ship Building Co.	Superior, Wis.	2	235	Fuel-oil barges	Do.
Manitowoc Ship Building Corporation	Manitowoc, Wis.	10		Submarines	Do.
Marine Iron & Ship Building Co.	Duluth, Minn.	4	180	Coast Guard cutter	U. S. Coast Guard.
Niagara Ship Building Co.	Buffalo, N. Y.	6	65	Harbor tugs	U. S. Navy.
Peterson Boat Works	Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	8	110	Subchasers	Do.
Robinson Marine Construction Co.	Benton Harbor	4	110	Wood subchasers	Do.
		2	65	Wire drag boats	Coast and Geodetic Survey.
		18	40–50	Launches	U. S. Army.
Richardson Boat Co.	North Tonawanda, N. Y.	47	36	Landing boats	U. S. Navy.
L. Smith Ship Building Co.	Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	6	165	Subchasers	Do.
		9	250	Coasting steamers	U. S. Maritime Commission.
Stadium Yacht Basin	Cleveland, Ohio	8	135	Wood mine sweepers	U. S. Navy.
Sturgeon Bay Ship Building Drydock	Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	4		Box boats	U. S. Army.
		3	150	Retrieving vessels	Do.
Toledo Ship Building Co.	Toledo, Ohio	1	230	Coast Guard cutter	U. S. Coast Guard.
Zenith Dredge Co.	Duluth	4	180	do	Do.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to prceeed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been an alarming increase in unemployment at Grand Rapids, Mich., and the area covered by Kent and Ottawa Counties, in my home State, comprising the Fifth Congressional District thereof. My efforts have been and will continue to be toward doing everything possible to relieve the situation, which not only affects labor but manufacturing as well, by securing war-production contracts for that city and the district.

On April 28 the Price Administrator issued a series of orders designating defense-rental areas, included in which is Grand Rapids, Mich. The order includes Kent and Ottawa Counties in the defense-rental area.

In the order I find the following statement:

> The designated areas now are or will be the location of establishments of the armed forces of the United States or war-production industries.

The order further states that in the areas covered, including Grand Rapids, an increase in employment has taken place in most of the same and is about to take place in the other areas and that most of the areas have been placed on the list of defense-housing areas in which builders may secure priority ratings on critical materials for residential construction.

I am now accumulating detailed data to present to the Government officials having jurisdiction with the view of, first, having Grand Rapids, Mich., designated as a defense-housing area; and second, to show the availability of ample office space to quarter some of the Federal agencies required to be transferred from Washington to other cities to provide quarters here for war-agency work.

It is therefore pleasing to note from the order of the Price Administrator that inasmuch as Kent and Ottawa Counties, Mich., are included in the same, war-

production industries will be located therein.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a transcription of a "Buy a Bomber" campaign at Chattanooga.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2404. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit and the Medal for Merit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Monday, May 4, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., Friday, May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Monday, May 4, 1942, in connection with the investigation of petroleum.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Helen Mary Nichols; without amendment (Rept. No. 2063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of William Frank Coman Nichols; with amendment (Rept. No. 2064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5819. A bill directing the Attorney General to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Vivian Chang; with amendment (Rept. No. 2065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 7029. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THILL:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution urging the Civil Aeronautics Authority immediately to institute an aircraft pilot and mechanics training program in high schools; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 7030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Daufkirch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7031. A bill for the relief of Acting First Sgt. David Schlesinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 7032. A bill for the relief of the Custer Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7033. A bill for the relief of certain trial examiners of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 7034. A bill for the relief of Roy Chandler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. R. 7035. A bill for the relief of Garland Gailey, of Baldwin, Ga., and Mrs. Clara Mae Gailey, of Baldwin, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of the American people and the Congress of the United States to Capt. Maude Davison and the other members of the United States Army Nurse Corps in the Philippines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2742. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Dora A. States and 158 others, in support of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesale defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2743. By Mr. ROLPH: resolution of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the California State Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, of whom are all things and for whom all things exist, teach us to be as children in our Father's house, where we are thankful for every gift of Thy bestowal. We thank Thee for the glow of battle when we fight to win; for the glow of satisfaction as we worthily attain our goal; for the bliss that comes from doing always that which should be done, no matter what the difficulties, and, finally, we bless Thee for the joy that comes to us when we share our best for others' good.

May we ne'er be exercised with the mere question of what we shall eat or drink, or wherewithal we shall be clothed, but let this mind be in us to be rid of all selfishness and pride, that, with clean hands and pure hearts, we may do our work.

Make us glad with that summer in the heart which faith creates and love sustains; give us the gladsomeness of Christ, who, despite His short and troubled life, was nonetheless the happiest of men, whose joy o'erflowed on everyone with whom He came in contact. Open Thou to us the vision of a kingdom not from hence, regions of power beyond the range of ordinary sight; inspire us with those far-off influences that give new meaning to our Nation's cause and lend new beauty to each act of consecration to that cause. We ask it in the Name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 30, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hayden	Reed
Ball	Herring	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Rosier
Barbour	Holman	Russell
Barkley	Hughes	Schwartz
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chandler	McNary	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Doxey	Murray	Wheeler
Ellender	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FELICITATIONS TO THE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE ON HIS BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as one of the elderly Members of the Senate, it affords me pleasure to move that the Senate extend its cordial felicitations to Dr. Phillips, our beloved Chaplain, on this day, which marks the anniversary of his birth and another milestone in his distinguished career of service to his fellowman.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I heartily second the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, ETC., DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 202)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $14,778,000, and an authorization directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance an additional $105,500,000 to the Department of Agriculture in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MEMORIAL OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, April 20, 1942.

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States H. R. 6886, a bill to provide for tolls with respect to the use, for commercial navigation, of the improved inland waterways of the United States, for the purpose of reimbursing the United States for expenditures made in improving such waterways; and

Whereas the term "improved inland waterways" means, according to the bill, any inland or coastal canal and any natural waterway (except the Great Lakes) in the United States, wholly or partly constructed or improved with moneys appropriated by the Government of the United States, excepting any improved inland waterway forming a boundary between the United States and any foreign country; and

Whereas the State of New York constructed the Erie and Oswego Canals at a cost of approximately $230,000,000, and spends approximately $3,500,000 per annum of State moneys for their maintenance. These waterways have been toll free for more than two generations, and agriculture, labor, and industry have vigorously and successfully opposed the imposition of tolls on them; and

Whereas the necessities of war are demonstrating the great value of our inland waterways to the entire Nation. The demand for war equipment requires the maximum production by the many great plants located on, or adjacent to, inland waterways. Transportation is the key to the problem of delivering war supplies to military reservations, depots, and embarkation ports; and

Whereas the imposition of tolls, as proposed in H. R. 6886, would not apply to the Great Lakes or to ocean harbors or to the St. Lawrence River, thus creating a definite discrimination against other waterways, and thereby placing producers and consumers, served by such other waterways, under a very great disadvantage; and

Whereas the imposition of tolls on inland waterways would not help in the solution of national problems of industrial depression, domestic and foreign trade barriers, and widespread unemployment. It would not promote the use of existing facilities and develop the potentialities of these services in the solution of one of our major economic problems; namely, the transportation of the products of the farm and the factory to the consumer in the city and the country, or to ocean ports for export; and

Whereas low-cost transportation is vital to the well-being and life of the American people. Our distances are so great that the transportation problem will always be paramount. Low-cost water transportation shortens the distance between the farm and the market, and between the source of raw material and the factory; and

Whereas H. R. 6886 would nullify the natural economic advantage of inland water transportation and deprive the public of the savings in transportation that are passed on to the consumer in reduced costs of living; and

Whereas Government agencies established and maintained for the purpose of promoting the welfare of agriculture, industry, and labor, including the Departments of Agriculture, Navy, and War, and the Maritime Commission, have publicly gone on record to the effect that any increase in inland water transportation costs is unnecessary and unwise and would prove harmful to agriculture, industry, and labor; and, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby affirms its opposition to H. R. 6886, and to the imposition of tolls on the canal system of the State of New York as well as the inland waterways of the United States, with respect to their use for commercial navigation; and, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, manifested by the considered judgment of their elected representatives in the legislature, that the imposition of Federal tolls on the New York State canals and inland waterways of the United States would operate against the present war effort, and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the clerk of the senate be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the secretary of the United States Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

By order of the senate,
WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, April 24, 1942. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to present a petition signed by some 180 members and friends of the First Baptist Church, of Augusta, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of liquor in or around our Army and Navy training camps. This petition has my wholehearted approval, and I trust the Senate may take favorable action on the measure in the near future. I ask that the petition may be properly referred and printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned, wish to express our sincere approval of the Sheppard bill, which is to prohibit the sale of liquor in or around our Army and Navy training camps. We therefore urge you to lend all your force and influence for its passage.

REV. R. R. SHIRK,
MRS. H. D. WOOD,
(And sundry other citizens of Augusta, Kans.)

SUPPRESSION OF VICE AND LIQUOR TRAFFIC AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of this body a letter received by me from the Reverend W. W. Beasley, of Southampton County, Va. The letter is addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I shall read to the Senate the gist of the letter, as follows:

The matter of giving our county boys and every boy now in the armed forces of our country proper protection from the encroaching liquor and vice traffics was recently presented to a large group of citizens assembled in the Courtland Methodist Church, Southampton County. It went on record overwhelmingly in favor of the passage by Congress of Senate bill 860 or of legislation similar to that of 1917 for the protection of the armed forces of our country from the liquor and vice traffics.

The Reverend Mr. Beasley asked me to bring the action of the congregation of the Courtland Methodist Church, of Southampton County, Va., to the attention of the Senate at this time, and therefore I am glad to comply with his request.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1300) thereon.

INVESTIGATION OF TELEGRAPH INDUSTRY—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 236 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 236) submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (For Mr. WHEELER) on April 9, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, authorized by Senate Resolution 95 of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and Senate Resolution 268 of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, to investigate the telegraph industry is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, to complete the investigation authorized by the above-mentioned resolutions, $2,500 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized for said purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marlin Croft, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2505. A bill to amend sections 23–701 and 23–702 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HAROLD SINGER

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 242), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Harold Singer, son of Joseph F. Singer, late an employee of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LAWRENCE BRIZENDINE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1899) for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine, which was on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$3,260" and insert "$2,060."

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

E. P. CORLEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTATE OF ROMANO EMILIANI

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALVIRA MANFREDI

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I announce that, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I have appointed the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs for the second session, Seventy-seventh Congress.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION, AND OF FEDERAL COURT DECISIONS ON ITS CONSTITUTIONALITY DURING FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 203)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is in existence Senate Document No. 49 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, covering legislation and decisions for the years 1933 to 1940, inclusive. I have in my hand a supplement to that containing a list of the major legislation for the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which is supplementary, prepared up to January 1942. This compilation is strictly a supplement to Senate Document 49 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and follows in every particular the plan of that document. In the description of the acts to be included the attempt has been made to include all 1941 amendments, however trifling, to acts listed in the document, as well as all important new legislation of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

In listing decisions as to constitutionality, the general rule has been to ignore cases in lower courts which merely follow the principles laid down by higher courts.

I ask unanimous consent that this supplement be published as a Senate document for the information of the Senate and of the country, and for distribution under the rules governing such documents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have a brief editorial from the Oregonian, a newspaper published in Portland, Oreg., which presents clearly an idea which is so pertinent to the current thought among many good citizens that I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT WITH THE COCKROACHES

Attorney General Francis Biddle announces that several thousand cases involving alleged

subversive activities among Government employees—mostly, it is assumed, in the National Capital—have been reported to his office by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Where there is so much smoke there is bound to be considerable fire. Let us see what is smoldering. The Attorney General proposes to appoint an interdepartmental committee to review each case on its merits, thus expediting an inquiry and action that should long ago have been taken. But it does seem that the Dies committee was right in large part.

On the one hand have been the Dies committee and a resentful public; on the other, the radicals themselves, and the apologists for radicals, and even to some extent the administration. Such a condition of affairs is as bad for national unity as it is suggestive of worse to come. We, the people, have the right to demand that subversive influences be not kept on the public pay roll and pampered. There should be no shelter under the wing of the eagle for such dubious riffraff.

Then, too, it is probable that among those who are suspect are some who have been falsely accused. They are entitled to clean bills of health. Housecleaning might better have been done at an earlier time—but better late than never. Away with the cockroaches.

CONDUCT OF MILITARY OPERATIONS—QUOTATION FROM LIVY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, human nature has not changed very much in the last 2,000 years. I desire to read into the RECORD at this point a short excerpt from Livy, book XLIV, chapter 22, as follows:

IN WHICH LUCIUS SAYS SOMETHING

Lucius Aemilius Paulus, a Roman consul, who had been selected to conduct the war with the Macedonians, B. C. 168, went out from the Senate house into the assembly of the people and addressed them as follows:

"In every circle, and truly, at every table, there are people who lead armies into Macedonia; who know where the camp ought to be placed; what posts ought to be occupied by troops; when and through what pass Macedonia should be entered; where magazines should be formed; how provisions should be conveyed by land and sea; and when it is proper to engage the enemy, when to lie quiet. And they not only determine what is best to be done, but if anything is done in any other manner than what they have pointed out, they arraign the consul as if he were on trial. These are great impediments to those who have the management of affairs; for everyone cannot encounter injurious reports with the same constancy and firmness of mind as Fabius did, who chose to let his own authority be diminished through the folly of the people rather than to mismanage the public business with a high reputation. I am not one of those who think that the commanders ought never to receive advice; on the contrary, I deem that man more proud than wise who did everything of his own single judgment. What then is my opinion? That commanders should be counseled, chiefly, by persons of known talent; by those, especially, who are skilled in the art of war, and who have been taught by experience; and next, by those who are present at the scene of action, who see the country, who see the enemy, who see the advantages that occasions offer, and who, embarked, as it were, in the same ship, are sharers of the danger. If therefore anyone thinks himself qualified to give advice respecting the war which I am to conduct, which may prove advantageous to the public, let him not refuse his assistance to the state, but let him come with me into Macedonia. He will be furnished by me with a ship, a horse, a tent; and even with his traveling charges. But if he thinks this too much trouble and prefers the repose of a city life to the toils of war, let him not, on land, assume the office of a pilot. The city in itself furnishes abundance of topics for conversation; let it confine its passion for talking to those topics and rest assured that we shall confine ourselves to our military councils.

UNION SECURITY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in recent weeks the issue of union security or the so-called maintenance-of-membership clause has come to the forefront of discussion. To foster a better understanding of the issue, I call to the attention of the Senate the following:

First. Unanimous statement of the War Labor Board, dated April 22, 1942, responding to the speech of William P. Withrow, president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Second. Majority, concurring, and minority decisions of the War Labor Board in the important Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. case.

Third. Article by Ernest K. Lindley entitled "Freezing Union Membership" appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent to have these items printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
April 22, 1942.

William H. Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board, today issued the following statement with the unanimous approval of the members of the Board. Those members of the Board voting approval of the statement in addition to Mr. Davis were George W. Taylor, Frank P. Graham, and Wayne L. Morse, representing the public; Roger D. Lapham, Walter Teagle, E. J. McMillan, and H. B. Horton, representing employers; Thomas Kennedy, R. J. Thomas, Emil Rieve, and Martin P. Durkin, representing labor.

"In a joint statement issued yesterday, William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, and Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, took the position that the industry-labor agreement which provides for no strikes and no lock-outs contained the provision that all labor disputes, including those involving issues of union security, were to be finally determined by the War Labor Board, and that the industry representatives in the industry-labor conference accepted that arrangement. That position is correct. At the conclusion of that conference both industry and labor committed themselves to a peaceful settlement of all disputes by a War Labor Board to be established by the President.

"In a speech in New York last night William P. Witherow, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, is reported to have said that the question of union security was not included in that commitment. Any such statement runs counter to the pledge signed by Mr. Witherow and the other 11 industry members of the conference. The opening sentence of that pledge reads as follows:

" 'The employer members of the conference accept the President's direction for peaceful settlement of disputes and the establishment of a War Labor Board.'

"The industry members of the conference went on to point out that they believed that 'in determining the procedure of the Board, consideration should be given' by the Board to industry's suggestion that union security disputes were not a proper subject for final determination by the Board.

"The Executive order of January 12, 1942, establishing the War Labor Board provided '* * * that for the duration of the war there shall be no strikes or lock-outs, and that all labor disputes shall be settled by peaceful means, and that a National War Labor Board be established for the peaceful adjustment of such disputes'; and 'After it takes jurisdiction, the Board shall finally determine the dispute, and for this purpose may use mediation, voluntary arbitration, or arbitration under rules established by the Board.'

"The question whether such disputes were within the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board was raised last month by the Inland Steel Co. The Board unanimously disposed of this question of jurisdiction by a resolution which read in part as follows:

" 'This Board has jurisdiction to consider all labor disputes which might interrupt work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war, including labor disputes as to union status such as the one raised in this particular case.'

"In such consideration, each member of the Board reserves the right, of course, to vote upon the merits of particular cases according to his convictions."

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
April 24, 1942.

IN THE MATTER OF FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING & DRY DOCK CO. AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE & SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 16, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

DIRECTIVE ORDER

It is the directive order of the National War Labor Board that the following article be included in the contract between the Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. and the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, Local 16, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

1. In view of the joint responsibility of the company and the union to maintain maximum production during the present emergency and of their reciprocal guarantees that there shall be no strikes or lock-outs for a period of 2 years from June 23, 1941, as set out in the Atlantic coast zone standards agreement incorporated herein and made a part hereof, there is an obligation upon each employee who is now a member of the union or who hereafter voluntarily becomes a member to maintain his membership in the union in good standing during the life of this agreement.

2. If any member is certified by the union not to be in good standing as defined in section 3 of this article, the case may be treated by the company as a grievance and submitted to the grievance machinery. If through this process such employee is declared not to be in good standing the arbiter shall discharge the employee unless as a condition of continued employment the employee agrees to request the company, in writing, to deduct from his pay his financial obligations to the union. In any cases in which the company is so requested to make deductions the company will deduct from the first pay period of each month during the term of this contract and pay to the union a sum equivalent to the union dues, and also if any fine is imposed upon the employee a sum equivalent to that fine.

3. In order to maintain good standing in the union for the purposes of article 2 above, an employee shall be required to pay only the regular monthly dues or fines and comply with any other penalties that may be imposed upon him by the union for specific acts involving the violation of any of the terms and conditions of this agreement, or violation of any of the terms or conditions of the constitution or bylaws of the union.

4. Immediately after the signing of this agreement the union shall furnish to the company and to this Board a notarized list of those members in good standing as of that date. If any employee named on the list asserts that he has withdrawn from member-

ship in the union, or if the company disputes the accuracy of the list, the assertion or dispute shall be adjudicated by an arbiter appointed by the National War Labor Board whose decision shall be final and binding upon the union, the company, and the employee.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
April 24, 1942.

IN THE MATTER OF FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO., KEARNY, N. J., AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 16, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

OPINION

This case came to the National War Labor Board because of the long defiance of the Government of the United States by the Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation. It is high time that in the midst of a world war involving the future of America and the future of freedom, a dispute in a plant building most essential ships for America and for freedom be settled without further delay.

At the outset of the now 10-months-old dispute, the union based its demand for the union shop on the need for a stable union and continuous industrial production. The company based its demand for the open shop on the protection of the individual liberty of its employees. The National War Labor Board, after a careful examination of the facts, and after balancing the claims and equities in the case, accepted its responsibility under the President's Executive order to settle this dispute, and issues today the directive order for its final determination.

NO ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENT FOR DISCHARGE

In the interest of more stable membership in the union, of more responsible and cooperative relations for maximum war production, and on account of the special circumstances and equities in the long-standing dispute between the company and the union, the National War Labor Board, by a vote of 8 to 4, decided in favor of a provision in the contract for the maintenance of membership in good standing in the union. This is essentially a reaffirmation of the recommendation made July 26, 1941, by the National Defense Mediation Board.

The freedom of choice of the individual worker is protected by a provision already in the contract against any coercion of a worker into membership in the union. In addition, the individual's right to work is safeguarded by a clause in the Board's order. Under this clause, a member of the union may withdraw from the union by not maintaining his membership in good standing. In such case, he must, as a condition of employment, continue to pay his financial obligations to the union for the duration of the contract, which has little more than a year to run. A member of a club has no more freedom and no lighter obligation. No member of the union need ever be discharged under this provision, except by his own choice.

NO REQUIREMENT THAT ANY EMPLOYEE JOIN THIS UNION AT ANY TIME

The maintenance of membership clause does not require any worker, at any time, to join the union. It does not require the company to employ only members of the union and is, therefore, not a closed shop. It does not require the employees who have been hired by the company, to join the union, and is, therefore, not a union shop. It does not require the company to give preference in hiring to members of the union, and is, therefore, not a preferential union shop. It does not require any old employee, any new employee, or any employee whatever to join the union at any time.

The maintenance of membership clause requires only that any employee who is a member of good standing, at the time the contract is signed, or who thereafter voluntarily joins the union, shall remain a member in good standing. This he is required to do as part of his obligation to keep the provisions of the contract made by the union with the company on his behalf. Every employee who, since the original recommendation of July 26, 1941, has chosen to remain a member in good standing, or who has since joined the union, has had full knowledge of this provision and has thus made the choice voluntarily to maintain his membership. Any others have already resigned.

THE POSITION OF CHIEF JUSTICE STACY AND THE OTHER SIX PUBLIC MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE MEDIATION BOARD

Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy, spokesman for the panel majority which made the original recommendation, rejected the demand of the union for a union shop. He did this in the face of almost universal closed shops in the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast and a union shop negotiated by the same union in the Camden, N. J., plant of another large shipbuilding company. He held that, in view of the fact that the union was giving up the right to strike for 2 years and the right to any general wage increases except automatic adjustments for 2 years, at the request of the Government, a maintenance of membership provision was a just compensation and a reasonable protection.

It is noteworthy that all the seven public members of the former National Defense Mediation Board supported Chief Justice Stacy in this position.

THE UNION'S EQUITIES IN THIS CASE

The circumstances and equities of the case are even more compelling now than when they moved Chief Justice Stacy and the six other public members of the National Defense Mediation Board to favor a maintenance-of-membership clause in this case.

When the United States Steel Corporation refused to comply with the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board, the shipyard was taken over by the Government. At that time the Government assured the union that the maintenance-of-membership clause would be in effect unless the shipyard should be converted into a Government shipyard. The Kearny shipyard was not converted into a navy yard. The clause was, as a matter of equity, in effect even though unenforced by the Navy Department. However, procedure for its enforcement was at last in process on the eve of Pearl Harbor.

During all this time of uncertainty there was trouble with the newly organized local independent union, there was an increase in the number of grievances, and there was consequently a relative loss in the number of members in the union in good standing, bearing out Chief Justice Stacy's conclusion that in all the circumstances this union needed the protection of the maintenance-of-membership clause.

When the war came American labor and American management made a national agreement with the Government against strikes and lock-outs for the duration of the war. In view of this agreement for continued production, the Navy Department turned the yard back to the company with the understanding that any unsettled labor dispute would be referred to the War Labor Board.

The Government of the United States is under a moral and equitable compulsion not to take advantage of the national agreement which has disarmed this union of its only weapon. It is under the same compulsion not to allow the most powerful corporation in the world to take advantage of this covenant of honor and this covenant for maximum war production.

The leaders and members of this union have long stood at the forefront of all-out aid to the democracies and all-out war production. Their patriotic zeal for their country's cause and their cooperation with the production program, regardless of their failure to receive a contract clause assured them by their Government, must certainly be counted among the equities of their case.

THE VALUES OF MAINTENANCE OF MEMBERSHIP BY WORKERS WHO HAVE VOLUNTARILY JOINED THE UNION

The case for maintenance of membership is based not only on the equities in this case, but also on its value to the Nation. The experience of the War Labor Board has shown how strong, responsible union leadership can keep production rolling. History affords no parallel to the success of this voluntary agreement between labor, management, and the Government. In the first 3 months of 1942 less than six one-hundreds of 1 percent of all the time worked in war production has been lost by strikes.

Mainly responsible for this amazing record are the labor leaders of America who courageously stand guard day and night over the keeping of this agreement. The few leaders who have failed their country in a few situations serve to emphasize the overwhelming number of those who settle, stop, and prevent strikes at their first threat.

A great deal of the credit for this record goes to the patriotism of the rank and file of the workers themselves and to the discipline and stability of their local unions. There is a basic relation between maintenance of membership, maintenance of the contract, and maintenance of production.

An increasing number of companies recognize certain values in the maintenance of membership clause. These managers hold some such views as these:

A stable, responsible union is better for management than an unstable, irresponsible union. An unstable membership contributes to an irresponsible leadership. Too often members of unions do not maintain their membership because they resent the discipline of a responsible leadership. A rival but less responsible leadership feels the pull of the temptation to obtain and maintain leadership by relaxing discipline, by refusing to cooperate with the company, and sometimes by unfair and demogogic agitation and attacks on the company. It is to the interest of management, these business leaders have found, to cooperate with the unions for the maintenance of a more stable, responsible leadership.

Union leaders sign a contract for all the members and are responsible to both the union and the company for the maintenance of this contract. For this reason they feel that the company and the union should cooperate in the maintenance of this responsible membership. Holding the membership, they argue, is essential to holding the membership to the contract. Cooperation between the company and the union for the maintenance of membership can make for the cooperative maintenance of production on higher levels.

In the North American Aviation plant, the outright maintenance of membership clause has facilitated responsible industrial relations and promoted increased production. A survey of the northwest lumber industries indicates that the maintenance of membership clause has helped to stabilize the strife torn northwest woods, and has helped to promote vital production for the war.

In recognition of these values and the special merits and circumstances in this case, the War Labor Board made its directive order.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE BOARD'S POWER

The National War Labor Board is set up by Executive order under the war powers of the President. The United States Steel Corporation questions the powers of this Board in this case. This challenge is directed not so much to this Board as to the powers of the Chief Executive of a democracy and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in the midst of total war. Our Congress, our courts, and our history make the answer that our

democracy can lawfully make war to save our democracy.

Last summer the corporation, when making a propaganda argument to stir the American people against the recommendation of the Mediation Board, claimed that a maintenance of membership clause was a closed shop. Last month at the public hearing before the War Labor Board, the corporation rested its case on the argument that the same clause would in this situation be illegal because it was not a closed shop.

The National Association of Manufacturers, in a heavy broadside, recently charged that the War Labor Board had a closed shop policy. Some union leaders have charged that the Board had an open shop policy. The War Labor Board, as a matter of fact, thus far has not made a decision for a closed shop or for a union shop or for a preferential union shop. The labor members of the Board in joining in the decision in this case, have, of course, in no way expressed their strongly held views for complete union security. The War Labor Board, according to its judgment of the merits, has made decisions for union security in accordance with what the majority could unite on as merited in the case. The War Labor Board does not have an open shop policy and does not have a closed shop policy. It examines thoroughly the facts and considers the circumstances and equities in each case and attempts to arrive at a just decision. In between any effort of either the corporations or the unions to take advantage of the war situation, the Board steers a course of balance and equity as far as it has the light and insight needed for this difficult task.

Without any pretense whatever as to infallibility of consciously fallible men, the War Labor Board, nevertheless, is the appointed and responsible umpire. Destruction or erosion of the foundations of the Board by concerted and successive defiances is nothing less than destruction of the national agreement for uninterrupted production. Any union or corporation which, in the midst of this war, defies and thereby undermines the values of the War Labor Board, defies the umpire, defies the Government, breaks down peaceful procedures for the settlement of disputes, encourages strikes, and damages the war effort in an hour upon which now turns the humane hopes of mankind.

The umpire may once in a while miscall balls and strikes. But in the midst of a total war for our existence as a free people, let no labor union or no corporation defy the peaceful procedures of the Nation for the settlement of disputes and for unbroken maximum production. It is inconceivable that this subsidiary of even the most powerful corporation in the world shall longer defy the Government of the people of the United States.

In the momentous struggle between the United Nations and the Axis Powers, let us have no defiance of the Nation, no mustering of disunity, no measuring and testing of the comparative sovereignty of the United States Steel Corporation and the United States of America. To use great corporate powers against the settlement of this dispute would continue uncertainty in a shipyard where are built the ships which are to carry the cargoes and hopes of mankind on all the desperate seas of the world. Failure to settle this dispute would reveal both a lack of the acceptance of the democratic process and a lack of understanding of the decisive role of ships in the world strategy of the United Nations against the long-gathered might of the Fascist Axis Powers.

As we look across the seas we see American and Allied ships going down in waters far and near. As we look down the centuries and back to this the world's darkest hour, we see centuries old charters of human liberty torn and trampled under the ruthless heels of dictators. As we look around the earth today we see freedom and democracy lately the goal of modern nations, now renounced or crushed in almost half the world. As we look inside the totalitarian nations we see subjected the most precious institutions of human freedom—the church, parliament, the corporation, the press, the radio, the university, and the labor union—high on the list in its once vital democratic meaning to the freedom and security of the millions who now in servile subjection do the work of the totalitarian states. This is part of the ground and background of our directive order to end this dispute by a fair and balanced settlement through a maintenance of membership clause.

SUMMARY

1. This maintenance of membership clause, as implemented in the directive order, has no absolute requirement for the discharge of a member of the union except by his own choice.

2. It does not require any employee to join the union at any time.

3. In its original form as proposed by Chief Justice Stacy, it was supported by all the seven public members of the National Defense Mediation Board.

4. It has merits and values of its own for the maintenance of membership, the maintenance of the contract, and the maintenance of maximum production for winning the war.

5. It is the decision of the umpire, upon the acceptance of whose decisions depends the survival of the national agreement for all-out uninterrupted production of arms, tanks, planes, and ships.

6. In the midst of this total and desperate war is no time for defiance of the Government by any labor union or corporation. It is the time for the acceptance of a decision carefully arrived at in accordance with the national agreement between labor, management, and the Government of the people of the United States. The war is wide and desperate, but the time is short. The time is too short for any further delays in the settlement of a dispute in a plant where are built the ships which carry the men and armaments and supplies to support American boys as they fight for the future of America and the future of freedom in the world.

Decision written by:

FRANK P. GRAHAM.

Members concurring:

WILLIAM H. DAVIS, *Chairman.*
GEORGE W. TAYLOR.
WAYNE L. MORSE.
THOMAS KENNEDY.
GEORGE MEANY.
EMIL RIEVE.
MARTIN DURKIN.

IN THE MATTER OF FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO. AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 16, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONCURRING OPINION BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS

I agree completely with the opinion of Dr. Graham in this case and write this concurring opinion only because I have been concerned with the case for such a long time and it involves an issue, namely, that of union security, which has been in my thoughts ever since I became Chairman of this Board, and even before then, naturally.

I want to say at the outset that I would vote for the order for one overwhelming reason—because I think it will increase production of ships and help win the war. This issue has been disturbing the relations between management and the workers at Kearny for just about a year. It is time to put an end to it.

The union demanded a union shop, asserting the belief that cooperative relations with the management and production of ships could best be served if all the eligible employees were members of the same union. The company wanted its employees to be quite free to join the union or not to join the union, as they chose. On this broad issue the decision of the Board is in the company's favor. That decision applies only to employees who have joined the union of their own choosing.

In August of last year the National Defense Mediation Board decided that under the conditions created by the emergency and the shipbuilding stabilization agreement this local union was fairly entitled to the assurance that its membership would not be reduced by any form of attack during the life of the stabilization agreement, which binds the union until June 23, 1943. The Mediation Board recommended this same form of union protection in many cases, notably the North American Aviation case and in the Northwest lumber field, for instance. All the evidence that has accumulated during the intervening months is that the maintenance of membership clause has increased production and led to a more stable relationship between the management and the workers in the places where it has been put into effect. Of course, one cannot absolutely attribute this effect to one cause when a number of possible causes may be involved. But no impartial person, charged with the responsibility that rests upon the public members of the National War Labor Board, can ignore the established fact that wherever this type of clause, in its various modifications, has been put into operation production has invariably increased.

On the paramount consideration of increased war production, it is my considered and deliberate judgment that no representative of the public on this Board who is impartial and unafraid could fail to vote for the order of the Board in this case. Here the Board has assiduously tried to put this clause, which its judgment shows to be in accord with the interests of increased production, into effect without in any degree imperiling those rights of freedom which we all hold dear.

A number of arguments have been put to the Board, both in this case and in other cases involving union security, and I would like to set forth those arguments and make certain observations with respect to them in the light of the clause which the Board is ordering in this case.

1. It has been urged that the Government should never order a worker to become a member of any union or lose his job, because certain workers as a matter of principle are opposed either to unions in general or to the particular union in the plant in which they make their living. With respect to this argument, it should be observed that the clause ordered by the Board in this case leaves every employee free to join the union or not to join, as he chooses. The order of the Board applies only to men who have already voluntarily joined the union, and it imposes even upon them the obligation to maintain their membership only in a limited sense. It is self-evident that these men by joining the union have expressly demonstrated that they do not hold a creed which would lead them to reject trade-unionism in general or this union in particular.

2. It has been urged that even though a worker may have accepted in his creed the principles of trade-unions in general and this particular union individually he might have a reservation in his mind with respect to making his membership in the union a condition of his employment or the surrender of some other right to which he is normally entitled. It is argued that the Government should not order peremptorily such a person to surrender this reservation of feeling. With respect to this argument it may be observed that the clause in question applies only to members who are in good standing at the date on which the contract between the company and the union is entered into pursuant to the order of the Board. For over a year this union has demanded a closed shop and for almost a year a recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board has made

a maintenance of membership clause one of the paramount considerations at the shipyard. Surely no one could say that any of the workers who has maintained his membership in the union throughout this period has not accepted for himself the principle that maintenance of membership might be a condition of his continued employment.

3. It has been brought to the attention of the Board that every man has a right at common law to withdraw and cease to be a member of any association, whether it be a trade-union or some other form of organization. It is argued that the Government, by its order, should never abrogate this deep-rooted common-law right. With respect to this argument, it should be observed that the clause ordered by the Board in this case does not abrogate this right for two reasons: (1) The War Labor Board is in essence an implementation of collective bargaining during the war period. It settles all labor disputes by directing the parties to include certain clauses in collective-bargaining contracts. The present order is an order of this character. Thus the clause contained in the order will not become effective until it is incorporated into a contract entered into by the parties. Pending such time, any individual member of the union at the shipyard has a right to formally withdraw from the union. (2) An individual member has the right to withdraw from the union if, for some reason of conscience or otherwise, he cannot adhere to the principles which a majority of the union wishes to forward. In the event that such a person wants to withdraw the only penalty entailed is that he continue to pay his dues for the duration of the contract. This is a very normal common-law concept. A man may join a club and obligate himself to pay dues for a certain period. The law gives him the right to withdraw from the club and to cease to be associated with its members but such withdrawal does not of necessity, legally or in good conscience, cut off his obligation to help the organization discharge the financial obligations it has incurred by continuing to pay his dues for a limited term.

4. The counsel for the company in this case has argued that an order of the type issued by the Board would be illegal as a violation of the National Labor Relations Act. The argument runs like this: Section 7 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act provides that it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discriminate in regard to hire or tenure of employment, or any term or condition of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization; provided that nothing in the act shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization to require as a condition of employment membership in the labor organization

It is argued that the proviso in the statute precludes this Board from ordering the inclusion of a maintenance of membership clause in a contract for two reasons: (1) It is contended that the proviso contemplates only a closed or union shop, and accordingly, that anything short of a union or closed shop would be illegal under the well-recognized maxim of construction that when a legislative body expresses approval of one thing, it excludes the legality of all other alternatives. (2) From the same maxim of construction it is argued that by providing that such an arrangement should be an agreement, Congress precluded any other method by which the obligation of a maintenance of membership clause might come into effect.

Of course, this Board does not arrogate to itself the power to dispose of questions of law. However, we have given serious thoughts to these legal arguments which have been put before us and are not prepared to accept them for three reasons: (1) With respect to the first contention, namely, that the proviso necessitated the conclusion that only a closed shop is legitimate under the statute, the answer seems to be that the whole includes its parts as a matter of common-sense construction. Certainly it is anomalous for someone who is opposed to a maintenance of membership clause to base his argument against the clause on the ground that Congress by a statute permits only a closed shop. (2) With respect to the second argument, it should be observed that the maxim of construction that where a legislative body expresses itself with respect to one subject matter, it excludes all other subject matters, is one of very definite limitations. For example, if Congress passed a statute now making all gambling contracts legal, it would be fruitless to argue from such a statute that by virtue of its very existence some other form of contract is illegal, and we cannot believe that by putting its stamp of approval on an agreed closed shop or some modification of a closed shop, Congress intended to preclude a Board set-up in time of war from granting a form of union security which meets the practical needs of the war situation. (3) Lastly, of course, the National Labor Relations Act is in truth the buckler of labor and it clearly wasn't the intent of Congress that the buckler should be thrown away in time of war and turned against labor by ingenious legal arguments.

WILLIAM H. DAVIS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1942.*

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
April 25, 1942.

IN THE MATTER OF FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO., KEARNY, N. J., AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 16, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

DISSENTING OPINION

We employer members of the Board feel that we have no alternative, as American citizens or as representatives of a Government agency, except to dissent from the directive order in this case.

Each of us is deeply concerned with the gravity of the whole labor relations situation of our country at this time. We fully appreciate the value of a unanimous decision with respect to establishment of a national labor policy. All groups are being called on to make sacrifices to preserve the Nation. Knowing this, we made several proposals for the settlement of this case. These proposals were rejected. There is a point beyond which we cannot go in sacrificing sound principles of government, and this is the stand that we now take.

The issues in this case are quite clear. This is not an ordinary case. In July 1941, the same issues were presented to the National Defense Mediation Board; a decision was rendered; the company refused to accept the recommendation of the Board and offered to turn the yard over to the Government for operation rather than agree to the contract proposed by the National Defense Mediation Board. The shipyard was taken over and operated by the Government until early 1942. At that time the shipyard was turned back to the company unconditionally. During the period that the shipyard was operated by the Government, the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board was not enforced.

The identical issue is now brought before the National War Labor Board. The union has demanded that the employer be compelled to discharge any employee who fails to keep his membership in the union in good standing. This is the same issue that was presented to the Mediation Board, to this company, and to our Government in 1941. The only change in the present directive order is to provide as an alternative that the employer be requested by the employee, under penalty of discharge, to deduct from his pay his financial obligation to the union.

In view of all the circumstances surrounding this case and the publicity it has received, it is plain that a decision in this case is not one merely affecting the labor relations of this one company. Much has been said about each case being determined on its own merits. Any practical person, and especially the members of this Board and those who served on the National Defense Mediation Board, know the fallacy of such statements. The National Defense Mediation Board was wrecked on this issue and the resignation of some of the labor members of that Board was predicated on the theory that a previous decision of the Board established a governing precedent. This pattern, of necessity, will have to be followed not only by this Board but by conciliation and mediation services throughout the country, and not only in the shipbuilding industry but in all industries.

Some of the arguments advanced by the majority are paradoxical. One is that when an employee voluntarily joins a union that he delegates to the officers of that union the right to make a contract which will not permit him to withdraw from the union without losing his job. We do not agree that any such inference can be drawn. We assert that if the members of a union are to be bound to pay their dues and fines to that union during the life of an agreement, each and every member should have the opportunity to say whether he wishes to be so bound, and all we ask is that such members be given such opportunity. If the contention is correct that members of a union intend to be so bound by virtue of joining a union, what then can be the possible objection to giving each of them an opportunity to express his wishes?

We are not taking a position as individuals or as employers for or against the closed shop, the union shop, the preferential shop, union maintenance, or any other form of contract that any employer and union may see fit to make, provided that contract is not contrary to law. However, acting in our capacity as members of a Government agency, we cannot subscribe to any national labor policy which compels an unwilling employer to force an unwilling employee either to join or to remain a member of a labor union in order to play his part in winning this war. If this position is taken by a Government agency and a national labor policy is thus established, then Government must of necessity accept the responsibility of the supervision of that labor organization to which it forces an employee to pay dues, fines, and assessments. If this position is taken by government, then government, in effect, exacts taxes from an individual citizen to be paid to a private organization for the privilege of working.

Acting as employer representatives of the National War Labor Board, we cannot subscribe to such a policy.

The employer members presented two proposals, both of which the majority rejected, which can be summarized as follows:

(1) That the company shall insert a provision in the contract with the union making continuance of membership a condition of employment for all union members who voluntarily certify in writing thereafter their willingness to remain members of the union during the life of the contract.

(2) That if the company is directed to insert a provision in the contract requiring union members who are employees to maintain their membership in the union in good standing as a condition of employment, then after such contract is entered into each employee who is a union member shall be given a definite opportunity, within a stated time, to resign from the union. If he fails so to resign, he would then be required, as a condition of employment, to remain a member of the union in good standing for the contract period.

The majority of the Board, by rejecting both of these proposals, have made it clear that they do not concede the right of the individual worker an opportunity to resign from the union. On the other hand, by failing to provide an "escape" clause, as sug-

gested in (2) above, they are deciding that employees who are already members of the union must be conclusively presumed to have agreed, when they originally joined the union, that their jobs would, for the duration of the union contract, depend upon the continuance of union membership. We are not willing to ascribe any such state of mind to those employees who are already members of the union, and in our view the only fair and practical way to determine the intention of individuals who have already joined is to give them the opportunity to remain in or resign from the union. We submit that the right to resign from a labor organization is exactly the same as the right to join or not to join in the first place.

In the Walker Turner and the International Harvester cases, and now in this case, the employer members have reiterated their belief that harmonious and cooperative relations between the management and employees, so essential to production, cannot be obtained by an administrative board compelling an employer and a union to enter into any agreement which deprives the worker of the opportunity to decide for himself whether or not he wishes to remain a member of a labor organization as a condition of continued employment.

The majority have stressed that the union security provisions now ordered by them are necessary to efficient production in this shipyard. This is contrary to the clear facts in the case. Since the Navy turned the plant back to the company at midnight on January 6, 1942, the company has been exerting all its efforts to produce vessels so essential for national offense. This company has been in the shipbuilding business for over 25 years and it is noteworthy that on or about January 9 last, the Navy Department asked this same company to construct and manage a second shipyard devoted to turning out more vessels for national offense. This company, doing work vital to our war effort, is well ahead of schedule at the present time. No such contract provision as now ordered is necessary to achieve that result. The imposition of such a provision on management and employees, against their will, may well result in the very opposite of what the majority so confidently predict.

ROGER D. LAPHAM.
H. L. DERBY.
E. J. MCMILLAN.
H. B. HORTON.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
April 25, 1942.

IN THE MATTER OF FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO., KEARNY, N. J., AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 16, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEPARATE DISSENTING OPINION OF E. J. M'MILLAN IN FEDERAL SHIPBUILDING CASE

I concur completely in the dissenting opinion of the other employer members in this case. Because of the importance of the issues involved, I wish to record the following additional individual views in support of the dissenting opinion.

It has been contended that the order relative to union security handed down by the National Defense Mediation Board on July 26, 1941, in the case of Federal Shipbuilding Corporation is still in effect and that the National War Labor Board should consider itself bound by that order, simply implementing that order to make it effective. An agency of the Federal Government, the Navy Department, took over the plant of the Federal Shipbuilding Corporation August 24, 1941, and operated it until January 6, 1942, when it was turned back to the owners unconditionally. During the period of operation of the plant by the Navy Department, the order of the National Defense Mediation Board was not complied with. Furthermore, the National Defense Mediation Board ceased to exist January 12, 1942. The National War Labor Board created by the President's Executive order of January 12, 1942, should, we contend, consider this case, or any other case properly before it, purely on its merits and we have so considered this case. It cannot be considered bound by any decision or action of a predecessor agency.

If the union certified in this case by the National Labor Relations Board as the exclusive bargaining agent for the employees of the corporation, desires union security in any form and should the corporation voluntarily agree in collective bargaining to such union security, well and good, providing such agreement is not in violation of the National Labor Relations Act or any other laws of the land. But when through collective bargaining, such agreement cannot be reached and the union appeals to this Board for a directive order providing union security, an entirely different situation presents itself.

I maintain that no agency of the Federal Government, without empowering legislative enactment (now lacking) should compel an unwilling employer to impose "union security" upon any of its employees unless each of those employees, free from intimidation or coercion, elects to be bound by a pledge to maintain his membership in good standing in the union as a condition of continued employment. Such imposition transgresses the inalienable right of freedom of action guaranteed under the Constitution to every citizen of these United States. If a directive order is made by this Board, providing union security, certainly under his constitutional right, the employee, after noting the terms of the contract resulting from the Board's directive order, is privileged to elect in some fair manner, whether or not he will continue his membership in the union, when such continuance of membership commits him to continued support of the union during the life of the contract. True, under the terms of the directive order of the majority decision in this case, a man may deliberately violate some rule or regulation of the union or refuse to pay his dues therein so that he ceases to be in good standing in the union, and as the result of such action, may be expelled from the union without necessarily being discharged by the company. But I maintain that no such reprehensible action should be necessary in order for one to withdraw from the union. Why should a properly conducted union not grant to each of its members the privilege of withdrawal from the union after examination of a contract containing union security provisions? Would not the cause of labor be forwarded by such democratic process?

Furthermore, if labor demands of an agency of the Federal Government the imposition of union security upon its members, meaning that the Government requires one of its citizens to pay dues into the treasury of the union, then should not the Government prescribe the rules governing the operation of that union and the disposition of its funds?

For the foregoing reasons, as well as those stated in the dissenting opinion of the other employer members, I cannot subscribe to the majority decision in this case.

E. J. MCMILLAN.

FREEZING LABOR POLICY

(By Ernest Lindley)

MAINTENANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

The attack on the War Labor Board by certain employers and employer groups is intensifying. The critical question is union security—often erroneously called the closed shop. On this question the Board is dividing with painful regularity—the employer representatives on one side and the labor and public representatives on the other.

In three successive important cases the Board by such a divided vote has granted to the unions a form of security known as "a maintenance of membership clause." Roughly, this means that any worker who belongs to the union when the contract is signed, or becomes a member thereafter, must keep up his membership until the expiration of the contract. This is not the closed shop which requires the employer to hire only union members. It is not the union shop which permits the employer to hire non-union members on condition that they join the union. Under the "maintenance of membership clause," no employee is required to join the union, but those who do join are "frozen" until the expiration of the contract. If the member fails to pay his dues, the employer must discharge him.

This clause is attacked as an interference with individual liberty. As a recent dissenting opinion of the employer members of the War Labor Board said, "We cannot subscribe to any national labor policy which compels an unwilling employer to force an unwilling employee either to join or to remain a member of a union in order to play his part in winning the war."

The quotation is from the dissent in the Kearny case, involving a C. I. O. union and the Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation. There was no question of compelling an employee to join a union. The only point at issue was compelling him to remain a member once he voluntarily had joined.

The majority did not ignore the right of a union member to change his mind. Its order requires the union member to pay his dues until the contract expires, 14 months hence, but it does not require him to remain a union member. If he finds the union leadership obnoxious or for any other reason wishes to register his protest by resigning, he may do so. In addition, in the Kearny case there are two other escape provisions. The "maintenance of membership" clause does not go into effect until the company and the union sign the contract conforming to the Board's order. Every union member has had due warning that this clause has been ordered included in the contract. By resigning at once he would voluntarily escape any obligation to pay dues for the duration of the contract.

Moreover, it has now been 9 months since the Kearny situation was first passed upon by the War Labor Board's predecessor, the National Mediation Board. At that time the union wanted a closed or union shop and believed it could get one by striking. The Defense Mediation Board, deciding that it should have some form of protection, offered the milder maintenance-of-membership clause. The union voted down this proposal twice before accepting it. Then the management balked. The management's inflexible attitude led the President to order the Navy to take over the yards. In January the Navy returned the yards to the owners, who still refused to accept the maintenance-of-membership clause.

This past history undoubtedly imposed a moral obligation on the Government to protect the union, which, under Government pressure, had given up the fight for the stronger form of union security which it believed it could get by striking. But it also has afforded employees of this shipyard 9 months to make up their minds about joining the union or withdrawing from it. Some have resigned. Those who kept their membership presumably did so with full expectation of paying dues to July 1943, when the contract will expire, for it was reasonable for

them to suppose that, having turned the yards back to the owners, the Government would see that the contract contained the maintenance-of-membership clause granted last summer.

Thus, any union member objecting to a union-maintenance clause has had 9 months to resign from the union. Under the War Labor Board's award he may still withdraw completely at any moment until the contract is signed, and even after the contract goes into effect he may register his protest at any time by resigning, even though he must then continue to pay dues.

In fact, between what the majority of the board ordered and what the employer members said they wanted the difference is slight.

The basic question remains: Why award any form of union security? The answer is that the unions have given up the right to strike and their leaders are attempting, with very great success, to enforce this rule among the rank and file. In addition, the unions are signing contracts fixing wages and other conditions of work for definite periods. The unions, in short, are giving up the methods which normally are most effective in holding and increasing their membership, and in compelling employers to grant closed or union shops. The unions feel entitled, in return, to some kind of protection against dissolution. The maintenance-of-membership clause is an intermediate form of protection. It is a method of freezing the union's strength.

ALFRED W. HANMER—WETHERSFIELD'S FIRST CITIZEN

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it was my pleasure some years ago, when secretary of the State of Connecticut, to solicit and procure from Gov. Wilbur L. Cross an article descriptive of the office of Governor as he viewed it, and his article appeared in the Connecticut State Register and Manual for 1934.

Dr. Cross, dean of the Yale Graduate School, one of the most dearly beloved of our Connecticut citizens, served four successive terms as Governor of our grand little State. Describing himself, as many thought, he said:

> Almost invariably the Governor was a well-educated, shrewd, and honorable man of florid complexion who, once in office, managed to stay there until overtaken by death or the infirmities of age. In the eyes of all classes he was a highly respected symbol of government, though in fact he was but a dignified and venerable shadow of the general assembly.

The practice has prevailed as to offices other than that of Governor, notably in our town governments which are the more important because the voting public is most intimately concerned with government at the scene of its first impact, namely in the towns. Thus, I might paraphrase Dean Cross in his reference to the "well educated, shrewd, and honorable man of florid complexion who, once in office, managed to stay there until overtaken by death * * *" in my reference to Hon. Alfred W. Hanmer, first selectman of the town of Wethersfield, Conn. For over 300 years of Connecticut history in its town and local governments, where a pure democracy can be found to have operated at its best, we have pursued the general method of selecting worthy men for office, and then continuing them therein.

One of the oldest towns in our State, the town of Wethersfield, founded more than 300 years ago, held an election on the 27th of April of this year. At that time Mr. Alfred W. Hanmer was reelected first selectman of the town of Wethersfield for his forty-third term. Mr. Hanmer, known to everyone in and about Hartford County, is one of the most able and gifted of the citizens of our community. I have felt such a deep and personal interest in him and in his achievements in behalf of the community, the town of Wethersfield, right there in the cradle of Connecticut history, that I have abstracted from the Hartford Courant for April 12, 1942, an article entitled "Wethersfield's First Citizen." Because of Mr. Hanmer's many contributions to the principles of local government and to the town of Wethersfield, which he has so honorably represented these many years, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Hartford Courant be published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant Magazine of April 12, 1942]

WETHERSFIELD'S FIRST CITIZEN

(By Mary G. Jensen)

"What this town needs * * *" is the essence of town meeting talk. Sometimes it's the "outs" hammering away at the "ins," or the "ins" looking for an out, the progressives criticizing the reactionaries or the reverse. Wethersfield, in common with hundreds of other New England towns, has been periodically stirred by demands for changes.

But when the young men of the town elected their 28-year-old candidate for first selectman, some of the old guard thought things had gone too far. Their most optimistic hope for the candidate's political future was that with proper guidance the boy might get through a term. That was in 1898. The young selectman did survive his first year in office and ran again.

And again! On April 6, 1942, the Wethersfield Republican caucus renominated the same man for the same office for the forty-second time. Today Alfred W. Hanmer is a man of 72 with a record of 44 years uninterrupted service as first selectman of his town. He was elected annually until 1938, when the selectman's term of office was extended to 2 years.

Josiah G. Adams, first selectman for 14 years, knew that there had been some talk about a group of young insurgents in the Republican Party when he dropped into Dix & Wells old store on Main Street one afternoon in the fall of 1898. "Some of the boys are thinking of putting me up for selectman," the new owner, a young man who had recently bought the establishment in partnership with Charles Bulkley, told him. "And if you're planning to accept renomination, I'd like to know because I don't want to run against you."

Mr. Adams said he didn't know and let it go at that until less than a week before caucus. When he finally told young Hanmer that he was definitely in the running, Al's campaign workers, young men who wanted a change in town government, had gone too far too fast to be stopped. At the caucus Al Hanmer won the nomination by a majority of 16 votes.

This year, the veteran town leader had hoped to retire, but friends urged him to carry on through the present period of uncertainty. It just seemed to him, he explained, that 44 years was a little more than long enough. However, when and if the first selectman is ever permitted to retire from office, it is certain that his townspeople will never permit him to retire to a private life.

Al Hanmer, in Wethersfield, is like a competent housekeeper in her home. He knows where everything is, and the whole town, officials and residents alike, have come to depend on him.

Over 6 feet tall, erect as ever, the first selectman can be found daily behind the counter of his store on Main Street when duties of office do not require his presence in town hall diagonally across the street.

The convenience of Al Hanmer's retail grocery and feed store, the same one where he once worked for Newton Dix and J. Frank Wells, has made it a town hall annex. For 50 years his workday has followed the same pattern, dispensing groceries and advice, weighing feed and decisions with care to give full measure in both. Residents drop in to do their marketing, register complaints, ask about permits, discuss taxes, the war, and the weather. Town commissioners always know where to find the first selectman for matters of business, increasingly heavy as the town grows.

The first year Al Hanmer was in office the population of Wethersfield was 2,500, and it cost $15,000 to run the town. Town expenses in 1941, with a population close to 10,000, approximated half a million dollars.

Mr. Hanmer carried Wethersfield safely through the dark days of bank-holiday year, and he is proud of the continued stability of town finances. In 1898 Wethersfield's debt, owed to individuals, churches, and private organizations, was $39,074, secured by a grand list of about $1,400,000. With the 1941 list up to $15,794,876, the town's indebtedness of $322,000 leaves a borrowing capacity balance of almost $700,000.

Tolerant, sympathetic, easy to talk to and laugh with, Al Hanmer is a good listener. He says he knows what he has to say, but if he listens to other people he always learns something new. Sharp-edged criticisms never seem to register very deeply with him. His interest is in finding out what the specific trouble is and doing something about it, if he can.

The veteran selectman hasn't forgotten his early experience with older men in Wethersfield who had to be sold on progressive ideas by a 28-year-old first selectman. At the first town meeting over which he presided the vote was put through to investigate electric lighting for Wethersfield. Then came the radical effort to regain approval for installation of sewers in town. In addition, the consolidated school system, modern school buildings, reorganized fire department, police force, welfare organization—all those services that are taken for granted today—were effected during the public lifetime of this one man.

At the time of the Wethersfield tercentenary in 1934 Mr. Hanmer was signally honored by his townspeople at a celebration of his thirty-fifth anniversary as first selectman. In 1913 he was elected as representative to the State legislature, where he served one term. He was appointed to the metropolitan district commission at its inception in 1927 and continues serving in that capacity.

A director of the Wethersfield Bank & Trust Co., he is now a member of the advisory board of its successor, the local branch of the Hartford, Conn., Trust Co. He is a charter member of the Wethersfield Country Club and Rotary Club, member of the Grange, Hospitality Lodge, No. 128, A. F. and A. M., First School Society, and Cemetery Association.

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY HON. OSCAR R. EWING

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, assistant chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the Jackson Day dinner in Seattle, Wash., April 13, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAXATION OF CHARITABLE OR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter stating the attitude of the Catholic bishops of the United States toward a suggestion for the taxation of charitable and educational corporations, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 71, line 14, after the words "steam plant", it is proposed to insert "the construction of a system of public-use navigation terminals of the Tennessee River."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I take this occasion to congratulate and commend the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and especially the distinguished and able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the chairman of the subcommittee, for their recommendations which were adopted yesterday by the Senate that substantial reductions be made in the overhead and administrative expenses of a number of agencies covered by the independent offices appropriations bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942. The credit for this is due in large measure to the energy, ability, and fearlessness of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

I may say at this point that I have been serving with the Senator from Tennessee as a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, where he has rendered most important and valuable service. During the lengthy hearings and discussions held by this committee on many branches of Government activities, he has demonstrated a knowledge of the financial operations of the Government that has astonished his colleagues on the committee and has made him one of its most valuable members. This committee is working very diligently to reduce all nonessential spending so that the funds so saved can be conserved for the necessities of national defense.

The recommendations of the Appropriations Committee adopted by the Senate yesterday have a peculiar significance, in that for the first time, certainly in some years, a determined and courageous effort was undertaken to reduce the excessive and unreasonable administrative costs of a number of agencies, notably in traveling expenses and in publicity.

I may say, Mr. President, that in recent years there has been a flagrant abuse of the traveling privileges, and the multiplicity of publicity bureaus very nearly approaches a national scandal in the waste of public funds.

What the Appropriations Committee has done so effectively in the particular agencies dealt with should be extended to all other agencies of the Government, and this would result in the saving of millions unnecessarily expended for traveling, long-distance telephoning, and overlapping and unnecessary agencies conducting publicity or propaganda activities.

For traveling expenses, Mr. President, for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1941, according to information furnished by the Office of Government Reports, the total cost was $147,986,385.

The National Youth Administration spent $2,446,208 for traveling expenses.

The Work Projects Administration spent $3,287,714 for traveling.

The Department of Agriculture spent, in all, $16,595,435 for traveling. The traveling expenses of the Farm Security Administration, one of the smaller bureaus of the Government, amounted to $6,607,083. The Farm Security Administration was the second bureau of the Government in the amount of expenditures for traveling.

These are just a few of the expenditures for traveling included in the total of approximately $147,000,000.

For publicity, Mr. President, the Budget estimated that for the year ending July 1, 1941, the cost was $27,770,000, and it has increased considerably since then.

It is estimated that 2,895 persons are giving their full time to publicity, while 31,618 persons on the Government pay roll are on a part-time basis.

The main publicity offices are the Office of Government Reports, which cost last year $1,800,000; the Office of Facts and Figures, which cost $950,000; the Division of Information, Office for Emergency Management, with 346 employees, which cost $1,500,000; and the Coordinator of Information, which cost $6,600,000. But these do not by any means represent the total, as every department has its own separate, distinct, and private publicity bureau.

The total pay roll for publicity agencies for the year ending July 1, 1941, was $19,463,470, and other expenses $8,306,470, and it has been increased since then.

I merely mention this, Mr. President, to indicate the broad field that still remains for very constructive economies in publicity, traveling, long-distance telephoning, and such overhead expenses.

Under the able leadership of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], a remarkably fine start has been made, and I hope that similar reductions will be made in other agencies of the Government as the appropriations are presented to the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is my recollection that when the Senate recessed last evening there was pending an amendment which I had offered from the floor. I should like to be advised as to the parliamentary situation, because, as I understand, the Chair announced the question to be on a committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Chair is that consideration of the committee amendments was to be concluded before individual amendments were to be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the consideration of committee amendments was concluded yesterday, with the exception of the amendment just stated, which was passed over, and I offered my amendment yesterday with the permission and understanding of all Senators present that it would be in order. It was pending before the Senate, as will be seen by reference to the RECORD of yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Both amendments were postponed until today, and under the circumstances, both of them being postponed until today, the committee amendment would have preference.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, the Chair is quite correct in his ruling, of course. In fact, I do not recall that there was any agreement yesterday to proceed to the consideration of any amendment prior to the full disposal of the committee amendments. However, I have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland being considered now, if other Senators have no objection.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have no objection to that being done, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe my amendment is not of a controversial nature, and, inasmuch as it was discussed before the Senate recessed yesterday, I shall take the liberty of asking unanimous consent that it be considered now; and if it leads to debate, I myself will voluntarily withdraw it. I should like consideration of the amendment to follow the discussion had concerning it yesterday in the RECORD.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I send to the desk the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. Where in this act appropriations have been authorized to be expended for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor may not exceed the amount of $50, but this limitation shall not apply to the Office of Government Reports and the Selective Service System.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the amendment now submitted offered as a modification of the amendment submitted yesterday?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And as a part of it?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The other amendment is withdrawn, and the amendment just now submitted is offered in its place.

Mr. MCNARY. On what page will it come?

Mr. TYDINGS. The amendment will come at the end of the bill. There are about 30 or 40 different agencies which are authorized by the language of the bill to buy newspapers and periodicals. The funds provided for lawbooks, newspapers, and periodicals run as high, I believe, as $10,000 in one case, $6,000 in another case, $5,000 in another case, $7,500 in another, and $6,000 in another. Of course, all this money would not be spent for newspapers and periodicals. Some of it would be spent for lawbooks and reference books. But the newspaper and periodical items are incorporated into the net sum, so there is no limitation at all on the purchase of newspapers and periodicals. I therefore have put the amendment in the amount of $50 and have exempted from it the Office of Government Reports, the information office of which Mr. Mellett is the head, because newspapers and periodicals are the meat on which that Office feeds; and if they should be cut down, of course, the whole Office would be ineffective. I think we should either have the Office or not have it, and that question should be dealt with by direct attack and direct defense, rather than by a submarine attack. So I have excluded that Office from the provisions of the amendment, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in hearty sympathy with the purpose of the Senator's amendment; in fact, I think the Appropriations Committee did in most instances strike from the bill appropriations for newspapers and periodicals. I should like to point out, however, that some of these agencies have been moved out of the city of Washington, and it occurs to me that we might work great injustice in some cases because they do not have available the Congressional Library and the other facilities which are available to the agencies which remain in Washington.

Mr. TYDINGS. My amendment does not deal with lawbooks and reference books. It deals only with periodicals and newspapers. The provision for lawbooks and reference books is still retained in the measure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose the matter could be worked out in conference, but it seems to me rather unjust to an organization such as, we will say, the Securities and Exchange Commission. I hold no brief for the Securities and Exchange Commission, but that organization has been transferred—lock, stock, and barrel—to Philadelphia, where it does not have the facilities to obtain information which are afforded other Government agencies which are located in Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the provision as now worded would cause a hardship, I am sure the matter will be worked out in conference. I am sure we are in favor of the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland. It is simply a question of working out a proper arrangement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in hearty accord with the proposal. The Appropriations Committee incorporated that policy in the first bill that came before it, and eliminated the appropriation for newspapers and periodicals, but I hope that the Members of the Senate who are on the conference committee will see to it that in our zeal for economy, which I share, no injustice shall be worked on some of the agencies of the Government which have been moved away from the city of Washington.

Mr. TYDINGS. The language may have to be modified in conference. If it shall so appear, I shall be the first one to agree to necessary modification.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Maryland a possible ambiguity in the language as it has been read at the desk.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I realized it myself as it was being read; namely, that the limitation in amount did not refer to each department, but I think that can be corrected in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to suggest that we correct it now by inserting after the word "therefor", in the fifth line of the amendment, the language "under each such appropriation."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will accept that modification of language, and ask for a vote on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, as modified.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am in favor of the Senator's amendment, but I was very much interested yesterday when he was giving information in regard to the various other items in the pending bill which provide for newspapers. I was on the point of interrupting him to tell him that if he would proceed a little further he would find an exception, in an item in which newspapers and periodicals were stricken out, and we are practically up to that item now. It appears on page 71, and applies to the T. V. A. A different rule was applied by the committee to the T. V. A. than was applied to all the other agencies and departments.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct about that.

Mr. NORRIS. In respect to the T. V. A. the item was stricken out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I was present in committee the day that action was taken, and I do not know what the discussion was with respect to it, but I trust——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we will make the same rule apply to all.

Mr. NORRIS. I was about to suggest, if the Senator had not brought it up, that when we do reach this T. V. A. item, whatever rule applies to other agencies ought to apply to the T. V. A.

Mr. TYDINGS. It ought to apply to all, yes; and we can correct it when we come to that item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland, as modified, is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe there are two items which come before us next, and I should like to have them voted upon now. The first is in lines 14 and 15 on page 71, after the word "plant;" to insert "the construction of a system of public-use navigation terminals on the Tennessee River."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments have already been stated. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in lines 14 and 15 on page 71.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority" will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 71, line 22, after "reference", to strike out "newspapers,".

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is covered by the Tydings amendment, and the committee amendment should be disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment is rejected.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 23, after "periodicals", to strike out "purchase."

Mr. McKELLAR. That amendment does not refer to newspapers, and should be agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if the purpose of the amendment is to prohibit the T. V. A. from acquiring new passenger cars in the administration of the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true. The reason the amendment was adopted by the committee is that it was shown by the evidence that last year the T. V. A. had in use 763 passenger cars. It was the opinion of the committee that with the present priorities and the present lack of rubber, the Tennessee Valley Authority was particularly and peculiarly fortunate in having 763 cars, and that it was not necessary to give the Authority the right to buy any additional cars.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I know; but the Senator cannot retain the floor indefinitely.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can retain it for the present, to make a speech at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no intention of interrupting the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not think so. The Senator said he wanted to obtain the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to speak on the question before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand this amendment relates only to striking out one word.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the amendment which is before us. Is it on that subject that the Senator wishes to address the Senate or on the whole T. V. A. situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to discuss the next amendment, on page 72.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator from Nebraska wishes to discuss the

amendment striking out the word "purchase."

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is all, let him do so now. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not wish to take the Senator from Tennessee from the floor. Before we vote on an amendment every Senator is entitled to express himself on it. I wish to speak on the question of striking out the word "purchase."

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Tennessee has the floor, as he says, and wishes to speak on that question, or any other question, I have no objection. I do not want to interrupt him. However, he has stated that he wishes to speak on the next amendment.

Mr. President, I suppose it is useless to contest this amendment, because on the face of it it cuts down expenses. As a matter of fact, it involves no economy. I do not expect to oppose it seriously, because I presume the Senate will agree to the amendment.

The effect of the amendment would be that during the fiscal year 1943 the T. V. A. could not purchase a single automobile. At the same time, because of conditions with which we are all more or less familiar, the use of automobiles in 1943 will be greater than it was in 1942. If the T. V. A. were deprived of the use of automobiles, it would be impossible for it to carry on its business. As we know, it covers a territory extending over seven States. It has an office in Washington. It has dealings with manufacturers of various articles which it must have all over the United States. Under State laws, it must look after the shores of its many lakes, to protect the area from malaria and other mosquito-borne diseases.

In many cases the only way in which the T. V. A. can reach the territory is by automobile. The restrictions on automobiles and rubber will themselves probably decrease the use of automobiles, regardless of what our appropriation may be.

In order to buy an automobile under existing conditions, the purchaser must go through the formula of obtaining consent from the proper authorities. It may be that the T. V. A. will have enough old and second-hand automobiles on hand to enable it to function properly. However, I anticipate that the demand for their use in 1943 will be much greater than it was in 1942. Necessarily the T. V. A. cannot be supplied with all its needs in that respect because of the conditions which prevail in regard to the use of rubber and other materials which enter into the manufacture of automobiles. Automobiles will not be manufactured; and in order to obtain one the purchaser must show that he has use for it in some necessary activity.

At the present time the T. V. A. is engaged in war production more than in any other one activity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to the normal activities of the T. V. A. in furnishing power to communities, which was the main object of the creation of the T. V. A., within the radius of the territory which it can serve, my information is that 80 percent of its power is now furnished to war industries for the production of war materials, such as aluminum and various other things. There is now under consideration the construction in that area of a synthetic rubber plant. We all know that already, because of the war, the load on the T. V. A. has been enormously increased, and it is bound to increase still further. It is impossible to anticipate the increase very far ahead.

What effect would the amendment, denying the T. V. A. the right to purchase a single automobile, have upon the ability of the T. V. A. to serve the new requirements because of the war? It has more than 5,500 miles of transmission lines of its own. It also has agreements by which it obtains power temporarily from other utility units which are able to furnish it while its dams are being completed so that it can furnish the power from its own generating plants.

In view of the increase in the load for war purposes and the probable further increase, depending upon the number of plants which may be located in the area for war purposes, what effect would the amendment have upon the ability of the T. V. A. to function and serve the various agencies, if it were denied the right to purchase a single automobile? I realize, as does the Senator, that 700 or more cars seem to be a great many cars, but we must not forget that up to the present time this has been a $225,000,000 enterprise. The people have put that much money into the project.

Mr. NORRIS. It is engaged in a business which requires the use of automobiles.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a great utility. It is necessary to have representatives on the ground in the various units all over the territory served. It is even necessary to send inspectors to factories which are making things which enable the T. V. A. to install units and to make repairs and extensions necessary to serve those who depend upon it for power. That means that at times a representative must be sent a distance of a thousand miles or more. In view of the increase in traveling expenses by reason of the increase in passenger fares and other items, if representatives of the T. V. A. must be sent to various places by rail or air because the T. V. A. cannot have enough automobiles, what would be the effect, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. NORRIS. In my opinion, the expenditures would be increased rather than decreased, which is the object of the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. This amendment would deny the T. V. A. the right to purchase automobiles. By another amendment its travel allowance would be very materially reduced.

Mr. NORRIS. The next amendment would cut down the travel allowance. Such a situation might make it impossible for the T. V. A. to operate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have any interest in any individual buying a car. I myself cannot buy a car. I cannot even buy a tire. The other day I had to have a couple of old tires plugged in order to get from my house to the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I have a tire which I will sell to the Senator. I will throw in an automobile. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says he will sell me a tire and throw in an automobile?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will negotiate with the Senator privately. [Laughter.]

I mention that only as evidence of the fact that, while we in Washington can get along without cars or tires, because we can travel on the streetcars or walk, in view of the present emergency it is necessary for business organizations which have been set up by the Government to have the ability to get around and transact their business. We must consider whether, in the long run, it is cheaper to buy a car for the use of those who must go to various places, send them on the train or by airplane, or not send them at all. If they cannot be sent at all, the T. V. A. will have to wait until something which it has ordered is delivered, and then perhaps find that it is wrong because it was not inspected at the place where it was made. This would cause much delay and interference with its activities. I wish the Senator would elaborate on that point.

Mr. NORRIS. I had not intended to talk about that. I thought I might do so on another amendment, one relating to travel.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In line with the thought expressed by the Senator from Kentucky, let me point out that the T. V. A. now has under construction, not yet finally completed, some 12 dams. They are also doing work on 2 large steam-power plants. In order to get to many of the dams the only way to go is by car. To many of the dams there is no railroad; and there are no airfields nearby, so certainly it is impossible to reach them by airplane. The only way to reach them is by automobile. Of course, the engineers must be able to get to the dams. In one instance a project manager has charge not of 1 dam but of 4 different dams. That means that he has to keep busy going to the different projects. The dams and the construction works have to be visited by engineers and superintendents and project managers. Many men are working there. The only way they have to get there is by road, which means by traveling in an automobile of some kind. If the amendment is voted down, the appropriation will not be increased by $1. It is not the purpose of the Senator to increase the appropriation.

The only result for the T. V. A. would be that if it were necessary, if the War Production Board thought it were necessary, and were to give its consent from the standpoint of defense, the T. V. A. would be permitted to buy an automobile.

Is not that correct?

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is correct; yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this organization has 763 passenger cars. That is more than most other organizations or individuals are blessed with. Last year the cost for gasoline, oil, repairs, depreciation, and the like, for those cars amounted to $372,000, and they still have the same cars.

They have 763 cars, and last year they spent $372,630, according to the statement of their general manager. Certainly those cars will give the T. V. A. all the passenger transportation it could possibly use. That is what it used last year, and it can use them this year.

Mr. NORRIS. All that may be true, Mr. President; I am not in a position to deny it. They may not buy a single car; but it seems to me, if they were not able to buy a car unless they came to Congress and got an appropriation for it, if an emergency arose in which 1 car or 100 cars would be absolutely necessary in order to permit them to function, the situation would be deplorable.

That is the only thing that is affected here. The Senator from Alabama says the appropriation would not be increased. If the instrumentalities of Government having charge of priorities on rubber, steel, and so forth, permitted, if the T. V. A. were to show that they were entitled to one car, and had to have it, this would enable them to get it. That is all. That is all I am contending for.

I cannot tell what may happen. I sincerely trust that they will not have to buy any cars; but to close the door, Mr. President, in the face of their activities for national defense, it seems to me, would be dangerous.

I should like to have a vote on this question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator recognizes that the work of the T. V. A. will be substantially greater this year than it was last year, because of the fact that, due to the war, due to the increase of war production in that area, the work of the T. V. A. has had to be greatly augmented. Is not that true?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. What might have served the purpose of the T. V. A. last year very likely would not serve its purpose this year. For instance, at one great plant, the plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, at Alcoa, Tenn., production has been enormously stepped up due to the demand for aluminum. That means that the T. V. A. has had to rush in and use steam plants that it did not use last year in order to obtain the power which is necessary to bring about the increased production of aluminum. That is just one illustration.

The present demands on the T. V. A. are far greater than were the demands a year ago. In fact, the demand today is the very maximum that could be imposed upon it, due to the crying need for aluminum, for ferrosilicon, for phosphorus, and for other war materials which are being produced in the valley of the Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have a vote?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee one or two questions in connection with the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator what the evidence disclosed with respect to the number of automobiles purchased by the Authority during the last year?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not that record with me; but they have a way—they did last year and they want to do it again—of trading in cars. They have stated in their testimony that their purpose is to trade in cars. As I understand, cars cannot now be traded in. Of course, an organization like this one might possibly trade them in if it were given the authority.

At this point I should like to read the testimony of the general manager, Mr. Clapp:

Senator BANKHEAD. How many automobiles does the Authority own?

Mr. CLAPP. We own 763 passenger cars.

Senator McKELLAR. Seven hundred and sixty-three passenger cars.

Are you able to use them, all of them? Is it possible for your official force to use them, or do all of your people have automobiles?

Mr. CLAPP. Those passenger cars are used very heavily; they average in excess of 1,500 miles a month.

He said that all of them were used.

I continue to read from the testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. Well, now, you have 765 passenger cars; is the gasoline paid for by the Authority?

Mr. CLAPP. That is correct.

Senator McKELLAR. And the upkeep of the cars?

Mr. CLAPP. By the Authority.

Senator McKELLAR. And the new cars?

Mr. CLAPP. We operate those.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you allow the passengers in those cars mileage for using those cars?

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, no, sir.

Then he was asked to present a break-down as to repairs; and the break-down is given as exhibit G, from which I read, as follows:

EXHIBIT G

Tennessee Valley Authority-owned passenger-car statistics, fiscal year 1941

1. Average number of passenger cars in service	574
2. Average investment in passenger cars	$344,400
3. Operating costs of passengar cars:	
A. Gasoline	$78,986
B. Oil	3,717
C. Tires and tubes	9,292
D. Miscellaneous services	37,170

Whatever they are—

E. Repairs	$59,473
F. Depreciation	83,633
G. Garage and administration	98,500
H. Storage	1,859
Total	372,630

Under the circumstances, as they have 763 cars, and, in addition, a number of old cars, as was testified in another place, with all the necessary material and men to repair the cars, surely, I think, they can get along with that number of passenger cars for the State of Tennessee, the northern part of Alabama, and the northern part of Mississippi, particularly.

Furthermore, as I will show the Senate in a few minutes, aside from passenger cars, which are just one item—and the upkeep of the passenger cars is $372,000 a year, and, as testified, the cost was $1,200,000—travel pay alone for the T. V. A. amounts to about $800,000. That seems to be a considerable sum for travel pay, and at this time when our country is so greatly in need of money for war purposes it seems to me that the T. V. A. could get along with the 763 passenger cars they had last year, and that they could forego buying new cars, as they will probably have to do. Surely, this organization can get along with 763 passenger cars—not trucks and busses, for such vehicles are not included—the upkeep and gasoline for which cost $372,000, when it also has $800,000 for travel pay. In my opinion, they should have no difficulty in traveling from one dam to another.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator if this is the first time the Appropriations Committee has attempted to place any limitation upon the number of cars which may be obtained by the Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; so far as I know, it is; and if I am permitted to make a statement to the Senate, as I hope I will later on, I will make clear the reason.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry that I bothered the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Illinois has not bothered me at all; I shall be glad to answer any questions he desires to ask, but these small amendments seem to me to be rather inconsequential as compared to the important amendment which we desire to discuss in a few moments. If the Senator has any other question, I shall be glad to answer, if I can.

Mr. LUCAS. It may be true that this item is inconsequential, but all I was attempting to do was to seek a little information about the automobile question, and I do it primarily because of the national defense. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he feels that the curtailment of automobiles under control of the Tennessee Valley Authority will, in any way, endanger the efficient operation of the plants of the T. V. A. during this emergency? I am interested only in one thing in connection with all these appropriations; I do not want to do anything that will cripple or curtail or hurt the war effort, and neither does the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, I do not; and I am glad the Senator from Illinois feels that way about it. I wish to say that if I thought this amendment would, even in the remotest way or in the slightest degree, interfere with the war effort, I would be opposed to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I congratulate the Senator and his committee in attempting to do what they are doing, but sometimes

we can go, it seems to me, perhaps, a little too far in our zeal to save. That is the only reason I rose, for I know what contribution the Tennessee Valley Authority has made to the war effort, and I would be the last one in the world who would do anything, even to the extent of taking one automobile away from them which would, in anywise, cripple the war effort which is being made in that great valley.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I had the slightest idea that it would cripple the war effort, I should not favor the amendment. The Authority, however, has 763 passenger cars and adequate provision for their upkeep. It has a force to keep them in repair and the necessary materials and mechanical devices for the upkeep of the cars. At a time such as this, when we have no rubber in the country, when many materials are on the priorities list and are difficult to get—and I doubt if tires could be bought—surely, under these circumstances, the Authority should not be allowed to buy automobiles at a time such as this.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have tried to run through the testimony of Mr. Clapp, the general manager of the T. V. A. The Senator asked Mr. Clapp the number of cars on hand at the time, I think, of his testimony, which was 763. The Senator asked him the average number, which Mr. Clapp fixed at 500 and some, which would indicate that the number now needed has been increased, probably because of new developments there. Did the Senator ask Mr. Clapp or anyone else connected with the T. V. A. to what extent the use of automobiles might be curtailed or to what extent it would cripple their activities or offer a serious handicap if they were denied the right to purchase any more cars?

Mr. McKELLAR. They were given every possible opportunity to do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator drew out from him how many cars they had, but the hearing does not disclose that there was any discussion with anyone connected with the T. V. A. as to denying them the right to purchase any cars at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read further from the testimony. Mr. Clapp said:

> Those cars are not assigned to individuals. Those cars are pooled at various garages, at important points of operation.

They have garages and mechanical appliances for the repair of the cars in order to keep them in proper shape. I quote further from the testimony:

> Senator McKELLAR. Your commissioners, the members of the Authority—the three members of the Authority do not have cars?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. They do not have cars other than their personally owned cars. They, of course, use the Tennessee Valley Authority cars on official business.
>
> Senator McKELLAR. They use Tennessee Valley Authority cars on official business?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. Yes.
>
> Senator McKELLAR. Do they use gasoline in their cars all the time, regardless of official business?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. They do not use Tennessee Valley Authority cars for other than official business, and, of course, the gasoline and oil and expense of maintenance on those cars is a part of the cost of that official travel.
>
> Senator McKELLAR. Does not each man have a car, each official have a car, all the way down the line? Do you not have a car?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. You mean a personal car?
>
> Senator McKELLAR. Yes; do you not own a car?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. I own a car, Senator, but I do not——
>
> Senator McKELLAR. Do you have a chauffeur?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. No; I do not have a Tennessee Valley Authority car assigned to me; but if I want to use a Tennessee Valley Authority car on official business——
>
> Senator McKELLAR. You use one of the cars?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. I use one of the Tennessee Valley Authority cars.

Mr. BARKLEY. That still does not answer my question, which is whether the committee discussed with anyone connected with the T. V. A. the question of denying them the right to buy a ne car and what the effect of such action would be.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee had the officials of the T. V. A. before it time and again, as I recall. I know they were before us two or three times. The question of cars was discussed. The particular question suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, so far as the evidence disclosed, was not asked, but the T. V. A. officials were given every opportunity in the world to make any claim they wanted to make about cars.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Clapp and others in the T. V. A. could not anticipate, I imagine, what in executive session the committee might do in denying the Authority the right to purchase cars.

Mr. McKELLAR. They could anticipate what the committee thought about it from the questions which were asked them. If Mr. Clapp could not understand what was proposed, then someone else ought to be made manager of that organization.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to get the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am giving the Senator the facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not quite; I mean the Senator has not stated as yet whether any member of the committee asked anyone connected with the T. V. A. what the effect would be on their program of denying them the right to buy a single automobile during the year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that question was asked as the Senator suggests it; but, in effect, it was before the officials of the T. V. A. They were asked to present any matter that they wanted to present, and they did so.

Mr. BARKLEY. They could not present a matter that was not specifically brought to their attention. It was entirely proper for the committee to ask how many cars they had, and it would have been proper, I think, and fair to have asked what effect it would have on their operations to deny them the right to buy an automobile. I do not see how the T. V. A. could have anticipated, in the absence of any inquiry of that sort, that the committee was then going to deny them the right to purchase a car. It may be that the committee did not think it necessary to get that information. Evidently they did not, for they did not obtain it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays. Let us see where we are going.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Chair state whether the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in doubt about the number demanding the yeas and nays. The Chair will inquire if there is a second to the demand.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hayden	Reed
Ball	Herring	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Rosier
Barbour	Holman	Russell
Barkley	Hughes	Schwartz
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chandler	McNary	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Doxey	Murray	Wheeler
Ellender	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have concluded to make a general statement about the Tennessee Valley Authority. In the first place, I desire to give a brief history of the building of the dams on the Tennessee River.

In the year 1916 I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, which committee had charge of matters relating to rivers and harbors. After a consultation with Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, who had been for many years a Member of the House, but who was then a Member of the Senate, I offered an amendment to a bill in 1916—and I hope Senators will remember the date—providing for the building of a dam at Muscle Shoals, on the Tennessee River.

The Committee on Military Affairs, of which Mr. James Hay, of Virginia, was chairman at the time, adopted the amendment and it went to the House, but when it reached the floor of the House, Mr. John C. McKenzie and Mr. Nicholas Longworth both opposed the

amendment very vigorously. They did not want the improvement at Muscle Shoals made. They fought the amendment well, because both were able men and splendid gentlemen. They had a different view about it from my own, and they defeated the amendment on the floor of the House, as the record will show.

The bill then came to the Senate, and Mr. Underwood continued his interest in the matter, as I did. For some reason the bill did not go to the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate, but was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. At that time the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] was a member of that committee, of which he subsequently became chairman. This was during the first Wilson administration. The Senator from South Carolina introduced a bill, which was a tremendous improvement over the amendment I had offered in the House. His bill, as enacted, provided in part—

SEC. 124. Nitrate supply. (June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 215), sec. 124.)

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to make, or cause to be made, such investigation as in his judgment is necessary to determine the best, cheapest, and most available means for the production of nitrates and other products for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products by water power or any other power as in his judgment is the best and cheapest to use; and is also hereby authorized and empowered to designate for the exclusive use of the United States, if in his judgment such means is best and cheapest, such site or sites, upon any navigable or nonnavigable river or rivers or upon the public lands, as in his opinion will be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act; and is further authorized to construct, maintain, and operate, at or on any site or sites so designated, dams, locks, improvements to navigation, powerhouses, and other plants and equipment or other means than water power as in his judgment is the best and cheapest, necessary or convenient for the generation of electrical or other power and for the production of nitrates or other products needed for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products.

The President is authorized to lease, purchase, or acquire, by condemnation, gift, grant, or devise, such lands and rights-of-way as may be necessary for the construction and operation of such plants, and to take from any lands of the United States, or to purchase or acquire by condemnation materials, minerals, and processes, patented or otherwise, necessary for the construction and operation of such plants and for the manufacture of such products.

The products of such plants shall be used by the President for military and naval purposes to the extent that he may deem necessary, and any surplus which he shall determine is not required shall be sold and disposed of by him under such regulations as he may prescribe.

The President is hereby authorized and empowered to employ such officers, agents, or agencies as may in his discretion be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes herein specified, and to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies to perform any and all of the duties imposed upon him by the provisions hereof.

The plant or plants provided for under this act shall be constructed and operated solely by the Government and not in conjunction with any other industry or enterprise carried on by private capital.

The complete act is set out in the hearings. It is the law of the land to this very day.

Mr. President, I digress at this point to say that no one ever thanked another more than I thanked the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] for putting the provision I have read into the bill which was passed in that year. After its passage and after the bill was signed by the President of the United States, the then Senator from Alabama, Mr. Underwood, who had been a candidate for President against Mr. Wilson in the preceding campaign, was in doubt as to how the President felt toward him. He came to my office and I regarded his visit as a very great honor. Mr. Underwood had been the leader of the Democrats in the House. He had come to the Senate in 1914, as I remember, and had taken a high position in the Senate of the United States. When he came to my office and invited me to go with him to call on the President of the United States in an endeavor to get the dam located at Muscle Shoals, I regarded it as a very high compliment to me, and I still do.

We went to see the President. Senator Chamberlain, of Oregon, one of the predecessors of my distinguished and splendid friend who sits in front of me now, the present Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], was then chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. He had already seen the President in the interest of having the dam built on the Columbia River. Mr. Underwood and I had a most pleasant interview with the President, and he agreed that the dam should be placed at Muscle Shoals.

There may have been others who went to ask the President to place the dam at Muscle Shoals. This dam was authorized by the act introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], one of the oldest Members in this body, and one of the finest men in the United States Senate or elsewhere. I wish to say that I took off my hat to him then; I honored and respected him then; and in the long years which have passed I have always honored and respected him because I think he did a great service to the people of the United States in having the dam, which was afterward known as the Wilson Dam, established at Muscle Shoals. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] had been in the House—a very able and splendid Member of the House—and at that time, as now, was progressive in his views.

I am not sure whether he took an active interest in the passage of that first bill, but, knowing him as I do, I believe he did take an active interest in that bill, because when I came to the Senate the leading antagonist to the trusts of the country, and especially the Power Trust, was GEORGE W. NORRIS, and he has continued to be through all the years he has been in the Senate.

What happened then? The Government had nearly finished building the dam by 1920. The war was over, it is true, but the dam was to be used both for military purposes and for production of fertilizer for agriculture. We had obtained appropriations up to 1921, but when we endeavored to obtain appropriations in 1921, the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of Mr. Smoot, a very able and efficient member of the Appropriations Committee, turned down the request for an appropriation for completion of the Wilson Dam. Senator Smoot said it would be throwing good money after bad money—I remember that expression was used time and again in the debate—and the Senate upheld his contention. Work was discontinued on the dam. There was not much more to be done, fortunately, and afterward the dam was completed, and this is the reason it was completed: About that time Mr. Ford, thinking it was junk, offered a small sum for it. His offer did not amount to a row of pins, and, incidentally, I, myself, at one time thought that probably was the best way to handle the matter. But the Congress would not give it to Mr. Ford on his terms, and afterward he withdrew his offer.

That was about 1922 or 1923, or perhaps 1921. It is a long time ago, and I cannot be accurate with respect to dates. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] had introduced a bill to develop the Tennessee River. I had also introduced a similar bill. But the difference between our positions in the Senate was very great indeed at that time. The Senator from Nebraska was the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We had introduced practically identical bills. We continued to introduce them until Mr. Roosevelt became President. We did not get very far with either of our bills. Of course, I upheld the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska, because it offered the only chance under God's heaven to obtain legislation on this subject.

The only way we could get the legislation we wanted was to accept the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Besides, it was exactly the same kind of bill that I had introduced and that a number of other Senators had introduced, and we made the fight for it.

The Senator from Nebraska and I had one difference, if the Senator does not mind my recalling it. We fought together all along the line except once. The only time we differed was with respect to the amount of compensation which should go to the States which were involved. The Senator from Nebraska was unwilling to accept the provision which is now in the bill on that subject. I have forgotten its exact terms. The law contains a provision with respect to compensation to the State of a certain percentage of the receipts in money for power. Because the Senator from Nebraska left out Tennessee and Alabama entirely, we differed about the bill, but he won, and his bill was passed and went to President Coolidge, and the President vetoed it.

The next year the Senator accepted my amendment, which was placed in the bill, and the bill was passed again, and President Coolidge again vetoed the bill.

That was the situation in which we found ourselves. Of course, Mr. Hoover was not for the bill.

In the meantime, however, we did get an appropriation for the construction of the dam. Mr. Ford's offer resulted in our getting the appropriation. About that time the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] became a member of the Appropriations Committee. The Senate was good enough to place me on the Appropriations Committee, and, with many other Senators who felt as we did, we obtained the necessary appropriation for completion of Wilson Dam, and it was completed.

I shall not talk long about what happened when Mr. Roosevelt was elected President, but he was very much interested in Muscle Shoals and the Tennessee Valley. He thought it was a marvelous place to try the experiment. He went to Muscle Shoals and invited certain Senators and Representatives to go along with him. I cannot remember who they all were, but I remember some of them. One was my distinguished colleague, then Senator Hull, now Secretary of State. Incidentally, he was tendered the position of Secretary of State on that trip. Senator Hull, Senator NORRIS, and I were three members of the party, I am not absolutely sure who the other members of the party were. Their names were in the newspapers. Our pictures were taken with the President. On that trip the President went even further than we had asked him to go. He had a plan all laid out. In it he went further than we had gone. Even as active and vigorous as Senator NORRIS and I were in our advocacy of the dam, the President went even further than we did. He offered to set up a special authority with direction to build the dams contemplated. I do not know who actually prepared the bill; but, as a matter of fact, it contained primarily the ideas of the President on that subject. It was passed overwhelmingly by the Congress, and in a short time the Norris Dam was started. Not long after that, I think it was the next year, the Wheeler Dam was authorized and started.

I wish to say one word about the members of the Authority. After the passage of the bill I talked with President Roosevelt. I am quite sure he did not mention members of the Authority to me, but I mentioned them to him. I am not sure, but I am rather inclined to think he asked me about the Authority. That may or may not be. My recollection is somewhat vague about it, but that is immaterial.

I said to the President, "You have done a great thing for my State. I shall not even make a suggestion about any member of the board. Appoint whomsoever you like." He appointed three men. He appointed Dr. A. E. Morgan. He took Dr. A. E. Morgan out of obscurity and made him Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not mean to reflect on the doctor. I think he does the best he can. I do not think he was the man for the place, but he was made chairman. The President also appointed Mr. Lilienthal and Dr. H. A. Morgan, a splendid Canadian, who went to Tennessee and became the head of the department of agriculture of that State and was afterward made president of the State university. He was quite an elderly man. Being an elderly man myself, I can say that of some one else. He is not as active a man as he used to be, and he was not a very active man on the Commission.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Dr. A. E. Morgan was a very inefficient man. I am stating a little history. After the Norris Dam was well under way—and at that time Dr. Morgan said it was to be merely a storage dam—and after the Wheeler Dam, which is near Muscle Shoals, was begun, Dr. A. E. Morgan happened to be in my office. It was not often that any of them ever came to see me. I do not know why they seemed to resent my being a Senator from Tennessee, but that was immaterial, so it did not make any difference to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I would rather listen to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Dr. A. E. Morgan came to my office. Sitting across the desk from him I said, "Doctor, why is it that you have not recommended any more dams on the Tennessee River?"

He said:

> The underlying thought and principle of the Tennessee Valley Authority is not to build power dams in competition with private companies. All we are asked to do in that regard is to build two or three dams—and we are to have three—to form a yardstick by which private power companies will be taught what is a proper price to charge for power. The great underlying principle of the Tennessee Valley Authority was to reach down and lift up the poor, ignorant Tennessee mountaineers and put them on a comparative equality with the other people of this country.

I represented those people, and Senators can imagine what I said to him. I told him that he had me to fight as long as I was a Member of the Senate. He said that he was opposed to building the dams, and that Mr. Lilienthal agreed with him.

At that time the Board was divided in this way: Dr. A. E. Morgan was Chairman and Mr. Lilienthal was vice chairman. They controlled the T. V. A. Dr. H. A. Morgan was placed on the shelf, and he just went along.

When Dr. A. E. Morgan told me what the purpose of the T. V. A. was, as he understood it, and that he was not going to build any more dams, we parted company at that time. As I recall, I saw Dr. A. E. Morgan only once after that. I recall only one other visit.

I made up my mind very quickly what to do. So far as the record shows, the T. V. A. did not recommend any more dams. As a matter of fact, it recommended only two. The other one had been built in a previous administration. I do not know whether the T. V. A. recommended the Norris Dam. I think it was arranged by unanimous consent, but it was the first one built. The Wheeler Dam was recommended, but no more. The T. V. A. did not recommend it to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget did not recommend it to the President, and the President did not recommend it to the Congress. The House did not pass a provision for another dam that year. That was in 1934. Keep that in mind.

The T. V. A. was opposed to building any more dams. If I remember correctly, in 1934 the question first came up in connection with the Pickwick Dam. When the bill came to the Senate without provision for any dams, I offered an amendment requiring the T. V. A. to build the Pickwick Dam. I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and other members of the Appropriations Committee will bear me out in which I am about to say. I offered an amendment requiring the T. V. A. to build the Pickwick Dam. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, and when we reached the stage of conference we had a big fight over it, and held the bill up for quite a while, but the amendment stayed in, and the Pickwick Dam was started the next year.

Still realizing the opposition of Dr. A. E. Morgan and Mr. Lilienthal to the dam, what happened next year when the question came up? Again there was no recommendation. The T. V. A. did not recommend any dams. The Bureau of the Budget did not recommend any dams. The President did not recommend any. The House passed the question by without a word. When the bill came over to the Senate I offered an amendment, which was printed at the time, which provided that the T. V. A. should build the Guntersville (Ala.) Dam, the Chickamauga Dam near Chattanooga, and the Hiwassee Dam not far from Chattanooga. I believe the exact site is in North Carolina, but it is near Chattanooga in the mountains; also the Aurora Dam in Kentucky, which is now called the Gilbertsville Dam, and which is just across the Kentucky line. Shortly afterward the site was fixed a little way down the river and it became the Gilbertsville site.

That was the time Dr. Morgan came to my office. I did not know until afterward that he had been here for 3 or 4 weeks lobbying with my colleagues on the committee against building any of these dams. When he found out that the provision was going to be adopted by the committee, he came to my office and told me that he was perfectly willing that the Guntersville, Chickamauga, and Hiwassee Dams should be built, but that he wanted a little longer time to fix an exact site for the Kentucky dam. I am sorry the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is not present at the moment, because if he had depended upon Lilienthal and Morgan for dams he would not be bothered about dams today.

What happened? Dr. A. E. Morgan said that he was perfectly willing to agree to the first three dams if I would postpone the Gilbertsville Dam until a later date. I told him that might be all right, and that I would look into the question. I told him to write out the kind of amendment he wanted. Incidentally, I have his amendment, in his own handwriting, today. It is in my files. He wrote it in pencil and called me from the

next room when he had finished, as I had asked him to do.

After making that agreement, the next morning, when I went before the committee—I have no doubt the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] will remember it, because he was on the subcommittee as well as the full committee—I said, "I have all my dam sites settled. Dr. Morgan and I have agreed to build three, and let Gilbertsville go for another year, because he wants a little more time." I never got such a laugh in my life. The Senator from Virginia, former Senator Byrnes—who is a distinguished and able member of the Supreme Court of the United States and who was then a Senator and a member of the committee—and my other friends on the committee laughed at me. They said, "Dr. Morgan has been around lobbying against all of them this very afternoon." He had agreed with me in the morning.

The committee agreed to the three dams, and Dr. A. E. Morgan had the audacity to call me up the next day about 11 o'clock to find out what had happened. I told him that I had heard that he had been lobbying, that I would have a man at the Union Station that afternoon, and that if he was not on the train I would denounce him on the floor of the Senate the next day. He and Lilienthal fought and lobbied. Perhaps I should not say that Lilienthal lobbied, but Dr. A. E. Morgan was representing the two of them. He lobbied against the building of the Pickwick, Guntersville, Hiwassee, Chickamauga, Watts Bar, Fort Loudoun, and Gilbertsville dams.

Five of those dams have been built through amendments originating in the Senate committee, agreed to by the Senate, and agreed to in conference. The only ones which have not been completed are the Fort Loudoun Dam and one other. Today we should be in a bad predicament if those five dams were not producing power. They were built despite the opposition of the two responsible officers of the T. V. A.

What happened? I know there is not a Member of the Senate who has not read the celebrated novels of Dickens, written over a hundred years ago. I am sure that all of us are familiar with Uriah Heep, a character mentioned in one of Dickens' novels. If ever there was a modern Uriah Heep in the flesh, it is this man Lilienthal. He was the meekest and mildest man in all the world until he became Chairman of the T. V. A., but now he has become one of the greatest warriors in the world, and a man who can do no wrong. He is a Harvard man, and he cannot possibly do any wrong. Everything he does is right; and anyone who does anything contrary to what he thinks is right is a scoundrel.

Mind you, this man claims to be the Authority. He talks as an authority on national defense and what the Authority is doing for national defense. Speaking of authorities and of what the Authority is doing for national defense, suppose Mr. Lilienthal's plans and those of A. E. Morgan had been carried out. Today we should not have the five dams which now are furnishing power for the manufacture of aluminum in that area.

Since I am referring to the history of the T. V. A. I might furnish a little more: Five or six years ago—I cannot say exactly when it was—we had in Tennessee a native Blount County man by the name of A. D. Huddleston, who is one of the finest men I know—straightforward, honorable, and high-minded in every way. Many years ago he became connected with the Aluminum Co. when it was established down there, and by successive step-ups he became its general manager.

One day he came into my office, the most excited man I ever saw. We had been personal friends. He said that he had a piece of information which he thought I ought to have. I said, "All right; let's have it." He said that the board of directors of the Aluminum Co., at Pittsburgh, had sent for him and asked him to come there. When he went there they told him that they were in doubt about where to locate a very large plant; that they had finally got down to the question of whether they would locate the plant in Canada, right across from Niagara Falls, or whether they would locate it at Alcoa, in Blount County, Tenn. They said, "We want to say to you that it is a question of power. We have tried for a long time to make a deal with the Tennessee Valley Authority to obtain run-of-the-river power which now is going to waste; and if we could get them to agree to furnish it at anything like a reasonable price, we would prefer to locate the plant in Blount County."

Mr. Huddleston, being a good friend and an admirer of mine, said, "Senator, you can help us out." I always want to help out my friends, my country, and my State. I thought it would be a fine thing to have the plant located there. This is the course I took: I think the first man I went to was the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I told him that Mr. Lilienthal would not deal with Mr. Huddleston; that we had built the plants, and that the water was running away and going to waste. What is known as the secondary power was running to waste and being lost. As I remember, this concern was willing to pay about $2,000,000 a year—perhaps a million and a half the first year, then $2,000,000 a year, and afterward perhaps more.

The Senator from Nebraska agreed with me. He thought it would be perfectly right, and I thought it would be perfectly right—if I had not thought so I would not have suggested it to him—for the Tennessee Valley Authority to sell run-of-the-river power to the concern which wanted it. At that time the T V. A. did not have the tremendous number of customers it now has. I went to the President of the United States, and suggested to him that I hoped he would have a word to say to Mr. Lilienthal so that the contract could be made. It was made; and Lilienthal is the man who is talking about this bill.

I should like to say something which all Members of the Senate know. The Senator from Nebraska has always been a progressive; he is level-headed; he is a kindly man. He has done everything humanly possible to aid the development of this great project in my State. I am under great obligation to him, and my State is under great obligation to him, because the Tennessee River development has been a great public improvement. I took off my hat to him when he first came to our help in 1921, and I take off my hat to him today for the magnificent work he has done.

Of course, my work has not been so prominent, because I did not introduce that bill. I have been a humble worker in the cause. I have given the best years of my life and the best thoughts of my brain to this cause. I have done more work for the Tennessee Valley Authority than for anything else for which I ever worked in my life, yet this man, Lilienthal, who was opposed to the building of the seven dams, has the effrontery to travel in an airplane all over Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, denouncing me for being an enemy of the T. V. A., when God knows that if ever a man believed a thousand percent in an organization, I believed a thousand percent in the T. V. A. It has done wonders for my State. It has done wonders for my country, and there is nothing honest and right that I would not do to forward it.

I remember that my friend the Senator from Virginia did not always agree with me about these dams. He had misgivings about them. He acted generously toward me every time I ever went to him; but he knows, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] knows, and every other member of that committee knows the difficult time I had in getting these dams. My friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] knows it, too, because I had to appeal to him by night and by day to help me. I appreciate what he did. I appreciated it then, and I appreciate it now. He obtained a vote when I did not think I should ever get one; and I have never failed to vote for dams in Oregon in which he is interested [laughter], because I thought I owed my friend a debt of gratitude and owed my country a duty in helping to build such dams.

For 26 years—from 1916 to 1942—I have been fighting to upbuild the Tennessee Valley. I told my friends that that project would be honestly managed and that the work would be honestly performed. I should be an ingrate toward the members of the committee and toward the Senate if I did not do my utmost to have that promise fulfilled. That is all that I am asking to have done.

By the way, that brings to my mind a very remarkable thing to which I wish to direct attention. I ask the Senate to hear me for just another moment, and then I shall pass on to the exact language in the bill. I am being denounced as having undertaken to injure the T. V. A. because of some difference I had with Lilienthal about a dam known as the Douglas Dam. That is one of the charges made against me. I did not put this language in the House bill; I did not undertake to change the law. Who did? I want to find out today if I can.

Under the law as it will be after July 1, T. V. A. receipts will have to be put into the Treasury of the United States, if we do not have any other law on the subject. What is proposed and who proposed it? The House bill has this language, and I wish every Senator would turn to the House bill, which is on their desks, and read it, as I proceed. Let us see who started this thing.

Mr. SMITH. From what page is the Senator about to read?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am about to read from page 72. After the appropriation of $136,000,000 for building new dams there is found in the bill this proviso:

Provided, That this appropriation and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1942," and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended)—

Listen to this language—slick, smooth, ingratiating. It reminds me of another character in literature. Mr. President, do you remember "Oily" Gammon? Listen to this language, and then think of "Oily" Gammon, who was portrayed in Warren's novel, Ten Thousand a Year—

shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943," to remain available until June 30, 1943, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942."

In other words, while we have spent about three-quarters of a billion dollars on T. V. A.—I will get the exact figures—those in charge of it, after the expenditure of three-quarters of a billion dollars, are now producing a revenue of between twenty and thirty billion dollars a year. It will be remembered that they bought a number of other companies in several of the States, among them the Commonwealth Co.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think this is an appropriate place to have an expression from the Senator of his construction of the House language.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. McNARY. The provision the Senator read provides that the receipts shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a special fund which is maintained by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is covered into a special fund; that is the real meaning of it—a special fund on which Mr. Lilienthal may check whenever he pleases, without the consent of the Congress.

He does not want to be restricted by such a body as this; he does not want to be confined; he does not want to be hampered; he wants the power to draw on the fund whenever he desires to do so. By the way, I call the Senate's attention to a document much of which, I am afraid, has long since gone into what Cleveland called "innocuous desuetude," or, in other words, become out of date, but, according to the Constitution of the United States——

Mr. McNARY. May I again interrupt the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. I wanted to answer the Senator's question, but I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. I will forego the interruption.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I am waiting for the answer. In reading this provision the Senator laid emphasis on a certain portion which indicated the construction which he placed on the language. It is clear to me that it keeps within the entity of the Tennessee Valley Authority the control of the funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be clear to the Senator, but it is not very clear to me. I had to study it quite a while before I could make it out, but, of course, I am a very obtuse sort of a man and cannot catch on to such things so quickly as can my good friend from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I shall not argue that observation at all, but it is plain to me. I have only read it once, but it stipulates that the funds shall be kept within the control and power of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly what it does.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, if that is not true, what is the use of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not any amendment. I favor striking out the House provision, because it sets up a plan to enable Lilienthal to draw money out of the Treasury in violation of the Constitution of the United States and without the consent of the Congress. That is what I am objecting to, and that is why the Appropriations Committee struck out the House provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is a fact, is it not, that the Tennessee Valley Authority is not subject to the scrutiny and regulations of the General Accounting Office which apply with regard to every other agency of the Government? Now Lilienthal wants to go a little bit further, take one more bite, and have a special account from which he can appropriate any time he wants to do so without any authority from Congress whatever.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course that is true. I wish to say he goes further than that.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I make it clear—for myself at least—that that authority is now vested in the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. Only until July 1.

Mr. McNARY. It can control its own funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Only until July 1. There was a similar provision in the law last year.

Mr. McNARY. This is simply a repetition of the existing law and practice.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is the practice, but not the law.

Mr. McNARY. But the Senator's proposal—I am not going to argue its merits—asks that we set aside a rule of the Senate and have this money placed in the Treasury of the United States, from which the only way it can be distributed is by act of Congress. That is the whole difference between the situation now, on July 1, and in the future.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the committee amendment is agreed to, then, of course, Mr. Lilienthal, if he obeys the law, will have to pay some twenty-odd million dollars into the Treasury and come to the Congress, as every other department of the Government has to come, to get an appropriation. That is all there is to this amendment.

Now, I wish to say a word about another man, with whom I have likewise not always agreed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will wait a few moments, I shall then yield to him. This morning the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] conducted hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee considering that bill, but when I reached the committee room—I was a little late, I am sorry to say—Secretary Ickes was testifying. Upon the completion of his testimony, I asked him several questions. I said, "Mr. Secretary, you have the great Central Valley light and power project under you, have you not?" He said, "Yes." I said, "You have the great Bonneville Dam project, on the Columbia River, under you, have you not?" He said, "Yes." Then I said, "You have the Grand Coulee Dam under you, have you not?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Do you have to get estimates from the Director of the Budget and then come before the committees of Congress and explain what you want to operate those dams?" He said, "Yes." I said, "What do you do with the receipts you derive from those projects? Do you pay them out as you see fit?" He replied, "No." I asked, "What do you do with them?" He answered, "I put them into the Treasury of the United States as general receipts." I said, "Are you handicapped in any way; are you hampered in any way; have any dire or awkward results of any kind followed from your doing that?" He answered, "No. I do not always get all I want when I come to Congress, but I usually get what is necessary." That was his testimony.

Why should we treat the Tennessee Valley Authority—no; I will not use that term, because it is David Lilienthal, the man—why should we treat him differently from the way in which we treat these reclamation projects? Why should we establish one rule in Oregon, one rule in Washington, one rule in California, and another rule in Tennessee and Alabama, so as to give the Chairman of the T. V A. the right to handle these funds as he desires, without any control by Congress?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Aside from the point of principle involved in the contention here, has the Senator available, and will he give it to the Senate if he has it, any information as to how Mr. Lilienthal has used these receipts? Has he used them to undertake entirely new projects not authorized by Congress, or to expand existing projects, or to buy transmission lines? How have these funds been used by Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to take that matter up at this time. We have been discussing the subject of travel pay in connection with the bill before us, and I wish to recur to that subject. We have had our attention called to little mites of travel pay in connection with the departments.

Mr. President, I think I can take newspaper criticism almost as well as anyone else in the world. It sometimes gets under my skin, sometimes makes me very unhappy for a little while when I see it and read it, but I try to realize that we cannot please everybody, and that someone must be against us. But Mr. Clapp, manager of T. V. A., last fall, when I doubted the wisdom of covering up all the farm land in one of the valleys in east Tennessee, came out in the most vitriolic attack that was ever made on me. He got a man by the name of Pasley, who, I believe, lives in Washington, to write the article for him, but he gave out the interview, and actually they used quotations. I think it was the most vitriolic attack that was ever made on me. They denounced me for everything that was corrupt and dishonest.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that I will answer his question in a moment, but I have something which I must say now.

This man stated that the T. V. A. has 35,000 political plums, if they got into the hands of Senator McKELLAR. Now let me say a word or two about that. I have been in politics in Tennessee for over 30 years. In the last 15 years of that time I think the highest vote that was ever cast against me, in either primary or general election, was fourteen thousand and some hundred out of about a quarter of a million or so, sometimes 300,000 or thereabouts. The vote has been exceedingly complimentary to me. About 14,000 in the State voted against me, I think, at the last election, or the election before the last, and that was the highest in a long period of time, about 12 or 15 years.

I am getting along in years, as I stated a while ago, and for me to start now to build up a political machine would seem to be a very foolish undertaking. Why should I want to appoint 35,000 people in the place of the 35,000 now in the T. V. A., when I believe that at least 90 percent of them vote for me now? Would I not be crazy if I should want to do a thing like that? Would not any man be utterly crazy to have such a desire? With only 14,000 people voting against me in the State, I am the most grateful man in the world to my friends in Tennessee who have thus stood by me for all the years. I have not suffered a defeat in that time. Perhaps I had better "knock on wood," because I understand Lilienthal and this man who comes from Texas and Illinois and Tennessee and Maryland, Silliman Evans, who went to Nashville a year ago and bought a newspaper there, have made an agreement to put me out of politics; and I think the report must be true.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say to the Senate that I have no political ambition. I do not want 35,000 plums. I would not undertake to have an organization like this at my time of life. Most of the 35,000 now vote for me, all of them, I think, except a few whom Lilienthal can keep from voting for me; and there are very few of those. I doubt if there are a thousand in the whole Tennessee Valley Authority who vote against me. I carried every county in the State in the 1940 election. I carried Knox County, where the T. V. A. is located, by about 10 to 1. Why should I want to change a political situation of that kind? Why should I want to undertake such a thing? I have no one I desire to appoint. Where could I find people to appoint? I have been trying to get an assistant secretary for some time, and have not been able to get one yet, though I will sooner or later, I hope. I want to get a Tennessean, and I am trying my best to get a Tennessean. How in the world could I undertake to do what this man says I would do?

I want to call attention to what he says. I ask Senators to listen to what I am about to read. This man is going around in an airplane, paid for by the Government, paid for from the very appropriation which I helped get through last year, and it is going to be paid for out of the appropriation we are about to make. Listen to this, from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of the 24th of April, just a short time ago:

Lilienthal attacks McKELLAR'S Tennessee Valley Authority bill. Asserts it would be worst blow agency could suffer. Talks to Tupelo group—

That is in Mississippi—

Talks to Tupelo group. Chairman of Authority declares passage of measure would turn 35,000 jobs into political plums.

If anyone thinks I am going to fool with 35,000 jobs, or 3,500 jobs, or 35 jobs, or a single job, in the T. V. A., he is merely thinking about something which I have not the slightest intention of doing. I have not lost my mind, I know.

Mr. McNARY. How about "plums"?

Mr. McKELLAR. There would not be any "plums" for me. I cannot imagine a harder job a man could have, and certainly I would not undertake it.

I want to say another thing about the man who makes this statement publicly. I denounce the statement as a willful, deliberate, malicious falsehood, unworthy of any man who claims to be a gentleman. It is not true. I have not the slightest notion of trying to build up any kind of organization. I think I can safely say I do not have to, even if I wanted to, and God knows I do not want to. I would not have it on my hands for anything in the world.

Listen to what this man said to the people gathered in Tupelo. This is not half of what he said in another article which I shall read in a moment. This is a news article from Tupelo:

LILIENTHAL ATTACKS McKELLAR'S TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL—ASSERTS IT WOULD BE WORST BLOW AGENCY COULD SUFFER—TALKS TO TUPELO GROUP—CHAIRMAN OF AUTHORITY DECLARES PASSAGE OF MEASURE WOULD TURN 35,000 JOBS INTO POLITICAL PLUMS

TUPELO, MISS., April 24.—The place of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the valley area in the war against the Axis Powers was discussed by Tennessee Valley Authority Chairman David E. Lilienthal in an address here Friday before members of the Kiwanis, Rotary, and Lions Clubs.

He was introduced by Mayor J. P. Nanney, who recounted some of the early experiences of Tupelo officials in being the first to sign a contract with Tennessee Valley Authority. Several other officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority who are accompanying Mr. Lilienthal via plane to several towns in the Tennessee Valley Authority area were introduced.

Early Friday he spoke at a meeting of power officials here.

HITS M'KELLAR BILL

Stressing that the Tennessee Valley Authority has been kept out of politicians' hands and operated in a businesslike and progressive manner, Mr. Lilienthal expressed firm opposition to a bill proposed by Senator McKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which comes up in the Senate Monday, following its passage by McKELLAR'S committee Thursday.

Enactment of this bill would be the worst blow the Tennessee Valley Authority could receive, he said, as it forbids the Tennessee Valley Authority to expend its revenues as received, as has been the practice in the past, and requires Tennessee Valley Authority officials to seek approval from Congress of every item in its program.

There would be constant changes in policies, as administrations or Members of Congress were replaced, business concerns would not make contracts because they could not be assured of what the Tennessee Valley Authority would do, and the 35,000 jobs of the Tennessee Valley Authority would be political plums, Mr. Lilienthal declared.

FAR FROM TRUTH

Pointing to the concentration of heavy industries in the North and East, particularly around Detroit, Mr. Lilienthal said he found a great many Government officials and industrialists who, having only seen and heard the windbag and breast-beater type of southerner, and never having any experience with the southerners who really carry out the progressive programs of their home areas, had the opinion that workers in this agricultural section could be hard to teach to operate industrial machinery.

"Nothing could be farther from the truth," he said, "and it is our purpose to correct this."

He told of the Tennessee Valley Authority's current program of power construction, "the largest job of building ever undertaken directly at one time by any organization in the history of this country" to produce vast amounts of aluminum for aircraft, as well as munitions and chemicals. He stressed the need for strength, not only on a national scale but through all the State, county, and local institutions to the people themselves.

I come now to travel pay. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] asked me about that. I am sorry he has left the Chamber temporarily, and hope he will soon return. When I asked the Authority about a budget and what objection they had to coming in and getting a budget from Congress, they said they had

a budget of their own. I asked them to let me know what they had with respect to travel pay in their budget, and this is what I got:

Tennessee Valley Authority direct travel expenses.

Mr. President, this does not apply to the over 1,000 automobiles. By the way, Mr. Smith, clerk of the committee, has called my attention to the fact that the T. V. A. has over 1,000 automobiles down there instead of 763, as I erroneously stated, and I now make the correction. But this matter is separate and apart from that. This is what I got from the Authority on travel pay:

Tennessee Valley Authority direct travel expenses by departments, 1942–43.

Chief Engineer: $3,000 for 1942 and $3,000 for 1943.

Construction: I did not know that construction traveled, but I suppose it does under Mr. Lilienthal. Construction, $112,583 in 1942, and $66,028 in 1943.

Design: $63,900 in 1942; $53,700 in 1943.

Water-control planning: $68,000 in 1942; $47,000 in 1943.

Manager of power: Julius Abraham Krug is manager of power. He and David Lilienthal are the "gold-dust twins" of the T. V. A. Both of them ought to be dismissed. I recommended to the President some time ago that he discharge these two men.

Let us see about the manager of power. Who is Mr. Krug? Mr. Krug gets a salary of $9,500. He has a travel pay allowance of $21,000 each year. I asked for the vouchers on his travel pay for the fiscal year 1941–42. How did he expend the money for travel? I have Mr. Clapp's testimony on that matter, which I will read. It is that there are at least five other staff members in that office who use travel pay. Mr. Krug and five staff officers, six in all. Six into $21,000 makes $3,500 apiece travel pay. I live in Memphis, and get travel pay of $372.20. Twenty-one thousand dollars is the travel pay for five staff members and Mr. Krug. I asked the T. V. A. to get me the vouchers and the names of the persons who had used this money, and after waiting a week or two I received the vouchers. I have them on my desk here. They found that instead of having 6 using travel pay they had 49. Forty-nine persons in the office of the manager of power used it, and the manager said there were six. The T. V. A. came with a list of 49. And with the 49, do Senators know how much they could account for? They could account for $15,292.42, and never have been able to find where the remaining amount is. That is all they could find out of the $21,000 allotted to Mr. Krug for that year.

Mr. President, incidentally, Mr. Krug is quite a remarkable man. They gave as a reason for his large travel pay that Mr. Krug was sometimes called out of the country. Somebody borrowed him and sent him to Costa Rica as an engineer. Mr. Krug, according to a letter from Mr. Batt, which is now in the record, never studied engineering a moment in his life. Yet he is the general engineer of this organization. General engineer, mind you.

They ask that we shall have no supervision over their expenses. No; let us take our filthy hands off these two men. Let them run the T. V. A. as they please, make whatever expenditures they please.

I shall ask Mr. Smith to get me another important document.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the question of travel pay——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not going to leave the travel-pay item at this point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Do I understand that the remaining approximately $6,000 was actually spent, and there never were any vouchers filed for it?

Mr. McKELLAR. We have never found a voucher. They have not presented them as yet. That matter is still unexplained. But, Mr. President, that is not all. Good heavens, no. Let us consider this matter a few moments longer. This information comes from Mr. Clapp. This is not from someone who is examining the Authority, but this is from the manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is from the man who denounces me as one who wants to do evil to them. Listen to this:

Manager of power: $21,000.
Power operations.

This is an item which has never been explained. I used to be in the power business, and I know something about it, but I never knew of any "power operation" to travel on trains or airplanes. Here is a little item of travel pay for power operations: $80,000 last year and $80,000 again this year.

Power utilization: There may be a difference between power utilization and power operation, and there must be, because last year they were given $21,778 travel pay for "power utilization," and this year $20,351.

Power engineering and construction: $140,000 last year, and $160,000 travel pay this year.

Chief conservation engineer: Mr. President, I want to make a protest in respect to this item. In the name of economy, I want to protest. Chief conservation engineer, $700 last year, $700 this year. That man must be in the dog house so far as Krug and Lilienthal are concerned. He received only $700 for travel pay when all the others are getting scores of thousands of dollars.

Agricultural relief: $20,924 last year, $33,713 this year.

Chemical engineering: Mr. President, I am referring to travel pay. Tennessee is nearly 600 miles long and more than 100 miles wide, and there is in the Valley about a 100-mile strip in Mississippi and Alabama. Travel pay for chemical engineering, $20,000 last year and $25,000 this year.

Forestry relations: $22,700 last year, and $24,350 this year.

Commerce comes next. Commerce travels; we know that. Commerce, $19,500 last year; $22,000 this year.

Health and safety: I wonder what that is. For health and safety, $24,700 last year and $22,040 this year.

Regional studies: They are getting down to studies now. The researchers have to travel. Thirteen thousand dollars last year and $12,000 this year for travel pay for regional studies.

Reservoir property management: That is a proper item. Ten thousand seven hundred and fifty-one dollars last year, $10,912 this year.

Finance comes next. This is travel pay under the head of "Finance"; $36,270 last year, and $40,000 this year.

Land acquisition: Of course, that is a proper charge, although I think the amount is entirely too large. It was $106,800 last year, and $51,000 this year.

Legal: $20,000 last year for travel pay for lawyers, and $25,000 this year.

Material: $6,000 last year, $6,000 this year.

Office service: I did not know that "office service" travels.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him here?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Do I understand from the reading of this account of travel expenses that those expenses are authorized by the Congress specifically, or are they paid by the T. V. A. out of income without any authorization by Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Which of the two statements is correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are paid without any authorization by Congress. Congress never heard of the subject until this report was filed by the manager of power.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that I may get the facts straight, is it a correct statement to say that the travel expenses are paid, not out of appropriations by Congress, but out of revenues earned by the corporation?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

For the Board of Directors the amount for travel pay for last year was $4,000; for this year the amount is $4,000. For the general manager the amount last year was $1,000, and the amount this year is $1,000. For the budget office, $1,000 last year, and $1,000 this year. For the information office the amount of travel pay is $6,250. That is their publicity office. That is the office which "skinned" me so thoroughly. The travel pay for the poor Washington office is $6,250.

The entire travel pay last year was $857,956; and for this year it is $769,044.

That is not all. The Transportation Division operation includes all costs of operation of Tennessee Valley Authority-owned vehicles and planes, except heavy specialized equipment used only in major construction projects. That is not a part of the $769,044. How much do Senators suppose automobiles cost them last year? They have not enough automobiles, and they want more. In 1942 the amount was $1,320,900, and the figure for this year is $1,200,000.

According to the figures furnished by Mr. Clapp, general manager, the travel pay last year was approximately $2,000,000. This Congress is not going to allow such expenditures; and yet if we reject the pending Senate amendment and allow the House language to stay in, the T. V. A. can spend twice as much as the figure mentioned, and we shall have nothing to say about it. The great majority of those constituting the Authority are

doing a fine job; but these two "birds"—Lilienthal and Krug—are quite different. Let us see what else they did. They have not only arranged matters so that we cannot bother them in their appropriation but they have fixed things so that we cannot bother them at all. I wish to read the most remarkable act I think I ever read in my life——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, would it divert the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has made the statement that when power projects are completed and put into operation and earn revenues, the revenues are turned in to the Federal Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. When such revenues are turned in to the Federal Government, are they general revenues?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. We can use them for war purposes, or for any other purpose in the world whenever they are turned in as general receipts; but when they are turned in to the special fund which is provided for in the House language, they cannot be used for anything except upon the check of and under the direction of Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will allow me to develop that thought, because I do not know much about it, to be perfectly honest. When funds for the T. V. A. come into the Treasury, I suppose they are under a special bookkeeping heading. Would it be possible to use those funds for any other purpose without an act of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. They are tied up and frozen for the sole purpose of answering the checks of the T. V. A. as at present constituted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator another question. I think he said that there were about $20,000,000 of such funds from T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. More than that. There will probably be $30,000,000 this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. For 1 year?

Mr. McKELLAR. For 1 year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the T. V. A. earn that much in a single year?

Mr. McKELLAR. It earned $21,000,000 last year, and will earn a great deal more this year, because it has more dams.

Mr. TYDINGS. How long have the so-called T. V. A. funds, set aside under a special heading in a special account, been accumulating in the Treasury out of earnings?

Mr. McKELLAR. For a year or two. I do not know how long.

Mr. TYDINGS. Only for a year or two?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think since they began to receive earnings from the properties which they bought.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, these projects were built with Government money, and largely through borrowed money, because they are not really normal governmental activities. I am wondering how we propose to pay back the principal into the Treasury again. Is that to be done out of earnings?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no proposal in that connection.

If the House provision is allowed to remain in the bill, the funds will be put in the Treasury in a special account, but after they have been paid out, under another act, a copy of which I hold in my hand, the acts of the T. V. A. are final, and cannot be disturbed. Let me read the act to which I refer. It was approved on November 21, 1941. This body voted for it. I read:

[Public Law 306—77th Cong., ch. 485—1st sess.—H. R. 4961]

An act to amend section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1080), be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provisions of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), and accounts for all receipts and disbursements by or for the Corporation shall be rendered accordingly—

If the act had stopped there, what would have been the effect? The financial activities of the T. V. A. would have been under the supervision of the General Accounting Office, and the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority could have been examined from time to time. It could then be determined whether its accounts should be approved. But listen to this proviso—

Provided, That, subject only to the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, the Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem necessary, including the final settlement of all claims and litigation by or against the Corporation; and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, each time a new dam or project is built in the Tennessee Valley area Congress makes an appropriation to pay for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. For what will the funds which are left after expenses be used?

Mr. McKELLAR. Whatever Mr. Lilienthal says shall become of them.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand, but how will Mr. Lilienthal use them?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just as he pleases. The act to which I have referred gives him carte blanche. His accounts may not be questioned by the General Accounting Office or anyone else.

Mr. TYDINGS. How has he used such funds in the past? Have they been used for betterments or improvements, new dams, roads, reforestation, irrigation, or reclamation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot tell the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Apparently this is a fund with respect to which Mr. Lilienthal has complete control. I was wondering what he was doing with the fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the terms of the act which I read, he cannot be questioned about it. I do not know what he has done with the fund.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator refers to Mr. Lilienthal as though he were the whole Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that there are three members of the Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but Mr. Lilienthal is the whole thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. He cannot be the whole thing without the concurrence of the other two members of the Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not know Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I do know Mr. Lilienthal. He is not even chairman of the Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; he is chairman of the Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; he is not chairman of the Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; he is.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that he is not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I know perfectly well that he is. He was a Uriah Heep until he became chairman; but when he became chairman, he changed, and now a great military man is he. He is running everything according to his own will, and no one else has any show.

Mr. BARKLEY. He is not the chairman.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, he is the chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think he is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. He put out old man H. A. Morgan a year or two ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the President put him out.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the other Morgan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, there were two Morgans, A. E. Morgan and H. A. Morgan. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] can tell you. Confer with him; he can tell you that.

Mr. BARKLEY. There were too many Morgans in the institution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; there were too many Morgans, and one of them got out.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President fired one of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. He removed the poorer one.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. There seems to be a controversy about the two Morgans. There were two Morgans originally on the Board. One of them became a little old for active duty, and he retired, and

Senator Pope, of Idaho, was appointed. Mr. Lilienthal is now the Chairman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that there were two Morgans and one Lilienthal. One Morgan was fired by the President, and the other Morgan was made Chairman of the Board. He remained Chairman until recently; and when he asked the President to relieve him, Mr. Lilienthal was made Chairman. I find that that is the situation, and I want to correct my former statement in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator now has the correct information. We all know how those things happen. Lilienthal took charge after Pope came in.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to how this act originated. I think the Senate passed it by unanimous consent; apparently that is so. Nothing about it appears in the record of the Senate proceedings; but in the record of the House proceedings we find something about this marvelous act which puts the T. V. A. under the General Accounting Office in the first instance, and takes it out from any control in the second instance. I will read what happened.

Mr. Lilienthal went to Mr. MAY. I digress here long enough to say that Mr. MAY is from the State of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and is a very fine man.

Mr. BARKLEY. A very fine man, but a persistent and a consistent enemy of the T. V. A., as the Senator knows.

Mr. McKELLAR. As persistent an enemy of the T. V. A. as was ever in either House of Congress; and yet when "Mr. Heep" became chairman he went to this arch enemy of the T. V. A. and got him to help him out with his bill. Here is what took place:

> The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4961, to amend section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935.
>
> The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
>
> Mr. COLE of New York—

I do not know Mr. COLE; some new Members of the Senate probably served with him, and can say whether he is all right. [Laughter.] I have no doubt that he is all right, judging from what took place in that instance; but I want to tell the Senate what took place. [Laughter.]

Someone is laughing, I observe.

Mr. BARKLEY. Everyone is laughing.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I have said anything that reflects on Mr. COLE, I want to take it back; because I know of nothing in the world that could possibly reflect on Mr. COLE.

I read from the proceedings of the House at that time:

> Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs would explain the purposes of this bill and its effect.
>
> Mr. MAY—

He fought the Tennessee Valley Authority for 13 months on one bill, did he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not remember how long it was, but it was too long.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it was too long. It may have been twice that long; but whatever it was, it was too long. We all had to fight it out.

I continue to read from the proceedings in the House:

> Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to place the Tennessee Valley Authority under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, with two exceptions. The measure as reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs allows the adjustment and settlement finally without the intervention of the Comptroller General of lawsuits that may be pending by or against the T. V. A. The second class of accounts that are not subject to auditing and settlement are such accounts as the board of directors of the T. V. A.—

Listen to this:

> such accounts as the board of directors of the T. V. A. may determine by a meeting of the board to be necessarily of such character that delay would result in loss or serious delay to the Authority, and the board of directors may settle such accounts at the time.

That is his explanation.

I continue to read from the proceedings:

> Mr. COLE of New York. Then the effect of the bill is that it places the T. V. A. under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 except where the board of directors of the T. V. A. determine that they should not be under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act.
>
> Mr. MAY. No; except where they say that some case involves an emergency.

There is no such case in there at all.

> Mr. COLE of New York. Is not that the effect of it. If the board of directors reserves the right to say what accounts shall be audited and what ones shall not be audited, then the bill does not mean a thing. The Tennessee Valley Authority still has the discretion of either coming or not coming under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

It will be remembered that there was a controversy over whether the T. V. A. came or did not come under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; and this bill was introduced in order to make certain that they did. What was done? The Board got all their contracts ratified before they were ever made; and no other department of government had a right to interfere with them.

I read further from the proceedings in the House:

> Mr. MAY. The gentleman may not know it, but I came in with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and it came in with me, and I have been trying ever since to get its accounts audited by the Comptroller General.

If ever a man made a conspicuous failure, my good personal friend, but opponent on matters of T. V. A., certainly made a failure of having that institution brought under the General Accounting Office.

> Mr. COLE of New York. I know the gentleman has been trying to do that.

This is the explanation Mr. MAY gave of it:

> Mr. MAY. In order to be sure that it was the understanding of the committee and the Congress and the understanding of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Comptroller General that this measure would place the Tennessee Valley Authority under the Comptroller General for accounting and settlement of all claims other than the two exceptions I have mentioned—

The two exceptions took in all of them—

> we called the general counsel for the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. Phipps, who testified before the committee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] was particularly cautious to make him admit to the committee that under this bill they would be under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 with these two exceptions.

Listen to this:

> We then called the counsel of the Comptroller General and he admitted that the bill put the Tennessee Valley Authority under that act. As an extra precaution—

Oh, Mr. MAY, who fought the T. V. A. so much—

> As an extra precaution I called one of the Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority who was present, Mr. David Lilienthal, and asked him to say whether or not that was his construction of it and if it was their purpose to go under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. He said that he so construed it and so understood it.

Thereupon, the bill was passed. Mr. President, that bill was passed November 21, 1941. I do not know whether I was present and failed to know about it. If I had been here, it certainly would not have passed with my consent or approval, and I think it is one of the most damaging of bills. But it was passed.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Tennessee was here. In fact, the RECORD shows that he participated in debate and discussion in the Senate on the day when the bill was passed, and that he answered to a roll call on the same day, when, under the call of the calendar, the bill was passed. That was not a T. V. A. bill; that bill originated with the enemies of T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, that was it, was it?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course it was.

Mr. McKELLAR. But why did they call Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. NORRIS. I know, he agreed to it; and, as the Senator has said, the bill was introduced by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the other House who does not pretend to be a friend of the T. V. A., and has always been an enemy of it. I wish to say that so far as I know he has been an honorable enemy; I do not know of any reason why he should not be an enemy of it if he wants to be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I know of no reason why he should not. I think he is an honorable man; I have no criticism to make of him if he wants to oppose it.

Mr. NORRIS. That bill was introduced on June 4, 1941. It was referred to the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and hearings were held June 18, 19, and 27, 1941. That would not indicate that there was any secrecy or snap judgment. The bill was reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs on July 15, was passed over in the House without prejudice on July 21, that is,

when it first came up on the Consent Calendar, I presume, it was objected to, and went over. It then was debated on July 21 and 22, and passed the House on July 22. It was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on July 24, and was considered in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on October 4. So there was the period from July until October before the Senate committee took it up.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], was authorized and directed by the committee to report the bill favorably to the Senate. On the 6th of October, when the Senator from South Carolina had not come in, and we were about to adjourn over, I asked unanimous consent that he be allowed to file the report during the adjournment or recess of the Senate. Such consent was granted; and thereafter he filed the report. The bill passed the Senate on November 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was no debate on it in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. There was no debate on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the records here.

Mr. NORRIS. I know about the bill. I was present, of course, at the committee hearing when it was considered. I did not care anything about the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator had examined it, I am quite sure he would have done what I have done; he would have opposed it.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I would not have opposed it.

Mr. McKELLAR. He certainly would have done so if he had examined it carefully.

Mr. NORRIS. The bill was passed because of a request made by the Comptroller General. I did not think it was necessary to pass the bill, but I had a conference with the Comptroller General and some correspondence with him concerning it, all of which I can produce here. The Comptroller General wanted the legislation, and I understand Mr. MAY introduced it following a letter from the Comptroller General. At any rate, the Comptroller General wanted it, as I know from my personal conference with him. The bill was reported, it was placed on the calendar, and was passed. The record shows—and I have it here—that on the day it was passed or just before it was passed, there was a roll call. The Senator from Tennessee was present and answered to the roll call. He participated in the discussion of other bills. There was nothing said about this bill when it came up. So the Senator from Tennessee was present, undoubtedly, and in the Chamber when the bill was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. The first time I ever heard of this bill was when it was called to my attention a day or two ago.

Mr. NORRIS. There was nothing surreptitious about the action; there was nothing covered up; the long time it took to get through shows that to be so, and I know, from my conferences with the officials, that there was nothing secret about it. It was passed without any objection from anyone.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, assuming that its passage was all right, it is quite remarkable to me that Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. MAY should confer about it, in view of their past relations. It is remarkable——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. Let me say a word or two further, for I want to make plain the facts; then I will be delighted to yield to the Senator.

A remarkable thing about it is that when it was brought up in the House and debated, Mr. COLE questioned it, and put a proper estimate on it from his reading of it. He objected, and the bill went over. Then, a few days later, it came up when Mr. COLE, evidently, was not present, and it passed by unanimous consent. The bill came to the Senate, was reported by the committee, and passed by unanimous consent. I had never heard of it. I do not know how many other Senators ever heard of it. I should like to know how many Senators ever heard of it. If anyone heard of it, I should be glad to have him so indicate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I heard of it, as did the Senator from Nebraska. I did not pay much attention to the procedure in the House, but when the bill came to the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as all T. V. A. legislation has been referred. I thought at the time it was largely a bookkeeping matter; it was a measure which the Comptroller General wanted passed for bookkeeping purposes. When it was passed, it was understood to be largely a bookkeeping matter. I understand that the Comptroller General is now satisfied with the operation of that act, and is making no complaint against it or any request for any change in it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I understand, the Senator is a strong advocate of Mr. Lilienthal's management.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no interest in Mr. Lilienthal's management. I have had very few interviews with Mr. Lilienthal. I do not care who manages the T. V. A. I am not interested in any personal job connected with it. I will say that I have not seen anything in Mr. Lilienthal's management, either as a member of the board or as chairman more recently, that induces me to condemn the way in which he is undertaking to operate the T. V. A. I am not his advocate here; I have no interest in whether he retains or does not retain the position.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says he was acquainted with the provisions of the bill. He is the only Senator who was acquainted with them, I think.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not say that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt if any other Senator knew about the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator asked as to whether anybody understood or knew anything about this bill, which the Senator has stated was secretly and surreptitiously passed through the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I did not. I said it was passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator told me in a conversation that the bill was slipped through the Senate. I do not understand that it was slipped through the Senate. It was on the calendar like every other bill which is passed on the call of the calendar, and nobody objected to it. There was not much debate about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a plain question. I quote a provision and want to know whether the Senator approves of it: -

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the Treasurer or other accountable officer or employees of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

Does the Senator endorse that?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee was here, I suppose, at the time, and he did not object to it. We assume that a man who has any objection will make it, and, knowing my good friend from Tennessee as I do, I am sure he would have made objection if he had thought of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I had known about it, but I did not know, or I would have objected.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator always objects to anything he objects to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; I do, with vigor, when I think I am right.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said he would have objected if he had known about it; I assume he is correct, and that he would have objected if he had known about it. I do not know why he did not know about it; but that is neither here nor there. I am going to discuss this situation a little later; I do not want to do so in the Senator's time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not do so in my time. There are several important matters I should like to discuss.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator asked me a question, and I was trying to answer him.

Will the Senator yield to me now for another purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been asked by a number of Senators whether it is possible to conclude this bill today. I am satisfied it is not possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have yet 2 hours and ought to be able to conclude it today.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are a number of speeches to be made on this question; I do not think it would be possible to conclude it today, and it is not my desire, and it is not the desire of the Senate, I think, to hold a session tomorrow. Therefore, it seems to me that it might be well to announce now that this bill will have to go over until Monday. I am not asking that any hour be fixed to vote on the bill on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will agree to vote at any hour on Monday the Senator will suggest.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not seeking to fix any hour. I do not know how long the Senator is going to speak today. I am sure the Senator is not through.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not through.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is now after 3 o'clock, and it may be 5 o'clock before the Senator from Tennessee concludes.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I can get the floor, I think I can conclude in half an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has the floor and has control of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. I simply wanted, for the benefit of Senators who asked me about it, to suggest that, in my judgment, it will be impossible to vote on this bill today.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator agree to vote on it at 3 o'clock Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will he agree to vote on it at 5 o'clock on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will not agree to vote on it at any time on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator agree to vote at 1 o'clock on Tuesday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to make any agreement now for voting. I do not know how long the Senator is going to take. The Senator from Nebraska wants to speak on this subject; the Senator from Oregon wants to speak; the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] wants to speak; and I myself desire to speak on it, as do other Senators. It is a very important matter. I cannot agree now to any hour at which to vote. I merely asked the Senator to yield to me in order that I might announce to the Senate that we cannot vote today, in my judgment, and that we do not desire to have a session tomorrow, so that Senators may understand that this matter will have to go over until Monday. I have no objection to the Senator from Tennessee taking the remainder of the afternoon if he desires to do so.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. If I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH. No one else seems to have it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. I inquire, What year was the law which the Senator read passed?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was passed November 21, 1941—last November.

Mr. SMITH. Who was the author of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. The author was Representative MAY, of Kentucky. He had been one of those who were against the T. V. A. in the past, but he said that he had conferred with Mr. Lilienthal about the bill, and he thought that Mr. Lilienthal, under the bill, would put the T. V. A. under the General Accounting Office. It may have been put under the General Accounting Office, but without any power in the General Accounting Office to change any account.

Mr. SMITH. Now let me ask the Senator from Nebraska if this is the bill which I was authorized to report during the recess of the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. It is.

Mr. SMITH. I remember hearing that request made, and I did report the bill without knowing very much of what was in it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. This was a House bill. It originated in the General Accounting Office, it passed the House, as has been stated, and came to the Senate. It did undertake to put the T. V. A. under the General Accounting Office, subject to certain exceptions and reservations, and those reservations were intended to make the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority a board of directors to manage the organization. That is what it intended to do and that is what it did and that was done with the consent of the T. V. A., with the consent of the Comptroller General, and with the consent of both Houses of Congress almost unanimously. That is the provision of the law which the Senator from Tennessee is now seeking to repeal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee, before he goes on with the discourse, permit me to make an interjection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that an inquiry into the precise parliamentary stages by which this measure was passed is really beside the question. I assume that the passage of the measure was legal. It was passed by each branch of the Congress and was signed by the President. I am frank to say that I am one of the Senators to whom the Senator from Tennessee referred awhile ago, who are not familiar with this act, as I have not had the opportunity of being familiar with many House bills which have been reported from committees and passed the Senate on a call of the calendar. It does not seem to me that that is the important question in this matter. So far as I am concerned, I do not know Lilienthal or care anything about Lilienthal. I recall that when the Tennessee Valley Authority was first created I, single-handed and alone, by main strength and awkwardness, in the first year of my service in the Senate, held up the confirmation of Dr. A. E. Morgan for some 2 weeks. I finally yielded only on the representations of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Nebraska, who were at that time both great admirers of Dr. A. E. Morgan. As I have said, I do not care anything about Lilienthal one way or the other.

I think the Tennessee Valley Authority as an institution has done a splendid job in the development of power, but, instead of having wrangling about the various parliamentary steps by which this act was passed, why does not someone come in and tell us exactly why the Tennessee Valley Authority should be a sacred cow, why it should be taken out of the general jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office of the Comptroller General's authority, why there should be a difference between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Dam, between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Boulder Dam, between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Grand Coulee Dam, between the Tennessee Valley Authority and that great work which has gone on in the last few years under the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the development of flood protection and navigation on the lower Mississippi, now about to become so valuable to us as affording barge-line transportation for gasoline.

It seems to me that it is very much more important, instead of finding out the parliamentary steps by which this measure was passed—and some of us are frank to say that we are not familiar with them—to ascertain the justification for the bill when it was passed, or the justification for its continuance at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Tennessee will yield, I will say to the Senator from Missouri that some of us will undertake to disclose just what he suggests.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to listen to the Senator from Kentucky or to anyone else.

Mr. BARKLEY. We will undertake to do that when we get a chance to do it. I think the Senator's inquiry is pertinent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to be present and listen to the explanation with a completely open mind.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Missouri has gone to the very heart of this question. I wish to repeat what the Senator from Kentucky said. I do not care to intrude upon the time of the Senator from Tennessee, but if the Senator from Missouri will be with us on Monday——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will be here.

Mr. HILL. Some of us will attempt to answer the Senator's question to the best of our ability.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to have an answer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator answer another question. We are in a great war, and if the War Department itself has to come to Congress for its appropriations, have the Budget Bureau first pass on them, then the President send a Budget estimate of the expenses, and the committee of each House go over each item for the War Department, why is it that, as the Senator from Missouri has said, there is something sacred about the Tennessee Valley Authority, and its officers do not have to do as those of the War Department do, or as those of the Navy Department do? They have to come before the Congress for their appropriations. Is there anything dishonorable, is there anything outrageous in having them do so? The same statement applies to the Treasury Department and the Interior Department. Secretary Ickes, the head of the Interior Department, said he did not consider it wrong or improper for him to have to come before the Congress.

I now call attention to the fact that if the House provision were agreed to it would be unconstitutional, because the Constitution requires that all money taken out of the Treasury shall be taken out by appropriations of the Congress. It cannot be taken out otherwise; it is impossible.

If the Senate is to go over until Monday—and I am sorry if it is——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry, too. I had hoped we could vote today, but it is obvious we cannot. I think the Senator will agree that we cannot vote today.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will take my medicine like a man, and let the bill go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator will agree that we cannot vote today, unless the session runs into the night.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry we cannot, but I desire to bring up one more subject before I finish for the day, and I will then conclude on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean he is going over to Monday, too?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; if the Senator is going over until Monday, I am going over until Monday. I am going to stay with him in this fight until it is over.

I desire to call attention to some remarkable expenditures. This is a small matter, in a way, but a very large matter in another way. It will take me but a few moments to explain it, although the record is pretty large.

We hear talk about politics. Mr. Lilienthal thinks it is outrageous for a Senator to have anything to do with the Tennessee Valley Authority after he has obtained control of it. He previously took a very different position, but he is undertaking to build up a little machine himself.

I have in my hand the record of the hearings. I am wondering how many would vote for an appropriation of the sort here indicated. Here is an item of newspapers, exhibit 1. This is by the Authority itself; it is one of the officers testifying:

Huntsville Times, an advertisement, $147.84, on May 25 last.

Louisville Courier Journal. The Authority is now getting out of its bailiwick, and it puts an advertisement in the Louisville Courier Journal costing $933.28.

Mr. BARKLEY. Louisville is not without the bailiwick, it is within the radius of the power of T. V. A. I do not know what the advertisement was, but certainly Kentucky is not outside the bailiwick of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely and entirely. If there is a word about Kentucky in the Tennessee Valley Act or any of its amendments, I have been unable to find it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait a moment; I refuse to yield. The Senator must give me a chance to say a word.

Mr. NORRIS. That is right; give the Senator from Tennessee some time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I really think the Senator owes it to me to let me say a word about the matter. I am reading from a record which shows that the Tennessee Valley Authority paid the Louisville Courier Journal $933.28 for an advertisement last May.

I have been presenting a bill for the last 10 years to include the Cumberland Valley in the T. V. A., without success. The Senator from Nebraska put through a similar bill, and I admire him for getting it through.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I will not yield. I decline to yield.

The Senator from Nebraska got his bill through the Senate, but it was lost in the House. They refused to put even the northern part of Tennessee in the T. V. A., but one of the complaints against Lilienthal is that today he is making contracts—or has been for the last number of days—with power companies for the purchase and distribution of power in the State of Kentucky, although we were unable to get through our bill amending the Tennessee Valley Authority Act so as to bring the Cumberland River Valley into the system.

Mr. BARKLEY. Now will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yet they are undertaking to deal in Kentucky.

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senate would not permit that for a moment, if it were an original proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Getting back to the Senator's suggestion that Kentucky is outside the jurisdiction of the T. V. A., and the fact that Kentucky is not named in the act, of course, Kentucky is not named in the act, and no other State is named in the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Except Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; Alabama is.

Mr. BARKLEY. The reason why Tennessee is named is that the Tennessee River is named for the State of Tennessee, and it is the Tennessee Valley Authority which we created. I do not know what these advertisements in the Courier Journal were——

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will give me a small portion of my time, I will tell him very quickly, but the Senator jumps up every moment, and is undertaking to stop this proceeding, and I do not think it is right.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not have to yield to me unless he desires to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will not yield to the Senator any further. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows the river runs through Kentucky.

Mr. McKELLAR. What river does?

Mr. HILL. The Tennessee River runs through Kentucky and flows into the Ohio River.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is giving me some geography I never heard of.

Mr. HILL. The Gilbertsville Dam is in Kentucky. That is the largest dam the Tennessee Valley Authority is building. The largest dam the Congress has authorized and provided the money for is in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is in the valley of the Tennessee?

Mr. HILL. It is in the valley of the Tennessee River; of course it is. Let me say to the Senator, if I may, and then I shall not interrupt him any more, that there is a vast difference, of course, between the Tennessee Valley Authority going down the river and taking care of the whole Tennessee Valley, as the original act authorized and directed, and bringing in another river, the Cumberland River, which does not in any way affect the Tennessee Valley. The Cumberland River is a separate river, with a separate valley, a separate water system entirely. The two are entirely different.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall ask unanimous consent to proceed for a moment to tell about these different newspaper advertisements. Full-page advertisements appeared in each of the following newspapers, and I am stating the amount paid for the advertisements: Huntsville Times, $147.84; Louisville Courier Journal, $933.28; Columbus Commercial Dispatch, $92.80; Corinth Journal, $58.80; Chattanooga News-Free Press, $337.12; Chattanooga Times, $337.12; Jackson Sun, $117.60; Johnson City Press Chronicle, $172.48; Johnson City Times, $105.84; Kingsport Times, $129.36; Knoxville Journal, $295.68; Knoxville News Sentinel, $337.12; Memphis Commercial Appeal, $831.60; Murfreesboro News Journal, $94.08; Nashville Tennesseean.

Here we have two political twins. Silliman Evans, sometimes of Chicago, sometimes of Baltimore, sometimes of Tennessee, sometimes of Texas, and David Lilienthal. The Nashville Tennesseean, $596.

The total is $4,607.50.

Later, on November 2, another advertisement of the same size, appeared in the same newspapers, which is quite remarkable. Senators must know that the newspapers have not been very strong for me in Tennessee. The Nashville Banner has been for me. The Greeneville Sun has been for me. I do not find either one of them in this list. Practically all the others are in the list.

I come now to the county newspapers. Why in the name of Heaven would the Tennessee Valley Authority be advertising in county newspapers? Talk about politics. What is the plan?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it would be well if the Senator would put in the RECORD as a part of his speech the advertisements themselves, to show that they were signed not only by the Tennessee Valley Authority, but by the Georgia Power Co., the Alabama Power Co., the Tennessee Power Co., the Central Power Commission, and I am not sure but that the Secretary of War signed them. If the Senator will

read the advertisements themselves he will find that they are self-explanatory.

Mr. McKELLAR. One moment. I shall finish this part of my statement, and then in a moment I will reply to the Senator's statement, because he has suggested a matter I never thought of. Mr. President, I have sat in the Senate with my mouth open listening to the Senator talk about the horrid Power Trust, and I have agreed with every word he said. The Tennessee Valley Authority is one of the nine big power companies. They are all together. They have a working agreement. Since Lilienthal came into power they have established a pool.

I have heard the Senator from Nebraska tell us, and I have endorsed every word he said, that we in this country were in the hands of the Power Trust, and the only way to get out of its hands was to create this Government-owned institution, and we created it, and yet when Mr. Lilienthal gets hold of it he joins the Power Trust, the other power companies.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. NORRIS. The Tennessee Valley Act itself provides for agreement with private power companies. Does the Senator from Tennessee object to the agreement by the Tennessee Valley Authority with private power companies whereby their power was pooled, and the power production for aluminum was increased, I think about 300,000 kilowatts, and was used in the manufacture of aluminum which went into airplanes which have gone all over the world?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken in his facts. The pool gets the power from the T. V. A., but precious little power comes from the pool to the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I see that. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. The next fiscal year, beginning July 1, the Tennessee Valley Authority will get between seven and ten million dollars' worth of power from private power companies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it will get it in the future.

Mr. HILL. It has been contracted for, I will say to the Senator, and the Tennessee Valley Authority is getting a good deal of it now. A power company could no more operate efficiently and on a good business basis without having some interchange with the surrounding companies than a railroad could operate efficiently which would not permit one of its cars to go over the lines of other railroad companies. Economy in business dictates that such cooperation take place.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Alabama thinks that pooling agreements with private power companies is all right, very well. I think it is all wrong.

Mr. HILL. I think the kind of agreement they have had is not only right, but I think if they did not have that kind of agreement, Congress would cry out in protest against the Tennessee Valley Authority operating its business in such an uneconomic way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to call attention, Mr. President, to the number of county newspapers in Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama which carried these advertisements. They are all there; the Authority did not leave any of them out. Listen, Senators. The Ashland City (Tenn.) Times; Adamsville, the Tennessee Valley Appeal; Alamo, the Crockett Times; Athens, the McMinn County Herald; Bells, the Crockett County Sentinel; Bolivar, the Bulletin; Brownsville, the States Graphic. All the county weeklies in the State are in the list.

Mr. LUCAS. What did the advertisement say?

Mr. McKELLAR. The last advertisements set forth what the Tennessee Valley Authority were doing when they "blacked us out" down there. They gave Tennessee a black eye when they said we did not have power enough to run our establishments. They certainly were reflecting upon us. We did not have any shortage of power. There was not a particle of reason for any blackout. There was plenty of power there at all times. The power served every interest. The Aluminum Co. never has shut down for a moment. It is running 7 days a week on power furnished from these dams which we would not have had if Lilienthal had had his way when he was lobbying against them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois asked what these advertisements carried. As a matter of fact, they carried information to the people of the Tennessee Valley. I have here in my hand a full-page advertisement appearing in the Chattanooga Evening Times, of Chattanooga, Tenn., on Monday, November 3, 1941, in which the Tennessee Valley Authority advises all the people in the Tennessee Valley what has happened under an order of the Office of Production Management, with regard to priorities. It tells the people what can and what cannot be done. It lists five things and, if the Senator will permit me a moment, I will read them. I shall not read the whole page of the advertisement, but only the five things:

The following uses of electricity are prohibited by the O. P. M. order:

1. Sign lighting.
2. Show-window lighting.
3. Outline and ornamental lighting.
4. Out-door lighting—flood lighting or field lighting for amusement or sports.
5. Interior or exterior lighting for decorative or advertisement purposes.

The foregoing prohibited uses do not include:

A. Ordinary street or traffic lighting.

B. Signal or other lighting required by police, fire, or other public-safety departments.

C. Lighting for defense property protection required by defense regulations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us put that article into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am going to put it into the RECORD during my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. That full-page advertisement, following the order of the O. P. M. designating what could and what could not be done with respect to the consumption of electricity last November, was intended to inform the people of the Tennessee Valley of what could and what could not be done. I do not know what that advertisement cost, but it was certainly information the people of that valley was entitled to.

Mr. McKELLAR. It cost $457.52.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it was worth it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps so; but I wish to say to the Senate and to the Senator, who perhaps is not familiar with the situation, that there was no such order put into effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator——

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait a moment. I have given nine-tenths of my time to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; only two-tenths.

Mr. McKELLAR. Two-tenths. That is a good deal of it. I have been very generous.

The order was not put into effect. When it was brought to the attention of the W. P. B. it was canceled; and I will tell the Senate why it was canceled. That order was really made by Mr. Julius Abraham Krug, whom Mr. David Lilienthal had loaned to the W. P. B.; and for some purpose Mr. Krug, acting for the W. P. B., issued the order or had it issued. When it was brought to Mr. Nelson's attention it was canceled. It was never put into effect, and the advertisement was useless.

Mr. BARKLEY. The T. V. A. could not have loaned Mr. Krug to the W. P. B. unless the W. P. B. had wanted to borrow Mr. Krug from the T. V. A. So there must have been a mutual relationship in order to lend or borrow. Certainly the order of the O. P. M. was in effect at the time of the advertisement.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The sum of $41,697.09 was spent for advertising in every newspaper in my State, with two or three exceptions, and in every newspaper in the States of Mississippi and Alabama, about something which never took place as a matter of fact. The advertisement may have been legitimate. I do not believe the Senate would have allowed that much for advertising.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not like to continue to interrupt the Senator. The private power companies in that area did exactly what the Tennessee Valley Authority did. In my home city of Montgomery, Ala., the Alabama Power Co. carried advertisements in the two local newspapers exactly like the advertisement of the Tennessee Valley Authority, because the O. P. M. called on the private power com-

panies and the Tennessee Valley Authority to acquaint the people with the situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The O. P. M. canceled the order when it was brought to its attention, because there was no shortage. It was ridiculous. It was a piece of nonsense. With most of the plants in that vicinity running 7 days a week, and the aluminum plant running 7 days a week at all times, I never could understand why, in the name of God, Krug, one of the Gold Dust Twins of the T. V. A., wanted to put a black-out on the people of Tennessee. I cannot imagine any reason. I should be almost ashamed to suggest a reason.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The testimony before the committee, when the Senator was present, shows that, while the order did not actually go into effect, it was thought—and from the evidence I am inclined to agree with that opinion—that the advertisements signed by all the power companies and the Federal officials called attention to what they feared would be a shortage of power. The people, of their own will, cut down the use of power for the purposes which were prohibited, which made the order unnecessary. In due time the rains came, the rivers flowed, the dams were filled, and it was unnecessary to have anything of that kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, it was unnecessary. Why? Because on the Tennessee River we have a greater amount of developed water power than exists on any other river in the country.

Mr. NORRIS. I know——

Mr. McKELLAR. We have built it up after years of fighting. Now the T. V. A. comes along and blandly joins with the power companies.

Mr. NORRIS. As a matter of fact, some of the reservoirs were empty at that time. I believe the great reservoir behind the Norris Dam was empty, or nearly empty.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was low, but it was not empty.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. It becomes low every fall.

Mr. NORRIS. It was as low as it could get.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is one of the natural things which come about.

Mr. NORRIS. There was no rain. I happen to know that the Federal officials and the private power companies worked together. They issued this order as a safeguard. They did keep the great aluminum industry going. They were afraid they could not do so. They thought they had better keep that industry going and produce aluminum rather than to use electricity for the purposes which were prohibited in the order of the O. P. M.

Mr. McKELLAR. At any rate, the T. V. A. were acting in concert with the power companies. In the past, when the Senator used to discuss the power companies so frequently, he absolutely converted me. I cannot imagine how my distinguished and able friend from Nebraska, after what he said about the power companies, could go along with the T. V. A. and lie down with nine of the big power companies, all acting in perfect harmony, as they are today.

Mr. NORRIS. I feel the same way about the power companies as I feel about Russia. I now have great admiration for Russia. I did not like the Russion Government, but the Russian Government is doing a work which no other country in the world has been able to do. I think we owe a great deal to Russia. When we get through, if we win the war—as I think we shall—we shall owe more to Russia than to any other country in the world for the victory.

Mr. McKELLAR. It begins to look that way. I wish the Senator and I agreed as well on this question as we do on the subject of Russia.

Mr. NORRIS. When somebody whose help I need comes along, I do not stop to find out whether he is a Presbyterian or a Methodist before I accept his help. The power companies were producing power through an arrangement with the T. V. A. and transmitting power to the places where it could be used. In one instance 300,000 kilowatts of power were produced for use in the manufacture of aluminum. That power would not have been available had it not been for the arrangement between the private power companies and the T. V. A. I may be mistaken, but I think it was a good thing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend from Tennessee has mentioned Mr. Krug. The first important job which Mr. Krug got after he left college was in Kentucky.

At the request of Mr. Lilienthal, while I was Governor, we reluctantly let him go from Kentucky. I wish to say a word for him. I think he is dependable, reliable, and devoted to the public welfare and to those who operate T. V. A. That was my own personal experience with him. I did not want him to leave Kentucky, because he was highly successful. While my friend says that there was no shortage of power in Tennessee, my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] will confirm the statement that we could not obtain a guaranty of 20,000 kilowatt-hours in 10 months. We lost an important industry, which went elsewhere because we could not obtain the necessary power. In my opinion, if Mr. Krug said these things were necessary, I should be inclined to say that he was right about it, based upon my personal experience and my knowledge of how he works for the cause.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the Senator wants the T. V. A. to jump over the Cumberland Valley and go over into Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want the Gilbertsville project completed. When it is completed we can obtain power which we do not now have. Neither can it be brought to us. If we could have obtained it in time, we could have made a commitment to the industry which was considering locating in Kentucky; but we could not obtain a guaranty of 20,000 kilowatt-hours in 10 months. My colleague will recall the meetings which we had in that connection.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. We lost several important industries because of the failure to obtain power in any quantity, or at a fair rate.

Mr. NORRIS. Or with certainty.

Mr. CHANDLER. Or with certainty.

Mr. Lilienthal and I were in college together. I think that Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Krug are devoted to the public service. I know that to be true of Mr. Krug from my own personal experience with him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has facetiously and in good humor undertaken to chide the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] because the Tennessee Valley Authority and the private power companies, following the order of the O. P. M., issued an advertisement through the newspapers.

The order of the O. P. M. did not apply to the Tennessee Valley alone. It was a policy adopted for the southeastern section of the country, designed to save electric power and conserve electricity. It so happened that the Tennessee Valley was within that region.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority issued the advertisement to which I referred a moment ago it was appealing to its own customers in the Tennessee Valley to conserve electricity and calling attention to the order which had been issued by the O. P. M. to conserve electricity. The private power companies issued a similar advertisement appealing to their customers. There was no collusion. There was no lying down in bed together. They were appealing to their own customers in accordance with an order issued by the O. P. M. to conserve electricity, because it was feared that there might be a shortage for war purposes. That was the only reason for the order and the warning.

It is not quite fair to undertake to say that the T. V. A. and the private power companies lay down in the same bed together because they all issued an advertisement directed to their consumers, urging them to conserve electricity and power which might otherwise be wasted, in order that it might be concentrated on the production of war materials. That is what the advertisement was intended to do. The fact that the order was subsequently found to be unnecessary and was canceled has nothing to do with the merits of the advertisement. The people were being warned against the waste of electric power.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is talking about advertisements, and making a complaint against spending money for advertisements of this kind, apparently advising the Senate that the Tennessee Valley Authority has sole power to issue such advertisements. Much time has been spent in discussing this question. Under the terms of the committee amendment, I am wondering who would

have the authority to say whether such advertisements should be issued?

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee amendment would not affect it in the slightest.

Mr. LUCAS. Then why all the argument?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether the Senator has followed this matter; but it is because the committee does not think that the Tennessee Valley Authority should make these expenditures without having a committee of Congress pass on them. No other governmental agency does it, and why should the Tennessee Valley Authority have that exclusive power?

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. Under his amendment, then, before they could publish an advertisement of this kind they would have to get congressional authority to do so; is that the idea?

Mr. McKELLAR. They could not do it until the present law is repealed; but the Senator misapprehends what the amendment does. The provision proposed to be amended was offered in the House and was agreed to. It excludes the Tennessee Valley Authority from the requirement of paying its receipts into the Treasury of the United States, as other agencies do. If the provision is stricken out, then the Tennessee Valley Authority will have to pay its receipts into the Treasury, and will receive the appropriation Congress provides for them in this bill. In this bill we would appropriate an additional $36,000,000 with which they would pay their expenses; but we would require them to come to Congress, and we would get their estimates.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I understand the Senator; but I am simply trying to find out in my own way how newspaper advertising, for instance, which we have discussed here for the last hour, would be affected by this amendment. Would the Tennessee Valley Authority still have the same right and the same power and the same authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would not have the money to pay for it unless it got the money from Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming it got the appropriation from Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would have to come here and get the money with which to pay for such advertisements. That is what every other agency has to do.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that; but I also understand that the Tennessee Valley Authority has been in existence for 8 or 9 years——

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And the Senator has been a member of the Appropriations Committee all that time. Why has not this question been thrashed out before?

Mr. McKELLAR. Because it has not sharply and definitely come up before, for the reason that, as the Senator knows, not until 2 or 3 years ago was very much power created by the T. V. A.; but 2 or 3 years ago we authorized the T. V. A. to buy all the power companies in Tennessee except those in northeast Tennessee. Before that time they had a very small amount of income, but since they bought all the State power companies—they bought the company of Mr. Willkie, the former Republican candidate for President—they have had an enormous income; and since that has come about it is very important that the Congress should know what becomes of the money. An enormous amount for the power companies in that locality.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator says, and I only arise for the purpose of trying to obtain some information; because I am not a member of the committee, and, frankly, I have not followed its proceedings at all, and I know nothing about the hearings. It occurred to me to ask the question because the Tennesse Valley Authority has been in existence for 8 or 9 years, and the Appropriations Committee has been meeting each year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, the T. V. A. have been building dams all during that time. Until the last 3 or 4 years practically no money has come in. Very little money came in, and it was paid into the Treasury as general receipts. But when Mr. Lilienthal became head of this agency he had put into the law the same provision that is now in the House bill, which excused them from paying their receipts into the Treasury. That was after they bought up a large number of power companies.

Mr. LUCAS. What year was that?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say positively. It was 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that 3 or 4 years ago Congress authorized the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority fund in the Treasury, a fund which is a separate fund in the Treasury. The money was not covered into the Treasury, as is done with other receipts. It was held as a special Tennessee Valley Authority fund, and is now in the Treasury of the United States; and that has been true for the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. LUCAS. That thought occurred to me, and——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that there is now no difference between the way the Tennessee Valley Authority is handling its funds, the way it is turning its funds into the Treasury, and the way that has always been done since 1933, when the Tennessee Valley Authority came into being.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, there has been a change.

Mr. HILL. Of course, as the Senator from Tennessee says, through the years more dams have been constructed, more power has been generated, the Tennessee Valley Authority has sold more power, and the receipts have grown larger year by year, but the basic provision for the handling of Tennessee Valley Authority funds was written into the basic act, which was passed on May 18, 1933. It is section 26 of the act. I read section 26 of the law Congress enacted in 1933; it has been the law for many years, and is still the law. It is as follows:

> The net proceeds derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the Corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

At the end of each calendar year the money the Tennessee Valley Authority has not held back for operating expenses has gone into the Treasury. I say to the Senator from Illinois that if he had the time to examine the hearings, he would find that the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee handling the bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority appropriations has gone into all these matters. If the Senator would look through all those hearings, he would find that everything brought out at this time has been brought out time and time again before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is another thing to be considered in that connection. Of course, it is a worn-out document and one that many persons think does not amount to much; but I shall refer to it. This money, the Senator from Kentucky said a while ago, went into the Treasury as a special fund. Here is what the Constitution says:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; * * *.

If we accept the provision agreed to by the House, this money would be drawn out without any appropriation made by law. Mr. Lilienthal could draw it out if, as, and when he pleases.

The Constitution prohibits the drawing of any money from the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law. A moment ago the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] stated that this money went into the Treasury; and his colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] agreed to the statement that it went into the Treasury. At the present time it goes out of the Treasury without any appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; there is an appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; there is no appropriation for it.

Mr. HILL. Certainly there is.

Mr. McKELLAR. How can they get it out?

Mr. HILL. Congress appropriates it, and, after it is appropriated, the Treasury, by an order countersigned by the Comptroller General of the United States, turns the money over to the special Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. The money comes from the Treasury——

Mr. HILL. By appropriation of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not by appropriation of Congress.

Mr. HILL. Yes; certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Congress is not asked to appropriate it. The Constitution provides that no money shall be drawn from

the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now they want to draw out the money without any appropriation.

Mr. HILL. No; let me say to the Senator; that is exactly why we have this item in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and that is why I want it stricken out.

Mr. HILL. There is no difference between this provision and what has been provided through the years. An appropriation is made, as one is proposed to be made in this instance; and then ordinarily the agency uses the unexpended balances, if the money has not been appropriated for a particular fiscal year.

If we appropriate money for the construction of a dam, we limit during the fiscal year the money that is available to them; but every dollar that is appropriated by the Congress comes out of the Treasury of the United States. No one has any authority to take money out of the Treasury except the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that we do not want to fool ourselves.

Mr. HILL. No; we do not want to fool ourselves; but I am afraid the Senator from Tennessee is fooling himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to wait a moment. The Tennessee Valley Authority will collect $30,000,000 next year. If the bill, when passed, does not contain the House provision, that $30,000,000 will have to go into the Treasury, and we shall have to appropriate money for the T. V. A. If the bill is passed with the House provision in it, the money will go into the T. V. A. fund in the Treasury, but the T. V. A. can take it out whenever it wants to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The provision for the disposition of Tennessee Valley Authority funds is the same as the one which has been included in the acts passed from year to year. There is no difference between this provision and the ones contained in the acts passed for the last 8 or 9 years. During the last 8 or 9 years, when the Congress has dealt with the Tennessee Valley Authority in this same manner, the constitutional provision read by the Senator from Tennessee has been in effect, just as it is now, but it has not been invoked until now.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator state that again, please?

Mr. BARKLEY. I state that all during the years when Congress has been dealing with the revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority just as they are dealt with in this bill, as passed by the House, the constitutional provision referred to by the Senator from Tennessee has been in full force and effect, just as it is now, but no one has invoked it until now, notwithstanding the fact that the appropriations dealing with the Tennessee Valley Authority funds have gone on from year to year. The result is that—just as provided in the law of 1933—from their revenues they may deduct their operating expenses and then turn the balance into the Treasury, where, in turn it is allocated to the special Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Kentucky has convinced himself on that subject, we shall go to another one.

I desire to read an editorial from the Knoxville Journal—and if ever there was a paper that has uniformly and at all times opposed me, that is the paper; it has opposed me in both the primary and general elections in my State.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he proceeds to another subject?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to make my position clear regarding the point I raised a moment ago. What I cannot understand is how the Congress of the United States, how the Appropriations Committee, for all these years has passed by this very important matter which now seems to be before the Senate of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator says "all these years" he is mistaken. I will be able to state the length of time in a moment; I have requested the secretary of the committee to supply that information. It is the last year or two.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] read the law a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. That measure went through just as other bills frequently pass the Senate. As the Senator knows, measures sometimes pass the Senate without Senators paying much attention to them.

Mr. LUCAS. But this seems to be probably one of the most serious matters we have encountered in a long time. We have taken all today on it, and will take Monday on it and perhaps Tuesday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we have done some good today, and, if the Senator will wait, I will give him information from Mr. Lilienthal as to what effect it is going to have.

Mr. LUCAS. The only conclusion I want to draw is that, in view of the fact that during these years, if the Senator from Alabama is correct in reading the law, we are operating today under the same law as in 1933, when the act was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Alabama is entirely mistaken about that.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know upon whom to rely. I have so much faith in both Senators that I am certainly in a quandary to know whom to follow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the secretary of the committee to get it from the books, and, when the Senator sees it, if the Senator from Alabama is right, the Senator from Illinois can follow him, and, if I am right, he can follow me.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I want to make in conclusion is—I do not think I care to say anything more on this subject—that it seems to me that, in the greatest crisis we have ever faced in the entire history of this country, the Senate might have postponed this controversy, which seems so serious, for at least another year or two in view of the fact that we have passed it by for about 8 years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention to Mr. Lilienthal's views as stated by the Knoxville Journal. We make specific appropriations in this bill, just as asked for by Mr. Lilienthal, for the Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, for the Watts Bar Dam and steam plant, for the Fort Loudon Dam—including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project—for the Cherokee Dam, for the Apalachia Dam, for the Ocoee Dam No. 3, for the Fontana Dam, for a dam on the south fork of the Holston River, for a dam on the Watauga River, and for an additional unit at the Sheffield steam plant. We appropriate $136,000,000 for those projects. I now quote from the Knoxville Journal concerning Mr. Lilienthal's views:

In Sunday newspapers Chairman David Lilienthal, of Tennessee Valley Authority, listed the disasters—

I hope Senators will listen to this, because I am quoting Lilienthal now——

Mr. NORRIS. I am rather surprised that the Senator should quote Lilienthal. Does he want to have contradicted what he has just said?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator does not contradict the statement I am about to read, I shall be surprised. I have heretofore quoted Mr. Lilienthal, and will quote him again, although he denounced me and falsified concerning me.

In Sunday newspapers Chairman David Lilienthal, of Tennessee Valley Authority, listed the disasters which would follow in case Congress should approve Senator KENNETH McKELLAR'S amendment—

I have not offered any amendment. The provision is that of the House which the Senate committee has recommended be stricken out—

whereby the Authority would have to obtain specific authorization from that body—

They would have to obtain authorization, not from the Senate alone but from the Congress—

for expenditure of the current revenues from the vast power systems.

The results which would flow from the passage of the McKellar legislation Mr. Lilienthal detailed as follows:

Work on Douglas MacArthur Dam would be stopped.

Is there any Member of the Senate who believes such a statement as that? When we are appropriating for Douglas Dam, do Senators believe that work on it would be stopped if the Senate committee amendment were adopted? No one could so believe.

Aluminum, aircraft, chemical, and explosive materials, dependent for manufacture on Tennessee Valley Authority power, could not be produced.

Is there a Member of the Senate so simple as to believe that would happen?

Aluminum company additions, presumably at Alcoa, would stand idle.

Does anyone in the world believe that statement, when we have appropriated all the money T. V. A. have asked for?

A new black-out would fall over the Tennessee Valley this fall.

How could that happen if the T. V. A. came to Congress and received the money necessary for operating expenses? Every precaution has been taken about that.

Thousands of men would be thrown out of employment at Tennessee Valley Authority dams projects.

We have furnished specific money for each project. How could that happen? How in the world could any man make such a statement as that? If any Senator thinks it could happen, I should like to have him interrupt me and say so. I should like to know if anyone believes such a statement.

Work would be stopped on Watauga and Upper Holston Dams.

Yet there is an appropriation in this bill for those very dams. How could the work on them be stopped?

Work would be stopped on Fontana Dam.

There is a specific appropriation for that dam; so how could work on it be stopped?

Completion of Gilbertsville Dam would be delayed.

How, in the name of heaven, could it be delayed? An appropriation is made for it; more money than they can probably expend this year is appropriated by the pending bill. Thirty-six million dollars more than carried by the House bill is appropriated by the bill as reported by the Senate committee, striking out the House provision. How could the work be stopped? No one is simple enough to believe any statement such as that.

Work would stop on the new steam-electric plant in north Alabama.

That is the plant, by the way, we directed the T. V. A. to build, but we never could get Lilienthal to build it.

War establishments scheduled for location in the Tennessee Valley would have to look elsewhere for facilities.

What a silly statement!

River freight terminals in Knoxville, Chattanooga, and other cities would go unbuilt.

There is a provision in this bill for such facilities.

Purchase of properties and distribution of power in Kentucky would immediately cease.

What, in the name of heaven, has the Tennessee Valley Authority to do with the purchase of properties in Kentucky? There is not a single, solitary provision in the bill which would authorize them to buy property in Kentucky.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, at that point, may I interrupt the Senator? If he had not courted interruption, I should not ask him to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator believe any of these statements?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has more credulity than I thought was in him.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall not try to debate the matter now in the Senator's time, but I simply wanted to give notice so that my silence would not be misunderstood; that is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not misunderstand the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that, while all the statements are not probably 100 percent correct, as I understand the situation, some of them are a hundred percent correct. If the committee amendment should prevail, it would very materially injure, if not completely destroy, some phases of the work.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator can "get by" with that, he can "get by" with anything.

The editorial from the Knoxville Journal continues:

This is as comprehensive and extensive a bill of particulars on impending catastrophies as we have seen listed for many a day. The Lilienthal statement is a potent political lever, too, in that the threatened economic results of the enactment of the McKellar measure would be felt in at least three States. Their citizenships, therefore, can be depended upon to support the Authority's opposition to the McKellar amendment. Splendid political manipulator that Chairman Lilienthal is—

This newspaper has been defending him and defending the Authority. It has been against me, regardless of what I am for; but here is what it says:

Splendid political manipulator that Chairmain Lilienthal is, he very accurately gaged his statement so as to thoroughly frighten the business elements in every community, which are quick to sense any threat to the pocketbook nerve.

This is not pointed out in criticism of the chairman, who naturally is using whatever weapon is at hand to fend off the McKellar assault on his power.

"Assault on his power." He is asking for power he does not possess under the law, and I am seeking to strike out the provision granting such power. I am not assaulting him; he is assaulting the Congress.

There is one thing, however, of which we are certain and which the citizenship of the whole Tennessee Valley may also be certain; that is, no matter whether Congress passes the McKellar legislation or not, the dire predictions of a shut-down throughout the Tennessee Valley Authority system will not come to pass.

This has been one of the "henchmen" newspapers of Lilienthal heretofore.

If the effects of the McKellar amendment would be as outlined by the chairman, then, if it is passed, the amendment itself will be amended so as to permit the carrying forward of the Tennessee Valley Authority program, every part of which, as suggested by Mr. Lilienthal, is essential to the national war program.

Of course it is. If Lilienthal had had his way when the Senator from Nebraska and I were fighting together for these seven dams, they would not have been built.

We feel no deep-seated concern about the personal fight between Senator McKELLAR and Chairman Lilienthal, though we suspect that Chairman Lilienthal is going to win this first round against the Senator. Whichever wins, the Tennessee Valley citizen may be perfectly confident that the Tennessee Valley Authority program will go on, at least through the war, unimpeded.

The people of Tennessee and the people of this country may be absolutely certain that the program will go on whether the amendment is agreed to or not. If it is agreed to, it will go on. It should go on. The T. V. A. is doing a grand work, or did until this "Uriah Heep" became chairman, and since then the result has been a very unhappy one.

Mr. President, I have not concluded, but I am tired, and I should like to have the Senate take an adjournment now without my losing the floor.

DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CHARITY AND FOR GIFTS TO COLLEGES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, Mr. Randolph Paul, tax adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury, suggested before the House Ways and Means Committee that there should be a limitation upon deductions under the Federal estate-tax law for contributions to charity, and for gifts to colleges.

From Mr. Henry A. Ingraham, a trustee of Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., and a trustee of other educational institutions, I have received a letter succinctly and pointedly analyzing Mr. Paul's recommendation. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ingraham's letter be printed in full as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *April 30, 1942.*

Senator JOHN A. DANAHER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been called to the suggestion of the Treasury Department that provision be made in the new tax bill limiting the tax exemption of gifts to colleges and other educational or charitable corporations.

This in my opinion will be a grave mistake. The underlying philosophy from the beginning of this Nation has been that private colleges and charities have more than compensated the State by relieving it of the expenses of conducting such educational and charitable work. In the record of our Nation there has been a justifiable pride in its unparalleled private colleges, hospitals, and other charitable and religious organizations. Recent events have to an alarming extent made inroads upon the support of such institutions. To curtail the tax exemption of gifts might well lead to their dissolution.

The proposed change is not a war measure. No appreciable amount can be collected in the next 3 years. It is not a true revenue measure because the final collections by the Government will be proportionately small. It is not a wise social measure. If abuses have arisen under existing law they can be corrected without an indiscriminate death warrant levied against all private charity. It would be unfair to include such a drastic and revolutionary provision without a public awareness of its consideration. Up to date publicity, whether by design or accident, has been absent.

I urge that no step be taken at this time in the direction proposed. If the proposal has some elements of merit, its importance demands that time be given for careful consideration, and that the public be apprised of its imminence.

Respectfully,

HENRY A. INGRAHAM,
Trustee, Wesleyan University, chairman of the Board of Trustees of Long Island College of Medicine; trustee, Packer Collegiate Institute; trustee, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

Several officers for appointment under the provisions of law, and sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, all in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER NOMINATION REJECTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernice B. Lyons to be postmaster at Vinton, La.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is rejected.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carlton J. H. Hayes, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Laurence W. Taylor, of California, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 4, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Carlton J. H. Hayes to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Cornelius Van H. Engert to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Laurence W. Taylor to be a consul of the United States of America.

Maynard B. Barnes to be a consul general of the United States of America.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 30), 1942:

POSTMASTER

Bernice B. Lyons, Vinton, La.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art Spirit, whom to worship we must worship in spirit and in truth; God who art Light, with whom we may have fellowship only if we walk in the light as Thou art in the light; God who art Power, upon whom, if we wait, we shall renew our strength, for we shall mount up with wings as eagles, we shall run and not be weary, we shall walk and not faint; God who art Love, whom to know is to be born again in love: We beseech Thee to inspire, to guide, to strengthen, and to love us with the glorious revelation of Thy divinity and the tender, gentle leadings of humanity in the Christ of Bethlehem, that, in reflecting Thine own image, we may grow into Thy perfect likeness. With the best gifts of Thy grace, which we covet now more earnestly, grant that what we do here may be done to Thy honour and glory.

Do Thou bring to our beloved friend and colleague the consolations of Thy love, and may the tenderness of our human sympathy, borne to him on the mystic wings of human understanding, minister to his comfort at this time of utmost need.

And now, dear Lord, forgive our sins, our negligences and our ignorances, and make us this day worthier Thee, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 1, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 2, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1765) for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesus Zamora Felix, deceased.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2315. An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States;

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.; and

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Norris
Andrews	Gillette	Nye
Austin	Glass	O'Daniel
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Herring	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Brown	Hughes	Shipstead
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Spencer
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Lee	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Danaher	McNary	Vandenberg
Davis	Maloney	Van Nuys
Downey	Maybank	Wallgren
Doxey	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Willis
George	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] as the members of the Special Committee to Investigate

Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, authorized by Senate Resolution 235, agreed to April 16, 1942.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 204)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $3,793,440, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUANCE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by 200 Farmers Union members in convention assembled at Columbus, N. Dak., favoring appropriation by Congress of the full amounts originally requested for the Farm Security Administration and for loan operations under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A paper from the executive secretary of the Thousand Islands Bridge Authority, transmitting a financial statement of the Authority for the fiscal year ended March 1, 1942 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from Mrs. Audrey Lockwood, of Entiat, Wash., relative to a strike and labor conditions in that vicinity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco (Calif.) Junior Chamber of Commerce favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the creation of a Federal Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition signed by J. A. Goddard, pastor of the Eden Church of Christ, St. Louisville, Ohio, on behalf of the congregation, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of all intoxicating liquors in proximity to military camps; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TAFT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Newark, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Denison, Holton, and Paola, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BURTON:

The petition of Mrs. Harry L. Parker and sundry other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Franklin County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

Also petitions by Mr. BURTON; ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

The petition of Mrs. J. W. Francis and sundry other citizens of Newark, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860;

The petition of A. E. Grant and sundry other citizens of Findlay, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860;

The petition of Grace H. Deeks and sundry other citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860;

The petition of Lenore E. Hinckley and sundry other citizens of Lakewood and vicinity, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; and

The petition of Dora A. States and sundry other citizens of Spencerville and vicinity, Allen County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. TUNNELL. I present several petitions of citizens of Cannon, Milton, and Seaford, all in the State of Delaware, in support of Senate bill 860. I ask that the petitions may be appropriately referred and that the body of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to lie on the table and one of the petitions, without all the signatures attached was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the War Act of 1917 the Congress of the United States included legislation forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice, even though liquor was then forbidden in any military unit; and

Whereas in the Selective Service Act the Congress of 1940 called the young men of the present time to train for the defense of our Nation if need be, and there now exists for these young defenders no defense from the activities of what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," namely, the traffic in alcoholic beverages, and since beer is now sold in the camps by Government authority and since commercialized prostitution in camp areas threatens health, morals, and efficiency of service: Now, therefore,

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Delaware, do respectfully petition you to vote for S. 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1941 the protection their fathers had in 1917.

VIRD WOOTTEN,
MRS. LAURA A. ALLEN,
MRS. ERNEST E. CANNON,
(And sundry other citizens of the State of Delaware.)

RESOLUTIONS OF KNOX COUNTY (OHIO) POMONA GRANGE—PRICE AND WAGE CEILINGS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by the Knox County Pomona Grange, Mount Vernon, Ohio.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the history of war is that food prices, which reflect the demand caused by fear of hunger; destruction of available supplies and lack of labor for man's part of its production (thereby causing a shortage of supplies) have always reached high peaks; and

Whereas the present war is following the trend of all past wars as regards prices in general, with the possible exception of wheat, which, due to manipulation of our Government during the past years, finds itself dependent on the same Government for continued financial support, although it (Government) is staggering under its financial load incident to the prosecution of the World War; and

Whereas the general public is misinformed upon the subject of parity as applied to farm prices; and

Whereas the price the farmer receives for food produced should represent a fair comparative price for labor plus a reasonable net interest on his capital investment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Knox County Pomona Grange regrets that our Government has seen fit to put the most emphasis on ceilings as regards farm products while refusing to make comparative the ceilings on the wages of organized labor or the profits to industry; and be it

Resolved, That we also believe that the interest of all the citizens, which, of course, includes farmers, will be best served by the immediate suspension of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the liquidation of its assets as fast as economically possible, thus saving millions of dollars to our hard-pressed United States Treasury as well as releasing thousands of employees for more important war work; and further be it

Resolved, That in order to clarify our position we give a copy of this resolution to the county press; also forward copies to our Congressmen and Senators in Washington.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LEGION OF OREGON—UNIVERSAL-DRAFT LAW

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the American Legion of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we came back from the World War convinced that all men and all property should be equally subject to the service of the Nation in any future war; and

Whereas for more than 20 years we have demanded that Congress pass adequate legislation for universal draft of all men and all property needed for war, whether in defense fighting or defense industry; and

Whereas the Nation's existence is now endangered by external warfare waged by powerful enemies aiming to destroy us, and our internal safety, peace, and security are critically shaken by the effort for maximum defense production with less than the all-out means of the universal draft; and

Whereas the Milwaukee convention last September, expressly referring to its 20-year program before Congress for universal-service legislation, reaffirmed the principle of universal service as applicable equally to the armed forces, capital, and labor; and

Whereas it appears the time has come for aggressive fighting action to attain that 20-year objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion of Oregon, Through its executive committee in regular meeting assembled hereby demand that the national organization proceed forthwith in full force to complete enactment into law by the Congress now in session of the universal-service principle; and it is further

Resolved, That such universal-draft law expressly provide for the drafting or conscripting of all the resources of this Nation, including property, capital, labor, and industry as well as the fighting manpower, in line with the Legion sponsored bill heretofore introduced in Congress; and it is further

Resolved, That public meetings be arranged for so that all members of the public may be informed thereof and may arouse themselves to the immediate necessity of such a law for the safety, security, peace, and preservation of the Nation; and it is further

Resolved, That upon enactment of such universal-service law the American Legion devote its maximum effort to the success of its application to the end that out of "equal service for all and special profit for none" America shall derive a new unity of spirit and purpose, a new confidence and consecration, which will make our defense impregnable and our triumph assured.

That copies of this resolution be sent to the press, to national and department heads of the American Legion, and to the Congressmen and Senators from the State of Oregon, with the request that it be embodied in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This resolution dated this 19th day of April 1942.

JOSEPH K. CARSON, Jr.,
Department Commander.

Attest:

JUNE W. VALIANT,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on April 16 the Kansas State Board of Agriculture adopted a resolution urging an extension for 5 years of the 3½-percent interest rate now charged on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. The board at that time also adopted two other resolutions. These resolutions are embodied in letters addressed to me. I send the letters to the desk and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters embodying resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Topeka, April 29, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: At the board's quarterly meeting at Hays April 16–17, the following motion was unanimously adopted:

"That the board go on record as favoring the United States Department of Agriculture as the Federal agency to handle the National Food Administration, if and when such an administration is established."

Very truly yours,
J. C. MOHLER, *Secretary.*

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Topeka, April 29, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: At the quarterly meeting of this board, April 16–17, at Hays, Kans., a motion was unanimously adopted—

"Calling for the increased use of surplus grains in the manufacture of alcohol, and thus reducing the quantities of sugar for alcohol conversion and at the same time make more space available for storage of this year's wheat crop.

The board believed this was a sensible suggestion and hoped it might have your favorable consideration.

Very truly yours,
J. C. MOHLER, *Secretary.*

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMODITIES FOR SCHOOL LUNCHES—RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT VEGETABLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a letter which I have received from Mr. Frank W. Roberts, Secretary of the Connecticut Vegetable Growers' Association, Middletown, Conn., containing a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that association urging that the Surplus Marketing Administration be enabled to continue the distribution of commodities for school lunches.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNECTICUT VEGETABLE
GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
April 29, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Connecticut Vegetable Growers' Association on March 23, 1942:

"Whereas 310 schools in Connecticut have received surplus commodities during the current school year, and have thereby been enabled to serve lunches to 35,250 children; and

"Whereas a total of 1,500,000 pounds of food will have been distributed to these schools by the end of the current school year; and

"Whereas overwhelming evidence from school principals, nurses, physicians, and teachers, agrees that the children's health has been materially improved, their weight has increased, fewer colds and sore throats have been reported, there have been fewer absentees and less truancy among the children receiving the lunches; therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Connecticut Vegetable Growers' Association urge that in the interest of better health and nutrition on the part of growing children, the Surplus Marketing Administration be enabled to continue the distribution of commodities for school lunches; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That insofar as possible that produce used in the State be the produce grown in that State. That a definite amount of this appropriation be earmarked for that purpose."

Additional information:

Total number of schools receiving surplus commodities	310
Number of high schools	25
Number of elementary schools	285
Urban	71
Rural	214
Total number of pounds of food distributed in current school year	1,500,000
Estimated retail value	$150,000

Very truly yours,
FRANK W. ROBERTS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF LUCKIAMUTE FARMERS' UNION, OREGON—PROTEST AGAINST CERTAIN LABOR PRACTICES

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, on April 24 last the Luckiamute Farmers' Union, Monmouth, Oreg., adopted a resolution which expresses thoughts so wholesome and truly American that I request it be published in the RECORD and appropriately referred, so that every Member of the Congress may read it.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the laboring men who seek employment in the construction of the cantonment at Camp Adair in Polk and Benton Counties in Oregon are, in order to qualify for employment, compelled to pay high tribute in cash to the labor-union racketeer leaders who have, with apparent approval of the Government, assumed jurisdictional charge of the employment of labor for that camp construction;

And exorbitant charges are exacted from those who seek employment as a prerequisite to their obtaining it; and very insecure rights, if any rights at all, are given in return for those charges;

And it is reported and assumed that during the construction of the Camp Adair cantonment this unlawful and dastardly tribute will amount to the staggering sum of $450,000;

And in some instances, as we are informed, laborers in the shipyards in Oregon, not desiring to become affiliated with any labor union or organization, are permitted to work as nonunion workers only by paying tribute at the rate of as much as $2 per day while so working; and

Whereas the labor racketeer in this country has in the past decade increased his power and fattened himself upon the toil and the cash of the laboring men, until he has became an octopus of great and dangerous power;

And to encourage or even to tolerate a continuation of conduct so treacherous is a lie to our armed forces and constitutes a deception and failure of proper support to those red-blooded Americans who are offering and laying down their lives in defense of their country; and

Whereas the growth and power of this monster are so great that he has been able to defy, and he has defied, our National Government in Washington, and he has assumed, and continues to occupy, the roll of dictator to the administration of that Government; and

Whereas this labor racketeer, who is thus running amuck in our civic structure, is dictating to contracting employers as to who may and who may not be hired in defense work, is dictating and arbitrarily enforcing unreasonable terms of employment, is sapping the life blood from labor, is creating disloyalty to our Government, is hoarding unaccounted hundreds of millions of dollars for private gain and advantage to be later used for vicious, unpatriotic, and seditious purposes, is engendering in the minds of Americans generally the unfair and unjust belief that all labor unions should be suspected of improper and disloyal designs and should be suppressed; and

Whereas we apprehend and feel certain that, unless this un-American racket is checked, halted, and put down, its presence and its activities will, at or before the end of this war, lead to revolution and bloodshed in this country, thus causing this Nation to go down in ignominious defeat or lose the fruits of a too costly victory; and

Whereas the rank and file of labor and labor unions are patriotic employees, loyal to our Government and to our American

institutions, and they are bitter, though helpless, in their opposition to the rackets here complained of; and they are in no way to be blamed nor condemned for the existing racketeering conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Luckiamute Farmers' Union, headquarters near Monmouth in Polk County, Oreg., That this labor racketeering is extremely detrimental to the welfare and to the progress and the safety and the best interests of our great country, and it creates far too much power in the hands of unscrupulous men; and it leads to individual and organized graft in stupendous proportions, with no requirement for accounting to constituted authority; and it is our sincere desire and hope that it be brought promptly to an end before it is too late, and that its promoters—who are the only beneficiaries of its pernicious scheme and of the mischief it performs—be made to find useful and constructive tasks in the prosecution of this terrible and savage war which this Nation dare not lose; and to that end and purpose it is hereby further

Resolved, That Oregon's Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they hereby are, urged forthwith to exert their utmost endeavors to see that such legislation is promptly enacted by Congress as will quickly and effectively halt and suppress the work of this crafty and insidious monster, and as will definitely and promptly discourage the administrative branch of our Government from giving any further aid or assistance, or even tolerance, to the activities, or to the very existence, of this labor racketeer organization, to its collection of tribute and its grab of power, all of which are to the distinct detriment of labor as a whole and to the damage of those who labor, and all of which definitely leads toward the rapid and complete disintegration and collapse of our democratic form of government; and be it further

Resolved, That no reflection or criticism is here made or intended with respect to the loyalty and patriotism and the noble efforts of the laborers and the laboring classes and organizations who are so patriotically doing their utmost toward the winning of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith to each member of the Oregon delegation in Congress, and to the Governor of the State of Oregon, to the end and view that they may know how we feel concerning this most serious problem, and we believe that our sentiments upon the matter are shared generally throughout the land, or even universally among all those who have had opportunity to observe the true conditions and to sense the extreme importance and seriousness of the situation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Angela Skeoch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2507. A bill to authorize the use of appropriations for travel and transportation for the transportation of dependents of officers and employees of Government agencies from zones of military operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2508. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6430, the independent offices appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as follows:

On page 72, at the end of line 22, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That commencing July 1, 1942, all proceeds derived by the Board of Directors of the Authority from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Authority, and from any other activities of the Authority, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States monthly, and shall not be expended until subsequently appropriated by the Congress: *And provided further*, That any unexpended balances on June 30, 1942, in the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942,' are hereby reappropriated, and shall remain available until June 30, 1943, and shall be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the said fund for the fiscal year 1942."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY ON POLAND

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BARKLEY on May 2, 1942, the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON UNITY AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the American-Irish Historical Society, at the Biltmore Hotel, New York, May 2, 1942, on the subject Unity and Freedom of the Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT ON WAGES, PRICES, AND PROFITS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding wages, prices, and profits, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS TO THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY JESSE H. JONES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, before the thirtieth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on April 30, 1942, at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MR. GEORGE DEPASTA, MINISTER-COUNSELOR OF GREECE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. George Depasta, Minister-Counselor of Greece, on March 23, 1942, the occasion of the biennial banquet of the Order of Ahepa, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES TO CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS IN CERTAIN CASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Rules of practice and procedure with respect to appeals authorized by this Act shall be prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 688, U. S. C. Title 18, sec. 687)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
H. M. KILGORE,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE JOHN DELEHANT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Senate unanimously voted approval of the President's appointment of one of Nebraska's worthy citizens to become United States district judge in Nebraska. I refer to the appointment of John Delehant, of Beatrice, Nebr. His appointment, like so many others we are called upon to approve, was handled as a routine matter here on the Senate floor, following the report of the Judiciary Committee.

Following the appointment of Judge Delehant I happened to be in Lincoln, Nebr., on the day it welcomed the judge and his family to the city. He was presented to the large audience of distinguished Nebraskans who had gathered for the occasion by the Chief Justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court, Mr. Robert G. Simmons, who for 10 years was a Member of Congress from Nebraska.

The remarks of the chief justice, and the impromptu response by Judge Delehant, so impressed me that I asked them to put their remarks in manuscript form to be offered for the RECORD here. I shall refrain from reading them, but shall ask that they be made a part of my remarks, in the body of the RECORD. I am sure Senators will find them interesting and inspiring—a story that is typical of what it means to be a citizen of the United States—the life story of the grandson of an Irish immigrant upon whom the President of the United States has conferred a signal honor, in whom he has placed a great trust, and on whom he has laid a high obligation and heavy task.

Mr. President, we of Nebraska are proud of the judiciary of our State, and I am sure the remarks of the chief justice and Judge Delehant will be of interest not only to Members of the Senate who confirmed the appointment of the judge, but to thousands who read the RECORD. The remarks will, I hope, convey the thought that appointments and great responsibilities which we often must handle as a matter of routine, are accepted in a spirit of genuine humility,

profound gratitude, and a knowledge of the duties and obligations involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF ROBERT G. SIMMONS AT THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS LUNCHEON, GIVEN IN HONOR OF JUDGE DELEHANT, FEBRUARY 27, 1942

Judge Delehant, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply appreciative of the honor you do me, and the court of which I am a member, in asking that I speak for Lincoln in welcoming to our fellowship, as he begins his judicial service, a distinguished Nebraskan and his fine family.

It seems futile to undertake to tell him and his family of Lincoln, when they have lived next door and have been a part of the professional, social, and spiritual life of the Capital City these many years. It seems almost as futile to undertake to tell you of his life and of his family for that is known to many of you. With the danger of repetition, I tell that story for another reason—a reason that for me makes it not only of human interest but of public concern.

Something over a century ago a family named Delehant immigrated from Ireland and came westward in that movement that resulted in the settlement of all the area that we describe as the Mississippi Valley. That particular family of Irish, who became Americans, settled first in Iowa, then moved around as occasion required or inclination prompted. Daniel, the grandson, was born an American. The lure of the West called and Daniel stopped for a bit of time in our own State near Tecumseh in the seventies. He then journeyed to Kansas and lived there the life of a homesteader in frontier days—seeking to wrest a living from the soil and to become the owner of the soil he tilled.

About this same time there came westward also a veteran of the war named Snyder. He was of Dutch ancestry with a bit of English blood in his veins. His daughter Hattie became a Kansas school teacher—the homesteader and the school teacher married—and from their union came 12 children. John, the oldest, was born in Kansas; for a few months his people lived in Beatrice, then for 2 years in Iowa; and then just half a century ago came back to a farm in Gage County. There the son John lived the life of the average Nebraska boy, attended country school, went to high school in town at Wymore, and then to Creighton University. He graduated in the arts and sciences and in law at Creighton. Throughout these years life was not easy; it had its problems, and he met and solved them. He had the physical energy, the mental ability, and the spiritual strength that came from a virile ancestry. These he used and, by his own efforts in no small degree, the education he sought became his.

He returned to the county where he had lived to begin the practice of his profession—not quite 30 years ago. He took time out to serve his country in the armed forces in World War No. 1. He has remained in Beatrice these years. There he has continued his education not only as a student of the law but as a student of all the varied social, political, economic, and spiritual problems that have faced America. To all of these he has applied a keen well-balanced mind, arrived at his own conclusions, maintained his beliefs, and at the same time has had a high regard for the opinions of those with whom he might disagree. He has participated in the business, social, and political life of his community and State. He has grown in the spiritual faith of his people, yet withal has given full respect to the views of those who worshipped at other altars. He has been signally honored by his church for outstanding qualities and services well done.

In 1917 he married Dr. Loretto May White, an Iowa girl, a graduate of Creighton and at that time a practicing dentist in Norfolk. To the union thus established there has come a fine family of five youngsters, who, each in his own individual way, are carrying on the traditions, life, and activities of young Americans. Together this family have lived their lives in our neighboring city, respecting and being respected by their neighbors. They have been and are a typical Nebraska family in all the good that that name implies.

Thus, briefly, I have sketched the life story of the grandson of an Irish immigrant upon whom the President of the United States has conferred a signal honor, in whom he has placed a great trust, and on whom he has laid a high obligation and heavy task. Those of us who know him have a firm confidence that the judgment of the President was well exercised.

I have told you this story, not because it is the story of John Delehant, but because it is the story of America and of many Americans and in particular is the story of the people of our own West.

John Delehant is Judge Delehant today because of the institutions of government that are ours, but back of that, John Delehant became qualified to be Judge Delehant because our institutions of government made possible the free play of the forces of native ability, maintained opportunity, furnished educational facilities, protected the God-given inalienable rights of men and kept open the door of the future to every American.

I have told the story in order that it may help us visualize something of our high task in these dangerous times and increase our determination that our America be preserved so that similar stories may be told of countless others in these generations yet to come.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor to present to you a distinguished scholar, a lawyer of ability and good repute, an outstanding citizen of the State and Nation, a Christian gentleman, the United States district judge for Nebraska, the Honorable John W. Delehant.

REMARKS OF JOHN W. DELEHANT AT TESTIMONIAL LUNCHEON OF LINCOLN, NEBR., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, FEBRUARY 27, 1942

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Chairman, Senator BUTLER, officers and members of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Lincoln, and our other friends here present, without exception, you realize, I am sure, the embarrassment in which one speaks in my position on an occasion of this character. All but overcome by sentiments of profound gratitude, mingled with unaffected humility, words come most reluctantly upon his bidding. And I assure you that I find myself this noon to be no exception to the rule. In many similar gatherings I have enjoyed my own participation in a testimonial in honor of one or another of my friends; but, I assure you, it is not so comfortable when one is, himself, the recipient of the generosity of those he holds in high esteem.

For Mrs. Delehant and me, it is more than pleasant to anticipate our early residence in these surroundings where we have already so many friends. We confess, indeed, to no measure of resignation to our removal from Beatrice which, through nearly a quarter century, has been so kind to us; which has been the home of our marriage; the cradle of our children. But, granting that our labors must call us to some other city, we could not remove to more congenial precincts than to this good neighbor of the town that, in a very real sense, will always be home.

This company is gathered from among the more active people of the city of Lincoln, businessmen and women, workers, professional men, the faculty of our great university, and the public servants whose duties involve their residence in this, our capital city.

May I now say to you, in an altogether proper sense, and with no reference to my own participation in your meeting, that you do well—you exhibit a very praiseworthy appreciation of the structure of your government—in your offering of this testimonial of your respect for the office and function of the Federal judiciary. For, be assured, that I do not magnify my individual significance in this pleasant hour. You would not even think of this gesture of esteem for John Delehant personally; nor would he presume personally to accept or receive it. That which we here honor, you and I alike; is that cherished instrument of human justice in our society, the American judiciary. And I repeat, that thus appraised, this assembly is an appropriate expression of the best in American thinking.

Especially in the city of Lincoln does the Federal court enjoy the universal respect of the community, for it has long been appraised by you and me in terms of the learning and justice and nobility of character of one great and good man, the Honorable Thomas C. Munger. He has been the only resident judge of the United States court whom your city has known. And by the acknowledged rectitude of his life, by his personal reverence for objective truth, by his unselfish devotion to the cause of justice, he has purchased, through these more than 34 years of his service, your golden opinion both of his person and of his office.

And still upon the recollection of Judge Munger may I be allowed to offer here an expression of my own personal regret that the dispensations of providence did not suffer him to enjoy at least a few years of the retirement which he sought so recently before his death? He was richly entitled to it on the score of meritorious service. And for my part I would have reckoned it a rare privilege, indeed, to commence my own judicial labors under the personal direction of his wise and practiced mind. What an opportunity it would have been, if I might have taken my earlier steps along an absorbingly interesting, but admittedly difficult, road with the sure guidance of his practiced and certain hand.

The occasion seems necessarily to suggest that our reflections during its remaining minutes be upon the mission in our American governmental system of the judiciary. For it has a mission that our people must never be suffered to forget or to neglect. And with your indulgence may I briefly recall it.

I am persuaded that we reexamine and remember all too rarely the functional departmentalization of our democratic Government. For its general comprehension by our citizens is an objective that ought constantly to be fostered. The division of the powers of government is at the very core of democracy. Without it self-government simply cannot endure. True, it is not imperative that the separation be as manifest and as explicit as it is with us; it may admit of spheres of joint ministration, or exist by unwritten tradition, as it does in the English system. But we of the United States have elected to define, as nearly as apt language may, the separate offices and their respective services to the Nation and its citizens.

Accordingly we learn as school children that the powers of government are distributed between its executive, its legislative, and its judicial branches, three distinct but coordinate, independent but rationally cooperative and sympathetic, units of our governmental structure. They are equal in their imperative necessity; and should remain equal in the sight of the people for whose

service they are erected. As a matter of permanent policy, neither of them should exalt itself to the disparagement of the others, although it must readily be acknowledged that seasons of national crisis may—and rightly do—throw into clearer relief, and actually magnify for the time the functions of one or the other of the departments. But that very flexibility, rationally accepted and wisely administered, is the security of democracy.

If it is true that the judiciary is less adequately understood by the average American than either the executive or the legislative branch of Government, it is no less certain that in a very real sense, it is, of the three departments, the one to which he looks habitually, and almost unconsciously, for the assurance of his way of living. By its assumed, though unreal remoteness, it purchases in his estimation that quality of detached impersonality that he has come traditionally to associate with the judicial function. And he relies upon it with a measure of confidence which it must be the solemn responsibility of the judiciary never to betray.

Each one of you is aware that in the last analysis the judiciary is the forum in which your basic liberties, rights, and immunities as American citizens are ultimately defended. To the glory of the legislative and executive departments of our Government, let it be said that they have been placed in jeopardy only very rarely in our Nation's history and then only under the strain of great national or local emotional crisis and all but irresistible popular demand. But, upon each of those few occasions, the courts, in calmer precincts, have defined the proper limitations upon the powers of a numerical majority through governmental process, under our broad and tolerant American way of living together.

No American must be allowed to forget that the fundamental liberties of his citizenship, so confidently affirmed in the body of our Constitution and in its Bill of Rights, require his constant vigilance for their preservation. The American Constitution is neither self-executing nor self-sustaining. It will endure so long—and so long only—as successive generations of Americans essentially understand, believe in, and diligently and jealously preserve it. And in that generation which esteems it too low to make efforts and sacrifices for its preservation it will cease to function and to exist, and thereupon the United States that you and I know will cease to be.

Upon the general theme of our rights as citizens, may I be allowed a rather timely digression. There is and long has been too much of loose thinking, and vastly more of loose writing and speaking, upon an asserted distinction between the so-called rights of persons and rights of property. Courts, we are sometimes told, are—at least relatively—more jealous of rights of property than they are of personal rights. And, it is said, this error sometimes clouds the vision of the other branches of Government, especially the legislative.

As one who, by origin, by education, and by environmental influence, cherishes a rationally liberal outlook upon society and the law, let me deny the objective validity of any such distinction. There is no such thing as a right of property divorced from the element of personality. Property as such has no rights. What we Americans too loosely characterize as a property right is in reality the personal right of an American citizen to be secure in the ownership and enjoyment of his property. And this, in its very essence, is, sometimes remotely, but more often immediately, the right of a man to possess and enjoy the fruits of his own toil and thrift and frugality.

What human right, may I inquire, is, with the exception of freedom of worship, more sacredly personal than that one? To no purpose shall we extol the hallowed privacy of the American family, unless we assure its rights in the physical house that shelters and enfolds it. There is utter mockery in preaching of the glory of American industry and initiative, unless they be granted their natural material reward, less, of course, its proper social contribution, which must fluctuate with changing times. Even freedom of worship, in modern society, is not adequately assured without a fair measure of stability in the ownership of the material edifice to which the individual American resorts for its enjoyment. The groves may have been God's first—but they are not His current—temples.

And so it was not by accident, but rather in recognition of a simple and rational truth that, in our Federal Constitution, the so-called property rights are generally bracketed with manifestly personal rights in clauses for the assurance alike of both.

Understandingly or not, they who framed the protecting language rightly perceived the licit and rational right to property as one of civilized man's most valued and cherished personal privileges; as a basic conception that ends nomadic existence and assures the building and preservation of stable and permanent human society.

Another reflection, based not on any abstract reasoning but rather upon very recent human experience. If you are tempted to deny the practical validity or utility of the personal right of the individual to property, just recall the events of the last 10 years. And I make bold to say that they differ only in detail and in degree—not in kind—from those of all recorded history. Where has your modern tyrant generally dealt his first blow at human liberty? Precisely at his victim's property. When he has sought to exterminate a race of human beings he has first despoiled them of their material substance, then deprived them of their franchise to earn a livelihood, or, at most, more than a mere minimum of subsistence. Even when freedom of conscience has fallen under his hostility, he has first requisitioned the physical property and endowments of religious societies for the uses of the State, in the fond illusion that, materially impoverished, the divine faith must languish and die. Even the individual who has not molded his conduct to the Master's will is usually first oppressed in respect of those material things by which he lives in the physical sense.

Let us, therefore, in our American thinking, beware of the peril that lurks in any attempted distinction between the fundamental rights which we enjoy as citizens. Let us refuse to suppose that we shall preserve some of these rights while we strike down the foundations of the others, for, after all, they rest upon the selfsame bases, and one of them will not survive the collapse of the others. Above all, let us individually avoid the practice of striving to emphasize the particular privileges which we currently cherish by the neglect of those that seem of less immediate urgency to us; for we shall surely wear in torture tomorrow the shoe that today pinches our neighbor's foot.

I realize that a period of war is rarely congenial to the discussion of internal human liberty and its judicial protection. That is inevitable. And at the moment, our America is engaged in a war of incomparable magnitude and peril. For the first time since the War of 1812, continental American soil has been violated by an aggressive enemy. In no alarmist spirit, but rather in solemn realism, I am persuaded that the days immediately, and for many months ahead are destined to be grimly distressing and bitter to every American heart. We are, and shall be, fighting against a combination of powerful foes for our very existence as a nation, for the preservation of our American way of living and governing. Make no mistake about it, nothing less than that is the issue for the United States. They with whom we fight, hate, with the fanaticism of all tyranny, the institutions, and usages, and liberties, aye, the very name of democracy; and they hate the United States as its preeminent exemplar in the modern world. They cannot remain dominant in their respective lands if we shall be the victors in this struggle. And for the tyrant, death is preferable to deposition. Contrariwise, neither America nor Americans will be wholly free if they shall succeed, for triumphant absolutism cannot tolerate either freedom or democracy among its vanquished people. We shall prevail—we must prevail—in this most perilous crisis of our modern America. We must not consider or orient ourselves to the possibility of defeat.

But in the meantime, let you and me dedicate ourselves to a twofold task immediately, of course, that of victory in our unsought struggle, but concurrently with it, and closely related to it, the preservation of our American governmental structure, our American liberties, both during the war, and against the day when peace shall be restored.

Let us remember, too, that in seasons like this, there is sore temptation to abandon as a burden some of the citizen's undoubted rights in the interest of a united front. That the individual must yield in all but fundamentals to the general good and the national defense is certainly true. But let it be constantly asserted that, with his deprivation of his elemental liberties, the general good is likewise thwarted, and the national defense rendered a doubtful blessing. Let us tolerate no such thinking as that which in the face of imminent peril demands "business as usual," or "myself before the Nation." Let us individually surrender our every convenience to the public weal and safety. But let us likewise preserve our American tolerance and our American concept of human liberty.

And may I close on a final note respecting the position of the judiciary in the instant struggle. Insidious influences from abroad will not be wanting to insist upon the impairment of the judicial office and function. It is the necessary habit of the omnipotent state to demand a servile and exterminate a free judiciary. And the pervasive philosophy of national absolutism will not be slow to attack the American judiciary, to insist that it is outmoded or too cumbersome for the exigencies of the modern state in a season of peril. Even at home, defeatists and men with little minds will be found to follow that alien thinking.

But the great body of the American citizenry and its devoted and dedicated leadership will repudiate the thought; will insist that we preserve among ourselves for the better prosecution of our battle and against the triumphant day of victory and for the era of the peace the very thing for which we are contending against our enemies, our democracy. And we shall preserve it, its liberties, its instruments of self-government, its coordinate and cooperative governmental branches, its unfettered executive, its uninfluenced legislature, and, last but not least, its independent judiciary.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment on page 71, line 23, to strike out the word "purchase."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I stated on Friday last that I should desire

to occupy the floor again on Monday, but I do not care to proceed at this time, and I yield the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is only because I feel that the amendment on page 72 of the pending bill, in connection with the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Tennessee under suspension of the rule, which he has given notice he intends to ask, would be extremely disastrous that I have thought it well to address the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I know the Senator does not wish to make a mistake. The amendment to which he refers is the amendment which the committee has recommended, to strike out the language which gives certain power to the T. V. A.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall proceed as did the Senator from Tennessee, and discuss the subject generally. The two amendments which are important, the committee amendment on page 72, proposing to strike out certain language, and the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Tennessee if the rule shall be suspended, are what I shall discuss first.

The adoption of these two amendments would, in the first place, interfere very much with the operations of the T. V. A., and, in my judgment, would be almost disastrous; but more than that, and what affects me more than anything else, the adoption of the amendments would make it impossible for the T. V. A. to carry on as it has been proceeding in the great effort to win the war.

I have before me on my desk a large number of documents which I have assembled, but I know, feeling as I do this morning, that it would take much longer for me to go through the documents than I shall be able to spend in speaking. I feel that my remarks may be of a rather rambling and disconnected nature.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate first to the magnitude of the operations of the T. V. A. Since we have gotten into the war, they have grown by leaps and bounds, and I think that if it had not been for the increased power operations of the T. V. A., as a result of which electric energy has been supplied to the aluminum factories in the vicinity of T. V. A. activity, we would today be almost facing defeat, at least it is probable we could not look for victory in our war efforts for a year or two.

Mr. President, if we were thinking only in terms of the welfare of the T. V. A. we might say that its expansion has been too rapid, causing a rather unhealthy condition. The rapidity of its expansion, however, has not occurred by reason of the T. V. A.'s desires along that line. The T. V. A. has been compelled to depart from the general rule it has followed ever since a year or so after the T. V. A. Act was passed, but I do not believe that one who understands the desirability and need of production of aluminum on a large scale, can read the record and not realize that one of the great activities of the T. V. A. has been in connection with the production of aluminum and some other products which have been used and are now being used in the building of airplanes—bombers and fighters.

When we consider the events of the war and see what has been done by the fighting machines in the air, it seems to me we must reach the conclusion that the greatest of all activities necessary to bring about victory in this war against the dictator nations will be in the air. Since we have been in the war practically all the great victories have been won by air forces. Our Navy, commencing with Pearl Harbor, has suffered greatly because of the air forces of the enemy. Great Britain has lost in Asiatic waters two of the prize ships of her navy, which were bombed and sent to the bottom of the sea by air forces alone. The one battleship of the Japanese Navy which was destroyed was sunk by an American flyer attacking from the air.

In the construction of airplanes aluminum is necessary. We do not want to send our flyers into the air to fight battles of life and death unless they have the best possible airplanes, and in order to obtain the best airplanes aluminum is necessary.

At this moment many of our airplanes, some of which were built from aluminum produced by the electricity which was developed by the T. V. A., are in Russia, many are in Africa, many are in Asiatic waters. We have not achieved any victories so far in this war except from the air. This is a war of the air. Battleships will not venture out on the ocean unless they are guarded by air forces.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement which was prepared to be made before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has under consideration a bill which was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], some provisions of which, according to his notice, he proposes to offer as an amendment to the pending bill. The statement was prepared by Mr. Wessenauer, acting manager of power production of the T. V. A.

I wish to quote some of the figures he gives in his statement. He calls attention to the magnitude of the T. V. A., going, as it does, into 6 different States, and supplying with power 470,000 customers—not individuals, Mr. President, because every customer supplied represents a number of individuals, but customers. More than 2,500,000 individuals are getting their electricity at this time, and have been for some years past, from the T. V. A.

The T. V. A. has over 5,000 miles of transmission lines, covering the Tennessee Valley almost completely. It has 19 major generating plants, 13 of them hydroelectric plants, and 6 steam plants, having a total installed capacity of 1,141,000 kilowatts. It is estimated that seven and one-half billion kilowatt-hours will be supplied by this system in the current fiscal year.

Business enterprises all through the Tennessee Valley, and outside the Tennesessee Valley within transmission distance of these generating systems, are now operated by electricity supplied by the T. V. A. For instance, at the beginning of the war the largest plant for the production of aluminum was that of the Aluminum Co. of America located at Alcoa, Tenn., on the Little Tennessee River. When the demand for additional aluminum to build more planes came upon the country almost without warning, this great company found itself short of power. It could not produce the quantity of aluminum which was demanded. In the present development of the science, power is necessary in the production of aluminum. The Aluminum Co. of America turned to the Tennessee Valley Authority and asked whether it would be possible for the Authority to make available to the Aluminum Co. the additional energy required to keep its plant at Alcoa, Tenn., in full operation. At that time the Authority had some steam capacity which was not required for the other loads, and consequently entered into an agreement with the Alumnum Co. of America to make surplus power available to the company. During the remainder of that fiscal year the Authority delivered more than 288,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy to the Aluminum Co. The Authority expended $1,300,000 for the items of fuel, labor, and transportation involved in the operation of the steam-generating plants, and it received in revenue from the Aluminum Co. $1,600,000 from the sale of the electricity produced.

That contract was entered into in September 1939 after Congress had passed the appropriation bill—long after the estimates had been made. When the estimates were made no one knew what power was going to be demanded, or what was going to be asked for in the production of aluminum. If the two amendments of which I spoke a moment ago had then been the law, the T. V. A. would not have been able to enter into that contract. The Tennessee Valley Authority put the steam plants to work, paid the necessary items of expense to do the work, purchased the coal required, hired the labor necessary, and paid the transportation costs and other expenses in connection with the operation. It was able to use the money which it received from the Aluminum Co. of America in payment for the power produced to pay for the items of labor, fuel, and transportation necessary for the production of the power. There was no appropriation made for the operation. The Authority then, as it always had been doing from a time within 1 year of its birth, used the ordinary revenues which come in from the sale of power, to pay the expenses for the production of that very power. These amendments would make it impossible for that to be done. It has been done ever since we have had a T. V. A. The practice has been questioned only once, and then the opposition was decidedly defeated, as I shall show if I am able to proceed long enough.

What would that power be worth if translated into bombers? Mr. President, 29,000,000 pounds of aluminum were produced with that power. That was aluminum enough, in the remainder of that fiscal year, from September on, to produce 1,500 10-ton bombers. I presume those bombers, manned for the

most part by American fliers, have been destroying ships, airplanes, and other property of the enemy all over Russia, Europe, and Africa, and all through Asiatic waters. Such a thing would be absolutely impossible if these amendments should be agreed to by the Senate.

I presume all of us remember the strike which took place in the Allis-Chalmers Corporation, and how those who knew what the facts were watched that strike almost breathlessly from day to day, as it went on week after week, to see whether it might not end. That great corporation had a contract with the T. V. A. to furnish generating machinery for four units. Unless they were produced the T. V. A. would not be able to produce the power. The same amount of power was afterward produced by steam.

It must be realized that the T. V. A. cannot come to Congress for an appropriation every time it has an opportunity to enter into a new contract. The T. V. A. has always used receipts from the sale of power in order to make new contracts and developments when such opportunities arise after appropriations by Congress have already been made. Such practice is only good business. Nobody knew that there was to be a strike in the Allis-Chalmers Corporation. The T. V. A. had no knowledge of it; and yet it had contracts for the sale of power depending on the production which was to be developed by four units for which that corporation was then manufacturing parts.

What happened? After waiting breathlessly for a while, and finally reaching the conclusion that it could not afford to wait longer, the T. V. A. started a steam plant. That was not in the appropriations bill. Nobody knew it would be necessary. Production of power by the use of steam was more expensive. Coal had to be purchased. Transportation charges had to be paid. A large amount of money had to be paid for labor. There was no appropriation for the project. Congress had not appropriated money to meet that condition. Congress did not know, and could not know, that such a condition would arise; but, because under the act the T. V. A. had always used the income it received from the sale of power, it put the steam plant in operation.

I should like to give the exact figures in that connection. Because of the flexibility which had always existed and was intended by the original act should always exist, the T. V. A. operating in the same manner in which a private corporation would operate, used the revenue which it received from the sale of power to pay for the expenses or the development of the same amount of power by steam. If the Allis-Chalmers Corporation had been able to complete its contract and deliver the machinery on time, the steam plant would not have been necessary. Six hundred thousand dollars additional was required to produce the power by steam. If the T. V. A. could not have used its revenues, it could never have made that expenditure without coming to Congress and obtaining a deficiency appropriation.

Do Senators suppose that a strike would wait for Congress to discuss the subject? How long a time would be required? The examples which I have given are only typical. I hope other Senators who will follow me will give additional and better illustration than I have already given. If it were not for the authority which the T. V. A. has to use revenues obtained from the sale of power, it would be necessary to come to Congress once a week.

Mr. President, if these amendments are agreed to, the T. V. A. will be unable to do its part in the production of power which is necessary for the manufacture of aluminum, and power used by other industries to help us win this war. I could give many other examples. I believe that when the Senate understands what the truth is, and knows what is bound to happen, it will not agree to the amendments. We cannot afford to do so. It seems to me that our patriotism ought to rise above it. We must not do such a foolish thing.

The original T. V. A. Act intended that revenues from the sale of power should be used by the T. V. A. They have always been so used. As the House passed the bill they could continue to be used. The committee amendment on page 72 would strike out certain language in the bill as passed by the House. The bill was passed by the House in January. That was before Douglas Dam had been provided for. The bill has been in the committee for practically 3 months. After the bill passed the House a deficiency appropriation bill, containing an appropriation for the construction of Douglas Dam, was passed by the House. The entire estimated cost of Douglas Dam was included in that appropriation. The estimated cost is $30,000,000. Everybody knows that Douglas Dam cannot be completed this fiscal year. Everybody knows that at the very best much of next year will be required for its construction, so the unexpended balance will have to be reappropriated.

The T. V. A. Act provides that the revenues received from the sale of power shall be turned over to the Government of the United States at the end of every year. If these amendments are agreed to, they will have to be turned over every month, making it impracticable to use them. In the two instances I have cited, in which the T. V. A. produced additional power, the power is not now costing anyone any more money. The power was paid for out of the proceeds of the sale of the electricity produced. Incidentally, the T. V. A. made a profit; in the first illustration I have given, the profit to the Government of the United States was $300,000.

It was intended by the act that this corporation should be just as free as a private corporation. It must compete with private corporations, and for 8 years it has been allowed by every appropriation bill covering the matter to use the unexpended balances which have been reappropriated.

Now, reverting to the Douglas Dam, let me say that $30,000,000 was appropriated. Congress knew, the committees knew, everyone knew that that money was to be only partially expended in the present fiscal year. Everyone understood that it was to be reappropriated at the end of the fiscal year so that the work might continue and the dam might be completed. No one could tell just how much would be used this fiscal year, and how much would be left. That was impossible to determine, as, I think, must be apparent to everyone. That was the understanding. After the bill now before us had passed the House, and while it was before the Senate committee, the House passed the deficiency appropriation bill making that appropriation. This bill in effect nullifies that appropriation. The money will have to be reappropriated.

I have never heard of any charge of dishonesty or misuse of any of these funds. The T. V. A. has undergone a most thorough investigation by a joint committee of Congress, and not one dollar has been found to have been illegally expended.

Now, for the first time, while we are in the midst of this war, comes the proposition that this business organization must cease operating in the usual manner and that every time it wishes to spend any money it must come to Congress in order to get it. No business corporation could do business under that kind of a system; and many illustrations could be cited of activities under the Government of the United States which have not been forced to adopt such a procedure. I understand the illustrations will be cited by other Senators as this debate proceeds.

Mr. President, I had intended to discuss a number of other matters, but I think I shall have to leave a discussion of them to my colleagues. However, I cannot take my seat without making reference to something which has no direct bearing upon the question before us. We heard the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] last Friday, charge Mr. Lilienthal, who is now the Chairman of the T. V. A. Board, with being, for instance, a Uriah Heep. That charge was made in a tribunal where Mr. Lilienthal has no opportunity to be heard. I have not heard of any evidence cited either here or elsewhere to show any justifiation for that kind of a charge.

I was relieved to quite an extent when other Senators, including the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and some other Senators who had had relations and dealings with Mr. Krug, gave Mr. Krug a clean bill of health. I myself have known Mr. Krug for a great many years. I have known Mr. Lilienthal ever since he has been on the T. V. A. Board. I have come into rather intimate contact with him many times, particularly during the course of the investigation which was held, and also with Mr. Krug. I have reached the conclusion that they are two of the finest gentlemen I have ever met, that they are absolutely honest and are absolutely doing their duty as they see it. While the investigation was proceeding and while all kinds of

charges—many of them wicked—were being made against Mr. Lilienthal, I saw him taken to the hospital; I saw him when he was overcome, and at the time I thought that was going to be the end of Mr. Lilienthal. He was beset on all sides; and yet, after that searching investigation, never a penny of dishonesty was traced to his hands. He is not that kind of a man, Mr. President. Those who know him know that he is not that kind of a man.

He did not abuse anyone. I have read Mr. Lilienthal's testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, relative to one of the amendments now under consideration; and I have wondered how he could possibly withstand the method which was pursued there in his examination. Never once, so far as I was able to ascertain from a reading of the testimony, did he lose his temper; never once did he resent; and yet the record shows that when he started to testify, before he could finish the first sentence he would be interrupted, and a whole page, and often more than a page, of the record would be used by the Senator from Tennessee in making various kinds of charges and claims, which seemed to me to be rather in the nature of a stump speech. When Mr. Lilienthal started again he was interrupted again. For page after page he was not able to finish a sentence; and yet never once was he discourteous, so far as I could ascertain; never once did he resent such a method of interrogation. Of all public officials I have ever been acquainted with, Mr. President, I will put none above Mr. Lilienthal for honesty and integrity; and I could say the same thing about Mr. Krug.

That statement, I know, Mr. President, has no direct bearing on the appropriation under discussion; it may be a side issue; but I cannot remain silent when such charges are made—charges which, I think, are without cause, without reason, without any justification whatever.

Mr. President, I have before me copies of two telegrams, one of which was sent by the Senator from Tennessee to the T. V. A., and the other the reply of the T. V. A.

On November 27, 1941, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] telegraphed the T. V. A. as follows:

NOVEMBER 27, 1941.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn.:

Am informed your Mr. Lilienthal is again here lobbying for passage of Douglas Dam bill—

The telegram was sent from Washington—

As the real and genuine friend of the Tennessee Valley Authority I suggest to you that lobbying on the part of Lilienthal or anyone else connected with the Authority is in very bad taste and ought not to be indulged in. It would be much better for you gentlemen to direct your efforts to the completion of Watts Bar steam plant, the Sheffield steam plant, and other means of obtaining current. The Krug-Nelson black-outs in the Southern States, in my judgment, were unnecessary, but if the two steam plants had been finished as Congress provided there would have been no possible excuse for black-outs. If these black-outs are being used to force Congress into passing the Douglas Dam bill it is an iniquitous and shameful policy. I hope the Tennessee Valley Authority, by a majority vote anyway, will disavow its intention of thus trying to force Congress to pass a bill.

KENNETH McKELLAR.

I now read the answer sent on the next day:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *November 28, 1941.*

The Honorable KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

This is in response to your telegram of November 27. We want you to know that Mr. Lilienthal is representing and acting in accord with the unanimous view of the Board of Directors. We want to make it emphatically clear that the members of this Board are as one in the administration of our public responsibility.

You allege failure of the Tennessee Valley Authority to build steam plants authorized by Congress. Every steam plant authorized by Congress is proceeding on schedule. The same can be said for every other Tennessee Valley Authority project for defense power authorized by Congress and now under construction. The present Sheffield plant which you state we should complete was authorized and completed during the first World War and like all other completed steam and hydro plants has been in continuous operation throughout this emergency.

With respect to Douglas Dam, we who are responsible for the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority cannot disregard the engineering facts or misinform the Office of Production Management, the President, or the Congress or the public on a matter of such vital importance. Having made our unanimous recommendations upon reliable engineering studies by an unquestionably competent engineering staff this Board leaves the matter and the responsibility with Congress.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
H. A. MORGAN, *Director.*
JAMES P. POPE, *Director.*

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Pope are the other two members of the Board.

I cannot understand why there should now be an attempt, as it looks to me, to try to brew trouble in the T. V. A. itself and endeavor to cause the members of the board to quarrel among themselves.

With reference to Douglas Dam, which probably resulted in the great hatred and animosity the Senator from Tennessee has against Mr. Lilienthal, the fault is not his any more than it is of other members of the board, and the fault is not Mr. Krug's. Anyone who will study the history of what was done about it, it seems to me, cannot reach any other conclusion than that whatever may be thought about building Douglas Dam the acts of the board cannot be criticized. They were acting upon engineering authority, including their engineers, O. P. M. engineers, and I think, though I may be wrong about it, the engineers of the Federal Power Commission.

I have before me, Mr. President, a report entitled "The Unified Development of the Tennessee River System," which was prepared away back at about the time of the inception of the T. V. A., and was asked for by Congress. In the report the T. V. A. set out the manner and speed with which it expected to develop the Tennessee River. The law made it their duty to make the river navigable from its mouth to Knoxville to a depth of 9 feet. They set out the plan they expected to follow, and, with the exception of one or two instances, I think the plan has been followed. The report is a full answer, it seems to me, to the claim made by the Senator from Tennessee that T. V. A. has fought the construction of most of these dams and that Congress had provided for their construction against the opposition and lobbying of T. V. A.

I have here among my papers a complete list of every dam constructed by T. V. A. Congress itself provided in the original act for the construction of the Norris Dam, then known as Cove Creek Dam, before the T. V. A. was ever appointed to office. The T. V. A. did not recommend that dam, of course. Two of the dams, I think, were started by the President by the allocation of funds, one the Pickwick Landing Dam and the other the Wheeler Dam, both of which were recommended by the T. V. A. I have amongst my papers letters from the chairman of the board, acting in behalf of the board, asking the President to permit construction to proceed with one of those dams. There were two dams planned when the controversy arose over the Douglas Dam. The two dams were provided for by Congress, and they are now under construction. They are comparatively small dams, and are east of Knoxville, on branches of the Tennessee River. While I believe they ought to be constructed, I would not have constructed them at the present time in preference to the Douglas Dam. I would have them wait, and that is what T. V. A. wanted to do, but they were provided for by Congress, and T. V. A. is carrying out the instruction of Congress as best it can.

Mr. President, I read from a memorandum furnished at my request by the T. V. A. itself.

Since its creation in 1933 the Tennessee Valley Authority has completed or has under construction today a total of 18 dams and 1 large steam plant. The building of the Norris Dam was authorized in the act creating T. V. A. For every dam whose construction has been undertaken since that time, with the exception of the projects known as the Watauga and South Holston, authorized December 17, 1941, funds having been made available upon the recommendation of T. V. A. That is a matter of public record. * * *

In March 1936 the Board of Directors of Tennessee Valley Authority filed with the Senate and the House of Representatives a report, requested by Congress, entitled "The Unified Development of the Tennessee River System"—

That is the report I hold in my hand [exhibiting].

That report set forth the construction program which the Authority recommended for the orderly development of the Tennessee River and its tributaries. The dates and schedules on which it was then believed that the various projects could be most efficiently and economically constructed were indicated. At the time the report was filed, the Authority had already constructed or begun construction of Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, Guntersville, and Chickamauga Dams. In building these projects and the rest of the projected program (excepting only the Fontana project recently approved as a part of the

emergency defense program) the schedule as presented then was substantially adhered to until the current national defense emergency required an acceleration of electric power supply.

I now read from the statement a list of the dams:

Douglas Dam: Authorized pursuant to Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

Construction was begun upon this project early in February 1942 with funds supplied by the Fourth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved January 30, 1942. This project was recommended by Tennessee Valley Authority, the Office of Production Management, the Bureau of the Budget, and on September 15, 1941, by the President as an essential part of a program to provide increased power supply for vital defense industries.

South Holston and Watauga Dams: Authorized without Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

Construction was begun upon these two projects in December 1941 with funds supplied by the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved December 17, 1941. These two projects were approved by the Congress without recommendation by Tennessee Valley Authority.

Fontana Dam. Authorized pursuant to Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

I think I should explain that the Fontana Dam has been considered for a great many years. I have always been in favor of it. The property where the dam was to be constructed was owned by the Aluminum Co. of America. Negotiations were had over a series of years for the construction of the dam, but arrangements had to be made with the Aluminum Co., and there were many intricacies involved. The chairman of the board was in favor of an agreement which he was able to obtain from the Aluminum Co. of America, but which was not satisfactory to the other two members of the board, and they rejected it.

I well remember that time. I was sorry at the action taken. Yet, when I went into the matter and discovered what the proposition was, I came to the conclusion that the majority of the board was right, that they should have rejected the agreement. Chairman Morgan was in favor of it, and the other two members of the board were opposed to it. I am not blaming anyone. I do not question the sincerity of the chairman of the board, but he was very enthusiastic. It is a very enticing proposition.

Negotiations still continued, and there was reached a conclusion very much more satisfactory to the Government and to the T. V. A. An agreement was entered into and approved by the Congress and the money has been appropriated by Congress in an appropriation bill for starting construction of the dam. As it was appropriated for, it was approved unanimously by the T. V. A. board. I now read from the statement:

Construction was begun upon this project in December 1941 with funds supplied by the "Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942," approved December 17, 1941. This project was recommended by Tennessee Valley Authority, the Office of Production Management, the Bureau of the Budget, and on September 15, 1941, by the President as a part of a program to provide increased power supply for vital defense industries.

The Hiwassee: Authorized pursuant to Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

Projects (Apalachia, Ocoee No. 3, Chatuge, and Nottely Dams.)

That was once rejected in the House, and put back in in the Senate, and, as I remember, in the conference only a small appropriation was provided, so small that no work was commenced during that fiscal year. The next year an appropriation of $5,000,000, as I recall, was made, and the T. V. A. proceeded to construct the dam, and it has been completed and has been in operation for a year or two. The statement says:

Construction on these defense power and storage projects began in July 1941 under a 1942 supplemental appropriation, "H. J. Resolution No. 194," approved July 16, 1941. The Office of Production Management and the Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation after approval by the Bureau of the Budget and the President was supported by the Secretary of War, Office of Production Management, and Tennessee Valley Authority. Favorable action by the House and Senate Committees expedited the enactment of the bill on July 16, 1941.

Cherokee Dam and Watts Bar steam plant: Authorized pursuant to Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

Cherokee Dam was ready for closure December 1, 1941, 4 months ahead of its emergency schedule. Construction of Cherokee Dam and the Watts Bar Steam plant began in August 1940 with funds supplied in a 1941 supplemental appropriation for National Defense purposes, "H. J. Resolution No. 583," approved July 31, 1940. The Tennessee Valley Authority in response to the sudden need for additional power for aluminum production recommended Cherokee, the Watts Bar steam plant, and additional generating units in existing dams. In addition to approval by the Bureau of the Budget, these projects were urgently pressed by the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense. After approval by the House and Senate Committees, the bill was enacted upon July 31, 1940.

Fort Loudon Dam (Coulter Shoals): Authorized Pursuant to Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

Construction was begun upon this project in July 1940 according to schedule from funds provided in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, Fiscal Year 1941," approved April 18, 1940. The Tennessee Valley Authority budget estimate for the project received approval from the Bureau of the Budget, the House and Senate committees. References to the record are listed below:

1. At the first hearing after the unified development report to Congress, this project was listed by the Tennessee Valley Authority as a project which it definitely proposed to construct. (See House hearings on independent offices appropriation bill, 1939, pp. 919 and 948.)

2. Estimate included in Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941 (pursuant to budget submitted by Tennessee Valley Authority), page 200.

3. Hearings before subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1941, part II, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

4. Bill passed House with inclusion of funds for Fort Loudon construction (86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 735).

5. Bill passed by Senate with item included (86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1907).

6. Construction was authorized and funds necessary to commence construction appropriated by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act—1941 (54 Stat. 138).

7. Construction actually commenced July 1, 1941. Today this project is 40 percent completed.

Watts Bar Dam: Authorized pursuant to Tennessee Valley Authority recommendation.

Construction began on this project in July 1939 out of funds provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, approved March 16, 1939. The Tennessee Valley Authority estimate for the fiscal year 1940, including provision for this project, followed the usual procedure of approval by the Bureau of the Budget, inclusion in the President's budget, and approval by the Congress. Refernces to the record are listed below:

Mr. President, I ask that the references to the record with respect to Watts Bar Dam set forth on pages 4, 5, and 6 of the memorandum, be printed at this point as part of my remarks, without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

1. At the first hearing following submission of the unified development report, the Watts Bar project was listed by the Tennessee Valley Authority as a project which it definitely proposed to construct and had under investigation.

a. Subcommittee of House Appropriations Committee on the independent offices appropriation bill, 1939.

Page 919, table entitled "Tabulation of Principal Features of Present and Proposed Dam and Reservoir Projects, December 13, 1937"—both Watts Bar and Fort Loudon (Coulter Shoals) included.

Page 948, table entitled "Proposed Construction Schedule as of December 13, 1937," showed scheduled starting dates of proposed dams, including Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, July 1, 1938; Watts Bar, July 1, 1939; Fort Loudon (Coulter Shoals), July 1, 1940; Fontana, July 1, 1942.

2. Estimate included in Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1940 (pursuant to budget estimate submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by T. V. A.), page 128.

3. Hearings before subcommittee of House Appropriations Committee on independent offices appropriation bill, 1940 (H. R. 3743, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

Page 1737, Chief Engineer Parker's testimony in support of beginning construction immediately.

4. House Committee on Appropriations reported the bill with provision for funds for Watts Bar included (House Rept. No. 23, 76th Cong., 3d sess.).

5. On the floor of the House, item for Watts Bar, together with item for continuation of construction of Gilbertsville, was deleted (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1250).

6. Items restored by the Senate (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1673).

During debate in Senate, Senator MCKELLAR spoke for inclusion of the item for Watts Bar Dam, largely supporting his arguments by quotations from testimony of Colonel Parker before the House committee (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1592–1593).

7. Conference report included the item and was agreed to by House (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2090).

8. Construction authorized and funds to commence construction appropriated by Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1940 (Public, No. 8, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

9. Construction begun July 1, 1939, accelerated due to war; schedule reduced 1 year. In operation today.

Mr. NORRIS. The Gilbertsville Dam, now called the Kentucky Dam, was authorized pursuant to T. V. A. recommendations. I ask that the statements contained in the memorandum with respect to the Gilbertsville Dam be printed

in the RECORD at this point without reading.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Funds for preliminary construction on this project were provided for the fiscal year 1938 in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, which was approved May 28, 1937, and which included the regular Tennessee Valley Authority appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year. Prior to this action by the Congress, the Tennessee Valley Authority had presented its estimate for beginning construction of Gilbertsville Dam in the usual way. The item was eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget and as transmitted to the Congress, no item for Gilbertsville was recommended. House action followed the Budget recommendation in this regard. In response to questioning before the Senate committee, Tennessee Valley Authority's witness explained that the item had been recommended to the Budget Bureau which had disallowed it. The Senate committee then added to the appropriation a sum sufficient for construction to begin. Congress subsequently approved a provision for beginning construction in the appropriation bill mentioned above. The Tennessee Valley Authority estimate for the following fiscal year, 1939, which provided for increased funds for continuing construction work, was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but was eliminated by the House. However, a Senate amendment which reintroduced the Tennessee Valley Authority and Budget recommendation subsequently became part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, approved on May 23, 1938. References to the record are listed below:

1. Estimate included in the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, was in the amount of $739,243 and provided solely for the continuation of studies and preliminary investigations including nothing for actual construction, page 113.

2. Hearings before subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on the second deficiency appropriation bill for 1937.

Pages 417–418: Dr. A. E. Morgan testified that Tennessee Valley Authority had requested $2,700,000 to begin actual construction of Gilbertsville, following intensive investigation of the Aurora and Gilbertsville sites, but that the Bureau of the Budget had failed to include the amount requested by Tennessee Valley Authority in the Budget of the United States.

3. House Report No. 669, to accompany H. R. 6730, page 4, stated that the committee had been urged (by Tennessee Valley Authority witnesses) to include provision of a small amount for commencement of construction, but had decided not to do so.

4. Passed House without provision for commencement of construction, (81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3930).

5. Hearings before subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on H. R. 6730 (pp. 19, 20, 21). Senator MCKELLAR offered amendment to permit beginning actual construction of Gilbertsville rather than merely continuing investigations. Dr. A. E. Morgan stated Tennessee Valley Authority favored such an amendment.

6. Senate Report 527, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, to accompany H. R. 6730, page 3, inserted the language of the McKellar amendment authorizing construction.

7. A conference report including amendatory language but reducing the appropriation by $2,000,000 to $36,000,000, was agreed to by the House (81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5087; as well as by the Senate, 81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4825).

8. Construction was authorized and funds necessary to commence construction were appropriated by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1937 (Public, No. 121, 75th Cong., 1st sess.).

9. Additional funds for continuation of construction of Gilbertsville were included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1939 (Public, No. 534, 75th Cong., 3d sess.).

10. The Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, included (pursuant to budgetary recommendations submitted by Tennessee Valley Authority) $12,500,000 for continuation of construction of Gilbertsville, Budget of the United States, page 808.

11. Hearings before subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, on independent offices appropriation bill, 1940.

Pages 1730, 1731: Colonel Parker testified in favor of project, quoting statement by water resources committee of the National Resources Committee that dam should be built.

12. Item for Gilbertsville was deleted by the House (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1250).

13. The Senate passed a bill with the item restored (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1673).

14. Conference report including item authorizing continuance of construction agreed to by House (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2090).

15. This project is now almost 50 percent complete and is scheduled, due to war needs, for initial operation January 1, 1944, or 15 months ahead of the pre-war schedule.

Mr. NORRIS. I come next to Hiwassee Dam, which was authorized pursuant to T. V. A. recommendations. I read from the memorandum:

Construction on this project was started in July 1936 out of funds provided in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, approved June 22, 1936. As indicated above, the Tennessee Valley Authority had requested funds for construction of Hiwassee in the previous year, 1935, but that item was stricken by the House; and although some funds were restored by the Senate, the amount was insufficient to start construction work in 1935. The following year the Tennessee Valley Authority renewed its request, and funds for construction were approved. References to the record are listed below.

Mr. President, I ask that the references in the memorandum with respect to the Hiwassee Dam be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Hearings before subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations on second deficiency appropriation bill for 1935 (H. R. 8554).

a. Page 474. "General summary analyses" included item I–D, "Tributary dam projects—$6,500,000" for Hiwassee.

b. Page 475. "Revision of general summary analyses" included item I–D, "$6,250,000, tributary dam projects (Hiwassee Dam)."

c. Page 523. Hiwassee Dam recommended by Dr. A. E. Morgan.

2. House Committee Report No. 1261, to accompany H. R. 8554, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, deleted Hiwassee funds. Bill approved by House without Hiwassee funds (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9860).

3. Hearings before subcommittee of Senate Appropriations Committee on H. R. 8554, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session. Letter from Dr. A. E. Morgan to Senator ADAMS recommending construction of Hiwassee, page 89.

4. Senate Report No. 1085, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, provided for the construction of Hiwassee with a limited appropriation of $1,000,000 for construction plus sums necessary to purchase land rights.

5. Passed by Senate in form recommended by committee (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 11692).

6. Conference report authorized construction by further limiting appropriation to $1,000,000 without additional sums for purchase of land rights approved by House (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 12639).

7. Construction was authorized and a restricted fund of $1,000,000 to commence construction was appropriated by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1935 (Public, No. 260, 74th Cong.).

8. It proved impossible to begin actual construction during the succeeding fiscal year due to the limitation placed on the amount of the appropriation by the conference committee. In addition, the succeeding fiscal year was taken up with extended negotiations for land rights on the Hiwassee, which negotiations proved to be extremely difficult.

9. Budgetary estimate for fiscal year 1937 included (pursuant to Budget estimate submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by Tennessee Valley Authority) an item of $5,000,000 for construction of Hiwassee. (Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, pp. 84 and 694.)

10. Hearings before subcommittee of House Appropriations Committee on first deficiency appropriation bill for 1936 (H. R. 12624), Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

a. Page 160: Revised Budget estimates for navigation and flood-control program—summary of projects included an item of $3,337,228 for Hiwassee or alternate.

b. Page 207: Dr. A. E. Morgan stated that the Authority wished the amount appropriated with the privilege to Tennessee Valley Authority of using it to begin construction either of Hiwassee or alternate at Fontana.

11. House Report No. 2591, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, to accompany H. R. 12624, page 13, stated that committee had provided for funds for construction of Hiwassee but without privilege of using them for any alternate site.

12. Passed by House with item for Hiwassee included (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 7072).

13. Passed by Senate without any amendments affecting item of Hiwassee (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8170).

14. This project was completed in the summer of 1940.

Mr. NORRIS. The Guntersville and Chickamauga Dams both were authorized pursuant to T. V. A. recommendation. I read the following in respect to them from the memorandum:

Construction of these projects was started early in 1936 out of funds provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved August 12, 1935. Tennessee Valley Authority budget estimates for the fiscal year 1936 did not name specific dams and were included in the budget as Main river dams. Subsequent to Tennessee Valley Authority testimony concerning the desirability of specific projects and the recommendation of Guntersville and Chickamauga Dams, the House committee allowed funds for construction of both Guntersville and Chickamauga, but postponed consideration of Hiwassee Dam, which had also been discussed. This recommendation was approved by the House and subsequently by the Senate. References to the record are listed below.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the references to the record be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Hearings before a subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations on Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill for 1935,

a. Page 474: "General Summary Analyses of Estimates" included Item I–E for "main river-dam projects, $3,300,000."

b. Page 475: "Revision of General Summary Analyses" showed Item I–E for "main river-dam projects (Guntersville and Chickamauga), $5,000,000."

c. Page 488: Testimony of Dr. A. E. Morgan concerning the expectation of erecting Guntersville and Chickamauga.

d. Pages 628 to 629: Testimony by Dr. A. E. Morgan that Authority intended to begin at least one and possibly two main river dams during the succeeding fiscal year.

2. Bill passed House with funds for Guntersville and Chickamauga included (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9860).

3. Senate passed bill with total appropriation raised from $34,675,192 to $38,000,000 with funds included for Guntersville and Chickamauga, as well as Hiwassee (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 11692).

4. Conference committee report cutting appropriation from $38,000,000 to $36,000,000 but with funds for Guntersville and Chickamauga approved by House (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 12651) and by Senate (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 12639).

5. Construction authorized and funds to begin construction appropriated by Second Deficiency Appropriation Act for 1935 (Public, No. 260, 74th Cong., p. 29).

6. The Guntersville project was completed in the fall of 1939 and Chickamauga was completed in the summer of 1940.

Mr. NORRIS. The Pickwick Landing Dam was authorized pursuant to T. V. A. recommendation to the President. I read the following with respect to it from the memorandum:

Construction of this project was begun in March 1935 out of funds allocated to the Authority by the President from an emergency appropriation upon recommendation by the T. V. A. T. V. A. desired to construct the dam and requested that the allotment be made. Letter from A. E. Morgan to President Roosevelt dated September 22, 1934, follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1934.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington. D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: An immediate allocation of $15,000,000 is desirable to expedite the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When these funds are made available the Authority plans to undertake the construction of the Pickwick Landing Dam, which is the next logical project in the development of the Tennessee Valley's water resources.

At a meeting held September 18, 1934, the board of directors adopted a resolution requesting that you approve and direct the allocation of $15,000,000 for the use and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the total of $899,675,000 which was appropriated in accordance with the provisions of the first paragraph of title 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental, general, and emergency appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1934, and June 30, 1935, and for other purposes," which was approved by you on June 19, 1934.

Very sincerely yours,
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
By ARTHUR E. MORGAN,
Chairman of the Board.

Construction of Pickwick Landing Dam was begun with funds made available by allotment under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act approved June 19, 1934. This project was completed in the summer of 1938.

The Wheeler Dam was authorized pursuant to T. V. A. recommendation to the President. Construction of this project was started in November 1933 out of the same appropriation as that of Norris Dam by special order of the President upon recommendation by the T. V. A.

Norris Dam was constructed pursuant to provisions of the T. V. A. Act of 1933. Norris Dam was expressly authorized by provisions of the T. V. A. Act of 1933. Construction was started in October 1933 out of funds provided in the N. I. R. A. appropriation for the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. President, I have not completed what I wanted to say. I feel that under the circumstances, however, I cannot proceed further. I feel very deeply on this subject. I think the Tennessee Valley Authority's operations are vital to our efforts in the war. If the proposed amendments are agreed to, the T. V. A. will be seriously handicapped in producing and obtaining power in the way it has been doing. We cannot foresee all the calls for power which will be made upon the T. V. A. or the need for increase in its activities.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to some things which have occurred in connection with increases in the T. V. A. activity. The estimate for 1 year, as I remember, of the amount of money necessary for increased production was about $14,000,000. It actually turned out that $21,000,000 was needed for that purpose by reason of the demand for increased power made upon the T. V. A. from the President down. The adoption of the committee amendment would mean that every time the Authority builds some project necessary to the production of power, which cannot be foreseen when the appropriation bill is passed by Congress, the Authority will have to come to Congress and obtain a deficiency appropriation. If we should pass the pending bill as reported by the committee, the T. V. A. would have to come to Congress to get an appropriation every time it wanted to spend a nickel to invest in something which would produce sufficient revenue to pay for it. Under the provisions of the bill as reported to the Senate, the Tennessee Valley Authority would not be able to make such expenditures without first coming to Congress.

Mr. President, I hope the pending committee amendment affecting the T. V. A. will be rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews	Danaher	Kilgore
Austin	Davis	La Follette
Bailey	Downey	Lee
Ball	Doxey	Lucas
Bankhead	Ellender	McCarran
Barkley	George	McFarland
Bilbo	Gerry	McKellar
Bone	Gillette	McNary
Brewster	Glass	Maloney
Brown	Green	Maybank
Bulow	Guffey	Mead
Bunker	Gurney	Millikin
Burton	Hayden	Murdock
Butler	Herring	Norris
Byrd	Hill	Nye
Capper	Holman	O'Daniel
Chavez	Hughes	Overton
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Radcliffe	Smith	Tydings
Reed	Spencer	Vandenberg
Reynolds	Stewart	Van Nuys
Russell	Taft	Wallgren
Schwartz	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Shipstead	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Smathers	Tunnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4402) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4402) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the question involved in the committee amendment is whether to strike out the language on page 72, beginning with line 5, and extending through the word "further" in line 15. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the bill involves two propositions: First, if we strike out the language now in the bill, we fail to reappropriate the unexpended balances. At the present time the unexpended balances are very large. They amount to between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000. These balances are absolutely necessary if the work of construction of the Douglas Dam, the Watauga Dam, the Upper Holston Dam, the Fontana Dam, the Kentucky Dam, and other dams and the new steam electric plant in north Alabama and other installations is to be completed on schedule time. They are the dams and installations the construction of which must be completed on schedule time if we are to get from the Tennessee Valley the production of aluminum, phosphorous, magnesium, aircraft, and chemicals on which the War Production Board and the Army are relying, and which both the War Production Board and the Army advise us to be so necessary. If the amendment should be adopted, aluminum-plant additions would stand idle; aircraft factories and workers would be idle; the cry for more and more planes could not be answered for lack of T. V. A. power. Explosives and chemical-warfare materials could not be produced for lack of such power. The adoption of the amend-

ment would prevent the building by T. V. A. of river freight terminals at Guntersville, Decatur, Chattanooga, and Knoxville. Freight shipments of war materials by water would suffer.

The second proposition involved is that the Tennessee Valley Authority would be denied the use for current operating expenses of its receipts from the sale of power. No question is involved of the Tennessee Valley Authority constructing dams, great fertilizer plants, or anything of that kind, without coming to the Congress and getting a definite and specific appropriation for the particular project. The question is whether the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be permitted to continue to do that which it has done since its birth in 1933, namely, use some of its current revenues for operating expenses, expenses which arise from time to time, expenses which sometimes are necessary in order to meet an emergency, and expenses which were not foreseen and could not be foreseen at the time when the Tennessee Valley Authority made and submitted its estimates for appropriations for any particular fiscal year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask him a question at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says there is no authority to proceed with new projects and new installations. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that the Authority erected a steam plant under certain circumstances?

Mr. HILL. No; the Authority did not erect the steam plant. What the Senator from Nebraska had in mind was this——

Mr. VANDENBERG. He emphasized the fact that it was done without coming to Congress.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. The Authority put in operation a steam plant which was not in operation. In order to put the plant in operation the Authority had to buy a considerable amount of coal and expend a considerable amount of money for labor. At the time when the Authority made out its estimates for that fiscal year, which happened to be in the year 1939, the estimates did not cover the cost of operating the steam plant.

It costs money to operate a steam plant. We all know that it costs a great deal more money to operate a steam plant than it does to operate a hydroelectric plant; it is necessary to buy fuel and to employ much more labor and personnel. So what the Authority did in the particular instance, as I have said, was to buy coal and to employ personnel to operate the plant.

Since we are on this subject I might briefly review the matter. In December 1939, the Aluminum Co. of America, which has its great aluminum plant at Alcoa, Tenn., in the Tennessee Valley, came to the Tennessee Valley Authority and said, "We must step up our production of aluminum. In order to do so we must have some 288,000,000 additional kilowatt-hours of power."

The Tennessee Valley Authority did not have the power available from its dams and installations which were then operating; so it expended, out of its receipts, approximately $1,300,000 in purchasing coal and paying labor. It may even have had to make a few changes in the steam plant.

At any rate, the T. V. A. expended $1,300,000 to produce 288,000,000 kilowatt hours of power, and sold the power to the Aluminum Co. of America for $1,600,000, making a profit of $300,000. The Aluminum Co. of America, by virtue of obtaining the additional power, was able to produce 29,000,000 pounds of aluminum, which was enough aluminum to build 1,500 large bombers. And by this action of the T. V. A. our defense was strengthened by the 1,500 bombers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Where did the T. V. A. get the steam power?

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator mean which particular steam plant?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. The T. V. A. was building a steam plant at Watts Bar, and was very much behind with it. It had promised to start it some time earlier, and in October 1941 made a similar promise. I think it came into operation about January 1, 1942. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Watts Bar steam plant?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I do not understand that the T. V. A. was behind on the Watts Bar plant, but the Senator knows that the Watts Bar steam plant is not the only steam plant in the Tennessee Valley Authority system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also know that when the Wilson Dam was built, a steam plant was constructed there, and was allowed by the T. V. A. to remain an auxiliary plant, but was not used. Only two units were put in at the time, and additional units were to be installed later. We have been appropriating money for quite a while in order to put steam plant into operation. Is it yet in operation? If it is it has been put in operation only recently. I do not think it is in operation.

Mr. HILL. Let us be perfectly clear about this. The steam plant at Muscle Shoals, known as the Sheffield steam plant, was built during the World War, in 1917 and 1918. When the T. V. A. took it over, in 1933, that steam plant was what is called obsolete. It cost a great deal more to generate power at a steam plant built in 1917 or 1918 than it did to generate power at one of the hydroelectric plants. So it was not until this great emergency came upon us, when one of the bottlenecks in our great production program was power, and when every possible effort was necessary to generate power, that the T. V. A. came to Congress and said, "Give us some money so that we can modernize the Sheffield plant, use the plant and make the power more economically and more in line with what it should cost." As a result of the money appropriated by Congress that steam plant is now being modernized and brought up to date.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is now being modernized; but if the Senator will permit me to say so it took an act of Congress to force Mr. Lilienthal to revamp that steam plant. Last June some prominent contractors in Indiana, Chicago, or in that locality, made him an offer to revamp that plant for $2,000,000. He rejected the offer on the ground that the plant was not necessary. Congress disregarded Mr. Lilienthal's views, made an appropriation for the purpose, and now is forcing him to build the plant.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to get into an argument with the Senator from Tennessee as to whether the T. V. A. was forced to modernize that steam plant. Such an argument would serve no purpose here and I wish to go straight to the issues before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was what was done.

When the present emergency came upon us, and a tremendous need for power rose, the T. V. A. recommended that the Sheffield plant be modernized. I do not want to go over what was said by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] in his speech this morning, and I do not think that this particular matter has much to do with what the Senate is interested in and with the issues before the Senate. On Friday, however, the Senator from Tennessee made a statement that practically all the dams which have been built on the Tennessee River by the Tennessee Valley Authority have been built despite the opposition of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I gave the specific ones, and the acts of Congress to show it—seven of them.

Mr. HILL. I have a memorandum on that point with reference to the pages of the record, with testimony before the Bureau of the Budget, testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, and testimony before the Senate committee, and I am going to ask consent, Mr. President, that at the end of my remarks the memorandum be inserted in the RECORD. It gives the history of all these dams and shows that in each instance except in the case of two dams—the Watauga and the Upper Holston Dam, the T. V. A. recommended the construction of the dams. The T. V. A. also recommended the construction of the Watts Bar steam plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if it would not interrupt his speech, I wish the Senator would put the memorandum in the RECORD now and let us see about it, because the House itself did not consider the Pickwick, the Guntersville, the Chickamauga, the Hiwassee, the Watts

Bar, the Fort Loudon, and the Gilbertsville Dams—seven of them. Not only did the T. V. A. not consider them, but the House did not consider them; they were put in by the Senate and the record so shows, and there cannot be any answer to it.

Mr. HILL. The trouble is the Senator does not go far enough into the record. The fact that the House did not put a particular dam in does not mean that the T. V. A. did not recommend the dam.

The T. V. A. might have recommended a dam and the Budget Bureau might have turned down the recommendation or the T. V. A. recommendation might have been included in the Budget Bureau's recommendation, and the House might not have carried out the recommendation of the Budget Bureau and the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I may be in error, but I do not think the Senate at this moment is so much interested in who recommended a dam which perhaps was built 5 or 6 years ago. I think the Senate wants to know what would be the effect of these amendments. After I conclude my main remarks, I will, if the Senator wishes, take up each dam, as I can readily do from the data I have, and I can show the dams recommended by the T. V. A.; but at the present time I think, from what Senators have advised me, they are interested not in knowing who recommended or did not recommend a certain dam which has been built, but what would be the effect of the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee proposes.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan. I do not desire to be discourteous to the Senator from Tennessee and will yield to him later.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me get back to the question which I submitted, because I agree with the Senator that I am not interested in this ancient history.

Mr. HILL. The Senator wants me to discuss this amendment, does he not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want a few facts about the matter. I want to know how far T. V. A. can go under the present procedure in the expenditure of these funds, over which it apparently has exclusive control, in making capital investments and capital extensions. The Senator says it does not build new dams, for instance. On the other hand, he says that it rebuilds steam plants. Suppose, in addition to that——

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will excuse me, I want to say that the steam plant was rebuilt by the use of money appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose and not from the receipts of the Authority. The money for rebuilding the steam plant came from a direct and specific appropriation by Congress and not out of receipts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What expenditure can be made out of receipts, and how are the expenditures out of receipts audited, so far as Congress is concerned? That is what I desire to know.

Mr. HILL. I should say that operating expenses could be paid out of receipts. Such operating expenses might involve in certain instances minor capital expenditures; for instance, expenditures for a transmission line, a substation, or something of that kind. I should say that no new major links or major projects in this enterprise could be started without appropriations by Congress, but anything that was necessary to carry on what are called the current operations of the T. V. A., even though they included stepping up the power to increase its income, could be paid for out of receipts.

As to the auditing suggestion, which is a good one, I want to read to the Senate a statement——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the question at issue will he yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I turn to page 3886 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, and I read what the Senator who is now addressing the Senate quoted from the basic law of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. The provisior of the law which the Senator quoted reads as follows:

> The net proceeds derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the Corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

The question I desire to ask is, May not the board, in its discretion, deduct not only operating expenses but amorization, depreciation in an amount which it may deem necessary for new developments and the enlargement of plants?

Mr. VANDENBERG. "New construction" is the phrase used.

Mr. HILL. The building of a substation would be new construction; the building of a transmission line would be new construction. Even a new roof on a powerhouse would be new construction; but, let me say to the Senator the language which I read was from the basic law of 1933, which was subsequently amended by the Act of 1935. The 1935 Act made some little change in section 26 of the original act. So I think I had better at this point read section 26 of the act as amended by the amendment of 1935, because that is really the law today, rather than the provision read by the Senator from Louisiana.

I now read section 26 as amended:

> SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the corporation, and from any other activities of the corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the board shall be necessary for the corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the board to defray emergency expenses to insure continuous operation.

That is the basic law as it stands today. Under that law, as I have said, I do not think it would be possible for the T. V. A. to build a dam or to build a fertilizer plant or any other large project or plant, but it would be entirely possible—and would be within the intent and meaning of the Congress—for the T. V. A. to carry on its current operations, whether it be the purchase of coal, the employment of additional labor, or perhaps even the building of a new transmission line. Let me give an illustration of a new transmission line being built.

About a year ago, when there was a severe drought in the Southeast, and when that section was faced with a great shortage of power, the Aluminum Co. at Alcoa, Tenn., came to the Tennessee Valley Authority and said, "We are confronted with a great shortage of power; we are not getting the power we absolutely have to have; we must have more power." So what the Tennessee Valley Authority did was to build a transmission line 51 miles long. In connection with the construction it did a record job. It acquired all the rights-of-way for the 51 miles, ran the line through very mountainous, rugged, and difficult terrain, and completed the construction in a record time of 76 days, so as to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to buy power from the Associated Gas & Electric Co. and distribute such power to the Aluminum Co.'s plant at Alcoa, Tenn. This meant that there was no diminution, there was no let-up on the part of the Aluminum Co. of America, in the production of the aluminum, which we so vitally need for our aircraft.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has made a very interesting observation. What would be the legal position of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the event this amendment were adopted?

Mr. HILL. There are two amendments. One is the committee amendment to strike out the language on page 72. Then we have the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the first amendment.

Mr. HILL. So far as the building of the transmission line is concerned, the first amendment would not have any effect, because striking the language out of the bill would merely result in the language in the basic law controlling, which would give the Authority the power to make use of their receipts. But let me say to the Senator, so that we may not lose sight of it, that striking out the language in the bill as proposed would fail to provide for a reappropriation of the unexpended balances, now amounting to $30,000,000, to carry on the construction of the Douglas Dam, to carry on the construction of the Watauga Dam, the Holston Dam, and the Fontana Dam, and to carry on other dam construction and other necessary installations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. At this point I should like to read what the second amendment, to which the Senator has referred, provides, as it will be offered:

Provided further, That commencing July 1, 1942, all proceeds derived by the Board of Directors of the Authority from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Authority, and from any other activities of the Authority, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States monthly, and shall not be expended until subsequently appropriated by the Congress: *And provided further,* That any unexpended balances on June 30, 1942, "in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942," are hereby reappropriated, and shall remain available until July 30, 1943.

So the amendment will certainly take care of the unexpended balances.

Mr. HILL. May I see the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the proviso has been added today since the original amendment was read.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I asked the clerk at the desk to make it so plain that anyone could understand it.

Mr. HILL. It was not a question of making it plain.

Mr. McKELLAR. To make it right, then.

Mr. HILL. Let us understand this matter. As originally offered, and as printed, the amendment required the Tennessee Valley Authority to turn all its revenue into the Treasury every month, which, of course, standing by itself, meant that the Tennessee Valley Authority could not expend any of its revenue for any purpose. It is not possible to turn revenue in every month and at the same time expend any of it. The Senator now proposes to modify his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is not the Senator satisfied with the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I certainly am not satisfied at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. HILL. This is what the Senator does now; he provides for a reappropriation of the unexpended balances for the year.

Mr. McKELLAR. For the next year.

Mr. HILL. For the coming fiscal year. The Senator first reported the bill with an amendment to deny the reappropriation of the unexpended balances, as the other House had reappropriated them. By his proviso the Senator would take care of the unexpended balances. He has modified his amendment to that extent.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has come along "some bit." If he will keep on coming perhaps he will withdraw the whole amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I shall not go so far as to make a distinction between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the authorities controlling projects in the West, such as Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and others in Colorado and Nevada. They have to come before Congress in order to obtain appropriations. What I intend to have done, if it is possible, is to have the T. V. A. come before the Congress and get its appropriations in exactly the same way in which the others, in the West, get their appropriations.

Mr. HILL. I intend to discuss what the Senator has said about those projects. Their status at the present time is different from the status of the T. V. A.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is exactly the question I desire to have the distinguished Senator from Alabama discuss. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, without the second proviso which he brings in today, would create an entirely different situation from that at the Boulder Canyon operation.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand, the Boulder Canyon Project Act creates a Colorado River fund. All the power receipts from the Boulder power dam are turned into that fund, but they are kept separate and apart from the operation of the Boulder Canyon project until the profits are ascertained, and then, of course, they go into the general fund.

Mr. HILL. But those in charge have flexibility as to the use of those funds, exactly as the T. V. A. does. So far as the Grand Coulee and the Bonneville Dams are concerned, this is the story: Those dams have been in a period of construction. It is true that they are selling some power because, due to the emergency, due to the war, it is necessary to use every available kilowatt of power. So they are today selling some power to a few big concerns with which they have made contracts. But it is not the intent that they shall not have the same flexibility the T. V. A. has always had when they get into full utility operation.

I have here the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], for himself and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], setting up the Columbia River Authority, and giving to that authority flexibility as to the use of the receipts and revenues from the Grand Coulee and Bonneville as was given to the T. V. A., except, as I read the language in the bill, the Columbia River Authority would have a great deal more flexibility than the Tennessee Valley Authority has today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to recur for a moment to the question I propounded to the Senator from Alabama. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, as now modified, eliminates the first question I asked. As a result of the modification of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, what does the amendment do in the way of changing the basic law?

Mr. HILL. Under the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, the Authority would have to turn in its receipts and revenues once a month. It could not use those revenues and receipts for operating purposes. Under the basic law, the Authority can use its revenues and receipts for operating expenses. That is the whole question, and that is the big question here, as to whether or not the Tennessee Valley Authority is to be able to have flexibility, and to use its receipts for operating purposes, or is to be denied flexibility and denied the use of its receipts.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the only difference, as a result of the modification of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, from what the basic law is at the present time?

Mr. HILL. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator a further question. How long have we been operating on this basis?

Mr. HILL. We have been operating on this basis ever since the Tennessee Valley Authority was brought into being in 1933.

Mr. LUCAS. What questions have been raised heretofore with respect to the very situation that is brought forward at this time?

Mr. HILL. This question was raised in 1935, when we brought in the amendments to the basic T. V. A. Act, and at that time it was proposed to do what the Senator from Tennessee now seeks to do, but the House of Representatives, as the Senator from Illinois no doubt remembers, voted down the proposition. So year after year we have proceeded with this established policy, as written in the basic law, permitting the Tennessee Valley Authority to use its receipts.

We have made one change in the mechanics which I think I should make clear at this point. Under the basic act, as amended by the act of 1935, the Tennessee Valley Authority takes its revenues and uses them for operating purposes, and then at the end of the year what is not needed for operating purposes goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Who decides how much shall go back into the Treasury?

Mr. HILL. Under the basic law, I take it, the decision would be in the hands of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Under the basic law, as I have read it to the Senator, it would depend upon what the T. V. A. needed in the way of operating expenses.

In 1935 question was raised as to how the Bureau of the Budget should handle the estimates of the T. V. A., the question of a proper audit, so Mr. Daniel A. Bell, who, as Senators will recall, was the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, wrote a memorandum making a suggestion which the President sent to the Congress under date of May 9, 1935. Mr. Bell made the suggestion, including a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation item for the Tennessee Valley Authority:

The purpose of the proposed provision was to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority

Fund and to authorize the Authority to include therein all funds from whatever source received.

To put into that fund receipts, revenues, appropriations—everything in the nature of receipts. Mr. Bell stated:

This procedure will simplify control accounting, cost finding, and financial reporting by consolidating the separate accounts of appropriations, allotments, and receipts and permitting the Authority to function in this respect like other large construction agencies of the Federal Government.

Carrying out the recommendation of Mr Bell, through agreement between Mr. Bell, the officials of the T. V. A. and Representative Buchanan, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, placed the language in the appropriation bill making the first direct appropriation for the T. V. A., the language being the same we find in the bill before us today. Up to that time there had been no direct appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Up to that time the Tennessee Valley Authority had secured funds twice.

The first funds had come from the first N. I. R. A. measure from which the T. V. A. secured $50,000,000, that $50,000,000 being allocated the T. V. A. by the President. The second amount was allocated by the President in the same way. He gave them a lump sum of $25,000,000. So the first appropriation which was ever made directly by Congress for the Tennessee Valley Authority was made in 1935. In line with the suggestion made by Mr. Daniel W. Bell, and the agreement, as I stated, between Mr. Bell and the T. V. A. officials, the House Appropriations Committee agreed on the language which we now find in the bill before the Senate. The first appropriation for the T. V. A. was carried in the deficiency bill making appropriations for the fiscal year July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936. If Senators will examine the language of that appropriation bill and compare it with the language in the pending bill, as well as with the language of the other appropriation bills—and I have copies of all of them here, year by year—they will find that the same language is contained all the way through, setting up this Tennessee Valley Authority fund, providing that all money coming to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall go into this fund, which is in the Treasury Department. What Congress has done has been to appropriate money direct out of the Treasury and also appropriate the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, making them at all times available to the Tennessee Valley Authority in line with the provision of the basic act. The pending bill makes this appropriation, and goes on to say, in the language stricken out by the Senate committee—

Provided—

What?

Provided, That this appropriation—

That is the direct appropriation by Congress—

and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1942"—

If there is any money left in that fund—

and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943, to remain available until June 30, 1943, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942."

The T. V. A. has one fund, which is in the Treasury. The receipts all go into it. The appropriations all go into it. Then Congress appropriates money into that fund, making it available to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Language providing for that procedure has been contained in every bill from the time we made the first appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I emphasize this, if I may, because the Senator from Tennessee on Friday spoke about this language. He said how smooth this language was, how oily it was, and gave me the impression that it was some new language that had been placed in the bill in some way or other in the House of Representatives. I have before me copies of all the appropriation bills of each year carrying the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority; and if Senators will examine them, they will see that there is nothing new about the provision in the pending bill. If it is oily or smooth, then we have been riding on this oil and sliding over this smooth language for the last 7 or 8 years when it has been before the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee of which the Senator from Tennessee is one of the leading members. The language has been there all the time.

Mr VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the gross business done by the Tennessee Valley Authority in a year? In other words, how much money flows into this consolidated fund, gross?

Mr. HILL. I will say that the receipts this year from the sale of power, from the sale of everything, will amount to about $25,000,000. How much else has gone into the fund depends upon how much was appropriated for dam construction and such things. I do not have the figures before me. I can get them, however, with respect to how much was appropriated for the Douglas Dam, how much for the Watauga Dam, the Holston Dam, the Sheffield steam plant, and other construction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But the T. V. A. can use this $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, whatever it is, at its own discretion, in "generating transmitting, and distributing electricity," and it is monarch of all it surveys in that aspect, and there is no other public responsibility in respect to that money; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. No. The T. V. A. can use this money, but to say that there is no check on it or accounting for it would not be correct. In the first place, the Tennessee Valley Authority under the law has to make an annual report to the Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is a post mortem made after the money is spent.

Mr. HILL. The report is made after the money is spent, but the T. V. A. has to come before the Bureau of the Budget. It has to come before the House Committee on Appropriations. The Senator would be interested in seeing the length and scope of the hearings held on the pending bill, and the detailed Budget estimates embodied in those hearings. Here [exhibiting] is a copy of the hearings. The T. V. A. has to go before the Senate Appropriations Committee. It comes before this body just as it goes before the House. Then the T. V. A. is checked by the Comptroller General. At this point, because it is apropos, I wish to read a statement which Mr. Warren, who most Senators know, made before the House Committee on Military Affairs in December. As Senators remember, there was passed at that time a bill making clear and definite the authority of the T. V. A., and the authority of the Comptroller General. Mr. Warren made this statement:

We have gotten together in a complete understanding and agreement on the matters involved between the General Accounting Office and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and it is that which I am here to submit to you today. It is covered by an amendment to the pending bill introduced by the chairman—

That is the distinguished chairman, Representative MAY, of Kentucky—

and it—

Meaning the bill—

would bring the Tennessee Valley Authority under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, which they have heretofore contended they are not under. I have stated both in my decision of last December and the communication to the Congress of June 2 that I recognized, on account of the peculiar type of the business that they are engaged in, that they are entitled to certain latitude that other agencies would not be. That latitude has been given by Congress on numerous occasions to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Maritime Commission, the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Federal Housing Administration, the United States Housing Authority, in many respects to the Veterans' Administration, the Soil Conservation Administration, and the World War Adjusted Compensation Administration. This proposed agreement recognizes that latitude but makes definite that they—

Meaning, of course, the Tennessee Valley Authority—

come under the Budget and Accounting Act. It also for the first time will bring their contracts and their vouchers to the General Accounting Office in the seat of the Government for permanent keeping. That in itself will facilitate our future audits, and certainly should give us a certain degree of economy in making these audits that we have not had before.

That is the statement of Mr. Warren, saying that the T. V. A. would definitely come under the Budget and the Accounting Act, and saying what we, of course, know, and what we are endeavoring to continue for them, that they would be given certain latitude exactly as other

Government agencies are given. The proposition is that whenever we set up a Government agency to engage in a business or to engage in what may be termed semibusiness, we have to give such agency a certain amount of latitude.

I have here a memorandum which I shall not undertake to read, as it is rather lengthy——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator reads Mr. Warren's letter, may I ask him a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How can there be any effective responsibility to the General Accounting Office if what I now propose to read is the existing law? I read the act approved November 21, 1941, and ask the Senator from Alabama if it is the existing law?

Provided, That, subject only to the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, the corporation is authorized to make such expenditures and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem necessary, including the final settlement of all claims and litigation by or against the corporation; and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the Treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

How could it have more unlimited control over its own expenditures?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The board does have control. The board of directors is operating a great power distribution system; and the board must have authority to negotiate and make contracts and carry out those contracts. The board could not carry on the business it does if some private power company with which it might be exchanging power, or from which it might be buying power, thought that afterward some man in the Comptroller General's office in Washington, who knew nothing about power, could upset the whole contract. We must have confidence in the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, just as we have confidence in the heads of other agencies of the Government which are doing business under various acts of Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How can it be argued that the General Accounting Office has any substantial authority?

Mr. HILL. The General Accounting Office checks the records and audits the accounts, and makes its report to Congress as to what has been done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is a mathematical calculation.

Mr. HILL. I have found that most men who have been in trouble in business have been discovered by some auditor checking their accounts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is referring to an unlimited audit.

Mr. HILL. It is an unlimited audit. The Senator would not contend that an auditor who checks the accounts of a private corporation has anything to say about the kind of contracts which the private corporation makes. As Mr. Warren says, in the case of the T. V. A. there is an unlimited audit, falling fully under the budget and accounting acts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee should be adopted what could the Tennessee Valley Authority do in the way of management, in the way of making contracts with other power companies, or in the way of developing a power system in this emergency?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the amendment would stop everything. Instead of the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority being the board of directors for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Congress of the United States would become the board of directors for the Tennessee Valley authority. That would be the result.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the last answer, let me ask the Senator another question. In this emergency, suppose a Japanese or German saboteur should go into that section of the country and wreck a power plant or a dam. Is it the Senator's contention that, under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, before the Tennessee Valley Authority could act it would have to come to Congress and obtain some sort of legislation, or an appropriation to repair the damage?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly my contention; and that is exactly what the effect of the Senator's amendment would be.

At the present time the Tennessee Valley Authority wishes to build a phosphorus plant near the phosphate fields in Florida. The plant would be located at Mobile, Ala., near the Florida line. Provision for the plant is in this bill. The bill passed the House on the 22d of January, more than 3 months ago, and construction of the plant of course has not yet been started.

Mr. LUCAS. As a result of the audits which have heretofore been made in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority, has anyone said that it is not a businesslike organization?

Mr. HILL. Not a soul that I know of.

Mr. LUCAS. Has anyone ever found any fraud or corruption in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. HILL. Not a bit. The Senator will recall that former Senator Donahey, of Ohio, one of the ablest and most honorable men ever to sit in this body, was chairman of a joint congressional committee which investigated the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] said, that committee made an excruciating investigation of the T. V. A. Not a thing was found to the discredit of the T. V. A. On the contrary, it was found that the T. V. A. had done a fine job. It has made an enviable record in the economies which it has brought about, in the savings it has made in the use of its equipment in the construction of dams. It has the best record of any construction concern in the whole country, in the matter of saving human life, preventing injuries, and all that sort of thing. It has never had a strike. It has built up an exceptionally loyal and efficient organization. It has done a fine job. Unless my memory fails me, on Friday the Senator from Tennessee said that the T. V. A. had done a wonderful job.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, inasmuch as he has referred to me?

Mr. HILL. If I am mistaken, I want the Senator to correct me. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator contend that there has ever been an audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. HILL. I know this about it——

Mr. McKELLAR. Has there ever been an audit? That is what I want to know.

Mr. HILL. I know that the Comptroller General has been on work on the books of the T. V. A. ever since its inception.

Mr. McKELLAR. But he has not made an audit. No audit has ever been made of the books. Is the Senator opposed to an audit of the books?

Mr. HILL. No; I am not opposed to an audit of the books. I believe so much in an audit that I read with much assurance the language of Mr. Warren before the House Committee on Military Affairs stating that the T. V. A. definitely came under the Budget and Accounting Act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Why has not an audit been made before? If an audit is so important this year, why has not someone demanded an audit during the past 7 or 8 years?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that the Committee on Appropriations, of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is one of the leading members, has had an opportunity year after year to go into the subject. The officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been before the committee year after year requesting appropriations. The Senator from Tennessee has been one of the strongest advocates of appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am still one of its strongest advocates. No man on earth is stronger for the T. V. A. than I am; but I want an honest T. V. A. I want an open examination of its accounts. I want the Government to know that it is being honestly and fairly conducted. I do not want any bills passed which make it appear as though an effort is being made to cover up something. That is my attitude about the T. V. A. I am a thousand percent for it; but I want an honest T. V. A. I do not want to see scandals in connection with that organization. I am for open dealings with the public, as is true in the case of other power projects which the Government owns.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is no stronger for an honest T. V. A. than I am. The record shows, from the investigation of the congressional special committee headed by former Senator Donahey, and the investigations of various appropriations subcommittees, that that is exactly what we have had. We have an honest T. V. A. and there is absolutely nothing that questions or impugns the honesty of the T. V. A. or its officials.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make one further observation with respect to the amendment involving the purchase of automobiles. During the past 2 or 3 weeks we have had several tornadoes in the South. There have been a couple of serious ones in Oklahoma, and one or two in my State. Suppose a tornado should come through the Tennessee Valley and destroy 40 or 50 automobiles which are now necessary and useful in connection with the operations of the T. V. A. Under the terms of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Tennessee would it be necessary for the T. V. A. to come to Congress before it could replace by purchase those 40 or 50 automobiles?

Mr. HILL. Before it could purchase a 10-year-old, run-down "jitney" automobile it would have to come to Congress and obtain the consent of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The T. V. A. now has a thousand automobiles; and the tornado which is in the mind of the Senator from Illinois would have to destroy more than 250 of them before it would seriously interrupt the T. V. A. The T. V. A. now has more than a thousand automobiles.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Last Friday the Senator from Tennessee said that the T. V. A. had 763 automobiles. Has it bought 240 since last Friday?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. According to the records—and I will give them to the Senator from Kentucky so that he may examine them—we have found that the T. V. A. evidently had 250 more automobiles than it admitted at that time. I offer the records to the Senator from Kentucky so that he may have them before him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was that information developed at the hearings?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is in the records.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am talking about the hearings which the Senator held before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is in the records which were developed as the result of the hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon the hearings, the transcript of which was read last Friday, the Senator from Tennessee said that the T. V. A. had 763 automobiles.

Mr. McKELLAR. The T. V. A. admitted having 763. When the records came in they showed a little more than a thousand.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know who is responsible for the automobiles——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator need not bother about the automobiles. The T V. A. has plenty of them.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know who is responsible for the number of automobiles which the T. V. A. has. I take it that in the past the Appropriations Committee has done very marvelous work in handling matters of that kind. I am satisfied that the committee made a very thorough investigation of what was necessary in the way of automobiles for the Tennessee Valley Authority. As I understand, this is the first time any serious complaint has been made about the number of automobiles possessed by the T. V. A. In my limited way, as a Member of the Senate, I wish to avoid doing anything which would cripple the T. V. A. in this emergency.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am a thousand times stronger for the T. V. A. than is the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am always glad to yield to my friend from Tennessee; but I have the floor, and I have yielded to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Apparently the Tennessee Valley Authority has been going on successfully for 7 or 8 years. Now, all of a sudden, in this wartime emergency we are met with a complaint about what is going on down there. A complaint that in reality has no serious aspect. It seems to me that we might have waited for at least another year or two before going into the question. Every debate of this character creates disharmony and disunity among Senators, which is reflected throughout the country. I simply cannot understand what the "shooting" is all about. It is so sudden. There seems to be some motive that does not appear in the legislation which is causing all the trouble with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Let me say this to the Senator from Illinois: When he spoke about sabotage and about a tornado, he was not having any wild dreams.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that I am not having wild dreams, but certain Senators are.

Mr. HILL. I want to say to the Senator that just a few weeks ago in the Mississippi part of the T. V. A. area there was a terrible tornado; and that tornado blew down eight of the great tower structures, and damaged the transmission lines on those structures for miles around.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I will yield in a moment. I will yield to every Senator who desires me to do so, but the Senator from Illinois has made an observation upon which I want to comment. The Senator has asked why this matter had to be brought here at this time. The truth of the matter is that the way for the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to prevail is for the Senate to suspend the rule, and to permit him to put legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator is mistaken about that, if he will permit me to interrupt him. I have the ruling of the parliamentarian that the legislation in the House bill has been stricken out, and that it is perfectly in order to move to substitute for it if I desire to do so, and it is under the rules. The House has put on legislation, and we have a right to strike it out, and we have a right to amend it. The Senator is wholly mistaken as to the position of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HILL. I understood that the Senator from Tennessee filed a motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did file such a motion; I did so out of the utmost caution, because I knew what was going to happen; I knew that the T. V. A. would be active against this proposal. I say "T. V. A."; I will put it differently: I knew that David Lilienthal would be active here. I made the motion to suspend the rule; I did so as a precaution. But the parliamentarian has stated that the amendment is in order, and I shall offer it in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as I am concerned, I do not even know David Lilienthal; I never saw him, and it does not make any difference to me whether I ever meet him or see him; but I do not want anyone to believe that David Lilienthal is active so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned. I do not want anyone to insinuate that David Lilienthal is influencing me. Once again I repeat—and I cannot repeat it too often on this floor—that if the Senate of the United States were more interested in winning this war, if the Senate of the United States were more interested in cursing the Japs and raising hell with Hitler and his scavenger Mussolini than debating and quarreling among ourselves, it would be much better for the general welfare of the country. Candidly, I do not like the way this situation is brought here. There is not a single thing against the Tennessee Valley Authority in its record for a period over 7 or 8 years; and yet in spite of this record of efficiency, from a clear sky we are confronted with a heated debate over the flexibility of these funds.

If this were in peacetime I should say that I should seriously consider whether or not the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is in order and should be agreed to. But this is not the time, Mr. President, for me to change the authority that is granted down there in this emergency. The Senate is constantly granting authority to the Chief Executive of this Nation, giving him every conceivable type and kind of power to carry on this war. As the result of that, we have little or no authority left. Yet, here, by this amendment, we are going to hamstring one of the great agencies in this country for the making of war materials, especially those vital and strategic metals. It is not right, and the Senate ought not to agree to the

amendment, regardless of who offered it, or regardless of what merit it might have in times of peace. It has no merit here in view of the facts which have been submitted.

Mr STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment.

Let me say in connection with what the Senator from Illinois has said that the Senator from Tennessee introduced a bill embodying the very proposition, embodied in his amendment together with a provision relative to changing the procedure for condemnation of land in the Tennessee Valley area. That bill—a legislative bill—was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which, of course, under the rules, it should have gone. The bill is now under consideration by the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the chairman of which subcommittee is my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. The senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] is another member, and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is another member. The subcommittee has held hearings on the bill. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has been given every opportunity before that subcommittee to bring out all the facts, to say everything in the world he wanted to say in behalf of his bill. The subcommittee has not been dilatory about this matter, it has not delayed unduly; but it has not acted on the bill, it has not reported the bill.

Now, without any hearings before the Appropriations Committee, without the officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority or anyone else being called before the Appropriations Committee to determine what would be the effect of the Senator's amendment, he brings in this amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator talks that way, but the hearings are here.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator to turn to the hearings and find where he raised this question.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. HILL. In the meantime, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have examined the hearings. The only question upon which the T. V. A. was given any opportunity to testify before the Appropriations Committee was the question of travel. The clerk of the committee called the T. V. A. and asked that they come and talk about travel expenses; and in the hearings we do not find many pages of testimony about the travel expenses.

Mr. HILL. There was one witness from the T. V. A., Mr. Clapp. That was all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; there was one witness from the T. V. A., Mr. Clapp, the general manager.

Mr. HILL. And the question now under consideration was not explored at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. This question was not gone into at all.

Mr. HILL. Certainly not.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one was given a chance to come before the committee and say what would be the effect of this change in the fundamental law. The committee did ask Mr. Clapp how many automobiles they had; but after he stated how many automobiles they had, there was no further inquiry into that subject. Then the committee in executive session decided that they had too many automobiles, and provided that they could not buy any more. Then they went into the question of advertising. But on the question of policy, involved in these amendments, the question of what would be the effect on the T. V. A. of changing the fundamental law, as carried in the amendment recommended by the committee, and in the amendment that is to be offered by the Senator from Tennessee, or the one he proposed to offer under his notice, no one in the T. V. A. was given any opportunity to testify what the effect would be upon its present policy, or upon the Authority's effort, or upon its production for war.

Mr. HILL. The subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had a hearing, and has gone into these things.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. HILL. But it has not reported the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. HILL. The subcommittee has gone into it, but the Appropriations Committee did not go into it, and did not give anyone an opportunity to present any facts with reference to this question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I promise not to make a speech. My mind is not sufficiently made up to permit me to advocate anything. I rise only to ask questions, and I should like to ask a few questions about the subject of an audit of these funds.

Let us assume that this is a business corporation, even though it be owned by the United States: Nevertheless, it should have an entirely free hand to expend the appropriations or the income; and Congress has declared the policy that it shall be audited. That is the basic law:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the Treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provisions of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement—

And so forth, and so on. Accompanying that was a proviso that the General Accounting Office shall not disallow credit for expenditures already made, provided that the Board shall have determined that they were necessary.

I ask the Senator from Alabama if it is his interpretation of the basic law that the last clause, the proviso, relates to the judgment necessary in order to determine whether these funds are legally expendable for the purpose for which they were spent. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. Next let me refer to the language, "notwithstanding any other law." Therefore, is it the judgment of the Senator from Alabama that the expenditure of these funds, after the funds had been spent for the erection of a dam—an expenditure which is prohibited by other law unless it is especially appropriated for—must be approved by the General Accounting Office, after the funds have been spent, if the Board of Directors says the expenditure was necessary in order to carry out the provisions of the act?

Mr. HILL. I think that is true.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. My questions do not imply that I am opposed to that.

Mr. HILL. I understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. But I want to know what is the Senator's view about the amendment we are considering. In what way would the amendment change that basic act and that requirement and the liberty of the directors with respect to the auditing?

Mr. HILL. The amendment would change it to the extent that it would require all the receipts and revenues to go back into the Treasury at the end of each month. The amendment would apply to whatever the T. V. A. might have to expend, and it would deny to the T. V. A. the right to expend the receipts and revenues.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is, if the amendment were assented to?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. If the amendment were not assented to, does the Senator understand that the proviso with respect to funds already expended would remain untouched?

Mr. HILL. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. So that when it comes to the question of post auditing, that is, the auditing of funds already expended, this amendment and the original act which it would amend would not affect the post auditing?

Mr. HILL. It would not affect it; the Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator graciously permit one further question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is there anything in the existing law of which the Senator knows that requires a preaudit?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama does not know of any such requirement. If the Senator from Vermont himself knows, I should be glad to yield to him to have him state where it is found.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Vermont does not know of any such requirement, and he called attention to the lack of it once before.

Mr. HILL. I recall that the Senator did.

Mr. AUSTIN. The only audit we have, then, is a post audit, and in that audit, regardless of what the Senate does with respect to the pending amendment, there will be no change?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Vermont is absolutely correct.

Mr. STEWART and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Illinois "raised so much hell" here a while ago that I am sorry he is not present to listen to one or two questions I desire to ask in connection with what he had to say. He said he was not willing to do anything to the T. V. A. in this time of emergency. I should like to have the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator put his finger on one thing that will injure the war effort if this amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will be patient and bear with me, I intend to refer to that, but I desire first to conclude on the pending matter which we have had under discussion. If any Senator has any question to ask about the particular matter now being discussed, I should like to have him ask it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to correct him about a matter concerning which he made an erroneous statement?

Mr. HILL. If I made any erroneous statement, I should like to have the Senator correct me.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said there was no hearing on this subject. I want to read to him from page 249 of the Senate committee hearings. By the way, I had representatives of the T. V. A. invited before the committee at the time, as other members of the Appropriations Committee will recall. I quote from the testimony as follows:

Senator McKELLAR. I want to ask you if you cover into the Treasury the profits that you receive from conducting the Tennessee Valley Authority like other Government corporations?

It seems to me that is about the same matter we are discussing here today. The Senator from Alabama says that no hearings were had on it.

Mr. HILL. I think there were no——

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment.

Mr. HILL. I say that there were no hearings as to what the effect would be if the T. V. A. were required to turn in their receipts. That is what I was talking about and that is the issue before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me proceed with the testimony if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I quote further from the testimony:

Do you pay the proceeds into the Treasury or what is done about them?

Mr. CLAPP. The revenues that the Authority receives, Senator, are recorded, and to date have been reappropriated each year, to the Authority.

The revenues have been appropriated each year to the Authority—

To the extent that those revenues are net, over expenses, they take the place of appropriations of new money.

Senator McKELLAR. What I want to know is how much if any of your income has been covered into the Treasury of the United States. Has a dollar of it since you have been in existence?

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, yes; a great deal has been.

Senator McKELLAR. How much has been? Have you got a statement of it?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not happen—let me see if I can find that.

Senator McKELLAR. I will be glad if you will.

Mr. CLAPP. Senator, I can give you the actual figure for the fiscal year of 1941, which shows that the Authority had a total revenue from its power operations of $21,137,371; of that, $11,868,648 is a net income from power operations after taking out all direct expense, interest payments, depreciation, payments in lieu of taxes, etc.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, was that paid into the Treasury of the United States, that $10,000,000 that you had left?

Mr. CLAPP. It would be covered in, in the estimates for the succeeding fiscal year, to serve as an offset for additional capital expense appropriations.

In other words, Mr. President, it was covered into the Treasury, not as a general receipt, but as a special fund to be reappropriated this year.

So, to say that the question was not submitted to the T. V. A. is totally without foundation. We had another witness before the committee on this point. So the Senator was incorrect in saying that the committee did not have the facts before it. We had the facts from the manager of the Authority himself.

Mr. HILL. I submit that the language which the Senator has read did not go into the question now before the Senate as to whether the committee was going to deny to the Tennessee Valley Authority the use of its receipts and revenues. The testimony the Senator from Tennessee has read, of course, throws no light on the subject now before the Senate and does not go into the subject. I submit that to the Members of the Senate. Only one witness from the T. V. A., Mr. Clapp, was heard by the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I have not interrupted the Senator, but I confess that I am ignorant about the T. V. A.; I never have been where its dams are located, and I never have investigated it in any way. Am I to understand from what has just been read from the hearings—and is it the understanding of the Senator from Alabama—that the Authority treats earnings over and above expenses as a credit on appropriations?

Mr. HILL. What happens is that at the end of the year, when the receipts go into the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, the Appropriations Committee has a statement of the amount of such receipts before it, and, naturally, I take it considers how much the Tennessee Valley Authority will have from such receipts.

Mr. HUGHES. They do not go into the Treasury, of course?

Mr. HILL. They go into the Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

Mr. HUGHES. If $10,000,000 were appropriated the receipts would be treated as a credit on that appropriation.

Mr. HILL. They would be reappropriated; yes. Under the language of the appropriation bills which have been passed for the last 7 or 8 years, the receipts are reappropriated, together with any other funds which it is thought should be appropriated out of the Treasury.

Mr. HUGHES. In the appropriation bill?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. HUGHES. I understood Mr. Clapp to say that the receipts were reappropriated to the T. V. A. authorities.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I got the impression from the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a few moments ago that there was no power granted to the Comptroller General to audit the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In the basic law I find a provision on this subject, if the Senator from Alabama will permit me to read it.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I quote section 9, subsection (b):

The Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the transactions of the corporation at such times as he shall determine, but not less frequently than once each governmental fiscal year, with personnel of his selection. In such connection he and his representatives shall have free and open access to all papers, books, records, files, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other things, property and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation, and shall be afforded full facilities for counting all cash and verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries.

Then, provision is made for a report to the President and also to Congress.

So, it seems to me, under that provision of the basic act, certainly the Comptroller General has full power to make an audit each and every fiscal year, and he is granted access to the books, papers, and transactions of the Tennessee Valley Authority. If he has not made such an audit, certainly, it is not because of a lack of legislation giving him the power and authority to do so.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Utah is exactly right. I read a statement made by Mr. Warren, the Comptroller General, last December in which he made it very clear that the Tennessee Valley Authority comes under the Budget and Accounting Act, which is of course the Auditing Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me to reply to what the Senator from Utah has said?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator wants to ask a question I yield, but I do not want to occupy the floor too long.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I will ask the Senator is it not true that under this act there has been a constant difference between the Comptroller General and the T. V. A., and up to this good hour there has never been an examination of the accounts of the T. V. A.?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will say to the Senator, if the Senator from Alabama will yield, certainly I cannot conceive of language that could confer greater power than that I have read.

Mr. McKELLAR. But an amendment which was offered and adopted November 21 last says that the Comptroller General's Office cannot change the accounts even after it has examined them.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know about that; I take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will show the Senator the provision.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I desire to understand the provisions of the basic law which cover the disposition of these funds in connection with the proviso on page 72 which the committee proposes to strike out.

Section 26, as the Senator read it, it provides that each year after the payment of operating expenses and other expenses, and with the exception of a million dollar revolving fund, the balance of the T V. A.'s receipts shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BALL. But in effect that has been repealed each year by this proviso in the appropriation act.

Mr. HILL. In effect it has been repealed by the proviso, which has caused them to put all the money into this fund, and then have the Congress reappropriate all the money, receipts, revenues, and direct appropriations.

Mr. BALL. Is the balance at the end of each fiscal year in the T. V. A. fund taken into account in the appropriation? I notice, for instance, where the reappropriation is stricken out, the appropriation out of the Treasury is increased from $136,000,000 to $172,000,000, roughly about $36,000,000. That is to take care of turning this balance into the Treasury?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. If the amendment were agreed to, unless the specific appropriation were made every year, none of the receipts could be used, none of the revenue which came in could be used.

Mr. BALL. They could use them for that year. but at the end of the year they would have to turn in the balance.

Mr. McKELLAR. The War Department could not use revenues it received, either, unless we made appropriations.

Mr. HILL. No; and the War Department does not run a business, as the T. V. A. does; but other Government corporations, such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, have latitude such as that granted the T. V. A., in fact, much greater latitude.

The Inland Waterways Corporation, in which the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has always been so much interested, and which he has supported so loyally, has such latitude with reference to its income and flexibility for operations. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank—a number of these corporations which are engaged in business are treated in that way They are differentiated from the strictly Government agency which is not in business in any way whatever, and they are given this flexibility in reference to the use of their receipts.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr HILL. I yield.

Mr BALL. It seems to me that in times such as these, for this kind of a business organization a revolving fund of a million dollars probably is not nearly large enough, but if the revolving fund were increased to five million, or to a sufficient amount to meet any emergency which might arise, then it would be possible, it seems to me, to stop turning this balance back every year, and they could simply be permitted to operate under the act and submit their estimates to the committees on appropriations.

Mr. HILL Under the basic act, section 26, they can use their income; they can use their receipts.

Mr. BALL. They can use their receipts during the year.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. BALL. But Congress does not reappropriate the balance.

Mr. HILL. They can hold back as much as they think should be held back for operation purposes.

Mr. BALL. How would this language affect their right to hold back enough to meet any emergency?

Mr. HILL. This language would not have that effect. If the language were stricken out, they could still use their receipts under the basic law, section 28, but if the language were stricken out, and nothing else were done, they could not use their unexpended balances, appropriations for dams and construction, direct appropriations.

Mr. BALL. The appropriation is increased about thirty-six million, which is the total of the balances.

Mr. HILL. About $36,000,000 of unexpended balances goes into the construction of the dams, the steam plants, and other installations. That is money which has been appropriated already out of the Treasury, but which has not yet been expended.

Mr. BALL. If we increase this appropriation $36,000,000, and strike out the language on page 72, but leave the basic act, without adopting the other amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, I cannot see how we would materially cripple the Authority.

Mr. HILL. No. If we struck that out, we then would revert to the basic law. The basic act is more flexible than the language of the appropriation bill. They could operate under the basic act with reference to their receipts. But instead of having one fund which is set up by this language in the appropriation bill, we would have a separate fund for these receipts, because if they once put them into the Treasury they will never get them out again. So Mr. Bell, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, wanted one fund, as I read earlier. He thought that was an easier way to audit the accounts and control them, having them all in one fund. And that one fund would be destroyed if the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I want to ask a question I intended to ask a moment ago when I was on my feet.

The Senator from Illinois assumed a condition which might exist, or something which might occur, when he asked us to suppose that a German or Jap saboteur could do damage or might do damage to the transmission system, or to some of the properties of the Authority, and that money would be required for repairs—which of course would be true—in which event an appropriation would have to be requested of the Congress. He asked the Senator from Alabama a question based on that assumption, assuming that the "McKellar amendment," as he called it, should be agreed to. I wanted to ask the Senator this question: Assume such a thing should happen, why would there be any objection to asking Congress for an appropriation?

Mr. HILL. The question would be as to how much delay would be caused. It would be a question of delay. We are in a war.

Mr. STEWART. I have heard that.

Mr. HILL. We have to produce aluminum, we have to produce phosphorus, we have to produce magnesium, we have to produce aircraft, we have to produce many other things necessary to carry on the war with all the expedition possible. As the Senator knows, when it is necessary to go to the Bureau of the Budget, to go through the House Committee on Appropriations and the House, through the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Senate, and finally get a bill signed by the President, it takes time.

Mr. STEWART. That would be about the only objection, would it not? Of course, Congress could be trusted to make any appropriation necessary to make such repairs as were proper to be made in wartime, if such a thing as the Senator from Illinois imagines should occur.

Mr. HILL. The delay might be fatal, I say to the Senator. The question of whether we will have 1,000 bombers, 2,000 bombers, or 5,000 bombers, at a particular place might make a tremendous difference. If the Senator wants any examples, I think the battles which have been lost in the present war will tell the story, as time and again the forces of the United Nations have gone down in defeat because, as it has been well expressed, men, supplies, and planes were "too little and too late."

Mr. STEWART. I think Congress could be depended on to act as rapidly as it was possible to put the machinery of the Congress in motion, and I do not believe any delay would be experienced which would result in any danger at all. If I thought that would be the result, I should not support the amendment. I am just as patriotic in my feelings as is the Senator from Illinois, who likewise pounded the desk and raised his voice to a high pitch a moment ago when he proclaimed in a patriotic spirit that he was not willing to permit anything to be done that would hamper the war effort. Nor am I, and if the Senator from Alabama will permit me to say so, I might say that some of those who have been furnishing information to the Senator's side with respect to the repeal of this provision have undertaken to stress the fact that they think such action would impede the war effort. I presume they have told the Senator that.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that no one in this body esteems or respects him more than do I, but it is my own opinion, arrived at by myself, without

suggestion from anyone else, that the adoption of this amendment might and undoubtedly would seriously impede our war effort, particularly as that war effort must be carried out in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. STEWART. Let me say to the Senator that I had in mind more what some of the newspapers which have been misrepresenting this situation down in Tennessee have been printing recently. They have been proclaiming loudly that it would hamper the war effort and impair the services which the T. V. A. has been rendering to the people of Tennessee. I did not mean to say to the Senator that I thought he was acting facetiously in this matter, or undertaking to make misstatements to this body. The Senator knows I did not mean that.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that, of course.

Mr. STEWART. I do know that certain interests in the State of Tennessee, where, of course, a great portion of the T. V. A. is located, have made statements which are absolutely false with respect to this amendment. I am pretty well disgusted with their attitude. That does not concern the Senator, of course, and the other Members of this body I assume have not seen the Tennessee papers, and do not know about what they have stated.

Mr. HILL. What the Senate wants is the facts.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; and the absolute truth.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. I would not support this amendment at all if I thought it would hamper the war effort. But why there should be any objection to coming to Congress and asking each year for an appropriation ample and sufficient to conduct the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority is more than I am able to understand. That is what is required of practically every other governmental agency, excepting the banking agencies and the money agencies. Why there should be objection to it in this case is more than I am able to understand.

As to the suggestion made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] a moment ago to the effect that the revolving fund might be increased from a million to even five or six million dollars, enough to anticipate and apprehend the emergencies which have been referred to—storms, sabotage, or what not—I think that might perhaps furnish a very adequate remedy in the situation.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I did not wish to speak in his time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question, first stating to him that since the war began the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, of which my friend, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is chairman, has appropriated every dollar that has been asked for the support of the war directly or indirectly. I am afraid we have gone even further sometimes than we should have gone, so anxious has the committee been to appropriate the money necessary to carry on the war. Has the Senator from Alabama greater faith in Mr. Lilienthal than he has in his associates on the Appropriations Committee for the appropriation of every dollar of this money?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is not a question of greater faith in Mr. Lilienthal or greater faith in someone else. The point is that Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of his board are on the ground in the T. V. A. area at Knoxville, Tenn., with their engineers and experts, and they can, of course, act much more quickly and with much more speed than if they have to come to Congress and go through the routine and the procedure of getting appropriations from Congress. I used the illustration a little while ago that the very bill we are now considering has in it an appropriation for a phosphorus plant which the Army is very anxious to have established—a phosphorus plant to be built by the T. V. A. The bill passed the House on the 22d of January, over 3 months ago. It has not as yet passed the Senate. As a result no start has been made even toward the construction of this phosphorus plant. The Senator ought not to try to lug in a question of faith between the Congress and Mr. Lilienthal. If the Senator would think a little bit more about the facts and a little bit less about Mr. Lilienthal, I believe we would get along better and faster. It is not a question of faith between Mr. Lilienthal and the Congress. The question is that the board of directors of the T. V. A. can, of course, act with a great deal more expedition if they themselves can act, than if they have to go through the procedure and the routine of getting an appropriation through the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator objects to that sort of a question I will ask him another one. The Tennessee Valley Authority helps to furnish power for the making of about 40 percent of the aluminum made in the United States. It does not furnish all the power, because the Aluminum Company itself has an enormous amount of power. It has several dams, and, as I recall, steam plants. In Tennessee we make about 40 percent of the aluminum produced in the United States. In Oregon, Washington, and California about 40 percent is produced. The plants in Washington, Oregon, and California are owned by the Government. The power plant in Tennessee is owned by the Government. If all these dire results are going to happen to us in Tennessee, if we are going to be raided by enemy airplanes, and our plants put out of business, and if we ought to let the T. V. A. have all the money they say they want regardless of every other consideration, why should not the same rule apply to the Grand Coulee Dam, and the Bonneville Dam, and the Central Valley Dam project in California? A thunderstorm or lightning may damage one of those projects. It is just as likely that lightning should strike and destroy the plant in California as it is in Tennessee. The officials in charge would have to come immediately to the Congress for help. Those three plants in the West are among the largest in the world. Why does the Senator make a distinction between four plants belonging to the Government?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that I tried to make that clear to him earlier in my speech, and I hesitate to go back over it all again.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not blame the Senator for hesitating.

Mr. HILL. I hesitate because if I were to start and try to enlighten the Senator about everything that has been brought up in this debate, as demonstrated by his speech on last Friday, I would hold the Senate for about a week's time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, I hope the Senator will not reply to my speech.

Mr. HILL. No; the Senate does not want to stay here that long. We know how hard a job it would be to conclude such a debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would be willing to vote right now if the Senator is willing.

Mr. HILL. As I said before, the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams have been in the process of construction. They are not as yet completed. Because of the urgent need for power, they have been selling some power to two or 3 aluminum companies, but they have not yet gone into a power distribution business covering an area such as has the Tennessee Valley Authority. There is now pending in Congress the bill which I had here a few minutes ago and held up to view for the benefit of Senators—a bill introduced by the two Senators from Washington [Mr. BONE and Mr. WALLGREN], to give to the Columbia River Authority, which will be the authority for the control and operation of these dams, the same flexibility in its operations as the Tennessee Valley Authority now has. So, when this Authority goes into the business, as the Tennessee Valley Authority is now in the business when it covers an area comparable to the area covered by the Tennessee Valley Authority, when it has the number of customers approaching the number of customers the Tennessee Valley Authority has, then the Columbia River Authority will have the same flexibility and will have the same power which is now enjoyed by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief observation, and I shall try not to interrupt him again?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I asked the question a moment ago why there would be objection to coming to Congress and asking for appropriations. The Senator said the element of delay might sometimes be disastrous. I simply wish to make the observation that the Navy Department and the War Department come to the Congress for appropriations for airplanes, for warships, for munitions, for guns, for everything they use with which to fight.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but they do not run a business like that of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. STEWART. No; but they are doing the fighting for the country.

Mr. HILL. They are doing the fighting for the country, but the privates who are doing the fighting in the field never see Congress.

Mr. STEWART. No; they do not see Congress, but the Congress can be depended upon to vote the amount neces-

sary to build ships and airplanes. We have to be depended upon for that purpose, and I think likewise we can be depended upon to support the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and we are going to be depended upon to do so, because we are going to pass this bill as we have passed appropriation bills in the last 9 or 10 years, to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to carry on. We have always shown that we can be depended upon to do this, and we can be depended upon to do it now. We are not going to hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. STEWART. I do not agree with the Senator that we can be depended upon to pass the bill in the same form as previously.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there not this difference between the situation described by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to appropriating annually for the Army and the Navy, and the T. V. A., that the Army and the Navy have appropriations of which they have absolute control, and they make contracts with those who are to build warships or tanks, and whatever is to be built in the training of an army and so forth, whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority is a vast utility organized and established by Congress. It is organized to make contracts with cities and with private industries for the furnishing of power, and to do all the things necessary in order to carry out its obligations. One of the things that is absolutely essential is that those who enter into contracts with the T. V. A. must know beyond the peradventure of doubt that they are to receive the power contracted for. That means that day by day, and week by week, the Tennessee Valley Authority must be in a position to do those things necessary to furnish the power, otherwise it could not enter into long-term contracts with either cities or with private industries.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The situation is not at all analogous between the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is a vast business organization, a vast utility created by Congress, and the War Department or the Navy Department, which get appropriations from Congress, and then spend those appropriations in the production of things which they think are necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about Bonneville? What about Grand Coulee?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Appropriations Committees in Congress in the annual appropriations do not even designate how many tanks are to be built out of the money to be appropriated. There is a vast amount of discretion and flexibility left with the War Department and the Navy Department as to the material they shall produce with the money we appropriate to them.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. But under the committee amendment, this new policy which is attempted to be inaugurated by the committee amendment, the Tennessee Valley Authority would have no flexibility at all to speak of. It would have to come back here. It could not build a transmission line without the specific appropriation from Congress. It could never guarantee to any community or to any industry that Congress would appropriate the money in the future necessary for it to carry on its business and keep its contracts with these private organizations or with municipalities.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky is exactly correct, and the Senator knows that the Tennessee Valley Authority not only has contracts direct with industry, such as with the Aluminum Co. of America, the Reynolds Metals Co., the Monsanto Chemical Co., and other big companies, but it distributes and sells power through 115 municipalities or cooperative associations, and it has to be able to let those municipalities and these cooperative associations, as well as these great industries, know that come what may or what might, that power will be there on the line 24 hours out of the 24 hours of every day of every month.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that there may be an inclination on the part of some to regard the Tennessee Valley Authority as a purely local enterprise. In a sense it is, although it distributes its power within six States. However, it is now more than a local enterprise, because 80 percent of its power is being expended upon war industries, and there is now in contemplation the establishment of additional war industries in the Tennessee Valley because power is available. Obviously, unless such industries could depend upon the continuity of power, and unless they could feel that there would be no serious interruption with their power, they would not feel free to enter into a contract with a concern which must depend upon the whims of Congress and wait 3 months to obtain an appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know of any private business in America which would put its business in a position in which it had to rely upon congressional action in order to continue in business?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not; and that is no reflection on Congress.

Mr. HILL. It is no reflection on Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is one of the things with which we must contend legislatively. If the expenditure of any of the funds for war purposes or any other purposes in this bill had depended upon the speed with which we enact legislation, it might be that some of these plants might have been idle for the past 3 months, since the House passed the bill.

Mr. HILL. I have just cited an illustration—and it is no criticism of Congress. There is an appropriation in this bill for a phosphorous plant which the War Department wants as quickly as possible. The bill passed the House on the 22d of January, and has not yet passed the Senate. Nearly 3½ months have elapsed. We know that Congress has many things to do. We know that Congress is busy with all kinds of legislation. It is no criticism of Congress that we take into consideration the fact that we are busy and have a great deal to do, and therefore know the necessity of permitting others to act when, if we had to act, very likely there would be great delay.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Would not the emergency fund in the bill, about which we have been talking, take care of the very situation described by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HILL. We might provide for any kind of an emergency fund; and if we should do so, I am frank to admit that it would perhaps take care of the situation for 1 year. However, if the emergency fund were not used, and the T. V. A. should come back next year and ask for the same amount, we might say, "You do not need all that money. You had it last year and did not use it. You used only so much last year. You need nothing like that amount of money." We should next be charging the T. V. A. with padding its accounts and trying to get more money than it needed. There is no way in the world for the T. V. A., the Bureau of the Budget, or the Congress to know, when the estimates are submitted and when the appropriations are made, exactly what the need for expenditures by the T. V. A. will be.

Mr. STEWART. That is the reason we have a deficiency subcommittee functioning every day in the year.

Mr. HILL. Yes; we have such a committee. As I say, the phosphorus plant has been held up in the Senate alone for three and a half months.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The estimates for the T. V. A. are made approximately 9 months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. Which means about 21 months before the end of that year?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; 21 months before the end of the fiscal year. The estimates which are made for the annual appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, which begins on July 1 next, were made last September.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been shown that, especially in the stress of war, when the load placed upon all Government organizations is enormously increased, no organization can submit an accurate estimate of the amount of money it will need 9 months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. Particularly with the Nation at war.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is shown in the present instance. Since last September the estimates of the T. V. A. have necessarily been revised, and they must be revised from week to week. So it seems to me that it would be impracticable for the T. V. A. to come to Congress every time it finds itself confronted with a

new requirement, or every time it may have to build a new transmission line. It may have to buy coal in larger quantities than it anticipated. It may have to employ more labor than it anticipated 9 months ahead of time. It seems to me impracticable, as a business proposition, for the T. V. A. to come to Congress to obtain specific authority for every expenditure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why would not the same argument apply to the Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other projects?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects are served by a single dam. There is no widespread series of dams, as there is in the case of the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. There will be 18 dams and two great steam plants in the T. V. A. system, covering hundreds of miles in this area. When Grand Coulee and Bonneville become parts of a great system such as the T. V. A. is today, they must have the same flexibility. That is why the Senators from Washington have introduced their bill, which is now before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. BALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not true that the War Department itself, with all its activities and unforeseen emergencies, must come to the Congress to obtain its appropriations? Is it not true that the Navy Department, with all its unforeseen emergencies, must come to the Congress to obtain its appropriations? If that be true—and certainly they are just as important to the Nation at this time as anything else—why should not the T. V. A., having no more importance than the War Department or the Navy Department, come to Congress for its appropriations?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator, as I have said several times previously, that the T. V. A. is in a different category from the War Department or the Navy Department. It is in the category of an agency of government which is in business. Whenever we set up such an agency of government and put it into business we must recognize that it must have flexibility, and we have given flexibility to it. The Tennessee Valley Authority has possibilities for all kinds of situations arising which the War Department and the ordinary Government agencies do not have.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator would not say that the War Department, which is perhaps the most important department of government in the present emergency of war, is not in business?

Mr. HILL. It is not in business in the sense that the Tennessee Valley Authority is in business.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about the Post Office Department? It is in business.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not have to come to Congress every time it wants to buy supplies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it comes to Congress for its appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Every time it wants to buy something to supply the Post Office Department it does not have to come to Congress and obtain the approval of Congress for that item.

Mr. HILL. Of course it does not.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Post Office Department must come to Congress for its appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it does come to Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it comes to Congress; but it does not require specific approval of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads or of the Congress as to each item for which it spends money.

Mr. McKELLAR. It must come before the Appropriations Committee for each item.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it justifies before the Appropriations Committee the total amount of its appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is the largest business in the world today.

Mr. BARKLEY. We might as well say that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation ought to come to Congress every time it makes a loan out of its revolving fund, or that the United States Housing Authority ought to come to Congress every time it wants to establish a slum project.

Mr. HILL. Or that the Inland Waterways organization should come to Congress every time it wishes to add to the number of barges.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or that the Federal Housing Administration ought to come to Congress every time it insures a loan which some bank has made in order to build a home.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have heard of no such contention.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress cannot substitute itself as the board of directors of the various corporations which it has created.

Mr. HILL. It has recognized that fact by giving the corporations the very flexibility which we have given the Tennessee Valley Authority. In fact, some of the corporations, such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and some others, have far more leeway and flexibility than has the T. V. A.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Kentucky gave me the impression that if the committee amendment on page 72 were adopted the T. V. A. could not spend its receipts during the next fiscal year, and that the receipts would have to go immediately into the Treasury. It seems to me, from a reading of the amendment, that that would not be true unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee were also adopted.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. In effect, since there is a balance of $30,000,000 and we propose to increase the appropriation by $36,000,000, the committee amendment would not deprive the T. V. A. of any authority or flexibility which it now has, except that it would be required to account for the funds and keep two separate accounts whereas it now keeps one. We would then go back to the basic act.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The use of the receipts would not be affected, as the basic act would provide for them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That modification is an afterthought. It was not contained in the amendment reported by the committee in the beginning.

Mr. BALL. I am referring to the committee amendment as it reads in the bill before us.

Mr. HILL. It would deny the use of the unexpended balances.

Mr. BALL. It would make a bookkeeping problem for the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. If the committee amendment were adopted, it would deny the use of the unexpended balances.

Mr. BALL. Only in principle, because it is proposed that we appropriate $36,000,000 more for the same purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. BALL. I cannot see how the T. V. A. would be crippled next year. I can see that it might possibly have to keep accounts on two funds instead of one; but I cannot see that it would have any less money to spend.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is an increase in the appropriation of $36,000,000 because of leaving out this provison. There is no possible excuse for saying that there is any attempt to cripple the T. V. A. Heaven knows, I would be the last one on earth to cripple that organization.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Minnesota says, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee were rejected, the receipts would then be handled in accordance with the basic law.

Mr. BALL. The T. V. A. could spend the receipts almost as it chose.

Mr. HILL. It could spend them under the provisions of the basic act.

Mr. BALL. It would have to keep accounts for 1943 and 1942 for two separate funds, instead of one.

Mr. HILL. The money from the receipts would not go into the Tennessee Valley Authority fund under the basic law, and there would have to be separate accounts. If the T. V. A. once put it into this Tennessee Valley Authority fund they would lose control of it, if the Congress did not appropriate it out of that fund.

Mr. BALL. Except insofar as they needed to pay operating costs?

Mr. HILL. No. If they wanted to use that for operating costs, or hold back any for operating costs, they could not put it in the fund.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I would not interrupt the distinguished Senator from Alabama again, except for the reason that I want to get the matter clearly in my own mind; and if I can contribute anything toward clarifying the minds of Senators on the other question, I think I should do so. I find that the Congress has not in any way relaxed

the requirement that the Comptroller General audit the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which requirement has been in effect since the basic act was passed.

However, in connection with the amendment under discussion, I do find that Public Law 306 of the Seventy-seventh Congress requires—if I may read it—that—

Section 9 (b) of the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the Treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provisions of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to section 236 Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (41 Stat. 24), and accounts for all receipts and disbursements by or for the Corporation shall be rendered accordingly: * * *."

I also find, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, that in the adjustment and settlement of accounts there is a provision here which requires that credit shall be given:

and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the Treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of the said act.

That in no way relaxes the requirement of an audit.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. It in no way interferes with the authority and power of the Comptroller General to audit the books.

So I think the point should be cleared up that under the basic act it is his duty to audit; all facilities are provided for him; and if audits are not made I think it might be on account of the Comptroller General rather than the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. And knowing the Comptroller General as I know him, I do not think that he is ever derelict in any duty.

Mr. HILL. I am sure that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt in that connection, I may say that these audits not only have been made by the Comptroller General but the Tennessee Valley Authority has been audited year by year by one of the outstanding private audit concerns of the United States; and in no instance, so far as I know, has that audit disagreed with the audit conducted by the Comptroller General with respect to the books and the expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. In order to be absolutely careful, to make sure that their accounts were all right, each year they have had a firm of private auditors audit their accounts; and in no instance have they found anything wrong with them.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I desire to conclude, if I may; however, if the Senator desires that I yield to him, I shall do so.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with respect to the matter of the audit I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that on August 31, 1935, the following amendment was added to the basic act:

Provided, That such report—

Which is the audit report—

shall not be made until the Corporation shall have had reasonable opportunity to examine the exceptions and criticisms of the Comptroller General or the General Accounting Office, to point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and to file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report.

I have communicated with the Comptroller General, and also I have referred to his report of 1941 in which I find he states as follows:

There were received on June 5, 1941—

Six years after the passage of the act—

formal replies of the Corporation to exceptions included in audit reports by this office for the fiscal years 1934 to 1939.

In other words, the T. V. A. held up the reports to Congress for 6 years, because they failed to reply to the criticisms and the exceptions made by the Comptroller General's office.

I was wondering if the Senator from Alabama was familiar with that, when he said that annual audits and annual reports had been made to Congress, when, as a matter of fact, no reports have been made to Congress with respect to the auditing of the T. V. A.'s operations.

Mr. McKELLAR. And there could not be any under the present law.

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. HILL. As I said earlier—and I suppose the Senator was not able to be here at the time—the present Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, appeared before the House Committee on Military Affairs in December, which was subsequent to the time when the statement the Senator has just read was made; and there Mr. Warren made to that committee a statement which, earlier in my remarks, I read to the Senate. I shall not read the whole statement again, but I shall read this sentence:

This proposed agreement—

And the Comptroller General was then talking about an agreement between the T. V. A. and the Comptroller General's Office, which is embodied in a bill which the Congress has passed; and Mr. Warren was before the House Committee on Military Affairs testifying in behalf of that bill when he made this statement:

This proposed agreement recognizes that latitude—

Which is the latitude we have been talking about today—

but makes definite that they—

Meaning, of course, the T. V. A.—

come under the Budget and Accounting Act.

Mr. BYRD. What I wanted the Senator to address himself to was the fact that for 6 years the Tennessee Valley Authority prevented the making of any report to Congress, because they failed to reply and to send back to the Comptroller General the exceptions that the Comptroller General's Office made, which he was required by law first to present to the T. V. A., and to obtain their reply, before he could make his report to Congress.

Mr. HILL. This is the first time that the memorandum or paper to which the Senator refers has come to my attention; and, of course, I shall have to read it and be fully advised as to its contents.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will refer to the Comptroller General's report of 1941 he will see that therein it is stated:

The formal replies to the exceptions, the first one of which was entered on April 5, 1935, were made on June 5, 1941—

Six years later; and during those 6 years no report was made to Congress because the Comptroller General was prohibited from making a report until he received the answer from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us see what the law provides on that point. This is what the law provides, if I am reading it correctly—and if I am not, I want the Senator to correct me:

Provided, That such report shall not be made until the Corporation shall have had reasonable opportunity to examine the exceptions and criticisms of the Comptroller General or the General Accounting Office, to point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and to file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report.

I want to point out, Mr. President, that that might be a provision behind which some Comptroller General could hide, and say that he was precluded from making a report; but if he wants to make his report and to act in accordance with the law, certainly it is not incumbent upon him to wait year after year under a provision that he shall wait only a reasonable time. I think it is a nice excuse, if a Comptroller General does not want to make a report; but certainly it does not preclude him from making the report, as the Senator from Virginia would have us believe.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not deny, however, that 6 years elapsed before these exceptions were returned; does he?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not deny that.

Mr. BYRD. Was the Tennessee Valley Authority then acting in accordance with the law?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I say that they were not acting in accordance with the law; but the fact that they have not acted in accordance with the law should furnish no excuse for the Comptroller General not to act in accordance with the law. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. BYRD. The question is only one of determining what is reasonable. As a matter of fact, the Comptroller General received the formal replies on June 5, 1941, 6 years after the exceptions were

made and sent to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. However, the plain, undisputed fact is that 6 years have passed, and there has been no examination of the Tennessee Valley Authority's books by the General Accounting Office, because the Tennessee Valley Authority has not permitted them to be examined.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no, Mr. President; that statement is not quite correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a plain, everyday fact. I challenge the Senator to find a report from the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BARKLEY. The statement that there was no audit is not an accurate statement. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee does not intend to say that.

Mr. McKELLAR. An audit by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes. If there was an audit, and if any criticisms were made—and they must have been made before the T. V. A. had an opportunity to reply to them—after waiting for a reasonable time, the Comptroller General could have filed his report with Congress, and could have said, "We have waited a year"—or 2 years, or whatever the period might be—"but they have made no response; and this is our report."

If there had been an audit, and if criticisms were made, I do not know why they waited 6 years. It may be that they did not; there may be a reason for that; but certainly the Comptroller General did not have to wait an "unreasonable time," when the law says only a "reasonable time."

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have the floor, but I am willing to take it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I realize that, but the Senator's colleague has agreed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was the necessity then for the compromise in the adjusted bill which was passed last November, which nominally gave the General Accounting Office some sort of jurisdiction and at the same time excepted the T. V. A.? I will read the exception to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is an exception where the board of directors, acting as a board of directors, find expenditures to be necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. The accounts of the T. V. A. were not to be interfered with in any way in the world. In other words, the General Accounting Office has, under the law of November 21, 1941, not one particle of control over the accounts of the T. V. A.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we realize that the provision as to a board of directors means what it says, and, if there is a board of directors, it must have some discretion in the expenditure of money.

Mr. McKELLAR. For instance, the case of the president of a corporation receiving $75,000 a year and his stenographer $40,000 a year, under the authority of the board of directors of one of the concerns having contracts with the Government, as was revealed a short time ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was an isolated case of a shoestring corporation undertaking to defeat the tax laws of the country, which they cannot do, for the Secretary of the Treasury can make an assessment against that company nullifying all the allowances it made. That is not a parallel case and the isolated case in Cleveland, where some hijackers undertook to "skin" the Government, does not represent the business of this country. I apologize to the Senator from Ohio, but I am sure that he does not approve of what the hijackers in his home town did. I repeat, however, such acts do not represent businesses; they are not typical of the corporations of this country. It seems to me that when the Congress has created an organization to develop a great natural resource and created a board of directors, unless it is a misnomer, the board must have some discretion. We cannot substitute our judgment for theirs.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator think that they ought to have discretion to make illegal expenditures?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not; the Senator need not have asked that question.

Mr. BYRD. This bill now gives them the right to make an illegal expenditure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all; I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I will read what it says.

Mr. BARKLEY. We could do an illegal act here.

Mr. BYRD. Let me read the provision:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the Treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

That gives the board the supreme power to control its own expenditures, regardless of the action of the Comptroller General.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the Senator desires to read into that act the right to make an illegal expenditure, he can do so.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator show me wherein the board is prohibited from making an illegal expenditure?

Mr. BARKLEY. It might be said, in the same category and by analogy, that there is nothing in the law which prohibits Congress from passing an unconstitutional act, which sometimes we do; but we exercise our discretion; we are exercising our judgment; we are not criminally liable for the exercise of our judgment. We may vote for and pass a law which the Supreme Court may declare to be unconstitutional, and, after it has done so, it proves that we have done an illegal act, an unconstitutional act; but it is necessary to leave discretion to men, and there is no criminal responsibility attached to it.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator from Kentucky deny that under this provision the board of directors is the supreme authority to determine what expenditures are proper and what expenditures are legal?

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume that was the very purpose of that act, which was drawn and sponsored by the Comptroller General himself, who at the time suggested by the Senator from Alabama testified in behalf of it when it was passed in 1941. It was recognized, I think, by the Comptroller General and by the T. V. A. and by Congress, because there was not any serious objection to the enactment of the statute, that in their capacity and acting upon their responsibility as a board of directors, there must come expenditures here and there and now and then which must be determined by their best judgment. Whether it be in an emergency or in a routine matter it seems to me makes no particular difference, and, even if we admit that, in the exercise of their judgment, they might conceivably approve an appropriation which might technically be regarded as illegal, I do not think that, in any way, argues against giving them the discretion.

Mr. BYRD. The present law makes the action of the Board final, does it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It makes the action of the Board final as to expenditures which they think are necessary.

Mr. BYRD. Regardless of whether they are necessary or illegal, any action of the Board is final in the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same thing is true of boards of directors of the R. F. C., the Import-Export Bank, and other Government corporations.

Mr. BYRD. They are subject to having suits instituted against them by the stockholders.

Mr. BARKLEY. In these cases the stockholders happen to be the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to read again this marvelous provision giving the authority to the General Accounting Office to examine the accounts of the T. V. A., but requiring that they shall not interfere with the board of directors. The provision reads:

> And, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the Treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure—

Not one expenditure, not some simple expenditure, but "any expenditure"—

> which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that language any more marvelous now that it was last year, when the Senator voted for it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not vote for it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The RECORD shows the Senator was present.

Mr. McKELLAR. The RECORD does not so show; the Senator is mistaken about it. Nowhere does the RECORD so show, and the Senator from Tennessee has said, time and again, on this floor that he never heard of this act until a few days ago when he told the Senator from Kentucky that it had been slipped through.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was not a roll call on the bill, but I understood the Senator from Nebraska or some other Senator referred to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee was present on that day. Whether he voted for it or not, I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not here when the bill passed, and, if I had been, I should have objected to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Kentucky is not responsible for that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Alabama longer.

Mr. HILL. I have held the floor for about 2 hours and a half; I do not desire to be discourteous, but we have been over the act to which the Senator referred regarding the Comptroller General, and that is really not at issue. There is really no amendment which would change that act at all.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to discuss another question. I want to reply to the criticism that has been made of the Comptroller General for not reporting the facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the Senator from Alabama will permit me, the present Comptroller General was not the Comptroller General during all the 6 years referred to.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator from Utah has criticized the Comptroller General, whoever he was during these years, because, for most of the time, he did not report the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority had not replied to the exceptions taken by the Comptroller General.

Mr. BARKLEY. During most of that time, I will say to the Senator, there was an Acting Comptroller General.

Mr. BYRD. I am not discussing that fact. What I want to call the attention of the Senate to, and of the Senator from Alabama to, is that from the report of 1937 this statement is presented to Congress:

> During the fiscal years 1936 and 1937 exceptions were made and the Authority regularly notified on a total of 7,964 transactions involving $15,542,459.70. Of such number and amount there was released, after proper explanation or recovery, a total of 3,077 exceptions, amounting to $4,814,950, leaving 4,887 still pending in the amount of $10,727,509.70.

So a report was made to Congress, but, so far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no report made to Congress with respect to the balance of 4,887 exceptions, amounting to over $10,000,000. So there has been something radically wrong, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, in the auditing of the T. V. A. from its very inception, because the Congress has not on record one single report of the auditing of the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. Is not that a report from which the Senator has just read?

Mr. BYRD. It is merely a report stating that the Accounting Office has not been able to complete the audit because the T. V. A. has not responded. I read from the annual report of the Acting Comptroller General of the United States for the fiscal year 1937. It seems to me, in view of the vast sums of money T. V. A. is expending, that their accounts should be audited; there should be a definite report presented to Congress by the Comptroller General each year, and the Comptroller General should not be prohibited by law, as he is now, from making a fair and full audit of the transactions of the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator it is my understanding that the bill does exactly what the Comptroller General interprets the present law to mean, and that is exactly the gist of what he said before the House Military Affairs Committee when he made this statement:

> This proposed agreement—

That is the agreement embodied in the bill in behalf of which he was testifying—

> This proposed agreement recognizes that latitude but makes definite that they come under the Budget and Accounting Act.

This means, of course, the annual auditing of the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Comptroller General.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HILL. I yield, but I am anxious to conclude as soon as I can.

Mr. LEE. If the Senator will be good enough to yield to me until I finish the contribution I should like to make in his argument——

Mr. HILL. I have occupied the floor now for about 2½ hours, and I really should like to conclude, if I may. Will the Senator indicate how long his contribution might take?

Mr. LEE. Not very long.

Mr. HILL. Suppose the Senator lets me finish, and, then, as soon as I get through, I am sure the Chair will recognize the Senator and we will be glad to hear his contribution. I have been on my feet for over 2½ hours, and I should like to conclude, if possible.

Mr. LEE. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I will yield to the Senator if he insists, but if he makes a contribution some other Senator may desire to answer his contribution, and I should like to conclude if I can. Is that agreeable to the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. HILL. I now see the Senator from Tennessee on his feet. He sees the Senator from Oklahoma interrupting, so he desires to get into the debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am coming to the Senator's rescue.

Mr. LEE. I believe I should be correct in saying that the Senator from Alabama has not yielded any more than the Senator from Tennessee yielded, the last time he spoke, to certain Members of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I have not declined to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LEE. I should appreciate the Senator's yielding to me, and I think he will thank me after he has yielded.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma. Does he want me to thank him in advance? [Laughter.]

Mr. LEE. Both before and after would be all right.

Mr. HILL. I have such confidence in the Senator that I thank him in advance.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask the Senator categorically whether the amendment recommended by the committee would reduce the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority at all.

Mr. HILL. Whether the committee amendment would reduce the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. LEE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. If the committee amendment itself were agreed to, without the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, it would reduce the appropriation; yes.

Mr. LEE. But with that amendment it would not reduce the appropriation?

Mr. HILL. I could not say that, because that would depend upon what the receipts and revenues for the next year would be.

Mr. LEE. Then I will put the question in this way: In the Senator's opinion, would the committee amendment effect any saving to the Government without hindering the T. V. A.?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's question cannot be answered yes or no. It might be very costly to the Government in many ways. If the Senator had been in the Chamber earlier in the day he would have heard me tell the story about the T. V. A. getting receipts and making a $300,000 profit out of the use of those receipts.

Mr. LEE. I have been here listening to the argument all day; but the Senator started answering the question before he heard the end of the question. I said, Would it effect any saving without limiting the T. V. A.?

Mr. HILL. No; if it does not limit the T. V. A., it would not effect any saving.

Mr. LEE. Has there been any evidence of corruption or crookedness in the T. V. A. since 1935, since it had this revolving fund?

Mr. HILL. No; and it has been thoroughly investigated, as the Senator knows. The fact is that the joint committee of the two Houses which investigated T. V. A. particularly commended T. V. A. on its personnel, stating that it was surprising that the T. V. A., with the small salaries T. V. A. was able to pay in comparison with the salaries paid by private utilities and private businesses, was able to get men of the ability and character and standing that T. V. A. has in its organization.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator believe that the adoption of these committee amendments would seriously hinder or injure the operation of the T. V. A.?

Mr. HILL. The Senator does indeed.

Mr. LEE. The main question, then, does not seem to be one of crookedness or corruption or one of Government economy, but the effect would be to limit the T. V. A. by not keeping this revolving fund arrangement for use by the corporation. Is not that true?

Mr. HILL. That is true.

Mr. LEE. The Senator referred to a similar revolving fund arrangement provided in the bill offered by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] to set up a similar authority on the west coast. I wish to refer to three existing

laws on the statute books, which Congress has enacted, which provide revolving funds similar to the one which is sought to be destroyed by the committee amendment.

I read from the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, approved June 16, 1933, 48 Statutes at Large, chapter 98, page 273:

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

* * * * *

SEC. 84. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized, with the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, to reduce the capital of any Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation by such action as may be suitable for the purpose. The funds made available by any such reduction shall constitute a revolving fund, all or any part of which shall be available for use from time to time by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of increasing, with the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, the capital of any Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I now wish to quote from page 2 of the National Housing Act, as amended, the last sentence of section 2:

The total liability which may be outstanding at any time plus the amount of claims paid in respect of all insurance heretofore and hereafter granted under this section and section 6, as amended, less the amount collected from insurance premiums and other sources and deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the provisions of subsection (f) of this section, shall not exceed in the aggregate $165,000,000.

I may say that the effect of this paragraph is the same as that provided at the present time under the law which gives the T. V. A. the same privilege.

I now wish to quote from "Federal Farm Loan Act, with Amendments," page 93, section 6:

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 which shall be made available by the Congress as soon as practicable after the approval of this act and shall constitute a revolving fund to be administered by the Board as provided in this act.

I now wish to quote from the Bankhead-Jones Act, page 7, section 40, subsection (h):

(h) All money of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States or in any bank approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to withdrawal by the Corporation at any time, or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury may be invested in obligations of the United States. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized and directed to act as depositories, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the performance of its powers.

Mr. President that concludes the references I wish to make to the three laws now on the statute books which provide the same type of arrangement which is provided and which has been in existence since 1935 in connection with the T. V. A. It seems to me that these afford adequate precedent for us to keep the same arrangement for the T. V. A. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to the Senator for his contribution, a very fine contribution, coming from one who is always doing everything he can to the end that our war effort may be carried out with the greatest possible speed and effectiveness and that the people may receive electric power at fair and just rates.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] earlier today in his remarks spoke of the magnitude of the T. V. A. enterprise, an enterprise which is serving people in parts of 6 States, an enterprise with over 5,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines, an enterprise with some 252 large substations, an enterprise which will have, when it is completed, 18 great hydroelectric dams and 2 great steam plants, an enterprise which during the next fiscal year will distribute some seven and one-half billion kilowatt-hours in the great T. V. A. area; an enterprise which is making an outstanding and notable contribution to our war effort—in fact, an indispensable contribution to that effort.

As the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] brought out earlier today in his questioning, it is absolutely necessary that the power which the T. V. A. has contracted to sell to its customers be available at all times, that there be a continuous flow of this power, that the power be ready 24 hours of every day of every week of every month.

Now that we are at war, when the demand for power is constantly growing, when, week after week, there is an insistence on the part of the War Production Board and the Army and the Navy that additional power be brought into being, it is all the more important that the Tennessee Valley Authority have the flexibility with reference to its receipts that it has enjoyed during the past 9 years. There is no way in the world for any committee of Congress, for any Budget director, or for any one else, when the Budget estimates are made and the appropriations are made, to know what the needs and the demands and what the expenses of the Tennessee Valley Authority may be during the coming fiscal year.

Those estimates are usually made in September or October. The appropriation does not become available until the first of July, and then must cover the whole fiscal year of 12 months. Some 21 months' time ordinarily elapses from the time the estimates are first submitted until the time the appropriations are finally used. All kinds of emergencies are apt to arise.

Mr. President, I cited earlier in the day the fact that just a few weeks ago in the Mississippi area of the T. V. A. there was a terrible tornado, and some eight great towers, with transmission lines on those towers, were blown down. Of course those towers and those transmission lines had to be repaired immediately. There would have been no time to come to Congress to get the money for the repairs. We all recall the Allis-Chalmers strike which took place a year ago. Because of that strike, which could not possibly have been foreseen at the time the estimates for the fiscal year were prepared and agreed upon, the T. V. A. was delayed some 3 or 4 months in some of its hydroelectric installations. As the result, to meet the emergency situation, it had to spend money for coal, it had to spend money for labor, and for other purposes, and those expenditures could not possibly have been foreseen when the estimates were made or when the appropriations were made.

There is always the threat of dry weather. Some years we will have abundant rainfall. In other years we will have a drought. A drought may make a difference of as much as five to seven millions of dollars in expenses in one year's time, because if we have a drought, then we must use the more costly power, the power generated by coal and by labor, or we may even have to go out and buy a block of power from some utility corporation. We cannot foresee what the weather is going to be. We cannot foresee what expenses we may have to meet as the result of unfavorable weather conditions. Sometimes the plans for a dam are changed after the estimate and appropriations have been made. The change in these plans for dams may cause a delay, may cause expenditures that could not possibly have been foreseen.

Many different matters can arise which will cause unforeseen emergencies, which will cause unforeseen expenditures, and the only way in the world that the Tennessee Valley Authority can meet these expenditures is in the same way that every private utility meets unexpected expenditures, which is by using the money from the receipts taken in to pay the expenditures. That is exactly what the Tennessee Valley Authority has been doing for the last 9 years. No one has yet arisen on this floor, no one has arisen anywhere else in this country, to say that those expenditures were ever contrary to the intent or the will of the Congress, or in violation of any purpose of the Congress. No one has shown any dishonesty in those expenditures. No one has shown anything that would bring those expenditures into criticism or condemnation. Everywhere there has been honest, efficient, businesslike operation carried on by Mr. Lilienthal, the able chairman and his associates.

Mr. President, as I have said, it is more important now that we are in the great war, and with the Tennessee Valley as a great center of production of war materials, that this flexibility continue to exist. I cited the illustration, as did the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], of how we provided additional power for the Aluminum Co., the need for which no one could have foreseen when the estimates and appropriations were made. The Tennessee Valley Authority built the 51-mile transmission line in order that the production of aluminum might go on and that there might be no stoppage and no surcease in the production of aluminum.

Just last year the Electrometallurgical Co. was able to increase its production of ferrosilicon and of ferro-alloys by 100 percent because the Tennessee Valley Authority had flexibility and was able to provide the company with the power which was necessary for the 100-percent increase.

The increased need of power on the part of the company was not foreseen. It was not contemplated when the estimates for the appropriations were made. If the T. V. A. had not had the flexibility with reference to its receipts it would not have been able to supply the power for the company to increase the production—this production which is so necessary and so needed for our defense. The ferrosilicon produced by the company is an indispensable element in the production of steel and steel alloys. All these ferro-alloys are necessary to our defense and to the production of defense materials.

The same thing happened in connection with the Monsanto Chemical Co. and the Victor Chemical Co. They are great producers of phosphorus. This phosphorus goes into the manufacture of incendiary bombs. We have to have phosphorus in order to make incendiary bombs. We have to have phosphorus for smoke-screen purposes. We have to have phosphorus for other needed war chemicals. By reason of the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority last year had this flexibility and could use its receipts it was able to produce additional power and thus enable the Monsanto Chemical Co. and the Victor Chemical Co. greatly to increase their production of these war materials. The same thing is true with reference to the Reynolds Metals Co. When the estimates and the appropriations were made it was not foreseen that the Reynolds Metals Co. would want to increase its production of aluminum. No provision was made in those estimates or in those appropriations for any increased power for the Reynolds Metals Co. so they might increase their production of aluminum. But when it was found that the Reynolds Metals Co. needed additional power, when the War Production Board and the Army and the Navy said to the T. V. A. that they wanted the increase made, that it was necessary for our defense that the increase be made, the Tennessee Valley Authority because of this flexibility was in a position to provide and did provide the additional power necessary for the increased production of aluminum by the Reynolds Metals Co.

Mr. President, the hour is late. I could go on citing many other instances in which our war efforts and our war program have been greatly strengthened, fortified, and accelerated because of the flexibility given to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I shall not do so but I do wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that since the estimates were made for the very appropriation bill now before us there has been a demand on the Tennessee Valley Authority by the War Production Board, the Army, and the Navy for an additional 650,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power. Since the estimates were made for the very bill now before us the War Production Board, the Army, and the Navy have come to the Tennessee Valley Authority and said, "You must produce more power than you contemplated when you made your estimate. You must produce more power than we thought you would have to produce when you submitted your estimate. You must produce 650,000,000,000 more kilowatt-hours of power, because we need the additional power for additional production of ferro-alloys, aluminum, phosphorus, magnesium, carbide for synthetic-rubber production, additional production of aircraft, and many other absolutely necessary materials of warfare."

Those demands have come and that necessity has developed since the estimates for the very bill pending before us were submitted, illustrating that we cannot place the Tennessee Valley Authority in straitjacket. We cannot hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority without hamstringing the war effort of the United States and all the United Nations. I know of no better way to impede the war effort of our country than to hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority as is proposed in these amendments.

The Tennessee Valley Authority must have flexibility in order to buy coal, to hire and pay personnel, and, if need be, to rehabilitate obsolete plants. It must have authority to buy power from other utilities. Since these estimates were made the Tennessee Valley Authority, in conjunction with private utilities, has worked out an interconnecting system at Nashville, Tenn., under which system the Tennessee Valley Authority can obtain some 300,000 additional kilowatts of power. This interconnection was not foreseen when the estimates were made; but the industries need the 300,000 kilowatts of power and the Tennessee Valley Authority must go forward and make the interconnection and spend whatever money may be necessary to make it.

It is now estimated that the Tennessee Valley Authority to meet the war needs of our country—not domestic consumption, not consumption for commercial purposes, but the war needs of our country—will use more than 80 percent of the power which it will produce in the Tennessee Valley during the coming fiscal year, and that it will then have to go out of the valley and buy from private utilities, or from anybody who can sell a kilowatt of power to the Tennessee Valley Authority between $7,000,000 and $10,000,000 worth of power. There is a great power bottleneck in that valley today. I have referred to the great aluminum plants of the Aluminum Co. of America and of the Reynolds Metals Co. They must have power. The Tennessee Valley Authority, after generating all the power it can, will still have to purchase and resell to the industries, in order that they may be supplied, between $7,000,000 and $10,000,000 worth of power.

Shall we hamstring the Authority? Shall we say to it, "If you are to buy any power you must first come to Congress and let us weigh the proposal and delay it before you may spend a penny"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The natural question which occurs to me is this: Since the bill is still before us, and the amount of money carried in the appropriation is subject to change, if the situation is as the Senator has described it, can we not increase the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. HILL. The things to which I am referring are occurring every day. There is no way in the world for us to know today on May 4 what the need will be even on May 14, June 1, June 14, or July 1. We are in a great war fighting for the very life of our Nation; and if there is any one thing which the American people want and insist upon it is that we do nothing to impede the war effort; that we do nothing which might in any way prevent one more airplane, one more tank, or one more weapon from getting to our soldiers, who are fighting the war for us on the far-flung battle fronts of the earth.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Let me ask another question: Does the Senator believe that an appropriation of $36,000,000 is adequate to cover the presently known demands?

Mr. HILL. The unexpended balances alone amount to approximately $30,000,000. The unexpended balances are only for the construction of new dams and similar installations and are all needed for these purposes. That does not take into consideration at all the things about which I have been talking, such as operating steam plants, buying power from other utilities, repairing transmission lines, putting in new transmission lines, new substations, or anything of that kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to be discourteous. I wish to finish my speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator does; but the Senator does not want to make a misstatement.

Mr. HILL. No; I do not.

Mr. McKELLAR. The $36,100,000 in the bill is to take the place of the unexpended balances. There can be no dispute about it.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; but the $30,000,000 of unexpended balances would be included in the $36,100,000, which is needed to finish the dams, to finish the big steam plant, and to carry on installation work. There ought also to be available the receipts from the Corporation so that it may meet the other conditions which may arise.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is absolutely mistaken. The amount of the appropriation approved by the House is $136,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate has added $36,100,000 to take the place of the money which the Senator says he wants to use.

Mr. HILL. The bill as it passed the House would make an appropriation of $136,000,000. It would also carry over the unexpended balances, amounting to $30,000,000, and also make available the receipts of the Corporation. All the Senator from Tennessee would do would be to add $36,100,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Even counting that item, the amount appropriated is the same.

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only possible difference between the two provisions is that in one case the T. V. A. would have to come to Congress and obtain an appropriation; and in the other case it would appropriate whatever it chose.

Mr HILL. The amount is not the same at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am so advised by the clerk.

Mr. HILL. The facts are these: The House appropriated approximately $136,000,000 and also made available the unexpended balances, representing an additional $30,000,000, to complete the dams and power installations. The House also made available the receipts, which run anywhere from $25,000,000 to $36,000,000. That is a good deal more than $172,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The net result is that in the House $136,000,000 was appropriated, plus $30,000,000 of unexpended balances reappropriated, which made $166,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Plus the receipts, which would range from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps $36,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difference between that and what the Senate committee has done is that even with the reappropriation of the $30,000,000 the Senate committee adds only $6,000,000, in lieu of $25,000,000 to $36,000,000 of receipts. So there is quite a difference in the figures as between the House language and the bill as reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I think another point is contained in the question of the Senator from Vermont; and that is that if all this were done, the T. V. A. could not use the money; it would have to come to Congress and get deficiency appropriations every time anything of this kind happened.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably it would be here on an average of once a month before the next year has passed, requesting deficiency appropriations.

Does any Member of the Senate believe that if all such items were to be put into separate deficiency bills they would get through the House and Senate and through the committees, in time to have appropriated the money with which to do these things?

As I see it, that is a vital point. The T. V. A. cannot come to Congress and get deficiency appropriations every time it wants to buy a spool of thread or something of that kind.

Mr. HILL. Or to build a transmission line or something equally important.

Mr. NORRIS. Such procedure would be impracticable. Before the bills could be passed the need for them in the fiscal year would have passed, and the fiscal year would be over.

Mr. HILL. I have referred to this matter several times. I dislike to repeat; but, as the Senator knows, the War Department went to the Tennessee Valley Authority and stated that it needed a phosphorus plant. The Department asked the Tennessee Valley Authority to build the plant and carry on the operations because of the fine work the T. V. A. had been doing in its small plant at Muscle Shoals. The War Production Board joined the Army in urging the Tennessee Valley Authority to build the plant and put it into production as soon as possible. The money for the plant is provided for where? It is provided for in this pending bill. The bill passed the House of Representatives on the 22d day of January but has not yet passed the Senate—some 3½ months afterward.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator certainly is not at all informed about that matter. We have had at least three deficiency bills including just such items as the item for the phosphorus plant in Mobile. If the War Department, the War Production Board, or any other department of Government had come before the Appropriations Committee when it was dealing with the deficiency bills the money for the plant could have been had in January if they had wanted it. They have not wanted it much or they certainly would have asked for it.

Mr. HILL. The truth of the matter is that at one time, because of the need for the plant the item for it was lifted cut of this bill and put into a deficiency bill which went to conference where the item went out.

Mr. McKELLAR. It must have been very bad if it went out in conference.

Mr. HILL. It was an imperative item, but it went out. That item was at one time taken out of this bill, and put into a deficiency bill; it went to conference, went out, and now is in this bill. Of course, it was in the bill when it passed the House on the 22d of January. The bill has been in the Senate and in the Senate committee ever since the 22d of January and that provision is still in the bill.

Mr. BONE. What provision went out of the bill?

Mr. HILL. The provision for the phosphorus plant.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have just asked the clerk of the committee about that matter. He says that the item complained of was in the sixth supplemental bill, and the House would not agree to it in conference.

Mr. HILL. Very well. That is exactly what I am saying; that is my point.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is that situation.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That situation comes up constantly, and we all know it.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; that is the very reason I mention the point. That is exactly correct. That is the very point. I do not want the T. V. A. to have to come to Congress every time before it can spend a penny.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is the case, why does not the Senator offer an amendment to this bill to the effect that, "There is hereby appropriated to the T. V. A. an unlimited sum to be expended by it as and when it will, without hereafter coming to Congress"? Why not do that? That is what the Senator proposes.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; I want Congress to keep a check on the T. V. A. consistent with efficient operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a mighty poor check that the Senator suggests.

Mr. HILL. I want Congress to keep a check on the T. V. A. consistent with efficient and businesslike operation of the T. V. A.; but I do not want the business efficiency of the T. V. A. destroyed as these amendments would destroy it. I do not want to see the development of all the vast area served by the T. V. A. seriously retarded, if not prevented, as I believe these amendments would do. I do not think there is any businessman in the world who would invest any money in a plant in the Tennessee Valley if he thought he had to depend on congressional action to get power with which to carry on his business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that he need not bother. The Tennessee Valley Authority will not be retarded; it will not be injured. It will be upheld. All we ask it to do is to be honest in its dealings with the Congress and come before the Congress, just as the other power companies owned by the Government come, to get its appropriations in a straightforward manner, just as the other power companies do. The Authority will get its appropriation, and it will be infinitely better for the Authority; for I never would be taking the position which I am taking if I did not know that in this case honesty is the best policy and that the best way to run the Tennessee Valley Authority is to have it run by the Congress which gives it the money. The money does not belong to Mr. Lilienthal, it belongs to the Government of the United States and to the people of the United States. It seems to me that it is going a long way to say that the Government which is furnishing the money shall furnish the money but shall not require any examination as to how it is spent.

The question involved is one of common honesty. When we get to the position in which we turn over to someone else the obligation of being honest for us, we shall have gone a long way toward injuring our Government and injuring that very Authority. I am not willing to do it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I know of no better illustration of the fact that honesty is the best policy than the very fine record of achievement of the Tennessee Valley Authority under its able Chairman, Mr. Lilienthal, through its policy, which has been an absolutely honest one, an absolutely efficient one, and one that has provoked the admiration of all privileged to see its work.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have never yet had a report on it by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; we have had a great many reports on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HILL. We have had a report of a special congressional committee, and year in and year out the Senator from Tennessee has sat on the Appropriations Committee, which has gone into the Tennessee Valley Authority matters. The House Appropriations Committee has done likewise.

As a reading of the House hearings on the present bill will show, the House committee has gone into these matters very thoroughly. As a matter of fact, I think the record will show that the House goes into these matters with what may be called a fine-tooth comb. As the Comptroller General has stated, and as has been stated here this afternoon, there is no question of an audit by the Comptroller General of the United States. Each year there will be such an audit. Congress will continue, just as it has during the last 9 years, to check and to double check this agency, in order to know where the money goes and for what purpose it is expended, and in order to find out just exactly what is being done by the T. V. A. to carry on the work and the operations of the agency.

Mr. President, I urge that the amendments be rejected, because, if they were adopted, they would destroy the business efficiency of the Tennessee Valley Authority and would seriously impede and impair our war effort, as that effort is being so vitally and tremendously carried on today in the Tennessee Valley. For the sake of our country and its people the amendments must be defeated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment we are now discussing, and in connection with the debate which has been proceeding for 3 or 4 days, we have seen an exhibition of economy in the paring down of many amendments, and I have voted for some of the reductions as we have gone along. But I think it will be rather interesting if I place in the RECORD at this point what I read in the Chicago Sun this morning about the amount of money we are spending:

The United States this year will spend nearly $70,000,000,000—call it $69,000,000,000, if you like. Now here is a strange fact: It makes no difference to the average man whether total 1942 spendings are $69,000,000,000 of $70,000,000,000. If he is in Congress, he accepts war costs, interest on the public debt, and emergency aid to agriculture as necessary; but he will argue furiously for cutting "ordinary costs" of Government.

The truth is that if our Government were utterly wiped out, save for war costs, farm aid, and contractual obligations, the total 1942 spending would still be between $69,000,000,000 and $70,000,000,000.

The Government dollar is now divided 95 cents for war, 3 cents for interest and other contracts, 1 cent for farm relief, and 1 cent for everything else.

Why spend all our time talking about fractions of 1 cent? Take 1 cent of waste out of the 95 cents and it will support our whole Government.

CONTRIBUTION OF SMALL BUSINESS TO THE WAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it is said that two schoolboys went into a field one day searching, one for beautiful wild flowers, the other for serpents. Each found what he looked for.

A few weeks ago, when the "Smaller War Plants Corporation" bill passed the Senate, I mailed a thousand copies of it to editors, businessmen, and chambers of commerce in Colorado. It was accompanied by a two-page statement written by me on the possibilities this legislation opened up for Colorado.

It was my hope that out of it would come paper pulp mills, vegetable-dehydrating plants, plastic plants, and numerous facilities for the production of small parts for our war machines. I thought at last Colorado would be able to get into the subcontracting industry on a widespread scale; that at last every idle screw driver would be put to work.

While I should have anticipated it, I was stunned when the Rocky Mountain News, a newspaper that has substituted stomach ulcers for an editorial policy, blasted me with a distorted tirade, ending with this venomous conclusion:

Who's bellyaching?

We'll tell you who's bellyaching. It's shilly-shallying politicians such as ED JOHNSON who are bellyaching.

Where there are brickbats there are usually roses. I have here a response worthy of Colorado. I refer to a letter from R. A. Andrews, of Boulder, Colo. This is the kind of a letter that makes one glad that he is an American, the kind of a letter Byers, the founder of the Rocky Mountain News, would have written.

I ask leave to insert at this point copies of my statement, A Call to Arms, and my correspondence with Mr. Andrews. Also an article from the April number of Reader's Digest entitled "Home Workshops Go to War."

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL TO ARMS

My fellow citizens, the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill passed the Senate April 1 and now has gone to the House for further consideration and I hope final passage.

Its possibilities and far-reaching implications can hardly be visioned. If it fulfills the expectations of its sponsors it will completely revolutionize the industrial life of this Nation for the duration and perhaps long after the war has ended.

Almost every chamber of commerce in Colorado has written me repeatedly in the interest of locating a war-industry plant in their city. For obvious reasons it has not been possible to accomplish much along this line. Everybody has talked about the desirability of spreading the war-production industry out over the entire country, but very little has been accomplished.

Many Colorado cities, due to the impact of the war effort, are withering and slowly dying. Population considered, Colorado has been given far more than her share of war orders, large war industrial plants, Army camps, cantonments, air schools, aerial bases, storage facilities, etc. And yet many Colorado communities are suffering severely right now from the unemployment caused by the war.

If we had any assurance that this war would be over within a year or two, we might try to get along some way, but no such assurance can be given. No one can tell what the post-war period will be like, except that we now realize that the America we have known and loved will never be the same again.

There is but one industry in this country today, and that is the war industry. Every business and vocation not connected directly with the war effort faces dislocation and perhaps oblivion. The sooner we realize this unpleasant reality the better off we will be. Above all, we must bear in mind that this is a war against totalitarian states—and calls for a totalitarian response.

It is only prudent then that we not only start putting our house in order but that we do our part to bring victory to our armed forces. Let's stop bellyaching and start doing something ourselves to win the war. Easier said than done, to be sure. However, the "small business" bill affords a way out of the present confusion and doubt and makes it possible to put every idle screwdriver and every willing worker in the land at work against our common enemies. Obviously, it is the plain duty of every public-spirited patriot to stop finding fault and find instead the place where his talents, skill, and sweat will support the armed forces of his country.

The modern assembly plant needs to be supplied by 10,000 small plants, each making a different part. In Germany thousands of peasants and shopkeepers spend their idle hours making small parts for assembly lines. Instructors go about showing them how to do the work and checking the results. America must fight fire with fire.

I suggest that a mass meeting be held in every city and town in Colorado, that the "small business" bill be explained, and that a committee be appointed to contact Mr. Clyde C. Hartzell, State director, Contract Distribution Division of the War Production Board, Denver, Colo., to learn what subcontract is suitable to their respective community and make application to the Smaller War Plants Corporation for a loan to build and equip whatever plant is deemed essential.

Loans under this bill are also available for mining and milling. Consequently, communities having vital, critical, or strategic mineral deposits should investigate the possibilities of their production and file an application for a loan to get under way if a real contribution to defense mineral supplies can be made.

During its consideration in the Senate the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill and its operation were fully explained. I am, therefore, sending you a copy of the act as passed by the Senate and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31 and April 1, which carry the complete Senate debate. It is exceedingly important that these records be studied carefully.

This act must still be enacted by the House of Representatives, but I hope you will organize at once and present your application so that the hour the President signs the bill your petition will be ready for consideration by the Board.

Congress has acted in good faith to spread war production, and I am sure you will do your part. I cannot, of course, guarantee how Washington will respond to your application, but I believe they will greet it with open arms. If the Smaller War Plants Corporation fails to meet our joint challenge, the responsibility of failure will rest upon their shoulders and not ours.

I shall be glad to assist you in Washington. With every good wish, I am,

Most sincerely,

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator, Colorado.

THE STANDARD MACHINE WORKS,
Boulder, Colo., April 13, 1942.

The Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We thought you might like to know about one small shop in Colorado that did not go around crying about Washington and the 40-hour week, we took our coats off and went out looking for contracts and trouble, we got both. Our first contract was for $25,000 worth of labor, at that

time this shop was employing three men, the work was started and then two of the men quit and went to work for the Government. Mr. Reynolds then hired green men and trained them himself, paying them well while they were learning. I was a Ford salesman and joined up as office boy-machinist-production boy or something. We now have 15 men working two 10-hour shifts.

Of course we had a lot of trouble getting extra machines and tools but we are doing the job and our first contract which was for machine tools, is finished, 60 days ahead of schedule. We have plenty of work ahead for at least 90 days.

If you are ever in Boulder drop in and see us.

Yours very truly,

R. A. ANDREWS.

APRIL 21, 1942.

R. A. ANDREWS,
The Standard Machine Works,
Boulder, Colo.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: Thank God for men like W. I. Reynolds! Everybody in Colorado ought to take their hats off to a fellow like that.

May I have permission to make a thousand copies of your good letter of April 13 and mail them out to every Chamber of Commerce in the State of Colorado? I also want to put your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where everyone can see it.

The Rocky Mountain News, long noted for its bitter political attacks upon me, reached a new low in distortion and misrepresentation in its editorial of April 11. At least, that is my opinion. * * *

Most sincerely yours,

STANDARD MACHINE WORKS,
Boulder, Colo., April 27, 1942.

The Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Please feel free to use our letter in any way you see fit.

One thing, we spoke about the 40-hour week, our men are paid overtime for all time in excess of the regulation 40 hours.

This morning we received another contract for $11,500 labor. All materials to be supplied by the prime contractor.

Everyone in Colorado should be interested in getting subcontracts, but they have to have someone to show them the way. The local War Production Board has too much other business and cannot give the time needed. Colorado should appoint a man to work with Mr. Hartzell, locating the machines, then the men, and lastly to contact the contractors and get the work.

Personally I can see a steady stream of war supplies coming from Colorado, but someone who understands priorities, machines, tools, and men must lead the way.

Yours very truly,

R. A. ANDREWS.

HOME WORKSHOPS GO TO WAR

(Arthur Grahame)

[From Readers Digest of April 1942]

One day last spring Stanley A. Carlson, 36-year-old president of a small machinery manufacturing company in New Jersey, needed additional machine tools to fill subcontracts he had received for airplane, gun, and bombsight parts. He had already opened a second plant, bought all the new and second-hand tools he could get, and expanded his force from 20 to 200. But orders kept piling up. He couldn't find any subcontractors in that region who could take on more defense work.

Carlson solved the problem, and the way he did it was so simple and effective that the Government is introducing his home workshop subcontracting plan all over the country.

While Carlson was wondering where he could get additional lathes, John Lindstrom, a machinist who worked in the plant, came into the office on some errand. Carlson remembered that John's hobby was experimental tool making, and that he had a good lathe in a little workshop in his basement. If he would use that lathe to do at home the same work he was doing in the plant, it would make his plant lathe available for another machinist.

Carlson offered Lindstrom his regular wages and overtime, plus something extra for overhead. John went home with material for parts which had to be machined to two-thousandths-of-an-inch accuracy, and a few days later brought in the completed job.

After Lindstrom had worked a few weeks at home he came to Carlson with a proposition. Ever since he'd been an apprentice in Sweden he had dreamed of owning his own shop. He had his lathe and a small drill press, and he had tracked down a rusty old milling machine that could be made serviceable. A friend of his, a good amateur machinist, wanted to go to work for him. He would keep his car in the yard and turn his garage into a shop. Carlson had found his first subcontractor.

Were there other men in the vicinity who had machine tools in their home workshops? Carlson decided to find out. Next day this advertisement appeared in a New Jersey newspaper:

"Toolmakers, machinists, hobbyists, if you have an idle machine in your basement that you are willing to use in the interest of national defense, write at once giving full particulars as to your equipment and abilities."

Carlson received 75 answers, mostly from home-workshop hobbyists who were holding down regular jobs. Sam Pecorino, one of his plant engineers, was put in charge of transforming these applicants into subcontractors. Some had to be eliminated because they didn't have adequate tools or skill. Pecorino decided what sort of work each was best fitted to do and gave him material with which to make a sample. If the part passed rigid inspection, the man was given a contract.

Thirty-five of those who answered that first advertisement proved they could do work of the required quality. Later ads increased the number of home-workshop subcontractors. Some of them have found it profitable to give up their former occupations; others devote 25 to 60 off-time hours a week to defense production. Today about 150 men give full or part time to the work. And Carlson has found that the subcontractors who work in their basements and garages have a lower percentage of rejections for faulty craftsmanship than the men in his plant.

When technical difficulties crop up, Pecorino is available for advice. The subcontractors show their appreciation when there is a rush job; some of them have worked 30 hours without a break. Usually they name their own delivery dates, which they almost always meet without prodding.

Pecorino took me to several of the home workshops. He stopped first at George Carell's house in a quiet suburban street. "Carell's one of our best men," Pecorino said: "He does beautiful precision work. When he answered our ad he was an oil salesman and did mechanical work for fun, such as making his wife a sewing machine and a vacuum cleaner. After working part time with us for several months he started out for himself. Now he has three men on his day shift and several who work a few hours in the evening. Carell himself averages close to 18 hours a day. One of his best men is a hobbyist who, when the war started, was a lace importer."

Over the cellar stairway was a sign: "Positively no admittance. United States Defense work." We went in. Except in a submarine, I've never seen so much machinery in so little space. "I like to have my machines close together," Carell said, "if a fellow doesn't have to waste time walking from one machine to another, sometimes he can operate two at once."

Our next stop was at John Lindstrom's. To accommodate the old machine tools he has bought and reconditioned, Lindstrom enlarged his garage twice and now plans another addition. He employs, on day and night shifts, eight nonprofessional machinists whom he has trained to do precision work. Recently Lindstrom devised a lathe fixture that grinds four gun-recoil parts in the time that it formerly took to grind one.

George C. Wyland, another top-flight subcontractor, formerly built and maintained scientific apparatus for the Columbia University School of Mines. A hobbyist with a well-equipped machine shop in his home, he resigned his position, after a few weeks of spare-time work, to give all his time to subcontracting. He now has six men working for him.

Another successful subcontractor is Michael Brodsky, a toolmaker in a rubber plant, who used to make model gasoline engines in his home shop. Now, in addition to his regular job, he works 50 hours a week at home. His subcontracting is a family affair—a brother-in-law averages 40 to 50 hours a week, and Mrs. Brodsky and her sister have learned to rough out small parts on an old lathe.

Carl Riel, foreman in a food-products plant, works 25 hours a week on airplane tools, his wife knitting busily for the marines while she keeps him company in his basement shop.

These people work hard and go short on sleep—but they like it. The work is highly profitable, and they are helping win the war.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified in each case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY: As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

George Carnahan, of New York.
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut.
James G. McCargar, of California.
Allan W. Pattee, of Illinois.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, to fill an existing vacancy.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Lloyd T. Morgan, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Pueblo, Colo., Reappointment.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Pay Inspector William B. Young to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 1st day of June 1942.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of May 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, eastern sea frontier.

Rear Admiral John W. Greenslade to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of May 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, western sea frontier.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Thomas F. Meaney, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Thomas Glynn Walker, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 19th day of June 1942:

Claude W. Adams, Jr.
Frank W. Adams
Robert B. Adams
Robert S. Adams
Aubyn L. Adkins
Robert N. Adrian
Homer B. Allen, Jr.
William B. Allen
James C. Aller
Earl J. Alt
Robert G. Amme
Steven N. Anastasion
Robert J. Andersen, Jr.
Clyde B. Anderson
William R. Anderson
Raymond L. Angelo
Dante Armogida
Harry L. Arnest, Jr.
Victor K. Atkins
Norbert E. Aubrey, Jr.
Frank W. Ault
William J. Ayers
Francis J. Bader
Daniel G. Bailey
William P. Baker
Jewett A. Baldridge
William R. Banks
Laughlin Barker
Alcus E. Barrett
John M. Barrett
Herbert L. Baslee, Jr.
Turner W. Battle, Jr.
Frederic L. Bays
Robert H. Beaver
Jack L. Becker
John H. Behl
Robert A. Belden
Bailis M. Bell
Bernard Bennett
Milton D. Bennett
William R. Bennett
Edward R. Bergin, Jr.
Edmund E. Bevan
Clarence R. Beyer
William W. Bissell
James H. Black
Walter C. Blattmann
Henry B. Bottoms
Thomas A. Boulton
Francis X. Brady
John E. Braun
Richard E. Brega
John J. Brennan
Henry Bress
Morgan L. Brett, Jr.
John F. Biggs, Jr.
Clifford L. Brown
Melvin W. Brown
Townsend Brown
Philip B. Brugge
George R. Bryan, Jr.
Thomas J. Buchanan, Jr.
Earl E. Buckwalter
William A. Budding, Jr.
Albert C. Burley
William J. Burton
William S. Busik
Francis A. Butler
William F. Cafferata
Warren D. Calhoun
John F. Callahan
James F. Calvert
James M Campbell
Joseph M. Campbell
William F. Campbell
Lawrence D. Caney
Eugene J. Canty
William P. Carmichael
Arthur McD. Carter, Jr.
Thomas L. Carter, Jr.
Thomas H. Casey, Jr.
Clifton B. Cates, Jr.
William R. Cecil
Alfred A. Cherbak
Philip M. Childs, Jr.
Raymond J. Clare, Jr.
Harry L. Clark, Jr.
Howard E. Clark
Gerald W. Clarke
Thomas LeR. Clear 2d
Michael J. Clemens
James L. Cloman
Philip M. Clow
William W. Cobb
Deale B. Cochran
James A. Cochran
William K. Coker
Gerard F. Colleran
Cecil B. Collins, Jr.
Bartholomew J. Connolly 3d
Robert E. McK. Conwell
Clarence H. Cook, Jr.
Henry J. H. Cooke
Charles T. Cooper 3d
Paul R. Copeland, Jr.
George Cornelius
Robert D. Cousins
Stanley J. Cowin, Jr.
Albert W. Cox
Dale W. Cox, Jr.
Edward J. Cummings, Jr.
Franklyn E. Dailey, Jr.
Robert F. Daly
Robert M. Dampier
John J. S. Daniel
Edwin G. Dankworth, Jr.
Howard E. Danner, Jr.
Edwin T. Davis
George J. Davis
George S. Davis, Jr.
James H. Davis
Jaquelin C. Davison
Frank H. Dean, Jr.
Daniel D. Decker, Jr.
Roderick C. Dennehy
Austin L. Detweiler
Joseph J. Devlin
Stuart A. Dewees
Joseph O. Di Gangi
Arthur Dirck, Jr.
Paul Doane
James C. Donaldson, Jr.
John L. Doneff
John A. Donnelly
Homer M. Doran, Jr.
Richard Y. Dow
Richard G. Dowell
Wilbur T. Doyel
Joseph B. Drachnik
Robert W. Duborg
John A. Dudley
Lincoln M. Dunlap
Hugh M. Durham
Marsh K. Eckhardt
LeRoy Edleson
Arthur T. McB. Edwards
Gail J. Ellerbe
Alfred B. Ellis
James W. Ellis, Jr.
John J. Emanski, Jr.
Phillip F. Erken Brack
Melvin R. Etheridge
William J. Everett
James H. Eversole
Gordon C. Facer
Frederick R. Fearnow
Harrison R. Fehr 3d
Leonard E. Field
Miles R. Finley, Jr.
Harold B. Fish
Peter D. Fisler
Conrad J. Flessner
Robert J. Fossum
George H. Foster, Jr.
Leonard A. Franz
Daniel H. Freeman
Bernard W. Frese, Jr.
Clarence T. Froscher
Roy H. Gallemore
Amedeo H. Galvani
Joe L. Gammon
John H. Gano
Martin D. Gastrock
Chester W. Gates, Jr.
James C. Gibson
James McK. Gillin, Jr.
Robert H. Gillock
William C. Godfrey
William A. Golden, Jr.
Rene E. Gonzalez
William M. Goode
Joseph E. Gould
William J. Gray
Robert B. Greenwood
Robert T. Gregory
Charles F. Greasard, Jr.
Joseph S. Griffin
John B. Griggs 3d
James A. Griswold
George Grkovic
Warren A. Grossetta, Jr.
Earl D. Hackman, Jr.
Joseph E. Hadley
Stephen V. Hadley
Homer H. Haisten, Jr.
Alvin W. Hall, Jr.
Perry Hall
Philip P. Hambsch
Hugh D. Hamilton
Henry R. Hamner
Edward J. Hannon, Jr.
Frank C. Hansche, Jr.
Arnt B. Hansen
Frederic T. Hansen, Jr.
Robert L. Hansen
Ralph M. Hanson
William M. Harnish
John P. Harrell
Milton L. Harvey
Robert E. Hawthorne
Hugh McC. Hayden
John C. Haynie, Jr.
Charles F. Helme, Jr.
John H. Hennessy, Jr.
James W. Herring
Alvin R. Hersh, Jr.
Leslie R. Heselton, Jr.
Norbert F Hesse
Lawrence Heyworth, Jr.
Fred C. Hill
Edwin N. Hitchcock, Jr.
Stanley M. Hogshead
James L. Holloway 3d
Frank W. Hollowell, Jr.
David C. Holmes
Carl O. Holmquist
Robert P. Horrigan
Harvard C. Huber
Allan MacM. Hudson
Jack G. Hudson
Alvin D. Huff
William S. Humphrey, Jr.
Eugene J. Huntemer
Thomas C. Hurst 3d
Stanley K. Hutchin
James K. Irvin
Eric Ischinger, Jr.
Erwin S. Jackson
William F. Jacobs
Earl B. Johnson
Richard H. Johnston, Jr.
Donald R. Jones
Jack B. Jones
Robert L. Jungkias
Robert G. Kackley
Daniel M. Karcher
Robert D. Karl
William H. Kastenbein
Hal A. Kauffman
Owen F. Keeler, Jr.
Harry B. Keeler
James E. Kelley, Jr.
John W. Kelsey, Jr.
Joseph C. Kemp, Jr.
Edward F. Kenney
Edward E. Kerr
Henry C. Kirchner
William B. Kirkland, Jr.
William M. Knapp
Philip C. Koelsch
Albert C. Koplewski
Leonard T. Kreidler
Robert M. Kunhardt
Archie C. Kuntze
Lawrence A. Kurtz
Paul L. Lacy, Jr.
Reginald C. Lamb, Jr.
Arthur S. Lane, Jr.
Harold F. Lang
Allen N. Lasater
Donald L. Lassell
Lefteris Lavrakas
Richard R. Law
Dunbar Lawson
Richard D. Lazenby
Guy C. Leavitt
Samuel C. Leedom
Abraham K. Leichtman
Frederick H. Lemly, Jr
Bernard C. Lennon
James E. Lewellyn
Kenith V. Lindstrom
John H. Lobdell
Robert C. Logan
Benjamin F. Lohr
Joseph A. Lovington
William S. Luberda
Wiley T. Mackie
Richard O. Madson
David D. Maher
Neal Martin, Jr.
William J. Martin
Theodore F. Marx
Willis E. Maxson 3d
George B. May
Audley H. McCain
Thomas R. McCants
William H. McCaughey
Brian McCauley
Thomas R. McClellan
Walter D. McCord, Jr.
William M. McCulley, Jr.
Alexander G. McEwen
Patrick H. McGann
Howard M. McKinley, Jr.
Robert E. McLeod
Philip S. McManus
Wilfred J. McNeil, Jr.
William R. McQuilkin
John A. McTighe
Glenn A. Medick
Charles F. Merz
Lewis W. Metzger 3d
Edgar R. Meyer
Francis A Meyer
George R. Meyer
Anthony J. Miller
Donald A. Miller
Kenneth M. Miller
Robert O. Mink
Forrest R. Mitchell
Stanley Montunnas
Robert R. Mooney, Jr.
Howard S. Moore
William C. Moore
Bernard W. Moulton
Gregg Mueller
Francis C. Mulvanity
Robert J. Murphy
Jesse A. Naylor
Norman W. Naylor
Frank M. Nelson
Arthur W. Newlon
John L. Nichols
John J. Nolan
Robert D. Norton
Elwood E. Nutt
Albert E. Oberg
Clement E. O'Brien
John J. O'Brien
James M. O'Brien
James D. Oliver, Jr.
Warren G. Olson
Frank P. Omohundro
Irad B. Oxley
Paul E. Padget
John P. Paikos
William McK. Pardee
Jackson W. Parker
William C. Patterson
Raymond E. Peet
Charles A. Pendleton, Jr.
Lewis E. Pennell
Billups P. Percy
Alfred A. Perez-Guerra
Donald E. Perry
Joseph R. Perry
Richard H. Petersen
Robert M Peterson
Richardson Phelps, Jr.
Melvin C. Phillips
Richard W. Phipps
James E. Pickens, Jr.
Bryan S. Pickett
Wallace K. Ponder
John D. Price
Robert R. Price
Benjamin T. Pugh
Charles D. Pulver
Frederick R. Putnam
Emmett R. Quady
Jack P. Qualey
James C. Quillin, Jr.
John E. Quirk
William A. Racette
Arthur G. Rand, Jr.
Spottiswoode W. Randolph, Jr.
William T. Rapp
Albert L. Rasmussen
Leon H. Rathbun, Jr.
Julian E. Rawls
James M. Reaves
Joseph B. Rechen
Frank J. Reh
Nicholas Revotskie
Robert B Rhett, Jr.
William R Riblett
Eugene G. Richardson
Herbert H. Ries

George W. Ringenberg
Spencer E. Robbins
Edgar A. Robie
Samuel J. Robinson, Jr.
Charles D. Robison, Jr.
Henry F. Rodner, Jr.
Robert H. Rossell
Robert T. Ruble
Walter D. Rupert, Jr.
Carl B. Russell
Joseph F. Ryan
James R. Sahlin
Robert J. Sammons
Goodwin W. P. Sandvig
Merrill H. Sappington
Lee R. Scherer, Jr.
George A. Schlichte, Jr.
Arnold L. Schralla, Jr.
Hugh A. Scott
John W. Sedwick
Daniel R. Seidell
Leslie H. Sell
Robert J. Selmer
Donald W. Sencenbaugh
Joseph A. Sestak
Tazewell T. Shepard, Jr
John T. Shepherd
David A. Shonerd
Samuel W. W. Shor
James W. Short
John W. Shultz, Jr.
Edwin L. Sibert, Jr.
Arthur P. Sibold, Jr.
Andrew K. Simmons
John W. Sincavich
Charles C. Slater
Winfield S. Slocum 3d
George E. Slone
Clayton W. Smith
Fenton F. Smith, Jr.
Harry C. Smith
James E. Smith
Kenneth "M" Smith
Leonard G. Smith, Jr.
Robert G. Smith
Richard P. Smith
Thomas F. Smith
Gordon A. Snyder
Harold D. Sollenberger
Ruben P. Songco
George E. Spaulding, Jr.
James D. Spencer
Roger E. Spreen
Robert E. Staff
Ralph M. Stair
David S. Stanley
Robert E. Stark
Robert W. Stecher
David S. Sterrett
Walter W. Stevens
Jack L. Stowe
Reuben E. Strelow
Mitchell P. Strohl
Hope Strong, Jr.
Arthur D. Struble, Jr.
Robert M. Stuart
John R. Sullivan, Jr.
Ted N. Swain
John M. Sweeney
Frank Swint
Philip B. Taliaferro
Charles A. Taylor, Jr.
John Parks Tazewell
Orion A. Templeton
Bernard A. Thielges
Francis P. Thomas
Frank L. Thomas, Jr.
Gardner Thomas, Jr.
Bert A. Thompson
Raymond C. Tolerton, Jr.
Virgil H. Traxler, Jr.
James T. Traylor, Jr.
Myron E. Tremain
Earl F. Tuhey
Charles W. Turner
Louis "K" Tuttle, Jr.
Bernard S. Umbarger
James A. Underwood, Jr.
James D. Unger
William W. Vallandingham
William B. Van Dusen
Harper E. Van Ness, Jr.
Dale O. Van Orden
Americo J. Vescovi
Vito L. Vitucci
Joseph E. Volonte
Albert C. Waldman, Jr.
Lewis W. Walker, Jr.
Richard H. Walker
Maurice E. Wall
Gersen L. Wallace
Kenneth C. Wallace
John J. Wannamaker
Herbert H. Ward 3d
James R. Ward
Joseph D. Watson
Samuel E. Watson
Elliott M. Weart
Donald E. Weed
Richard S. White 3d
Merle E. Weedlun
John M. Weeks
John T. Wheeler
George H. Whisler, Jr.
Norman E. White
John H. Wickert
Daniel W. Wildfong
Thomas H. Wilkinson
Robert J. Williams
William W. Williams
Richard W. Willis
Thomas D. Wilson
Grover "B" Windham, Jr.
Walter K. Wilson
Reuben F. Woodall
Robert C. Woodside
Halford Woodson
Horace J. Woodward
Lynn F. Woodward
Nelson C. Woodward
Charles F. Wortham
Adam L. Wozniak, Jr.
David P. Wynkoop
Frederick A. Yates
Maury F. Yerger, Jr.
Alexander P Zechella
Joseph S Zeigler
Richard G Zimermann
Robert J. Zoeller
Elmo R Zumwalt, Jr.
Richard A. Banks
Richard W. Belt, Jr.
Carl R. Berquist
Robert G. Bradley
Howard W. Burnett, Jr.
John J. Caporaso
John W. Collins
Roy N. Dunklin
Arthur T. Emerson, Jr.
Elmer L. Fox
Robert D. Golly
George S. Goodspeed, Jr.
Solon G. Hale
William H. Hardcastle Jr.
Benjamin S. Head
William O. Hill
Daniel Hunt, Jr.
Philip Hurt
Douglas H. Jennings
Archie L. Julian
George A. Kelley, Jr.
Algernon H. Kerr, Jr.
Robert A. Kirtland
George W. Klauer
Kenneth R. Klofkorn
Joseph A. Kriz
William F. Lally, Jr.
John M. Lee
Ralph G. Leedy
Patrick Leehey
John W. Logan
Forrest B. Mackellar
Robert J. MacQuaid
William J. Manby, Jr.
Allan E. May
Robert McC. McConnell, Jr.
David L. Merrill
Michael U. Moore
John W. Newland, Jr.
Walter P. Nock, Jr.
Myron L. Ogden
William T. Peach 3d
Paul J. Ramsey
William H. P. Robertson
John Rowland-Fisher
Deitz A. Rudisill
Charles K. Ruiz
Joseph J. Schmidt
Harry C. Sipe, Jr.
Thomas J. Smith
Charles W. Smyers, Jr.
Charles E. Stastny
Joseph B. Sullivan
Francis M. Tully
Dennis A. Wagner
Ernest C. White

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of June 1942:

Robert W. Besch
John W. Bowman
Stephen J. Burich, Jr.
William C. Chip
Angus J. Cronin
Joseph F. Donahoe, Jr.
James A. D. Eaton
Eugene R. Flathmann
Joseph S. Gardner
Marshall C. Gregory
William D. Glynn
Lawrence E. Giuliani
John A. Hardy, Jr.
Allen C. Hendley
Byron A. Kirk
Robert B. Laing
George W. McHenry, Jr.
Robert G. McMaster
Herman Poggemeyer, Jr.
Thomas L. Randall
James E. Rice
Morris V. Shively
Morris R. Snead
George W. Stivers, Jr.
Richard L. Sullivan
Robert H. Twisdale
Lawrence V. Van Laanen
Roger J. Womeldorf
Herbert E. L. Zastrow

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 30), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS

William Holmes Crosby, Jr.
Alex Brown.
Charles Mathews Swindler.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Frank Coffin Holbrook.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. Everett Clifton Hayden.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. John Barkley Pattison, Jr.
Second Lt. George Major White.
Second Lt. William Jonreau Williams II.
Second Lt. John Edward Nitsche.
Second Lt. Alfred George Hayduk.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, Thou art a God who giveth to all men liberally; Thy gracious promise is, As thy days so shalt thy strength be. Thy name is our hope and Thy love is from everlasting to everlasting; all honor, glory, and praise be unto Thee both now and ever. We pray that the presence of the Lord may fall across the busy, confusing tideways of our daily lives, joining our hearts in the chant of the temple choir: "Fret not thyself because of evil doers; rest in the Lord; wait patiently for Him and He will give thee thy heart's desire."

Blessed Lord God, forgive our intolerable impatience; sometimes our rebellion is speechless and its currents effect our peace and threaten inroads upon our faith. We humbly pray: Thou who doest watch over the martyrdom of man and dost hear the sighs and the sorrows of this sad world, oh, crown us with a living trust in an unfaltering and in an unfailing God, a good God is in processes of this world and is working everywhere in the darkness and in the shadows keeping watch above His own.

"Drop Thy still dews of quietness,
'Til all our strivings cease,
Take from our lives the strain and stress
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 30, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3767. An act for the relief of Frank Sheppard.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2202. An act to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4092) entitled "An act for the relief of E. P. Corley," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5845) entitled "An act for the relief of Alvira Manfredi," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5295) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on April 30, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of James A. Quillinan;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.;

H. R. 6166. An act to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; and

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMY SHOES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for 1 minute.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPENCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the menhaden fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by the State administrator of the W. P. A. in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMY RULE BARRING DATES OF PRIVATES AND NURSES

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Josephus Daniels, when Secretary of the Navy in the last war, upset tradition by banning liquor from fighting ships and has now gone gunning for another unwritten law of the armed forces. This time the Army tradition that he is lambasting—the unwritten law forbidding privates to have dates with nurses who are commissioned as second lieutenants.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Daniels, when Secretary of the Navy in the last war, upset tradition by banning from fighting ships intoxicating liquor, that concoction which has no power except to rob one of his reason. Now, being sure that democracy and snobbery cannot well exist together, he inquired of the War Department the other day whether there is any regulation prohibiting social contacts between officers and privates in the armed forces. He was informed that no rule obtained to this effect, but that custom or tradition so decreed. Mr. Daniels paid his respects to such condition and in no uncertain terms.

I consider this of so much importance that I am compelled to add my disappointment and my disapproval of such custom.

Mr. Speaker, any man, in war or in peace, in any relationship or under any circumstances, who thinks that he must hold himself aloof from his fellows in order to impress his own superiority is incompetent to exercise authority; and if this country has to look to many such men for many things, we are in a hell of a fix. I had thought that this snobbery had long ago gotten lost in the growth of intelligence and common sense. Professing democracy alone is not enough; it must be practiced.

A man can "walk with kings and not lose the common touch," but it takes a man to do it.

I would entertain the hope that this hurtful unwritten law may suffer immediate death, which it so richly deserves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an historic document with respect to a distinguished predecessor of mine, the Honorable Matthew Lyon. Mr. William Kennedy, of the Star newspaper, has made a long study of the proposition and has discovered some new facts which are of historical interest. I think it is valuable that it should be in the RECORD, from the standpoint of the Congress, and I ask permission, notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit prescribed to the amount of about $125, that it be inserted in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions, one of the American Legion of the State of Oregon, and also one of the Spanish-American War Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LEA, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, for printing in the RECORD.

COTTON SHEETS FOR SOLDIERS

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, along the line of the remarks made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] regarding whether or not men in the Army should have sheets, I wish to say that at this time if there are men in the Army who do not have sheets to sleep between, they should have them for one reason, if for no other. We are very short of wool in this country and we have a surplus of cotton. Therefore it is the part of good management to see that the men have sheets to sleep between and thereby conserve the wool that we have in the Nation by saving it just that much from wear.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I object to punishing the soldier by making him sleep between woolen sheets when he can get good cotton sheets.

Mr. FADDIS. At least it would be the part of good management and it would conserve the wool that we have now and also contribute toward cleanliness and sanitation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent discussing farm prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McGREGOR was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTIONS FROM KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just received copies of three resolutions adopted unanimously by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture. They are as follows:

Calling for the increased use of surplus grains in the manufacture of alcohol, and thus reducing the quantities of sugar for alcohol conversion and at the same time make more space available for storage of this year's wheat crop.

That the board go on record as favoring the United States Department of Agriculture as the Federal agency to handle the national food administration, if and when such an administration is established.

That the board favor an extension for 5 years of the 3½-percent interest rates on Federal land bank and commissioner loans, an extension of the rates now charged.

I commend these resolutions to you and I trust they may have the support of the membership of this Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COPPER TUBING USED ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the Members of this House to take a look from my office window at the hundreds of feet of copper tubing being laid by the Government on Capitol Hill, for a lawn sprinkler system.

Thousands of businessmen have been put out of business because our "all-out Victory program" called for this strategic material, but our own Government can use copper and brass on a sprinkler system without which we have managed for over 37 years.

I shall welcome all who would care to see for themselves this use of potential shell-casing material.

Perhaps, gentlemen, the grass will grow better under this new system and perhaps it is needed, but I insist that it would be better for all the grass in the District of Columbia to wither than for a tommy gun in the Pacific to be denied a single clip of ammunition.

I refer the "powers that be" to the fact that this is 1942, the year of our war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. LARRABEE] may be permitted to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RATIONING OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just do not believe that the American people need to be "psychologically prepared" for certain sacrifices that may be asked of them. I think they are already quite prepared. Frankly I think it would be a lot better if announcements were made when the time came that certain things had to be done, such as rationing or restricting the consumption of certain commodities or what not, instead of having arguments ahead of time as to what is or what is not going to be necessary to be done in the future. I think the reception by the people would be better if this were done, and I earnestly suggest that that policy be followed by all concerned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SMALL MEAT PACKERS ON THE OUTSIDE LOOKING IN

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FULMER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter addressed to me by Mr. Leon Henderson and letters I addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture and to Dr. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CORRECTIONS IN TRIBAL MEMBERSHIP ROLL OF PUYALLUP INDIANS, WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar, H. R. 4578, to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 268, to extend the time for amending the petition of the Indians of California under section 4 of the act of May 18, 1928.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIMITING THE OPERATION OF SECTIONS 109 AND 113 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE AND 190 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3759, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to certain counsel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5484, for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time within which suit or suits may be filed by the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska under the terms of the act of Congress of June 19, 1935 (ch. 275, 49 Stat. L. 388), is hereby extended for a period of 3 years from and after the date of the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE STRAITS OF MACKINAC

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2133, to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved September 25, 1940, granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SNAKE AND PIUTE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 622, authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEASE OR SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH MANUFACTURE OF ARMS, ETC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5394, to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to lease or sell, on such terms and conditions and subject to such provisions and restrictions as he may deem proper, vacant public lands withdrawn or reserved by Executive Order No. 6910 of November 26, 1934, or Executive Order No. 6964 of February 5, 1935, or within a grazing district, but not otherwise withdrawn or reserved, to any person, partnership, or corporation for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or the production of equipment, supplies, and materials, or machinery usable in such manufacture: *Provided*, That all patents issued under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same.

SEC. 2. For so long as any public land is leased under the provisions of this act, the lessee's interest in the land and improvements shall be taxable by the State in which the land lies or by any political subdivision of such State, except that tax liens on the leasehold interest or improvements shall be subordinate to any liens held by any agency or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make any rules or regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall cease to be operative 6 months after the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President in the proclamation of May 27, 1941 (Executive Order No. 2487).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "Order" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Proclamation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING EMPLOYMENT BY DEFENSE CONTRACTORS OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS OF THE LAND AND NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6634, facilitating employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no defense contractor shall deny employment, on account of failure to produce a birth certificate, to any person who submits, in lieu of a birth certificate, an honorable discharge certificate from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, unless such honorable discharge certificate shows on its face that such person may have been an alien at the time of its issuance.

SEC. 2. As used in this act the term "defense contractor" means an employer engaged in—

(1) the production, maintenance, or storage of arms, armament, ammunition, implements of war, munitions, machinery, tools, clothing, food, fuel, or any articles or supplies, or parts or ingredients of any articles or supplies; or

(2) the construction, reconstruction, repair, or installation of a building, plant, structure, or facility;

under a contract with the United States or under any contract which the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission certifies to such employer to be necessary to the national defense.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "certificate", insert "or certificate issued in lieu thereof."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of the War Department to issue certificates in lieu of discharge certificates which have been lost. They do not issue, as I understand it, copies of the original certificate, but upon application a certificate in lieu of the lost discharge may be issued.

The amendment merely provides that if a soldier has lost his certificate he substitutes a certificate in lieu of the discharge certificate which he has received from the War Department.

Mr. CELLER. Is this acceptable to the author of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have not talked to the author of the bill. We put it over last week, and I did not know whether the author would be here or not, but I offer the amendment because I think it should go in, in keeping with the purpose of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVING CERTAIN LANDS IN CALIFORNIA FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MANCHESTER BAND OF POMO INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5685, reserving certain lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1927, to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to all valid existing rights and claims, lot 15, section 1, township 12 north, range 17 west, Mount Diablo meridian, California, being part of the public lands of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, withdrawn from entry, sale, or other disposition and set aside as an addition to the Manchester Rancheria in California, for the exclusive use and benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians residing thereon.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5685) was laid on the table.

USE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CENTRAL PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2989, use of certain Federal lands in the construction of the Central Valley project, California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be used for any and all purposes in connection with the Central Valley project in California, as authorized by the acts of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and

August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 850), the following-described land situated in the county of Madera, State of California:

The north half of the southeast quarter and lots 2 and 3 of section 33, township 10, south, range 21 east, Mount Diablo meridian, containing 140.86 acres.

SEC. 2. That all right, title, and interest of the Indians, or any of them, to such land is hereby terminated.

SEC. 3. That since said land was originally acquired by the United States for the use of Indians in California in accordance with the act of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 325, 333), there is hereby made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior, from moneys now or hereafter available for the construction of the Central Valley project, the sum of $2,800 for the purchase of other lands or interests in lands for the same uses and purposes as authorized by said act of June 21, 1906.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as may be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINING MISCONDUCT FOR COMPENSATION AND PENSION PURPOSES, AS LIMITED TO FELONIOUS MISCONDUCT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6634, defining misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot agree to that request, and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] will not object to the bill, because there are many meritorious cases of disabled World War veterans in every congressional district in the United States who are being unjustly punished by having attributed to them or having their disabilities attributed to misconduct. Many of them have not only been punished for 20 years, but their families have been humiliated by the most injurious form of publicity that could be given, and that is the publicity that bears the stamp of governmental approval.

Many of these men fought on the western front, many of them went through the hell of the World War. They were among the best soldiers we had; yet because of this crazy provision inserted in the law more than 20 years ago—a provision that never has been applied to the soldiers of other wars—these men are not only driven to the poorhouse, if you please, but they are humiliated and their families are disgraced. I am not going to agree to this bill going over. I want it passed on now.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be informed as to what this bill does, may I state that it gives the veterans the right to compensation for any disability incurred by them, even by reason of their own misconduct except when that misconduct constituted a felony; consequently it would be possible for a veteran to deliberately maim himself under the provisions of this bill and become eligible.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman should not make that statement.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I object to that statement. That is not the law and never was the law.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, that is not my reason for asking that the bill be passed over without prejudice. It is not on the merits of the bill at all. I point out to the House that the Veterans' Administration is recorded as against the bill. The bill would increase the cost currently by $1,720,000.

For those two reasons—in view of the opposition of the Veterans' Administration and the fact that the bill itself would cost at least $1,750,000, I ask that the bill be brought up in the regular way.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] that he is wrong, dead wrong, when he says that a man who maimed himself would come under the provisions of this bill. That would not be in accordance with the law. That would be felonious misconduct, and specifically excepted by the provisions of this bill. Besides, this provision by which these men are penalized was never written into the law with reference to the Civil War veterans, it was never written into the law with reference to the Spanish War veterans, or with reference to the Revolutionary War veterans. It is not in any other veterans' law on the statute books. All we ask here is to confine it to the men whose conduct was felonious.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that even if it does cost a little extra money to pay the men who have been denied compensation for the last 20 years, it is our duty to see that that is done.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I am very much in favor of the principle of this bill, but I am interested in knowing whether the gentleman is sure that if a man shot himself in the foot at the front, or shot himself in the hand, as unfortunately did occur a few times, that would be considered felonious.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. He cannot be compensated, because that is felonious misconduct.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This amendment will answer the question raised by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Absolutely.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It will identify the man who deliberately shoots himself to escape military service from the man who innocently acquires a venereal disease.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. The records of the War Department with regard to the incidence of venereal disease show that in some States rejections because of syphilis ran as high as 170 per 1,000. The public health testimony before our subcommittee shows that 16,000 cases out of 40,000 had never been recognized under the methods available during the World War for detecting syphilis. There is no question but that thousands and thousands of these men never knew they had the disease, and thousands of them did not acquire it through their own misconduct at all; yet, as a matter of fact, if they have syphilis they are barred.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Many thousands of them went all through the World War and were among the best soldiers we had; yet long after the war, somebody boll-weeviling around through their records found a record of where some doctor had alleged that at some time they had had a social disease, and they attributed their disabilities to that one thing and denied them compensation.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if it is not possible now for a veteran having a social disease to be compensated?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Under the present law, if the disability is attributed to that fact, if he is a Spanish War veteran, he gets compensation, and if he is a Civil War veteran he gets his pension, but if he is a World War veteran he is knocked out.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not true that there are World War pensioners on the rolls who are receiving compensation for venereal diseases innocently acquired?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; I do not think so.

Mr. COLE of New York. The report of the gentleman's committee so states.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If there are, why do you want to punish the rest of them? Why not treat them all alike? We are narrowing this thing down to the ones whose misconduct was felonious. If a man becomes injured in violating the military law or shirking his duty as a soldier, that is described under the law as felonious; and where he inflicts his disability intentionally, he cannot come under the provisions of this act. It specifically excludes him.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I ask the gentleman where there is any definition of what constitutes felonious conduct?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Is the gentleman a lawyer?

Mr. COLE of New York. I was before I became a Member here.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I never thought that becoming a Republican Congressman would take away a man's qualifications as a lawyer.

Mr. COLE of New York. The reason is that for the past 8 years lawyers and the courts have not had much to say about running the country.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from New York that ordinarily these felonies are described as such in the law governing our soldiers.

Of course, the State laws consider a felony to be any offense for which a man, if convicted, may be sent to the penitentiary or punished with death.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does this bill, in referring to felonious misconduct, refer to State statutes or to some Federal statute describing the misconduct?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman that we are now legislating for the United States, and this would refer to the military law or to the Federal law. If this were a felonious misconduct on his part, then he would be subject to such punishment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman prepared to say that it is a violation of the Federal statute for any individual in this country to cut off his left hand deliberately?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. A felony?

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it a felony?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If he is in the military service and it is done to shirk military duty, it is a felony.

Mr. COLE of New York. But these veterans are not in the military service now.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They were at the time to which this relates.

Mr. COLE of New York. But this disability does not necessarily have to be incurred during the service.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This provision referring to felonious misconduct is placed in here to protect the Government against these slackers who would injure themselves feloniously to avoid military duty.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it may be, and no doubt is true, that this bill has considerable merit, but in view of the added cost and in view of the opposition of the Veterans' Administration, I renew my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I must object to its being passed over, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman objects, it will remain on the calendar and it will take three objections to knock it off next time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, MURFREESBORO, TENN.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2356, authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant easements to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line, in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., described as follows:

PIPE LINE

Beginning at a point in the southern boundary of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., in the center of Compton Road, said point being three thousand and eighty-eight feet east of the intersection of the center line of Compton Road with the center line of Lebanon-Murfreesboro Pike at the southwest corner of the Veterans' Administration Facility; thence north one degree thirty-two minutes west four thousand and thirty-four feet more or less to a point on the south bank of Stones River.

PUMP-HOUSE SITE

Beginning at a point in the above-described pipe line twelve feet south of the south bank of Stones River; thence south eighty-eight degrees twenty-eight minutes west eleven feet; thence north one degree thirty-two minutes west thirty-five feet; thence north eighty-eight degrees twenty-eight minutes east twenty-two feet; thence south one degree thirty-two minutes east thirty-five feet; thence south eighty-eight degrees twenty-eight minutes west eleven feet to the point of beginning.

ACCESS ROAD

A strip of land twelve feet wide running in an easterly direction eight hundred feet more or less along the south bank of Stones River from the pump-house site to the easterly boundary of the Veterans' Administration Facility.

SEC. 2. The easements authorized by this act shall be conditioned on the erection by the city of Murfreesboro, without expense to the United States, of a fence, enclosing the pump-house site, satisfactory to the Veterans' Administration, and no other portion of the lands described in this act will be fenced; the depth of the cover over the pipe line shall be sufficient so that no interference will result in the use of the land for farming activities; no electric transmission line of any kind shall be erected on the facility lands by the city of Murfreesboro under the easements granted pursuant to this act and no pole for the support of electric wires shall be located at any point on the facility outside of the pump-house site; all of the lands covered by the easements with the exception of the fenced pump-house site shall remain available for Veterans' Administration activities not incompatible with the purpose of the easements and the existing dam and reservoir in Stones River shall be maintained by the city of Murfreesboro and available as an emergency water supply for the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 3. The easements herein authorized to be granted shall be limited to the period of time the aforesaid lands are required and actually used by the city of Murfreesboro for the construction and maintenance of a water-pumping station, and when no longer so required and used, all interests herein authorized to be conveyed in said lands shall cease and determine.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO EVIDENCE OF DEATH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6646, to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no State law providing for presumption of death shall be applicable to claims for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. If satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the continued and unexplained absence of any individual from his home and family for a period of 7 years, and that after diligent search no evidence of his existence after date of disappearance has been found or otherwise received, the death of such absentee as of the date of the expiration of such period may be considered as sufficiently proved: *Provided*, That, except in a suit brought pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or section 617 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, the finding of death made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be final and conclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING TEMPORARY DISABILITY RATINGS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS PERMANENT AFTER 10 YEARS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6824, proposing to make temporary disability ratings of world war veterans permanent after 10 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this is not the bill that the Veterans' Administration opposed on the ground, among other things, that it did not take into account the fact that a man who was rated as being permanently disabled might, in view of the development of medical science and the discovery of new remedies or new cures, stage a complete recovery after the running of the period of 10 years provided by this bill and still be on the rolls with a rating of permanent disability?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as was once said by a supreme court judge of my State, the gentleman's suggestion is too refined and sublimated for the practical affairs of our everyday life.

It may be we will find cures for everything in the years to come—I do not know—but the fact remains we have not found cures to restore these men, and they have been held to have carried these disabilities for 10 years or more. Under the law governing Spanish War veterans, they are placed on the pension rolls permanently. The same thing is true with reference to the Civil War veterans. All this bill does is to provide that the disability ratings of these veterans shall be considered permanent after 10 years, except in cases of fraud, error, or mistakes. So I can see no reason on earth why this bill should not become law. It would probably save untold thousands and probably millions of dollars in the years to come in the personnel expenses of the Veterans' Administration people who have to go through these records from time to time. I believe it will save money to the Government instead of costing the Government extra money.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. As I recall the testimony of General Hines and the experts from the Veterans' Administration, when they appeared before our committee they are now doing everything possible within the specific authority and the broad powers vested by existing laws in the Administration, to take care of cases of this kind. That being true, it seems to me that specific legislation of this sort, which would simply be in line with the very policy now being

followed by the Veterans' Administration, is not needed.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman from New York that this bill is requested by disabled veterans all over the Nation. It will give them a sense of security and satisfaction that they do not have now and I do not believe it will cost the Government one dollar in the long run, for it will probably enable us to reduce the cost of the Veterans' Administration by many millions of dollars in the years to come.

Let me say to the gentleman from New York on this very subject that I presented these facts to the House several years ago. At the time when the Pension Bureau was in operation the expenses of that great Bureau were only about three and a half million dollars a year, whereas the expenses then of the Veterans' Administration were $43,000,000 a year and about $20,000,000 of that amount was in the administration, if I remember correctly. Now, to keep a great horde of clerks to go through the records of these disabled veterans from year to year when the net result is to keep them on pins and provide expense to the Federal Government, is wrong. If they were Spanish War veterans they would be on there permanently. If they were Civil War veterans they would be on the roll permanently. So, after they have gone for 10 years with this rating, except in the case of fraud, error, or mistake, I think it is nothing but right that we should freeze those cases, or freeze their ratings, in order to give them this satisfaction and, probably, reduce governmental expenses as we go along.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have enough confidence in the fairness and good judgment of General Hines and the Veterans' Administration——

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, so have I.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. To feel that they will keep a man on as long as he is entitled to receive these benefits. In fact they have assured us that this will be done.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. But the gentleman was elected to Congress, and not to the Veterans' Administration. We are supposed to legislate here.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Quite true. But not to legislate needlessly. Also, while we must never fail or falter in our duty to generously care for the veterans of the first World War who are suffering from service-connected disabilities, yet we are charged with the duty of not enacting legislation which might require the payment of vast sums of the taxpayers' money in the form of pensions in cases where disability has ceased to exist.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And the gentleman knows that he was the only member of the Veterans' Committee who did not vote for this bill.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. That is correct, and I have no misgivings on that score, in the light of the fair and cogent reasoning of the Veterans' Administration which was the basis of its adverse report to our committee on this bill. Let it also be understood that I will be the first to take up the cudgel in behalf of any disabled veteran, who is threatened with being unjustly removed from the pension rolls.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course the gentleman knows should this bill become a law, still the veteran will have the privilege of applying to the Veterans' Administration for a physical examination for the purpose of reopening his claim based on the veteran's feelings he is entitled to increased benefits. Now is it not true that the enactment of this bill will in no way harm the chances of the veteran to receive increased benefits?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. That is true, and the rights of the veteran in that respect would be unimpaired. I trust the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the House will understand that my motive in questioning this bill is not to deprive the veterans of any of their rights, but I am genuinely concerned about the possibility of saddling the already overburdened taxpayers with the obligation of paying pensions in cases wherein disability has terminated.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In other words, the gentleman is willing to harass all these disabled veterans who are worried about this situation and who will continue to worry about it, for fear that by passing this bill there might be one out of a thousand or one out of ten thousand who would remain on the rolls that should be knocked off.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. According to the report and testimony of the Veterans' Administration, there will be no harassment. My views of the situation are so irreconcilable with those of the gentleman from Mississippi that I shall ask that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I do not want the bill to go over without prejudice. If the gentleman wants to take the responsibility of objecting to the bill, all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EASEMENT IN CERTAIN LANDS, JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6926) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant an easement to the State of Missouri for highway purposes in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., described as follows:

A strip of land lying along the westerly boundary of the Veterans' Administration reservation at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., between the easterly right-of-way line of Koch Road and a line parallel to and 25 feet distant in a northeasterly direction from the center line of said road, and extending from the southerly property line of the United States of America to a line at right angles to the center line of said Koch Road at survey station 3 plus 20 on said road; said survey station is 320 feet from the intersection of the center line of Koch Road with the center line of the approach road to the Mississippi River bridge, containing five one-hundredths of an acre, more or less.

SEC. 2. The easement herein authorized to be granted shall be limited to the period of time the aforesaid lands are required and actually used by the State of Missouri for highway purposes, and when no longer so required and used, all interests herein authorized to be conveyed in said lands shall cease and determine.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO SANDOVAL COUNTY, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 673) authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the county of Sandoval, N. Mex., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tract of public land (including any improvements thereon) containing approximately 1.2 acres, located in lot 17, section 31, township 13 north, range 4 east, New Mexico principal meridian, used as part of the site of the courthouse and courthouse grounds at Bernalillo, N. Mex. The conveyance of such land shall be made upon payment therefor by the county of the appraised value thereof, exclusive of improvements, but not less than $1.25 per acre.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXPORTATION OF SILICA SAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1331) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals, lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, under the rules and regulations adopted pursuant to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended, so far as applicable, to lease for the exploitation of the deposits of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals found thereon, the lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RIGHT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6071) to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the expiration of the 5-year term of any noncompetitive oil and gas lease issued pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 674), amending the act of February 25, 1920,

and maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations, the record title holder shall be entitled to a preference right over others to a new lease for the same land pursuant to the provisions of section 17 of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended, and under such rules and regulations as are then in force, if he shall file an application therefor within 90 days prior to the date of the expiration of the lease. The preference right herein granted shall not apply to lands which on the date of the expiration of a lease are within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF EXPIRING 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM INSURANCE FOR VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4402, to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while personally I am in favor of this measure which would extend for another period of 5 years the right of veterans to continue their level-premium insurance policies, I feel that being a member of this thankless committee, it is my responsibility to call to the attention of the House the fact that when a similar bill was passed by the Congress 5 years ago it was vetoed by the President and was passed over the President's veto. I am sure the Members generally know the provisions of this bill, because it is one which has to be passed every 5 years. This is the fourth time, I believe, that such extension has been made. However, I felt it incumbent upon myself, serving in this capacity, to bring to the attention of the House the fact that this proposal has heretofore met with Executive disapproval.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct about having passed this measure over a veto. The fact of the business is that about all the veterans' legislation we have got since 1920 we have passed over the veto of some President.

Let me call attention to this fact: These men are on the average now about 50 years old and they have carried this term insurance for about 24 or 25 years. Unless this measure becomes law by the first of June they will lose their insurance unless they convert it. Many of them are now in the service. I doubt if they can get any other kind of insurance. Many are unable to convert. They have paid on it for more than 20 years and they are asking us to do just what we did before, that is to extend it for 5 years longer. An objection now would simply kill the bill. Do not make any mistake about that. It shuts out these men from the benefit of that insurance which they have carried since the last war.

Mr. COLE of New York. As far as the time limit is concerned, I will say it is true that this right to renew expires on May 31. The gentleman from Mississippi has suggested that an objection today will mean that all these veterans will lose their insurance. The gentleman from Mississippi is chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Legislation, having the responsibility to report to the House legislation of this sort. Five years ago his committee knew that this law would expire on May 31, 1942, and there seems to be little reason, if time was important, why the gentleman should wait until the 4th day of May to report the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. We could not foresee the situation as it exists today.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This legislation is simply permissive. It is not mandatory. It does not say that he must continue to carry term insurance, but he has the privilege of doing that if he thinks it is the best thing for him to do.

I would also like to suggest that in this period of war through which we are now passing, to many of these veterans protection in the next 5-year period for their families is the most important thing to them of all—even more important than the distant future. An objection by the gentleman will mean, in effect, that you say to the veteran, "You cannot continue that 5-year level-premium policy." I do not think we should say that.

Mr. COLE of New York. I assure the gentleman that he does not need to impress upon me the merits of this measure. I announced when I arose that I was in favor of it and that I thought it should be passed, but simply because of my responsibility on this committee I felt I should advise the House that a similar bill had been vetoed by the President. It is only because of the time element involved that I am willing that it should go through by unanimous consent. I think any bill that has once been vetoed should receive more consideration than can be given a bill on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Do I understand the gentleman is not going to object?

Mr. COLE of New York. I have made no request. In further support of the idea that it should be brought up in the regular way, of course, the Veterans' Administration now, as in the past, is against the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to call the attention of the House in connection with this bill to the fact that I have in my hand—but have not yet placed on the Speaker's desk—a concurrent resolution from the State of Arizona favoring this measure. This is Arizona State Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 of the fifteenth legislature, special session. This, I take it, is expressing the views of the veterans of the State of Arizona in regard to the matter, asking that it be enacted. I feel the bill should be passed.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I just want to make the observation that the reasons for the enactment of this legislation now are perhaps more cogent and compelling than they were 5 years ago. I know the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, is going to pick up his ears when I say I speak in favor of one of his bills.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from New York, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say that in all my years as chairman of this committee I have never reported or passed through this House a single bill of which I could be a beneficiary. I have already converted my insurance and am paying the full premium; but there are many of these boys who unfortunately cannot do that, and I am unwilling to shut them out or take away this protection. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I do not mean to question the gentleman's sincerity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (47 Stat. 334; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year level-premium term policy may be renewed for a second or third or fourth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination; and in case the 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, 1942, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same conditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO FACILITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6402, to facilitate the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, approved May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685).

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill? It is very difficult to understand from the report.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The chairman of the Committee on Reclamation is not here, but I think I understand this bill.

The sole purpose of the bill is to make provision whereby the Department of the Interior, under the Bureau of Reclamation, can utilize in connection with the Department of Agriculture under the Case-Wheeler Act a certain appropriation that was made some time ago of $5,000,000.

Mr. KEAN. The appropriation has already been made?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The appropriation has already been made. The only question is whether it can be used by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. KEAN. The purpose of this bill, then, is to straighten out a technicality in the law?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is just to correct a technicality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority conferred by section 10 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), may be exercised with respect to any project which has been or may be authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation pursuant to the provision headed "Bureau of Reclamation," subheading "Water conservation and utility projects," in section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940 (53 Stat. 685, 719). The authority conferred by section 10 of the act of October 14, 1940, shall supplement the authority respecting such projects contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940. All proceedings heretofore undertaken in respect to any such project within the scope of section 10 of the act of October 14, 1940, are hereby ratified and validated. The Secretary of the Interior may from time to time make such rules, including rules for the delegation of his powers and duties to officers of the Bureau of Reclamation, as he deems appropriate to carry out the authority conferred by the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, and section 10 of the act of October 14, 1940, in connection with any project above described.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN UNITED STATES INVESTIGATION AND INTELLIGENCE SERVICES TO CONDUCT CERTAIN INVESTIGATONS IN THE INTEREST OF PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 304, to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department to conduct certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary. A subcommittee of this committee has been appointed to correct the language of the joint resolution in the light of recent Supreme Court decisions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUSPENDING STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR FRAUD AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6484, to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the objection to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina that after this bill was reported out by the Judiciary Committee certain amendments were proposed to the bill which the committee now desires to consider. The committee has not had an opportunity to consider the amendments and feels that they should be considered in connection with the bill itself. For this reason it is the wish of the committee, by motion of the committee, that the bill be passed over in order that it may be considered in connection with the amendments.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the purpose of holding up this bill is solely for the purpose of adding an amendment whereby the Department of Justice will not be permitted to prosecute any monopolies that may be operating against the provisions of the Antitrust Act. Today the big monopolistic groups, at the expense of the smaller groups, the consumer, and the taxpayer, and fixing prices, are doing more along that line than ever in the history of the country.

I call to your attention a speech made by me on the floor of the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1942, wherein I have discussed this matter at length. I referred to an indictment by the Federal grand jury, representing the Department of Justice, of 140 persons connected with certain groups, including a number of the large meat-packing companies of the country, for fixing prices on cheese and milk. This indictment was not only against those representing the large manufacturers of cheese but included some of the large meat-packing industries of the country.

Some days ago Mr. Henderson issued price ceilings on meat products. It is interesting to note, according to the facts contained in this speech of mine and letters that I have from Mr. Henderson, that in calling in the representatives of these large packing industries they were able to understand just what was going on and what would happen, and they were able to put it over on Mr. Henderson to the extent that the small packing industries of the country were just about put out of business. It appears that we have been able to correct this.

It this speech I referred to just what is happening in connection with the monopolistic control over sugar legislation, all of which has brought about the rationing of sugar, and at a higher price, all at the expense of our national defense program and the consuming public. Everyone is well acquainted with the testimony of Mr. Arnold and others before a Senate committee in regard to just what these large monopolistic groups have done in the way of preventing the production of rubber in this country, through certain cartels and patents, all of which has operated against the best interests of our national defense program.

The large meat packers of this country have a real monopoly in securing all the Government orders for Federal agencies and under the lend-lease bill.

I cannot see any good reason why we should place an amendment on this bill that has for its purpose the holding up of the prosecution of any industry or corporation that would attempt to monopolize in price fixing, especially in this great emergency, either at the expense of small industry, the consuming public, or the taxpayers of the country. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman further reserve his objection?

Mr. FULMER. I reserve it for the time being, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina that the President on March 20, 1942, sent a letter to the Secretaries of War and Navy and to the Attorney General in which he approved a communication which these Cabinet members had sent to him on the same day in which they stated that the war effort may be impeded and delayed if the Department of Justice is required during the war period to prosecute antitrust cases. The matter had been considered by the War Department, the Department of Justice, and the Navy Department, which departments have an intimate and direct responsibility in connection with the conduct of the war. These various departments and also, I may say, Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, who prosecutes these antitrust cases, all had suggested in their communication to the President that it would be desirable to amend the law so as to permit the Government, without prejudice, to withhold prosecution of those antitrust cases which should be withheld at this time. This does not mean that no such case will be prosecuted. It simply means that these departments will be given discretion to determine what antitrust case prosecutions may be postponed in order that the war effort may not be impeded. That is the sole purpose of the suggestion of the War, Navy, and Justice Departments which has the approval of the President and that is all that is sought to be accomplished.

Mr. FULMER. I thoroughly understand the President's position and I thoroughly understand the position of those large groups whose representatives have complete charge of our national defense program and who are grabbing everything in sight. If the gentleman wants

to bring in a regular bill and discuss it on its merits that is another question.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXPEDITIOUS NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN FORMER CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6633, for the expeditious naturalization of former citizen of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 323", and adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) A person who shall have been a citizen of the United States who has lost or shall lose his citizenship by taking an oath of allegiance upon entering the armed forces of a foreign state at war with a state with which the United States is or may be at war may resume American citizenship by taking the oath of allegiance to the United States prescribed by subsection (b) of section 335 of this act before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States or before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of this act: *Provided*, That such person intends to reside permanently in the United States. Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF NEW LOCK IN ST. MARYS RIVER AS THE "GENERAL DOUGLAS MacARTHUR LOCK"

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 294, instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the "General Douglas MacArthur lock."

I may say that I understand there is no objection on the part of the committee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a joint resolution that has not been on the Consent Calendar a sufficient length of time to be called today. May I inquire of the gentleman from Michigan if there is any further explanation which he wishes to make?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the joint resolution itself is self-explanatory and needs no further explanation. I may say to the gentleman that the only reason for this legislation is because it has been the practice of the War Department in the past not to name existing structures such as the new lock in the Soo for living persons. In deference to the splendid record of Douglas MacArthur and as an inspiration to the workers on this new lock construction which has been started at the Soo, it should be named the "General Douglas MacArthur lock" and I hope the gentleman will not object to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, irrespective of any previously enacted legislation and irrespective of any previous regulations or customs, the Secretary of War shall be, and is hereby, instructed to immediately and henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., as authorized by H. R. 6446, as the "General Douglas MacArthur lock."

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF THE BLACK WARRIOR NATIONAL FOREST TO THE WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 6502, to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I may say for the benefit of the House that this bill simply changes the name of a national forest in my district to the William B. Bankhead National Forest. Most of all of us here are familiar with the life work of former Speaker Bankhead.

Mr. Speaker, until today I have followed the unwritten rule of the House that a new Member should be seen and not heard. However, under the circumstances, I am sure that the Members will forgive me for trespassing on their valuable time to make a few observations on the merits of H. R. 6502, a bill to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest.

As a general rule, I am opposed to naming public buildings, memorials, parks, and forests for living persons, but I feel that naming memorials, buildings, and so forth, for deceased great leaders of a democracy is laudable and should be followed to a greater extent than has been the practice heretofore. Such action keeps ever in the minds of our citizens that we live in a free country. It keeps before us the names of those great patriots who have contributed so much of their talents, energies, and lives to the preservation of our precious liberties. It keeps alive the history of the builders of our Republic.

Today, when the very existence of our democracy is being challenged by the mailed fist of the Axis dictators, we are proud to live in a Nation that is still governed by the people through their duly elected representatives. Our fight for freedom is going forward to victory by people who have a burning desire to preserve freedom of enterprise, freedom of speech, freedom of the right to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, and the right to change our form of government by free ballot instead of by the unconscionable dictates of a tyrant who answers to no one but himself. These freedoms were not all gained by peaceful means; many of them were gained by the blood and sacrifice of our ancestors, and now must again be defended with the blood of this generation whose patriotism and courage will make it possible for future generations to live in a free country.

Many of the liberties we enjoy today were not gained on the field of battle but were won by courageous action here in this Chamber. Tomes and tomes of history devote the greater part of their texts to the conquests of military men who gained their places in history by destroying human life and human liberty, while too little space has been given to those men of science, religion, and public service who dedicated their lives to serving humanity and making the world a better place in which to live.

Most of you served in the House with the late Hon. William B. Bankhead, who represented the Seventh District of Alabama, which it is now my honor to represent, but to those of you who did not have that privilege, permit me to give you a brief sketch of his life, character, and accomplishments.

William Brockman Bankhead was born on April 12, 1874, at Moscow, Lamar County, Ala., which was also the birthplace of his illustrious father. He was the second son of the late Senator John Hollis Bankhead and Tallulah Brockman Bankhead and the brother of the present distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD. Mr. Bankhead was educated in the public schools of Alabama, and graduated from the University of Alabama in June 1893, receiving an A. B. degree. While attending the university he participated enthusiastically in athletics, being a member of both the football and baseball teams. He distinguished himself in oratory and showed great interest in the study of English and the dramatic arts. The young student followed his father to Washington where the latter had been a Member of Congress since 1887. Here he studied law at Georgetown University Law School and obtained his LL. B. degree in 1895. After admission to the Alabama bar, he practiced at Huntsville for 10 years. During this period he actively entered politics and represented Madison County, Ala., in the State legislature in 1900 and 1901. In 1905 he removed to Jasper and became associated with his brother in the law firm of Bankhead and Bankhead. From 1910 to 1914 he was circuit solicitor of the fourteenth judicial circuit and 2 years later was elected as a Member of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. Bankhead's talents and ability were soon recognized by the Members. Early in his career in Congress he sponsored legislation for vocational rehabilitation, the development of our inland waterways and Federal aid to the States for the construction of roads. He was recognized as one of the leaders in a movement to lift the yoke of bankruptcy from the large majority of the farmers in this country, and continued this interest until his untimely death. Mr. Bankhead was chosen in the Seventy-third Congress as chairman of the Rules Committee of the House and at the beginning of the Seventy-fourth Congress, he was elected as majority leader. On June 4, 1936, owing to the sudden and unexpected death of Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, Mr. Bankhead was unanimously elected to fill the position of his departed friend, which position he held until his untimely death on September 15, 1940.

Speaker Bankhead was one of the ablest parliamentarians to ever sit in the chair of the Speaker of the House. He acted impartially toward all Members and did not permit his personal feelings to influence his decisions. On many occasions he bent over backward to be fair. He possessed a delightful sense of humor. Although he engaged in levity at times, he always took his position seriously. Speaker Bankhead was a profound student of literature and possessed a command of the English language equaled by few. His rare ability to present technical, involved, financial, and legal problems in a manner readily understandable by persons endowed with only average intelligence; his innate capacity to compel his hearers to listen intently to his explanations; his keen interest in anything concerning the welfare of his country; his ardent desire that justice be meted out to the underprivileged tillers of the soil and workers in industry, combined to make William Brockman Bankhead a great statesman. Many progressive statutes that are now on the books were sponsored by Mr. Bankhead.

Although Mr. Bankhead was a pacifist at heart, he voted during his first term in Congress to declare war on Germany, and in addressing the House on October 2, 1917, he made it plain to all who wished to know that he voted for the entry of the United States in the war not primarily "to make the world safe for democracy, but as a Representative of a part of my country and, in a sense, as a Representative of all its people, to make the United States of America safe in its own conception of democracy" and because the American people had "a long series of accumulated grievances of the most specific and brutal nature."

When our country was faced with a crisis from without or within, Speaker Bankhead always exhibited his sincere patriotism by subjecting his own personal or political interests to those of his country. On January 25, 1918, in a speech before Congress on the conduct of the war, Mr. Bankhead showed his sincere patriotism when he reminded his colleagues in Congress that—

> In the midst of and throughout this war, until it shall end in triumph for our arms, we owe it to our country, and to ourselves, and to our cause to give to our Commander in Chief the full measure of sympathetic and helpful aid, comfort, and assistance, and in addition thereto to stand behind and back to the limit his policies and to grant the adequate powers he asks us to grant.

This advice is as timely today as it was in 1918, because today there is a well-organized fight to discredit the Congress and shake the confidence of our people in their duly elected officials. Many people lose sight of the fact that during a crisis, even in a democracy, we have to give up some of our liberties and surrender some of our legislative prerogatives to the Chief Executive, but most of our people realize that it is better to temporarily give up these liberties and win the war than to run the risk of losing the war and permanently losing our freedom. When the majority of our people lose confidence in their elected officials, then and only then will there be a one-man dictatorship in this country.

Early in life Mr. Bankhead realized that it was necessary to start a program to conserve our natural resources which were being ruthlessly destroyed by a money-mad public. He interested himself in the acquisition of forest lands that our country might, when the need arose, have the timber necessary to carry on its national defense. He sponsored the purchase by the Federal Government of forest lands lying in the Seventh and Eighth Districts of Alabama, which lands later became known as the Black Warrior National Forest. He was not only interested in conserving our natural resources but was interested in having the forest made a recreational center for the people of Alabama.

This forest of beautiful pine and oak, covering the hills of Winston, Franklin, and Lawrence Counties, will be, so long as our democracy stands, a living monument to the memory of William B. Bankhead who played such a vital part in steering the destiny of our Republic through some of its darkest hours.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]?

Mr KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, there is no great urgency for a bill like this. In the future I believe that bills on the Consent Calendar ought to be considered in the regular way. In this case I will not object, but in connection with future bills, unless there is a great emergency, I shall be forced to object.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and, of course, I shall not object.

Let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] that ordinarily I would agree with him, that measures of this kind should go on the Consent Calendar. But here is a bill to which there can be no objection.

It is a great tribute to a great American. There has not been a more popular or a more worthy man in this House in all its history than Will Bankhead. I submit to the gentleman from New Jersey that there can be no objection to the passage of this measure on the part of any Member, and for that reason it was unnecessary to place it on the Consent Calendar. For I am sure that every Member of this body is glad to join in honoring this great American.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman has stated the reason why I am not objecting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the date of enactment of this act the national forest situated in the State of Alabama known and designated as the "Black Warrior National Forest" shall be known and designated as the "William B. Bankhead National Forest." All laws, regulations, and public documents and records of the United States in which such national forest is designated or referred to under the name of the "Black Warror National Forest" shall be held to refer to such national forest under and by the name of the "William B. Bankhead National Forest."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6972) relating to the payment by certain persons in the armed forces of the United States entitled to be naturalized under title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, of fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the gentleman should explain the bill before permission to consider it is granted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that ordinarily measures of this kind should come up in their regular order, but the occasion for asking to have this particular measure considered now is this:

When the war powers bill was considered by the conference committee, in the section dealing with a short method by which certain aliens who are in our armed forces could procure citizenship, the conferees failed, it appears, to provide that such aliens should not be required to pay the $2.50 fee ordinarily required for certificate of entry. The House and Senate passed on the question, and did not intend to charge this $2.50 fee, but when the language in the bill was worked out by the conference committee it was not stated clearly enough to satisfy the Departments affected that this fee is waived. This measure simply clarifies what I think was the intent of Congress that the $2.50 fee for the issuance of a certificate of arrival would be waived in these cases.

Mr. COLE of New York. Who receives the $2.50 fee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Federal Government receives it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is not a portion of that fee passed on back to the local county clerks for performing some function in connection with the naturalization of these aliens?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; it is not. The Federal Government gets that particular fee.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the purpose of charging $2.50?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Under the law, petitioners for citizenship are required to secure certificates of entry. They are for the purpose of proving legal entry into the United States. These aliens will also be required to secure certificates of entry, but under this measure the fee, in their particular cases, is waived.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it contended that the $2.50 fee covers the cost to the Government of handling these cases?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; it does not cover the entire cost.

Mr. COLE of New York. At any rate, if any portion of this $2.50 is eventually turned back to the offices of the local county clerks, this bill would not affect that reimbursement?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; it would not. This fee goes to the Federal Government; it does not go to the county clerks.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the $2.50 goes to the Federal Government, but does not the Federal Government in turn pay something to the local county clerks for their part in the naturalization of aliens?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Other fees are charged, such as for filing petition for citizenship, a part of which does go to the office where the petition is filed. The fee of $2.50, when charged, goes to the Federal Government.

Mr. COLE of New York. If that is true, will this waiver of the $2.50 fee to the soldiers take from the county clerks the usual fee they might receive from the Federal Government?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It will not.

Mr. COLE of New York. It will not affect that in any way?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It will not.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. These are cases that do not come to the county clerks in ordinary times. This is simply to recognize the loyalty, the patriotism, and the devotion to our institutions these aliens show by enlisting in the Army. This simply gives them a short cut to citizenship.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The law prescribes the manner in which these aliens who are in our armed forces may become citizens. Among the requirements is the filing of petition, qualifying under the examination, taking of the oath as well as other requirements. This measure simply provides that although he be required to provide a certificate of entry, he does not have to pay the fee of $2.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 701 of title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after "no fee shall be charged or collected for" the following: "the issuance of a certificate of arrival or for."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES AND MAKING OF CONTRACTS BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 9, strike out "2 and 3" and insert "1 or 2."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House was good enough to grant my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] leave of absence on account of the illness of his mother. I regret to announce that that very beautiful and gracious lady has passed away. I am sure the Members of the House will join with the New Jersey delegation in extending to our colleague and to his wife and daughter our sympathy over this great and irreparable loss that has shadowed their hearts and home.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct a misstatement I made with respect to the cost of an article which I recently asked to have inserted in the RECORD. I had two communications from the Public Printer. One of them related to a manuscript submitted on the subject, Matthew Lyon's Vote Made Jefferson President. It was estimated that this manuscript would take up three and two-thirds pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $165. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, one on the subject of sugar and one on the subject of O. C. D. workers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a press release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a couple of resolutions passed by the National Association of Farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include a letter and in the other to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from former Senator Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr; and

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2315. An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

The petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 8, 1942, in connection with the investigation of petroleum.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson will appear before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1606. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency to provide for the requirements of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration in the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1607. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 5, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Whatcom Creek, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1608. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on the McCreadys Creek, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1609. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Michigan City Harbor, Ind., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1610. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Ohio River, with a view to determining whether any modifications should be made in the flood-control plans with respect to flood-control works on the Cache River, in Union, Johnson, Massac, Pulaski, and Alexander Counties, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 25, 1940; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1611. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Angela Skeoch; to the Committee on Claims.

1612. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 23, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Burlington Harbor, Vt., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 2, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1613. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 17, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1614. A letter from the Secretary of the American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1615. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6921. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7036. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 7037. A bill to increase the pay of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7038. A bill to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated April 24, 1942, relative to House bill 6886 concerning tolls with respect to the use for commercial navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 146 relative to the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7039. A bill to provide that the death of Daniel K. Lunt shall be held in line of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 7040. A bill for the relief of the J. P. Snyder Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2744. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to pass appropriate legislation to eliminate the inequitable discrimination against the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2745. Also, petition of the members of the staff of the Samuel Gompers Vocational High School, Bronx, New York City, N. Y., expressing their opposition to the McKellar bill which would abolish the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2746. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Harry Herman, president, Los Angeles Central Labor Council, asserting their support of House bill 6486; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2747. By Mr. HOBBS: Petition adopted by the congregation assembled in a union service held in the First Methodist Church of Anniston, Ala., on April 19, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2748. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Helen Crook and 117 citizens of Barton County, Kans., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2749. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. Orville Heaton, president, and Mrs. G. A. Hobson, secretary, Woman's Federated Club, of Webster, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2750. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petitions from citizens of Yates Center, Junction City, and Emporia, Kans., endorsing Senate bill 860 or similar legislation to safeguard health, welfare, and safety of men in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2751. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 2579, of the board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, relative to the proposal for establishment of priority procedure for certain businesses and associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2752. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 10 residents of Bad Axe, Mich., urging favorable action on Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2753. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to pledging support in the war emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Nelson F. Parke, rector of St. Andrew's Church, New Berlin, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, King of Kings, and Lord of all Rulers: Bestow upon the people of this land such a measure of Thy light and wisdom as to make us obedient to Thy will, and mindful of our calling.

Give understanding and strength to our President, Vice President, the Members of the Senate, and all others to whom we entrust the authority of government. Endue with courage and hope those who have gone forth in battle to defend the great and noble heritage Thou hast given us. Sanctify the hearts and minds of those who labor in the more humble walks of life, that they may dedicate their service to Him who forsook the palace for the manger and the throne for the cross.

All of which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 4, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse;

S. 1331. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929;

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria;

S. 2133. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940; and

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress, S. 3055, an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2989. An act to authorize the use of a tract of land in California known as the Millerton Rancheria in connection with the Central Valley project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 6071. An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees;

H. R. 6402. An act to facilitate the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, approved May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685);

H. R 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest;

H. R. 6633. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States;

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes;

H. R. 6972. An act relating to the payment by certain persons in the armed forces of the United States entitled to be naturalized under title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, of fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur lock.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine;

H. R. 3767. An act for the relief of Frank Sheppard; and

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bailey	Barkley
Andrews	Ball	Bilbo
Austin	Bankhead	Bone
Brewster	Herring	Pepper
Brown	Hill	Radcliffe
Bulow	Holman	Reed
Bunker	Hughes	Reynolds
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Byrd	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Smathers
Chavez	Lee	Smith
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Spencer
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Stewart
Danaher	McFarland	Taft
Davis	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Doxey	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maloney	Tunnell
George	Maybank	Tydings
Gerry	Mead	Vandenberg
Gillette	Millikin	Van Nuys
Glass	Murdock	Wallgren
Green	Norris	Walsh
Guffey	Nye	Wheeler
Gurney	O'Daniel	White
Hayden	Overton	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT ON HOUSING FACILITIES TRANSFERRED TO THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the general manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the transfer of certain housing facilities from the Farm Security Administration to the Tennessee Valley Authority for use at Murphy, N. C., for employees engaged at the Hiwassee Projects; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I hereby appoint the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to represent the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy during the remainder

of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

PETITIONS

Mr. HUGHES presented petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

LETTER FROM SUPERIOR (WIS.) BUILDING TRADES COUNCIL—LABOR SITUATION IN THE SUPERIOR LOCALITY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, with the signatures attached thereto, a letter from the Superior Building Trades Council, of Superior, Wis.

There being no objection, the letter, with the signatures attached, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERIOR BUILDING TRADES COUNCIL,
Superior, Wis., April 23, 1942.

Hon. Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Superior Building Trades Council wishes to submit the following true facts concerning the labor situation for this locality.

We consider the Head of the Lakes a very vital defense area, with its vast ore-dock facilities, large grain elevators, and shipbuilding plants. There is already over $40,000,000 worth of defense contracts allotted to this area.

All of these industries are organized and most of them are operating under closed-shop conditions. There has not been 1 hour's time lost here due to labor trouble, and the employers themselves agree that their relations with labor have been most harmonious.

Labor is proud of its patriotism and is willing to make any sacrifices that will prove beneficial to the country, but we are opposed to the unfair methods the press and commentators are employing. It is their wish that the mind of the public become permeated and contaminated with propaganda, thereby creating disunity and disruption between the organized and unorganized workers of this country.

It is the American duty of every worker to produce to his utmost in this great production battle. They are aware of that fact and are willing to do so. In order to achieve our purpose of preserving the world democracies, it is most essential that we have a unified labor front and be in mutual accord with all its policies.

Most sincerely yours,

Leonard E. Peterson, William E. Vaskl, Chas. C. Jubenville, Hugh F. McKay, Oscar F. Erickson, C. A. Doolittle, Chas. Flack, Arthur Peters, Elmer Pearson, James Whalen, Lloyd Northcott, Lawrence B. Meyett, Elmer Starstead, Chris Peterson, Oscar Score, Purl O. Fetters.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution designating June 11, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance; with amendments (Rept. No. 1301).

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3572. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a)); without amendment (Rept. No. 1302).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4402. A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 4, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2509. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 2510, which was referred to the Commitee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

CLASSIFICATION OF DRAFTEES ACCORDING TO FAMILY STATUS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and wish to make a brief statement regarding it.

The bill proposes to classify draftees according to their family status, without reference to actual dependency. There has been great discrimination throughout the United States with reference to the question of dependency. Some local boards have been very strict indeed, and others have classified in 3-A practically every man who is married. Boards have made different rules to determine when a wife is dependent. Some do not consider a wife dependent if she is working or has ever worked. Others do not consider her dependent if they think that she could work, even though she never has. The question is further complicated by the arrival of children, so that today many men are in the Army who actually have dependents unable to support themselves.

Furthermore, it is becoming apparent that we shall have to draft many men with actual dependents. Everyone is agreed that money allowances must be made for the wives and children of enlisted men. Furthermore, there is hardly a man today under 45 who is able to make any plans for the future. No one can be certain whether he can continue in his business or be drafted. This has resulted in a flood of applications for commissions from older men.

My bill proposes to abandon the dependency test, and provide that all men be called by classes, each class to be exhausted before the next class is called. The proposed classes are as follows:

First. Men under 35 who are unmarried and childless, or married since September 16, 1940, the date of the Draft Act.

Second. Men between 35 and 45 who are unmarried and childless, or married since December 20, 1941, when the draft was extended above 35.

Third. Married men under 35 without children.

Fourth. Married men over 35 without children.

Fifth. Men under 28, married before the draft, with children.

Sixth. Men between 28 and 35, married before the draft, with children.

Seventh. Men over 35, married before December 20, 1941, with children.

The bill would not affect in any way the jurisdiction of local boards regarding occupational deferment.

The bill is not intended to be retroactive regarding men already drafted, because the administrative difficulty would be too great. It would eliminate all the doubtful questions regarding dependency, and would give assurance to men in the later classes that they will only be called when conditions make it absolutely essential. Such men could freely undertake obligations in connection with defense work at home.

If this bill is passed, of course, it is essential that the bills providing increased pay for soldiers and allowances for their dependents should also be adopted.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2510) to provide a uniform system of classification under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RETIREMENT, WITH ADVANCED RANK, OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.; and

H. R. 6071. An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6402. An act to facilitate the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, approved May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former

members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6633. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; and

H. R. 6972. An act relating to the payment by certain persons in the armed forces of the United States entitled to be naturalized under title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, of fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 2989. An act to authorize the use of a tract of land in California known as the Millerton Rancheria in connection with the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur Lock; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE subsequently, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6926) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1304) thereon.

NAMES OF CERTAIN ARMY PERSONNEL WHO HAVE ASKED TO BE RELIEVED OF MILITARY DUTIES

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution, which I send to the desk. I request that the resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 243) was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Whereas our country is in peril and threatened on every side by enemies; and

Whereas according to American traditions of loyalty and patriotism our citizens have responded to the call of arms; and

Whereas Congress has appropriated nearly $160,000,000,000 to furnish arms and equipment for our sailors and soldiers; and

Whereas the President has now declared that by 1943 we shall have more than 4,000,000 men under arms; and

Whereas the registration and drafting of women has become an issue before Congress; and

Whereas the glorious deeds of General MacArthur have served as a great inspiration to our people in this time of need: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the War Department be, and it is hereby, requested to furnish the names of all personnel above the rank of captain and under the age of retirement who have voluntarily asked to be relieved of their military duties in this time of the Nation's peril, together with those at or over the age of retirement who have continued in the service.

TWO-PARTY GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on two-party government, delivered by him on May 4, 1942, at the meeting of the Women's Republican Club of the District of Columbia, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment on page 71, line 23, to strike out the word "purchase" and the comma.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, sometimes, under certain conditions, people do foolish things. For example, I have heard of some very funny things happening when a man's house has caught fire. I once heard of a man whose house caught fire and who, of course, wanted to save everything he could. The ice man had just brought in a chunk of ice and put it down on the kitchen sink. The man rushed in, grabbed up the chunk of ice, took it out, and deposited it on the sidewalk. I heard of another man whose house was on fire, who picked up an armful of dishes, rushed to the window, and dumped them out the window. I use these illustrations to show how it is possible, under stress, and in the psychology of critical conditions, for us to do a foolish thing in an effort to do a helpful thing.

At this time we all want to cut down nondefense expenditures, but I am sure none of us want to hinder any activity necessary toward winning the war. It has developed that the adoption of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, now under consideration, would not reduce Government expenditures. It has also developed in the debate that its only effect would be to deprive the Tennessee Valley Authority of a governmental arrangement by which it utilizes a revolving fund, which governmental arrangement now exists under the provisions of at least three laws to which I referred late yesterday evening. This arrangement is that which is accorded most governmental corporations, allowing them revolving funds for operating, in order that they may act with greater speed. Further, it was not developed in the debate that there has been any fraud, crookedness, or corruption in the Tennessee Valley Authority. It also appears that agreeing to the committee amendment would limit and might hamstring the T. V. A. to an extent which would be dangerous in wartime.

For instance, if we should adopt the first amendment, absolutely prohibiting the T. V. A. from purchasing any more automobiles, I can conceive of an unfortunate situation ensuing. Last week two terrible storms hit Oklahoma—one at Pryor and one at Pawhuska—resulting in widespread destruction of property and the loss of many lives. I can easily conceive how it would be possible for a storm of that kind to strike the Tennessee Valley where a number of cars, necessary for carrying on the business of the T. V. A., might be clustered in a parking lot, and destroy them. Under the committee amendment before the T. V. A. could secure other cars in order to carry on its business, it would be necessary for them to come and secure action by Congress, which, at the very best we could do, would be a long process.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we err now we should err on the side of defense. If it should be determined to withdraw the use of the revolving fund from the T. V. A., I certainly believe it should be done only after adequate hearings, and consideration of every angle of the action, before taking away an authority and a privilege and an arrangement which has been a part of the T. V. A. since 1935.

Mr. President, I wish to show in the next few minutes how important electric power is to our war effort. I wish to show first how far the United States is behind the Axis, how far ahead of the United States the Axis is at this time in the development of electric power.

Europe has about one-third of the water power of the world, with a major portion located in Axis-controlled countries. The developed water power in these 11 countries totals practically 15,000,000 kilowatts, or 25 percent above the developed hydroelectric power in the United States.

The total dependable capacity of Axis-controlled power plants is from forty to forty-three million kilowatts, or approximately 25 percent in excess of the public and private capacity of this country.

Between 1935 and 1942 Germany, in her own and occupied territories, has quadrupled the output of electric power. While they are doing that we are considering the adoption of an amendment which might limit and hinder the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is the greatest source of electric power in the United States.

Today the Axis European electric production is about 40 percent above that of the United States levels, of which half comes from occupied territories. We need to add at least 7,000,000 kilowatts as early as possible, and then to provide about 5,000,000 kilowatts additional for reserves.

Japan, with heavy rainfall and precipitious slopes has great hydro power resources. Its potential hydro power is nearly 5,000,000 kilowatts, and its developed power is in excess of three and one-half million kilowatts. This is one reason for that country's war production activity.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss now the part that electric power plays in the development of aircraft production. Aircraft production is principally a light electric metal industry. The materials required for engine construction are magnesium-aluminum alloys for the engine blocks, high-grade alloyed steel for cylinder walls, forged steel shafts and brass, bronze, copper, and lead for bearings. The plane bodies are built of aluminum and aluminum-magnesium alloy

sheets and shapes. All of these basic raw materials are electric metals.

The fabrication of these metals into planes also requires large blocks of power. The electric metal weight in the average bomber is about 12 tons, in the medium bomber 10 tons, and in the pursuit plane 5 tons. It takes about 3¼ kilowatts working every hour in the year, except for repairs, to turn this raw material into 1 ton of finished fabricated product. This means that each average bomber takes about 40 kilowatts working continuously for a full year, the average bomber 32 kilowatts, and the pursuit plane 16 kilowatts. It has been estimated that the average plane requires about 8 tons of such material, or 26 kilowatt-years.

A yearly schedule of 60,000 planes represents about 1,600,000 kilowatts. Applying this to my own State, this is over 7 times the total electric maximum use now existing in Oklahoma. A 125,000 yearly plane program will require 3,200,000 kilowatts, or approximately one-tenth of the total effective American electric capacity.

Let us now consider electric power with respect to the manufacture of munitions. The classification of munitions includes shell casings, explosives, gases, and smokes. Casings are generally brass, which is made from electrolytic copper and zinc. These materials have extensive war uses. Brass melting furnaces will produce about 25 tons per kilowatt-year. Pure zinc is produced at the rate of 2 tons per kilowatt-year, whereas electrolytic copper reduction direct from the ore ranges from two and a half to three and a half tons per kilowatt-year.

Next I wish to discuss the manufacture of ordnance and the use of electric power. This classification includes small arms, artillery, tanks, antiaircraft, naval guns, and accessories. This type of manufacture requires forgings of alloy steels, aluminum, and magnesium. This means conventional furnace steel plus electrolytic refined steels and ferroalloys. High-grade iron and alloy steels are basic to this type of manufacture. The alloy steels require large quantities of power as such furnaces range in size from 25,000 to 35,000 kilowatts each.

I wish also to discuss the construction and building of ships with respect to electric power needed. The base of the shipbuilding industry is steel plates and structural shapes which require iron and steel furnaces as well as ferroalloys. Ferrochrome is used to make armor plate. High-grade electric steel is required for propulsion machinery. The present trend is toward the rapidly growing use of alloy steel, which is another electric product.

The light metals, such as aluminum and magnesium, are the materials vital to the manufacture of airplanes and incendiary bombs.

In 1933 the United States produced more than twice as much aluminum as Germany. In 1940 Germany and her occupied territories produced over twice as much aluminum as was produced in the United States—more than 15 percent in excess of the combined output of Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. This is exclusive of Japan. In 1940 Japan produced what would compare to about 19 percent of the aluminum manufactured in the United States. At the end of 1941 Germany was outproducing the United States, Great Britain, and Canada in aluminum and magnesium.

Mr. President, I present these cold facts to show how important electric power is for the prosecution of this war, and to point out the danger that might come to the United States if we in any way limited or hindered any of our power-producing facilities in the United States. Instead of limiting them and hobbling them, we should be considering methods here of expanding the production of electric power.

I have here two newspapers, both of them from the same publishing company. One of them has a headline:

Power short, State out of defense race.

This is the Daily Oklahoman of Wednesday, April 15. Then there is the subhead line:

Congressmen told it's no use to seek new plants.

That is, for Oklahoma. This article is by Carl K. Stuart, of the Oklahoman Times, Washington Bureau.

It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Oklahoma is out of the picture from now on in the competition for important defense industries because it has no more electric power available for them, the State congressional delegation was told Tuesday.

Russell Rhodes, executive secretary of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, brought these gloomy tidings to the Congressmen, and his conclusions were echoed by Representative JACK NICHOLS, who asserted that "there is not a single kilowatt of power now available, or even in sight for any definite future delivery, for any war industries in the State not already allocated."

So serious did the delegation take these warnings that it ordered the appointment of a committee to survey the power situation and report any departmental suggestions that may be found for breaking this bottleneck.

Then there is another subhead line:

No use to try.

I continue to read under that headline.

Rhodes declared that the power famine already has lost to some Oklahoma community the sundry ammonia and shell-loading plant which has just been awarded to the Amarillo area; that it threatens to block the $13,000,000 butadiene plant proposed for Seminole, and that it has put eastern Oklahoma out of the running for a huge chemical warfare establishment.

Mr. President, I wish to read the headline of the afternoon newspaper of this same publishing company, the Oklahoma City Times of April 30:

United States admits Oklahoma's power is sufficient for war industries.

First report of shortage proves false.

Congressmen investigating an alleged shortage of electric power in Oklahoma for war industries Thursday had direct, official word from the War Production Board that the power available is sufficient for industries allocated or planned.

The statement, issued by J. A. Krug, Chief of the Power Branch of the War Production Board, is being circulated among power company executives by a special Oklahoma power investigating committee, including Congressmen LYLE H. BOREN (chairman), JED JOHNSON, and WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, and is expected to be the final chapter in the argument over Oklahoma's power supply.

Another heading is:

CAN SUPPLY MORE PLANTS

The official analysis, which points out that there are no "large blocks" of power available in Oklahoma for "aluminum, magnesium, or other war industries which require enormous quantities of power," adds that the supply is "sufficient to meet the requirements of all war industries which have been allocated to Oklahoma and a sufficient supply can be made available, by curtailment if necessary, for such additional war industries as should be located in Oklahoma because of natural advantages."

The statement came in refutation of charges made in Washington and attributed to Russell Rhodes, manager of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, that Oklahoma is losing war industries because of the lack of power. The charge stirred up a hornets' nest in power circles and brought an investigation by both Congressmen and business leaders of the State.

Mr. President, I have read both sides of this controversy. Those whom I have consulted about the possibility of locating new war industries in Oklahoma say that there is a shortage of power. They do not say that there is an actual shortage now, but that all the available power has been allocated. Therefore they hesitate to give consideration to the location of other industries in that area.

Recently at Chicago, Mr. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, made a speech in which he stated that there was a shortage of power. I have given facts which have been checked for accuracy with the War Production Board.

Those figures definitely show that there is a shortage of power in this country; that we are behind the Axis in the production of power; that we are behind the Axis in the development of hydroelectric power; that Germany and the conquered countries have quadrupled their power production since 1935; and that their developed hydroelectric capacity is above that of the United States.

Mr. President, in the light of these facts I submit that we should not do anything, no matter how small, which would in any way threaten the further production and development of power in this country. Therefore I hope that the two committee amendments to which I have referred will both fail.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Gurney
Andrews	Capper	Hayden
Austin	Chavez	Herring
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Bankhead	Danaher	Hughes
Barkley	Davis	Johnson, Calif.
Bilbo	Doxey	Johnson, Colo.
Bone	Ellender	Kilgore
Brewster	George	La Follette
Brown	Gerry	Lee
Bulow	Gillette	Lucas
Bunker	Glass	McCarran
Burton	Green	McFarland
Butler	Guffey	McKellar

McNary	Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho
Maloney	Reed	Thomas, Okla.
Maybank	Reynolds	Tunnell
Mead	Russell	Tydings
Millikin	Schwartz	Vandenberg
Murdock	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Norris	Smathers	Wallgren
Nye	Smith	Walsh
O'Daniel	Spencer	Wheeler
Overton	Stewart	White
Pepper	Taft	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 71, line 23, to strike out the word "purchase" and the comma.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, during the debate yesterday reference was made to our Columbia power development and the changes proposed to be made in the set-up, which are outlined in Senate bill 2430, introduced by me on behalf of my colleague and myself. It seemed desirable that I should make some comment on what is proposed to be accomplished in the Columbia River Basin. I do not desire to explore the bill thoroughly, since I expect to do that later when it is before the Senate. However, I do think it will be of more than passing interest to the Members of the Senate to understand something of the conditions which led me and my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], to introduce a bill which is of live interest to the people of the Northwest, and especially to the two Northwestern States, Washington and Oregon.

In the first place, it must be understood that the situation confronting us in the Northwest is different from that which is exemplified by the T. V. A. picture. Presidential fiat brought Grand Coulee into existence, and it was placed under the Interior Department and operated by the Reclamation Service. It was a multiple-purpose dam and a multiple-purpose project. The Bonneville project was created also by Presidential fiat, and its operation was placed under the Board of Army Engineers.

To this day Grand Coulee has and, under the proposed and contemplated legislation, will look to the Interior Department and the Interior Department budget to provide additional generating equipment. With respect to the Bonneville, that project under the domination of the engineers will look to the budget of the Board of Army Engineers for the necessary amount to add additional generating equipment.

That presents to the Congress this sort of a picture. The Columbia River power agency proposed to be set up under the bill which I have introduced will be a sales agency. It will be a seller of electric energy. It will own a few great main transmission lines. It will take the power produced by the Reclamation Service at the Grand Coulee and the power produced by the Army engineers at the Bonneville, and will sell it.

It will probably have at its command the greatest pool of hydroelectric energy in this country, if not in the world.

One project on the Columbia River, the Grand Coulee, when fully completed will produce about as much energy as can be produced at all the dams in the Tennessee Valley. Of a consequence, the agency set up to dispose of that energy has a sizeable problem on its hands, but it is the normal problem incident to the operation of a big power system. T. V. A. was a creature of Congress. I was in this body when it and the House created the T. V. A. back in 1933. It was the brain child of our able and distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. It started from scratch, so to speak, and developed that valley as a single entity. It did this without being tied in with other governmental agencies such as I have referred to—the Interior Department and the War Department. Therefore its operations have been conducted, necessarily, in a different fashion.

Congress passed the Bonneville Act in 1937. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and I did a great deal of work on that bill. The Senator from Oregon was generous of his time and suggestions and he will recall, as other Members of the Senate will recall, that the bill provides that it is provisional legislation. We, too, were "starting from scratch," so to speak, in attempting to set up an agency to sell the electric energy produced at Bonneville. We faced the fact that at Bonneville the Army engineers were turning the wheels and producing the energy, so we set up an agency which took the current produced at Bonneville and made it a sales agency of the Federal Government, under the title "Bonneville Administration."

When Grand Coulee later became a producer of power, we faced precisely the same problem. The picture had jelled and set. The Reclamation Service was in charge of the vast Grand Coulee development. The Army engineers were still in charge of the Bonneville project. So the proposal now before the Senate in the form of Senate bill 2430 simply creates an enlarged sales agency. In creating it, we have attempted to give it the powers that legitimately belong to such an agency. Without such powers we would simply crucify its usefulness by restrictions that no private business would tolerate or impose on itself. By our proposals, we have tried to create an efficient business organization.

First, there is capitalized on the books the amount of money the Federal Government has so far spent in its power developments there, or that portion of the Federal expenditure which can properly be allocated to and chargeable to the production of power. When that figure is determined, it goes on the books, and is charged as a capital debt which the project owes the Federal Government, and which it agrees, under the bill, to pay back, so much a year, with interest on the debt.

The bill further provides that when this agency takes over any private system for later sale to public bodies, it will pay the same amount of taxes paid by the private corporation previously owning and holding it, during the time such property is held by the agency. Under the bill it is made the duty of this agency immediately to sell these acquired distribution systems back to the many public utility bodies in the State of Washington which have been set up for the purpose of operating electric distribution systems. They will then buy power from the Columbia Power Authority.

There are 39 counties in the State of Washington, and in 30 of them the people of my State have set up public agencies to own and operate power systems and to distribute electrical energy to their people. So, when the Federal Government takes over one of the big private systems—and, parenthetically, let me say to the Senate that one of the largest in the State, in fact, the largest, is quite ready to sell out and wants to get out of the picture—the system, when acquired by this instrumentality which we want to set up, will be immediately broken up, and the entire distribution system sold to the cities, to public power districts, and to cooperative organizations among the farmers and incidentally to the R. E. A.'s in that State.

There is not a State in the Union so thoroughly committed to the principle of public power as is my State. It is no longer a question to be debated on this floor, because the people there, year in and year out, have made their attitude of mind all too evident in elections.

So, through this agency, it is proposed to acquire one or more of these private systems, break them up, deliver over and sell such properties to these numerous public agencies. These State power agencies will pay for such property and these payments will be used to retire the debt which was created in the acquisition of the private system, and this process will wipe out and liquidate the agency debt arising out of such acquisition. Such a system will and should operate as efficiently as a private system.

I and those who have been interested in this bill—and there are a number of men in this body who are interested—have tried to set up this instrumentality on such a basis as would enable it to pay its way out. Whether or not it can be done, has been demonstrated for the last 50 years in my State. I want to give one illustration.

When I was a young man in Tacoma, starting to practice law, my city built a little hydroelectric plant on the Nisqually River. That plant, with a transmission line into the city of Tacoma, cost $2,000,000, in round figures. We issued "revenue bonds" such as are to be employed under this bill. That was a complete departure from ordinary Federal fiscal operations. Those bonds were payable so much a year over a period of 20 years or thereabouts. At the end of 12 years, we had amortized our bond quota each year, and there was enough profit to have almost cleaned up payments for the remaining 8 years. Yet the day when that plant was proposed, and when the plant was built, the bright minds linked to private power systems, through numerous editorials in newspapers and in paid articles in newspapers, said that the city of Tacoma would regret it had ever built the plant; that it would be a "white elephant," that the city would wish to God it had not owned it, and would be glad to sell it for 30 cents on the dollar. Within 2 years after that little

hydro plant was finished, my city of Tacoma was giving its people the cheapest electric light and power rates in this country, and has maintained that very enviable position in the power field ever since. I have not heard a single legitimate criticism of the municipally owned Tacoma Light & Power System. It has been an outstanding example not only as a yardstick in the field of rates but as a yardstick in the field of business operations. We have tried to breathe into S. 2430 the spirit that lay behind the Tacoma plant which was so eminently successful that even those who are defenders of the principle of private power have found nothing in the system against which they may legitimately complain.

I want to refer again to the problem involved. We had to face the Columbia power program in a different way than did those who grappled with the problem of the Tennessee Valley. There they had built the whole thing from scratch; they had to lay the foundations; the whole concept had to be engineered here in the mind of a great public servant with a great vision of future accomplishments; but, in my section of the country, the President brought into existence the Grand Coulee and the Bonneville projects by a stroke of the pen. There they were, and we took them as they were. Against that set-up we have woven into this new fabric of legislation those principles which we devoutly hope the Senate and House of Representatives will approve. To assail what we propose is to assail all that we have so far accomplished in the State of Washington, by the will of the people. We can present to you an outstanding example of success in the power field. In that section we have demonstrated how much profit there is in the business and how readily it can pay out. A cub lawyer, who, in the light of all the judicial dicta and of our body of State legislation on our books, could not set up one of these agencies, ought to be sent back to school. There are plenty of bench marks, both in the field of practical experience and in the legislative field, to guide the footsteps of any young lawyer who might want to be counsel for a public body desiring to set up one of these public power agencies.

Of course, the T. V. A. had a wholly different problem, because it was a step-by-step development, which presented something of the pattern and problems the city of Seattle had to face in the development of its great Skagit River project, where it poured out money, perhaps twenty million or twenty-five million dollars, in building the first unit of power. I remember critics used to say that this was an outstanding example of ineptitude, and was full of business crudities because the city had many hundreds of dollars per horsepower invested in a plant of limited capacity. The Skagit is a swift river, running through a rugged, precipitous country. It had to be harnessed a step at a time. When that plant is fully completed, the per-horsepower cost will be astoundingly low. Seattle is fortunate in possessing such an asset.

My city built a magnificent hydroelectric development in the Olympic Mountains, at a completed cost of approximately $75 to $80 a horsepower. The first unit came in 1926, and its cost has been rapidly amortized. I recall one instance, which, if Senators will consider, will enable them to realize the difference between public and private ownership, and how these contrasting systems operate. It is not that men try to be mean, but the very nature of a private plant involves maintaining its capital structure intact and of paying interest and dividends on the highest valuation it can establish and maintain. I remember at one time Tacoma had amortized her debt to about $36 a horsepower, but at that time a private plant set-up represented approximately $400 a horsepower of alleged valuation. The private plant never repaid 1 penny of its capital debt, but Tacoma's debt of $36 a horsepower was gradually paid out by the process of amortization of bonded debt. That is precisely what we are proposing to do on the Columbia River projects. Public developments should pay back what the Government put into the plants. It can and will be done. I do not know of any power system owned by the Government that does not have as its objective that very thing.

In S. 2430 we propose to utilize the revenues to operate the project and keep it going. One of the fixed charges there is the amortization of the debt. That will be done by a process familiar to us in the State of Washington. The specific debt to which I have just referred is the bonded debt of the plant, the proceeds of which will be utilized to acquire private systems, break them up, and sell them back to public power bodies.

I take time to explain what the term "revenue bonds" means. The revenue bond which under this bill we propose to issue through this Federal agency is a bond payable out of operating revenues of the plant. Those bonds will be issued in proper series, and from the revenues of the plant so many of them will be retired each year. There has been a ready market for this type of bond. In the darkest and gloomiest period of the depression in this country, in the thirties, the power bonds of Seattle and Tacoma never defaulted, but I know of many defaults in bond issues resting upon the sovereign power of taxation. I contemplate no trouble whatever in selling these bonds, and, having been sold, the revenues of the plant and proceeds of sales of distribution properties to public bodies will amortize them. So we are not compelled, under this system, to come to the Treasury for money to purchase a private power system. We would have faced a different situation, of course, if we had tried to build "from scratch," as was done in the case of the T. V. A.; but Bonneville was built, Grand Coulee was later built, under Presidential order; and the Bonneville administrator was later directed to take the power produced at Grand Coulee and sell it over the lines which he had built.

In the matter of new capital investment, Congress would pass judgment. In the first place, additional power installations in the generating plants would come through the budget of the Interior Department and the Army engineers. Such major investments as additional heavy transmission lines would come that way. But the costs of all forms of operation would be met by revenue from the operations. That is the logical and horse-sense way of handling this problem.

Any additional revenue in the form of surplus in this plant would be utilized to amortize, over and above the regular maturities, those bonds which were outstanding, and were sold for the purpose of acquiring private systems. Over and above that, any further additional surplus revenues would be utilized to further amortize our debt to the Treasury for the capital expenditures resulting from congressional appropriations. That, in a general way, is the set-up proposed in S. 2430.

Under our proposal the Administration will have to submit to the department at the beginning of each year a program of the activities expected to be carried on from receipts from power revenue and surplus, and that program must go to the President for his approval. The bill makes it mandatory that the program shall be carried out in accordance with its terms, assuming, of course, that the President approves. That, in general, is the plan proposed in this bill.

The Administration thus proposed to be set up will be a sales agency. T. V. A. possesses and operates its dams somewhat as a private corporation would, though perhaps not in the exact sense. On account of its situation, it has a much greater problem on its hands than we would have in the Northwest. It had to build as well as operate those dams. It is much more of a proprietor in that sense than the Columbia power program would make the new Columbia Power Administration. The Columbia Power Administration will not operate the dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

The legislation affecting the Columbia development would only get into the field T. V. A. now occupies if, in taking over a private system, it took over one or more of its hydroelectric or steam plants, in which case it would operate such plants as T. V. A. now operates dams and power plants in the Tennessee Valley. But the bill also provides that it shall sell to public bodies any of the power plants it acquires in case they wish to buy them. In any event, the Columbia Power Administration would retain Grand Coulee and Bonneville and such other acquired generating units which public bodies did not desire to buy. That is why our picture is somewhat different from that presented by the T. V. A. We employed the processes suggested because we had to set it up in this way.

We faced the fact that the Grand Coulee is under the Interior Department and Bonneville is under the Army engineers. Facing that, and knowing that the picture is set and jelled, we tried to do a logical and decent job in setting up the organization as a sales agency to dispose of the electric energy created at these huge dams.

I presume that if we had started as did T. V. A., we would have had some organization closely following the lines of T. V. A., but since Congress has seen fit to ratify each year, by appropriations, the expansion of these Columbia River plants under these two Presidential bureaus, we elected to follow the pattern open to us. It is for Congress to decide which form of organization it prefers. I do not attempt to enter that field. Both sections should be happy. Tennessee has been immeasurably enriched by the work of Senator NORRIS. The Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. In 1937, when I worked with the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] on the first bill, we had to deal with Bonneville only. Grand Coulee was coming along.

Grand Coulee is the mightiest thing of its kind in the world. This is the giant with which we must now deal. A dam about 5,000 feet wide, and as high as the Washington Monument from base to top creates an artificial lake 150 miles long. The Columbia is the greatest power stream in the United States, and when Grand Coulee is finished it will develop two and a half million horsepower of energy, a large part of which will be firm power. There is nothing like it in this world. The Dneiper Dam in Russia is a toy, an infant, compared with the great Grand Coulee. One need only look at the Grand Coulee Dam to be impressed with its magnitude and possibilities. What a tremendous asset it is. It has brought into the Northwest an industrial stimulus comparable to nothing else in the United States.

It has made possible a vast increase in production of aluminum in these terrible times. Many great aluminum companies went out there, because we had this potentially illimitable pool of power which might be tapped. As the mighty turbines turn, the mightiest in the world, they will pour out an increasing flood of electric energy. There are to be 18 of them in this plant.

Personally, I would have preferred some changes in the proposed set-up, but Congress has in effect ratified and approved what we are proposing. It ratified and approved a somewhat different set-up in the Tennessee Valley. I accept that as one of the things one meets in attempting to shape legislation to fit into the many and varied needs of a community. T. V. A. has done a magnificent job and will continue to do so. We can do likewise.

I think we have done a good job in preparing our bill. Many capable lawyers have looked it over, a great many critics have examined it, and they have had little of a critical nature to say about it, because it does represent and follow the ideas which have now become firmly entrenched in the great Northwest. Its objectives meet what the people out there want, and I hope the Senate of the United States will see fit speedily to pass the bill. We are not coming and asking for money to bring about much of the program. We are coming with a proposal the like of which Congress has never seen. This is the "revenue bond" financing feature. I doubt if anyone can seriously quarrel with our proposal to go to New York for the financing. Only a few weeks ago my city of Tacoma sold $4,000,000 worth of its bonds at an interest rate of 1.74 percent. There is no Government financing that is done on that basis. Even the United States Government is proposing to float a bond issue at 2½ percent, yet my city of Tacoma, on the very basis we propose to employ on this great Federal project, got its money for 1.74 percent, which will indicate about how very thoroughly sold even investors are on this type of security, which rests solely on the earnings of the plant.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say, unless some one desires to ask me some question about the bill. I did not go into this subject at length, because I shall occupy the attention of the Senate later, when I call the bill up. I hope there will be a favorable report from the committee, because if a project like this were interrupted we would leave it hanging in midair, like Mahomet's coffin, and it would be an atrocity to let the thing dangle, merely waiting for a further Presidential edict, instead of setting up a well organized business agency to handle it.

Because of my rather long contact with public power development in the West, I want to see this set-up have a business organization comparable to that of a private corporation in order to insure flexibility of operation. I want it to have all the power a private power company has so that its ability to serve the people shall not be hamstrung by senseless regulations that curtail its usefulness.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the Senator's bill has been agreed to practically by all parties interested in the subject of power development in the Northwest, after many long conferences on the subject.

Mr. BONE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. For these projects set up under the bill it would create what we commonly call a revolving fund, and out of operating income the authority, or the administration, as the Senator calls it, would be permitted to use operating income to meet its ordinary expenses without having to come to Congress for an appropriation every time it desired to make an expenditure. In other words, it would have the power any private corporation would have to use operating income to meet operating expenses.

Mr. BONE. Oh, yes. It would have to do that in order to survive and function in a normal way, because it will be a purely business operation. The acquisition of the private systems we contemplate will be effected through sale of revenue bonds to secure the purchase price. Congress will not be concerned, so far as raising this money goes, since the Treasury is not affected. An operation of this size and scope has to have funds available, exactly as does a private concern in the same field.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for the information and for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Before the Senator came to the Senate he had had a great deal of experience in the conduct and administration of public power, did he not?

Mr. BONE. I wrote or helped write some of the power legislation of my State. I was one of the authors of the so-called grange power law, under which all the present public-utility districts were set up, and I have represented public power groups out there.

Mr. HILL. In connection with these power districts, did the Senator find it necessary to give them the flexibility in reference to power and administration which the private companies enjoyed?

Mr. BONE. I can best answer that by saying that in preparing the legislation to which I have referred I tried to give the public power body all of the powers enjoyed by private power corporations. The Senator is a good lawyer, and he knows about how far a private corporation can go under existing laws. I tried to give public bodies the same power. I did not want them hamstrung by ruthless political pressure. They were entitled to meet competitors on an equal basis. The private companies have always been in politics trying to hamstring and circumscribe them. The pending bill is designed to give them access to the greatest pool of power on the continent and bring ever cheaper power to the people.

Mr. HILL. So far as the existing Bonneville law under which the construction program has gone forward is concerned, it was understood that was only a temporary and provisional set-up, and that you would have to have more permanent legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. BONE. The answer to that question is best provided by the language of the Bonneville law, in which this expression appears:

> The form of administratio.. herein established for the Bonneville project is intended to be provisional pending the establishment of a permanent administration for Bonneville and other projects in the Columbia River Basin.

So the bill we have introduced is in response to the suggestion in the original bill that we provide permanent legislation. We are engaging in that effort.

Mr. HILL. The very language the Senator has read was written into the act because at the time the measure was drafted it was realized by its authors that the set-up provided in the bill would not be sufficient for a permanent organization and a permanent operation?

Mr. BONE. That is entirely true.

Mr. HILL. In fact, notice was then served that there would have to be further legislation?

Mr. BONE. It was made abundantly clear at the time that this legislation was purely provisional, that it was a makeshift and an expedient. It had to be temporary in its nature, because there was coming into the picture this great Grand Coulee Dam, which overshadowed everything. The Bonneville Act of 1937 was a provisional set-up, not intended to be permanent, and I want to make

that plain now. We knew then that we would later on present a program to the Senate and ask them to confirm and ratify it.

Mr. HILL. Which has been done in the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator on behalf of himself and his colleague?

Mr. BONE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has provided that the administration in charge of the project shall have great latitude?

Mr. BONE. If the Senator will go through the bill, he will find we have tried to give the administration a measure of power absolutely necessary; a minimum of power in the absence of which we would merely invite disaster for an enterprise vital to the people of the great Northwest. Such an enterprise cannot operate successfully if we hamstring it and circumscribe it in a fashion that would invite ruin for a private outfit. It will be in competition with huge private companies which are in that field. We must give it sufficient power to enable it to do business like it should, if we expect it to be a success.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and I, and all of us, have been hoping that we could dispose of this matter as soon as possible, perhaps today, but it is obvious that we cannot vote on it today. A number of Senators are absent who want to be present when the vote is had. They have been unavoidably called out of the city. I have conferred with the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and with other Senators about fixing a time to vote tomorrow, and, therefore, pursuant to those conversations, I ask unanimous consent that not later than 3 o'clock p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote on the pending amendments, that is, the T. V. A. amendments—there are four of them—and, of course, subject to any others that may be offered, but on the pending amendments, known as the T. V. A. amendments, that the Senate proceed to vote not later than 3 o'clock p. m. tomorrow, and that the time tomorrow from the beginning of the session until the vote is taken shall be equally divided between the Senator from Tennessee and me, the time to be controlled by us respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it will be remembered that I have been very anxious to have a vote on this matter since Monday. Indeed, on Friday I asked that we fix a time on Monday to vote. I wanted to have a vote on Monday, and I wanted to have a vote today, but now it seems that the earliest moment at which we can get a vote is at 3 o'clock tomorrow. In order that every Senator may be apprised of the exact time when the vote shall come on this amendment, I feel that we should fix the time. So far as the pending amendment is concerned, it is virtualy an immaterial amendment, and I have no objection to the Senate voting on it now and disposing of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think all the amendments ought to go over. We have discussed them as a group.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If the Senator wants the pending amendment to go over also I shall agree that it go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. The T. V. A. amendments will have to be voted on separately, but they have been discussed as a group, and I think we all understand them.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Very well. Mr. President, I should prefer to vote on the principal amendment first, and I ask the Senator from Kentucky to modify his unanimous-consent request so that may be the understanding. We can easily turn back to the other two amendments after disposing of the principal amendment. I ask that the Senator modify his unanimous-consent request, and ask that the vote be taken first on the amendment on page 72, beginning with the word "this", in line 5, and ending with the word "That" in line 15. There is no reason why we should get into controversy about the amendment, because that is the amendment which has been discussed since last week. I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he is willing to modify his unanimous-consent request so as to provide that the amendment I have just mentioned may be voted on first?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, before any further action is taken I should like to be heard for a moment. I understand the able Senator from Tennessee would like to have incorporated in the unanimous-consent request the request that the vote on the amendment on page 72 be had first.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes. That is the main amendment.

Mr. MCNARY. That is the amendment which has been discussed, and it is one concerning which notice has been given for suspension of the rule. I do not know whether the Senator from Tennessee intends to insist upon his motion to suspend the rule, or whether he is going to rely upon the parliamentary situation in respect to presentation of a proposed amendment. Furthermore, Mr. President, I may raise the question of its germaneness. Those are items we want to consider. In other words, I should not want at this time to permit a vote outright on the proposed amendment, as though it simply stood by itself, and was in the class of any other amendment, which I do not admit it to be.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, there is no question in the world about the amendment striking out those words being in order, and that is the amendment I want to have voted upon first.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly understand the notice served by the Senator from Tennessee, it does not deal with the amendment to strike out, but with an amendment which he proposes to offer from the floor.

Mr. MCNARY. Yes; I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The two are tied together, and they are interrelated, but the notice the Senator gave does not relate to the committee amendment to strike out certain language, and it may be that there will be discussion as to the question of germaneness, or on a point of order, or other questions which might arise with respect to it. The notice which the Senator from Tennessee gave is not related to that matter, as I understand.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No. Besides that, I am going to offer my amendment without regard to notice, because I am quite sure the amendment, if I should offer it, is in order.

Mr. MCNARY. The amendment the Senator is going to offer, if I can rely upon the notice, is language to be incorporated in the bill in substitution for that which the committee deleted on page 72. Is that not correct?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MCNARY. That raises the question first——

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not want to enter into an agreement of any kind; I prefer to vote today; but if we are to enter into an agreement about the matter going over until tomorrow and a vote being taken then at 3 o'clock, I want the vote taken on, first, the amendment striking out the language on page 72, in line 5, beginning with the word "this", and ending in line 15 with the word "That." That is the subject of discussion and has been the subject of discussion for nearly a week, during which we have been considering the question. That is the amendment I want to agree to vote on first.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, may I interrupt for a moment to make an observation?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MCNARY. If the language on page 72 is stricken out, the Senator from Tennessee would not be content simply with that action. He would want then to supplement the action striking out language by a new set of words which he has given notice he intends to propose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have very serious doubt about it at this time, but that is a matter which will take care of itself. The first thing to be voted on is the amendment I have indicated on page 72, beginning with the word "this", in line 5, and ending with the word "That", in line 15. That is the matter we have been discussing all the week, and that is the matter I am willing to make an agreement with respect to, that we vote on it tomorrow at 3 o'clock. For instance, the question of the purchase of automobiles is virtually entirely out of the picture, because the Authority cannot purchase automobiles now anyway. So I am not bothering about that amendment. It is rather an immaterial amendment. That the traveling expenses shall not exceed $615,236 is the same kind of amendment we have acted on with respect to all the other governmental activities that are provided for in the bill, and I take it there will not be much controversy over that amendment.

However, what we are trying to agree on now is to vote on the main question, which is the striking of the language to be found on page 72, and that is the amendment I want to agree to vote upon first. I do not want to be bothered with other amendments. I want to vote on that amendment, because that is the amendment which the Senate has been discussing for nearly a week, and that is

the amendment I know the Senator from Kentucky wanted to vote on.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had in mind all the amendments, including the amendment relating to purchase, and the amendment relating to limitation of traveling expenses, as well as the one on page 72. It is not very material which one is voted on first. But, of course, the Senator has not offered the amendment with respect to which he gave notice, and whether he will offer it I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is another thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is another thing. That is not pending. I suppose we cannot make an agreement with respect to an amendment which is not pending, although I had hoped that we might dispose of this whole subject, including the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I, too, hope we can dispose of the whole subject; but the amendment the discussion during the week has centered around is that striking out of the language on page 72, and if I correctly understood the Senator from Kentucky a while ago, he was willing to vote on that amendment tomorrow at 3 o'clock. I would very much prefer to vote on it now. I would be very glad to have the vote now on that and also on the other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. If an agreement is made it is going to be made about that language on page 72.

Mr. BARKLEY. The agreement I asked for applies to all three of the committee amendments. I do not care which one comes up first.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator makes the request as to all three, it will simply result in prolonging the discussion. I am not going to agree to mixing up other amendments with the amendment we have been debating for a week.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there cannot be any mixing up as to facts. There are three amendments proposed by the committee, which are pending.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am willing to vote on all three of them now.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator cannot get a vote on all three now.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I cannot, I am willing to vote on the main one first. I am willing to make an agreement to vote on the main one, which we have been discussing here for nearly a week, the amendment which appears on page 72, to which I have referred. I am unwilling and shall object to any unanimous consent unless we vote on that first, because that is the main matter in controversy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think that a vote on the word "purchase" and a vote on the limitations on traveling expenses would in any way affect the vote on the other amendment on page 72?

Mr. McKELLAR. We have already cut down the traveling expenses in the other departments by a yea-and-nay vote. We can easily manage that matter at any time. That is not really in controversy in the Senate. So far as the word "purchase" is concerned, that can be kept in the bill or taken out, and it does not make the least difference. What I want and what I am going to agree to is that we shall vote tomorrow at 3 o'clock. I am perfectly willing to agree to that. Also, I am willing to agree to the terms set out in the request by the Senator from Kentucky, that one-half of the time be controlled by me and one-half of the time be controlled by him. I am perfectly willing to agree to that. If we are going to vote on the amendment when the time runs out at 3 o'clock tomorrow, very well. If we are going to discuss some other amendment I am not willing to agree to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no need to become exercised——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not exercised in the slightest. If the Senator wants to vote on this amendment on page 72, beginning with the word "this", in line 5, and running down to the word "That" in line 15, I am willing to make an agreement to vote on it tomorrow. That is what I understood the Senator from Kentucky to submit in his unanimous consent request. I did not understand that the other amendments were to be voted on first, and if I had so understood I would not have agreed to the Senator's suggestion or request. So I shall object to the request unless it is made in the manner I understood it was to be made.

Mr. BARKLEY. The way I suggested to the Senator, and the way I put it in the proposal was that we vote at 3 o'clock on these committee amendments, of which there are three.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood it the other way.

Mr. BARKLEY. The vote on amendments occurs ordinarily in the order in which they appear in the bill. I am willing to vote on the third amendment at 3 o'clock, but I want to leave the situation so that after we have disposed of that amendment, then we shall go ahead and dispose of the amendment with respect to purchase and the amendment with respect to traveling limitation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us vote on the purchase amendment and the traveling limitations amendment now. I am willing to vote on those two amendments now, and then let us vote tomorrow on the language which the committee has stricken from the bill on page 72, beginning in line 5 with the word "this" and ending in line 15 with the word "That."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall modify my unanimous-consent request in this respect: That at 3 o'clock tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote on the three committee amendments which are pending, voting first on the committee amendment which appears on page 72, to strike out the language beginning with the word "this" in line 5 and ending with the word "That" in line 15, without further debate, and that the time be divided as I have heretofore indicated; that following the disposition of that amendment the Senate proceed to dispose of the other committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, just a word so that I may be correctly understood. I do not want the Senator from Tennessee to be taken by surprise, and I am mentioning this in his own interest. With respect to the amendment referred to on page 72, he has filed written notice of a motion to suspend the rule in order that he may offer a substitute amendment. I do not know whether it is necessary for him to do so. I am not the occupant of the chair. However, I have decided views on the question.

However that question may be decided by the Chair, it is my opinion that the proposal is not appropriate, because it is not germane, which is necessary according to rule XVI. The proposal treats of another subject matter. The subject matter in the language proposed to be stricken out is that of a revolving fund. The proposal of the Senator would cover the money into a static fund in the Treasury of the United States. I do not think the proposal is germane, and I wish to raise that issue tomorrow. That is the reason I am now telling the Senator of my intention. I do not wish to be precluded by a unanimous-consent agreement from discussing the parliamentary situation and raising the question at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that, so far as the question of germaneness is concerned, that question must be settled by the Senate without debate.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that; but some Senator must raise the point, and I propose to do so. Of course, it must be settled by a vote of the Senate. I am not asking the Chair to decide it or intimating that the Chair can decide it. It is a question which must be referred to the Members of the Senate. However, the Chair can decide whether the point which is raised requires a suspension of the rule. I am clear on that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is one amendment upon which we are seeking to obtain an agreement for a vote. That is the committee amendment on page 72. The Senator from Tennessee has filed notice that he intends to offer from the floor an amendment beginning in line 22 on the same page, which, as I see it, is not a substitute for the amendment of the committee. With respect to his proposed amendment, he filed notice of a motion to suspend the rule. He has now modified his amendment, however, so that it is not the same amendment with respect to which he filed notice of a motion to suspend the rule. That question will be subject to disposition when the amendment is offered.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that a vote on the language proposed to be stricken out on page 72 would interfere in any way with our rights in the disposition of the amendment when it is offered, either on the point of germaneness or any other point.

Mr. McNARY. I simply wished to notify the Senator, in all fairness, that I

propose to raise that question if and when the amendment shall be offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not involved in the unanimous-consent request to vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish any dispute to arise tomorrow if I raise the point, or to be charged with taking advantage of a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may the request be again stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kentucky restate his request?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that not later than 3 o'clock tomorrow the Senate shall proceed to vote on the pending committee amendments without further debate, voting first on the amendment on page 72 striking out the language in lines 5 to 15, and that after that is disposed of the other committee amendments shall be disposed of in the order in which they appear in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, to be accurate, the language proposed to be stricken out begins after the word "That", in line 5, and extends to and including the word "That" in line 15.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of that amendment the remaining committee amendments be voted on in the order in which they appear in the bill without further debate; and that the time tomorrow be equally divided between the Senator from Tennessee and myself, to be controlled by us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOHN C. CROSSMAN—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 205)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 836, a bill "for the relief of John C. Crossman."

It is the purpose of the bill to compensate Sgt. John C. Crossman for injuries sustained while on duty with the Texas National Guard at Camp Hulen, Palacios, Tex., on August 10, 1933, caused by the explosion of a gasoline lantern.

It appears that while assisting in the lighting of a gasoline lantern in one of the supply tents an explosion occurred which threw flaming gasoline over Crossman and spilled it over the lantern and container. The tent contained several thousand dollars worth of Government property as well as a considerable amount of explosives. Instead of throwing away the flaming lantern and container, Crossman ran with them and doubled his body around the lantern's basin so that the flames were extinguished without damage to any property or injury to any other person except Crossman himself. While his injuries were severe and painful, incapacitating him for several months, he was reemployed by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. on March 1, 1934, and remained in continuous employment until December 1940. Since that time, except for a brief period, he has been in military service and is now serving with the Engineer Corps as a master sergeant, receiving pay and allowances of $165 a month. There is no indication that his earning capacity has been affected or that he has been handicapped in the performance of his duties either with the railroad or in the military service.

While the accident occurred at a Federal camp and doubtless prevented a loss of Federal property being used for training purposes, the training exercises in which Crossman was engaged were not conducted under a Federal law or by Federal authority, but were exclusively under the jurisdiction of the State, and it has been the uniform practice of the Federal Government not to assume the responsibility for injuries sustained by a member of the National Guard. The payment proposed in the bill under consideration would, therefore, establish an undesirable precedent, and, for this reason, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

If it be the opinion of the Congress, however, that pecuniary recognition should be given, as an act of grace, to the heroic act of the claimant in preventing the destruction of Federal property, I would be glad to give my approval to a measure providing a reasonable gratuity for that purpose.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1942.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William H. Bartley, of Miles City, Mont., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont. (reappointment); and

William J. Korth, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Utah, in place of Ira N. Hinckley.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Lyal A. Davidson to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 30th day of November 1941; and

Capt. Charles A. Pownall to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of December 1941.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 6, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of April 30), 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

William Edgar Bradley, Alma.
Lee Rea, Caraway.
Samuel K. Purdy, Carthage.
William E. Carpenter, Cave City.
Joseph D. Gault, Dardanelle.
Bess M. Nobles, Dierks.
Clarence G. Cooper, Fouke.
Jettie Douglas Hodges, Leachville.
Ralph T. Ferguson, Marshall.
James L. Willson, Moro.
Jo Etta Carolan, State Sanatorium.
Samuel C. Scott, Wheatley.

CALIFORNIA

Clare A. Partridge, Mentone.
Aiva A. Fields, Modesto.
Herbert C. Halterman, Rodeo.
Anna Mae O'Keefe, Summit City.

ILLINOIS

Ruth Fosdick, Proving Ground.

KENTUCKY

Stanley H. Jones, Fort Knox.
Lula Sharp, Sharpsburg.
Myrtle B. Milam, Wallins Creek.

LOUISIANA

Robert Lee Pettit, Baton Rouge.

MAINE

Norman W. Hulit, Cumberland Center.
Rachel Gates Haskell, Dixfield.
Charles P. Lemaire, Lewiston.
H. Edward Rice, Orono.

MARYLAND

Philip J. Kurtz, Belcamp.
Charles A. Bechtold, Fort George G. Meade.
Michael J. Byrnes, Frostburg.

NEW YORK

Walter J. Merritt, Margaretville.
Frank D. Hurd, Napanoch.
Edna L. Quinn, Rush.
John A. Martin, Saugerties.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie B. Morton, Carolina Beach.
Robert F. Loftin, Troutmans.

PUERTO RICO

Julia Chacon de Vidal, Ensenada.

RHODE ISLAND

Ralph Campbell, Wickford.

VIRGINIA

Carroll A. Gathright, Goochland.
Henry C. Browning, Meadowview.

WEST VIRGINIA

John L. Cook, Lorado.
Warren W. Smith, Reedsville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we pray that we may experience the surge of divine compulsion and thus have the broadening vision of the mission of Jesus, looking beyond the hills of time's tragedy and beholding the fair morning which is to come. The glowing truths of humanity with their sacrificial tasks and aspirations will forever flow from the universal Godhead. Do Thou, dear Lord, enrobe our souls with the spirit of our Saviour's prayer and with a chastening sense of our failures, we shall know that it is the power of God unto salvation.

Thou hast not promised us to withhold affliction, calm without storm, nor the sun without a cloud. Blessed be Thy holy name. Thou hast vouchsafed unto us a divine sympathy that stoops to conquer and an unfaltering strength whose heights and depths give triumph on the battlefields of life. Oh let Thy wisdom be our guide, Thy service our delight, and Thy peace our richest possession. Today direct our words that they do no harm and keep our hearts free from any wrong desire. Grant that our labors may be for our country's good and our conduct for the encouragement of all. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) entitled "An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill H. R. 7041 (Rept. No. 2068), making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 479), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs not to exceed $40,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee conducting such studies and investigations or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which appropriates additional money for the Naval Affairs Committee.

I have a letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy wholeheartedly approving of the work of the committee.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, May 4, 1942.

The Honorable JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Committee on Accounts,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: I understand that House Resolution 478 authorizing further expenses, not to exceed $50,000, by the Naval Affairs Committee in conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 has been referred to your committee.

I am taking the liberty of writing you to let you know that I feel that the activities of the Committee of Naval Affairs in conducting such studies and investigations have been of considerable value to the Navy Department. This committee has cooperated wholeheartedly with the Navy Department in the study of many of the problems involved in the expanded naval procurement program and its investigations have been most helpful to us. I believe that the continuation of the committee's present work, as authorized by House Resolution 162, will be extremely beneficial to the war effort and I would like to add my personal endorsement to its adoption.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is pleasing to note this cooperation. At a time such as this cooperation is essential. Naturally at the outset contracts were hastily drawn. Mistakes were made, but one thing is certain, all excess profits will be recaptured.

It is often said select committees do not accomplish much, but in this instance I think all will agree our committees investigating national defense expenditures are doing a wonderful job.

Members of the Naval Affairs Committee appeared before the Committee on Accounts this morning. They said that through renegotiation of contracts for which they were partly responsible the Government had been saved over $507,000,000.

This is excellent news for the taxpayers. We were informed this morning this amount will grow from week to week so the small amount we are appropriating for expenses of this committee is money well spent. In some instances, where a large bonus has been handed out, there is justification for criticism but neither the Government officials nor the contractors are to be blamed if excessive awards were made at the outset. There just was not time for competitive bids. We needed ships, we needed planes, tanks, and so forth, and the one thought in the mind of the departments was to get them. If we continue to proceed in the investigations and renegotiate the contracts no one will get rich out of this war, and that is as it should be. It should also be said that some of the corporations voluntarily made refunds after this committee had worked out an agreement with the Treasury Department that the corporations would not be taxed for the refunds.

The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is present and I yield 5 minutes to him to make an explanation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the House will recall, last May I introduced a resolution giving to the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee jurisdiction to make an inquiry in regard to expenditures made by the respective departments. As a result of that resolution, the Naval Affairs Committee organized and selected one of the most outstanding Washington attorneys, Mr. Toland, as its general counsel. We built up a staff of experts loaned to us from the various departments. We have sent out thousands of questionnaires and have analyzed and audited approximately 25,000 accounts. As a result of that investigation, contracts have been renegotiated at a reduction in prices to the Navy alone of $41,354,277. For the Army and Navy jointly a total of $337,208,277 direct saving to the War Department and to the Navy Department.

Indirect saving, brought about by readjustment of various forms of contracts, saved an additional $170,000,000. So therefore the investigating committee, headed by our distinguished counselor, has been responsible in bringing about a saving to the Government of $507,208,277.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia and his committee upon the splendid work they have done for the country. Not only have they saved this $500,000,000, but I believe they have spurred the actual war effort to an extent that is not fully appreciated by the public.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is testified in the letter which the Undersecretary has written to the Committee of Accounts urging that $50,000 be given to us to carry on our work.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. This investigation you are making is of contracts that were let by the Army and the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. The prices they were receiving for furnishing this material to the Government were so exorbitant that they will make returns.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct. For instance, in the investigation of the Jack-Heintz Co. they were getting for starters $600 per starter. As a result of our investigation they have renegotiated the contract and they only get $200 per starter. The other day we had the Bendix Aeronautical Corporation before the committee and the president of the corporation stated that he had renegotiated and reduced his price $76,000,000. It was due to the publicity of our investigation, and he stated that he had written the letter after he had received a subpena to come before the committee and tell us about the profits he was making.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the committee on what it is doing, but I think we as a Congress ought to pin the responsibility for letting contracts of this kind. Why should the Congress or any department of Government make contracts so that people will get these enormous profits?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me answer the gentleman. The question of the gentleman is a very pertinent question. It has not been possible to tell what would be a fair cost when the contract was first let, but now as articles are beginning to be delivered we can estimate the cost, and therefore we are forcing them to make reductions.

Mr. RICH. I want to say to the gentleman this: That in the Appropriations Committee after Pearl Harbor when we started to shell out billions and billions of dollars and the Members of the House did not know what these appropriations were for—I say that because of my knowledge—it was up to the Army, it was up to the Navy, to see that these contracts were let in a manner that was in some way acceptable to good business. They tried to see how many contracts they could let instead of investigating how reasonable was the contract price.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I cannot yield for a speech, Mr. Speaker; I have but 5 minutes. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. The responsibility belongs to the Army and Navy. We gave them the money, and they ought to spend it wisely.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may be true, but the Naval Affairs Committee is certainly entitled to credit for having brought about this change.

Mr. RICH. We give the gentleman and his committee all credit.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to express my personal thanks to the gentleman and his committee for the splendid job they have done. I do not believe the gentleman takes as much credit as is due him, because it seems to me that one of the most important results of an effective investigation like this is the inevitable influence it has on new contracts which may be let.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It has a big influence when they know somebody is on the job like the gentleman's committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I wish to join with others in the House in paying tribute to the gentleman and his committee. The gentleman himself is rendering very great service to his country and has saved over $300,000,000. I should like to ask the gentlemen, however, if he did not find that the Bureau of Yards and Docks was being handled very efficiently and satisfactorily under Admiral Moreell; if things in his department were not expeditiously handled?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are; and we have not any recapture from the Bureau of Yards and Docks up to date, but we have not by any means finished.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to insert into the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 24, 1942, the Sperry Corporation addressed a letter to the Price Adjustment Board of the War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission wherein it offered to renegotiate with the War and Navy Departments to effect a saving of some $100,000,000 in its existing contracts. This offer, while apparently voluntary on the part of the corporation, came after accountants and investigators of the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee had been engaged in surveying its books and records since February 3, 1942. At some time in the near future it is hoped that the results of this will be presented to the committee in order that a determination might be made of the reasonableness of the $100,000,000 saving thus far offered.

On Thursday, April 30, 1942, Mr. E. R. Breech, president of the Bendix Aviation Corporation, publicly announced at a hearing of the committee that the corporation had voluntarily reduced its prices on Navy and Army contracts to the extent of $73,354,000. This was done without any prior consultation with the interested departments; it was an action taken by the board of directors of the corporation on its own initiative. Significantly, this action of the board of directors occurred on April 16, 1942, some 10 days after Mr. Breech had been served with a subpena to appear before the committee. As a matter of fact, Mr. Breech's appearance before the committee was postponed from April 16 to April 30 in order to permit him to attend this board meeting. In his testimony before the committee Mr. Breech stated that this huge price reduction was "generated by the general publicity on the subject" and his desire to pass on economies effected through production to the Government. He further stated that he was quite cognizant at all times of the activities of the committee.

Because neither the offer of the refund of the Sperry Corporation nor the price reductions of the Bendix Aviation Corporation has been broken down as yet between Army and Navy contracts, it is not possible at this time to present the actual savings to each department. The important thing is that the Sperry and Bendix offers came after the committee had signified its intention of investigating the contracts of those companies—at Sperry, through sending in committee investigators and accountants on February 3, 1942, and Bendix through subpenaing Mr. Breech and Mr. Bendix for appearance before the committee on April 16. Thus, the committee can be credited with the entire savings on these two refunds amounting to $173,354,000 even though the Navy Department will receive directly only a portion thereof.

The offer to renegotiate on the part of the Sperry Corporation and the price reductions of the Bendix Aviation Corporation raise a question as to the other activities of the committee with respect to the renegotiation of Navy contracts in particular and other Government contracts in general. Almost from its inception, in fact, since May 1941, the committee has been vitally interested in the problem of renegotiating those contracts wherein excessive profits were realized.

The first great field of activity with regard to this matter was the so-called time and material contracts for the repair, alteration, and conversion of naval auxiliaries. The first letter addressed to the department by the committee concerning this was dated May 20, 1941, regarding an offer of a refund made by the Associated Ship Builders of Seattle, Wash. Subsequent correspondence and conferences related to other shipyards devoted to this work. As a result of the efforts of the department and the committee, actual monetary savings in the form of refunds amounting to over $3,000,000 were effected on these contracts alone. In addition, according to letters received by the committee from the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, practically all of these time and material

contracts have been revised downward to allow no more than 10 percent profit. When it is considered that the average profit on these contracts prior to renegotiation was approximately 30 percent, it can be seen that the renegotiations on contracts amounting to more than $100,000,000 will effect savings of at least $20,000,000.

Other fields of Navy Department contracting wherein excessive profits were being realized also attracted the attention of the committee. Correspondence was entered into with the Department regarding steps taken to renegotiate such contracts, and letters were also written to those companies apparently showing excessive profits from the questionnaires they submitted. In addition, a tax ruling was procured from the Treasury Department that refunds of excessive profits would not be subject to income or gift taxes. This ruling was distributed to contractors concerned and also was sent to the Undersecretary of War for his information.

Subsequent to the interest of the committee in contracts where excessive profits were being shown, many contracts were renegotiated by the various bureaus of the Navy Department. Most of the renegotiations antedated by many months the formation of the Price Adjustment Board previously referred to.

The Bureau of Aeronautics has renegotiated many of its contracts, resulting in savings of over $22,500,000. The same is true of the Bureau of Ships, where the renegotiation of various contracts has resulted in savings of over $15,000,000, and the Bureau of Ordnance, where renegotiation has effected savings of almost $3,500,000. Altogether the actual money saving has been $41,354,277 to date.

The following is a list showing the actual monetary savings to the Navy Department by bureaus:

Total monetary savings to Navy Department

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:	
General Motors Corporation	$125,000
Bureau of Aeronautics:	
Curtiss-Wright Corporation	3,418,109
United Aircraft Corporation:	
Pratt & Whitney Division	12,665,899
Hamilton Standard Propellors Division	5,415,172
Jack & Heintz, Inc	1,198,787
Total	22,697,967
Bureau of Ships:	
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co	628,323
Bethlehem Steel Corporation	750,000
Associated Shipbuilders	450,000
Maryland Dry Dock Co	235,000
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co	4,205,100
Willamette Iron & Steel Corporation	272,625
Todd Shipyards, Inc	4,000,000
General Motors Corporation:	
Cleveland Diesel Engine Division	4,592,225
Total	15,133,283
Bureau of Ordnance:	
General Motors Corporation:	
Fisher Body Division	3,349,400
Blaw-Knox Co.: Union Steel Castings Division	48,627
Total	3,398,027

Recapitulation:

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	$125,000
Bureau of Aeronautics	22,697,967
Bureau of Ships	15,133,283
Bureau of Ordnance	3,398,027
Total	41,354,277

It should be kept in mind that many other contracts are in the process of renegotiation—and the savings that will result should run into additional millions of dollars.

These actual monetary savings are by no means the only benefits accruing to the war effort from the renegotiation activities initiated by the committee where contracts disclosed excessive profits. One of the very great benefits, one that cannot be measured in actual dollars, is the saving resulting from lowered prices on additional orders for products wherein the original contracts showed excessive profits. The savings from this type of economy undoubtedly run into many millions of dollars; in fact, a high official of the Navy Department stated that the indirect benefits to the Navy Department of the renegotiation policy have amounted to over $150,000,000.

Benefits have accrued to the War Department from the committee's efforts as well as to the Navy Department. In one instance, the Jack & Heintz case, the actual monetary savings to the War Department were over $9,500,000, and to the Navy Department $1,200,000—in other words, in this particular case the Army received benefits from the work of the committee over eight times those received by the Navy Department. In addition, a very salutary effect on the Army's renegotiation with Continental Motors was achieved through the Jack & Heintz hearing, with the result, according to a high official of the War Department, that a saving of $39,000,000 was brought about at least in part through that hearing. In passing, it should be stated that the War Department has received savings of almost $75,000,000 from the renegotiation of its contracts with North American Aviation Co. This was one of the companies the committee has had on its agenda for some months for investigation.

The indirect savings of the Navy Department that have been achieved since the existence of this committee and its activities with respect to the renegotiation of contracts have been referred to. These savings are difficult of actual measurement but there can be no doubt of their existence. Not only are such savings being presently realized but they will continue to be realized so long as the war effort continues. Considering the enormity of that effort, both now and in the immediate future, the savings from a policy of renegotiation will be tremendous.

It is significant that the Price Adjustment Board, which was set up pursuant to an Executive order on April 3, 1942, to handle the renegotiation of Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission contracts wherein excessive profits were realized or are being realized, was created some 10 weeks after the preliminary report of the committee was issued on January 21, 1942. That report recommended, based on the study made of 25,000 Navy Department contracts, that contracts showing excessive profits be renegotiated to reduce the huge profits being realized on many of them. There can be no doubt that the recommendation of the committee had a very important part in the decision to create the Price Adjustment Board.

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that both the House and Senate have approved of the rider attached to the appropriation bill that permits recapture of excessive profits through renegotiation by the Secretaries of War and the Navy. It can be stated with complete accuracy that the activities of this committee with regard to renegotiation had a tremendous effect in procuring the passage of that provision.

Recapitulation of direct and indirect savings to the United States through the activities of the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee

Direct savings:	
Completed renegotiations by Navy Department Bureaus	$41,354,277
Sperry Corporation (Army and Navy)	100,000,000
North American Aviation Corporation (Army)	74,000,000
Bendix Aviation Corporation (Army and Navy)	73,354,000
Continental Motors (Army)	39,000,000
Jack & Heintz, Inc. (Army)	9,500,000
Total	337,208,277
Indirect savings:	
Reported by official of Navy Department	150,000,000
Revision of time and material ship-repair contracts	20,000,000
Total	170,000,000
Grand total	507,208,277

I quote the following from a press release of the Navy Department, dated April 27, 1942:

Present and scheduled war contracts with the Sperry Corporation have been readjusted with a saving to the Government of $100,000,000, it was announced today by the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox.

The readjustment followed a study voluntarily entered into by Thomas A. Morgan, president, the Sperry Corporation. The result has been formalized by a voluntary agreement with a joint Army and Navy Board. Coincident with this announcement, the Secretary of the Navy publicly expressed his appreciation of the cooperation of the House Naval Affairs Committee, under the chairmanship of CARL VINSON.

"The committee has been most helpful, and the Navy appreciates its spirit of cooperation in the review of war contracts," the Secretary said.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I want to congratulate the gentleman and say to him that I believe the public confidence inspired by such a report is of just as great good, and perhaps greater, than the monetary savings made.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. While the Naval Affairs Committee is entitled to a great deal of credit, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to Mr.

Tolan and the able staff that has assisted us in this work.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to an old member of the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee for 12 years. All during those years I served with the gentleman from Georgia. Knowing him as I then learned to know him and knowing the high character of the entire membership of the Naval Affairs Committee, I can assure the Congress and the country that the service which he and the committee are now giving is something we knew we might expect, and we are not in the least surprised.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article by ex-Ambassador Josephus Daniels and in the other an article by Mr. G. M. Chapman, of Kerens, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the sad passing of Hon. James Young, a former Member of Congress from the Third Texas Congressional District, the district I have the honor to represent.

Because Mr. Young served the Third Texas Congressional District from 1910 until 1920 as Congressman, there are many of the present Members of Congress who knew him well. Several of my Texas colleagues served with him.

It was my happy privilege to be acquainted with Mr. Young, and because I was born in the county with which he was most closely identified, Kaufman County, and, furthermore, because I now have the honor to represent Rusk County, the county in which Mr. Young was born and in which he has recently lived, I have known much of the late Mr. Young for many years. Incidentally, it has been my privilege to know well and favorably several of his brothers and relatives. His record as a man, a successful lawyer, and as a Member of Congress was a very enviable one. Not one unkind or derogatory word have I ever heard uttered about him and the service he rendered as a professional man or a public servant. I know of no one who ever served in Congress that was more favorably and frequently mentioned than Jim Young, as he was so often and affectionately spoken of by his many friends. This is attested by the fact that Jim Young after 10 years of service in Congress voluntarily retired from Congress in 1920.

Mr. Young was very able in every respect and most diligent. Ceaseless was he in his efforts to espouse a cause or the causes in which he believed. No one ever sought to do more for our farmers and for agriculture than the one about whom I speak. He was a man that carried more than his share of every load and he realized that no man could kick when he was pulling or could pull when he was kicking. Indeed, he did much good in life. Tried by the standard, "How rich is life if we do good," no one can gainsay that Jim Young lived a rich life. Jim Young's many friends will not only remember the exemplary life he lived and service he rendered, but also will long lament his passing, for, in words we have frequently heard, "to know him was to love him and to name him was to praise him."

In the lines of poetry written by another, I think the essence of the life of Jim Young is well described. The words are:

Far from his rank he neither sank nor soared,
But sat an equal guest at every board.
No beggar ever felt him condescend, no prince presume,
For still himself he bore at manhood's simple level
And wherever he met a stranger there he left a friend.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House may extend his remarks on the life and character of Hon. James Young at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. On April 29, 1942, Hon. James Young, formerly a Member of this House from Texas, passed away. It was my privilege to serve for 10 years in the House with him.

He was a man of the finer qualities, a pleasing personality, an honest, upstanding, able Congressman and splendid American. He was a devoted son, husband, and father. His life was filled with service to his fellow man.

As a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture, he was one of the first of the outstanding advocates of relief of the agricultural classes. He laid a foundation for many of the acts that have since become law.

His going will be regretted by all who knew him and I shall miss him always.

PERMITTING APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 139, to permit appeals by the United States to the Circuit Courts of Appeals in certain cases, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) entitled "An Act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Rules of practice and procedure with respect to appeals authorized by this act shall be prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 29, 1940, (54 Stat. 688, U. S. C. Title 18, sec. 687)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) entitled "An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1. This amendment strikes out a quotation mark and is occasioned by the second amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2. This amendment proposed to add the following language to the bill: "The Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of practice and procedure with respect to appeals authorized by this act."

The conferees agreed upon new language in lieu of that proposed by the Senate amendment.

H. R. 139 enlarges the power and authority of the United States to appeal in the following ways:

1. Permits appeals to be taken to the Supreme Court not only from certain specified decisions and judgments on demurrers to indictments but also from similar decisions and judgments on pleas in abatement.

2. Permits appeals from orders on informations and indictments, instead of from orders on indictments only, as permitted under existing law.

3. Permits appeals to the circuit court of appeals from all decisions and judgments

having the effect of quashing, setting aside, or sustaining demurrers or pleas in abatement to indictments or informations and from all decisions arresting judgments of conviction except in those instances where direct appeals to the Supreme Court are permitted under the existing law. Appeals direct to the Supreme Court now permitted under existing law, are permitted only in cases in which the decisions are based upon the invalidity or construction of a statute upon which the indictment is founded.

4. Permits appeals to the circuit courts of appeals of the United States where appeals have improperly been taken directly to the Supreme Court and also permits appeals to the Supreme Court where they have been taken improperly to the circuit courts of appeals. In other words, it permits of a correction of the appeal in cases where appeal has been taken to the wrong court.

By the act of June 29, 1940, the Supreme Court was given the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings prior to and including verdict, or finding of guilty or not guilty by the court if a jury has been waived, or plea of guilty in criminal cases. The act of February 24, 1933, authorized the Supreme Court to prescribe rules of practice and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings after verdict, or finding of guilt by the court if a jury has been waived, or plea of guilty in criminal cases. This 1933 statute also referred to appeals, providing that the rules "may prescribe the times for and manner of taking appeals and applying for writs of certiorari and preparing records and bills of exceptions and the conditions on which supersedeas or bail may be allowed."

The conferees were of the opinion that under the act of June 29, 1940, the Supreme Court is empowered to prescribe rules of practice and procedure with respect to appeals authorized by H. R. 139. It was considered, however, that H. R. 139 being an act broadening the right of appeal, it would perhaps be well to specifically state that rules with respect to appeals authorized by the act shall be prescribed by the Supreme Court in accordance with the act of June 29, 1940, and remove any possible doubt of its applicability.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. MCLAUGHLIN,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H. R. 139) passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent and also passed the Senate by unanimous consent. There was no controversy as to the objectives of the bill but when it went to the Senate some question was raised as to the applicability of the present statute with reference to the power of the Supreme Court to promulgate rules with respect to the appeals authorized by and provided for in the bill. For this reason the bill was amended in the Senate and it went to conference. The conferees agreed on an appropriate amendment. The conference report is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a short article by Mr. George N. Peek, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an introductory article by Mr. Marshall Andrews, one of the Post staff writers, dealing with present conditions in the Army camps. May I say that this introductory article is very laudable of the spirit that exists in the camps today. I hope I may have the pleasure of putting into the RECORD later these articles as they come along, because they are highly instructive and, I think, bring to the people of the country a much better understanding of the spirit of the men in the camps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I ask what bill that committee is considering?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sorry, I cannot tell the gentleman. The chairman just called and asked that the request be made. I do not know what the bill is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], I ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to quote from a recent article appearing in the Washington Star by Gould Lincoln.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN SECTIONS OF RAMSPECK ACT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing on the Speaker's desk a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of House Resolution 470, providing an order of business of H. R. 6690.

This bill seeks to repeal the provision in the recently enacted Ramspeck Act, Public, 411, which grants pensions up to around $5,000 a year to some 250,000 political job holders receiving salaries up to around $10,000 annually, who took no competitive civil-service examination or had anything to do with the real merit system, and which will cost taxpayers more than $44,000,000 annually.

Consider the national peril and the sacrifices all of us are called upon to make. Consider also the fact that no money has been appropriated or taxes levied to pay the cost involved here and that every dime of it must be borrowed and added to the Federal debt. Consider further the great threat of inflation that faces the Nation and the fact that the Treasury is already under the greatest strain to find sufficient funds to meet the war costs. When this is done and in view of the increasing outcry of the people throughout the country for the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington to stop grabbing, to eliminate waste and discontinue all nondefense expenditures that are not absolutely necessary, can there be any question that this unconscionable provision in the Ramspeck Act should be forthwith repealed? Shall we or shall we not heed the voice of our constituents in respect of these matters?

Which Members of this House will dare go back to their districts and openly defend the provision in the Ramspeck Act which my bill seeks to repeal?

The placing of this discharge petition on the Speaker's desk will provide an opportunity for every Member to go on record as to how he stands on this repeal measure.

I respectfully request each Member to consider signing this discharge petition so that H. R. 6690 may be brought before the House for consideration.

In this connection I think it should be understood that this repeal measure is complementary to the act which repealed congressional pensions. The repeal of congressional pensions only is not enough.

To do our duty as Representatives in Congress, I think we must repeal also the pensions which the Ramspeck Act provided for the other, some 250,000, purely political job holders.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by one of my constituents entitled "Stop, Look, and Listen."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co., at the celebration of the bicentennial of the incorporation of Lancaster, Pa., as a borough.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some short quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article by King V. Hostick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article with reference to two Shasta generators transferred from the Shasta Dam to the Grand Coulee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Armed Merchantmen."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Oregon Prepares for War Emergencies" by Mr. Jerrold Owen, coordinator of the Oregon State Defense Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on the saving he reported a while ago. If he had been supported by his own committee in regard to the labor situation on the amendments proposed to existing law, and the House would have passed those amendments, then the saving he reported today would have been trivial in comparison.

In Topeka, Kans., blacksmiths under the industrially accepted wage scale get $1 an hour. In the construction of a new bombing field at Topeka, a blacksmith gets $1.50 an hour, a rate approved by the War Department and the Department of Labor, before time and a half for overtime. This is half again as much as the common wage. If a blacksmith at Topeka wants to work 10 hours a day for 7 days—and some of us have worked 12 hours a day for 30 days—he can earn $555 in 1 month of blacksmithing for the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, somewhere in Scripture it is recorded that Agur, the son of Jakeh, said there were four things he knew not. One was the way of an eagle in the air, another was the way of a serpent upon a rock, another was the way of a ship in the midst of the sea, and another was the way of a man with a maid.

There are some things I know not of, and one of them is the fiscal direction this country is taking. Notwithstanding the yeoman effort on the part of the Committee on Naval Affairs to save some money for the taxpayers, and notwithstanding the heroic effort of this House to whittle down the Farm Security Administration to its proper size in a time of conflict, the President now sends us a supplemental estimate asking for $14,750,000 for farm security over and above the $50,000,000 in the original Budget, plus $105,500,000 for R. F. C. loans for the foods-for-freedom program.

Will we ever come to the time when we can let our farmers alone for a little while? They will take care of this food-for-freedom business.

What does it avail for this House or any committee of the House to labor diligently in the interest of economy only to be confronted with supplemental estimates for additional expenditures which are so obviously and so patently nonessential in a time of conflict? Let me serve notice here and now that I propose to resist this item unless its indispensability to the war effort can be definitely demonstrated.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed for a while with general debate, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and myself.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I ask the gentleman from Texas if we can expect to finish this bill today?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I am confident we can finish the bill today. If we can proceed for a while with general debate, we can take care of some outstanding requests for time.

Mr. STEFAN. I am agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker. We can go along for a while and see how much time is desired for general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7041, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we come today to the consideration of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943. A lot has been said about the reduction of appropriations by the Congress, about the reduction of nondefense expenditures, but more has been said about it than has been done about it. Figuratively speaking, we have cut the cuff off the trousers, but we have added the material to some other part of the garment.

Some years ago it was urged that appropriations should be increased by reason of the depression. Then a little later ti was necessary to increase appropriations by reason of the emergency, and then a little later it became urgently necessary to increase appropriations on account of the war. When in an appropriation bill you asked the head of a department if he could not cut some of his request, he usually maintained that reductions could not be made because of the war or because of the emergency, and in previous days, because of the depression.

Contrary to popular belief, the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia, which is considered by this Subcommittee on Appropriations each year, is not an uninteresting bill. Washington is the Capital of our Nation. The eyes of the people of America are focused upon Washington, more so today than ever before in the history of our Nation, and the eyes of the people of the world are focused upon Washington today more so than ever before in the history of the world, and therefore it has not been an unpleasant task, although it has been burdensome and vexatious at times for this subcommittee to go into its hearings and to proceed with the consideration of the items which have to do with the welfare of the key city in our Republic

and which have to do with the greatest nation in the world.

Last year we brought in an appropriation bill for something over $57,000,000 for the District. It costs considerable money to run any city. It costs something over $600,000,000 to run the city of New York, for example, and I think the figures will bear out the statement that the average city comparable to Washington spends more money than the city of Washington.

A very fortunate situation obtains in regard to the city of Washington which differentiates it to a considerable degree from most of the major cities of the country. In most of the major cities of the country a large part of the revenue of the city must be applied to the debt of the city, but Washington, comparatively speaking, has a very negligible public debt. The public debt of the District of Columbia is less than $13,000,000, and I am able to make that statement by reason of the fact that the Congress, in its wisdom, has not encouraged the incurring of debt by the District of Columbia. It is interesting to point out that in this bill we are providing two and a half million dollars for the retirement of a portion of the public debt of the District of Columbia, the largest portion of which debt was incurred some years ago in connection with a P. W. A. program in the Nation's Capital.

In many of the bills which are presented from the Appropriations Committee, there are reductions in Budget estimates, but in few of them, indeed, are there reductions in the amount requested over the amount requested for the previous year. In this bill we have not only reduced the Budget estimates by $468,000, we have reduced the total amount recommended in the bill under the amount appropriated last year by the sum of $1,240,000.

There are a number of important aspects to the bill and a number of interesting items in the bill. One who considers the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia must consider the sources of revenue of the District and the funds into which the revenues of the District are placed. The general fund is the largest fund. There is another source of revenue which is devoted to highway improvements and to the Department of Vehicles and Traffic. From that fund last year we appropriated about $8,000,000. Then, another source of revenue and another separate fund in the District of Columbia is the water fund. We are recommending an appropriation from the water fund of something in excess of $3,000,000. It is interesting to point out that the water rates charged to consumers in the District are smaller in this city than in any comparable city in America.

The minimum water rate in the District of Columbia per year is $8.75. Heretofore there has been a surplus in the water fund which has been accessible to the Commissioners, but that surplus is being rapidly whittled away by the extraordinary demands which are being made upon the water system of the Capital during this period of rapid expansion. Your committee in this report has recommended an increase in the water rates in the District of Columbia and has recommended that every effort be made to collect delinquent sums which are due from those who receive the benefits of the water system. Of course, this is not a legislative committee; we handle appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Another source of revenue of the District of Columbia which is payable into the general fund is the direct grant from the Federal Government in the sum of $6,000,000. The Congress, in the Revenue Act of 1939, settled the controversy as to the sum which should be contributed by the Federal Government and fixed that appropriation by the Revenue Act of 1939 at $6,000,000.

The financial condition of the District is good. The debt is small, something short of $13,000,000. The tax collections are good. There is an anticipated surplus in the general fund of the District of more than $2,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1942, and for the fiscal year 1943, for which we are now making appropriations, it is anticipated there will be a surplus of well over $1,000,000. This is in excess of a cushion of about $1,000,000 which is carried in this bill to take care of contingencies and unexpected deficiencies of one kind or another.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now, if we should come down to a consideration of the various items in the bill it would take a considerable amount of time, and I hardly think it necessary in view of the very painstaking care which your committee has exercised in seeking to present this bill to you.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia—Mr. Young, Mr. Mason, and General Kutz—have been most helpful. I think probably they have been more cooperative this year than they have ever been before, and they have always cooperated with the committee. They sat through many of our hearings. They submitted to us all the information which we requested. The budget officer, Mr. Fowler, and his able assistant, Mr. Wilding, were very faithful to the committee.

For the first time this year Mr. Bob Williams acted as clerk for the committee, and we who worked with him know that he did a very splendid job, and we wish to publicly commend him for his service to the District, to the Congress, and to the city of Washington.

One of the interesting things which we did in the bill this year was to reduce the appropriations for the public schools in the sum of more than $1,300,000. The public schools get the largest portion of the revenue of the District of Columbia. They get something over $14,000,000 a year ordinarily, but, at the request of the Board of Education and Superintendent Ballou, we struck from the bill something over $1,300,000, which had originally been planned for an extension of the school system in some of the areas where there has been increased population.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a school man, I am vitally interested in the matter of education throughout the entire country as well as in the city of Washington. I can see why a certain reduction during wartime might be called for logically by the school people themselves, as well as by the committee. This would apply especially to planned building which now in war cannot be done. Has the committee made any plans toward emphasizing physical education, or health education, which is now called for throughout the country, urgently called for by the circumstances of war and the preparation of our young men for war?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has asked a very pertinent and interesting question and I should like to submit that the committee has been aware of the situation which the gentleman has mentioned. Before going into that matter of the physical training and health in the schools I should like to suggest that in spite of the tremendous increase in population in Washington the scholastic population in the schools is about 1,600 less at this time than it was a year ago.

A great deal of interest has been shown by citizens of this city in the question of public health and in the question of the health and physical training in the schools. The program has been sponsored by one of the leading newspapers of the city, the Evening Star, and there has been emphasis from various quarters of this problem of physical training and the health program for the District.

The importance of this subject was further emphasized by statistics which developed in the examination of men under the draft act. It was found that 45 percent of the men examined for military training were disqualified by reason of physical defects—a tremendous and astounding number of our young men, nearly one-half of them being disqualified for physical defects. We felt that the school, in addition to the home and the state as such, had a grave responsibility to bring about a change in that deplorable condition. We exceeded the budget for physical training and health programs in the schools by $135,000 in order to make it possible to put on in the senior high schools of the city of Washington a real physical training program and a more adequate health program for the high schools and for all the schools in the District of Columbia.

If I may cite some facts that were brought out some time ago and which I got this morning from the office of the Chief of the Selective Service, General Hershey, I think it will be most interesting and enlightening: 21 percent of those disqualified for the draft by reason of physical defects were disqualified because of defects of teeth. I am using round figures. Fourteen percent were disqualified by eye trouble of one kind or another; 11 percent by reason of heart and blood conditions; 7 percent by reason of muscle or bone structure conditions; 6 percent by reason of venereal disease; 6 percent by reason of mental and nervous disease; 6 percent by reason of hernia; 5 percent by reason of ear defects; 4 percent by reason of

defects of feet; and 3 percent by reason of defects of the lungs and because of tuberculosis; 18 percent for miscellaneous reasons. So we thought we ought to do something about it. In this we had the support of the District officials, and we feel that in 1943, in the school year which begins this fall, the program which has been sponsored will mean a great deal to the Government, to the Army, and to the individual student.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to commend the committee's work in this respect, particularly as one jealous of school conditions and supporting funds. I think it is well done. I hope in this case the work of the committee will serve as an example to the school systems throughout the Nation in regard to physical education and health training.

Mr. MAHON. It has been my hope and the hope of the committee that the activity of this Congress in accentuating the importance of the health program in the schools of the Nation's Capital might more or less set a pattern for the other schools of the country.

We realize that we have not undertaken a very ambitious step in this bill, but we hope this will be a forerunner of an extended program for this purpose in our schools.

Next to the school item the largest item in the bill is for public welfare. The sum requested and recommended in this bill is about $8,529,245. This represents a reduction over the amount last year, because we felt that in some items in this particular bill we would be able to save some money by reason of increased employment and increased private income. It is interesting to point out in this connection that of all the major cities of the Nation the per capita income in the District of Columbia ranks No. 1.

The Department of Health, as differentiated from the health program in the schools, has been given an appropriation considerably in excess of $3,000,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hesitate to interrupt the splendid chairman of the subcommittee as he goes into another matter, but before he leaves the item in which he discusses the per capita income of the residents of the District of Columbia, I think it is only fair for the record to show also that the per capita cost of living is higher in the District of Columbia than in any other city in the Nation. Is not this true?

Mr. MAHON. I think it is very probably true. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and since he serves ably as chairman of the Legislative Committee for the District of Columbia I believe it would not be inappropriate to pay him and his committee a compliment for bringing in this year the rent control measure. We had before us the administrator of rent control. We granted him all the funds he requested for his work.

Upon investigation of his work we found that he was doing, on the whole, a grand job, and that he was saving the people of the District of Columbia tremendous sums of money and preventing a lot of abuses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed a total of 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. The Department of Public Health as such, including the schools and all other aspects of the problem was reduced by about $69,000. There might be those who would be prone to criticize the committee for this reduction if they did not look at the report and hearings; but the fact is that during the last few years we have tremendously increased the appropriations for the public health work, and rapid strides have been made in public health work in the District of Columbia. We felt that by appropriating $400,000 in excess of what we appropriated last year we were going as far as we could afford to at this time. The reductions which were made are slight compared with the increases which we permitted.

In connection with the work out at Blue Plains, the home for the aged and infirm, where about 550 inmates are kept, we made a slight reduction in the bill, but we find today that the W. P. A. workers who previously served this institution are being withdrawn in the very near future and the committee will offer an amendment which will make it possible for the work at this home for the aged and infirm to go forward as it has in recent months. At the present time it is going forward in a most wholesome manner, especially when we compare it with the conditions that existed at Blue Plains a few months and a few years ago.

While we eliminated 9 nurses which were requested for public health, we granted 10. At another point in the bill where we cut out 23 nurses we granted 30. We increased the number of Public Health nurses in the District of Columbia from 95 by the sum of 40, which will make a total of 135.

We gave a considerable number of additional medical examiners for schools in order that they may help effectuate this health program. We gave a number of additional dentists for the schools. We gave a considerable number of additional personnel and money for the tuberculosis program in the District. I may say that tuberculosis is one of the major problems of the District.

We felt that the program for fighting venereal disease should be pressed forward and we granted additional money, I believe in the sum of $25,000, for an accentuation of that program. We granted additional doctors for this work, feeling that hardly anything could be much more important to the Nation's Capital than good health.

In the Police Department we made no change of moment. Last year by the regular bill and through supplementary appropriations we increased the number of police by about 190. The District now has something over 1,700 regular Metropolitan Police in addition to less than 100 Park Police who are paid by the District government and, of course, there are other police, such as the Capitol Police and other secret-service agents and officers having to do with the White House and other governmental departments and buildings.

Mr. BENDER. Will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman tell the House which District official has authority over taxicabs here?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I am not positive of the correct answer to the gentleman's question. I should certainly say he should see the police, and he might confer with the Department of Vehicles and Traffic. The situation might be such that he might want to see his lawyer. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for elaboration upon that statement.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not desire to take the place of the chairman of the subcommittee in answering this question except to say that we have dealt through the legislative committee with this problem more directly than the gentleman has in connection with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BENDER. I will give the gentleman an idea of what I have in mind. I would feel sorry if the gentleman's constituent was here and had an accident in a taxicab, and I might say the same would be true of a constituent of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], because I find that we have in the department down here more buck passers per square inch than they have in any other city in America. Several of my constituents were injured quite seriously in one of these taxicabs last July. One department passes the buck to the other. You do not know whether you are afoot or horseback, because all these people get is conversation, no satisfaction. They will not put anything in writing. In my opinion, somebody in the Utilities Commission is in cahoots with some of these gyps who are in the taxicab business. They are giving these people, my constituents, a royal run-around. It is most amazing.

Mr. HOUSTON. Has the gentleman taken that up with the Public Utilities Commission?

Mr. BENDER. I have taken it up with everybody around here.

Mr. HOUSTON. The Public Utilities Commission has jurisdiction.

Mr. BENDER. Some of these taxicab companies have an insurance company or a holding company back of them. Now you see them and now you do not. It is like a ricocheted bullet, you do not know where you are shooting.

Mr. HOUSTON. I may say to the gentleman that in the past several years there has been a bill or two introduced to cover that situation, but they failed of enactment.

Mr. BENDER. I had in mind submitting an amendment to the Utilities Com-

mission paragraph cutting down the appropriations for that department.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the proposition that the gentleman from Ohio raises has from time to time been presented by other Members of the House on particular occasions when their own constituents have brought the matter closely to their attention. We have had on at least two occasions through the District of Columbia legislative committee attempted to present to this House certain bills which we thought would give certain relief in connection with the problem of the operation and financial responsibility of taxicabs in the District of Columbia, but we have been unable to proceed in that manner, and in one instance we were defeated on a roll-call vote on the House floor.

I may say to the gentleman that the District of Columbia legislative committee has attempted always, insofar as we can humanly carry forward the individual requests of Members to get some action in these matters, and I shall take pleasure in receiving the file of the gentleman on this subject. I assure him it will be the determined effort of the chairman and the members of that committee to go into the problem that he presents and see if we cannot expedite the answer to the matter the gentleman has brought to our attention.

Mr. HOUSTON. May I say with respect to the reduction the gentleman has just spoken of, that we have already reduced the Public Utilities Commission by $17,000 out of a total asked for of $88,000. We did allow one chauffeur, so he could get up here and tell us why he cannot do these things.

Mr. BENDER. He certainly is a great buck passer.

Mr. MAHON. It would be well if we might tell the House the various aspects of every item in the bill, but it takes weeks to go into every item of an appropriation bill of even this character, and it will not be possible to do so in the time available.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I may point out one item that occurs to me now, that in the appropriation for the public library of the District of Columbia we made a reduction in the Budget request. It was requested that we set up a more or less temporary library over in Anacostia to serve a large group of people there. This library was to be placed in a store building which could be rented. We would have liked to accommodate the people in that area, but we found that it would cost something like $50,000 to do it. We provided funds last year for the purchase of ground, and we decided that this project could wait until after the war was over, when the matter could be handled in a more appropriate and satisfactory manner.

It was interesting to hear from the able librarian, Miss Herbert, that the people are not using the library during this period of great stress as they previously used it. Some 100,000 less circulation was anticipated this year as compared with last year. However, there has been an increased interest in the use of the library in connection with technical subjects and matters which have to do with the defense effort.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to ask a question regarding the Health Department. Dr. Ruhland, the Health Commissioner, on page 322 of the hearings points out the probability of epidemics in Washington due to unsanitary conditions. Does this appropriation give Dr. Ruhland additional inspectors?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; this appropriation gives Dr. Ruhland considerable additional personnel. It gives 1 additional food inspector, I note at first glance, 10 additional food inspectors at another grade SP 5, and 5 additional sanitary inspectors. However, it does not give the total amount requested.

Mr. PADDOCK. Can the gentleman tell me whether these sanitary inspectors have the power to close up unsanitary places they find on their inspections?

Mr. MAHON. I am not familiar with the exact power of the sanitary inspectors, but I should think, offhand, that if a condition exists that would warrant closing a place, they would have authority to take steps to do so.

It has been found that the sanitary condition is not good in a number of eating places in the District, especially of the drug-store type, where adequate facilities are not present. For that reason, we have granted additional personnel and additional money for the purpose of safeguarding the health and the well-being of the people of this city.

I might refer to some of the other items in the bill but I have now consumed about 35 minutes. I shall reserve the balance of my time, and the able and faithful Representative the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the ranking minority Member, can proceed with a further discussion of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in making up the committee recommendations for the total amount to run the affairs of the District of Columbia during 1943 your committee had before it the representatives of every department in the city. Before examining these witnesses the members of your committee—as is always the custom—visited many of the facilities in the district to get a first-hand picture of what is going on here.

As presented to the committee the request was for a total of $56,594,840. Long before these figures were submitted the committee requested that the Budget be revised, because it had been made up originally many months ago and was out of date. The revision in many cases was based upon conditions that existed almost to the last day of the hearings. So we come before you with what we are assured are figures revised to meet conditions as they exist at the present moment. Of course, the conditions are changing here so rapidly that by the time the Senate finishes with this bill there may be some necessity for further revision. That is all caused by the war conditions as they affect your Nation's Capital.

So we come before you with a total request for $56,126,127. This sum was decided upon by the committee after most careful consideration. Every item was scrutinized closely from the viewpoint of being fair to both the taxpayer of this district and the people of the entire country. These are not ordinary times, and this is not an ordinary capital of a nation. Washington has become the headquarters for the second World War so far as the Allies are concerned, and your committee has insisted that all nonessentials be eliminated in this bill and that it come to you with the understanding that all emphases have centered around our war effort.

In this work we have been given unusual assistance by members of the Board of Commissioners who include J. Russell Young, the chairman, Guy Mason, and General Kutz. These excellent gentlemen are the appointees of our President, and from our observation we feel they are highly qualified to conduct the gigantic and important duties now imposed upon them. Never before in the history of our Capital have greater responsibilities been put on the shoulders of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Most able assistance was also given to us in our work by Mr. Walter Fowler and his staff of efficient auditors and assistants in the District office. Mr. Robert Williams, our committee clerk, should be highly commended for his unusually fine work. Each member of the subcommittee, which is composed of the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, of Texas; JOHN HOUSTON, HARRY BEAM, VINCENT HARRINGTON, ALBERT THOMAS, FRANCIS CASE, and WILLIAM LAMBERTSON, should be commended for giving their many hours to the deliberations and study given to this appropriation bill which carries one of the largest totals of any bill ever submitted to the Congress for making annual appropriations for the District of Columbia.

As has been already said, Washington being the world headquarters for the conduct of the second World War to defeat the Axis, an unusual amount of extraordinary responsibility is placed on the shoulders of the officials here. Therefore, your committee had somewhat of a dual appropriation to consider. One, dealing with the revenues of the District and their reflection on the expenditures; and the other, the expenditures directly out of the Federal Treasury and their reflection in the expenditures of same within the confines of the District of Columbia. Therefore, the Members of the House should be interested in the fact that the estimated receipts into the general fund during the present fiscal year, 1942, will be $41,331,000, and that the Federal Government has expended up to March 31, $13,503,863.59, including the usual Federal contribution of $6,000,000. In addition there are allotments from the Lanham Act of December 20, 1941, which to date have amounted to approximately $674,000 cash, a portion of which will have to be repaid. It is estimated that the general revenue for the fiscal year

1943 will be $41,566,000, and that the Federal Government will spend even a greater amount than in 1942 because of the act of April 10, 1942, which provides for defense housing and community facilities in the District of Columbia and which will be available in 1942 and 1943. The appropriation to carry out this act in its present status provides for $29,500,000. It is not known at this time how much will have to be repaid. As the war continues, we can expect larger Federal expenditures in the District.

In fairness to the District it should be stated that quite a large portion of the Federal expenditures will be repaid by the District.

POSSIBLE RECEIPTS

With the gigantic increase in population in the District caused by the war, it is believed that sources of revenue will be increased. The population here is figured all the way from 777,000 to 850,000 and the population of the metropolitan area of Washington has already passed the 1,000,000 mark.

The additional gasoline tax has brought additional revenue to the city treasury. The real estate rates, based on actual valuation, are very low at $1.75 per $100, and this source of additional revenue could easily be explored in case additional funds are needed. The water rates in Washington are very low and could be raised. Uncollected water bills running to around $300,000 to $400,000, should be collected more promptly. Another source of revenue is in the local theaters which pay a flat license fee of $30 per year plus $5 for inspection no matter what size the theater. Also the $5 per year fee at the ball park where as many as 35,000 people pay admission to one game could be increased. Similar increase in license fees could easily bring additional revenue to the city. The electric light, gas, and telephone rates in Washington are reasonable.

INCOME TAX

The local income tax is adding much new revenue to the treasury. People coming here to work and earning $1,000 or more and who are domiciled in Washington are subject to this income tax. The burden of proof as to residence is on the shoulders of these thousands of new workers. Just how the new income tax law is going to affect them in the future must be studied. So far I have been informed there is no inclination on the part of the local officials to make a general wholesale drive to collect these income taxes from these people here temporarily.

TAX-FREE PROPERTY

The Commissioners have given much attention to the elimination of tax-free real estate in the District and are receiving an unusual amount of cooperation from some of the institutions which heretofore have enjoyed tax-free privileges. About $20,000,000 worth of tax-free property has been transferred to the taxable books and some collections are now being made. No hardship is intended to be placed on actual charitable and eleemosynary institutions in this effort to increase the revenues of the District, but wherever possible the recapture of taxable property is being done under the energetic program of the Commission.

There is a great need to urge the fullest effort on the part of the District officials to collect every penny of possible revenue from those enjoying the benefits of the District in order that when normal times come again the receipts of the District can equal the necessary expenditures.

FREE TUITION

Many Government activities have been moved from Washington in order to make room for the war workers. The schools have lost a population of 1,600 due largely to many people moving to surrounding States. In discussing this matter it is suggested to eliminate the free tuition given to Maryland and Virginia students in the District schools. This costs the taxpayers of Washington $250,000 annually, and in view of the need for additional space here for the war effort, it is felt these outside students should become the responsibility of their own States, in any event, for the duration of the war.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

A word of commendation for the police department should be added here. Maj. Edward Kelly should be highly commended in making a real showing in the decrease of crime in Washington and also for the formulation of one of the finest police organizations in our country. Complementing this fine police force an auxiliary police force has been organized. This is composed of about 4,000 volunteers picked from the best citizens in the District. These people come from every walk of life. They include lawyers, doctors, and other professional people; skilled mechanics, merchants, and even laborers. They even include some Members of Congress. These people are given strict examinations and are selected after much care. They give their time free to the Nation's Capital in order to safeguard its citizens and its property. These auxiliary police members have already demonstrated their high value and have been commended many times by officials in high office. The Washington Police Department recognizes the gigantic task confronting it and is ready for any eventuality.

PARK POLICE

Members may be interested that although the District pays the salaries, pensions, furnishes uniforms, and equipment for the 72 park policemen, the District has no jurisdiction over them. In fact this represents a dual police jurisdictional system in Washington. Over this, however, your committee has no control due to the fact that the Park Police comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The expense of the Park Police, however, is reflected in the expenditures made here.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

What has been said about the Washington Police Department can be also said for the Washington Fire Department, which is under the supervision of Chief Porter, a highly efficient and able superintendent who, long before our entry into the war, anticipated the needs of our Capital and reorganized not only his regular force but added an auxiliary volunteer force of over 1,300 men who have already done some valuable service. Long ago Chief Porter and his able staff secured the benefits of studies in England, where the fire departments had been called upon for much rescue work following bombings. The Washington Fire Department members have gone through a series of studies which will fit them for important service in all cases of emergency. Besides fighting the ordinary fires which may increase as the result of the construction of many temporary buildings, the department is subject to call in case of drownings and other accidents. The department is keeping abreast of the times and is closely fitted into the war protective work in Washington.

Anticipating further burdens on the Fire Department, the committee has added 20 firemen, 50 more than are on the force at present.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

About 50,000 civilian defense workers have undergone training in the city in the past and more training is going on daily. Under the direction of Colonel Bolles this civilian defense work is closely coordinated with the work of the Police and Fire Departments. Dean Landis, head of the O. C. D., has been a frequent examiner of the work done by the local O. C. D., the Fire and Police Departments in Washington, and your committee has given every encouragement to these 3 protective organizations.

You may be interested that the committee has given every encouragement as assistance and appropriations for the installations of two-way radio and other necessary equipment in order that the protective service of Washington will be successful.

SCHOOL HEALTH PHYSICAL TRAINING PROGRAM

The District and the Nation is indebted to the publishers of the Washington Star for its effective campaign to inaugurate an effective physical training and health program in the schools of the District of Columbia. This farsighted activity by this great newspaper followed the suggestion by the Army and the Navy that the youth of America be toughened up in order to be prepared to meet coming events and in order that every boy and girl in our schools be made physically fit in order to be prepared for the future. To fit the youth of America into the war picture was the basis of many illuminating newspaper articles printed in the Washington Star. The report of the selective service officials indicating the large number of physically unfit selectees also attracted the attention of your committee. Following many suggestions made by the Washington Star, your committee made some investigations. These suggestions resulted in the request by the committee that the budget be revised and made up to date. It was then decided that there was great need for the immediate inauguration of the health examination and physical training program here. In these efforts your committee was given splendid assistance and cooperation by Dr. Ballou, the superintendent of public schools, the Commissioners

of the District, and the health and physical training officials of the city. From these investigations and following many conferences your committee provided in this bill what is said by those in authority to be sufficient funds to carry out the plans for an effective health and physical training program. Five periods per week for physical training instead of the present two periods per week, as planned in this bill, is to be increased as the program gets under way. In encouraging the health examination work it is not the intention of the committee to in any way encourage socialized medicine but emphasis is made on the hope that the family doctor will be the ultimate consultant in aiding in this effort to bring better health to the school children of the District. The committee hopes that this program will become the model from which all of the schools of the country can work in this effort to bring better health to the youth of America.

AVIATION IN SCHOOLS

Your committee has encouraged and provided funds for increased studies of aviation in the District schools. Although the amount provided for the summer aviation studies are rather small, the committee was informed that this amount is sufficient to meet the present needs. The committee was also informed that it had provided sufficient funds in the regular appropriations for schools to carry out a general aviation study program throughout the regular school year in practically all of the higher grades. The work of constructing airplane models for the Navy in the manual-training departments of the schools is highly commended and the committee has been assured that this work will be continued. In encouraging extended aviation studies throughout the school system of the District the committee was impressed with the cooperative spirit of the school officials, and it is hoped that as the program progresses the farsighted efforts of the officials of the Civilian Aviation Administration will be reflected in the aviation studies in the schools here. There is no reason why the aviation study program in the schools of the District should not become the basis from which the schools of the entire country can work. The Office of Education, headed by Dr. John W. Studebaker, has been of untold assistance in aiding in the advancement of these aviation programs and other vocational work in our school system. Members of the committee were encouraged in the determination of the school officials here to plan for some elimination of nonessentials and to fit their present and future activities into the Nation-wide determination to win the war quickly.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman advise a little more fully and, perhaps, more particularly, the type of training this aviation program will be?

Mr. STEFAN. The type of training in the public schools of America will follow the program recommended by Robert Hinckley, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, and his able staff in the Civilian Aviation Administration, and through Dr. Studebaker, of the Office of Education. It will not be a definite flight program insofar as physical flight is concerned, but will consist of information about aviation and something that will bring to the imagination and the mind of the youth of the schools a knowledge of what aviation is and prepare him, perhaps, eventually, for the elementary aviation training.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. If the gentleman will look at page 8, second paragraph of the report, he will find it is pretty fully covered there as to what the different types of training are to be.

Mr. COLE of New York. This is not an educational program peculiar to the District, but a part of a Nation-wide educational program.

Mr. STEFAN. The committee hopes, and has so stated in its report, that the program in Washington will follow the program inaugurated today by the officials of the Civilian Aeronautic Authority and which is being spread over the entire Nation and being discussed by educators in the schools and colleges of the country. Such a meeting was held in my State capital only a few days ago.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the attention which the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska is giving to the subject of aviation training in the high schools. I think it only fair to say that there are only a very few States that are now carrying on aviation courses in their high schools, just about the number of States that we could count on our fingers. The District of Columbia, I think we can say with a certain sense of pride, has been a leader in the aviation program. During the past year with only a small amount of funds provided, aviation courses in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia have been given in 8 white high schools and 3 colored high schools, with approximately 300 young men taking these courses.

It has been my privilege to visit on several occasions classrooms where this instruction was going forward; to see the keen interest of the youth and the application of the instructor combining to bring that background which is going to serve well the purposes of military aviation now and a few years hence, and then later the broadly expanded civil aviation program of our country. I commend the Subcommittee on Appropriations in recognizing that we here in the District of Columbia, by the proper providing of funds, can perhaps lay the solid groundwork which in conjunction with the Nation-wide program inaugurated by the Office of Education and the Department of Commerce, through the civil aviation programs, will be helpful in the years that are to come. I commend the subcommittee on its attention to this important subject.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. He has given much aid to our aviation program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I wish to commend the chairman of the legislative committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] because I know what he has done for aviation and what his philosophy is. I want to assure him that we appreciate the support he is giving us, because we feel that in inaugurating this program we will have not only 300 students in the Washington schools studying aviation, but we hope to have a program eventually of more than 1,000 students, and perhaps more than that, studying aviation. We are assured by the superintendent of schools, Dr. Ballou, that we have sufficient funds in this bill to carry out a very good and effective program based on the ideas of Robert Hinckley and his far-sighted men in the Civil Aeronautics Administration, through its Office of Education, Dr. Studebaker. Had we not been assured that sufficient funds were provided in this bill we would have increased the amount, but we are assured there is plenty here, and we hope that this instruction in aviation in the schools of the District of Columbia will be a model for the rest of the 48 States of the Union.

I wish to tell the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] who has been a leader in an effort to bring instructions in soaring and gliding to America, that we hope the schools will do something along that line, because it was after the gentleman's continued demands that soaring and gliding instruction come into the Army and the Navy, that the Army and Navy did something about it. The initiative and the foresightedness of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is highly appreciated by the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I be indulged for one further statement?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would just like to state that when I made reference to approximately five States that have pioneered along with the District of Columbia in aviation courses, New York State has been one of those in that group.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. And since we are talking about States, I wish to say that the State of Nebraska, through its very fine aeronautics commission, headed by Mr. E. J. Robins, is one of the top States of the Union, so far as State appropriations for aviation are concerned. Nebraska is leading the Nation in aviation enthusiasm. Nebraska today is one of the only two States in the Union which has a C. A. A. instruction aviation project. It is directed by Dean Henslick and was made possible for Nebraska by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which recognizes Nebraska's work in aviation. This research aviation project is located in the State university, at Lincoln, Nebr. Columbia University has the only other C. A. A. research aviation project in our

country. I feel this speaks highly for Nebraska. The Nebraska Aeronautics Commission, due to the farsightedness of our legislatures, spends substantially more than the other States spend on aviation development. Nebraska will have approximately $250,000 to spend on airports during the fiscal year as compared to New York State's $100,000. The Nebraska Aeronautics Commission has cooperated in every way possible with the Civilian Aeronautics Commission from the time the Commission was organized. I feel that is why Nebraska is given this very high rating by the aviation authorities of our country.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am very much pleased with the announcement the gentleman has been making, but I am also curious to know the approximate cost of this program. The report indicates that about 700 students in the District of Columbia will take advantage of this opportunity during this next year. Can the gentleman tell us what the approximate total cost will be?

Mr. STEFAN. I tried to explain that during the colloquy between the gentleman from West Virginia and myself. We are allowing a small amount for training during the summer vacation. You know the school budget is the largest item in this bill. It totals over $14,000,000. We are assured that they can eliminate some nonessential work in the schools and divert some of that money to aviation instruction. I cannot tell you the amount that will be used, because they are going to start this conservatively and effectively, and I am sure there is enough money that can be diverted from nonessentials—I mean nonessentials during wartime—but we believe there are some nonessentials that can be eliminated. What we would like in the schools of America today is health, good physical training, a fine health examination—not socialized medicine—aviation, and elimination of what we could now call luxuries.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I certainly yield to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I was glad to hear the gentleman make the statement about the progress in the State of Nebraska, it being one of the pioneer States in aviation. I have a strong suspicion that probably that may be due to the interest and activity manifested by one of the Representatives in Congress from the State of Nebraska, who has been, to my mind, one of the most enthusiastic advocates of aviation since it was my pleasure and privilege to come here 3 years ago.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina very much. I want to say in reply that the gentleman and I serve on the subcommittee which makes appropriations for the Department of Commerce, in which is included the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The gentleman, I wish to tell my colleagues, was one of the men who helped to save civilian pilot training for America at a time when we had considerable opposition from certain people who did not believe that aviation would win the war and who today are opposing the chairman of the District Legislative Committee, who believes there ought to be more coordination in aviation in America.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate the very nice compliment, but I want to say for the RECORD that while it was my privilege to take an active part in securing an increase in his appropriation for aviation last year in the pilot-training work, I make the frank confession that my inspiration and my determination to see that there was an increase in the appropriation came from association with the gentleman from Nebraska; and I am sure I would not have been able to get an increased appropriation if it had not been for his enthusiastic and cooperative support.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is very kind, and I thank him on behalf of many aviation enthusiasts for his cooperation.

I want to assure the Members we did everything we possibly could to put this entire bill into the program for victory.

Speaking of the prospects of more revenue here you should know that the people of Washington are pretty well off. The average of $1,800 per capita pay roll here is very high. There are a lot of ways in which the people of the District can increase revenues. Rents here are now controlled, but real-estate taxes are low, $1.75 a hundred; water rates are the lowest in the country; the city is behind in water-bill collections $300,000 to $400,000. They charge a license fee of only $5 a year for the great big ball park here which seats 35,000 people at a time. They charge $35 a year license for picture shows whether they be the little "shooting galleries" on Ninth Street or of big theaters on the main drag. There are many, many ways in which they can raise revenue. The city has never been so prosperous. The stores have Christmas rushes every day.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I was interested in the capitulation the gentleman is giving us of the phases in which Washington might be characterized as a taxpayer's paradise. Will he not also tell us the approximate cost of licensing an automobile in the District of Columbia? Will he tell us what the income-tax rate is here? And will he tell us whether there is a sales tax of any sort that the people of the District have to pay?

Mr. STEFAN. The income tax has been quite a controversial matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Many of your constituents and mine are coming here, they are coming by the thousands. There is an income tax in the District of Columbia. If your constituent who comes to Washington today cannot prove that he is not domiciled in the District of Columbia he is subject to an income tax if he earns $1,000 or more. There are a lot of chiselers here, too. There are people in courts today, people who have lived here 20 or 25 years, but they are in court trying to prove they are not domiciled in the District of Columbia and trying to get out of the payment of income tax. But we went into that at great length, because we did not want our constituents who come here for temporary jobs to be charged an income tax.

Mr. COLE of New York. But if they do have to pay an income tax it is only at the rate of 1 or 2 percent.

Mr. STEFAN. That is very true. I wanted merely to explain the many, many means of revenue that can be availed of in this city.

Mr. COLE of New York. And registration for an automobile is what? About $5?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. And there is no sales tax of any sort?

Mr. STEFAN. No; not at all.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I wish to make an observation before I ask a question: I think the gentleman from Nebraska has been very kind in commending the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the District Committee the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I am sure the commendation is well deserved. I am particularly impressed by the statement being made by the gentleman from Nebraska, because I know of the hard work and the painstaking and timely study that has been made of the whole situation by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I do not know whether the gentleman was here when I related the experience of one of my constituents who suffered injury in a taxicab. I said that the trouble was possibly that too many of these people on the District pay roll worked as a closed corporation.

Since that time I have been told by some who were conversant with District matters that people on the pay roll here when they refer to the enemy do not mean the Axis but mean the fellow across the hall; that there are some of these fellows who are not on speaking terms. This fine condition that exists in the Appropriations Committee and in the District Committee certainly does not apply to some of these offices here. I understand the Utilities Commissioner will not speak to one of the District Commissioners, and so on, that you have got to invite them in on different days for they cannot get along together in the same room. Now, it seems to me that these two committees might call them all together and have an understanding so that when a Member of Congress calls a department regarding an unfortunate experience of a constituent, he can get consideration instead of their not calling up the other fellow because they are not on speaking terms. It is about time they get together.

Mr. STEFAN. May I say to my colleague from Ohio that I am sure from what the chairman of the legislative

committee had to say in regard to the case he referred, it will be taken care of and gone into thoroughly. Naturally in every department there is some jealousy and usually some friction.

Washington started out here before the war with a population of around 500,000 people. It jumped up to 770,000, and today metropolitan Washington is a city of 1,200,000 people. It has grown by leaps and bounds and there is going to be a lot of trouble and difficulty which you and I have to face. So far as compliments back and forth between the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee are concerned, you and I know that these jobs on the District of Columbia committees are thankless jobs. The people here have no vote and we have to act as their representatives. It is our Nation's Capital and belongs to all of the people of the 48 States of the Union. Today it is the Capital of the world for the war against the Axis. The committee's work today is very voluminous and important.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

When we are working on these District bills we have in mind our own States and our own districts, and of course, our country as a whole.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman repeat the statement he made with reference to there being upward of three-quarters of a million dollars' worth of unpaid taxes or rents here?

Mr. STEFAN. No; I referred to unpaid water bills.

Mr. PLUMLEY. All right. Let us call them water bills.

Mr. STEFAN. There are from three to four hundred thousand dollars of water bills that have not been paid in Washington, D. C. We have some remedial legislation in this bill in regard to that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. You are undertaking to take care of that situation?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. I referred to it as being a place where there is the possibility of collecting money.

Mr. PLUMLEY. How old are these bills?

Mr. STEFAN. Well, they are quite old.

Mr. PLUMLEY. It is an annual carry-over?

Mr. STEFAN. These are overdue.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Do you have in mind the total revenue derived from the water rent bills annually?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman wants to know how much it is?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes. I want to find out what percentage of the revenue we have to expect is not paid into the Treasury annually on this basis of overdue water rents.

Mr. STEFAN. The overdue water rents amount to three or four hundred thousand dollars up to the present time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Why do you not get some of these fighting Commissioners together and either fire them or else make them collect what is due?

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I tried to tell the gentleman. We are doing something about it in this bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Why come in and ask us for an appropriation when you have a half million dollars due from people who have drunk our money up?

Mr. HOUSTON. This is not an appropriation that the gentleman refers to. It is just language. We are putting in a 10-percent penalty for overdue bills.

Mr. STEFAN. This is remedial legislation. We are trying to recapture this money.

Mr. HOUSTON. We have been operating under a law since 1859, and we are trying to remedy the situation in this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. When you get into the water question it is a deep and perplexing question.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes. I know the water is deep.

Mr. STEFAN. They give away a lot of water here that is never paid for. The taxpayer gets little out of this free water program.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The water is awfully deep, but you are getting into something deeper when you undertake to add a penalty and you cannot even collect the original sum. You will not collect the penalty. It is not a good administrative policy to impose a penalty on what you know is far overdue, because if you cannot get the original, you cannot get the 10 percent additional. It is just a phoney proposition.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman think we would get action if we were to cut the appropriations for this department entirely and let them get their salaries from the money they collect?

Mr. STEFAN. Well, the Water Department has been doing a good job. The man in charge has been there many years. But his work has increased. The town is growing too fast. They had a big surplus in the water fund at one time and they are now digging into that. If they could collect this three or four hundred thousand dollars, they will not have to dig into their surplus.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make an observation relative to the question which the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] propounded of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] on the fact there is no sales tax now operative in the District of Columbia. Of course, he well knows the form of taxation levied here in the District comes through the channels of the Congress of the United States. There have been occasions, particularly at one time, when a roll-call vote on the subject of a sales tax for the District of Columbia was defeated.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding I wish to call attention to page No. 31 of the hearings, which will give a very good picture as to the amount of money the Federal Government has spent in the District of Columbia during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

Taking that into consideration and looking over the bill you have before you now, and noticing the totals, you will find that that will give you practically a complete picture of the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the annual contribution of the Federal Treasury to the operation of the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. Six million dollars. That is basic law. No change in that figure is contemplated in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, each day it becomes more evident that our system of price control is a failure. True, Leon Henderson and his associates are working diligently to stem the rising cost of living. But it is another occasion of too little and too late. The selective system of price control is not adequate to meet the situation. What we need is a program which not only controls the ultimate price but every element which enters into it. Congress, in my judgment, made a serious mistake in refusing to adopt the Baruch plan, based on the freezing of all prices as of a certain date. Eventually we will be forced to adopt this method. Why not now?

It is true, difficulty would be experienced in selecting the date which is to be the criterion. No date could be chosen during which all prices would bear the proper relationship, one to another. Adjustments would need to be made. This could be accomplished by a board having authority to hear evidence and adjust prices which are out of line. At least, that system would be much simpler than the one we now have.

Those who object to this method should realize that there appears to be no alternative except constantly increasing costs, continuous readjustments, and the ever-present threat of inflation. We are now facing two very disturbing factors in our economic life. One is the constantly dwindling production of many kinds of consumer goods. As more and more factories are converted from the uses of peace to war, that situation will become rapidly worse. The other factor is the ever-increasing consumer demand. As more money spent in the war effort flows into circulation, that also will become worse. In these two factors we have the formula for spiraling prices. Nothing will stop it but the heavy hand of the Government. We cannot do it by halfway measures. Rather than such a system, it would be better to take our chance with the law of supply and demand. At least, we would save a costly overhead of attempted control and enforcement.

Of course, a proper tax measure would do something to sponge up unusual earnings. The 1942 tax bill should be written with that as one objective. But what about the man who is out of work? What about the small businessman whose

peacetime activities have been destroyed? For these unfortunate people, hanging on desperately for a better day, there should be given some assurance that the cost of living will be kept under control.

Nor in this calculation should we lose sight of the future. We talk glibly of spending billions of dollars with too little thought that the money must be paid back. We may be paying it back when earnings are small and business is bad. I hope Congress will act immediately to freeze at proper and fair levels all prices of raw materials, finished products, profits, interest, wages, and, in fact, everything which enters into the cost of living.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

WHY "BIDDLE" WHILE THE COUNTRY BURNS?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I shall, later, in the House, ask unanimous consent to revise and extend these remarks and include an article from the People's World, resenting the attack that I made upon Harry Bridges. I am advised, after checking with the Dies committee, that this is the official Communist organ on the Pacific coast.

I particularly call this to the attention of Attorney General Biddle. This is only one more proof of Bridges' Communist connection, not that any more should be needed, but here is just another. Why do these people defend Harry Bridges if he is not one of them?

I have noted, as have all others, that the Attorney General has set out upon a large program of prosecuting newspapers, periodicals, and so forth, for sedition. Included in this program are many individuals. Of course, I do not know all the facts in connection with these cases, but will say this, that wherever any sedition or treason exists, I will always commend and congratulate the Attorney General for protecting this country's interests. All the facts should be brought out in connection with these matters and handled upon their merit, without any political consideration whatsoever.

My stand is definitely known to Members of this House. I have fought the Nazis just as hard as I have fought the Communists, as well as the Fascists and all the teachers of the philosophy of Karl Marx, and the encroachment of any of them upon our American form of government as I have known it. The record will show this. It was I who signed the affidavit for the cancelation of Fritz Kuhn's citizenship, protested his release from prison, and made the statement that the bund had no place in this country with its pledge of allegiance first to Hitler, as against allegiance to this country. With that purpose in mind, I want to publicly ask some questions in regard to this whole program.

The first question is, Why is it that certain people seem to have immunity against prosecution, no matter how seditious their expressions and their actions may have been and continue to be? How is that certain of these people appear to have protection from high official sources? In this connection, I am going to ask these questions specifically, with reference to Harry Bridges, and wish to place a few facts in the RECORD.

Why has Harry Bridges not been prosecuted for perjury, in view of the fact that he executed three affidavits in connection with his citizenship, with reference to his marriage date, none of which agree? The Attorney General has these facts in his possession, and at least two out of three must be lies, because they are presumed to answer the same question. Now, the Attorney General has in his possession evidence in Harry Bridges' own handwriting that should convict him, but still no prosecution on this account has ever been forthcoming.

I agree thoroughly with the Attorney General of the United States prosecuting every individual, every newspaper, every periodical, or any or every thing in fact, that is seditious or treasonable, and I do not think we should split hairs in so doing, and I do not believe anyone should be favored in any manner whatsoever, and that the laws should be enforced with equal justice to everyone and everything. Now, in this connection, why does not the Attorney General go back and review and take action on Harry Bridges' whole record? Does he see fit to forget that Harry Bridges actually destroyed the shipping industry on the Pacific coast, and has crippled it in many other places?

Does not the Attorney General realize that shipping and the merchant marine are most important factors in our war effort today? Why, then, this lack of action against this man, who has struck right at the heart of our war effort?

Why does the Attorney General refuse to take cognizance of Bridges' statement that any sabotage occurring in the shipping industry or the merchant marine should be reported to Bridges, and not to duly authorized officers of the land? This in itself is sedition, and violates a very specific law covering this matter. Does the Attorney General believe that airplane production is an important factor in our war effort? If he does, why does he choose to forget that Harry Bridges supported Freytag, the self-confessed Communist, in his abortive effort to destroy production at the North American plant in my district? Why does the Attorney General seek to forget, or not inform himself, that Bridges supported this abortive strike, even after the troops of the United States took this plant over, and was willing to fight the Government itself?

Why does the Attorney General refuse to take cognizance of the statements placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, about Harry Bridges and the conspiracy to commit murder, placed there by Arthur Anderson, former district attorney in St. Louis, who was well qualified by his position to know that which constituted conspiracy to murder?

These are only a few, and a very few, of the highlights of the seditious statements and actions of Harry Bridges. My people on the Pacific coast and many throughout the United States know that Harry Bridges has been thousands of times more seditious, and committed more treasonable acts, than many of the people whom the Attorney General is now prosecuting, and right here I want to state that I have no brief to make nor defense for any of these who have been prosecuted who have been guilty.

Why have Madam Perkins and all in her Department defended this man?

Why has not the F. B. I. been supported through the courts? Many of us greeted the transfer of this Bureau from the jurisdiction of Madam Perkins to the Attorney General with much hope. Were these false hopes, Mr. Attorney General?

Action was asked against this man while he still could be deported, and perhaps he still can, to Australia, and we do not propose to be fooled now by the statement that there is no place to send him. As a matter of fact, in answer to this question there are many Federal prisons and concentration camps where he can be placed. Mr. Attorney General, why this favoritism? During this crisis of war the President of the United States has asked for a nonpartisan, nonpolitical consideration in every single one of our actions, and I ask you, therefore, that any political pressure that may have been present in the past should now be waived and this man should be placed where he belongs.

The people of this country are not children and are not going to be fooled with any weak-kneed, mealymouthed excuses as to why this man is still being protected. His reputation is generally known and his acts are known. Neither can he now come out and fool the American people by his offer to cooperate, when we know that his fundamental philosophy is to get as close as he can to the picture, and occupy a position as high as he can, all the better to destroy us and to bore from within. Our whole Nation, and particularly the people in California, are not going to be fooled by his statements and professions of help, because they know him only too well and feel that he is much worse than the Japanese peace group, who sat here in Washington and made the same kind of professions, only to attack us in their treacherous manner without warning. The people of this country cannot look with complacent confidence upon you and your office as long as this discrimination and favor are shown to this man Bridges. The facts are too well known and they cannot be covered up.

Mr. Attorney General, the eyes of this whole country are upon you and are going to be kept there, particularly in California, to see whether you have enough red American blood in your body, and the intestinal fortitude to do your duty in this matter, as, by tradition, we have been taught to expect a Federal official to do his duty. This is up to you, and don't you ever believe that we are going to let you forget this situation for 1 minute.

Now I want to direct some remarks to the chairman of the Rules Committee. I have written you, phoned you, and plead with you for a hearing before your committee on my resolution calling for a congressional investigation of this whole matter. I have gone to the individual members of the committee, and no less than 10 of these members have stated

that this matter ought to be brought up, but it was in the hands of the chairman. Mr. Chairman, you have stated from time to time that you would give me a hearing, but you never have.

I draw to your attention that when the Allen bill for the deportation of Bridges was brought up, the fight on the rule was carried some 363 to 20; that the bill was passed some 343 to 40. I believe this indicates the desire and temper of this House. I hesitate to think that as chairman of this committee, you are going to continue to deny a hearing that every Congressman in this House is entitled to have held. I have been patient, but, after all, there is a limit to which that patience will extend. What are you going to do?

The article referred to from the Peoples' World of April 28, 1942, is as follows:

LELAND FORD FROTHS—BUT NOT AGAINST HITLER

Congressmen who should be changed this year include California's JOHN ANDERSON and LELAND M. FORD.

ANDERSON, from San Juan Boutista, has been an energetic Associated Farmers spokesman in the old days when the Associated Farmers was prominent as the leader of all reactionary forces in the State. His latest is a demand that there shall be no more cuts in overtime for machinists, coupled with a lot of slander about unions delaying work during their 40 hours' straight time in order to do it on overtime rates.

FORD took the floor recently with a revival of the attack on Harry Bridges and a demand that Attorney General Francis Biddle prosecute him for "seditious utterances and treason." Since it did not seem that FORD could possibly mean Bridges' challenge to employers in his recent Commonwealth Club speech to a "friendly rivalry to see whether capital or labor can do most to win the war," Congressmen listened patiently and finally found out what FORD had in mind was that Bridges be prosecuted for whatever the Marine Workers Industrial Union did to aid the 1934 waterfront strike.

(Neither the union nor anybody in it has ever been tried for treason, and it dissolved 8 years ago.)

V. S.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. HOUSTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be considered as read, but that this do not preclude the offering of amendments or points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments which relate to the same item, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOUSTON:

On page 55, line 10, strike out "$138,600" and insert "$149,640."

On page 55, line 13, strike out "$140,600" and insert "$151,640."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, this morning the committee was notified that the W. P. A. workers at the home for the aged and infirm have been withdrawn. In order to supplement the deficiency appropriation for personnel, we are asking for a change in this amount to add 12 additional attendants there, which would make a total of 22, the number there before the W. P. A. workers were withdrawn. This amount covers payment to these workers at the rate of $1,080 each, less $160 subsistence for each.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 7, line 17, strike out "$71,120" and insert "$41,120."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman I am asking that this appropriation for the Public Utilities Commission be cut $30,000.

I understand the committee has already cut this appropriation over $17,000. I do not think you have cut him enough. I trust you will adopt this amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has made a good case for the record, but I think this is the wrong way to approach this subject. I think it should go through the House legislative committee on the District of Columbia.

We have already eliminated from this item $17,395. We cut the total request of $88,000 by over $17,000. We did allow one chauffeur. I think as far as curtailing the appropriation is concerned we have done all that we are justified in doing at this time.

The scope of the duties and activities of the Commission is enormous. There are many things they have to do. If the gentleman from Ohio will take time to look at the justifications on page 74, he will see what this Commission does have to do.

I think the amendment should be defeated and that the matter should be taken up with the House Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been looking through the hearings on this bill a little bit and there is some material in here that was extremely interesting to me and not a little disturbing. I notice the committee had under consideration the granting of some money for an investigation of gas and electric rates in the District of Columbia, and I notice that in the course of the hearings on that matter, apparently, the committee went somewhat into the question of the earnings of the Potomac Electric Power Co., and I would like to ask some member of the committee if he will tell me, briefly, what the findings of the committee were on that matter.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will look on page 129, near the bottom of the page, and read the questions propounded to Mr. Hankin and Mr. Hankin's replies thereto, he will find that the Potomac Electric Power Co., beginning in 1924, declared dividends of 10 percent on the par value of the stock and that the dividend grew gradually until 2 years ago they paid a dividend of 65 percent on the par value of the stock. The property account rose from $32,500,000 in 1924, to $92,500,000 in 1941.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I see that.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to other questions propounded by myself, it developed that all of the public utilities in Washington have been enjoying very fine dividends and very fine business, and it has been increasing right along.

Now, as to rates, we were assured by Mr. Hankin and Mr. Flanagan, that the rates apparently were normal and they were under many of the other cities of the country, but your committee felt that whatever investigation the Commission wished to make, they were perfectly free to go ahead and make with the funds they have on hand now because in investigating such public utilities they usually assess the utility for most of the expense of such an investigation. Needing these funds in other very necessary war effort work, we felt that the Commission, which between us, is really absolutely new, having only been there 2 or 3 months, should be able to proceed with this work. They are just beginning to feel their way in this undertaking and we believe they have sufficient funds on hand with what they may assess the private utilities to make all the investigations they may find it possible to make.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman, and I would like to say that I, for one, certainly believe such an investigation ought to be made, and it does not seem to me to be pertinent to say that the rates received from the public utilities in the District of Columbia are comparable with those received in other cities, especially if at the same time they are able to pay a dividend of 65 percent on their stock.

Mr. STEFAN. It was for that reason I would like to tell my colleague from California that I went to great lengths to find out what these public utilities are making, what they are worth, how much money they are collecting, and whether or not the public was being robbed. That is why I went into those details.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from California that if he will turn back to the RECORD he will find where I put these facts into the RECORD both last year and the year before.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And did not the gentleman also introduce a bill

which had some bearing on this situation?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; and let me say to the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Nebraska that the reason they are able to make 65 percent on the common stock is that they are not bleeding the people by holding companies as the private power companies are in other States. You see, one reason they do not show so much dividends or so much returns on the common stock of the Nebraska Power & Light Co. or the Louisiana Power & Light Co. or the Mississippi Power & Light Co. or these other private companies is because they have stacked on top of them vast holding companies that are sapping their finances out of them. If you will strip them all, if you will strip the holding companies off of every private company in America you will find they are making a greater percentage of profit on the common stock than is the Potomac Power Co.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. And I agree with him. In other words if many utility operating companies really retained all their earnings as these local ones do instead of having them drawn off by holding companies the picture of the profits actually made out of this public business would be much more striking than it is in many parts of the country. I want to say one thing further, because it seems to me this is illustrative of a very important economic principle. It was not the street railway company of the District of Columbia and it was not the Potomac Electric Power Co. that caused the population of Washington to double in a very short period of time. That was the result of social development and yet it was reflected in this additional value and earning power of these utilities. By right the benefits of such development ought to go to the people generally and not the private corporations under the circumstances. Either by means of some fair method of taxation or by means of a reduction of rates or by means of a yardstick such as the gentleman from Mississippi suggests as the way to do it. I am very much in favor of this investigation to determine just what is the situation, and am glad the committee has opened the matter up as it has.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The point I wanted to make is that we should strip these companies of all holding companies and then hold the private power companies down to legitimate returns. If we do that we will distribute power to every consumer in America at the T. V. A. rates and then be able to reduce those rates as the years go by.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I simply want to state to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that the committee is in favor of all these investigations in order to protect the public.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate that.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly the gentleman from California does not infer that the committee was opposing any investigation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at all. I do not think I said anything that gave that impression. I understood the gentleman to say that the committee had favored the investigations; had taken the position that it was possible for them to go ahead, and everything else. All my remarks were to indicate was that I appreciated the gentleman's service in these hearings as well as that of other members of the committee and that I hoped the investigation will be a thorough one, because it seems to me that the facts brought out by the committee are indicative of the fact that we do need such an investigation.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I merely want the record to show the committee wants always to protect the interests of the public.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is there anything in this investigation that would apply to the holding companies running taxicabs in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. I assume when Mr. Hankin and Mr. Flannagan get together they will make an investigation of all of the public utilities wherever investigations are necessary. The public is entitled to know all facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what I wish to say is not in criticism of the committee, but more in explanation.

I know it is contended that we have cheap electric light and power rates in the District of Columbia. That is true for the higher brackets. That is true for the first 50 or 100 kilowatt-hours per month. When you get beyond that, however, you are going to find that the rates are exorbitant. You will find the commercial consumers, the merchants, the hotel operators, the cafe and cafeteria operators, the filling station people and others who pay commercial rates, are greatly overcharged for their electricity.

The company is making about 60 or 65 percent a year on its common stock. The reason it is able to do that is that we have not permitted them to pile up vast useless holding companies on top of the Potomac Electric Power Co. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that a large portion of this power comes from the Susquehanna River. If you will search the record you will find that power is laid down wholesale in the District of Columbia at something like 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. I live 75 or 100 miles from the Tennessee River, the way the line runs. In my town we buy power at 5 mills per kilowatt-hour wholesale. If the rates over the country, if the people in the State of Pennsylvania, for instance, received their electricity at the same retail rates that we do in Tupelo, Miss., they would save about $80,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone.

If you will strip all these holding companies off of the private power companies of the Nation and see that electricity is delivered to the people at rates that provide only reasonable returns on legitimate investments, you will save the American people at least a billion dollars a year on their light and power bills on the present load.

We are just in the edge of the electric age. From this day forward our domestic, our commercial, and our industrial life will be geared to a power economy. The importance, the prosperity, and the progress of every city, town, and community will be governed largely by the availability of its electric power and the rates that people have to pay for it.

When I came to Congress we were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year throughout the country. That is how much was sold to the electric consumers annually. Last year there were sold 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. This year it will be above 200,000,000,000. By the turn of the century, by the dawn of the year 2000, I predict that the American people will be using a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

We are just in the beginning, lagging far behind other nations in rural electrification, in the electrification of the farm homes of the Nation, as well as in rate reduction.

Here is the place where we should set an example in holding down light and power rates, here in the Nation's Capital.

I hope the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia will see to it that all these overcharges are stripped down and that the power company is compelled to deliver electricity to the people of the District of Columbia at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, with a reasonable return on legitimate investment, and make that the yardstick for the Nation.

When you do that you will be rendering a great service to the American people.

As I stated, it will save them a billion dollars a year on the present load. That load will grow by leaps and bounds, and we will enjoy benefits of which the former generation never dreamed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the gentleman from Mississippi knows more about the utility question than I do; but I am wondering if it is not a fact that one of the reasons why the utilities all of them, in the District of Columbia are able to show such favorable profits is because they enjoy a very favorable tax rate here? They have a lower tax rate in the District than perhaps anywhere throughout the United States. Not only are their taxes at a low rate, but you will also find I think they are taxed on a very low valuation at the same time, and this helps to add to the profits of these utilities in the

District. Furthermore, they do not have franchise taxes usually imposed. Now I want to comment for a moment on the question of taxes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point on the matter of taxation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. As soon as I get through with my statement I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration provides for an appropriation of $56,126,131 to be used to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year.

I shall not take the time to discuss the items of expenditure, but rather to call the attention of the Congress again to the fact that at least $6,000,000 of this fund is taken direct from the Federal Treasury and paid by the taxpayers of this country. You do not find this situation in any cities in the Nation except in the Capital City of Washington.

I would not object to that so much if it were not for the fact that the people who live in the District of Columbia, and who own property in the city of Washington, enjoy the lowest tax rate of any community of its size in the United States. The people who live in the city of Washington have privileges that you do not find in any other city throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is quite fair to the people, the taxpayers, of this broad land of ours to permit the property owners in Washington to have the low tax rate of $1.75 per hundred when the average rate throughout the country is twice that much. There are some who tell you that property in Washington is taxed at its real value. Impartial investigation has shown that such is not the case. The gasoline tax for the District was only recently raised to 3 cents per gallon. Income taxes are extremely liberal. There is no sales tax at all. Privilege taxes are low.

On the other hand, the businessmen and the property owners in Washington have, for many years, had high rents and good profits. It is generally known that rentals are, on an average, much higher in Washington than other localities.

Mr. Chairman, I should also call attention to the millions of dollars of emergency funds that have been expended in the District in one way or another. I am not registering objection to that at this time, except that people should know, according to the hearings about $25,000,000 was expended in the District from these funds last year.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee of this Congress, charged with the responsibility, should proceed immediately to make plans to see that the people of the District of Columbia, those who own property in the city of Washington, may have a chance to come more nearly paying their fair share of taxes. I am not asking that they pay excessive taxes, but they ought to be glad to contribute to the expenses of their government in the same proportion as people in other communities.

Here we are this afternoon continuing to dip into a treasury, billions of dollars in debt, and saddle another $6,000,000 on the taxpayers of our country and at the same time permit the taxpayers of one community to be granted a special privilege of lower taxation. I just do not want to be a party to this kind of a transaction. It is not fair to the people in your district or mine.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that the wholesale power distributed here is manufactured in Pennsylvania and Maryland. It is delivered here, as I said, for around 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. That power is sold for a profit; do not forget that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman will permit, I was talking about the value of their property.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am getting at that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They own a great deal of valuable property in the District of Columbia but do not pay a fair share of tax on that property. Furthermore, they are not required to pay, as they would be in a great many other cities, additional taxes for the right to operate within the city.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If the gentleman would apply to the Potomac Electric Power Co. the same rate of taxation that is charged in the home town of the gentleman from Kansas, or the home town of any other member of this committee, they would still make 50 percent on their common stock.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure they are making big profits, and I do not believe the gentleman from Mississippi feels that 65-percent profit ought to be taken out of the taxpayers of the District.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It is not taken out of the taxpayers; it is taken out of the power consumers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is what I meant—the power consumers. I think it is excessive.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Large numbers of them live beyond the city limits.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They live out in Maryland. What I am opposed to, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas, is private power companies and especially to the mass holding companies that contribute absolutely nothing—they are useless, they are a nuisance—allowing them to come in and indirectly reach down into the pockets of the power consumers and take an over-charge amounting to 100 percent, as a rule, a year, without giving anything in return.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not condoning that, but I do not think the utility companies here pay a fair share of taxes as compared with that of other communities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

I notice that the total sum requested for the District's public schools is $14,256,170. I wonder if the gentleman has the total amount appropriated by this bill for public-school purposes?

Mr. MAHON. The total amount which would normally have been appropriated in the bill for public schools is in excess of $14,000,000. The largest item of appropriation in this bill is for the schools. At the request of the Board of Education and of the Superintendent of Schools we deleted from the bill something like $1,300,000 which had been suggested for capital improvements and which could not be done in view of the war situation. The total amount appropriated for schools for 1942 was $14,117,858 and the amount recommended in this bill for schools is $12,828,475.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Which excludes appropriations for buildings which cannot be constructed because of war conditions?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It excludes those permanent buildings and includes some temporary construction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What were the reductions?

Mr. MAHON. There are a number of them embraced in the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The main ones?

Mr. MAHON. Schools in the southeastern portion, down toward Anacostia, where there has been a rapid increase by reason of the defense effort. There are a large number of them that I could give the gentleman or insert in the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask whether or not the gentleman's committee has found that the school administration here has been doing a pretty good job under difficult conditions?

Mr. MAHON. I think the schools in the city of Washington are comparable to schools of other cities.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And so far as expenditures for public schools are concerned, they compare very favorably with the cost of administration in cities of this size?

Mr. MAHON. I think that is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman need have no concern about the schools because there is quite a sizable item in the deficiency bill under the Lanham Act to take care of the local situation as far as schools are concerned.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to learn that, because I feel that the present school officials in the District of Columbia have been doing a rather good job under difficult circumstances. As one Member of Congress, I certainly do not want to see this appropriation reduced to the extent that the schools will be injured in any way.

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that we tried to increase the efficiency of the schools by beginning a more comprehensive physical training and health program as well as an aviation-training program, and we hope that this program may be expanded in succeeding years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I read that in the report and in the bill and I want to congratulate the committee for its good work toward that end.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House, with certain amendments, with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the story of The National Archives as presented by the Washington Evening Star over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Monday evening, April 27, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution approved by the North American Gasoline Conference at Denver, Colo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from California [Mr. LELAND FORD] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include therein an article to which he referred this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after reading of the Journal, disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all the special orders of the day have been concluded I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, because I have been very much interested in the work of the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I have been glad to see these items in the papers of the last several days. This is one of them:

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS SAVED BY NEW CONTRACTS

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Renegotiation of Army and Navy contracts has resulted in a saving of $150,000,000 in Navy contracts and $100,000,000 in Army contracts, Chairman CARL VINSON (Democrat, Georgia) of the House Naval Affairs Committee, said today.

Committee Counsel Edmund Toland said that $9,500,000 of the money saved was in War Department contracts awarded to Jack & Heintz, Inc., manufacturers of airplane starters. Officials of the company appeared before the committee recently.

On May 2, this article appeared:

ARMS FIRM OFFERS $1,500,000 REFUND

ALTON, ILL., May 2.—Western Cartridge Co. disclosed today a voluntary offer had been made to refund to the Government $1,500,000 in profit on an Army contract.

The profit came from the manufacture of certain armament items by the Winchester Repeating Arms plant at New Haven, Conn., a division of Western Cartridge.

In explaining the refund offer, first made orally April 23 and later submitted in writing, executives related that bids on the items were made on the basis of engineering estimates, but that experience proved it was possible to reduce production costs.

Here is another article:

FIRM REDUCES PRICE FOR TRAINING PLANES

INGLEWOOD, CALIF., May 2.—North American Aviation, Inc., today reported a voluntary reduction in training-plane prices which will mean a saving of about $60,000,000 to the Federal Government.

J. H. Kindelberger, company president, said increased manufacturing efficiency had made the move possible. The price cut applies to ships contracted for but not yet in production.

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is this: After Pearl Harbor this country was very much incensed at being attacked by Japan. Message after message was sent to the Congress by the President, asking us to make fabulous appropriations to the President and the Army and the Navy to execute contracts for the progress of this war. The fourth supplemental appropriation bill carried $12,566,000,000, and we passed that in a day. The naval appropriation bill carried over $19,000,000,000 when it left the House, and when it got through the Senate it amounted to $26,500,000,000. This was passed in a hurry. Then we had the fifth supplemental defense appropriation bill, which amounted to $32,762,739,900 by the time it got through the Senate. And it went through Congress in a hurry. In other words, the Congress of the United States threw itself in the laps of the Chief Executive and the Army and Navy.

I have been listening in the past years to stories of the terrible squandering by Congress. No doubt there is a great deal of truth in them in some instances; but I tell you that the Congress let the bars down when we turned everything over to the Army and Navy and the Chief Executive, and this investigation is now showing us the results.

When contracts are awarded, certainly somebody should know a little something about them before they are awarded, and know something about the costs involved. At least, those in charge ought to be intelligent enough to get some information on what the materials will cost before awarding contracts that yield such fabulous profits that the manufacturers now want to turn back millions and millions of dollars because they are afraid of what will happen.

Not only have we awarded the contracts to which I have referred, but we do not know how many similar contracts are outstanding. The Chief Executive has dwelt on the fact that we are spending and spending and spending this tremendous sum of money. In my business I have always figured that it is not how much we spend but what results we get for the money we do spend that is important; similarly, it is important for us to know how much material to fight this war we are getting for every dollar the American taxpayers put up, so that the money may be spent wisely and judiciously. Then when the taxpayers come to pay this bill you are creating they will know that they have got something for their money, that there has not been a lot of graft, and that contracts have not been awarded that yield exorbitant profits.

Where are the money changers, I ask the administration?

I claim, too, that the Congress of the United States deserves a lot of censure on this point. I, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, deserve some of it, and am willing to assume it. I have tried in the Committee on Appropriations to find out for what these funds were spent, but everybody was so engrossed with the idea that we ought to turn this money over to the President and Army and Navy that it almost seemed as if anybody who criticized the

spending of these moneys would be looked upon as a Nazi sympathizer or a Communist.

I guarantee I am neither. I am 100 percent American.

It is rather tough to stand here in the Well of the House and make the statements I am making now. It is also hard to have the sentiment expressed over the country that anyone who is trying to do a legitimate and conscientious job should be criticized if he wants to find out whether all of these appropriations are being wisely and judiciously expended. I believe that whenever we do not go into these things and delve into all matters of expenditure we should be criticized. We should know. We have the right to insist that graft and corruption should and must stop.

When I look at the Treasury statement here of April 30, and I see that in 10 months we have gone into the red over $14,000,000,000 I am impressed more than ever by the necessity for looking carefully into every one of our expenditures. Large as this sum is, $14,000,000,000, it is only one-half or one-third of the amount we are going to be in the red next year.

We now hear about a tax bill coming in here for $7,000,000,000. The amount to be raised by that tax bill is not going to be a drop in the bucket when we consider the rate at which we are spending today. Later on we will have to go back to the people of the country and tell them that they have got to bend their backs and work to pay for the extravagances and the wastefulness that is now going on.

It does not make any difference whether we are in war or at peace. It certainly behooves us to assume our responsibilities and we should certainly see that the men entrusted with this vast sum use their ingenuity and their business ability, if they have any, in order that we may get our money's worth for every dollar expended. The people charged with this responsibility should use their business ability, if they have any, and if they have not, then it is about time we got some business ability into the administration and not allow these enormous profits to be made. I charge this administration for the failure today for sensible contracts. That is all wrong and should never be permitted at any time.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I do not like to stand up here and criticize things that are going on, but I certainly do not like unethical, unsound, or unbusinesslike methods to be employed in connection with the expenditures of the Government. We should be patriotic, but I do not believe we are supposed to agree to everything the administration may want to do in the conduct of this war. I certainly want to win this war as much as anybody on earth and that is the greatest job we have to do, but we certainly are not going to win it by extravagance. We will break down by extravagance. This administration always has been extravagant.

I think the chairman of the Committee on Accounts did a fine thing in giving the Naval Affairs Committee money to carry on its work. That is money wisely spent and may yield a thousandfold in returns. That fits in with the point I am trying to make now that the Army and the Navy and everyone in the Government who has anything to do with the letting of contracts ought to know what they are doing before they let them. They should have some idea of cost. It is too bad when we have to dig out information about these things after the water has gone over the wheel. It is always said that water that has gone over the wheel is lost forever and that is the way it is with money that is spent extravagantly—it is lost forever.

Let us see that the Congress does a better job and let us also see that the President and Army and the Navy and those responsible for Government expenditures give us sane and sensible contracts, contracts that the people of this country will be pleased that we have negotiated. Remember the people have to pay by the sweat of their brow the taxes that will be assessed. Remember a nation cannot fight with a bankrupt treasury. Remember you cannot support an Army, a Navy, and an Air Corps with a financially impaired nation. I charge the administration with carelessness and incompetence in awarding contracts so far in this war and if it is to be won we must stop it. Stop it now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACOBSEN (at the request of Mr. HARRINGTON) on account of serious illness in his family.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2202. An act to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3767. An act for the relief of Frank Sheppard; and

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Junior; and

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 6, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 8, 1942, in connection with the investigation of petroleum.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson will appear before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1616. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting reports of negotiated contracts entered into by the Navy Department during the quarter ended March 31, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1617. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of contracts entered into by the Navy Department for buildings, facilities, etc., for the quarter ended March 31, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1618. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (session 1941) pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1619. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1620. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the

claim of *D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc.*, v. *the United States;* to the Committee on Claims.

1621. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 25, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of the reports on the Richmond Harbor, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on July 30, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1622. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Boston Harbor, Mass., with a view to determining if it is advisable to construct a deep channel extending from the Seaplane Channel to or near the property of the Boston Port Development Co., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 10, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7041. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 479. Resolution to provide for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2069). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6949. A bill to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6950. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7006. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); with amendment (Rept. No. 2072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6362. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 2074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6925. A bill to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7042. A bill to amend the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, to provide compensation for air-raid wardens and other civilian defense workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 7043. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7044. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7045. A bill to authorize employment on active duty in time of war of officers on the emergency officers' retired lists of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 7046. A bill to protect the rights of the workingman; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 7047 (by request). A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of Indians of the Northern Indian Confederacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 7048. A bill to grant to certain non-Indians owning land in the Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo., the right to renew certain leases and permits held or formerly held by them with respect to ceded lands in such reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY:

H. R. 7049. A bill relating to the taxation of community-property income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 7050. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve and safeguard the financial integrity of the Farm Credit Administration by effecting a better coordination of Federal lending and marketing activities; to provide a permanent formula for arriving at parity prices for farm commodities; to provide for the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing the means to stabilize the purchasing power of money, to protect them and their property from the recurring evils of inflation and deflation, and to promote the greatest normal exchange of goods and services among themselves and with the citizens of other nations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7051. A bill for the relief of Angela Skeoch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 7052. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hannah Casler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Flora M. Overton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2754. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of M. L. Cross and sundry other citizens of Equality, Ill., and vicinity, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2755. Also, petition of the local Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Equality, Ill., by Elizabeth Read, president, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2756. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Harry M. Dobben and 25 others of the First Baptist Church of Topeka, Kans., urging necessary legislation into law to prevent the sale, possession, or use of intoxicating or alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine, in, at, or in the vicinity of any military camp, station, fort or other defense projects, and also laws necessary to prohibit and prevent prostitution; also protesting against the decision of the the tire rationing boards in which beer was classified as a food; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2757. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Mahaska County, Iowa, urging favorable consideration of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2758. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the State of Arizona through its legislature, being Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 of the fifteenth legislature, first special session, requesting the Congress to extend veterans' insurance policies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2759. Also, memorial of the State of Arizona from the State legislature, Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 2 of the fifteenth legislature, first special session, requesting additional buildings and equipment for the Veterans' Administration at Tucson; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2760. Also, memorial of the State of Arizona, through its legislature, House Memorial No. 1, fifteenth legislature, first special session, requesting that provision be made for a Government ore buyer in Arizona; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

2761. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal and Soft Drink Workers of America, Drivers Local Union, No. 227, of California, at San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2762. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Florence Smith, of South Williamsport, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend James F. Madison, rector of St. Michael's Church, Milton, Mass., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father, Creator and Preserver of all mankind: Accept our humble thanks for the many blessings that we have received at Thy hand. Increase and multip'y upon us Thy mercies, and let Thy fatherly care be over every citizen of our Nation, especially our President, our Vice President, the Members of the Senate, and all others in authority. Grant us patience and steadfast faith under every affliction which we may be called upon to bear, and so strengthen our lives by the power of Thy Holy Spirit that in all we think, say, and do, we may manifest Thy will unto all nations, to the end that peace may be established on earth, to Thy honour and glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1942.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS, a Senator from the State of New Jersey, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon, Mr. SMATHERS took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 5, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 2, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2002) to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further anncunced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse;

S. 1331. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929;

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria;

S. 2133. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940;

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line; and

H. R. 139. An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bulow	Doxey
Andrews	Bunker	Ellender
Austin	Butler	George
Bailey	Byrd	Gerry
Ball	Capper	Gillette
Bankhead	Caraway	Glass
Barkley	Chandler	Green
Bilbo	Chavez	Gurney
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Hayden
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Herring
Brooks	Connally	Hill
Brown	Danaher	Holman
Hughes	Murray	Spencer
Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Stewart
Johnson, Colo.	Nye	Taft
Kilgore	O'Daniel	Thomas, Idaho
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Lee	Overton	Tydings
Lucas	Pepper	Vandenberg
McCarran	Radcliffe	Van Nuys
McFarland	Reed	Wagner
McKellar	Reynolds	Wallgren
McNary	Rosier	Walsh
Maloney	Russell	Wheeler
Maybank	Schwartz	White
Mead	Shipstead	Willis
Millikin	Smathers	
Murdock	Smith	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey. On behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who is chairman of the subcommittee considering this nomination, and as required by rule 1 of the committee, I announce that Wednesday, the 13th of May 1942, at 10 a. m., has been set as the time for the public hearing on this nomination in the Judiciary Committee room, at which all interested parties will be heard.

REAFFIRMATION OF LEXINGTON RESOLVES OF DECEMBER 1774—LETTER FROM GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Vice President on April 30 by Governor Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, calling attention to an assembly which was held on Lexington Battle Green on Sunday, April 19, and to the statement of policy and aspirations adopted by that assembly.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
State House, Boston, April 30, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Some 5,000 people assembled on the Lexington Battle Green Sunday, April 19, 1942, in commemoration of those who fought and lost their lives at that battle in 1775, and renewed and reaffirmed their pledge by reciting the following sentiment taken from the Lexington Resolves of December 1774:

"We trust in God that should the state of our affairs require it we shall be ready to sacrifice our estates and everything dear in life, yea, and life itself, in support of the common cause."

In compliance with their request, this sentiment is being forwarded to you.

Respectfully yours,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth.

CLAIM OF D. A. SULLIVAN & SONS, INC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, submitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., against the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions, numerously signed, of citizens of Topeka, and sundry other citizens, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2251. A bill for the relief of Charles Brauch; with amendments (Rept. No. 1305);

S. 2317. A bill for the relief of Lillian LaBauve Linney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307);

H. R. 246. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308);

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of Joseph Soulek; with amendments (Rept. No. 1306); and

H. R. 6594. A bill for the relief of M. V. Forsythe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2275. A bill to amend section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, to grant National Service Life Insurance in the cases of certain Army flying cadets and aviation students who died as the result of aviation accident in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2511 (by request). A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of Indians of the Northern Indian Confederacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2512. A bill for the relief of Reuben M. Pederson; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2513. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 79, after line 6, to insert:
"Upper Missouri project, Montana, Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant, $2,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for testing fuel, under the Bureau of Mines, from $283,305 to $313,305, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MAY DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him over short wave to Europe on the occasion of May Day 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

A JEWISH ARMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relative to the formation of a Jewish army delivered by Senator MEAD in New York City on May 3, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTITUDE OF THE PEOPLE TOWARD THE WAR—EDITORIAL BY A. S. GOSS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Righteous Wrath—Not Complacency," written by A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange, and printed in the National Grange monthly of May 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

USES OF SILVER—ARTICLE FROM WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Silver Being Rationed by Dealers to Jewelry and Tableware Makers," and in connection therewith an article from the same journal entitled "Silver Exports to Europe Are Banned To Keep Metal From Axis Industries," which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following conference report, which was ordered to lie on the table:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after part III thereof the following part IV:

"'PART IV

"'SHORT TITLE

"'SEC. 401. This part, divided into sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act:

"'TABLE OF CONTENTS

"'Sec. 401. Short title.
"'Sec. 402. Definitions and exemptions.
"'Sec. 403. General powers and duties of Commission.
"'Sec. 404. Rates, charges, and practices.
"'Sec. 405. Tariffs of freight forwarders.
"'Sec. 406. Commission's authority over rates and practices.
"'Sec. 407. Motor carrier rates applicable to small parcel forwarding.
"'Sec. 408. Authority for assembling and distribution rates.
"'Sec. 409. Adjustment period pending establishment of assembling and distribution rates.
"'Sec. 410. Permits.
"'Sec. 411. Relationships between freight forwarders and other persons.
"'Sec. 412. Accounts, records, and reports.
"'Sec. 413. Bills of lading and delivery of property.
"'Sec. 414. Collection of rates and charges.
"'Sec. 415. Allowances to shippers for transportation service.
"'Sec. 416. Notices, orders, and service of processes.
"'Sec. 417. Enforcement and procedure.
"'Sec. 418. Carriers the services of which freight forwarders may utilize.
"'Sec. 419. Liability for past acts and omissions.
"'Sec. 420. Special powers during time of war or other emergency.
"'Sec. 421. Unlawful acts and penalties.
"'Sec. 422. Separability of provisions.

"'DEFINITIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

"'SEC. 402. (a) For the purposes of this part—

"'(1) The term "person" includes an individual, firm, partnership, corporation, company, association, or joint-stock association, and includes a trustee, receiver, assignee, or personal representative thereof.

"'(2) The term "Commission" means the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"'(3) The term "State" means a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"'(4) The term "United States" means the States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

"'(5) The term "freight forwarder" means any person which (otherwise than as a carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act) holds itself out to the general public to transport or provide transportation of property, or any class or classes of property, for compensation, in interstate commerce, and which, in the ordinary and usual course of its undertaking, (A) assembles and consolidates or provides for assembling and consolidating shipments of such property, and performs or provides for the performance of break-bulk and distributing operations with respect to such consolidated shipments, and (B) assumes responsibility for the transportation of such property from point of receipt to point of destination, and (C) utilizes, for the whole or any part of the transportation of such shipments, the services of a carrier or carriers subject to part I, II, or III of this Act.

"'(6) The term "interstate commerce" means transportation (A) between a point in a State and a point in another State, whether or not such transportation takes place wholly within the United States; (B) between points within the same State but through any place outside thereof; or (C) from or to any point in the United States to or from any point outside thereof, but only insofar as such transportation takes place within the United States.

"'(7) The term "service subject to this part" means any or all of the service in connection with the transportation in interstate commerce which any person undertakes to perform or provide as a freight forwarder, or which such person is authorized or required by or under the authority of this part to perform or provide; but such term shall not include that part of the undertaking of any such person for the performance of which the services of an air carrier subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, are utilized, or for the performance of which transportation by motor vehicle exempted under the provisions of section 203 (b) (7a) of this Act is utilized.

"'(8) Wherever reference is made to control (in referring to a relationship between any person or persons and another person or persons), such reference shall be construed to include actual as well as legal control, whether maintained or exercised through or by reason of the method of or circumstances surrounding organization or operation, through or by common directors, officers, or stockholders, a voting trust or trusts, a holding or investment company or companies, or through or by any other direct or indirect means; and to include the power to exercise control.

"'(b) The provisions of this part shall not apply (1) to service performed by or under the direction of a cooperative association, as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929, as amended, or by a federation of such cooperative associations, if such federation possesses no greater powers or purposes than cooperative associations so define, or (2) where the property with respect to which service is performed consists of ordinary livestock, fish (including shellfish), agricultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), or used household goods, if the person performing such service engages in service subject to this part with respect to not more than one of the classifications of property above specified.

"'(c) The provisions of this part shall not be construed to apply (1) to the operations of a shipper, or a group or association of shippers, in consolidating or distributing freight for themselves or for the members thereof, on a nonprofit basis, for the purpose of securing the benefits of carload, truckload, or other volume rates, or (2) to the operations of a warehouseman or other shippers' agent, in consolidating or distributing pool cars, whose services and responsibilities to shippers in connection with such operations are confined to the terminal area in which such operations are performed.

"'GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMISSION

"'SEC. 403 (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to administer the provisions of this part, and to that end it shall have the authority to make and amend such rules and regulations and to issue such orders as may be necessary to carry out its provisions.

"'(b) The Commission shall have authority to establish reasonable requirements with respect to continuous and adequate service.

"'(c) The Commission shall have authority to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations governing the filing of surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, in such reasonable amount as the Commission may require, to be conditioned to pay, within the amount of such surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, for loss of or damage to property with respect to which a freight forwarder performs service subject to this part.

"'(d) The Commission shall have authority to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations governing the filing of surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, in such reasonable amount as the Commission may require, conditioned to pay, within the amount of such surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, any final judgment recovered against a freight forwarder on account of bodily injuries to or death of any person, or loss of or damage to property (except property referred to in subsection (c) of this section) resulting from the negligent operation, maintenance, or use of motor vehicles operated by or under the direction and control of such freight forwarder, in service subject to this part, in the performance of transfer, collection, or delivery services.

"'(e) The Commission shall have authority, for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this part, to inquire into and report on the management of the business of freight forwarders, and to inquire into and report on the management of the business of persons controlling, controlled by or under a common control with freight forwarders, to the extent that the business of such persons is related to the management of the business of one or more such freight forwarders, and the Commission shall keep itself informed as to the manner and method in which the same are conducted. The Commission may obtain from such freight forwarders and persons such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this part; and may transmit to Congress from time to time, such recommendations (including recommendations as to additional legislation) as the Commission may deem necessary.

"'(f) The Commission may investigate, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, whether any freight forwarder has failed to comply with any provision of this part or with any order, rule, regulation, or requirement issued or established pursuant thereto, and, after notice and hearing, take appropriate action to compel compliance therewith. Whenever the Commission is of opinion that any complaint does not state reasonable grounds for action on its part, it may dismiss such complaint.

"'RATES, CHARGES, AND PRACTICES

"'SEC. 404 (a) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder to provide and furnish, upon reasonable request therefor, the service subject to this part covered by its permit issued under this part, and to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable rates and charges therefor and just and reasonable classifications, regulations, and practices relating thereto and to the issuance, form, and substance of receipts and bills of lading, the manner and method of presenting, marking, packing, and delivering property for transportation in service subject to this part, the facilities for such transportation, and all other matters relating to or connected with such transportation, and every unjust or unreasonable rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice is prohibited and declared unlawful.

"'(b) It shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder, in service subject to this part, to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, port, port district, gateway, transit point, locality, region, district, territory, or description of traffic in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, port, port district gateway, transit point, locality, region, district, territory, or description of traffic to any unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to apply to discriminations, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any carrier of whatever description.

"'(c) It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any freight forwarder, whether or not such freight forwarder is controlled by such carrier, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any freight forwarder, whether or not such freight forwarder is controled by such carrier, to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever.

"'(d) Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit any freight forwarder from entering into an agreement with another freight forwarder for the joint loading of traffic between points in transportation subject to this part, except that the Commission may cancel, suspend, or require the modification of any such agreement which it finds, after reasonable opportunity for hearing, to be inconsistent with the national transportation policy declared in this Act.

"'TARIFFS OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS

"'SEC. 405. (a) Every freight forwarder shall file with the Commission and print, and keep open to public inspection, tariffs showing its rates and charges for service subject to this part, and all classifications, rules, regulations, and practices with respect thereto. Such tariffs shall become effective only after thirty days' notice, and shall plainly state the points between which property will be transported, the classification of property, and, separately, all terminal charges, or other charges which the Commission shall require to be so stated, all privileges or facilities granted or allowed, and any rules or regulations which in any wise change, affect, or determine any part or the aggregate of such rates or charges, or the value of the service rendered to the shipper or consignee.

"'(b) All rates and charges of freight forwarders for service subject to this part shall be stated in lawful money of the United States. The Commission shall by regulations prescribe the form and manner in which the tariffs to which this section applies shall be published, filed, and posted; and the Commission is authorized to reject any tariff filed with it which is not in accordance with this section and with such regulations. Any tariff so rejected by the Commission shall be void and its use shall be unlawful.

"'(c) No freight forwarder shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for or in connection with service subject to this part than the

rates or charges specified therefor in its tariffs lawfully in effect; and no freight forwarder shall refund or remit in any manner or by any device any portion of the rates or charges so specified, or extend to any person any privileges or facilities in connection with such service and affecting the value thereof except such as are specified in its tariffs: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 22 of part I of this Act, as amended (relating to transportation free or at reduced rates), insofar as such provisions relate to transportation or service in the case of property, shall apply with respect to freight forwarders, in the performance of service subject to this part, with like force and effect as in the case of the persons and service to which such provisions are specifically applicable.

"'(d) No change shall be made in any rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice specified in any effective tariff of a freight forwarder for or in connection with service subject to this part, except after thirty days' notice of the proposed change, filed and posted in accordance with this section. Such notice shall plainly state the change proposed to be made and the time when such change will take effect. The Commission may, in its discretion and for good cause shown, allow changes upon notice less than that herein specified, or modify the requirements of this section with respect to posting and filing of tariffs, either in particular instances or by general order applicable to special circumstances or conditions.

"'(e) No freight forwarder shall engage in service subject to this part unless the rates and charges for such service have been filed and published in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"'COMMISSION'S AUTHORITY OVER RATES AND PRACTICES

"'SEC. 406. (a) Any person may make complaint in writing to the Commission that anything done or omitted to be done by any freight forwarder is or will be in violation of this part. Every complaint shall state fully the facts complained of and the reasons for such complaint. If such freight forwarder shall not satisfy the complaint within a time specified by the Commission, or there shall be any reasonable ground for investigating said complaint, it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate the matters complained of in such manner and by such means as it shall deem proper.

"'(b) Whenever, after hearing, upon complaint or in an investigation on its own initiative, the Commission shall be of opinion that any rate or charge demanded, charged, or collected for service subject to this part, or any classification, regulation, or practice relating thereto, is or will be unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential or prejudicial, or otherwise in violation of any provision of this part, it shall determine and prescribe the lawful rate or charge or the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, rate or charge thereafter to be observed, or the lawful classification, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective.

"'(c) In any proceeding to determine the justness or reasonableness of any rate or charge of any freight forwarder, for service subject to this part, there shall not be taken in consideration or allowed as evidence or elements of value of the property of such forwarder either goodwill, earning power, or the permit under which such forwarder is operating; and in applying for and receiving a permit under this part any such forwarder shall be deemed to have agreed to the provisions of this subsection on its own behalf and on behalf of all transferees of such permit.

"'(d) In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates and charges of freight forwarders, and classifications, regulations, and practices relating thereto, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other factors, to the inherent nature of freight forwarding; to the effect of rates upon the movement of traffic by the freight forwarders for which the rates and charges are prescribed; to the need, in the public interest, of adequate and efficient freight-forwarder service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service, and to the need of revenues sufficient to enable freight forwarders, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide such service.

"'(e) Whenever there shall be filed with the Commission, under this part, any tariff stating a new rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, the Commission may upon complaint or upon its own initiative at once, and, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading, but upon reasonable notice, enter upon an investigation concerning the lawfulness of such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, and, pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Commission, by filing with such tariff and delivering to the freight forwarder affected thereby, a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may from time to time suspend the operation of such tariff and defer the use of such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than seven months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the Commission may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding instituted after such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice had become effective. If the proceeding shall not have been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period: *Provided, however*, That, subject to section 405 (b), this subsection shall not apply to any initial tariff filed prior to the expiration of ninety days after the date of enactment of this part. At any hearing involving a change in a rate, charge, or classification, or in a rule, regulation, or practice, the burden of proof shall be upon the freight forwarder to show that the proposed changed rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice is just and reasonable.

"'(f) Whenever in any investigation under this part, or in an investigation instituted upon petition of the freight forwarder concerned, which petition is hereby authorized to be filed, there shall be brought in issue any rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice of any freight forwarder made or imposed by authority of any State, the Commission, before proceeding to hear and dispose of such issue, shall cause the State or States interested to be notified of the proceeding. The Commission may confer with the authorities of any State having regulatory jurisdiction over the class of persons subject to this part, with respect to the relationship between rate structures and practices of such persons subject to the jurisdiction of such State bodies and of the Commission; and to that end the Commission is authorized, under rules to be prescribed by it, to hold joint hearings with any such State regulatory bodies upon any matters wherein the Commission is empowered to act and where the rate-making authority of a State is or may be affected by the action taken by the Commission. The Commission is also authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of such State authorities in the enforcement of any provision of this part. Whenever in any such investigation the Commission, after full hearing, finds that any such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice causes any undue or unreasonable advantage, preference, or prejudice as between persons or localities in intrastate commerce on the one hand and interstate commerce on the other hand, or any undue, unreasonable, or unjust discrimination against interstate commerce, which is hereby forbidden and declared to be unlawful, it shall prescribe the rate or charge, or the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, thereafter to be charged, and the classification, regulation, or practice thereafter to be observed, in such manner as, in its judgment, will remove such advantage, preference, prejudice, or discrimination. Such rates, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices shall be observed while in effect by the freight forwarders parties to such proceeding affected thereby, the law of any State or the decision or order of any State authority to the contrary notwithstanding.

"'MOTOR CARRIER RATES APPLICABLE TO SMALL PARCEL FORWARDING

"'SEC. 407. In the establishment of rates or charges, classifications, rules, or regulations by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act, consideration may be given to the type of property tendered for transportation by any freight forwarder engaged in service with respect to parcels which do not exceed seventy pounds in weight or one hundred inches in length and girth combined, with a view to affording, in the case of such transportation, rates or charges as low as may be consistent with the receiving of reasonably adequate compensation by the carriers transporting such property.

"'AUTHORITY FOR ASSEMBLING AND DISTRIBUTION RATES

"'SEC. 408. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to make it unlawful for common carriers subject to part I, II, or III of this Act to establish and maintain assembling rates or charges and/or distribution rates or charges, and classifications, rules, and regulations with respect thereto, applicable to freight forwarders and others who employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of such common carriers under like conditions, which differ from other rates or charges, classifications, rules, or regulations which contemporaneously apply with respect to the employment or utilization of the same instrumentalities or services, if such difference is justified by a difference in the respective conditions under which such instrumentalities or services are employed or utilized. For the purposes of this section (1) the term "assembling rates or charges" means rates or charges for the transportation of less-than-carload or less-than-truckload shipments into a point for further movement beyond as part of a carload or truckload shipment, and (2) the term "distribution rates or charges" means rates or charges for the transportation of less-than-carload or less-than-truckload shipments moving from a point into which such shipments have moved as a part of a carload or truckload shipment. The provisions of this section shall not be construed to authorize the establishment of assembling rates or charges or distribution rates or charges covering the line haul transportation between the principal concentration point and the principal break-bulk point.

"'ADJUSTMENT PERIOD PENDING ESTABLISHMENT OF ASSEMBLING AND DISTRIBUTION RATES

"'SEC. 409 (a) In order to provide a reasonable period of adjustment within which rates and charges may be established pursuant to the provisions of section 408, nothing in this Act shall be construed to make it unlawful for freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act to operate under joint rates or charges during a period of eighteen months from the date of enactment of this part, but not thereafter. The provisions of part II of

this Act shall apply with respect to such joint rates or charges and the divisions thereof, and with respect to the parties thereto, as though such joint rates or charges had been established under the provisions of such part II, and the provisions of this part shall not apply with respect thereto: *Provided, however,* That—

"'(1) Joint rates or charges and concurrences, contained in tariffs heretofore filed with the Commission shall become effective, without notice, as of the date of enactment of this part, unless the parties thereto file notice with the Commission, within thirty days after the date of enactment of this part, canceling such joint rates or charges and concurrences;

"'(2) Joint rates or charges and concurrences, contained in tariffs heretofore offered for filing with the Commission, but rejected by the Commission, shall become effective, without notice, as of the date of enactment of this part, if filed with the Commission within thirty days after the date of enactment of this part;

"'(3) Joint rates or charges and concurrences, under which freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act were actually operating on July 1, 1941, may become effective, without notice, as of the date of enactment of this part, if tariffs covering such joint rates or charges and concurrences are filed with the Commission within thirty days after the date of enactment of this part;

"'(4) After the expiration of six months from the date of enactment of this part, (i) no new or additional joint rates or charges or divisions may be established under authority of this section, and (ii) no change shall be made in any joint rate or charge or division established, or which becomes effective, pursuant to this subsection, except as may be expressly authorized or required by order of the Commission in the exercise of its powers under part II of this Act;

"'(5) Any joint rate or charge or concurrence established, or which becomes effective, pursuant to this subsection may at any time be canceled or withdrawn in accordance with the provisions of part II of this Act;

"'(6) The filing of tariffs under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection may be in accordance with the requirements with respect to the form and manner of filing tariffs in effect under part II of this Act prior to December 31, 1936;

"'(7) For the purpose of computing the period of fifteen days prescribed in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, the date of mailing by registered mail shall be deemed the date of filing; and

"'(8) As used in this subsection, the term "rates or charges" includes classifications, rules, and regulations with respect thereto.

"'(b) If the Commission shall find that the purposes of this section may be carried out within a shorter time than such period of eighteen months, it shall by order fix a date prior to the expiration of such period after which the joint rates or charges and concurrences referred to in this section shall no longer be lawfully in effect.

"'PERMITS

"'SEC. 410. (a) No person shall engage in service subject to this part unless such person holds a permit, issued by the Commission, authorizing such service; except that (1) any person engaged in service subject to this part when this section takes effect may continue to engage in such service for a period of one hundred and eighty days thereafter without a permit, and (2) if application for a permit is made to the Commission by such person within such period, such person may, under such regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, continue to engage in such service subject to this part until otherwise ordered by the Commission.

"'(b) Application for a permit shall be made in writing to the Commission, be verified under oath, and shall be in such form and contain such information and be accompanied by proof of service upon such interested parties as the Commission shall, by regulations, require.

"'(c) The Commission shall issue a permit to any qualified applicant therefor, authorizing the whole or any part of the service covered by the application, if the Commission finds that the applicant is ready, able, and willing properly to perform the service proposed and that the proposed service, to the extent authorized by the permit, is or will be consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in this Act; otherwise such application shall be denied. No such permit shall be issued to any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act; but no application made under this section by a corporation controlled by, or under common control with a common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act, shall be denied because of the relationship between such corporation and such common carrier.

"'(d) The Commission shall not deny authority to engage in the whole or any part of the proposed service covered by any application made under this section solely on the ground that such service will be in competition with the service subject to this part performed by any other freight forwarder or freight forwarders.

"'(e) Any permit issued under this section shall specify the nature or general description of the property with respect to which service subject to this part may be performed, and the territory within which, and the territories from which and to which, service subject to this part may be performed, under authority of such permit. At the time of issuance, and from time to time thereafer, there shall be attached to the exerecise of the privileges granted by any such permit such reasonable terms, conditions, and limitations as are necessary to carry out the requirements of this part or those lawfully established by the Commission pursuant thereto; but no such terms, conditions, or limitations shall restrict the right of the freight forwarder to add to its equipment, facilities, or services within the scope of such permit, as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require.

"'(f) Permits shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall remain in effect until suspended or terminated as herein provided. Any such permit may, upon application of the holder thereof, in the discretion of the Commission, be amended or revoked, in whole or in part, or may upon complaint, or on the Commission's own initiative, after notice and hearing, be suspended, modified, or revoked, in whole or in part, for willful failure to comply with any provision of this part, or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder, or with any term, condition, or limitation of such permit: *Provided, however,* That no such permit shall be revoked (except upon application of the holder) unless the holder thereof fails to comply, within a reasonable time, not less than thirty days, to be fixed by the Commission, with a lawful order of the Commission, commanding obedience to the provision of this part, or to the rule or regulation of the Commission thereunder, or to the term, condition, or limitation of such permit, found by the Commission to have been violated by such holder: *Provided further,* That the right to engage in service subject to this part under authority of any permit or any application filed pursuant to the provisions of this section may be suspended by the Commission, upon reasonable notice of not less than fifteen days to the forwarder but without hearing or other proceedings, for failure to comply, and until compliance, with the provisions of section 405 (a) or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder or under the provisions of sections 403 (c) or (d).

"'(g) Any such permit, or any right to engage in service subject to this part pending disposition of any application made to the Commission for a permit, and any right to a permit when issued, may be transferred, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission shall prescribe to insure compliance with the provisions of this part, if the Commission finds that, with respect to the service covered by such right or permit, the transferee thereof satisfies the conditions prescribed in subsection (c) with respect to the original issuance of permits: *Provided, however,* That if the proposed transfer would affect the interests of employees of a freight forwarder, the Commission shall require, as a prerequisite thereto, a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the employees affected.

"'(h) Permits issued under this part shall not authorize the holder thereof to conduct any direct railroad, water, or motor-carrier operations, except motor-vehicle operations in transportation which, pursuant to the provisions of section 202 (c) (1) of this Act, is to be regulated as service subject to this part.

"'(i) No freight forwarder which is controlled by, or under common control with, a common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act shall abandon all or any portion of its service subject to this part unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that such abandonment is consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in this Act. Any such abandonment contrary to the provisions of this paragraph may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, any commission or regulating body of the State or States affected, or any party in interest; and any such freight forwarder or any such carrier controlling or under common control with such freight forwarder which, or any director, officer, receiver, operating trustee, lessee, agent, or person acting for or employed by such freight forwarder or carrier who, knowingly authorizes, consents to, or permits any violation of the provisions of this subsection shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000.

"'RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FREIGHT FORWARDERS AND OTHER PERSONS

"'SEC. 411. (a) (1) It shall be unlawful for a freight forwarder, or any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with a freight forwarder, to acquire control of a carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act; except that this subsection shall not limit the right of any carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act to acquire control of any other carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of part I of this Act.

"'(2) It shall be unlawful to continue to maintain control accomplished or effectuated after this subsection takes effect and in violation of its provisions.

"'(b) It shall be unlawful for any person whose principal business is that of manufacturing and selling and/or buying and selling articles or commodities, and whose business operations are of such a character that services of a freight forwarder or forwarders (or similar assembling, consolidating, and shipping operations performed by such person for itself) are commonly used in connection with the transportation of such articles or commodities, or for any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such person, to engage in service subject to this part: *Provided, however,* That the Commission shall have power to issue a permit, under section 410, to any such person upon

a finding that the proposed service will be consistent with the public interest and with the national transportation policy declared in this Act and that the applicant is otherwise qualified under section 410: *And provided further*, That any such person who has been continuously engaged in business as a freight forwarder since October 1, 1941, and is on the date of enactment of this part so engaged, shall have the same authority to continue to engage in service subject to this part, until otherwise ordered by the Commission, as is granted to other persons under the provisions of section 410 (a).

"'(c) After the expiration of six months from the date of enactment of this part it shall be unlawful for any director, officer, employee, or agent of any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act or of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such a common carrier, in his or their own personal pecuniary interest, to own, lease, control, or hold stock in, any freight forwarder, directly or indirectly; but this subsection shall not forbid or preclude the holding of a director's qualifying shares of stock from which no personal pecuniary benefit is derived by the holder.

"'(d) The Commission is hereby authorized, upon complaint, or upon its own initiative without complaint, but after notice and hearing, to investigate and determine whether any person is violating the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c). If the Commission finds after such investigation that such person is violating any of such provisions, it shall by order require such person to take such action as may be necessary, in the opinion of the Commission, to prevent continuance of such violation. The provisions of this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other enforcement provisions contained in, or applicable for purposes of enforcement of, this part.

"'(e) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction upon the complaint of the Commission, alleging a violation of any of the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) or disobedience of any order issued by the Commission thereunder by any person, to issue such writs of injunction or other proper process, mandatory or otherwise, as may be necessary to restrain such person from violation of such provision or to compel obedience to such order.

"'(f) The Commission may from time to time, for good cause shown, make such orders supplemental to any order made under the foregoing provisions of this section as it may deem necessary or appropriate.

"'(g) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to make it unlawful for any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act, or any person controlling such a common carrier, to have or to acquire control of a freight forwarder or freight forwarders; and, in any case where such control exists, no rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice of the common carrier or of any freight forwarder controlled by such common carrier, or under common control with such common carrier, shall be held to be unlawful under any provision of this Act because of the relationship between such common carrier and such freight forwarder.

"ACCOUNTS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS

"'SEC. 412. (a) For purposes of administration of the provisions of this part, the Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from freight forwarders, and to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made, and to require from such forwarders specific, full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary. Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the freight forwarder in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission. The Commission may, in its discretion, for purposes of administration of the provisions of this part, prescribe a uniform system of accounts applicable to freight forwarders, and the period of time within which they shall have such uniform system of accounts, and the manner in which such accounts shall be kept. The Commission may also require any such forwarder to file with it a true copy of any contract or agreement between such forwarder and any person in relation to transportation facilities, service, or traffic affected by the provisions of this part.

"'(b) Such annual reports shall contain all the required information for the period of twelve months ending on the 31st day of December in each year, unless the Commission shall specify a different date, and shall be made out under oath and filed with the Commission at its office in Washington within three months after the close of the year for which the report is made, unless additional time be granted in any case by the Commission. Such periodical or special reports as may be required by the Commission under subsection (a) hereof shall also be under oath, whenever the Commission so requires.

"'(c) The Commission may, in its discretion, prescribe the forms of any and all accounts, records, and memoranda to be kept by freight forwarders, with respect to service subject to this part, and the length of time such accounts, records, and memoranda shall be preserved, including the accounts, records, and memoranda of the movement of traffic, as well as of the receipts and expenditures of money; and it shall be unlawful for freight forwarders to keep any accounts, books, records, and memoranda contrary to any rule, regulation, or order of the Commission with respect thereto.

"'(d) The Commission or its duly authorized special agents, accountants, or examiners shall at all times have access to and authority, under its order, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, or equipment of freight forwarders; and shall have authority to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of freight forwarders, and such accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any freight forwarder, as the Commission deems relevant to such person's relation to or transactions with such freight forwarder. Freight forwarders and persons shall submit their accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents for the inspection and copying authorized by this subsection, and freight forwarders shall submit their lands, buildings, and equipment for examination and inspection, to any duly authorized special agent, accountant, or examiner of the Commission upon demand and the display of proper credentials.

"'(e) The Commission may issue orders specifying such operating, accounting, or financial papers, records, books, correspondence, or documents of freight forwarders as may after a reasonable time be destroyed, and prescribing the length of time the same shall be preserved.

"'(f) As used in this section the words "keep" and "kept" shall be construed to mean made, prepared, or compiled, as well as retained.

"'BILLS OF LADING AND DELIVERY OF PROPERTY

"'SEC. 413. The provisions of section 20 (11) and (12) of part I of this Act, together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, shall apply with respect to freight forwarders, in the case of service subject to this part, with like force and effect as in the case of those persons to which such provisions are specifically applicable, and the freight forwarder shall be deemed both the receiving and delivering transportation company for the purposes of such section 20 (11) and (12). When the services of a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act are utilized by a freight forwarder for the receiving of property from a consignor in service subject to this part, such carrier may, with the consent of the freight forwarder, execute the bill of lading or shipping receipt for the freight forwarder. When the services of a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act are utilized by a freight forwarder for the delivery of property to the consignee named in the freight forwarder's bill of lading, shipping receipt, or freight bill, the property may, with the consent of the freight forwarder, be delivered on the freight bill, and receipted for on the delivery receipt, of the freight forwarder.

"'COLLECTION OF RATES AND CHARGES

"'SEC. 414. In the case of service subject to this part, it shall be unlawful for a freight forwarder, or a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act whose services are utilized by a freight forwarder, to deliver or relinquish possession of property to the consignee named in the bill of lading, shipping receipt, or freight bill of the freight forwarder until all tariff rates and charges thereon have been paid, except under such rules and regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe to govern the settlement of all such rates and charges and to prevent unjust discrimination or undue preference or prejudice: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not be construed to prohibit any such forwarder or carrier from extending credit in connection with rates and charges on freight transported for the United States, for any department, bureau, or agency thereof, or for any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or for the District of Columbia.

"'ALLOWANCES TO SHIPPERS FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

"'SEC. 415. If the owner of property transported in service subject to this part directly or indirectly renders any service connected therewith, or furnishes any instrumentality used therein, the charge and the allowance therefor, to such owner, shall be published in tariffs filed in the manner provided in this part and shall be no more than is just and reasonable and the Commission may, after hearing on a complaint or on its own initiative, determine what is a reasonable charge as the maximum to be paid by the freight forwarder or forwarders for the services so rendered or for the use of the instrumentality so furnished, and fix the same by appropriate order.

"'NOTICES, ORDERS, AND SERVICE OF PROCESSES

"'SEC. 416. (a) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder to file with the Commission a designation in writing of the name and post-office address of an agent upon whom or which service of notices or orders may be made under this part. Such designation may from time to time be changed by like writing similarly filed. Service of notices or orders in proceedings under this part may be made upon such forwarder by personal service upon it or upon an agent so designated by it, or by mail addressed to it or to such agent at the address filed. In default of such designation, service of any notice or order may be made by posting in the office of the secretary of the Commission. Whenever notice or order is served by mail, as provided herein, the date of mailing shall be considered as the time of service. In proceedings before the Commission involving the lawfulness of rates, charges, classifications, or practices, service of notice upon an attorney in fact of a freight forwarder who has filed a tariff in behalf of such freight forwarder shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the freight forwarder.

"'(b) The Commission may suspend, modify, or set aside its orders upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper.

"'(c) Except as otherwise provided in this part, all orders of the Commission shall take effect within such reasonable time, not less than thirty days, as the Commission may prescribe and shall continue in force until its further order, or for a specified period of time, according as shall be prescribed in the order, unless the same shall be suspended, modified, or set aside by the Commission, or be suspended or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction.

"'(d) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder, its agents, and employees to observe and comply with such orders so long as the same shall remain in effect.

"'ENFORCEMENT AND PROCEDURE

"'SEC. 417. (a) The provisions of sections 12 and 17 of part I of this Act, together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, and of the Compulsory Testimony Act (27 Stat. 443), and of the Immunity of Witnesses Act (34 Stat. 798; 32 Stat. 904, ch. 755, sec. 1), shall apply with full force and effect in the administration and enforcement of this part.

"'(b) If any freight forwarder fails to comply with or operates in violation of any provision of this part, or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or of any term or condition of any permit, the Commission or the Attorney General of the United States (or, in case of such an order, any party injured by the failure to comply therewith or by the violation thereof) may apply to any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties for the enforcement of such provision of this part or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, or condition; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by a writ or writs of injunction or other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining such carrier and any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof from further violation of such provision of this part or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, or condition, and enjoining obedience thereto.

"'(c) The Commission shall enter of record a written report of hearings conducted upon complaint, or upon its own initiative without complaint, stating its conclusions, decision, and order; and shall furnish a copy of such report to all parties of record. The Commission may provide for the publication of such reports in the form best adapted for public information and use, and such authorized publications shall, without further proof or authentication, be received as competent evidence of such reports in any court of competent jurisdiction.

"'(d) The copies of classifications and tariffs of rates and charges, and of all contracts, agreements, and arrangements of freight forwarders filed with the Commission under this part, and the statistics, tables, and figures contained in the annual or other reports of freight forwarders made to the Commission under this part, shall be preserved as public records in the custody of the secretary of the Commission, and shall be received as prima facie evidence of what they purport to be for the purpose of investigations by the Commission and in all judicial proceedings; and copies of and extracts from any of said classifications, tariffs, contracts, agreements, arrangements, or reports, made public records as aforesaid, certified by the secretary, under the Commission's seal, shall be received in evidence with like effect as the originals.

"'CARRIERS THE SERVICES OF WHICH FREIGHT FORWARDERS MAY UTILIZE

"'SEC. 418. It shall be unlawful, except in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services, for freight forwarders to employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of any carriers other than common carriers by railroad, motor vehicle, or water, subject to this Act; express companies subject to this Act; air carriers subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; common carriers by motor vehicle engaged in transportation exempted under the provisions of section 203 (b) (7a) of this Act; common carriers by motor vehicle exempted under the provisions of section 204 (a) (4a) of this Act; or common carriers by water engaged in transportation exempted under the provisions of section 303 (b) of this Act.

"'LIABILITY FOR PAST ACTS AND OMISSIONS

"'SEC. 419. No person shall be subject to any punishment or liability under the provisions of this Act on account of any act done or omitted to be done, prior to the effective date of this part, in connection with the establishment, charging, collection, receipt, or payment of rates of freight forwarders, or joint rates or divisions between freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this Act.

"'SPECIAL POWERS DURING TIME OF WAR OR OTHER EMERGENCY

"'SEC. 420. The provisions of section 1 (15), (16), and (17) of part I of this Act shall be applicable, in the case of service subject to this part, with respect to freight forwarders and other persons, and the service, equipment, and facilities of freight forwarders, with like force and effect as in the case of the carriers and other persons, and the service, equipment, and facilities, to which such provisions are specifically applicable.

"'UNLAWFUL ACTS AND PENALTIES

"'SEC. 421. (a) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any provision of this part, or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or any term or condition of any permit, for which no penalty is otherwise provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $100 for the first offense and not more than $500 for any subsequent offense. Each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

"'(b) Any freight forwarder or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof who, by any device or means, shall knowingly and willfully assist, or shall willingly suffer or permit, any person to obtain service subject to this part at less than the rates or charges lawfully in effect, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 for the first offense and not more than $2,000 for any subsequent offense.

"'(c) Any person who shall by any device or means, whether with or without the consent or connivance of any freight forwarder or its officer, agent, employee, or representative, knowingly and willfully obtain service subject to this part at less than the rates or charges lawfully in effect, or shall knowingly and willfully, directly or indirectly, by false claim, false billing, false representation, or other device or means, obtain or attempt to obtain any allowance, refund, or repayment in connection with or growing out of such service, whether with or without the consent or connivance of such forwarder or its officer, agent, employee, or representative, whereby the compensation of such forwarder for such service, either before or after payment, shall be less than the rates or charges lawfully in effect, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 for the first offense and not more than $2,000 for any subsequent offense.

"'(d) Any freight forwarder, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof, who shall willfully fail or refuse to make a report to the Commission as required under this part, or to make specific and full, true, and correct answer to any question within thirty days from the time it is lawfully required by the Commission so to do, or to keep accounts, records, and memoranda in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission, or shall knowingly and willfully falsify, destroy, mutilate, or alter any such report, account, record, or memorandum, or shall knowingly and willfully file with the Commission any false report, account, record, or memorandum, or shall knowingly and willfully neglect or fail to make full, true, and correct entries in such accounts, records, or memoranda of all facts and transactions appertaining to the business of the freight forwarder, or shall knowingly and willfully keep any accounts, records, or memoranda contrary to the rules, regulations, or orders of the Commission with respect thereto, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject for each offense to a fine of not more than $5,000. As used in this subsection, the word "keep" shall be construed to mean make, prepare, or compile, as well as retain.

"'(e) Any special agent, accountant, or examiner of the Commission who knowingly and willfully divulges any fact or information which may come to his knowledge during the course of any examination or inspection made under authority of this part, except as he may be directed by the Commission or by a court or judge thereof, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not exceeding six months, or both.

"'(f) It shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder or any officer, agent, employee, or representative of such forwarder, or for any other person authorized by such forwarder or any such person to receive information, knowingly and willfully to disclose to, or permit to be acquired by, any person other than the shipper or consignee, without the consent of such shipper or consignee, any information concerning the nature, kind, quantity, destination, consignee, or routing of any property tendered or delivered to such forwarder in service subject to this part, which information may be or is used to the detriment or prejudice of such shipper or consignee, or which may or does improperly disclose his business transactions to a competitor; and it shall also be unlawful for any person to solicit or knowingly and willfully receive any such information which may be or is so used. Any person violating any provisions of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $100 for the first offense and not more than $500 for any subsequent offense. Each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense. Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent the giving of such information in response to any legal process issued under the authority of any court, or to any officer or agent of the Government of the United States or of any State, Territory, or District thereof, in the exercise of his powers, or to any officer or other duly authorized person seeking such information for the prosecution of persons charged with or suspected of crimes, or to another freight forwarder, or its duly authorized agent, for the purpose of adjusting mutual traffic accounts in the ordinary course of business of such forwarders.

"'(g) The provisions of the Elkins Act of February 19, 1903, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, secs. 41, 42, and 43), shall apply to service subject to this part, and to freight forwarders and shippers in respect to such service, and shall apply for purposes of enforcement of this part; and the provisions of such Act shall be considered to apply in addition to, and not to the exclusion of, the provisions of this part.

"'SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"'SEC. 422. If any provision of this part, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the other provisions of this part, and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.'

"AMENDMENT TO SECTION 202 (C)

"SEC. 2. Section 202 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this section or of section 203, the provisions of this part, except the provisions of section 204 relative to qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees and safety of operation and equipment, shall not apply—

"'(1) To transportation by motor vehicle by a carrier by railroad, subject to part I, or by a water carrier subject to part III, or by a freight forwarder subject to part IV, incidental to transportation or service subject to such parts, in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services; but such transportation shall be considered to be and shall be regulated as transportation subject to part I when performed by such carrier by railroad, as transportation subject to part III when performed by such water carrier, and as transportation or service subject to part IV when performed by such freight forwarder;

"'(2) To transportation by motor vehicle by any person (whether as agent or under a contractual arrangement) for a common carrier by railroad subject to part I, an express company subject to part I, a motor carrier subject to this part, a water carrier subject to part III, or a freight forwarder subject to part IV, in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services; but such transportation shall be considered to be performed by such carrier, express company, or freight forwarder as part of, and shall be regulated in the same manner as, the transportation by railroad, express, motor vehicle, or water, or the freight forwarder transportation or service, to which such services are incidental.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 219

"SEC. 3. Section 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 219. The provisions of section 20 (11) and (12) of this Act, together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, shall apply with respect to common carriers by motor vehicle with like force and effect as in the case of those persons to which such provisions are specifically applicable."

"AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

"SEC. 4 (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 1003 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'Air carriers may establish reasonable through service and joint rates, fares, and charges with other common carriers; except that with respect to transportation of property, air carriers not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation (other than companies engaged in the air express business) may not establish joint rates or charges, under the provisions of this subsection, with common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'APPROVAL BY AUTHORITY

"'(b) The Authority shall by order disapprove any such contract or agreement, whether or not previously approved by it, that it finds to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this Act, and shall by order approve any such contract or agreement, or any modification or cancelation thereof, that it does not find to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this Act; except that the Authority may not approve any contract or agreement between an air carrier not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation and a common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, governing the compensation to be received by such common carrier for transportation services performed by it.'

"NUMBERING OF SECTION 23 OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

"SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February fourth, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven,' approved March 2, 1889 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, sec. 49), which has been commonly cited and referred to as section 23 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby designated and numbered as section 23 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 6. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that section 405 shall take effect sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and sections 404, 406, 413, 414, and 417, shall take effect ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, if found by it to be necessary or advisable in the public interest, by general or special order, postpone the taking effect of any of the provisions of this part to such time, but not beyond the 1st day of September 1942, as the Commission shall prescribe."

And the House agree to the same.

B. K. WHEELER,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
LISTER HILL,
WALLACE H. WHITE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
ROBERT CROSSER,
CHAS. L. SOUTH,
LUTHER PATRICK,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the part of the House.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 5, page 72, extending down to and including the word "That", in line 15.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the arrangement made yesterday, the time until 3 o'clock will be divided by the Senator from Tennessee and myself. I now yield 15 minutes of my time to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous attitude of the Senator from Kentucky, and I shall confine my remarks to narrow limits. I shall limit what I say particularly to the procedural aspects of the case. I shall not enter into a discussion of the substance of the question involved, because that has been gone into by other Senators who are probably more familiar with the subject than am I.

Mr. President, I have known the project under discussion from its infancy. I refer now not to the T. V. A., but to the parent project, which was the Muscle Shoals undertaking, a matter before the Senate a great many years ago. If I can trust my memory, it was in 1916 that the National Defense Act was passed, which contained a provision for the construction of the dam at Muscle Shoals, afterward named Wilson Dam. In that act there was a provision that the dam should be used for the making of propellants in time of war and fertilizer in time of peace. I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when I came to the Senate, and that committee has had jurisdiction over the subject matter since that time. For a number of years I was chairman of the committee, and various bills affecting the Muscle Shoals project, and later bills affecting what is now known as the Tennessee Valley Authority, came before the Senate.

I recall most graphically that when I was chairman of the committee much of the legislation revolved about processes for the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen. We studied the arc process, the cyanimid process, the Haber process, and finally the synthetic process. That is all a matter of history, but it all ripened into the present organization known as the T. V. A.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and as its chairman at one time, I served on conferences, and always exercised my interest in behalf of this project. I hope I have been helpful in the development of that great undertaking.

I think we generally accord the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] the distinction of being the father of the T. V. A., and from the able speech made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], it appears he was father of the Muscle Shoals project, and, as the latter begat the former project, this would seem to make him a kind of foster grandfather of the T. V. A. I think I might be called a remote cousin by a line of consanguinity, because my affiliations with this project, and the legislation affecting it, have been very much in my life. I am glad, however, to know the genealogy of this whole undertaking as manifested by the speeches of these two able Senators.

I concede that there is much to contemplate and that serious study should be given to the proposal made by the Senator from Tennessee. I do not like the procedure under which this matter comes before the Senate in the pending bill. For years I have tried to conform to the Senate rules, and as ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Committee on Commerce I have repeatedly opposed proposals of legislation on appropriation bills. The function of an appropriation bill is to appropriate money, and the members of the Committee on Appropri-

ations become familiar with the various projects which come before that committee. In connection with matters of independent legislation, or legislative bills in general, we have committees having jurisdiction of the various subject matters, who have the duty and the right and the jurisdiction to handle legislative matters. This indicates the objection I am now interposing to the matter before us as it is presented today, and my vote will be against the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

I have in mind rule XVI of the Senate Rules, subdivision 4, with which all Senators are conversant, I am sure. It provides:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received.

I think the amendment now before the Senate violates two of those provisions. I am sure it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is no defense to say that it is legislation coming from the House of Representatives on the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. McNARY. I anticipated the rising of the able Senator from Tennessee. If the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the House itself have violated a House rule, that is no justification for the Senate to multiply the violation of the rule. I remember hearing when I was a little boy, and I am sure all have heard the saying, that two wrongs do not make a right. They often make a double wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely with the Senator's suggestion. The House has put this legislation in the bill, and all the Senate committee has recommended is that the part containing the legislation be stricken out.

Mr. McNARY. That may be an alibi which satisfies the conscience and judgment of the able Senator from Tennessee, but it does not conform with the judgment of the Senator from Oregon. The Senate committee goes further than that: it strikes language out, and then attempts to insert language which has an entirely different meaning.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. I am answering the Senator. He will have ample time to plead his own case, and he took 2 or 3 hours in arguing his position, and did it magnificently. I shall take my own time and use it as I choose.

The bill as it came from the House contained language which violates the rules of the House and Senate. It attempts to create a revolving fund within the T. V. A. Corporation. I am not arguing that that is the best type of legislation. I am not arguing that the T. V. A. should be an autonomous, self-governing institution. That is a question which goes to the substance and heart of this very proposition. I do know, I say in behalf of the able Senator from Tennessee, that he has a case there which might well be considered, whether we should create self-governing, independent, autonomous corporations under statute and turn them loose to do about as they please, and not subject to the will of Congress. I think the judgment employed by the Board of the T. V. A. has been excellent. I do not believe they have committed any blunders up to this time. The wisdom of such a policy is something which we should consider, but not during our consideration of an appropriation bill.

In the amendment which has been offered by the able Senator from Tennessee he takes away the revolving characteristics of the fund provided in the language of the House bill and substitutes a provision for coverage of the funds into the Treasury of the United States. That is the difference between the two. All the revenues collected from the sale of electrical energy, which amount to about $21,000,000 this year, will go into the revolving fund, under the language of the bill as it passed the House, but under the language proposed by the able Senator from Tennessee they will go into the Treasury of the United States. That is the issue. How it is raised is what perplexes me, and that is the reason why I hope the Senate will vote to prevent the incorporation of the amendment in the pending bill.

I am hurrying along in order that I may conform to my pledge to the able Senator from Kentucky. Some time ago, on the 10th of March of the present year, to be accurate, the Senator from Tennessee introduced a legislative bill in the Senate covering the very substance of what he seeks to do by his amendment, and under the rules of the Senate the bill was referred to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee met on March 16, 17, 18, and 19, 4 days, and held hearings on the bill, which, as I have said, is a legislative bill.

I called up the secretary of the committee at that time, as I recall, and stated that the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was much interested in the proposed legislation, and was confined in the Naval Hospital by illness, and I asked that final action be deferred on the bill until his recovery. I thought that fixed the status of the measure. With me it did fix its status. It was a gentlemen's understanding. The hearings were not pursued, and the case went to rest until the pending appropriation bill came in, when the Senator from Tennessee, by virtue of his right and membership on the Committee on Appropriations, attached this legislative bill to an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, that is fashioning legislation in violation of good taste, the precedents, and the rules of the Senate. For that reason I am opposing the amendment, as I should oppose it whoever might offer it. If we are now to start legislation before a committee which has jurisdiction to hold hearings, and have them interrupted because of the illness of a Senator, and then, to avoid that, attempt to put the proposal on an appropriation bill, against a rule of the Senate, we are legislating in a novel, unsatisfactory, and unfortunate way.

Briefly, Mr. President, I have stated my reason for opposing the amendment pressed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether I can add anything to the discussion of this subject that will enlighten Senators beyond their present enlightenment. I do not claim to be the father, putative, step, grand, or otherwise of the T. V. A. I think any Senator or anyone else might well take pride in having fathered that legislation, but I have always been proud to afford to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] the greater share of the honor, although from the time of the last World War, when we started the dam at Muscle Shoals, Ala., until now, I have favored and worked as best I could for the development of the Tennessee Valley, because it was a great natural resource, because it would bring a better form of life and greater convenience to a large section of the country involving now six States, and possibly more, because this power can be transmitted from the dam which is now under construction in western Kentucky, to Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri, and to the extent of that radius will, in my judgment, bring to those sections the same benefits which have accrued to the watersheds of the valley itself.

In considering the radius of service by the T. V. A. we make a mistake if we limit it to the watershed of the Tennessee River and its tributaries. We do not know as yet how the development of the science of electricity and transmission may carry power far beyond present limitations and far beyond the area at present contemplated.

Following the World War there was a lull in the proceeding, but for many years I recall that at every session a Member of the House from Alabama, Judge Almon, persisted in bringing this matter before the House and keeping it before the House. Bill after bill was passed and vetoed and not until 1933, under the leadership of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was the Congress able to enact this legislation. Of course, even then the Congress itself, in a sense, was creeping and feeling its way. Not only was it desirable from a local standpoint to improve the Tennessee Valley and the river, and to harness its power, but as an experiment it was justified in order to determine from the circumstances connected with that valley the feasibility of similar developments throughout the country in river valleys where there was potential power.

We passed the law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933. From that time on the development has progressed. Some 19 or 20 dams have been authorized and are now either in operation or under construction. I think 7 of them have been completed and are now in operation. Twelve are still in an uncompleted state. Some of them are partially completed, sufficiently so to make their power usable, and some of them are being used because of their partial completion. Still others are in process of

construction. Their construction has not proceeded far enough to make use of power possible at this time.

Mr. President, I, along with the Senator from Tennessee ([Mr. McKELLAR], my good friend and neighbor, for whom I have utmost respect and a deep affection, until this particular proposal came before the Senate have worked hand in hand in behalf of this development without any difference of view. We have fought consistently and with the help of other Senators, and by helping other Senators interested in this development as a great public matter, have succeeded in bringing about what I regard as one of the great water and power developments of the United States.

Because of the power which can be generated in many of the rivers, we have started other developments ahead of the T. V. A. development, but they involve, in most cases, a single dam. This case involves the development of the entire valley. The Tennessee Valley Authority is now constructing the only dam which will be built on the river in my State, I presume, which is the dam near the mouth of the Tennessee—not precisely at the mouth but some 20 or 25 miles above the mouth—which will be completed in 1944. Until that dam is completed the lower reaches and stretches of the Tennessee Valley will not receive any benefit from the power which it will generate. Other dams will be completed before that, because this is the largest one in the entire project.

When all the dams are built and the matter of construction of the project is behind us, and we come to deal with the business operation of the T. V. A., which is a corporation set up as a utility by the Federal Government, when the only question involved is one of receipts and disbursements, and how to dispose of the revenues, of the income of the corporation, it may well be that then we shall have to give consideration to the manner in which the corporation shall be operated. I contend that now, in the very midst of the construction process, and particularly in the midst of our present emergency, with 7 dams completed and 12 under construction, it is unwise to change the method which Congress itself provided for the operation of the T. V. A. involving the financial arrangement between it and the Treasury of the United States. Certainly nothing should be done which would bring about confusion or possible delay in the construction of any dam, or in the operation of any dam or any other activity connected with it which gives power to those who sorely need it and who now are engaged in the great war effort which to some extent has been centered in that valley because of its power possibilities.

After we had passed the original act—and I shall not discuss the question how prompt and diligent the T. V. A. was in recommending individual dams—I became impatient because some of the dams which are now under construction or have been completed were not recommended as promptly by the T. V. A. as I and my friend the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators thought they ought to be.

I had in mind particularly one dam which before the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority had been projected by a private power corporation. That corporation had made surveys, had acquired land, had spent money for the purpose of erecting a private dam on the Tennessee River for the generation of power. When the Tennessee Valley Authority was created I think we all recognized that the projects in that valley could not be part public and part private. Negotiations were entered into between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the private corporation contemplating the construction of the dam. Arrangement was made by which the private concern was repaid its expenses up to that time, as I recall. At least an amount was agreed upon. After the T. V. A. obtained all the rights involved in the private enterprise, the question arose as to whether that was the particular location which was best suited for the construction of the dam.

The Tennessee Valley Authority made surveys and soundings. It took the Authority a year or two to determine where the dam should be located. During all that time I was impatient because the people in that region were impatient to have the dam started and to obtain the power, and also the benefits of navigation and flood control involved in the construction of that dam. After the surveys were made it was determined that that dam should be built 20 or 25 miles below the site which had been surveyed by the private corporation. The dam was located at what is now Gilbertsville; it is now under construction, and will be completed in 1944. Time has demonstrated the wisdom of the Tennessee Valley Authority in delaying the construction of that dam until the best possible site, in view of foundations, power, navigation, and flood control, could be determined. While, as I have said, I was impatient at the delay, I now concede that the Tennessee Valley Authority was correct in what it did.

Mr. President, I do not have the time and it is not necessary to go into the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority recommended to Congress a comprehensive program for building these dams. That program is in process of being carried out.

The question involved here is not necessarily an historical question. It certainly is not a personal question. Congress is not concerned, I take it, with any controversies that arose between any Senator and Dr. A. E. Morgan, who was made the first chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. A very unfortunate circumstance arose within the Tennessee Valley Authority itself which resulted in the President dismissing Dr. A. E. Morgan from the chairmanship. There was a great deal of discussion about that at the time. It was a very unpleasant incident, but the President's action was necessary in order that the Tennessee Valley Authority itself could operate without the confusion, bickering, and friction with which it had theretofore had to contend.

One of our former colleagues, Hon. James P. Pope, was appointed a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority and is now a member. The other Dr. Morgan, Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, a prominent educator of Tennessee, was made chairman in place of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, the first chairman. Last year he asked the President to relieve him of the chairmanship of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and asked the President to appoint Mr. Lilienthal as chairman, which the President did, and Mr. Lilienthal is now the chairman of the board.

Mr. President, I have had my moments of disagreement and impatience growing out of perfectly natural and human reactions on account of the Tennessee Valley Authority. When the Gilbertsville Dam was authorized and construction of it was begun unemployment was rife and widespread in the Tennessee Valley region and in my State. I live within 23 miles of the Gilbertsville Dam. Thousands of persons came to me thinking that I could obtain employment for them in the Tennessee Valley Authority. To all of them I pointed out the fact that when we enacted the law in the beginning we were so anxious to keep the T. V. A. out of politics that we put in the law a provision that no political consideration should be given by the Tennessee Valley Authority to the employment or nonemployment of any person who might apply for employment under it.

The T. V. A. has been so anxious to obey that injunction of the Congress and to be meticulous in the observance of that law that a recommendation by a Member of the Senate or the House was a disadvantage rather than an advantage to those who sought employment. The Tennessee Valley did not want the people to get the idea that anybody could come there and obtain a job because he had a letter from a Senator or Representative. It was not easy to explain that to persons who were out of work and who harbored the laudable desire to obtain employment. Time and time again, when men whom I had known all my life came to my home to ask me about it, I felt that when they left they were still not convinced that I was not using the law as an alibi to avoid trying to help them secure employment. I mention that because the T. V. A. has been kept absolutely out of politics. It has given no consideration to politics in employing anybody, whether he was a Democrat, a Republican, or otherwise.

The T. V. A. instituted a sort of civil-service system, by which it required every applicant for employment to take an examination. When the Gilbertsville Dam was started 46,000 persons took the examination for jobs on that project when, at the peak, only 4,500 could be employed. The T. V. A. has been kept out of politics. It is out of politics now; and I do not want to see any amendment or provision adopted which would remotely make it subject to political considerations.

When we enacted the act of 1933 we provided, in section 26, that:

> The net proceeds derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the Corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance,

depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

Under that provision the Corporation had the right to do what any corporation has the right to do; that is, to balance its accounts at the end of the year, deduct its operating expenses from its operating revenue, and turn the balance into the Treasury.

In 1935 the act making appropriations for the T. V. A. carried a provision which has been included in every such appropriation bill from then until now. That provision set up an independent fund in the Treasury, known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund. That change was recommended by the Treasury; it was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; it was recommended by the President; and it was recommended by the Comptroller General, because they said it would be simpler and in the interest of accuracy not to have the miscellaneous Tennessee Valley Authority funds covered into the Treasury as a part of the general funds of the Treasury. The T. V. A. funds were made up of two items: First, the appropriations which Congress passed for the construction of dams and for the operation of the corporation. At first that was the only fund. Later, when the Authority began to complete dams, an operating income came in; so the fund was composed of what we had appropriated plus unexpended balances which have every year been reappropriated, together with any income the Tennessee Valley Authority might obtain from operations.

That was in 1935. That provision, which is now sought to be eliminated, has been in every bill appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority from then until now. Nobody objected to it. I recall that 2 or 3 years ago the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, one of the ablest, most conscientious and beloved Members of this body, was in charge of the independent offices bill. He had been in charge of such bills for many years. We all recall him and his service here, with great affection for his memory. As I recall, in 1939 an effort was made to change the method of bookkeeping and accounting. It was defeated. In all the T. V. A. appropriation bills which have been enacted from 1935 until now this language has been included. It came over here in each instance rom the House and was retained by the Senate. There is now in existence in the Treasury a special fund called the Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

It might be interesting to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the Seventy-fourth Congress the revolving fund, which is the subject of the amendment which we are now considering, came before the Congress in the second deficiency bill in 1935. On May 9, 1935, the President sent a message to the Congress requesting that the pending appropriation for the T. V. A. provide for the establishment of this fund.

The proposal was recommended by the Acting Director of the Budget, Mr. Daniel W. Bell, who is now Under Secretary of the Treasury. The recommendations are contained in House Document No. 181, in the first session of that Congress. I have before me a communication from the President of the United States, dated May 9, 1935, which I shall not read. It was directed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In response to that request and recommendation a fund was set up in the Treasury as a T. V. A. fund. I also have before me a copy of a communication from the Acting Director of the Budget, Mr. Bell.

As a result, under the heading of general public works in that appropriation bill, the following language was included, which has come down from that day to this:

Provided further, That all appropriations, allotments, and other funds made available hereafter to the Tennessee Valley Authority, including any unexpended balances remaining from the appropriation of $50,000,000 made to the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933, the allocation of $25,000,000 made to the Tennessee Valley Authority under the emergency appropriation act, fiscal year 1935, and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources, except as limited by section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act approved May 18, 1933—

Which was an amendment to section 26 of the original act—

shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund, to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, and shall remain available until expended.

I take it for granted that I need not argue with respect to the wisdom of that policy. The Tennessee Valley Authority now has more than 5,500 miles of transmission lines in order to furnish power to those who are dependent upon it, including municipalities and cooperatives as well as private industries.

The amendment reported by the committee proposes to strike out language in this bill which has been in T. V. A. appropriation bills for 7 years. If it should be adopted, and the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee proposes to offer from the floor should be agreed to, not the net result as carried in the act of 1935 creating the fund; not the result after deducting operating expenses from operating income, which would arrive at a net balance; but all the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, from whatever source, would be required to be turned into a general fund of the United States Treasury, and not a dollar of that money could be expended by the Tennessee Valley Authority except after a specific appropriation. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee provides that the Authority shall turn that money in once a month; and I suppose every month we should have to appropriate in order that the Tennessee Valley Authority might operate.

The present fiscal arrangement between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the United States Government is one which was recommended by the Treasury and by the General Accounting Office. The very law of which complaint is made, which permits the Tennessee Valley Authority to exercise its discretion and judgment in the day-to-day expenditure of revenues in order to provide the power which it is called upon to furnish so that it may receive revenues to carry on its operations, and without which it would have to come to Congress every time it needed money, was recommended by the President, by the Treasury, and by the Director of the Budget. It was written by the Comptroller General of the United States, who came before the House committee and testified in its behalf.

He urged it because it was a simplification of the bookkeeping arrangement between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Government, and would relieve the Treasury of a great burden, since this fund was set up as a special fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund.

I think we ought to admit, in all frankness, that this is a corporation and that the fact that it has been set up by the Government of the United States and that its capital investment has been made out of the Treasury of the United States does not destroy its character as a utility. It is a utility, a large utility. It was not built for the benefit merely of those in the Tennessee Valley, but it was built as a national project. In the debates which occurred in the Senate in which the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Kentucky, and other Senators participated, while we realized that, because of geography and proximity, benefits would accrue to the people of that valley which would not accrue intimately and closely and locally to the people in far removed sections of the country, we created it in the beginning as a national project and we have so maintained it from then until now. Indeed, it is more national now than it has been at any time since it was created, because 80 percent of the power which is being generated and distributed at this very hour by the T. V. A. is being used in the production of necessary, essential, and indispensable war materials; so that it is today more of a national project than it has been at any time since its creation.

May I ask the Chair how much more time I have at my disposal? Some time was taken up by the roll call, and I suppose that the net time left is to be divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Kentucky has 36 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I do not care to take up any unnecessary time in dealing with the other amendments. I do not know how many automobiles the Tennessee Valley Authority may need; I do not think any Member of the Senate knows. It is a vast organization. It is now constructing 12 dams. It has, according to the testimony in the hearings, 763 passenger automobiles, all of them small. The Tennessee Valley Authority has also another type of automobile, more for utility use, not trucks, not limousines, but a particular type of car that lends itself to particular uses; so that altogether the T. V. A. has about 960 automobiles.

These automobiles are kept in a pool in various places along the Tennessee Valley where they may be needed. No one has the exclusive use of a car in which to ride around at leisure. They are kept in this pool; and whenever one is needed by an employee or by a superintendent or by an inspector, or all of them, resort is had to the pool, and cars are assigned for official purposes only.

All the departments of the Government for which we provide in appropriation bills use automobiles. I do not understand why in this bill this particular agency should be denied the right to purchase another car during the fiscal year. No such denial has been made to any other agency. Appropriations for new cars for other agencies may have been cut down, but there has been no denial of their right to purchase cars. Under this language, the Tennessee Valley Authority could not trade in an old car, a worn-out car, for a new car. They could not even trade in an old one for an old one, because that would be a purchase, and if it turns out that they need a new car or a dozen new cars during the year to replace cars worn out and no longer of any use, they either must go to the expense of repairing an old one or do without it. That, however, is not the vital question before the Senate. It may not make much difference whether they are allowed to buy another car. I am merely pointing out the fact that the T. V. A. is the only agency which has been denied the right to do it.

So far as traveling expenses are concerned, that is not the most important part of the series of amendments; but I cannot help reflecting upon the fact that this great business enterprise, organized by the people of the United States through their Congress, in which they now have invested $225,000,000, is being singled out for special treatment on the ground of economy.

The change in the bookkeeping system provided by the final amendment on page 72 is not in the interest of economy, unless we can assume that the Congress will deny any appropriation or large parts of appropriations for operating expenses incurred by the Tennessee Valley Authority. It means that to any community which under the laws of its State might vote to buy an electric-light plant or to erect its own electric-light plant, under laws which have been specially enacted in order to enable cities and communities to take advantage of Tennessee Valley Authority power, the T. V. A. could not build a transmission line to that community; they could not either build or take over an existing steam plant in order to furnish the power while they are completing a dam from which power will be later furnished without coming to Congress for the authority to do so. Under the Tennessee Valley Act as it exists today, they undoubtedly have the right and power to do that.

This corporation, this utility, which it is, must compete with other utility corporations. It has the right, under the law, to contract with other power companies, and it has exercised the right to contract with other power companies to furnish power to business corporations or cooperative organizations and municipalities which operate within the radius of its power potentialities.

Reference was made here the other day to the fact that there was no shortage of power. The advertisement to which I called attention a few days ago was criticized. It was a full-page advertisement in the Chattanooga Evening Times—and the same kind of advertisement was inserted by private utility companies—warning their consumers that under an order issued by the O. P. M., the Office of Production Management, it would be necessary to curtail the use of power because of a shortage of power.

Before the order was put into effect economies which were worked out by private consumers made it, in part, unnecessary to carry the order into effect, and, furthermore, the heavy rains in the Tennessee Valley watershed immediately after that filled the reservoirs with water so that more power could be generated. We who live in that valley all know that there was a tremendous and long-lived drought in that region of the United States, which was not relieved until after this order was issued, but because of these two things, economy in the use of power by their consumers and the creation of more power by the rains which had occurred and filled the reservoirs, it was not necessary to put the order into effect. In order, however, that their consumers might know that, and that the consumers of private utilities might know it, they all went into the newspapers with an advertisement for which they had to pay. Men may argue with themselves and with others as to whether the T. V. A. or any of these utilities ought to have expended money to inform their consumers, but I think the result justifies the expenditure.

Of course, the Tennessee Valley Authority has tried to keep in touch with current events, not only in the utility and electrical world but in the immediate region where it operates. It has been subscribing to newspapers and magazines. It has spent $1,200 for that sort of information. The committee deletes that; denies its right to buy any more newspapers and magazines. If the amendment shall be agreed to, no one can go into any center of T. V. A. activity from now on, and find a scientific magazine giving the development of electrical energy and the improvements in the science, or keep in touch with the current events of the territory to be served. That may not be very material; I mention it merely because it is one of the things which the committee has seen fit to do in the restricting of the Tennessee Valley Authority which I do not think has been done in regard to any other Federal activity or department.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit, it is done in the case of all of them covered by the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the committee reduces the appropriations, but I do not understand that the committee reported a bill absolutely prohibiting such things on the part of all agencies. Perhaps that is a minor matter, and I do not care to discuss it further, except to emphasize the fact that it seems to me that the Tennessee Valley Authority has fared more unfavorably in the bill than any other agency of the Federal Government.

The Senator from Tennessee, who, as I stated a while ago, has cooperated with all of us in the development of the Tennessee Valley, says he wants an honest administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of course, we all want such an administration, and in order to determine whether we were getting an honest administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I may state that when the controversy arose between Dr. Morgan and the other members of the Authority, and between him and the President, and there was widespread criticism of the Tennessee Valley Authority, in which Dr. Morgan himself indulged, a joint committee of Congress was appointed to investigate the Tennessee Valley Authority. The chairman of that committee was the Honorable Vic Donahey, of Ohio. The committee held exhaustive hearings; they went into the Tennessee Valley, and in detail went into the methods of the operations of the Authority, their expenditures, and their bookkeeping.

The committee reported to the Congress that there was no justification for any charge of dishonesty; that the Tennessee Valley Authority had done a magnificent job, and when the report was made, the Senator from Tennessee defended the committee and defended the Tennessee Valley Authority. On the basis of that report and on his own responsibility, and as a result of his own observation and experience, he stated on the floor of the Senate over and over again that there had not been found the slightest justification for any criticism of the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It is said that their books should be audited. They are audited. In the law enacted last year, which was advocated by the President, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Comptroller General, who wrote the bill himself and defended it in the House Committee on Appropriations, the only exception made was that wherever the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority have seen fit to make an expenditure which they regard as necessary, the Comptroller General shall not deduct that from the amount made available, or withhold funds on that account from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. For a brief question.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be very brief. The Senator says the books have been audited. Have the books ever been audited by the Comptroller General of the United States, and has the Senator ever seen a report from the Comptroller General of the United States in the matter?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but the fact that I had not seen it would not mean one

had not been made. We cannot all keep up with and read all the reports sent to Congress. Many of them sent here are never read by most of us, because we do not have the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator say there has ever been an examination or audit of the books?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only has there been an examination but there is at all times in process an examination by agents of the Comptroller General. In addition to that, one of the largest private accounting firms in the country goes over the books of the Tennessee Valley Authority, just as private auditors go over the books of private utilities, and there has not been an instance of any disagreement between the audit made by the private accountants and the audit and examination made by the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General is satisfied with this arrangement.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator can produce an audit by the General Accounting Office, he will do me a great favor, because I have tried to get one, and they say there never has been one.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not dug around in the musty tomes of the Capitol or of the General Accounting Office to find whether an audit or a report has been made. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on Monday read from a memorandum he had of a law providing that the Tennessee Valley Authority had the right to protest against the criticism of any item by the General Accounting Office, and that after a reasonable time it should make its report. I do not undertake to justify the Comptroller General if he has not exercised his authority. He had a right to make a report and detail any item he criticized, and call the attention of the Congress to the fact that he had notified the T. V. A. and had waited a reasonable length of time, and that they had not protested, and he made his report. The Comptroller General's office has not done that. I assume that if it had had any reason for doing it, it would have been done.

Mr. President, I do not think anyone can charge that the Tennessee Valley Authority has not been honestly administered. No charge has ever been made on the floor of the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations or by any member of the committee that it has been dishonestly administered. No charge is made now that it is dishonest. Every dollar the Tennessee Valley Authority takes in is reported to the United States Treasury. When it gets to the Treasury it is there allocated to the special fund created by the Congress, recommended by the President, the Budget Bureau, and by everyone else who has had anything to do with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I have before me a memorandum showing the method followed in making the T. V. A. funds available for expenditure. If they have to build a coal house or buy coal, or employ labor to operate a plant—and war industries and municipalities depend upon T. V. A. power continuously day by day—do we desire to require them to come to Congress every time they wish to make an expenditure of that sort? I do not think so. We must trust men in this world. Our constituents trust us. They send us here year after year because they have confidence in us. Are we to say that we shall not trust other men? I do not feel that way about it.

I am under no obligation to anyone connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Authority have never done anything for me. They have never appointed or employed a single human being on my recommendation, so far as I know. I am not interested in that phase of the matter. Now that they have established their character and their reputation for honest, nonpartisan, public-spirited work, I rejoice in the fact that no one can point a finger at the T. V. A. and say, "You have exercised favoritism, you have given someone who lives in the region of T. V. A. an advantage or favor over someone else. You have favored those who have been recommended by men supposed to have great political influence."

It may result that the change in this policy will deprive the Authority of flexibility and deprive them of the right to exercise their judgment as the board of directors of a similar corporation would exercise it. If they desire to cooperate with the municipalities which, under the laws of their States, may desire to operate their electric light plants—and that is true in the six States now within the immediate radius of the T. V. A., and it may be true of others when they have completed their program and have extended their lines—do we desire to say to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the people who may be served by it, "Although you may vote to buy your utility, although you may be able to obtain it at an advantage; although you may be able to save money by the thousands of dollars by the use of cheap T. V. A. power, you cannot enter into any negotiations which would consummate such an arrangement until you have come to Congress and gotten the permission of Congress for the Tennessee Valley Authority to furnish the power or to build the transmission lines or temporarily to operate a steam generating plant while they are finishing a dam in that region from which they can supply the power"?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I have not much more time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very brief. Will the Senator point out anywhere in the T. V. A. Act where the Tennessee Valley Authority is given the right to purchase utility companies without the slightest authority from Congress?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot run through that act. I have only 5 or 10 more minutes. There is one section of the act, however, which gives the Authority the power to do that very thing in terms that nobody can misunderstand, and they have entered into such agreements, and until now no one has questioned them, not even the Senator from Tennessee. They have entered into such agreements heretofore, since they have had power to sell, and they have negotiated and are now in the process of negotiating with, I think, nine communities in the States of Tennessee and Kentucky to furnish power to them in the event they should take over the utilities. They have agreed on the price with the Kentucky-Tennessee Utility Co. Until the Gilbertsville Dam and hydroelectric plant are completed they may have to operate a steam plant for a year or so. Under the provisions of the committee amendment the Authority could not do that without coming to Congress and asking for specific authority either to run a transmission line from some other dam or reservoir, or to be given the authority to operate a steam plant while they are waiting for the completion of the dam.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the committee would deny to the Tennessee Valley Authority the reappropriation of the unexpended balances on the 1st day of July of this year. It is true the Senator from Tennessee has modified the amendment he intended to offer from the floor, which would change the law on the subject, and which is subject to a point of order, and because of that he gave notice that he would ask to suspend the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but, Mr. President, the parliamentarian has since stated that it would not require a suspension of the rule; that the amendment would be in order without a suspension of the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall have to disagree with the parliamentarian on that question. I have great respect for him. He is a good parliamentarian. I do not think the adding of a reappropriation of unexpended funds for the year 1942 can make in order a change in the law of the United States, a change which is in violation of the rule of the United States Senate. We will have to deal with that subject, however, when we reach it. The amendment on which we shall have to vote would deny to the T. V. A. the reappropriation of these funds, the unexpended balances. We appropriated $30,000,000 for Douglas Dam in the latter part of January. There will be about $22,000,000 of that amount left unexpended, because the Authority was not able to start the construction of the dam until some time in the latter part of February or the early part of March. The Authority cannot spend that $30,000,000 by the 1st of July. Congress appropriated for a couple more dams which were advocated by the Senator from Tennessee, provision for which was placed in the legislation by the committee and adopted. I cannot recall where they will be located. Those funds have not been expended and cannot be expended by the 1st of July. They amount altogether to about $30,000,000. The T. V. A. will be denied the right to have those funds reappropriated, and if the bill is passed containing the amendment made by the Committee on Appropriations, the Authority must come back to the Congress again in another measure to get a reappropriation of funds which were appropriated for the Authority only 3 months ago.

Mr. President, when 80 percent of the power production of the Tennessee Valley

Authority is now going to industries, and when there is now in contemplation the location of a synthetic-rubber plant in the Tennessee Valley to use T. V. A. power, and when there is in contemplation the construction and operation of a phosphate plant in the Tennessee Valley to use this power, are we going to say that we will change a law which has been in effect ever since 1935 by which we provided for the keeping of a separate fund in the Treasury, from which money cannot be paid out except upon vouchers issued by the Treasurer of the United States? Every expenditure that goes out of that special fund goes out on a voucher signed by the Treasurer of the United States. The voucher is not signed by the treasurer or by the secretary of the T. V. A. It is signed by the Treasurer of the United States, after the account has been gone over by the officers of the Treasury in the conduct of the operation of this special fund set aside for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, I am always glad to express my deep regard and affection for the Senator from Tennessee, and my belief in his sincerity, his high motives, and his public purpose. I am sorry I must disagree with him about this matter. It is not a personal disagreement. I am sure he thinks he is serving the public by the attitude which he takes. I feel utterly conscious of the fact that I am trying to serve the public in the attitude which I take; but I do not know of a more harmful thing, a more injurious thing, that could occur in the development and completion of our program of production than to throw hobbles and restrictions and restraints around the Tennessee Valley Authority so that it cannot go forward with its work without coming to Congress once a month in order to get our permission to do what the Nation expects it to do and depends upon it to do.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] yesterday called attention to a bill introduced by him and his colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] upon which he hopes to have early action. That bill has been worked out after negotiations and conferences which have extended I think for a year. Every interest concerned, every section involved, and every one interested in the subject from the President of the United States all the way down, has sat around the table discussing the matter, I dare say that if the truth were known the President of the United States himself has spent altogether 20 or 30 hours on that subject, perhaps more.

Mr. BONE. We have taken a great deal of his time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President has spent a great deal of time conferring about this matter in order to get a bill which could be agreed upon. The bill which is sponsored by the Senators from Washington, and which I hope to support at an early date in the Senate and see it enacted, sets up a revolving fund for the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, just as the Tennessee Valley Authority now has a revolving fund. Those projects must have such a fund if they are to operate day by day, because neither cities nor private industries will enter into contracts for the consumption of power if they think that some day the power will be shut off or denied to them, and that the project involved then must come to Congress to have an act passed appropriating money to enable it to run a transmission line, or to repair one, or to erect a building to house facilities, or to do any other thing which any utility must do day by day and week by week in order that it may function and supply power uninterruptedly to those who depend upon it.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I cannot speak for other States, but in my State the supreme court has held upon a number of occasions that when a municipality or public body goes into the power business it assumes the liabilities of a private operator. It may not raise the defense of ultra vires in its contracts, and in all respects, so far as its operations go, it is a private corporation. Utilizing that principle of law, which is well grounded, and I think it is largely applicable in most States, I tried to set up the Columbia River proposal with that in mind. The Corporation must have the right to function as a private company if it is bound by the obligations of a private company. That has been announced as good law in my State, and I think it is good law.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the generally acknowledged law. Besides that, it is necessary because, if utilities set up by the public with their own money are to compete with private utilities, which they have got to do, they must be able to operate and function all the time without interruption. They cannot rely upon the whims or the change of views or the political complexion of Congress in order to determine whether they are to be left in the position where they may compete in the region they serve, with those who can operate day by day and all the time without having to go to anybody but their own managers and their own board of directors.

Mr. BONE. Of course, when private utilities in the power field are set up under State regulatory systems, and their rates are adjusted on that basis, they are virtually using public money, because that in effect is a tax lawfully employed and imposed under a State regulatory body.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. BONE. Yet we do not clamp down on them any of the restrictions we might be tempted to impose upon our own instrumentalities.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the funds which are used by the private utilities are obtained by way of the charges which are made to the public.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator spoke about the Tennessee Valley Authority having to come to Congress and ask Congress for appropriations. Is it not a fact that the Authority comes each year to the Congress and asks for appropriations?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Authority has been coming to Congress each year since we established it, because it is still in the stage of construction. The Authority is still in the stage of making capital investments. When it began to receive revenues Congress thought it wise, and everyone in the Government from the President down thought it wise that it be allowed to use its operating revenues to make expenditures in order that it might carry out its policy which resulted in operating revenues. In other words, T. V. A. is obliged to spend money in order to make money.

Mr. STEWART. It is a fact that the Authority must come to Congress each year, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Authority does have to come to Congress each year. So does the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have to come to Congress; but it has a revolving fund, and it does not have to come here every time it wants to lend money to a private corporation or to an individual.

Mr. STEWART. Money cannot be expended by any agency of the Government without an appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Congress can, by a general act, authorize the expenditure of receipts from revenue activities for the continuous day-by-day operation of the plant, and does that.

Mr. STEWART. That has to be done every year.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does that with regard to the Housing Administration. They can use a revolving fund to loan to cities for slum clearances. I do not have in mind all the various agencies that can do that, but the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] recently secured the enactment of a very wise and far-sighted measure, and set up a committee in the W. P. B. to help little business. However, that committee does not have to come here every time it wants to make a loan.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senate voted unanimously for it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate voted unanimously for it; and I do not think the Tennessee Valley Authority ought to be singled out.

Mr. STEWART. I voted for it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator nearly always votes right, and I am sorry he is wrong in this case.

Mr. STEWART. I am sorry the Senator cannot see things my way at this time. As a matter of fact those agencies do come to the Congress each year for their appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course they do. They come each year for the general appropriation, to enable them to carry on. The Tennessee Valley Authority comes to Congress each year for an appropriation to enable it to build dams; but under the law as it now exists it does not have to come to Congress every time it wants to use some of its operating income in order to pay necessary expenses. If this amendment should be agreed to, that is what it would be required to do.

Mr. STEWART. Each of the agencies to which the Senator has just referred,

to which authority has been delegated to expend funds, must come to Congress at least every 2 years. Under the law no appropriation may be made beyond 2 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. That still does not alter the situation.

Mr. President, I have only 1 minute left. I cannot yield that minute. I cannot go into that subject.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to go into the subject. I merely wish to make one observation——

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will take my last minute.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator said that the amendment would require the T. V. A. to be subject to the whims of Congress. Any time any agency comes before Congress it is subject to the whims of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. And there are always many whims.

Mr. STEWART. Assuming that Congress has whims.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know that it has.

Mr. President, I have never been more interested in anything in my life. I am not interested from a personal standpoint, but from the standpoint of the public, particularly in our present war effort. I am not trying to use the war effort as an alibi. I would oppose the amendment if there were no war. Certainly it has no place now. It ought not to have been brought in by the committee to arouse discussion and cause delay, friction, bitterness, and bickering on the part of the Government of the United States toward one of its great agencies set up by us.

It does not seem to me that it lies in our mouths now, after 9 years, to denounce the T. V. A. and intimate that it is dishonest, and that because it is dishonest it is necessary to adopt an amendment like this in order to make it honest. It is an honest agency. It is an efficient, competent, public-spirited agency. There is not a man in any key position in this agency who could not make more money in private industry than he makes as a Government employee.

Therefore, I hope this amendment will be rejected, and that all other amendments which would restrict, restrain, handicap, and hobble the operation of the T. V. A. will be defeated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. As much time as the junior Senator from Tennessee may require.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I shall not consume more than a few minutes. I do not think it will be necessary to set any time limit for me, because I have only a few words to say on this amendment.

I was impressed by the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I believe his concluding remarks were to the effect that by reason of this amendment there was an intimation that the T. V. A. is a corrupt and dishonest organization.

This is the first time that statement has been made on the floor. The Senator from Kentucky has departed to a portion of the building which is no doubt very pleasant to occupy at this moment. I doubt not that he is having his lunch at this hour, feeding the inner man. I am sorry that he is not present to hear me say that I am quite certain that no Senator who would vote for this amendment would make the charge of dishonesty. I do not make any charge of dishonesty; and I have not heard it made.

I do say that there should be regular audits of the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. As the law now stands, in effect the Authority is permitted to audit itself, so to speak. I make that statement without making any charge of dishonesty. I think that too much care cannot be exercised in requiring proper accounting for public funds; and I think that any man or any group of men who handle public money should not hesitate readily to permit an examination of the workings of the particular agency with which they may be connected.

I believe that every honest man would agree to the statement that every officer who is in charge of any agency of the Government should not only encourage, but should welcome—yea, should invite, and demand—an audit of the affairs of his particular agency. I cannot understand why there should be any idea or thought of fleeing from an audit, or opposing an audit, or of demanding that the T. V. A. be permitted to audit its own affairs.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Is the Senator from Tennessee advised as to whether the Reconstruction Finance Corporation handles its own auditing, or how the financial operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are handled with respect to audits?

Mr. STEWART. I have had absolutely no information on that subject with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I do not know; but if it does audit its own affairs, I would include it in the statement I have just made.

I know, of course, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other money-lending agencies of the Government are not required to come to Congress regularly, as are most of the other agencies of the Government, and request each year an appropriation from the Congress after the Bureau of the Budget has approved their budgets. I know that the R. F. C. does not follow the usual, routine course; but in the nature of things, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a banking corporation. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and other agencies lend money; and probably the nature of such organizations is such that they should not be required to come to Congress. I do not know. I am not speaking as an expert on the subject; but I am making a distinction between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator suggesting that the Tennessee Valley Authority is opposed to being audited by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. STEWART. I was about to read the law, which practically exempts it from being audited.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator that that very law brings the Tennessee Valley Authority under the Budget and Accounting Act, which requires an aduit by the General Accounting Office. The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, so testified before the House Committee on Military Affairs. There is no question about the audit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may reply to the statement of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has never been an audit of the T. V. A. accounts by the General Accounting Office. There has been a protest on the part of the T. V. A. against it. After some 6 or 7 years of dispute, in which the accounts never were examined by the General Accounting Office, Congress undertook to settle the question last year by the equivocal act, a copy of which is in the hands of the Senator from Tennessee and which no doubt he will read. The General Accounting Office has never made a report and has never made an audit.

Mr HILL. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely in error in saying that it has never made an audit. It has made an audit each year. It is true that the General Accounting Office has not made any final report to Congress as to its audit of the books; but it has audited the books. If there be any criticism—and I do not suggest that there is—because there has not been a report to Congress, it certainly should not fall on the Tennessee Valley Authority, but rather on the General Accounting Office.

Mr. McKELLAR. The General Accounting Office has not made a report, because there has been no audit. Mr. Lilienthal has not permitted an audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority books.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee is absolutely in error. It does not lie within the power of Mr. Lilienthal to deny an audit, even if he should wish to do so. On the contrary, the law specifically gives the Comptroller General the power to make an audit of the books of the Tennessee Valley Authority and to check its vouchers and other records. The record shows that Mr. Lilienthal and the Tennessee Valley Authority have cooperated with the Comptroller General, and that the Comptroller General has yearly been examining the books and making audits.

Mr. STEWART. Where is the audit now?

Mr. HILL. It is in the hands of the Comptroller General. Mr. Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, would have no power to send the audit of the Comptroller General to Congress. That would be the duty and responsibility of the Comptroller General, and would be within his control.

Mr. STEWART. Is there now such an audit in the office of the Comptroller General?

Mr. HILL. Year after year the Comptroller General has been examining and auditing the books of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I want the record to be absolutely clear on that question. I realize that the Senator's time is limited, and I do not wish to trespass too much on it. I have before me a statement setting forth the whole history of this transaction, which shows that although the Comptroller General has not made a report to Congress, he has been to the T. V. A. He has had all the books, vouchers, papers, documents, everything needed for this audit every year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on July 21, 1941, Representative MAY, of Kentucky, in discussing this very question on the floor of the House, as recorded on page 6199 of the RECORD, made the following statement:

> Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to place the Tennessee Valley Authority under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, with two exceptions. The measure as reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs allows the adjustment and settlement finally without the intervention of the Comptroller General of lawsuits that may be pending by or against the Tennessee Valley Authority. The second class of accounts that are not subject to auditing and settlement are such accounts as the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority may determine by a meeting of the board to be necessarily of such character that delay would result in loss or serious delay to the Authority, and the board of directors may settle such accounts at the time.
>
> Mr. COLE of New York. Then the effect of the bill is that it places the Tennessee Valley Authority under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 except where the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority determine that they should not be under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act.

I will amplify that by saying there has not been an audit by the General Accounting Office until this good hour. While it can make an audit, it cannot report anything contrary to the express will of the Authority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; Mr. President; I will continue to yield for a few moments.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee is in error. What the Senator read simply does not state the purpose. Mr. Lindsay Warren, at the present time Comptroller General, testifying before the House Committee on Military Affairs in behalf of the bill which Congress enacted and which is now the law, made the specific, categorical statement that the bill makes it definite that the Tennessee Valley Authority comes under the Budget and Accounting Act. There is no question that the Tennessee Valley Authority, under the law today comes under the Budget and Accounting Act.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, before the passage of the existing law, was subject to annual audit every year by the Comptroller General, because section 9 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act provides as follows:

> The Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the transactions of the Corporation at such times as he shall determine but not less frequently than once each governmental fiscal year, with personnel of his selection.

That is, the Comptroller General's selection.

> In such connection he—

The Comptroller General—

> and his representatives shall have free and open access to all papers, books, records, files, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other things, property and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation, and shall be afforded full facilities for counting all cash and verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries.

That is the basic law. Under the amendment on the desk there is no question that the T. V. A. is today under the Budget and Accounting Act. Its affairs must be audited each year by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator has read section 5.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. An amendment to section 5, which is the existing law, was read into the RECORD by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] yesterday, I believe, which requires the T. V. A. law to render accounts and settlements; but—

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office—

That is the same Office the Senator has been talking about.

Mr. HILL. That is correct; it is the same Office, the Comptroller General's office.

Mr. STEWART:

> In the settlement of the accounts of the treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation—

Now, listen and tell me what this means——

Mr. HILL. Very well; but I can tell the Senator what it is without his reading it. He may read it, however, if he wishes.

Mr. STEWART. I read:

> Shall not disallow credit or withhold funds because of an expenditure which the Board—

That is the Tennessee Valley Authority—

> shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Will the Senator tell me what that means?

Mr. HILL. I will tell the Senator what it means. It means that when the Tennessee Valley Authority acting as a board of directors, makes a decision and determination with reference to some operating matter the Comptroller General cannot veto its decision; that is, the decision of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It does not mean, however, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, that the Comptroller General does not audit all of the books and accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. If a person hires a firm of auditors to make an audit of the books of a corporation and a full and detailed audit is made of the books of the corporation, nevertheless the auditors do not pass on the question whether some action taken by the board of directors, or the controlling body of the corporation was right. That is all that is meant by the language the Senator read.

Mr. STEWART. The provision I have read makes the statement very positively and conclusively.

Mr. HILL. I have given the Senator my interpretation of that language.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to know what else can be read into this language except what is stated by the words themselves.

Mr. HILL. Again, I will tell the Senator. It makes the decision of the Tennessee Valley Board final so far as the Comptroller General is concerned as to whether they had the power to take certain action in carrying out their operations; but it does not in any way interfere with, deny, or take from the Comptroller General his duty, his power, and his responsibility to make a full and complete audit of the books.

Mr. STEWART. And the Senator says that the Comptroller General has done that?

Mr. HILL. I say that every year he has done it. The record shows that each year he has audited the books of the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I say the Comptroller General never has made such an audit.

Mr. HILL. Let us make a distinction there. The Senators from Tennessee confuse the making of an audit with the making of a report to Congress. I say to the Senators——

Mr. STEWART. No; I was asking the Senator if that had been done.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Comptroller General has not sent a report to Congress, The fact that he has not made a report does not mean that he has not made an audit; it means rather that he has had to wait upon the auditing of the books.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Office of the Comptroller General was created by the Congress for the purpose of having someone to pass upon the legality of the expenditures under the appropriations of the Congress.

Mr. STEWART. I stated that might be done under the pending amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Precisely. As the law now stands, the Tennessee Valley Authority is the judge of the legality of its expenditures. If we adopt the amend-

ment, then the appropriations made to T. V. A. will be subject to the same test which we require with regard to all other expenditures; and that is in the interest of the Congress. We must have someone to look after us. That is why the Comptroller General has a 15-year tenure of office; it is in order that he may sit in judgment and determine the legality of a given expenditure, whether the expenditure of money is within the authority provided by Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator who just addressed us happens to be the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I am sure—and if I am in error I ask the Senator to correct me—that he voted for the Maritime Commission bill, that he helped write it, as chairman of the committee, that he supported it, and no doubt piloted it through to passage on the floor. I am not absolutely sure about that, but, at any rate, I call his attention to the fact that in the use of Maritime Commission funds even greater latitude is given to the Maritime Commission than is given to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the expenditure of its funds.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I will meet that suggestion very simply: The bill was passed in 1935. I was on the committee and I did work on the bill. My attention was not called to that omission. Whenever a Maritime Commission appropriation item comes before the Senate I shall vote to put the Maritime Commission under the Comptroller General, in the interest of the Congress. Congress appropriates the people's money, and it is the duty of the Congress to see that the money is expended according to the will of the Congress as expressed in the act. This is notice to every other such agency of the Government, if there is any left of this kind, that my vote for the amendment shows my intention to bring them all within it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield further of his short time I shall try to be brief and will not interrupt him any more, I hope.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. HILL. Not only is the latitude given to the Maritime Commission not a latitude to exempt from an audit—the Comptroller General audits them—but it is with reference to certain of their receipts and certain of their transactions. The same latitude is given to other governmental corporations in the acts we have passed creating them, which are in any way engaged in business, whether it be the Maritime Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the United States Housing Authority, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the Inland Waterways Corporation.

Mr. STEWART. I believe the last few minutes of this debate as well as the previous portions of it, have provided a very clear demonstration of how little we know about the financial affairs of the T. V. A.

Some persons say its books have not even been audited; others say they have. I do not know as to that; I am not an auditor, and I imagine I would not know what an audit was if I met it in the middle of the road; but there are men with ability along that line who are in the employ of the United States Government other than those who are connected with the T. V. A. I think that, under the law, it should be possible to have such an audit made by disinterested auditors, and that the facts should be made clear so that there could not be any question raised.

I repeat I am not making any charges of dishonesty or of corruption; I am not saying there is anyone connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority whose hands are tainted or who has done a thing, so far as honesty is concerned, that is even questionable. I am not making that kind of a charge. We are talking about public funds and about an agency that will collect this year twenty or perhaps thirty million dollars. That is a lot of money, and it belongs to the United States Government.

I think this debate has also emphasized the importance of doing away with the practice which permits the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Inland Waterways Corporation, and even the banking corporations which have been set up under the Government, such as the R. F. C. and the other money-lending concerns, to expend funds without appropriation by Congress, for that kind of practice can result in the Congress knowing very little about the affairs of agencies which are permitted to operate independently of the Congress. I think, as was observed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], that it would be a very good time to clean house entirely and require every one of them to come before the Congress and ask for appropriations. Then, certainly the Congress could keep a check on them and could know how the public money which is collected by them is expended. There would not be any argument about it; there would not be any question about it; there would be regular audits made and they would, I assume, be correctly made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator if I should read a brief excerpt from the Maritime Commission law? I know his time is limited.

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to yield to the Senator. He was very kind in yielding to me when he had the floor the other day.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's time is limited; my time was not limited. If I may, I should like to read a brief section, section 207, of the Maritime Commission Act:

SEC. 207. The Commission may enter into such contracts, upon behalf of the United States, as may, in its discretion, be necessary to carry on the activities authorized by this act, in the same manner that a private corporation may contract within the scope of the authority conferred by its charter. All the Commission's financial transactions shall be audited in the General Accounting Office according to approved commercial practice as provided in the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 444)—

Just as in the case of the T. V. A.—

Provided, That it shall be recognized that, because of the business activities authorized by this act, the accounting officers shall allow credit for all expenditures shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities, notwithstanding any existing statutory provision to the contrary.

That is the law as to the Maritime Commission, and it is even broader than the law governing the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to make a few other observations, and then I will complete my statement, which I said would be brief. It has already been longer than I had intended.

The Senator from Kentucky said that we ought to keep politics out of the T. V. A.; that there is very little politics in the T. V. A., and that if this amendment were adopted the result would be that the T. V. A. would be in politics. The Senator from Kentucky did not elaborate on that statement. I do not know what he meant. I do not know by what manner or means he could reach such a conclusion. I cannot see that the adoption of the amendment would place the T. V. A. in politics in the sense which I assume I have a right to believe the Senator from Kentucky intended to use the word. I cannot see how politics would enter into the situation at all in that sense. Every agency of the Government, except those that have been referred to here as being not included, is required to come to Congress at regular intervals and ask that money be appropriated in order that it may conduct its business. I do not think the Tennessee Valley Authority ought to be any exception. I cannot understand how anyone can possibly say that it would hamper the operations of the Authority to require them to come before Congress at regular intervals with a budget estimate and appear before the Appropriations Committee and ask for a certain amount of money.

I interrogated the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] the other day along that line when he was making his able address on this question. His statement was that if an emergency should arise, or a storm should destroy a substation, a transmission line, or other properties of the Authority, there might be fatal delay if the Authority had to come to Congress and ask for an appropriation in order to make the necessary repairs. My answer is that, as brought out, as I recall, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], a revolving fund of ample proportions—I think he called it a "revolving fund," and for lack of a better word we will call it that—could be set up out of which expenses could be met in the case of such emergencies as indicated, and if it should happen that the fund was not sufficiently large, I think the Congress could be depended upon to do its duty with reasonable dispatch.

It has also been said here that the adoption of the amendment reported by the committee might hurt the war effort. I have already said that if I

thought it would do any sort of substantial injury to the war effort, I would not vote for it, and I have more reasons than one for saying that. I do not think there is a Member of this body who would support it if he thought it would injure our efforts in this war.

America stands today, practically speaking, taking a whipping on every front on which we are fighting. We read the story in the morning newspapers of the fall of Corregidor, which is practically the last stand our boys have made in the islands of the Pacific. A good many people have criticized the War Department and Congress and even the President for lax sort of efforts in connection with fighting this war. People have been seriously concerned about it, worried about it, bothered about it. There is not a Member of this Congress who is not just as much concerned as is any other American citizen, in my belief, and there is not a Member of this Congress who would vote for this amendment or any other measure if it would keep even one bomber from going to the aid of our boys who are on the various fronts which America is undertaking to maintain at this time. So there is not anything in the suggestion that the adoption of the amendment would hurt the war effort. It could not possibly hurt the war effort. I challenge anyone, regardless of how vivid his imagination may be, to conjure up and place in the RECORD any sensible or reasonable statement which would create a reasonable doubt in the mind of anybody about this amendment doing injury to the war effort. In the parlance of other days, that is plain "flapdoodle."

It has also been suggested during the course of the debate, that the adoption of the amendment might make industries afraid to locate in the Tennessee Valley. I live in the valley, and I am as much concerned about seeing it advance and, of course, grow and prosper as is anyone else. I do not think that such a statement rises to the dignity of common nonsense. The adoption of the amendment could not by any manner of means frighten any industries that wanted to locate in the Tennessee Valley. The reason which has been given is that an industry might want to be certain that power would continue to flow; but, suppose this amendment were adopted, how could it happen that power would not continue to flow over the transmission lines and wires of the Authority? It could not happen by reason of this amendment. Of course, someone might willfully try to do some injury; but it could not happen by reason of this amendment by any manner of means.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask the Senator to yield merely that I may make a suggestion. Some 2 or 3 days ago the Secretary of the Interior was before the Appropriations Committee, and was very properly interrogated as to whether the revenues derived from Boulder Dam, the Grand Coulee, and other great power projects were turned into the Treasury of the United States, and whether he, as Secretary of the Interior, came before the Committee on Appropriations to obtain annual appropriations in order to conduct the affairs of those projects. His answer in each instance was in the affirmative. He said he was very glad it was so arranged. There was nothing in his answer to indicate that electric current was not going over the wires of all those great power projects.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator for his contribution. His statement was very pertinent, and I think the inquiry at the time the hearings were held was very pertinent.

It has been said that perhaps one of the reasons why the adoption of this amendment might injure the T. V. A. is that if we should require them to come before the Congress every year and ask for an appropriation, at some time in the future there might be a Congress which would be unfriendly to the T. V. A., and which could emasculate the Authority. That could happen whether the amendment were agreed to or not; so that balloon bursts before it gets out of reach of the average man.

There are many other things I should like to say, but my colleague desires to make a further statement, I understand, and I shall surrender the floor in a moment. I do wish to add one or two thoughts, and then I shall be through.

The argument that the adoption of the amendment would hurt the war effort, and would prevent industry from locating in the valley, is nothing in the world but an appeal to the old psychology of fear, an attempt to freighten someone, to scare someone into believing that the war effort might be injured, or that a synthetic rubber plant might not be located in the valley.

I have already stated that, in my opinion, the argument that the power might be cut off, and that industrialists could not depend upon a regular flow of power, is fallacious, and cannot be anything more than an offhand statement, with utterly nothing to back it up. No evidence has been submitted and placed in the record of the hearings which would justify such statements, and it is only by the exercise of a man's imagination that such a conclusion could possibly be reached.

Mr. President, I submit that, so far as politics is concerned, there would not be any more politics in T. V. A. as a result of compelling it to come to Congress each year and ask for an appropriation than would result as to any other agency of the Government, or than exists in the T. V. A. today. I was not a Member of the Senate at the time the Tennessee Valley Act was passed. If I had been here I probably would have voted as most other Senators did, for setting the Authority up in the manner in which it was set up; but I am not prepared to say today that that set-up is the right one; in fact, I think I am prepared to say that, in my opinion, it is wrong.

The Congress of the United States, day in and day out, month in and month out, has surrendered the authority vested in it by the Constitution, until the Members of this body and the Members of the other House are probably looked upon as mere provincial satraps, without any authority, without any large amount of responsibility. I not only think the time has come when Congress should call a halt to this trend, and retain in its hands the reins controlling that portion of the Government which it was supposed to undertake to steer along the highway, but I am prepared further to say that I think that in the case of the T. V. A., the adoption of the amendment we are discussing would not in anywise injure the Authority, the service it renders the people, or the service it renders in the war effort.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Herring	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Rosier
Bilbo	Holman	Russell
Bone	Hughes	Schwartz
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brown	Kilgore	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Connally	Millikin	Walsh
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	White
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I rise to ask for information. I realize that in connection with these Government-created corporations, of which we have so many, a great deal of latitude must be given them in transacting their business. They have charters from the Federal Government to transact certain business. Such a charter can almost be compared to a charter given a bank which handles trust funds. I understand there is not any controversy over the honesty of the handling of the funds by the T. V. A., but I find some statements made in the RECORD which are not quite clear to me, and I should like to have them cleared up. In the RECORD, on page 3915, there is a statement made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] with respect to certain amounts of money having been spent, and, as I understand the report which he quoted, there were 3,077 items which were explained; that is, they were submitted by the T. V. A. to the General Accounting Office, and 4,887 items which were not presented to the General Accounting Office for the purpose of showing how the money was spent. I may have a misunderstanding of that state-

ment. If my understanding is correct, why should not those items be submitted for review by the General Accounting Office? Why should not the T. V. A. show just what the moneys were spent for, what prices were paid for material, and so forth?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator wants an answer I will give it to him. For 6 or 7 years there has been a controversy between Mr. Lilienthal and the General Accounting Office, I believe, over the possession of the accounts. The T. V. A. contend that the papers must not be taken out of the T. V. A. office, and the General Accounting Office desires that they be submitted to it. At all events, there has been a controversy over the matter, and there has not been an examination made, and there has not been a report made by the General Accounting Office with respect to the T. V. A. since its accounts were nominally put under the control of the General Accounting Office. The very purpose of striking out the provision contained in the House bill is to require the Tennessee Valley Authority to put its receipts into the Treasury of the United States, and to pay them out by coming to Congress and getting an appropriation for them, so that the Congress may have the information which it does not have today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is, of course, an entirely different proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. There are certain funds within a revolving fund of a Government corporation. Certain amounts of money are appropriated as capital for the corporation. As I said in the beginning——

Mr. McKELLAR. There has not been any money appropriated for the capital of this corporation at all. It has been appropriated for building dams.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In transacting business I can understand that it would be very embarrassing or inconvenient or impractical for the organization to come to Congress for every item in respect to which it wants to spend money, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. The War Department has to do it; the Treasury Department has to do it; the State Department has to do it; the Post Office Department has to do it. This organization seemingly desires to create itself a forty-ninth State, really, so that it will not have to be bothered by the restrictions imposed on other branches of the Government.

The T. V. A. has received some half billion dollars for the construction of dams and has used the money for that purpose. Now, the Authority is deriving an income of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 from the operation of its dams, and the Authority does not want to account for the money or pay it into the Treasury.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, it seems to me to be an extraordinary situation that when the money is spent the Authority shall not make an accounting as to how it spent it and for what purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so, too. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota feels that way about it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Unless some Senator can give me a better explanation than I now have, I must——

Mr. McKELLAR. An explanation of what?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of the difference between what appears to be the Senator's contention and mine. I would not consider it necessary for the Authority to come here for every little item any more than any other corporation, but when it spends money I claim it should have the accounts examined by the General Accounting Office, or by some other accounting agency of the Government, in order that we may know what the money is spent for.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I will show him in the bill what is provided in the way of money for the Tennessee Valley Authority. If the Senator will put on his glasses, or if he can see without them, he will see in the bill that the House appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority $136,000,000. The Senate committee has added $36,000,000 more for the very expenses to which the Senator is referring. The Authority will have all the money it can possibly use. There is not a particle of real merit in the Senator's contention because the Senate committee has already provided the money for the Authority.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I assume they have not been able to state, item by item, what it is for and how it is going to be spent.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they have not, but the committee has given them the money anyway, out of an abundance of precaution. There is no question about that. The Senator can see that by examining the bill.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand that, but——

Mr. McKELLAR. If the committee amendment is agreed to, and the bill is passed, that money will be available to the Authority. The Senator is mistaken about the Authority having to come to Congress for money this year. The money is provided right here in the pending bill. Next year, however, the Authority will have to come and ask for money again, and it should do so. The Senator from Minnesota has just said it should do so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When the money is spent does the Authority give an accounting for the money to the Federal Government, to the Accounting Office, or to the Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. It never has done so yet.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have only a limited time, and I hope the Senator will not ask me to yield. The Senator from Alabama can speak privately to the Senator from Minnesota. I hope the Senator from Alabama will not be so vehement in his explanation as to interrupt what I have to say. I am sure he will not be.

Mr. President, I am sorry to take any more time, and I doubt whether I shall take the half hour allotted to me. If anyone on earth is more favorable to the Tennessee Valley Authority than I am, I do not know him. The Authority is located in my State. The Congress has been gracious to me, having furnished at my request the money with which to build these dams. I feel that I am in a sense a trustee for that money. Congress has been very generous in granting the money I have asked for this purpose. In the Senate Appropriations Committee money has been given at my request to build these dams. I am 1,000 percent for this organization, but I feel that it is my duty to see that the money is honestly, fairly, and justly spent.

As I said here the other day, the idea of my desiring to appoint any persons to positions in the T. V. A. is absurd and ridiculous. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said awhile ago, and it is a matter of great merit to him, that he did not have anyone in the T. V. A., that he had never appointed anybody. I never have neither. In that respect he has nothing on me, and yet the T. V. A. is located in my State. But I am entirely satisfied. I imagine nine-tenths of those connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority vote for me. Perhaps Mr. Lilienthal does not. I do not know whether he has the right to vote in my State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. One of the most persuasive things to me in this whole situation is the fact that two Senators from the State of Tennessee, in the heart and center of the T. V. A., take the position they do. I am unable to convince myself that they would assault or injure the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would no more think of doing that than I would think of flying.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I have not exactly familiarized myself with the details respecting the T. V. A. matter either in the committee or on the Senate floor, but I am entirely familiar with the attitude of the senior Senator from Tennessee, and it is largely because of his attitude that the Appropriations Committee has appropriated funds to the T. V. A. That is why I voted for them in the committee, and that is why I shall vote for the position now taken by the Senator, because I think he has done a wonderful work for the T. V. A., whereas other persons have done a wonderful work against the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart.

As God is my judge I have no desire but to foster the T. V. A. in every honest and honorable way of which I am capable. But when I find that for the past 7 years the T. V. A. has not been examined by the duly constituted Accounting Office, and that it has come to Congress and obtained legislation which excuses it from going before the General Accounting Office, and when it comes here and obtains legislation which appropriates money even before it is made by the T. V. A., to spend for its purposes, as and when it will, I cannot go along. As I look at it, as one of the Senators from Tennessee, who asked my colleagues to put up the money to build the dams, if I

were to squint at any such transaction I should be very, very remiss in my duty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I do not wish to get into any controversy. I ask the Senator to be brief.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has just stated that the T. V. A. Act provides for the expenditure of money before it is actually made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes that the T. V. A. must make contracts for supplying power, either to public communities or to private industries, and that frequently it derives the money with which to pay for the creation of the power from receipts from the sale of power. The T. V. A. must make contracts in advance. Otherwise it could not make them at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no doubt about that; but an appropriation of $36,100,000 is recommended by the Appropriations Committee for that very purpose.

I want to show what we propose to do in this bill. We propose in this bill to treat Mr. David E. Lilienthal even better than we are treating the President of the United States. The President of the United States is given a revolving fund of $25,000,000. It is right and proper that he should have it; we are in a great war; but in the same bill Mr. Lilienthal is asking for a revolving fund of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 to use as he pleases. He has taken a very peculiar course. In December he came to Congress requesting that this provision be put in the bill. In November he came to Congress and obtained the passage of a bill which excuses him from the necessity of submitting to the General Accounting Office or to anybody else.

Does the Congress want to do that? To what other individual, except only the President of the United States, have we given a personal revolving fund? The T. V. A. is a large concern. More than half a billion dollars is invested in it. It is not Mr. Lilienthal's money, strange as that may seem to Mr. Lilienthal. It is the money of the American people; and he is merely acting as temporary trustee of it. We are asking him to account for that money.

I should like to read again the language proposed to be stricken out. By the way, my delightful friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] missed the point of the amendment. All my amendment would do would be to strike out legislation which is now in the appropriation bill. I am not seeking to insert legislation in an appropriation bill. Such a statement is poppycock. It is not true. What I am seeking to do is to strike out legislation giving to Mr. Lilienthal the authority to use $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 of receipts as he sees fit, without accounting to anybody. I have referred to the act which was passed in November. I shall not go into that.

Listen to this:

Provided, That this appropriation and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942," and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, shall be covered into—

It does not say into the Treasury, but presumably that is the inference—

and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943," to remain available until June 30, 1943, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942."

That is an appropriation. That provision would give the Tennessee Valley Authority, including Mr. Lilienthal, the power of a revolving fund. If that language were stricken Mr. Lilienthal would be required, just as every other department or activity of the Government is required, to come before Congress and ask for an appropriation. Is there anything wrong about that? If I thought that even in the remotest degree it would interfere with our war effort, I would not be for it.

What I propose is simply to make Mr. Lilienthal come before the Congress and obtain his appropriation, as is required of all the other agencies of the Government.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] stated—and it is the truth—that Mr. Ickes was asked day before yesterday if he found any trouble in coming before the Congress and obtaining money to run the power activities of which he is in charge, such as the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects, Boulder Dam, the Central Valley Dam of California, and other projects. He said he had no trouble. They are part of the war effort, just as much as is T. V. A. Those agencies are not hurt by the requirement that they come to Congress for appropriations. Why should the Congress give Mr. Lilienthal a revolving fund of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, or whatever the receipts are, to help the war effort, when such a thing is not done for other agencies?

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, we shall make the greatest mistake of our lives if we do not require the Tennessee Valley Authority and all other agencies to come to Congress and ask for appropriations, precisely as we require the great departments of Government to do. Is our war effort hindered because we ask the War Department to come before us and explain its requests for appropriations? Is our war effort interfered with because we ask the President to come before us and request the funds which he uses? Has anybody complained of such a requirement? How, in the name of heaven, can it be argued that such a requirement would hurt the war effort? The last thing under God's heaven that I want to do is to injure the war effort, because I am one of those who believe in the war effort.

Mr. President, some remarkable things are happening. Yesterday my good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] had something to say about this amendment being proposed without proper evidence. The evidence was read the other day. The Tennessee Valley Authority knew about it. It had its officers appear before the committee to testify about it. Where are we going when we leave things in such shape?

The other day I referred to advertising. I did not read all the material. I intended to put it in the RECORD. I shall later ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

With regard to advertising, I quote from the testimony of Mr. Clapp:

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; and I have just read the purposes here, and there is no semblance of a suggestion, hardly, that you have got the right to print and sell books advertising the company.

Do you have any other publications advertising the company, in any way, publicizing the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir; we have a number of booklets.

Senator McKELLAR. We want to see those, and we want to know why it is necessary for the Tennessee Valley Authority to advertise in any such way as this?

Mr. CLAPP. We do not construe it as advertising, Senator. We construe it as giving out information which is requested, and which if not covered by information booklets would have to be covered by individual correspondence, of which there is still a great volume.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, be that as it may, will you point out again, if you will, your authority under this act; point out, if you will, the authority for printing these publications?

Do you get pay for these publications or do you send them out, or what numbers do you print them; give us facts about them?

Mr. CLAPP. Some of these publications are obtainable at cost by those who request them, a limited number of them are assembled to answer general and specific inquiries that are made by the public and various agencies interested.

A publicity bureau in its most perfect form. Do Senators know how much it cost last year? The manager says it cost $128,000.

I digress here long enough to say something else about the matter. I refrained from doing so the other day, and I am a little doubtful about it now. All Senators will remember the controversy about the Douglas Dam. I was opposed to the building of that dam, and the Senate voted with me twice. The President asked that it be allowed. It took my vote on the subcommittee to get it through, as Senators will remember, and it was allowed. I thought I acted very decently about it, probably too decently. After that attitude on my part, what do you suppose, Mr. President, this man Lilienthal, or his crowd, did? I shall give the evidence just as it was presented:

Senator McKELLAR. Now, you do not confine your advertising and publicity to merely giving information about the Tennessee Valley Authority, do you?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir; we do.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you have on your list a man by the name of Fred Pasley? Is he employed by the T. V. A.?

Mr. CLAPP. No; he is not.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you pay for newspaper advertising?

Mr. President, let us see how much they spend in the information bureau. There were 16 exhibits undertaking to show how

much they spend. They are required to put it in. The figures are as follows:

Exhibit No.:	
1	$4,636.93
2	3,437.68
3	3,437.68
4	103.32
5	878.40
6	828.00
7	3,873.22

The grand total is $12,805.28; and that is the first example, Mr. President, of their publicity program. Outside of that, on page 261 and following, we find an item of $171.36 and another of $7,808.96, for merely newspaper space.

Exhibit No.:	
11	$3,420.60
12	828.31
13	456.22
Also	432.08
Also	433.17
Also	407.25
Also	374.22
Also	453.08
Also	523.86
Also	480.17
Totaling in exhibit No. 13	14,277.44
14	3,420.60
15	826.86
16	290.70
Also	270.30
Also	275.70
Also	283.65
Also	246.90
Also	291.60
Also	328.50
Also	233.67
Other items aggregating	9,973.91

If their statements are correct, the total is in the neighborhood of $16,442.39.

Mr. President, lest I forget it, I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the names of the newspapers and the amounts paid for advertisements during the last year to all the newspapers, except two or three, in the State of Tennessee, and those in northern Alabama and northern Mississippi. I have the list of them here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Statement of advertising expense, Tennessee Valley Authority, July 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1941

SUMMARY

Defense power conservation program:	
Direct expense (schedule 1)	$31,723.18
Reimbursements to municipalities and cooperatives (schedule 2)	9,973.91
Employment advertising in various newspapers and magazines	955.25
Procurement advertising in various newspapers and magazines	2,340.77
Land condemnation advertising in various newspapers	2,062.97
Grand total	47,056.08

NOTE.—Copies of all advertising related to the defense power conservation program as set forth on schedules 1 and 2 are on file with the committee.

DEFENSE POWER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

SCHEDULE 1.—*Direct advertising expense*

		Payments net	Exhibit
C. P. Clark, Inc	D. O. 41-99407	$4,573.09	I.
Do	D. O. 42-65689	12,625.98	II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII.
Do	D. O. 42-75192	170.31	VII, VIII.
Do	D. O. 42-84935	31.70	IX, X.
The Purse Co	D. O. 42-84935	14,277.44	XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.
Do	D. O. 42-87884	26.25	XIII, XVI.
Copper City Advance	E-10-212	10.00	XVII.
Fannin County Time	#-11-757	8.41	XVIII.
Total		31,723.18	

C. P. CLARK, INC.

ADVERTISING

NASHVILLE, TENN., *May 31, 1941.*
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn.

STATEMENT, NEWSPAPER SPACE

Exhibit I

Full-page advertisement in each of the following newspapers, Sunday, May 25, issues:	
2,464 lines at 6 cents—Huntsville Times	$147.84
2,456 lines at 38 cents—Louisville Courier Journal	933.28
2,320 lines at 4 cents—Columbus Commercial Dispatch	92.80
1,960 lines at 3 cents—Corinth Journal	58.80
2,408 lines at 14 cents—Chattanooga News-Free Press	337.12
2,408 lines at 14 cents—Chattanooga Times	337.12
2,352 lines at 5 cents—Jackson Sun	117.60
2,464 lines at 7 cents—Johnson City Press Chronicle	172.48
2,352 lines at 4½ cents—Johnson City Times	105.84
2,352 lines at 5½ cents—Kingsport Times	129.36
2,464 lines at 12 cents—Knoxville Journal	295.68
2,408 lines at 14 cents—Knoxville News Sentinel	337.12
2,520 lines at 33 cents—Memphis Commercial Appeal	831.60
2,352 lines at 4 cents—Murfreesboro News Journal	94.08
2,384 lines at 25 cents—Nashville Tennesseean	596.00
Night letter telegrams to 15 newspapers, May 23	16.08
6 phone calls, 2 each: Norris (Mr. Henley), Paducah and Louisville, May 24	4.70
	4,607.50
Setting type and plating full-page advertisement, Paducah Sun Democrat (advertisement killed after set)	29.43
	4,636.93

Sixty-three dollars and eighty-four cents discount allowed on above newspaper space if paid by June 10, net thereafter.

Exhibit II

Full page advertisement, Sunday, Nov. 2, issues:	
Nashville Tennesseean—2,384 lines, at 28 cents	$667.52
Murfreesboro News Journal—2,352 lines, at 4 cents	94.08
Memphis Commercial Appeal—2,520 lines, at 33 cents (net)	831.60
Knoxville News Sentinel—2,408 lines, at 14 cents	337.12
Full page advertisement, Sunday, Nov. 2, issues—Continued.	
Jackson Sun—2,352 lines, at 5 cents	$117.60
Knoxville Journal—2,464 lines, at 12 cents	295.68
Chattanooga Times (including Chattanooga Evening Times, Monday, Nov. 3) — 2,408 lines, at 19 cents	457.52
Chattanooga News-Free Press—2,408 lines, at 14 cents	337.12
Corinth Journal—1,960 lines, at 3 cents	58.80
Columbus Commercial Dispatch—2,320 lines, at 4 cents	92.80
Huntsville Times—2,464 lines, at 6 cents	147.84
	3,437.68

Exhibit III

Full-page advertisement in all of the above newspapers, Nov. 9	3,437.68

Exhibit IV

Full page, Decatur Daily, Nov. 9, 2,296 lines, at 4½ cents	103.32

Exhibit V

80 inches (5 columns by 16 inches), Monday, Nov. 3, issues:

	Cents per inch
Clarksville Leaf Chronicle, at	56
Athens Post Athenian, at	42
Cleveland Banner, at	42
Columbia Herald, at	45
Dyersburg State Gazette, at	42
Morristown Gazette and Mail, at	45
Paris Post Intelligencer, at	42
Union City Messenger, at	42
Memphis Press Scimitar, net, at	322
Florence, Ala., Times, at	63
Decatur, Ala., Daily, at	63
Tri-City Daily, Sheffield, at	63
West Point, Miss., Times Leader, at	56
Tupelo Journal at	70
Tupelo News, at	63
Corinth Corinthian	42
Total per inch	$10.98
Total Monday schedule—80 inches, at $10.98	878.40

Exhibit VI

80 inches, Monday, Nov. 10, issues, same papers as Monday, Nov. 3, schedule, total	878.40
Less 80 inches at 63 cents in Decatur Daily (ran full page Sunday, Nov. 9, instead)	50.40
Total	828.00

Exhibit VII, week of Nov. 3, and exhibit VIII, week of Nov. 10

Three columns x 10 inches, and 3 columns x 11½ inches, ran in following weeklies, week

of November 3 and November 10, respectively, total 64½ inches:

Tennessee weeklies:	Inch rate, cents
Ashland City Times	25
Adamsville, Tennessee Valley Appeal	35
Alamo, Crockett Times	35
Athens, McMinn County Herald	45
Bells, Crockett County Sentinel	35
Bolivar Bulletin	35
Brownsville States Graphic	35
Byrdstown, Pickett City News	25
Camden Chronicle	35
Carthage Courier	30
Celina, Bill Fiske's Bugle	30
Centerville, Hickman City Chronicle	30
Clinton Courier	35
Chattanooga, Hamilton City Herald	60
Cleveland Herald	35
Cleveland, Bradley City Journal	35
Chattanooga Labor World	85
Colliersville Herald	42
Columbia, Maury Democrat	40
Covington Leader	30
Dayton Herald	47
Dresden Enterprise	35
Erin, Houston County Times	40
Etowah Enterprise	40
Fayetteville, Lincoln County News	35
Franklin Review Appeal	40
Franklin, Williamson City News	40
Friendship, Tri-County News	30
Gainesboro, Jackson City Sentinel	30
Fayetteville Observer	35
Greenfield Gazette	40
Gallatin Examiner	35
Gallatin, Sumner County News	35
Gatlinburg News	50
Hartsville Vidette	25
Halls Graphic	35
Harriman Record	42
Henderson Chester County Independent	35
Hohenwald, Lewis County Herald	30
Humboldt Courier Chronicle	35
Huntingdon, Tennessee Republican	29
Jamestown, Fentress County News	50
Jasper Journal	35
Jellico, Advance Sentinel	30
Jefferson City Standard	35
Kingston, Roane County Banner	35
Lebanon, Wilson County News	35
Lebanon Democrat	40
Loudon, Loudon County Herald	40
Lynchburg, Moore County News	30
Lexington Progress	25
Lexington Leader	35
Linden, Perry Countian	30
Livingston Enterprise	40
LaFollette Press	40
Lawrenceburg Democrat-Union	35
Lawrenceburg, Lawrence News	35
Lewisburg, Marshall Gazette	30
Lewisburg Tribune	30
Lenoir City News	35
Hickman County News-Herald, Centerville	40
Cookeville, Putnam County Herald	45
McMinnville, Southern Standard	40
Madisonville Democrat	29
McKenzie Banner	40
Manchester Times	35
Martin, Weakley County Press	40
Maryville Times	45
Milan Exchange	40
Mt. Pleasant Record	30
Murfreesboro, Rutherford Courier	49
Memphis Labor Review	100
Newport Plain Talk and Tribune	35
Parsons News Leader	30
Portland Herald	25
Portland, Upper Sumner Press	25
Paris Parisian	42
Pikeville, Bledsonian	40
Pulaski, Citizen	35
Pulaski Record	35
Rockwood Times	42
Rogersville Review	45
Sparta News	30
Sparta Expositor	40
Savannah Courier	25
Sevierville Record Republican	35
Shelbyville, Bedford County Times	35
Shelbyville Gazette	35
Somerville, Fayette Falcon	35
South Pittsburg Hustler	40
Springfield, Robertson City Times	40
Springfield, Herald and Robertson City News	42
Tiptonville, Lake City Banner	30
Tracy City, Grundy County Herald	30
Trenton Weekly Gazette	40
Trenton Herald Register	35
Union City, Obion City Commercial	36
Wartburg, Morgan County News	35
Waverly, Democrat Sentinel	40
Waynesboro, Wayne County News	30
Winchester Chronicle	30
Woodbury, Cannon Courier	40
Newbern Tennessean	35
Oneida, The Scott Countain	40
Nashville, Trades and Labor News	75
Oneida, Scott County News	40
Maryville Enterprise	45
Mississippi weeklies:	
Ashland, Southern Advocate	30
Ackerman, Choctaw Plain Dealer	35
Aberdeen Examiner	42
Amory News Advertiser	49
Booneville Banner	30
Booneville Independent	35
Charleston, Mississippi Sun	36
Coffeeville Courier	35
Carthage, Carthaginian	35
De Kalb, Kemper County Messenger	35
Fulton News Beacon	42
Holly Springs, South Reporter	42
Houston Times Post	35
Iuka Vidette	40
Louisville, Winston County Journal	35
Macon Beacon	35
New Albany Gazette	49
Oxford Eagle	42
Okolona Messenger	25
Pontotoc Progress	42
Philadelphia, Neshoba Democrat	42
Ripley, Southern Sentinel	42
Senatobia, Tate County Democrat	42
Sardis, Southern Reporter	35
Starkville News	42
Water Valley, North Mississippi Herald	36
Alabama weeklies:	
Athens, Alabama Courier	40
Albertville Herald	50
Athens, Limestone Democrat	40
Bessemer, Tribune-Advertiser	75
Centre, Coosa River News	35
Cullman Democrat	30
Cullman Tribune	50
Cullman Banner	40
Cherokee County Herald, Centre	35
Fort Payne, DeKalb Times	35
Fort Payne Journal	35
Florence Herald	56
Guntersville Gleam	40
Guntersville, Advertiser Democrat	30
Huntsville Mercury	56
Moulton Advertiser	35
Russellville, Franklin County Times	50
Sheffield Standard and Times	60
Scottsboro, Jackson County Sentinel	40
Tarrant, Alabama News Digest	125
Tuscumbia, Colbert County Reporter	50
Total inch rate	$60.05
Total, 64½ inches, at 60 05 — 154 weeklies above	3,873.22
Exhibit VIII, Dunlap Tribune, 34½ inches, at 30 cents (did not run first advertisement)	$10.35
Exhibit VIII, Dandridge Banner, 34½ inches, at 35 cents (did not run first advertisement	12.07
Exhibit VIII, Huntingdon, Carroll City Democrat, 34½ inches, at 35 cents (did not run first advertisement)	12.07
Exhibit VIII, Knoxville Labor News, 34½ inches, at 85 cents (did not run first advertisement)	29.32
Exhibit VII, Knoxville Progressive Labor, 30 inches, at 75 cents (did not run second advertisement)	$22.50
Exhibit VIII, Rutledge, Grainger City News, 34½ inches, at 25 cents (did not run first advertisement)	8.62
Exhibit VIII, Sweetwater News, 34½ inches, at 45 cents (did not run first advertisement)	15.53
Exhibit VII, Tullahoma Guardian, 30 inches, at 30 cents (did not run second advertisement)	9.00
Exhibit VIII, Batesville, Miss., Panolian, 34½ inches, at 35 cents (did not run first advertisement)	12.08
Exhibit VII, Columbus, Miss., Spectator, 30 inches, at 45 cents (did not run second advertisement)	13.50
Exhibit VIII, Dyer, Tri-City Reporter, 64½ inches, at 35 cents, 30 inches on November 6 and 34½ on November 16	22.58
209 mats, 13 full pages, 16, 80 inches, and 180, 34½ inches, net	58.00
Wrapping above mats for shipment, including 418 corrugated boards, net	15.00
October 31, wires to Murfreesboro, Jackson, Corinth, Memphis, Columbus, Huntsville, Chattanooga (2), Knoxville (2), full page copy for November 2 full-page advertisement	6.36
Grand total	12,805.28
Discount allowed if paid by December 10, net thereafter:	
Dailies and Sunday papers	110.61
Weekly papers	68.69
Total cash discount	179.30

C. P. CLARK, INC.

ADVERTISING

NASHVILLE, TENN., *December 10, 1941.*
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Chattanooga Bank Building,
Chattanooga, Tenn.

STATEMENT

Copy wired to following cities on Nov. 1 by Western Union:	
Columbia	$5.49
Clarksville	5.49
Union City	5.49
Florence	5.49
Paris	5.49
Athens	5.49
Cleveland	5.49
Decatur	5.49
Morristown	5.49
Dyersburg	5.49
Memphis	5.49
West Point	5.58
Tupelo	5.58
Corinth	5.58
Tupelo	5.58
Murfreesboro	1.41
Chattanooga	1.41
Do	1.41
Huntsville	1.41
Columbus	1.80
Jackson	1.41
Corinth	1.48
Memphis	1.41
Knoxville	1.41
Do	1.41
Memphis, labor paper, Nov. 5	1.05
Knoxville, labor paper, Nov. 5	1.15
	99.47
Plus tax—10 percent of 99.47	9.94
Exhibits VII and VIII: Old Hickory News, 64½ inches at 40 cents, Nov. 6 and 13	25.80
Exhibit VIII: Smithville Review, 34½ inches at 30 cents, Nov. 20	10.35
Exhibit VII: McMinnville, Warren County Times, 64½ inches at 40 cents, Nov. 7 and 14	25.80
	171.36
$1.45 discount allowed if paid by Dec. 20, net thereafter.	
Exhibits IX and X: 64½ inches, Montgomery's Vindicator, Sevierville, Tenn., 30 inches on Nov. 5 and 34½ inches on Nov. 12, at 50 cents an inch	32.25
55 cents discount allowed if paid by Jan. 10, net thereafter.	

THE PURSE CO.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *December 29, 1941.*
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
In care of Mr. G. D. MUNGER,
409 Chattanooga Bank Building,
Chattanooga, Tenn.

[Newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *"]

SUMMARY INVOICE

	Amount
Sheet 1—1, newspaper space	$3,420.60
Sheet 1—2, newspaper space	828.31
Sheet 1—3, newspaper space	456.22
Sheet 1—4, newspaper space	432.08
Sheet 1—5, newspaper space	433.17
Sheet 1—6, newspaper space	407.25
Sheet 1—7, newspaper space	374.22
Sheet 1—8, newspaper space	453.08
Sheet 1—9, newspaper space	523.86
	7,328.79
Sheet 1—10, miscellaneous expense	480.17
Total	7,808.96

Exhibit XI

[Sheet 1-1, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," full page, Sunday, Nov. 30, 1941]

Tennessee:	
Chattanooga News-Free Press	$337.12
Chattanooga Times	337.12
Jackson Sun	117.60
Knoxville Journal	295.68
Knoxville News Sentinel	337.12
Memphis Commercial Appeal	831.60
Murfreesboro News Journal	94.02
Nashville Tennesseean	667.58
Alabama:	
Decatur Daily	103.32
Huntsville Times	147.84
Mississippi:	
Columbus Commercial Dispatch	92.80
Corinth Daily Journal	58.80
Total	3,420.60

Exhibit XII

[Sheet 1-2, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 5 columns by 16 inches, Monday, Dec. 1, 1941]

Tennessee:	
Clarksville Leaf Chronicle	$42.00
Athens Post Athenian	33.60
Cleveland Banner	33.60
Columbia Herald	37.98
Dyersburg State Gazette	33.60
Morristown Gazette and Mail	36.00
Paris Post Intelligencer	39.20
Union City Messenger	33.60
Memphis Press Scimitar	258.75
Alabama:	
Florence Times	47.93
Tri-Cities Daily	47.25
Mississippi:	
West Point Times Leader	44.80
Tupelo Journal	56.00
Tupelo Daily News	50.40
Corinth Corinthian	33.60
Total	828.31

Exhibit XIII

[Sheets 1-3, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 4 columns by 12 inches, on dates indicated]

Tennessee:	
Dec. 5, Adamsville, Tennessee Valley Appeal	$14.40
Dec. 4, Alamo, Crockett Times	16.80
Dec. 4, Ashland City Times	12.00
Dec. 4, Athens, McMinn County Herald	21.60
Dec. 4, Bells, Crockett County Sentinel	16.80
Dec. 5, Bolivar Bulletin	16.80
Dec. 5, Brownsville States Graphic	16.80
Dec. 4, Byrdstown, Picket County News	13.80
Dec. 5, Camden Chronicle	16.80
Dec. 4, Carthage Courier	16.10
Dec. 3, Celina, Bill Fiske's Bugle	14.40
Dec. 5, Centerville, Hickman County Chronicle	14.40
Dec. 4, Centerville, Hickman County News-Herald	19.20
Dec. 5, Chattanooga, Hamilton County Herald	28.80
Dec. 5, Chattanooga, Labor World	40.80
Dec. 4, Cleveland, Bradley County Journal	16.80
Dec. 5, Cleveland Herald	16.80
Dec. 4, Clinton Courier	16.10
Dec. 4, Collierville Herald	20.16
Dec. 3, Columbia Maury Democrat	21.60
Dec. 4, Cookeville, Putnam County Herald	20.25
Tennessee—Continued.	
Dec. 4, Covington Leader	$11.25
Dec. 4, Crossville Chronicle	16.80
Dec. 4, Dandridge Banner	16.80
Dec. 4, Dayton Herald	20.16
Total	456.22

[Sheets 1-4, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 4 columns by 12 inches, on dates indicated]

Tennessee:	
Dec. 5, Dresden Enterprise	$16.40
Dec. 4, Dunlap Tribune	14.40
Dec. 4, Dyer, Tri-City Reporter	16.80
Dec. 5, Erin, Houston County Times	19.20
Dec. 4, Etowah Enterprise	19.20
Dec. 4, Fayetteville, Lincoln County News	16.80
Dec. 4, Franklin, Review Appeal	19.20
Dec. 4, Franklin, Williamson County News	16.80
Dec. 4, Friendship, Tri-County News	14.40
Dec. 4, Gainesboro, Jackson County Sentinel	14.40
Dec. 5, Gallatin Examiner	16.80
Dec. 4, Gallatin, Sumner County News	16.80
Dec. 4, Gatlinburg News	24.00
Dec. 5, Greenfield Gazette	19.20
Dec. 5, Halls Graphic	16.80
Dec. 4, Harriman Record	20.16
Dec. 5, Henderson, Chester County Independent	16.80
Dec. 4, Hohenwald, Lewis County Herald	14.40
Dec. 4, Humboldt Courier Chronicle	19.20
Dec. 5, Huntingdon, Carroll County Democrat	16.80
Dec. 5, Huntingdon, Tennessee Republican	13.92
Dec. 4, Jamestown, Fentress County News	24.00
Dec. 4, Jasper Journal	16.80
Dec. 4, Fayetteville Observer	16.80
Dec. 5, Hartsville Vidette	12.00
Total	432.08

[Sheet 1-5, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 4 columns by 12 inches, on indicated date]

Tennessee:	
Dec. 4, Jefferson City Standard	$16.80
Dec. 5, Jellico, Advance Sentinel	14.40
Dec. 4, Kingston, Roane County Banner	16.80
Dec. 4, Knoxville Labor News	34.50
Dec. 4, Lebanon Democrat	18.80
Dec. 4, Lebanon, Wilson County News	16.80
Dec. 2, LaFollette Press	18.00
Dec. 5, Lawrenceburg Democrat-Union	16.10
Dec. 4, Lawrenceburg, Lawrence News	16.80
Dec. 5, Lewisburg, Marshall Gazette	13.20
Dec. 5, Lewisburg Tribune	13.80
Dec. 5, Lexington Leader	16.80
Dec. 5, Lexington Progress	11.00
Dec. 4, Lenoir City News	16.80
Dec. 5, Linden, Perry Countian	14.40
Dec. 5, Livingston Enterprise	19.20
Dec. 4, Loudon, Loudon County Herald	19.20
Dec. 4, Lynchburg, Moore County News	14.40
Dec. 3, Madisonville Democrat	13.92
Dec. 5, Manchester Times	16.80
Dec. 5, Martin, County Times	14.40
Dec. 5, Martin, Weakley County Press	19.20
Dec. 4, Maryville Times	20.25

Tennessee—Continued.

Dec. 5, McMinnville, Southern Standard	$19.20
Dec. 4, Maryville Enterprise	21.60
Total	433.17

[Sheet 1–6, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 4 columns by 12 inches, on dates indicated]

Tennessee:

Dec. 5, McKenzie Banner	$14.40
Dec. 5, Memphis Labor Review	48.00
Dec. 4, Milan Exchange	19.20
Dec. 5, Mount Pleasant Record	14.40
Dec. 2, Murfreesboro, Rutherford Courier	23.52
Dec. 5, McMinnville, Warren County Times	19.20
Dec. 4, Nashville Trades & Labor	33.00
Dec. 1, Newport Plain Talk & Tribune	16.80
Dec. 4, Old Hickory News	14.40
Dec. 5, Oneida, Scott County News	19.20
Dec. 4, Oneida, The Scott Countian	13.20
Dec. 5, Paris Parisian	19.32
Dec. 5, Parsons News Leader	14.40
Dec. 5, Pikeville, Bledsonian	16.80
Dec. 5, Portland, Upper Sumner Press	12.00
Dec. 3, Pulaski Citizen	15.75
Dec. 3, Pulaski Record	16.80
Dec. 5, Ripley, Luderdale County Enterprise	13.50
Dec. 4, Rockwood Times	20.16
Dec. 4, Rogersville Review	19.20
Dec. 3, Rutledge, Grainger County News	12.00
Dec. 5, Savannah Courier	12.00
Total	407.25

[Sheets 1–7, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 4 columns by 12 inches, on indicated date]

Tennessee:

Dec. 3, Sevierville, Montgomery's Vindicator	$24.00
Dec. 3, Sevierville Record Republican	14.40
Dec. 2, Shelbyville, Bedford County Times	16.80
Dec. 5, Shelbyville Gazette	16.80
Dec. 4, Somerville, Fayette Falcon	16.80
Dec. 4, South Pittsburg Hustler	19.20
Dec. 4, Sparta Expositor	19.20
Dec. 4, Sparta News	13.20
Dec. 4, Springfield Herald and Robertson County News	18.48
Dec. 4, Springfield, Robertson County Times	19.20
Dec. 4, Sweetwater News	19.20
Dec. 5, Tiptonville, Lake County Banner	14.40
Dec. 5, Tracy City, Grundy County Herald	14.40
Dec. 4, Trenton Weekly Gazette	19.20
Dec. 4, Tullahoma Guardian	13.50
Dec. 4, Union City, Obion County Commercial	15.84
Dec. 4, Wartburg, Morgan County News	13.80
Dec. 4, Waverly, Democrat Sentinel	19.20
Dec. 5, Waynesboro, Wayne County News	13.80
Dec. 4, Winchester Chronicle	16.80
Dec. 5, Woodbury, Cannon Courier	19.20
Dec. 4, Newbern Tennessean	16.80
Total	374.22

[Sheet 1–8, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *,"—4 columns by 12 inches, on dates indicated]

Alabama:

Dec. 4, Athens, Alabama Courier	$19.20
Dec. 4, Athens, Limestone Democrat	16.80

Alabama—Continued.

Dec. 5, Albertville Herald	$19.20
Dec. 5, Bessemer, Tribune-Advertiser	36.00
Dec. 5, Center, Coosa River News	14.40
Dec. 3, Center, Cherokee County Herald	12.00
Dec. 4, Cullman Banner	19.20
Dec. 4, Cullman Democrat	13.20
Dec. 4, Cullman Tribune	18.40
Dec. 3, Fort Payne-DeKalb Times	16.80
Dec. 3, Fort Payne Journal	16.80
Dec. 5, Forence Herald	19.60
Dec. 3, Guntersville, Advertiser Democrat	14.40
Dec. 3, Guntersville Gleam	19.20
Dec. 4, Huntsville Mercury	26.88
Dec. 4, Moulton Advertiser	16.80
Dec. 4, Russellville, Franklin County, Times	24.00
Dec. 5, Sheffield Standard and Times	27.00
Dec. 2, Scottsboro, Jackson County, Sentinel	19.20
Dec. 4, Tarrant, Alabama News Digest	60.00
Dec. 4, Tuscumbia, Colbert County, Reporter	24.00
Total	453.08

[Sheet 1X9, newspaper advertisement—"Our Country Is Relying on * * *," 4 columns by 12 inches, on indicated date]

Mississippi:

Dec. 1, Aberdeen Examiner	$20.16
Dec. 5, Ackerman, Choctaw Plain Dealer	16.80
Dec. 4, Amory News-Advertiser	21.50
Dec. 4, Ashland, Southern Advocate	14.40
Dec. 4, Batesville Panolian	17.76
Dec. 4, Booneville Banner	14.40
Dec. 4, Booneville Independent	16.80
Dec. 4, Calhoun City—Monitor-Herald	15.36
Dec. 4, Carthage, Carthaginian	16.80
Dec. 4, Charleston, Mississippi Sun	17.28
Dec. 5, Coffeeville Courier	16.80
Dec. 2, Columbus Spectator	21.60
Dec. 4, DeKalb, Kemper County Messenger	15.40
Dec. 4, Fulton News Beacon	20.16
Dec. 4, Holly Springs, South Reporter	20.16
Dec. 4, Houston Times-Post	16.80
Dec. 4, Iuka Vidette	19.20
Dec. 5, Louisville, Winston County Journal	16.80
Dec. 5, Macon Beacon	16.80
Dec. 4, New Albany Gazette	23.52
Dec. 4, Okolona Messenger	12.00
Dec. 4, Oxford Eagle	20.16
Dec. 5, Philadelphia Neshoba Democrat	20.16
Dec. 4, Pontotoc Progress	20.16
Dec. 4, Ripley, Southern Sentinel	20.16
Dec. 5, Sardis, Southern Reporter	16.80
Dec. 4, Senatobia Tate County Democrat	20.16
Dec. 5, Starkville News	18.48
Dec. 4, Water Valley North Mississippi Herald	17.28
Total	523.86

[Sheet 1–10, newspaper advertisement "Our Country Is Relying on * * *"]

Miscellaneous expense:

Finished art	$46.50
Hand composition	53.13
Machine composition	40.67
Engravings	113.15
Pattern plates	55.08
Mats	109.11
Shipping supplies—mats	12.62
Wrapping expense—mats	9.62
Shipping charges—mats	40.29
Total	480.17

THE PURSE CO.,
Chattanooga, Tenn., December 29, 1941.

[Newspaper advertisement—"A Victory for National Defense * * *"]

SUMMARY INVOICE

	Amount
Sheet 2–1, newspaper space	$3,420.60
Sheet 2–2, newspaper space	826.86
Sheet 2–3, newspaper space	290.70
Sheet 2–4, newspaper space	270.30
Sheet 2–5, newspaper space	275.70
Sheet 2–6, newspaper space	263.65
Sheet 2–7, newspaper space	246.90
Sheet 2–8, newspaper space	291.60
Sheet 2–9, newspaper space	328.50
	6,234.81
Sheet 2–10, miscellaneous expense	233.67
Total	6,468.48
Add—Summary invoice, "Our Country Is Relying on * * *"	7,808.96
Grand total	14,277.44

Exhibit XIV

[Sheet 2–1, newspaper advertisement, "A Victory for National Defense * * *," full page, Sunday, Dec. 7, 1941]

Tennessee:

Chattanooga News-Free Press	$337.12
Chattanooga Times	337.12
Jackson Sun	117.60
Knoxville Journal	295.68
Knoxville News Sentinel	337.12
Memphis Commercial Appeal	831.60
Murfreesboro News Journal	94.08
Nashville Tennessecan	667.52

Alabama:

Decatur Daily	103.32
Huntsville Times	147.84

Mississippi:

Columbus Commercial Dispatch	92.80
Corinth Daily Journal	58.80
Total	3,420.60

Exhibit XV

[Sheet 2–2, 5 columns by 16 inches, Monday, Dec. 8, 1941]

Tennessee:

Clarksville Leaf Chronicle	$42.00
Athens Post-Athenian	33.60
Cleveland Banner	33.60
Columbia Herald	38.59
Dyersburg State Gazette	33.60
Morristown Gazette & Mail	36.00
Paris Post Intelligencer	39.20
Union City Messenger	33.60
Memphis Press Scimitar	257.60

Alabama:

Florence Times	47.02
Tri-Cities Daily	47.25

Mississippi:

West Point Times Leader	44.80
Tupelo Journal	56.00
Tupelo Daily News	50.40
Corinth Corinthian	33.60
Total	826.86

Exhibit XVI

[Sheet 2–3, 3 columns by 10 inches, on dates indicated]

Tennessee:

Dec. 12, Adamsville, Tennessee Valley Appeal	$12.00
Dec. 11, Alamo, Crockett Times	10.50
Dec. 11, Ashland City Times	7.50
Dec. 11, Athens, McMinn County Herald	13.50
Dec. 11, Bells, Crockett County Sentinel	10.50
Dec. 12, Bolivar Bulletin	10.50
Dec. 12, Brownsville States Graphic	10.50
Dec. 11, Byrdstown, Pickett County News	9.00
Dec. 11, Camden Chronicle	10.50
Dec. 12, Carthage Courier	10.50
Dec. 10, Celina, Bill Fiske's Bugle	9.00

Tennessee—Continued.

Dec. 12, Centerville, Hickman County Chronicle	$9.00
Dec. 12, Chattanooga, Hamilton County Herald	18.00
Dec. 12, Chattanooga, Labor World	25.50
Dec. 11, Cleveland, Bradley County Journal	10.50
Dec. 12, Cleveland Herald	10.50
Dec. 11, Clinton Courier	10.50
Dec. 11, Collierville Herald	12.60
Dec. 10, Columbia, Maury Democrat	13.50
Dec. 11, Cookeville, Putnam County Herald	13.50
Dec. 11, Covington Leader	7.50
Dec. 11, Crossville Chronicle	10.50
Dec. 11, Dandridge Banner	10.50
Dec. 11, Dayton Herald	12.60
Dec. 11, Centerville, Hickman County News-Herald	12.00
Total	290.70

[Sheet 2–4, 3 columns by 10 inches, on dates indicated]

Tennessee:

Dec. 12, Dresden Enterprise	$10.50
Dec. 11, Dunlap Tribune	9.00
Dec. 11, Dyer, Tri-City Reporter	10.50
Dec. 12, Erin, Houston County Times	12.00
Dec. 11, Etowah Enterprise	12.00
Dec. 11, Fayetteville Lincoln County News	10.50
Dec. 11, Fayetteville Observer	10.50
Dec. 11, Franklin Review Appeal	12.00
Dec. 11, Franklin, Williamson County	10.50
Dec. 11, Friendship, Tri-County News	9.00
Dec. 11, Gainesboro, Jackson County Sentinel	9.00
Dec. 12, Gallatin Examiner	10.50
Dec. 11, Gallatin, Sumner County News	10.50
Dec. 12, Gatlinburg News	15.00
Dec. 12, Greenfield Gazette	12.00
Dec. 12, Halls Graphic	10.50
Dec. 11, Harriman Record	12.60
Dec. 12, Henderson, Chester County Independent	10.50
Dec. 11, Hohenwald, Lewis County Herald	9.00
Dec. 11, Humboldt Courier Chronicle	12.00
Dec. 12, Huntingdon, Carroll County Democrat	10.50
Dec. 12, Huntingdon, Tennessee Republican	8.70
Dec. 11, Jamestown, Fentress County News	15.00
Dec. 11, Jasper Journal	10.50
Dec. 12, Hartsville Vidette	7.50
Total	270.30

[Sheet 2–5, same as above]

Tennessee:

Dec. 11, Jefferson City Standard	$10.50
Dec. 12, Jellico, Advance Sentinel	9.00
Dec. 11, Kingston, Roane County Banner	10.50
Dec. 11, Knoxville Labor News	22.50
Dec. 11, Lebanon Democrat	12.00
Dec. 11, Lebanon Wilson County News	10.50
Dec. 9, La Follette Press	12.00
Dec. 12, Lawrenceburg Democrat-Union	10.50
Dec. 11, Lawrenceburg, Lawrence News	10.50
Dec. 12, Lewisburg, Marshall Gazette	9.00
Dec. 12, Lewisburg Tribune	9.00
Dec. 12, Lexington Leader	10.50
Dec. 12, Lexington Progress	7.50
Dec. 11, Lenoir City News	10.50
Dec. 12, Linden, Perry Countian	9.00

Tennessee—Continued.

Dec. 12, Livingston Enterprise	$12.00
Dec. 11, Loudon, Loudon County Herald	12.00
Dec. 11, Lynchburg, Moore County News	9.00
Dec. 10, Madisonville Democrat	8.70
Dec. 12, Manchester Times	10.50
Dec. 12, Martin, County Times	9.00
Dec. 12, Martin, Weakley County Press	12.00
Dec. 11, Maryville Times	13.50
Dec. 12, McMinnville, Southern Standard	12.00
Dec. 11, Maryville Enterprise	13.50
Total	275.70

[Sheet 2–6, 3 columns by 10 inches]

Tennessee:

Dec. 12, McKenzie Banner	$12.00
Dec. 12, Memphis Labor Review	30.00
Dec. 11, Milan Exchange	12.00
Dec. 12, Mount Pleasant Record	9.00
Dec. 9, Murfreesboro, Rutherford Courier	14.70
Dec. 12, McMinnville, Warren County Times	12.00
Dec. 11, Nashville Trades & Labor News	22.50
Dec. 10, Newport Times	12.00
Dec. 8, Newport Plain Talk & Tribune	10.50
Dec. 11, Old Hickory News	12.00
Dec. 12, Oneida, Scott County News	12.00
Dec. 11, Oneida, The Scott Countian	12.00
Dec. 12, Paris Parisian	12.60
Dec. 12, Parsons News Leader	9.00
Dec. 12, Pikeville, Bledsonian	10.50
Dec. 19, Portland Herald	6.75
Dec. 12, Portland, Upper Sumner Press	7.50
Dec. 10, Pulaski Citizen	10.50
Dec. 10, Pulaski Record	7.50
Dec. 12, Ripley, Lauderdale County Enterprise	9.00
Dec. 11, Rockwood Times	12.60
Dec. 12, Rogersville Review	12.00
Dec. 10, Rutledge, Grainger County News	7.50
Dec. 12, Savannah Courier	7.50
Total	283.65

[Sheets 2–7]

Tennessee:

Dec. 10, Sevierville, Montgomery's Vindicator	$15.00
Dec. 10, Sevierville Record Republican	9.00
Dec. 9, Shelbyville, Bedford County Times	10.50
Dec. 12, Shelbyville Gazette	10.50
Dec. 11, Somerville, Fayette Falcon	10.50
Dec. 11, South Pittsburg Hustler	12.00
Dec. 11, Sparta Expositor	12.00
Dec. 11, Sparta News	9.00
Dec. 11, Springfield, Herald & Robertson County News	12.60
Dec. 11, Springfield, Robertson County Times	12.00
Dec. 11, Sweetwater News	12.00
Dec. 12, Tiptonville, Lake County Banner	9.00
Dec. 11, Tracy City, Grundy County Herald	9.00
Dec. 11, Trenton Weekly Gazette	12.00
Dec. 11, Tullahoma Guardian	9.00
Dec. 11, Union City Obion County Commercial	10.80
Dec. 11, Wartburg, Morgan County News	9.00
Dec. 11, Waverly, Democrat Sentinel	12.00
Dec. 12, Waynesboro, Wayne County News	9.00
Dec. 11, Winchester Chronicle	10.50

Tennessee—Continued.

Dec. 12, Woodbury, Cannon Courier	$12.00
Dec. 11, Newbern Tennesseean	10.50
Dec. 11, Smithville Review	9.00
Total	246.90

[Sheet 2–8, 3 columns by 10 inches, on indicated dates]

Alabama:

Dec. 11, Athens, Alabama Courier	$12.00
Dec. 8, Athens, Limestone Democrat	12.00
Dec. 12, Albertville Herald	12.00
Dec. 12, Bessemer, Tribune-Advertiser	22.50
Dec. 12, Centre, Coosa River News	9.00
Dec. 10, Centre, Cherokee County Herald	7.50
Dec. 11, Cullman Banner	12.00
Dec. 11, Cullman Democrat	9.00
Dec. 11, Cullman Tribune	12.00
Dec. 10, Fort Payne, DeKalb Times	10.50
Dec. 10, Fort Payne Journal	10.50
Dec. 12, Florence Herald	16.80
Dec. 10, Guntersville, Advertiser-Democrat	9.00
Dec. 11, Guntersville Gleam	12.00
Dec. 11, Huntsville Mercury	16.80
Dec. 11, Moulton Advertiser	10.50
Dec. 11, Russellville, Franklin County Times	15.00
Dec. 12, Sheffield Standard and Times	18.00
Dec. 9, Scottsboro, Jackson County Sentinel	12.00
Dec. 11, Tarrant, Alabama News Digest	37.50
Dec. 11, Tuscumbia, Colbert County Reporter	15.00
Total	291.60

[Sheets 2–9, 3 columns times 10 inches, on indicated dates]

Mississippi:

Dec. 8, Aberdeen Examiner	$12.60
Dec. 12, Ackerman, Choctaw Plain Dealer	10.50
Dec. 11, Amory News-Advertiser	14.70
Dec. 11, Ashland, Southern Advocate	9.00
Dec. 11, Batesville Panolian	9.00
Dec. 11, Booneville Banner	9.00
Dec. 11, Booneville Independent	10.50
Dec. 11, Calhoun City, Monitor-Herald	9.60
Dec. 11, Carthage, Carthaginian	10.50
Dec. 11, Charleston, Mississippi Sun	10.80
Dec. 12, Coffeeville Courier	10.50
Dec. 9, Columbus Spectator	13.50
Dec. 11, De Kalb, Kemper County Messenger	10.50
Dec. 11, Fulton News Beacon	12.60
Dec. 11, Holly Springs, South Reporter	12.60
Dec. 11, Houston Times-Post	10.50
Dec. 11, Iuka Vidette	12.00
Dec. 12, Louisville, Winston County Journal	10.50
Dec. 12, Macon Beacon	10.50
Dec. 11, New Albany Gazette	14.70
Dec. 11, Okolona Messenger	7.50
Dec. 11, Oxford Eagle	12.60
Dec. 12, Philadelphia, Neshoba Democrat	12.60
Dec. 11, Pontotoc Progress	12.60
Dec. 11, Ripley, Southern Sentinel	12.60
Dec. 12, Sardis, Southern Reporter	10.50
Dec. 11, Senatobia, Tate County Democrat	12.60
Dec. 12, Starkville News	12.60
Dec. 11, Water Valley, North Mississippi Herald	10.80
Total	328.50

[Sheet 2–10, miscellaneous expense]

Hand composition	$54.78
Machine composition	7.70
Pattern plates	39.05
Mats	77.80
Shipping supplies, mats	9.98
Wrapping expense, mats	5.46
Shipping charges, mats	38.90
Total	233.67

THE PURSE CO., ADVERTISING,
Chattanooga, Tenn., January 16, 1942.
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
In care of Mr. G. D. MUNGER,
409 Chattanooga Bank Building,
Chattanooga, Tenn.

Exhibit XIII

[Newspaper advertisement, "Our Country Is Relying on," 4 columns by 12 inches, on indicated date]

Tennessee: Dec. 4, Trenton Herald Register ---------- $15.75

Exhibit XVI

[Newspaper advertisement, "A Victory for National Defense," 3 columns by 10 inches, on indicated date]

Tennessee: Dec. 11, Trenton Herald Register ---------- $10.50

Total, $26.25.

NOTE.—These items not previously invoiced. Tear sheets finally obtained. Final billing on both advertisements.

THE PURSE CO.
H. O. HENRICKSEN.

Payments to newspapers

	Voucher No.	Amount	Exhibit
Copper City Advance	E-10-212	$10.00	XVII
Fannin County Times	F-11-757	8.41	XVIII
Total		18.41	

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, thousands, scores of thousands of dollars were spent for advertising in newspapers—ridiculous rot. Can you wonder that, in order to hold the reputation I believe I have as an honest man, I want to have these matters examined by a committee of the Congress before they are allowed?

I continue reading from the testimony:

Mr. CLAPP. We carried on some newspaper advertising in connection with the power-conservation and curtailment program, to acquaint consumers of electricity with the need for conserving power.

Senator MCKELLAR. Will you file all of those publications, and the cost of each, and in what papers they were published?

Mr. CLAPP. We would be glad to, Senator.

And here they are [exhibiting]. I have already placed them in the RECORD.

Then I asked him:

Do you know Mr. Fred Pasley?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know him.

Senator MCKELLAR. You never saw him?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not believe I ever did.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did you give out an interview to Mr. Pasley?

Mr. CLAPP. No; I did not, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. If Mr. Pasley quotes you as giving out an interview, he does not quote you?

Mr. CLAPP. I am sure that he does not quote me.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did you give out any such interview on this particular subject, the head of which I have just read?

Did you give out an interview to any other newspaper or publicity man?

Mr. CLAPP. No; I did not, sir. You may be referring to a statement——

Listen to this, Senators.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did he have an interview with Mr. William L. Sturdevant?

Mr. CLAPP. I believe he did.

Publicity department. Thousands of dollars of the people's money being paid for this kind of publicity.

Talking about the Douglas Dam, he said:

A one-man "filibuster" in the United States Senate threatens a vital phase of America's war effort against the Axis Powers.

So critical is the situation regarded by the White House that President Roosevelt called in MCKELLAR for a conference, along with Senate Majority Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky. Both the President and BARKLEY are understood to have made personal pleas to MCKELLAR to drop his fight. The Tennessean is said not only to have refused to do so but to have curtly informed the President that he would continue his battle until the Douglas Dam project is "wiped off the map."

Already the President has written letters to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees declaring in effect that Douglas Dam must be built or the Nation will face a shortage of aluminum production in 1943.

He said further:

Speaking for the Tennessee Valley Authority, William L. Sturdevant, assistant to General Manager Gordon Clapp—

Head of the publicity department, gave out this falsehood:

MCKELLAR has rolled the pork barrel over every one of our boys in the armed services of our country.

I denounced that when it was published; I denounce it here as an infamous falsehood. I denounced it before the committee in the same way.

Again, listen to this—this is the publicity department, spending scores of thousands of dollars in giving out this kind of falsehood and rot—

Not one of his pork-barrel substitutes can be completed in time to meet our immediate and crucial defense needs. May God have mercy on McKellar's soul when the fathers and mothers of the country begin to weigh the casualty lists.

Mr. President, again I denounce these statements as willful falsehoods. If there is any Member of this body who thinks I am the kind of man here depicted, he ought to move to expel me from this body. But I am not that kind of man. I am ready to meet the issue any time, anywhere; but it can be imagined that I do not want the Government to be paying for this sort of publicity in Tennessee.

Not only that, but they are doing all kinds of things down there, and also in the State of the Senator from Kentucky. They are buying other power companies there. They have no authority to buy those power companies. They want the receipts, and they have an arrangement by which no power on earth, neither the Congress nor any other power, can interfere with them. I am talking about Lilienthal, who is the head of the whole matter so far as these things are concerned. According to the newspapers, and I have not the slightest doubt of the truth of the statements—he is undertaking to buy up power companies in the State of Kentucky and add them to his dominion, which is now rapidly becoming the forty-ninth State in the Union, but not under the same conditions under which the other States were admitted into the Union.

Ah, Mr. President, I read from this article. This is the publicity department in full swing in my State!

MCKELLAR now menaces power deal. Five Kentucky cities affected by proposed change.

Buying up power companies!

When we bought up the power companies in Tennessee, we came before the Congress and asked Congress to buy those power companies; but since Lilienthal has become the Chairman of this Authority, he is not coming anywhere. He has two measures here which preclude anybody from examining into his affairs. He fixes his accounts beforehand, ratifies and confirms them beforehand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I have been referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCKELLAR AMENDMENT MENACES POWER DEAL—FIVE KENTUCKY CITIES AFFECTED BY PROPOSED CHANGE—WOULD TIE UP MONEY—LILIENTHAL INFORMS GOVERNOR THAT AUTHORITY MAY NOT HAVE FUNDS TO OPERATE PLANTS UNDER PROPOSAL

FRANKFORT, KY., May 2.—Governor Johnson has been advised that an amendment to a United States Senate bill which would direct Tennessee Valley Authority revenue to the Treasury rather than to Tennessee Valley Authority operating costs is menacing the power deal in which Tennessee Valley Authority seeks to aid five southwestern Kentucky cities in purchasing properties of the Kentucky-Tennessee Light & Power Co.

The Governor Friday made public a letter from David Lilienthal, Tennessee Valley Authority chairman, who charged that a "hamstringing and destructive" amendment to the Senate's independent offices appropriation bill would "make impossible" the transaction by which Hopkinsville, Bowling Green, Murray, Mayfield, and Russellville would take over Kentucky-Tennessee's distribution facilities for $2,600,000 and Tennessee Valley Authority the transmission and generating properties for $935,000.

M'KELLAR AMENDMENT

The amendment offered by Senator MCKELLAR (Democrat, Tennessee) would order Tennessee Valley Authority to deposit in the United States Treasury all revenue obtained from operating these plants instead of using the revenue to satisfy operating expenses.

"We would, therefore, have no money with which to operate the plants and the entire transaction would be impossible," Mr. Lilienthal wrote.

The Governor, praised warmly by Mr. Lilienthal for his recent pro-Tennessee Valley Authority views in the General Assembly, which passed a Tennessee Valley Authority enabling act for Kentucky, made no official comment on the situation, other than to make the letter public.

The Chairman said that if the transaction proceeded as previously anticipated the cities and three rural cooperatives, also figuring in the deal, would be supplied with power by Tennessee Valley Authority from the generating stations purchased by the Authority.

"HIGH COST" POWER

This would be "high cost" power, Mr. Lilienthal said, and until the Kentucky Dam is completed and interconnected with Tennes-

see Valley Authority's system, the wholesale and resale rates would not be Tennessee Valley Auhtority's standard ones.

However, he said, if Tennessee Valley Authority began to operate in southwestern Kentucky, a 20-percent reduction in rates for commercial and residential customers and a 10-percent reduction for industrial customers would be put into effect immediately. These rates probably would remain until the end of the war, he said, when they woud be reduced to Tennessee Valley Authority's standard.

Debate on the adoption of the McKellar amendment is expected to resume Monday in Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this man Lilienthal comes here and asks the Congress to do something for him that it is not doing for any other power activity in this land, and that is why the Committee on Appropriations have asked that this proposal be stricken out, and why I am here asking that it be stricken out.

Mr. President, noting that it is now 3 o'clock, when, in accordance with the agreement, we are to vote, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Herring	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bilbo	Holman	Rosier
Bone	Hughes	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brown	Kilgore	Smathers
Bulow	La Follette	Smith
Bunker	Lee	Spencer
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Wallgren
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	Norris	White
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Chair state the amendment upon which the Senate is about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 72, line 5, after the word "That", it is proposed by the committee to strike out "this appropriation and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1942', and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943', to remain available until June 30, 1943, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942': *Provided further*, That."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. McKELLAR asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. AUSTIN's name was called). The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on temporary service in Vermont. He is paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. If the senior Senator from Vermont were present he would vote "yea", and if the junior Senator from Ohio were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent. If present, he would vote "nay"

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family. If present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. LODGE), but he has very graciously on this vote released me from the pair. I, therefore, let my vote stand.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I understand that, if present, he would vote as I have voted. So, I am permitted to let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], if present, would vote "yea." He has a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Andrews	Herring	Reynolds
Bailey	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Spencer
Byrd	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McFarland	Taft
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Millikin	Tydings
George	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Gillette	Overton	Walsh
Glass	Radcliffe	White
Hayden	Reed	Willis

NAYS—38

Aiken	Doxey	Murdock
Ball	Ellender	Murray
Bankhead	Green	Norris
Barkley	Gurney	Nye
Bilbo	Hill	Pepper
Bone	Hughes	Rosier
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Bulow	La Follette	Shipstead
Bunker	Lee	Smathers
Butler	Lucas	Wagner
Caraway	McNary	Wallgren
Chandler	Maybank	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Mead	

NOT VOTING—16

Austin	Downey	Tobey
Barbour	Guffey	Truman
Bridges	Hatch	Tunnell
Burton	Langer	Wiley
Chavez	Lodge	
Davis	Thomas, Utah	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. The next amendment passed over was on page 71, line 23, after the word "periodicals" and the comma to strike out the word "purchase" and the comma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, no debate is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, line 25, after the word "elsewhere" and the comma, to insert "traveling expenses not to exceed $615,236."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not desire to be heard upon this amendment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order at the present time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No debate is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For what reason?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought all the committee amendments had been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the committee amendments are not as yet disposed of. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 71, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, line 4, after the word "field" and the comma, it is proposed to strike out "$136,100,000" and insert "$172,220,112."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That concludes the committee amendments. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, several days ago, as I understand, there was adopted an amendment, proposed by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], relating to the purchase of newspapers and periodicals by various agencies and departments of the Government. I had hoped it would be possible for me to get in touch with the Senator from Maryland to discuss the possibility of a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, but, due to his being occupied in one committee and I in another, I have not been able to confer with him, and I believe the time has passed for entering a motion to reconsider the vote. I am not complaining about that; but representation has been made to me by a member of the Federal Power Commission, Commissioner Manly, to the effect that, for the purpose of securing information as to the local rates on public utilities, especially gas and electricity, it is the present practice of that Commission to purchase newspapers published throughout the United States. Those rates are compiled for use in the work of the Commission, as well as in the work of other agencies, and are so utilized.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall yield in a moment. Furthermore, I am also advised that the Commission purchases a large number of so-called trade journals, which are not at all similar to ordinary magazines, but are specific journals which have to do with the power industry, the gas industry, and so on.

In order that there may be consideration in conference of the purchase of newspapers and periodicals which are purely for the purpose of helping a particular agency and others in the Government to carry on certain enforcement and regulatory work which the Congress has imposed upon them, I shall read a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to which I hope the conferees and the Senator from Maryland will give due consideration, because I feel quite certain that it was not the purpose of the Senator from Maryland in offering his amendment to prevent the purchase of periodicals and newspapers which may be used in connection with the discharge of official responsibility by the various agencies affected by the bill. My proposed substitute reads as follows:

> or to the purchase of newspapers exclusively used in the preparation of digests of information for official use or to purchase of technical, financial, and legal periodicals, or to trade journals and other periodicals relating specifically to the industry or industries subject to regulation by such independent agencies.

I feel quite certain that when the Senator comes to study the proposal he will find that it would not interfere at all with the purpose and objective of his amendment, and I hope the conferees will give it consideration.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I stated at the time the amendment was agreed to, there may be cases in which a blanket clause might work to the disadvantage of the Government. I do not believe that will be true in most cases, but where it is true, obviously an exception should be made. However, my recollection is that in the case of the Federal Power Commission it has either six or seven thousand dollars a year for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, and it seemed to me that some economy could be effected by this agency in that item.

So far as the rates are concerned, the Federal Power Commission can obtain information as to the rates of every public utility in the country, in my judgment, by writing to the public utility commission or similar agency in each State. However, if there is any case in which the purchase of newspapers or periodicals is essential to the efficient functioning of a governmental agency, I think the Senator's suggestion in some form or other should be adopted as to that particular agency; but, basically, I do not believe that would be necessary in many cases, if at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I happen to know something about some of the work which the Federal Power Commission has done in relation to the question of rates, and rather recently I sponsored a resolution which secured the publication of a public document relating to the varying costs to the consumer of natural gas in the United States. I hope the particular work of the Commission, about which I know something, is not to be prevented or hampered by the Senator's amendment. I wish again to say that I hope the conferees will give consideration to the proposal I have made. I think they will find, as I think the Senator from Maryland will find if he will study it, that it is drawn rather tightly in connection with the official use of the newspapers and periodicals for the purpose of regulation. Of course, we all know that responsibility has been fixed by law upon some of the agencies affected by the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and I have joined in sponsoring a proposed amendment which will appear in connection with the provision on page 74, line 9. I shall read the proposed amendment, and explain it, before formally offering it. The amendment is to come on page 74, line 9, after the word "statutes", where we proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That not less than the sum of $20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of tow boats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, and other fuels over the inland or coastal waters of the United States."

Reference to page 72 of the bill, insofar as it deals with the appropriation for the United States Maritime Commission, will reveal that we are appropriating $980,080,000 to increase the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The proposed amendment would earmark from that construction fund a sum of not less than $20,000,000 to be used for tow boats and barges in which to haul oil, gasoline, and other fuels over the inland waterways of the United States.

Merely to outline the situation, Mr. President, will prove sufficient, I believe, for our consideration of the amendment which we intend to offer. I read from the release of the Office of Price Administration under date of April 23, 1942, as to the rationing of gasoline alone, not to mention fuel oil, as to the following States: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. All these areas are directly affected by the rationing plan set up by the Office of Price Administration. In connection therewith Mr. Henderson said:

> The petroleum shortage in the East arises, not from a scarcity of crude or from refinery facilities, but from a lack of transportation means," Mr. Henderson said. "Normally more than 90 percent of the 1,500,000 barrels of petroleum products we consume daily in the East is brought in by tanker. Since the start of the war many tankers have been sunk by enemy submarine action, and sinkings continue. At the same time the Army and Navy, preparing for offensive action at the earliest possible moment, need every tanker that can be pressed into military service.
>
> There is also an ever-growing demand for petroleum products on the home front, and every gallon that comes into any area must be wisely used. Industries, thousands of which are located in the Eastern States, must have oil, or their production of war materials

will stop. Gasoline must be used to get workers employed in those factories to work, or war production again will be hampered. Then there are many other types of gasoline users—the doctor, the nurse, the commercial driver—who need gasoline to carry on activities regarded as essential to civilian efficiency under war economy.

Mr. President, the subject has been of most intimate concern to the Eastern States affected by the rationing order. Curiously there is an abundance of fuel so much needed in these States, bunker fuel oil, as well as gasoline required by defense workers for their own transportation. I have conferred with various Senators from the midcontinental oil-producing section, who tell me that there is such an enormous byproduct of the high octane gas being produced for aviation purposes, that gasoline actually will have to be destroyed in order to make room in storage places for the high-octane product, while the defense workers in the East in the 17 rationed States will be deprived of the very fuel they need to implement their obtaining transportation to and from their defense work. In New England alone, Mr. President, there are at this very minute at least 2,000 industries engaged in the war effort, employing hundreds of thousands of workers, who will be deprived of transportation facilities if they do not have gasoline with which to propel their automobiles. I have talked with Senators from the Midwestern sections, who tell me that the inland waterways system at the present moment serves more than 26 States, including the Great Lakes. It seems to me that the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Shipstead] and I have collaborated in preparing, will go a long way to meet the difficulties and alleviate the emergency.

Mr. President, if we rely upon the Gulf intracoastal canal, barges loaded at Corpus Christie, Tex., or at other shipping points of the midcontinental oil-producing States, can come all the way up the Mississippi, up the Cumberland River into Tennessee, up the Missouri River to Sioux City, up the Mississippi to the Twin Cities, up the Ohio River to Pittsburgh, and up the Illinois River to Chicago.

Mr. President, officials of the War Production Board tell me the pipe line at Pittsburgh, which at present is engaged in pumping oil and fuel westward, can be reversed, and the flow thus reversed can take the oil and the fuel provided, from Pittsburgh, and shunt it into the eastern territory in that fashion.

From the Illinois River, through the Great Lakes to Buffalo, down the Erie Canal and into the Hudson River, barge transportation will be available to carry the much-needed fuel, whether hard or soft coal, or fuel oil or gasoline, or in whatever form the fuel be shipped.

Mr. President, the regulated Inland Waterway Carriers' Association operating 162 tow lines on the Mississippi River and its tributaries alone operate anywhere from 600 to 700 barges at the present moment. There are hundreds of these barges available for transportation of fuel over the inland waterways. Steel barges particularly are readily susceptible of conversion by the simple process of sheathing their upper decks with a thin layer of steel. Wooden barges can be readily and promptly and expeditiously constructed to take their place for the hauling of the bulk cargoes now being carried by the steel barges.

On the coastal side, Mr. President, the inland waterway system all the way from Florida north is available. The President of the United States, as reported in the New York Times of April 8, said that he had been talking to various Government officials about reopening the old shipyards of Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts in which to build wooden vessels, barges of a type which would carry either bulk cargo or fuel oil, as the case may be, all up the eastern inland waterway system of the United States. The Chief Executive said that steel barges, as well as self-propelled concrete barges, would likely interfere with the war effort, but there was no reason why wooden barges could not be constructed.

Mr. President, since the supply of material is available, since workmen, carpenters, and others, at the shipbuilding yards on the inland-waterway system are numerous, and are looking for work, since there is no critical or strategic material involved in their construction, wooden barges can readily supplant steel barges, which in turn can be converted to fuel oil transportation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to know the precise meaning and implication of the language used in the proposed amendment—

Provided, That not less than $20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of—

And so forth. What does that mean? That is not a directive to proceed with the construction.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will have to answer the Senator in this way, that I turned to the bill which was prepared by the Committee on Appropriations, and I adapted its very language to this purpose. I will read from the bill, insofar as the Committee on Appropriations reported it to the Senate, and see if this will not answer the question of the Senator from Michigan. I read from page 72, line 24 of the bill, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission":

To increase the construction fund established by the "Merchant Marine Act, 1936," $980,080,000, of which not to exceed $9,956,734 shall be available for administrative expenses of the United States Maritime Commission, including—

Then there is a break-down of the uses for which that fund shall be available. Similarly, there is a break-down as to other items under each of the subheadings in the bill before us. Therefore, Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota and I sought to adapt to the needs that we envisioned, and for which we seek to provide, the very same language which is used throughout the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The net result is a permission rather than a mandate.

Mr. DANAHER. In exactly this sense, that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 itself constituted the directive for the construction of necessary shipping. All we do in the Independent Offices appropriation bill is to implement already-existing legislation containing directives for construction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the answer to my question is "yes," I can agree to the Senator's amendment. That is why I am trying to get him to say "yes."

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator from Connecticut can say "yes" with less evil consequences than finding agreement with the Senator from Michigan, I gladly say "yes."

Mr. President, I wish to be explicit with the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], I am informed, has taken the matter up with the Chairman of the Maritime Commission. I understand further that the Chairman of the Maritime Commission felt that the language which the Senator from Minnesota and I originally had in mind would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill for one thing and, second, might be construed to constitute a limitation on his already-existing power, and therefore we reframed the language to provide that not less than $20,000,000 should be earmarked for the purpose stated.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am wondering if the Senator is not in error in saying that the Chairman of the Maritime Commission considered it legislation upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. DANAHER. I believe I am in error, now that the Senator from Minnesota makes the suggestion. He said simply that he feared that the language we originally considered might constitute a limitation on the fund. That was it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct, and I thank him.

Mr. WHITE rose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maine, who is obviously eager to question me.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I wanted to say a word in my own time.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall not give the Senator the time for a few minutes, if he will pardon me.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Connecticut always makes a much better speech than I can make. I am myself in complete sympathy with the proposed amendment, and I think it would be the part of wisdom for me to remain silent and let the Senator do the talking.

Mr. DANAHER. I am, indeed, gratified at such additional evidence of support, Mr. President, and I shall proceed.

The New England Council selected a committee consisting of Mr. Howard Palmer, president, New Haven Railroad; Mr. I. L. Moore, president, New England Power Association; Mr. Richard L. Bowditch, president, C. H. Sprague & Son; and Mr. J. C. Richdale, vice president, Colonial Beacon Oil Co., who made a canvass of the needs in New England alone, not to mention the other States which are rationed under the O. P. A. order with reference to power supply and rail and water transportation service. Thereafter they sent a telegram to Mr. Harold L. Ickes, and it seems to me that bearing the name, as it does, of so important an individual to our war effort as that of Ralph E. Flanders, I should read the telegram into the RECORD. It is as follows:

Our executive committee has just completed review of New England's critical situation with respect to the fuel-oil supply so essential to our industries and utilities and has unanimously voted endorsement of the recommendation to you by the Petroleum War Council and the Petroleum Products Marketing Committee for the eastern seaboard that gasoline stations be closed from 7 p. m. to 7 a. m. weekdays and all day Sundays, thereby reducing gasoline consumption, releasing shipping space for fuel oil, and further saving of fuel through elimination of lighting. We are convinced that our situation in New England is so serious that no time should be lost in the exercise of your powers to establish this limitation of hours to continue until such time as New England's fuel-oil supply situation is improved. We also urge that priorities be established governing the sale of bunker fuel oil in this industrial area.

Thereafter, Mr. President, the Hartford Electric Light Co., in my State of Connecticut, which serves the United Aircraft Corporation, the Colt Patent Firearms Co., and many other leading industries now engaged in the war effort, converted from a fuel-oil basis to a coal basis; but it uses 25 carloads of coal a day, obviously placing an enormous strain over the coming winter months on transportation facilities by rail to keep that important power center supplied with fuel.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. A few moments ago the Senator spoke of Admiral Land's letter of May 1.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to put that letter into the RECORD at this point. As I understand, the Senator has met the suggestion in that letter by the addition of the words "not less than."

Mr. DANAHER. I hope I have met the point of the Maritime Commission chairman in that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator feels that inland boats should be built to help in the transportation of gasoline and other petroleum products.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator ask me if I think the construction of barges to transport fuel oil and other fuels would help the situation? Is that his question?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the question.

Mr. DANAHER. I certainly do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so, too. I think there is a good deal of merit in what the Senator says.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that Admiral Land's letter be printed at the conclusion of my remarks rather than at this point.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The inland waterway runs from Maine to Florida.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. It now has a mean depth of about 12 feet. It is capable of carrying all the cargo indicated by the Senator. So far as I know that tremendously expensive project is not being used.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that in that particular he is in agreement with the President of the United States. In order that the Senator from South Carolina may take renewed impetus in the view he expresses——

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not need any outside help. I simply wondered why we were not using our waterways.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me answer the Senator from South Carolina flatly. I do not know why they are not being used. I talked with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] the other day. He told me at very considerable length of the situation which he has personally observed in the inland waterways along the Atlantic coast. I shall be very happy to have him tell us of his own experience in that particular.

Answering the senior Senator from South Carolina specifically, I do not know why greater use has not been made of the inland waterways. I do know that there are harbors where there are little tugs tied up which could do the job of hauling barges to handle bulk freight on the inland waterways.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was attracted by the remarks being made by the able Senator. Let me say that in the past 2 or 3 days I have sat in a conference with representatives of the War Production Board, Mr. Joseph Eastman, and his representatives from the Office of Defense Transportation, representatives of the Petroleum Administrator, the Army, the Navy, and other agencies which have to do with transportation. They have been giving a great deal of study to the question of the use of the inland waterways. One, in particular, runs along the Atlantic coast from Trenton, N. J., down to Jacksonville and Miami, Fla.

They are also considering the question of the use of what is known as the cross-State canal in Florida, an existing waterway which runs from Stuart, on the east coast of Florida, where it intersects the inland waterway on the Atlantic seaboard, over through Lake Okeechobee to Fort Myers, Fla. Those agencies are considering the whole question as to whether they should build steel barges to use on those waterways, or whether they should build wooden barges, or what other type of transportation facilities they should provide. They say that the decision will depend upon what method will provide the most economical use of steel.

It must be remembered that if wooden barges are built and tugs are provided to haul those barges Diesel engines will be required in the tugs. I am inclined to believe that at a very early date some recommendation on the subject will come from the administrative agencies. I know that the subject has had serious consideration.

Undoubtedly the existing waterways ought to have been used long before. The same statement applies to the inland waterway which runs from Port Arthur, Tex., to Point St. Joe, Fla., on the Gulf coast. Part of the way it is 12 feet deep, and the remainder of the way, from Pensacola to Port St. Joe, it is 9 feet deep. Judge Mansfield, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the House, has introduced a bill contemplating the deepening of the inland waterway running from Port Arthur to Port St. Joe, and on down to the mouth of the Withlacoochie River, the western terminus of the proposed Atlantic-Gulf ship canal, known as the Florida ship canal, then to traverse the peninsula along the route of the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal with a barge canal, which would make possible continuous transit all the way from Port Arthur to Trenton, N. J.

Sometime ago I introduced a bill to put a pipe line across that same route, and also to traverse that area with a barge canal from 12 to 14 feet in depth. I am glad to hear the Senator manifest an interest in the subject. I think the administrative agencies will surely have something of a concrete nature to offer in a matter of days.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution. There is no criticism implicit in what I am about to say. However, I know that on April 7 the President said that plans were being made. He said that greater use of the inland waterway facilities had been discussed.

It is now May 6, and they are not yet being used. I know that the Regulated Water Carriers' Association submitted a plan to the Office for Emergency Management at least 5 months ago, and still, so far as I know, it is only being discussed. I am hoping that we can get some action on the whole situation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. For the information of the Senator, let me say the subject has been discussed for more than a year. After the Senator has concluded I intend to cover that ground.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

With reference to the matter of barges, the New York Times of April 8, 1942, has this to say:

Discussing plans for reopening shipyards in New England to build wooden barges, the President said that there were a good many older workers there who were good shipwrights and who would be available for barge building without interfering with labor-supply problems of other defense industries.

Mr. President, barges can be provided. There is not the slightest question about it. I have a partial list of at least 35 shipyards on the Mississippi and its tributaries alone, engaged or subject to being engaged, in the building of river boats and barges, whether of wood or steel.

Only today I received a letter from a gentleman who is not known to me, who tells me that the deveolpment of reinforced concrete since the last war has been as great as that of the automobile or the airplane. He says that concrete boats, barges, and tankers could now be turned out quickly, cheaply, and in quantities.

Mr. President, there can be no question that a supply of barges constructed of materials which would not interfere with the war effort can readily be procured.

The thought of the Senator from Minnesota and myself has been that we could lay the foundation for a quick conversion of existing steel barges and existing towboats to fuel transportation, in the hope that bulk cargo, such as pig iron, could thereafter be carried in wooden barges, which could readily be produced.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with all the Senator has said. For years the inland waterway system has been used for the transportation of pulpwood and other such materials. I think that every effort should be made to make a thorough investigation into the use of the inland waterways in order that the people of the country may receive petroleum products. Furthermore, according to newspaper reports in recent months, many vessels have been torpedoed and sunk off the Carolina coast south of Cape Hatteras. The inland waterway would be a safeguard against such attacks.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and that we shall go into such transportation fully, because I am sure it would mean much to the war effort. It certainly would not interfere with the war effort in the general shipbuilding plants.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I wish to state briefly by way of summation that it is our hope that with congressional notice taken, with congressional approval of this particular result which we so earnestly seek and in which all concur, there may be speedily worked out plans to the end that barge transportation may be made available to furnish fuel oil, gasoline, and similar products, coal, and all the associated and allied fuels to those smitten States upon which we depend so completely for adequate production for the war effort.

Mr. President, I want to thank the Senators who have so courteously cooperated with me in this presentation.

EXHIBIT A

MAY 1, 1942.

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR MCKELLAR RE PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TOWBOATS AND BARGES

The proposed amendment would make available from the construction fund of the Maritime Commission $20,000,000 for the construction of towboats and barges adapted for use in transportation of fuel oil over inland or coastal waters.

It appears that the Maritime Commission under existing law has general authority to construct for Government account inland craft of the type referred to.

In addition to being unnecessary, the amendment might be construed as a limitation and hamper any such program if it were adopted.

The determination as to requirements for domestic transport facilities to meet the needs of the war effort and the necessity for additional transport facilities and equipment for domestic transportation services is expressly placed in the Office of Defense Transportation (established by Executive Order No. 8989, December 18, 1941) for the purpose of assuring "maximum utilization of domestic transportation facilities for the successful prosecution of the war." Such domestic transportation as defined in the order includes "inland waterways, * * * and coastwise and intercoastal shipping."

The determination as to needs for further construction and the program for such construction under existing law is in the Office of Defense Transportation. If that Office determines that such a construction program is necessary, other Government agencies, including the Maritime Commission and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, have the authority and the funds to carry out the program.

The Maritime Commission, therefore, believes that the proposed amendment should not be adopted.

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the inadequacy of the rail transportation system to meet the threatened emergency in the transportation of petroleum products was called to our attention by Chairman Land of the Maritime Commission something like a year ago and by Secretary of the Interior Ickes, who had charge of the transportation of fuel oil. Admiral Land at that time appeared before the O. P. M. committee and suggested that instead of a pipe line requiring a great deal of steel it would be cheaper and much more expeditious to build barges to handle the oil on the inland waterways. As a matter of fact, no steel was allowed by the O. P. M. Priorities Division for that pipe line. I am told now that it would have taken 2 years to build it. I am also informed by the press that something like 1,400 miles of steel pipe line is to be dug up and relaid toward the Atlantic coast. This will take a great deal of time, and the emergency is presently upon us.

I am not sure that this amendment should not be so mandatory as to provide that not less than $20,000,000 shall be spent out of this fund, because we shall be faced again with the delay that has been experienced in the past by various agencies in this city which have had authority to do specific things. However, I am informed that this amendment will be mandatory as now worded. I do not mention this delay in criticism.

On the 18th of last December authority to work out this transportation system and to build barges was vested in the Defense Transportation Agency by Executive order under Joe Eastman. I spoke to Joe Eastman some time ago. He said he had been so taken up by railroad matters that he had not had time to give it much consideration. I have in my hand, however, a quotation attributed to Mr. Eastman, made by him in Chicago the other day, in which he said that assuming that all available barge equipment were in use now, 50,000 barrels of oil a day could be transported on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh. This article quotes him as making the following statement:

Study is being made to the practicability of converting steel barges now used for other purposes so they may be available for the movement of oil. It is possible that in some instances wooden barges, which could be quickly constructed, might be used as a substitute for dry cargo.

Steel barges, of course, require steel to build them, but barges can be built of wood; and if wooden barges are not suitable to carry oil or gasoline, they are suitable to carry dry cargoes. It is conceivable that wooden barges could release the hundreds of steel barges by operating on the inland waterways so that these steel barges can be converted into carriers of gasoline and oil.

I have here also a newspaper statement which quotes General Reybold, Chief of the Army Engineers, as saying:

If all the oil required to alleviate the east-coast shortages were to move in barges from the Gulf into coastal waterways, the resulting traffic would be well within the waterways' capacity.

But, he said:

The blunt truth is that we cannot use the waterways to capacity because there are not enough barges or towboats.

It is not only oil that needs to be transported; it is not only coal that needs to be transported. From very reliable sources I am informed that a very serious tie-up and a backwash of transportation on account of overloading of the railroads is to be expected at least not later than this fall.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Apropos of what the Senator just said, I wonder if the movers of the amendment would not consent to its modification so as to substitute for the word "fuels", in the next to the last line of the amendment, the word "commodities"? I make this suggestion because I am sure the Senator does not want the barges to be limited only to the transportation of fuels. I am sure the Senator wants them to be available for the transportation of other commodities as well as fuel.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is true.

Mr. PEPPER. As it is now under this amendment they would be limited only to fuel.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senators in charge of the amendment agree to the modification, for I believe it would make it very much better.

Mr. DANAHER. Rather than strike out any words, would it not be better to modify the amendment by adding the phrase "and other commodities"? This particular change would be preferable. I want the word "fuels" in there because I am considerably concerned about fuel

for the defense industries in the eastern States that are so seriously affected by the present situation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may I suggest this language to the able Senator: Strike out the word "and" in line 5 of the amendment, and after the word "fuels" insert "and other commodities"?

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should have no objection to the present suggested change, but, like the Senator from Connecticut, I should not want to see the word "fuels" stricken from this amendment.

It takes about 1,500,000 barrels of fuel oil to serve the Atlantic Coast States. This has been moving practically in its entirety by water commerce. My understanding is that with the disappearance of the tanker tonnage the railroads have been utterly unable to meet the requirements of my section. I believe the maximum service of the railroads up to this time—and it is having the diligent attention of the railroad authorities and governmental authorities—does not exceed 600,000 barrels a day, which is only a little over one-third of the requirements of the eastern seaboard.

Fuel oil to the Senator from Connecticut and to me is not a matter only of industrial activity, but fuel oil is a necessity of life in northern New England. I digress to say that I very much hope the Senator from Tennessee in charge of the bill will accept this amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the amendment is modified to include the phrase "and other commodities" would it not have the effect of increasing the cost of constructing the barges? In other words, could barges constructed primarily to carry oil be used to carry other commodities?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Anything can be carried in the barges. If it is desired to carry oil in them, oil is put in them. If it is desired to carry coal, coal is put in them. Anything can be put in them.

Mr. SMITH. I was speaking only of my knowledge of tank cars on the railroads. They are nothing but tanks.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know what other commodities could be carried in oil tanks.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him there?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. During the course of this discussion this afternoon the statement was made that blackstrap, a molasses product, could be transported in the same kind of equipment that is used for the transportation of oil. Blackstrap, of course, is not a fuel commodity but is a commodity from which industrial alcohol is made.

I had in mind another thing in making the suggestion as to the type of barges. If we limit the type of barge that can be made from this fund to the type suitable only for the transportation of fuel oil, the Commission would not under such restrictions be authorized to build the type of barge that could carry anything but fuel oil. I do not believe the Senator would want to limit the character of the barge only to tank type.

Mr. SMITH. The only object I have is to come to a realization of the realities of the situation. I believe it is time for us to wake up to the fact that we have got to accommodate the American people by every facility within our power to provide. Here are the waterways abandoned. The railroads say that their capacity will not allow them to transport the oil that is needed. The U-boats are destroying the ocean-going tankers. If we can utilize our waterways we should do so. What I am driving at is to get as quickly as possible, whether limited to gasoline or not, a maximum use of our waterways and the raising of the limitation just as soon as possible.

I do not know about the construction of concrete barges, but I do know that we built some concrete ships during the last war and that some of them are anchored right off the coast of my own State. It seems to me we ought to impress those in authority with the necessity of promptly furnishing these carriers.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will permit me, under the Lend-Lease Act, the Maritime Commission has constructed both wooden and concrete barges for foreign countries. I believe Admiral Land told me he had constructed concrete barges with a capacity of 6,000 tons.

So far as wooden barges are concerned, it is a very simple matter to build such a barge. On this photograph [exhibiting] is a tow of steel barges loaded with coal for the North States Power Plant in Minneapolis. Here [indicating] are two rows of 4 barges each side by side, the barges having 2,000 tons capacity apiece. So the 8 barges carry 16,000 tons of coal; and it takes a very large Lake freighter or even ocean freighter to carry 16,000 tons of coal. These particular barges are open. If they were filled with oil they would be covered, and when the barges are built they are made so that they can be covered.

A 1,500-ton barge 3 or 4 years ago would cost about $18,000, and a jumbo barge of 2,000 tons would have cost about $22,000. What would be the cost of steel barges now, I do not know, but they can be built of wood. I do not know from what State the coal comes but it goes up to the Northern States Power plant in Minneapolis.

The question has been asked why greater use is not made of the inland waterways. One reason is that, under the so-called Coal Commission law, the Commission has fixed prices on coal based on the cost at the mine plus transportation by rail. Consequently, under that condition, there is no saving by the use of the inland waterways to the consumer of coal unless, under the ruling of the Commission, a plant is at the water level, as the plant in Minneapolis happens to be. In that case it can get a special rate or a so-called water rate, but a plant which is not on a river bank must pay for the coal the price of the coal at the mine plus the rail rate.

Here [indicating on photograph] is a towboat which some years ago would cost about $250,000. It is propelled by a Diesel engine. Today it might cost a half million dollars. Diesel engines are difficult to get; but old shipping men tell me that a low-pressure engine, made mostly of cast iron, with a little steel for the boiler, while it cannot make a speed of 10 miles an hour with a load, as the towboat in the photograph can, will make 5 miles an hour, and, traveling 24 hours a day, will make 120 miles. If Diesel engines cannot be supplied because of priorities for defense, there are many machine shops up and down the rivers which can make low-pressure engines, which do not require the amount of steel and the various other kinds of metal that Diesel engines require.

I have consulted some of the old shipping men on the Mississippi who tell me that towboats with low-pressure engines can carry as much in a tow as those with Diesel engines, but cannot make the same speed.

I shall not detain the Senate longer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

Mr. PEPPER. I assume the Chair refers to the amendment as modified by the suggestion made a minute ago?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; the modification should be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 74, line 9, after the word "Statutes", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the sum of not less than $20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of towboats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, fuels, and other commodities over the inland or coastal waters of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not wish to conclude without saying that I have enjoyed the wholehearted cooperation of the Office of Defense Transportation in gathering and preparing material and data in connection with the amendment which has just been adopted, and I wish to have the RECORD indicate that fact.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not want it to be implied by anything I have said that the delay in this program has been due to any fault on the part of the Maritime Commission, or of Chairman Land, or on the part of Mr. Joseph Eastman, who assumed charge of the defense transportation program last December. Matters piled in on them and caused delay. I hope the adoption of the amendment will serve to speed relief in the transportation blockade that is in the offing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a letter which I have already called to the attention of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who offered the amendment the other day which was discussed awhile ago by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I have a letter from Mr. C. G. Abbot, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, in reference to the amendment adopted limiting the expenditures for newspapers and periodicals to $50. We all realize that the Smithsonian Institution is a scientific institution and to limit its power to purchase newspapers and periodicals to $50 would very greatly cripple it. The institution spends only about $1,500 or $2,000 for that purpose.

I shall not offer an amendment, and, in fact, could not do it without moving to reconsider—and I suppose that would not be in order in view of the time—but I ask that the letter from Mr. Abbot be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope the conferees will pay some attention to it when they come to write up the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not think there is any desire to strike out anything that is necessary, and, when the bill goes to conference, I am sure the matter will be straightened out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter referred to by the Senator from Kentucky will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, May 4, 1942.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Regent of the Smithsonian Institution,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: I notice that the Senate has adopted on May 1 an amendment proposed by Senator TYDINGS to the Independent Offices Appropriation Act limiting the expenditure for newspapers and periodicals from each appropriation to $50, where no specific limitation is already placed thereon in the act.

The Institution is not concerned in the matter of newspapers, but scientific and technical journals are absolutely indispensable in the work of our scientific staff, and we customarily expend annually for these necessary tools for our scientific workmen between $1,500 and $2,000.

I beg, therefore, to ask that the words "and the Smithsonian Institution" be added to section 6 of the act, after the words "Selective Service System," in order to exempt the Institution from the provisions of the section.

Very truly yours,
C. G. ABBOT, *Secretary.*

Mr. BARKLEY. Now, Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to another provision of this bill. It is not a Senate amendment but is a House provision on page 18, which reads as follows:

Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of Goodwin Watson.

I do not know Mr. Goodwin Watson; I never heard of him, as I recall, until this matter came up, and my attention was called to the provision of the bill. It seems to me that it is brutal and arbitrary to undertake to legislate a man out of office by providing that out of the appropriation he shall not be paid a salary. The appointment of men to public office is an executive function, not a legislative function, and the whole history of Congress, with one or two exceptions, indicates that it has frowned upon provisions of this kind which are, in fact, bills of attainder; that is what they amount to.

The Constitution of the United States says that Congress shall pass no bill of attainder. A bill of attainder is an effort by legislation to punish a man without a trial. Whenever such a question has come before the Supreme Court of the United States, as it has a time or two, it has taken adverse action.

Following the Civil War, when passions were aroused, Congress passed a law denying to any lawyer who had taken up arms against the Union in the Civil War the right to practice law before the Supreme Court. Alexander H. Garland went before the Supreme Court in a case of that sort, and the Supreme Court rejected the law and declared it to be, in effect, a bill of attainder.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to say to the Senator that in Missouri, in the unhappy days of the Civil War, a law was passed making it a crime for anybody to practice law or medicine or to preach or perform any professional function or to vote who not only had borne arms against the Union, but who had sympathized with anybody who had borne arms against the Union. When Gen. Frank T. Blair, the man who had saved the State of Missouri to the Union, came up and demanded to vote he was refused the right to vote, although he had served 4 years in the Army, because he refused to state that he did not sympathize with his friends and kinsfolk on the other side.

A priest in my home county was put in jail for administering, without taking the required oath, extreme unction to a dying parishioner. The case went up to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was a very celebrated case, coming from my home county, and the law was declared to be unconstitutional.

I agree very thoroughly with what the Senator from Kentucky is saying about the practice of undertaking to exclude a man from holding office by a limitation in an appropriation bill. I think it is a disgraceful practice. I never heard of this man in my life until I got a letter from him the other day calling attention to his case; I do not know anything about him now; but I think it is a disgraceful practice, and I refuse to endorse it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I might also call the attention of the Senator to another case from Missouri, of a Baptist preacher by the name of Cummins, who was denied the right to vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was the case to which I referred, of Father Cummins living in my home county.

Mr. BARKLEY. My information is gleaned from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which that case was referred to by Hon. Henry St. George Tucker, who called him a Baptist preacher.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Henry St. George Tucker was a very distinguished lawyer, but he was mistaken about that. The incident had to do with Father Cummins, the priest to whom I referred as having been put in jail for having administered extreme unction to a dying parishioner.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was the same case. Not only is it disgraceful, but, in my judgment, to include in an appropriation bill a provision that a Government employee cannot be paid his salary is a cowardly way in which to deal with him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it not a bill of attainder, which is expressly prohibited by the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggested, in effect, that that is what it is.

Mr. HILL. If we can take one man's right away from him by a certain procedure, why cannot we take the rights of others away by the same method?

Mr. BARKLEY. I could cite a number of cases where the House of Representatives have undertaken to deny the right of a man to hold an executive position by taking his pay away from him, in an effort to perform an executive function by firing a man by a legislative bill of attainder; but until this was done in this particular bill, the House of Representatives has almost uniformly frowned upon that practice, and has defeated the efforts when they were made.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROSIER. I happen to have some personal acquaintance with Dr. Watson, who has been a member of the faculty of Columbia University for a good many years. I have frequently met him in educational conventions. On a number of occasions I have heard him deliver educational addresses. His character and his ability have been vouched for by probably thirty or forty of his colleagues. The only fault he seems to have had in the past has been that he has been a little outspoken on some questions affecting the welfare of this country. Certain people have been offended by what he has said in some of his statements. But his colleagues, and others who know him, have no question about his character or about his ability.

It should be understood here today that the question of freedom of speech, of academic freedom, is involved in this matter. Here a distinguished man, a man who holds a doctor's degree, who is highly esteemed and respected by his colleagues in a great university, is picked out for this sort of punishment. It is an outrage on the freedom of speech, on academic freedom, and on the freedom of thought in this country, and it should not be tolerated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator read Mr. Watson's writings as quoted in the hearings? It is perfectly clear, if one reads them, that he believes the Russian system to be superior to the American system. There is no question about that.

I, personally, do not think any man should be legislated out of office, but as to this man's Communist sympathies, as to his complete opposition to our system of government, I do not think there can be the slightest question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not read Dr. Watson's book. In the hearings some excerpts from it were quoted by the Senator from Tennessee, who asked Mr. Fly, Chairman of the Communications Commission, about it. This man is employed in the Federal Communications Commission. He did not seek the job. He was sought to do a special work under the Communications Commission, and was brought to Washington. He is not an ordinary job seeker. He had a distinguished position as an educator in Columbia University, and he was brought here to do a special job. Mr. Fly, testifying before the Commission, said he was doing that job in a loyal and efficient way, and he protested against this provision in the bill as it passed the House.

The Senator from Tennessee quoted some excerpts from a book written by Dr. Watson in which he was quoting someone else, apparently, by the name of Ward. He was writing a book upon capitalism, and drawing some distinctions, and commenting upon the efforts to adjust and work out the problems of capital and labor, and in his treatise on that subject he quoted other people. It is my understanding he did not quote them with approval, but quoted them as citations on the problem which was being treated by him in the book.

Mr. President, I have a letter here from Mr. Watson, which I shall ask to have the clerk read in a moment in order that the Senate may have the benefit of his own expressions on the subject. It is the only communication I have had in regard to the matter. I never paid any attention to this before. I never heard of Mr. Watson. I suppose that classifies me as an ignorant man, but I do not know all the professors at Columbia University, and I have not read their books. However, I think I am familiar with the fact that in the war in which we are engaged we are spending untold billions of dollars, and raising an army of five or six or seven million men, and perhaps, before it is over, 10,000,000, to fight to preserve the right of free speech in this country, the right of men to think, and to express their thoughts. So far as I have been able to find in the testimony or in any of the writings of Dr. Watson, he has never said anything which indicates that he prefers the Russian system to the American system. That does not mean that he might not have found some things in Russia which were to be commended. I visited Russia in 1930, and I found some things in Russia which I commended, and I did it publicly when I returned. That did not mean I favored the Russian system, or that I believed in communism, but I did find some practical results there which were being brought about by organization and industrialization, which had elevated the condition of the Russian people above that in which they were in the days of the Czar. I think what is happening now on the eastern front is a tribute to some of the improvements the Russian Government has made among the Russian people, because they are doing an outstanding job in beating Hitler, and I pray to Almighty God that they will keep on until they have driven him back into Germany, and into the North Sea; and, as a Senator sitting near me suggests, into hell.

The provision we are considering is not a Senate committee provision, it is a House provision, adopted by the House, which has time and again refused to do any such thing. One of the ablest speeches ever made against an amendment of that sort was made by Henry St. George Tucker, one of the great constitutional lawyers of the United States, as the Senator from Missouri will testify, who was a stickler for the Constitution. He interpreted such an attempt, in language which I think no one could misunderstand, as a bill of attainder. It is simply a legislative effort to punish a man without giving him a trial.

No one has charged this man with committing crime; no one has undertaken to say that he is advocating the overthrow of our Government by force, or that he prefers any other system of government to ours in his intellectual distinctions and discriminations. It is manifestly unjust to say that because we do not agree with him in some views he has expressed, based upon the writings of other people, and upon his own investigation, we should single him out and say, "You cannot hold a job under the United States." It is not the function of Congress to appoint men or dismiss them, but we are asked to exercise an executive function by providing that out of all the thousands of Government employees, here is a man we are going to dismiss, and we are asked to dismiss him by providing that he cannot draw his pay. The Chairman of the Commission under which he works testifies in behalf of this man.

I ask that the clerk read the letter which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Would you be willing to oppose on the Senate floor a measure, smacking of a bill of attainder, which, if enacted, might be ruinous to the reputation of a 100-percent loyal American citizen, might dishearten liberals, and shake faith in our Congress?

A rider on the independent offices appropriation bill, now before the Senate, excludes me by name from employment. I sought no job in Washington but came here, before Pearl Harbor, in response to urgent requests that I contribute my experience in social psychology and in foreign affairs to the analysis of foreign broadcasts. I was born in Wisconsin, from 10 generations of American ancestry; I enlisted in the Navy in 1918; I was ordained a minister in the Methodist Church, worked for the national council of the Young Men's Christian Association, and for the past 18 years have served acceptably on the staff of Columbia University. I have never been a Communist or a fellow traveler; my economic views accord with the New Deal; I publicly supported our participation in this war while Communists still pretended pacifism. More than a hundred leaders of my profession—psychologists and educators—on their own initiative, sent letters, telegrams, or petitions of support. I understand that the Federal Bureau of Investigation report on me was favorable, and that the Senate subcommittee, which granted me a hearing, voted to remove the rider. In my 5 months' leadership of the Analysis Division of the Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service, our work has been built up to a point where it receives many expressions of appreciation from other Government agencies.

One might suppose, as I did, that a clean record of high American ideals and public service, the full support of my profession, a desire to be of service to my country, and a good job done on the present assignment would suffice to clear my name. I am told, and you can judge the truth of this better than I, that the continuing attack is aimed less at me than at Chairman James L. Fly, for quite other reasons. Surely you will want to oppose an action which would stoop to unwarranted attacks on any person for ulterior political advantage.

Please don't let this go by default.

Yours respectfully,
GOODWIN WATSON,
Chief Analyst, Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service, Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely want to say a final word. I am wondering whether our institutions are in such great danger of being undermined and toppled over that 130,000,000 men are afraid of 1 little man in the Communications Commission; are afraid that if he is permitted to go ahead and work and draw his salary the foundations of our Republic will be undermined and corroded. It seems to me to be unthinkable that the Congress of the United States would be so afraid of 1 man in a Government department because of something he wrote, in which he largely quoted other people, that we would be willing to retain a provision such as this in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I move that the provision be stricken from the bill, and I hope the motion will be agreed to.

RUSSIA'S PART IN THE WAR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is the appropriate time for me to deliver a few remarks which I had contemplated making earlier in the day upon the Russian situation, and in view of what the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said about what the brave and heroic people of Russia have done in this great world crisis, I shall take the time of the Senate to make a brief statement. I regret to take the time of the Senate, but we have been fooling around with the T. V. A. portion of the bill for 4 or 5 days, and I believe that perhaps the Senate can stand 15 or 20 minutes more upon this question.

Mr. President, one of the most encouraging reports to come out of this war was made by Premier Josef Stalin in his May day pledge to the Russian people and the world.

In that address there were many things that should give aid and comfort to the United Nations. Stalin was grateful for and satisfied with the increasing assistance given to his country by the United States and Great Britain under

the Lend-Lease Act and other legislative measures.

Aside from the stand made by the brave defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, the bombing of Tokyo, and Hitler's speech of April 26, I can think of nothing that has occurred since December 7 that has done more to lift my morale to the extent that I intuitively feel the ultimate and certain destruction of the Axis Powers.

In that speech Premier Josef Stalin also pledged that Russia has no territorial ambitions upon foreign countries, and declared that the Soviet's sole aim is to liberate its lands from the German Nazi blackguards.

Mr. President, Josef Stalin is a man of few words. Primarily, he is a man of action and deeds, and when he says that Russia must smash the German Nazi Army to the last man, if they do not surrender, who is there to question the statement other than Hitler himself, in view of the fact that the Russians have been more than successful in protecting their country from Nazi domination. I care not what any individual may think of the Government of Russia and the so-called despotism of her leaders. I confess that I have criticized the spreading of communistic doctrines in this country in the past, but I know of no instance in the history of the world which demonstrates the tie of nationalism more strongly that the heroic stand of Russia at this hour.

This heroism displayed by the Russian people was the answer to the wild speech made by Hitler on June 22, 1941, when he said:

> We are neither Englishmen nor Jews. The task is to safeguard Europe and thus save all. I have, therefore, today decided to give the fate of the German people and the Reich and of Europe again into the hands of our soldiers.

The Nazi propagandist described this war to the world as a war of Christianity against the Russian barbarians, but these Nazi pagans fooled no one except themselves. Millions of German soldiers marched to the Russian front under the hypocritical doctrine of the Nazi leaders that they were waging a holy war, but the democracies of the world had long before passed judgment upon the lying and hypocritical Hitler. They answered the charge by allying themselves with Russia. They delivered hundreds of planes, tanks, guns, and other munitions of war to aid the Soviet Union in its death struggle.

On October 3, 1941, Hitler returned to Berlin and declared to a seething, cheering mob, "Russia is broken and will never rise again." Time went on, and Russia continued to resist, even though she was compelled to retreat hundreds of miles into her own territory. General Winter stepped in and aided these brave people in their all-out fight against this monster and his fanatical followers.

The fact that any nation can take what Russia did in the early history of her struggle with Germany, and then counterattack during the winter months with such reckless courage and success, demonstrates beyond question that the people of Russia are more solidly united today under the rule of Josef Stalin than the people of Germany are united under the terroristic and awful rule of Adolf Hitler.

The love for country and the deep sense of nationalism was best demonstrated by the scorched-earth policy. In order that they might win and still remain on Russian soil, they destroyed everything as they retreated. It was a policy that some other nations had neither the wisdom nor the courage to follow.

Mr. President, America has faith and confidence in Gen. Douglas MacArthur, proclaimed by many as the outstanding military general of this war. Listen to what he had to say in an anniversary greeting to the Red Army on the occasion of its twenty-fourth birthday, February 23, 1942:

> The world situation at the present time indicates that the hopes of civilization rest on the worthy shoulders of the courageous Russian Army. During my lifetime I have participated in a number of wars, and witnessed others, as well as studying in great detail the campaigns of outstanding leaders of the past. In none have I observed such effective resistance to the heaviest blows of a hitherto undefeated enemy, followed by a smashing counterattack which is driving the enemy back to his own land. The scale and grandeur of this effort marks it as the greatest military achievement of all history!

Who is there to question the statement of MacArthur, when he says that the Russian counteroffensive is the greatest military achievement of all history?

It was a mighty struggle. Moscow for a while seemed to be doomed. In view of the sincere recognition that Stalin, in his May Day address, gave America for her help under the Lend-Lease Act, who is there to say that the supplies and materials and implements of war that we furnished Russia may not have been one of the primary factors that saved Russia from defeat in her darkest hour?

Now that the Nazi machine has been slowed down and driven back, the United Nations must see that a never-ending supply of planes, guns, tanks, and manpower finds its way into Russia to meet the next offensive, which the desperate Mr. Hitler must make to keep his head upon his murderous shoulders. The effort to place the totalitarian grip upon the world by Germany, Italy, and Japan must be broken on the Russian front.

Mr. President, there was a time in this country when it was argued rather vociferously by many honest and sincere persons that all the United States had to do was prepare in the defense of its own land and shores. It has been frequently said that the United States of America could defend itself from the world, but, Mr. President, I undertake to say that in view of the modern mechanized weapons which are now being used to kill and destroy, there is no single country that could withstand the military onslaughts of the rest of the world.

I shudder even to think of what might have happened to this glorious Republic had the nonaggression treaty between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dated August 23, 1939, been carried into force and effect. I do not believe that this agreement has ever been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I am going to read it as a matter of information to the Senate and the country. It is as follows:

MUTUAL GUARANTEES

NONAGGRESSION TREATY BETWEEN GERMANY AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

According to a telegram dated August 24, 1939, from the American Embassy at Berlin, a Nonaggression Treaty Between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was signed at Moscow on August 23, 1939, a translation of which reads as follows:

"The Governments of the German Reich and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics directed by the wish to strengthen the cause of peace between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and proceeding upon the basic provisions of the treaty of neutrality concluded between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in April 1926 have reached the following agreement:

"Article I

"The two contracting parties undertake to refrain from any act of violence, any aggressive action or any attack against one another whether individually or jointly with other powers.

"Article II

"In case one of the contracting parties should become the object of war-like acts on the part of a third power the other contracting party will not support that third power in any form.

"Article III

"The Governments of the two contracting parties will in future remain in contact with each other through continuous consultations in order to inform each other concerning questions affecting their mutual interests.

"Article IV

"Neither of the two contracting parties will participate in any grouping of powers which is indirectly or directly aimed against the other party.

"Article V

"Should disputes or conflicts arise between the contracting parties regarding questions of any kind whatsoever, the two parties would clear away these disputes or conflicts solely by means of friendly exchanges of views or if necessary, by arbitration commissions.

"Article VI

"The present treaty is concluded for a period of ten years with the provision that unless one of the contracting parties denounces it one year before the end of this period the duration of the validity of this treaty is to be regarded as automatically prolonged for another five years.

"Article VII

"The present treaty is to be ratified within the shortest possible time. The documents of ratification are to be exchanged in Berlin. The treaty becomes effective immediately upon signature.

"Drawn up in duplicate texts in the German and Russian languages.

"Moscow, August 23, 1939.

"RIBBENTROP
"MOLOTOV"

I reread article IV, which says—

> Neither of the two contracting parties will participate in any grouping of powers which is indirectly or directly aimed against the other party.

Ah, Mr. President, had this part of the nonaggression pact been carried out in good faith, the security and safety of America at this hour might be much more seriously threatened. Senators will remember that within less than a month after the signing of this pact, Germany attacked Poland and immediately thereafter became at war with England and

France. Germany could, with her distorted type of logic, argue that England and France and Poland were a grouping of powers aimed against Germany, and that therefore Russia was bound under the treaty to remain neutral. That is exactly what Russia did until she was treacherously and savagely challenged by the despicable and lying Hitler on the 22d day of June 1941.

Mr. President, with Russia, Germany, and Japan fighting together, is there anyone who will seriously question at this hour in world events what would happen to England, her Army, and her fleet; is there anyone who at this late hour would believe that the United States of America was not marked upon the totalitarian schedule for ultimate extinction? Hitler said in his Mein Kampf that—

> An alliance whose aim does not comprise a plan for war is senseless and worthless. One makes alliances only for fighting.

It is apparent that under the Hitler philosophy this agreement was made at a time when Germany knew she was going to war on Poland, because under article II it was jointly agreed that—

> In case one contracting party should become the object of warlike acts on the part of a third power, the other contracting party will not support that third power in any form.

In other words, Hitler, through treacherous diplomacy, was merely putting off the day when he would attack Russia. Mr. President, it is fortunate for the world that prior to this World War there was no comity of purpose, understanding, or mutual friendship between these two great nations. Anyone who knew the history of Russia and Germany must have realized the impossibility of carrying out a pact of that character; and yet at the moment it was made, there was no binding tie of friendship between Russia and England, Russia and France, or Russia and Japan. Russia was persona non grata in England, Japan, and France, just as she was in Germany. We had a right to believe that she might have been tied up with Germany as she is today tied up with England.

Hon. Joseph Davies, former Ambassador to Russia, writing in his book entitled "Mission to Moscow," said in a letter to President Roosevelt, dated January 18, 1939:

> The leaders of the Soviet Government have stated to me that there is only one government in the world that they trust, and that is the United States Government under your leadership.

Davies further said that—

> In the event of so dire a calamity as an international conflict between the totalitarian and the democratic states, the Soviet Government is, in my opinion, a much more powerful factor than the reactionaries of Europe concede and might be of the greatest value.

That was a prophetic utterance. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to Joe Davies for the fine work he has done in this country on behalf of Russia and her people in this crisis. I have talked with him many times about the foreign situation. He is one of the very few men who believed that Russia would hold.

I also talked with some of the high-ranking officers in the Army, who felt that Russia would not last more than 3 months under the onslaught of the German machine. Joe Davies, having been Ambassador to Russia, and having had the opportunity to study what she had, told me more than once that in his opinion Russia would hold the German horde in check. Davies, like the President of the United States, has accurately visualized what the future held for the world.

Mr. President, thank God the alliance between Russia and Germany was ineffectual and worthless. It was made only to serve Hitler's momentary demands. It seems to me that Russia could not have believed that Hitler was sincere, if the Russian leaders were familiar with Mein Kampf. In that book, Hitler says that:

> Russia is composed of bloodstained criminals, the scum of humanity; that the rulers belong to a nation which combines a rare mixture of bestial horror with an inconceivable gift of lying.

He further said that the Russian leaders are not the advocates of honor and truthfulness, but the advocates of lying, deceit, theft, rapine, and plundering. He further said:

> If anybody thinks of going into treaty ties with parasites, this resembles a tree's efforts to conclude to its own advantage an agreement with a mistletoe.

Mr. President, the world knows at this hour that Adolf Hitler is the embodiment of all the vicious characteristics he attributed to the Russian leaders. Hitler has lied, deceived, stolen, raped, and plundered. He has brought more misery and suffering to civilization than has any other single man in all history.

Mr. President, the speech made by Stalin is exceedingly hopeful, but let no American take it for granted that the war is won. In my opinion America is still in danger. Let nothing that Stalin said in any way reduce our war effort. In fact, what he said should be a reminder to every American that the more we can do in 1942 the sooner we shall destroy the slave owners and slave drivers of the totalitarian regime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] wishes to discuss this amendment briefly. Before he takes the floor I wish merely to emphasize one point which I probably overlooked awhile ago.

My action in seeking to strike out this language is not in any way to be interpreted as an approval of the views expressed by Dr. Watson, or of his original appointment to the position which he now holds. I think it should be said that Senators who will vote against this provision are in the same attitude. They do not thereby endorse his views or his original appointment. A matter of principle is involved as to legislative propriety, and the justice to which an American is entitled at the hands of the legislative branch of the Government. In his letter he states that he is an American by 10 generations of inheritance. It seems to me that this proposal is so preposterous that it ought to be unanimously eliminated from the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is there not on the statute books general legislation which prohibits the payment of any money appropriated by Congress to any person who advocates the overthrow of our Government by violence, or to any person who is a Communist? Is not that the proper way to approach such a question, instead of passing a bill of attainder, as we should be doing if we should allow this language to remain in the bill?

I am happy this afternoon to see the democratic leader of the Senate rise and offer an amendment to strike this language. We have neither the facilities nor the time to try individual cases in Congress. Why should we spend billions of dollars and millions of American lives in preserving and perpetuating our form of government, and at the same time disregard the provisions of the Constitution in the Halls of Congress?

I hope that in the consideration of this question, Senators will not have to go to Russia and determine whether that Government is good or bad. I hope that we need look to nothing except the Constitution of the United States. We do not have to endorse anything that Goodwin Watson has said. We do not have to endorse his appointment. All we have to do is to adhere to the Constitution of the United States. When we do so, we know that to include such language in this bill is in direct conflict with it, and a violation of it.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment, not because it believes in Goodwin Watson or anything he has said, but because it believes in the Constitution of the United States, which absolutely prohibits the passage by Congress of bills of attainder, or anything that smacks of a bill of attainder.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. It is true that we have enacted legislation denying the use of appropriations by Congress for the payment of compensation for services rendered the United States to any person who believes in or advocates the overthrow of this Government by force or violence. We have included the word Communist in our prohibition. So it is for the executive departments to administer the prohibition which we have placed in our law.

This provision does not accuse Watson of anything. It simply says that he shall not be paid. It does not say that he advocates the overthrow of the Government by force. It does not say that he is a Communist. I dare say that the majority of the Members of the Senate, with the exception of the members of the subcommittee who heard him testify the other day, do not know him. I have never seen him. The subcommittee which granted him a hearing rejected this language. Evidently the majority of the subcommittee were impressed with his statement. But when the bill came before the full committee, notwithstanding the rejection of the language by the

subcommittee, the full committee restored it.

While I am on my feet I wish to call attention to another matter which originated in the Congress.

The American Bar Association is not a Communist organization. It is not made up of "fellow travelers." It is not in sympathy with any such policy or principle. It went on record in a published report against legislation of this sort. The House of Representatives had passed a bill naming Harry Bridges, and deporting him by act of Congress. The bill came to the Senate and was sent to the Committee on Immigration. The committee amended it so as to provide for an investigation. The bill was never passed; but while it was pending the American Bar Association made this statement, which is contained in its reports:

> A bill was recently passed by the House of Representatives calling for the deportation by name of a particular alien, Harry Bridges. We express no view as to whether this man should be deported—

And we express no view here as to whether this man, Watson, should have been employed or whether he should be continued in the employment of the Government. The American Bar Association said:

> We express no view as to whether this man should be deported. But on the question of procedure the bill in question, whether or not constitutional, seems plainly contrary to the spirit of our institutions. He, like any other alien, should have a hearing under a general law applicable to all under similar circumstances. We understand that the bill at present is not being pressed by the Senate, but that a new investigation is being made as to his deportability under the general terms of the amended Immigration Act. This course is proper, whereas the other would be contrary to the American constitutional system, at least in spirit if not in letter.

That is the language of the American Bar Association on a constitutional privilege involving the deportation of an alien. If the American Bar Association, made up of lawyers, for the most part conservative lawyers, takes that position with respect to a congressional act naming some man to be deported by act of Congress, certainly we ought not to violate that principle which they properly lay down in determining whether we should by legislative act dismiss a man and thereby violate the Constitution in passing what amounts to a bill of attainder.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Every Senator knows Representative SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, and what his attitude is about communism and every other "ism" except Americanism. If every Senator would get the classic speech which was delivered by SAM HOBBS in the House of Representatives against the Bridges bill he could not help being convinced that when we single out individuals, as was done in that case, and as is done by this language, we violate the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree entirely with that position. If this principle were to be included as a part of our legislative policy, it would be necessary only to get a sufficient number of votes to add a proviso, in the appropriation for the payment of our judiciary, that the Chief Justice of the United States should not be paid out of the appropriation, if a majority of the Members of the House and Senate disagreed with some opinions he might have rendered as Chief Justice, or the way in which he presides over the Supreme Court. We might legislate him out of office merely by refusing to pay him. It seems to me that the ramifications, implications, and possibilities of this sort of legislation ought not to be encouraged.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. One of the fundamental principles, I may say as a matter of interest, which prevailed in the old Colony of Connecticut and later the State of Connecticut down through these hundred and more years is to be found in its original resolution adopted after the Declaration of Independence became known. The general court of Connecticut said this, and it is so real in its application, so apropos, that I call it to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky:

> No man shall be deprived of his honor or of his good name except by due process of law.

In these days when we find the characters of citizens being assassinated in the press, when we find people being denied rights by specific mention in legislation without even the imputation of the grounds upon which they are mentioned in the proposed legislation, it is indeed high time, it seems to me, that the Congress of the United States take note of the sort of thing that is going on.

If we can properly justify the particular language that appears here and against which the Senator from Kentucky inveighs, I respectfully submit it is open to amendment, and we can add a few other names if we like. I have a list of my own, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may be able to supplement the Senator's list.

Mr. DANAHER. I have not any doubt we could agree on many.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as Connecticut preceded Kentucky into the Union by only a day or two, it would not be inappropriate in this situation for the Senator from Kentucky to add to the list the Senator from Connecticut might furnish, the names of all persons against whom we might desire to wreak some vengeance and provide that they shall not be paid their salaries if they happen to be employees of the Government, or that they shall not be employed by the Government, and if employed that they shall not be paid.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me add further with the forbearance of the Senator from Kentucky——

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not forbearance, I assure the Senator; it is the Senator's pleasure.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The executive departments are not to be denied a sense of responsibility, Mr. President, in employing persons who are justly subject to criticism, but they can and do create a standard.

In case it has been overlooked in the course of the colloquy I invite the Senator's attention to page 81 of the pending bill where in section 4 it is expressly provided:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States, by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

There are other provisions, Mr. President, making a violation a felony and winding up with the following:

> The above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Kentucky in the pending amendment.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, under the circumstances, to refer again to this provision, any man who is charged with being a violator of this provision is given an opportunity to defend himself; and his own affidavit denying the charge is sufficient to exculpate him from the implication that might result in his dismissal or his failure to obtain a position.

Mr. DANAHER. But he could be held to trial for perjury.

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely, that is true, but in this case no such opportunity of exculpation is given, because there is no charge made, there is no implication; he would not know how to make an affidavit under this provision to exculpate himself from any charge or any rumor as to his belief.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. There would be no person whose honor, whose good name, whose property, whose rights, whose liberty would be safe if we were to adopt this policy and put in appropriation bills provisions which run absolutely contrary to the very fundamental principle which safeguards and protects the rights of all American citizens.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is against the honor, the good name, the integrity of the man that this provision is directed. If it is retained in the law, it is a part of the permanent archives of the Government of the United States and throughout the future years not only does it follow him, but it follows his children. Without designating any cause, any complaint, any crime, even any charge, Congress has said that this man, by name, cannot be employed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Without any trial or day in court, without any due process of law.

If we can do this to one man, we can do it to another. We could easily wipe out all the rights of the American people.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I had occasion to read the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives, and I found no reference in those hearings to the fact that Mr. Watson was ever called before the subcommittee to testify. Action was taken against him on hearsay evidence and on the evidence of Mr. Fly. I am wondering whether this gentleman was called at any time before any committee, either of the House or of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee heard first Mr. Fly, Chairman of the Commission in which Mr. Watson is employed. Mr. Fly gave Mr. Watson a very explicit endorsement, but he stated he did not endorse the things that had been said in his book which seems to be the basis of complaint. He also set out the fact that the quotation was not from Watson himself but was a quotation from a book by a man named Ward which in turn was quoted by Watson. Following Mr. Fly, the Chairman of the Commission, the subcommittee heard Mr. Watson who made an extended statement in the record which appears in the hearings. The subcommittee after hearing these gentlemen struck out this provision of the bill. The bill went to the full committee with the provision eliminated, but the full committee restored it, I believe without any further testimony on the part of Fly, Watson, or anyone else.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senate has obtained a very erroneous opinion of the facts in this case. I never saw Mr. Watson except when he appeared before our subcommittee. I have no interest in the matter in the world. While this kind of proceeding has taken place several times in the Congress, it seems to me it is not a desirable procedure. To show how little interest I have in it or how little thought I paid to it, I do not even recall how I voted either in the subcommittee or in the full committee. I was chairman of the subcommittee. We heard testimony about it; we heard Mr. Watson, we heard Mr. Fly. After hearing the testimony, the subcommittee, after seeing Mr. Watson and hearing him, by a very close vote—as I recall, a majority of probably only one—struck out the provision. Then the bill went before the full committee, and the full committee restored the provision. I will state why. As I have said, I do not remember how I voted, but I feel it is my duty to lay before the Senate the reasons for the action taken by the majority of the committee. Their vote is an instruction to me to represent what they did in the committee.

Mr. Fly first appeared, and, incidentally, I note that in his letter to the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Watson says that "the continuing attack is aimed less at me than at Chairman James L. Fly for quite other reasons."

I am sory Mr. Watson makes that suggestion about Mr. Fly. I think Mr. Fly is one of the finest men I know. He is one of my very dear friends, one whose friendship I cherish, and I honor and respect him as a man.

Mr. BARKLEY. That remark in the letter was not directed at the Senate committee. I think it was directed at the sponsors of the provision in the other body.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a matter of no importance, but I am an old-fashioned kind of man, and after an employer stands by an employee as Mr. Fly stood by this man, and gave him a splendid recommendation, it does not seem to me that if I had been in Mr. Watson's position, I would have reflected upon my employer, who had stood by me so nobly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, so far as I am concerned, if anyone wants to have an investigation of Mr. Fly and the Communications Commission, I should be very much in favor of it, and I should be glad to vote for it. I think the Communications Commission has been guilty of very flagrant favoritism, both as to applications for licenses and as to certain favored attorneys, some of whom were formerly connected with the Communications Commission. I think such an investigation would be entirely proper, with a view to working on Mr. Fly. But it does seem to me that Congress should go about it by way of an investigation, and not attack Mr. Fly through a man who happens to be working under him.

I received from Mr. Watson a letter identical with that received by the Senator from Kentucky. I had already read in the public press that the attack on Dr. Watson in the House was really an attack on Mr. Fly. It seems to me that if anyone desires to attack Mr. Fly, the thing to do is to attack him and not beat about the bush and attack this college professor, who is working under the Commission in a minor job.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to place before the Senate the position of the majority of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is it the desire and purpose of the Senator to conclude this evening?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I can conclude in a few minutes, if I can get an opportunity to read what Mr. Watson said that caused the full committee to vote as the House voted. It will take me but a few moments.

Mr. McNARY. I have no desire to shorten the Senator's remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not care a thing about the matter one way or the other.

Mr. McNARY. I thought that if it was to go over——

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope it will not go over. Let me read what happened in the committee:

> Senator BANKHEAD. Mr. Fly, what position does this man hold?
>
> Mr. FLY. He is one of the leading psychologists, is highly versed in analyzing propaganda. All of the foreign propaganda coming to this hemisphere comes over our desks down there, and he is supposed to take that foreign incoming propaganda and give us an analysis of it and tell us what it means.

That was the testimony of Mr. Fly about Mr. Watson's duties. Now I wish to read the testimony in which Mr. Watson was asked about it. I asked him about it, because his position struck me as being very unusual for an American citizen. Everyone knows we have a capitalist form of Government, and this is the first thing Mr. Watson said about the matter:

> How is it with the present necessity to replace the broken-down profit system with one designed to produce and distribute all the goods and services the public can use? Shall we work for an all-or-none change, leaving the old order definitely behind us and building the new on a different foundation, or shall we work for gradual modification and improvement of the old, trusting that the net effect of many lesser changes will equal the greater one?
>
> There are four major lines of argument: Humanitarian, psychological, economic, and political. Each of them leads to the conclusion that the apparent attractiveness of gradualism is fallacious; that only the sharp break brings promise of success.

One way is to destroy the old capitalistic system, which he says is worn out, and the other is to gradually get rid of it, and he says that the second way is fallacious.

Again he said:

> A people learned in tragedy that there is no safe compromise with capitalism.

Again:

> As a matter of fact, the present capitalistic society, far from stimulating a desirable kind of initiative, is itself stifling some of the best creative potentialities of youth.

Then, when he was himself examined, this is what he had to say:

> As a matter of fact, the present capitalist society, far from stimulating a desirable kind of initiative, is itself stifling some of the best creative potentialities of youth.

Again he said—and I think the Senator from Kentucky should listen to this, but he has left the Chamber, so I shall ask other Senators to listen.

Mr. MURRAY. I will listen for him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Listen to this:

> Roosevelt must go far before he achieves a program like theirs. The Austrian socialists actually did the things Roosevelt makes speeches about.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it does not make a particle of difference what the Senate thinks about Dr. Goodwin Watson. I judge from the testimony of Dr. Watson himself that he is not worth one-half the time we have spent discussing him this afternoon. He may be a harmless man; I do not know. He is in a position, in the Commission, however, where he may do the country a good deal of hurt. The majority of the committee thought he was a Communist from the expressions he had used. He wanted to get rid of the capitalistic form of government, which is our system. I merely say that, not that I give a toot about Goodwin Watson. I do not care whether or not he works for the Government; I do not care whether or not he is paid; but I wish to make clear what was the opinion of the

majority of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the greatest committees in the world, composed of level-headed, able, and splendid men. I do not wish the Senate to think from what has already been said that we have done an improper thing. When I say "we" I mean the majority of the committee. I do not recall whether I voted on the question. I do not care how the Senate votes on the matter. I did, however, wish to place before the Senate the statement of Mr. Watson himself, which I think no good American citizen ought to make, and, in my opinion, no good American citizen should entertain such views as those reflected by Dr. Watson's statements. If he wishes to get rid of the capitalistic system in this country, he ought not to be working for that capitalistic system.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to remind the Senator from Tennessee that many of the leading economists of the country and many of the leading writers on the subject which Dr. Watson discussed have expressed themselves in similar language.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but they were not working for the Government which they were trying to put out of business, and that is what the majority of the committee thought he was doing. I leave the matter as it is. I do not care anything about it. Such action as is proposed ought not to be taken except in the most extreme cases. I do not know just how extreme this case is. I received the distinct impression that Dr. Watson was a Communist, and that he comes under the rule we have already laid down. I did not get that impression from anyone except Dr. Watson himself. He came before the committee and gave the committee the testimony to which I referred. I leave the matter now to the Senate. Senators may vote as they like.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator believe that the method followed by the Senate committee in undertaking to prevent this man being paid out of the funds of the appropriations to be made is a proper method?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been told—I do not know whether it is so—that every effort under God's Heaven has been made to get Mr. Fly, whom I like very much, to discharge this man, because he was in a confidential situation and went over the propaganda of other nations. Having the views he holds about our own Government, the Government for which he was working, a majority of our committee voted to take this extreme way of getting rid of him as a public servant.

Whether that is the best way or the only way that the proposed action can be taken is another matter. As I said, I do not believe that a man who has such views can get very far with them. I do not believe he is worth a hurrah so far as working for the Government is concerned. I do not think he should want to work for a capitalistic government about which he talks in the way he does.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, being a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which considered this matter, I feel that a few observations from me would be in order at this time. We held very brief hearings on this subject, as the printed hearings will indicate to any Senator interested enough to read them. If I remember correctly, the only evidence presented against this man was the evidence presented by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who read a number of quotations from a book that Mr. Watson is reported to have published. Mr. Watson said that in writing this book he quoted for reader-interest purposes from some other book. He also said that if one would read the quotes and then read the entire paragraph or chapter one would find his real thoughts and his real ideas, which, according to what he told us, were just the reverse of the meaning conveyed by the quotations which were inserted in the record by my distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, the only witnesses who were called before the subcommittee testified in behalf of this man's loyalty, devotion, and integrity, and urged the committee to continue his employment. If that presents to the Senate the principle embodied in the philosophy of the American Government which guarantees to even the most violent criminal a trial by jury, then I am afraid we are drifting to a procedure which will come home to embarrass the Senate.

Mr. President, at the final meeting of the subcommittee a motion was made to strike out the language in question. There were four members of the committee present, and three members voted to strike it out, and my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] voted to keep it in.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember what the vote was, but I am frank to say to the Senator from New York that the kind of sentiment we have spoken of, coming from a man who is working for the American Government, does not lie very well with me. I wish to say to the Senator that so far as I know I do not have anything against anyone, and if the Senator will let the matter go to a vote I shall not object. I think the purpose of the Senate is to strike out the language in question, and I have no objection to that being done. I simply wanted to put the matter correctly before the Senate. The only reason I quoted these remarkable statements which appeared in the testimony was to show the character of the man. I think the testimony of the man himself is the worst thing in the world that has ever been said about him; much worse than anything I could say if I had a mind to, and if I ever had a mind to do so, I do not have a mind to do it today, because I feel in a very good humor.

Mr. MEAD. I do not have any objection to my distinguished colleague taking me off my feet without addressing the Chair, which is what he should have done in keeping with parliamentary procedure. I do not have any objection to that procedure on his part, but I do object to the Senator asking me to vacate the floor without presenting some information which might be helpful to my colleagues in arriving at a determination of the pending matter, especially after the Senator from Tennessee has presented his side of the story to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I take it all back, if the Senator will yield to me. I admire the Senator from New York so much and like him so much I would not stop him for anything in the world, but I thought perhaps the sooner we could get to a vote on the matter the better. However, I withdraw that request.

Mr. MEAD. That is perfectly all right with me. I merely wanted to explain as briefly as possible the sort of trial we gave this man. As I said in the beginning, the distinguished Senator placed in the RECORD about all the evidence I know of against Mr. Watson. The evidence consisted of some brief excerpts from a book he is reported to have published. Every witness that appeared before the subcommittee testified to the loyalty, fidelity, and devotion of this man. It was my understanding that we were to have Mr. Watson come before the committee and read, not the excerpts, but the entire chapters, even the entire book if we wanted it, but he was never called. We were evidently in a hurry to get the matter over with on that occasion as we seem to be on this occasion.

Is that a trial by jury? Is it a trial of any kind? It is rather difficult to understand how any man with a love for the juridical processes which have made America and America's democracy great can condone such a farce.

Mr. President, I am just as much opposed as is any other man to the employment of any person who is against our Government and who advocates its overthrow by means other than constitutional means. If we should find such a man employed in any agency of the Government, we ought to fire him and also the man who hired him. However, we ought to see to it that our citizens have the right to trial and the right to defend themselves, which right was denied in this case.

Mr. President, what was the evidence?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am still trying to defend the majority of the committee.

Mr. MEAD. The majority of the subcommittee or of the full committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Both.

Mr. MEAD. Then the Senator will have to talk on both sides of the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am doing that very thing. I am very doubtful about what ought to be done.

The Senator says that certain excerpts were taken from Mr. Watson's testimony. The committee told him to publish anything he wanted in his own defense. If the Senator will look at the hearings between pages 95 and 105, he will find that Mr. Watson put in all the favorable articles he had.

Mr. MEAD. It is still my opinion that Mr. Watson wanted to come back to tell it all to us in person.

At any rate, let me say that the preponderance of the testimony in the record is in Mr. Watson's favor. Until we give him a trial, until we set up any formula for a trial, I think the provision

ought to go out of the bill. It is bad practice.

I believe that any man whom we may find to be intolerant of our democratic system ought to be discharged. I am only pleading for the right to a fair trial, pleading for the prestige of the Senate. We did not give this man a trial. Let me read this excerpt from his own statement to the committee:

I am 100 percent American in ancestry, upbringing, ideals, and actions. I was born in Whitewater, Wis., on July 9, 1899. My parents, Walter Starr Watson and Ellen Goodwin Watson, were both teachers in the State normal school. Both the Goodwins and the Watsons settled in Connecticut about 1630, so I am of the tenth generation direct line American ancestry, with three of my forebears having fought in the Revolutionary War. I grew up under the most favorable influences of a happy home, excellent schools, and unusual church participation. My father, president of the Laymen's Association in the Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Church, and my mother, president of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society for Wisconsin, led me naturally into a career of service in the Epworth League, of which I became State president.

I graduated from the normal school at the age of 16, and shortly after graduation became principal of the State grade school at Albion, Wis., and moved up the next year to be assistant principal in the Randall Junior High School at Madison, Wis., where I also taught science and mathematics and coached the basketball team.

In September 1918 I enlisted (rating apprentice seaman, United States Navy) in the Student Naval Training Corps assigned to the school of engineering, University of Wisconsin. I was appointed clerk of Company K, and served until honorably discharged in December 1918.

He concluded his testimony with this statement:

I stand firm now, as I have throughout my career, in the conviction that America is the best country the world has ever known, and in my determination to do all in my power at the cost of life itself if need be, to defend our American heritage and to pass it on, a little improved, to our children.

The charge against him to the effect that he belonged to certain organizations of a communistic front were answered in this manner:

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. I am not now and never have been a member of this organization.

* * * * *

International Workers' Order. I am not now and never have been a member of this organization. * * *

American League for Peace and Democracy. I am not now and never have been a member of this organization. * * *

Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo. I am not now and never have been a member of this committee. * * *

The League of American Writers. I am not now and never have been a member of this organization. * * *

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights. I am not now and never have been a member of this organization.

He continued:

I am not now and never have been a member of the Communist Party or of any organization associated with it.

On his testimony and on the testimony of other witnesses who appeared in person—there were only a few of them—we are called upon today to convict this man. If this practice is to continue, I hope that before we dismiss this man we dismiss every man who is in any way associated with communistic "front" organizations, as reported by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the other House. But if we do not do that— and I hope we avoid doing it today—we ought to set up some formula whereby such persons may be given a trial. I for one will vote to dismiss every one of them, if we find that they would, with violence or means other than those prescribed in the Constitution, change our system of government or make an attempt to do so. But until we set up such a formula I am unwilling to call this a trial and to retain this language in the bill with my vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Have we not already laid down a standard and made it a criminal offense to swear falsely in that connection? Is it not already a criminal offense to receive money from the United States Government when one entertains any of these subversive doctrines? Would not such a person be subject to criminal prosecution if he accepted money under the false pretense that he does not entertain such doctrines? Have we not already laid down a standard in appropriation bills? I think there is one in this bill.

So if this man has such views, and accepts money from the United States, falsely swearing that he does not hold such views, he is subject to prosecution in court, and Congress has nothing to do with it. It is a justiciable matter.

Mr. MEAD. Congress has adopted a policy. We have the courts to resort to. The statement made by the able Senator from Florida is in keeping with the record. However, I should go one step further, if the Senate were not satisfied with that procedure. I should set up a formula, create a committee, or do something to give the man a trial. He has not had a trial. Until we do that, I believe we ought to go slowly before ruining a man who may be innocent, robbing him of his reputation and character, and putting a blight upon him and his whole family.

Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee, I merely report to the Senate that this seeming interference with the authority or the obligation of the Executive on the part of our committee was brought about without a full opportunity for the alleged un-American to be given a trial and the consideration which I believe he merits. Until we give him a trial, until we hear both sides, I think we ought to postpone action by striking this provision from the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6430) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. NYE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

RENOMINATION OF SENATOR GLASS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am very happy to announce to my colleagues in the Senate that the beloved and distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has just been renominated once again without opposition by the Democratic Party of Virginia. I venture the prediction that he will be reelected next November also without opposition.

This is the fifth consecutive time that Senator GLASS has been nominated for the United States Senate without opposition by the Democratic Party of Virginia. This is merely an evidence of the affection, love, and admiration the people of Virginia have for Senator GLASS, and it is equally a great tribute to his record of public service as a United States Senator, which, I think, is unexcelled in the long history of our Republic.

I could say much more, but I merely wanted his friends in the Senate to know that this afternoon the time expired within which anyone could file as a candidate in the Democratic primary in opposition to him, and no one has filed against him.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 1342, House bill 6927.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, in section 1, page 1, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "the National Housing Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 2, line 13, after the word "sentence", to insert "thereof"; and in line 24, after "section.";", to strike out "and (2) striking the word 'section', appearing in the last sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'title'" and insert "(2) substituting the word 'title' for the word 'section' in the last sentence thereof; and (3) inserting at the end

thereof the following new sentence: 'The Administrator is further authorized to prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to war workers occupancy priority with respect to properties which have not been previously occupied and which are covered by mortgages insured under this section and section 608.'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 4, line 4, after the words "National Housing Act", to strike out "amendments" and insert "Amendments"; and in line 8, after the word "Act", to strike out "amendments" and insert "Amendments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, on page 6, line 1, after the word "property", to strike out "must" and insert "shall"; in line 2, after the word "use", to strike out the comma and "primarily to" and insert "by"; in the same line, after the word "workers", to strike out the semicolon and insert a period; in line 3, after "(3)", to strike out "Involve" and insert "The mortgage shall involve"; in line 5, after the figures "$5,000,000" and the semicolon, to insert "and"; in line 9, after the word "land", to strike out the semicolon and "the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incidental to construction and approved by the Administrator" and insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That such mortgage shall not in any event exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of the following: Public utilities and streets; taxes, interest, and insurance during construction; organization and legal expenses; and miscellaneous charges during or incidental to construction"; on page 10, line 10, after the word "that", to strike out "all references therein" and insert "as applied to such mortgages (1) all references in such section 207 (k)"; in line 13, after the word "and", to insert "(2)"; and in line 14, before the word "shall", to strike out "thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 13, on page 12, line 9, after the word "accommodations", to strike out "suitable for war workers"; and in line 15, after the word "subsection", to insert "The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to war workers occupancy priority with respect to any additional living accommodations referred to in clause (2) of the preceding sentence."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 14. Title VI of the National Housing Act as amended is further amended by striking the word "defense" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the word "war."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 23, to insert:

SEC. 14. (a) The heading of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Title VI—war housing insurance."

(b) Such title VI is hereby amended (1) by striking out the word "Defense" wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "War", and (2) by striking out the word "defense" wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "war."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill (H. R. 6927) was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

Pay Inspector William B. Young, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years from the 1st day of June 1942.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward H. O'Hare, United States Navy, to be advanced 30 numbers in rank for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle, pursuant to the provisions of law; and

Lt. William L. Kabler, United States Navy, to be advanced 30 numbers in rank for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle, pursuant to the provisions of law.

NOMINATIONS OF MIDSHIPMEN REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on May 4 the President sent to the Senate the nominations of 610 midshipmen now at the Naval Academy and soon to be graduated, 581 to be ensigns in the Navy and 29 to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I favorably report the nominations. If they were merely reported and placed on the calendar the names would have to be reprinted. In order to save space and printing, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately approve the recommendation of the committee concerning these nominations, that the President be notified, and that the RECORD, instead of reprinting all the names refer to the nominations as submitted on May 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; the President will be immediately notified, and the course suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts as to printing the names will be followed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be collector of internal revenue, first district of Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I feel it incumbent upon me not to permit this nomination to be confirmed without specific notification to every Member of the United States Senate that this is the nomination about which he has been served with what amounted to a special edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch scurrilously attacking the nomination long before it was made.

I do not want the Post-Dispatch to be able to say that a vote on this nomination was taken without the fact being called to the attention of the Senators who are present that this is the particular case about which the Post-Dispatch has been conducting such a crusade.

Mr. President, this nomination is the culmination of one of the most remarkable efforts on the part of a newspaper to control and terrorize public officials that has ever fallen under my observation. Mr. Hannegan is an extremely able, honest, capable, patriotic, and outstanding citizen of the State of Missouri. When the vacancy occurred because of the death of the preceding collector, Mr. Hannegan was so outstanding in the minds of both my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and myself, that we never even held a meeting on the subject. We agreed to have a meeting, but before we had a chance to have the meeting, we met casually and he suggested Mr. Hannegan to me before I had a chance to suggest Mr. Hannegan to him, as it was my full intention to do. In this connection I should like to add that Mr. Hannegan was not an applicant for this or any other office, and that Senator TRUMAN and myself agreed to suggest his name to the President without any request from him.

A day or two later, without any desire on my part or that of my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN], the matter leaked out, and the Post Dispatch proceeded to carry an editorial, written, I am informed, by a man who is not even a citizen or resident of the State of Missouri, but who lives at Belleville, Ill., attacking the nomination and demanding that President Roosevelt and Secretary Morgenthau reject the nomination.

The only suggestion that has ever been made affecting Mr. Hannegan's availability was the terrible charge that he was a Democrat and that he had been chairman of the Democratic city committee. Nevertheless, probably on the same principle as that which actuated the man who accidently in a lawsuit swore that a horse was 17 feet high instead of 17 hands high, and then refused to change his testimony but said that the horse was at least 17

feet high and probably 18, the Post Dispatch proceeded to conduct the most remarkable campaign that has ever been conducted within my knowledge. They issued a scarehead edition, a copy of which was sent to every Member of the Senate. They served seven copies on me, although I habitually subscribe for the paper. They conducted a regular dervish crusade, urging people to write to the President of the United States, busy as he is, with all of his responsibilities, urging everyone to deluge the White House with letters.

I can say in that connection that neither my colleague nor myself ever even discussed this matter with the President of the United States, other than to make a recommendation in writing, because we would not take his time, we would not add a single straw to the tremendous burden the President of the United States is carrying. The only conversation I had with the Secretary of the Treasury about the appointment was to ask him to personally examine the report of the investigation.

Mr. President, as the result of this scurrilous campaign on the part of the Post-Dispatch, Mr. Hannegan was subjected to what I dare say was the most complete investigation to which any nominee for a public office has been subjected in many years. I am told that in the whole investigation, in which the Post-Dispatch and all of its cohorts were invited personally to testify, the only charge brought against Mr. Hannegan was, as I have stated, that he was a Democrat, and that he had been chairman of the Democratic city committee. According to this standard set up by the Post-Dispatch, that great American who has honored the office of Secretary of State ever since 1933, Cordell Hull, would be debarred from holding office, because he is also a Democrat, and he was once chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

The Post-Dispatch went so far as to send out telegrams to prominent citizens all over the State of Missouri, many of whom were outside the internal revenue district involved in this case. As a matter of fact, one could not tell from the Post-Dispatch that they had done that, since so far as I have been able to read their columns—and I have read the Post-Dispatch very carefully—they received only three responses to the hundreds of telegrams they sent out, because that was all they printed. But I know they sent out a great many more telegrams than that, because I have 30 or 40 of them in my office, which people sent to me instead of responding to the Post-Dispatch.

Moreover, Mr. President, I happen to know that the Post Dispatch sent out a reporter one day to interview citizens upon the matter and obtain statements. I also happen to know that he interviewed 18 prominent citizens but obtained only 1 adverse to Mr. Hannegan's appointment, that of a man who is a good friend of mine but who happened to get mad at Hannegan because Hannegan refused to support him for Governor, and to hold some resentment against me because I did not recommend him for Federal judge when I had the chance.

Mr. President, this is by no means the first time the Post-Dispatch has conducted a campaign of this sort. A few years ago I recommended Judge George H. Moore for appointment as judge of the district court for the eastern district of Missouri. Without rhyme or reason the Post-Dispatch started an almost equally unfair campaign against Judge Moore's appointment. The President saw fit to appoint him, the Senate saw fit to confirm him, and the Post-Dispatch has many times since been compelled, in its news columns and in its editorial columns, to admit that Judge Moore has been one of the finest judges who ever sat on the bench in the eastern district of Missouri or anywhere else, and I predict that the same result will happen in this case; that Mr. Hannegan will make such a record as collector for the eastern district of Missouri that even the Post-Dispatch will be forced to admit that he is as good a public servant as ever lived in that district.

They finally ran out of soap so completely that they published an interview from a Congressman from Pennsylvania, who probably was never in Missouri, who certainly never knew Hannegan, and who knows no more about Missouri than a hog does about Christmas, to the effect that the appointment of Mr. Hannegan would carry Missouri for the Republicans. He himself is the chairman of a purely partisan committee and that is his sole and only claim to fame.

Just one further word, Mr. President. In addition, the Post Dispatch has been calling up newspaper editors and publishers in other cities outside the eastern district of Missouri urging them to join in their dervish campaign. They have called up Members of Congress over the long-distance telephone to urge them to protest, and they actually got a young fellow, not a Member of this body, but a Member of the Congress, who apparently learned to talk before he learned to think, to make an attack on my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN] and me because we had recommended the appointment of Mr. Hannegan.

I am very proud of the fact that, after full consideration, the Secretary of the Treasury recommended the appointment to the President, and the President acted upon the recommendation. I hope, and I am certain, that Mr. Hannegan will conduct himself in such a way as to discourage campaigns of this sort in the future.

Mr. President, I have taken the trouble to make this statement because I do not want the confirmation of this nomination to go through as a matter of courtesy to the President or to my colleague, or myself. I urge confirmation of Mr. Hannegan purely on his merits. I assert that the very rigid examination conducted over a period of months by the Treasury Department shows Mr. Hannegan to have the very highest qualifications for the office to which he has been nominated, because neither the Post-Dispatch, nor anyone else, in the most rigid investigation, has been able to find anything whatever which reflects in the remotest degree on Mr. Hannegan's ability, his efficiency, his patriotism, or his honesty, and the fact that after such a rigid investigation, after hundreds and hundreds of leading citizens of Missouri were interviewed, Mr. Hannegan's record was found to be absolutely untarnished, but enhanced, is a tribute to him. Really the Post-Dispatch, by the extremely unfair fight they made on him, unwittingly did Mr. Hannegan a favor, and caused him to be paid a great tribute.

Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

WILLIAM J. KORTH

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Korth to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Bartley to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Lyal A. Davidson to be rear admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Charles A. Pownall to be rear admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

RENEWAL OF EXPIRING 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM-TERM POLICIES FOR ANOTHER 5-YEAR PERIOD

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kentucky moves that the Senate adjourn, I move that the Senate resume legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, because it is an emergency matter, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 4402, Calendar No. 1345.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4402) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE PRESIDENT OF PERU—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to Members of the Senate, and those who may read the RECORD in the morning, that so far as I know there is no business to be transacted tomorrow, but it is necessary to meet for two reasons. It had been expected that the President of Peru would be in the city tomorrow, and we had informally decided that we would, at an appropriate hour, go into a brief recess in order that the President of Peru might come to the Senate Chamber and be received by Members. My information is that he is 24 hours late in arriving, and that we probably shall not be able to carry out that program tomorrow. If he is here on Friday it may be desirable to meet then, but it is necessary to meet tomorrow, so that if we have no further business to transact during the week we can adjourn until Monday, and also to ascertain definitely whether the President of Peru is to be here on Friday in order that we may then have an opportunity to greet him.

With that understanding, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 7, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6 (legislative day, April 30), 1942:

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert E. Hannegan to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri.

William J. Korth to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Utah.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William H. Bartley to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Alice D. Brown, Doyline.

NEW MEXICO

John A. Werner, Albuquerque.

OHIO

Helen B. Owen, Lowell.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Deaton, Howe.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Lyal A. Davidson
Charles A. Pownall

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

The nominations of Claude W. Adams, Jr., et al. to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 19, 1942, and the nominations of Robert W. Besch et al. to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from June 19, 1942, which were received by the Senate on May 4, 1942.

(NOTE.—A full list of the persons, whose nominations as ensigns in the Navy, or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, were today confirmed, may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 4, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 3921.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with most grateful hearts we bow at the altar of prayer. We pray Thee to control our reverses, our disappointments and our sorrows by a healthy, vigorous faith in the future. Oh this human life, so intense, so crowded, and so burdened, how much we need Thee; help us to know that in the plans of our Lord there are no faithful failures. Thou wilt not stretch the line of duty beyond our strength and we pray Thee to make us more lowly and more contented, more trustful and more faithful.

O Shepherd of our souls, Thou alone canst make the light to shine as the day, bidding us be calm in the presence of difficulty, patient in the face of opposition and most compelling when personal honor is in question. Enable us to always remember that the highest reach of manhood is the protection of the weak, the poor, and the unfortunate and to keep ourselves unspotted from the world. Let the words which trembled from the holy lips of our Master be set in our daily lives; they are the laws of the soul, of the universe, and of God. In the name of Mary's Holy Son, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF CORREGIDOR

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, never since the dawn of so-called civilization has man or a group of men more nobly defended a great cause than has Lt. Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright at Corregidor.

Many think that his defense of this Little Gibraltar surpasses any feat of recorded history as far as war efforts and battle goes.

The following telegram that President Roosevelt sent to General Wainwright yesterday points out and implies the type and character of this great patriotic fighting American:

During recent weeks, we have been following with growing admiration the day-by-day accounts of your heroic stand against the mounting intensity of bombardment by enemy planes and heavy siege guns.

In spite of all the handicaps of complete isolation, lack of food and ammunition you have given the world a shining example of patriotic fortitude and self-sacrifice. The American people ask no finer example of tenacity, resourcefulness, and steadfast courage.

The calm determination of your personal leadership in a desperate situation sets a standard of duty for our soldiers throughout the world.

In every camp and on every naval vessel soldiers, sailors, and marines are inspired by the gallant struggle of their comrades in the Philippines.

The workmen in our shipyards and munition plants redouble their efforts because of your example. You and your devoted followers have become the living symbols of our war aims and the guaranty of victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PRICE OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include a telegram as a part of my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a very timely and pertinent telegram from the livestock dealers of Kansas City, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 5, 1942.*

Representative CLARENCE CANNON,
Washington, D. C.:

To the livestock interests of the Middle West it seems most inconsistent that in these times of all-out war effort, when the production of foods, of which meat is one of the most vital, is a primary essential to victory, that the United States Government should do anything which would tend to curtail such production. Yet this is exactly what has happened in the recent order of the Office of Price Administration, wherein a ceiling was placed upon the wholesale and retail price of beef at levels prevailing during the Lenten period, a season when meat consumption is lowered by the presence of fast days, and which, at present costs of feed and labor, will not enable the producer of beef animals to pay from the returns received from the sale of those cattle the bare cost of producing them. Many authenticated records show that in finishing cattle for market the cost of feed ranges from 16 to 20 cents per pound of grain. Feeders could pay such costs only at a distinct loss if they are compelled to sell their stock at the prices which the major packers have endeavored to enforce during the several marketing days since the issuance of this Office of Price Administration order. The patriotism of livestock men as a whole is unquestioned and unquestionable. At the request of the Government and in the interests of victory, they have unhesitatingly made major increases in their production and feeding schedules. But even the most patriotic of men cannot continue to operate at a loss, no matter how vital their business may be. If prices which major packers are now endeavoring to enforce as a result of this order are to continue to prevail, cattle production and feeding must of necessity be sharply curtailed; and that, we are sure, is not only contrary to the wishes of the Government but is also definitely inimical to the great cause for which we are all fighting. In the interests of the livestock producers of the Middle West, we, the livestock marketing agencies of Kansas City respectfully submit these facts for your attention and consideration.

THE KANSAS CITY LIVESTOCK MARKET,
THE KANSAS CITY LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE,
R. A. WILLIS, *President.*

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, May 7, 1942, following the regular legislative program and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE CLUB WAR EFFORTS

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a very interesting brochure entitled "Exchange Club War Efforts." This excellent booklet was edited and prepared by the national officers of the Exchange Club of America and is to be sent out to the membership of the affiliated clubs located in many cities throughout the country.

It contains various civilian programs and instructions in which the membership of this outstanding organization can aid in building national unity in connection with our war effort.

Some of the outstanding activities suggested in this publication are as follows:

First. Organize Cass units. Cass already is a loosely knit but effective organization. It takes in the Exchange-sponsored model clubs and is open to any other groups that wish to work under the same program. Primary purposes of Cass are: (1) Utilize aero-modelers' skill in building scale models for identification purposes and gunnery practice; (2) further the movement to place model building in the public schools; (3) make it possible for model building to be continued during wartime; and (4) make the public more model-aircraft conscious.

Second. Organize model airplane clubs now if there are none in the community.

Third. Have the Cass units build scale model aircraft for the Navy.

Fourth. Send Cass-built model aircraft to the Army flying training command.

Fifth. Have exchangites train as enemy-aircraft spotters.

Sixth. Organize a civilian-defense organization if there is none.

Seventh. Enlist the Exchange Club as a unit in the existing civilian-defense organization.

Eighth. Push the sale of War Bonds and Stamps.

For many years Exchange Clubs all over the country inspired by their motto, "Unity for service," have contributed a great deal to the betterment of their community, State, and Nation. Now, when America is at war, exchangites of the Nation are applying this same motto in their war effort which cannot help but aid in the building of a real national unity so necessary for an all-out victory.

As a member of the Exchange Club of Minneapolis, Minn., for many years, an affiliation which I prize very highly, may I take this opportunity to congratulate the officers of the National Exchange Club for this splendid contribution to our war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Department of Agriculture in working out a policy that is of real benefit to the American wheat grower. The 1942 crop and the reserve from previous years are expected to provide a 2-year supply of bread grain. If it were not for this program, I actually think the price of wheat would be demoralized today, with such tremendous surpluses on hand.

It is with pleasure that I quote from the Great Falls Tribune a tabulation which shows, from 42 of the 55 counties in the State, the wheat farmers have voted 8,872 to 1,079 in favor of continuing the quota system.

In Park County, my home, which is one of the smallest counties in the State, the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of the quota system. The vote cast was 179 for and 12 against.

The Triple A program is the result of the first real attempt on the part of any administration to ever afford any substantial relief to the American wheat grower. Of course, it has its imperfections, but as we go along efforts are continually being made to improve and round out the picture. It has been my privilege and pleasure during the time I have been in Congress to support this program. I think it is the best so far devised. The Agriculture Department is rendering real, constructive, and beneficial service to the wheat grower.

It is indeed unfortunate that the Department and our State department took the view they did respecting the curtailing of production of sugar beets in this country. We of the West pleaded for an expansion of production of sugar beets. Had our pleas been heeded, there would be no sugar shortage today and in addition our beet growers would be in much better financial condition to meet the demands that are coming upon them in the form of taxes, and so forth.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I wish to extend my remarks and include therein an article on powder output.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a brief biographical sketch of Hon. H. D. Smith, Director of the Budget.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the legislative business for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DIVERSION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I picked up the Treasury statement of May 1, I found we were $14,496,525,568 in the red, a large deficit for 10 months, with a national debt of over $70,000,000,000. It makes me think of the money we are spending and appropriating. Are you spending wisely? Do you count the pennies?

I understand we gave a million dollars for civilian defense in the District of Columbia lately, besides the appropriation we made yesterday. I understand that with this amount of money for each sector they have been able to furnish one stirrup pump and one load of sand. Complaints are current for inadequate equipment.

It has also been brought to my attention that some of the money appropriated for civilian defense, or black-out, as it is sometimes termed, was used for the Rent Commission, and some was used for the Boxing Commission. Why should any commission have money that was appropriated for civilian defense?

I believe the Committee on the District of Columbia should make an investigation of these charges, for if they be true, it amounts to a misapplication of funds, and we should not permit it. It does not make any difference whether it is in the District or some other place in the country, when money is appropriated for a certain purpose the money should be used for that purpose and that purpose only.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse;

S. 1331. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals, lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929;

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria;

S. 2133. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940; and

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 7, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 8, 1942, in connection with the investigation of petroleum.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson will appear before the committee.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7054. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 7055. A bill to promote research on minerals in the United States, to establish mining and metallurgical stations in universities and colleges in the several States to aid prospectors and small operators, and to promote utilization of the natural resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (H. R. 7056) for the relief of Joseph Nathaniel Gownder, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2763. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Second United Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2764. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Phoebe J. Lentz, of Warrensville, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860 concerning the exploitation of the men in the United States Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2765. Also, petition of the Townsend National Organization of Ukiah, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to social security and old-age pensions program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2766. Also, petition of the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the creation of a Federal guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2767. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the State and County Coordinating Committee on Reemployment for the State of California, regarding employment for friendly aliens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1942

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

O, Thou whose wondrous name is love, grant that the deliberations of this day may be subdued to the sanctities of our worship, as out of the deeper silence we catch the echoes of Thy voice directing heart and mind and will into new channels of resolve. Endue us with courage sufficient to face each fateful task with a devotion unsoiled by thought of self, but ennobled by that larger loyalty to God and Country that shall compel us to dare our utmost for the betterment of our world, content to leave with Thee all consequences.

Comfort every saddened heart, dear Lord, and upon all who are passing through the valley of the shadow, bestow the light and the glory of Thy Presence, to their great and endless comfort. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GLASS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 6, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GLASS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bankhead	Brewster
Andrews	Barkley	Brooks
Bailey	Bilbo	Brown
Ball	Bone	Bulow
Bunker	Hughes	Radcliffe
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Capper	Kilgore	Rosier
Caraway	La Follette	Russell
Chandler	Lee	Schwartz
Chavez	Lucas	Shipstead
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Smathers
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Smith
Connally	McKellar	Spencer
Danaher	McNary	Stewart
Doxey	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
George	Mead	Tobey
Gerry	Millikin	Tunnell
Gillette	Murdock	Tydings
Glass	Murray	Van Nuys
Green	Norris	Wagner
Gurney	Nye	Wallgren
Hayden	O'Daniel	Walsh
Herring	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hill	Overton	White
Holman	Pepper	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on a temporary service in Vermont.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERCY E. BUDLONG

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of our trusted employees, Mr. Percy E. Budlong, who since 1913 has been one of the official reporters of debates of the Senate, passed away yesterday.

We all recall Mr. Budlong's efficiency, his devotion to duty, his courtesy, his qualities as a gentleman and as an American. We recall his erect figure, his fine head, his handsome form, and we record our sorrow and grief at his passing.

We do not always appreciate the value of the services of those who report our proceedings. Many a slipshod sentence is burnished by the scholarly reporters. They are always generous to us, they are always cooperative. The day is never too long or the night too dark to find them ready to serve us and this body as a whole.

I am particularly grieved over the death of Mr. Budlong because he was a friendly, affable, genial, warm-hearted man, and I am sure the Senate has heard with deep sorrow of his passing.

I ask that as a part of my remarks there be printed a little story of Mr. Budlong's life which appears in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

P. E. BUDLONG, OFFICIAL SENATE REPORTER, DIES

Percy E. Budlong, 64, cohead since 1933 of the official reporters of debates of the Senate and regarded by his associates as one of the most accomplished shorthand reporters in the United States, died last night in Doctors Hospital following several months' illness.

A member of the Senate staff of reporters since 1913, Mr. Budlong became ill on February 19. About 3 weeks ago he returned to work, but finally, on April 27, his last day at work, he was advised to enter a hospital for treatment. His residence was at 1308 Gallatin Street NW.

Mr. Budlong gained a national reputation for his shorthand work in 1902 when he was appointed official reporter for the Coal Strike Commission by President Theodore Roosevelt.

He was born February 14, 1878, in New Jersey and came here in 1890. At 15 he was an accomplished shorthand reporter and entered the employ of Smith & Hulse, one of the largest firms at that time of shorthand reporters.

Later he established his own office and did a great deal of work for the District Attorney's office. In 1913 he joined the Senate staff of reporters and in 1933, upon the death of the late Theodore F. Shuey, who was a Senate reporter for 66 years, Mr. Budlong by Senate resolution was named cohead of the reporters of debates.

He was a member of the Corinthian Yacht Club and owned a succession of various types of motorboats. He also was an expert photographer, and many of his prints were reproduced from time to time in photographic magazines. He authored many articles dealing both with photography and boating and, in addition, was a frequent contributor to shorthand magazines.

He was a member for many years of Foundry Methodist Church. Mr. Budlong is survived by his wife, Mrs. Mabel Perry Budlong; his mother, Mrs. Nellie Easton Budlong of Hackensack, N. J., and three sons, Arthur L. Budlong, of Hartford, Conn.; Robert R. Budlong, superintendent of the Fort Jefferson National Monument, Dry Tortugas, Fla., and Herbert Budlong, a member of the Senate staff of reporters.

Funeral services will be held Saturday at 10 a. m. in Hines chapel, Fourteenth and Harvard Streets NW., with the Right Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, Senate chaplain and dean of Washington Cathedral, officiating.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two concerning the passing away of my close and splendid friend Percy E. Budlong. Mr. Budlong was one of the most accomplished men I have ever known. His knowledge of the English language was superb. He was one of the gentlest and kindliest men I have ever known. He was courteous in the highest degree. He was a remarkably efficient employee of the Senate, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has just said. He was the ideal man for the place he held in the Senate for so long. I was devoted to him. I admired and highly respected him. I deeply mourn his passing.

I learned to know Mr. Budlong when I first came to the Senate, nearly 26 years ago, and through the entire period from then until now we were true and genuine friends. I never knew a man in the employ of the Senate to be more friendly, more courteous, more efficient, more accommodating, and more kindly than was Mr. Budlong.

I have often said to him, as I have said to his friends, that Mr. Budlong would have made a great Senator in this body. He was a man of vast information. He was a fine historian. He had a wide knowledge of men and affairs, and it seems almost a pity that such a man as Mr. Budlong could not have served in public life. He would have been an ornament to any legislative body; indeed, he would have filled almost any office with credit and distinction, for he was a splendid, upstanding, honest, and high-minded gentleman.

Mr. President, I know that every Member of the Senate, without regard to party, to faction, or to any other consideration, will sincerely mourn the loss of this splendid man, this able public servant. I will miss him; his place cannot be easily filled.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I heartily approve and confirm the tributes so properly and appropriately paid by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to our deceased friend, Mr. Budlong. I wish to take a moment of time to testify to the many personal kindnesses and services which were rendered to me from time to time by Mr. Budlong. He was a man of vast historical information. Many times during the transcribing for the RECORD of the remarks made in the course of debates on the Senate floor, I have had conversation with him and received many helpful suggestions. He was a man of marvelous industry; he had an absorbing interest in the transactions of the Senate, and was thoroughly advised as to the history of this body and its traditions. He was deeply interested in the individual Members of the Senate. He was a man of fine culture and broad education and information.

Mr. President, I wish to express my personal grief at his passing, and to pay this brief tribute to his manhood, to his splendid service, and to his fine personal qualities which he uniformly exhibited on the floor of the Senate and in his dealings with Senators.

May his ashes rest in peace.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish to add what little I can in relation to the sad event which has been alluded to by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

I knew Mr. Budlong intimately. I have known him ever since I have been here, which is a long, long period. I knew him as a man of ability, and in his chosen career no man was more competent. I know that to be so because shorthand reporting was also my chosen career in my early life. Mr. Budlong not only possessed the ability of a good shorthand reporter who would in every way he could assist any Member of this body, but he had that fine human trait of desire to serve to the extent of his ability, and he always did serve to the utmost of his powers.

I feel that I should be wanting at least in recognition of what I knew to be his fine traits of character if I did not join in this little symposium by those who also knew him. He was a good man. He was an able man. He was a man who filled his position thoroughly and well. He was always willing to undertake any sort of work in order to help a Member of this body.

I say of Mr. Budlong, may he rest in peace; may he have the peace that was denied him in the latter days of his life. May he be all that he would have been.

Good-bye, Budlong.

PRESIDENT MANUEL PRADO, OF PERU

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that on next Monday it is contemplated that the President of Peru, who will be visiting in the city of Washington, will visit the Senate, and that at some time during the early afternoon he will be welcomed on the floor of the Senate. I understand he desires to make a brief address to the Senate, and I hope that if possible there will be a full attendance of Senators at that time.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 6955) to promote the prosecution of the war by exempting from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property for use in performing defense contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Buffalo County, Nebr., Farmers Union, requesting that the Government hold surplus grain off of the market until at least parity prices are received therefor, and also opposing the imposition of a general sales tax; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPPER:

The petition of members of Heart of America Auxiliary Lodge, No. 6033 (Union Pacific Railroad), Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the rejection of all proposed legislation which may be detrimental to the interests of labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Fort Scott and Independence, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCNARY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

H. R. 5142. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising

in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2273. A bill for the relief of Ruth D. and Henry L. Brittingham; with amendments (Rept. No. 1312);

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1313);

H. R. 5687. A bill for the relief of Edwin L. Wade; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315); and

H. R. 5955. A bill for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2454. A bill to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. No. 1316);

S. 2490. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.); with amendments (Rept. No. 1317); and

S. 2496. A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2254. A bill providing for certain additional appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; with amendments (Rept. No. 1319).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2514. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional naval academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2515. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2516. A bill to authorize the presentation of medals to enlisted men who took part in repelling the attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On May 5, 1942:

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine.

On May 6, 1942:

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse;

S. 1231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5165, dated May 3, 1929;

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria;

S. 2133. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940; and

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR PIERRE VAN PAASSEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator MEAD at the testimonial dinner for Pierre van Paassen, sponsored by the Committee for an Army of Palestinian and Stateless Jews, on Sunday evening, May 3, 1942, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A JEWISH ARMY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GILLETTE in Philadelphia, Pa., on April 26, 1942, at a meeting of the National Committee for a Jewish Army, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL TO THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in this emergency we are sustained and assured by practically every element of our national life in the work they are doing in connection with our Nation's war effort. In the field of sport and entertainment the war effort is emphasized as has never been the case heretofore.

We are all familiar with the notable contribution made by the boxing profession to the Army and Navy relief, especially in the gatherings at Madison Square Garden, and more particularly the two in which the champion heavyweight, Joe Louis, participated. The stage, the screen, and every other activity of entertainment are likewise making very notable contributions.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate and of the country this morning to the contribution made by the baseball fraternity. It is probably to be expected that America's national pastime would emphasize the war effort as it has always done in the past; but it is outdoing itself in this emergency, and its great contribution, in my judgment, should receive notice in the Senate.

Mr. President, I have before me a copy of last evening's Washington Star. In this newspaper I find a complete schedule of 16 major league games which are to be played for the benefit of the Navy Relief Society and the Army Emergency Relief Fund. These games will be equally divided between the American League and the National League, and no doubt a very substantial sum of money will be provided for both the Navy and the Army relief funds.

I have also a letter from the president of the Minor Baseball Leagues of the United States, which reads:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL LEAGUES,
Durham, N. C., March 14, 1942.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: Knowing your great interest in professional baseball, and having in view that at some time there may arise in the Senate an occasion to present to that honorable body facts concerning our national pastime, I want to give you certain information that may be found helpful to you.

Upon the date of writing this letter 600 professional baseball players, out of the ranks of our 41 leagues, have entered the armed forces of the Government. An additional 250 players have voluntarily retired from the game to enter the service of industrial plants engaged in the manufacture of munitions and equipment for the Government. These figures only have reference to the minor leagues.

We are averaging about 10 players a day now entering the service.

In addition to this both the National Association and each club, their officials and players are investing to the very limit in defense bonds and stamps.

Our clubs have prepared to set aside the receipts of a number of games during the season to be likewise invested.

We have adopted the health shield issued by the Government as an emblem to be carried on the sleeve of all of the uniforms, home and road, used by our clubs.

Last summer all of our clubs put on bond sale days consisting of a patriotic program to advertise defense bond sales.

The National Association (the minor leagues) have a standing national defense service committee, consisting of Tom Fairweather, W. C. Tuttle, Trammell Scott, George M. Trautman, Rev. Harold J. Martin, Thomas J. Halligan, and Shelby Peace, presidents of leagues throughout the various sections of the country, whose duty it is to keep in touch with the professional baseball players in all branches of the service, and to render them every service possible, particularly such as arranging their personal affairs back here in the States and keeping in touch with them and their families. Recently we have had cases where these boys had moved about so fast that they did not get their Government checks and our committee has dispatched the money to them pending the receipt of their checks from the Government and relying upon the reimbursement to them by the player.

Many of our clubs have thrown our gates open without charge to men in uniform, and in nearly every case that I know of where free admission has not been possible, greatly reduced admissions have been charged these men

A bat-and-ball fund of $25,000 was provided by the major leagues to purchase balls, bats, and other equipment for soldiers in camp.

Where players were under any restriction in professional baseball, we have held that such ineligibilities were suspended while the players were in service and playing on their service teams.

I wish to assure you that baseball is supporting the Government in the national emergency and doing everything it can for the men in the service, not merely theoretically but practically, and the flag of our Government flies from the flagpole of every park in professional baseball.

If there should be other information that you might like at any time and which I have overlooked in this communication, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

We have many former professional baseball players, league presidents, etc., serving in the Congress of the United States, of which we are very proud.

Very truly yours.

W. G. BRAMHAM, *President.*

Mr. President because of the importance of this contribution, and because of the huge sum of money which will be raised for the Army and Navy relief funds, I have read this letter, and ask that the article from the Evening Star be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DODGERS, GIANTS START ARMY, NAVY RELIEF GAMES FRIDAY—EVERYONE, EVEN UMPIRES, MUST PAY ADMISSION AT BROOKLYN CLASH

NEW YORK, May 6.—The complete schedule of the 16 major league games which will be played for the benefit of the Navy Relief Society and the Army emergency relief fund has been made public by the Navy organization.

The first game will be played at Brooklyn Friday between the Dodgers and the New York Giants, with the Navy getting the entire proceeds. Newspapermen, club officials, umpires, and everyone else who enters Ebbets Field to see the game will buy tickets.

A second contest between the two clubs will be played at the Polo Grounds in New York, August 3, with all receipts going to the Army relief.

The two groups will divide the returns from all other games equally under an arrangement worked out here last month at a meeting of Commissioner Kenesaw M. Landis and other baseball leaders and representatives of the service funds.

The schedule:

AMERICAN LEAGUE

Saturday, May 23: New York at Washington.
Saturday, May 23: Philadelphia at Boston.
Monday, May 25: Chicago at Cleveland.
Monday, May 25: Detroit at St. Louis.
Tuesday, June 30: St. Louis at Detroit.
Thursday, July 2: Cleveland at Chicago.
Saturday, August 22: Boston at Philadelphia.
Saturday, August 22: Washington at New York.

NATIONAL LEAGUE

Friday, May 8: New York at Brooklyn.
Tuesday, May 19: Pittsburgh at Philadelphia.
Wednesday, May 27: Chicago at Cincinnati.
Wednesday, June 3: Boston at St. Louis.
Thursday, June 25: St. Louis at Boston.
Tuesday, June 30: Cincinnati at Chicago.
Thursday, July 9: Philadelphia at Pittsburgh.
Monday, August 3: Brooklyn at New York.

Many minor league clubs also are arranging games for the two charities on the same home-and-home basis.

INSTRUCTION IN FLYING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD a program of education and research related to air transportation at the University of Illinois, including a university airport.

This report emphasizes my recent recommendation for the training in flying of young men in the public schools, the colleges, and the universities. It will be noted that the great University of Illinois, one of the foremost educational institutions in the country, has considered the construction of an airport and a program of education for that institution which would augment the aircraft personnel of the country.

President A. C. Willard and Dean M. L. Enger prepared the report for the board of trustees of the university. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRAM OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH RELATED TO AIR TRANSPORTATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—INCLUDING A UNIVERSITY AIRPORT

(Prepared for the board of trustees of the university by Dean M. L. Enger and President A. C. Willard, April 10, 1942)

At the meeting of the board of trustees on January 24, 1942, the president of the university was authorized to request the Governor to include in a call for a special session of the General Assembly of Illinois an appropriation of $200,000 for the purchase of one section of land for an airport. This request has been made and is now under consideration by the Governor. The president was also authorized to make a survey, in consultation with the college of engineering and with appropriate State and Federal agencies, and to report a proposal for the operation of such an airport. This report is being submitted, in accordance with that authorization, for consideration by the board of trustees.

BACKGROUND

The university was established by an act of the legislature creating the Illinois Industrial University in 1867, and was opened in 1868, to serve the needs of the people of the State, through education and research, for the development of agriculture and the mechanic arts. At that time those two important industries were greatly in need of more scientific and technical knowledge than then existed, and, above all, there was a great lack of institutions of learning in which students could study the applied sciences and related subjects so essential to successful farming, manufacturing, and transportation. The university met this situation as best it could with a courageous and determined faculty devoted to the teaching, discovery, and dissemination of the scientific and technical knowledge so badly needed in those early days.

Since its opening in 1868 the University of Illinois has developed and expanded into numerous colleges, schools, and experiment stations, covering many professional fields, until it is now one of the four or five largest universities in the country with an annual enrollment of 15,995 students as of March 1, 1942, and a faculty and staff of 2,838 persons. During its lifetime it has continued to be the policy of the university to meet so far as possible the demands for new and varied educational and research programs growing out of the rapidly changing social, industrial, and professional life of the State and Nation.

AIR TRANSPORTATION A MAJOR INDUSTRY

The most recent demand for a new program of education and research at the university rests squarely on the amazing growth of air transportation all over the world. The supreme importance of the airplane in war has accelerated research and developments in design and has caused a vast increase in the manufacture of many types of aircraft, in the training of pilots and ground crews, and in construction of airports. There is every indication that air transport will assume as much importance in the post-war economy as it now assumes in war.

It is hardly conceivable that the university can be completely effective in any program designed to aid and advance military and civil air transportation unless it can acquire a fully equipped modern airport in close proximity to its Urbana-Champaign campus. Such an airport should have a field area of 640 acres, well drained and equipped with paved runways of suitable length, some of which should be wide enough for planes landing by instrument control. In addition, hangars, machine shops, laboratories, and other service and administration buildings will be necessary. Many of the various research projects related to air transportation should be housed in appropriate buildings located at the field. This airport must be as modern and complete as science and technology can make it. Its function is to serve a great State in providing education and research at the University of Illinois for the advancement of air transportation in this country.

MANY PROBLEMS CONFRONT THE AIR TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

The requirements of war have serv d to emphasize the importance of unsolved physiological and medical problems involving the fundamental problems of circulation, body temperature, special sense acuity, muscular coordination, work capacity, and mental alertness and fatigue. The fighting services are subjected to an extreme range of temperature, humidity, and atmospheric pressure, varying from arctic cold to tropical desert and jungle heat, from atmospheric pressures at sea level to the low pressures and temperatures at high-altitude flying. In the over-all development of aeronautical educational and research programs the biological sciences have an important place. Researches involving the effect of weather and the atmospheric environment on human beings have been under way in the college of medicine for a number of years. (See appendix I for a partial list of publications on Researches on the Influence of Atmospheric Environment Related to Problems in Aviation Medicine.) These researches, together with those now in progress or being planned, involve the departments of medicine, physiology, physiological chemistry, pathology, pharmacology, psychology, psychiatry, and surgery.

Some important problems of education and research require a regrouping of fields of knowledge and concerted action of specialists in several departments and faculties in the university. The development of the airplane and air transportation is such a problem. Fortunately, the university has such a group of men, both in the medical and engineering fields, who have been cooperating effectively in a research program on the effect of the atmospheric environment.

The university, through the engineering experiment station, has made important contributions to the development of railway and highway transportation (See appendix II to this report as evidence of what the university has done for land transportation.) This has been done through the cooperation of members of the staff and the use of equipment of nearly every department of the college of engineering and the departments of chemistry, chemical engineering, and mathematics in the college of liberal arts and sciences. With adjustments and additions to the staff and facilities the University of Illinois can make contributions to the training of personnel and to the development of air transportation comparable with those which have increased the economy, safety, and comfort of railway and highway transportation.

The design of the many types of airplanes for military and civilian service requires, in addition to the fundamental engineering training, instruction and research in aerodynamics, thermodynamics, engines, structural design, fatigue of metals, vibrations, radio, metallurgy, tests and specifications of materials, instruments, etc. This will require modifications (often small) and additions to existing advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in the departments of mechanical engineering, civil engineering, theoretical and applied mechanics, electrical engineering, metallurgical engineering, and physics.

Airport design is in its infancy. Many problems are involved: Selection of site, grading, drainage, soil stabilization, paved run-

ways, a comprehensive lighting plan, design of hangars and other buildings, the analysis and treatment of soil, Weather Bureau, radio facilities, water supply, and sewage disposal. In November 1940, it was reported that there were 2,400 civil airports in the United States, but there were only 36 airports meeting class 3 specifications of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Since then many new airports have been built and old airports have been improved. The planning and construction of airports requires the cooperation of men trained in architecture, civil engineering, electrical engineering, meteorology, and agronomy. The agronomist is needed for testing, selecting, and treating the soil and selecting seed for turf outside of the paved landing strips. Grading operations usually expose subsoil on which grasses grow with difficulty. For landings most pilots prefer turf because there is less damage to tires, but pavements are necessary in wet weather and for heavy planes.

Training of inept military pilots is expensive in money, equipment, and time. Investigations are being made to devise simple tests which will eliminate candidates for the Air Corps who lack the coordination, quick responses, and the ability to act correctly under stress so vitally important for military pilots. Promising results have been obtained. This important work is in the province of psychology.

The present airport facilities of the United States can be compared with the highway facilities 25 years ago. There were then fairly good automobiles, but their use was limited by lack of paved roads. Billions have since been spent for highways. We now have good airplanes, but their use is limited by lack of airports. This is true of the Midwest in general and of the State of Illinois in particular. In the near future the network of airways will be greatly increased. An airway from Kansas City to Indianapolis passing through Quincy, Springfield, Decatur, Champaign-Urbana, Danville, and Crawfordsville would serve a large population, as would an airway from Chicago through Kankakee, Champaign-Urbana, Mattoon, Effingham, Mt. Vernon, Carbondale, Cairo, to Memphis. The income from commercial operations of the airport would help defray the cost of operation and maintenance.

FLIGHT TRAINING FOR CIVILIAN, MILITARY, AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

One of the most important services of a university airport would be to provide flight training for civilian aviation units, as well as for military and naval aviation units. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is continuing and expanding its program of civilian pilot training at colleges and universities where suitable approved flying fields are available. The Navy has a greatly expanded aviation program (known as V–5) for college men, and the Navy recommends that men enlisted in the V–5 aviation-cadet program get flying experience while still in college by enrolling in the civilian pilot-training course at their own universities. An airport at this university would make it possible to establish a Reserve Officers' Training Corps for the Air Corps of the Army. This branch of the service will be very important in the future, and an aviation unit should be included in the university's Reserve Officers' Training Corps brigade.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AN AIRPORT

The Civil Aeronautics Administration recommends "to any city, regardless of size, that an area adequate for all future needs, as nearly as can be anticipated, should be controlled from the start on an airport project in order to provide for future expansion." A square mile of land is recommended. Consideration must be given to possible obstructions in the approach areas within 2 miles of the boundaries of the airport. The towers of the university radio station are over 300 feet high and exclude from consideration all land lying within a 2-mile radius.

Engineers of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Illinois Aeronautics Commission have made a preliminary inspection of the area in the vicinity of the Twin Cities and have found several promising sites. The site most favored is about 4 miles from the campus.

A class 3 airport is recommended for the university. Such an airport would be adequate for important cities on feeder-line airway systems and many intermediate points on main-line airways—general population range 25,000 to several hundred thousand. A class 3 airport should have landing-strip lengths of at least 3,700 feet at the local elevation above sea level. It would accommodate present-day transport planes up to 50,000 pounds gross weight. The facilities required are in general the same as for a class 4 airport (except for minimum runway lengths of 4,600 feet and an administration building) and include: Drainage, fencing, marking, wind-direction indicator, lighting, hangar and shop, fueling, weather bureau, two-way radio, and visual traffic control. The lighting requirements include: Airport beacon, boundary lights, range lights, obstruction lights, illuminated wind cone, apron flood lighting, traffic pistol light, illuminated wind T, ceiling projector, runway contact lights, and approach lights on every runway equipped for instrument landing. The width of usable landing strips should be 500 feet and runways should have a width of 150 feet (200 feet is required for runways equipped for instrument landings) and should be laid out so that landings can be made within 22.5° of the wind direction 90 percent of the time when wind velocities exceed 4 miles per hour.

PROPOSAL FOR THE ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF A UNIVERSITY-OWNED AIRPORT

Since the operation of an airport at the university depends entirely upon the acquisition of a suitable area for a flying field, and its subsequent construction and equipment, the following program of procedure is necessarily involved in providing for such an airport:

1. Purchase of a tract of land, approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, from funds provided through an appropriation by the General Assembly of Illinois. Proposed amount, $200,000.

2. Preparation of plans and specifications for converting this tract into a flying field which will meet the class 3 requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Such services have been offered by the Illinois Aeronautics Commission, provided the university controls the area to be improved. No funds are required of University of Illinois.

3. Funds for the improvement of the field—grading, drainage, fencing, runways, and airport lighting—may be secured as a 100-percent grant from the Civil Aeronautics Administration, or as a 75-percent grant from Work Projects Administration, provided approval of the project can be secured after items 1 and 2 have been completed. It is difficult to estimate the cost of this work before the land has been selected and surveys have been made. However, the probable cost, based on similar airports, will run about $800,000. The sponsor's contribution for the Work Projects Administration grant would then be at least $200,000.

4. Funds for improvements—hangars, shops, weather bureau, and laboratories—cannot be secured from the Civil Aeronautics Administration, but Work Projects Administration may approve such a project if labor conditions warrant an allocation of Federal funds. However, the amount of Work Projects Administration allotment which could be used for building construction may be limited by lack of skilled workmen on Work Projects Administration rolls. At a total cost of $750,000 it would probably be necessary to secure $500,000 to $650,000 from the State of Illinois.

RECAPITULATION

The expenditure for a class 3 airport is estimated to be:

Land	$200,000
Grading, drainage, runways, etc.	800,000
Buildings	750,000
Total	1,750,000

If the Civil Aeronautics Administration assumes cost of grading, drainage, runways, etc., and Work Projects Administration contributed to other improvements, the appropriation required from the State of Illinois is estimated to be: Land, $200,000; buildings, airport lighting, etc., $500,000 to $650,000; totaling $700,000 to $850,000.

If the work of grading, drainage, construction of buildings, etc., is done as far as possible under a Work Projects Administration grant, the State of Illinois would probably have to appropriate the following amounts: Land, $200,000; grading, etc., $200,000; buildings, etc., $500,000 to $650,000; totaling $900,000 to $1,050,000.

5. The operation of the airport would, of course, involve flying equipment, personnel, supplies, and maintenance. It is recommended that the university operate the airport through a manager reporting to the professor of aeronautical engineering. When it is decided to go ahead with the project a competent man with aeronautical experience and with a professional background of education in this field should be appointed to assist in planning the development of the physical facilities and the curriculum. During the construction period it is recommended that aeronautical options be offered in mechanical engineering and civil engineering, and since there will be little laboratory work the increase in expense will be small.

The minimum staff at the airport and the salary and wages would probably be:

Manager	$4,000
Two flight instructors	5,000
Two airplane mechanics	4,000
Miscellaneous wages	4,000
Total	17,000

The income from airport operations should be in excess of the above expenses. If the civilian-pilot training program is continued with quotas of 50, at least 7 flight instructors would be required, but the net profit would be higher.

When the Department of Aeronautical Engineering is established the salary budget would be about as follows, on the assumption of 100 seniors in the curriculum:

Head of Department	$7,500
Two assistant professors	7,200
Four instructors	9,600
Two mechanicians	4,000
Wages	1,000
Total	29,300

Against this there would be an offset due to decreased enrollment in mechanical engineering.

The expense and equipment budget for the Department should not exceed $6,000 for the first year.

APPENDIX I: RESEARCHES ON THE INFLUENCE OF ATMOSPHERIC ENVIRONMENT RELATED TO PROBLEMS IN AVIATION MEDICINE

Flight personnel and passengers are subjected to stresses and conditions of atmospheric environment more severe than those encountered in transportation on the ground. As compared with military aviation, civilian passengers are subjected to a relatively small range of conditions. However, many civilian flyers are in such poor physical condition that

even small changes of atmospheric pressures and other stresses have pronounced effects. Investigations in aviation medicine are therefore of importance in all flying. In the full development of instruction and research in air transportation the well-being of the flyer as well as the improvement of equipment must be taken into account.

Many investigations have been carried on by members of the staff of the college of medicine on the adjustment of human beings to the atmospheric environment. In the last few years there has been cooperation between the colleges of medicine and engineering in planning equipment in which investigations can be made on human subjects under controlled atmospheric pressures, temperatures, and humidities. These investigations are fundamental in aviation medicine.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning where we ended at the time of the last call of the calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator intend that we recur to the first part of the calendar after the conclusion of the consideration of the measures to which he has referred?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, next Sunday will be Mother's Day. It will be observed all over the world—in the Americas, in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, on all the continents and islands of the seas, and over the seven seas.

In the air, on land, on water, men seeking destruction of their fellow men will pause for a time to remember, to commemorate, to send a message to, or drop a tear in remembrance of the one person all mankind holds dear and reverences—mother.

In churches, in the fields—for these days production must continue ceaselessly and endlessly for the war of survival—in homes, in faraway places, and in strange surroundings grown men and women, boys and girls, will remember mother.

Different words stir different emotions in different people, but there is one word—"mother"—which in all languages appeals to the best and the highest in all of us, whether we be good or bad or indifferent. The benevolent and the wise, the malignant and the foolish, the cynic and the sophisticate, those who have attained the heights in mental and spiritual development, those who have sunk to the depths, all respond to the one word—"mother."

Mother love is unselfish; it is everlasting; it is self-sacrificing. It is tenderness and devotion, loyalty and truth without end. Mother love is more than kind; it also is thoughtful and provident for its loved ones. Mother love has no limits, nor does it measure consequences to self, in serving loved ones.

The mother, when all is said and done, is the life spring of the family, here and everywhere. She is the center. Around her the father, the brothers, and sisters move within the orbit of her affection, her care, her providence.

Three qualities make for greatness, for permanence, in families, in communities, in nations—loyalty, the will to sacrifice, the willingness to cooperate. Mother love is all of these. Mothers offer their lives to bring children into this world. They live their lives for their children; if necessary give their lives for their children; they suffer when the children suffer, rejoice when the children are happy. They give all, and in the giving, receive all.

Mr. President, those who on this Mother's Day may turn to mother and pay her tribute in person are indeed fortunate. Others of us who are not so fortunate, who have only the priceless heritage of memory on Mother's Day, can make it a day of consecration and service to our fellows, and to our country.

These are days of suffering and sorrow for mothers all over the world. They are days also of pride in sons, husbands, brothers, and sisters who also are offering all for country and for the future of mankind.

Our country today is at war. Mothers of America have sons—aye, and daughters also—facing privation and death in all the far-flung continents and islands of the world. I know these mothers hearts are wrung; I know also they face the future with the same courage and fortitude with which mothers have faced the unknown for untold centuries.

Let every American on this Mother's Day resolve so to live, and, if needful, so to die, that mother will be glad she brought him into the world to better the world. If every one of us could approach living up to the ideals of his mother, the world would be a better world than it is today.

Let us consecrate ourselves today to the task of making this a better world tomorrow for the mothers of the world. Thereby only can we justify our own existence in this world.

Mr. President, there is one thing close at home which I believe we can do to relieve the worries and heartaches of many American mothers today. Hundreds of thousands, aye, millions, of our boys, mothers' boys, are in the armed forces of their country. They are in training camps, in outposts, and in the fighting forces. Many of them will face death; all of them face struggle and privations such as we at home cannot conceive of, excepting those who have gone through the mills of war.

I know, because I have received letters from thousands of them, that the mothers of America would feel safer and happier today if they could only know that the Government, which has taken their boys into the armed services, would also afford them all the protection possible against the insidious influences of vice and intoxicating liquors in training camps and in the field.

Incidentally, let me say I know of no better way for Congress to commemorate Mother's Day than during the week which follows to enact into law the Sheppard bill, Senate bill 860, for the protection of the sons of American mothers in our armed forces.

In closing I must pay tribute to an American woman, Miss Anna M. Jarvis, of Philadelphia, Pa., who, more than three decades ago, inaugurated the formal observance of the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day. That observance today is almost world-wide. In the statute books of the United States there are four Federal laws relating to the United States flag. One of these, a joint resolution approved May 8, 1914, authorizes the display of the flag on Mother's Day, officially designated as the second Sunday in May.

Let us again consecrate ourselves next Sunday to the service of mother, and so live the coming year that she may be proud of us, wherever she and we may be.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1314, the clerk will proceed to call the calendar.

DAYEE JONES

The bill (S. 1143) for the relief of Dayee Jones was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Roy Vernon Jones, lieutenant, One Hundred and Sixteenth Observation Squadron, National Guard of the United States, who was killed in line of duty in active service on the 21st day of October 1940, shall be deemed to have made application for and to have been granted $10,000 national service life insurance, and to have designated his wife, Dayee Jones, as beneficiary thereof, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay the beneficiary of such insurance in installments as provided in the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as is necessary to meet the payments herein authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CADETS UNDERGOING FLIGHT TRAINING AND AVIATION INSTRUCTION

The bill (S. 2446) to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during such time as cadets of the United States Military Academy are undergoing flight training and aviation instruction they shall receive the same base pay as is now or may hereafter be provided for Army aviation cadets, which pay shall include extra pay for flying risk, as provided by law, and shall be issued at Government expense the necessary aviation clothing and equipment for such training; during the course of such training when not quartered at the Military Academy they shall receive the same allowances for travel, sub-

sistence, and quarters as are now or may hereafter be provided for Army aviation cadets; and during the course of such training they shall be entitled to the same insurance benefits as are provided by the Act of June 3, 1941 (Public, No. 99, 77th Cong.), for enlisted men of the Army detailed as aviation students: *Provided*, That, upon completion of the prescribed training as aviation students, and until permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights, the insurance provided shall continue, but the premiums shall be deducted from the pay of the individual concerned and paid as the Secretary of War may direct to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and upon being permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights, the insurance may be continued at the option and at the expense of the individual concerned.

INCREASE OF NUMBER OF CADETS AT MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 2477) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, doubtless due to important public matters, and I wish to ask him some questions and make some observations on my own account with respect to the bill. For that reason I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY subsequently said: Mr. President, one bill was passed over a moment ago on objection of a Senator because of certain information which was desired. I believe the objection has been withdrawn, and I ask that the Senate revert to Calendar No. 1316, Senate bill 2477, and consider it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was the Senator the able Senator from South Dakota has in mind. He conferred with me and also with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and explained the matters concerning which I desired to propound questions to the chairman of the committee. I am quite satisfied, and now have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2477) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments in section 2, page 2, line 9, after the word "qualified", to insert "alternates and", and in line 10, after the word "board" to insert "two-thirds thereof from qualified alternates and one-third thereof from qualified candidates"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, on and after July 1, 1942, there shall be allowed at the United States Military Academy four cadets for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, six for the District of Columbia, and two cadets to be selected by the Governor of the Panama Canal from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and the sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Co. residing in the Republic of Panama, in addition to the number now authorized to be appointed from the United States at large, and from the enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard, and from the sons of deceased officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines.

SEC. 2. When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board, two-thirds thereof from qualified alternates and one-third thereof from qualified candidates: *Provided*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF OBLIGATION OF FUNDS OF THE COAST GUARD FOR CERTAIN WORK

The bill (S. 2453) to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all orders or contracts for work or material, under authorization of law heretofore or hereafter placed with Government-owned establishments by the Coast Guard, shall be considered as obligations in the same manner as provided for similar orders or contracts placed with private contractors, and appropriations for such work or material shall remain available for payment therefor as in the case of orders or contracts placed with private contractors.

PAY OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO SUBMARINES AND DIVING DUTY

The bill (S. 2455) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty", to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," approved April 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 412), as amended (49 Stat. 1091; 34 U. S. C., 886), be, and the same is hereby, further amended by striking out in line 20 thereof the words "as now provided by law" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "as now or hereafter provided by law"; and by striking out the proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof a proviso to read as follows: "*Provided*, That divers employed in actual salvage or repair operations in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find in accordance with instructions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall, in addition to the foregoing, receive the sum of $5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof so employed."

AWARD OF MEDALS OF HONOR, DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDALS, AND NAVY CROSSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2456) to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 7, after the word "who", to strike out "while in the naval service" and to insert "while serving in any capacity with the Navy", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, shall, in action involving actual conflict with the enemy, or in the line of his profession, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to mission of his command or to the command to which attached: *Provided*, That the design of this medal shall be the same as that adopted pursuant to the act approved December 21, 1861 (12 Stat. 330).

"SEC. 2. That the President be, and he hereby is, further authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a Navy cross of appropriate design and ribbon, together with a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the naval service of the United States, distinguishes himself by extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy.

"SEC. 3. That the President be, and he hereby is, further authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a distinguished-service medal of appropriate design and a ribbon, together with a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Navy of the United States, since the 6th day of April 1917 has distinguished, or who hereafter shall distinguish, himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility.

"SEC. 4. That the President be, and he hereby is, further authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a silver star medal of appropriate design and a ribbon, together with a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Navy of the United States, since December 7, 1941, has distinguished himself or who hereafter shall distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity in action, such gallantry and service not being sufficient to justify the award of a medal of honor or a Navy cross.

"SEC. 5. That each enlisted or enrolled person of the naval service to whom is awarded a medal of honor, Navy cross, distinguished-service medal, or a silver star medal shall, for each such award, be entitled to additional pay at the rate of $2 per month from the date of the distinguished act or service on which the award is based, and each bar, or other suitable emblem or insignia, in lieu of a medal of honor, Navy cross, distinguished-service medal, or silver star medal, as hereby provided for, shall entitle him to

further additional pay at the rate of $2 per month from the date of the distinguished act or service for which the bar is awarded, and such additional pay shall continue throughout his active service, whether such service shall or shall not be continuous.

"SEC. 6. That no more than one medal of honor, or one Navy cross, or one distinguished-service medal, or one silver star medal shall be issued to any one person; but for each succeeding deed or service sufficient to justify the awarding of a medal of honor, or Navy cross, or a distinguished-service medal, or silver star medal, respectively, the President may award a suitable bar, or other suitable emblem or insignia, to be worn with the decoration and a corresponding rosette or other device.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to expend from the appropriation 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel' of the Navy Department so much as may be necessary to defray the cost of the medals of honor, Navy crosses, distinguished-service medals, and silver star medals, and bars, emblems, or insignia herein provided for, and so much as may be necessary to replace any medals, crosses, bars, emblems, or insignia as are herein or may hereafter have been provided for: *Provided*, That such replacement shall be made only in those cases where the medal of honor, Navy cross, distinguished-service medal, or silver star medal, or bar, emblem, or insignia presented under the provisions of this or any other act shall have been lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use without fault or neglect on the part of the person to whom it was awarded and shall be made without charge therefor.

"SEC. 8. That, except as otherwise prescribed herein, no medal of honor, Navy cross, dstinguished-service medal, silver star medal, or bar or other suitable emblem or insignia in lieu of either of said medals or of said cross, shall be issued to any person after more than 5 years from the date of the act or service justifying the awarding thereof, nor unless a specific statement or report distinctly setting forth the act or distinguished service and suggesting or recommending official recognition thereof shall have been made by his superior through official channels at the time of act or service or within 3 years thereafter.

"SEC. 9. That in case an individual who shall distinguish himself dies before the making of the award to which he may be entitled, the award may nevertheless be made and the medal or cross or bar or other emblem or insignia presented within 5 years from the date of the act or service justifying the award thereof to such representative of deceased as the President may designate: *Provided*, That no medal or cross or no bar or other emblem or insignia shall be awarded or presented to any individual, or to the representative of any individual, whose entire service subsequent to the time he distinguished himself shall not have been honorable: *Provided further*, That in cases of persons now in the naval service for whom the award of the medal of honor has been recommended in full compliance with then existing regulations, prior to February 4, 1919, but on account of services which, though insufficient fully to justify the award of the medal of honor, appears to have been such as to justify the award of the Navy cross, or distinguished-service medal, or silver star medal hereinbefore provided, such cases may be considered and acted upon under the provisions of this act authorizing the award of the Navy cross, distinguished-service medal, and silver star medal notwithstanding that said services may have been rendered more than 5 years before said cases shall have been considered as authorized by this proviso, but all consideration or any action upon any of said cases shall be based exclusively upon official records now on file in the Navy Department.

"SEC. 10. That the President be, and he hereby is, authorized to delegate, under such conditions, regulations, and limitations as he shall prescribe, to flag officers who are commanders in chief or commanding on important independent duty power conferred upon him by this act to award the Navy cross, the distinguished flying cross, and the silver star medal; and he is further authorized to make from time to time any and all rules, regulations, and orders which he shall deem necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and to execute full purpose and intention thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE IN DESIGNATION OF BUREAU OF NAVIGATION OF THE NAVY

The bill (H. R. 6874) to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT CONVENTION OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

The bill (H. R. 6913) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVY, CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 6932) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] indicated a desire to have a brief explanation of House bill 6932, a bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy. He has no desire to object to the bill; but I think, in fairness to him, that the report of the committee should be printed in the RECORD.

In that connection I think it will be interesting to note just what action has been taken in authorizing an increase in the strength of the Navy in recent years.

The act of March 27, 1934—the Vinson-Trammell Act—established the composition of the Navy at treaty limits.

The act of May 17, 1938, increased the authorized strength of the Navy by approximately 23 percent.

The act approved June 14, 1940, increased the authorized strength of the Navy by approximately 11 percent.

The act approved July 19, 1940, increased the authorized strength of the Navy by approximately 70 percent. This is the so-called two-ocean Navy bill.

The act approved December 23, 1941, increased the authorized strength of the Navy by 150,000 tons.

This bill authorizes an increase in the authorized strength by 200,000 tons, to be used mostly for building submarines. The estimated cost is $900,000,000. This figure does not include the auxiliary vessels of the Navy or the minor combatant vessels such as submarine chasers, patrol boats, escort craft, and other similar types.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1284) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6932) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the authorized composition of the Navy in under-age vessels by 200,000 tons of combatant ships, and to authorize the President to undertake the construction of such types and tonnages of combatant ships as he shall determine to be necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

It is vital during the continuance of the war that the naval shipbuilding capacity be utilized to the utmost. In order to accomplish this, contracts must be let and plans completed in time to lay down new ships as fast as required facilities will permit. The shipbuilding that would be authorized by enactment of the bill is necessary in order to accomplish this objective.

The committee are advised that the Navy Department contemplates utilization of the authority contained in this bill for the construction of submarines. The committee are of the opinion, however, that discretion should be vested in the President to depart from this plan in the event that experience gained in this war dictates such a course to be necessary The bill, as reported, confers such discretion.

ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2452), to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in line 3, after "Coast Guard", to insert "and the Coast and Geodetic Survey", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers of the Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, shall, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list with the rank of the next higher grade and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey."

RETIREMENT WITH ADVANCED RANK OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line

6, after the word "may", to insert "if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212), or the act of July 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 180, 77th Cong.)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as the commander of a fleet or subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212), or the act of July 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 180, 77th Cong.), in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list: *Provided*, That no increase in retired pay shall accrue as the result of such advanced rank on the retired list: *Provided further*, That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may in his discretion extend the privilege herein granted to such officers as have heretofore been retired and who satisfy the foregoing conditions.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] had intended to offer an amendment to this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

The President is further authorized, without reference to the power conferred upon him by this act, to continue with the rank of admiral on the retired list the officer who, as commander in chief of the Asiatic Fleet, rendered conspicuous and distinguished service in operations against the enemy in the Far East from December 7, 1941, until February 14, 1942.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is to include among the officers who, upon retirement, will hold their advanced rank Admiral Hart, who was in command of one of the units of the Navy which would be affected by the bill. The bill as drawn would permit the promotion of Admiral Hart, and he would be included among those affected.

However, I think the Senator from Michigan desires, as we all do, to give special commendation to Admiral Hart. Therefore I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the interest in this bill on the part of the Senator from Missouri, who is absent, I ask that the committee report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1277) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "may," insert the following: "if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89, U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212), or the act of July 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 180, 77th Cong.)."

The purpose of the bill is to provide that any officer of the Navy falling within one of the two below-mentioned classes, who may be retired while serving as a commander of a fleet or subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral; or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list.

The two classes of officers referred to above are as follows:

(1) Those admirals or vice admirals appointed to such rank pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212).

(2) Those vice admirals appointed to such rank upon their being designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command naval units afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 180, 77th Cong.).

The bill further provides that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may, in his discretion, extend the privilege herein granted to such officers as have heretofore been retired, provided they satisfy the foregoing conditions.

Under existing law (52 Stat. 839; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 685a) the Chief of Naval Operations, all chiefs of bureau of the Navy Department, the Judge Advocate General, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, may retire under certain conditions with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade or rank held by them while occupying such office. Officers who command fleets or subdivisions of fleets at sea with the temporary rank of admiral or vice admiral occupy positions of equivalent importance but do not enjoy the same benefit with respect to advancement upon retirement.

The bill was originally reported to the Senate on March 26, 1942, without amendment. When the bill was taken up in the Senate objection was made that the scope of the bill was not adequately defined. Consequently, on April 16, 1942, the bill was recommitted and amended so as to provide that the officers retired with advanced rank, in accordance with the authority of the bill, should have had that rank conferred on them pursuant to the provisions of either one of the following laws or parts thereof:

SECTION 18, ACT OF MAY 22, 1917 (40 STAT. 89)

SEC. 18. That the President be, and he is hereby, further authorized to designate six officers of the Navy for the command of fleets or subdivisions thereof and, after being so designated from the date of assuming such command until relinquishing thereof, not more than three of such officers shall each have the rank and pay of an admiral, and the others shall each have the rank and pay of a vice admiral; and the grades of admiral and vice admiral are hereby authorized and continued for the purpose of this act: *Provided*, That in time of war the selections under the provisions of this section shall be made from the grades of rear admiral or captain on the active list of the Navy: *Provided further*, That the pay of an admiral shall be $10,000 and the pay of a vice admiral $9,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That in time of peace officers for the command of fleets and subdivisions thereof, as herein authorized, shall be designated from among the rear admirals on the active list of the Navy: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall create any vacancy in any grade in the Navy or increase the total number of officers authorized by law: *Provided further*, That when an officer with the rank of admiral or vice admiral is detached from the command of a fleet or subdivision thereof, as herein authorized, he shall return to his regular rank in the list of officers of the Navy and shall thereafter receive only the pay and allowances of such rank: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be held or construed as amending or repealing the provisions of sections fourteen hundred and thirty-four, fourteen hundred and sixty-three, and fourteen hundred and sixty-four of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

ACT OF JULY 17, 1941 (PUBLIC LAW NO. 180, 77TH CONG.)

That in addition to those officers who may be serving in the grade of vice admiral by virtue of the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212), naval officers, not to exceed a total of nine at any one time, designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command naval units afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission may, within the discretion of the President, have the rank, pay, and all allowances of a vice admiral while so serving. In time of war or national emergency the provisions of this act shall be applicable only to officers on the active list of the rank or grade of captain and above. At all other times the said provisions shall apply only to officers of the rank or grade of rear admiral.

Approved, July 17, 1941.

The Navy Department is of the opinion that officers charged with the responsibility of commanding fleets or subdivisions of fleets, of such importance as to warrant their temporary advancement to the grades of admiral or vice admiral while exercising such command, should receive as much consideration as officers who bear similar responsibilities in the Naval Establishment ashore.

Enactment of the bill would result in no additional cost to the Government.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The bill (S. 2459) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 1, 1929, entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 1441), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking from the last two lines thereof the words "if the total compensation actually paid for all services does not exceed $2,000 for any one fiscal year" and substituting therefor the words "at the rate provided by law for such services."

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, on page 1, line 4, after the name "War Department," to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, line 1, after the word "That," to strike out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942,"; in line 3, after the words "the number of", to strike out "flying" and insert "aviation"; in line 5, after the words "Army Nurse Corps," to strike out "and"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "with the Air Corps, shall not apply: *Provided*, That, exclusive of officers of the Army Air Corps and those assigned thereto for training," and insert "and"; in line 11, after the word "flights", to strike out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, shall not exceed 5 per centum of the total authorized commissioned strength of the Army, notwithstanding the provisions of section 20, act of June 10, 1922, as amended (10 U. S. C. 292)" and insert "are hereby suspended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 2, line 16, after the words "Sec. 3" to insert "(a)"; in line 17, after the word "authorized" to strike out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, in connection with military construction, defense installations"; in line 22, after the name "United States" to insert "or in Alaska"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "or in Alaska"; in line 4, after the words "shipment of" to strike out "household goods and"; in line 7, after the name "United States" to insert "or in Alaska"; and in line 8, after the word "therefrom" to strike out "and to provide for transportation of the dependents of such employees by such means as may be found expedient; and on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

(b) When civilian employees are on duty at places designated by the Secretary of War as within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated for military reasons, or upon transfer or assignment to duty of such civilian employees to places where their dependents are not for military reasons permitted to accompany them, their dependents and household effects may be moved at Government expense under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, to such locations as may be designated by the employee concerned and later from such locations to a duty station to which the employee is assigned and at which the above restrictions do not apply: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents and household effects moved on and after December 8, 1941.

(c) When civilian employees are assigned to temporary duty away from their permanent station on orders which do not provide for return to the permanent station, or which do not specify or imply any limit to the period of absence from the permanent station, their dependents and household effects may be moved at Government expense, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, to such location in the United States as may be designated by the employee concerned and later from such location to a permanent duty station to which the employee is assigned, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe regarding the shipment of dependents into specified zones: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents and household effects moved on and after December 8, 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 4, line 16, after the words "Sec. 4" to insert "(a)"; in the same line, after the word "available" to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942"; in line 21, after the words "personnel of" to strike out "the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the National Guard" and insert "corresponding grades in the Army of the United States"; in line 24, after the name "United States" to strike out "when ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 15 days, including transportation from home to first station, from last station to home upon relief from active duty, and upon permanent change of station" and insert the following:

and from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to or relieved from active duty: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents on and after September 8, 1939.

(b) When such military personnel are on duty at places designated by the Secretary of War as within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated for military reasons, or upon transfer or assignment to duty of such military personnel to places where their dependents are not, for military reasons, permitted to accompany them or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available, dependents for whom travel allowances and travel in kind is authorized, and household effects which are authorized to be moved at Government expense, may be moved at Government expense to such locations as may be designated by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned and later from such locations to a duty station to which such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man may be assigned and at which the above restrictions do not apply: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents and household effects moved on and after December 8, 1941.

(c) When such military personnel are assigned to temporary duty away from their permanent station on orders which do not provide for return to the permanent station, or which do not specify or imply any limit to the period of absence from the permanent station, dependents for whom travel allowances and travel in kind are authorized, and household effects which are authorized to be moved at Government expense on permanent change of station, may be moved at Government expense to such location in the United States as may be designated by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned and later from such location to a permanent-duty station to which the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man is assigned, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe regarding the shipment of dependents into specified zones: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents and household effects moved on and after December 8, 1941.

(d) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, now in the active Federal service, for whom transportation of household effects is authorized, may elect to have such household effects moved at Government expense from their permanent station to any point in the United States, for storage at their own expense for the duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged. After the termination of such wars such household effects may be moved from the point to which originally shipped to any permanent-duty stations to which the officers, warrant officers, or enlisted men may be assigned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 5. That any funds available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for the payment of travel allowances and travel in kind shall be available for the payment of such allowances as are now or may hereafter be authorized for dependents of personnel of the Regular Army, for travel of dependents of retired officers, retired warrant officers, and retired enlisted men of the first three grades and enlisted men of the first three grades of the Regular Army Reserve, including such allowances for dependents, when such personnel is ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 7, line 13, after the word "available", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, made available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, on page 7, line 21, after the word "available", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942"; and in line 23, after the name "Maritime Commission", to insert "and War Shipping Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, on page 8, line 1, after the word "available", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942"; in line 8, after the word "sections", to strike out "355"; in line 9, after the figures "1339", to strike out "40 U. S. C. 255"; and in line 10, after the end of the parentheses, to insert "and the land and interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, on page 9, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "fiscal year ending June 30, 1942" and insert "period prescribed in section 16 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, on page 9, line 5, after the word "available", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942"; in line 9, after the words "operation of", to strike out "a" and insert "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, on page 9, line 13, after the word "available", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942"; in line 18, after the word "sections", to strike out "355"; in line 19, after the beginning of the parentheses, to strike out "40 U. S. C. 255"; in line 20, following the parentheses, to insert "and the land, and interests

therein, including the temporary use thereof, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255)"; and on page 10, line 1, after the word "purposes", to strike out "until June 30, 1943" and insert "during the period prescribed in section 16 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 12, on page 10, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 13, on page 10, line 19, after the word "purposes", to strike out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942" and insert "during the period prescribed in section 16 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 15. The Secretary of War may, with respect to contracts for public works for the Military Establishment, whether or not for construction at military posts, entered into upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis out of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 or authorized to be entered into prior to July 1, 1942, waive the requirements as to performance and payment bonds of the act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793; 40 U. S. C. 270a).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 14, on page 11, line 7, after the word "maintained" to strike out "shall be" and insert "are"; and in line 8, after the word "suspended" to strike out "during the fiscal year 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 15. Except as provided in section 8 of this act, nothing in this act shall be effective to limit or affect any power or authority granted or conferred by the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 16. The provisions of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerks will be authorized to renumber the sections.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRIMO GIORDANENGO AND ANGIE GIORDANENGO

The bill (S. 2318) for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, of San Pedro, Calif., the sum of $1,784.51 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for damages to, and for loss of rentals from, their apartment building in San Pedro, Calif., which resulted from heavy gunfire on June 17 and 18, 1941, by Coast Artillery units located at Fort MacArthur, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MR. AND MRS. GEORGE M. LEGG AND LOETTA TRAINER

The bill (S. 2354) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg, of Dodge City, Kans., the sum of $5,000, and to Loetta Trainer, of Cimarron, Kans., the sum of $908, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Howard Legg, and for personal injuries sustained by Loetta Trainer, when the automobile in which they were sitting was struck by an Army airplane piloted by Col. Laurence F. Stone (O-4829), United States Army Air Corps, on May 25, 1940, at the airport approximately 3 miles east of Dodge City, Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in conection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

O. R. MAXFIELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2279) for the relief of O. R. Maxfield, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$1,032.11" and insert "$552.52", and in line 9, after the words "result of a", to strike out "mutual", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to O. R. Maxfield, of 111 South First Street, Temple, Tex., the sum of $552.52 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by said O. R. Maxfield as a result of a mistake in connection with the price quoted on 18 sets of plot equipment for infiltrometers built and furnished by O. R. Maxfield to the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, at Beltsville, Md., and Asheville, N. C., on July 17, 1940, and August 6, 1940, under purchase order No. 5239-40SCS, dated June 19, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WESLIE A. COULTER, SR.

The bill (H. R. 5275) for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES WARREN

The bill (H. R. 5658) for the relief of James Warren was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FERD W. MEILE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Ferd W. Meile, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of Ferd W. Meile, of Detroit, Mich., against the United States for loss and damage sustained when his automobile was struck by a truck owned by the United States at Camp Custer Military Reservation near Battle Creek, Mich., on April 20, 1938.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Ferd W. Meile, of Detroit, Mich."

FLOYD ODOM

The bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Floyd Odom was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. FURMAN RICHARDSON

The bill (H. R. 5468) for the relief of J. Furman Richardson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOE A. MUMFORD AND THE ESTATE OF W. C. MUMFORD

The bill (H. R. 5563) for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLEAVER KELLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4153) for the relief of Cleaver Kelley, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GUARDIAN OF JOHN LESNIAK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4723) for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "Works Progress" and insert "Work Projects."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriation for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the bill go over. I understand that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] wishes to bring the bill up Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2319) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EDGAR B. DUNLAP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2037) for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$14,275" and insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edgar B. Dunlap, of Gainesville, Ga., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damages to farm property owned by him and leased by him to the Georgia Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, an agency of the Federal Government, for the years 1935 to 1939, inclusive, such damages having been sustained by reason of (1) the failure of such Corporation to maintain and repair houses and buildings on such property as provided in the lease agreement, (2) the failure of such Corporation to terrace lands as provided in the lease agreement, (3) depreciation in the value of land by reason of the failure of such Corporation to comply with the terms of the lease agreement, and (4) the wrongful destruction and use of timber by persons who were tenants of such Corporation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating June 11, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the joint resolution go over until I can confer with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

DUTY ON COCOA FIBER FLOOR COVERING

The bill (H. R. 3572) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a)) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES AT JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.

The bill (H. R. 6926) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MURRAY FREEMAN

The bill (H. R. 246) for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. V. FORSYTHE

The bill (H. R. 6594) for the relief of M. V. Forsythe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH SOULEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of Joseph Soulek, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$4,050" and insert "$2,314.60"; and on page 2, line 1, after the words "shall be", to strike out "accepted in full release of" and insert "deducted from."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LILLIAN LABAUVE LINNEY

The bill (S. 2317) for the relief of Lillian LaBauve Linney was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lillian LaBauve Linney, widow of Fred C. Linney, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, the said Fred C. Linney, who died September 19, 1941, as a result of injuries sustained on September 17, 1941, when the car in which he was riding was struck by an Army truck at the intersection of College Avenue and Johnson Street in the Parish of Lafayette, State of Louisiana: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHARLES BRAUCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2251) for the relief of Charles Brauch, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$1,639.75"; and in line 7, after the word "for", to insert "damages and", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Brauch, the sum of $1,639.75, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for damages and personal injuries suffered by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on the Pacific Highway, being United States Highway No. 99, about 3 miles south of Sutherlin, Oreg., on July 31, 1940, when the truck which he was operating was struck by a truck owned by the United States and operated by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE FOR CERTAIN AVIATION CADETS AND STUDENTS

The bill (S. 2275) to amend section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, to grant National Service Life Insurance in the cases of certain Army flying cadets and aviation students who died as the result of aviation accident in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941, was considered, ordered to

be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended by section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 20, 1941, be, and the same is hereby, amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of (d) (2) thereof and adding the following: "*Provided,* That if such person serving as a flying cadet or aviation student, Air Corps, Army, between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941, the date of approval of Public Law No. 97 and Public Law No. 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, and died as the result of an aviation accident incurred in line of duty while in such active service, such person shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted an aggregate amount of insurance of not less than $10,000. Any additional insurance granted by virtue of this proviso shall be payable in the manner provided by this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOODRUM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. STARNES, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 210. The report was presented yesterday and has been printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, this bill originally was introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and myself. When Senate bill 2009, the general transportation act, was before the Senate, inquiry was made as to why that bill did not include a provision for the regulation of freight forwarders. Both the Senator from Kansas and I stated at that time that we preferred to examine the entire subject more closely before proposing legislation on that point.

Subsequently we introduced a bill for the purpose of regulating freight forwarders; long hearings were held on the measure; it came before the Senate, and passed the Senate, as I recall, unanimously. Heretofore freight forwarders have never been regulated. This was a new industry which had sprung up, so to speak, over night. The measure now before us provides for the regulation of freight forwarders along the same general lines that other carriers of freight have been regulated. It gives the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to fix rates and requires that freight forwarders obtain permits before they may engage in business. Heretofore, as a result of nonregulation, a great many practices sprang up in the industry of which complaint was made.

The bill passed the House of Representatives in a form which resulted in certain differences between the House and the Senate. We held conferences for a considerable period of time, and the differences were finally ironed out. Every member of the conference committee on the part of the House and of the conference committee on the part of the Senate has agreed upon the final form of the bill. I believe when the industry comes under regulation, while there may arise some necessity for amending the bill in the future, the effect will be salutary. On the whole the Congress has followed the line adopted by the Interstate Commerce Commission in regulating trucks, busses, railroads, and other common carriers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that when this bill passed the Senate, if my memory serves me aright—it was passed several months ago—there was no provision exempting any particular type of user of forwarding facilities, and I think when the bill was considered by the House there was an amendment added to it. I inquired of the Senator several weeks ago about the status of that matter. What provision on that subject was included in the conference report? It was complained to me by someone that there were certain large mail-order houses, for instance, which under the House bill would be exempt from any provision whatever in regard to the act. Does the Senator recall about that?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. We wrote in a provision on the point to which the Senator refers. As the bill passed the Senate, it included a provision prohibiting mail-order houses and similar large freight shippers from entering the freight-forwarding business.

Mr. BARKLEY. They could carry their own freight, I presume, but they could not become common carriers for others.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. When the bill went to the House, the House exempted them. Under the conference report as it comes to the Senate, such firms are permitted to remain in the forwarding business for a period of 3 years, but the Interstate Commerce Commission is given the right to investigate and to determine whether such activities on their part are against the public interest; and if they are found to be against public policy, then the Interstate Commerce Commission can prevent them engaging in the business.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, during the 3-year period, if the Interstate Commerce Commission makes a finding, after investigation, that the public interest would require their inclusion, then they may issue such an order. Beyond the 3-year period, it is absolutely in the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct. In other words, the Commission can issue a cease-and-desist order if they find their engaging in the freight-forwarding business is against the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of Roger W. Creer, to be postmaster at Spanish Fork, Utah, in place of R. W. Creer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William B. Young to be Paymaster General and Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY—OFFICERS ADVANCED IN RANK FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. William L. Kabler to be advanced 30 numbers in rank for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward H. O'Hare to be advanced 30 numbers in rank for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC., DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature; that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the Appropriations

Committee be authorized to submit reports during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 11, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 7, 1942:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

William B. Young to be Paymaster General and Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, term of 4 years from June 1, 1942.

ADVANCE IN RANK IN THE NAVY

To be advanced 30 numbers in rank for eminent and conspicuous conduct in battle

Lt. William L. Kabler
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward H. O'Hare

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, pastor of the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, who art the Refuge and Strength of Thy people in every age and who art our Refuge and Strength in this present hour, bless us, we beseech Thee, as we lift our hearts to Thee. We pray for strength of body and spirit. We pray for steadiness of mind and heart. Grant unto us the strength and steadiness of Jesus that amid uncertainty, and criticism, and even seeming defeat, we may have His victorious spirit.

Help us to do our duty, difficult though it may be. Help us to stand by our high ideals, no matter how rough the way. Help us to be true to Thee that in sincerity and truth we may keep our Nation in the path that leads to life and liberty and happiness for all.

"Set our feet on lofty places;
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to set men free.
Grant us wisdom,
Grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee!"

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4402. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. NYE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H R. 6927. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL—1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree with the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia, as chairman of the House conference committee, agree to bring back the T. V. A. amendment adopted by the Senate yesterday and give us a separate vote on it in case the Senate conferees do not recede?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that there are a number of amendments in the independent offices appropriation bill that have to be carefully considered by the House conferees. I would not feel justified in making any agreement to bring back a particular amendment, but I will say to the gentleman that I can assure him the matter will be gone into, the gentleman will be conferred with in every particular in order to see what ought to be done, but I think there ought to be a free conference.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I would not want to tie the hands of the conferees, of course, but unless the Senate recedes from this amendment, I want a separate vote on it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a complicated amendment which will have to be studied carefully. We propose to do that. The gentleman from Alabama, who is not present, is on the committee and is interested in it. I agreed not to take it up until he returns, so I can assure the gentleman it will have very painstaking consideration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to earnestly join with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in expressing the hope that the conference committee will give us a chance to vote on the T. V. A. amendment unless it can be worked out satisfactorily so that the T. V. A. will not be damaged or impeded in its very necessary work at the present time. I do not think the Members of the House want to impede the activities of the T. V. A. in the war effort and I hope we can have a separate vote unless the Senate conferees will recede or unless the matter can be ironed out satisfactorily, so that the T. V. A. will not be damaged.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I have gone over the amendment very carefully, and I am hopeful that the conference can work it out to our satisfaction, but unless that is done we would like to have a vote on this amendment when the conference report comes back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. WOODRUM of Virginia, FITZPATRICK, HOUSTON, STARNES of Alabama, HENDRICKS, WIGGLESWORTH, DIRKSEN, and CASE of South Dakota.

THE FALL OF BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, Bataan and Corregidor have fallen. The flag of the Rising Sun has replaced the Stars and Stripes. They fell, not from any lack of valor or fortitude on the part of their defenders, who have written a new epic into military history, but because of a blundering, muddling, indecisive policy of selfish isolationism and pacifism on the part of this, which should have been the mightiest nation the world has ever seen.

To what extent this disastrous policy was due to the influence and activities of our enemies abroad and how much of it was due to the ignorance of those who deliberately drew a curtain over their own eyes to obstruct their own vision, is too humiliating to admit. This much we must admit. Such a policy brought us to the most critical period in the history of civilization, totally impotent to measure up to the high standard our own past had set for us.

Now that the end has come, it can be said that determined and costly attempts were made to replenish the food, medicines, and ammunition of the be-

sieged spots—with but small success. Too late we have learned the truth of the sad prophetic words of the illustrious MacArthur—"Too little and too late."

Although humiliated, we are not disheartened. In our sorrow is no note of defeatism. We have no thought, no word, no intention but battle. The courage, sacrifice, and devotion of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and nurses, both American and Filipino, as well as all civilians involved throughout the entire action, measures up to the highest of the high standard of our armed forces. Their conduct shall be a halo above our battle flag throughout this conflict, which shall ever beckon us on to triumph.

Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, we who are guilty of the neglect which brought about your fate salute you. You have fought a good fight. You have kept the faith. Not that we expected less of you. You, in every way, measured up to our highest estimate of you. We realize, however, that we failed to measure up to your estimate of us. We pledge you our very best attempt to do so in the future.

By your heroic defense of these outposts, you provided the time to secure Australia, a base from which we can and will launch an offensive which shall retake the lands you fought so valiantly to defend. MacArthur will return. Side by side with the valiant armies of China, we shall wipe the scourge of despotism from the east. With sad hearts we witness your captivity. We pledge upon the faith of this Nation that your liberation will be as speedy as can possibly be accomplished.

With humble and with contrite hearts, cleansed by your sacrifice, heartened by your heroism and strengthened by your devotion, with confidence and a clear vision we face the future—one people, one idea, one objective—victory.

HIS EXCELLENCY, MANUEL PRADO, PRESIDENT OF PERU

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 11, the House of Representatives will, for the first time, have the honor to greet the President of one of the South American republics while in office, when His Excellency, Manuel Prado, President of Peru, will be received by the House at a quarter past 12 o'clock. At that time the Members of the House will have the opportunity of greeting His Excellency and welcoming him to the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial about our distinguished guest, Dr. Manuel Prado, President of the Republic of Peru, which appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, May 6.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have received many inquiries from Members of the House and from others generally with respect to two particular pieces of pending legislation. I feel I ought to make an announcement that on the adjusted-pay bill for the Army of the United States I have just filed a report, and on the bill increasing the number of cadets to the West Point Military Academy I have likewise filed a report, reporting both bills favorably, with the recommendation that they be enacted into law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us when the two bills will be brought up for consideration?

Mr. MAY. My purpose in rising at this time is to say that I hope we will be able to bring up the cadet bill on Tuesday, if we can do so, by unanimous consent. If we cannot do it by unanimous consent, we will bring it up at such other time as we may get a rule, but I do not think it will be necessary to ask for a rule.

As to the pay bill, we hope to be able to go before the Rules Committee on tomorrow at 10 o'clock for the purpose of obtaining a rule, and we hope to be able to call that up on Wednesday, if it meets with the approval of the leadership of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that there are a number of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and especially the Members from Pennsylvania, and perhaps some other States where primaries are imminent, who are anxious to be in their respective States next week if they can. If the gentleman could get the pay bill up on Tuesday, I believe it would be quite an accommodation to the Members of the House and, perhaps, to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from Virginia has just said. A number of the Members have requested me to see if the bill could not be brought up on Tuesday. I do not believe the West Point bill is going to take any particular time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I was going to suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that he ask unanimous consent now to have the consideration of the bill made in order on any day he wishes to bring it up.

Mr. MAY. With respect to that, the gentleman from Massachusetts has always been so willing to cooperate with the majority on all of these matters that I wanted to consult his wishes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] suggested to me this morning that in the absence of the ranking minority member of the Military Affairs Committee that I not call it up now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think we can arrange that on Monday without any difficulty.

Mr. MAY. I have no particular preference about when the pay bill comes up, and I shall be pleased to take it up on Tuesday if that is agreeable.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May it be understood, then, that the gentleman will bring it up at that time?

Mr. MAY. Yes; if the gentleman so desires.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman, in his opening remarks, referred to this bill only as the Army pay bill. What about the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the other services?

Mr. MAY. The others are included. I mentioned the Army because I did not want to be in the position of seeming to assume any of the jurisdiction of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Your committee has jurisdiction where both Army and Navy are in one bill.

Mr. MAY. That is true.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Kentucky would inform the House as to how many additional cadets will be appointed to West Point.

Mr. MAY. One for each Senator and one for each Representative in Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MAIL FOR MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which I think is affecting the morale of our troops, both in the Army and the Navy, that ought to have some immediate attention. I do not believe there is anything that is threatening the morale more than the nondelivery of mail to the troops and sailors.

We are all urged in a Nation-wide campaign to write to the boys in the service, but they are not getting the letters. Mothers and fathers are receiving mail from the boys in the Navy and the Army from far distant places, but the boys themselves are not getting mail from home. In some cases they have not received any mail for 2 or 3 months. The Post Office Department says they are delivering the mail to the Army and the Navy for forwarding and for further distribution, but something has broken down in the system of getting mail promptly to these boys. This particularly affects the sending of money to the boys in the service before they go overseas so they can buy some of the things they will not be able to purchase after they have reached their foreign station.

Their letters are not getting to them, and they are going over without this money. The Naval Affairs Committee has already proceeded to take action and has appointed a subcommittee to look into the matter as it relates to the Navy, and I would ask the Military Affairs Committee to take similar action very promptly and see if we cannot assist the Army and the Navy in this matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of all other business and following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of free speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the fortification of Guam, concerning which there is some interest in my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MEN AND WOMEN OVER 40

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, by Presidential proclamation this week of May 3 has been designated as National Employment Week. Its purpose is to call to the attention of employers the desirability of giving employment opportunities to men and women over 40 years of age, especially those who served in the last World War.

To my mind, there is nothing that is more disheartening than the picture of a man over 40 plodding the streets in search of work so that he might support his family. Even in these days of war, when it is said that there is a scarcity of labor, we find that the man over 40 is the forgotten man in industry. This is a condition that should not exist, but every veterans' organization in the city of New York will tell you that the employer, as a rule, pays little or no attention to the fact that an applicant for a job is a veteran of the last war. This barrier to the man over 40 is due in no small part to the short-sightedness of employers and the lack of cooperation on the part of Federal, State, and municipal agencies charged with the duty of placement for the unemployed.

Let me give you an example of lack of cooperation in our Federal agencies. Two weeks ago I sent a constituent of mine, a pipefitter by trade, to the United States Employment Service in New York City. He was told that there were no jobs open. That same day in our metropolitan papers there were large advertisements in the help wanted columns by a manufacturing concern doing war work advertising for pipefitters and stating that applicants should apply either to the firm or to the United States Employment Service in Jersey City—about 15 minutes' ride at most from the New York office of the Employment Service. That advertisement appeared not for 1 day in one New York newspaper but for several days in almost all New York morning newspapers. It was evident that just across the river there was a shortage of this type of labor, but either the New York office of the United States Employment Service did not know of this shortage, or interoffice restrictions prevented them from sending men to the job. I am convinced that this was not an isolated instance of lack of cooperation.

According to reliable statistics there are 318,000 registered job seekers in New York City and more than 80,000 of these are experienced industrial workers, exclusive of the garment industry and building and construction industry which also have heavy unemployed totals. Of the 80,000 experienced unemployed workers, more than 11,000 are experienced specifically in metal products occupations, which are the primary defense occupations.

To my mind, to say that men who have been used to handling tools all their lives could not with some degree of training be made to fit into many of these defense jobs is ridiculous. This is going to be a long war, and the sooner we train these mechanics, whose years of experience in their own trades make them adaptable to other mechanical jobs, the greater war production we will have. The simple answer is that industry management for the most part is so engrossed in its net profit that it cares little about the employees, except as it is compelled to do either by union organization or by Federal or State legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the indifference of industry to the plight of the employable man over 40 is well nigh calamitous. It is a short-sighted policy that is inviting economic disaster. Men over 40 must live, and the families that they, as decent, God-fearing people, have brought into the world must live, and if industry will not place them in jobs where they can earn enough to give their families the necessities and some of the comforts of life, then the Government is in duty bound to support them and that support must come from taxation upon business and individuals. I am in my third year as a Member of this distinguished House, and in that time I have received many letters from business associations and individuals all over the country, protesting against the high taxes that have been imposed. Let me say that no inconsiderable sum of money could be saved the Government and therefore the taxpayer, if business and industry would employ the man over 40, whose family must be maintained by the Government if the husband and father cannot get employment in business or industry.

I feel strongly about this matter. I have spoken of it on the floor of this House on other occasions. I believe that the family is the unit of society and the cornerstone of the State. I represent a district that is composed of families larger than the ordinary, where, for the most part, the breadwinner is a skilled or semiskilled worker and I am therefore concerned that the heads of these families should find employment. In the first session of this Congress I introduced bill No. 4958 which provided for an appropriation of $10,000,000 for refresher courses for men over 40 years of age and who had not worked at their trades for 5 years last past. Following the introduction of that bill, and in all due modesty, I believe as a result of the introduction of that bill, the regulations with respect to admissions to vocational schools, to which W. P. A. funds were allocated, were changed so that the only requirement in order to take refresher courses was registration with State employment bureaus. Refresher courses in themselves, however, only solve part of the problem. I believe that the problem in its entirety will not be solved, and that the full utilization of the mechanical skill of the country will not be had, until training schools are established in the war plants themselves. The Government has, in effect, subsidized the transformation of industry to war use; let it now subsidize the training of mechanics from civilian to war production, not only in trade and vocational schools, but in the war plants as well, and then the forgotten man over 40 will find a place in the war effort of the country.

RELIEF FOR THE AGED AND NEEDY

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a long time ago I introduced in this House the bill (H. R. 1036) to provide relief for the aged and needy people of this country. It was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. That committee still has it. I filed a discharge petition and on that petition are 172 names of Members of this House, asking that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that the bill be taken up on the floor of the House for consideration.

I am not now going to say what I think of any rule that provides that before a bill may be considered in this House just as many Members are required to sign a petition to get it out of a committee as are needed to pass the bill, assuming that every Member of the House was present on the floor of the House, which I have never seen happen since I have been a Member of the House. I said before it is unjust, arbitrary, and ridiculous.

This rule was adopted by the House before I became a Member of Congress. Since coming to Congress I have tried to have it amended, but did not succeed.

With living costs mounting, with our dollar having but about 60 percent of the purchasing power it had 2 years ago, our aged and needy people, though they receive financial help from the State and Federal Governments, they are today un-

able to meet and pay for the dire necessities of life. Remember the aged people of this country must eat food, wear clothing, and be housed and should be supplied with reasonable comforts of life—war or no war. I ask the Members of this House who have not signed this petition to discharge the committee to sign the same, to the end that on days when the Congress is biding time that we take this bill up for consideration; and that if it does not meet with the ideas of the majority of us, that the same be amended so that it will furnish some, at least, of the relief for which its provisions provide. That is not asking too much.

Remember, in addition to 172 Congressmen who ask for consideration of this bill, millions and millions and millions of the people throughout the 48 States are likewise pleading and asking for its consideration and passage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from Newsweek.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald on April 30, 1942, entitled "W. P. A. in Time of War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. GEHRMANN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am dropping a bill in the hopper that will provide for the purchase of motor vehicles now held by automobile dealers. Since we passed a bill which was supposed to assist automobile dealers a week or 10 days ago, I have heard from almost 200 automobile dealers from all over the country. They say that that bill is not going to do them much good because it will not be compulsory upon the Government to take those cars off their hands or even to grant them loans until after 18 months.

I see that a bill is being pushed in the Senate that will allow the requisitioning of our cars and the cars of everybody else if they so desire. The automobile dealers are now holding over 400,000 cars. At least half of them are requisitioned by the Government now, but the dealers are holding them at their own expense. It seems to me the Government does not treat any other industry like this. If the Government wants those cars, it should take them off the hands of the dealers, and not force the dealers to finance them as well as take care of them so that they do not deteriorate. After the Government has decided how many might be needed, the dealers should then be permitted to sell the balance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, this whole problem of automobile rationing and tire rationing and the treatment of the different automobile dealers has been messed up right along by the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. GEHRMANN. The gentleman is no doubt right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a section of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from George N. Peek.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HEALTH CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, many Members must have been surprised and startled by the testimony of Dr. George C. Ruhland, District of Columbia Health Officer, regarding the danger of a serious epidemic here in the near future. Dr. Ruhland, an experienced and capable official, informed a subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee on April 17, 1942, that—

We have been fortunate, so far as acute communicable diseases are concerned, in being able to avoid any epidemics. However, I would like to place in the record here the fact that undoubtedly we are exposed to epidemics at any time, because of the very unusual overcrowding. We have the elements that can give us trouble. We have the risk of typhus fever in the District, we have the risk of malaria, and we have the risk of typhoid in the District of Columbia.

Dr. Ruhland's alarming statement has been amply supported by recent articles in the Washington papers. There can be no doubt that the filthy slums which have been tolerated for so many years, are now a grave hazard to an overcrowded city. Epidemics of typhus, malaria, and typhoid are feared by Dr. Ruhland and bubonic plague, spread by swarms of rats, is not unlikely.

From the overcrowded dwellings where people live in insanitary surroundings, come household servants, hotel employees, and restaurant workers. If an epidemic once got a good start in these slums, it could rapidly and easily involve the entire community.

Washington is not only the Capital of a great Nation, it is the general headquarters of a world-wide war effort. The casualties resulting from a serious epidemic would dangerously affect the conduct of the war and be equivalent to a major disaster in the field.

We have had our warning. Let us act promptly and vigorously to clean up these slums which disgrace our civilization and threaten our victory. The danger spots are well known and nearby. They should be cleaned up or closed up.

If the local authorities need more legislation, which I doubt, they should ask for and receive it. The long-awaited Washington Housing Code should be enacted at once. Dr. Ruhland's inspectors should be given authority to close up insanitary premises without the present lengthy and complicated procedure. Landlords who repeatedly violate the law should receive jail sentences. A system of fines for these offenses is equivalent to licensing and degrades the community as a partner in unlawful enterprises.

I repeat, we have had our warning and must act or bear the consequences. If Congress and the District authorities cannot clean up these insanitary slums and remove their undoubted threat to the city's health, we can expect the Army or the Navy to take over the job. Certainly they will not allow conditions to continue which endanger the lives of their officers and men.

The "Battle of Washington" could be the worst defeat of the war. We can turn it into a victory by prompt, efficient, and decisive action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and incluude two short editorials from Progress and one from the Ottawa (Kans.) Daily Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial published in the Evening Courier, entitled "While Americans Fight."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the

Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, relative to the patriotism and loyalty of the American Negro.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is detained from the House for a short time today, and he has requested that I ask unanimous consent that he may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which he has prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSERVE OUR RESOURCES—STOP WASTE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the waste and extravagance that is going on in this country today grieves me greatly. We are at war and need to conserve every dollar we have in order that we might prosecute the war to the best advantage.

I call your attention to the daily statement of May 4 of the Federal Treasury, showing that we have gone in the red in the past 10 months and 4 days $14,761,160,334.59 and our national debt is now recorded in this statement as about $71,000,000,000. The greatest record of debt and spending the Nation has ever known, or in fact any nation of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been accustomed to this spending for the past 10 years and it seems to me that it does not know the value of a dollar. Such wastefulness and extravagance cannot go on much longer. It should have been stopped 10 years ago, but instead no one seems to care. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where are you going to get the money? It may be an old song that I sing, but it certainly is one of the most pertinent and one that needs answering, and it needs it now. Do not wait another day, another week, or another year. Get the long-looked-for tax bill before the House of Representatives. Certainly it is going to be one that is most detrimental to every American when he thinks of the amount of cash it is going to take out of his pocket. But it is fundamental to our national security and it is as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow morning that a bankrupt nation cannot support an army or navy or air corps or marine corps to do the fighting to win this war without funds. This Nation has been subjected to this war, and certainly contrary to the wishes and desires of myself, because we did many, many things which in my opinion only led us into the war, and that cannot be denied. Had we attended more to our own business than trying to police the world we would not have been in the place we are now. But we have got to fight it through. We had got to gird ourselves and arm ourselves to the very hilt for our own protection. This is a crucial moment for America. If we do not furnish the arms and ammunition and planes for our Army we cannot hope to win, and we are not treating our soldiers right when we permit strikes to go on now in this country in the plants that are producing arms and ammunition for these fighting men. It is the responsibility of the President and the Congress to see that we have no strikes. Every man who strikes today ought to be sent to the front. When our Army does not have the tools to fight with and they engage in battle and are shot down in cold blood, the responsibility now belongs to the people back home.

If we have a bankrupt nation we cannot furnish the implements of war. I say again to the War and Navy Departments and to the President, the Congress has given you the greatest sums of money the world has ever known to furnish these implements of war. Now you are wasting these funds on contracts that are extravagant. For example, I give you the following news article from Savannah, Ga., that was taken from the Evening Bulletin in Philadelphia, concerning the awarding of contracts to unethical contractors:

UNITED STATES TO RECONSTRUCT NEW SHIPYARD—TAKES $20,400,000 IN ORDERS FROM SAVANNAH COMPANY

SAVANNAH, GA., May 5.—Charging failure to comply with contract stipulations, the Federal Maritime Commission has taken over and is reconstructing the plant of the Savannah Shipyards, Inc. It also turned over an order for 12 10,000-ton vessels to another concern.

Assistant United States Attorney General Norman M. Littell said in Federal court yesterday that engineers had reported no ships could ever have been launched from the shipyards and described financial operations of Frank Cohen, company secretary and treasurer, as dwarfing the legendary "Get-Rich-Quick Wallingford."

The Savannah company began construction of its yards last spring and in November obtained from the commission a contract for the 12 ships at approximately $1,700,000 each. In December the commission canceled the contract and took physical possession of the shipyards on January 2. Later condemnation proceedings were filed.

Our responsibility here in Congress and in the departments of the Government should be one of vigilance, one of good sound business and one of economy in unessentials if this Nation is to survive. I am willing to assume my responsibility. Are you?

[Here the gavel fell.]

PRESERVING OUR DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the days of William Penn—

The frosty sons of thunder from among the hills of Somerset—

did their full share in creating, forwarding, and preserving our democratic way of life.

These excerpts from the communication I just received from Somerset indicates that the same spirit prevails.

An elderly couple, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Pyle, in sending their fifth and last son to the Army on May 1 with their blessing:

We are glad to have five sons to help defend our country.

Mr. Pyle was a W. P. A. worker and is now an invalid. Mrs. Pyle said to the interviewer:

I'll work the garden for us. This puts a hardship on us, of course, but when we think of how people live in Germany, Italy, and Japan we are glad our sons are fighting because we don't want to live like those people.

The youngest of the sons in the armed service of his country is Benjamin, 18, then Frederick, 22, then Hamilton, 25, then Glenn, 28, and then Joseph, 30, who was the one to enlist on the 1st of May, when he said:

Do you think I want to be the only one staying at home?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have tens of thousands of such patriots back in my district.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the life and character of Gen. Eddie Brower, who was captured by the Japanese at Bataan. He is a very distinguished Mississippian, and I will include therein a résumé of his life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter I have received from a young man who is president of a high-school graduating class, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, the 10th of May, is Mother's Day. Let the flags fly. It is so prescribed by law. It is the least we can do. The most we could do would be not enough.

It is to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that a day and an occasion so set apart for acknowledgment by us and for our observance of the obligation and great debt all of us owe our mothers should have been so commercialized as almost to have destroyed its real significance.

Nothing is more foreign to the sentiment and underlying reason for the establishment and observance of the day than the commercialization of it. The love of a mother for her own and for her country cannot be bought; neither can it be sold. It passeth all understanding. "Her children rise up and call her blessed."

THE MOTHER'S KINGDOM

I agree with Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day, that this day in 1942 is

different from any Mother's Day we have ever seen before. We are at war again, and for the first time, as she says, it is peculiarly a mother's war. Other wars saw mothers fighting through their sons at the front. But in no other war in history were bombs as likely to burst beside a baby's bed as to shatter on a battlefield. In no other war were mothers on the battle line. Other times we were trying to win a war. Now we are fighting to win back a civilization. War has invaded the mother's kingdom—the home.

It is fitting therefore that here in free America we have a day that makes us think only of the one who loved us best and for us sacrificed the most.

A BOUNDEN DUTY

So also it is all the more an imperative duty, right, meet and bounden, for us—the living—in these days of war, of sacrifice, of stress and strain, to appropriately recognize this day, so set apart, on which we once more shall and should pay our tribute to the hand which rocks the cradle and rules the world. Men are what their mothers make them. Every day in every man's life is in fact Mother's Day.

THE BRAVEST BATTLE

Shall I tell you about the bravest battle that was ever fought?

The bravest battle that was ever fought—
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not,
It was fought by the mothers of men.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since the House will adjourn today over May 10, I would like today to insert here and now in the RECORD and as a part hereof some selections from my mother's writings, as a tribute to her and to all mothers everywhere, as, of, and for the tenth.

My mother was a frequent contributor to magazines and periodicals of her day. After her death in 1906 I found several unpublished manuscripts tucked away in inconspicuous places about her home. Some of them were incomplete; written on scraps of paper as she went about her work of homemaking; put into bureau drawers and on shelves in the pantry and kitchen, to await the day, which never came, when she could complete and publish them. Some of these my friend the late Walter J. Coates, a publisher of poetry, assembled for me. They were published as a memorial brochure.

On a piece of paper bag, written in pencil, I found a prose poem which has always been a favorite of mine. It is appropriate for this season. Signed "Fanny Fern," which was a penname my mother used, this little vignette in words is entitled "I Want My Mother," and reads as follows:

I WANT MY MOTHER

"I want my mother"—I heard these words on the street from a little sobbing child. How many mothers, thought I, with children of their own, have uttered this agonized heart-cry, when to none else save God could they go, with those unspoken sorrows, whose unshared burden was greater than they knew how to bear and live.

SHE KNEW

She always knew what to say to us. If she blamed, it was not when heart and flesh failed that she stood inexorable in denunciation by our side; but with soothing hand and caressing words she loved our griefs out of us, and when tears had cleared our vision she pointed out the better way. Or if our path was so hedged about that we could only fold our hands and wait, still it was she who made our waiting easy and hopeful.

"I want my mother." Yes—over the little coffin with hands outstretched to Heaven, and she not there to comfort us. At birth, and she not there to give the new baby her kiss and blessing. In the home, where solemn vows "to cherish" are forgotten and indifference is where love should be, when rough words cut the tender heart and smite, each like cruel blows, leaving bruises that no human eye sees. Ah! where shall we turn when even God himself seems too far away? Does there ever come a time to many loving women when they cease to "want my mother?" I think not. Not even when their lot is happy. Then it seems cruel that she should not have the reward of all the years of patient toil and waiting and see the result. And so she does, though not with mortal eyes. Else were life and human love the most stupendous of all mockeries. And so, seeing also our pain and grief, and counting our tears, yet shedding none, she waits for us till like ripened sheaves we are gathered to the final harvest.

IMMORTALITY

But, alas! If faith come not to our help here, that faith which can help us to understand how Heaven can be Heaven to her while we suffer and grieve and stumble amid the dark mountains of doubt and despair. There is no word save God, which is so all embracing, so round, so full, so heart-satisfying as mother. Better to have known and felt its perfect meaning for a few short years, even though it be followed by this desolate yearning, through which we learn to spell, slowly but surely, the word "immortality."

PERHAPS

Among the manuscripts I found there are two poems which appeal to me—in fact, all my mother's poems appeal to me—but there is something intangible in these two which always, as I read them, makes my mother stand out as I knew her best.

The following is typical of her attitude toward life and people. She called it "Perhaps":

Perhaps not least of all the glad surprises
That wait us in that wondrous land unseen,
As Heaven's serene, unclouded morn arises
Upon our eyes, with purer vision keen,
And, one by one, the glad soul recognizes
Its loves—not least will be to see, to know
What kingly souls have dropped the strange disguises
Which hid their royalty from us below;
Have laid aside their garments soiled and lowly
And, clad in regal robes and princely grace,
They wait before the throne of God most Holy
Beholding evermore the Father's face.
Ah, friends, we cannot tell with our poor vision
Whom to exalt with praise or heap with scorn;
The King of Glory knew a world's derision;
His earthly diadem—a crown of thorns!
Then let us learn to honor one another
In word and deed and truth, remembering
That the coarse garb of e'en the humblest brother
May yet conceal the ermine of a king.

It is regrettable that my mother could not have realized her ambition to live long enough to put on paper her dreams in words. She was too young to die. God knows I believe it.

The other of the two poems of which I am particularly fond runs as follows:

A SONG AT TWILIGHT

While the shadowy night steals softly down,
Singing, she sits in the quiet hour,
And, listening apart, unseen, unknown,
My fancy yields to the music's power.
On the amber tide of the harmony
A lily, white, is her silvery voice,
Floating and drifting across to me,
As the tuneful billows fall and rise.
I list, and the lily has taken wings—
A dove, it rises and mounts the skies;
A soul unfettered, it soars and sings
By the jasper walls of paradise.
Lo, the very gates of heaven unbar,
And down from the pure, celestial dome
Floats a wandering echo, faint and far,
Of the waiting seraphs' welcome home.
One rapturous burst of heaven-born song
From the harps of gold throbs down to me,
One chord of the anthem rich and strong
Which the hosts redeemed chant ceaselessly.
One ray divine from the great white throne,
One distant gleam of the crystal sea,
Then the glory dies and the dream is flown
And silence and shadow come back to me.

BOYS GROWN TALL

In a little book which I used as a pupil in the fourth grade at school in my attempt to procure the autographs of my schoolmates I find, over my mother's signature:

Men are only boys grown tall,
Hearts do not change much after all.

What a flood of memories that lets loose; and how true it is, only we boys of yesteryear can ever know; the while we still long in vain for the touch of a vanished hand as we listen without hope for the sound of a voice that is forever still.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

INCREASING THE NUMBER OF CADETS AT THE WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday immediately following the passage of the pay bill to call up the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest that the gentleman modify his request to permit consideration of the West Point cadet bill following the passage of the pay bill, but not necessarily on Tuesday?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I accept the modification.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand what the gentleman's request was.

Mr. MAY. It has been suggested that the Army and Navy pay bill be considered on Tuesday, and my request was that immediately following the passage

of the pay bill it be in order to call up the bill allowing one additional cadet to the West Point Military Academy for each Senator and Representative in Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Further reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I am just wondering why all of these bills now are being taken up in this order instead of going through the regular channels?

Mr. MAY. I have already announced that I would appear before the Rules Committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to ask for a rule on the pay bill. I am asking consent only on the cadet bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that it may be in order next week following the passage of the pay bill to call up the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase in the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DISCOVERY OF COLUMBIA RIVER AND GRAYS HARBOR 150 YEARS AGO

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we here in the National Capital, surrounded by the States of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, an area known as the cradle of the Republic, and with the battlefields of the Revolution and the Civil War close at hand, are inclined to lose sight of the fact that other sections of the country have a historic background. Today, the 7th of May 1942, is the sesquicentennial of Capt. Robert Gray's discovery of Grays Harbor, one of the largest waterways in the Pacific Northwest, and from which my home county, on its shores, takes its name. And 4 days later, on May 11, 1792, Captain Gray traveling south from Grays Harbor, discovered the mystic river of the West, christened the Columbia, the name of the ship Captain Gray was commanding on this famous voyage. The vessel was owned by the American Fur Co., of Boston, and a few years earlier Captain Gray had made history by traveling around the world on the *Columbia*, the first time the Stars and Stripes had circumnavigated the globe. The flag carried was the one adopted by the American patriots, the 13 stars and 13 stripes.

Upon Captain Gray's discovery of Grays Harbor and the Columbia River rests our original and valid claim of title to all the vast territory between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific, and between the northern boundary of California and the Canadian border—that empire of the West embracing the great States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and those portions of Wyoming and Montana drained by the Columbia River, which has the unique distinction of being the only part of our national domain not acquired by conquest or by purchase. By harnessing the mighty Columbia, we are now developing hydroelectric power which is making possible the production of aluminum for our airplanes which are such a vital factor in our war program.

George Washington was serving his first term as President when Robert Gray set out from Boston on this voyage on September 28, 1790. He carried with him a letter signed by Washington as President and Thomas Jefferson as Secretary of State, reading as follows:

To All Emperors, Kings, Sovereign Princes, State Regents and Their Respective Officers, Civil and Military, and to All Others Whom It May Concern:

I, George Washington, President of the United States of America, do make known that Robert Gray, captain of a ship called the *Columbia*, of the burden of about 230 tons, is a citizen of the United States, and that the said ship which he commands belongs to citizens of the United States; and as I wish that the said Robert Gray may prosper in his lawful affairs, I do request all of the before mentioned, and of each of them separately, when the said Robert Gray shall arrive with his vessel and cargo, that they will be pleased to receive him with kindness and treat him in a becoming manner, etc., and thereby I shall consider myself obliged.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1790, New York City.

(United States seal.)

Relating to the discovery of Grays Harbor, Captain Gray's log book contains this entry:

May 7, 1792: Being within 6 miles of land, saw an entrance in the same which had a very good appearance of a harbor. Lowered away the jolly boat and went in search of an anchoring place, the ship standing to and fro, with a very strong weather current. At 1 p. m. the boat returned, having found no place where the ship could anchor with safety; made sail from the ship; stood in for shore. We soon saw, from the masthead, a passage between the sand bars. At half past three bore away, and ran in northeast by east, having from 4 to 8 fathoms, sandy bottom, and we drew nearer between the bars, had from 10 to 13 fathoms, having a very strong tide of ebb to stem. Many canoes came alongside. At 5 p. m. came in to 5 fathoms of water, sandy bottom, in a safe harbor, well sheltered from the sea by long sand bars and spits. Our latitude observed this day was 46 degrees 58 minutes north.

The late Eldridge Wheeler, regent emeritus of the University of Washington and for many years superintendent of schools at Montesano, the county seat of Grays Harbor, was a student of history, and I am inserting at this point in the RECORD his recital of Captain Gray's discovery of Grays Harbor and the Columbia River:

On the 29th of April 1792, while off the entrance of Juan de Fuca, Captain Gray met Admiral George Vancouver, then on an expedition of discovery sent from England to explore the North Pacific Ocean.

Vancouver had sailed north along the California coast, keeping a lookout for the fabled River Oregon of which much had been written. However, the presence of the great river was doubted by many. On meeting Gray off the entrance to Juan de Fuca, Vancouver was anxious to find out what this American captain knew of this coast and particularly about the presence of this great river. Captain Gray informed Vancouver that he was sure of the presence of this river. He told him he had observed fresh water many miles out from the shore and that he had noticed an opening in the coast in latitude 46 degrees 10 minutes. It would seem that with this evidence Vancouver would have immediately retraced and searched for this river. On the contrary, if we may take his diary for his conclusion, he doubted the accuracy of Gray's observation and immediately entered the Straits of Juan de Fuca, then discovering and mapping all of what is now known as Puget Sound.

It is interesting to know what apparently trivial events have changed the course of history. Here on this spring evening these two captains met and exchanged courtesies. One is engaged in commercial affairs for his company. His duty is only to secure furs and make profits for his company. The other, wearing the uniform of his nation, is under instructions to find new lands, map and chart new waters, and make it possible to add new possessions to his already great country, that the British thread of commerce might reach around the world.

No one knows the thoughts that impelled Gray to turn his ship south, but we do know he immediately did so, and on May 7, 1792, he observed an entrance into what appeared a good harbor. He sailed in over the bar and remained 3 days mapping and charting it. Many Indians visited his ship and some trade was carried on. He named the harbor Bullfinch Harbor in honor of Charles Bullfinch, one of the principal officers of the Boston Fur Co. This name remained for over 50 years, when it was changed to Grays Harbor, giving due honor to the man who discovered it.

On the evening of May 10, at sundown, the *Columbia* sailed out of the harbor and southward, looking for the discolored water that Gray had previously seen. Here, just 2 weeks after Vancouver had passed it, Gray again discovered the same strong current and the same discolored water. The wind was fresh from the west and the opening was seen. With sails set, the courageous Yankee sailor passed over the bar and his ship floated on the waters of the mighty Columbia.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the great prize of the centuries had fallen to an American, with Spanish, English, and Russian navigators aware of its meaning. The inland would go with the finding of the mouth of this majestic river. Through all the days of navigation nations have been awarded the lands drained by the rivers they have found. So it had to come about the Stars and Stripes should wave over the great basin of the river of the West. This discovery was made when the United States laid no claim to lands west of the Mississippi River, several years prior to Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Endicott Daily Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by Mr. Bergson on the formation of the Jewish army in Palestine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARRINGTON indefinitely.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that com-

mittee did on Wednesday, May 6, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 139. An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases;

H. R. 3767. An act for the relief of Frank Sheppard; and

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 11, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 8, 1942, in connection with the investigation of petroleum.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson will appear before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1623. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Petit Jean River, Ark., authorized by an act of Congress approved on May 6, 1936, and the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1624. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of the Portage River and its tributaries, with particular reference to the Middle Branch, in Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6979. A bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength; with amendment (Rept. No. 2075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges; without amendment (Rept. No. 2076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R 6081. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2387. An act to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Navy, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 310. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes; wthout amendment (Rept. No. 2079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 162, first session, Seventy-seventh Congress. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national defense program. Fourth interim report from the Special Committee No. 3 on Matériel Procurement and Personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R 7020. A bill amending Public Law No. 100. Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 2082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. Senate Joint Resolution 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W K. Richardson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son; without amendment (Rept. No. 2084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew; without amendment (Rept. No. 2089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker; with amendment (Rept. No. 2090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 2092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2093) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R 4242. A bill for the relief of the Corbitt Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5938. A bill for the relief of A. H. Larzelere; without amendment (Rept. No. 2095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5957. A bill to provide compensation for Mrs. Marion Yarnott for injuries sustained by her in a collision between a United States mail truck and a car in which she was riding as a passenger on May 23, 1940, in Venice, Calif., and to appropriate money therefor, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6077. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Reilly; with amendment (Rept. No. 2097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R 6349. A bill for the relief of the estate of Quitman Roberts; with amendment (Rept. No. 2098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6421. A bill for the relief of Arch A. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 2099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6510. A bill for the relief of L. H. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 2100) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6545. A bill for the relief of Spencer Meeks; with amendment (Rept. No. 2101).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6569. A bill for the relief of William M. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6597. A bill for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd; with amendment (Rept. No. 2103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims: H. R. 6598. A bill for the relief of Leanna M. Stright; without amendment (Rept. No. 2104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Layman and Dorothy J. Layman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6676. A bill for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 2106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. R. 7057. A bill to provide for the purchase of motor vehicles for war purposes, to remove restrictions on the sale of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7058. A bill to provide for the acquisition of Mueller's Airport, Revere, Mass., for the use of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7059. A bill to amend section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to facilitate farmers in the service of the United States receiving the benefits of the farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7060. A bill to provide that the death of David K. Lunt shall be held in line of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7061. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7062. A bill for the relief of Martha A. Donaldson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7063. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2768. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New York urging passage of legislation to eliminate inequitable discrimination against New York State Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2769. By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging Congress to pass appropriate legislation to eliminate the inequitable discrimination against the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2770. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Esther Gall, Jr., and sundry other citizens of Harrisburg, Ill., and vicinity, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2771. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by J. LaVern Jacobs and 63 citizens of Crossville, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2772. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Rev. Robert D. Tolliver and 46 members of the Baptist Church of Clay City, Ill., in opposition to the manufacture and sale of alcohol for beverage purposes for the duration of the war as a part of the national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2773. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Mr. Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, City Hall, Los Angeles, Calif., resolving that the city council go on record as opposed to legislation or negotiations which would allow the importation into this country of labor from a foreign country for use in agricultural pursuits; to the Committee on Labor.

2774. By Mr. McGREGOR: A resolution submitted by Floyd R. Hartpence, department commander, and J. J. Saslavsky, department adjutant, and adopted by the department executive committee, the American Legion, department of Ohio, in regular meeting assembled on May 2, 1942, protesting against the removal of the Fifth Region Headquarters of the Office of Civilian Defense from Columbus to Cleveland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2775. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Rev. Waldo C. Ekeberg, B. D., Secretary, The Evangelical Lutheran Iowa Conference of the Augustana Synod, Dayton, Iowa, urging the passage of S. 860, regarding the moral conditions surrounding the training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2776. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands, United States of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, United States of America; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2777. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. F. E. Lehman, Wathena, and 15 others of the L. A. B. Study Club, protesting the removal of the alien enemies from our west coast to the interior of the United States for the duration of the war. They are also desirous that none of such alien enemies be located in northeast Kansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2778. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the board of governors of the Mart Association, San Francisco, relative to the federalization of the California State Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 11, 1942

The Senate was called to order by the Vice President, who said:

Because of the death of the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips, the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., has been requested to offer prayer at the opening of the session of the Senate today.

Dr. Montgomery, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose presence our souls take delight, consider and hear our humble prayer. Thy ways are in the deep and in the mighty waters, yet Thy hand over us is the sovereignty of Divine love; we would feel Thy hallowed spirit 'round us stealing. Strengthen us with a supreme faith that we are not alone; our chivalrous defenders, amid the fire and tempest of death, are not alone; their sacrificial parents are not alone; and may we rise disenthralled to rejoice in Thy presence now and evermore.

O God, in the midst of life we are in death; with our beloved comrade, earth's door has closed. Oh, hear us as we bestow the silent tokens of abiding affection and of deepest sorrow. He loved his country and his vision saluted a greater future for all humanity. He recognized no superior save his Divine Lord, at whose altar he ever bowed in homage and humble reverence. Heavenly Father, comfort her who sits in the shadow and glow of a wonderful memory; we commit her and the loved ones to Thy gracious care. We pray that the chambers of our souls may be hung with visions of our glorified Master as we see the future distances flowing into the sunset which is the fadeless dawn. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 9, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse;

S. 1331. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease for the exploitation of silica sand and other nonmetallic minerals lands withdrawn by Executive Order No. 5105, dated May 3, 1929;

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria;

S. 2133. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940; and

S. 2356. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4402) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Nye
Andrews	Glass	O'Daniel
Austin	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bilbo	Herring	Rosier
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Brooks	Hughes	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lee	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
George	Murray	
Gerry	Norris	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT FOR BUILDINGS, FACILITIES, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into for buildings, facilities, etc., for the quarter ended March 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of negotiated contracts entered into by the Navy Department during the quarter ended March 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEGISLATION BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS AND COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (session 1941) and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION (S. Doc. No. 206)

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, submitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 228, Seventy-seventh Congress the response of the Board relative to transport aircraft production since 1938 and plans for future development of the air-transport industry (with an accompanying report); referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (4) and Agriculture (9); the War Production Board, Federal Security Agency (2), and the Civil Service Commission (2), which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by members of the board of deacons of the First Baptist Church of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution adopted by the National Cooperative Elevator Association, at a meeting in Omaha, Nebr., favoring as a minimum contribution of the member organizations and their individual members the investment of an amount equal to their patronage dividends, capital reserves, and Agricultural Adjustment Administration benefit checks in the purchase of War Bonds plus as great an additional purchase as financially possible; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the local chapter of the American Legion of Polk County, Nebr., favoring full participation by the Nation in an all-out war effort and dedication by all loyal Americans to the principle of the Declaration of Independence, that to the successful conduct of the war "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BURTON:

The petition of Mrs. Virgie M. Bucklew and about 175 other citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Charles G. Gildersleeve and sundry other citizens of Pickaway, Ross, and Fairfield Counties, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. Pauline Gillespie and sundry other citizens of Ashtabula and vicinity, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Rebecca Lamoreux and sundry other citizens of Rockford, Celina, and vicinity, in Mercer and Van Wert Counties, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Ola M. Williamson, of Bluffton, and sundry other citizens of Mount Cory and vicinity, in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. William McCloud and sundry other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, and vicinity, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Sarah Carter and sundry other citizens of Haskins and vicinity, Wood County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Moritz and sundry other citizens of Ashland County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of G. D. Lauby and sundry other citizens of Canton, Stark County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Joshua Crenshaw and sundry other citizens of Xenia and Wilberforce, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Catherine Brace and sundry other citizens of Youngstown and H. V. Webb and sundry other citizens of New Middletown, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. Edna Hinkle and sundry other citizens of West Unity and vicinity, Williams County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Miss Georgiana Richardson and sundry other citizens of Cleveland and vicinity, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. Frank Mason and sundry other citizens of Hillsboro, Highland County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Florence Dennis and sundry other citizens of Orient, Pickaway County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of T. W. Comadall and sundry other citizens of Akron, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Berta Ladd and sundry other citizens of Hillsboro, Leesburg and vicinity, Highland County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Flossie Watts and sundry other citizens of Waverly, Pike County, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A petition of sundry citizens of Turner and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, praying that the Farm Security Administration be permitted to continue to make loans in

excess of $1,000; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Montcalm County (Mich.) Board of Supervisors, favoring the enactment of legislation to permit old-age assistance beneficiaries to accept $15 a month and work, without corresponding reduction in their grants during the farm-labor shortage; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Washtenaw County (Mich.) Board of Supervisors, protesting against the present Federal project of building a city within Washtenaw County and Superior Township, Mich.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Berrien County, Mich., protesting against the imposition of Federal taxes upon State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial of sundry students of Nazareth (Mich.) College, remonstrating against the recommendation of the Treasury Department to destroy or limit section 101 (6) of the Revenue Act of 1913, relating to corporations, community chests, and foundation funds, organized and operated exclusively for religious and educational purposes, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Dixie Oil Distributors, in the State of Michigan, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2431, to suspend the operation of the antitrust laws and Federal Trade Commission Act in certain instances requisite to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the so-called Sweeney bill, House bill 6486, for the benefit of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted by members of the Metropolitan Club, Spirit No. 15, of Cadillac, Mich., favoring the enactment of the so-called Sweeney bill, House bill 6486, for the benefit of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A resolution adopted by members of the Fur Floor and Shipping Clerks Union, New York City, N. Y., protesting against any reduction in appropriations for Work Projects Administration employment and services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Elmira, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the New York State Council of Brewery and Soft Drink Workers (Union Labor Trades Department of the State of New York), protesting against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Kings County (N. Y.) Chiropractic Society, protesting against alleged discrimination against the chiropractic profession in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution unanimously adopted by a meeting of the board of managers of the Sons of the Revolution, at Fraunces Tavern, New York City, N. Y., pledging loyalty to the Government and embodying a statement of purpose adopted by the society; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of Albany and vicinity, New York, praying for the enactment of the so-called Sweeney bill, House bill 6486, for the benefit of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Presbytery of Champlain, composed of the Presbyterian and some of the Congregational Churches of Clinton, Essex, and Franklin Counties, N. Y., and sundry citizens of Bangor and vicinity, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Amityville, Lindenhurst, Babylon, and vicinity, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 860, the so-called Sheppard bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Commerce:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, February 23, 1942.

(By Mr. Young)

Whereas passage of persons and movement of commodities across the border between this country and Canada are hampered and affected by many governmental restrictions and regulations; and

Whereas during this time of perilous conflict in which both nations are allied and mutually engaged for the preservation of freedom and the defeat of dangerous enemy nations, it becomes particularly urgent that all unnecessary barriers which tend to injuriously affect the common war effort shall be eliminated; and

Whereas continental solidarity and friendly exchange are not only desirable but extremely essential to successful prosecution of the war, and irritating and distressing border conditions are not only undesirable but harmfully inimical to those essentials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, an efficient, and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, February 24, 1942. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly,

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

MINE DRAINAGE ENGINEERING SURVEY OF THE ANTHRACITE FIELD

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter dated April 30, 1942, addressed to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], Representative BOLAND, Representative FENTON, and myself, by Mr. Karl A. Hoffman, chairman of the Southern Anthracite Mine Drainage Association, concerning action desired by the Federal Government to authorize and finance a general mine drainage survey of the entire anthracite region, together with a resolution for that purpose signed by the members of the association. I request that the letter and accompanying papers be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying papers were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN ANTHRACITE MINE
DRAINAGE ASSOCIATION,
Shenandoah, Pa., April 30, 1942.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND,
Hon. IVOR D. FENTON.

GENTLEMEN: Our association has directed me to congratulate the congressional members of the Federal Anthracite Commission for the completeness of its report to the President and for the judicious recommendations it offered for the present and future welfare of the anthracite region.

It is now our hope that you gentlemen, either jointly or individually, will take immediate action to translate certain of the Commission's recommendations into an action program.

Specifically, we urge that the Federal Government authorize and finance a general mine drainage survey of the entire anthracite region. It is our considered judgment that such a survey should be made by some nationally recognized engineering organization, and should not be undertaken by relief agencies such as Public Works Administration or Work Projects Administration.

A copy of our association's resolution to this effect is attached herewith together with a roster of our membership.

If you concur in the method indicated in this resolution, we trust you will lose no time in introducing the proper legislation; should you have alternate methods or suggestions to offer, we will be pleased to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

SOUTHERN ANTHRACITE MINE DRAINAGE ASSN.
KARL A. HOFFMAN, *Chairman.*

Whereas the Federal Anthracite Commission, in its report to the President of the United States, dated April 2, 1942, under the subheading "For immediate improvement," item No. 4, made the following recommendations: "In order to reduce mining hazards and pumping costs and to prevent loss of large reserves, comprehensive surveys of mine flooding, plans for drainage tunnels and for prevention of inflow should be pressed to completion. Extensive work in this direction has already been started by the Anthracite Mine Drainage Subcommittee of the Susquehanna Drainage Basin Committee"; and

Whereas in the same report under the subheading "Mine water, pumping costs and reserves," the seventh paragraph states: "The United States Bureau of Mines has already made a brief report on the water problem in the Pennsylvania anthracite mining area (Information Circular 7175) indicating the desirability of an engineering survey costing approximately $300,000. It is recommended that this survey be started immediately, and that it cover the entire area. It should be followed as rapidly as possible with a program under a suitable governmental agency to carry out the work which the survey shows to be necessary. One project for this purpose was approved by the President in 1941, but unfortunately the work was not carried out. Delay in starting or carrying out a comprehensive program to solve the mine-water problem may result in an

irretrievable loss of valuable anthracite reserves"; and

Whereas an identical project was endorsed early last year by a subcommittee of the Susquehanna Drainage Basin Committee, which acts in an advisory capacity to the National Resources Planning Board: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association urgently requests the four Members of Congress, who were members of the Federal Anthracite Commission, to introduce bills in the United States Senate and House of Representatives for the purpose of initiating and completing, under Federal jurisdiction, a mine drainage engineering survey of the entire anthracite field along the lines suggested in the foregoing paragraphs, and that a Federal appropriation of not less than $300,000 be made to defray the cost of such a survey.

This resolution was unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of this association, held April 24, 1942, at Pottsville, Pa.

SOUTHERN ANTHRACITE MINE DRAINAGE ASSOCIATION,
KARL A. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

Dated at Shenandoah, Pa., April 24, 1942.

MEMBERS OF SOUTHERN ANTHRACITE MINE DRAINAGE ASSOCIATION

Karl A. Hoffman, chairman, business manager, Shenandoah Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa.

Martin F. Brennan, coordinator, districts 1, 7, 9, United Mine Workers of America, Hazleton, Pa.

Joseph Kershetsky, president, district 9, United Mine Workers of America, Shamokin, Pa.

John Oshinskie, vice president, district 9, United Mine Workers of America, Shamokin, Pa

John J. Cullen, president, Cullen Coal Co., Mount Carmel, Pa.

Henry A. Dierks, mining engineer, East Bear Ridge Colliery Co., Mahanoy Plane, Pa.

E. G. Erdman, mining engineer, Susquehanna Collieries Co., Nanticoke.

H. W. Montz, mining engineer, Lehigh Valley Coal Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

B. H. Hay, superintendent, Reppiier Coal Co., Buck Run, Pa.

Thomas J. Lewis, mining engineer, Frackville, Pa.

W Parkes Millington, engineer and land agent, Girard estate, Pottsville, Pa.

William C. Muehlhof, mining engineer, Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., Pottsville, Pa.

William S. Pugh, consulting mining engineer for Schuylkill County, Pottsville, Pa.

James Quigley, State mine inspector, Mount Carmel, Pa.

Harry F. Reinhart, consulting mining engineer for Northumberland County, Shamokin, Pa.

B. Helme Stockett, general manager, Locust Coal Co., Shenandoah, Pa.

Oscar W. Shimer, assistant division engineer, Hudson Coal Co., Pottsville, Pa.

Charles W. Wagner, division engineer, Hudson Coal Co., Pottsville, Pa.

William B. Wells, engineer and land agent, Sheafer estate, Pottsville, Pa.

Walter Williams, division superintendent, Hazle Brook Coal Co., Raven Run, Pa.

John Cullather, director, department of public assistance, Pottsville, Pa.

REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. AUSTIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I wish to submit a report on House bill 6293 to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States. There were referred to that committee with the bill certain amendments. The committee has passed upon those amendments and I now report favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs House bill 6293, without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1320) thereon.

I desire to give notice that the urgency of this matter is such that I shall try to have it taken up tomorrow, if the Senate should then be in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT: EQUAL RIGHTS TO MEN AND WOMEN (REPT. NO. 1321)

Mr. HUGHES. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights to men and women, and I ask permission later to file a written report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. NORRIS, as in executive session, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported favorably the nomination of James P. Pope, of Idaho, to be a member of the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1942 (reappointment).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2517. A bill for the relief of George W. Fenton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2518. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of D. A. Sullivan & Sons., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. DAVIS introduced Senate bill 2519, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 2520. A bill to authorize the waiver of rights to pensions, compensation, retirement pay, and other benefits by certain officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL DEPUTY COMPTROLLER IN THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, experience of many years in Washington has convinced me of the benefits which may be derived from more careful attention to the expenditures of public funds. The money Congress appropriates is the public's money, and its expenditure should be carefully supervised.

I believe that the office of special deputy comptroller should be established in the General Accounting Office, under the supervision and direction of the Comptroller General, and that the incumbent should examine, settle, and adjust all accounts of expenditures of all governmental agencies whose accounts are not settled by the General Accounting Office on the date of enactment of the bill I am about to introduce. Particularly, I refer to accounts which involve the construction, maintenance, or operation of power projects, housing projects, public utilities, or other projects or services which are directly or indirectly in competition with private industry.

I refer also to appropriations made by Congress wherein lending power is conferred upon any governmental agency for financing the construction, maintenance, or operation of any project with respect to which such financing might be provided by banks or other private financial or lending institutions.

Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which embodies these suggestions.

My experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority showed very clearly the need for special audits, because the general run of business in the Comptroller General's office is so great that it is not always possible to give the special attention that is needed for special accounts. I am introducing a bill which provides for this need.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2519) relating to the accounts of certain governmental agencies was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, to strike out "and/or dependent mother or father."

On page 5, lines 8 and 9, to strike out the semicolon and "dependent mother or father, $20; or both, $15 (each)."

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON THE PRICE OF FREE WORLD VICTORY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an address entitled "The Price of Free World Victory," delivered by the Vice President at a dinner of the Free World Association in New York City on May 8, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAILEY TO CAROLINA POLITICAL UNION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Let Us Have Faith, to be delivered by Senator BAILEY to the Carolina Political Union of the University of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

CANDIDACY OF SENATOR BROWN—EDITORIAL FROM SAULT STE. MARIE EVENING NEWS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brown for Senator," published in the Evening News of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., of May 8, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. JUSTICE MURPHY—ARTICLE BY W. K. KELSEY

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to Mr. Justice Murphy, of the Supreme Court of the United States, written by W. K. Kelsey and published in the Detroit News of May 10, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LT. GEN. JOSEPH W. STILWELL—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of March 29, 1942, with reference to Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Daily Mirror, entitled "Herbert H. Lehman, a 'Best American,'" which appears in the Appendix.]

GRUENING OF ALASKA—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER FROM COMMON SENSE

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger from Common Sense, issue of May 1942, entitled "Gruening of Alaska," which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—EDITORIAL FROM CHARLESTON (W. VA.) GAZETTE

[Mr. ROSIER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of March 9, 1942, explaining the services of the National Youth Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

EARNINGS ON PUBLICLY OWNED UTILITIES—EDITORIAL FROM MADISON (WIS.) CAPITAL TIMES

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., May 1, 1942, relating to earnings of publicly owned utilities, and an accompanying table, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN COMMUNISTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD CERTAIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the May 9, 1942, issue of Editor and Publisher, dealing with the attitude of the American Communist Party toward certain American citizens, republished in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of May 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION IN DEFENSE WORK—EDITORIAL FROM COLUMBIA (S. C.) RECORD

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to the accomplishments of the Work Projects Administration in defense work, published in the Columbia (S. C.) Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECEPTION IN HONOR OF THE PRESIDENT OF PERU

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at 12:30 o'clock the President of Peru is to be the guest of the Senate, and will be escorted into the Senate Chamber by a committee which will be presently appointed by the Vice President. President Prado will deliver a short address, after which I hope we may form a reception line in the front of the Senate Chamber, and that Members of the Senate will pass by and greet the President of our sister republic in South America.

I therefore ask that at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the Senate may stand in recess until called into session by the Vice President, and that the Vice President appoint a committee of four Senators to escort the President of Peru into the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] the committee to escort the President of Peru into the Senate Chamber.

The hour of 12 o'clock and 20 minutes having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will stand in recess.

The Senate being in recess,

His Excellency Manuel Prado, President of the Republic of Peru, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CAPPER, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by His Excellency Dr. Francisco Tudela; His Excellency Dr. Victor Andres Belaunde; the Honorable Dr. Roberto MacLean Estenos; the Honorable Señor Carlos Holquin de Lavalle; General of Aviation Fernando Melgar, military aide; Captain of Navy José R. Alzamora, naval aide; Col. José M. Tamayo, military aide; American Ambassador R. Henry Norweb; His Excellency Manuel de Freyre y Santander, Ambassador of Peru at Washington; the Honorable Gonzalo N. de Arámburn, Director of Protocol of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru; Brig. Gen. John B. Coulter, United States Army, military aide to President Prado; Capt. Paulus P. Powell, United States Navy, naval aide to President Prado; and Manuel Prado, son of President of Peru.

The President of Peru, having been escorted to a place on the rostrum in front of the Vice President, and the distinguished visitors accompanying him having been escorted to places assigned them on the Senate floor on the left side of the Chamber,

The VICE PRESIDENT said: Members of the Senate, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me unusual pleasure on this occasion to introduce to you the President of a great and friendly sister republic—a President who has an unusual understanding of the great Latin-American culture to the south and an equally great understanding of our culture here in the north. I am sure we will profit greatly from the message which he is now to bring us.

Senators, ladies and gentlemen, the President of Peru.

[Prolonged applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF PERU

President PRADO. Members of the Senate, I have just been informed of the loss the Senate has sustained in the death of the Chaplain of the Senate, and I wish to extend to you my sympathy.

Members of the Senate, it is indeed a high honor which the Congress of the United States, worthy guardian of the traditions of freedom, law, and justice of the great American Nation and faithful interpreter of its will throughout its existence, grants to me today. I acknowledge and gratefully accept the honor in the name of the Peruvian people.

Honorable legislators, I bring you a message from my country, one that bears the solemn accent of all multitudinous expressions defining the thoughts and attitudes of peoples, when in the epochal moments of their history vital interests of humanity are found to be at stake, imperatively claiming from them the active participation which it is their duty to give in order to mark the great paths of history.

It has fallen to our lot to live the most tragic and somber hours since the moment when man began his arduous ascent on the millenary ladder of progress, for at no other time has the struggle been so vast between the forces representing a past of enslaving despotism and a future holding high the banner of democracy, wherein we find inscribed in shining characters the principles of equality among men and nations.

Peru born to independent existence and proclaiming, as did all the nations of America, her republican convictions, a country which throughout her history has endeavored to render invariable homage to the rights of all peoples to decide, each their own destiny and to regulate their relations on the basis of mutual respect, whatever their differences of material might, could not hesitate for a single moment in adopting a definite and decided position in the face of the outbreak of forces which are trying to drown in blood every notion of freedom in order to perpetuate over the planet a system of racial hegemony, that it is to everybody's interest to abolish wherever it may be found. [Applause.]

America, the refuge of liberty and democracy, constitutes an immovable barrier against which any attempt to annul the historical efforts and experiences of more than a century, carried out under our founding institutions, will be shattered.

In order that the American Continent may fulfill that mission, as defender of human culture and of the eternal values of the spirit, it was necessary that the nations composing it, rising above all narrow interest, should form a united and indissoluble front, identified by the cult of the same ideal and by the same indestructible faith in the conquest of a common destiny.

And thus at this moment, which will mark an epoch in the history of the continent, a new economic and social policy is being crystallized, which will guide in its main directions the relations of the people of this hemisphere, within a concept that is eminently humane, constructive, and guarantor of the intangibility of its democratic institutions and its independence.

We must admit with fortitude, that events have caught us by surprise and that they have had an enlightening effect compelling us to adopt without delay important rectifications and to be-

come integrated spiritually and materially as a great geographic unity, endowed with all the elements necessary to the full and harmonious development of our life and our culture.

We are thus faced with the urgent task of organizing at a rapid pace the exploitation of our natural resources within a vast integrated plan of research, inventory, and preparation of the constructive elements, along with the factors of communication and transport, so that we may immediately and efficiently set in motion the extensive and complex mechanism of our primary production and its industrial processing, in that measure made necessary in order to satisfy the needs of our population and the enormous and urgent demands of the war.

And I have the intimate satisfaction of announcing, honorable legislators, that the cooperation of Peru is destined to represent a factor of real importance in the solution of the common problems of the defense of our continent [applause], furnishing as it does without reservations the great possibilities that its territory offers in its rich virgin forests, in its majestic mountain ranges enclosing great mineral and hydroelectric wealth, in its fertile valleys, in its copious rivers, in its mild climate, and in the proverbial tranquillity of the ocean along its shores. With all this magnificent background, wherein portentous civilizations now lost in the mists of the past once flourished, today a people, whose blood unites the virtues of the native and the Spanish races, is engaged in fulfilling the imperatives of the hour with indomitable decision and absolute faith, for the triumph of the principles that inspire the great cause of democracy.

This is a noble task, honorable Members of the Senate, which the peoples of America are fulfilling in obedience to the mandate of the Fathers of Independence, who in a magnificent constellation shine everlastingly in the skies of the New World and whose august memory I wish to evoke in this place of justice and of law, as symbols of our republican creed.

The great democracy of the United States, in whose hands God has placed today the destinies of mankind, is fulfilling that historic mission, as the brain, heart, and propelling impulse of the titanic fight for freedom and democracy [applause], which uses the whole world for its stage and in quest of which she is contributing unstintingly the high virtues of her people and her formidable capacity for organization, discipline, and toil, such as has permitted her to secure in a short time an unsurpassed military power, not only for her own direct action but to serve as a gigantic and inexhaustible arsenal for all the democracies of the earth. The vigorous and effective cooperation of the United States reaches every corner where the battle is being waged for democracy, justice, and right, that is to say, for the survival of sovereign nations and freemen.

In the name of Peru, whose destinies I have the honor to guide, I reiterate in this supreme moment her spontaneous adherence to the international policy of President Roosevelt [applause], maximum incarnation of the democratic ideal, and I reaffirm my unbreakable faith that, however strong the forces of oppression and despotism and however painful the sacrifices imposed upon the peoples fighting for the rights of civilization, they will be vanquished and the sun of liberty will once again shine for all men of good will. [Applause.]

Honorable legislators, as long as I live, I shall always remember these transcendental moments and the homage with which your generosity overwhelms me. We are identified in the same beliefs and the same objectives and we have met today, in this temple of democracy, to temper our spirits and to renew before the guiding spirits of the fathers of our liberty our solemn vow to preserve unharmed the patrimony of freedom which they forged with their own lives and which we have received as a sacred heritage which, embellished and increased, we must hand over to posterity. [Applause.]

The expectations of the world are now centered upon this continent, the favorite home of liberty. And America, gentlemen, is demonstrating with extraordinary eloquence that, consistent with its honorable traditions, it is worthy of the confidence of mankind and that it knows how to fulfill faithfully the mandates of history which have designed for it a destiny of struggles and glories. [Applause.]

The supreme objective of the present hour is to win. The goal to be reached is victory. In order to insure it we must coordinate with severe precision all, absolutely all, our economic and social activities so that the mobilization of the material and spiritual resources of each nation will respond with accuracy and with maximum efficiency to the execution of the plans for action and for reciprocal collaboration between all those peoples who in the defense of democracy find themselves associated in this painful tragedy. [Applause.]

But at the same time it is indispensable that the men who have the responsibility of conducting the destiny of the nations, looking to the future above the terrible drama of the war, should search within the very depth of these events the great and fundamental orientations of the future. It is necessary that out of the chaos visiting the world today there shall rise an invincible will to bring about such a condition as will prevent present or future generations again being thrust into a similar catastrophe. [Applause.] The present moment imposes the duty of taking action, not only in obedience to an instinct of self-preservation in the face of danger, but also to formulate a declaration of faith in the eternal principles of Christianity, which provide an inexhaustible source of just standards of equality and high moral planes to govern life, to promote progress, and to assure the welfare of all human beings. [Applause.] If the war is followed by mystification, misery, and confusion, then the blood, sweat, and tears of today will have been shed in vain. Only the rule of justice, as the supreme law of the relations of men and of nations, will make it possible to overcome the disquieting uncertainty of post-war days.

In the face of the thirst for justice and the necessity humanity feels for reparation, it is our unavoidable duty to open the wide roads that shall carry us to the most ample realization of the common ideals of the democratic creed whose basic principles are imbedded in the flags of all the nations of the continent: Rehabilitation of the rights of man, of the family, of the free institutions of culture and of the nations, as expression of the historic realities which, impressing special characteristics upon the people, far from engendering antagonisms between them should enrich and accelerate their evolution within a constructive universal cooperation, the only means of laying the foundations for a perpetual peace in which man and society may attain the fullness of their harmonious development and their happiness. [Prolonged applause; Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

Following his address the President of Peru advanced to the area in front of the Vice President's desk, accompanied by Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CAPPER, and greeted the Members of the Senate as they were introduced to him.

The President of Peru and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were then escorted from the Chamber.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m. the Senate was called to order by the Vice President, and resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business has been concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 6802, making appropriations for the legislative establishment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 20, after the figures "$4,000", to insert "and $500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; on page 3, line 2, after "executive clerk, $3,180", to insert "and $420 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "each" and the comma, to strike out "three at

$2,640 each" and insert "one at $2,640 and $660 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, two at $2,640 each"; in line 9, after the word "each" and the semicolon, insert "assistant in Library, $1,440;"; in line 11, after the words "assistants at the press door—one at", to strike out "$2,140" and insert "$2,200"; in line 12, after the words "laborers—one at", to strike out "$1,740" and insert "$1,800"; in the same line, after the figure "$1,620", to insert "one at $1,440"; at the end of line 12, to strike out "five" and insert "four"; and at the end of line 14, to change the appropriation for Office of the Secretary from $146,640 to $149,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee employees", on page 5, line 1, in the item for the Committee on Enrolled Bills, after the figures "$2,220", to insert "assistant clerk, $1,800, and Senate Resolution 215, agreed to January 16, 1942, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1942;"; on page 5, line 6, item for the Committee on Finance, after the words "clerk, $4,200 and", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500"; and on page 7, at the end of line 9, to change the appropriation for Senate committee employees from $506,440 to $507,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clerical assistance to Senators," on page 8, after line 3, to insert:

For three additional clerks at $1,500 per annum each for each Senator from any State which has a population of 10,000,000 or more inhabitants, $9,000; for two additional clerks at $1,500 per annum each for each Senator from any State which has a population of 5,000,000 or more inhabitants but less than 10,000,000, $36,000; in all, $45,000: *Provided*, That such additional clerks shall be in addition to any other clerical assistance to which Senators are entitled, and shall be employed only during the period of the emergency.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, at the end of line 3, to change the appropriation for clerical assistance to Senators from $1,111,800 to $1,156,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 9, line 16, after the words "clerks—one", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$3,120"; in the same line, after the word "one", where it occurs the third time, to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,120"; in line 17, after the word "majority", to strike out "$2,280" and insert "$2,400 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 21, after "at $2,400 each" and the semicolon, to insert "one at $1,740 and $260 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 23, before "(including four for minority)", to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-nine"; and on page 10, line 22, to change the appropriation for Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate from $271,444 to $272,064.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Folding room", on page 11, line 8, after "Foreman, $2,460", to insert "and $540 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent;"; at the end of line 9, to strike out "assistant, $2,160" and insert "clerk, $2,280"; and at the end of line 11, to change the appropriation for the folding room from $28,560 to $29,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Legislative Council" on page 30, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "$80,550" and insert "$82,550", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$42,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Architect of the Capitol—Buildings and grounds", on page 31, line 23, after "May 15, 1941" and the semicolon, to strike out "$288,341" and insert "$289,900"; and on page 32, line 3, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $6,000 of the unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the appropriation for Capitol Buildings contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1942, shall continue available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 8, to insert:

The appropriation of $25,000 contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved December 17, 1941, to enable the Architect of the Capitol to prepare suitable space directly beneath the crypt in the central portion of the Capitol Building as a depository for the valued documents of the two Houses of Congress since the organization of the Government, shall hereafter also be available for expenditure by the Architect of the Capitol for labor and any incidental items necessary to transfer documents, cases, or other equipment from their present location in the Senate Library in the Capitol Building to the depository in the Capitol Building and to a reserved storage room in the Senate Office Building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 21, to insert:

The appropriation of $25,000, contained under the caption "Architect of the Capitol" in title III, Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 353), approved December 17, 1941, for a suitable depository for the valued documents of the two Houses of Congress, shall also be available to enable such Architect to provide suitable space for such documents in the Annex Building, Library of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 23, to strike out:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; and for personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules; in all, $276,837: *Provided*, That structural changes in the Senate Office Building shall only be made with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; and for personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, including four female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,500 each; in all $306,260, of which $6,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That hereafter the Senate Office Building, and the employment of all services (other than for officers and privates of the Capitol Police) necessary for its protection, care, and occupancy, together with all other items that may be appropriated for by the Congress for such purposes, shall be under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules as to matters of general policy; and the Architect of the Capitol shall submit annually to the Congress estimates in detail for all services (other than for officers and privates of the Capitol Police) and for all other expenses in connection with said office building and necessary for its protection, care, and occupancy: *Provided further*, That hereafter the assignment of rooms and other space in the Senate Office Building shall be under the direction and control of the Senate Committee on Rules and shall not be a part of the duties of the Architect of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That hereafter it shall not be a duty of the Architect of the Capitol to certify any pay roll or other voucher covering any expenditure from any appropriation for the Senate Office Building, or for any other building or activity, unless the obligation involved was incurred by him or under his direction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Increase of the Library of Congress," on page 41, line 13, after the word "exchange", strike out "$55,000" and insert "$173,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 23, after the word "library", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$72,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for printing and binding, Library of Congress, on page 42, at the end of line 18, to reduce the appropriation for general printing and binding from $360,000 to $260,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government Printing Office—Working Capital and Congressional Printing and Binding", on page 47, line 14, after the numerals "1943", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), no part of the foregoing sum of $3,985,000 shall be used for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any person who shall perform any service or authorize any expenditure in connection with the printing and binding of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) for 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Superintendent of Documents', on page 50, after line 7, to strike out:

In order to keep the expenditures for printing and binding for the fiscal year 1943

within or under the appropriations for such fiscal year, the heads of the various executive departments and independent establishments are authorized to discontinue the printing of annual or special reports under their respective jurisdictions: *Provided*, That where the printing of such reports is discontinued the original copy thereof shall be kept on file in the offices of the heads of the respective departments or independent establishments for public inspection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 23 to insert:

SEC. 2. In order to keep the expenditures for printing and binding for the fiscal year 1943 within or under the appropriations for such fiscal year, the heads of the various executive departments and independent establishments are authorized to discontinue the printing of annual or special reports under their respective jurisdictions: *Provided*, That where the printing of such reports is discontinued the original copy thereof shall be kept on file in the offices of the heads of the respective departments or independent establishments for public inspection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 9, to change the section number from 2 to 3; in line 11, to change the section number from 3 to 4; in line 22, to change the section number from 4 to 5; on page 52, line 16, to change the section number from 5 to 6; on page 53, line 14, to change the section number from 6 to 7, and on page 54, line 12, to change the section number from 7 to 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent wherever in the bill it is necessary because of the adoption of amendments to change section numbers and totals and to make other purely technical corrections, that the engrossing clerk be instructed to make such changes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 10, line 7, after "$1,740" to insert "and $120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent." The position is held by Bill Montgomery, whom we all know, and who has worked for the Senate for over 45 years. He has been faithful, trustworthy, and accommodating, and is certainly entitled to this small increase of $120 a year. I hope the Senator from Maryland will agree to the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think if the committee had known about this matter in time it would have reported such an amendment as that offered by the Senator from Oregon. It has been the policy of the committee to give slight increases at this time to all employees who have been here over 40 years. This is one of the cases overlooked, and I see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted. It is a very meritorious case.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I certainly approve the amendment, and hope it will be adopted. It affects a very valuable employee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 7, line 1, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, I desire to offer an amendment to strike out the words "assistant clerk, $2,280" and insert "two assistant clerks, $2,280 each."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the bill as reported, provision is made for one assistant clerk at $2,280 and another assistant clerk at $2,580. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would provide for two assistant clerks at $2,280 each and one assistant clerk at $2,580.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, the reason for this amendment, I may say, is that the Public Lands Committee, through a subcommittee, has been conducting a very thorough investigation of the minerals on the public domain. Because of this new study much more work is being done than has been done by the committee in many years past. The importance of developing new sources of mineral supplies, I think, is readily recognized upon all hands. I was reluctant to act in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], which explains why the amendment was not presented to the committee.

The work has been carried on by a clerk of the committee who served with the late Senator Adams while he was chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. This clerk has been kept at work by reason of a special appropriation which was allocated to the committee for the investigation which has been carried on.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has made a very good case for compensation for the particular employee to whom he refers, but I suggest to the Senator that the proper place for handling the situation he has pictured would be before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I say that for the reason that, in the nature of things, the work to which he refers is largely of a temporary character. I am a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I will pledge myself, in advance, to see that provision is made so that the clerk of the committee to which the Senator refers will be paid the compensation he should have. There are, however, many cases of committees which are now about to undertake special work which would not be undertaken in normal conditions, and, if in the permanent law we start making an exception in one case, I am afraid it will lead to a great deal of confusion. I shall be glad to help the Senator in any way I can because of the very fine work I know the committee is doing in developing mineral resources, as they should be developed in view of the shortage in the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am impressed with the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland, and, in view of the fact that he has been good enough to indicate that, as a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, he will support this item, I shall be content to present the matter by special resolution to that committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to come in on page 32, line 3. I ask that the clerk state the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 3, after the word "expended", it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following: "and in addition there is appropriated, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and for expenditure in the same manner as, the appropriation hereinbefore extended, the sum of $331,880, to remain available until expended; such merged amount shall be available also for replacement of the skylights over the Senate and House Chambers with reinforced concrete roof slab, reconstruction of ceilings, redecoration, acoustical treatment, improved lighting, and other changes and improvements in connection with such Chambers: *Provided further*, That the War Production Board shall apply such preference ratings as may be necessary to secure deliveries of materials for the expeditious accomplishment of such projects."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it seems proper that I should make a brief explanation of the occasion for offering the amendment. It was taken up both by the subcommittee and the main committee which had this bill in charge at the instance of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I am not offering it technically as a committee amendment, but it is offered with the approval of the committee.

As Members of the Senate remember, about 2 years ago the question of the safety of the ceilings and skylights over the Senate Chamber and the hall of the House of Representatives was taken under consideration. The subject was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. That committee went extensively into the matter, held hearings, considered all phases of the subject, and submitted a report which was adopted by the Senate and the other House, and an appropriation was made for doing the necessary work.

The principal argument used at that time was that the metal structure which supported the roof had become tired after long years; I do not know whether it was because of listening to Senatorial speeches or what may have been the direct cause, but it was old and worn out, having been put in place between the years 1859 and 1865. For that reason it was recommended that a new roof and skylight be installed, and also that some other changes be made in the Senate Office Building and the Capitol. The emergency was great, and it was thought better to make merely temporary provision for the safety of the occupants of the respective legislative chambers. Therefore, only a small part of the sum appropriated was spent for the

temporary scaffolding which was erected in order to prevent the roof from falling in in case of a snowstorm or other natural cause.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has covered the essentials of the matter. I should like to say, as one member of the committee, that, of course, whatever is done in the case of the Senate Chamber similar repairs have to be made to the Hall of the House of Representatives, as we are treating the Capitol as one building. Therefore the reason the committee asked the Senator to present this amendment rather than to report it as a part of the bill was so that it would be adopted by the Senate with full knowledge, and when it was taken to conference the architects, the House Appropriations Committee, and the conferees could go into the whole picture. If there is no serious objection, I hope the amendment will be adopted. I think it is understood by the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to add a word or two further. The action proposed has the consent and approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. If adopted, the amendment will provide for a ceiling not of glass, as it is at present, and which is a serious threat to the safety of those in this Chamber, for if a bomb should fall on this building, not necessarily on the building itself but anywhere within 2 or 3 blocks of it, all this glass would be shattered and fall on our heads and there would probably be a long list not only of injuries but of fatalities. The proposed appropriation would simply supplement a previous amount and is necessary because, for various reasons, the work will cost more than was originally allowed. I shall be glad to go into the reasons if called upon to do so.

Mr. ANDREWS subsequently said: Mr. President, when the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] offered his amendment to the legislative appropriation bill earlier in the day it was my intention to make a statement regarding the necessity for the changes recommended to be made in the roof of the Senate wing of the Capitol, and particularly the reconstruction of the Senate Chamber, ceiling and all. I shall not now make a statement on the subject, since the amendment has been adopted and the bill has been passed, but I have information which I believe will be of value to those who may be interested.

Under the authority of Senate Resolution 150, which was submitted to the Senate by me, I was appointed chairman and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] were appointed members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate to study and make report to the full committee, with recommendations.

The subcommittee held hearings, at which several men of long experience appeared and testified relative to acoustical treatment, air conditioning, decorating, and lighting as applied to auditoriums.

The committee recommended that the appropriation of 1940 for replacing the roof of the Senate wing of the Capitol and for reconstruction of the ceiling of the Senate should be supplemented, as repairs and improvements over the Senate Chamber and also over the Hall of the House of Representatives were very necessary, and in fact fell in an emergency category. We later conferred with the Speaker of the House and Representative LANHAM, chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House, who requested us to include a sufficient appropriation to cover costs of similar improvements in and over the House Chamber.

The committee recommended, first, that in constructing the permanent roofs there should be constructed at the same time a better lighting system for the Senate Chamber; second, that the present wrought-iron and ground-glass ceiling of the Senate Chamber, weighing about 90 tons, should be replaced with a vaulted type of plaster ceiling acoustically treated and decorated; third, that a better system of lighting, with air conditioning, and a new noiseless type of seat for the galleries be provided.

Under these circumstances we have included in this amendment an additional appropriation for similar improvements in the House wing of the Capitol. It is now up for consideration as an amendment to House bill 6802, making appropriations for the legislative branches of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

As Members of the Senate know, the repairs and improvements recommended have been long needed and long delayed. In fact, because of the delay it was necessary to install the present steel beams, temporarily supporting a roof which was about to cave in, so as to prevent the collapse of the roof and ceiling pending the adjournment of the Senate for a sufficient length of time to complete the reconstruction of the ceiling and roof and make other improvements.

Following our consultation with Hon. David Lynn, the Architect of the Capitol, and his assistants, together with Mr. Thomas W. Marshall, consulting architect, they furnished us with a complete estimate of the additional cost, over and above the present appropriation, necessary to make the improvements for both the Senate and House Chambers.

I now present a break-down of the recommended improvements and their cost, with the request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reconstruction of roofs over Senate and House wings of Capitol, replacement of skylights over Senate and House Chambers with concrete roof slab, replacement of cast-iron ceilings of Senate and House Chambers with plaster ceilings acoustically treated and decorated, better lighting system, and other improvements in connection with the Senate and House Chambers

SENATE CHAMBER

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the portion of the Senate wing roof structure over the Senate Chamber (appendix A)	$169,390
Estimated additional cost of replacing present cast-iron ceiling of Senate Chamber with a vaulted-type plaster ceiling acoustically treated and decorated; replacing present skylight over Senate Chamber with reinforced concrete roof slab; providing a better system of lighting; air conditioning changes; new seats for gallery and repairs to gallery floors in the Senate Chamber (appendix B)	$103,500
Total, Senate Chamber	272,890

HOUSE CHAMBER

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the portion of the House wing roof structure over the House Chamber (appendix D)	224,369
Estimated additional cost of replacing present cast-iron ceiling of House Chamber with a valuted-type plaster ceiling acoustically treated and decorated; replacing present skylight over House Chamber with reinforced concrete roof slab; providing a better system of lighting; air conditioning changes; new seats for gallery and repairs to gallery floors; and replacing marble coping in the House Chamber (appendix E)	150,380
Total, House Chamber	374,749
Total, Senate and House Chambers	647,639

OTHER SECTION OF ROOF—SENATE WING

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the rest of the roof over the Senate wing adjacent to the Senate Chamber area (appendix C)	85,516

OTHER SECTION OF ROOF—HOUSE WING

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the rest of the roof over the House wing adjacent to the House Chamber area (appendix F)	103,534
Total, other sections of roof, Senate and House wings	189,050
Total estimated cost of all work to be done	836,689
Amount previously appropriated—Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1940, approved June 27, 1940	585,000
Less amount expended to May 1942 for all items involved in the installation of temporary steel supports in the Senate Chamber ($32,076.40) and in the House Chamber ($48,114.60)	−80,191
Unexpended balance of appropriation, available May 1942, requested in 1943 legislative appropriation bill to be continued available beyond June 30, 1942	504,809
Supplemental appropriation required to complete project	331,880
Total	836,689

APPENDIX A

SENATE CHAMBER

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the portion of the Senate wing roof structure over the Senate Chamber:

Removal of temporary steel supports	$14,000
New staging and protective work, temporary roofs, and other temporary work	32,390

Demolition of old work, cleaning up, hauling	$10,000
Structural steel work	31,100
Concrete and brickwork	12,700
Fireproofing trusses	25,700
Electrical work	4,500
Painting	11,400
Roofing	5,000
Skylights	12,000
Removal and replacement of duct-work	10,600
Total	169,390

APPENDIX B.

SENATE CHAMBER

Estimated additional cost of replacing present cast-iron ceiling of Senate Chamber with a vaulted-type plaster ceiling, acoustically treated and decorated; replacing present skylight over Senate Chamber with reinforced concrete roof slab; providing a better system of lighting; air-conditioning changes, new seats for gallery, and repairs to gallery floors, in the Senate Chamber:

Additional steel, concrete, and roofing required to fill in skylight area, plus net cost of removal of old cast-iron and glass ceiling	$26,000
Less allowance for new skylight in original appropriation	12,000
Total	14,000
Ornaments cast in acoustical plaster	16,000
Plain plaster and setting	14,700
Painting	900
Lighting	17,500
Air conditioning	22,000
New seats (670) for gallery and repairs to floors	18,400
Total	103,500

APPENDIX C

OTHER SECTION OF ROOF—SENATE WING

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the rest of the roof over the Senate wing, adjacent to the Senate Chamber area:

Staging and protective work, temporary roofs, and other temporary work	$6,316
Demolition of old work, cleaning up, hauling	4,000
Structural steel work	11,500
Concrete and brickwork	30,000
Painting	5,000
Roofing and gutters	26,800
Removal and replacement of duct-work	1,900
Total	85,516

APPENDIX D

HOUSE CHAMBER

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the portion of the House wing roof structure over the House Chamber:

Removal of temporary steel supports	$21,000
New staging and protective work, temporary roofs, and other temporary work	35,669
Demolition of old work, cleaning up, hauling	14,300
Structural steel work	43,500
Concrete and brickwork	18,800
Fireproofing trusses	30,500
Electrical work	6,000
Painting	17,900
Roofing	8,200
Skylights	16,700
Removal and replacement of duct-work	11,800
Total	224,369

APPENDIX E

HOUSE CHAMBER

Estimated additional cost of replacing present cast-iron ceiling of House Chamber with a vaulted type plaster ceiling acoustically treated and decorated; replacing present skylight over House Chamber with reinforced concrete roof slab; providing a better system of lighting, air-conditioning changes, new seats for gallery, and repairs to gallery floors, and replacing marble coping in the House Chamber:

Additional steel, concrete, and roofing required to fill in skylight area, plus net cost of removal of old cast-iron and glass ceiling	$35,350
Less allowance for new skylight in original appropriation	16,700
	18,650
Ornaments cast in acoustical plaster	21,330
Plain plaster and setting	19,600
Painting	1,200
Lighting	23,300
Air conditioning	29,300
New seats (616) for gallery and repairs to floor and replacing marble coping	37,000
Total	150,380

APPENDIX F

OTHER SECTION OF ROOF—HOUSE WING

Estimated cost of reconstruction of the rest of the roof over the House wing, adjacent to the House Chamber area:

Staging and protective work, temporary roofs, and other temporary work	$7,534
Demolition of old work, cleaning up, hauling	5,000
Structural-steel work	14,200
Concrete and brickwork	37,300
Painting	6,600
Roofing and gutters	31,500
Removal and replacement of duct work	1,400
Total	103,534

Mr. ANDREWS. It will be observed that the total amount necessary to make the new improvements recommended for both House and Senate wings is $331,880. Of this additional amount $103,500 will be used for the improvements in the Senate Chamber, and $150,380 for the additional improvements in the House Chamber.

The records show that the Senate Chamber was constructed from designs and plans prepared by Thomas U. Walters and was first occupied by the Senate in 1859 before Lincoln's first inauguration. Previous to that time the Senate had been occupying the room in the Capitol recently vacated by the United States Supreme Court.

Originally the present Senate Chamber was partially lighted by gas, aided by the skylights above during the daytime. In 1888 incandescent electric lights were substituted for gas lights. These artificial lights occupy a space between the glass panel ceiling and the glass skylight roof, and this method of lighting has been continued, with some modification and improvements until the present time.

The present beamed ceiling is composed of cast iron weighing 90 tons, which is supported by iron braces and trusses of about the same weight which have, due to age and change of weather, become totally unsafe.

This method of lighting is far from satisfactory. The variation produced by changes caused by cloudy weather makes the natural lighting through the skylight uncertain and of varying intensity, and when artificial lights are used to aid skylighting the contrast between the lighted glass panels and the unlighted portion of the ceiling is not agreeable and is more or less injurious to the eyes.

The committee therefore recommends that the wrought iron beams and glass ceiling be removed during the construction of these new improvements, and that a vaulted type of permanent plaster ceiling, acoustically treated and decorated, be substituted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

Allowances: Allowances herein provided for mileage and stationery for the President of the Senate and Senators, and for Representatives, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall not be or be deemed to be part of the salary or compensation of such officers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as the amendment does not provide for any extra appropriation, but merely for administration for income-tax purposes, and to correct an apparent oversight in the law, I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has correctly stated the purpose of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland and of the Senate to a situation which exists in regard to the radio press gallery of the Senate. In 1940 we adopted a Senate resolution providing for a superintendent and an assistant superintendent of the radio press gallery at salaries of $2,800 a year and $1,560 a year, respectively. The salaries are now paid out of the contingent fund.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. All the Senator desires in the way of an amendment is one transferring the employees of the radio gallery from the contingent fund, and placing them under the permanent law. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and I wish to have a slight change made in the salaries. The superintendent of the radio press gallery now receives $2,800 a year, and I think he should draw as much as is paid the assistant press gallery superintendent, and that the assistant in the radio press gallery, drawing $1,560,

should receive as much as the second assistant in the press gallery. Therefore, I should like to amend the bill by inserting, on page 10, line 18, after the words "each", the words "radio press gallery—superintendent, $3,000; assistant superintendent, $1,960."

Mr. TYDINGS. I see no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be offered the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6802) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMENDATION OF THE HOLLYWOOD VICTORY COMMITTEE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, today, more than ever before, the people of this Nation are united in their determination to win this war.

Toward that end our citizens are making special contributions and rendering voluntary services, speeding the day of victory. This body cannot pause to praise each individual who merits recognition, but it is altogether fitting that we should comment, and—to use an old political catch line in its best sense and meaning—"point with pride" when an entire industry goes all out in a special service.

The Hollywood Victory Committee, which represents all the motion-picture industry, has just made a very valuable contribution to our Nation's war effort through the 13-city tour of the Hollywood Victory Caravan for Army and Navy Relief. By the end of the tour some $750,000 will have been raised through this wholehearted contribution, to which 22 famous actors and actresses, 8 young starlets, a noted producer, a talented musical conductor, and other skilled theater technicians gave their services.

Opening at Loew's Capitol Theater in Washington on April 30, the Caravan attracted $25,000 to the box office—the largest amount of money a benefit performance at any Washington theater has ever raised for any charitable organization. In cities where larger auditoriums are available the gross runs much higher, of course, and because nearly everything connected with the Caravan is contributed the cost of the tour will be surprisingly low.

The wealth of talent in the performance would literally have been impossible to present in a program at any price had not the stars given their services entirely free. And more than that—everyone connected with the caravan made distinct contributions for which they could not have been paid; for no rehearsal was too long and no work too difficult to complete if it added to the success of the show.

In addition to the generous sum of money which Army and Navy Relief will share as a result of the caravan, there will be vast dividends which cannot be calculated. Not only in cities where the stars appear, but throughout the Nation, the Army and Navy Relief drives are feeling the stimulus of this special contribution by these favorites of the stage, screen, and radio. Beginning next Thursday, May 14, the motion-picture theaters of the entire Nation will hold a week of collections for Army-Navy Relief, and theater men all over the country are planning to achieve the same success with this drive that they have won in the many campaigns they have handled for similar worthy projects.

Our hearty commendation for a splendid achievement goes to the Hollywood Victory Committee, which planned and directed the caravan; to the famous players who contributed their time and talent so wholeheartedly; to the technical workers who assured the success of this unprecedented series of 1-night stands; and to the theater men in each city who, cooperating with local Army and Navy Relief committees, had the responsibility of selling the tickets and presenting the caravan in the best traditions of showmanship.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., of Maryland, to be a judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. George S. Brown, resigned, and also several nominations in the United States Public Health Service, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT—CONFIRMATION OF WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that I may report favorably from the Committee on Finance the nomination of Representative WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., of Maryland, to be a judge of the United States Customs Court, vice George S. Brown, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the report being received? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was distracted. Who is the nominee?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Representative WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., to be a judge of the United States Customs Court.

Mr. McNARY. I join in the Senator's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, Representative COLE, whose nomination to be a judge of the customs court is now before the Senate, is a distinguished citizen of Maryland, and an able lawyer. He was a captain in the American Army during the World War, and for seven successive terms has been a Member of the House of Representatives, where he rose to a position of leadership. For instance, during the absence recently of the Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN] Representative COLE was selected to be acting Speaker of the House. Quite likely Senators will recall, on a very historic occasion, when Prime Minister Winston Churchill addressed in this Chamber the Senate and the House in joint session, Representative COLE was here in the official capacity of Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Representative COLE has demonstrated in countless ways that he is a man of ability, industry and integrity. He has rendered faithful and invaluable service in all the various positions he has held in public and private life. I am confident that as a member of the Customs Court he will continue to be faithful, conscientious, and efficient.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is a matter of very great personal pleasure to me to note the action which has just been taken in reference to Representative COLE. I have known him all my life. We were classmates together at the University of Maryland, where we both studied engineering. During the war we were in adjoining divisions, and I have had the good fortune to have his regard and friendship throughout the years.

Today, the anniversary of Representative COLE's birthday, finds him in a hospital in Baltimore. He suffered a disability during the last war which affected his lungs, and has caused him a great deal of difficulty since. At one time it was necessary for him to go to North Carolina and spend a year. It is particularly gratifying, in these tragic hours, that fate has conspired to project some of the humanities into this appointment and that while he is sick, and in the hospital, word may go forth of the confirmation of his nomination.

The House of Representatives has lost a very valuable Member. Personally, I am sorry indeed to see Representative COLE of Maryland leave the Halls of Congress. He is such an able, tolerant, judicial-minded, and experienced Member that the Nation and our State could ill afford to lose him, but he had a desire for the appointment, and I am gratified he has been named. I merely desired to add this brief word to what has been said by my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself, in just a word, with the two Senators from Maryland in what has been said about Representative COLE

of Maryland. During my service in the Senate and in the House of Representatives I have not known a more sincere, honorable, upright man, one more devoted to the public interest, than is Mr. COLE of Maryland. While I share the grief expressed by my colleagues at his loss as a Member of the House, where he has served ably, I am happy, inasmuch as he was interested in this appointment, to know that he has received it. I am sure he will discharge his duties in his new position with the same fidelity that has marked his services so far in other public office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

ROGER W. CREER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while we are considering executive matters, since there is only one nomination on the calendar, that of a postmaster at Spanish Fork, Utah, I ask, as in executive session, that the nomination of Roger W. Creer to be postmaster at Spanish Fork, Utah, be confirmed, and that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before we take such far-reaching action as that, may I ask where Spanish Fork is located?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is in Utah.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is all right, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roger W. Creer to be postmaster at Spanish Fork, Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the postmaster at Spanish Fork, whose name has been R. W. Creer, but whose commission has expired, and whose name as the new postmaster at Spanish Fork is Roger W. Creer, will be glad to have the confirmation of his nomination associated with that of the distinguished Member of the House from Maryland, and I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of both nominations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate and the country will be gratified to know that both nominees have in the past rendered good service to the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified of both nominations this day confirmed.

TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS RELATING TO FREIGHT SERVICE

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barkley	Bulow
Andrews	Bilbo	Bunker
Austin	Bone	Burton
Bailey	Brewster	Butler
Ball	Brooks	Byrd
Bankhead	Brown	Capper
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Chandler	La Follette	Rosier
Chavez	Langer	Russell
Clark, Mo.	Lee	Schwartz
Danaher	Lucas	Shipstead
Davis	McCarran	Smathers
Downey	McFarland	Smith
Doxey	McKellar	Spencer
George	McNary	Stewart
Gerry	Maloney	Taft
Gillette	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Glass	Mead	Tunnell
Green	Millikin	Tydings
Guffey	Murdock	Vandenberg
Gurney	Murray	Van Nuys
Hatch	Norris	Wagner
Hayden	Nye	Wallgren
Herring	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Hill	O'Mahoney	White
Holman	Overton	Willis
Hughes	Radcliffe	
Johnson, Calif.	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is about to make a very notable address. I have had the pleasure of reading his notes, and I wish to inquire of the Senator whether he has a manuscript of his remarks.

Mr. REED. I have had the address duplicated.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to have copies of the address distributed to Senators before the Senator from Kansas delivers it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, nothing is more important just now than providing transportation adequate to meet war demands and take care of what is left of the daily needs of what recently was our normal life. As the anguish of our citizens over the shrinkage in supply of sugar and rubber and gasoline deepens, as water transportation between the coasts and between Atlantic and Gulf ports disappears, as the ability to move traffic on rubber tires on the highways decreases, the burden on the all-important railways increases.

What are the railways currently doing?

What of their ability to handle a still larger volume of traffic?

On the answer to these questions hangs the welfare of the country—one might accurately say the fate of the Nation. There is no use to manufacture munitions, produce food for ourselves and our allies, to raise cotton and wool and bring iron ore from the Lake Superior ranges, unless the finished product can be moved into use or consumption.

The railroads have been through some lean years. With a very few exceptions their credit was impaired during these lean years. About one-third of the mileage of the American railroads was in bankruptcy. Substantial mileage is still in bankruptcy.

Yet the railroads of the United States are today doing the most phenomenal job in their history. It is interesting and it is important to examine a few outstanding facts.

The task of the railroads in providing transportation necessary to the country's welfare can be very simply stated. It is: "To move so many tons so many miles."

Doing the job is not so simple as stating it. It is a most complex problem, calling for the highest executive ability, organizing genius and faithful performance by more than a million men.

The first fact is that the railroads of the United States performed more service in 1941 than any year in their history. They moved 475,000,000,000 ton-miles. Ton-miles are the product of multiplying the tons originated by the miles hauled. The tons originated were not so many as in several previous years. The tons of freight originated in 1941 were 1,209,584,892.

This amount of originating freight traffic was exceeded in 1917, 1918, 1920, 1923, and every year from 1925 to 1929, inclusive.

But the tons of 1941 traffic traveled more miles than any previous year. The average haul was 392.74 miles for each ton. That is to be compared with an average haul of 310.81 miles in 1926.

I shall use 1926 as a basis of comparison. That was a year of heavy traffic and normal railroad operation.

In 1926 the railroads owned or leased 2,348,679 freight cars of all types. In 1941 they owned or leased 1,693,978 freight cars of all types. Thus there was a decrease of approximately 25 percent in the number of cars available in this period.

With this decrease in available freight cars, how did the railroads manage to handle the highest amount of ton miles in their history?

I stated the problem of the railroads as "to move so many tons so many miles." I might add, "with so many cars."

If each car can carry a heavier load and each car move faster a greater service can be rendered with fewer cars.

In 1926 the average freight car load was 35.1 tons. In 1941 the average load was 38.2 tons. This is an increased efficiency in the use of freight cars of 9 percent.

Then comes this factor known as car-miles per car-day. Obviously the more miles a freight car can be made to travel, the more traffic it can move in a given period.

In 1926 the average miles per day for all freight cars was 32.6 miles. In 1941 the average miles per day was 42.2 for all freight cars, an efficiency increase of 29 percent.

For the purpose of consideration here, these two factors of increased efficiency can be added. When that is done, they show an increase of 38 percent in the use of freight cars. This increased efficiency more than offsets the decrease in the number of cars. It is the increased efficiency of the railroads and that factor alone that is keeping the traffic of the country moving in this critical hour.

Mr. President, I have given the high points of some tables which have been prepared for me by the Association of American Railroads with assistance from the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation. This information is valuable and useful, and timely for public purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the complete tables which include these figures and some additional tables bearing upon increased efficiency in freight-car use and train operation be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that brings me to ask, What of the future?

No one careful of his reputation will do more than to venture a carefully guarded outline of the transportation problem for the remainder of this year. No man whose opinion I respect will venture anything for 1943.

In addition to my own lifelong experience with transportation, I have conferred with Director Eastman of the O. D. T., and with Mr. M. J. Gormley, car service genius of the Association of American Railroads. I shall refer to these gentlemen later. I have examined the reports of the Shippers Advisory Boards and have considered all sources of information available.

The peak of freight traffic movement almost invariably comes in October. During the period from May to October, freight traffic averages 20 percent heavier than during the period from November to May. The railroads are getting along in reasonably good shape at the present moment. Can they handle an increase in traffic, which this year is estimated to be 10 percent in car loadings and 20 percent in ton-miles? The answer will depend upon several factors which I shall state:

First. The railroads need more engines and more freight cars. Director Eastman is asking the W. P. B. for priority in materials out of which these engines and cars can be built.

Second. Can the railroads further improve their already remarkable record of efficiency in order to handle increased traffic? It is not sufficient to maintain the present efficiency of operation. Efficiency must be increased.

On this point, there is a ray of sunshine. The railroads are this year showing some improvement over their splendid record of 1941. During January and February the average tons per car as compared with the average of 1941 increased from 38.2 tons to 39 tons. The average miles per car day in these months increased from 42.2 to 42.9 miles. These increases are not large, but they show improvement over an already astonishingly good record.

Third. Will the shippers of the country cooperate by more heavily loading freight cars; by more promptly unloading when switched to their warehouses or elevators, or industrial plants?

Fourth. Will coal consumers, both domestic and industrial, take advantage of the ability of the railroads to move coal now? To lay in supplies for the next fall and winter, at which time the ability of the railroads to move the entire traffic is open to some doubt?

It is the unanimous view of those familiar with this problem that coal is more likely to run into a bottleneck next October, November, and December, than any other form of traffic. The critical outlook for the movement of coal next fall and winter cannot be overemphasized. Citizens of New York and the New England States ought by all means to buy all the coal that can possibly be stored.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, does the Senator care to yield at this time, or would he prefer to conclude his statement?

Mr. REED. I have been asked a large number of questions, and my office has tabulated the questions which have been asked. If it is just as satisfactory to my friend the Senator from Maine, I should rather wait until I finish this statement, after which I shall be very happy to take all the time necessary to answer any questions which any Senator may desire to ask. Otherwise, I should be glad to yield to my friend the Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, in this equation a number of factors must be given consideration. There will be more truck tonnage turned over to the railroads as rubber tires wear out. Movement of war emergency materials involves longer-than-average hauls, which means more service for this volume of traffic. Transportation must be furnished by railroad for fuel which formerly moved by water into New England and other Northeastern States. Other factors are involved, but these are sufficient for this purpose.

I have outlined the record of the greatest transportation agency in the world, which should fill with pride the men who are making it, and which deserves the gratitude of the people of the United States. Outside the production of essentials, no factor in our economic structure is so important as transportation. The railroads of the country have an ample supply of ability in their executives, and of efficient and loyal service from the million men who operate the trains and man the offices and yards. To all of those men who have contributed to this almost miraculous result, I pay my tribute.

I now come to a question of immediate interest in this territory, and that is the movement of gasoline and fuel oil from the producing and refining regions of the West into the Atlantic seaboard territory.

The East and Northeast areas consume about 1,700,000 barrels of petroleum and its products daily. The estimate of consumption varies from 1,300,000 barrels a day to 1,700,000 barrels a day. Personally I do not undertake to say which figure is correct. I use the larger estimate. Up to the time when submarine operations interfered with coastal transportation from the Gulf of Mexico into Atlantic ports, about 2 percent was moved by railroad, a relatively small amount by pipe line and inland-river barge, and the remainder by water.

Last September Secretary Ickes, as Petroleum Coordinator, asked the railroads for an estimate of what they could do in the way of increasing their movement as water transportation declined. President Pelley, of the Association of American Railroads, made an estimate of 200,000 barrels daily. The railroads were then handling about seventy-five or eighty thousand barrels daily. Mr. Ickes was skeptical of the ability of the railroads to handle the larger amount of petroleum.

For the week ending May 2, the railroads delivered into Atlantic seaboard territory 640,478 barrels a day. There has been a gradual ascent from the average handling last September to this figure.

An order issued by Director Eastman, of the Office of Defense Transportation, withdrawing tank cars from all short-haul and intracity handling, will provide additional cars for long-haul service. A rail movement of 800,000 barrels daily into eastern and northeastern territory may reasonably be anticipated.

The railroads are showing an astonishing efficiency in the entire tank-car service. Throughout 1941 all freight cars moved an average of 42.2 miles a day. Through March 1942 tank cars averaged 71 miles a day.

When it comes to the long hauls from refineries along the Gulf coast as far west as Texas and from the midcontinent field to the eastern area, the performance is almost incredible. From the most distant refining point on the Gulf coast to Philadelphia and return is 3,750 miles. Tank cars are regularly making this round trip in 15 days, an average of 250 miles a day. Similarly, from Tinsley, Miss., to Bay Way, N. J., a distance of 3,100 miles, round trips are being made in 14 days, an average of 221 miles a day. Other long-haul tank-car operation is on a comparable basis.

The car-service division of the American Association of Railroads lists the following steps as being taken to speed up tank-car movements:

First. Solid trains of loads and empties moved speedily on main tracks through yards and terminals.

Second. Block billing of empties from unloading points in large groups rather than billing cars out individually—the result, considerable switching saved.

Third. The same blocking plan of distributing empties at the larger loading points.

Fourth. Substitution of direct for circuitous routes.

Fifth. Concentration of crude-oil movement to eastern ports on one route to each point rather than dividing tonnage over two, three, or even four, routes. This permits trainload handling of loads and empties.

Sixth. Sunday and holiday switching and train service to meet expanded activities of the oil industry.

Seventh. Construction of new track and facilities by the railroads to meet increased demands at loading and unloading points.

Eighth. Close supervision by carriers of principal movements, especially of crude oil in trainload lots.

Ninth. Substitution by oil companies of tank trucks for tank cars on cross-town or short-haul movements.

Tenth. Assignment by private-line car owners of mechanical men at principal loading and unloading points for making repairs—time saver permitting uninterrupted loading.

Eleventh. Shippers and receivers load and unload as fast as possible working 7 days a week and not hold cars over hours.

Twelfth. Checks by field men at principal gateways and terminals for speedy railroad handling.

Thirteenth. Checks by field men for detention at shipping and receiving points.

Fourteenth. Supervision of these matters by car efficiency committees of shippers' advisory boards.

Mr. President, before I close I wish to give a word of deserved praise to the two men who are most important in the efficient operation of the railroads at this time. One of them is Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation in the Office of Defense Transportation. Everybody knows Joe Eastman. His name is synonymous with faithful public service of the very highest quality. He is the foremost transportation statesman of the United States. He brings to bear upon the tremendous problems confronting him and the country long experience, high intelligence, and untiring industry. I have previously said upon the floor of the Senate that the country has no more capable, devoted, and valuable public servant than Joe Eastman. I repeat that statement. I can testify to these qualities out of 20 years of close contact and warm friendship.

The other man is M. J. Gormley, better known in the railroad world as "Mike" Gormley, long-time head of the car service division of the Association of American Railroads. His name is not so well known as that of Joe Eastman, but Gormley, too, deserves recognition and commendation for highly efficient service.

Up to 20 years ago every year the entire country experienced a shortage in transportation during the heavy traffic period from July to October. This shortage was especially severe throughout the Grain Belt, where the movement of crops harvested through those months imposed a tremendous burden upon the railroads and was of vast importance to the farm and business economy of that section. From 1919 to 1938 it fell to me in one capacity or another to be closely identified with providing the transportation necessary for Kansas through the harvest period. Kansas is the largest wheat-producing State in the country. It produces about 40 percent of the entire winter wheat crop. It was in that way that I came to know Mike Gormley.

Prior to 1923 there were enough freight cars owned by the railroads of the country to provide adequate transportation. The trouble was that the freight cars were not in the right place at the right time.

Mike Gormley came to the head of the car-service division of the railroads in 1922. I discussed the whole situation with him at length that year. He told me of his plans, to be made effective in the early part of 1923. He hoped to solve this vexatious problem by more efficient handling and use of freight cars.

He succeeded. Beginning in 1923, freight cars have been in the right place at the right time. With the same number of freight cars, and even with a reduced number in recent years, railroad service has been increasingly efficient. Of course, many factors go to make up this increase in efficiency, but the prime factor is the centralized control of the entire freight-car supply of the country, and a systematized handling of this supply so as to make it available.

There has been no serious car shortage since Mike Gormley brought order out of chaos and substituted system for guesswork. To the man whose organizing genius and high ability made this possible, my friend and coworker for 20 years, I pay this tribute.

EXHIBIT A

Statistics, class I railways—Tons originated, average haul per ton of freight, and revenue ton-miles

[Year 1926=base for percentage figures]

Year	Tons originated	Percent	Average haul per ton of freight (miles)	Percent	Revenue ton-miles (millions)	Percent
1916	1,203,367,190	90.1	277.98	89.4	362,444	81.7
1917	1,264,015,725	94.6	288.18	92.7	394,465	88.9
1918	1,263,343,993	94.6	296.89	95.5	405,379	91.4
1919	1,096,449,305	82.1	308.60	99.3	364,293	82.1
1920	1,255,420,991	94.0	303.52	97.7	410,306	92.5
1921	940,182,560	70.4	304.11	97.8	306,840	69.1
1922	1,023,745,007	76.6	307.77	99.0	339,285	76.5
1923	1,279,030,222	95.7	299.94	96.5	412,727	93.0
1924	1,187,295,744	88.9	304.44	98.0	388,415	87.5
1925	1,247,241,615	93.3	308.93	99.4	413,814	93.3
1926	1,336,142,323	100.0	310.81	100.0	443,746	100.0
1927	1,281,611,186	95.9	314.75	101.3	428,736	96.6
1928	1,285,942,976	96.2	318.00	102.3	432,915	97.6
1929	1,339,091,007	100.2	317.17	102.0	447,321	100.8
1930	1,153,196,636	86.3	316.21	101.7	383,449	86.4
1931	894,185,637	66.9	329.23	105.9	309,224	69.7
1932	646,222,818	48.4	346.63	111.5	233,977	52.7
1933	698,942,511	52.3	341.77	110.0	249,223	56.2
1934	765,295,920	57.3	336.91	108.4	268,710	60.6
1935	789,626,714	59.1	341.05	109.7	282,036	63.6
1936	958,830,389	71.8	337.29	108.5	339,245	76.5
1937	1,015,586,028	76.0	337.43	108.6	360,626	81.3
1938	771,862,020	57.8	356.05	114.6	290,084	65.4
1939	901,669,335	67.5	351.21	113.0	333,438	75.1
1940	1,009,420,663	75.5	351.13	113.0	373,253	84.1
1941	1,200,584,892	90.5	392.74	126.4	475,053	107.1

EXHIBIT B

Statistics—Class I railways

[Year 1926=base or percentage figures]

Year	Number freight cars owned or leased	Percent	Average tons per loaded car (carload traffic)	Percent	Car miles per car-day	Percent	Average freight-train speed (miles per hour)	Percent	Freight-train mileage (miles per year)	Percent	Net tons per train	Percent
1916	2,253,233	85.9	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	617,606,223	97.6	(1)	----------
1917	2,302,059	88.0	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	631,187,856	99.7	(1)	----------
1918	2,325,673	89.0	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	616,151,416	97.3	(1)	----------
1919	2,361,102	100.5	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	549,657,072	86.8	(1)	----------
1920	2,322,122	98.9	34.5	98.3	28.6	87.7	10.3	86.6	607,508,144	96.0	708	91.7
1921	2,315,692	98.6	33.7	96.0	25.8	79.1	11.5	96.6	510,291,696	80.6	651	84.3
1922	2,293,392	97.6	33.3	94.9	26.9	82.5	11.1	93.3	534,654,994	84.5	676	87.6
1923	2,315,612	98.6	34.4	98.0	30.3	92.9	10.9	91.6	620,329,534	98.0	713	92.4
1924	2,348,725	100.0	34.0	96.9	29.1	89.3	11.5	96.6	579,571,262	91.6	715	92.6
1925	2,357,234	100.4	34.3	97.7	30.8	94.5	11.8	99.2	591,581,590	93.4	744	96.4
1926	2,348,679	100.0	35.1	100.0	32.6	100.0	11.9	100.0	633,054,707	100.0	772	100.0
1927	2,324,834	99.0	35.1	100.0	32.2	98.8	12.3	103.4	610,883,001	96.4	777	100.6
1928	2,297,589	97.8	34.9	99.4	33.3	102.1	12.9	108.4	603,117,834	95.3	792	102.6
1929	2,277,505	97.0	35.4	100.9	34.4	105.5	13.2	110.9	613,444,410	96.9	804	104.1
1930	2,276,867	96.9	35.7	101.7	30.5	93.6	13.8	116.0	539,392,133	85.2	784	101.6
1931	2,201,510	93.7	35.4	100.9	26.6	81.6	14.8	124.4	465,896,830	73.6	733	94.9
1932	2,144,730	91.3	34.9	99.4	22.2	68.1	15.5	130.3	392,680,079	62.0	663	85.9
1933	2,034,886	86.6	35.5	101.1	24.7	75.8	15.7	131.9	395,649,870	62.5	699	90.5
1934	1,938,362	82.5	35.4	100.9	28.3	86.8	15.9	133.6	424,074,611	67.0	706	91.5
1935	1,835,736	78.2	35.6	101.4	30.0	92.0	16.0	134.5	430,008,548	67.9	734	95.1
1936	1,758,192	74.9	36.3	103.4	35.3	108.3	15.8	132.8	486,340,892	76.8	774	100.3
1937	1,743,834	74.2	36.7	104.6	36.6	112.3	16.1	135.3	501,685,747	79.2	796	103.1
1938	1,699,689	72.4	35.8	102.0	32.3	99.1	16.6	139.5	422,388,483	66.7	759	98.3
1939	1,650,031	70.3	36.8	104.8	36.4	111.7	16.7	140.3	451,990,410	71.4	813	112.6
1940	1,653,663	70.4	37.7	107.4	38.7	118.7	16.7	140.3	481,892,054	76.1	849	110.0
1941	1,693,978	72.1	38.2	108.8	42.2	129.4	16.5	138.7	568,023,295	89.7	915	118.5

[1] Not available.

Mr. REED. I am now very happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator has already answered the questions which I had in mind when I rose; but I shall take advantage of his offer and ask him one or two more.

As I understand the situation, last year the railroads were moving in tank cars to the eastern seaboard from 75,000 to 80,000 barrels of petroleum products a day.

Mr. REED. Last September.

Mr. WHITE. Last year.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. They have now increased that movement to about 640,000 barrels a day. However, as I understand, the consumption along the eastern coastal range is in the neighborhood of 1,700,000 barrels a day.

Mr. REED. Yes. It varies from 1,300,000 to 1,700,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interject a question at that point, let me ask whether that figure includes the figures for consumption in the 17 States to which the restriction applies?

Mr. WHITE. It is my understanding that it does.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. That still leaves us receiving by tank cars only about one-third of the amounts which the Atlantic seaboard States have heretofore deemed necessary. Can the Senator hold out to me any hope of closing the gap between 640,000 barrels a day and 1,700,000 barrels a day? This problem is of vital concern to those of us along the Atlantic seaboard, and it increases in importance and significance as we move north. Fuel oil makes its contribution to the industrial life of Maine; but, beyond that, it is a very necessity of life. We cannot live in that climate, through long winter months, without adequate fuel with which to heat our homes and our factories and to sustain our people. I should like to know if the Senator can tell me whether there is in sight a supply of fuel oil which can be transported to our section of the country to take care of the gap between 640,000 and 1,700,000 barrels a day. If the Senator cannot tell us where we are to get such a supply, we face a rather dismal future.

Mr. REED. Let me suggest to my good friend the Senator from Maine that there is no shortage in the production of crude petroleum. Production is ample. There is no shortage in refining capacity along the Gulf Coast, in Texas, in Oklahoma, in Kansas, at East St. Louis, Ill., in the vicinity of Chicago, south of Philadelphia, and around Jersey City, N. J., at Bayonne, and other refining points. There is ample production of crude oil. There is ample refining capacity. It is wholly a question of transportation.

The railroads have made an astonishing record with the facilities they have. I should not want to hold out to the Senator from Maine much hope of any great further increase in efficiency of use of the present equipment.

Mr. WHITE. Is there in sight additional equipment which will be available to our section of the country before cold weather begins?

Mr. REED. I will reach that point in a moment.

When we are averaging 71 miles per day for all tank cars, we are making almost as good an average as I think is possible. That figure might be pushed up 1 or 2 or 3 percent.

When we turn to consider the question of additional cars, let me point out that the freight-car supply of the country now is depleted. There were delivered to the railroads in the first 3 months of this year in addition to the cars listed in the figures which appear in the tables which I have inserted in the RECORD, approximately 23,000 cars. For the current quarter there are to be delivered to the railroads 16,000 additional cars. Of the 16,000 additional cars, 4,000 are to be tank cars, and 10,000 are to be coal cars—open-top cars, whether of the hopper-bottom or gondola type.

Let me say to the Senator from Maine that a tank car moving into the eastern and northeastern territory, over the long haul, carries about 300 barrels of oil, and makes a round trip about every 15 days. The figures which I gave awhile ago—15 days for the long haul—apply only to the very long hauls. The shorter hauls have about the same average time, without making the same average speed. That means that a tank car going to Maine or to any other point on the Atlantic seaboard, is worth 20 barrels of petroleum products a day.

Mr. WHITE I ask the Senator please to speak about Maine, because just now that is the most important State in the Union.

Mr. REED. I am very fond of the Senator and of his State.

So if we can divert to Maine all the carrying capacity of the 4,000 additional tank cars it would receive 4,000 times 20 barrels daily. That would be an additional amount of 80,000 barrels daily if my mental computation is correct.

Mr. WHIE. If the Senator's figure is correct, that amount is only a drop in the bucket.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that on last Saturday I had a luncheon conference with Joe Eastman and Mike Gormley. At that time we discussed all these questions, including the fact that the Director of Defense Transportation has asked the War Production Board for priority on steel and other necessary materials with which to build a great many more freight cars and locomotives. Of course, the Director was very conservative, careful, and cautious in discussing that request; but it is a matter of common knowledge that the request was made. If it is granted, that will be one thing; if it is not granted, that will be another.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has spoken chiefly of tank cars. My recollection is that in New England we consume about 26,000,000 tons of hard and bituminous coal a year. A very large part of that coal has heretofore moved into New England by water, in coal barges. Can the Senator indicate what amount of coal the 10,000 additional coal cars of which he has spoken would be able to carry into New England?

Mr. REED. A coal car will carry from 50 to 60 tons, depending upon what railroad owns it. Some railroads have gone entirely to the use of heavier cars. I cannot tell the Senator how long it takes a coal car to make a round trip from the West Virginia, Ohio, or Pennsylvania coal fields; but, assuming that it made a round trip every 10 days, that would be as much as could be hoped for, and perhaps better than would be realized.

Mr. WHITE. I noticed in the Senator's prepared statement that he strongly recommended that those of us living along the Atlantic seaboard buy coal now.

Mr. REED. Yes; now.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because some of us who have been interested in this problem and who have been disturbed by the situation have given like advice when it has been sought from us.

Mr. REED. Let me emphasize what the Senator from Maine has said—which ought to give added apprehension to the people of New England: On April 30, 1941, there were, in round numbers, 139,500 surplus coal cars in the country. On May 2, 1942—ending a week ago last Saturday—there were approximately 11,600 surplus coal cars—a decrease from 139,500 last year at this time to 11,000 this year. When we add 10,000 coal cars to the coal movement, in which rail movement of coal must replace the 90-percent movement of coal to New England heretofore from the Virginia ports, out of Hampton Roads, perhaps from Baltimore, and some from Jersey City——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator inform me the source of supply of gasoline going to Canada?

Mr. REED. I cannot. So far as I know, it must be the United States. I make that statement because to the best of my knowledge and belief Canada has no oil. There may be a small amount there, but I do not know of it.

Mr. WHITE. That is the situation as I understand it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has just now informed me that there is a producing oil field in the prairie provinces of Canada, just north of Montana. He did not tell me the production in barrels per day. That is the first information I have had about it.

Mr. WHITE. That accounts for only a negligible part of the total Canadian consumption, I take it.

Mr. REED. I should assume so.

Mr. WHITE. Another thing about this whole situation that disturbs me is that the new rationing regulations which have just been announced indicate that a motorist engaged in a nonessential activity, is to get approximately 3 gallons of gasoline a week for the operation of his car. On the basis of 15 miles to a gallon, that figures up to the magnificent total of about 45 miles a week for an automobile.

My information is that in Canada, right across the border from my State, cards are now being issued by which a tourist in Canada is privileged to receive the equivalent of 120 gallons of gasoline; and if he is in Canada for more than 48 hours he can receive that amount of gasoline for use in a period of something like 6 weeks. In other words, on the basis of 120 gallons, and on the basis of 15 miles to the gallon, he will be able to travel approximately 1,800 miles in Canada, while the people from Kansas and Vermont, who like to come to Maine, will be limited to about 45 miles a week.

Can the Senator, from his wide experience with transportation problems, show me the equity of such an arrangement as that?

Mr. REED. There is no equity in such an arrangement. I share the feeling which I know the Senator from Maine and many other Senators have—that the citizens of this country have been pushed around by the bureaucrats about long enough.

I do not want to criticize any officer who is doing a conscientious job; but there has been so much confusion about gasoline rationing and so wide a difference of opinion amongst Cabinet officers and the heads of some defense agencies, that certainly the duty and responsibility ought to be lodged somewhere of clearing up whatever confusion exists. I am sure the Senator from Maine and myself and all others are willing to make what sacrifices are necessary, but sometimes there creeps into our minds a doubt as to whether some of the things which are being done are actually necessary. I beg the Senator from Maine to remember I am dealing only with the transportation phase of the question.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. About 2 or 3 weeks ago, Mr. Eastman was before the Truman committee and testified on the subject and said he was then investigating the possibility of providing greater transportation facilities through the canals up and down the coast on the inland waterways. I wondered whether the Senator had any further information of progress made along that line, for such increased facilities would provide for the New England States an additional supply, which is so essential?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. There was in the independent offices appropriation bill, which passed the Senate 2 or 3 days ago, as the Senator will remember, an earmarking of $20,000,000, as I recall, for the building of barges for use on the intercoastal canals. The only trouble with that is that the intercoastal canals do not extend above Massachusetts, and it is pretty difficult for any of us in northern New England to find anything getting by Massachusetts and coming up our way.

Mr. BURTON. Recognizing the importance of Maine—and I am also interested in the other coastal States—will the Senator throw some light as to the effect that suggestion might have on other information Mr. Eastman may have given on that subject?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio I have no specific, direct, and recent information; but I caution him not to place too great hope in that avenue of transportation. In other words, it is necessary to build barges, and, while my information is not definite and specific, my general understanding is that it would be necessary to provide more towboats in order to pull the barges. Furthermore, as I recall, some of the costal canals along the Atlantic Ocean carry as low as seven, or perhaps, nine feet of water. Many such factors have to be taken into consideration. It is necessary to build barges, to obtain towboats, and, in some cases, to deepen the channels. So, speaking generally, I should not anticipate very much relief from that source this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say, for the information of the Senator from Ohio and in partial answer to his question, that, as I understand, there is a substantial increase in the amount of gas going into New York and New England by way of the Great Lakes. I understand it originates largely in the Oklahoma field. How it reaches the Great Lakes, I do not know, but it enters this area, district No. 1, principally from the port of Buffalo, and, from there, would naturally flow eastward to eastern New York, New Jersey, and New England.

A few days ago the Oil Administrator amended the rationing order exempting 93 counties in western New York, western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Mr. REED. Erie County, in which Buffalo is situated, was included.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I do not know that exempting West Virginia and Virginia will have so much effect upon the gas supply for New England and eastern New York, but when the Administrator exempted Buffalo, Rochester, and Pittsburgh, and allowed them unlimited use of gas, he simply invited them to use gasoline which otherwise would be destined for eastern New York and New England. In my opinion, it was manifestly unfair to amend the order so as to give to the people in the 93 counties an unrestricted use of gas and oil, although they live in the same area, which is district No. 1.

I understand, too, that the reason for that is that certain amounts of oil and gas products are refined in the western Pennsylvania oil field. Some of those products used to be distributed in eastern Ohio. From now on, if I am correctly informed, the Pennsylvania oil is not supposed to go over into Ohio except as it may cross the line here and there, more or less, as an accommodation; but theoretically the Pennsylvania oil can be distributed and used in western Pennsylvania and western New York, and the ostensible reason for amending the order is to give them unrestricted use of gas and oil. The catch, however, lies in the fact that Pennsylvania refineries produce only about 40,000 barrels a day of all kinds of oil and gas products, including some 19,000 barrels of gasoline a day, which is an infinitesimal part of the supply which is used in that area; but it was enough to give an excuse for exempting the great industrial area embracing Rochester, Buffalo, and Pittsburgh from the provisions of the rationing order to which all the rest of district No. 1, including 17 States, has been subjected.

I protested to Secretary Ickes over this exemption, and I feel that the amendment to the regulation which has been promulgated providing for the rationing of gas should be rescinded so that fair treatment will be accorded to all sections of the eastern seaboard.

Mr. REED. I can answer the junior Senator from Vermont very quickly by telling him that from the so-called Mid-Continent field, which is composed principally of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, pipe lines run to East St. Louis and up to Chicago. I cannot tell the Senator what the capacity of the pipe lines is, but there is no difficulty in moving some petroleum by pipe lines as far as Chicago.

Mr. AIKEN. If I am correctly informed, about 800,000 barrels a day can be moved into the eastern area after July 1, which is approximately two-thirds of the requirement of that area. So, unquestionably, some restrictions will be necessary on sales.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator mean moved by rail or by pipe line?

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the oil to which I have just referred is moved by rail.

Mr. REED. I said a while ago that, on the basis of the best information one could obtain, and the best judgment I could form from information available, it may be reasonably anticipated, though it is not certain, that the rail movement of petroleum products may go as high as 800,000 barrels a day.

Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. MEAD addressed the Chair.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from New York will pardon me, I will yield first to the Senator from Vermont, and, then, I will be very happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator; I have been trying for some time to get his attention.

Assuming that there are added facilities and means for the construction of additional tank cars to be hauled by rail and additional coal cars, and assuming that we could have them manufactured, on the basis of some sort of priorities allocations, then would there be a sufficient number of engines with which to haul them?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Vermont raises a very pertinent and very important question. The railroads at the present time desire to build 800 or 900 locomotives. That point was discussed with me last Saturday by Mr. Gormley. So, assuming priorities for the building of locomotives which are essential—and my judgment is that they could move somewhat more traffic with the

power they now have—they will have to have some additional power in the form of locomotives in order to take care of the peak traffic movement by next October and throughout the heavy traffic months. Have I answered the Senator?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; and I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I desire to supplement the argument advanced by my distinguished colleague from Vermont by offering the suggestion that, where the railroad facilities and pipe-line facilities, as well as the waterway facilities, are found to be available the rationed areas within the 17 restricted States be contracted.

I have in mind that there are a number of pipe lines running from the western New York and western Pennsylvania oil fields, to Rochester, N. Y., where connection is made with lake shipping on Lake Ontario, and where service along the St. Lawrence River is available. There is another pipe line running through Auburn, N. Y., and terminating in Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. REED. How large a pipe line is that?

Mr. MEAD. From my information, it is not a very large pipe line, but in view of the fact that Syracuse, N. Y., is at least temporarily in the restricted area, it is not to be used; but it could be used to furnish supplies to the barge canal terminus at Syracuse. Then over the barge canal the trade along the barge canal, the Hudson River, and Lake Champlain could be supplied and it would be possible to take care of a great deal of New England, without using tank cars, if they were unavailable, and without taxing available facilities beyond their capacity.

I believe that restrictions should be lifted when available avenues of transportation can be found. I suggest as worthy of inclusion in the splendid argument which the Senator from Kansas is making to the Senate that there be an investigation of the facilities which may be left unused as a result of their terminus being in a restricted zone. I can see that much of New England as well as all of New York can be supplied by the utilization of our railroads, our barge canal system, and of minor pipe lines which are available in the oil fields of western New York and western Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. Let me inquire of the distinguished and able Senator from New York whether the Federal Government can have the full cooperation of the State government of New York after the junior Senator from New York becomes Governor of that State next January. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEAD. If a calamity of such catastrophic proportions should occur, I should make haste to read the autobiography of a recent Governor of Kansas who is now an esteemed Senator from that State, and I should endeavor to give my State the exemplary cooperation which he gave his State.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. In order to complete the picture, I should like to ask the Senator whether he has any comment to make on the proposal for a large pipe line from the oil fields to the eastern border, made at least twice in the past, I believe, and rejected because it was felt there was not sufficient steel available for that purpose. I understand it is now again being proposed, and therefore I take it that the steel for such a pipe line would come in competition with the steel the Senator has recommended be used for the construction of additional freight cars. Does the Senator have an opinion on that point?

Mr. REED. I might add to what the junior Senator from Ohio has said that I understand there is a proposal now being considered to build a pipe line out of second-hand steel pipe, which at least will be provided by the larger oil companies in the territory concerned.

Mr. BURTON. I understand the pipe line which is to be built out of second-hand material is distinguishable from the pipe line which is advocated by the Petroleum Coordinator. I think he proposes to build his pipe line out of new steel, and it is distinguishable from the 1,400-mile pipe line to be built out of old steel.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that of course there must be a final over-all judgment exercised somewhere, and authority to exercise it must be lodged somewhere along the line. It is not in the Senate, it is not in the Coordinator, and it is not in Joseph Eastman. If the emergency were sufficiently grave, the cost would not be important; but if we are looking at the matter of transportation from the standpoint of economy and expedition, particularly of economy, we find this situation: From the Gulf coast and the Louisiana coast into the eastern territory, before Pearl Harbor, and before tank vessels were diverted to the Atlantic trade, we had three avenues of transportation. We had all-water transportation from the Gulf coast and the Louisiana coast to the eastern seaboard; we had rail transportation, which handled about 2 percent, and we had a limited amount of pipe-line transportation this far east. There is a very large amount of pipe-line transportation into my section of the West. There virtually all the crude oil and a large proportion of the gasoline moves by pipe line, not by rail.

I am giving the figures from memory, but I think they will at least illustrate the point I make, even though the figures themselves may not be exactly accurate. We have three kinds of transportation—water, pipe line, and railroad. If we assume the cost of transportation of oil by water as 1, then my recollection is, though I may not be entirely accurate, that the pipe-line transportation would be about 2 or 2½, and rail transportation would be about 4 or 4½.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is speaking of the relative expense of these different methods of transportation?

Mr. REED. Yes; the cost of moving a ton or a barrel of oil a month. That is the basis upon which all transportation costs are computed.

Again I wish to say that I am not certain these figures are correct, but they illustrate, roughly, at least, the difference between the costs of the three kinds of transportation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I happen to have in my pocket figures showing the comparative expenses, given me by Mr. Davies some months ago. I do not know whether they have changed since then, but the cost of transporting gasoline from Houston to Bayonne by rail was 4.158 cents a gallon; by tanker, 1.19 cents a gallon; and by a 24-inch pipe line, not over 1 cent a gallon. However, the other figures show, as we all know, that the smaller the pipe line the greater the cost. Furthermore, it depends on whether the pipe line is in use 30 percent of the time, or 70 percent of the time, or practically all the time.

Mr. REED. In short, let me say to the Senator from Ohio we will never build a pipe line to compete with water transportation so long as water transportation is available. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BURTON. Not quite, because the question arose about the competition between pipe-line and rail transportation. I presume it is cheaper to transport by pipe line than by rail.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio, from a life-long residence in the oil section, that after a field has once been developed and the pipe line connected up there has been virtually no movement of crude oil by railroad out of those fields to the refineries. All movement is by pipe line. Just as soon as the pipe lines are connected up the crude oil is taken off the railroads.

Up to about 20 years ago it was thought gasoline could not be moved by pipe line, except in the case of one such line, a small one, which ran to the East, I think from Chicago, or perhaps from Lima, Ohio. That was used for gasoline, but it was the only one. Then it was discovered that by welding the joints in the pipe line and adjusting the control stations to the gasoline instead of the crude-oil load, gasoline could be moved. The result has been that not only all the crude oil but a very large proportion of gasoline is moved by pipe line, and pipe-line transportation is less costly than rail transportation.

Mr. BURTON. If I may press the point a little further, as a war measure, which is the problem confronting us now, as I understand, the issue is determined on whether steel is available for the pipe line, plus the fact that it may take a longer time to build the pipe line than it would take to build the corresponding number of freight cars. Therefore the issue is, does the steel for the pipe line have priority over the steel for freight cars, and if so, when can we get the oil through the pipe line? That is the problem involved, which will be important during the next year and a half.

Mr. REED. Those are all very important questions. It might interest the Senator—and I am sure neither Mr. Eastman nor Mr. Gormley would object—for me to say that at the lunch table our conversation was devoted wholly to the transportation problem now being discussed, and at my request, so that I might have the benefit of their information and judgment for this discussion

today, there came up the question of the priority of steel as between the different uses. Mr. Gormley, being a very able and aggressive railroad man, and a very plain and profane and outspoken Irishman, insisted that Joe Eastman should have sufficient authority to say how much steel should go to the railroads. Mr. Eastman made the statement I made a few moments ago; he made it in advance of my statement, and I concurred in it.

Mr. Eastman said that somewhere along the line there must be lodged final authority—not in him but in somebody—which could say how much steel should be used for munitions, how much for shipping, how much for battleships, how much for railroads, how much for pipe lines, and that he, being the Coordinator of Transportation, and his greatest problem the railroads, might be regarded as being favorable to the railroads, and therefore he did not think it was proper that he should have the last say, and I agreed with him.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Kansas. I do not know whether it will be of any value; but I have thought much about it in connection with what we are now considering, and I have heard it suggested by several other people, although I do not remember at the time who they were. In connection with the proposal to build a pipe line up the east coast and into Pennsylvania and New York, and probably into New England, the question of priority has arisen, as the Senator said, and also the question of cost. Therefore, it seems to me the authorities ought to give consideration to constructing a wooden pipe line. I happen to know that in a rather early day, quite a number of years ago, a town which was a county seat in the West, with which I was familiar, in putting in a system of water works, used wooden pipes. More and more I have thought about the use of wood for the construction of a pipe line. More and more I have asked myself why we cannot avoid the extra cost and avoid the priority question with respect to steel by building a pipe line made of wood? It would last 10 or 20 years, and at least would serve us over the present period of emergency.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Nebraska makes a very interesting contribution to this discussion.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. For the information of the Senate I will say that there are large manufactories in the West which make wood stave pipes which last for many years, and for some purposes, such as water mains, they meet steel pipe in even competition. I think it is high time for our Government to look to the use of wood products in the construction of pipe lines and cargo carriers, as well as trainer planes and transport planes.

Mr. REED. I also thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution. I shall be very happy to yield to any Senator who has a question to ask.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As the Senator from Nebraska started to speak my attention was diverted and I did not hear all he said. Was the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska that wood be used to build pipe lines, or was it with respect to tank cars?

Mr. NORRIS. The suggestion was with respect to pipe lines.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the suggestion been made that the body of a tank car be made of wood? The reason I ask that question is that the suggestion has been made to me that I bring the proposal before the appropriate authorities. I wondered whether that matter had been considered?

Mr. REED. Not so far as I know, I will say to the Senator from Colorado.

A question arises which might not be important when we consider the limited amount of lumber necessary for building tank cars; but the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and I had a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture about 3 weeks ago, at which time we discussed the question of storage for wheat. We have an enormous amount of wheat on hand, the largest carry-over ever known. The Secretary suggested that if we could get priority for lumber and nails, which are the two important items in the construction of storage facilities, the A. A. A. would finance farm storage by advancing to the farmer 7 cents a bushel. But he said he could not get priorities on those items, for the Army had the priorities.

I may realize a little personal experience which has a bearing on the question asked by the Senator from Colorado. I happen to have a son who is a West Pointer and a major in the Army. He has charge of the Procurement Division of the War Department, and bought all the lumber and nails for the present war construction. He had been buying a million kegs of nails at one time, 250,000 kegs at another time, and 3,000,000,000 or 4,000,000,000 feet of lumber at a time. I went to see him about this matter in which I was interested. I thought that through him perhaps I could get some consideration from the War Department. So he asked a certain major in the Army if he could have a couple of pounds of nails and a few feet of lumber for farm storage purposes, and the major informed him he could not. I do not know what the situation is with respect to tank cars.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand the priority order is to be issued tomorrow.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Most respectfully I should like to suggest that perhaps the priorities to which the Senator from Kansas is referring are transportation priorities rather than material priorities. There is no priority on lumber, is there?

Mr. REED. There is a limitation on lumber, yes indeed. I cannot give the details. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon may be more familiar with them than I am.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is plenty of lumber. So far as I understand, it is a question of transportation by rail carriers and cargo ships, and so on.

Mr. REED. So far as I know there is no priority on railroad transportation. There is no need for any priority restriction at this time. Of course, I do not mean to say that preference is not given to the movement of munitions and the movement of troops, but so far as my information goes, no transportation facilities have been denied to anyone as yet by reason of the movement of troops, or the movement of material for Army construction or for war purposes. Does that answer the question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The other day I happened to sit in on a discussion had between Secretary Wickard and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and it developed that while perhaps there were no priorities on the use of lumber, there was very definitely a shortage of transportation facilities to bring lumber from the Pacific coast to points where it is most needed. The Secretary agreed that that was most probably the trouble rather than the shortage of lumber. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] advised that many of the lumber mills were running on short time in Oregon because they could not move their lumber. I suppose they formerly moved most of it by water, and when they were called on to move it all by rail, it seemed the railroads, with their present transportation facilities, could not handle it.

Mr. REED. I think perhaps some confusion exists in that respect. I should like to have more information upon that subject before expressing any further opinion. To the best of my knowledge and belief transportation is not denied to anyone. Someone may have been denied facilities for a day or two by reason of great troop movements. It is now past the time when it was a military secret that great contingents of troops were moved, say, from a camp in Massachusetts to the Pacific coast which required the use of 1,100 flat cars, and long strings of passenger cars, and all that sort of thing. Of course, anyone who wanted such cars in that territory for the next few days would have to wait. There is some shortage of rail transportation now on the Pacific coast. The attempt is being made there to get gasoline and oil out of Southern and Central California into Washington, Oregon, and Northern California. According to my memory the oil field farthest north in California is the Coalinga field in the San Joaquin Valley. Most of the oil which was transported into Northern California, Oregon, and Washington formerly went by coastwise vessels, but now it moves, just as on the East coast by rail, and some difficulty exists in that far western region in moving gasoline and oil.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say that enormous amounts of lumber have heretofore been carried by the American and Hawaiian Line and the Nelson Line from Oregon and Washington through the Panama Canal to the Atlantic coast ports.

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and also the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that when we wrote the Transportation Act of 1940—and we spent a year and a half considering it—we heard much about lumber being moved through the Panama Canal. Lumber and oil from the West coast to the East coast constituted the greatest movements of commodities through the Panama Canal. Of course, they were all cut off when the Panama Canal was shut down to commercial transportation and the load thrown back on the railroads.

Mr. MAYBANK. Some companies chartered private ships.

Mr. REED. Some chartered private ships, and some of them were big enough to own their own ships, and there was an enormous movement of lumber through the Panama Canal, which is now cut off.

Mr. MAYBANK. That movement through the Canal took the place of the export business which was lost by Oregon and Washington. The lumber was carried through the Canal to ports along the Atlantic coast.

Mr. REED. If there are no further questions Senators wish to ask I shall hurry on. Heretofore I have been asked several questions by Senators and I have made notes of them. The question was asked me if there is cooperation between the railroads and the Office of Defense Transportation. I can answer that question, having talked last Saturday with both the Defense Transportation Coordinator and the representatives of the railroads. There is 100 percent cooperation between them. There is no friction between them at all. There is perfect cooperation.

The question was asked me: Can anything further be done to speed up unloading of cars by shippers. I wish the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] were present. The speed with which cars are unloaded is an important factor in the car supply. That goes for tank cars as well as grain cars and other cars. About 90 per cent, perhaps 95 percent of the shippers of the United States unload cars within what we call free time. In other words, when a carload shipment reaches destination and is sent to the consignee, the consignee has 48 hours in which to unload, beginning at 7 o'clock in the morning following the setting out of the car. That is his free time. If he holds the car longer than 48 hours he is subject to a demurrage charge of $2 a day. A freight car is a transportation facility. It is not a storage warehouse.

I have had much experience in moving grain crops out of my State. If they were allowed to do so, the elevator men and the mills at times would leave cars standing unloaded on their sidetracks for many days. They would rather pay $2 a day a car for 4 or 5 days beyond the free time than to unload the cars. That practice is being cut down. I will indicate how important it is. Last year the shippers of the country paid the railroads $9,000,000 in demurrage charges. That meant the detention of a car beyond the free limit and its use for storage by the consignee. Nine million dollars at $2 a day is equivalent to 4,500,000 car-days. Reduced to the number of cars, it is equivalent to about 13,000 cars which are constantly out of service because of detention beyond 48 hours by the consignee. If my health permits and I am able to write such a bill or have it written, I shall this week introduce a bill which would change the rate of demurrage from $2 a day. In the first place, I want to cut down the free time from 48 to 36 hours. Also, I want to charge $5 a day for the first day, $10 for the second day, and $25 a day thereafter. I believe that such a measure would result in prompt unloading of cars, 5 or 10 percent of which are not now unloaded in the free time but are used for storage and for the convenience of shippers rather than for transportation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that much of the tying up of freight cars is the fault of the Government itself? When lease-lend shipments come in from all over the country and perhaps 40 different items are sent away in one ship, are not cars more or less tied up by Government agencies themselves to fully as great an extent as they are tied up by private shippers and consignees?

Mr. REED. I do not think so. To begin with, I think that the Government ought to pay demurrage, just as does any private shipper.

Mr. President, I had intended to deal with the chaos which existed in transportation in World War No. 1, and contrast it with the smoothness with which the transportation machine is now functioning. There is no congestion anywhere. There is no comparison between the two conditions. It is a contrast.

I think the Senator from Vermont is correct to some extent. Yesterday I read in the Washington Post an article by Mr. John G. Norris, entitled "Army Directs Flow of Supplies From Factories to Battlefronts." Mr. Norris mentions some early port congestion. As the Senator knows, port congestion is caused more by lack of shipping than by any trouble on the railroads. In World War No. 1 the condition was fearful. There have been some cases of that kind.

I have discussed that question specifically with the car service experts, and they tell me that the Government is making a remarkable record in unloading cars at all the interior and coastwise construction projects which have been undertaken in the past year or two. There is no complaint at all. Railroad men think that Government officials, especially those in the Army, are making a remarkable record in unloading railroad cars. Railroad officials have given me some specific examples.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by John G. Norris printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY DIRECTS FLOW OF SUPPLIES FROM FACTORIES TO BATTLEFRONTS

(By John G. Norris)

There's been a great deal said about America's unprecedented war production job and the many fronts throughout the world on which our tanks, planes, and men are fighting.

Less known is the vital but unspectacular problem of getting the war supplies and men from factories and camps in the United States to the war theaters overseas.

It is the biggest transportation job ever attempted—easily ten times greater than the task of moving the American Expeditionary Forces to France during the last war—and complicated by innumerable difficulties.

It is the biggest bottleneck and at the same time one of the best-handled phases of the entire war effort.

Lack of ships now and for a long time will limit the operations of the United Nations in carrying the war to the Axis. Yet it may be said that the huge job of transportation from plant and camp to fighting front is going forward with dispatch so far as available shipping permits.

ARMY'S PROBLEM

The job is largely the Army's. The War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission and the Nation's shipyards are rushing the building of merchantmen. The Navy takes them across. But the newly formed Army Transportation Service, with the cooperation of the American railroads and Office of Defense Transportation, bears the main brunt.

Until recently the Army was responsible only for shipping its own supplies from within the United States to points overseas. The movement of lend-lease material from factory to ship was handled by a multitude of Government agencies.

As the shipments grew in volume, trouble began to develop with the Allied program, while the American Army supplies went through on schedule.

At one major seaport, serious difficulties developed. Freight cars full of munitions clogged up in the city's railroad yards. Warehouses were full. Ships could not be loaded promptly because some of their scheduled cargoes were "frozen" somewhere back down the line on a railroad siding.

It was the same sort of situation which developed in the last war and played havoc with military shipments. Army men then swore that the mistake would not be made again.

For years the Army War College pounded the transportation lesson of 1917–18 into the heads of its students. As a result, there was no clogging of the Army's own shipments in this war.

Moreover, when lend-lease shipments at one port started to freeze and it became likely that similar troubles might develop elsewhere, the War Department stepped into the picture.

A conference of all Government and Allied agencies concerned with war supplies and transportation was called. At its conclusion, the Army was put in charge of all lend-lease shipments from plants to ships.

SET UP NEW BRANCH

Special new Army units known as port agencies were set up at principal seaports and the whole lend-lease shipment program dovetailed with Army troop and supply movements under the direction of the Army Transport Service.

This new Army branch, headed by Brig. Gen. Charles P. Gross, a 53-year-old West Pointer and veteran Army engineer, is one of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell's Services of Supply. It was formed recently by merging the old Army quartermaster land and water transportation units with parts of the General Staff Supply Division.

Generals Somervell and Gross have organized Army transportation in accordance with one basic principle—centralization of authority and decentralization of operations.

Centralized authority is obtained through the Services of Supply, Transport Service's traffic control division. Decentralized operations are carried out by means of the Association of American Railroads and Army Transport Service regulating station.

Some 500 picked men and women make up the Army Transport Service traffic-control division here. Among them are veteran Army officers who have specialized in transportation problems since World War No. 1 and experts drawn from the railroad and kindred industries.

This division controls the entire flow of war supplies from plants throughout the country to "holding and reconsigning depots" along the seaboards as well as the movement of troops from inland camps to "staging areas" near the coasts.

Personnel of this key Army unit keeps track of the whereabouts of every freight car in the United States and available space on air, bus, and truck transports.

They regulate the movement of men, planes, tanks, guns, trucks, food, clothing, fuel, and all manner of supplies going from plants, stockyards, markets, and depots all over the United States to "behind-the-port" storage facilities.

Working hand in glove with this important Army branch are the Nation's railroads. The Association of American Railroads has a sizable staff permanently assigned to the Army Transportation Service Traffic Division at the War Department.

The association has set up an organization throughout the United States which exactly parallels the Army Transportation Service chain of command. Railroad men are established in Army headquarters to direct the flow of military rail traffic.

The actual plotting of train movements is handled by these civilians, with Army officers maintaining close contact and supervision.

Military men here say the system is working well. They are high in their praise of the Association of American Railroads and the work it is doing.

After the Army Transportation Service Traffic Division and the railroad association move the supplies and men to the "holding" points near the coasts, other Army units take charge.

The holding depots are warehouses set up by the Army Transport Service anywhere from a few to a hundred miles back of a port. Supplies intended for shipment abroad are held there until ships are available and the port facilities can load them.

Staging areas are Army posts near the coast which are used as temporary homes for troop units scheduled to sail overseas.

PORT AGENCY TAKES OVER

The various Army ports of embarkation and the new Army port agencies take over from the Army Transportation Service traffic division at these points.

Ports of embarkation are long-established Army stations, with Government-owned docks, yards, warehouses, and railroads, spurs through which troops and Army supplies pass on their way to foreign stations. The commanders of the ports of embarkation control the movement of men and equipment from the holding and staging areas until they put to sea in Army transports.

Port agencies are the new organizations established to handle lend-lease shipments from holding depots to freighters. The Army has set up such agencies in every principal American seaport and recruited prominent officials in various transportation lines—shipping, loading, rails, etc.—as consultants at each point.

The job of the port agency is to control and coordinate all of the varied facilities concerned with lend-lease shipments—from municipal port authorities and stevedore unions to foreign-ship captains and Allied purchasing missions.

Army chiefs say the job is being handled smoothly. The situation at the port which became "frozen" some weeks ago has now been ironed out, it was said, and the "turn-around time"—the period ships are in port—has been reduced there from three weeks to five days.

America's war transportation job, however, is more than building and convoying ships and efficient movement of supplies to and through ports. One problem is the loading of merchantmen.

Experts in the packing and shipping of goods have been at work in the War Department for months on the most compact methods of crating of planes, tanks, trucks, guns and varied equipment.

OTHER PROBLEMS

The Army Transportation Service's job does not end with carrying supplies from plants to ships—so far as our own equipment is concerned.

It must unload the supply vessels overseas, and often has to provide its own port facilities and men to handle the job. Then it faces the often terrific task of moving their troops and supplies on to the fighting fronts.

Big as it is today, the Army's transportation problem is still growing. General Somervell declared recently that the Army is "very much alert" to the tremendous load that is coming next fall when "we get this country up to the peak of war production and plaster heavy troop movements on top of that."

Then the Army's carefully worked-out transportation system—the result of 20 years preparation—will receive its big test. Recalling the 1917–18 break-down, Somervell says: "I hope we are intelligent enough to avoid it in this war. I think we are."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have a figure for 1941 of 10,125,000 barrels of crude oil produced in Canada, mainly from the Turner Valley field.

Mr. REED. That is the field to which the Senator from Colorado referred awhile ago.

I have been asked about the movement of the wheat crop. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] may be interested. The wheat crop movement will not cause any trouble this year. There is no place for wheat to go, because there is no place to store it except on the farm. This year a small amount of wheat will be moved off the farms in the winter Wheat Belt, and later in the spring-wheat territory. The amount will probably be the smallest in 50 years.

Heretofore I have had 19 consecutive years' experience with the Kansas wheat crop movement. For 15 years I was chairman of the shippers' board in that territory. I was paid no salary. I paid my own expenses, and I was allowed to keep that job. I always insisted—whether I was Governor, chairman of the public service commission, or chairman of the shippers' board—that the railroads store between 8,000 and 24,000 empty cars in the Wheat Belt in May and June. The railroads had empty cars at that time of year, and could just as well store them in the Wheat Belt as anywhere else. The railroads did so. The variation between 8,000 and 24,000 cars depended upon the size of the crop.

This year it will not be necessary to store a single car. I have had three or four talks with car service officials, and have told them that, in my opinion, it will not be necessary to store a single car this year; that because of the lack of storage facilities for wheat the wheat crop will move so slowly that it can be taken care of by means of the cars normally made empty in that territory. If storage facilities for the wheat existed, that would not be true.

Another question is, how much further can the railroads increase their efficiency in tons per car and in miles per car-day? I think I have covered that question.

What will be the saturation point of such efficiency? I fear that we are pretty close to the saturation point of efficiency. I think it will be very difficult to obtain additional service through increasing efficiency alone. I think the railroads must have more cars and engines to be certain to avoid a transportation crisis next fall.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the Senator discussed the train-load hauling of oil, as distinguished from hauling in scattered cars? Was that matter discussed in the earlier part of his remarks?

Mr. REED. I do not believe the Senator from Colorado was present when I was discussing that question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I missed part of the Senator's remarks. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. REED. The railroads have enormously increased the movement of cars. Earlier in the course of my remarks I stated that all freight cars were moving an average of 42.2 miles a day. Tank cars are moving 71 miles a day. The car-service division gave 14 reasons why such a good record is being made. One of those reasons is that solid trains of loads and empties move speedily on main tracks through yards and terminals. That means without switching.

In connection with the movement of oil, at the gateways through which it moves between the West and the East the oil is brought to the gateways and moved through in solid trainloads. The trains are not divided.

In moving traffic across the Mississippi at St. Louis destined to the Baltimore & Ohio, the Pennsylvania, and the New York Central, solid trainloads of petroleum and its products are put on the Pennsylvania for Pittsburgh, the Baltimore and Ohio for Washington, and the New York Central for Buffalo. By not dividing the traffic it is possible to concentrate it into trainloads. That is the reason why the railroads are making such a remarkable record. If there were 100 empty tank cars in a string, belonging to 10 different oil companies—and most of the tank cars do belong to the

oil companies—ordinarily they would have to be switched around, and 2 or 3 hours would be required to switch a long string of 100 cars and separate them according to ownership. Nowadays the owner would obtain 10 cars. It would not make any difference whether they were his or somebody else's. In that way corners are being cut.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Are the empty cars returned in full trains?

Mr. REED. The empty cars are returned in full trains, in the same way.

Mr. President, this is a very important subject. We are in a critical hour so far as transportation is concerned. Many of us have thought of the freight car only as a squat, rectangular blot on the landscape. When a long freight train has held us up at a country crossing we have grumbled a little; but if the crop of freight cars ever fails for a single year famine and cold will depopulate every city in the country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 65), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in enrolling S. 210, an act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to strike out the word "fifteen" in section 409 (a) (7) contained therein and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

LT. COMDR. WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, recently there has been considerable discussion of, and many queries have been made with reference to, the status of Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, a statement which gives definite information with reference to the service and private life of Walter Winchell. I will say for the RECORD that I believe he is doing a fine job, and is carrying out the assignment of his superiors with fidelity and devotion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of February 23, 1942]

WALTER WINCHELL ON BROADWAY

NOTES OF AN INNOCENT BYSTANDER

From the New York Times: Secretary Knox was asked by members of the House Naval Affairs Committee today to explain why Walter Winchell, newspaper columnist, is permitted to make radio broadcasts sponsored by a commercial firm while on active duty as a naval officer.

"Winchell should be assigned to duty at Samoa or permitted to resign," one committee member said.

The columnist, a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve, has been on active duty since the country entered the war and thus wears full uniform. He said in his first wartime broadcast that the Navy had asked him to continue his newspaper and radio activity.

Colonel Knox was understood to have told the committee that he knew very little about Lieutenant Commander Winchell's case and that he would ask Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, to supply details tomorrow.

From Stanley Woodward's column in the Herald Tribune: Even before the crowd started to assemble for the Joe Louis-Buddy Baer heavyweight championship fight, it became apparent that the record for receipts at an indoor show was in danger of being beaten.

It is perhaps worth repeating that the unprecedented "amateur" event was arranged by Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, U. S. N. R. Incidentally, this seems as good a time as any to correct the public idea about Lieutenant Commander Winchell's naval service. A great number of people seem to think that he entered the Navy as a sort of holy cow when national emergency arose. As a matter of fact, he has been a naval reserve officer for nearly 10 years and has faithfully carried out the prescribed courses of study and made the cruises. The reason he is still carrying on his newspaper and radio work is that he is ordered to do so by the Navy. In spite of the fact that this work keeps him up most of the night, he reports for duty at 90 Church Street every morning at 9 o'clock.

Lieutenant Commander Winchell originally asked promoter Mike Jacobs to arrange a boxing show for the navy yard. When the yard was closed to civilians the show was called off. Then Winchell had the idea of a more comprehensive enterprise and approached Jacobs on that.

Jacobs organized this present show with the cooperation of Louis and nearly startled the Navy out of its sea boots when he made known the possible returns to the Navy Relief Society. The amount of money which the Relief Society will get undoubtedly will exceed $100,000.

From Sgt. Jimmy Cannon's column in PM: I'm Jim who never sends Walter Winchell pretty flowers. I don't talk to the guy for personal reasons. But I'm for Winchell or anyone else, when a carbon-smudged posse of imitators start to knock his brains out for being a loyal citizen of this country. And if they succeeded in knocking his brains out, I'm certain Winchell could still write a better column than the hecklers who attacked him with the style he created. What do they want Winchell to do?

The columnist served his hitch as an enlisted man in the Navy during the last war. He has a wife and two kids, and he left the draft age behind him long ago. Winchell, whose parsimony was a Broadway legend, has contributed a fortune to war charities.

His tormentors, who flatter him with imitation every time they denounce him in the form he invented, are outraged because he is a commissicned officer. This was no recent appointment. They never mention that Winchell received and held his commission during the peace.

His shadows were very busy playing vaudeville or learning to dance the rhumba. They jeered at him when he cried out warnings of the approaching storm which broke in the beautiful sky over Pearl Harbor. Because he played down the dirty whisperings of the night clubs to print the news of the Nation, they mocked him with sneering parodies. But as soon as Winchell established the trend, they peppered their essays about New York with national news notes.

I don't contend that Winchell's record as a journalist is an immaculate one. As a green hand, fresh out of vaudeville, he committed many misdemeanors against the code by which newspapermen work.

I think he should be reprimanded for these things by competent critics. But I don't think that men who have taken their identity from him have the right to sit in judgment of him as either a newspaperman or a patriot.

Now these buzzards of journalism who roost on Winchell's typewriter and feast on his talent are berating him because he is fighting the foes of democracy with radio and column; because he is giving his time and money and talent when he doesn't have to. Most of us were drafted and had to go into service. They forgot Winchell volunteered.

I think he is employing his glib and extraordinary gift in the way it will help the country most. There are a lot of things I don't like about Winchell but it angers me to see him denounced because he is giving his time, his talent, and his money to a just cause. Since when has patriotism become a felony?

To Whom It May Concern:

One year before December 7, 1941—in Washington—in an interview with Under Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal—I stated that I was anxious for active duty anywhere. On December 7, 1941, in a telegram to my commandant, I wrote: "Respectfully request active duty." On December 24, according to the official Navy press release issued from the third naval district, I was assigned to volunteer active duty—without pay, the latter at my suggestion. My duty was assigned. I did not select it. Naval duty, as you know, is based on maximum usefulness to the service. My special assignment for the time being is assisting the fundraising for the Navy Relief Society. In connection with that line of duty—this is to remind you—of the big Navy relief show (starring over 100 stage and screen stars) to be held at Madison Square Garden on March 10.

EFFECT OF LABOR LAWS UPON WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, recently the War and Navy Departments communicated with the Governors of the 48 States, urging the suspension of such State laws and regulations as might interfere with giving full effect to the President's call for service. That has been construed by some who have been centering their drive here in the Capitol for the repeal of labor legislation as applying distinctly to labor legislation in the various States, with the result that they have relaxed their energies here, and are seeking the repeal of many labor laws in the various States throughout the Union.

Mr. President, is labor legislation impeding or retarding war production? Would the scrapping of State and Federal labor laws, or any part of them, insure speedier output of supplies and equipment for our armed forces? If the answers to these questions are clearly in the affirmative, there should be no hesitation or long debate about what action should be taken. The one test for every decision today is simply this, "Will it help to win the war?"

But before we strip the statutes of any or all regulations which over the years have been adopted for the protection, welfare, and security of American workmen, it is expedient that we verify the findings of fact which seem to make such action expedient. In the process of such verification it is well to sift carefully the loud complaints and allegations which

cry out for a major operation on labor legislation as the one and only therapeutic measure, and to determine first whether there is reason or merely rancor behind this demand.

It should always be kept in mind that no labor law of any potency was ever enacted in any jurisdiction, State or national, that did not encounter vigorous opposition. The very nature of labor laws develops a clash of interests, because their over-all purpose is to remove certain inequalities and disadvantages encountered by wage earners in relation to their employment. Labor laws are in effect rules established by government to provide a more even balance between groups that are far from equal in strength, power, and influence. Since it is not in the nature of individuals or groups of individuals to give up without protest an advantageous position or privilege, is it surprising that throughout the entire history of labor legislation, practically every remedial statute on the books was placed there only after a struggle. The Members of this body will recall that the outstanding accomplishments of this administration, the development and adoption of such progressive pieces of legislation as the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, the Railway Labor Act, and numerous other less conspicuous, though important, remedial enactments were not brought into being without strong resistance in each instance. Sometimes it is true, as in the case of the State Workmen's Compensation Acts and the Federal unemployment-compensation and old-age benefit legislation, that the original bitter opposition has after enactment yielded grudging acceptance and, finally, there has even been hearty approval by the former opponents. But there always remains a minor group which sulks in bitter resentment against every betterment of labor's position or condition. This group, perhaps relatively small numerically, but powerful and persistent, overlooks no opportunity to badger and batter the national administration now engrossed with steering the country through the most perilous period in our history. Indeed, the same sinister influence which stimulated the pay envelope crusade against the Social Security Act back in the campaign of 1936 has now seized upon war as a pretext for powerful assault upon the Fair Labor Standards Act, popularly known as the Wages and Hours Act.

An illustration of the methods of those seeking to repeal these laws can be found in the cunning technique of constantly referring to that act as the "40-hour law," and by repeating this phrase over and over in a continuous stream of publicity, there has been slyly planted in the minds of many of our citizens the idea that war production plants can now operate only 40 hours a week.

I have in my hands a typical example of such deliberately distorted propaganda against the Fair Labor Standards Act, and, incidentally, a piece of chicanery as tricky and slippery as any product from the pen of Hitler's henchman, Goebbels. This instrument is a 4-page newspaper size publication—printed, by the way, on expensive coated paper, and packed with tirades against what it terms "the 40-hour-a-week law." Although its sponsors hide their identity, the text indicates its origin in an Oklahoma newspaper office. It is liberally interspersed with reprints and extracts from editorials, with cheap, flippant jibes at the President, the Secretary of Labor, Donald Nelson, General Knudsen, and our distinguished colleague, Senator Thomas. Of course, it reeks with attacks upon organized labor and labor leaders. Prominently displayed are printed pledges for the signatures of duped readers. Here is the pledge, which speaks for itself:

> I solemnly pledge that I will refuse to vote for the reelection of any United States Senator or any United States Congressman who does not consistently vote for a law outlawing all strikes in every industry connected with defense and who does not vote to abolish the limitation of 40-hours-a-week labor in defense industries for the remainder of the war.

Nothing could be more deliberately misleading than this brazen piece of chicanery. It is true, of course, that several million workers now engaged on war contracts would not be fooled by it, for the simple reason that a great majority are working far more than 40 hours a week, and many of them, indeed, as much as 72 hours a week. But back in the rural districts, and even among that part of our urban population not directly engaged in industrial employments, and unfamiliar with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, this planned deception may be effective in creating a belief that the Fair Labor Standards Act actually limits hours of work to 40 a week.

It is inconceivable, of course, that any Member of Congress would be inspired to scuttle the Wage-and-Hour Act by virtue of such blatant misrepresentation. The sponsors are obviously knaves but certainly not novices. They started this self-styled "grass roots prairie fire" to simulate a flaming expression of popular opinion as a smoke screen to the real purpose back of the move, namely, the determination to restore sweat shop wage levels for millions of unorganized workers in this country.

These profit patriots are not interested in promoting production in our war industries. Rather, their eyes are upon further exploitation of thousands of workers who still earn only 30 cents an hour under the minimum rate established by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

They would, if permitted, snatch a few pennies from the pay envelope of $12 a week which the act sets as a positive minimum, and this in the face of rapidly rising costs of living. Obviously, however, there are in Congress and among the general public many persons who seemingly believe that the Fair Labor Standards Act is somehow impeding war production by reason of the basic 40-hour-a-week standard with its requirements for time-and-a-half pay for hours worked over and above that weekly total.

It is difficult to understand why and how the law can possibly interfere with production. Responsible public officials and leaders in industry consistently disclaim such defect. Testimony on this point from Donald Nelson, General Knudsen, Secretary Perkins, and many others is definitely to the point that the basic 40-hour week has not obstructed production. The record itself, stripped of all personal or political bias, is clear and convincing upon this point. The facts show that more than two-thirds of our war industries at this time are working their employees a minimum of 48 hours a week, and in thousands of cases over 48 and even up to 72 hours a week.

As of January this year, a survey by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, conducted among 16 important war industries, revealed that 96 percent of workers in the machine-tool industry were working 56 hours a week and that 91.2 percent in the shipbuilding industry were putting in an average of 12.3 hours overtime each week—or, in other words, 52.3 hours.

To those who have somehow let themselves be persuaded that war factories are blacked out after operating 40 hours a week, let me call attention to some further records kept by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These records disclose that back in January 1942, 80.2 percent of our aircraft plants were working 120 hours per week or over; 64.2 percent were operating 140 hours or more each week; and 37.4 percent were keyed to a pace of 160 or more hours out of a possible total of 168. Eighty percent of our blast furnaces were pouring out war materials throughout 160 or more hours each week for an almost perfect score.

Upon this point the Secretary of Labor, in a statement before the House Naval Affairs Committee on March 24, and, incidentally a statement that can be profitably read by every Member of the Congress, cited 2 significant facts disclosed by the Labor Statistics survey of January. One was the statement that 5,600,000 workers in our war industries were employed on shifts totaling 48, 50, 55, and 60 hours or more. Another significant point was that out of 650 employers who were canvassed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, only 2 mentioned overtime rates as an excuse for their failure to operate 7 days a week and 24 hours a day.

These facts constitute something beyond mere preponderance of evidence that the Fair Labor Standards Act in no way blocks, breaks, or retards maximum production of war material. The record should convince anyone other than the partisan sharpshooter, intent on a possible target, or the confirmed labor baiter bent on breaking down work standards of every kind and description.

The point has been raised that the requirement of time and a half over the basic 40-hour week is unnecessarily costly to the Government. Obviously, of course, it is the Government and not industry which bears the cost.

Just what is this extra cost to our war production brought about by the time-and-a-half requirement? According to the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, if the war industries surveyed by that agency in January had worked exactly the same hours and paid straight

time rates without overtime bonus, they would have reduced their wage bill per se by 7 percent. The final net saving would be little more than 3 percent. Against that saving, however, there must be seriously considered the inevitable loss of work hours due to the removal of overtime pay which now stimulates our workers to bear up at their jobs for the long workweek now prevailing in so many of our war plants.

As I have pointed out, it seems to me the most potent argument against the time-and-a-half provision is the possibility that it may induce workers to put in longer hours than can be sustained without impairment to health and without causing eventual loss of production through sickness, increased accidents, and compulsory lay-offs for rest periods. It is the uniform experience of industry that there is a definite limit to the hours a worker can be employed profitably from the production standpoint. In a recent canvass of several hundred manufacturing firms undertaken by a Princeton economist, a great majority of those reporting expressed the belief, based on actual experience, that 48 hours or a figure not greatly beyond that point constituted the optimum workweek.

Beyond the point of 54 hours a week there were uniformly noted substantial increases in accidents, absenteeism, and reduced per capita output. Without exception, also, the employers condemned the 7-day week for any worker, even with a 6-hour day. These findings check closely with the report of the experience of the British, both in the World War and in the present conflict.

There is one plain fact seemingly ignored by those intent upon removing all overtime premiums for our war workers. It is that the practice of paying and receiving time and a half for work over 40 hours has now become a part of our wage structure. With the lengthening of our work week under defense and war conditions, the additional income as reflected in the pay envelope has come to be depended upon by millions of our workers. If the pay envelope is trimmed down by abolishing the overtime premium, particularly now in the face of rising costs of living, basic wage increases may inevitably be demanded.

Failure to grant them would bring about dissatisfaction and discord at a time when we need all possible unity and sustained effort. If the increases are granted, as they should be in many instances, the cost to the Government will be at least as great as before, and the post-war period will find us with rigidly fixed wage rates which will make more difficult any transition back to normal conditions.

While the Federal Wage and Hour Act has been the special target of attack in recent months, there has been some equally loose thinking and loose talking about suspending other labor laws, State and national, for the duration. Shortly after Pearl Harbor the President called for all-out war production, pointing to the need for operation of our essential industries 24 hours a day 7 days a week. The overtime payment will make little or no difference; in fact, in many instances it will result in economy of operation.

Some time ago the War and Navy Department officials—as I said a moment ago—communicated with governors of the 48 States, urging the suspension of such State laws and regulations as might interfere with giving full effect to the President's call. There followed much confusion as to the purport of this request. Some of the States accepted it as a demand to suspend all labor laws, even those relating to the safety and health of workers.

To clarify the situation the Secretary of Labor was moved to call a conference of officials of the War and Navy Departments and State labor officials. Of course, it developed that the Federal Government was not asking or expecting the States to abolish every labor regulation. It developed that the attitude of the War Department today was essentially the same as in the last war, when the Chief of Ordnance issued the famous General Order No. 13 warning against excessive hours of employment for workers, and recommending not in excess of 48 hours a week for the sake of efficiency in production as a long-pull standard. Incidentally, the Secretary of War on July 20, 1918, suggested to the National War Labor Board that work in excess of 8 hours a day be permitted only on condition that time and a half be paid for such overtime.

In the conference called by the Secretary of Labor it was revealed that the only State laws which even temporarily might be deemed to hamper the launching of a full all-out production program were those requiring one day's rest in 7, those limiting the workweek for women to 48 hours, and in a few States laws forbidding employment of women on the night or graveyard shift. Through immediate legislative or administrative action, adequate easement from these regulations is now being granted by the States whenever the need is demonstrated.

Of course, this practical way of meeting the situation does not completely satisfy all those who would wield the ax upon labor laws in the name of war effort.

In lieu of a program of labor law nullification as an approach to top war production, I believe there is an opportunity at hand for positive action that will definitely insure increased output and, incidentally, a line of action that can be undertaken by industry either alone or in collaboration with the Government. For example, I believe that industry can and should make fuller use of the Nation's skilled manpower by immediately suspending all restrictive physical examination standards, and by using medical staffs for the primary purpose of suitable placement, and by instituting a service which will reduce absenteeism due to sickness.

I believe that industry can and should seriously set about removing accident and disease hazards, and developing plant safety practices which will "stop cold" the enormous waste of manpower now due to these work disabilities—an annual loss, incidentally, several times greater than the loss of hours through strikes or any other cause except sickness of workers.

I believe that industry can and should develop more effective and extensive training programs to keep abreast of expansion needs. I believe that industry can and should utilize more fully the recruiting facilities offered by the United States Employment Service, in order to reduce to a minimum competitive hiring. I believe that industry should at once make preparations for the employment of women in all possible plant operations.

Finally, it is my belief that industry, by refraining from attacks upon all types of labor legislation, can appreciably enhance the morale and esprit de corps of our great army of production. These things may not be the complete answer to our requirements for more and more output, but I am convinced they will be immeasurably more helpful than raids, or attempted raids, upon our labor laws, either our Federal labor laws or our State labor laws.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I believe by giving this opportunity to our older workers, eliminating all age requirements and substituting physical examinations affording opportunity to the women of America and giving to them equal pay for equal work, and calling into the war effort the physically handicapped for the contribution which they can so admirably make, there will be avoided the possibility of a bottleneck in our manpower in the immediate future.

Mr. President, I believe it is high time for those here who advocated sometime ago and those in our State capitals who now advocate the repeal of the protective labor legislation to devote their maximum effort to the war program, and to agree with the findings of those in authority in our Government, with the decisions which have been made by the leaders of industry, and with the Congress of the United States that we will make greater progress by a unity of effort in which no place will be found for an attempt to repeal labor legislation which in no way retards the Nation's war effort.

MAINTENANCE OF FOREST HIGHWAYS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senate that my recent trip home occasioned me to question the policy of one of the bureaus of the Government with respect to the maintenance of some of our forest highways. I know a number of other Senators are interested in this matter. The Civilian Conservation Corps, as their first duty, constructed a great many forest highways for fire protection. During the time when there were a large number of men in the C. C. C. there was no difficulty about the maintenance of those highways. In the northern part of the lower peninsula of Michigan and in its upper peninsula, which is largely a forested section, and, to my knowledge, in many other States of the Union, forest roads have not been maintained and, as a consequence, there will be lost the benefit of a very heavy expenditure on the part of the Government for the purpose of fire prevention and general forest access.

I understand that the Bureau of Public Roads appropriation is contained in the independent offices appropriation bill which is now in conference, and that it would be impossible to secure an appropriation in that bill, but the Agricultural Department appropriation bill is coming before the Senate very soon, and in connection with that bill I shall do my part in presenting to the committee the situation to which I have referred, so that we may get a fund which will provide in some manner for the maintenance of forest highways. They are not, of course, first class highways; they are highways in connection with which all that is necessary is a few dollars a mile for the reconstruction of bridges which may have been washed out over small runs by rains, and for cutting bushes and brush along the highways. These roads were constructed for the purpose of preserving our forests, and, as I say, we shall lose the benefit of the expenditure if the roads are not properly maintained. Many of these roads lead to national and State forests. I have discussed the subject with Mr. MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, and with our Michigan State highway commissioner, G. Donald Kennedy, who is president of the American Highway Association. Out of those conversations has come the thought that because the C. C. C. equipment has been largely taken by the Army and the manpower likewise taken, that it might be well for the Federal Government to provide funds to enable the Forestry Service either directly or through the Bureau of Public Roads to contract with the State highway departments for the maintenance of these highly necessary roads and prevent their loss.

I am making these remarks in the hope that Senators from States which embrace large forest areas will join with me in an effort to have provided sufficient money and adequate plans to take care of the maintenance work on the forest highways.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. BARKLEY. As in executive session, I report from the Committee on Foreign Relations a number of Foreign Service nominations which are routine, being appointments and promotions, and ask for their present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The Secretary read the following nominations for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service:

George Carnahan, of New York;
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut;
James G. McCargar, of California; and
Allen W. Pattee, of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

EXTRADITION TREATY WITH CANADA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the injunction of secrecy on Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an extradition treaty with Canada, which was submitted to the Senate on May 6, be removed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, is as follows:

The President of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada,

Desiring to promote the cause of justice, have resolved to conclude a treaty for the extradition of fugitives from justice between the two countries and have named for that purpose as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada:

Mr. Leighton McCarthy, K. C., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Canada at Washington;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The high contracting parties engage to deliver up to each other, under the circumstances and conditions stated in the present treaty, those persons who, being accused or convicted of any of the crimes or offenses enumerated in article III, committed within the territory of the one party, shall be found within the territory of the other party.

ARTICLE II

For the purposes of the present treaty:

(a) the territory of Canada shall be deemed to be all territory wherever situated under its exclusive administration and control;

(b) the territory of the United States of America shall be deemed to be all territory wherever situated belonging to the United States of America including its dependencies and all other territories under its exclusive administration or control;

(c) the word "territory" shall be deemed to include territorial waters, merchant vessels on and aircraft over the high seas, and men of war wherever situated;

(d) "requesting country" shall be deemed to mean that country on behalf of which a competent authority requests the surrender of an accused or convicted person;

(e) "requested country" shall be deemed to mean that country from which the surrender of an accused or convicted person is requested by a competent authority of the other country.

ARTICLE III

Extradition shall be reciprocally granted for the following crimes or offenses:

1. Murder (including crimes designated by the terms assassination, parricide, poisoning, and infanticide); manslaughter.

2. Malicious wounding; inflicting grievous bodily harm.

3. Rape, abortion, carnal knowledge of children under the age of 16 years; indecent assault or incest provided such crime or offense is punishable by the laws of both countries.

4. Procuration; abduction, or detention of women or girls for immoral purposes.

5. Bigamy.

6. Arson.

7. Wilfull and unlawful destruction or obstruction of railroads, highways, docks, channels, beacons and buoys, airdromes, and other transportation facilities.

8. Crimes committed on the high seas, in the territorial seas or inland waters as follows:

(a) Piracy, as commonly known and defined by the law of nations, or by statutes;

(b) Wrongfully sinking or destroying a vessel or attempting to do so;

(c) Mutiny or conspiracy by two or more members of the crew or other persons on board of a vessel, for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the captain or commander of such vessel, or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel;

(d) Assault on board ship with intent to do bodily harm.

9. Burglary, shop-breaking, and housebreaking.

10. The act of breaking into and entering the offices of government and public authorities, or any buildings not dwellings with intent to commit a crime or offense therein.

11. Robbery.

12. Forgery or uttering what is forged.

13. The forgery or falsification of the official documents or acts of the government or public authority, including courts of justice, or the uttering or fraudulent use of any of the same.

14. The fabrication of counterfeit money, whether coin or paper, counterfeit titles or coupons of public debt, created by national, state, provincial, territorial, local, or municipal governments, bank notes, or other instruments of public credit, counterfeit seals, stamps, dies, and marks of state or public administrations, and the utterance, circulation or fraudulent use of the above-mentioned objects; knowingly and without lawful authority making or having in possession any instrument, tool, or engine adapted and intended for the counterfeiting of any of the above-mentioned objects.

15. Embezzlement.

16. Kidnapping or false imprisonment of minors or adults.

17. Larceny or theft.

18. Obtaining any property, including money or valuable securities, by false pretenses, or receiving any property, including money or valuable securities, knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained.

19. Perjury or subornation of perjury.

20. Fraud, or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, or by a director or officer of any company or corporation, or by any one in any fiduciary position; fraudulent conversion.

21. Crimes and offenses against the laws for the suppression of slavery and slave trading.

22. Wilful desertion or wilful non-support of minor or dependent children.

23. Bribery, defined to be the offering, giving or receiving of bribes.

24. Crimes or offenses against the bankruptcy laws.

25. Crimes or offenses against the laws for the suppression of traffic in narcotics.

26. Using the mails to defraud.

27. Extortion, or threats with intent to extort money or other things of value.

28. Malicious injury to property.

29. Use of explosives so as to endanger human life or property.

30. Smuggling, defined to be the act of wilfully and knowingly violating the customs laws.

31. Crimes or offenses against the laws for the prevention of fraud in the sale or purchase of securities.

32. Crimes or offenses, if indictable, against the laws regulating

(a) public securities markets, or activities affecting such markets;

(b) registration or licensing of securities or of persons or companies doing business in securities, or giving advice with respect thereto;

(c) investment or public utility companies.

33. Extradition shall also take place for participation or conspiracy in any of the crimes or offenses before mentioned or in any attempt to commit any of such crimes or offenses.

ARTICLE IV

An accused person shall not be surrendered if the crime or offense for which his surrender is requested is one of a political character, or if he proves that the requisition for his surrender has, in fact, been made with a view to try to punish him for a crime or offense of a political character, provided that in no case shall murder, assassination or poisoning, either consummated or attempted, be deemed a crime or offense of a political character.

ARTICLE V

An accused person shall not be surrendered under the provisions hereof, when, from lapse of time or other lawful cause according to the laws of the requesting country, he is exempt from prosecution or punishment for the crime or offense for which the surrender is asked.

ARTICLE VI

Extradition shall not take place if the person claimed has already been tried and discharged or punished, or is being punished, or is still under trial in the territories of the requested country, for the crime or offense for which his extradition is requested.

If the accused person be actually under prosecution, out on bail, or in custody, for a crime or offense committed in the requested country, or shall have been convicted thereof, his extradition may be deferred until such proceedings be ended, and until he shall have been set at liberty in due course of law.

ARTICLE VII

No person shall be tried for any crime or offense committed prior to his extradition, other than that for which he was surrendered, unless for one month after trial or, in case of conviction, for one month after having suffered his punishment, or having been pardoned, he has been at liberty to leave the country.

ARTICLE VIII

The arrest and extradition of persons under the provisions of this treaty shall be carried out in the United States of America and in Canada, respectively, in conformity with the laws regulating extradition for the time being in force in the requested country.

Pertinent statutes of the requesting country shall be regarded as sufficiently proved for the purposes of extradition if they are certified by a principal law officer of such country of a sub-division thereof.

Requisition for the surrender of accused persons shall be made by the diplomatic agent of the requesting country. In the event of the absence of such agent from the country, requisition may be made by a consular officer.

ARTICLE IX

Extradition shall take place if the evidence be found sufficient to justify commital for trial for a crime or offense against the laws of the requesting country. In determining the sufficiency of such evidence, the courts of the requested country may apply the laws of the requested country with regard to the sufficiency of evidence to justify committal for trial in criminal causes. It shall not be essential to produce evidence sufficient to convict the accused person of the crime or offense charged were he placed on trial therefor, and it shall not be essential to establish that the crime or offense would be a crime or offense under the laws of the requested country.

If the person claimed shall have been convicted of the crime or offense for which his surrender is asked, it shall be sufficient to prove that he is the identical person so convicted in the courts of the requesting country and to produce a duly authenticated copy of the sentence of the court before which such conviction took place.

ARTICLE X

If the person claimed by one of the high contracting parties pursuant to the stipulations of this treaty shall also be claimed by one or more other countries on account of crimes or offenses committed within their jurisdiction, such person shall be delivered to that country whose claim is first received unless such claim is waived.

ARTICLE XI

Either Government may ask for the provisional apprehension and detention of a person, if it indicates at the same time its intention to request his extradition. During the period of provisional arrest of a person, whether pursuant to a formal request or otherwise, for the purpose of extradition hereunder, the legal officers of the requested country shall oppose the release on bail of such accused or convicted person, except in cases in which the denial of bail would, in their opinion, cause injustice.

Any fugitive provisionally arrested shall be released unless within two months from the date of arrest, or within such further time as a proper authority of the requested country shall direct, the formal requisition for surrender is made by the appropriate representative of the requesting country and within that time the documentary proofs in support of the requisition are produced before the appropriate judge or magistrate.

If, at any time prior to committal for trial, the accused or convicted person shall signify his willingness to return to the requesting country he shall, subject to the consent of the competent authorities of the requested country, be delivered to the proper officials of the requesting country for return thereto.

ARTICLE XII

All articles which were in the possession of the person to be surrendered at the time of his apprehension, and any articles that may serve as a proof of the crime or offense, shall be given up when the extradition takes place, in so far as this may be permitted by the law of the requested country.

ARTICLE XIII

All expenses connected with the extradition shall be borne by the requesting country. However, the appropriate legal officers of the requested country where the proceedings of extradition are had, shall, consistently with the discharge of their duties and without charge, cooperate with the officers of the requesting country before the respective judges and magistrates.

ARTICLE XIV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the high contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional methods and shall take effect ten days after the exchange of ratifications which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

The present treaty shall remain in force for a period of five years and in case neither of the high contracting parties shall have given notice one year before the expiration of that period of his intention to terminate the treaty, it shall continue in force until the expiration of one year from the date on which such notice of termination shall be given by either of the high contracting parties.

On the coming into force of the present treaty it shall supersede all other existing provisions of treaties and conventions relating to extradition between the United States of America and Canada.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the above-named plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty and have hereunto affixed their seals.

DONE in duplicate at Washington this twenty-ninth day of April, 1942.

CORDELL HULL [SEAL]
LEIGHTON MCCARTHY [SEAL]

TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF DR. PHILLIPS, LATE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate concludes its business today, I wish to call attention officially to the sad news of the death of our Chaplain, Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of the Senate, without regard to political differences, without regard to denominational differences, when I say that Dr. Phillips, who, since 1927, has been the Chaplain of the United States Senate, enjoyed the love and affection, the respect and confidence of every Member of this body. The Chaplain, the spiritual leader, advisor, and counselor of a great legislative body as Dr. Phillips was, occupies a distinguished position. While he had no voice in determining the legislative policy of this body, and had no vote on any measure that came before us for consideration, his influence and his guidance were always an inspiration to the Members of the Senate of the United States.

Dr. Phillips was an intensely human man. One had only to come in contact with him to appreciate his great sympathy and his human qualities.

He was an accomplished man. Not only was he a scholar, versed in all the rich lore of literature, but he was also a musician. I recall attending a little dinner recently given by him in his home, at which one of his charming and lovely daughters sang beautiful songs, while Dr. Phillips accompanied on the piano. I later expressed some surprise, not knowing of his talents as a musician, and he told me that for many years he had been a professional organist in one of the great churches of the United States.

Not only was Dr. Phillips a great scholar, not only was he a philosopher, not only was he in a great sense and in the true sense an actor, because he had all the qualifications and attributes of an actor, in his power of emphasis and of portrayal of human events and human emotions, but he was a deeply spiritual man. Those who have listened to his prayers day by day, and who have copies of his prayers, which have been published by order of the Senate, realize how deeply religious and spiritual they were.

We all mourn the untimely death of this minister of God who was our friend. Personally I did not even know that he was ill until I heard last night that he had passed away.

I am sure I could utter no more appropriate encomium than to quote what Dr. Phillips himself said a few days ago at the bier of one of our respected and honored reporters, Mr. Percy E. Budlong. On that occasion Dr. Phillips said, referring to Mr. Budlong:

He was a man to whom the beautiful things in life made their tremendous appeal, a man through whose relationships naught

but loving, tender sympathy for those in trouble, for those in distress, for those less fortunately situated, was ever reflected.

I have no doubt that when Dr. Phillips uttered those beautiful sentiments about one of our reporters, most of us would have thought he would not have been the next to answer the final call. Those words fit Dr. Phillips.

We honor him today as he goes to the final judgment, to meet his God face to face, and to give an account of his life upon this earth as one of us—a great human, a great humanitarian, a great scholar, a great preacher, a great American.

As reflecting these sentiments, which I am sure are the sentiments of the Senate, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 244) as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and regret of the death of the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., late Chaplain of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire very briefly to join with the Senator from Kentucky, who has so well expressed the sentiments of sorrow and grief which the whole Senate feels at the passing of our late beloved Chaplain, Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips. I am sure that the feeling of loss and of deep regret the Senator from Kentucky has voiced is in the heart of every Member of this body.

I had the privilege and pleasure of knowing Dr. Phillips for many years. He was formerly the pastor of one of the leading churches in the community in which I lived. It has been my pleasure to know him since he had been in Washington, and I knew him long before. I am sure that every Member of the Senate, and every visitor to the Senate, has been impressed with the noble bearing and by the high Christian spirit and lofty eloquence exhibited on our rostrum every day by Dr. Phillips.

To those of us who have served with him in this body it has been a revelation, an inspiring example, to see the life Dr. Phillips lived, and to be honored by his friendship and by association with him.

I have seen Dr. Phillips as a visitor at the bedsides of Senators and members of Senators' families who were afflicted with illness. I have seen him in the homes of Senators when the hand of death had been laid upon the household. I have heard him on many occasions conduct the funeral services of Members of this body, with an inspiring eloquence, a deepness of feeling, and a lofty Christian spirit, that afforded consolation to the members of the afflicted families and the friends of the deceased.

I am sure that no one could possibly go out of this Chamber who would be more constantly missed than that noble spirit who departed from us yesterday.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, Chaplain of the Senate, survives in the lives of all Senators who have ever been ministered unto by him as Chaplain of this great deliberative body. Eternal truth was interpreted to them through his spirituality, which was unusual in its depth and breadth, and his prayers expressed the closest intimacy with our Heavenly Father.

We share the sorrow of his beloved family. The shock, the disappointment which death brings is ours and theirs, and we extend to them the sympathy of this great body, of which he has been the notable Chaplain.

I believe that a sentiment contained in the very last prayer he delivered in the Senate will sustain the family as well as us. No more appropriate plea could be made to the Heavenly Father on an occasion such as this, a time of great sorrow, than the concluding part of his last prayer:

Endue us with courage sufficient to face each fateful task with a devotion unsoiled by thought of self, but ennobled by that larger loyalty to God and country that shall compel us to dare our utmost for the betterment of our world, content to leave with Thee all consequences.

Comfort every saddened heart, dear Lord, and upon all who are passing through the valley of the shadow bestow the light and the glory of Thy presence, to their great and endless comfort. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have shared with the other Members of this body the loss of several Members during my brief service here, and I have always been content to sit silent as the tribute was paid by the Members of the Senate at their passing, because they had known them longer and known them better than had I. But it did not take long to know Dr. Phillips. By virtue of the position and physical location of the seat I occupy, it was my privilege each morning to see his friendly smile. I received great encouragement, as a junior Member of this body, in feeling the touch of his hand and the cheer of his voice as he left the rostrum each day.

Dr. Phillips was a man of God, inspired in the service of humanity, and occupying, as he did, in these trying times, the position of Chaplain of this body, its spiritual leader, not only the Senate but the Nation has suffered a great loss. Because of his knowledge of the frailties of men, his intimacy with his Creator, and his knowledge of the problems of our country, it is tragic that we should lose him now.

Dr. Phillips was the living exemplification of spiritual leadership, not confined to one denomination or one creed, and in a world that is torn by racial and religious hatreds none could have been found who would have engendered greater tolerance in this great land of freemen, encompassing all the creeds and races and colors of the earth, than Dr. Phillips.

I say again, the Nation could ill afford to lose him now. Certainly the Senate is the great loser. I can say for myself, what I believe to be true of every other Senator, that I have lost a great friend.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, Dean Phillips was a native of Springfield, Ohio, and his noble character and devoted service were recognized and appreciated by his native State and by his many friends who knew him there as a boy and as a young man.

As one of the younger members of the Senate, I join with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] in expressing appreciation of the inspiration which has come from the daily prayers offered in the Senate by Dean Phillips. One of the most inspiring features of service in the Congress, I believe, is the opportunity each day to recognize the fact that our Government is closely related to the principles of religion. It has been brought to us since the early days of the Nation that there is a unity of purpose between religion and the principles of a free government. So it has been a privilege for those of us who have gone through the trying days of the past to have had brought to us each day a message such as came from Dean Phillips. He has taught us that we depend upon the recognition of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God in developing the sound principles of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 12, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 11, 1942:

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., of Maryland, to be a judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. George S. Brown, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named surgeons to be senior surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Winfield K. Sharp, Jr., June 27, 1942.
Fred T. Foard, June 27, 1942.
Ralph L. Lawrence, June 30, 1942.

The following-named senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

John D. Reichard, May 12, 1942.
Vance B. Murray, July 26, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 11, 1942:

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

William P. Cole, Jr., to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

George Carnahan
James C. Lobenstine
James G. McCargar
Allan W. Pattee

POSTMASTER

Roger W. Creer, Spanish Fork, Utah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 11, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God of all Holiness and Love, in humility and penitence, in praise and supplication, we are lifting up our hearts and voices, confident that our ceaseless needs do not exhaust the infinite resources of Thy grace and goodness.

We pray that we may understand more fully that our imperfect and distorted vision of the world's needs cannot be repaired until we have a clear and unclouded vision of the Lord, our God, and His will.

Grant unto our President, our Speaker, and all leaders in the affairs of state the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.

Help us to labor in faith and in faithfulness for that blessed day when men and nations shall be brought under the kindly and kingly sovereignty of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Dayee Jones;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Branch;

S. 2275. An act to amend section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, to grant national service life insurance in the cases of certain Army flying cadets and aviation students who died as the result of aviation accident in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941;

S. 2279. An act for the relief of O. R. Maxfield;

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy;

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Lillian LaBauve Linney;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2246. An act to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S 2456. An act to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes;

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; and

S. 2477. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4153. An act for the relief of Cleaver Kelley;

H. R. 4476. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment;

H. R. 4723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak;

H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Ferd W. Meile; and

H. R. 5439. An act for the relief of Joseph Soulek.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 210) entitled "An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders."

REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 210, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after part III thereof the following part IV:

"'PART IV

"'SHORT TITLE

"'SEC. 401. This part, divided into sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act:

"'TABLE OF CONTENTS

"'Sec. 401. Short title.
"'Sec. 402. Definitions and exemptions.
"'Sec. 403. General powers and duties of Commission.
"'Sec. 404. Rates, charges, and practices.
"'Sec. 405. Tariffs of freight forwarders.
"'Sec. 406. Commission's authority over rates and practices.
"'Sec. 407. Motor carrier rates applicable to small parcel forwarding.
"'Sec. 408. Authority for assembling and distribution rates.
"'Sec. 409. Adjustment period pending establishment of assembling and distribution rates.
"'Sec. 410. Permits.
"'Sec. 411. Relationships between freight forwarders and other persons.
"'Sec. 412. Accounts, records, and reports.
"'Sec. 413. Bills of lading and delivery of property.
"'Sec. 414. Collection of rates and charges.
"'Sec. 415. Allowances to shippers for transportation service.
"'Sec. 416. Notices, orders, and service of processes.
"'Sec. 417. Enforcement and procedure.
"'Sec. 418. Carriers the services of which freight forwarders may utilize.
"'Sec. 419. Liability for past acts and omissions.
"'Sec. 420. Special powers during time of war or other emergency.
"'Sec. 421. Unlawful acts and penalties.
"'Sec. 422. Separability of provisions.

"'DEFINITIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

"'SEC. 402. (a) For the purposes of this part—

"'(1) The term "person" includes an individual, firm, partnership, corporation, company, association, or joint-stock association, and includes a trustee, receiver, assignee, or personal representative thereof.

"'(2) The term "Commission" means the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"'(3) The term "State" means a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"(4) The term "United States" means the States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

"'(5) The term "freight forwarder" means any person which (otherwise than as a carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act) holds itself out to the general public to transport or provide transportation of property, or any class or classes of property, for compensation, in interstate commerce, and which, in the ordinary and usual course of its undertaking, (A) assembles and consolidates or provides for assembling and consolidating shipments of such property, and performs or provides for the performance of break-bulk and distributing operations with respect to such consolidated shipments, and (B) assumes responsibility for the transportation of such property from point of receipt to point of destination, and (C) utilizes, for the whole or any part of the transportation of such shipments, the services of a carrier or carriers subject to part I, II, or III of this Act.

"'(6) The term "interstate commerce" means transportation (A) between a point in a State and a point in another State, whether or not such transportation takes place wholly within the United States; (B) between points within the same State but through any place outside thereof; or (C) from or to any point in the United States to or from any point outside thereof, but only insofar as such transportation takes place within the United States.

"'(7) The term "service subject to this part" means any or all of the service in connection with the transportation in interstate commerce which any person undertakes to perform or provide as a freight forwarder, or which such person is authorized or required by or under the authority of this part to perform or provide; but such term shall not include that part of the undertaking of any such person for the performance of which the services of an air carrier subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, are utilized, or for the performance of which transportation by motor vehicle exempted under the provisions of section 203 (b) (7a) of this Act is utilized.

"'(8) Wherever reference is made to control (in referring to a relationship between any person or persons and another person or persons), such reference shall be construed to include actual as well as legal control, whether maintained or exercised through or by reason of the method of or circumstances surrounding organization or operation, through or by common directors, officers, or stockholders, a voting trust or trusts, a holding or investment company or companies, or through or by any other direct or indirect means; and to include the power to exercise control.

"'(b) The provisions of this part shall not apply (1) to service performed by or under the direction of a cooperative association, as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929, as amended, or by a federation of such cooperative associations, if such federation possesses no greater powers or purposes than cooperative associations so defined, or (2) where the property with respect to which service is performed consists of ordinary livestock, fish (including shellfish), agricultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), or used household goods, if the person performing such service engages in service subject to this part with respect to not more than one of the classifications of property above specified.

"'(c) The provisions of this part shall not be construed to apply (1) to the operations of a shipper, or a group or association of shippers, in consolidating or distributing freight for themselves or for the members thereof, on a nonprofit basis, for the purpose of securing the benefits of carload, truckload, or other volume rates, or (2) to the operations of a warehouseman or other shippers' agent, in consolidating or distributing pool cars, whose services and responsibilities to shippers in connection with such operatons are confined to the terminal area in which such operations are performed.

"'GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMISSION

"'SEC. 403. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to administer the provisions of this part, and to that end it shall have the authority to make and amend such rules and regulations and to issue such orders as may be necessary to carry out its provisions.

"'(b) The Commission shall have authority to establish reasonable requirements with respect to continuous and adequate service.

"'(c) The Commission shall have authority to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations governing the filing of surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, in such reasonable amount as the Commission may require, to be conditioned to pay, within the amount of such surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, for loss of or damage to property with respect to which a freight forwarder performs service subject to this part.

"'(d) The Commission shall have authority to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations governing the filing of surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, in such reasonable amount as the Commission may require, conditioned to pay, within the amount of such surety bonds, policies of insurance, qualifications as a self-insurer, or other securities or agreements, any final judgment recovered against a freight forwarder on account of bodily injuries to or death of any person, or loss of or damage to property (except property referred to in subsection (c) of this section), resulting from the negligent operation, maintenance, or use of motor vehicles operated by or under the direction and control of such freight forwarder, in service subject to this part, in the performance of transfer, collection, or delivery services.

"'(e) The Commission shall have authority, for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this part, to inquire into and report on the management of the business of freight forwarders, and to inquire into and report on the management of the business of persons controlling, controlled by, or under a common control with freight forwarders, to the extent that the business of such persons is related to the management of the business of one or more such freight forwarders, and the Commission shall keep itself informed as to the manner and method in which the same are conducted. The Commission may obtain from such freight forwarders and persons such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this part; and may transmit to Congress from time to time, such recommendations (including recommendations as to additional legislation) as the Commission may deem necessary.

"'(f) The Commission may investigate, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, whether any freight forwarder has failed to comply with any provision of this part or with any order, rule, regulation, or requirement issued or established pursuant thereto, and, after notice and hearing, take appropriate action to compel compliance therewith. Whenever the Commission is of opinion that any complaint does not state reasonable grounds for action on its part, it may dismiss such complaint.

"'RATES, CHARGES, AND PRACTICES

"'SEC. 404. (a) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder to provide and furnish, upon reasonable request therefor, the service subject to this part covered by its permit issued under this part, and to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable rates and charges therefor and just and reasonable classifications, regulations, and practices relating thereto and to the issuance, form, and substance of receipts and bills of lading, the manner and method of presenting, marking, packing, and delivering property for transportation in service subject to this part, the facilities for such transportation, and all other matters relating to or connected with such transportation, and every unjust or unreasonable rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice is prohibited and declared unlawful.

"'(b) It shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder, in service subject to this part, to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, port, port district, gateway, transit point, locality, region, district, territory, or description of traffic in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, port, port district, gateway, transit point, locality, region, district, territory, or description of traffic to any unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to apply to discriminations, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any carrier of whatever description.

"'(c) It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any freight forwarder, whether or not such freight forwarder is controlled by such carrier, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any freight forwarder, whether or not such freight forwarder is controlled by such carrier, to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever.

"'(d) Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit any freight forwarder from entering into an agreement with another freight forwarder for the joint loading of traffic between points in transportation subject to this part, except that the Commission may cancel, suspend, or require the modification of any such agreement which it finds, after reasonable opportunity for hearing, to be inconsistent with the national transportation policy declared in this Act.

"'TARIFFS OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS

"'SEC. 405. (a) Every freight forwarder shall file with the Commission and print, and keep open to public inspection, tariffs showing its rates and charges for service subject to this part, and all classifications, rules, regulations, and practices with respect thereto. Such tariffs shall become effective only after thirty days' notice, and shall plainly state the points between which property will be transported, the classification of property, and, separately, all terminal charges, or other charges which the Commission shall require to be so stated, all privileges or facilities granted or allowed, and any rules or regulations which in any wise change, affect, or determine any part or the aggregate of such rates or charges, or the value of the service rendered to the shipper or consignee.

"'(b) All rates and charges of freight forwarders for service subject to this part shall be stated in lawful money of the United States. The Commission shall by regulations prescribe the form and manner in which the

tariffs to which this section applies shall be published, filed, and posted; and the Commission is authorized to reject any tariff filed with it which is not in accordance with this section and with such regulations. Any tariff so rejected by the Commission shall be void and its use shall be unlawful.

"'(c) No freight forwarder shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for or in connection with service subject to this part than the rates or charges specified therefor in its tariffs lawfully in effect; and no freight forwarder shall refund or remit in any manner or by any device any portion of the rates or charges so specified, or extend to any person any privileges or facilities in connection with such service and affecting the value thereof except such as are specified in its tariffs: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 22 of part I of this Act, as amended (relating to transportation free or at reduced rates), insofar as such provisions relate to transportation or service in the case of property, shall apply with respect to freight forwarders, in the performance of service subject to this part, with like force and effect as in the case of the persons and service to which such provisions are specifically applicable.

"'(d) No change shall be made in any rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice specified in any effective tariff of a freight forwarder for or in connection with service subject to this part, except after thirty days' notice of the proposed change, filed and posted in accordance with this section. Such notice shall plainly state the change proposed to be made and the time when such change will take effect. The Commission may, in its discretion and for good cause shown, allow changes upon notice less than that herein specified, or modify the requirements of this section with respect to posting and filing of tariffs, either in particular instances or by general order applicable to special circumstances or conditions.

"'(e) No freight forwarder shall engage in service subject to this part unless the rates and charges for such service have been filed and published in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"'COMMISSION'S AUTHORITY OVER RATES AND PRACTICES

"'SEC. 406. (a) Any person may make complaint in writing to the Commission that anything done or omitted to be done by any freight forwarder is or will be in violation of this part. Every complaint shall state fully the facts complained of and the reasons for such complaint. If such freight forwarder shall not satisfy the complaint within a time specified by the Commission, or there shall be any reasonable ground for investigating said complaint, it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate the matters complained of in such manner and by such means as it shall deem proper.

"'(b) Whenever, after hearing, upon complaint or in an investigation on its own initiative, the Commission shall be of opinion that any rate or charge demanded, charged, or collected for service subject to this part, or any classification, regulation, or practice relating thereto, is or will be unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential or prejudicial, or otherwise in violation of any provision of this part, it shall determine and prescribe the lawful rate or charge or the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, rate or charge thereafter to be observed, or the lawful classification, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective.

"'(c) In any proceeding to determine the justness or reasonableness of any rate or charge of any freight forwarder, for service subject to this part, there shall not be taken in consideration or allowed as evidence or elements of value of the property of such forwarder either goodwill, earning power, or the permit under which such forwarder is operating; and in applying for and receiving a permit under this part any such forwarder shall be deemed to have agreed to the provisions of this subsection on its own behalf and on behalf of all transferees of such permit.

"'(d) In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates and charges of freight forwarders, and classifications, regulations, and practices relating thereto, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other factors, to the inherent nature of freight forwarding; to the effect of rates upon the movement of traffic by the freight forwarders for which the rates and charges are prescribed; to the need, in the public interest, of adequate and efficient freight-forwarder service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service; and to the need of revenues sufficient to enable freight forwarders, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide such service.

"'(e) Whenever there shall be filed with the Commission, under this part, any tariff stating a new rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, the Commission may upon complaint or upon its own initiative at once, and, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading, but upon reasonable notice, enter upon an investigation concerning the lawfulness of such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, and, pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Commission, by filing with such tariff and delivering to the freight forwarder affected thereby, a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may from time to time suspend the operation of such tariff and defer the use of such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than seven months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the Commission may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding instituted after such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice had become effective. If the proceeding shall not have been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period: *Provided, however*, That, subject to section 405 (b), this subsection shall not apply to any initial tariff filed prior to the expiration of ninety days after the date of enactment of this part. At any hearing involving a change in a rate, charge, or classification, or in a rule, regulation, or practice, the burden of proof shall be upon the freight forwarder to show that the proposed changed rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice is just and reasonable.

"'(f) Whenever in any investigation under this part, or in an investigation instituted upon petition of the freight forwarder concerned, which petition is hereby authorized to be filed, there shall be brought in issue any rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice of any freight forwarder, made or imposed by authority of any State, the Commission, before proceeding to hear and dispose of such issue, shall cause the State or States interested to be notified of the proceeding. The Commission may confer with the authorities of any State having regulatory jurisdiction over the class of persons subject to this part, with respect to the relationship between rate structures and practices of such persons subject to the jurisdiction of such State bodies and of the Commission; and to that end the Commission is authorized, under rules to be prescribed by it, to hold joint hearings with any such State regulatory bodies upon any matters wherein the Commission is empowered to act and where the rate-making authority of a State is or may be affected by the action taken by the Commission. The Commission is also authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of such State authorities in the enforcement of any provision of this part. Whenever in any such investigation the Commission, after full hearing, finds that any such rate, charge, classification, regulation, or practice causes any undue or unreasonable advantage, preference, or prejudice as between persons or localities in intrastate commerce on the one hand and interstate commerce on the other hand, or any undue, unreasonable, or unjust discrimination against interstate commerce, which is hereby forbidden and declared to be unlawful, it shall prescribe the rate or charge, or the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, thereafter to be charged, and the classification, regulation, or practice thereafter to be observed, in such manner as, in its judgment, will remove such advantage, preference, prejudice, or discrimination. Such rates, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices shall be observed while in effect by the freight forwarders parties to such proceeding affected thereby, the law of any State or the decision or order of any State authority to the contrary notwithstanding.

"'MOTOR CARRIER RATES APPLICABLE TO SMALL PARCEL FORWARDING

"'SEC. 407. In the establishment of rates or charges, classifications, rules, or regulations by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act, consideration may be given to the type of property tendered for transportation by any freight forwarder engaged in service with respect to parcels which do not exceed seventy pounds in weight or one hundred inches in length and girth combined, with a view to affording, in the case of such transportation, rates or charges as low as may be consistent with the receiving of reasonably adequate compensation by the carriers transporting such property.

"'AUTHORITY FOR ASSEMBLING AND DISTRIBUTION RATES

"'SEC. 408. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to make it unlawful for common carriers subject to part I, II, or III of this Act to establish and maintain assembling rates or charges and/or distribution rates or charges, and classifications, rules, and regulations with respect thereto, applicable to freight forwarders and others who employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of such common carriers under like conditions, which differ from other rates or charges, classifications, rules, or regulations which contemporaneously apply with respect to the employment or utilization of the same instrumentalities or services, if such difference is justified by a difference in the respective conditions under which such instrumentalities or services are employed or utilized. For the purposes of this section (1) the term 'assembling rates or charges' means rates or charges for the transportation of less-than-carload or less-than-truckload shipments into a point for further movement beyond as part of a carload or truckload shipment, and (2) the term "distribution rates or charges" means rates or charges for the transportation of less-than-carload or less-than-truckload shipments moving from a point into which such shipments have moved as a part of a carload or truckload shipment. The provisions of this section shall not be construed to authorize the establishment of assembling rates or charges or distribution rates or charges covering the line haul transportation between the principal concentration point and the principal break-bulk point.

"'ADJUSTMENT PERIOD PENDING ESTABLISHMENT OF ASSEMBLING AND DISTRIBUTION RATES

"'SEC. 409. (a) In order to provide a reasonable period of adjustment within which rates and charges may be established pursuant to the provisions of section 408, nothing in this Act shall be construed to make it unlawful for freight forwarders and common

carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act to operate under joint rates or charges during a period of eighteen months from the date of enactment of this part, but not thereafter. The provisions of part II of this Act shall apply with respect to such joint rates or charges and the divisions thereof, and with respect to the parties thereto, as though such joint rates or charges had been established under the provisions of such part II, and the provisions of this part shall not apply with respect thereto: *Provided, however,* That—

"(1) Joint rates or charges and concurrences, contained in tariffs heretofore filed with the Commission shall become effective, without notice, as of the date of enactment of this part, unless the parties thereto file notice with the Commission, within thirty days after the date of enactment of this part, canceling such joint rates or charges and concurrences;

"'(2) Joint rates or charges and concurrences, contained in tariffs heretofore offered for filing with the Commission, but rejected by the Commission, shall become effective, without notice, as of the date of enactment of this part, if filed with the Commission within thirty days after the date of enactment of this part;

"'(3) Joint rates or charges and concurrences, under which freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act were actually operating on July 1, 1941, may become effective, without notice, as of the date of enactment of this part, if tariffs covering such joint rates or charges and concurrences are filed with the Commission within thirty days after the date of enactment of this part;

"'(4) After the expiration of six months from the date of enactment of this part, (i) no new or additional joint rates or charges or divisions may be established under authority of this section, and (ii) no change shall be made in any joint rate or charge or division established, or which becomes effective, pursuant to this subsection, except as may be expressly authorized or required by order of the Commission in the exercise of its powers under part II of this Act;

"'(5) Any joint rate or charge or concurrence established, or which becomes effective, pursuant to this subsection may at any time be canceled or withdrawn in accordance with the provisions of part II of this Act;

"'(6) The filing of tariffs under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection may be in accordance with the requirements with respect to the form and manner of filing tariffs in effect under part II of this Act prior to December 31, 1936;

"'(7) For the purpose of computing the period of fifteen days prescribed in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, the date of mailing by registered mail shall be deemed the date of filing; and

"'(8) As used in this subsection the term "rates or charges" includes classifications, rules, and regulations with respect thereto.

"'(b) If the Commission shall find that the purposes of this section may be carried out within a shorter time than such period of eighteen months, it shall by order fix a date prior to the expiration of such period after which the joint rates or charges and concurrences referred to in this section shall no longer be lawfully in effect.

"'PERMITS

"'SEC. 410. (a) No person shall engage in service subject to this port unless such person holds a permit, issued by the Commission, authorizing such service; except that (1) any person engaged in service subject to this part when this section takes effect may continue to engage in such service for a period of one hundred and eighty days thereafter without a permit, and (2) if application for a permit is made to the Commission by such person within such period, such person may, under such regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, continue to engage in such service subject to this part until otherwise ordered by the Commission.

"'(b) Application for a permit shall be made in writing to the Commission, be verified under oath, and shall be in such form and contain such information and be accompanied by proof of service upon such interested parties as the Commission shall, by regulations, require.

"'(c) The Commission shall issue a permit to any qualified applicant therefor, authorizing the whole or any part of the service covered by the application, if the Commission finds that the applicant is ready, able, and willing properly to perform the service proposed, and that the proposed service, to the extent authorized by the permit, is or will be consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in this Act; otherwise such application shall be denied. No such permit shall be issued to any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act; but no application made under this section by a corporation controlled by, or under common control with, a common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act, shall be denied because of the relationship between such corporation and such common carrier.

"'(d) The Commission shall not deny authority to engage in the whole or any part of the proposed service covered by any application made under this section solely on the ground that such service will be in competition with the service subject to this part performed by any other freight forwarder or freight forwarders.

"'(e) Any permit issued under this section shall specify the nature or general description of the property with respect to which service subject to this part may be performed, and the territory within which, and the territories from which and to which, service subject to this part may be performed, under authority of such permit. At the time of issuance, and from time to time thereafter, there shall be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by any such permit such reasonable terms, conditions, and limitations as are necessary to carry out the requirements of this part or those lawfully established by the Commission pursuant thereto; but no such terms, conditions, or limitations shall restrict the right of the freight forwarder to add to its equipment, facilities, or services within the scope of such permit, as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require.

"'(f) Permits shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall remain in effect until suspended or terminated as herein provided. Any such permit may, upon application of the holder thereof, in the discretion of the Commission, be amended or revoked, in whole or in part, or may upon complaint, or on the Commission's own initiative, after notice and hearing, be suspended, modified, or revoked, in whole or in part, for willful failure to comply with any provision of this part, or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder, or with any term, condition, or limitation of such permit: *Provided, however,* That no such permit shall be revoked (except upon application of the holder) unless the holder thereof fails to comply, within a reasonable time, not less than thirty days, to be fixed by the Commission, with a lawful order of the Commission, commanding obedience to the provision of this part, or to the rule or regulation of the Commission thereunder, or to the term, condition, or limitation of such permit, found by the Commission to have been violated by such holder: *Provided further,* That the right to engage in service subject to this part under authority of any permit or any application filed pursuant to the provisions of this section may be suspended by the Commission, upon reasonable notice of not less than fifteen days to the forwarder, but without hearing or other proceedings, for failure to comply, and until compliance, with the provisions of section 405 (a) or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder or under the provisions of section 403 (c) or (d).

"'(g) Any such permit, or any right to engage in service subject to this part pending disposition of any application made to the Commission for a permit, and any right to a permit when issued, may be transferred, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission shall prescribe to insure compliance with the provisions of this part, if the Commission finds that, with respect to the service covered by such right or permit, the transferee thereof satisfies the conditions prescribed in subsection (c) with respect to the original issuance of permits: *Provided, however,* That if the proposed transfer would affect the interests of employees of a freight forwarder, the Commission shall require, as a prerequisite thereto, a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the employees affected.

"'(h) Permits issued under this part shall not authorize the holder thereof to conduct any direct railroad, water, or motor-carrier operations, except motor-vehicle operations in transportation which, pursuant to the provisions of section 202 (c) (1) of this Act, is to be regulated as service subject to this part.

"'(i) No freight forwarder which is controlled by, or under common control with, a common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act shall abandon all or any portion of its service subject to this part unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that such abandonment is consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in this Act. Any such abandonment contrary to the provisions of this paragraph may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, any commission or regulating body of the State or States affected, or any party in interest; and any such freight forwarder or any such carrier controlling or under common control with such freight forwarder which, or any director, officer, receiver, operating trustee, lessee, agent, or person acting for or employed by such freight forwarder or carrier who, knowingly authorizes, consents to, or permits any violation of the provisions of this subsection shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000.

"'RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FREIGHT FORWARDERS AND OTHER PERSONS

"'SEC. 411. (a) (1) It shall be unlawful for a freight forwarder, or any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with a freight forwarder, to acquire control of a carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act; except that this subsection shall not limit the right of any carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act to acquire control of any other carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of part I of this Act.

"'(2) It shall be unlawful to continue to maintain control accomplished or effectuated after this subsection takes effect and in violation of its provisions.

"'(b) It shall be unlawful for any person whose principal business is that of manufacturing and selling and/or buying and selling articles or commodities, and whose business operations are of such a character that services of a freight forwarder or forwarders (or similar assembling, consolidating, and shipping operations performed by such person for itself) are commonly used in connection with

the transportation of such articles or commodities, or for any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such person, to engage in service subject to this part: *Provided, however,* That the Commission shall have power to issue a permit, under section 410, to any such person upon a finding that the proposed service will be consistent with the public interest and with the national transportation policy declared in this Act and that the applicant is otherwise qualified under section 410: *And provided further,* That any such person who has been continuously engaged in business as a freight forwarder since October 1, 1941, and is on the date of enactment of this part so engaged, shall have the same authority to continue to engage in service subject to this part, until otherwise ordered by the Commission, as is granted to other persons under the provisions of section 410 (a).

"'(c) After the expiration of 6 months from the date of enactment of this part it shall be unlawful for any director, officer, employee, or agent of any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act or of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such a common carrier, in his or their own personal pecuniary interest, to own, lease, control, or hold stock in, any freight forwarder, directly or indirectly; but this subsection shall not forbid or preclude the holding of a director's qualifying shares of stock from which no personal pecuniary benefit is derived by the holder.

"'(d) The Commission is hereby authorized, upon complaint, or upon its own initiative without complaint, but after notice and hearing, to investigate and determine whether any person is violating the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) If the Commission finds after such investigation that such person is violating any of such provisions, it shall by order require such person to take such action as may be necessary, in the opinion of the Commission, to prevent continuance of such violation. The provisions of this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other enforcement provisions contained in, or applicable for purposes of enforcement of, this part.

"'(e) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction upon the complaint of the Commission, alleging a violation of any of the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) or disobedience of any order issued by the Commission thereunder by any person, to issue such writs of injunction or other proper process, mandatory or otherwise, as may be necessary to restrain such person from violation of such provision or to compel obedience to such order.

"'(f) The Commission may from time to time, for good cause shown, make such orders supplemental to any order made under the foregoing provisions of this section as it may deem necessary or appropriate.

"'(g) Nothing in this act shall be construed to make it unlawful for any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of this Act, or any person controlling such a common carrier, to have or to acquire control of a freight forwarder or freight forwarders; and, in any case where such control exists, no rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice of the common carrier or of any freight forwarder controlled by such common carrier, or under common control with such common carrier, shall be held to be unlawful under any provision of this Act because of the relationship between such common carrier and such freight forwarder.

"'ACCOUNTS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS

"'SEC. 412. (a) For purposes of administration of the provisions of this part, the Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from freight forwarders, and to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made, and to require from such forwarders specific, full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary. Such annual reports shall give an account of the affairs of the freight forwarder in such form and detail as may be prescribed by the Commission. The Commission may, in its discretion, for purposes of administration of the provisions of this part, prescribe a uniform system of accounts applicable to freight forwarders, and the period of time within which they shall have such uniform system of accounts, and the manner in which such accounts shall be kept. The Commission may also require any such forwarder to file with it a true copy of any contract or agreement between such forwarder and any person in relation to transportation facilities, service, or traffic affected by the provisions of this part.

"'(b) Such annual reports shall contain all the required information for the period of 12 months ending on the 31st day of December in each year, unless the Commission shall specify a different date, and shall be made out under oath and filed with the Commission at its office in Washington within three months after the close of the year for which the report is made, unless additional time be granted in any case by the Commission. Such periodical or special reports as may be required by the Commission under subsection (a) hereof shall also be under oath, whenever the Commission so requires.

"'(c) The Commission may, in its discretion, prescribe the forms of any and all accounts, records, and memoranda to be kept by freight forwarders, with respect to service subject to this part, and the length of time such accounts, records, and memoranda shall be preserved, including the accounts, records, and memoranda of the movement of traffic, as well as of the receipts and expenditures of money; and it shall be unlawful for freight forwarders to keep any accounts, books, records, and memoranda contrary to any rule, regulation, or order of the Commission with respect thereto.

"'(d) The Commission or its duly authorized special agents, accountants, or examiners shall at all times have access to and authority, under its order, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, or equipment of freight forwarders; and shall have authority to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of freight forwarders, and such accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any freight forwarder, as the Commission deems relevant to such person's relation to or transactions with such freight forwarder. Freight forwarders and persons shall submit their accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents for the inspection and copying authorized by this subsection, and freight forwarders shall submit their lands, buildings, and equipment for examination and inspection, to any duly authorized special agent, accountant, or examiner of the Commission upon demand and the display of proper credentials.

"'(e) The Commission may issue orders specifying such operating, accounting, or financial papers, records, books, correspondence, or documents of freight forwarders as may after a reasonable time be destroyed, and prescribing the length of time the same shall be preserved.

"'(f) As used in this section the words "keep" and "kept" shall be construed to mean made, prepared, or compiled, as well as retained.

"'BILLS OF LADING AND DELIVERY OF PROPERTY

"'SEC. 413. The provisions of section 20 (11) and (12) of part I of this Act, together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, shall apply with respect to freight forwarders, in the case of service subject to this part, with like force and effect as in the case of those persons to which such provisions are specifically applicable, and the freight forwarder shall be deemed both the receiving and delivering transportation company for the purposes of such section 20 (11) and (12). When the services of a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act are utilized by a freight forwarder for the receiving of property from a consignor in service subject to this part, such carrier may, with the consent of the freight forwarder, execute the bill of lading or shipping receipt for the freight forwarder. When the services of a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act are utilized by a freight forwarder for the delivery of property to the consignee named in the freight forwarder's bill of lading, shipping receipt, or freight bill, the property may, with the consent of the freight forwarder, be delivered on the freight bill, and receipted for on the delivery receipt, of the freight forwarder.

"'COLLECTION OF RATES AND CHARGES

"'SEC. 414. In the case of service subject to this part, it shall be unlawful for a freight forwarder, or a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to part II of this Act whose services are utilized by a freight forwarder, to deliver or relinquish possession of property to the consignee named in the bill of lading, shipping receipt, or freight bill of the freight forwarder until all tariff rates and charges thereon have been paid, except under such rules and regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe to govern the settlement of all such rates and charges and to prevent unjust discrimination or undue preference or prejudice: *Provided,* That the provisions of this section shall not be construed to prohibit any such forwarder or carrier from extending credit in connection with rates and charges on freight transported for the United States, for any department, bureau, or agency thereof, or for any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or for the District of Columbia.

"'ALLOWANCES TO SHIPPERS FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

"'SEC. 415. If the owner of property transported in service subject to this part directly or indirectly renders any service connected therewith, or furnishes any instrumentality used therein, the charge and the allowance therefor, to such owner, shall be published in tariffs filed in the manner provided in this part and shall be no more than is just and reasonable and the Commission may, after hearing on a complaint or on its own initiative, determine what is a reasonable charge as the maximum to be paid by the freight forwarder or forwarders for the services so rendered or for the use of the instrumentality so furnished, and fix the same by appropriate order.

"'NOTICES, ORDERS, AND SERVICE OF PROCESSES

"'SEC. 416. (a) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder to file with the Commission a designation in writing of the name and post-office address of an agent upon whom or which service of notices or orders may be made under this part. Such designation may from time to time be changed by like writing similarly filed. Service of notices or orders in proceedings under this part may be made upon such forwarder by personal service upon it or upon an agent so designated by it, or by mail addressed to it or to such agent at the address filed. In default of such designation, service of any notice or order may be made by posting in the office of the secretary of the Commission. Whenever notice or order is served by mail, as provided herein, the date of mailing shall be considered as the time of service. In proceedings before the Commission involving

the lawfulness of rates, charges, classifications, or practices, service of notice upon an attorney in fact of a freight forwarder who has filed a tariff in behalf of such freight forwarder shall be deemed to be due and sufficient service upon the freight forwarder.

"'(b) The Commission may suspend, modify, or set aside its orders upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper.

"'(c) Except as otherwise provided in this part, all orders of the Commission shall take effect within such reasonable time, not less than thirty days, as the Commission may prescribe and shall continue in force until its further order, or for a specified period of time, according as shall be prescribed in the order, unless the same shall be suspended, modified, or set aside by the Commission, or be suspended or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction.

"'(d) It shall be the duty of every freight forwarder, its agents, and employees to observe and comply with such orders so long as the same shall remain in effect.

"'ENFORCEMENT AND PROCEDURE

"'SEC. 417. (a) The provisions of sections 12 and 17 of part I of this Act, together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, and of the Compulsory Testimony Act (27 Stat. 443), and of the Immunity of Witnesses Act (34 Stat. 798; 32 Stat. 904, ch. 755, sec. 1), shall apply with full force and effect in the administration and enforcement of this part.

"'(b) If any freight forwarder fails to comply with or operates in violation of any provision of this part, or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or of any term or condition of any permit, the Commission or the Attorney General of the United States (or, in case of such an order, any party injured by the failure to comply therewith or by the violation thereof) may apply to any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties for the enforcement of such provision of this part or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, or condition; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by a writ or writs of injunction or other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining such carrier and any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof from further violation of such provision of this part or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, or condition, and enjoining obedience thereto.

"'(c) The Commission shall enter of record a written report of hearings conducted upon complaint, or upon its own initiative without complaint, stating its conclusions, decision, and order; and shall furnish a copy of such report to all parties of record. The Commission may provide for the publication of such reports in the form best adapted for public information and use, and such authorized publications shall, without further proof or authentication, be received as competent evidence of such reports in any court of competent jurisdiction.

"'(d) The copies of classifications and tariffs of rates and charges, and of all contracts, agreements, and arrangements of freight forwarders filed with the Commission under this part, and the statistics, tables, and figures contained in the annual or other reports of freight forwarders made to the Commission under this part, shall be preserved as public records in the custody of the secretary of the Commission, and shall be received as prima facie evidence of what they purport to be for the purpose of investigations by the Commission and in all judicial proceedings; and copies of and extracts from any of said classifications, tariffs, contracts, agreements, arrangements, or reports, made public records as aforesaid, certified by the secretary, under the Commission's seal, shall be received in evidence with like effect as the originals.

"'CARRIERS THE SERVICES OF WHICH FREIGHT FORWARDERS MAY UTILIZE

"'SEC. 418. It shall be unlawful, except in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services, for freight forwarders to employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of any carriers other than common carriers by railroad, motor vehicle, or water, subject to this Act; express companies subject to this Act; air carriers subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; common carriers by motor vehicle engaged in transportation exempted under the provisions of section 203 (b) (7a) of this Act; common carriers by motor vehicle exempted under the provisions of section 204 (a) (4a) of this Act; or common carriers by water engaged in transportation exempted under the provisions of section 303 (b) of this Act.

"'LIABILITY FOR PAST ACTS AND OMISSIONS

"'SEC. 419. No person shall be subject to any punishment or liability under the provisions of this Act on account of any act done or omitted to be done, prior to the effective date of this part, in connection with the establishment, charging, collection, receipt, or payment of rates of freight forwarders, or joint rates or divisions between freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this Act.

"'SPECIAL POWERS DURING TIME OF WAR OR OTHER EMERGENCY

"'SEC. 420. The provisions of section 1 (15), (16), and (17) of part I of this Act shall be applicable, in the case of service subject to this part, with respect to freight forwarders and other persons, and the service, equipment, and facilities of freight forwarders, with like force and effect as in the case of the carriers and other persons, and the service, equipment, and facilities, to which such provisions are specifically applicable.

"'UNLAWFUL ACTS AND PENALTIES

"'SEC. 421. (a) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any provision of this part, or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or any term or condition of any permit, for which no penalty is otherwise provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $100 for the first offense and not more than $500 for any subsequent offense. Each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

"'(b) Any freight forwarder or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof who, by any device or means, shall knowingly and willfully assist, or shall willingly suffer or permit, any person to obtain service subject to this part at less than the rates or charges lawfully in effect, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 for the first offense and not more than $2,000 for any subsequent offense.

"'(c) Any person who shall by any device or means, whether with or without the consent or connivance of any freight forwarder or its officer, agent, employee, or representative, knowingly and willfully obtain service subject to this part at less than the rates or charges lawfully in effect, or shall knowingly and willfully, directly or indirectly, by false claim, false billing, false representation, or other device or means, obtain or attempt to obtain any allowance, refund, or repayment in connection with or growing out of such service, whether with or without the consent or connivance of such forwarder or its officer, agent, employee, or representative, whereby the compensation of such forwarder for such service, either before or after payment, shall be less than the rates or charges lawfully in effect, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 for the first offense and not more than $2,000 for any subsequent offense.

"'(d) Any freight forwarder, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof, who shall willfully fail or refuse to make a report to the Commission as required under this part, or to make specific and full, true, and correct answer to any question within thirty days from the time it is lawfully required by the Commission so to do, or to keep accounts, records, and memoranda in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission, or shall knowingly and willfully falsify, destroy, mutilate, or alter any such report, account, record, or memorandum, or shall knowingly and willfully file with the Commission any false report, account, record, or memorandum, or shall knowingly and willfully neglect or fail to make full, true, and correct entries in such accounts, records, or memoranda of all facts and transactions appertaining to the business of the freight forwarder, or shall knowingly and willfully keep any accounts, records, or memoranda contrary to the rules, regulations, or orders of the Commission with respect thereto, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject for each offense to a fine of not more than $5,000. As used in this subsection, the word "keep" shall be construed to mean make, prepare, or compile, as well as retain.

"'(e) Any special agent, accountant, or examiner of the Commission who knowingly and willfully divulges any fact or information which may come to his knowledge during the course of any examination or inspection made under authority of this part, except as he may be directed by the Commission or by a court or judge thereof, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not exceeding six months, or both.

"'(f) It shall be unlawful for any freight forwarder or any officer, agent, employee, or representative of such forwarder, or for any other person authorized by such forwarder or any such person to receive information, knowingly and willfully to disclose to, or permit to be acquired by, any person other than the shipper or consignee, without the consent of such shipper or consignee, any information concerning the nature, kind, quantity, destination, consignee, or routing of any property tendered or delivered to such forwarder in service subject to this part which information may be or is used to the detriment or prejudice of such shipper or consignee, or which may or does improperly disclose his business transactions to a competitor, and it shall also be unlawful for any person to solicit or knowingly and willfully receive any such information which may be or is so used. Any person violating any provisions of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $100 for the first offense and not more than $500 for any subsequent offense. Each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense. Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent the giving of such information in response to any legal process issued under the authority of any court, or to any officer or agent of the Government of the United States or of any State, Territory, or District thereof, in the exercise of his powers, or to any officer or other duly authorized person seeking such information for the prosecution of persons charged with or suspected of crimes, or to another freight forwarder, or its duly authorized agent, for the purpose of adjusting mutual traffic accounts in the ordinary course of business of such forwarders.

"'(g) The provisions of the Elkins Act of February 19, 1903, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, secs. 41, 42, and 43), shall apply to service subject to this part, and to freight

forwarders and shippers in respect to such service, and shall apply for purposes to enforcement of this part; and the provisions of such Act shall be considered to apply in addition to, and not to the exclusion of, the provisions of this part.

"'SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"'SEC. 422. If any provision of this part, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the other provisions of this part, and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.'

"AMENDMENT TO SECTION 202 (C)

"SEC. 2. Section 202 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this section or of section 203, the provisions of this part except the provisions of section 204 relative to qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees and safety of operation and equipment, shall not apply—

"'(1) to transportation by motor vehicle by a carrier by railroad subject to part I, or by a water carrier subject to part III, or by a freight forwarder subject to part IV, incidental to transportation or service subject to such parts in the performance within terminal areas of transfer collection, or delivery services; but such transportation shall be considered to be and shall be regulated as transportation subject to part I when performed by such carrier by railroad, as transportation subject to part III when performed by such water carrier, and as transportation or service subject to part IV when performed by such freight forwarder;

"'(2) to transportation by motor vehicle by any person (whether as agent or under a contractual arrangement) for a common carrier by railroad subject to part I, an express company subject to part I, a motor carrier subject to this part, a water carrier subject to part III or a freight forwarder subject to part IV, in the performance within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery services; but such transportation shall be considered to be performed by such carrier, express company, or freight forwarder as part of, and shall be regulated in the same manner as, the transportation by railroad, express, motor vehicle, or water, or the freight forwarder transportation or service, to which such services are incidental.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 219

"SEC. 3. Section 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 219. The provisions of section 20 (11) and (12) of this Act, together with such other provisions of such part (including penalties) as may be necessary for the enforcement of such provisions, shall apply with respect to common carriers by motor vehicle with like force and effect as in the case of those persons to which such provisions are specifically applicable.'

"AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

"SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 1003 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'Air carriers may establish reasonable through service and joint rates, fares, and charges with other common carriers; except that with respect to transportation of property, air carriers not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation (other than companies engaged in the air express business) may not establish joint rates or charges, under the provisions of this subsection, with common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'Approval by Authority

"'(b) The Authority shall by order disapprove any such contract or agreement, whether or not previously approved by it, that it finds to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this Act, and shall by order approve any such contract or agreement, or any modification or cancelation thereof, that it does not find to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this Act; except that the Authority may not approve any contract or agreement between an air carrier not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation and a common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, governing the compensation to be received by such common carrier for transportation services performed by it.'

"NUMBERING OF SECTION 23 OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

"SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February fourth, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven', approved March 2, 1889 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, sec. 49), which has been commonly cited and referred to as section 23 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby designated and numbered as section 23 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 6. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that section 405 shall take effect sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and sections 404, 406, 413, 414, and 417, shall take effect ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, if found by it to be necessary or advisable in the public interest, by general or special order, postpone the taking effect of any of the provisions of this part to such time, but not beyond the 1st day of September 1942, as the Commission shall prescribe."

And the House agree to the same.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
ROBERT CROSSER,
CHAS. L. SOUTH,
LUTHER PATRICK,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the part of the House.

B. WHEELER,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
LISTER HILL,
WALLACE H. WHITE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The differences between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following statement, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached, and minor clarifying changes.

Provisions of proposed part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act

Section 402 (a) (6). Definition of Interstate Commerce

Section 402 (a) (6) of the House amendment defined the term "interstate or foreign commerce" with a view to making the new proposed part IV apply to freight forwarding to and from points outside the United States, insofar as it took place within the United States. The definition was subject to problems of interpretation regarding the meaning of the word "transshipment." The conferees felt that it was not clear whether the term "transshipment" meant the giving of a new bill of lading or the unloading and reloading of the property. The definition as agreed to in conference follows the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act. The term defined is "interstate commerce" rather than "interstate or foreign commerce," but the term is so defined as to include foreign operations by freight forwarders insofar as such freight forwarding "takes place within the United States." This method of defining the Commission's jurisdiction will, it is believed, work out more satisfactorily than the method proposed in the House amendment.

Section 402 (b). Exemptions

Section 402 (b) of the House amendment specified certain forwarding activities with respect to which part IV was not to apply. Among those specified were forwarding operations with respect to a "single general commodity." The Senate bill contained no such exemption. The conference substitute omits this exemption.

Section 404 (c). Discrimination by Part I, II, and III Common Carriers

The conference substitute, in section 404 (c), contains a provision which was in neither the Senate bill nor the House amendment, making it unlawful for any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of the Interstate Commerce Act to give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any freight forwarder, whether or not such freight forwarder is controlled by such carrier, or to subject any freight forwarder, whether or not such freight forwarder is controlled by such carrier, to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage. The inclusion of this prohibition was deemed desirable for the purpose of making more effective the policy of including in the legislation all appropriate provisions to prevent discriminations, preferences, and prejudices growing out of relationships between operating common carriers and freight forwarders.

Section 404 (d). Joint Loading

The conference substitute contains, in section 404 (d), a provision to the effect that nothing in part IV shall be construed to prohibit any freight forwarder from entering into an agreement with another freight forwarder for the joint loading of traffic, except that the Commission may cancel or require the modification of any such agreement which it finds to be inconsistent with the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act. No such provision was contained in the House amendment. A similar provision was contained in the Senate bill, without the authority of the Commission to cancel or require modification of such an agreement.

Section 406 (d). Rate Making Rule

Section 406 (d) of the House amendment contained a "rule of rate making" similar to sections 15a (2), 216 (i), and 307 (f) of the Interstate Commerce Act. In the conference substitute, section 406 (d), the Commission is directed to give consideration, in addition to the other factors specified in the subsection as it passed the House, to "the inherent nature of freight forwarding".

Section 406 (e). Power to Suspend New Rates

Section 406 (e) of the House amendment granted to the Commission the same power to suspend new rates as is provided for under parts I, II, and III of the act. The House provision granted this power with respect to all new rates, except the temporary joint rates filed under section 409, including those initially filed under part IV. In the comparable provision in section 406 (f) of the Senate bill, an exception was made with respect to initial tariffs filed prior to January 1, 1942. This date was specified at a time when early enactment of the legislation was anticipated. This provision, included in the conference substitute in section 406 (e), provides that the suspension power shall not apply in the case of "any initial tariff filed prior to the expiration of 90 days after the date of enactment of this part".

Section 406 (f). Commission's Power With Respect to Intrastate Rates

Section 406 (f) of the conference substitute is a new provision granting to the Commission, with respect to intrastate freight forwarder rates, substantially the same power as is granted the Commission under section 13 (3) and (4) of part I in the case of intrastate railroad rates. It is the power to remove undue advantages, preferences, or prejudices as between persons or localities in intrastate commerce on the one hand and interstate commerce on the other hand, or unjust discrimination against interstate commerce.

Section 407. Motor Carrier Rates Applicable to Small Parcel Forwarding

Section 407 of the House amendment provided that in the establishment of rates, classifications, rules, or regulations by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, consideration could be given to the type of property tendered for transportation by any freight forwarder engaged exclusively in service with respect to parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight or 100 inches in length and girth combined, with a view to affording rates or charges for such transportation as low as consistent with the receiving of reasonably adequate compensation by such carriers. The Senate bill contained no such provision. This section is retained in the conference substitute, as section 407 thereof, except that it is modified by striking out the word "exclusively", so that it applies in the case of rates, classifications, rules or regulations applicable to transportation of such property for any freight forwarder.

Section 409. Adjustment Period Pending Establishment of Assembling and Distribution Rates

The conference substitute includes the provisions of section 409 of the House amendment permitting the continuance of joint rates between common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders during a temporary period, pending the establishment of assembling and distribution rates pursuant to the provisions of section 408.

The only changes made in this section by the conference substitute are as follows:

(1) The time within which notice must be given to the Commission, or tariffs must be filed with the Commission, under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) is changed from 15 days to 30 days.

(2) That part of paragraph (4) relating to the making of changes in joint rates or divisions is modified so as to permit such changes upon express authority granted by order of the Commission.

(3) Paragraph (6) in the House amendment provided that the filing of tariffs under paragraphs (2) and (3) could be in accordance with the requirements with respect to the form and manner of filing tariffs in effect under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act prior to July 20, 1937. In the conference substitute this date is changed to December 31, 1936.

Section 410 (1). Abandonment of Service

Neither the Senate bill nor the House amendment contained any provision relating to abandonment of freight-forwarder service. The conference substitute, section 410 (1), is a new subsection, providing that no freight forwarder which is controlled by or under common control with a common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of the Interstate Commerce Act shall abandon all or any portion of its service unless and until there shall have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that such abandonment is consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act. Appropriate provisions for enforcement are included. This subsection was included for the purpose of more effectively carrying out the policy of preventing, so far as possible, consequences harmful to the public interest as a result of relationships between operating common carriers and freight forwarders.

Section 411. Relationships Between Freight Forwarders and Other Persons

Subsections (b) and (c) of section 411 of the conference substitute contain provisions which were not contained in the House amendment, and which are based upon provisions contained in section 408 (k) of the Senate bill.

Subsection (b) prohibits any person whose principal business is that of manufacturing and selling and/or buying and selling articles or commodities, and whose business operations are of such a character that services of a freight forwarder or forwarders (or similar assembling, consolidating, and shipping operations performed by such person for itself) are commonly used in connection with the transportation of such articles or commodities, and any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such person, from engaging in service as a freight forwarder, as defined in section 402 (a) (5). It is provided, however, that the Commission shall have power to issue a permit, under section 410, to any such person upon a finding that the proposed service will be consistent with the public interest and with the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, and that the applicant is otherwise qualified. Upon the issuance of such a permit it will, of course, be lawful for such person to engage in service as a freight forwarder in accordance with the terms of the permit granted. The second proviso of this subsection merely extends to those persons covered by the subsection the right to continue operations, after enactment of part IV, pending determination of their applications for permits, if the applicant has engaged in business as a freight forwarder continuously between October 1, 1941, and the date of enactment of part IV.

Subsection (c) of section 411 of the conference substitute provides that after 6 months from the date of enactment of part IV it shall be unlawful for any director, officer, employee, or agent of any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of the Interstate Commerce Act (or for any director, officer, employee, or agent of a person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such a common carrier), in his or their own pecuniary interest, to own, lease, control, or hold stock in, any freight forwarder; except that the holding of a director's qualifying shares of stock, from which no personal pecuniary benefit is derived by the holder, is permitted.

Section 419. Liability for Past Acts and Omissions

Section 419 of the House amendment, because of the unsettled legal status of joint rate arrangements between common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders since the decision of the Commission in the *Acme case* (docket MC–2200) in 1937, provided that no person should be subject to any punishment or liability under the provisions of any Federal statute, on account of any act done or omitted to be done prior to the effective date of part IV, in connection with the establishment, charging, collection, receipt, or payment of rates of freight forwarders, or joint rates or divisions between freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. The Senate bill contained no such provision. Section 419 of the conference substitute is the same as the section passed by the House, except that it grants such immunity from punishment or liability under the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act only. This change accords with the recommendation made by the Attorney General of the United States.

Section 420. Special Powers During Time of War or Other Emergency

Section 420 of the conference substitute provides that section 1 (15), (16), and (17) of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act shall be applicable in the case of service subject to part IV by freight forwarders, with like force and effect as in the case of the carriers to whom such provisions are specifically applicable. These provisions of part I grant to the Commission and to the President special powers with respect to directing the use of equipment and facilities, and with respect to preferences and priority in transportation in time of war or other emergency. This section conforms substantially to section 415 of the Senate bill. The House amendment contained no such provision.

Section 421 (g). Application of Elkins Act

The House amendment, in section 420 (g), made the provisions of the Elkins Act of February 19, 1903, applicable to freight forwarders, and for purposes of enforcement of part IV, except (1) to the extent that such provisions were inconsistent with the provisions of such part IV, or (2) to the extent that such provisions imposed any duty or liability which was also imposed under such part IV. The Senate bill, in section 417 (g), made the Elkins Act applicable without such exceptions. Section 421 (g) of the conference substitute omits these exceptions and makes the Elkins Act applicable to freight forwarder service subject to part IV and to freight forwarders and shippers in respect to such service, and makes such Act applicable for purposes of enforcement of part IV. It further provides that the provisions of such Act shall apply in addition to, and not to the exclusion of, the provisions of part IV.

Provisions not constituting part of proposed part IV of Interstate Commerce Act

Section 5. Numbering of Section 23 of Interstate Commerce Act

Section 10 of the act approved March 2, 1889 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, sec. 49), has for many years been commonly cited and referred to as section 23 of the Interstate Commerce Act and has been carried as such in the compilations printed for the official use of the Commission, although the provision has never been officially designated as section 23. This section is merely for the purpose of officially designating, and authorizing the citation of such provision, as section 23 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Section 6. Effective Dates

Section 6 of the conference amendment, based upon section 5 of the House amendment, relates to the time of taking effect of the provisions of the proposed new part IV. It differs from the House amendment in that instead of providing that section 405 shall take effect in 90 days after the enactment date it provides that such section shall take

effect in 60 days after such date. The postponement of the effective date of other regulatory provisions for 90 days remains as in the House amendment. The change from 90 days to 60 days, in the case of section 405, is for the purpose of correcting a disparity in the time for filing "straight" forwarder rates under section 405 as compared with the time for the filing of temporary joint rates under section 409. The House amendment authorized the Commission to postpone the taking effect of any provision of part IV where found to be necessary or advisable in the public interest, but not beyond July 1, 1942. In the conference substitute this date is changed to September 1, 1942.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
ROBERT CROSSER,
CHAS. L. SOUTH,
LUTHER PATRICK,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us represents much consideration on the part of the committees of the House and of the Senate. I believe the great length of time we have given to this bill is justified in view of what has been accomplished. The result, in my opinion, of this long negotiation and consideration is a better bill. The Senate conferees joined with the conferees of the House in carefully considering practically every phase of the legislation. I am sure they will agree with us that the bill has been improved.

At this time I give particular commendation to the members of the subcommittee of the House who were also conferees for the House on this measure. The work done has resulted in what we believe is a useful and practical system of regulation for freight forwarders. This has been accomplished by the united efforts of every member of the subcommittee. I particularly commend the services of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] who has given much of his time, experience, and ability to this measure. It is fortunate for this country that this body has Members so well qualified by experience and ability to give such service to the Nation.

The effect of this legislation when it becomes law will be to give the freight forwarders a legal status in the transportation system of the country. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court we have for several years had freight forwarders doing a business aggregating approximately $200,000,000 a year, yet not subject to regulation. The evil conditions which attended that situation I am sure are going to be very largely, if not entirely, removed by the enactment of this bill.

This legislation as it passed the Senate and the House was framed along conventional lines of regulation but with particular application to the peculiar or unique conditions of the freight-forwarder business. The enactment of this bill will give the freight forwarders a legal status and place them in their proper relation to the transportation system of the country. Their true field of usefulness is not as a substitute for our regular common-carrier system, but as an auxiliary service which can supplement and improve the carrier supply of the Nation and frequently answer the needs of the small shipper which cannot otherwise be supplied.

The conference report we have before us this morning follows the lines of the bill as passed by the House. You may remember that the House struck out the Senate bill and substituted a House bill, which was accepted as the framework for the conference report now before us. Outside of details, in the main it follows the structure of the House bill.

Much attention was given by the conferees to one section that was not in the House bill. Those were the provisions of section 411 limiting the right of shipper-owners to have an interest in freight forwarders.

After much discussion and consideration a plan was worked out which we think will operate satisfactorily. Freight forwarders owned or controlled by shippers will, like others now operating, have 180 days in which to apply for a permit. If otherwise qualified, the Interstate Commerce Commission will scrutinize the relation of such shipper-owners to the forwarder and its business for the purpose of determining whether or not such a forwarder can be granted a permit consistently with the public interest and with the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act. A forwarder receiving a permit after such inquiry can operate in accordance with its terms.

This places it within the power of the Commission to protect shippers and our transportation system against any unfair practices that might not be otherwise properly controlled under the regulatory provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. In other words, this provision establishes a prohibition against shipper domination of a forwarder's business but provides a practical method by which the inhibition may be removed consistently with the policy of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Some concern has been indicated as to the provisions of section 413 relating to the right of a motor carrier receiving or delivering freight for a freight forwarder to execute bills of lading or shipping receipts or to take a receipt from the consignee on final delivery. This section in effect provides that when the services of a common carrier by motor vehicle are employed by a freight forwarder for receiving property for shipment such carrier may, with the consent of the freight forwarder, execute the bill of lading or shipping receipt for the freight forwarder. In similar terms, the delivering motor carrier is, with the consent of the freight forwarder, authorized to handle the freight and accept a receipt therefor for the freight forwarder.

It will be noticed that these provisions deal with the question of the motor carrier executing one of these instruments for or in behalf of the freight forwarder. The motor carrier, of course, would have no authority for signing such a receipt for the freight forwarder except as authorized so to do by the forwarder. It is the duty of the freight forwarder, in any event, to assume liability under the act regardless of who signs bills of lading or receipts. The object of this provision is to facilitate the shipment and delivery of freight-forwarder traffic at the origin and destination points and to reduce the paper work of handling the freight by eliminating the necessity of duplicating such work required en route to the delivery point.

These provisions, so far as the signature of the motor carrier for the forwarder is concerned, are permissive and dependent upon the consent of the forwarder. Some motor carriers have urged it desirable for two reasons that the motor carrier have a right to sign the bill of lading or take a delivery receipt in his own name. The first reason is based upon the existing practice of motor carriers in giving such bills of lading or receipts in dealing with their usual customers. In some instances, especially in isolated territory, the motor carrier is better known to the shipper than the forwarder. The motor carrier desires to be identified with the transaction in relation to his customer by giving his own bill of lading or receipt.

The other reason urged is that, in some instances, where the forwarder may be unknown to the shipper but the motor carrier may be well and favorably known to such shipper, the giving of the bill of lading or receipt by the motor carrier would tend to give the shipper confidence in the service performed by the motor carrier and thus encourage business.

Under the act as written, the freight forwarder is primarily responsible for the carriage from one end of the line to the other. He has a legal liability for such responsibility that he cannot waive.

This, however, does not preclude the motor carrier from giving his own bill of lading or receipt should he so desire. The responsibility under the bill of lading or receipt that he would give, however, would be different from that required of the freight forwarder, because the motor carrier's bill of lading or receipt would, under such circumstances, rest upon his own contractual obligation. The motor carrier's bill of lading or receipt would not lessen the responsibility of the freight forwarder. Whatever obligation the motor carrier assumed would be on his part and in addition to that assumed by the freight forwarder. The giving or signing of such an instrument by the motor carrier would, of course, not relieve him from his statutory duties to the freight forwarder for the safe and proper transportation of the freight.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] or such time as he may require.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the presentation of this conference report setting forth that the House and Senate conferees have come to an agreement with respect to legislation to regulate forwarders as an agency of transportation brings to an end a long and tedious effort to produce worthwhile legislation.

Too much credit cannnot be given to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and the members of the committee, and, those asscciated with them who have labored together so long and zealously

in an effort to iron out the differences arising from conflicting opinions and interests. It is a pleasure, and source of pride as a member of the committee, to report to the House that these differences have been satisfactorily settled and the legislation now presented to the House, which represents concurrence upon the part of the House and Senate conferees, is good and sound legislation, that recognizes principles of regulation that will provide proper control in the public interest without destroying that which can be used for the public good.

The bill as contained in the conference report which the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has now presented to the House for its approval is a well-considered piece of legislation, worthy to take its place as part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act. As the transportation system of our country has developed, the Congress has provided such regulation as has been deemed necessary and appropriate to the protection of the public and the assurance to it of an adequate system of transportation. The regulation of railroads developed gradually over a period of years, but the more rapid development of the motor carrier industry within the last decade caused the Congress in 1935 to provide in a single measure a virtually complete scheme of regulation for application to motor carriers. This Motor Carrier Act, as amended, is presently known as part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, the original portion, which was applicable primarily to railroads, now being known as part I. As the Members of the House will recall, the Transportation Act of 1940 brought domestic, coastwise, and intercoastal water carriage under Commission control by the enactment of a new part III of the Interstate Commerce Act. The bill now presented for adoption as part IV undertakes to provide suitable regulation for an agency of transportation which, although of more recent growth, has already attained an important place in the handling of package freight, particularly of the higher classes, and in the effective coordination of services of carriers by rail, motor vehicle, and by water.

IMPORTANCE OF THE FORWARDING INDUSTRY

While complete figures of the volume of traffic presently being handled by the forwarding companies are not before us, some idea of the importance of the industry can be gained from the fact that in 1936 the 3 principal forwarding companies, out of some 20 forwarders or carloading companies had a gross revenue of about $102,000,000, which was equal to about 45 percent of the total revenue of the railroads of the country in that year from less-carload shipments. Subsequent to that time a considerable number of additional forwarding operations were begun. The forwarders estimated that in 1940 their total revenues approximated $200,000,000, and apparently their business has been growing steadily.

FORWARDER SERVICE AS A COORDINATOR OF TRANSPORTATION

To an important extent the forwarder business is concerned with long-haul traffic which involves use of the services of more than one carrier with quite frequently of more than one type of carrier. Since shipments tendered to forwarders are customarily handled on their own bills of lading and since they are the only ones with whom the owner of the goods is in privity of contract, the actual carriers of the freight are not, or need not, be known to the shipper. Under this method of freight the forwarder assumes the entire responsibility to its shipper for the accomplishment of a complete transportation service but then makes its own arrangements with carriers of its own choosing for the accomplishment of the actual transportation for it. The forwarder is thus free to select the type of carriage and the particular carriers whose services it will utilize, and the identity of the carriers used by a forwarder in the performance of a particular service may vary from time to time and even from day to day as it may find necessary to the prompt accomplishment of the transportation it has undertaken to provide. Being free to offer service to the shipping public wherever it can obtain transportation service to enable it to effectuate its contracts, a forwarder can and does bring about a practical coordination of the transportation efforts of rail, motor, and water carriers in the movement of the higher grades of less-carload freight.

ABUSES RESULTING FROM AN ABSENCE OF REGULATION

As might be expected, the absence of regulation of the forwarding industry, as in the case of rail and motor carriers prior to the regulation, has been attended by numerous abuses and discriminations to the serious injury of the public and to carriers competing therewith. In addition to this, the competition among rail, motor, and water carriers for the important forwarder traffic resulted in the forwarders being accorded numerous advantages not customarily obtainable by other shippers utilizing such carrier services. These preferences were the subject of an extensive investigation in 1936 and 1937 by the Interstate Commerce Commission in its docket 27365 reports in which were issued in 1938, 1939, and 1941.

THE OBJECTIVE OF FORWARDER REGULATION

In this state of affairs the problem before your committee necessarily involved the bringing forth of a type of regulation which would preserve to the public the inherent and substantial merits of the forwarder method of handling freight while protecting the public from injurious and abusive practices and insuring sound relations as between forwarders and the carriers whose services they utilize so as to preserve a national transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the country and of the national defense.

THE GENERAL PATTERN OF THE PROPOSED REGULATION

As the members would naturally anticipate, the basic pattern of regulation which is proposed for the freight forwarding industry follows along the same general lines as is already embodied in the Interstate Commerce Act in respect to its regulation of carriers by railroad, motor vehicle, and by water. Thus the bill provides that forwarders must file with the Commission and strictly observe their rates, and that such rates must be reasonable. It also requires that forwarders shall avoid undue prejudice, preference, and discrimination as among their shippers. The Commission is given control over their rates so that, upon complaint or through appropriate suspension proceedings, such rates may be brought into conformity with the statutory requirements that they be reasonable and nondiscriminatory. Forwarders, like rail, motor, and water carriers, are required by the bill to file with the Commission reports covering their service. In all these and in various other similar respects the regulation which the bill provides for forwarders closely parallels that which has been applied to carriers now subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FORWARDERS REQUIRING SPECIAL TREATMENT

In certain respects, however, the nature of forwarders and the character of their services do not precisely parallel those of carriers presently subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. Thus, forwarders customarily do not invest large sums of money in property and facilities of transportation and are not themselves the actual transporters of the goods covered by their contracts with their shippers. On the contrary, their ability to perform their contracts is dependent upon their securing transportation services from carriers which perform the physical transportation. Thus, forwarders, unlike railroads, are not confined to a particular territory by the physical location of their properties and facilities, nor, unlike motor carriers, to the utilization of only such transportation facilities as are subject to their ownership or control. Even though they may assume or incur the obligations of a common carrier toward their own shippers, forwarders nevertheless stand in the role of shippers with respect to the actual carriers whose services they utilize. Such distinctions between forwarders and carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act made it necessary to vary, in some respects, the pattern of the regulation to be proposed for them from that which has heretofore been applied to the actual carriers of freight. A brief résumé of the more outstanding departures from customary regulatory provisions, which were occasioned by the special character of forwarding operations, may be of interest to the Members.

1. Joint rates

For many years forwarding or carloading companies have operated wherever they could assemble a sufficient volume of less-carload freight for tendering to the railroads as a single lot at the carload rate. The carload rate was customarily lower, and usually substantially lower, than the less-carload rate which the shipper of small lots would normally have to pay. Frequently the margin or "spread" between the less-carload and the carload rate was sufficient to enable the forwarder to charge its shipper something less than the less-carload rate and thereby to furnish him an inducement to use the forwarding service. However, at

the present time the rates of forwarders to an important extent are no lower than those of rail and motor carriers. Furthermore, the principal forwarders of the modern type, which control the movement of a substantial volume of package freight, can so select the most expeditious means of movement, particularly where the services of two or more carriers or carriers of a different type are used, as to enable them to offer the shipping public a more expeditious service than might otherwise be available and, in any event, a service under a single transportation contract from point of origin to final destination. But even where forwarder's rates are no lower than those of the regulated carriers it was frequently found that the margin between the ordinary less-carload and carload rates would not enable a forwarder to assemble or distribute small shipments by truck for any considerable distance from the concentration or distribution points if necessary to pay the trucker his full regular rate on such small shipments. To meet this condition some of the forwarders originally entered into contracts with truckers whereby they secured special rates lower than those generally available to other shippers. When, by reason of the regulation of motor carriers in 1935, questions arose as to the legality of such special agreements, certain forwarding companies attempted to construe the Motor Carrier Act as covering their own operations and to retain the benefit of the special rate arrangements through the device of filing with the Commission so-called joint rates in which the motor carriers concurred, and out of which the forwarders paid the truckers the same compensation as before as "divisions" of such joint rates.

The question of lawfulness of such joint rates between forwarders and regulated carriers came before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal courts in the Acme case, wherein the Commission held that freight forwarders were not subject to the Motor Carrier Act or as express companies to part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and that their joint rates with motor carriers were unlawful. This holding (17 M. C. C. 549) was sustained by the Federal courts (30 Fed. Sup. 968; 309 U. S. 638). During the pendency of the Acme case, and to protect against the possibility of an ultimate adverse decision therein, certain motor carriers undertook to establish special so-called proportional rates for the forwarders' use, which would have been applicable on less-than-truckload shipments to or from concentration or distributing points for forwarders' traffic. These proportional rates were lower than the regular less-than-truckload rates maintained by the truckers, and were predicated upon the theory that the volume of the forwarder traffic received by the trucker at the distributing point, or delivered by it at the concentration point, represented a difference in circumstances which warranted a difference in rates. Such proportional rates would have approximated the amounts received by the truckers under the old special contracts or received by them as divisions of such joint rates. Proportional rates so published were suspended by the Commission and ultimately condemned by it as unlawful in the *Chicago Heights case* (17 M. C. C. 571). The Commission's decision was sustained by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Trucking Co.* (310 U. S. 344).

As a result of this litigation the Commission entered orders striking from its files the tariffs of forwarders which had been filed with it, including the so-called joint rates with motor carriers. By repeated postponements of the effective dates of such orders, the Commission has withheld requiring compliance with such decisions, awaiting the action of the Congress on regulatory legislation for the forwarding industry.

Although at the outset of the hearings before your committee the forwarders advocated the authorization of joint rates, the evidence presented to the committee of the unsound and essentially vicious character of such joint rate arrangements was so overwhelming as to require us to conclude that such joint rates would be contrary to the public interest and in contravention of the national transportation policy as declared in the 1940 amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. The Interstate Commerce Commission was unanimous in support of this conclusion. The railroads of the country similarly supported this view. At the hearings before your committee the motor-carrier industry expressed opposition to such joint rates unless provision were made for rigid minimum-rate requirements, which latter we found to be impracticable. At the hearings opposition to such joint rates was also expressed by various shippers' organizations, by the railway brotherhoods, and even by some forwarding companies. It is my understanding that at the present time the forwarding industry is not urging authorization of joint rates.

Since forwarders stand in the relation of shippers to the carriers whose services they utilize, and are not restricted in the scope of their operations by the physical location or limitations of transportation properties or facilities held or controlled by them, but are free to contract with their shippers covering the movement of freight between any points where they can profitably operate, the maintenance of joint rates between forwarders and the actual carriers would not parallel the conception of joint rates as authorized by existing portions of the Interstate Commerce Act, but would merely represent a method by which the forwarder could obtain transportation at a lower rate than that open to the shipping public generally. In view of the great traffic controlled by the forwarders and the keenness of competition among the various carriers to obtain such traffic, the authorization of joint rates between forwarders and the actual carriers would inevitably result in the unjustified diversion to the forwarders of important revenues needed by the carriers to maintain a proper public service, with the consequence either that their service would deteriorate or that the public would be burdened by the necessity of increased rates on carrier traffic generally.

2. Assembling and distributing rates. Section 408

It is entirely probable that conformity to the policy of forbidding joint-rate arrangements between forwarders and the actual carriers will result in some instances in slight increases in some forwarder rates to outlying points; but if the existing rate is being maintained only at the expense of impoverishing the trucker which performs the gathering or distributing service, such a change in rate is in the public interest and in harmony with the national transportaton policy. Nevertheless, there may be instances where the conditions of transportation attending the distribution by a trucker of forwarder freight from a distributing point, or the gathering by a trucker of forwarder freight to a point of concentration, may be such as to justify the making of rates therefor on a lower basis than normally on individual shipments between the same stations. In instances of this character there appears to be no good reason for forbidding carriers to maintain special gathering and distributing rates applicable to less-truckload or less-carload shipments. Where the differences in the transportation conditions will justify such differences in rates, it may be possible, despite the elimination of their joint rates, for forwarders to maintain their own rates for the complete service without increase to the public. For these reasons your committee included in the House bill as presented to the House on October 23, 1941, section 408 which authorized the establishment, by common carriers subject to part I, II, or III of the act, of assembling and distributing rates on less-truckload or less-carload traffic. Since that provision is retained in the bill as now presented to the House for its approval, there appears to be no occasion presently to dwell further upon the reasons for and the nature of those provisions. I may say, however, that the explanation I then made to the House with respect to that section, and which appears at page 8218 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, is equally true as of the present time.

3. Period of adjustment. Section 409

In order that the necessary readjustment of existing joint-rate arrangements between forwarders and motor carriers, to conform with the policy of forbidding joint rates between forwarders and carriers by rail, motor vehicle, or by water, may be brought about gradually and with the least inconvenience to the users of forwarder service, and particularly in view of the military requirements of the country, there was embodied in the bill as now presented for your approval section 409 which provides for an 18-month period of adjustment. Under that provision the joint rates between forwarders and motor common carriers, under which they have been operating, whether presently on file with the Commission or not, may be continued in effect during such adjustment period by appropriate filing with the Commission. While the authorization in section 408 of special

gathering and distributing rates in respect of less-carload or less-truckload shipments may enable the forwarders in most instances to maintain their present through rates without increases, it should be realized that there is nothing in the legislation to require motor carriers, railroads, or water lines to make special gathering and distribution rates for less-truckload or less-carload traffic, and that even in cases where they are so disposed to publish such rates, the Interstate Commerce Commission may not find them justified in particular instances. But whether such gathering and distributing rates are established or not within the period of adjustment, the bill contemplates that at the close of such period of joint rates between forwarders and carriers subject to part I, II, or III of the act shall cease to exist.

PRINCIPAL DIFFERENCES IN THE SENATE AND HOUSE BILLS

With respect to the more basic principles of regulation, the Senate and House bills were substantially parallel in their provisions. Aside from various differences in the form of the bills, they contained several differences of a substantial character. The more important of the latter I shall attempt to sketch briefly. But at the outset it is only fair to say that the general adoption of the House provisions rather than those of the Senate bill is, in my opinion, a tribute to our chairman and his committee for the general excellence of the results of his and their labors.

1. Permits versus certificates of convenience and necessity. Section 410

One of the most fundamental points of difference between the two bills related to the nature of the authority which is required to be obtained as a prerequisite to the engaging in forward operations. The Senate bill required that application be made for a certificate of public convenience and necessity which the Commission was empowered to grant or deny according as the facts found by it met such a standard. Under such a plan of regulation special recognition would be given to those already engaged in the business by way of "grandfather" rights. Also inherent in such a system was the requirement of the Senate bill that certificates should meticulously specify the territory within which and the routes over which the operations might be conducted and the assembling and distributing points as well as the off-line points covered by the operating authority.

Because of the comparatively few companies which were engaged in forwarding operations of a public character up to a few years ago, the recognition of "grandfather" rights would have given virtually monopolistic rights to a comparatively few companies.

The bill passed by the House proceeded upon an entirely different theory in respect of the granting of operating authority to do a forwarding business. Thus the House bill contained no provision for certificates nor for the recognition of "grandfather" rights, nor did it provide that the authority granted should specify the precise extent of the operations or the points which should serve as assembling or distributing points or as feeder-line points. On the contrary, the House bill proceeded upon the policy that forwarding operations should be encouraged as the most practicable available means toward securing an integration and coordination of the transportation facilities of the Nation insofar as the handling of less-carload or less-truckload freight is concerned. Thus, while sufficient Commission control should be exercised to facilitate appropriate regulation, to provide for registration, and for the filing of rates, keeping of accounts, the making of reports in customary fasion, the House bill contemplated that authority to conduct forwarding operations should be granted by the Commission to all qualified applicants. Under this type of regulation it would not be necessary for an applicant to prove "public convenience and necessity" as required by the Senate bill, but the grant of operating authority would be appropriate without regard to whether the applicant would compete with existing facilities.

Upon careful consideration of the certificate and permit provisions as contained in the Senate and House bills, respectively, the conferees concluded that the House provisions were more appropriate having regard for the peculiar character of forwarding operations. Thus, while certificate provisions are contained in parts I, II, and III of the Interstate Commerce Act in the case of common carriers by railroad, motor vehicle, and by water, the reasons which were responsible for the certificate provisions as to such carriers do not obtain in the case of freight forwarders. The primary purpose of requiring a certificate as a prerequisite to operation is to protect the public from having to support in provident investments in transportation facilities. Forwarders, however, do not customarily invest any substantial amounts of capital in physical properties or facilities of transportation, but make use of such properties and facilities as may be provided by carriers subject to part I, II, or III of the act.

2. Acquisitions of control. Section 411

Adoption by the conferees of the theory of regulation embodied in the House bill with respect to permits, rather than that expressed in the certificate provisions of the Senate bill, logically necessitated the omission of most of the Senate provisions relating to a strict Commission control of consolidations, unifications, mergers, and acquisitions of control of freight forwarders. The greater freedom, under the House bill, of persons to go into the forwarding business made inappropriate several of the acquisition provisions of the Senate bill. However, the measure now presented to the House for its approval includes several provisions growing out of the differences between the Senate and House bills on the subject of acquisitions of control. Those respectively relating to control by carriers and by shippers merit special notice.

(a) Carrier Control of Forwarders

While both the Senate and House bills permit the control of freight forwarders by common carriers subject to part I, II, or III of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Senate provisions, by reason of their relation to the certificate provisions in the same bill, were more restrictive. In concluding to adopt the more liberal policy expressed in the House amendment, the conferees were impressed by several considerations favoring carrier control of forwarding operations. Among these were the following:

First. The two largest forwarding operations in the country were developed under railroad affiliation and no complaint of their service appears to have been made by the shipping public.

Second. Because of the universality of the service which railroads are required to perform, as among persons, localities, and as to different kinds of freight, their control of forwarding operations would tend to be more universal and less discriminatory than forwarder service conducted by individual operators having narrower rights and obligations.

Third. The investments made by rail, motor, and water carriers in transportation properties, facilities, and equipment furnish a substantial incentive on their part to provide and maintain for the public a permanent and stable service, and as a result their control of forwarding operations should insure to the public a greater permanency of service than if forwarding operations were only in the hands of those who have no real substantial investment in the properties and facilities which make such forwarding operations possible.

Fourth. The needs of commerce, the convenience of the shipping public, and the effectuation of the national transportation policy all require that for the future there shall be a closer and more effective integration of the services of all common carriers of property. Aside from such preferences as freight forwarders have been able to secure, and such competitive advantages as they have had due to an absence of regulation, the rapid rise of the freight forwarding industry in recent years has been due primarily to its accomplishment of an effective coordination of all transportation services under a single responsibility to the owner of the goods. In view of this, it seemed to your committee manifestly unsound and unjust that the Congress should give preference, in the business of integrating and coordinating transportation services, to forwarding companies which have no investment whatever in transportation facilities, equipment, and other properties, and to deny the railroads, the motor carriers, and the water lines which have an investment in the transportation plant of the country, by which the forwarder's service is accomplished, the opportunity to engage, in an appropriate manner, in similar operations upon equal terms.

In order to insure against possible abuses or discriminations by reason of carrier control of forwarders, several safeguards are incorporated in the bill as it now stands. The first of these is found in section 404 (c), which makes it unlawful for any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III of the act to unduly

prefer or prejudice any freight forwarder, whether or not controlled by it. To protect the public against the possibility that a carrier might seek to use a controlled forwarder to discourage other forwarder service and then discontinue the controlled forwarder service, there was incorporated as section 410 (i) a provision that no forwarder controlled by a common carrier subject to another part of the act shall abandon all or any portion of its service without first obtaining from the Commission a certificate that such abandonment is consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy. A still further safeguard is to be found in section 411 (c) which, for the purpose of more effective regulation, provides that any carrier control of a forwarder must be direct, rather than indirect.

(b) Shipper Control of Forwarders

Of the main points of difference between the Senate and House bills, one which required great consideration was the prohibition of shipper control of forwarders as embodied in section 408 (k) of the Senate bill. The House bill contained no such prohibition. During the course of the legislation the Interstate Commerce Commission had expressed its opposition to the principle of shipper control. At the present time there appear to be but a few instances in which a forwarder doing any important public business is controlled by a shipper which also uses its services. Furthermore, in view of the liberal provisions of section 402 (c), which make part IV inapplicable to cooperative or nonprofit forwarding or pool-car operations of a shipper or a group or association of shippers, the restriction of shipper control of forwarders does not appear to be of any considerable practical moment. For these reasons the House conferees have agreed to the provision embraced in section 411 (b), which makes unlawful the shipper control of a forwarder, subject, however, to the Commission's power to issue a permit to such person when consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy, and further subject to the protection of such shipper-controlled operations as may presently be in effect until the further order of the Commission.

3. Single general commodity. Section 402 (b)

As passed by the House on October 23, 1941, section 402 (b) exempted from regulation forwarding operations confined to the handling of a "single general commodity." That expression is omitted in the bill as now presented. Its original inclusion had been for the purpose of equalizing the situation of forwarding operations performed for a group of shippers of the same commodity on a profit basis with the situation of equivalent nonprofit operations which are exempted from regulation under section 402 (c). Opposition to the exemption developed from the Interstate Commerce Commission as setting up too indefinite a standard, and the freight forwarders and some motor carriers also opposed it. Elimination of the provision was not objected to by the National Industrial Traffic League, a country-wide association of shippers. Under these circumstances, and in view of the exemption of nonprofit, cooperative forwarding operations provided in section 402 (c), it was concluded that there was no particular reason for insisting upon retention of the single general commodity provision.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The conference report sufficiently explains the manner in which the differences between the Senate bill and the House amendment were resolved. In general, the balance of the bill now presented is substantially identical with that which was passed by the House on October 23, 1941. At that time I explained and commented on its principal provisions, and, to the extent that they are retained in the present measure, what I there said of them still remains applicable.

THE BILL IS GENERALLY SATISFACTORY TO ALL INTERESTS

Considering the fact that this legislation affected many diverse interests and involved the solution of many complex problems by reason of the peculiar nature of forwarders in their relations to their own shippers and to the carriers whose services they utilize, it is a distinct tribute to the chairman and the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that there is now before you a measure proposing to regulate freight forwarders which so well compromises the differences among the several interests and commands such general support from all. To an unusual degree your committee in the past has enjoyed and, I think, fully warranted, the support of the Members of the House, and in my opinion the general excellence of the regulatory measure now submitted for approval is such as to justify and merit a present reaffirmation of that confidence.

It is high time that the forwarding industry should be regulated. It is inconsistent with the national transportation policy as adopted by the Congress that an agency of transportation doing a national business of the scope of that done by the forwarding industry should go unregulated. While a lack of regulation results in discrimination as among shippers and in injuries to regulated carriers, it is also true that the industry itself cannot properly develop and furnish its best service to the public and contribute most effectively to the national defense if treated as an illegitimate service without the standing which regulation would confer. Because of the complexities of the problem involved in preparing legislation for the regulation of freight forwarders, the Congress, in my opinion, has been wise in not heretofore adopting makeshift measures for its control, but in awaiting the opportunity for a thorough study and considered action. The results of that study are now before the Members of the House in the bill now presented for approval. In my opinion, the bill is a substantial and salutary contribution to the development of an adequate transportation system for the Nation, and one in which the House can take a legitimate pride of accomplishment. It is a pleasure to me to commend this bill to the Members for their favorable consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 65), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in enrolling S. 210, an act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to strike out the word "fifteen" in section 409 (a) (7) contained therein and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, we propose the adoption of this concurrent resolution to correct an inadvertence in preparing the conference report which the House has just adopted.

The conferees agreed to change the time specified in section 409 (a) (1), (2), (3), and (7), as it passed the House, for the effective date of certain tariffs and notice to be given thereof. In each instance, the change agreed upon was to be from "fifteen" to "thirty" days.

Through an inadvertence in preparing the conference report the word "fifteen" in paragraph (7) was not changed to the word "thirty," as the conferees had agreed. The object of this resolution is simply to make paragraph (7) conform to the agreement of the conferees and to harmonize with the related paragraphs in this section.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

POST-OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, for 17 years members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks have been without a raise in pay.

Comparing earnings of the postal clerks with those in equal brackets employed in industry shows a marked discrepancy. It costs just as much for the post-office employee to raise his family as anyone else.

House bill 6486, introduced by Representative MARTIN L. SWEENEY, of Ohio, will correct the situation. Congressman SWEENEY'S bill reclassifies salaries and will enable post-office employees to adjust themselves to higher living costs.

One of my constituents writes:

As a member of the Women's Auxiliary to Local No. 2 may I add my plea to those of our large postal family in hoping that the salary reclassification bill will be favorably taken up by the Members of the House of Representatives.

Our monthly check averages $168.88, which doesn't go far in these days of high cost of living when it must be spent on our family consisting of my husband, our two daughters of 8 and 12 years, and myself.

Mr. Speaker, let us reward faithful, devoted service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VOORHIS of California, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. SHANLEY asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

WHERE DID YOU GET THE MONEY?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein some figures from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SUGAR PRODUCTION

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Times-Herald on the 8th of May.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TIN PROCESSING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I received today the first sample of tin produced in Texas at the new smelter recently erected at Texas City, just 8 miles across the bay from Galveston. In connection with that, I have received the following letter from Mr. J. van den Berg, vice president of the Tin Processing Corporation, which produced this tin from ore brought from Bolivia and from the Netherlands East Indies:

TIN PROCESSING CORPORATION,
Texas City, Tex., May 5, 1942.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD:
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: It is with pleasure that we send you at this time a mold of the first tin produced at the Longhorn smelter, Texas City, Tex., on Easter 1942.

As you will note, it is marked "Longhorn tin," which will remind the consumers that the smelter is located in Texas. The more we have watched the development of the plant and all the factors relating to its economic use, the more we are convinced that Texas was by far the best place to build the smelter.

The smelter was erected by Tin Processing Corporation as the agent of Defense Plant Corporation, and will be operated by Tin Processing Corporation on behalf of Metals Reserve Company.

There are now on hand in Texas City ores from Bolivia and the Netherlands Indies which will be smelted for the benefit of the united war effort. The process being used is that developed at the Arnhem smelter in Holland by the Billiton Co., which was, until the invasion, the largest private tin producer in the Netherlands East Indies.

We believe that the manner of construction of the smelter, the plans for its operation, and the sources of tin ores to be smelted in it constitute another example of the solidarity of the United Nations in the war against the enemies of freedom.

Very truly yours,

J. VAN DEN BERG,
Vice President.

LIVESTOCK PRICES—COST OF PRODUCTION FOR CATTLE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, I read into the RECORD a letter from the Kansas City Live Stock Exchange calling attention to the action of the Office of Price Administration in placing a ceiling on the price of beef at levels prevailing during the Lenten season when the demand and the corresponding price of meats were below normal. The letter pointed out that as a result there was a sharp decline in beef production due to the inevitable loss entailed upon feeders compelled to sell below the cost of production.

This morning I am in receipt of a similar letter from the Live Stock Commission Co., of National Stock Yards, Ill., one of the subsidiaries of the Missouri Farmers Association, the most successful farm cooperative in the Nation, as follows:

MAY 9, 1942.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Wish to advise that the summary of activity on all Corn Belt markets since the price-control announcement was made on finished beef products will show a downward trend of fully $1 per hundredweight. In spots this has been greater, but because of light receipts some losses have been regained, still leaving fully $1 per hundredweight lower, with prospects of heavier cattle receipts indicating a further decline.

These conditions are very disturbing because the Secretary of Agriculture indicated to the farmers that surpluses of all commodities were necessary to win the war. The farmers very graciously complied, and in cattle, as in other commodities, the increase has shown up in the Corn Belt States, where feeding operations are the largest. The increase of cattle in the Corn Belt States will show from 3 to 19 percent larger than the previous all-high time made in 1934, while on cattle in range country, where your replacement cattle come from to be fed in the Corn Belt, it will show from 4 to 20 percent decline from the previous all-high time. Replacement cattle prices have been exceptionally high, and the unfavorable price control on finished products is going to make feeding operations in the Corn Belt, where finished cattle come from, very questionable. Replacement cattle going into the feed lots from western markets on choice quality calves were as high as $14 to $14.50; good calves from $12 to $13. These prices, when considering speculative operations necessary to feed cattle and the necessity of carrying them the time necessary to finish them, create a real hazard.

As you know from experience in feeding cattle, your operations once begun and your program started, it is necessary to carry them a definite length of time to accomplish proper results and in-between times until the proper finish is obtained, your market has stagnated as to getting your money out of your raw product. This, in some instances, is entirely different from hogs, as a 6-month period will make a hog from beginning to end and at all stages of the growing period of a hog there is a ready cash market.

The withdrawal of orders for stocker and feeder cattle in the last 2 weeks plainly indicates the trend of the farmers' and feeders' minds as to feeding operations. The inquiry from farmers feeding cattle for market has placed the livestock commission man in a very peculiar position. Conditions beyond the market's control and the abnormal flow of fluctuating conditions because of price fixing on finished products does not give any basis for endeavoring to determine any set program.

The time-honored "supply and demand" operations determining market prices and conditions are completely out at this particular time, yet with the surpluses in the country and the knowledge that all price regulations are more or less controlled by surpluses, it leaves the farmer and stock feeder in a very unsatisfactory position. He has

created these surpluses through the encouragement of the Department of Agriculture and definitely knows that they can be used to hammer down his prices far below the cost of production, which leaves him in the position of putting his entire trust in the Department of Agriculture as to fair marketing prices for raw materials. If these conditions are not maintained at a satisfactory level, the present state of mind of the farmer and feeder is to cut down his operations.

Very truly yours,

F. B. YOUNG, *Manager*.

Mr. Speaker, reports from all exchanges corroborate the statements from the Kansas City, Mo., and National Stock Yards, Ill., markets. The following Associated Press release from the Chicago market is typical:

CATTLE SHIPMENTS REDUCED SHARPLY—PRODUCERS WITHHOLDING ANIMALS AS RESULT OF PRICE DECLINES

CHICAGO, May 7.—Cattle producers, reacting quickly to sharp price declines since the Office of Price Administration's announcement that ceilings would be imposed on dressed beef, have reduced substantially shipments to all major markets.

A drop of 25 cents to $1 a hundred pounds in values late last week, followed by another 50-cent decline Monday, convinced producers that their best course in resisting the downturn was to curtail marketings. Livestock circles acknowledged today that producers had gone into curtailment with a vengeance.

Reversing the trend of earlier this year, cattle offered for sale in 12 principal centers in the first 3 days this week totaled 102,300 head against 129,800 in the comparable 1941 days. In the same period last week, 149,200 salable head arrived.

This made a distinct contrast to April, when 767,439 salable head arrived at the same 12 markets compared with 659,696 in April 1941. For the first 4 months this year salable receipts totaled 2,996,157 head against 2,521,271 in 1941.

A feature of the cattle runs was the practically complete absence of choice or prime steers. With packers reducing the premiums normally paid for such offerings, the supply has consisted mainly of mediocre grades. Early last week, before the Office of Price Administration's order, choice cattle brought $17.25 a hundred pounds at Chicago. The top this week, established Wednesday, was $15.75—paid for much less attractive quality.

The Office of Price Administration's order sets dressed beef ceilings, both wholesale and retail, at the highest price prevailing during March. Livestock circles said that during April cattle prices had risen above March quotations. If dressed beef could not be sold above March peaks, they said, it therefore would be necessary to lower cattle prices.

Mr. Speaker, the highest military authorities have testified before the committees of the House that food is the most essential munition of war. Makers of all other munitions are receiving the highest wages and largest profits ever paid. But the Price Administration expects the farmers to produce at a loss. And I have no doubt they would if it were possible. The farmers have continued to produce uncomplainingly under the most adverse conditions and at the lowest rates of compensation received by any industry or group in the Nation. But conditions and costs of production become daily more difficult and expensive. I desire to quote from a letter from a man favorably known to every Member of the House. He served here for many years with distinction. His letter is as follows:

MAY 8, 1942.

DEAR CLARENCE: The farm-labor situation is becoming increasingly acute. I am just in receipt of a letter from a prominent farmer and livestockman, from which I quote:

"There is great danger in a break-down in farm production unless there is a correction made in farm labor. Farmers are not taking favorably to the city help of older men who are not able to do farm work or stand summer heat. Men who were raised on farms and have been off the farm are unfamiliar with farm work today and farmers are not going to risk men who know but little about expensive farm machinery, running same for them. It is hard to get repairs today and getting worse."

He might have added that with the present prices of livestock it would be very risky for farmers to depend on men for handling their flocks and herds, unless they are experienced in handling livestock. This farm labor situation is becoming more serious all over the Nation. In the Middle West it is exceedingly difficult to secure capable farm labor, and I have observed an increasing tendency to reduce cropping operations and seed the lands to grass because adequate and competent farm help is not obtainable. I know you are giving this phase of the agricultural situation careful and sympathetic consideration. I am writing you, not in a complaining spirit, but in order to emphasize the importance of a reasonably adequate supply of farm labor if the American farmers are expected to meet the production requirements of the present national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH F. LOZIER.

Mr. Speaker, the situation here presented is of more than passing interest. It is fraught with momentous consequences. Meat is essential to health and efficiency both in the front-line trenches and in the factory supplying the men in the trenches. Unless the Price Administration proposes to deprive our armies and workers of one of the most important and essential items of diet, it should immediately readjust its ceilings to permit the farmers to make at least their costs of production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief article published in the Eagle magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by a Statewide N. Y. A. advisory committee asking that N. Y. A. be continued as a training school.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the legislative business and following any other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

STATE TRADE BARRIERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any previous special orders I may be permitted to address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in Barron's Financial Weekly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, reference is made to the mileage yardstick which will be used in connection with the gasoline-rationing program which takes effect this week. This is a fair yardstick for nonessential and ordinary driving in noncongested areas, but, Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to espouse the cause of the motorist who must thread his tortuous way through congested city traffic, such as exists in my home city of New York and right here in Washington. It is a matter of common knowledge that it takes at least one-third longer to drive 6 miles through city traffic such as we have in New York and in Washington than it does in the rural or suburban areas, and the amount of gasoline consumed is proportionately larger.

There is virtually no idling of the motor in driving from home to work and back again on a fairly open road, but the worker whose route from home to work is along crowded city streets with traffic signals at every corner does not have this advantage. Hence, in rationing gas-

oline to the city motorist it is only fair and right, in my judgment, that the amount of his allotment be gaged not only by the mileage necessary for him to travel to and from his place of work but also by the more than average length of time involved and the resulting larger consumption of gasoline in making the trip, because of traffic conditions. I express the earnest hope that the officials in charge of gasoline rationing will carefully weigh this proposal in connection with the formulating of the final rationing schedules.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by my distinguished friend the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, delivered at the commencement exercises at Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind., May 10, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial from the Endicott Daily Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BASE PAY FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the bill to raise the base pay of soldiers and sailors of the forces of the United States will be brought up tomorrow. I rise to extend my sincere respects and appreciation to the Committee on Military Affairs for the patriotism of its members which has motivated their action. I commend their willingness to consider what I believe to be one of the most important and pressing problems that the Nation has to face today. The Congress has seen fit to double the base pay from $21 to $42 of every man in the armed forces of the United States. I hope that this is only the beginning of benefits to soldiers and sailors who are fighting the battles against the aggressors of the world and that in due time we will give consideration to other benefits for the men in our armed forces.

PLIGHT OF SMALL INDUSTRY

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks by the insertion of an editorial from the Des Moines Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an editorial tribute to a distinguished Member of the other body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Also, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a series of short newspaper comments by South Dakota newspapers on the South Dakota primaries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of certain excerpts from the War Department records with reference to class B retired Army officers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STATE TRADE BARRIERS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], is eminently sound in inveighing against trade barriers that keep out certain dairy products from New York City. I inveigh against those trade barriers also. Restrictions of this sort are only sound if they be in the interests of public health—to keep out, for example, milk-borne disease. But too often they aid selfish dairy interests to keep out wholesome food and thus limit the supply, causing higher prices.

Apropos those trade barriers I call attention, for example, to the situation with reference to migratory laws. It is estimated that 4,000,000 persons migrate across State lines seeking employment in agriculture and in war industry and that antimigratory laws in 27 States and settlement laws in 25 States tend to stop the free movement of workers to areas where their services are needed.

This Balkanization of our States must stop. The States have had their chance to remedy the situation and have fumbled the ball. The President as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, in furtherance of our war effort, must now carry the ball and wipe out these trade barriers, lock, stock, and barrel. He must do this for the duration. After peace the States must get together to arrange for uniformity of these restrictions that are reasonable and to arrange for repeal of such as may be unreasonable and inimical to the national welfare. And if the States do not or cannot act voluntarily and successfully, Congress must step in.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a memorandum therewith with respect to the pay bill that is to be considered tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein excerpts from the War Department records with reference to class B retired Army officers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution from the Dairy Farmers' Protective League of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks and include an editorial from the Bakersfield, Calif., paper on the Central Valley project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Illinois State Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF THE HEALING ART IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6362) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, and I ask unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"During the month of December each year, every person holding a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia issued by the Commission on Licensure shall register with the secretary-treasurer of said Commission his name and office address and such other information as the Commission may deem necessary upon blanks obtainable from said secretary-treasurer and thereupon pay a registration fee of $2, said fee to be paid in the manner provided in section 44 of said act.

On or before the 1st day of December each year it shall be the duty of the secretary-treasurer to mail to each person holding a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia issued by the Commission on Licensure, at his last-known address, a blank form for registration. Every person holding more than one type of license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia issued by the Commission on Licensure shall be required to register each license separately. In the event of failure to register on or before the 31st of December a penalty of $5 will be imposed which shall be paid in the manner provided in section 44 of said act. Should the licentiate fail to register and pay the penalty imposed, and continue to practice his profession in the District of Columbia, he shall at the end of 10 days from said date be considered as practicing without a license and penalized as otherwise provided in this act.

"Upon receipt of the application blank properly executed together with the $2 registration fee the registrant shall be mailed a registration card showing that the registration fee has been paid for the coming calendar year.

"On or before the 1st day of April each year, the said Commission shall cause to be printed and mailed to each person who shall have registered in accordance with the provisions of this section a list of the names of all such registered persons."

SEC. 2. Section 44 of said act is amended by striking therefrom the following language: "except such as may be incident to criminal prosecutions and to supervision and investigation with a view to criminal prosecution, the cost of which shall be paid from appropriations in the same manner as the expenses of other criminal prosecutions and supervisory work and investigations incident thereto are paid."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation which is brought to the House from your Committee on the District of Columbia, is to provide the Commission on Licensure in the District of Columbia with sufficient funds to carry on its work and permit the use of those funds within the Commission in making investigations of the illegal practice of the healing arts in the District of Columbia.

This bill provides that there would be an annual registration of all physicians in the District of Columbia and that they would pay for that registration a fee of $2. Practically every State in the Union has an annual registration. It is necessary that the Commission operate within its own funds, and there has been a very real need for this added sum.

Many physicians of the District have approved the measure, and the Health Department and the District Commissioners are very much interested in its passage.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr, RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As "mayor" of the District, I wish to ask the gentleman this question, because I know the gentleman is trying to see that the funds of the District are spent properly and correctly. Last week I made a statement on the floor that the $1,000,000 that was appropriated to the District for the purpose of civilian defense and black-outs was not used properly.

I mentioned the fact that money was spent for the Housing Commission and for the Boxing Commission. I was called on the telephone by Mr. Claude Owen, Boxing Commissioner, who said that the Boxing Commission did not receive any of that money. So, if that is the case, I want to apologize for making that statement, because I do not want to criticize anybody unjustly. I would like to know whether the "mayor" can tell us whether he knows if that money was spent properly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will say in answer to the gentleman's observation that I have always found the gentleman very diligent in following through on these matters after we have appropriated money, in order to see that the money is properly spent. All of us share in that feeling. I was not on the floor at the time the gentleman made his remarks about the disposition of funds under the so-called black-out or civilian-defense bill. However, I took occasion to tear from the RECORD the speech which the gentleman made and sent it to the Board of Commissioners, and especially to Mr. John Russell Young, the Commissioner who is coordinator for civilian defense in the District of Columbia. I knew there had been an error in the gentleman's remarks relative to the expenditure of funds for the Boxing Commission, but I knew perhaps that was an inadvertent remark and I did want to investigate to see just where these funds have gone. I have not yet received an official reply from Mr. Young, but I am sure it will be forthcoming.

I have every reason to believe that the funds which this Congress appropriated have been properly spent for the purposes for which we made them available.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know whether any of this money was spent for the Housing Commission?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Not for the Housing Commission.

There was some money spent for the so-called Rent Control Administrator's Office of the District of Columbia. It was thought by the Commissioners when they had no funds that they could properly take from this fund which had been provided, to operate at the very outset this Rent Control Administrator's Office. It was very necessary that it begin to function as of January 1, 1942. I think the position of the Commissioners, which will be explained fully in the communication to the committee will set forth their belief that part of the civilian defense program here in the District of Columbia in this emergency was the better control of rents of the thousands and thousands of workers who come here from the districts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other Members to work in this program.

Mr. RICH. Will the money that has been expended for rent control be returned for the purposes of civilian defense at some time later when they get their new appropriations?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true; that is the purpose; yes.

Mr. RICH. I should not want to charge the Boxing Commission with getting this money if after proper investigation we find the money was not expended by this Commission. I do not want to do anybody an injustice.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is fair. I appreciate the spirit in which he approaches this problem.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania took this matter up on the day we passed the bill making the regular appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Following the disposition of that bill.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not at that time have all of the facts on the black-out or the District of Columbia civilian-defense funds. Since that time I have made a very thorough investigation, and I have practically all the answers to the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert this matter in the RECORD at this point in order to clarify this entire situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was absolutely within his rights in asking those questions. I feel that when he reads this explanation he will be very well satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues has made some inquiry regarding the recent bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. He indicated some fear that money appropriated was not being expended for the purposes intended. I assure you that your committee has made every effort to guard these expenditures carefully. One reference was made to the effect that Congress has already appropriated a million dollars for civilian defense. I feel some explanation is due to the membership.

In the first place Congress never gave a million dollars for civilian defense in the District of Columbia. Congress authorized the District to borrow $1,000,000. The District taxpayers must pay it all back.

My colleague stated, "I understand for this amount of money for each sector they have been able to furnish one stirrup pump and one load of sand."

In reply to this statement we can inform you that the District has not furnished any stirrup pumps or sand to the sector posts. To equip each of the 2,400 sector posts with one stirrup pump would have required an expenditure of $31,800 for this item alone. From this it can be readily seen what the cost would have been to equip completely each post with barrels, buckets, radios, ropes, furniture, first-aid kits, log books, and so forth.

However, the Air Raid Warden Service has been furnished with 20,000 helmets, temporary arm bands and whistles, post signs, necessary training equipment, and emergency feeding equipment and supplies. The Commissioners have allotted a total of $62,795 for this service.

In addition, we have provided for the following major items from the $1,000,000 loan:

First. Complete equipment for 5,000 auxiliary policemen, including helmets, visibility belts, badges, raincoats, batons, and overseas caps. Provision has been

made for 30 scout cars equipped with two-way radios and sirens. Salaries have been provided for 50 police defense guards, together with the furnishing of uniforms and necessary equipment. The cost for services and equipment for the Police Department will be approximately $150,000.

Second. For equipment for the communication service, the Commissioners allotted $180,084, of which $131,000 was to provide for the purchase and installation of air-raid sirens. Many of these have been installed and are now operating from central control. The delay in delivering and installing these horns is due to difficulty in obtaining priorities, but to date we have installed 38 electric sirens, 16 steam horns, and one air horn. There are 14 more steam horns to be installed, and 21 more air horns. When completed, we will have a stand-by system so that if one goes out, the other will be available. In our opinion, when completed, the District alarm system will be about the best in the United States.

Third. For sand bags, $75,000 has been allotted, and 135,000 burlap bags have been delivered and are now in storage. In addition, bids will be opened Monday, May 11, for 200,000 more sand bags. Four hundred tons of sand have also been ordered.

Fourth. Due to the withdrawal of military forces guarding the District's water supply, the Commissioners were required to replace these troops with 230 civilian guards. Of this number more than 150 are patrolling Federal areas outside the District of Columbia. The cost of this guard service, including maintenance of automotive equipment, is $107,000 for the 5-month period, February 1 to June 30, 1942. In addition, provision has been made for motor vehicles, buildings, roadways, and telephone facilities, at a cost of $52,500.

Fifth. An allotment of $56,850 has been made to provide equipment for emergency repairs to the water and sewer systems.

Sixth. The purchase of all necessary items at an estimated cost of $20,000 has been authorized to provide equipment for 28 fire rescue squads. Most of this equipment has now been ordered by the fire department.

Seventh. In addition to the above, funds have been allotted for miscellaneous items, including black-out masks for head and tail lights of all District-owned motor vehicles, $4,000; stretchers for taxicabs, $2,075; street lighting control, $10,000; and black-out units for traffic lights, $14,665.

Eighth. Exclusive of the guard service, an amount of $119,159 is set aside as a fixed charge to cover the cost of personal services for the various activities under civilian defense for a period of 1 year.

As of this date, the Commissioners have authorized the expenditure of $958,275 from this fund for what we consider purely civilian defense needs.

The Boxing Commission has never sought to obtain one penny or anything of value out of this fund.

Between December 29 and February 18 the Commissioners allocated $15,560 for the rationing board, of which only $4,326 had been spent as of March 31, when the Federal Government took over; $3,225 was allocated for furniture and supplies, of which amount $400 still remains available. This was a job that had to be done, and the Federal Government had called upon the District to do it by furnishing quarters, furniture, supplies, and personnel. I do not believe it is contemplated that the District will get any of this back, nor is it being sought.

Congress further provided for a Rent Commission, and the Commissioners found that they had not asked for a sufficient amount to provide adequate personnel for that Commission, and until the regular District bill is finally approved this additional personnel is required to keep that office in operation. Fortunately, we did not have to spend any large sums of money for furniture. Of the amount allocated, $1,952 has been spent, and $7,098 remains available for expenditure until July 1. These two agencies are directly connected with wartime activities.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT OF PERU TO THE CHAMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints at this time the following Members: Messrs. McCORMACK, MARTIN of Massachusetts, BLOOM, and FISH, as a committee to escort from the Senate Chamber to the House Chamber a distinguished guest, the President of Peru.

READJUSTMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following report on the bill S. 2025 to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service (Rept. No. 2107) which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or Committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three particulars: In one, to include a telegram I have sent; in the second, to include a report on the production of war materials; and in the third, to include an editorial from the Eagles magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1:01 o'clock p. m.

THE PRESIDENT OF PERU

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is in the city a distinguished citizen of a friendly country to our south, the President of the Republic of Peru. I think it fitting and proper that the Members should have the privilege of meeting our distinguished guest.

I therefore move that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess the following occurred:

The President of Peru and his party entered the Chamber at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., and the President of Peru was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by Mr. BLOOM.

The SPEAKER. It is my great pleasure, my high privilege, and my distinguished honor to present the President of a great, a proud, and a friendly republic, the President of the Republic of Peru.

The PRESIDENT OF PERU. Members of the House of Representatives: Gentlemen, it is indeed a high honor which the Congress of the United States, worthy guardian of the traditions of freedom, law, and justice of the great American Nation and faithful interpreter of its will throughout its existence, grants to me today and which I acknowledge and gratefully accept in the name of the Peruvian people.

Honorable legislators, I bring you a message from my country, one that bears the solemn accent of all multitudinous expressions defining the thoughts and attitudes of peoples, when in the epochal moments of their history, vital interests of humanity are found to be at stake, imperatively claiming from them the active participation which it is their duty to give in order to mark the great paths of history.

It has fallen to our lot to live the most tragic and somber hours since the moment when man began his arduous ascent on the millenary ladder of progress, for at no other time has the struggle been so vast between the forces representing a past of enslaving despotism and a future holding high the banners of democracy, wherein we find inscribed in shining characters the principles of equality among men and nations.

Peru, born to independent existence and proclaiming, as did all the nations of America, her republican convictions, a country which throughout her history has endeavored to render invariable homage to the rights of all peoples to decide each their own destiny and to regulate their relations on the basis of mutual respect, whatever their differences of material might, could not hesitate for a single moment in adopting a definite and decided position in the face of the outbreak of forces which are trying to drown in blood every notion of freedom in order to perpetuate over the planet a system of racial hegemony, that it is to everybody's interest to abolish wherever it may be found.

America, the refuge of liberty and democracy, constitutes an immovable barrier against which any attempt to annul the historical efforts and experiences of more than a century carried out under our founding institutions will be shattered.

In order that the American continent may fulfill that mission, as defender of human culture and of the eternal values of the spirit, it was necessary that the nations composing it, rising above all narrow interest, should form a united and indissoluble front, identified by the cult of the same ideal and by the same indestructible faith in the conquest of a common destiny.

And thus at this moment, which will mark an epoch in the history of the continent, a new economic and social policy is being crystallized which will guide in its main directions the relations of the people of this hemisphere, within a concept that is eminently humane, constructive and guarantor of the intangibility of its democratic institutions and its independence.

We must admit, with fortitude, that events have caught us by surprise and that they have had an enlightening effect compelling us to adopt without delay important rectifications and to become integrated spiritually and materially as a great geographic unity, endowed with all the elements necessary to the full and harmonious development of our life and our culture.

We are thus faced with the urgent task of organizing at a rapid pace the exploitation of our natural resources within a vast integrated plan of research, inventory, and preparation of the constructive elements, along with the factors of communication and transport, so that we may immediately and efficiently set in motion the extensive and complex mechanism of our primary production and its industrial processing in that measure made necessary in order to satisfy the needs of our population and the enormous and urgent demands of the war.

And I have the intimate satisfaction of announcing, honorable legislators, that the cooperation of Peru is destined to represent a factor of real importance in the solution of the common problems of the defense of our continent, furnishing as it does without reservations the great possibilities that its territory offers in its rich virgin forests, in its majestic mountain ranges enclosing great mineral and hydroelectric wealth, in its fertile valleys, in its copious rivers, in its mild climate, and in the proverbial tranquillity of the ocean along its shores; in all this magnificent background, wherein portentous civilizations now lost in the mists of the past once flourished, and wherein today a people whose blood unites the virtues of the native and the Spanish races is engaged in fulfilling the imperatives of the hour with indomitable decision and absolute faith for the triumph of the principles that inspire the great cause of democracy.

This is a noble task, honorable Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, which the peoples of America are fulfilling in obedience to the mandate of the fathers of independence, who in a magnificent constellation shine everlastingly in the skies of the New World, and whose august memory I wish to evoke in this place of justice and of law as symbols of our republican creed.

The great democracy of the United States, in whose hands God has placed today the destinies of mankind, is fulfilling that historic mission as the brain, heart, and propelling impulse of the titanic fight for freedom and democracy, which uses the whole world for its stage and in quest of which she is contributing unstintingly the high virtues of her people and her formidable capacity for organization, discipline, and toil, such as has permitted her to secure in a short time an unsurpassed military power not only for her own direct action but to serve as a gigantic and inexhaustible arsenal for all the democracies of the earth. The vigorous and effective cooperation of the United States reaches every corner where the battle is being waged for democracy, justice, and right; that is to say, for the survival of sovereign nations and freemen.

In the name of Peru, whose destinies I have the honor to guide, I reiterate in this supreme moment her spontaneous adherence to the international policy of President Roosevelt, maximum incarnation of the democratic ideal, and I reaffirm my unbreakable faith that, however strong the forces of oppression and despotism and however painful the sacrifices imposed upon the peoples fighting for the rights of civilization, they will be vanquished and the sun of liberty will once again shine for all men of good will.

Honorable legislators, as long as I live I shall always remember these transcendental mor ents and the homage with which your generosity overwhelms me. We are identified in the same beliefs and the same objectives and we have met today in this temple of democracy to temper our spirits and to renew before the guiding spirits of the fathers of our liberty our solemn vow to preserve unharmed the patrimony of freedom that they forged with their own lives and which we have received as a sacred heritage, which, embellished and increased, we must hand over to posterity.

The expectations of the world are now centered upon this continent, the favorite home of liberty. And America, gentlemen, is demonstrating with extraordinary eloquence that, consistent with its honorable traditions, it is worthy of the confidence of mankind and that it knows how to fulfill faithfully the mandates of history which have designed for it a destiny of struggles and glories.

The supreme objective of the present hour is to win. The goal to be reached is victory. In order to insure it we must coordinate with severe precision all, absolutely all, our economic and social activities so that the mobilization of the material and spiritual resources of each nation will respond with accuracy and with maximum efficiency to the execution of the plans for action and for reciprocal collaboration between all those peoples who in the defense of democracy find themselves associated in this painful tragedy.

It is indispensable that the men who have the responsibility of conducting the destiny of the nations, looking to the future above the terrible drama of the war, should search within the very depth of these events the great and fundamental orientations of the future. It is necessary that out of the chaos visiting the world today there shall rise an invincible will to prevent that present or future generations may again be thrust into a similar catastrophe. The present moment imposes the duty of taking action, not only in obedience to an instinct of self-preservation in the face of danger but also to formulate a declaration of faith in the eternal principles of Christianity, which provides an inexhaustible source of just standards of equality and high morale to govern life, to promote progress, and to assure the welfare to all human beings. If the war is followed by mystification, misery, and confusion, then the blood-sweat, and tears of today will have been shed in vain. Only the rule of justice, as the supreme law of the relations of men and of nations, will make it possible to overcome the disquieting uncertainty of post-war days.

In the face of the thirst for justice and the necessity that humanity feels for reparation, it is our unavoidable duty to open the wide roads that shall carry us to the most ample realization of the common ideals of the democratic creed whose basic principles are imbedded in the flags of all the nations of the continent: rehabilitation of the rights of man, of the family, of the free institutions of culture, and of the nations, as expression of the historic realities which, im-

pressing special characteristics upon the people, far from engendering antagonisms between them should enrich and accelerate their evolution within a constructive universal cooperation, only means of laying the foundations for a perpetual peace in which man and society attain the fullness of their harmonious development and their happiness.

The President of Peru stood in the Well of the House and was presented to the Members individually by Mr. BLOOM.

At 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m. the President of Peru and his party departed.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings had in recess will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

JOSEPH SHARFSIN, ESQ.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6925) to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to pay to Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., of the Philadelphia, Pa., bar, 5 percent of the amount awarded to and received by the District of Columbia in cause entitled "In re First and Final Account of Girard Trust Co., Trustee Under Deed of Trust of Helen M. Fink (now deceased), dated April 10, 1929," in addition to the compensation heretofore paid him for professional services rendered to the District of Columbia in said cause, and an appropriation for said purpose from any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated is hereby authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] is necessarily absent today. He has submitted an extension of remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars: In one, to include an editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "W. P. A. In Time of War;" and in the other, to include an editorial from the Boston Post entitled "Army-Navy Relief."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FLAHERTY]?

There was no objection.

THE SPLENDID WORK OF THE UNITED STATES FLYERS; NEED FOR AVIATION EDUCATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, we have read with real interest and gratification the official announcement made by our War Department of the splendid work which our Army flyers did in connection with the bombing of Tokyo and other cities of the Nipponese Empire.

We know also that in this battle of the Coral Sea, on which no United States official communiques have come as yet as to the actual destruction to the enemy, much of the success for the United States and the allied forces has come through the striking power of our Navy flyers.

I have today introduced H. R. 7069 providing for a plan of aviation instruction in the high schools of the country as a proper approach to this very important problem of continuing our leadership in this decisive field. Not only now but in the future. Our youth can and must be taught aviation. Representatives CURTIS, of Nebraska; BRADLEY of Michigan; and STEFAN, of Nebraska, have expressed a desire for such an educational program. I feel they join me in this bill's purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Joseph B. Eastman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Wood County Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

WILL THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES SURVIVE THE WAR?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great objections to war is that in time of war the ordinary principles of democracy do not work fast enough to quickly muster the full force of the Nation's defenses. In times of such stress, action and not debate becomes our chief weapon of defense. That has always happened and will always happen in time of war.

In the Civil War, for example, there was much fear expressed that civil deliberation that had given way to military expediency was to be lost to the people. After the election of General Grant to the Presidency, publications appeared in many quarters announcing that Grant would now become emperor and our democracy would be lost. I have before me now a pamphlet proclaiming the death of democracy and the rise of Grant, the emperor.

In the first World War the same fear was expressed and more was written then about the loss of democracy than following the Civil War.

So it is now; the President is charged with planning to take over completely the reins of Government and suspend democracy for some new form of government not definitely described.

Food rationing, gasoline rationing, building and manufacturing rationing, sales rationing, purchase rationing, and all kindred planning is pointed out as indicative of the defeat of democracy. The most vital of all restrictions pertains to free speech and a free press under the first amendment to the Constitution in the Bill of Rights. This reads:

Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

If the national defense can best be served by restrictions on food and every other activity of a citizen there is no reason why our so-called free speech and free press may not also be circumscribed during a war emergency.

In order to curtail the right of free speech and of the press in our present emergency, it is not necessary for Congress to pass any law at all. Hence, the provision of the first section of the Bill of Rights does not mean much for the reason that Congress will not pass any such law as is therein described.

The power of the President in time of war, and especially at this time, under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act and the War Powers Act, is broad enough to do anything that is, in his judgment, necessary in the defense of this Nation. Each and every department of the Government is commanded to cooperate with the President in the national defense.

If the national defense can best be served by denying a citizen the free use of rubber, gas, iron, or any other product needed by the Government, the President has the right to order that done without any further act from Congress. In fact, the only power which Congress still retains is the power to make appropriations, and should Congress refuse to make appropriations for our defense, another Congress would forthwith be elected and the new Congress would follow the demands of the people.

If, in the judgment of the President, through his advisers, departments, agencies, the Army, the Navy, and the air force, certain forces must be put in operation to unify the national defense, the command of the President is final. No one will fight rationing; if anyone did, where would he begin the fight? How would he begin it, and to what court would he go?

On the question of free speech and a free press, the matter is more difficult to understand. The Bill of Rights on that subject makes no mention of free speech during war as distinguished from free speech during peacetime. As far as the law goes—that is, constitutional law—it would seem that any person can speak what he pleases during peacetimes and during wartimes. Yet, as a matter of common sense, we know that during a war period there is a check to every activity of every citizen, including the right of free speech.

In *Schenck* v. *United States* (1918, 249 U. S. 47), Justice Holmes, delivering the unanimous decision of the Court, said:

> We admit that in many places and in ordinary times the defendants in saying all that was said in the circular would have been within their constitutional rights. But the character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done. * * * The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic. It does not even protect a man from an injunction against uttering words that may have all the effect of force. * * * The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree.
>
> When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right.

In *Frohwerk* v. *United States* (1918, 249 U. S. 204), unanimous opinion:

> We think it necessary to add to what has been said in *Schenck* v. *United States*, only that the first amendment, while prohibiting legislation against free speech as such, cannot have been, and obviously was not intended to give immunity for every possible use of language. * * * We venture to believe that neither Hamilton nor Madison, nor any other competent person then or later, ever supposed that to make criminal the counseling of a murder within the jurisdiction of Congress would be an unconstitutional interference with free speech.

There is no particular formula to follow in determining what speech will or will not be allowed in time of war. This much is certain, however, that every citizen has the right to criticize the President, the Congress, or any other agency of government with respect to the conduct of the war. No President has ever objected to such criticism, and, in fact, one President—President Wilson, in signing the Espionage Act of 1917—said:

> I shall not expect or approve any part of this law to apply to me or any of my official acts, or in any way to be used as a shield against criticism.

But free speech does not give the speaker the right to stand on a street corner and advise a mob to blow up the White House and kill the President, who is conducting the war. These two examples represent, in the main, the limits of free speech and a free press. In between these two formulas are other examples of speech which may or may not be permitted. Each case must necessarily stand on its own feet and no formula can be given. The particular facts and circumstances surrounding the utterance must be taken into consideration. The opinion of Justice Holmes, however, is a pretty complete statement of the limits of free speech.

In a war such as we are now engaged unity of action is necessary. We have millions of men under arms, and these millions will soon be exposed to shot and shell. That thousands will be killed goes without saying. We must support these men with every ounce of our energy, and that cannot be done to the full measure unless we are completely united in the effort. A speech, therefore, advising disunity, advising the abandonment of our men in action, advising the surrender of our forces, obviously would not be permitted, and one who would utter such sentiments would, in due course, be convicted.

The trouble with the execution of a law abridging free speech was seen and eloquently expressed by Federal Judge Charles F. Amidon, of North Dakota, during the first World War.

> Only those who have administered the Espionage Act can understand the danger of such legislation. When crimes are defined by such generic terms, instead of by specific acts, the jury becomes the sole judge, whether men shall or shall not be punished. Most of the jurymen have sons in the war. They are all under the power of the passions which war engenders. For the first 6 months after June 15, 1917, I tried war cases before jurymen who were candid, sober, intelligent businessmen, whom I had known for 30 years, and who under ordinary circumstances would have had the highest respect for my declarations of law, but during that period they looked back into my eyes with the savagery of wild animals saying by their manner, "Away with this twiddling, let us get at him." Men believed during that period that the only verdict in a war case, which could show loyalty, was a verdict of guilty. (See p. 70, Chaffee.)

Regarding a speech made by a member of the Nonpartisan League, Judge Amidon says further:

> The head and front of it is that the speech tended to array class against class. I have been on this earth quite a spell myself. I never have known of any great reform being carried through where the people whose established condition would be disturbed by the carrying out of the reform did not say that the people who were trying to bring about the reform were stirring up class against class. That is an argument that I know to be at least 3,500 years old from my knowledge of history, and it is repeated in every effort to change an existing condition. (See p. 77, Chaffee.)

To those who prophesied that we would not have another congressional election because of a war dictatorship it should be gratifying to learn that we are having congressional elections every week. Some have already taken place—some Members have been renominated—some Members have been defeated. Our machinery of Government is working and, in my judgment, will continue to work during this war and afterward.

In recent years our whole system of government has been subjected to change. Any government that lives must go forward with the years. It cannot slip back to the days of Washington; it cannot stand still. It must move with the wishes and desires of the majority of the people.

It was once thought that a citizen was free to do anything he pleased if it were lawful. Even that principle has changed. An individual may do anything he pleases and his rights are guaranteed until what he is doing conflicts with the public good of all. When that point is reached the rights of the individual end and the rights of the public begin.

Chief Justice Hughes, in his speech at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the First Congress under the Constitution, eloquently said:

> With respect to the influences which shape public opinion, we live in a new world. Never have these influences operated more directly, or with such variety of facile instruments, or with such overwhelming force. We have mass production in opinion as well as in goods. The grasp of tradition and of sectional prejudgment is loosened. Postulates of the past must show cause. Our institutions will not be preserved by veneration of what is old, if that is simply expressed in the formal ritual of a shrine. The American people are eager and responsive. They listen attentively to a vast multitude of appeals, and, with this receptivity, it is only upon their sound judgment that we can base our hope for a wise conservatism with continued progress and appropriate adaptation to new needs.
>
> We shall do well on this anniversary if the thought of the people is directed to the essentials of our democracy. Here in this body we find the living exponents of the principle of representative government, not government by direct mass action, but by representation which means leadership as well as responsiveness and accountability.
>
> Here, the ground-swells of autocracy, destructive of parliamentary independence, have not yet upset or, even disturbed the authority and responsibility of the essential legislative branch of democratic institutions. We have a national government equipped with vast powers which have proved to be adequate to the development of a great Nation, and at the same time maintaining the balance between centralized authority and local autonomy. It has been said that to preserve that balance, if we did not have States we should have to create them. In our 48 States we have the separate sources of power necessary to protect local interests and thus also to preserve the central authority, in the vast variety of our concerns, from breaking down under its own weight. Our States, each with her historic background and supported by the loyal sentiment of her citizens, afford opportunity for the essential activity of political units, the advantages of which no artificial territorial arrangement could secure. If our checks and balances sometimes prevent the speedy action which is thought desirable they also assure in the long run a more deliberate judgment. And what the people really want, they generally get. With the ultimate power of change through amendment in their hands they are always able to obtain whatever a preponderant and abiding sentiment strongly demands.

We not only praise individual liberty, but our constitutional system has the unique distinction of insuring it. Our guaranties of fair trials, of due process in the protection of life, liberty, and property—which stands between the citizen and arbitrary power—of religious freedom, of free speech, free press, and free assembly are the safeguards which have been erected against the abuses threatened by gusts of passion and prejudice which in misguided zeal would destroy the basic interests of democracy. We protect the fundamental rights of minorities in order to save democratic government from destroying itself by the excesses of its own power. The firmest ground for confidence in the future is that more than ever we realize that while democracy must have its organization and controls, its vital breath is individual liberty.

If every citizen will realize that we are in a war to the death and that it can only be won by an enthusiastic unity of a great majority of the people, we will not object to being curtailed in our "everyday rights" if that curtailment will contribute to our defense.

This war differs materially from the last war; in this war we were openly attacked while we were in the midst of talking peace to our enemy. When attacked from any quarter, every American—true American—will defend his country. And when attacked under pretense of offering peace, no true American can be found who is not willing to remove such an underhanded, unscrupulous, and diabolical threat to a great peace-loving Nation.

The spirit that pervades this country today was expressed over a century ago by a lover of liberty in Scotland, Sir Walter Scott:

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself has said,
"This is my own, my native land";
Whose heart has ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turn'd
From wandering on a foreign strand.
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim—
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentered all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust from whence he sprung.
Unwept, unhonor'd, and unsung.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York News, of New York, dated May 3, and entiled "Concentrate—and Hear Rickenbacker."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by George Rothwell Brown analyzing the recent campaign results, in the State of South Dakota particularly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an editorial, and in the other to include an address delivered by Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of the American University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ENEMIES WITHIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WOODEN BARGES MAY SAVE THE DAY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have been glad to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the outstanding record that has been made by my native State, Oregon, in preparing the State for full participation in the war effort and also in carrying forward the many activities in the State which are contributing largely to speeding our war program. This is particularly true in three fields—lumber production, in which the Northwest leads the United States; aluminum; and shipbuilding.

There is one problem, however, now staring us in the face which may become critical and may materially interfere with carrying forward this program. I refer to the shortage in transportation facilities to bring petroleum products to the Northwest from the California oil fields, to keep the war industries from bogging down. There are no deposits of coal in Oregon available at this time to take the place of oil, and owing to the curtailment of transportation facilities due to war demands, it will be difficult to bring coal into the Northwest this coming winter. Furthermore, wood for fuel will not be available, owing to the lack of transportation, particularly truck service, and manpower to secure the wood supply from the forests. Aside, however, from these drawbacks, the mechanical equipment for apartment-house heating, as well as other heating, including industries, is designed for the use of fuel oil only. Wood and coal cannot be substituted without replacing the equipment. Under priorities in war production it is impossible to secure the needed equipment. There are many, many thousands of laborers employed in shipbuilding and other war industries in this area who live in apartments and other dwelling accommodations which are heated by oil burners. After the oil supply is shut off they will be completely without service, not only for heating but for hot-water purposes as well.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called to the attention of the Maritime Commission and Secretary Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator, this threatened predicament facing us in the Northwest, urging the immediate consideration of the proposal to build wooden barges to be used in coastal transportation as carriers of petroleum and petroleum products to Oregon and Washington, and to transport on the return trip lumber and other products needed in war production in the California area. The plan, after careful study by experts, seems to be not only feasible but practical, and its adoption will give a solution to these vexing problems facing us.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I wish to compliment the able gentleman from Oregon on the fine presentation he is making of a very important subject which is of great concern to all the people of the Pacific Northwest, including my own State of Washington. I believe the gentleman to be absolutely correct in the statement that it is altogether advisable and practical that we expand the program to building wooden tank barges and wooden tows to tow them—to engage in the intracoastal trade particularly.

Is it not a fact that we could build these barges out of fir timber, which is available in large quantities in our region of the United States?

Mr. ANGELL. That is quite true. The gentleman has anticipated the remarks I intend to make on this subject a little later. Lumber is available in the Northwest, manpower is available, and shipyards which heretofore have been engaged in building wooden ships are there, or can be made ready. Practically all the material and manpower necessary is available to meet this problem and construct the wooden barges.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Is it not also true that we would also be in a position in our section of the country to manufacture the engines and boilers for that type of transportation?

Mr. ANGELL. My information is that that is true, and we can and should provide those necessary facilities there in our own territory. The building of wooden barges and the tows and equipment to handle them will not interfere with our other war production.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I assume the gentleman from Oregon is aware of the fact that an amendment was recently

added to the independent offices supply bill making available $20,000,000 to the Maritime Commission for the construction of barges?

Mr. ANGELL. I am aware of that fact, and have been advised by the Maritime Commission that the Commission is now engaged in building some of these pilot barges as a matter of experiment—to see just what can be done, how soon they can be constructed, and how economical and efficient will be the service they will be able to render.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Does not the gentleman agree with me that that amount is inadequate, and that it should be increased so that at least $100,000,000 is made available for such a program?

Mr. ANGELL. I believe the gentleman to be absolutely correct. It is wholly inadequate now. This is a serious problem. It is one that should not be put off. We should begin the actual construction of the barges now so they will be available for fall delivery.

I thank the able gentleman from Washington for his contribution. The gentleman himself has on this floor and elsewhere presented this problem in a very distinct and helpful way. I am very glad indeed to add my word to what he has said on this same subject.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that approximately 500,000 board feet of lumber would be required for the construction of each barge. The plan calls for barges having a length of 180 feet at the water line and 192.2 feet at deck level. At 11 feet draft they would have 1,000 dead-weight tons capacity and at a draft of 16 feet, 1,600 dead-weight tons. Each barge could be operated with a crew of six or seven men and the barges could be towed in groups of four. Tugs of from 1,200 to 1,500 horsepower for ocean service would meet the requirements. It is planned to build these barges with a minimum of technical requirements in ship construction so that they would be built cheaply and rapidly and put into service at the earliest possible date. Those of us who were in the Northwest during World War No. 1 will recall the great wooden shipbuilding program which was carried on there at that time. There were over 16,000 men employed in this one industry which was more than a third of all the workers building both steel and wood ships. From the 15 yards building ships in the Columbia River area at that time there were launched 15 ships in 1916 and by June of 1918, 72 had been launched and contracts for 98 additional were building. It is reported that Mr. L. C. Stoll, Director of the United States Employment Service for Oregon has announced that 15,000 wooden-ship builders are available along the Columbia and Willamette Rivers and the Oregon coast at the present time. It is well known that there is an immense supply of lumber products in this area which could be made available for this program and there are a number of shipyards either available or which could be made ready to construct these ships in this territory. With from two to three of our ships going to Davey Jones' locker each day through the activities of enemy submarines, it behooves us to put in production any program which will increase our shipping capacity.

As far back as April I was advised by the Deputy Petroleum Coordinator, Mr. Ralph K. Davis:

> This office is definitely interested in all types of construction which will add, directly or indirectly, to the supply of equipment for petroleum transportation. * * * We fully recognize the great need for adequate supplies in the Northwest area.

On April 20 last, Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, in reply to my request that the wooden shipbuilding program be inaugurated, stated:

> The question of constructing wooden barges to transport oil has been under consideration for some time and we are concentrating on the matter at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly upon my colleagues who directly or indirectly are interested in this most important problem of ship construction to join with me and others who have been urging this program so that we may, by our combined efforts, secure the immediate adoption of the plan. The time for discussion has now passed and it is time to act. Too many of our activities have been subject to the charge: "Too little and too late." Here is one field of activity where immediate construction work will relieve a most distressing situation, and I will appreciate your assistance, my colleagues, in helping to give the green light to the program for building wooden ships.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MUST THE SMALL BUSINESS MAN BE THROTTLED?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the population of the district in Illinois that I represent is made up largely of small home owners, small business men and merchants, and comparatively small farmers. The distressing problems confronting the small storekeepers caused by the continuous elimination by the decrees of the War Production Board of the products they can sell will unquestionably force hundreds of these people to the wall and bring out hundreds of for-rent signs in the windows of the vacant stores. This hardship will be charged to the need for winning the war, and I presume anyone raising the question of the right or wrong of the situation will be branded as an obstructionist and practically as a pro-Nazi. Donald Nelson has said that the mortality rate among small business men, while regrettable, will be very high. I am quite sure that in this forecast Mr. Nelson is being ultraconservative. I am also quite certain that the individuals who will be forced out of business will meet their doom like good soldiers if they know its necessity as they know the righteousness of the cause.

For many months there have been persistent and ugly rumors circulating about the activities of the people who have been operating the various bureaus in the Office of Production Management and later the War Production Board, and the answers given to the Guthrie charges have not been, in my opinion, the kind of answers to which the American people are entitled. We all know of the greed displayed by automobile manufacturers last year and the enormous use that they made of hundreds of thousands of tons of critical materials, and we know today that they are attempting to make up the delays they caused to our armament program by stupendous efforts in the production of munitions. I am wondering if in the reorganization of the old Office of Production Management set-up, we have not changed from one type of business opportunist to another type of the same breed. With all of the gossip, rumors, and general dissatisfaction throughout the country, particularly on the part of the man operating a small hardware store, appliance shop, or farm-implement business, I am wondering if it would not be well for Mr. Nelson frankly to discuss his policies and his organization with the taxpayers. I have great respect for Mr. Nelson and the record that he has made in business, and I feel quite certain that a man who drew a salary of $80,000 a year from Sears, Roebuck & Co. must be most efficient and capable. I also realize that in an enormous organization, such as the War Production Board has become, it might be oversanguine to hope that every man appointed to every job would be either 100-percent honest or 100-percent efficient.

I spent an hour one day walking through the halls of some of the buildings occupied by the War Production Board personnel, and was astounded to see the large number of men of draft age who appeared to be working there. I was equally surprised to see the few American Legion buttons that were in evidence. I am, however, a trifle curious. I would like to know, for example, the names and titles of former Sears, Roebuck employees who are now working for the War Production Board. Likewise, it would be interesting to ascertain the names and titles of the personnel who were former employees of companies who do 25 percent or more of their total annual business with Sears, Roebuck & Co. The reason I would appreciate this information is because I would like to learn if there is any connection between the activities of these men in arbitrarily making rules and regulations to clamp down on small American business and the fact that as of January 31 this year Sears, Roebuck & Co. show in their annual report that they have inventories and commitments for merchandise totaling $317,776,558. My business friends in the district I repre-

sent are facing bankruptcy because they cannot obtain the merchandise that they so urgently need to make their livings, and yet I recently saw a quotation from Gen. Robert E. Wood, chairman of the board of directors of Sears, Roebuck & Co., in which he said, discussing Sears, Roebuck sales in 1942, and I am quoting:

The over-all decline in sales for the full year will probably amount to about 6 percent dollar volume.

Somehow there seems to be something anomalous in these figures.

Recently there have been unkind rumors in circulation reflecting most seriously upon the integrity of some of the leaders of big business, and other stories, while not intimating lapses in the honesty of our big businessmen, certainly carry a reflection on their business judgment.

I do not like to read in wartimes the implication that Mr. Knowlson, the president of Stewart-Warner Co., and Mr. Reed, chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Co., were using their positions in the War Production Board to so adjust production and prices in the radio and refrigerator industries, of which both are members, that it could be construed that they were helping their private interests. I do not like to read in the public press that the head of the Sears, Roebuck organization anticipates a mere 6-percent reduction in the dollar volume of sales that this gigantic corporation will make in 1942, when dozens of my friends, and thousands of other earnest, patriotic American citizens, trying to make a living operating little stores in the towns and villages of my district and in other sections of the country, are unable to get enough products to sell to pay their help or even their own grocery bills. I do not like to read about the millions of dollars the top executives in General Motors Co. must pay back because a judge found that they were not entitled to the money. I do not like to read about the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey having some kind of a fancy arrangement with the Germans, nor do I like to read about the General Electric deal with the Krupp interests.

The little manufacturer, the worker at the bench, the little storekeeper are all doing their bit today, uncomplainingly and willingly; so it seems to me that the time has come for Mr. Nelson to check over his organization and let the people and the Congress know who they are and what they are doing, because without the confidence of the public, without the confidence of the Congress, and without the confidence of the overall-uniformed soldiers on the production front, the War Production Board is doomed to failure, and we have not time for more failures than we have already experienced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a poem entitled "God's War," which appears currently in Collier's magazine. The poem deals with an expression uttered by Joe Louis. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I heard a brilliant radio sermon by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, in which a long time ago he pointed out that people should pray to be on God's side in this war rather than attempt to enlist the aid of God in an unrighteous war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SHALL WE HAVE MORE SUGAR OR MORE LIQUOR

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our Government has embarked on a huge rationing program. This move, we are advised, is to provide a more even distribution among consumers and to supply more essentials for war demands. Hundreds of items are included. Sugar is one of most importance. Certainly, few people should or would complain because their sugar supply is cut a little. There is no sacrifice involved, especially when the Government needs it.

Mr. Speaker, I call particular attention right now to the fact that little has been done to ration or take over the liquor supply in this country. It should be done, at least, for the reason that it contains such a great amount of sugar that can be used for making munitions.

It is estimated last year 130,000,000 pounds of sugar and sirup were used in making liquor. It is also reported there is a 5 or 6 year's supply of liquor on hand. It requires about 900 pounds of sugar in the explosive each time to fire a Navy 6-inch gun. This liquor supply would make a lot of smokeless powder.

More important is the protection of morale and physical well-being of the boys in our armed forces. Use and sale of liquor near our training camps would be prevented. Hardly anyone will insist the use of liquor is essential in winning the war. Neither would anyone seriously contend he is making a sacrifice not to have liquor in this emergency.

Mr. Speaker, on this question of rationing, it hardly seems right that beer trucks should have priorities on tires when a farmer using his car to carry his produce to market does not. Mr. Speaker, the use of a little common hard sense will convince anyone that the public, as well as the Army, would be a lot better off with less liquor and more sugar.

Using a quotation from a timely article in a recent issue of the National Grange Monthly, I ask, "Is American patriotism of such limited character that if making whisky retards winning the war will we still cling to whisky?"

Mr. Speaker, a government that can take over and ration automobiles, tires, typewriters, razor blades, clothing, sugar, and other foods can also take over the distilleries and the liquor supplies and use them completely for the more important purpose of making munitions of war.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for calling the attention of the House today to the fact that the huge sugar crop, subsidized by the Treasury of the United States, is being made into rum and sold in the United States. That certainly does not make sense when we need sugar and we do not need rum.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4402. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 12, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1625. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Emergency Management, fiscal year 1942, to increase the marine and war risk insurance fund of the War Shipping Administration in the amount of $210,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 720); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1626. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

1627. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1628. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Chagrin River and tributaries, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1629. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Spoon River, Ill., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1630. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Lost River and tributaries in the vicinity of Orleans, Ind., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1631. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 6, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Whiteoak and Straight Creeks, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 480. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2025, an act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2107). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture: House Joint Resolution 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Harvey C. Artis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Charles Thomason, administrator of the estate of Iverson Thomason; with amendment (Rept. No. 2109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1740. A bill for the relief of Luther Chitty and Susie Chitty; with amendment (Rept. No. 2110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3173. A bill to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord; with amendment (Rept. No. 2111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3402. A bill for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILLETTE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4741. A bill for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of James E. Savage; with amendment (Rept. No. 2114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5610. A bill for the relief of Marshall E. Cannon; without amendment (Rept. No. 2115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6491. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John W. Adams; without amendment (Rept. No. 2116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2627) for the relief of Benjamin E. McCall and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 7064. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7065. A bill to prevent excess purchasing power resulting from the war-production program from contributing to inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 7066. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 7067. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7068. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (ch. 586, 45 Stat. 1542); to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7069. A bill to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7070. A bill to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 7071. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 7072. A bill to provide reduced interest rates for certain indebtedness to the Federal land banks secured by farm real estate; to provide for the refunding of certain bonds of the Federal land banks; to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. J. Res. 312. Joint resolution to authorize an additional appropriation of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1943, for the purpose of carrying out the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 2, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 480. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2025, an act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. Res. 481. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives, in relation to the appearances of witnesses before the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BYRON:

H. R. 7073. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Leroy and Lula Leiby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 7075. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nora C. Fetterhoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 7076. A bill for the relief of Dr. Walter E. Kuhn; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2779. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Fred H. Wasson and sundry citizens of Carrier Mills, Ill., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2780. Also, petition of the Massac County Ministerial Association, by Rev. O. G. McClure, secretary, of Metropolis, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 and other legislation to provide the largest possible protection for the men in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2781. Also, petition of Wick Wise and sundry other citizens of the community of Harrisburg, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2782. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, concerning Federal Antiracketeering Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2783. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Minnie Thurber and sundry residents of Mansfield, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2784. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Central Labor Council of San Francisco, Calif., supporting House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2785. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, Anchorage, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Territorial Or-

ganic Act; to the Committee on the Territories.

2786. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Harrison, of East St. Louis, Ill., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the United States Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2787. Petition of the City Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1942

Rev. William H. Pinkerton, D. D., pastor of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we always are shocked and stand in awe when we remember that we are in the midst of Thy all-pervading presence, and when we unseal our lips and speak to the Almighty God; but, when we remember that we are Thy offspring, we nestle to Thy heart as children and feel the consciousness of Thy nearness and Thy fatherly love.

There is a dart of pain in the heart of every Member of the Senate, no doubt, and in our own heart when we think of that eminent clergyman, that genial friend and companion, the man who was Chaplain of this Senate for so many years and who directed the uplift of the eye and the outreach of the heart of the Members of this body to Thee, and asked upon them the blessing of God.

We pray, O God, today that Thou wilt extend Thy leading hand to the President of the United States and to the Vice President who presides over this body; and we pray that all of their councilors, Thy councilors, may somehow have a consciousness of the brooding presence of God in their minds and hearts.

We pray for this body, which is probably the most responsible and most important body of organized legislators in the world today. We pray that in their minds and hearts there may come the quickening inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, to the end that the wisdom and justice and will of God may be embraced in the enactments of this distinguished body, the Senate of the United States. We ask for Thy blessing in the name of Him who was our Lord and Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 11, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 11, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine; and

S. 2315. An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6362. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; and

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594 An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chandler	Holman
Andrews	Chavez	Hughes
Austin	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.
Ball	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Bankhead	Downey	La Follette
Barkley	Doxey	Langer
Bilbo	George	Lee
Bone	Gerry	McCarran
Brooks	Gillette	McFarland
Brown	Glass	McKellar
Bulow	Green	McNary
Bunker	Guffey	Maloney
Burton	Gurney	Maybank
Butler	Hatch	Millikin
Byrd	Hayden	Murdock
Capper	Herring	Murray
Caraway	Hill	Norris
Nye	Russell	Tunnell
O'Daniel	Schwartz	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Smathers	Vandenberg
Overton	Smith	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Spencer	Wagner
Reed	Stewart	Wheeler
Reynolds	Taft	White
Rosier	Thomas, Okla.	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Indiana and New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

A petition of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Harbeson, Lewes, and Milton, in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Iola and Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Maryland and West Virginia, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—MEMORIALS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I present memorials signed by citizens of the State of Wisconsin, numbering 4,827, in opposition to Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill, and House bill 4000, bills in relation to the liquor traffic in the vicinity of military camps, and so forth, which I ask may be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions unanimously adopted by the Center Hill Farmers Union, Local No. 1147, Riley County, Kans., at its recent meeting in Randolph, Kans., protesting against the use of liquor in the military camps and urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill, with a view to correcting existing conditions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas according to first-hand reports, deplorable conditions exist in and around our military training camps due to vice and alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas these moral evils are undermining the physical and spiritual strength of our manpower, thus greatly lowering the effectiveness of our armed forces and endangering the security of our Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved,

(1) That we urge you as our spokesman in the United States Senate to lend your influence and vote toward the immediate enactment of the now pending Sheppard bill, S. 860;

(2) That further steps be taken to prevent the drinking of alcoholic beverages within our training camps; and

(3) That now existing laws prohibiting vice and drunkenness be more strictly enforced.

Whereas necessary limitations have been placed upon many commodities; and

Whereas the use of sugar, and sugar-yielding products, is still permitted for the manufacture of beverage alcohol: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we urge upon the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Production Manager, Donald M. Nelson, that they take immediate steps toward the prohibition of the manufacture of all beverage alcohol, thus conserving essential products for our united war effort.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from Norfolk, Va., dated March 11, 1942, which reads as follows:

NORFOLK, VA., *March 11, 1942.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I am writing to you, not personally, but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

At a union service of the representatives of the Methodist churches of Norfolk, Va., at Colonial Avenue Methodist Church, the congregation requested the pastor of the church to write to you stating that those present desire you to present to the Senate of the United States the action of the congregation in favor of the prompt passage of Senate bill No. 860, or protective legislation for our soldiers from the liquor and vice traffic similar to that which was enacted in 1917.

You are also requested to present this action to the Senate that it may be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

JOHN F. OWENS, *Pastor.*

I also have a letter from C. S. Longacre, of Takoma Park, Washington, D. C., general secretary of the American Temperance Society, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, together with a brief petition, without all the names attached, which he sends.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without all the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.,
March 22, 1942.

The Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: With this I am enclosing a petition from citizens of Henderson County, N. C., requesting Congress to pass S. 860, known as the Sheppard bill, to restrict the sale and use of liquor in and around our Army camps, and also to banish vice from the areas surrounding the camps.

I wish you would kindly have the petition mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then sent to the committee that has this bill under consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

C. S. LONGACRE.

PETITION TO UNITED STATES SENATE

A petition in favor of the immediate passage of S. 860, known as the Sheppard bill, which aims to safeguard the health, welfare, and safety of soldiers in the Army camps from being exploited by vice mongers and debauched with liquor and beer.

We, the undersigned adult citizens of Henderson County, State of North Carolina, respectfully request your honorable body to pass S. 860 or any similar legislation.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED SEGO.
Mr. and Mrs. D. A. REED.
(And sundry other citizens of North Carolina).

Mr. REYNOLDS. In connection with these communications I wish to say that I was honored at my office this morning by a call in person from Bishop Adna Wright Leonard and Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, the latter the general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, who discussed with me the all-important subject of the traffic in liquor and vice in the respective communities where military camps are located. They furnished me with a report of their observations and the information they had received relative to that matter.

These gentlemen also brought to my attention a copy of the Federal Council Bulletin, the issue of April 1942, and asked that I bring to the attention of the Members of this body, on page 10, an article entitled "Actions of Executive Committee," which reads as follows:

ACTIONS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The following resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches on March 13 are called to the attention of the churches for their careful consideration:

"a. Concerning vice and liquor:

"Whereas the biennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, held in Atlantic City, N. J., in December 1940, adopted the following resolution:

" 'Whereas the National Selective Service Act now in operation will call up millions of young men for training in military camps and naval stations; and

" 'Whereas during the World War the Selective Service Act of 1917 set up effective procedures on the part of our Government for protecting the young men in the national service from being exploited by the liquor traffic and by commercialized vice, prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to any man in the uniform of the Army or the Navy of the United States, and throwing a zone of 10 miles around the training camps as a protection against organized vice: Be it

" '*Resolved*, That we call upon the President of the United States and upon the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to take such action as will secure the fullest possible moral and health protection for our soldiers and sailors.'

"Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America reiterates the action taken by the Federal council in December 1940, as indicated above, and hereby calls upon the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as will give to our armed forces protection from the liquor and commercialized vice traffics in order that the physical and moral welfare of our armed forces may be safeguarded and national defense be promoted.

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to present this action to the Military Affairs Committees of the House and of the Senate of the United States and advocate prompt protective action; and be it further

"Resolved, That communities adjacent to Army camps and naval bases and the churches throughout the country be urged to cooperate in securing necessary measures and in making them effective.

"b. Concerning Japanese evacuated from west coast areas:

"Resolved, That the executive committee authorize an appeal to the pastors of Protestant churches throughout those areas in the West not affected by the present evacuation order, to discover through their congregations whether employment can be provided on farms and in homes and in other occupations for American citizens of Japanese ancestry who by Government order are being removed from designated areas along the Pacific coast, it being understood that the churches in areas now being evacuated will undertake to interview and recommend suitable persons for such positions as may be opened."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letters and petition presented by the Senator from North Carolina will lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2248) to amend

the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1322) thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—INCREASED USE OF INLAND WATERWAYS FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 241) to investigate whether the use of inland waterways for the transportation of petroleum products and other commodities may be increased (submitted by Mr. MAYBANK on April 30, 1942), reported it with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2521. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. REED:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the more effective prosecution of the war by expediting the loading and unloading of railroad freight cars; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REGISTRATION OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, ETC.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. In connection with the resolution I present a press release or statement, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred as requested by the Senator from North Carolina, and, without objection, the press statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) requiring the registration of labor organizations, prohibiting the employment of certain persons as officers or agents of such organizations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The press statement released today by Mr. REYNOLDS is as follows:

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS (Democrat, North Carolina) today introduced in the Senate a joint resolution requiring the registration of labor organizations, prohibiting the employment of certain persons as officers or agents of such organizations, and for other purposes.

The Senator's joint resolution requires labor organizations to register with the Secretary of Labor and at the same time providing the Secretary of Labor with—

1. The name of the labor union or other labor organization;
2. The address at which it has its principal office or does business;
3. The names, titles, and salaries of its officers;
4. The initiation fees charged each member;
5. The annual dues charged each member;
6. The assessments levied against its members during the past 12-month period;
7. The limitations on membership;
8. The number of paid-up members;
9. The date of the last election of officers;
10. The method of election of officers;
11. The vote for and against each candidate for office at any election held during the past 12-month period; and
12. The date of the last detailed financial statement furnished to all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement.

In addition thereto, the Senator's proposed legislation would prohibit labor unions from employing as officers or agents or representatives anyone other than an American citizen, and specifically are barred Communists, Fascists, or members of any Nazi Bund organization.

The Senator asked that this joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and stated that he hoped to be able to procure early hearings thereupon.

In commenting upon this joint resolution the Senator said: "I have always been the friend of organized labor; I am now its friend. I believe the very best thing that could be done for labor now would be to require their registration with the Government in order that the members of these various organizations may know just what is being done with the moneys that pass into their respective unions by way of initiation fees and dues. Why shouldn't they have the benefit of that information? In addition to that, during these perilous times when we must scrutinize every person engaged in the war effort, certainly anyone other than an American citizen, and certainly no American citizen who belongs to the Nazi Bund or the Fascist or Communist Party, should be permitted to serve as a representative of a labor organization. To use the words of Attorney General Biddle, who recently said: 'As long as there are leaders in the labor union whose integrity is questionable, unionism in general will be in danger. There will always be articulate enemies of labor ready to pounce upon the activities of dishonest labor leaders and exploit such evidence, however isolated it may be in an effort to give the impression that all unions are led by racketeers, and that labor in general is selfish and unreliable.'

"Attorney General Biddle is absolutely right, and this is one of the reasons why the labor organizations themselves should not only be willing to go on record as to their financial activities, etc., but should know that none of their officers other than American citizens of good character are so appointed, and not affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi organization. Of course, there are a lot of differences now between labor and capital, but my opinion is that labor and capital should to a large extent forget their differences for the time being and await the settlement of them until after the expiration of this war, because the thing desired by all now is unity and victory.

"I am in high hopes that the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate will give prompt consideration to my resolution, and I shall be disappointed if I do not have the wholehearted support of labor itself, because this legislation is designed for the benefit of labor, which is being so severely criticized now."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6362. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; and

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

INCREASED PENSIONS TO WORLD WAR VETERANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4845) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 245), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is hereby authorized to employ, beginning June 1, 1942, for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,880 per annum.

RUSSIAN WAR RELIEF—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Russian Relief delivered by Senator MURRAY on April 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROWN ON PRICE CONTROL AND INFLATION

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on price control and inflation delivered by him on May 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. PHILLIPS BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Beloved in Life, Bemoaned in Death," in tribute to the late Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips, Chaplain of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FALL OF CORREGIDOR—EDITORIAL FROM MONTANA STANDARD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Montana Standard relating to the fall of Corregidor, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME FRONT—TEXAS STYLE: ARTICLE BY ERSKINE CALDWELL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the magazine of the Sunday Washington Star of May 10, 1942, entitled "Home Front—Texas Style," which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 210—REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 65, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in enrolling S. 210, an act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to strike out the word "fifteen" in section 409 (a) (7) contained therein and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. I will state for the benefit of the Senate that a few typographical errors were called to our attention by the Interstate Commerce Commission just after Senate bill 210 was passed, and the concurrent resolution is for the purpose of correcting those errors.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and was agreed to.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article from the Knoxville Journal of May 8, 1942, which purports to quote the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. Lilienthal, to the effect that the amendment which was adopted by the Senate recently, and which was so controversial, in nowise affects the Tennessee Valley Authority. I should like to read the article into the RECORD. The headline reads:

Tennessee Valley Authority safe, declares Lilienthal. Friends of agency told legislation not too serious.

This is an Associated Press report, under the date line of Chattanooga, Tenn., May 7. The article reads:

"Friends of the Tennessee Valley Authority should not take 'too seriously' legislation passed in the Senate Wednesday relating to certain aspects of the agency's financial control," Board Chairman David E. Lilienthal said here tonight.

Addressing one in a series of mass meetings of Tennessee Valley Authority employees, Lilienthal declared that when the excitement and hubbub attending the Senate action has died away, there still will be a Tennessee Valley Authority, serving the people of the country.

Lilienthal departed from his prepared text to discuss passage of the legislation, sponsored in the Senate by Senator MCKELLAR (Democrat, Tennessee). He did not once mention the name of Tennessee's senior Senator, however.

The Tennessee Valley Authority's governing policy in selection of its personnel always has been the rule of merit rather than the rule of political reliability, he declared.

"The Tennessee Valley Authority has stood on merit all the 9 years of its existence despite the efforts of some to force us to do otherwise," he asserted.

Lilienthal said there was one point on which all participants of the Senate debate were in agreement, "that the Tennessee Valley Authority has become one of the principal weapons of warfare for us."

I merely desire to have in the RECORD this article from so high an authority as the chairman of the T. V. A., for the purpose of allaying any anxiety which may exist since the strenuous debate which took place in the Senate on the day the independent offices appropriation bill was passed. I think everyone will now feel that T. V. A. is safe.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at this point, in connection with what the Senator from Tennessee has said, I wish to state that at the time this matter was brought up originally two amendments were contemplated, one presented by the committee, and another which was to be offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Those two amendments, taken together, according to the T. V. A., and in the judgment of those of us who agreed with their construction, would have been harmful, but the one which was adopted without the other did not create the difficulty which the two together might have caused.

I think Mr. Lilienthal's purpose was to reassure the people in the Tennessee Valley who desire to make contracts with the T. V. A. that the particular amendment agreed to was not as harmful as the two together might have been.

In that connection, during the discussion of the subject the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] called the attention of the Senate to the fact that among the advertisements which had been placed in the newspapers was one in the Louisville Courier-Journal. I did not have information as to the facts with respect to that, but I assumed at the time that it was an advertisement similar to one I exhibited to the Senate urging the consumers of electric power to economize.

I have a letter from Mr. Mark Ethridge, who is the vice president and general manager of the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, calling attention to the fact that this advertisement, which appeared in full page form on May 25, 1941, was signed by all the Federal agencies involved, as well as all the power producers in that region, all of them urging economy in the consumption of power by their respective consumers.

That advertisement was signed by the Federal Power Commission, United States Office of Production Management, United States War Department, Tennessee Valley Authority, Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and South Carolina Power Co. They all joined in the advertisement.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from Mr. Ethridge and the full-page advertisement referred to be placed in the RECORD at this point in order that the matter may be cleared up.

There being no objection, the letter and the advertisement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURIER-JOURNAL,
THE LOUISVILLE TIMES,
Louisville, Ky., May 9, 1942.

The Honorable ALBEN W BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I note that Senator MCKELLAR, in listing advertisements that had been run by the Tennessee Valley Authority, cited the Courier-Journal. I am enclosing for your information a page from the paper of the date on which the ad appeared.

You will observe that it is signed by four Government agencies and five private power companies. Although the ad was placed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, I imagine it was a cooperative proposition to which all the signers contributed.

I don't know whether you want to do anything with it or not, but I thought you might like the truth about it.

Sincerely yours,

MARK ETHRIDGE.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 25, 1941]

AN APPEAL TO ALL USERS OF ELECTRIC LIGHT, HEAT, AND POWER

The national defense program calls for an all-time high in production. Production of raw materials, aluminum, steel, and finished products must go forward on an unheard-of scale.

The southeastern area is a large contributor to this defense production. In addition, the area has been chosen for the location of many Army cantonments, air-training bases, munitions plants, and other defense facilities. These defense activities require a great volume of power. The continued supply of this power throughout the emergency must not be interrupted or curtailed. This year an unprecedented drought threatens that power supply throughout the Southeast.

Large additions to power supply for the region are now under top-speed construction by Tennessee Valley Authority and private companies. They are nearing completion. But until these new sources of supply are actually delivering power, and especially during the next few months, it is imperative in the interest of defense that power be carefully conserved.

Even if normal rainfall should end the drought, you will still be asked not to waste power. For every kilowatt-hour you conserve at this time adds that much to the Nation's capacity for defense.

The Federal Power Commission and the public and private power agencies in the area are cooperating on improved arrangements for interchange between the several systems in order to make every potential kilowatt-hour available. But this may not prove enough to meet the emergency.

The undersigned governmental agencies and companies therefore, appeal to the public to join immediately in a voluntary campaign of economy in the use of electricity. Such economy of use is a patriotic necessity.

If the arrangements for interchange of power are successful in making larger supplies of electricity available, and the response to this appeal is sufficiently general and spontaneous, further drastic curtailment may be long postponed or, perhaps, forestalled altogether.

Your cooperation is needed.

Federal Power Commission, United States Office of Production Management, United States War Department, Tennessee Valley Authority Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., South Carolina Power Co.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the matter referred to being printed in the RECORD, but I wish to ask the Senator if he knows who paid for the advertisement?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Inasmuch as the Senator placed the advertisement in the RECORD, will he be good enough to inquire who paid for it? I should like to know the pooling arrangements by which such advertisements were published.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the letter itself shows that the advertisement was carried to the Louisville Courier-Journal by the T. V. A. Whether there was any division of cost among those who signed the advertisement, I have no information.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. My information is that the advertisement which was signed by the Federal Power Commission, the O. P. M., the War Department, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and various power companies, was paid for by the power companies which supply the power to the particular section which the publication in question serves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no exact information on the subject, but I assume the cost would have been divided among those who inserted the advertisement.

Mr. NORRIS. The cost was divided between the different companies that advertised.

Mr. BARKLEY. Either equally or in proportion to their interests.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the cost was divided in proportion to the territory the various companies cover.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I do not know how the advertisement was paid for. There was a time when we could find out, but since the T. V. A. has gone into a pooling arrangement with the Alabama Power Co., the Mississippi Co., the Georgia Power Co., and all the power companies which we fought so vigorously many years ago in an effort to prevent them controlling the situation, it certainly is interesting to note that they are all joined together in this matter at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I imagine the advertisement cost all these power companies no more than it would have cost any one of them if it had taken a page advertisement.

Mr. NORRIS. The effect the advertisers wanted to bring about was curtailment of the use of electricity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and because of that curtailment, in part at least, the O. P. M. was not required to carry out its order restricting the use of electric power.

Mr. NORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the fact that, in the interest of economy, these various producers of electricity joined in one advertisement indicates any invidious connection between them, or that the T. V. A. has been taken over by any of the private power companies that joined in an advertisement to urge their customers to reduce the consumption of electricity.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement issued yesterday by my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

I want to say to the people of Tennessee that there is no man on earth more for the Tennessee Valley Authority than I am. I have devoted a very large part of my public life to it. There is not a public man now living, as far as I can recall, who was for it in 1916 except Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, and myself. Senator NORRIS came into the picture several years afterward, in the early twenties.

President Roosevelt in January 1933 conceived the idea of having a Tennessee Valley Authority and having it build the dams which had theretofore been under the War Department. President Roosevelt directed the bill and it contained many of the provisions which I had in my bill and that Senator NORRIS had in his bill. The people of Tennessee should be, and I have no doubt feel themselves to be, under the greatest obligation to President Roosevelt for sponsoring the Tennessee Valley Authority dams. I feel under the greatest obligations to him on that account. I am for him now and have been for him all during the administration. I am for his war policies 100 percent and believe that we will win.

Of all the money spent on the Tennessee Valley Authority dams I have secured more than 90 percent of it, first from the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and then from the Congress. If I had not been on that committee, the Tennessee Valley Authority would not have received the money and most of the dams would not have been built, especially the Guntersville, Hiwassee, Chickamauga, Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, and Fort Loudon Dams. This will be established by any Senator who has served on the committee between 1933 and 1942. On many of the dams I got the bills through the Appropriations Committee by a very slender majority, sometimes by only 1 vote, once by a tie vote.

While I was obtaining the appropriations for these dams Lilienthal and A. E. Morgan were lobbying against the building of any more dams, just as Lilienthal has been here for the last week or 10 days lobbying against paying his receipts into the Treasury as other public power organizations do, and lobbying against obtaining his appropriations from the Congress. He wants to be free to spend the Government's money invested in those dams as he pleases, not as the Government which built the dams pleases.

Lilienthal last fall, on November 21, 1941, secured the passage of a law taking away from the General Accounting Office the power to audit his accounts or to interfere with his spending the money in any way. I did not know of the passage of the law, and I think the people will give me credit for usually knowing what is going on as to my State. The General Accounting Office has the power over the accounts of all other agencies of the Government and the duty to audit and investigate them, but under that law only Lilienthal passes upon the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Recently he got the Budget to recommend a law to create a revolving fund of his enormous receipts of something like $25,000,000 a year to be spent as he sees fit without having to account to his Government therefor. We have several similar power organizations in the West. The law as to them read as follows:

"All receipts for transmission and sales of electric energy generated [at the dam projects] * * * shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

Why should Lilienthal be excused from this just and honest method of transacting the Government's business?

Lilienthal, since his election as Chairman of the Authority, has changed his character of "Uriah Heep" to an "American Hitler." He is now undertaking to run the Tennessee Valley Authority as he sees fit, without regard to law, justice, or right and fair dealing.

Talking about his being for the war effort. He is selling power to the Milan plant and the Tullahoma plant at a higher rate than he is selling to municipalities in Tennessee. He is profiteering on the Government, and notably tried to profiteer with regard to the TNT plant at Chattanooga when he was caught in the act and the War Department would not give him the contract.

He has over a thousand private passenger automobiles in his plant, the running of which cost $324,000 last year. His travel pay last year exceeded $2,000,000, including train, passenger automobile, and plane.

He got a law passed in some way taking private citizen's property by a commission instead of by a jury, as guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. He pays the commission $15 a day and $5 a day as subsistence. Thus, they become his paid agents passing upon the value of private citizens' property.

He has become an ardent advocate of the private power companies and has pooled the Tennessee Valley Authority with eight or nine private power companies.

The Constitution of the United States prohibits money from being paid out of the Treasury of the United States except by congressional appropriation. Under these circumstances I ask the people of Tennessee why should this "American Hitler" be permitted to evade the Constitution of the United States and to run roughshod over the people of Tennessee?

The people of Tennessee must not be misled. The Tennessee Valley Authority will go on even under Lilienthal until his term ends, and thereafter, without the "sacred cow," it will continue in much larger measure to bless the people of the State and of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6293, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have, of course, no objection to the consideration of the measure. Is the Senator from Vermont going to explain the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to ask one question before the Senator proceeds.

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall be very glad to answer.

Mr. McNARY. When the bill was brought before the Senate a week or two ago I offered an amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who is absent from the Senate, which provided that there should be no prejudice against anyone on account of race or color. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont if that amendment is incorporated in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it is not. It was considered by the committee. It was part of the Thomas amendment, to which it had been attached by the action of the Senate. The whole Thomas amendment, as so amended, was considered by the committee, and the committee decided, after hearings, instead of reporting the Thomas amendment, as amended, to report House bill 6293 in exactly the same words in which it came to the Senate. The reason for that will probably be disclosed later. Perhaps it is not necessary to state the reason at this time in my answer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the expeditious

disposal of the bill. I only regret that the amendment is not in the Senate committee version of the bill; but I understand the able Senator from Vermont is anxious to have the bill passed by the Senate as it passed the House, in order to avoid the necessity of having a conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I hope that some other bill which may be considered in the future may contain the provision to which I have referred.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the principle involved in the amendment to which the leader of the minority refers has my approval. I have supported it on other occasions in the Senate, and helped to have it incorporated in a bill which became Public, No. 783, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on September 16, 1940. That is the existing law, and it declares the policy of Congress perfectly clear in this proviso to section 4 (a):

Provided, That in the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

Congress had theretofore declared its policy in that respect in Public, No. 18, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved April 3, 1939. Congress undertook to provide for having young colored men made ready for training in the Air Corps by section 4 of that act, as follows:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under rules, regulations, and limitations to be prescribed by him, to lend to accredited civilian aviation schools, one or more of which shall be designated by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the training of any Negro air pilot, at which personnel of the Military Establishment are pursuing a course of education and training pursuant to detail thereto under competent orders of the War Department, out of aircraft, aircraft parts, aeronautical equipment and accessories for the Air Corps, on hand and belonging to the Government, such articles as may appear to be required for instruction, training, and maintenance purposes.

That provision sets forth the policy expressed by Congress; but prior to that declaration of policy, the National Defense Act and other acts relating to the Military Establishment made no discrimination whatever on account of color or race between the men who might afterward enlist or be inducted under the Selective Service and Training Act. The policy of the War Department is, I think, expressed in the development at Tuskegee of a school for the training of colored officers. This is an advancement which is praiseworthy and, I understand, has been successful.

So there is nothing about the attitude of the Military Affairs Committee in reporting House bill 6293 without amendment which could by implication be regarded as a denial of the amendment to which the Senator from Oregon has referred. There is in fact nothing in the action of the committee which undertakes to reverse or derogate the policy of Congress with respect to the subject matter of the amendment. There is a good reason for the action taken by the committee, which I shall explain later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Vermont for the statement which he has just made. As the Senator knows, I offered an amendment to House bill 6293 when it was previously under consideration, having in mind the purpose behind the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. When the bill went to the committee I naturally supposed that my amendment would follow the bill to the committee, and would have consideration by the committee, and, since I am a member of the committee, I expected to participate in the consideration; but, unfortunately, as things happen in the Senate at times, a Senator would have to be three or four persons in order to attend the meetings of all committees of which he is a member, and on the particular day when the bill was considered in the committee, Friday, May 8, I was occupied in a committee which was considering the question of priorities in metals, which is a matter of vital concern and interest to the West, and so I could not be present at the meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs.

I understand from the Senator's remarks that these amendments were considered at the time the bill was reported by the committee, and were rejected.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think an unfolding of what occurred in the committee will show that the amendments were not rejected on the merits of the policy they represented. The report shows in two places that the committee considered them, as I shall point out. The introductory paragraph states:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, having considered the same, together with a Senate-approved amendment offered on behalf of Mr. BARBOUR, an amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and certain amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. HUGHES, and by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that the bill H. R. 6293 in the form it passed the House of Representatives do pass without amendment.

In the last paragraph in the report I point out the following:

The amendment offered on behalf of Mr. BARBOUR and those intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. HUGHES, are substantially the same. Each provides that in the enrollment and appointment of women under this bill, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions thereof, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color. The bill, as now worded, does not discriminate against any person. The War Department has stated that this corps, if authorized, will include Negro units and the record of that Department with respect to the employment of Negroes in and with the Army does not justify an assumption that such discrimination will be exercised in the administration of the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That language is explicit; but I have read the statements of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and of General Marshall, Chief of Staff, and I do not find any mention of the matter in their statements. I notice that the report states:

The War Department has stated that this corps, if authorized, will include Negro units—

And so forth. Where is that statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is in the hearings. There have been three sets of hearings: One in the House Committee on Military Affairs on the House bill; one in the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate on the Senate bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], which differs only in two very minor respects from the House bill; and the third on the recommitment of the bill to the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator understand that in those hearings the War Department made the statement that there would be no discrimination of any kind?

Mr. AUSTIN. I so understand. I shall put the statement in the RECORD so that it may appear in connection with my remarks.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I can put it in the RECORD. At the last hearing which was held, the Senator from Vermont asked Mrs. Mankin, of Georgia, the following question when General Hilldring was present:

May I ask if you would favor attaching to the House bill the amendment of Senator BARBOUR?

The language of the amendment was stated, and Mrs. Mankin said that she thought it was needless, and that it raised questions which ought not to be raised, because there was no intention on the part of the Army to discriminate against anyone because of race, creed, or color.

Mr. President, without taking further time, I ask unanimous consent that so much of the testimony as pertains to this question be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It will definitely show that General Hilldring and others who appeared before the committee suggested that in their opinion this amendment ought not to be adopted because it was not necessary.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. MANKIN. Now, gentlemen, I have not presented what I had to say very well, but the thought that I want to leave with you is this. If it is a question of the bill that was presented in the House as Mrs. ROGERS' bill, and that has come to you, if it is a question of passing it without an amendment or defeating the bill, I say pass the bill, because I know a great deal of good can be done.

Gentlemen, there is one other point that I would like to bring up. That is, with reference to the corps enlisting both white and colored women.

I heard a little criticism from a friend of mine in the House, a friend from the South, on the subject of colored women. Gentlemen, remember this, that if this corps is going

to take over the Air Warning Service, this Air Warning Service does not extend just into the white districts of our cities. In Atlanta, we have a very large section, in fact, 40 percent, of colored.

Well, now, certainly, in those sections you should have colored air wardens, or colored women serving in this work. The white women should serve in the white section, and the colored women would be needed in this corps in many capacities.

The CHAIRMAN. In reference to that, it is my understanding that the Army has a perfect right to take in as many colored or white women as it desires; it is entirely voluntary.

General HILLDRING. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the bill, at the present time, of the 150,000, if they wanted to, they could take 125,000 colored and have the authority to take them anyway, if they wanted to, and place them in any position they wanted to, under the authority.

Mrs. MANKIN. Well, it seems to me that the Army is going to use its usual common sense in reference to that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mrs. MANKIN. And the Army is not going to do, in reference to white and colored women, any difference from what it is doing between white and colored men, and I do not see any danger there at all.

The CHAIRMAN. It is under the entire direction of the Army, without the amendment, because they have the authority.

Senator AUSTIN. May I ask you if you would favor attaching to the House bill the amendment of Senator BARBOUR?

Mrs. MANKIN. I am afraid I have not seen that amendment, sir.

Senator AUSTIN. That is where it says, on page 2, line 2, after the word "thousands", insert a colon and the following: "Be it provided that in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

Mrs. MANKIN. Well, my opinion of that amendment is that it is absolutely unnecessary. If you do not have some confidence in your Army, this country is in a bad fix, and I cannot see how that amendment would do anything—well, it is just a lot of words.

Senator CHANDLER. In other words, is it your opinion that that raises a question that simply ought not to be raised?

Mrs. MANKIN. I think it does; it is needless.

Senator CHANDLER. And ought not to be raised?

Mrs. MANKIN. It ought not be because they are not going to be discriminated against.

Senator CHANDLER. The Army has the authority and power, and I believe they have the desire, to handle the situation correctly, and there is no need to meddle in it and raise this question of color. I do think the Army can do better about it than anybody else.

Mrs. MANKIN. If you are going to turn over to the Army the question of defense, then you should turn over to them the problem of deciding where they are going to put the colored and where they are going to put the white people

Senator CHANDLER. And no one has a right to assume that the Army is any less interested in winning this war than anyone else.

Mrs. MANKIN. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand from the excerpt which the Senator has read from the hearings that he is quoting a Mrs. Mankin.

Mr. CHANDLER. She appeared in behalf of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But not on behalf of the War Department?

Mr. CHANDLER. The War Department officials were present. General Hilldring agreed to her statement. He was in accord with the statement which she made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the testimony show that he agreed, or is that merely her statement?

Mr. CHANDLER. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], said:

> In reference to that, it is my understanding that the Army has a perfect right to take in as many colored or white women as it desires, it is entirely voluntary.
>
> General HILLDRING. That is right.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am now able to turn to General Hilldring's testimony on this point.

I read from page 29 of the typewritten transcript of the hearing. The paging in the printed hearings will be different. General Hillding said:

> In regard to the amendment offered by Senator MCNARY, the War Department feels that such amendment is unnecessary, that is, the selection of people without distinction as to race, creed, or color. The War Department intends, and has so stated in both hearings, to organize colored units for service at appropriate stations, but is opposed to any amendment which raises the question of discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

I know that there are other places in the record where such a statement is made, but this is explicit, and I suppose it is adequate.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. As I now understand the situation, there is no amendment before the Senate on the matter which has been discussed. Does the Senator from Oregon have an amendment to propose, or has it been withdrawn?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amendment has as yet been proposed.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought probably we could get the matter before the Senate and clarify it if I should make the statement that I have an amendment which I propose to offer to the bill now or later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is now open to amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "thousand", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, under other circumstances this amendment would have my support. I ask the sponsors of the amendment to stand by and support the bill because of the emergency and the need for prompt enactment of the bill. Moreover, the parliamentary situation is peculiar. The legislative history back of the bill gives a sound reason for adopting what the House passed without the change of a word. I shall try to state it.

The House passed House bill 6293, which creates a semimilitary status for the proposed Women's Corps. It would not be in the Army. It would be with the Army. If the bill should become a law the Women's Corps would be under the command of the Chief of Staff of the Army, who, of course, is subject to the orders of the President as Commander in Chief. The regulations for the proposed corps would be made by the Secretary of War, to be executed under the Chief of Staff through a woman director and her subordinate assistants.

The theory of the bill is wholly different from the incorporation into the Army itself of a Women's Corps. Nevertheless, within a short time after the adoption of the first theory, of a corps with the Army, but not in it, the House seemed to have reversed its policy, because it passed a bill providing for a Naval Auxiliary Women's Corps, the theory of which was that such a corps would have a full military status. So the parliamentary situation of one of the bodies of the Congress is that, on the one hand, it has adopted the theory of a corps which would have a semimilitary status, and, on the other hand, it has adopted the theory of a full military status for women.

What would happen to this bill now if we should amend it in respect to one word, so that it would go back to the House for consideration again? Would the House stand by its most recent theory, its most recent view of the status to be occupied by the women who are to be members of such a corps? If so, it would reverse the whole policy of the pending bill and give the Auxiliary Corps full military status instead of the semimilitary status for which the bill now provides. The substantial result of amending this bill cannot be forecast; but, again, there is another reason why amendment of this bill would be against the public interest. The officers of the Army, those who are in charge of the prosecution of the war, have for a long time urged upon Congress legislation of some sort which would enable them to bring under military discipline the women who now are mere volunteers, not subject to any regulation, not subject to any limitation upon their conduct, who have no term of service, and are without responsibility and without reliability. I do not derogate the very excellent spirit of the members of these voluntary corps—and there are many of them in our large cities—nor do I question that they have done excellent service where they are established. But war has not yet

touched them directly. They have not yet been called upon to remain on duty for any definite or permanent length of time, nor have they yet been asked to submit to regulations and to military discipline, which are absolutely essential to the prosecution of a military effort. The War Department realizes that we may at any time have use for such organizations as those which now are set up on the Pacific coast, to operate under very strict discipline and regulations and to obey orders, rather than to do that which they so beautifully offer to do, and which they are eager to do, as volunteer patriots.

There is great need for immediate passage of some such law. On the last occasion, when representatives of the Army were sent here to testify about amendments to the bill, they repeatedly said that, although they had a preference, it made little difference whether the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was in or with the Army, so far as the policy of government is concerned, but it did make a great difference whether this bill became a law promptly or whether it dragged through a process of reconsideration, as it has already done. So the Army took the position, "We need this corps so badly that we leave it up to Congress, of course, to take such procedure as will assure the prompt enactment of a law on the subject."

I might refer to the testimony of General Hilldring with respect to the need.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator prefer not to be interrupted until after he shall have concluded his statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am entirely satisfied to yield at any time.

Mr. MALONEY. Then I should like to ask the Senator a few questions, if I may. Can the able Senator from Vermont tell us the origin of the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. The only origin I know is Mrs. ROGERS, who represents a district of Massachusetts in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MALONEY. I am prompted to ask the question because the Senator has said time and again that the Army is extremely anxious to have this proposal enacted immediately, and that there is danger in delay.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. I am wondering why, after all the years of the experience of the Army, that its leaders did not earlier think about this matter. I make this observation upon the assumption that the Senator is correct in assuming that the proposal originated in the House of Representatives.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, I should not undertake to state why the Army has not thought about the matter. However, there is evidence of persons other than Mrs. ROGERS thinking of this subject, and some of that evidence pertains to officers in the Army. I recall one who was formerly in the Army, but who now is in the Veterans' Administration, who told of his experience in World War No. 1 with what was called the W. A. A. C., a women's organization under the British set-up; and it had occurred to him that we should be at work to provide such an institution here. That testimony is in the record of the hearings.

Mr. MALONEY. The hearings, I understand, have not been printed, or made available to Senators; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Some of them have, and the testimony of that person is in the House hearings of January 20 and 21, 1942.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Can the Senator tell us whether or not it is contemplated that these women will be sent beyond the boundaries of the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; the Senator from Vermont can state that it is.

Mr. MALONEY. It is so contemplated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Can the Senator tell us whether or not, under the language of the bill, it would be possible to send the women into the front lines—not as fighting soldiers; I do not mean that; but in connection with their duties?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; the Senator can state that that is not contemplated. It would not be permitted by the proposed act.

Mr. MALONEY. But it is contemplated to send these women into foreign fighting zones; is it not?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. The word "fighting" is the word which makes me say "No." They cannot be put into a place of combat.

Mr. WHEELER. What is the language in the bill to prevent it?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, in the first place, the very first page, in lines 5 and 6, contains the words "for noncombatant service."

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; noncombatant service means that they are not fighting; but that does not answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; that is not a correct interpretation of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. I am prepared to pursue that point, if I may do so.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I ask the Senator to excuse me.

Mr. MALONEY. I think the bill quite clearly provides that the women may not be assigned to combatant service, but it seems to me that the bill permits them to serve in combat zones and to be sent to the front lines. They cannot be compelled to fight; but that is the only limitation that I find in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from Connecticut has not correctly interpreted the bill, if he assumes that it means that they can be sent into the front-line trenches, or even near them.

A question was asked on that point. There were some members of the committee who favored that idea and purpose, and, therefore, at the outset, and on principle, favored the amendment which would incorporate them into the Army, so that they could be put into that kind of dangerous position. The officers testifying, Brigadier General Hilldring and Lieutenant Colonel Swift, denied that that was the purpose of the bill, or within its power.

Then the question arose: Suppose that a corps that is employed in a filter station on the Pacific coast should be swept over by a flight of attacking bombers; would not the women in that corps be in a danger zone? Would not they be in a combat zone? The officers testifying answered, of course, "Yes."

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt, let me say that there is quite a difference between being sent into a combat zone and having the combat zone moved in on one.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. Would the Senator himself object to the inclusion, on page 1, line 6, after the words "United States," of the following language: "Within the boundaries of the United States"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I should. I should object to it on principle, and I should also object to it on the ground that this proposed legislation would be delayed, and we do not know what would be the result of such delay.

Mr. MALONEY. I can understand the Senator's anxiety about delay; but if it is not intended to send these women into foreign fighting zones, and the Congress does not desire that the Army have the authority to send them into foreign fighting zones, I think it is important that the Congress say so while it here has the chance.

Mr. AUSTIN. Even with the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, the Congress would not be saying so. The Congress would be saying much more than that.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not heard the entire discussion; but I should like to know what is the estimated cost of this program?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is a question I cannot answer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the committee had no evidence on that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. We have had evidence with respect to the pay table.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the time come when cost is totally immaterial?

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, hardly that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It seems that way, if the committee took no account at all of the cost.

Mr. AUSTIN. Although it often seems that the sums of money here involved are very great, yet we are more concerned in prosecuting this war to victory than we are in haggling over the cost of the maintenance of an Auxiliary Corps of 150,000 members. The pay table for the members of this corps is fixed, and they are payable in fixed wages. The wages appear in the bill, so that any Senator can make an estimate.

The Senator from Ohio suggests that in the report of the committee on page 4 there will be found a paragraph in the

form of a letter from the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, reading as follows:

The additional cost of this legislation cannot be determined at this time. It is estimated at approximately $3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and will probably be less than a military organization of the same size.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for assisting me at that point.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There is an interesting thing about this bill appearing on page 9, and which, while trivial in one aspect in comparison with the larger question of principle involved, nonetheless intrigues me. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two with reference to the language in lines 14 to 25, inclusive.

The provision referred to reads:

In the event any member of the corps dies during her period of enlistment or appointment, the necessary expense for the recovery of the body, its preparation for burial, including the use of such of the uniform and articles of clothing issued to her as may be required, interment or cremation, and transportation of remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort to her home or the place where she received orders or enrolled or was appointed, or to such other place as her relatives may designate provided the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to her home, shall be paid by the United States.

Who decides whether there shall be burial, interment, or cremation of the remains of a volunteer who shall die while a member of the corps?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is a veteran and knows from experience who decides such questions on the field of battle. Section 14 of the bill provides:

SEC. 14. The members of the corps shall be subject to such disciplinary regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, including provisions for the punishment of major infractions by summary discharge from the corps, and shall be subject to the Articles of War pursuant to the second article thereof when applicable.

Another section of the bill, to wit, section 2, the middle of the section, beginning in line 9, provides:

The Director, under the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, shall advise the War Department on matters pertaining to the establishment of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; shall operate and administer the corps in accordance with normal military procedure of command and administration and such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

While standing on the floor it is difficult to find all the different places in the bill where similar provisions appear.

The Senator from Ohio has called my attention to section 13, which reads:

The Secretary is hereby authorized to prepare and issue any and all regulations, rules, or orders and to employ any and all of the facilities of the War Department and of the Army of the United States to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

In many places in the bill the policy is declared by Congress; so that it appears that all questions, including those suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, will be decided according to the military method of decision.

If a death occurs on shore, say on the Pacific coast, in an area that is not a battle area, I presume there will be regulations to provide for the various contingencies. The members of this corps will have a quasi-military status and will be under regulations of the Secretary of War.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, I wish to have the Senator know that when he ascribed to me the status of a veteran, and thereupon imputed to me knowledge of Army rules and regulations which might determine who decides whether a member of this nonmilitary unit in case of death shall be cremated or not, I feel bound to disclaim any such extensive knowledge. It goes far beyond my status as a veteran, such as it is, and I will in that particular assert that I fought no more important battle than that of retaining Columbia, S. C., for Camp Jackson, which was a very important event, to be sure; but I acquired no special knowledge as a veteran on that account.

I will say further to the Senator from Vermont, if I may, that I know of no declaration by Congress with reference to the cremation of bodies of persons, whether in the Army or in noncombatant military service. I ask if the Senator from Vermont can point to any place in this bill which makes the noncombatant volunteers of the W. A. A. C. subject, in the event of death, to rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War? I should think merely to state the question would supply the answer.

I ask whether there is any protection afforded to, and whether members of the family, who are entitled under statutory laws of the State of residence to claim the bodies, will have some discretion as to whether the body of a volunteer shall be returned uncremated, if the Senator please. I point out that the Government went to very great expense in bringing back the bodies of thousands of veterans from France, and, I believe those that were left there were interred at the discretion and under permission of the families remaining in the United States. I know of no cremations.

I note that this legislative language states an alternative, and I should d slike to conceive that if, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has already suggested, the cost of this Women's Corps shall be considered too large, someone may say that the necessary expense involved in the recovery of a body, and its preparation for burial or interment becomes a factor of expense, and consequently order cremation on the ground that the necessary expense for cremation is very much less than the necessary expense for the recovery of a body and its preparation for burial. I think the family ought to be protected in some way, so far as it is possible.

Let me add, despite the claimed need for haste, after one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years without having any such legislation as this, that on the next page the bill makes provision for those volunteers who come within the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as to whom the measure provides for the payment of funeral and burial expenses, and, in addition, "the Commission may embalm and transport the body, in a hermetically sealed casket if necessary, to the home of the member."

I think that suggests a possible discrimination. If a member dies during her period of enlistment or appointment she faces the possibility of cremation. If, on the other hand, she dies while she is within the purview of the statutes dealing with Employees' Compensation Commission administration, then she is entitled to a hermetically sealed casket. I should like to know who is to decide in such cases? Does not the Senator from Vermont think that perhaps we ought to clarify the bill in those particulars?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not think the bill needs any clarification; I think it is perfectly clear and harmonious in all its particulars. It is obvious to me, anyway, that it is the purpose to create this unit of a semimilitary character under the administration by the military branch of the Government, and the members of the organization will have just as humane treatment as the circumstances admit. In some circumstances cremation may be deemed to be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not intend to delay action on the pending amendment. I say I would vote for it under other circumstances, but it is my hope that we may pass this bill through the Senate without a change, without any amendment at all, and I shall vote against the amendment on that account. I asked those who are not present in the Chamber but who are outside the Chamber and showed an interest in it to remain and help secure the passage of the bill; but, no, they evidently decided not to do that, and, therefore, they will lose my support on this occasion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, line 6, after the name "United States", to insert the words "and within the boundaries of the United States."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should first state that I am opposed to the pending bill, but it seems to me that it is extremely important that if the bill is to be passed the enthusiastic and patriotic young women whom I anticipate will rush in great numbers to serve should be fully informed as to what they might be commanded to do.

We have already been advised by the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] that the bill will permit the military authorities to send the

young women of this auxiliary anywhere in the world; that they can be sent, although not as fighters, into the fighting places. No one has yet clearly stated, despite the fact that in one place or another the bill has been under consideration for a period of many months, what these women will be called upon to do. In the brief report submitted by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs it is suggested that they might be called upon to serve as airplane spotters, or in some similar capacity. The implication, as I read the report to the Senate, is that these women will serve in such capacities within the continental United States. It seems clear that they are not to be called upon to serve as cooks, but rather that they will be furnished with cooks from the male forces of our Army. It seems rather clear to me that they are not to do housekeeping about the camps, and there is indication, although not too clear, that they will be called upon for semi-civilian duties at home—such clerical work, work as listeners, or perhaps on communication and similar detail.

Mr. President, I am rather amazed at the attitude of the Army for haste at this late date. I do not think the Army originated the idea, but 6 months after its introduction the Army decides that there is so much need for immediate action that the bill should not be changed to the extent of a single word. If, as many have been led to believe, these young women, upon the creation of this auxiliary, would serve only within the boundaries of the United States, this is the time and the place to so fix the policy.

I am not very optimistic about the chance of preventing the passage of the bill, but I should like to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, excepting here, and not very loudly and not from very many, there has been no strong clamor for the bill. There have been few, if any, witnesses coming to testify before the Senate committee urging its passage, and before it is passed, if it is to pass—I hope that the Members of the Senate will do what they can to make it sure that American women will not be sent into the far-away fighting places, under most uncertain circumstances and conditions.

For me, I do not want to see the bill passed at all. I think we can bring these patriotic American women into positions of importance where they may serve their country quite outside the Army. They can render the same kind of Army service women rendered during the last war, under civil service, and women who are called upon to serve as listeners in connection with the possibility of invasion, or as airplane spotters, can be depended upon, in my judgment, to render such service in a civilian capacity.

I cannot believe there is need to put these women under military authority in order that they may be commanded every hour of the day. I cannot quite see the wisdom of sending thousands of our young women into Army camps, even here at home. It seems to me that the least that might be said of the measure is that it casts a shadow over the sanctity of the home. Women so anxious to serve, women burning with patriotism, as they are, will be afforded plenty of opportunity in civilian capacities to work in the defense plants of our country and thus permit young men physically fit to go into the armed forces.

I do not intend to delay the Senate, but I should like to urge upon Senators careful thought as to the seriousness of this step, never thought of before, to my knowledge, in all our history, never very carefully studied here, in my judgment, never very definiteley explained by the military authorities, and, I say respectfully, not very clearly explained here, at least to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to say that I had the intention of explaining the bill, but before I could open my mouth the amendments were offered, and, of course, I am following the wishes of the Senate in this respect. If I have an opportunity, I shall explain the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if what I said in any way implied that the Senator from Vermont had not properly undertaken to explain the bill, I am sorry. I had proposed to wait until he had concluded, and I thought he had concluded. I early asked him if he preferred not to be interrupted until he had completed his statement, and he told me he welcomed interruptions. Then, of his own accord, as I understood, he surrendered the floor. But I certainly did not intend to suggest a criticism of the Senator in anything I said. I stated that the bill had not been clearly explained to me, that it was not clear what these women would be called upon to do if this Auxiliary Corps were created.

It is pretty much a question of words. This is almost the same proposal that was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] several days ago, at least in effect. It is true that these women are not to be actually put into the Army, but they are to be in an Army auxiliary. They will be under the complete command of the Army, and I for one do not want to see this very unusual step taken, at least now, because I do not think it is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. DANAHER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burton	Gerry
Andrews	Butler	Gillette
Austin	Byrd	Glass
Ball	Capper	Green
Bankhead	Caraway	Guffey
Barkley	Chandler	Gurney
Bilbo	Chavez	Hatch
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Brooks	Danaher	Herring
Brown	Downey	Hill
Bulow	Doxey	Holman
Bunker	George	Hughes
Johnson, Calif.	Murray	Smith
Johnson, Colo.	Norris	Spencer
La Follette	Nye	Stewart
Langer	O'Daniel	Taft
Lee	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	Overton	Tunnell
McFarland	Radcliffe	Tydings
McKellar	Reed	Vandenberg
McNary	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Maloney	Rosier	Wagner
Maybank	Russell	Wheeler
Millikin	Schwartz	White
Murdock	Smathers	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], I desire to make a few observations. I have listened with intense interest to what my distinguished colleague from Connecticut has said with reference to his amendment, because I know he is thoroughly interested in the successful prosecution of the war. I believe fully in his patriotism and his integrity and in his desire to cooperate to the very fullest extent in the successful conclusion of the war, particularly insofar as the United States of America is concerned.

Prefacing my remarks with that statement, I wish to comment briefly on what he said with respect to his amendment which, if agreed to, would confine within the limits of the United States the services of the women who may volunteer. If the Senator's amendment should be agreed to, I am of the opinion that it would largely destroy the measure itself. It would have the effect of nullifying the intention of those in charge of the Army insofar as the services of the women in question are concerned.

I do not believe I could any better combat the arguments which have been so ably put forth by the Senator from Connecticut than to read testimony submitted to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by a very eminent and prominent woman from the State of Georgia, who herself served with the overseas unit of women during the first World War, from the time of our participation in the war to the armistice in November 1918.

In opposition to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the name of Mrs. Helen Douglas Mankin, who in her opening statement before the Senate Military Affairs Committee said:

> My name is Mrs. Helen Douglas Mankin, from Atlanta, Ga. I am a lawyer in Atlanta, and I have served overseas, in World War No. 1, and I am at present, and have been for a number of years, a member of the Georgia Legislature.

Skipping over statements she made which are not directly pertinent to the subject of the Senator's amendment, I read further from Mrs. Mankin's statement:

> Following World War No. 1, there was organized in this country a small organization known as the Women's Overseas Service League. It is an organization of those women who served overseas in World War No. 1, and I have had the honor of serving that organiza-

tion as its national president. I am now one of its vice presidents, and I have served in the capacities of both national president and vice president.

We endeavored to get through Congress a bill that would take care of certain women who served overseas with the American forces as civilian employees, but were not successful in getting that bill passed, although in 1925 an act was passed by Congress that took care of, or gave hospitalization to, certain technicians who were attached to the American hospitals overseas.

Now, there were only a small number of those women civilian employees at that time. The best figures that we were ever able to get showed that there were about 1,194, and you gentlemen know that it is hard to get legislation through the Congress that is going to affect such a small group.

Following the war a number of these women needed hospitalization, care, and attention, but as they had served as civilian employees it was impossible to get it for them.

Mr. President, I bring this portion of her testimony to the attention of Members of the Senate for the reason that it is concrete evidence within itself that the Army of the United States needs the services of women overseas as well as it needs the services of women within the continental confines of our own country.

I do not have at hand at the moment a statement showing the number of women who served overseas during World War No. 1, but I know that a goodly number of women served overseas; officers of the United States Army and Navy recognized the fine, the noble, the courageous work those women performed and the bravery with which they performed it, and today the Government recognizes that their services were almost indispensable. As the result of experience in World War No. 1, the leaders of our Army and Navy now find that the services of women will be necessary overseas.

Mr. President, I further believe that the services of women will be necessary overseas because they can there fill positions which are now filled by men. Likewise, women can fill positions which are now filled by men in this country. Even today, when we have in the armed forces of the United States, speaking exclusively of the Army, only about 1,800,000 men, there is actually a dearth, a shortage of labor in this country. One may call up any number of service organizations in the city of Washington only to find that, because there is not available sufficient labor, those organizations serving the public are unable to do work which it might be desirable to have performed.

Yesterday I had occasion to communicate with one of the service organizations in Washington for the purpose of ascertaining if it were possible for it to do a certain job. I was told that it was not possible, for the reason that the organization had but 9 employees, and needed 30. So it was with 7 other organizations which I called on the telephone. In each instance I talked with the manager of the organization.

At present we are experiencing a lack of labor. We know that there is a labor shortage in the stores, in the factories, and in the fields. We know that in many instances the shortages will naturally have to be filled by women serving in this country, as provided by the Senator's amendment. At the same time, we know that there will be a great shortage of manpower; and so far as possible we want to fill that shortage. We want to supply the lack of manpower by the women of the country, who are today demanding that they be placed in a position to serve their country patriotically and voluntarily.

Mr. President, the pending bill would not make it mandatory on the part of any woman to enter the armed forces of the United States. The bill would merely provide an opportunity for the women of America between the ages of 21 and 45 who desire to serve their Nation and the United Nations of the world, not only upon American soil, but upon the soil of all the nations of the world, if necessary, in order to bring about the earliest complete victory for the United Nations and the United States. Women would not have to volunteer. The bill would merely provide them with an opportunity to volunteer their services to the Government if they so desire. They would know that if they should volunteer, the Army of the United States would be privileged, under the terms of the bill, to send them to any part of the world where the Army might feel it was necessary to have their services in order properly and successfully to prosecute the war.

As Mrs. Mankin said, during the World War there were various units of women in Europe on the fighting front, doing their part, and sharing the hardships of the men who were shouldering arms. The Army knows that the services of women will be necessary on the fighting front. Why not include them in a unit under the direction of the Army, coordinated with the Army, in order that they may do their part, and in order that we may not have a few little volunteer units scattered here and there over the face of the earth, and not directly under the head of any particular branch of the Government?

Mrs. Mankin said:

The Women's Overseas Service League, our little organization, took care of those women. Now, they had gone overseas, had been sent overseas by the United States Government; they were paid by the Government; they were subject to hazards of crossing; they were subject to the hazards of the bombardment of the Big Bertha, and things of that sort. Of course, they were not at the front. I myself was not with them. I served with the French Army. But those women, it always seemed to me, should have been taken care of by the Government, when they needed help following the war. Men who served right along with them and had not even been subject to the hazards of the crossing were permitted hospitalization.

She further said:

There was also another thing that I thought should not happen in this war that happened in the first war, and that is this: In the last war there were many small organizations, civilian organizations, some working with the American forces and some attached to other, foreign, armies; I served with one of them. Some of them, I just might say, were groups of women who wanted to do something and, really, I do not think had the proper protection in the way they should have had.

Mrs. Mankin unqualifiedly favors the passage of the bill. She continued:

I really approve of all these small organizations of women that went overseas, but I thought at that time it would be much better if those women who felt that they wanted to volunteer their services could do it with their forces and be, you might say, under the protection of the American flag.

I came in contact with the British, with the W. A. A. C.—"Waac's," as they called them, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and with other British women organizations, and I thought that the "Waac's" organization was a good organization.

I presume she was referring to the coordination of the women who were with the British Army at that time.

I thought that if we had another war and could have a similar organization, we would not have so many groups, isolated groups of women doing work such as I did when I was overseas in World War No. 1, when I did a man's work and carried the end of a stretcher, and I worked hard. I really felt, however, that it would have been better if I could have been with the American forces and perhaps working out my enthusiasm in a different way.

I believe that if we have a Women's Army Corps, and I hate the word "auxiliary," and I am speaking for the women of America in that. When I say that the women are tired of being auxiliaries, I am speaking for them. If they do the work, why not call them a corps; why stick that word "auxiliary" in there? Women do not like it; it is objectionable, and I am speaking now in a sort of aside and between commas when I say the women object to it as a whole, and I know women pretty well; I work well with them and come in contact with them.

I know numbers of them throughout the country, but the women members in the organizations have certain ideas, and I know what women like.

Several inquiries were directed to Mrs. Mankin in regard to various features of the bill which was before the committee for discussion. She further said:

Now, some of you gentlemen, of course, are not old enough to remember what happened following World War No. 1. [Laughter.]

Senator CHANDLER. Mrs. Mankin, I can well understand why you were elected.

There was a little byplay between Mrs. Mankin and the Senator from Kentucky, which the committee appreciated very much, and which added to the spirit of the occasion.

A number of inquiries were directed to Mrs. Mankin in regard to the Women's Auxiliary Corps, and she concluded her testimony by very enthusiastically endorsing the bill which we had before us for consideration, the identical bill which had been passed upon by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and later passed by the House. As Senators know, the bill which is now before the Senate was considered by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate once. Later a substitute was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]; and then we returned to the original bill as passed by the House.

Much as I dislike to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], I think it would be a calamity to the country to limit the activities of the active, patriotic women of America to service upon American soil, particularly in view of the fact that we know that during World War No. 1 thousands of American women served overseas in aid of the American forces and the Allies. We know that today many thousands of women are anxious to do their part enthusiastically. We know that they will do it courageously. They are anxious to serve upon foreign soil when necessary in the interest of our Government and our Allies, regardless of whether the Army should send them to Singapore, Australia, or any of the 32 points in this hemisphere where today we have outposts and expeditionary forces.

Are we to deny the patriotic, courageous women of America the opportunity of participating in this war? It is as much their war as ours. It is more their war than the war of the men, because they, the future mothers of the country, will be called upon to exert their influence for right after might has been exerted in this world-wide conflict.

I ask every Member of this body to permit the women of America to do that which they are desirous of doing. They desire an opportunity to volunteer for whatever work the Army wishes them to do. They are desirous of aiding the efforts of the United States and its Allies, the United Nations, in bringing this war to an early and completely victorious end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore am at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. He is out of the city in attendance upon sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in various Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNOLLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—26

Andrews	Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Danaher	Smathers
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Nye	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Rosier
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Burton	Lee	Schwartz
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McNary	Wheeler
Doxey	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Willis
Green	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

NOT VOTING—33

Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Barbour	Glass	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Lodge	Tobey
Bridges	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Norris	Wallgren
Ellender	Overton	Walsh
Gerry	Pepper	Wiley

So Mr. MALONEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MALONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the negative). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in various Government departments. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Barkley	Hayden	Schwartz
Brooks	Hill	Smathers
Bunker	Holman	Taft
Burton	Lee	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Wheeler
Chandler	McNary	White
Downey	Maybank	Willis
Doxey	Millikin	

NAYS—27

Bankhead	George	Murdock
Bilbo	Hatch	Nye
Brown	Herring	O'Mahoney
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	La Follette	Spencer
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Maloney	Tydings

NOT VOTING—31

Bailey	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Lodge	Tobey
Brewster	Lucas	Truman
Bridges	Mead	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Murray	Wagner
Connally	Norris	Wallgren
Davis	Pepper	Walsh
Ellender	Reed	Wiley
Gerry	Shipstead	
Glass	Smith	

So the bill (H. R. 6293) was passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT, FOR SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to file reports; that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature; and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to inquire when it is intended to take up the agricultural appropriation bill? The bill contains some items in which the Senator from Virginia is interested, and he should like to have an understanding to the effect that they will not be taken up on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; it is proposed to adjourn until Thursday; and we hope that the agricultural appropriation bill may be considered on that day.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have an expression from the Senator from Georgia as to the suggestion made by me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think it will be possible to conclude the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill this week unless there shall be a session of the Senate on Saturday. I hope that the committee will be able to get the bill to the floor of the Senate by Thursday, and, if the items to which the Senator from Virginia refers are not concluded on Thursday, I shall have no objection to their going over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can adjust that on Thursday if the bill shall then be before the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing two nominations), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of Glennie Flathers Whites, to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Whites.

REPORT AND CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF ANTHONY J. DREXEL BIDDLE, JR.

Mr. GEORGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the nomination of the present Minister, Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway and also his nomination to be Ambassador and Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reports will be received.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the two nominations just reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Norway:

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway.

To be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of the Netherlands:

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James P. Pope, of Idaho, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of the Netherlands now established in London.

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Norway now established in London.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry Grady Vien, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Arthur Roe, deceased.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

John W. Scott, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1947 (reappointment).

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY MARINE CORPS

Major General (temporary) Philip H. Torrey to be a major general in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

Brigadier General (temporary) Harry Schmidt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

The following-named colonels (temporary) to be colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Donald Curtis	Oliver P. Smith
William M. Marshall	Henry D. Linscott
Clyde H. Metcalf	Evans O. Ames
Walter T. H. Galliford	Maurice C. Gregory
Ery M. Spencer	Andrew E. Creesy
William N. Best	Merritt B. Curtis
William A. Worton	Charles N. Muldrow
John W. Thomason, Jr.	Joseph T. Smith

The following-named lieutenant colonels (temporary) to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Max D. Smith	Clarence R. Wallace
David A. Stafford	Ronald A. Boone
Richard H. Schubert	William B. Onley
John K. Martenstein	James H. Strother
John Kaluf	Ivan "W" Miller
Albert W. Paul	Joe N. Smith
Melvin E. Fuller	Louis E. Marie, Jr.
Frederick C. Biebush	James S. Monahan
Frank P. Snow	John A. Bemis
Walter W. Wensinger	John C. McQueen
Lawson H. M. Sanderson	Howard N. Kenyon
	James M. Smith
Jacob F. Plachta	Ernest E. Linsert
Harold E. Rosecrans	Orin H. Wheeler
Leo Sullivan	William O. Brice
Hayne D. Boyden	Francis M. Wulbern
Franklin G. Cowie	Edwin A. Pollock
Christian F. Schilt	Randolph M. Pate
Walter A. Wachtler	Lucian C. Whitaker
William E. Maxwell	

The following-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Harold R. Lee	Otho C. Ledbetter
George O. Van Orden	Deane C. Roberts
Walker A. Reaves	Joseph H. Berry
Louis C. Plain	Zebulon C. Hopkins
Robert L. Peterson	Wilfred J. Huffman
Kenneth H. Weir	Orin K. Pressley
Arthur F. Binney	Robert H. Williams
Perry O. Parmelee	Randall M. Victory
Max W. Schaeffer	Carson A. Roberts
Thomas G. Ennis	John B. Hill
Ernest E. Pollock	Chester R. Allen
Wilson T. Dodge	William F. Parks
Booker C. Batterton	John S. Holmberg
Edward T. Peters	Clarence J. O'Donnell
Ralph D. McAfee	Paul D. Sherman
William M. O'Brien	John F. Stamm
Clinton E. Fox	James P. Berkeley
Frank C. Croft	William P. Battell
Saville T. Clark	Cornelius P. Van Ness
Hewin O. Hammond	Archibald "D" Abel
Joseph J. Tavern	George H. Cloud
Joe A. Smoak	Charles E. Shepard, Jr.
William I. Phipps	Thomas B. Hughes
William F. Coleman	Paul Moret
Homer C. Murray	Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Edward C. Dyer	William B Steiner
Melvin G. Brown	Frank M Reinecke
Marly L. Curry	John M. Davis
Raymond F. Crist, Jr.	Walfried H. Fromhold
Richard P. Ross, Jr.	

The following-named captains to be captains in the Marine Corps to correct the dates from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

James C. Murray, Jr., from the 1st day of March 1941.

Wade H. Britt, Jr., from the 1st day of May 1941.

Thomas G. Roe, from the 1st day of July 1941

Oscar K. LaRoque, Jr., from the 1st day of September 1941.

The following-named captains (temporary) to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Levi W. Smith, Jr.	John P. Stafford
Lee C. Merrell, Jr.	Frank Shine
Howard G. Kirgis	Arthur H. Weinberger
Arthur E. Stacy	Stephen V. Sabol
Lewis W. Walt	Roy Robinton
Robert W. Clark	John E. Morris
Edward W. DuRant, Jr.	Erma A. Wright
Pelham B. Withers	Horatio C. Woodhouse, Jr.
Harry A. Waldorf	
Jack L. Stonebanks	John E. Willey
John B. Heles	Carl A. Youngdale
Hollis U. Mustain	Robert J. Johnson
Joseph O. Butcher	Robert M. Dean, Jr.
John J. Wermuth, Jr.	Douglas E. Reeve
John F. Dobbin	Philip C. Metzger
Robert H. Richard	James E. Mills
Gordon H. Knott	Charles S. Nichols, Jr.
Lindley M. Ryan	William J. Piper, Jr.
William R. Campbell	Gavin C. Humphrey
Robert Chambers, Jr.	Stewart B. O'Neill, Jr.
John H. Gill	George D. Rich

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of February 1942:

James A. Donovan, Jr., a citizen of Illinois.
Earl W. Gardner, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Richard Dickson, a citizen of Virginia.
Louis E. Hudgins, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.

James L. Fawley, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate May 12, 1942:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Carl W. Feickert, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

POSTMASTER

William R. Blackwood to be postmaster at Harborcreek in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of the Netherlands now established in London.

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Norway now established in London.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

James P. Pope, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lead on O King eternal and make plain the path of duty that we may understand that life needs the discipline of work to make it great and good. It is the pain of the heart and the scar on the face of suffering, the loneliness in the soul and the cross in the life, which gave lasting glory to the character of our Saviour. Oh, give us the faith that shall bear unmoved the cares of toil and shall murmur not when the chastening rod is heavy.

O Lord God be with the restless and the aimless throngs of humankind and let Thy mercy and wisdom break forth on their pathways, knowing that the dusk always has its dawn and the twilight of pain leads to the daybreak of reward. Oh, grant that the days of darkness may be short and that those influences may be hastened which breathe forth from the bosom of God, by which men shall live and grow to the full stature of perfect manliness and by which all nations shall stand together in righteousness and good will. In the name of our Elder Brother—the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6892. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of War.
3. Civil Service Commission.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. War Production Board.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be permitted to extend at this point in the RECORD a letter received from Gerardo Balbuena, Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LIMA, PERU, *April 23, 1942.*

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

On the happy occasion of the trip to the United States of North America, which is being made at the special invitation of the Secretary of State by Senor Don Jose Angel Escalante, member of the Parliament of Peru, former Minister of State, and eminent journalist, now deputy for the Province of Espinar and chairman of the principal war committee, the Chamber of Deputies of Peru sends its fraternal greetings to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the Union, and its most ardent hopes that at a very early period there may be definitely established in the world the principles of peace and harmony for which America is fighting.

I ask Your Excellency to please accept the expressions of cordiality of which Deputy Escalante is the bearer, especially insofar as they refer to our wishes for the permanent progress of our great sister nation.

With this motive, I have the pleasure of expressing to Your Excellency my deep consideration.

May God preserve Your Excellency.

GERARDO BALBUENA,
Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a national program for the physically handicapped, by Paul A. Strachan, of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address which I delivered over the national network of the Mutual Broadcasting System over Station WOL, Washington, D. C., May 8, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

USE OF THE SPRINKLING SYSTEM

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

[Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Sunday Post of May 10, 1942, by John Griffin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, also, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Secretary Wickard and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

USE OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], in connection with copper. I am glad to see the cooperation he has received.

I would like to direct the attention of the House and the country to how they are handling the building of temporary buildings in the District of Columbia. If you will go down to the War Department temporary buildings you will find angle irons all up there, 12 feet high, and a 12-foot high galvanized fence on all of these purely temporary buildings. All of that space could be used for parking. No; they could not do that.

Another thing I want to refer to is the bronze outlets for fire plugs. Every single one of those buildings have those bronze outlets. If there ever was a critical item in our program today it is bronze. Why is it that governmental authorities go ahead on purely temporary buildings and use such strategic materials as bronze when the buildings are to be torn down and thrown away? There is no question but what cast iron could be used in connection with this work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement made by the Prime Minister of Norway before the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution from the Louisiana Bankers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, May 13, after the reading of the Journal and the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCGREGOR was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from this morning's Times-Herald, which was an editorial in the Chicago Tribune. It is called Charley the Smear. It refers to Charley Michelson, and it calls attention to the fact that Charley Michelson is trying to blame certain people for being unprepared, when the real fact of the matter is it was the New Deal, and we want the public to know that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Maj. John L. Griffith, of the Western Intercollegiate Conference, and some resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Senator MEAD, and also to extend my remarks and include another article on the Jewish Army.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 480, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, of the time at my disposal I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], to be in turn yielded by him as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the pending rule proposes to make in order consideration of the pay adjustment bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. The members of the Military Affairs Committee who appeared before the Committee on Rules were asked if there was any known opposition to the bill. The answer was that none was known, which is as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be better informed as to the details of the bill and to give better opportunity to members of the committee reporting the bill to be heard, and who should be heard, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is known as the interdepartmental pay bill. At this time I wish to discuss briefly the general nature and scope of the bill and to give some history as to the origin of the legislation and the course it has presently taken through the Congress.

The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, covers the pay in six of the essential services of the Government; it covers the pay of the personnel of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. It covers the pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men. In these four essential groups are covered most of the personnel affected by the bill. There is, it is true, the pay of the cadets in the two academies, West Point and Annapolis, which is covered by the bill but which remains as it has been for years.

The subjects covered in this bill are the base pay received by the personnel of these groups, the longevity pay—that is, the pay increase over a period of years—that the personnel may have earned due to length of service. It covers likewise allowances for rent and for subsistence, all of which I am going to cover in a little more detail subsequently. The bill covers the mileage that may be used by the personnel in these six essential services of the Government; it covers the retired pay; it covers the air pay and the parachute pay in all of the fighting branches of the service.

The history of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is this: About 8 months ago one of the committees of Congress passed a resolution calling upon the heads of six essential services of the Government, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to organize a committee representing these six services and to make suggestions and recommendations as to changes in a pay bill which would more equalize and deal more equitably with the personnel of these branches of Government. After much study this interdepartmental pay committee, which, as I have stated, was composed of one representative from each of the six departments, wrote a suggested bill which was turned over to the Senate, introduced in the Senate, referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee and after consideration in the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate it was amended in some respects. It passed through the Senate, came to the House, was referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs, and then re-referred to the subcommittee No. 8 of the House Military Affairs, of which subcommittee I am chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked repeatedly how much this bill is going to cost the United States, because cost is always an essential item of every bill. It is impossible to say with any degree of correctness and definiteness how much any bill covering the Army, the Navy, the Geodetic Survey, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps at the present time will cost. This depends, Mr. Speaker, on the size of these branches of the service. For instance, with an army of 7,000,000 men the bill will cost one figure; with an army of 9,000,000 men, as my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] suggested in this morning's newspaper, it will cost considerably more. I give you here today the figures which were given us as a probable estimated cost of the bill for an army the size it was at the time of the hearings when these figures were formulated. The figures are as follows: For enlisted men this bill carries with it an increase which will cost the Government $220,000,000; for warrant officers, $3,917,000; for female nurses, $2,372,000; for officers, $56,000,000. It can thus be readily seen, Mr. Speaker, that seven out of eight dollars of any increase in this bill will go to the enlisted men in these branches of the service; and they are the ones the committee felt really needed some help at the present time.

For instance, let us take grade 7, which is what we call the buck private, the first grade in the service of the Army and seaman in the Navy. We find that about a year ago we passed a law which said that a man being inducted into service shall receive the sum of $21 a month, that sum to be paid him for a period of 4 consecutive months, and that thereafter he was to receive the sum of $30 per month, that to continue until the end of the year, following which he would get an additional bonus of $10. It always seemed to me unfair that a man who is inducted into the service should receive the sum of only $21 per month merely because he was a new man in the service and merely because this Congress perhaps felt that over a period of several months he should be trained before becoming a real soldier.

This bill, as recommended by the Interdepartmental Committee, increases the pay to $42 for the ordinary soldier and ordinary seaman. When he first goes into the service he will receive $42 per month. This is a 100-percent increase in pay, but as it works out it does not carry with it a hundred percent increase all the way through, because, as I said, after 4 months that man would be entitled to an increase to $30 per month under present law, and after 1 year's service he is entitled to an additional increase of $10 per month, making, as you will see, after a year's service in the Army or Navy a pay of $40 per month. This bill gives him $42 per month right from the start.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does this bill have any provision with reference to the payment of any sum to dependents?

Mr. BROOKS. This does not cover that subject. That will be brought up, I am told, some time later.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman's committee is considering a bill of that character?

Mr. BROOKS. It spent this morning considering such a bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I hope the committee will soon report it.

Mr. BROOKS. Further along the lines of the stipulations in this bill, the general increases in pay cover the enlisted grades. When we began with a base pay of $42 for the grade 7 soldier and seaman, we then carried that increase consecutively, but in decreasing amounts up to grade 1 of the enlisted service. Your pay schedule will therefore show the amount which the enlisted men in grades 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 receive, and, as I say, that sum carries with it a cost of $220,000,000 to the Government.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. How about the Air Corps, is that included?

Mr. BROOKS. It is included in this bill too.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. The gentleman mentioned $218,000,000. Does he mean $218,000,000 a month?

Mr. BROOKS. $282,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to cover another feature, the pay of officers. The Interdepartmental Pay Committee recommended a graduated increase more or less of all of the officers in the commissioned service. The Senate Military Affairs Committee made changes and recommended by amendment only an increase in the pay of second lieutenants in the Army and the corresponding grade in the Navy. It recommended no increase in any of the higher commissioned grades. The House committee did likewise, and presents to you a bill which carries no pay increase for the officers, with the exception of the second lieutenant in the Army and the ensign in the Navy. That means that a second lieutenant drawing a base pay of $1,500 per year has been increased to $1,800 per year, and a like increase is shown in the other branches of the service, so you have a $300 increase in this grade.

In all fairness to the men who serve as lieutenants and ensigns and in the other branches of the service, we submit that the pay increase there of $300 per year is still justified and amply substantiated.

There are a number of changes in the bill. There is, for instance, a slight pay increase for the female nurses which you will see on page 47 of the schedule and which gives them some little relief in their rate of pay.

There are two controversial items in the bill. That is, they were items which the committee felt were controversial. There is one reference there to section

14 (b) of the National Defense Act of 1922. You will see that that deals with what are called 24 (b) officers who have retired. I am not going into that matter now because it will form the subject of a separate debate later on and carry with it a full explanation, but I do want to mention that this was considered a controversial matter.

Then there is the Faddis amendment. The Faddis amendment, as you may know, deals with the commissioning of men from civilian life into the service. The committee felt that the Army, the Navy, and the other branches of the service should give careful consideration to the question of commissioning men from civilian life into the branches of the service and should proceed very cautiously in that respect. The committee first adopted the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] and subsequently changed to an amendment suggested by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the Army. That amendment with one slight change remains in the bill that you are to consider today.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then are we to understand it is the intention of the Committee on Military Affairs to offer an amendment to strike the so-called Faddis amendment from the bill as reported to the House?

Mr. BROOKS. The Faddis amendment remains there, but it was changed from the original Faddis amendment to the one suggested by General Marshall.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If it is not contemplated striking out what is in the bill now referred to as the Faddis amendment. I am authorized by the Navy Department to offer an amendment somewhat similar and along the same line.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

There is another feature, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be mentioned, and that is the feature of suspending the bonus for reenlistment. That came in the Senate bill. The committee deliberated on that long and hard, and I may say here that our subcommittee met in executive session for over 3 weeks, almost a month, in the morning and in the afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. The committee went over the bill word by word and line by line, to measure the importance of each and every part of the bill. Mr. Speaker, we found at one time in considering the merits of the bill that the question of whether we should strike out one stipulation was before us. I believe the committee were inclined to favor the striking out of this one stipulation of the bill, but it was found that to strike out this one little phrase would have affected some 138 acts which this Congress had passed over the years from time to time in piecemeal legislation. We did not feel that in an effort to preserve a balance among the various branches of the Government affected and in an effort to preserve a balance among the groups affected in each branch of service we should go so far as to examine into the merits of 138 acts passed by this Congress, representing the will and the intent of the Congress at the time of passing such acts.

So the committee presents to you a bill which does contain changes. It contains changes which we feel do away with some of the inequities and some of the injustices which have been carried in our law. It is not a bill that will disrupt the Services; it is not a bill that will do anything but further build up the morale of the Army, the Navy, and the other branches of the Service. It is a bill which is very much needed and will go a long way toward giving the proper recognition to the man who carries the gun. It is a bill that will help us carry on this war and make it easier and quicker to bring victory to our banner.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Does the gentleman mean to say that you have eliminated all gratuities for reenlistment?

Mr. BROOKS. No; we just suspended them for the duration of the emergency.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman understands, of course, that we have a double gratuity in the Navy provided the man ships over within 24 hours.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. That has been suspended for the emergency. The committee discussed the matter at great length and felt that this is a time which calls for the patriotic service and patriotic acts of everyone, and that a man who has been serving in the armed forces of the Nation, whether it be in the Army or the Navy, should reenlist when his time of enlistment comes to a close. He does not need a bonus for that act. The Army inducts its men by the use of the selective service, and the committee felt that there is no necessity now for a bonus in order to induce a man to reenlist.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct, I may say, but you run into this problem. After the war is over we shall have a two-ocean fleet. It will be necessary to man those ships, and we must have a contract Navy to carry on the regular peacetime pursuits of the Navy. If we eliminate the regular gratuity in addition to this double gratuity we have been paying recently, I believe we will disrupt the naval service.

Mr. BROOKS. I fully agree with the gentleman as to the necessity of carrying it in the bill, but it is merely suspended during this time of emergency and will be carried right on through in the bill as it has been the law for a number of years, so there should be no trouble there.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I thoroughly agree with him that the act which gave $200, $400, and $600 for enlistment within 24 hours should be suspended since we have gotten into the war. However, the gentleman cannot deny the force of the statement made by the gentleman from California that we must have a contract Navy or else, when the emergency is over, we shall not have anybody under contract to stay in the Navy. For that reason, the present law with reference to gratuities for reenlistment should not be stricken out.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is correct. It is not stricken out, it is merely suspended. There is nothing in this bill that will prohibit the Navy from contract service in the future. Personally, I hope the Navy continues with the contract service. However, we do prohibit them in this legislation from paying a bonus for that purpose.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, since we are in the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report from both the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Rules.

It may be well to refer briefly to the past history of this legislation. If my memory serves me correctly, the authors of the draft proposal, who met in the Harvard Club at New York a few years ago to promote a draft bill, suggested a pay of $5 a month for the soldiers and sailors. The House in its wisdom, under the Selective Training and Service Act, increased that amount to $21 for the enlisted personnel for the first 4 months of service. After that they were to get $30. That was the pay for enlisted men adopted in the Selective Training and Service Act 2 years ago. Today again the House in its wisdom, and in justice to the millions of service men, is about to increase their pay, I hope by a virtually unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate, to $42 a month.

Of course, $42 a month is not on a par with the pay received by the average wage earners in America, yet the Government will then be paying our soldiers more than any other country, with the possible exception of Canada and Australia. It is a simple act of justice and a very proper act by the Congress in the midst of war, and it should do a great deal to increase the morale not only of the soldiers but of their families back home, who see our wage earners receiving $5, $10, and sometimes as high as $15 a day.

No one knows just how much money this bill will call for because no one is a mind reader and no one knows how long this war will last. All of us Members of Congress are asked daily what we think of how long the war may last.

I am, possibly because I am on the Foreign Affairs Committee or possibly because I am interested in the military, but I know no more than any other Member of Congress about it. I know nothing more than what I read in the newspapers. This war may last 6 months or 6 years. We may know in a few months' time, if the Russians are able to hold the German attack, whether the war will be a short or a long war.

At the end of this year we will have an army, according to official reports, of

3,600,000. It is my opinion, if the war lasts 2 years, and it may well last 2 years or more, by the end of 1943 we will have 2,000,000 more. And by the end of 1944, another 2,000,000. So I believe if the war lasts until the end of 1944, we will have an army of 7,600,000, an air force of 1,400,000, and a Navy of 1,000,000, making a total of 10,000,000 in our armed forces. This would mean that this increased pay bill would cost well over a billion dollars a year, probably a billion and a half dollars a year by the end of 1944.

This is a war measure for the successful conduct of the war and for the prosecution of the war to final victory.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Could the gentleman tell us what the cost of this bill will be for an army of 3,600,000 as contemplated for the present year?

Mr. FISH. I believe it is stated in the report on the bill to be about $400,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is that the increase or the total?

Mr. FISH. That is the increase in the pay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time; I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I believe all Members of Congress are agreed that we are in an all-out war, all-out in sacrifice in service, and all-out in effort. We are all united and determined to continue the war without compromise or appeasement until final victory, no matter what it may cost in blood, money, and tears. We are about to vote for this bill providing for at least a billion dollars additional pay for our armed forces by 1943.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have just hurriedly examined this bill and as I read it, the lowest-paid enlisted man will receive $42 a month.

Mr. FISH. That is correct; in the Army, Navy, and in the Coast Guard services.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think that is fairly good, and I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the original conscription bill was before the House, I offered an amendment providing for an increase of pay up to $50 a month as base pay to all drafted men. I am going to offer the same amendment today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And at that time the House rejected it by a vote of about 39 to 89. I sincerely hope that today when this increase in the base pay of the drafted man comes up for a vote, it will be passed unanimously by the House. These boys are the ones who have to do the fighting and the dying.

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement. I voted the first time when the bill went through the House, for the Selective Service Act. When it came back after being amended in the Senate, I voted against it. There were a number of amendments that had been suggested and if they had been in the bill, including the one offered by the gentleman from Montana, I would have voted for it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With reference to the statement which the gentleman has just made, I think every Member of the House would have voted for the bill if it had contained reasonable pay for the men we were putting into the Army which, in my judgment, would have been around $50 a month.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman, I am sure, is quite right and reflects the prevailing sentiment of the House and of the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in the short time which I have at my disposal I do not intend, of course, to undertake to discuss the details of this legislation, but I do want to commend the Committee on Military Affairs for giving us this opportunity to increase the base pay of those in the armed forces as contained in this proposal. Of course, we all agree, I think, that monetary consideration is not what motivates the young men who are giving their lives or offering their lives in defense of the liberties of our people, but there is justice in giving them more nearly adequate compensation than we have provided heretofore. The cost of everything we have in this country has gone up, and I think it is only right and just that we should provide a higher rate of compensation for the armed forces. Therefore, I shall take great pleasure not only in supporting the rule but in supporting the bill when it comes before the House, and I hope there will not be a single vote cast in this House against this legislation, which only undertakes to recognize the valiant services of those who are going into our armed forces.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when the rule came up before the Committee on Rules, I asked that committee to make the time for general debate a little longer than 2 hours, upon the assumption that I would need a little extra time on one provision of the bill, section 15, the last paragraph. I am taking this time now to call attention to a change in my presentation of that subject matter when the rule was held down to 2 hours of general debate. I then determined upon placing in the RECORD yesterday detailed information regarding the last paragraph of section 15, which deals with those officers eliminated under section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act. If Members will turn to the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1696, they will find there and on the following pages, under my extension of remarks, and under those of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], information that will be quite wholesome reading for them before they go into the consideration of the merits or demerits of section 15, in its last paragraph. I placed that in the RECORD in that form to protect the Congress against anything going through here as a sleeper; and if you want to vote for that provision, I ask you to look into it and see all that you are voting for and figure out in advance what is coming when that provision comes up for amendment under the rule on the bill. I placed the information in the RECORD yesterday for the protection of Congress, so that gentlemen will know what they are voting for. Read and judge for yourselves just what position you want to try to justify when you go back to your own constituencies.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES W. WADSWORTH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a very able and constructive address made yesterday by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] upon the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree of doctor of law from the Rochester University. I know that all of our colleagues are pleased to hear of this great honor conferred upon our distinguished friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, by inserting a speech of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] and also to insert a letter which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAY READJUSTMENT OF 1942

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2025, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is entitled to 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] to 1 hour.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to make a very brief general statement with respect to this legislation. It will consist more of some facts not particularly related to the detailed provisions and sections of the legislation, but to the history of it, and how it comes before this

body. Some months ago the United States Senate passed a resolution calling upon the War and Navy Departments to set up an interdepartmental committee for the study of the general subject of pay of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. That resolution related particularly to the grade known as enlisted men. As a result of that resolution there was set up in the War Department a committee composed of gentlemen who represented each of those services, known as the interdepartmental committee. That committee made a recommendation to the Congress of the United States. As a result of that study in the departments concerned, the Senate of the United States passed the bill S. 2025, which is now before us for consideration.

After that bill passed the Senate it was referred, in the usual course of procedure, to the House Military Affairs Committee. When the bill came before that committee we conducted rather extensive hearings. We heard everybody who wanted to be heard in support of the legislation. No one at all appeared in opposition to it, as I recall the record.

After the hearings had been completed the House Military Affairs Committee held executive sessions on the measure, and after general discussion of the terms of the bill it was decided to refer the measure to a special legislative subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee. That was done. That committee was headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. That committee was directed to make a careful and cautious study of every provision in the measure and to report the bill to the whole committee with their recommendations. I know that after the bill was referred to that special committee, they spent several days, many hours each day, not only studying carefully the provisions of the bill, but as they had a right to do, they conducted additional hearings which I understand were not reported or printed as a part of the hearings before the House. After they had done that the committee reassembled as a whole and received their report and acted thereon.

So that we bring to you today a pay bill relating to these five different services with the unanimous report and judgment of the House Military Affairs Committee, with a few exceptions.

One of the things which I reserved the right to oppose was the question of increase in retired pay of retired Army officers. There is one provision in the bill relating to that subject that I think ought to be stricken out. That is the latter part of section 15 of the bill, which contains a provision that would cover some 121 to 125 Regular Army officers who have been retired for one thing or another. In most instances they were retired because of undesirable or unsatisfactory service.

As I understand this bill, it makes rather drastic increases in the compensation of those retired officers. I object to that. I do not think the pay of retired officers of the last World War applies to this particular situation and this particular piece of legislation. This is a pay bill and the committee, after carefully studying the facts, decided that the present base pay, as well as the retired pay of all Army officers above the grade of second lieutenant, was probably reasonable at this time, but might ultimately require some additional study and legislation. We have agreed in the Military Affairs Committee that we will set up a special committee to make a study of the general subject of pay of the upper grades of the Army of the United States, including the Navy and other services.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think there should be a joint committee from the House and Senate to deal with this question? In 1922 when the pay bill was drafted there was a joint committee, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who was Senator at that time, was chairman of the joint committee. Does not the gentleman think it is better to have a joint committee than to have just one committee to deal with that matter?

Mr. MAY. I not only think it is desirable to have a joint committee, but I should greatly favor setting up a joint committee to make a study of the whole situation. I would be happy to suggest that those members be selected from the House Military Affairs Committee, the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the House Naval Affairs Committee, the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] be included as one of the members.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For that very reason, does not the gentleman think the wise course to pursue now would be to make this bill provide for only during the emergency or 6 months or a year after the emergency?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is anticipating an amendment which he proposes to offer and trying so to speak to milk the court for an expression of opinion in advance. The court, having had some experience in the matter of popping off with curbstone opinions and judgments, reserves that question until the matter has been debated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not this the first time the gentleman ever made that reservation?

Mr. MAY. Well, I have not had the matter put up to me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I mean talking about curbstone opinions.

Mr. MAY. Oh, yes; and I know of several gentlemen in the House who are rather liberal with curbstone opinions. I hope the gentleman does not take that personal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to conclude my statement, because there are some other Members who have given this much more study than I have who want to debate it. However, I want to say that my purpose in the handling of this legislation from the very beginning has been to take care of the men in the lower groups. In other words, the selectees and the fighting forces who are in the field, and the men who will be sent to the front to bleed and die, if anybody does.

I feel, so far as I am concerned, that Army officers who are retired are adequately and well taken care of under present legislation. I am willing, however, to give further study to this subject if and when the time comes that it should be, as has been indicated here.

I am wholeheartedly for this bill; I think it ought to pass.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. This morning I received a letter from a father who stated that he had three sons in the service. He wondered if this bill carried a provision for retention of a certain part of this salary increase for the use of the boys after they get out of service. Was this matter considered by the committee?

Mr. MAY. The committee considered a number of things along that line, including one to provide that a part of their pay should be invested in Government bonds to be handed over to them when they returned from the foreign service; but the committee could not find any ground or basis upon which to do such a thing as that, and it was not included in the legislation. I believe it would probably have been unwise to do it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not a fact, I ask the distinguished chairman of this committee, this bill deals almost entirely with pay increases of the enlisted personnel? That outside of second lieutenants there is no pay increase in the bill for officers?

Mr. MAY. None whatever except allowances. Where under existing law certain allowances are 60 cents a day we raised that to 70.

Mr. BROOKS. The amendment to section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act, to which the gentleman refers, covers only 125 officers.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It also deals with the rental allowances.

Mr. MAY. It deals with allowances in general.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I believe every Member of the House knows the purpose of this bill and the situation which brought about its introduction.

As the chairman of the committee has just stated, generally speaking, the bill affects only those below the grade of second lieutenant. Any person who has ever had anything to do with an Army or Navy pay bill must realize that at best it presents a most difficult question. I suppose every Member of the House, like most of us on the committee, has been contacted by representatives of almost

every type of service man, past or present, with the thought that injustices exist in the present law. There are doubtless many injustices, but it has seemed to me that it would be a very unwise and an almost impossible task to attempt to remedy every injustice now existing in a pay bill in the midst of wartime.

In the consideration of the details of this bill the subcommittee has worked very diligently. This has been carried out almost entirely by members of a subcommittee on military affairs, a special subcommittee on pay under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who, more than anybody on our side has considered the important details of this bill. He, by the way, is a former Regular Army officer. I doubt if there is anyone in better position from personal experience to know the many ramifications presented by the provisions of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my experience in the Army does not fit me as an expert on Geodetic Survey or on Navy matters, and a lot of other things covered by this bill. This bill embraces a great many different services; so, when it comes to the point of asking questions, please spare me a little leeway on some of these other branches of the Federal service.

The best analysis I have seen of the bill, technical as it is, is that compiled by the committee which appears in the report starting at page 9 of House Report 2080. There you will find the answer to almost any question that may arise in your mind regarding the technical part of the bill.

Generally speaking, there has been a serious effort on the part of the committee to standardize the pay of the various services covered. In the first paragraph on page 9 you will find the pay for the various grades of enlisted rank set out in very simple and concise form. In the second paragraph you will find that the $10 bonus for service per month beyond 1 year has been eliminated. You will find the various specialists' ratings set out there in paragraph 3 are now eliminated.

In paragraph 4 of the analysis you will find that we have attempted to standardize the longevity time for the National Guard and Reserve service. You will find that for the duration of the war the enlisted allowance for reenlistment is eliminated. That is for the duration of the emergency and 6 months thereafter.

One of the most complicated parts of the bill has to do with the grade of warrant officer. On top of page 10 you will find an analysis there of the effort of the committee to standardize the pay of warrant officer grades, including commissioned warrant officers. The proposed pay schedule in the last column on the page there shows an effort to standardize and simplify that system of pay.

At the bottom of page 10 you will find the pay of nurses set out in parallel columns, including present pay and proposed pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As I interpret that section 13, the increase in the monthly base pay of nurses is as follows: Under 3 years, from $70 to $90.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Over 3 years from $90 to $105; over 5 years' service, from $115 to $120; over 9 years' service, from $130 to $135; and over 12 years' service, from $130 to $150.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is correct.

On page 11 you will find the matter of officers' pay set out. You will notice there the only base pay increase is that of second lieutenant, which is raised from $1,500 to $1,800.

The next paragraph sets out subsistence. You will find increases in subsistence allowance there set out with dependents and without dependents in comparison with the old schedule for subsistence.

The next paragraph, 4, on page 11, sets out the rental allowances. You will find there a careful study of comparative figures, and without going into detail they will reveal a very improved schedule of rental allowances when we departed from the old idea of so many rooms per officer, getting away from the rooms and getting down to dollars and cents, which is a more practical basis on which to determine the schedule of rental allowances.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In studying the bill I am somewhat disturbed. I notice the increase in rental allowances for officers without dependents is more than that for officers with dependents.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes; that is true in some instances.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Here is the situation. An ensign's allowance is increased from $40 to $60; a junior lieutenant from $60 to $75; a lieutenant from $80 to $90; a lieutenant commander from $100 to $105. Those are with dependents.

Officers without dependents: Ensign, from $40 to $45; lieutenant, junior grade, from $40 to $60. With dependents there is only a $15 increase, while there is a $20 increase without dependents. Lieutenant, from $60 to $75; lieutenant commander, from $60 to $90; and commander, from $80 to $105.

Why did the committee raise the rental allowances to officers without dependents not in the same proportion that they raised them with dependents?

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that this was recommended by the Interdepartmental Pay Committee. These are the figures they recommended to start with: The allowance for those without dependents started at $45 per month; then we go up $15 for each grade. For officers with dependents it started with $60 for rental allowance, then proceeded higher for each grade at the rate of $15 per month, which is the same in the case of those with dependents and those without dependents. It is the same increase.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The estimated cost of the changes in the bill in total are shown on page 11 for the strength of the Army as it stood on January 1 this year. This is $285,000,000. We could not get an accurate estimate for various-sized armies, and I am unable to give you an accurate estimate of the cost for the larger-sized armies that we are now recruiting.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I know there are many factors involved in arriving at these figures, but I wonder if the gentleman can give us any estimate as to how the basic $42 a month for a private compares with the average pay or income of men all over the country? No doubt the gentleman has made some such study. I remember in connection with the $21 per month we were told that the other allowances, such as susbsistence, clothing, and medical attention made the pay of the men amount to about $85 a month. These additional allowances will no doubt raise that substantially. Can the gentleman give us any figures on that?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The present pay of a private with more than 12 months' service is $40 a month, when you take into consideration the $10 bonus. This bill sets it at $42. This is still well below the pay of the civilian population, but when you take into consideration the allowances it brings it up to where we thought it was within striking distance, although not as high as many of us would like to make it.

In arriving at that figure, I may say that $42 was recommended by the Joint Pay Committee of all the services affected and I think the members of that committee could probably qualify as better experts than I in the matter of comparison.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman stated he could not get an estimate of the cost of different sized armies. What is the gentleman's own personal best estimate on the basis of 1,000,000 men? If we can get it in units, then we can figure an army of four or eight million fairly accurately. What would be the annual pay under this bill per 1,000,000 men?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The Army as of January 1, of course, would be about 2,000,000 men. You have the figure stated for the Army as of January 1, $285,000,000, but you cannot scale it upward in exact proportion, because the new men coming in to the enlarged Army will not have this matter of longevity increase in their pay. In other words, as the Army increases in size, the number of men with these various longevity increases will decrease in proportion. That is one reason we cannot make an accurate flat scale of comparison.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman would not want to hazard an estimate on that?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may state that the Bureau of Navigation, anticipating that question, has figured out what additional cost to the Navy would be caused by this bill. For 1943, based upon the Regular Navy, authorized to consist of 500,000 men, there would be an additional cost of $202,874,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is a point I would like to clear up in my own mind. On page 34, in section 2, appears this language:

> The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 percent.

Then at the top of page 43 it is stated that the lowest paid enlistee will receive $42. I am not clear on just how that is worked out.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. He will draw 20 percent on his base pay plus longevity pay. Very few privates will have longevity pay. They do not start drawing that until they have 3 years of service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does that 20 percent have anything to do with foreign service?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is for foreign service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to make that clear. The base pay of $42 a month is inceased by 20 percent if the man has foreign service?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is clear, is it? Now, there is another point I want to clear up. Does this bill make any provision for the dependents of the soldiers?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No; the question of dependency is coming up in another bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I should like to know about the foreign service. Is the increase in pay for such service effective when the bill becomes law?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. HOUSTON. It is not retroactive at all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is already the law.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. On the matter of pay for officers above the grade of second lieutenant, there is no question but that there are some cases of hardship. We felt that it would require more time than we could give to this bill at this time to go into that matter. The emergency just now is to adjust the pay of enlisted me and second lieutenants. It will be the intent of the committee—I believe I am authorized to say this—to investigate further the matter of officers' pay with a view to revising the pay schedule of officers above the grade of second lieutenant at some later time, but we could not hold up a bill of such vital and immediate importance as this to undertake a complete survey of the field of officers' pay at this time.

I owe the House an apology for omitting the record of one officer in this summary that appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1696. I shall call him officer No. 98. Commissioned service, 11 years. Present pay, $57.50. Proposed pay, $172.50. He has been on the retired list 15 years. I shall not name him. The record of the Classification Board is this:

> Below average in handling men, administrative and executive duties, tact, force, judgment, and leadership. Self-satisfied and opinionated. Temperamental.

That is the one I omitted by oversight in including in the RECORD today, where you could read them, all the cases of those who were classified under section 24 (b) by the boards.

These 125 officers who were eliminated under 24 (b) of the National Defense Act were eliminated by boards of officers in their respective areas of service. The officers of those boards by military law had to be senior to the officers in question or up for trial. The findings of those local boards were approved by a board of general officers here in Washington, in the War Department.

I feel that the one "sleeper" that is in this bill and that is positively dangerous to the Congress is the last paragraph of section 15. Read and study well the extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1696. I have set out there the record of the board that caused the retirement or removal from active duty, the present rate of retired pay, and the proposed rate of retired pay for those 125 officers.

I hope the Members of Congress will not come back after this becomes law, if it does become law, and say they were not informed on what they were voting on, because I am sure that someone is going to question the grounds on which you justify your vote to increase the pay of these officers eliminated under 24b from an average of $123 to an average of $228 per month.

Their disability is not a physical disability. Their disability is that they could not keep in step with the Army, they could not match the Army requirements. They were retired at an average age of 40, and, with their service experience, they should be of great value today to our Nation, but their service record is such that the War Department will not willingly place any of them back on Army duty today. That is the background of those officers, and it is in the RECORD.

The reason I went to great trouble to get that into the RECORD for your perusal today is that I could not complete that analysis in time to make it a minority report. I was not sure I would have it when this bill came out of committee. There is a lot of work in compiling these data for you. With the cooperation of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], I was very glad to get it into the RECORD entirely so that no one could charge that I had hand-picked the cases cited.

I have placed in here 98 cases, and the others have no classification except that they were placed under section 24b without explanation. I have placed in the RECORD all the records I can find on those 125 officers. I have not spared them except that I have not named them.

Now, the interesting thing about the committee report is that there is nothing said about the last paragraph of section 15. There is nothing in the setting out of the law, as required under the Ramseyer rule, so that you can compare this with present law. We do not want anything to go through here from the Military Affairs Committee without the Congress being fully informed and I want you to judge for yourself. If you disagree with me and if you think these officers who cannot serve the Nation today because of their incompatability in the service, should be so favored, then vote your own conscience and give them this increase and this retired pay up to the average of $228 a month. That is your pleasure, if you so decide, and I am not going to try to tell you how to vote, but you cannot say afterward that the committee put anything over on you unexplained.

I had the cooperation of a number of members of the committee in getting this before you after we completed the analysis of it, because we felt it was important to give the information to you. If we had had the time to make a complete analysis before the committee brought it out, we would have asked permission to file a minority report and would have given it to you in that form.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I do not believe the gentleman stated for the RECORD the time when these men were retired. I believe the gentleman ought to state to the House how long these men, who retired under section 24 (b), have been retired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Their average time in retirement now is in the neighborhood of 13 years, and I set out in the extension of my remarks that their average service is 15.7 years and their average time in retirement is approximately 13 years at this time. Their average age at time of original commission is in the neighborhood of 25 years. In other words, they went on the retired list at 40, and not for physical disability. They went there because they could not fit into the Army machine. They could not keep in step in a military way, for various reasons, and those reasons are set out in detail, and in as much detail as the board gave in their record in the War Department. I purposely omitted the names of the officers and simply gave them numbers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I want to say before I yield to the chairman of the

subcommittee that I have sat in the subcommittee with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who served as chairman of the subcommittee, and I have never seen a committee or a subcommittee work harder or more diligently, and I have never seen one more determined to be fair than was the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BROOKS. I was just going to ask the gentleman, in all fairness to the subcommittee, as well as to the full committee, to state that there was no effort to suppress debate or curtail consideration of this particular section.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not at all.

Mr. BROOKS. Neither was there any effort made by anybody to hide any facts.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman gave me every opportunity to present the facts with respect to the situation and I, perhaps, should apologize to the gentleman for not being able to assemble the facts for consideration by the committee sooner, but it was a long and difficult job to get all the facts.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me ask the gentleman if this section 5, interpreting its provisions in connection with section 3 of the act of 1940, does not place these officers at a greater advantage on retirement than it does any other service dealt with in this bill, because they retire on 75 percent of their base pay, while those in the other services retire on 2½ percent of their pay, multiplied by the number of years of their service.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes; it certainly does. They are lifted up bodily to 75 percent of their pay and longevity as of the time of their retirement, and that is a more liberal allowance than you have allowed to any other retired officers when retired for anything except physical disability or 30 years or more of service.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is exactly right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Have any of these men in this group offered their services to their country?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, indeed, they have.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they have been rejected?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. They have been rejected, although I believe there is one on duty today. I have been so informed unofficially, but I cannot recall just who gave me that information. They are not desired for active Army duty today by the War Department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They were not rejected on account of disability?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not on account of physical disability.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But passed over as not qualified?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise for the purpose of expressing my enthusiastic support of the pending measure to raise the base pay of members of our armed forces from $21 per month to $42 per month. I desire to commend the Committee on Military Affairs for reporting this meritorious bill to this House for consideration and passage. It is my sincere hope that there will not be a vote cast against this measure by any Member of this body.

The gentleman from Iowa, who preceded me, pointed out at least one weakness in the bill. I believe it is section 24 (b), which apparently discriminates against some officers in the Army, and especially second lieutenants. It is to be hoped that this will be corrected and adjusted before the final passage of the measure.

It is my understanding that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will offer amendments to correct this and other apparent weaknesses in the bill. I am sure that we all realize how difficult it is for a committee to deal with such a broad, comprehensive subject without doing an injustice to a few. The main purpose, however, of this measure, as I see it, is to bring relief to the low-paid enlisted men, many of whom have dependents at home who are in great need of relief.

As one who served for more than a year in France as a buck private during World War No. 1, I quite naturally understand, and deeply sympathize, with the problems of the enlisted personnel of all of our armed forces—the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard.

During World War No. 1 my salary was $30 in the United States and $33 per month while in France. Of that amount, I allocated $15 per month to my aged and dependent father and mother. Seven dollars and sixty-five cents per month was deducted from my salary for my Government insurance, which left the sum of $7.35 of my pay, while in the homeland and $10.35 after the Thirty-sixth Division, with which I served, arrived in France.

Of course, we all realize that the monetary consideration does not motivate our American youth to join our armed forces at this time, that our valiant men are offering their services, sacrificing their jobs, and foregoing many of the pleasures and privileges that the rest of us are now enjoying in order to preserve the American way of life and keep America a decent place in which to live. The least this Congress can do, nevertheless, for our brave men in the far-flung corners of the earth, fighting for us and our children, is to pay them a decent and respectable wage.

I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that this bill makes no provision for dependents of these men, many of whom are certain to actually suffer unless some provision is made in the near future by this Congress. It is my sincere hope that legislation will be forthcoming making adequate provision for actual dependents of the men now in uniform, who stand today as a mighty bulwark against all that Hitlerism and the Axis Powers would impose upon a free people. Let us stand by the Nation's defenders as they are so valiantly and courageously standing by us.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to spend a larger portion of my time on section 24, the provision about which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is so excited. I think if we will consider it calmly, it will be found not to be so exciting as he attempts to make it. This subcommittee was a hard-working committee. This is probably the most technical subject that you could approach on military matters. Of course, the pay system has grown up over a period of 100 years or more, and there are things in it that are hard to understand originally, but you will find somewhere in the course of the years some good reason for them, some basis of justice that has caused it and grown up. Personally, I favored going along with the recommendation of the interdepartmental committee and readjust the pay from the top to bottom, and until such time as you do so readjust it you will have inequality and situations that will not coincide with a uniform system. I was overruled in the subcommittee on that, and I make no point of it, because I think this legislation should go through with as near a unanimous report as possible, so that this relief may be given to these men.

In looking through it all, we have found such disparity as between the first and second lieutenants that we were able to break it off without doing injustice to any of the others or placing the second lieutenant too close to the officers next above him, so that we have here a bill that is thorough and just and equitable to all concerned.

I understand that there will be a proposal to make this temporary. I am not so violently opposed to that, but let me tell you this: The American people always think that the last war they have fought is the last war there will ever be. Just as soon as this war is over you will have the old attempt to economize on your Army and Navy, and, just as we have had the same bill since 1908, with a revision in 1922, you are going to have this pay bill of 1942 up perhaps to 1952 or 1962. So I say that now is the time to rearrange the entire subject as nearly as possible.

On this question of section 24 (b), which is rapidly becoming the point of feeling in this case, I shall address myself for a little while. There is nothing to become excited about in the provision now contained in the bill. If you will study the situation confronting the officers eliminated under section 24 (b) you will agree the provision in this bill is a matter of common justice and equity. When you condemn the proceeding under section 24 (b) you will not reflect on any member of the War Department. The strongest denunciation I have heard of section 24 (b) has come from the Chief of Staff himself. He came before our committee last year and condemned the provision of the National Defense Act known as 24 (b) on the ground that it is unworkable. We gave him a bill which created a system during the emergency under which he felt that he could operate, because section 24 (b) was not effective. That bill is now the law as Public Act No. 190, having been approved on July 29,

1941. Here is the situation: Back in about 1922, when the Army attempted to enforce the provisions of section 24 (b), these boards of which the gentleman from Iowa speaks went over the cases submitted to them. Approximately 300 officers were recommended for retirement under section 24 (b). Those who were guilty of misconduct, those whose drunkenness had rendered them inefficient and unqualified to discharge their duties, were not retired under 24 (b). They were eliminated from the Army, with no pension whatever. There was a specific finding by those boards in every case that the inefficiency of the officer was not due to his own misconduct.

When they finished and had 300 of these cases go into the executive departments, all 300 of them had had the same treatment of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] speaks. However, only 126 of them were then retired. What happened was that every man with political influence, every man who had any way of getting into the executive departments got his name taken off of that list. Every man who violated Army regulations in seeking political influence to aid his case remained in the Army. Remained until when? Until July 20, 1941, when General Marshall came before the Military Affairs Committee and requested new legislation which would be effective. As a result, Public, 190, was passed, but we put in a provision that every World War officer retired under the provisions of Public, No. 190, should get 75 percent of his pay, just exactly as is the provision now contained in the bill that is before you.

So what is the result? The men who used political influence, the men who ducked and dodged elimination for all of these years of active inefficient service, because they violated Army regulations and remained on the rolls, were retired at 75 percent of their pay. Under Public, No. 190, there was no requirement of a certification that the officer's inefficiency was not due to his own misconduct. If you will look at the extension of remarks placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] it looks like a bad set-up, I am willing to admit. But I call this to your attention: There were a number of officers retired under 24 (b) because they were not able to get along with their commanding officer. Of course, the commanding officer said which of the two was wrong and who was to be eliminated, and it was the junior officer who was eliminated and not the commanding officer.

Something is said on the question of intoxication. No man included in this bill which we are considering today was retired because of intoxication, because that was the result of his own misconduct. If he became inefficient because of the fact that he was addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors or drugs or any other weakness of character, he was not retired under 24 (b). He went out without compensation.

Now, there is a question of democratic procedure and the dignity of this House involved in this issue. I call attention to the fact that on the 14th day of April the War Department came before the committee and recommended the elimination of this provision from the bill. It had been placed in the bill in the Senate. At that time they said it ought to go out because it did not belong here. Now, your experience is probably the same as mine. That is, that a provision does not belong in a bill when the Department does not want it in the bill. That was the reason brought up by the Department. The only representative of the War Department to come before the committee said, on page 21 of the hearings:

> I grant you there is some merit to the proposition.

Other than that, the only thing he said was that it did not belong in this bill. If you will read another paragraph of the bill you will see that officers retired at 2½, 3½, and 4 percent are provided for. That is the reason. But here is where I say the dignity of this House is involved. This bill was sent to the committee for hearings so that we might get the evidence for you, evaluate it and discuss it. Before the committee the War Department simply said, "There is merit to the proposition, but it ought not to be in this bill." We were given no other opposition.

On yesterday three Members of the House put into the RECORD identical information. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] says he assembled it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sure the War Department collaborated on that a little, because no one else had the information from which to prepare it. I would like to know whether or not they have included in those eliminated because of this gross inefficiency the man whose last efficiency report I hold in my hand, in which he stood "excellent" in all subjects discussed.

I would like also to know whether or not they have this man, who wrote me from California as follows:

> I myself served over 20 years in the Regular Army. I have had five tours of foreign service in it, including 2 years in France, where I commanded a combat battalion and was awarded the Legion of Honor. I am now retired with the rank of lieutenant colonel, but with less pay than that of a master sergeant retired after only 10 years of service.

I say to you that the War Department should have given us the opportunity to ask as to each one of these men, "Was he the one with the Legion of Honor? Was he the one who had the excellent and superior efficiency report?"

There is nothing to be feared in section 15 of this bill; it is only justice. Now, I want to urge you not to be controlled in your decision on this matter by the stiff disciplinarian, the rigid military man. Each and every man affected by this provision is a wartime officer. These are only officers who served in World War No. 1. All World War officers retired until Public, 190, were retired at 75 percent of their pay. This group of 126 at only 2½ percent of their pay multiplied by their years of service. This does only substantial and positive justice, and it should remain in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas in order that I may ask him a question.

The gentleman favors the retention of these officers who were retired under section 50, known as the "Board bunch." I call the gentleman's attention to one other of them, No. 83:

> Below the professional standard required of an officer; requires close supervision, irresponsible in financial matters. Length of service, 15 years. Present pay, $78. Proposed pay, $180.

That is more than a $100 raise.

Mr. KILDAY. May I ask the gentleman whether he yielded to me or I to him?

Mr. MAY. I yielded to the gentleman to ask him a question and get his answer.

The gentleman says he voted for the bill last year to enable General Marshall to weed out the unworthy officers. Some 200 of them have been taken out under this provision. Does the gentleman propose to take these fellows that have been out 12 and 15 years and pay every one of them this increase?

Mr. KILDAY. I want to make it plain that every one of these officers who served in the World War and retired under Public, 190, is entitled to the 75-percent retirement pay. This is a group of 126 officers who served in the first World War. They should be given the benefits of section 15 of this bill. It will put them on an equality with other retired World War officers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But does it not give them a greater advantage than officers in other armed forces of the country?

Mr. KILDAY. Not at all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It goes beyond the Navy in this proposal.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; because the gentleman from Georgia never saw fit to prepare an amendment which would have brought the Navy men under it, which he might have done. This is an amendment to take care of this small group of retired World War officers. It would be a simple matter for the gentleman to prepare an amendment to provide for any naval officers in the same category.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that possibly the most important provision of this bill is that which relates to dependency allowance. I have just returned from a few days spent in my district. One question that was asked me repeatedly was on this subject. The increasing tempo of the war and the expanding estimates of the number of men that will be called to service are causing men with families to wonder when they will be called to the colors. Most of the men are making plans to be ready if they should be called, but, very naturally, they and

their families are wondering what provisions will be made to take care of their families. I recognize that this particular bill makes subsistence and rental allowance only for officers and does not go to the problem of the enlisted man, except insofar as it increases his base pay. I call attention to the subject, however, because it is a problem that must be faced before we can justly call the married man to Army service. These pay increases will help, but they do not meet the problem. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will soon make a report to the House on the subject.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member of the House, I am in full accord with the provisions of S. 2025, a bill to readjust existing pay and allowance rates of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the men in our armed forces scattered throughout the world have their eyes focused on Congress, hoping that we will expedite the passage of this bill that they may enjoy its benefits at the earliest possible moment.

I want to commend the House Military Affairs Committee for the time and effort spent in perfecting this legislation, and, in doing so, call attention to a possible inadvertence in the lack of provision for longevity credit for those men who were commissioned the hard way—that is to say, who arose from the ranks.

At the proper time it is my intention to offer an amendment sponsored by the veteran organizations of the country in behalf of those men who reached a commissioned status from the ranks. My amendment will simply provide that all commissioned officers who rose from the ranks shall receive an increase of 5 percent of their base pay for each 3 years of service, not exceeding 30 years; and the term "service" shall include active Federal and Reserve component service, including the National Guard, rendered as an enlisted man or warrant officer in the armed forces of our country.

The amendment will provide further that no commissioned officer will be entitled to receive pay and allowances of the maximum limitations contained in this act.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of S. 2025 is to readjust existing pay and allowance rates of the uniform services so as to provide adequate compensation and at the same time to give equal treatment to both the commissioned and enlisted personnel.

Unless my amendment is adopted, the intent of S. 2025 will not be carried out to the fullest extent, for the simple reason you have a group of commissioned officers today in all branches who received no longevity credit for prior enlisted service and who under the present language of S. 2025 will receive no such credit unless the bill is so amended to recognize prior enlisted service as covered by my amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we had this provision under consideration in the committee, that it was given very close study, and when voted on in committee it was defeated by a margin of only 1 vote. It came that close to being in the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In addition to these comissioned officers who arose from the ranks, we have commissioned National Guard officers who have been identified with the National Guard for years. Practically all their spare time has been spent in furthering the interest of the National Guard.

To show the inequity of existing laws, let us remember that Reserve officers called to active duty are given credit for longevity purposes of one-half of all period spent on inactive duty as Reserve officer. Yet on the other hand, the National Guard officer has been given no credit despite the fact that he has spent considerable time in not only attending drills and participating in summer training, but likewise has been called to become continuously occupied with administrative problems.

We must not forget to compare the enlisted service of officers today who arose from the ranks as contrasted with the credit given Reserve officers for their service in an inactive status.

Mr. Chairman, in a few words the amendment I will offer at the proper time will provide longevity credit for the enlisted men of our armed forces who by their loyalty and service have advanced to a commissioned rank, and in addition it will recognize the patriotic service rendered by commissioned National Guard officers.

Since the purpose of S. 2025 is to provide uniformity in pay allowances and since to effect such a purpose it is essential that my amendment be adopted, I sincerely hope that the amendment may receive favorable consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill in which I am happy to say I find myself in accord with most of the Members of the House. I am sure it is a fine feeling to the members of the committee here today that they are raising the pay of the enlisted men and also the pay of the lowest commissioned grades, the ensign and second lieutenant. There is no controversy whatever over that portion of the bill.

The only controversy I know of in regard to this bill is over that portion which raises the retired pay of a certain number of officers who were retired from the service because their presence there was undesirable. That is exactly why they were retired. They were inefficient. They were incompatible with the best interests of the service. They were not able, while they were in the service, to render a just return to the service in return for the money they were drawing. That is exactly why they were retired. They were retired for the good of the service. All you have to do is to turn to that portion of the RECORD which deals with the subject to learn that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Some of these men were apparently in the service for 15 years. Some of them had served overseas and were in actual combat. Why did they not discover this inefficiency sooner?

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman will get the RECORD and read the insertions that were put in yesterday, he will discover that for himself, and it will answer his question. A great many of them were retired because of being habitual drunkards or at least very hard drinkers.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would like to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I want an answer.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The reason many of them were not retired sooner was because there was no provision in the law to retire them until 1920. When you check the dates of retirement, you will find many of these officers were retired after enactment of the original authorization in the Defense Act of 1920 which was the first authorization the Congress gave the Army to eliminate them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman disagree with the gentleman from Texas who just said that none of these men were retired on account of drunkenness?

Mr. FADDIS. All I can say is that the gentleman from Texas must not have read the information put in the RECORD yesterday. The information that was put in the RECORD about that matter was taken from the files of the War Department and it gives the case history of these men. If the gentleman will turn to page A1698 and there look at the list of these men, he can ascertain for himself why they were retired.

I will leave it to his own good judgment whether the taxpayers of this country should have been saddled with the expense of maintaining a lot of worthless men in the Army who could give no return to the taxpayers for the salaries they were drawing, who were contributing nothing to the Army except inefficiency, who were trouble makers, who failed to pay their debts, who were habitual drunkards, who were incompatible with the best interests of the service, or who were not judged to be of sufficient efficiency to take an independent command or anything else.

There is no reason why those men should have been retained in the service, and there is no reason in the world why at a time like this the taxpayers of this country should be burdened by increasing the retired pay of these men. They have been gone from the Army 12 or 13 years. If they are not settled in civilian life and able to make a living by this time, then they deserve to fade entirely

out of the picture. The Government of the United States owes them no particular favors. They have been paid in full for their former services.

I know it is very popular among members of the committee here to want to give everybody more money, especially if some of the beneficiaries happen to live in your districts. That is quite true. But just the same, we are the guardians of the money of the people. We are the ones who should keep an eye on the expenditures of the Government and see that the money of the taxpayers is not spent for unworthy purposes. There is no reason why these men should have any further claim upon the consideration of this Government as far as giving them any raises is concerned. They were retired, and they were retired under provisions they knew of at the time and under which they have lived since that time. There is no reason why their retired pay should be raised today.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman understand from the list placed in the RECORD that the average raise for all of these men is around $100 a month?

Mr. FADDIS. I understand so.

A great deal has been said about the class B board. I have been rather well acquainted with the affairs of the Army for a good many years. One fault I have had to find with the class B board is that it did not work often enough. Another fault I have had to find with the matter is that the findings of the class B board have been too often interfered with by higher authority and set aside.

In relation to the workings of the class B board there came a time when it was almost impossible to make them work. It came to be that the officer who preferred the charges, who was trying to get the inefficient officer out of the service, was more on trial than the officer he was trying to get out of the service. It came to be that where an officer gave a low mark on an efficiency report he himself was put to such inconvenience and such trouble in defending his rating of that officer that he came to the conclusion it was a lot easier to give a rating of "satisfactory" and be done with all the trouble he would otherwise have been put to if he were conscientious in his actions.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Is not that the reason General Marshall came before the Committee on Military Affairs last fall and begged and pleaded with the committee to pass a law, which happily now is Public, 190, to enable the Department to get rid of dissipated, incompetent, inexperienced, and disqualified men? He said they had tried for years under the old law to get rid of inefficient men, but due to personal and political influence it was almost an impossibility.

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly true. The Chief of Staff of the United States Army himself admitted that the class B board could not be made to operate satisfactorily enough to rid the Army of its inefficient officers.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It looks as if we are about to spend all the time talking about 125 men. I do not believe there ought to be an increase in any retirement pay. What other increases in retirement pay are in this bill?

Mr. FADDIS. There are increases in retirement pay in this bill in respect to some other officers who were retired at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 percent of the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which they were entitled to credit.

At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to cut out all provisions to raise the pay of any retired officer in connection with this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Outside of the section to which the gentleman has referred, there is in this bill no increase in the retired pay of any officers except a very minor increase in the retired pay of second lieutenants, which is reflected in the fact that the second lieutenant's salary is raised $300 per year and, therefore, that raise is reflected in the percentage retirement. That is the only other raise.

Mr. FADDIS. At the proper place I intend to offer an amendment that will cut out any raise in retired pay to any officer.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I commend the gentleman on his position on that point. I think it is a very fundamental position. The retired list and what we do with it has no part in our present war effort which the active Army is fighting.

Mr. FADDIS. Absolutely not. The purpose for which this bill was designed was to raise the pay of the men in the service and the men who are going to render some return to the Nation for the raise they will receive.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. This does not raise the pay of those men very much, does it?

Mr. FADDIS. I am not acquainted with just how much it does raise the pay of those men, but it does raise the pay of these class B men an average of $100.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. As a matter of fact, this retirement pay is a pension based on rank, is it not?

Mr. FADDIS. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is admitted by Mr. Fitzgerald, the leading proponent of the proposed Emergency Officers Retirement Act, which was passed in 1928, who admitted that this is a retirement based on rank. Does it not seem to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that instead of increasing these pensions based on rank we might, to a greater extent, increase the pay of the men in the ranks of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps and avoid a bonus fight after the war is over?

Mr. FADDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the way to avoid a bonus fight after the war is over is to give each man a good proportion of the raise which he is receiving under the terms of this bill in war bonds today and then he would have it when he comes home.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman means by that statement that he would increase his pay now and pay a part of it in war bonds?

Mr. FADDIS. That is right.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. And it is further true that in respect of this retirement pay these officers have not contributed one penny to the retirement fund?

Mr. FADDIS. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In connection with the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the appropriation bill for the last fiscal year carried an appropriation of $76,156,000 for retirement pay to which no such contribution was made.

Mr. FADDIS. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not that make it all the more important that we concentrate at this time on the matter of increasing the pay of the enlisted man and adjusting any injustices or inequalities in allowances and then follow that with the gentleman's amendment regarding the commissioning of civilians into the Army? Could not a lot of these other matters wait until there is a study made of the whole subject of retired pay? It seems to me that the important thing now, and the thing that this Congress feels it ought to do in all justice, is to raise the pay of the enlisted man and let a lot of this other stuff go by for a while. I will support the bill, and I think that, on the whole, the subcommittee has done a splendid job, but many of these other matters can wait until the emergency is over and we have more time for consideration and careful study.

Mr. FADDIS. That is quite true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And is it not also a fact that the Senate bill and this committee amendment go further than that and deal with increasing the allowances and the retired pay and also deal with a number of complicated things that are necessarily involved in a pay

bill? Why should not this bill be made a temporary bill instead of permanent legislation?

Mr. FADDIS. I agree with the gentleman that it should be temporary and in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] I want to say that this matter of raising the retired pay of the class B officers came in as a result of the activities of a lobby composed of those officers themselves.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have just had some surprising information come to me to the effect that there is a misunderstanding as to whether the rates of pay in the cases set cut in the appendix for May 11 are for active duty. I would like to emphasize at this point that the rates of pay are for inactive, retired status.

Mr. FADDIS. And those men will not be ordered to active duty.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The War Department does not desire their presence in the Army in connection with our war effort.

Mr. FADDIS. And if they should at any time be ordered to active duty, it would be on the active duty pay of any other officer, plus the allowances.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. FADDIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one other thing. On the last page of this bill, page 60, in line 3, I intend to offer an amendment to that paragraph which will require the War Department to begin to report as of May 1, 1942, regarding the civilians they are commissioning directly into the Army.

This whole paragraph caused a great deal of discussion in the committee, and aroused a great deal of interest throughout the United States. There were a great many men being commissioned from civilian life directly into the Army, and whether wrongly or rightly, the people throughout the United States had gained the impression that this authority to commission directly from civilian life was being abused. I believe the matter has now been brought to a head, and I do not believe there is much danger of any further abuses of this power, and we have provided now that the Secretary of War must report to the Congress every 60 days in detail regarding all commissions given direct to civilians. I want to start that 60 days on May 1 of this year, giving the names, legal residence, age, rank, and branch of the service, with the special qualification of each person commissioned from civilian life.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more. The gentleman of course is the original sponsor of section 20 of this bill which relates to the issuing of commissions to civilians without military experience. I think, in justice to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I should say that he has rendered the country a great service in presenting that section, and he will admit, as he admitted in the committee, that the Army will have to have considerable latitude in calling in experts and technicians from business and industry and civilian life to aid in the character of war that we have on hand.

Mr. FADDIS. There is no doubt about that fact, and they have ample power under the terms of section 20, as it now is, to accomplish their purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask if the committee in adopting that paragraph on page 60 of the bill gave any consideration to requesting the Secretary of the Navy to give to the Congress similar consideration?

Mr. FADDIS. I believe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is going to take care of the provisions in respect to the Navy. The Committee on Military Affairs did not feel that it was competent to deal with those affairs of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia And may I say that the Navy Department does not feel it necessary to make a report every 6 months or every 30 days, but as to the other portion of the Faddis amendment, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. FADDIS. But the Congress might believe it wise for the Secretary of the Navy to report every 60 days, as well as the Secretary of War.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to make an explanation. The statement which appears on page 24 of the public hearings was read by me by request and does not necessarily express my own opinion. It was satisfactorily answered by representatives from the War Department.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to go into the technicalities of this bill. It is an extremely complicated measure and I think we can with confidence leave the technical details to the able members of the Committee on Military Affairs who have devoted considerable time and study to this important legislation.

I should just like to express the hope that when we come to a final vote on this bill, providing for an increase in pay of the men and women in the military and naval service, there will not be one dissenting voice. Having served in the United States Navy during the last war, I know something of the sacrifices made by the men and women in the service, by their parents, their wives, and children. When we raise the base pay of a private in the Army or of an apprentice seaman in the Navy to $42 a month, with adjusted increases for the higher grades, we are not compensating our soldiers, sailors, nurses, and marines for the risks they take and the sacrifices they make. No monetary consideration can be said to be adequate compensation.

Our boys are not fighting for $42 a month. They are fighting for their country and for her cherished traditions of freedom. They are giving their lives that this generation and the next, their children and our children, may be safe and secure from the yoke of tyrants and that all may have peace and security. For such a cause no sacrifice can be too great. That is the spirit of American manhood and womanhood, and it is that spirit which will ultimately bring victory.

When I cast my vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, I am merely saying, in a very small way, to the men in the service that I wish to do something to provide some measure of security for your families. It is little indeed that we do here.

There is more, Mr. Chairman, that we can do for our boys in the service, not necessarily by way of pay and patriotic speeches. We have duties to perform. It is for us to toil and sweat here at home, to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary, in order that these boys may have every ship, every tank, every gun, and every shell they need. It is for us to set aside petty differences and to unite, as freemen only can unite, in a concerted effort—each making his contribution in accordance with his talents and skill to the best of his ability, and more—for early and complete victory.

We must win. We will win. Freedom will never die. I take this occasion to salute the men and women in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Military Affairs Committee are to be commended for bringing in their unanimous report on the pending proposal to increase the pay for the members of our armed forces.

No amount of pay could ever be adequate compensation for the supreme contribution that they are making to the welfare and the safety of our own country. What they are doing cannot be measured in dollars and cents. But a just and considerate government could do no less than give wholehearted approval to the pending measure.

Deductions for insurance, deductions for laundry, payments sent home for dependents in many cases, and many other things, make the present pay scale wholly and totally inadequate.

The least that a grateful people can do is to give thundering and unanimous support to the pending bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I am happy to have an opportunity to vote for a measure that will increase the pay of the enlisted men of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. This debate has been very informative. I am taking this time for the purpose of urging the passage of this bill and asking some questions so that our minds may be perfectly clear on certain provisions of the bill. As I understand the bill as written, the base pay of all enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps is $42 a month, which begins with December 7, 1941, if this bill is passed.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And that will be the seventh grade. Then there are six other grades, which include warrant and petty officers, and the base pay of the first grade will be $138 per month. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And if any of these men are called into foreign service, their pay automatically increases 20 percent?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; 20 percent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman understands that there is only an increase in the first enlistment of $2 per month after a man has served a year. In other words, under the law today he gets $30 when he has served a year, and he gets $10 a month extra, and this bill gives him $42 a month.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand it that way. I am in favor of $50 per month for grades 6 and 7 instead of $42 and $48.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is what the law is.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand that all the men in the Army today, the privates in the lowest grade, whether they have served 1 month or 2 months or 10 days, will start with $42 a month.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. They all start at $42 a month.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I voted to increase their pay $10 when the draft bill was up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But then the man who has already been in the service for a year, by this bill, only gets an increase of $2 a month?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. So that it puts the seventh grade of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps all on the same basis, $42 a month?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; all in the same position.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The fact is this bill benefits those who have served less than 4 months, to a considerable extent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It doubles their pay.

Mr. MOTT. It benefits those who have served less than a year to a considerable extent. However, as to those privates and lower grade noncommissioned officers who have served more than a year, it benefits them practically nothing.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those who have had less than 4 months of service have been serving at $21 a month. That is the law now. If we pass this bill, we immediately raise them to $42. We increase their pay 100 percent.

Mr. MOTT. That is right. There is no doubt that this bill is better than what we had before, but the idea that this is greatly increasing the pay of the average enlisted man is a lot of bunk.

Mr. BROOKS. The point the gentleman has in mind is this: When you get to class 7, which is what they call the buck private of the ranks, under the present law he gets $21 a month, but that same man occupying the same classification, doing the same work after 4 months, would get $30 a month. We did not think it was fair to pay one man $21 a month and the other $30 a month for doing the same work.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This puts all of grade 7 on the $42 basis.

Mr. BROOKS. They are all on the $42 basis.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And in the Marine Corps and in the Navy as well?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then when you get up to the highest class, the first-class warrant and petty officers in the enlisted men, in the Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy, they start, with the passage of this act, at $138 a month. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, that covers the sergeant major. If the gentleman understands what a sergeant major is in the Army, and the corresponding rank in the Navy, he gets $138. There is a $2 increase for that rating.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. So that is cleared up. Now I am sure that some of you gentlemen know from your investigation that we have heard a lot of rumors and talk of what is being paid to enlisted men in other countries. What does Canada pay her enlisted man?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman, in looking at the hearings, will find a chart that covers all of the major nations of the earth. He will find that Australia pays more than the United States pays even under the proposed increase, but we will pay slightly above the Canadian pay.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Australia pays more than the United States?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And Canada at the present time is paying more than the United States, but with the passage of this bill we will pay slightly more than Canada? Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. I think it is just the reverse, but it is pretty close. I checked those charts and it looked to me that we will still be just a little below Canada.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So that it is your understanding that Australia pays more than the United States. How much more does Canada pay its enlisted men?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman can interpret the chart.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. I am sure the gentleman has it at his fingertips just how much it is.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not have the exact difference at my fingertips.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much more does Canada pay her men?

Mr. BROOKS. I said we pay more than Canada.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a small difference, but it is a difference.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You mean we pay more than Canada, or does Canada pay more than we do?

Mr. BROOKS. We pay more than Canada.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a small difference.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Since we are allowing 20 percent for overseas service, I am wondering whether or not that will increase the pay of our buck private above the pay of a buck private of the Australian Army?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I favor $50 a month for grades 6 and 7. Well, whatever you write into this bill you will not write too much.

Mr. BROOKS. I fully agree with the gentleman. I am in favor of the ordinary soldier getting as much as we can give him.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Absolutely. Now, I want to say that I am in favor of the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. I think it is a just and proper amendment and it should be adopted. It gives just recognition to those who work up from the ranks to commissions.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Where in the bill is the provision that states that the enlisted man shall continue to receive the $10 increase after 12 months of service?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is written into the bill.

Mr. PACE. I do not find it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am sure the gentleman will find it in the bill. I forget the page number.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The proposed increase of pay for the seventh grade, or the so-called buck privates, provides rates that are far more desirable than the $5 per month pay which was proposed in the original selective service bill. Does the gentleman recall that munificent sum with which it was intended to insult the young men when they were drafted into the service in peacetime?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; that was in the bill, the one which proposed to draft every male between the ages of 18 and 65 years of age. As I recall it provided $5 a month. That was the first draft draw proposed in 1940.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have heard that thing said so many, many times. I thought the people had gotten tired of saying it and hearing it. That amount was suggested in that bill purely as a token. It was explained over and over again before the Committe on Military Affairs and on the floor of the House. Five dollars a month—perfect nonsense!

Mr. DWORSHAK. But it was printed in the original bill when it was introduced.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was part of the proposed bill, I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Kentucky and I can hire a hall and debate it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I favor the base pay for enlisted men in grades 6 and 7 of $50 per month instead of $42 for No. 1 and $48 as written in

this bill. Under the bill as written corporals and seamen of the first class will receive $66 per month; sergeants and petty officers of the third class $78, staff sergeants and petty officers of the second class $96, first technical sergeants and petty officers first class $114, master sergeants and chief petty officers $138.

If we give the seventh grade $50 per month, the pay of enlisted men will range from $50 to $138 per month. This bill also gives an increase to second lieutenants.

Australia pays her enlisted men similar to our seventh grade of enlisted men, $62.10 a month. I have been informed that Canada pays her enlisted men in the lower grades for foreign service $65 per month. Why should we deny our 6 and 7 grade of enlisted men less than $50 per month to start with? Under this bill our enlisted men will receive 20 percent increase of their base pay for foreign service and our enlisted men will also receive 50 percent increase for service in the air with our aircraft forces, $50 to $100 extra for parachute service. This measure also gives increases to the nurses with our armed forces. The increases for our enlisted men are especially necessary and just. They must take out insurance, pay for cleaning, pressing, laundry, repairing of clothes and shoes, pay for soap, shaving outfits and other toilet articles and many other articles they must buy. They are also expected like other citizens are expected to buy bonds and stamps.

Hundreds of thousands of our young men will leave behind dependent wives, children, and parents.

In a few days, it is hoped that Congress will pass an allotment act whereby the Government will make allotments to dependents and it will be necessary for our enlisted men to match the Government's money to provide support for their dependents. I cannot see how they can get along with less than $50 per month, and I trust that this bill will be amended so as to provide $50 per month for base pay for those in the seventh grade.

Under this law those in the other five grades will receive substantial increases. This bill also provides for a 10-percent increase after 4 years of service. This will greatly benefit those who have been in the service for some considerable time and most of whom are in the higher grades. Only a few of those of the sixth and seventh grades will benefit by this 10 percent, and that is another good reason why those in the sixth and seventh grades should receive at least $50 per month as base pay.

We must not forget those who leave their homes, their families, and friends and business opportunities and go out to fight for us and offer their lives for us and our country should receive generous treatment at the hands of this great Republic. Let us cut out profiteering and boondoggling and nonessential projects and expenditures so that we may accord just and fair treatment to our defenders and their dependents. It would please me if we could secure for them a greater increase. I feel sure that $42 a month to start with is too low and we should not make it less than $50 per month.

In the last World War the base pay for enlisted men was $30 per month on this side and $33 in foreign service, and then the boys when they came home had to fight for more than 17 years to secure their adjusted compensation. The amount that we are paying our enlisted men and officers is only a drop in the bucket compared to what we are spending in this great war effort. We can and we must win this great war. Let us express our appreciation and gratitude to our defenders.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the same amendment about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] just addressed the House. I was not present when he made his speech, but I do agree that his amendment should be adopted. I too have prepared an amendment and I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are agreed that it accomplishes the same purpose. My amendment provides that when an enlisted man is promoted to become an officer, that the time he served as an enlisted man should count in computing his longevity pay, just the same as his time served as a commissioned officer.

On February 16 of this year this House by unanimous consent passed the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] giving that longevity pay credit for enlisted service to the Navy. It went through by unanimous consent. There was not a single objection. Why come along with this bill as of this date and rescind the action taken by this House in the Maas bill insofar as the Navy is concerned? I can see no reason why credit for service as an enlisted man should be taken away from a man when he is promoted to a commissioned status in the Army.

The amendment was before our committee and as I recall it was lost by one vote; so it was a very close opinion of the committee as to the justice of this proposition. I want the House to know that in conjunction with the gentleman from Pennsylvania I shall endeavor to correct what we believe is an injustice being done by withholding credit for longevity service of enlisted men. I hope the Members will support our amendment when the bill is read for amendment and the proper time comes to offer it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that men who were commissioned from the ranks prior to July of 1922 are receiving longevity credit for their enlisted and commissioned service?

Mr. EDMISTON. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Whereas the men in the same categories today do not?

Mr. EDMISTON. That is correct; and that comes about simply by the deadline of a date. That has taken the privilege away from them.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to state to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] who just relinquished the floor, that at the proper time I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the tables appearing on page 26 of the hearings setting forth the base pay of the enlisted men in the other great armies of the world.

Mr. EDMISTON. And I shall have some additional figures to include in the RECORD at the time the amendment is offered to show that it would be decidedly to the disadvantage of a master sergeant or a technical sergeant to accept a commission; that it would be more to his advantage to retain his status as a sergeant than to accept a second lieutenancy.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS. I am very much interested in the gentleman's reference to adjusting what seems to be a discrimination against enlisted men. As I understand the situation today, the War Department is now commissioning out of civilian life certain people whose special training renders it desirable that they be given commissions.

Mr. EDMISTON. That is right, and then every 60 days report to the Congress whom they have commissioned out of civilian life.

Mr. SANDERS. It is also my understanding that this same liberty of action does not hold true with regard to enlisted men. For instance, if there is an enlisted man already in the United States Army whose special training and special qualifications are such that he might be a desirable commissioned officer, the War Department has not the liberty of action that it has with regard to the commissioning of civilians, because the enlisted man comes under the requirements of Army regulations and Army regulations require certain things that are not required of civilians.

Mr. EDMISTON. That is true. Your enlisted man who is in the Army must attend an officers' candidate school to secure his commission.

Mr. SANDERS. Exactly. With regard to special training, such as for the Judge Advocate's Department, and I speak of that because I am an attorney, what earthly good would it do for an enlisted man to go to an officers' training school to qualify for that particular department, and is not the same thing true of other specialist branches? In justice to the enlisted man, where there is special training, the War Department should be able to give a commission to an enlisted man just as readily as to a civilian.

Mr. EDMISTON. I agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD at this point and to include certain quotations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PAY FOR ARMED SERVICE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that we now have an opportunity to consider S. 2025 and to provide for increased pay for the service of our selectees and enlisted men, and to readjust the pay allowances for the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The base pay of privates in enlisted service of $21 per month is wholly inadequate, as it is now provided in existing laws. Under the act now before us this base pay will be increased to $42 a month. This should be increased. While it is true that these enlisted men after the service of a year under present requirements receive $40 a month, it is also true that during this first year of service the enlisted men receive the lesser pay, and in many instances receive less pay than do their privates doing the same service.

The act of June 10, 1922, for the first time established a uniform pay system for service in these several branches of service. The 1922 act provided for a readjustment rather than for a pay increase. Since 1922 many changes have been made in the original pay readjustment act.

The present and the proposed monthly base pay of enlisted men is shown by the following table:

Grade	Present base pay [1]	Proposed base pay
1. Master sergeant; chief petty officer	$120	$138
1a. Acting chief petty officer, Navy and Coast Guard only	99	126
2. First or technical sergeant; petty officer, first class	84	114
3. Staff sergeant; petty officer, second class	72	96
4. Sergeant; petty officer, third class	60	78
5. Corporal; seaman, first class	54	60
6. Private, first class; seaman, second class	36	48
7. Private; apprentice seaman	30	42
Seventh grade men with less than 4 months' service	21	[2]

[1] Add $10 per month to total pay after 12 months' service.
[2] Eliminate.

Warrant and chief warrant officers of the Army are now paid according to the following schedule:

Army mine-planter service

Grade and monthly base pay:	
Master	$185
First mate	148
Second mate	148
Chief engineer	175
Assistant engineer	148
Second assistant engineer	148

U. S. Army

Grade and monthly base pay:	
Chief warrant officer	$175
Warrant officer (junior grade)	148

The effect of this bill, should it be enacted into law, will provide pay for members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, as shown by the following table, which also shows the existing pay therefor:

Monthly pay of nurses

Grade	Years' service	Present pay	Proposed pay
Nurse	Under 3	$70	$90
	Over 3	$90	105
	Over 6	$115	120
	Over 9	$130	135
	Over 12		150
Chief nurse		Pay as nurse plus $50	[1]
Assistant superintendent, director, assistant director		Pay as nurse plus $125	[1]
Superintendent		Pay as nurse plus $208.33	[1]

[1] No change.

Mr. Chairman, as shown by the committee's report, no accurate information was presented to the committee upon which to base the estimated cost of this bill to the Government for the personnel that will be included in our armed forces under the proposed plans now recommended. However, based upon the strength on January 1, 1942, the annual cost is estimated as approximately $285,000,000. Regardless, however, of the cost, as a matter of justice it is clear to me, Mr. Chairman, these men and women who have been called from private life to active service in our armed forces to provide protection for our country in this great emergency are entitled to fair remuneration for this most worthy service they are rendering. The minimum basic pay of $42 a month provided by this bill is at least a minimum that should be provided. I hope it will be increased by amendment. In this connection it should be remembered, of course, that additional allowances to the enlisted men in the service will very materially increase the total compensation above the $42 minimum.

At the proper time I will be happy to cast my vote for the passage of this bill for giving this belated recognition to our men and women in uniform who are giving such heroic service to our country in this time of trial confronting us.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], that we have no more requests for time on this side. I remind the gentlemen of the committee that the sooner we start reading the bill the sooner we will finish it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, thus far in this debate I have not had much to say on this bill. However, on the whole I am in accord with the measure, but would like to see certain amendments adopted. Well do I remember that an effort to raise the base pay of the soldier to $50 per month was made when the Selective Service Act was being passed. That amendment failed to carry. I understand from several gentlemen that a similar amendment will be offered today, and I wish to announce that I shall vote for it.

The offhand suggestion has been made that this measure to increase remuneration is chiefly for the officers, and while I approve of that part of it I do not want us to overlook the base pay of the man who has to carry the gun and face the fire of the enemy. Certainly I shall favor an improvement of this bill in respect to base pay.

In spite of all our efforts to fix prices and ration necessities, the pay heretofore voted for members of our armed forces is diminishing in purchasing power. It is only justice that we should recognize that fact and remedy it in this legislation. It is far better today to attempt to deal justly with our defenders than it is to attempt in after years to make good in part any deficiencies for our fighting men.

Of course, it is staggering to think of the enormous probable cost of this war when we consider the other millions of armed men which we plan to have, over and above our present force, and when we think of the increased pay which we are voting in this bill. On the other hand, we cannot compare either the pay or the sacrifices which the men in the armed forces are making with those of anyone who stays at home. I think we should legislate on the basis that nothing is too much to pay for the preservation of this country with all that it means to us and to the future, and along with that, nobody is doing so much to preserve this country for ourselves and our posterity as are the men in the fighting forces of our Nation. With this background let us enact this legislation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that I express the sentiment of the majority of the Members of the House when I commend the committee for having reported the Readjustment Pay Act which is presently under consideration.

Much has and will be said in connection with the basic purpose of the bill; namely, the general revision upward of the pay schedules of the enlisted men and the officers in our armed services. There can be little dispute with that objective. I should, however, like for a few minutes to refer to section 20 of the bill, and with respect to that section I want to commend the committee for having given additional and careful consideration to the necessity of broadening the limitations contained therein. This section has to do with the issuance of commissions. As originally drafted, the bill restricted unnecessarily the power of the authorities to commission civilians who had had no previous military training. Obviously, it would have been unwise to pursue that course, for the prosecution of a war such

as that in which we are now engaged requires that the Army and the Navy have the power to draw upon any type or source of civilian manpower where those civilians have specialized knowledge or training.

I have come recently to learn of the creation of the boards composed of civilians throughout the country whose duty it was to interview prospective candidates for commissions and refer those candidates who seemed qualified by training and experience to the regular authorities in the Army. The practice of engaging the services of such civilian boards has met with some criticism. Whether that criticism has been well founded or not, I do not know. But this I do know. In the boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens in the city of New York, there was created a civilian board to interview candidates for the administrative and other branches of the Army Air Corps, which board was composed of an outstanding group of public-spirited, patriotic, and unquestionably competent citizens.

The principal member of this board was former Judge Edward A. Richards, president of the East New York Savings Bank, a man who has been most successful in his own private life and public service and who continually is engaged in movements of public interest devoted to improving the community and the country.

The other members of the board were Supreme Court Justice James T. Hallinan, the late Cary D. Waters, former president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; Louis C. Wills, distinguished attorney of Brooklyn, and Mr. Mackin, an industrialist of that area.

These men I know served in a thoroughly unselfish and conscientious manner and served well. Their duty was principally to evaluate the background, training, and experience of the applicants and this their own executive qualities fitted them to do. In many of the types of places to be filled, no previous military training is required and, therefore, neither the members of the civilian boards nor the applicants should be criticized because they were civilians. It is rather unfortunate that general criticism of a method or procedure should be indulged in because it does result in injustice in many cases, and I know that any such criticism concerning the civilian board which operated in Brooklyn and Queens would be, in fact, unfounded and unjust. These men are as deeply interested in helping their country win the war as any citizen, whether he be in military or civilian life. Their long background of dealing with the public and appraising human characteristics, as well as discharging places of importance, were utilized in the work in which they were engaged. Rather than be subjected to any criticism, whether directly or indirectly, they should rather be commended for the patriotic zeal with which they discharged their duties. I want expressly to commend them and to express the appreciation of their fellow citizens for the splendid work they did. I want, too, to commend the authorities who were instrumental in utilizing their services and express the hope that the system will be continued.

We want to do everything we can to help today. The passage of this bill is a step in that direction.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall take pleasure in supporting this piece of legislation because I believe the pay and allowances of the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health should be adjusted.

I have asked for this time, however, to say a few words relative to the argument some of those who are unfriendly to labor are making respecting the pay of $21 per month the selectees have been drawing under the Selective Training and Service Act.

Oh, some of these labor haters can roll $21 per month around in their mouths until it has the ring of Judas' 30 pieces of betrayal silver. They try, by innuendo and suggestive if not by direct charge, to create the impression that labor is not only betraying their country but their boys in asking for a fair wage scale—in asking for their just portion of the profits of industry.

Well, let us look into this charge. I think I have a right to express my views on this subject, because I have a boy whose background for clean, manly living and scholastic attainment—and I say it with filial pride—is all that a father could ask, and he is drawing exactly that sum, $21 per month. Labor, the very class some are now trying to harass by the passage of repressive legislation, has more boys drawing $21 per month than any other class in America. And I testify with pride that I have not heard my boy, nor have I heard any of the sons of labor, complaining about the pay they are drawing. Why? Because, thank God, they are fighting for love of country and not for love of money. While you could not hire them to fight for $21 per month, or any other sum, you could not hire them not to fight when the safety and security of this Republic is in jeopardy for all the gold of a Midas.

It is a cheap, common argument—one that is calculated to incite prejudice and dampen patriotism—and therefore one that is unworthy of the true patriot. And, too, it is an argument that comes with poor grace from many of those who are making it. As to this let me be specific in my reference. I refer to those who, through pull and influence, have been able to take their sons out of combat service—out of the $21 class—by decorating them with epaulets and sheltering them, for the duration, in the War and Navy Departments at good salaries—at salaries that are far in excess of the best paid laborers in this country.

Let me remind you that labor has probably more at stake in this conflict than any other class. They know what has happened to labor in the countries that are under the ruthless heels of the dictators. Then, too, as I stated, labor has more sons in the combat service than any other class in America. Do you think that labor does not treasure its American freedom? Do you think that liberty is not as dear to them as it is to you? Do you think that they want to lose their freedom and liberty and become the slaves and vassals of a Hitler? Do you think that labor will let their own sons—their own flesh and blood—down? Do you think that because their hands are callous from toil that their hearts are not warm with filial love? Pray, I beseech you, tell me what kind of people do you think our laboring people are? Oh, let me paraphrase a famous passage from the Merchant of Venice. Hath not a laborer eyes? Hath not a laborer hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as the industrialist, the banker, the farmer, Members of Congress, yes; and members of the Manufacturers' Association, and the Southern States Industrial Council? If you prick him, does he not bleed? If you tickle him, does he not laugh? If you poison him, does he not die? And if you wrong him, will you not arouse his passion until he becomes resentful?

Did I say it was a cheap, common argument? Yes; that is exactly what I said, and that is exactly what it is. And no one knows this better than those who are making the argument. They cannot plead ignorant. They know that Americans—and there are no better Americans in America than our laboring class—do not fight for love of money but for love of country. They know—whether it is right or wrong—that there never has been any relationship between the industrial wage scale, salaries, dividends and profits, and the soldier's pay. Probably we should change our policy and require all classes, during grave emergencies, to stand upon the same footing. If we do make a change in our policy, then the change should consist not in commercializing the defense of our country and placing it upon a dollar-and-cent basis but rather in raising all civilian classes, during the emergency, up to the high patriotic level of the soldier. If the soldier fights for love of country, then there is strong and persuasive argument that we who stay at home should work for love of country.

But until we do change our policy, no one has the right to single out and point the finger of scorn at labor. Let me make this proposition, which is made on the Scriptural authority of letting the one who is without fault cast the first stone: That members of the Manufacturers' Association, the members of the Southern States Industrial Council, those who criticize Mr. Roosevelt for advocating limiting, during the emergency, net incomes to $25,000 per year, and all others who have given heed to the spurious argument, who are willing to limit their incomes to bed and board and $21 per month—which is the pay of the selectees—be permitted, without restraint, to throw all the rocks at labor they desire; otherwise quit their rock throwing.

If this proposition is accepted, then, in my opinion, rock throwing on this score will cease.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is important to the men who are serving in the armed forces of the United States. Their families are also directly interested in our dealing fairly with our soldiers. I am sure that the committee by bringing this legislation to the House today is acting in the best interest of the Nation. We owe a duty to these men who are protecting our Republic, and we must give them every consideration.

On March 23, during House debate, I called to the attention of the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. MAY] the need for raising the basic pay of those who fight for America in this terrible struggle.

During further discussion in this chamber on the subject on March 28, I commended the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] for presenting such a measure. At that time I said:

> Every excess in the operation of government here at home lessens by just that much what we give to our soldiers at the fighting front.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Congress will speedily send to the President an adequate and fair measure as a further proof of our intention to successfully prosecute the war.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill embodies the provisions of a bill which I introduced over a year ago, the first pay-raise bill for soldiers and sailors in the country. It is my primary interest to see this bill passed and to see that the base pay is increased from $21 to $42 per month.

On June 15, 1941, I made a nation-wide radio address in which I outlined for the very first time the proposal to double the base pay of enlisted men in the Army and Navy. I was most happy to see these same provisions become the fundamental part of the bill S. 2025.

Since that time much legislation for the benefit of our soldiers and sailors has been introduced. I have welcomed and approved proposals for higher base pay raises than the one I made. However, in making the original appeal I decided some definite system should be set up, some principle be established so it would reach down to the great rank and file of the men in the lowest grades of pay.

The bill we are now considering does exactly what I wanted in the first place. I am more than pleased and complimented that the distinguished members of the Committee on Military Affairs have seen fit to include in S. 2025 the provisions of the Hall bill which was the very first to call for doubling the base pay of soldiers and sailors of our armed forces, namely, from $21 to $42 per month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

The first period, $1,800; the second period, $2,000; the third period, $2,400; the fourth period, $3,000; the fifth period $3,500; and the sixth period, $4,000.

The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard who have completed 30 years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who have completed 23 years' service.

The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who have completed 17 years' service.

The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who have completed 10 years' service.

The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed 5 years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service up to 30 years.

For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 percent of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this act or as may otherwise be provided by law: *Provided*, That in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer who was appointed to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy, after August 24, 1912, the time spent at such academy shall not be counted.

The provisions of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 percent and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be increased by 10 percent for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the percent increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect 12 months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my very great appreciation of the fact that this bill is about to become law. I believe we all want the pay of the enlisted men and certainly the pay of some of the officers should be increased. I also wish to speak a word of appreciation of the remarkable and heroic work done by the Army nurses in the Philippines, the Bataan Peninsula, and in Corregidor. They undoubtedly saved many lives and performed their duties under tremendous hardship. We know that three of the nurses were injured. I am particularly glad that pay increases are granted for the nurses in this bill.

Certainly this bill is a matter of partial justice to our Army and Navy. The country demands great sacrifices of them. And the country owes them a great debt.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry to clarify a matter, at least in my own mind.

On page 34, in lines 18, 19, and 20, these offshore increases are made effective as of December 7, 1941. With this I am in full accord. Then on page 59, line 3, the bill carries this provision:

> No back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

I do not understand how you can make these increases retroactive to December 7 and then in this language state that these payments shall not be made.

Mr. BROOKS. The first provision to which the gentleman refers expressly states that those engaged in overseas and sea duty shall receive their pay. The other refers to pay and allowances, and is in the pay and allowances groups.

Mr. PACE. Would not making an increase retroactive to December 7 certainly be in the nature of back pay? If you are now going to pay a soldier an increased amount, that he otherwise could not receive except under this bill, and make it retroactive to December 7, it certainly would be an accumulation of back pay, it seems to me.

Mr. BROOKS. Personally, I have no objection to any change the gentleman may suggest, but when a law, as does this, states specifically that a payment shall be made, and then in general terms elsewhere states that back pay and allowances shall not be given, the specific provision takes precedence over the general provision.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the difficulty comes from failing to understand the technical meaning of the terms "pay" and "allowances" as used in this bill. "Pay" means base pay. "Allowances" means allowances for rental and for subsistence. Therefore, these special things such as the bonus, as it might be called, for flying pay or foreign pay or off-shore pay or sea pay do not count as actual pay under the text of this bill. It is an additional amount. It is an allowance which is in the form of a bonus for a particular or extra-hazardous service rendered. The part of the bill the gentleman referred to as speaking about pay refers only to base pay. The gentleman will find that allowances relate only to subsistence and rental allowances.

Mr. PACE. The trouble is that section 2 calls it "pay," stating that the base pay shall be increased 20 percent.

Mr. KILDAY. During that time.

Mr. PACE. Therefore, it becomes 120 percent, and certainly it is still pay.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think the gentleman will find that the difficulty will arise of which he speaks, in addition to what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has said of the special provision as to this allowance. I do not think there is any danger of that happening at all, because the meaning of pay and allowances is well understood in the Comptroller's office and everywhere else.

Mr. PACE. While I cannot agree with your distinction, at the same time I am willing to accept your statement and that of the gentleman from Louisiana as to the purpose and intent of the committee in the use of this apparently inconsistent language.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the percent and time rates up to 30 years provided in section 1 of this act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of 3 years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than 1 month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the 31st day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 35, line 15, after "National Guard", insert a comma and the words "National Guard of the United States."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a corrective amendment designed to include among those entitled to receive longevity pay men who have served in the National Guard of the United States. Up until a few months ago the United States Army and the War Department always considered that an officer of the National Guard of the United States on inactive service in the National Guard was entitled to longevity pay. It so happened that a ruling of the Comptroller General, based on previous court decisions, held that since the National Guard of the United States was not spelled out in legislation, these men could not receive the longevity pay the War Department and the National Guard Bureau had always accorded them.

I am informed by the members of the National Guard Bureau of the War Department that they have always considered these men as reserve officers in the National Guard of the United States, who are not assigned to active duty in the State National Guard units, as regular officers of the Reserve components of the armed forces. Many of them have been and are being called into active duty now. Always these men have been subject to call by the United States Army and were required to maintain training and to attend camps.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman is corrective of what seems to be an oversight in the bill, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Does not the gentleman believe that perhaps he should also include the inactive National Guard by name? I understand a situation has developed in the last few weeks in which the National Guard of the United States, those officers who are not assigned to any particular National Guard outfit but who hold federally recognized commissions, are affected by the gentleman's amendment.

Then there is an additional one, the inactive National Guard, where the man is not on active duty with some organization but is not in the technical category of the National Guard of the United States. So perhaps the gentleman would like to include the National Guard of the United States and the inactive National Guard.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would rather have another amendment about that. I have investigated this matter personally. I know the members of the National Guard of the United States are recognized as being Reserve officers in the sense of the term.

I thank the chairman of the committee for accepting this amendment, which will equitably correct this longevity-pay situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The term "dependent" as used in the succeeding sections of this act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under 21 years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term "children" shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 36, section 4, insert a new paragraph at the end thereof as follows:

"The determination of the fact of dependency under the provisions of this act shall be made by the head of the department concerned or by such subordinate as he may designate, and such determination so made shall be final and conclusive."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to make the determination or the finding of the Navy, War, Coast Guard, or Coast and Geodetic Survey, official, final, and conclusive with reference to dependents.

In other words, it keeps the Comptroller General, who may take 6 months or a year, from concluding that the facts did not justify the Navy Department or the War Department or the department concerned in making such finding.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman confident that the heads of those respective departments will achieve uniformity in interpretation of the word "dependents"?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will do it far better by this method than to have it done by the Comptroller General 6 months or 8 months or a year later after allotments and allowances have been paid.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At least it can be said that the Comptroller General was uniform in his treatment of the officers of all the services.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, for the simple reason that each case depends upon the facts surrounding it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Surely.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And the War Department could say under a given state of facts that they think the designation of a dependent is all right and the Comptroller General might say 6 months later that he does not agree with the War Department, and then what becomes of your paymaster? Your paymaster is held responsible. I may say that this amendment is submitted at the request of the Bureau of Navigation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not surprised.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if his amendment takes care of children physically handicapped beyond the age of 21?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The law defines exactly what constitutes dependency and I do not deal with that at all. I say that when the enlisted man designates someone as dependent and then the head of that department recognizes that designation, it is binding, final, and conclusive and cannot be disputed 6 months or a year later by the Comptroller General saying that the head of the department did not have the facts to justify it.

Now, if you do not adopt some amendment of this sort, then paymasters are going to hesitate to make payments that should be made until the Comptroller rules and holds that the designation is final and conclusive.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that should receive very careful consideration by the House before it is adopted. We considered this question in the subcommittee which worked on this bill and went into it very thoroughly and rejected it in the subcommittee. It would revert to a system that was in existence in the Army for many, many years and under which one of the worst abuses ever known in the military history of this country grew up. It would permit the heads of the departments to make determinations which would be finally binding on the Government.

The case of the dependents of the enlisted man would not make so much difference here. This is a case involving, primarily, the officers of the Army. There would be two ways to compensate officers. One would be a lump sum for rank and responsibility and the other on base pay plus allowances for subsistence and rental based upon whether or not the officer has dependents or is entitled to allowances for dependents.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. In just a moment. Let me make this observation:

For many years we have proceeded under the system of pay and allowances and when entitled to allowances they go up to $120 a month for rent in the case of certain officers and for subsistence.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Texas, that he is somewhat confused. It applies to enlisted men, to the fathers and mothers and to anybody who is dependent upon the enlisted man.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not yield for a speech. It is exactly what I said in the beginning. It applies to the enlisted men, yes, but that is not the important place where it applies, because the allowance for the enlisted man does not constitute the principal question, nor do dependents, in most instances, affect the pay of enlisted men.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia rose.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not yield further. It applies in all its importance in the case of officers. The adoption of this amendment will lead back to the system that we had for years and under which many persons not entitled to be so considered became dependents. Now the Comptroller General of the United States—and we all have confidence in Mr. Lindsay Warren—requires an affidavit setting out the circumstances surrounding the officer and with the evidence to sustain the status of the dependent as a dependent of the officer. Then the Comptroller General, in accordance with his judicial determination, finds whether or not the evidence sustains the claim. You thereby relieve the services then of all this danger. I say to you that the War Department does not want this responsibility and specifically requested that we not put the responsibility on the Secretary of War, stating that he does not have the means or the facilities at his disposal to make such a determination. If the Bureau of Navigation wants it, I may say that they failed to come before our committee and request it. This is a matter that has received very careful consideration by your committee. You have here a most technical and a most involved bill. We worked on the bill diligently, and I appeal to you not to upset the work that the committee has done. We have gone into these matters and considered them and gone into the background and the reason this was placed under the Comptroller General rather than under the heads of the departments, and the reason is a very cogent one. I appeal to the House not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. In that respect I may say that while the subcommittee was meeting there was a representative of the Navy Department there, and nothing was said in reference to the Navy desiring this change. There was a representative of the Army there, and that representative specifically asked that that burden be not placed back on the Army, to bring back the excesses they had had in the past in the Army.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. He said they were not prepared and did not have the facilitities to make such a determination.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And may I call attention to the fact that there is already a law on the books making such a decision binding on the Navy and conclusive in these matters.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, I understand it is a question of a matter of sea duty. There has been such a decision, but that is not comparable to the case in which every son-in-law living with an officer may be held to be a dependent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, the gentleman keeps talking about sons-in-law. Section 4 defines the status of a dependent. It sets out exactly who are dependents. When an enlisted man says his father or his mother is dependent upon him and he wants a part of the $42 a month set aside for them, he has that right.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, just a second. The gentleman is talking about a different bill entirely. The gentleman is talking about a bill that has just gone before the Military Affairs Committee this morning, and it does not refer to his amendment at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe we would better get a thorough understanding of the meaning of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. May I go back a moment and reminisce? When we wrote the act of 1922 we imbedded, for the first time, in the pay schedule of officers a varying degree of allowances for dependents. In other words a captain with a dependent normally gets more pay under existing law than a captain without dependents. It is the only provision of the existing law which I opposed, because I think that we should pay for service and not for the size of families. Enlisted men and their families are not interested in this thing in the slightest degree. There is nothing in the present law or in this bill which pretends to give the enlisted man additional pay because he has a wife and child. The enlisted man, contrary to the conception of the gentleman from Georgia, can go to his paymaster now and say, "I want all but $2 of my pay sent back home to my wife and child." He does not have to prove that his wife is a dependent, but

an officer has to prove that his wife is dependent upon him, that his mother is dependent upon him, that his children are dependent upon him, before he is entitled to the additional pay for dependents. You propose to leave that for the Secretary of War for the Army, for the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy, and some other officer for the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Instantly you will find channels of favoritism at work in each of these departments. The Secretary of War cannot dig into the facts in all of these cases, nor can the Secretary of the Navy. Reports must be made to him. By whom? By boards of examining officers. If a claimant has a friend on the board, that friend will say, "Yes. Captain Smith has a dependent mother."

You had better leave it to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month.

To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be $90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be $105 per month.

No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that under the paragraph last read there is a substantial increase in the quarters and subsistence allowance for officers of from $30 to $50 a month. Of course, under the bill there is an increase in the pay and allowances of second lieutenants to nearly $300. Do you know how much increase you are giving to the private under this bill after he has been in the service 12 months? Exactly $2. The fathers and mothers of this Nation think that you are doubling the pay of their boys. Now they get $21 a month for three months, $30 a month for 9 months and $40 thereafter. Under this bill they would get $42, or an increase of $2. That is because this bill a little further on repeals the law you passed last year which said that after a boy had been in a training camp 12 months and was moved to the battle-front he should be paid an additional $10 a month. For my part, I still think that he should be paid that extra $10 a month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman understands, of course, that under existing law, which includes what was known as the Leavy amendment written into the Selective Training and Service Act there are different grades of base pay for enlisted men.

Mr. PACE. I understand that.

Mr. MAY. Some of them for a few months receive the low base pay of $21. Others receive $30.

Mr. PACE. I understand that.

Mr. MAY. What we are doing here is equalizing it for all.

Mr. PACE. What you are doing here is repealing the extra pay that this Congress voted that those boys should have when they moved to the battle line. That was exactly the purpose the Congress had in mind in passing the act last year, which said that after the boys had been in service 12 months they should be paid an extra $10. I think that with the increased allowance, quarters, subsistence, and everything else that you are giving to the officers, you should at least give the boys with the guns an increase of $12 a month.

Mr. MAY. While I am not defending the officers, does the gentleman know that the officers pay for their own uniforms and pay for certain other things, and that the privates receive their uniforms and all their keep?

Mr. PACE. Oh, yes; indeed. I know also that under this bill an ensign or a second lieutenant gets approximately $250 a month, that you are increasing them substantially $600 a year, and that you are increasing the pay of the man with the gun $24 a year under this bill. I say it is wrong. I have an amendment on the desk, to page 58, to strike out the effort in this bill to repeal the provision of the act of 1941 which provides that when these boys have received their training during the 12-month period that they shall receive this extra compensation of $10 per month.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PACE. Of course.

Mr. MAY. Then the gentleman, according to his amendment, would put them back to where they would receive $21 and give them $10?

Mr. PACE. It does not. It simply strikes out two lines on page 58 where you seek to repeal section 8 of the act of 1941. If my amendment is adopted, the act of 1941, section 8, which says that after they have been in the service 12 months they shall receive an extra $10 per month, will remain in force, and it means that after they have completed their training they will receive $52 a month instead of $42 a month, or an increase of $10 a month under this bill.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman does not realize that there is a 20-percent increase for combat troops?

Mr. PACE. That is exactly right. I understand that. Certainly there can be no criticism of that increase at all. But I am taking the position that under this bill for the boys who have been in the service for 12 months—they know if their fathers and mothers do not—that all they get under this bill is $2 a month increase.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows that all of the battle lines are outside of the United States.

Mr. PACE. I hope they stay there.

Mr. BROOKS. We want to keep them there. In World War No. 1, when we went across to France we received a 10-percent increase. We provide a 20-percent increase for the enlisted men.

Mr. PACE. That is right, and 10 percent for the officers.

Mr. BROOKS. Twenty percent for the enlisted men. I notice the committee made this change: The enlisted longevity pay was at the rate of 10 percent for the first 4 years and 5 percent for each 4 years thereafter. We changed that so it would be 5 percent for each 3 years up to 50 percent whereas the law presently allows them only 25 percent.

Mr. PACE. What longevity pay does the average boy who goes into the Army now expect to be able to realize? None. That provision will not benefit any of the millions of boys now entering the service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the

Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than 10 years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, 77th Cong.).

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after 10 years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after 20 years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service, not exceeding 30 years. Such service shall be: Active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $458.33.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the splendid piece of work it did in bringing before the House this piece of legislation. I shall support it as it is. I have a suggestion, however, I should like for the committee to take into consideration. I have always been for the underdog. In this case I believe there is one group that has been left out, a group that I consider the underdog.

I read from page 41, line 12, of the bill the following language:

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after 10 years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

Personally, I should like to see inserted after the word "service" the words "and bandmasters", thus putting all the bandmasters in this class.

I ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if I am right in stating that a captain receives $200 a month plus a certain additional amount for rent and subsistence.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SNYDER. A bandmaster receives $175 a month. Am I correct?

Mr. MAY. I do not know what the bandmasters receive. It is set out in the table.

Mr. SNYDER. It is $175 a month.

Mr. Chairman, in this above all times the band is called upon to do more than ever to arouse and maintain morale. The life of the bandmaster is one of continual work. Not only that, but certain social obligations are required of bandmasters. It is almost impossible for them to keep up with the situation on a salary of $175 a month.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to tell the gentleman that I heartily favor his proposal to give them better pay.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman tell us how close to real combat the bandmaster gets?

Mr. SNYDER. In these days of aerial warfare he gets as close as a lot of generals, captains, and others.

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean he actually enters into combat duty?

Mr. SNYDER. It is combat duty, in my judgment, the same as that of any other group within a radius of 100 or 200 miles of the real shooting.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that not so many months ago Congress passed a bill giving a commissioned status to bandmasters, but it was vetoed by the President?

Mr. SNYDER. That is true. That, however, does not interfere with our putting this phrase "and bandmasters" in this particular bill.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the combat duty of bands, is it not a fact that members of the band act as stretcher bearers and get very close, indeed, to the real action?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this suggestion to the Committee for its consideration. I think it would be only fair and just to insert the words "and bandmasters" in this bill at this time. I understand, of course, that the United States Army Band, the Navy Band, and the Marine Band here in Washington and the West Point Band have already been taken care of under certain language; but bands at great cantonments, like Fort Benning, a big band that has worked as many hours as any other one group, and bands in some of the other large camps—Fort Bragg and Fort Sam Houston—should be taken care of.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I arise at this time to offer a unanimous-consent request.

On page 60, after line 9, it is my intention to offer an amendment providing for a new section in regard to longevity credit to commissioned officers of the armed forces for prior enlisted and commissioned service.

In the event that the Committee should adopt my amendment on page 60, after line 9, it will nullify the language on page 42, line 11, after the word "Reserve", to and including the period on line 15.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the subject matter of longevity affecting commissioned officers promoted from the ranks

may receive full consideration, at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer both amendments at the same time when we reach page 60 after the reading of line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $138; enlisted men of the second grade, $114; enlisted men of the third grade, $96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $48; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $42. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $126.

For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

Every enlisted man paid under the provision of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

On page 42, line 25, after the word "grade", strike out "$48" and insert "$54."

On page 43, line 1, after the word "grade", strike out "$42" and insert "$50."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to raise the minimum pay of the enlisted men in our armed forces to $50 a month.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. For what purpose?

Mr. BOREN. For a question. Does the gentleman's amendment take care of the man in the ranks? The enlisted soldier and sailor? That is what I want done.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; that is the object of it. This amendment would raise the base pay of the enlisted men to at least $50 a month. Even then the man in the rank and file, the man who is carrying the gun, the enlisted man in a tank, a plane, a ship, or a submarine, will not draw anything like the amount of pay the man gets who is working in a shipyard or a factory. Congress failed during the World War to raise the base pay of the enlisted men, with the result that we had a fight for adjusted compensation—which its enemies called a bonus—that lasted for more than 15 years after the war closed. We finally paid it. Added to what the men were drawing while in the service, it made their base pay average about $60 a month.

These men probably need this money worse today than they will when the war is over. By raising this amount to $50 we will be paying them more nearly what they were making in private life, and what we are paying men in industry. The average wage in industry today is above 75 cents an hour. These men in the armed forces drill 10 hours a day, they are on duty subject to call 24 hours a day; but suppose they work only 10 hours a day; even then we would not be paying them anything like the wages that men receive in industry. Many of these men leave businesses, they leave professions, they leave farms where they are needed and where there is nobody to take their places, they leave salaries that far exceed this amount, even after allowing for board and uniforms.

Remember these men never strike. They constitute the finest fighting force a nation ever had. Whenever it is deemed necessary for them to do so, they stay on duty day and night. They get no time and a half for overtime. They get no double pay for Sundays and holidays.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman realize that when we refer to $40 a month for the buck private he does not receive the $40 a month after you take into consideration all deductions?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entirely right. He remembers the old song the boys used to sing during the first World War about receiving "$30 every month, deducting $29." I know something about what those boys had deducted from their pay. By the time it was all deducted they had very little, if anything, left.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman tell us how much is being deducted at the present time?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I cannot say, but I presume it is about what it was in the last World War; and if so, they will not have much left, even if you pay them $50 a month.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Are any deductions at all taken out of a soldier's pay other than that which he authorizes?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; but he is required to authorize a great many deductions, and they are taken out of his pay.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What section is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Section 9.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman provides the same pay for the sixth and seventh grades?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I change only the last two.

Mr. MOTT. Fifty dollars for a private and $50 for a private first class?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; under my amendment an enlisted man of the sixth grade would receive $54 a month and an enlisted man of the seventh grade, $50. In other words, I take the man who is taken into the Army now, who is taken out of the factory, off the farm, or out of the law office, out of school, or out of the store, and start him at $50 a month.

Mr. MOTT. All right. What does the gentleman's amendment give the private first class?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I leave that just exactly as it is. If the gentleman from Oregon wants to change it, he can offer an amendment.

Mr. MOTT. I am referring to the provisions of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I have changed only two grades. I told the gentleman, and they are the last two. What I am really after is to raise the pay of these men who are going into the Army now, who are not being paid an amount commensurate with the services they are rendering.

Mr. MOTT. I understand the gentleman's position and I agree with it. I am going to support his amendment. I am asking if his amendment provides the same pay for the sixth and seventh grades.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No. I said enlisted men of the sixth grade are raised to $54 a month and enlisted men of the seventh grade, the buck privates, are raised to $50.

Mr. MOTT. That answers my question and I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's amendment. Without such an amendment the bill is far short of what it ought to be and far short of what the people of the country expected it to be.

The bill, as reported, is of considerable value to the enlisted men who have served less than a year and of very definite value to those who have served less than 4 months. To those of the two lower grades who have served more than a year, however, the bill, without this amendment offers very little relief. As a matter of fact it gives privates and privates first class and apprentice seamen and seamen second class a raise of only $2 per month.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], on the other hand, provides a substantial increase and changes entirely the picture presented by the table in the committee's report. If this amendment is adopted the table showing the increase in the

base pay of enlisted men will read as follows:

Grade	Present base pay [1]	Proposed base pay
1. Master sergeant; chief petty officer	$126	$138
(1a. Acting chief petty officer, Navy and Coast Guard only)	99	126
2. First or technical sergeant; petty officer, first class	84	114
3. Staff sergeant; petty officer, second class	72	96
4. Sergeant; petty officer, third class	60	78
5. Corporal; seaman, first class	54	66
6. Private, first class; seaman, second class	36	54
7. Private; apprentice seaman	30	50
Seventh grade men with less than 4 months' service	21	(2)

[1] Add $10 per month to total pay after 12 months' service.
[2] Eliminate.

The enlisted men, who are the backbone of the armed services, and without whom we could have neither Army nor Navy, are certainly entitled to this much consideration at the hands of the Congress, and I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] for his splendid contribution. He has explained the situation most clearly, and has demonstrated very concisely both the necessity for and the effects of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment was adopted on a roll call by a vote of 332 to 28, or more than 11 to 1, and to express the hope that the Senate will approve it unanimously.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I read in my home town paper, the Livingston Enterprise, just before I came over to the floor of the House that 101 men were cited by the Army for actions in the defense of the Philippines. I am very proud to say that 1 of these 101 was Pvt. Charles Ball—William Ball, father—of Harlem, Mont., in my district. I know the father and son very well. They are fine people.

I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for offering almost the same amendment I offered to the original conscription bill when that bill was before the House. I recall distinctly the words I used then. I said the time would come when this Congress would raise the pay of the boys we were taking out of their places of business, out of their homes, out of their employment, and putting into the Army. I am glad to see others now coming along the same line. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi voted for my amendment, and I can see many others here who did.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania over here made the same inquiry when I offered that amendment that he made here today.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If I recall correctly, I supported the gentleman's amendment. I congratulate him on pioneering in this field.

Let me call attention to the fact that right today workers in the Ford Motor Co. are demanding an increase of $1 a day in their pay.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. I may say that I am going to support the gentleman's amendment. If the gentleman had not offered it, I had intended to offer it myself. I congratulate the gentleman on beating me to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I also congratulate the gentleman from Montana on proposing to offer this amendment. I recall very well that when the Selective Training and Service Act was passed the gentleman from Montana offered a similar amendment and that it received heavy support, including my own.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. I may say to the gentleman I recall that he voted for it, too.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Mississippi said that, speaking of raising the pay of bandmasters, we ought to think of the man with the gun. We are thinking of the man with the gun.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The man who has to face the bullets.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SACKS. The chairman of the committee a few moments ago said no deductions were made in the soldier's pay. There are deductions at the present time, a deduction of $1.50 for laundry and deductions for insurance and other little items, the total amounting to about $7 a month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to be correct in his statement.

Mr. SACKS. I am.

Mr. MAY I did not say that no deductions are now being made. I asked the gentleman from Mississippi if he knew of any deductions made by the Army that were not authorized by the soldier. That is what I said. I did not say there were no deductions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offered two other amendments to the conscription bill, but they were also voted down. I regret that such action was taken by the House then. We wrote into the bill that when the draftees returned home after having served, they could only enforce their rights in the Federal courts. I wanted to give the right to the draftees to enforce their rights in the district courts of the several States as well; in other words, give the State district courts concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal courts. That amendment was turned down. I think it was a mistake.

In addition, I tried to amend the bill so as to compel a private employer to reemploy a draftee. This amendment was turned down. Both these amendments should have been adopted.

I hope the time will come as we go along with this war when we more fully realize the necessity for taking care of the men who are going to have to do the shooting and the dying, that these rights will be given our service men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, it would be indeed a spectacular if not a ridiculous, performance if the House of Representatives undertook to base an Army pay bill, or any part of it, on the fact that somebody in the country is making more profits out of the war program than he ought to make, or that somebody in the country is receiving higher wages than he should receive.

This committee has studied all the provisions of the legislation now under consideration. We gave time and attention to the recommendations of the interdepartmental pay committee. We found in the hearings and in the consideration of the legislation that there were many inconsistencies in the various grades of the lower groups of our soldiers. This is particularly true when you consider the fact that under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act the original base pay fixed for the inductees was $21 per month. I was opposed to that low rate of pay from the very beginning, and by reason of an amendment that was written into the Selective Service Act on the floor of this House, just as the pending amendment is proposed to be inserted, there was created a condition which brought many inequalities, and by the pending bill as written by your Military Affairs Committee, we have equalized the pay of all enlisted men. So it would now seem unwise to adopt the pending amendment which provides raises in only two grades out of a total of seven, so I oppose the amendment.

Later, the House of Representatives very appropriately wrote into the legislation a provision that at the end of 12 months of service the pay should be raised from $21 to $30 a month. This was known as the Leavy amendment. Now we propose here to provide that only two certain grades of pay shall be raised without reference to the seven grades that are involved. One is raised $6 by the Rankin amendment and another is raised $8, I believe.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I did not base this——

Mr. MAY. I am yielding only for a question.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman spoke a moment ago about this being based on profits being made or on wages earned by others. This is based on the economic situation. The

reason the people in industry are demanding these wages is because the cost of living has gone up, and for that reason I am asking that the pay of these soldiers be raised. Then, in addition, I am trying to forestall the fight for adjusted compensation that we went through before.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

When you consider that foreign service is added on top of the $42 under the provisions of this bill, every man in the United States Army among the enlisted group, will receive $50.40 per month. This is the highest pay in any army in all the world except Australia. Australia, of course, pays a little higher.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi ought to be voted down.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTPHIN to the amendment of Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: In the last line of the amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi, strike out "$50" and insert "$60."

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, every day we hear the statement made that we must do everything for the gallant fellows in the service who are serving on land, sea, and in the air. There are many hardship cases today occurring throughout the land, attributable to the patriotism of many people who have dependents at home. Each and every one of you who has seen military service, and a great many of you have, knows that we cannot pay these men too much and we should at least make it possible for their loved ones at home to be able to live in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTPHIN. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I am sure the gentleman will be pleased to hear that today we started consideration of a bill to take care of the dependents of these men, and they will be taken care of in much better shape than they were during the last war.

Mr. SUTPHIN. They should be taken care of in a much better way than in the last war and that is a reason why my amendment should be adopted.

FOR INCREASING PAY OF SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege in the recent past to visit many of these Army camps and Marine Corps camps. The spirit and the morale among the boys is very high. They are willing to make any sacrifice that is necessary to be made. They all want to render overseas service if possible. They are anxious to go, they are anxious to get into the fight, and they will do everything they can to save our country. I have never witnessed such demonstrations of patriotism.

I do not believe any country on earth ever had a more intelligent, a healthier, or a better army than we have today. It is my belief, however, that we should raise the pay above what they are now receiving. I personally favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I think that is a good amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

In the Army, when one goes in, whether he is inducted or enlists, the first thing he is asked to do is to sign up for insurance, and pressure is brought to bear on him to take the limit of $10,000, the cost of which is $6.50 per month on an average. He does not have to pay it then. It is deducted from his pay at the end of the month. In addition to this, he has to pay for having his clothes cleaned and pressed. He pays for this himself. In addition to this he pays for any repairs or alterations to his clothes and shoes, and must, of course, keep them in fine condition. In addition to this he pays his laundry bills, he pays for his entertainment — picture shows — which oftentimes does not amount to a great deal, but a dollar or two a month out of $21 or $42 amounts to quite a lot. Furthermore, these camps are not all well located. They are not close to good-sized towns where transportation facilities are available. They must use expensive busses and taxicabs. It would surprise you to go to some of these camps and see hundreds of taxicabs that have come from a distance of 25 or 30 or 50 miles in order to get some of these boys when they leave on week-end passes or evening passes.

Last Sunday I saw boys lined up by the hundreds and thousands next to a Marine Corps camp. They could not possibly get transportation at all. Everyone who came along in his own automobile picked up as many as he could carry, but there were thousands of them that could not get to town because of lack of transportation, and those that did paid well for their transportation. In addition to this, they are required to buy bonds and stamps if it is at all possible for them to do so or be called a slacker in disguise, because they are told that although they are working for their country, yet the country needs money, and it takes money to run this war and it is necessary to put in some money, so they have not anything left. In addition to that, a bill is being considered now for allotments to dependents, and I presume that will be predicated, as in the preceding war, on the amount that the soldier himself puts up. The soldier puts up a dollar and the Government puts up a dollar. There is another opportunity for a deduction. I think in all fairness to those in what may be called the low-income groups in the service, they should certainly have their pay raised to the amount asked by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi) there were—ayes 102, noes 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong.): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of this paragraph and of all other laws (including said Public Law 215, 77th Cong.) providing for enlistment allowances, shall be suspended.

Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 43, line 21, after the word "subsistence", insert "transportation during furlough."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, on several different occasions

during the debates on appropriation bills for military matters I have offered this amendment. I believe, however, that this is the one and only place in military legislation where such an amendment can be offered so that it will stick permanently. I was talking with a very good friend of mine back home not long ago. He was a member of the British armed forces during the World War. In discussing the subject of transportation during furlough for men in the armed services, he said: "Do you know that the American armed forces, the soldiers and sailors of the United States, are the only men in the world who do not have transportation furnished by the Government home and back during furlough?" I answered him that although I had heard that report, I was not absolutely certain of it. He insisted that during the World War the members of the British armed forces received their transportation during furlough, and are doing so today. I might also point out that members of the Australian forces and in other dominions throughout the British Empire they are receiving the same thing. I have persistently called to the attention of the committee, and I respectfully call it to your attention today, that it is absolutely necessary to provide transporation for these boys so that they can go back home before they go away and are shipped to the four corners of the world. I entreat the committee at this time to pass this amendment once and for all. I ask you to set up the principle of giving boys in the service free transportation. I do not need to elaborate upon the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] a short time ago when he said that the highways and byways are choked with men in uniform who should have their transportation paid, but who are unable to get their way home because the Government will not supply it. Right in my own family my brother who has been in the service for a year and a half now actually sent home for money not long ago because he was unable to get home when he was offered a furlough and he did not have the funds necessary to buy his train ticket home. This amendment is something which can be considered at this time, and at this time only, because the other bills on which it was offered were usually appropriation bills and proposed legislation on an appropriation bill definitely providing for transportation home was out of order.

I ask that the committee give serious consideration at this time to my amendment.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I am in accord with the gentleman's remarks and I shall support his amendment. In this connection I might add the observation that I am informed that in Germany it is a serious offense to pick up a hitch-hiking soldier on the road, or for a soldier to hitch-hike. Germany pays for the transportation of her soldiers on furlough to prevent their giving military information to strangers. German spy system in this country by picking up hitch-hiking soldiers is no doubt obtaining considerable information. The gentleman's amendment is a step in the right direction.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman's amendment apply for one furlough during the duration for each soldier?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This will set up a definite policy, which has never been set up by any legislation, to provide transportation for soldiers during furloughs. As I say, it is up to the War Department to do what they want to do with it after the Congress passes it, but it will definitely set up a principle which has never before been incorporated in law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. How many times would a soldier be able to be furloughed during the year?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. As I have said, that is a matter for the War Department to provide. This simply sets up a principle. I ask the committee to give it very serious consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Some of you may recall that we have a Committee on Expenditures in the House, of which I am supposed to be an active member.

I feel at this moment that I should express a little of caution lest our desire to be generous overcomes our judgment. I will not speak wholly to this particular amendment. The Members fully understand it. I was told yesterday of a boy hiking on his furlough from Massachusetts to New Orleans. He said it would take 4 days each way, but that he would have 4 or 5 days at home anyway. This was a case to arouse interest and sympathy and perhaps not too unusual.

I have two reasons for speaking. One is that I have a feeling that we may go too far in our anxiety to do all we should for our soldiers. No one here should proclaim that he is more zealous than others in their attempt to bring proper relief to those selected to serve in our armed forces. We may have some 9,000,000 under arms before we are through, and some very serious thought must be given to expenditures.

She had a portrait of her husband painted. Viewing it she exclaimed, "He did have a very large nose! A large nose is a sign of generosity! Paint the nose a little larger."

We will paint this bill a little larger unless we control our sympathetic emotions. The committee needs real support. They have performed a conscientious service. I will let them oppose this particular amendment if they desire to do so. The other reason I have for speaking may be more of a real criticism. I live close to a camp. I meet many soldiers. The Government has built many beautiful U. S. O. buildings, sometimes many miles from the camp. They are so beautiful that when I visit them I fear I may drop a cigarette or mutilate something.

I recently noted "no smoking" signs in these buildings. I protested. In reply, they called my attention to a smudge on the floor where someone dropped a cigarette. I could only say, "I hope the whole floor will be covered with smudges and then I will know the boys used it." I used most emphatic words. We must make these buildings give more suitable pleasure to our soldiers. They were not built for parlor games and socialite parties.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] spoke about transportation to and from the camps. I do wish you gentlemen would write to the colonels in charge of those camps and request them to furnish the boys transportation to and from these U. S. O. buildings. The Army has plenty of trucks. It can be done. They could have an M. P. supervise it. There is no good reason, to my mind, for those boys to do so much hitch-hiking for they should have a way of getting back and forth to these buildings which were built at such a very heavy cost, with an average of five paid attendants. I urge more use of them and more suitable methods used to furnish the boys more active amusements and games. Ping Pong seems to be the principal athletic feature.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is aware of the fact, of course, that the War Department has reported to the House Military Affairs Committee that the lowest possible estimate of the cost of this bill will be $280,000,000 a year, based on an Army of 3,000,000. Now, if you go to 9,000,000 men, you cannot tell how far it will go. The committee is opposing the amendment on which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course, there are many boys who can afford to pay their own expenses on furlough. There are many who cannot. If we could assist those who were really in need of this help, I would be glad to favor such a plan. Again, I rose to speak because of the assignment I hold to be watchful of expenditures.

Do not paint the nose a little larger under the spell of our great desire to be generous to our soldiers. I do not know where the limit is, but certainly the committee will have my support. They have given long and considerate study. Again, will you please write these officers in charge of the camps, to furnish the transportation back and forth to these buildings which I mentioned? That will mean much to the soldier and will not be an expensive way to show our appreciation and desire to make his life endurable.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment, but should it be adopted?

Mr. Chairman, it is a fine thing, a grand thing to aid and assist the men in the service. They need every assistance we can give them; but let me ask the Members if they know where they are leading this Nation? Do any of you know where

the end is going to be? Is it security, or is it bankruptcy?

It is fine for the boys in the Army to get back home; it is fine for them to get back home to vote, but we leave it to the Army to determine how many times a year they may go home, and I regard that your duty to say how many free rides, how many you can pay for.

Since the 22d day of January you have appropriated about $80,000,000,000 to the Army and the Navy, and the Chief Executive—I do not leave him out. You have placed this money in the hands of the Army and the Navy and Chief Executive and said to them it is their responsibility to spend it. Look at the contracts they have let to these big corporations that are making profits so fabulous they are turning them back to the Treasury because they are ashamed to take them—and rightfully so. But whose responsibility is it to continue to look after the expenditure of these funds? It is your responsibility and mine. You should not have passed such laws. Now be careful what you are doing today.

According to the Treasury statement of May 8 you have taken this country's Treasury to the tune of $15,178,610,765 in the red since last July 1. Next year you will be $40,000,000,000 in the red. This means the approach to bankruptcy for America unless you stop it. Then how are you going to get the men equipped to fight? How are you then going to furnish them guns, ammunition, tanks, and airplanes when you bankrupt this Nation? Who will pay the bill? Where is your tax bill? You have got to win this war you are in. It is right to help those boys, but if you fellows are interested now in doing the right thing, bring in some labor legislation so these men who are after the almighty dollar in the labor unions, raking in the fabulous sums, legislation that will set them back a little. Set the manufacturer back and everybody sacrifice. That is your responsibility. But that means votes to give people money. You men are here today because of votes. You have to vote for taxes or else we will have a lost cause that means bankruptcy.

If you want to see this country go forward, if you want to do right by these men who are in the Army, if you want to see that they receive pensions when they return, you must change your course, for they will never receive pensions from a bankrupt Treasury. Men who fought in the former World War will cease to receive their pensions unless you change the course you have charted for America's ship and turn it from the rocks of bankruptcy for which it is now headed.

You come in here filled with the desire to pass legislation you think will get votes. We like votes; we cannot be here if we do not get them; but are votes more valuable to you and your country than keeping your country under the Constitution and laws and liberties we have enjoyed for so many years? This is the most important thing. A dictator is about upon you. We do not want the damn Japs over here running this Nation, but if you break the Nation down financially that is what will happen. Let us get just a little bit of common sense into the things we are trying to do; let us do the things that are going to win this war. Let us cut down on every unnecessary expenditure for a while and see how that will affect the Treasury. This is your responsibility. Cut out all unnecessary expenditures. You must do it and do it at once to restore confidence to the American public. The New Deal has about wrecked this Nation, and you must get honest-to-goodness men of ability; men of integrity; men of courage; men who love liberty more than office, if this Nation survives. America wake up and elect such men to public office, is my plea, before it is too late—after November will be too late.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $6 per day.

Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term "permanent station" as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

The words "permanent change of station" as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof,

in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a Reserve component.

Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss SUMNER of Illinois: On page 51, line 2, after "expenses", insert a new section 12a, as follows:

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual and necessary medical and hospital expenses where such expenses were incurred after the individual's induction into the armed forces and prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is intended to cover cases similar to the one described in a letter I received last week which, with your permission, I shall read:

DEAR MISS SUMNER: When my soldier husband was home on a furlough, he had an attack of appendicitis and was rushed to a hospital and operated on immediately at St. Mary's Hospital, Kankakee, Ill.

Now the Army informs us that he has to stand his own expense.

You know how much money a private in the Army gets and after all insurance and laundry and other things are paid for there isn't much left.

My husband hasn't any money and I am staying at the home of my parents so I don't know how we will get the bill paid for. The bill is $177.

I am wondering if you know of any way possible that the Government will help.

These boys have been drafted into the Army and are giving their lives for their country. It seems to me that in an emergency like this the Government should pay the expense as it was impossible for us to get him to an Army hospital.

Hoping that you will look into this matter and that I will hear from you in the near future, I remain. Thanking you.

MRS. ALVIN SCHULER.

ASHKUM, ILL.

I am informed that the Comptroller General has ruled that, if a soldier is absent for more than 24 hours on furlough the Army is not responsible for any medical bills he may contract. There is no remedy in such a case.

It was suggested by the Enlistment Division of The Adjutant General's Office that the soldier nevertheless make a request for payment of his commanding officer so that if and when legislation be enacted it may be on record.

The soldier returning home on furlough is away from the hospital facilities of camp, but he is not returned to his normal ability to pay such expenses in private life. I doubt if the adoption of this amendment, since it is limited to cases where expenses were incurred prior to the enactment of the act raising the pay, would result in anything but a relatively trivial expense to the Government. To the soldier who has incurred the expense, however, the burden, as this girl indicates, is appalling.

I hope, therefore, that the Congress, in its wisdom, will agree that such claims must in all justice be paid.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that the committee accept this amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In recent months I have received two letters almost identical with the letter that the gentlewoman has read to the House. I am in favor of the amendment she has offered, and I think it should be adopted.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to inquire if the gentlewoman construes the amendment to apply to anybody who is on furlough at home, and whether she is also aware that there is hospitalization provided for the men in the camp?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This will apply to cases where it is actually necessary, and by regulation they can construe it to apply to emergency cases.

May I say further that I am not one to encourage either extravagance or generosity in this fateful moment, but it seems to me this is a just and reasonable claim.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Members of the House of an actual experience which will back up the amendment just offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], and I certainly hope the Committee will adopt it. This has to do with a boy from my district, Corp. Frank E. Hoskins, Jr., of Worthington, Minn.

At this point I wish to insert a letter from Mr. Raymond E. Mork, of Worthington, which presents the facts in the case:

WORTHINGTON, MINN., *October 27, 1941.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: A Mr. Frank E. Hoskins, Sr., who is assistant highway engineer for the county here, had a son who enlisted in the United States Army. The son was Corp. Frank E. Hoskins, Jr., Nineteenth School Squadron, Chanute Field, Rantoul, Ill. Corporal Hoskins joined the Army at the age of 18. On May 3, 1941, about 18 months after enlisting, he was shot by another soldier while engaging in target practice outside of the military field and near Danville, Ill. The target practice was not a part of his Army duties, but was done while he was on leave. After being shot, the other soldiers with him rushed him to a civilian hospital in Danville, Ill., where an emergency operation was performed and where he died on May 13, 1941.

The doctor and the hospital are now attempting to collect bills totaling $393.30 from his father on the ground that this boy was a minor. It would be very difficult for the father to raise this money, and I wonder whether there should not be some provision in Army regulations for these expenses to be taken care of. The father states that one of the features advertised at the enlisting post and also mentioned in the Army letters was that complete medical attention would be given those enlisting. As far as I can find out, this boy was in no way blameworthy regarding the accident. If anything could be done to relieve this man from the payment of this large bill, it would be greatly appreciated.

With kindest personal regards,

Very truly yours,

FLYNN & MORK,
By RAYMOND E. MORK.

P. S.—The boy was not on furlough at the time of the accident—just an afternoon off as I understand it. The accident happened about 20 miles from Chanute Field.

R. M.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a letter from the Surgeon General of the United States Army, in reply to my request as to what prospects the family of Corporal Hoskins had toward receiving payment by the Government of these hospital accounts:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, November 10, 1941.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: Receipt is acknowledged, by reference from The Adjutant General, of your letter of the 31st ultimo, enclosing a communication from Mr. Raymond E. Mork, of Flynn & Mork, lawyers, Worthington, Minn., respecting the payment of charges for the treatment of Corp. Frank E. Hoskins, Jr., on account of gunshot wound incurred May 3, 1941.

Records show that the injury in reference was accidentally incurred while Corporal Hoskins was absent from his post on authorized pass which covered the period 12 noon, May 3, to 6 a. m., May 5, 1941. Records show further that the injured soldier was carried by his companions (soldiers who were also on pass) to Lakeview Hospital, Danville, Ill., where he died May 13, 1941.

As above indicated, Corporal Hoskins was absent from his post on a pass in excess of 24 hours at the time of injury. Such being the case, accounts for his treatment do not fall within the provisions of law and regulation as proper public charges. The law appears in the annual appropriation bill for the support of the Military Establishment, under the title "Medical and Hospital Department." Therein funds are appropriated for the treatment of military personnel by civilian agencies (when treatment cannot otherwise be had), but a proviso is attached, "That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furloughs or leaves of absence in excess of 24 hours." The regulation bearing on the subject of treatment of military personnel by civilian agencies (in the absence of Army facilities or facilities of other Government agencies) appears in AR 40-605, paragraph 3b (1) which is as follows:

"Civilian medical attendance at public expense is authorized for the following personnel and none other:

"(1) Officers, Army nurses, warrant officers, cadets, enlisted men, and contract surgeons

(full time) of the Army of the United States in the Federal service when on a duty status or when absent on authorized leave, sick leave, furlough, or pass, when such leave, sick leave, furlough, or pass is originally granted for a period not in excess of 24 hours. Civilian medical attendance is not authorized for the personnel enumerated when absent without leave or when absent on authorized leave, sick leave, furlough, or pass, when such leave, furlough, or pass is originally granted for a period in excess of 24 hours."

It may be added, re the fact that Corporal Hoskins was injured at approximately 6 p. m., May 3—that is, about 6 hours after the beginning of his pass—that a case involving a similar point (pass in excess of 24 hours, but injury within a short time after departure from the Army station) was sent to the General Accounting Office not long since, inviting attention to this matter and requesting adjudication. The General Accounting Office disallowed the charges with the remark:

"Inasmuch as the soldier was on authorized leave of absence in excess of 24 hours, there is no authority of law whereby payment may be made from public funds."

This office regrets that the circumstances in the case were such that favorable action cannot be taken on the charges for treatment of Corporal Hoskins. According to reports previously received in this office, the accounts incurred were those of Lakeview Hospital and Dr. Harlan Cox, Danville, Ill., in amounts of $130.33 and $260, respectively.

Mr. Mork's letter is returned herewith as requested by you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. MAGEE,
Major General, United States Army,
The Surgeon General.

The father is not asking that the Government take care of the expenses of the funeral, but he does think and I think, and this amendment will so provide, that the Army should pay in such cases where the boys need medical or hospital attention when on furlough. It seems ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, that this family back in my district should have to meet this expense of $393 and funeral expenses in addition. This is not conducive to improving morale.

Here is the case of a boy who died while in the service of his country and yet, because of unfortunate circumstances connected with the accident which caused his death, the Army cannot under present law pay for the final expenses, hospital, medical, and burial.

Members of the House, I appeal to your sane judgment and common sense as to whether something like this is just or not. Had Corporal Hoskins not applied for leave, all of this expense would have been taken care of by the Government and his family would undoubtedly have received compensation for his death in addition.

Let us not say to the parents of the millions of American boys in service that the Government is not responsible for their medical and hospital attention just because these boys happen to be on leave in excess of 24 hours. I believe that any man in uniform, whether on leave or not, unless of course unauthorized leave, should be covered at all times by a blanket protection placed over him by our Government.

I have tried to have the Ways and Means Committee consider my free insurance measure but to no avail. Some day every boy wearing a uniform in our Nation's service will be protected by insurance, automatically provided upon induction into service and covering these boys even though they happen, as with Corporal Hoskins, to be killed while on authorized leave.

Let us pass Miss SUMNER's amendment and help make this good pay raise legislation just a little better. Corporal Hoskins' family and others like them deserve this protection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may reread the Sumner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Sumner amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentlewoman from Illinois would consent to an amendment to the amendment. It certainly seems there ought to be some limitation on it. If we are going to go out and have the civilian hospitals all over the country render bills, they will always be big bills.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As the law stands now, under the regulations they permit emergency expenses for the first 24 hours' leave. The effect of the amendment would merely be to permit them to extend it beyond 24 hours and to the full length of the furlough.

Mr. MAY. There is no time fixed. Would it include all time following his induction? Suppose a soldier goes out somewhere without leave and gets hurt, is the Government going to have to pay for that?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The authorities have the right to decide. Was this man killed or hurt playing baseball, which was not necessary? If they so find they can throw it out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Kentucky will understand that the amendment applies only while on furlough.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any particular objection to the amendment, but I think the Committee ought to be very careful about loading this bill up with amendments that may work a hardship on the Government and perhaps on individuals. The amendment does not seem to be complete, but I am willing to allow the Committee to vote on it as it is.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that some very serious thought should be given, especially when the matter comes before the conferees, to making an effort to solve this problem.

The gentleman raised the question a moment ago of whose responsibility it was. May I say to the gentleman that when the Army or the Navy has trained a man for 1, 2, 3, 4, or maybe 5 or 10 years, he is a very valuable man.

Just recently a case happened to come to my attention where three boys on their way back to camp were smashed up in an auto accident while in strange territory. They were taken to a hospital. There happened to be in the city a representative of the United States Health Department. He could not take them in because he had no authority to do so. Who was going to take them in? The United States Army or the Navy—it happened to be the Navy in this instance—had more interest in those men than anybody else, except their families. Yet the men were taken in, and somebody, a stranger, had to guarantee the expense.

Therefore, I think the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois deserves the most serious and careful study by the Committee on Military Affairs, and I sincerely hope that when the conferees come to consider the bill you will make provision for taking care of these men when they are on a 10-day furlough or a 30-day furlough. If they get hurt, who is going to look after them? Are you going to allow them to bleed to death? Certainly not.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. There has always been a rule that when a man is on furlough he is on his own responsibility. After all, you must inculcate in them some degree of responsibility for themselves when they are on furlough.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman, as a practical proposition, when an automobile smashes and knocks a man unconscious, whose responsibility is he on? You have to look at the question from a practical point of view.

Mr. FADDIS. I say he should be on his own responsibility.

Mr. BARDEN. Are you going to let him lie there and die because he cannot get up and look for a doctor?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows that neither he nor I nor anyone else wants to let a soldier lie there and die.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. MAY. What I am opposing is that you will open the door to the use of civilian hospitals all over the country, as a result of which you never will be able to tell how much expense will be involved.

Mr. BARDEN. I am in favor of opening some door, because some time ago I spent nearly 2 days with the Surgeon General and the Navy Department and others trying to get some kind of an arrangement made for the boys I just mentioned in a hospital. If it had not been for the goodness of heart of the private doctors, the last one of them would have died. I say some door ought to be opened. Men are not going to go out and bash their brains out just in order

to get into a hospital; certainly they are not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This cannot possibly open any door in the future, because it applies only to cases that have already occurred, that are already on record.

Mr. BARDEN. It does crack open the door of mercy, and I hope it will be opened, as far as I am concerned, wide enough not only to take care of cases that have already occurred, but will take care of those in the future. It simply must be done and I am supporting this amendment in order to be sure that this important matter will not escape the attention of the conferees. I believe the House is adopting this amendment with that in mind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring the minds of the committee back to this thought. We have before us what is perhaps the most technical bill our committee has considered this year, perhaps in the 6 years I have been a member of the committee. We worked in the morning and in the afternoon behind closed doors reading every line of the bill, studying every amendment that was presented. I hold here a whole file of amendments that were presented for consideration to that subcommittee. We gave careful thought to each and every one of them, and they should be given careful thought. The amendment here proposed should have careful thought and careful consideration given to it, but we have given no careful thought and no careful consideration to it because it was not presented to us. The first time I have heard the amendment read, and I dare say the first time others have heard the amendment read, is here at this hour.

I do not believe that even the sponser of the amendment herself believes it is presently drawn as she would have it drafted. I myself believe that inductees going into service should have consideration with regard to hospital service. I think the Government hospitals are as fine as can be found anywhere under the shining sun and that there is a real idea in the amendment. Knowing as I do the difficulties which besieged the Veterans' Administration a number of years ago with reference to a matter similar to this, I would certainly do all in my power to ask that most careful thought be given to such a matter before final action; and then we will know the man in the service who is entitled to help when sick and away from the military hospital or reservation will be cared for as you and I know that the defenders of America should be treated and cared for.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees on this bill could take the amendment of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], if it were adopted, and work out a practical solution of this problem when we admit that something should be done? Of course, there should be proper safeguards thrown around it.

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I do not believe it is fair to put that burden on the conferees. I think we ought to decide right here what we are going to do about it. It is worthy of consideration; it ought to be considered by a committee that will hear testimony and decide what is proper to be done in the premises.

Mr. BARDEN. If we adopt the amendment we can change it later if that is necessary, so I say adopt it now.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is it not a fact that there is an Army post in every section of the country where military hospitalization would be available to members of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Army in case of accidents of the kind referred to here? As a result there would be no necessity for providing hospitalization in civilian hospitals except for emergency treatment, after which they could be transferred to an Army post where an Army hospital would be available. Therefore the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. BROOKS. I think our Army and Navy and Public Health hospitals are good hospitals and I think the service men would like to use them in case of any emergency.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees could work out some provision that would be workable, taking into consideration the fact that you might jeopardize the life of a soldier in cases where it might be desirable or necessary to take him to a local hospital for emergency treatment?

Mr. BROOKS. I have not been able to study the amendment, but I doubt the wisdom of letting three or four conferees work out a matter as important as is this one.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not adopt the amendment and they study it?

Mr. BROOKS. But I do know that the committee can study the matter and after giving it proper consideration render substantial justice.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not have the conferees study it now?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 95, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first 3 years of service, $1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, $1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, $1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, $1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, $1,800.

Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of $2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of $1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of $600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 percent of the total annual active-duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 percent of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

SEC. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive $500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this act, retired officers, warrant officers,

nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the act of June 4, 1920.

In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 percent of the active-duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 percent for each year of active duty and a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay as authorized by existing law.

The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 percent of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue prior to the enactment of this act as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: On page 54, line 24, strike out line 24 and all the remainder of the section and insert:

"Nothing in this bill shall be construed as authorizing any increase in pay or allowance of any retired commissioned officer."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot for the life of me see why any one on the retired list is entitled to a raise in his pay and allowances at this time. They have already been retired under the provisions of existing law. They have already been compensated for whatever services they have rendered to this Nation. It is not contemplated that they will, and they probably will not, render any service in our armed services during this emergency. If they do, they will be taken into the service and will receive the rate of pay of their rank and grade in accordance with whatever pay is in force at that time.

Certainly, at a time like this we must guard our expenditures wherever it is possible. Oh, I know that is not a very popular idea with a great many people, but, just the same, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] endeavored to tell the Committee some time ago, if the men who come back from this war wounded and disabled are to expect to be taken care of as we would like to see them taken care of, we must curb our tendencies toward increased expenditures at a time like this in every possible way. Certainly we should be very slow about extending them any raises in connection with this bill to any retired officers and especially to those retired as a result of the findings of a class B board.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee once more in making up their minds upon this amendment to turn to those insertions placed in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and by myself. There read the list of the men who will get the most, and see if you believe by their records furnished to this committee by the War Department, they are entitled to be raised on the average of $100 per month per man.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have those who wish to be heard stand up.

Mr. MAY. I have no desire to be heard and I would gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that all debate upon this amendment close in 12 minutes? Three gentlemen are standing, which makes it 4 minutes each. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this under general debate, but I want to make a few additional observations at this time. In the first place there is nothing to the argument with reference to the retired men not being provided for under any of the provisions of this bill. This is a general pay bill for the military and naval services of the United States. If you will turn to page 53, section 15, of which this paragraph is a part, you will see that the bill as originally drafted provides for the retired pay of the service. This is an additional provision as to retired pay that is placed in the retired pay paragraph of the bill as originally drafted, and as originally passed by the Senate. It refers to 126 World War officers. It is a case in which an injustice, in my opinion, has been done, and that injustice should be righted. I mentioned earlier in the day that originally about 300 officers were slated for retirement under the provisions of section 24 (b). By the time political influence had put in its work, and by the time the cases were reviewed in the Executive departments of the Government, only 126 of the World War officers were retired under the provisions of section 24 (b). They went out at 2½ percent of their base pay multiplied by their years of service. Of course, men who went out for physical disability went out at 75 percent, but those who were retired for inefficiency, based on their own misconduct, got nothing, so that these 126 do not involve any question of personal misconduct. Those who used political influence were able to stay on the rolls until we passed Public Act No. 190 and they were then permitted to retire and we put in a provision that no World War officer should under any circumstance when retired under that provision receive less than 75 percent of his base pay. All those who stayed on the rolls at that time were permitted to retire in 1941 at 75 percent of their base pay. This is a small group of 126 men who are not receiving the same treatment the other World War officers are receiving. There has been placed in the RECORD an ex parte statement, that was not brought before the committee. They told us before the committee that this provision had merit, but they did not think it belonged in this bill, and then, ex parte, three members of the committee were furnished with information which was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. That information should have been brought to us on the committee. How about the man who received the Legion of Honor, was a combat officer in France and served for 20 years in the Regular Army and is now retired at less retired pay than that of a master sergeant? I would like to know which one of those men in the RECORD is the one who has the Legion of Honor. I would like to know also which one had an efficiency record showing excellent and superior at the time he was retired. You will see that some of these were retired for inefficiency, because they failed to keep up their financial obligations. Some mention is made about intoxication, but no member benefiting by this provision was charged with inefficiency on that ground, because those who were retired on account of intoxication went out without pensions.

Those men served for an average of 15 years in the United States Army. They have not been treated the same as other men who served during the World War. They have been subjected to an injustice over a period of years and now the argument is made that because it has existed over a period of years it should not be remedied, because they were retired some years ago there should be no remedy. That only aggravates the situation. This bill provides that

they are not to receive any back pay because of this provision. It would apply only to retired pay hereafter. You have gone on record with a policy. You did it in 1941, that you were going to pay these World War officers thus retired 75 percent of their base pay. Just because they were heretofore retired at an average of 25 percent of their base pay is no reason why you should not correct it. This injustice has existed for a long time but should be permitted to exist no longer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, these 125 men concerned with this proviso were mostly retired not because they were incompetent or because they were inefficient, nor because they could not perform the duties of their office. They were retired because of the contracting policy of our military service after the World War. These officers had been induced to come back into the Regular Army after the war when they had taken their discharge, and the Army went down to dangerous proportions. The Army decided that they would have to again expand it to some extent and they offered commissions to former World War officers in 1921. It is from this group of officers who gave up an opportunity for a civilian career to come back into the Army that these 125 officers come who became victims of economy. The only reason they were retired is because at that particular time we were reducing the Army. Had those same officers remained on until today they would be retired with 75 percent of their pay. Every officer retired subsequent to that last pay act, regardless of the cause, if he served in the World War, is retired with 75 percent of his pay, even though he might be much less efficient than any of these 125 who were the victims of the particular period in which they were retired.

Class B seems to place some stigma on the officers. It was used merely as a device at that time to reduce the Army in conformity with limited appropriations. Now, you are treating two identical officers entirely differently. Two officers who served together side by side in the World War, one who retired during this period is retired with 2½ percent of his pay multiplied by the number of years he served. The other officer who remained on a few years longer retired at 75 percent of his pay, no other conditions being dissimilar excepting the dates of their retirement.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I am surprised at the statement of my colleague that those men were retired because of a desire to reduce the officer personnel, in view of the records of the War Department as set forth on page A1697 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, they had to give a lot of excuses for the individuals they were getting rid of, but the fact is their appropriations had been limited and they had to reduce the commissioned strength of the Army. Word went out to get rid of them. Of course, they cooked up all kinds of charges and accusations in order to have some reason to get rid of these officers. But most of these officers served with distinction, and had it not been for the economy wave at that particular time would still be serving on the active list with distinction. Those who survived with political influence a few years and then retired, retired with 75 percent of their pay. Any World War officer who retires now or in the future is retired gets 75 percent. It is this one little group that has been treated so shamefully.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Were those officers retired as a result of court-martial proceedings?

Mr. MAAS. Indeed they were not. They were treated worse than an officer who was court-martialed and given the maximum fine in loss of numbers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise my voice in opposition to this amendment. I happen to know some of these officers personally. I served with some of them in the same outfit. Some of those men were later put out of the Army under section 24 (b). I cannot see where there is any justice whatsoever in singling out and retiring certain officers on the basis of 2½ percent of their base pay multiplied by the years of service, and taking all other officers in the Army of the United States and retiring them at 75 percent of their pay. I wish to correct the record as to the number. It is no material difference, but there are actually 121 of those officers now living who were singled out on a 2½-percent basis. Many of those officers were class B'd, as the gentleman from Minnesota has just told you, just because they wanted to get rid of officers in the Army as there was a hump when we were reducing the Army, they were singled out. This action was so unfair that it was finally abandoned by the War Department.

Many of these officers were class B'd for personal reasons of some superior officer who did not happen to like them. Why this Congress should single out 121 World War officers who—and I want to emphasize this point—who if there was any misconduct in their service whatsoever could not be retired but would have been kicked out of the service with no retirement pay. There was no misconduct on the part of these men. They rendered loyal, and many of them distinguished, service. We got rid of them because Congress was reducing the Army by lack of appropriations.

Mr. KILDAY. I ask the gentleman in view of his military experience if he does not know that if they had been guilty of the specific misconduct of which they are charged they would have been court-martialed?

Mr. EDMISTON. Absolutely. I am getting sick of the War Department's coming before the subcommittee that was working out this bill and telling the subcommittee that they thought there was no particular objection to these 121 officers, then after the whole committee reports the bill to the House they come along and get a couple of members of the committee to stick in the RECORD what the brass hats down here in the War Department want. A mean and unfair attack against these 121 World War officers.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman believe, in view of the records of the War Department, that the Army was exceedingly generous to these men by not court-martialing them, convicting them, and kicking them out?

Mr. EDMISTON. Certainly not; they were not generous. These men did not have anything in their records that they could have been court-martialed for. The War Department kicked out those men who had records sufficient to court martial them with no pay of any kind. They could not get anything against these men. That is the reason they class B'd them.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman wants to give them a raise notwithstanding their inefficiency, does he?

Mr. EDMISTON. They are entitled to the same treatment as their fellow American officers who served in the World War with them.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman want to take the position here, notwithstanding the records of the War Department and the records of these men, that he would increase their retirement by $100 a month?

Mr. EDMISTON. No such case as that exists among these 121 officers.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. How does the gentleman want us to vote?

Mr. EDMISTON. Against the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to tell any Member of this House how he shall cast his vote on the matter of increasing the retired pay of the out-of-step officers who were eliminated under section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act.

Answering the gentleman from West Virginia, I may say that this bill as now written does not eliminate section 24 (b) and it will go on functioning for every officer who has not World War service. I have not heard one voice lifted today to strike it out entirely. Let me get down to this summary of cases set out in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 11. The average length of service of the officers in question is 15.7 years. Their average retired pay at this time is $123.70 per month. Their average retired pay in case this section is enacted into law will be $227.40 per month. Most of these officers were originally commissioned at about 25 years of age so that they started to draw this

retired pay at an average age of about 40 years. They have averaged 13⅓ years on the retired list and their average age today is approximately 53. None of them was retired because of physical disability. We should add that 112 officers were discharged with 1 year's pay because they were discharged from the service under the provisions of section 24 (b) before they had completed 10 years of commissioned service. We should add also that 86 officers were discharged without pay because of findings by the Board that their classification under section 24 (b) was due to their neglect, misconduct, or avoidable habits. None of the 112 officers with less than 10 years' service and none of the 86 officers discharged without pay are included in the group of 125 officers to be benefited under this section.

Following are the findings of the board in regard to the qualifications of these officers that caused their original retirement:

Of the 125 officers in question, the records of 29 show only that they came within the provisions of section 24 (b).

The records of 26 officers indicated the general charge "that the officer's record does not come up to the standards expected of an officer of his rank and service," that he was lacking in judgment, attention to duty, or did not demonstrate sufficient leadership and efficiency, or that he was generally lazy and irresponsible.

Six of the records indicated, in addition to the general findings, that the officer in question failed to graduate from the various service schools to which he had been assigned.

Twenty records show the officer to be "below average in leadership, judgment, executive and organizing ability, and capacity for command," the general charge of being unsatisfactory in judgment and common sense, being inefficient, undependable, or temperamental, or guilty of inattention to duty.

Eighteen of the records indicate a lack of responsibility in financial matters, and 10 are reported as having been retired under section 24 (b) because of excessive use of intoxicating liquor. Two of the above were found guilty both of financial irregularity and of excessive use of intoxicating liquor.

That is a summary of their record. They made it while they were on active duty in the Army. The War Department dispensed with their services. This bill will raise them to about $227 per month in retired pay. These men will not be used as officers in any war effort, even though they are physically qualified to serve.

This is a war bill. If you want to revise the retired laws, that is one thing. I can cite you many cases that are more deserving than these. This is not the way to handle the situation. Do not stuff it in here piecemeal. Let us go after the retired list and revise the whole thing on a clear-cut, definite basis, after careful study. There has been no adequate study of the retired list. I agree with the author of this amendment that there is absolutely no occasion to revise the retired list of the Army in order to win this war. Those who are able to do duty and are acceptable to the War Department will get active duty, and when they are put on active duty they will get their regular active-duty pay. It is not necessary to revise the retired laws at the present time. I favor the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike this provision from the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out certain provisions of the bill. A vote to strike out is a vote to refuse to retire these officers under the provisions of the bill. A vote against it——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot pass on that.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 99, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAAS: On page 55, after line 22, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"The retired pay of any officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of his retirement."

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment had that provision of the bill stayed in which would have extended the same benefits to naval officers. Since that has been stricken out, of course it would not be in order.

I am now offering an amendment which will not affect the retired pay of anybody now on the retired list, but will simply bring the Navy into conformity with the existing law covering the Army.

It has been repeatedly stated that the Army and Navy should be treated alike. The pay bill is supposed to be one pay bill for all alike. All services come under one system of pay, but unfortunately a specific provision was passed for World War officers in the Army and did not include the Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. HARNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this will not affect any retired naval officers?

Mr. MAAS. On the retired list at present.

Mr. HARNESS. All the retired naval officers on the retired list now draw 75 percent.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. We have a great many World War officers and other officers who are drawing only 2½ percent multiplied by the number of years served.

Mr. HARNESS. The gentleman's amendment would increase them to 75 percent?

Mr. MAAS. The amendment would not affect them at all. All my amendment does is to enact for the Navy the existing law for the Army, which is that any World War officer in the Navy who may hereafter be retired shall be retired on 75 percent of his pay, which is existing law for the Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to carry out for the Navy what was provided in the act of June 13, 1940, for the Army?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; and it should have been done for the Navy at that time, but unfortunately it was not. I think it is the sense of the House and the Congress that the same laws on pay shall apply to both the Army and the Navy, as well as to the Coast Guard and Marine Corps. All I am asking is that existing law for the Army be extended to the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. HARNESS. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to increase the pay of the retired naval officers who are now drawing less than 75 percent of their pay?

Mr. MAAS. No; it will not affect any retired officer now on the retired list. The amendment says, "hereafter."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. It will affect those who are hereafter retired and put them on an increased basis over what they are now getting?

Mr. MAAS. It will put them on exactly the same basis as the Army, and the gentleman sponsored that bill. It will accord to naval officers who have served in the World War and who are retired hereafter the same benefits they would get if they were Army officers and were retired hereafter.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman know how much the increase will be? Let us take a particular rank, for instance, a commander in the Navy. How much increase would there be for him if he is retired on the basis of 75 percent?

Mr. MAAS. A commander who is forced to retire on account of failure to be selected would have had at least 27 years' service. He would get 27 times 2½ percent. If he is retired under this provision, he will get 30 times 2½ percent. It is not a large increase, a few dollars a month, but it would put him on a parity with a lieutenant colonel in the Army who is retired under similar circumstances.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. Under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment, if an officer retired under the provisions of a class B board or under similar provisions, then he would be placed on retired pay of 75 percent, on the same basis

as an officer who was retired in the regular line of duty for honest and efficient service.

Mr. MAAS. This applies only to World War officers, which is the law today for the Army. We do not have any class B officers in the Navy.

Mr. FADDIS. You may have officers that would correspond to that.

Mr. MAAS. No; the officers in the Navy or the Marine Corps who would correspond to class B officers in the Army are eliminated. We have a different law in the Navy. Such officers do not get a cent of retired pay, and beyond a certain grade they get 2 years' pay and then we kiss them good-bye.

Mr. FADDIS. If you do not have a class B board I think you should have.

Mr. MAAS. I do not think we need any class B board in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. FADDIS. They certainly need it in the Army.

Mr. MAAS. I am not talking about the Army, I am talking about the Navy.

Mr. FADDIS. It certainly needs to be worked a great deal more efficiently than it has been, and I know the Navy has no greater efficiency than the Army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAAS) there were—ayes 88, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than $1 nor more than $5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet.

SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 percent thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay at the rate of $100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of $50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this act, or transfer from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the Regular Navy for physical disability of any benefits, including pay and allowances or compensation which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of 30 years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this act.

The act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, 77th Cong.), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That acts or parts of acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this act except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

No back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

The provisions of this act shall be effective on the first day of the calendar month following the enactment thereof.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 58, lines 13, 14, and 15, strike out "and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941),".

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, in 1941, when the extension of the Selective Service Act was passed, section 8 was incorporated, and it reads as follows:

Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for active training and service, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 shall, in addition to the amounts otherwise payable to such person with respect to such training and service, be entitled to receive the sum of $10 for each month of such training and service in excess of 12.

You will notice that on page 58 of this bill numerous acts and parts of acts are sought to be repealed, and lines 13, 14, and 15 seek to repeal the section 8 which I have just read. This would have the effect of repealing the language providing that after the enlisted personnel have been in the service for 12 months they may receive additional compensation of $10 a month.

I realize that since I first addressed you earlier in the day the Rankin amendment, for which I voted, has been adopted, adding to two of the grades a $6 increase in one case and $8 in another. I am sure you understand that that entire amendment will have to be considered in conference. Of course, in view of his action on the floor, it will receive the very unfavorable consideration, I presume, of the chairman of the committee, inasmuch as he opposed it, and probably of the other conferees. Certainly, it will have to be studied and readjusted as it throws out of balance the sixth and seventh grades as compared with the fourth and fifth.

I therefore hope that the House will adopt my amendment and at least send to conference this provision retaining for these boys, after they have completed their training and are ready for the battle front, this additional compensation of $10 per month. I certainly think they are entitled to it.

As I have explained to you heretofore, under the bill as reported by the committee the only increase they would receive is $2 per month. If the Rankin amendment is not kept in the bill that is the way the bill will be finally enacted. I think it is necessary that we adopt this amendment in order that the conferees may have a clear and definite understanding of the sentiment of this House that we do not intend today to vote $30 and $40 and $50 increases for subsistence and quarters allowance for all the officers, for quite substantial allowances for second lieutenants and ensigns, and vote an increase of only $2 per month in the pay of the enlisted men.

My amendment would strike out the language in this paragraph which seeks to repeal section 8 of the act of 1941 and leave that in effect, the result being that after the enlisted man has had his 12 months of training and is ready for more substantial service, and very probably under present circumstances that means ready to be sent to the battle front, he will be paid this additional amount of a flat $10 per month.

I, therefore, hope the House will adopt the amendment, send this entire question to conference, and let the conferees understand that it is the wish of this House that better than a $2 increase be granted the boys with the guns.

If my amendment is adopted and the Rankin amendment is kept in the bill, then a private at the front, on the battle line, will receive a total of $70 per month, as follows: $50 base pay, $10 extra after 12 months in the service, and

$10 or 20 percent extra for foreign service. If my amendment is adopted and kept in the bill and the Rankin amendment is stricken out, then a private at the front would receive $60.40 per month.

When we consider that these boys must be at the front risking their lives before they can receive this $70 per month, when we consider that they are fighting to protect this country, its wealth, and its resources, when we consider that they are offering their lives to preserve our liberties and in defense of our homes, and when we consider the fact that there are millions here at home, safe and comfortable, receiving as much as $70 per week and more, I do not think my amendment can be regarded as unreasonable or improper.

You must remember that out of their pay these boys must pay the premium on their insurance, their laundry, their travel on furlough, and many other expenses. And many of them must send money home for those dependent upon them.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this is the very least amount we should provide for them. Even this is not half enough.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the idea of some Members of the House who propose legislation, and by way of amendment from the floor of the House to a committee bill that has had careful study, offer amendments merely for the purpose of throwing the whole matter into the hands of the conferees to settle. To my mind this is a wrong view to take of legislation. If an amendment is not meritorious it ought not to pass merely for the purpose of saying to the chairman of the committee, who, under the rules and under the procedure and practice of the House, is always chairman of the conference on one side or the other, that you will put him on the spot and then chastise him publicly and in the presence of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Not now.

So I am not denying any responsibility I have, and I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is now seeking recognition, that I never shirked a responsibility in my life and I never willfully or knowingly took an inconsistent position on the floor of the House, taking one position there and a different position somewhere else.

I am opposed to this amendment for the simple reason that it throws out of line the whole program of this bill. What we have endeavored to do is to take care of all of the selectees and the enlisted men of the Army in exactly the same manner. Under the provision which the gentleman would strike out there was an increase which, when adopted, provided that men getting $21 a month should get $31 as an amendment of the Selective Service Act. Now, if that were left in the bill—and it is expressly repealed here in the section itself—for the sole purpose of being able to present a bill that provides that all men in the enlisted service shall have $42 a month, and not some of them $21 a month and some of them $31, and some of them some other amount, you can realize what would be the real situation. So we have equalized the pay and we have provided that it shall go back to the date of December 7, 1941, the date of the Pearl Harbor disaster, in order to take care of discrepancies and inequalities that might occur if we did not do that.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, but my amendment has nothing in the world to do with $21 or $31. The $42 provision remains, and they will get it the day they enter the service, but after serving 12 months the extra $10 will be a flat increase over-all.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] would increase the pay of all of them $10, without knowing how many millions or billions of dollars that would amount to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that would make the seventh pay grade $70 a month, because the Rankin amendment is $50, and 20 percent for service abroad is $10, which is $60, and then the Pace amendment would add $10 more, and, therefore, for serving abroad they would get $70 a month.

Mr. MAY. That is right. Just one raise on top of another.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman think that is too much?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 17, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. Hereafter, except under circumstances where the military necessity requires the use of persons already possessing special knowledge, skill, training, or experience, required by the Army to properly protect the public interest and when such special knowledge, skill, training, or experience is not otherwise immediately available, no person shall, in time of war, be appointed a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States who has not been previously commissioned in the Regular Army or Navy, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve or enlisted in or inducted into the Army of the United States, unless such person shall have first completed a satisfactory course of instruction in the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy, or shall have first completed satisfactorily a prescribed course of instruction in military science and tactics in a college, university, or academy, approved by the War Department and maintaining a senior unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps or shall have first satisfactorily completed a course of instruction at an Officers' Candidate School conducted under the supervision of the War Department.

The Secretary of War shall, each 60 days after the effective date of this act, report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: Page 60, line 3, strike out all of line 3, and the first five words and the comma in line 4, and insert the following:

"Beginning May 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Unless the gentleman desires to make some statement on his amendment, I think we will agree to the amendment.

Mr. FADDIS. Very well. I only wish to secure the addition to the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Merely to ask a question about the amendment. I understand the purpose of it and I am more than willing to support it, but does he not need a further amendment which will have the effect of instructing the Secretary of the Navy to report naval commissions?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have an amendment to offer along that line.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will it conflict with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to so modify my amendment as to embrace as well commissions in the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Strike out the period at the end of line 9, page 60, insert a semicolon, and add: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple. None of us wants to have any public information given that might be of value to the enemy. Of course, officers might be appointed, for example, in the military

and naval service, whose names it might be inadvisable to have made public, such as officers engaged in antisabotage work, and espionage work, or counterespionage work, and those appointed to missions of a secret nature. The purpose of my amendment, I think, is to strengthen the provision and at the same time to put a protective provision there so that there will be no disclosure of the names of officers which should not be made public. The amendment that I have offered thoroughly protects the interest of the Nation in that respect, I think.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think the amendment is beneficial and ought to be adopted. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 60, section 20, at the end thereof, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"Hereafter, except for persons who may be commissioned in the staff corps of the Naval Reserve and those who possess specialized knowledge or skill as certified by the Secretary of the Navy, persons recommended for regular commissions as officers in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve shall satisfactorily complete a course of indoctrinal training, in a probationary status, prior to the issuance of such regular commission."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that right now.

Mr. Chairman, I think you can catch from the reading of the amendment the objective and purpose of it. It was to go along in line with the other part of that section which has been reported by the Military Affairs Committee in relation to commissions, except in these technical grades they must have some kind of indoctrinal training.

Now, here is the situation as far as the Navy is concerned—and I may say this amendment is suggested by the Navy Department. During the present fiscal year until April 30, 1942, a total of 15,327 officers, exclusive of the staff corps, were initially appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve. Of this number 13,228 received training covering a period of two months to one year. Had this proposed amendment been a matter of law, 2,099 additional would have had to undergo such training.

Between April 1, 1942, and June 30, 1943, it is estimated that 25,000 specialist officers—deck, engineer, aviation, intelligence, ordnance, and communication, exclusive of Staff Corps—will be appointed. Though the Navy Department now has plans for 19,900 to undergo training, the remaining 5,100 officers will, by this amendment, be placed in a probationary status until they satisfactorily complete the course of training. In other words, it is designed to get someone in the Navy who knows something about the Navy, as far as it is possible to do so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there provision, under existing law, for enlistment of those officers during this probationary or indoctrinal training? I did not know there was such a provision.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They have certain training, and after they get this training, then they get their commissions. As it is being done today, they are giving the commissions in the first instance without any indoctrinal training. This tries to get some knowledge of the Navy before they get the commission.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But is there provision now where they can enlist them in the Navy during this indoctrinal period?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am just wondering what the gentleman's amendment would do to students. I am thinking particularly of medical and dental students.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not apply to them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is the gentleman sure that it does not apply?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. Medical officers, dental officers, civil engineers, chaplains, and certain line officers are commissioned in the Naval Reserve for duty covering specific assignments. The soundness of the policy of commissioning such officers without regard to general requirements in indoctrinal service is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: What effect will this amendment, if adopted, have upon the Army personnel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not apply to the Army. We are just following out exactly in the Navy what you have already done in the previous part for the Army.

Mr. MAY. That is the way I understood it, but I wanted to have that clear.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. It has no bearing on the Army at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. MAY. To propound a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish it understood before I propound this request that I have no desire whatever to bar anybody from offering any amendment or from discussing any amendment that may be offered, or really for the purpose of limiting time; but in view of the fact that the leadership has been seeking some understanding as to whether we could finish this bill this afternoon I propound this request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments to section 20 conclude at 5:35.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment pending at the desk which I should like to discuss for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will be recognized on his amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I, too, have an amendment to section 20 and should like recognition for 5 minutes. Will the Chair inform us how the time is to be distributed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Louisiana will be recognized.

The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 5:35. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose to rise when we finish this section?

Mr. MAY. The purpose is to finish the bill if we can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows we cannot do that, because there are several other amendments pending and one new section to be offered.

Mr. MAY. I was under the impression that these were the only amendments pending.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] intends to offer a new section.

Mr. MAY. The limitation that has been agreed to would not apply to the new section.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought we had an understanding that we were going to rise at 5:30.

Mr. MAY. There was a tentative understanding to that effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I suggest that at the expiration of debate on section 20, which I understand will be at 5:35, the gentleman from Kentucky move that the Committee rise?

Mr. MAY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: On page 60, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "*And provided further*, That commissions shall in every case be available to enlisted men and members of the enlisted reserve upon the same terms and conditions as to civilians, any provision of Army regulations to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, under section 20 we are putting the seal of our approval upon commissions from civilian life. Under the abnormal conditions confronting this Nation today this is probably necessary, but I feel it is vital if we are going to authorize commissions from civilian life that these commissions should also be available to the members of the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and the Reserves upon the same terms and conditions. The situation today is this: If a specialist, a mechanical

engineer, a radio expert, or an electrical engineer is needed in the Army, and he is in civilian life he can be commissioned in whatever rank the Army sees fit to commission him; but if that same man should be an enlisted man or a member of the Enlisted Reserves he is controlled by Army regulations. He must go to the Army officers' camp, which has nothing to do with the training in his special line, and after 3 months' training he may then get a second lieutenant's commission and that only. A civilian is not limited to a second lieutenant's commission.

I believe it important if this House is going to put the stamp of its approval upon these commissions that it also put the stamp of its approval upon the proposition that these same commissions should be available to men in the ranks upon the same terms and conditions. I believe this to be essential and important. I have found circumstances in my own experience, Mr. Chairman, in which it would seem that men in the enlisted ranks could not get commissions that would be available to them had they not volunteered. I sincerely hope the Committee will put the stamp of its approval upon the principle incorporated in this amendment, and will adopt the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not opposed to equality for enlisted men, and for that reason I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under existing law there is nothing in the world to prevent an enlisted man from being given a commission just the same as others are given a commission.

If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, he subjects these enlisted men to the provisions of this section, thereby compelling them to first complete a satisfactory course of instruction in the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy or to have first completed satisfactorily the prescribed course of instruction in military science and tactics in a college, university, or academy approved by the War Department.

I am sure that the gentleman is no less zealous to have equality for the enlisted man than I am, but I do not want to put these enlisted men who by reason of their experience in the ranks, who have achieved a qualification that would entitle them to a commission, in the attitude of having to have this education which thousands and thousands, perhaps millions of them, do not have.

I think the amendment is one that should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 60, line 2, after the words "War Department", strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall preclude the appointment of commissioned officers for service in the Medical Corps in the Army of the United States made in part from among graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy, who are licensed or eligible for license under State law to practice medicine, or osteopathy, as the case may be, and who are otherwise qualified under such regulations as the President may prescribe."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean by his amendment to include the Army only, or does he mean it to apply, like all the other provisions of the bill, to the Army and Navy?

Mr. COSTELLO. The amendment simply refers to the Army because the original language of this particular section of the bill referred only to the War Department, and for that reason the amendment refers only to the War Department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say the amendment that has been adopted in this same section refers to the Navy. I am wondering if the gentleman cares to broaden it to include the Navy, before he discusses his amendment, and whether he has taken the matter up with the medical branch of the Navy to see what its reaction might be.

Mr. COSTELLO. I did not take the matter up with the Navy Department and have not submitted it to them. I do not know exactly what the practice of the Navy is in regard to the appointment of osteopaths as medical officers in the Navy. The language of section 20, I may say, was offered before the committee at an executive hearing and was adopted last Tuesday just before the bill was reported to the House. For this reason there was no opportunity to suggest this language, because section 20 was not a part of the proposed legislation. This amendment has not been submitted to the War Department and it has not been submitted to the committee, but I believe the language is desirable in view of the fact that the War Department is going to have need for approximately 23,000 doctors during the coming year. Those are in fact the War Department's own figures. Some estimates run as high as 35,000.

There are available in this country approximately nine or ten thousand osteopathic physicians and surgeons, men who have taken a course of study in medicine as well as osteopathy, yet the War Department for one reason or another declines to commission any osteopaths in the Medical Corps. If they are drawn into the service under the Selective Service Act, then they come in as ordinary privates and the War Department fails to avail itself of the trained skill and learning of these men and fails to utilize them in the Medical Corps as officers, as well they might.

I believe this is a serious mistake, and it is the subject of some criticism of the medical department of the Army in that they do not utilize osteopaths as well as regular M. D.'s.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it simply makes it possible, in the event the Army desires to use osteopaths, to use them under the terms of this amended bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. It is not mandatory?

Mr. COSTELLO. No. Section 20 limits the Army in the appointment of commissions to civilians, and my amendment will make it clear that there are no restrictions which will prevent an osteopath coming in from civilian life into the Army and being given a commission.

There is nothing mandatory about the legislation. It is merely permissive. In fact, it is a sort of a direction to the Medical Corps of the Army that it is the desire of the Congress that trained osteopathic physicians and surgeons shall be commissioned as medical officers.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Since the Navy has been included, would not the gentleman's amendment, as drawn, preclude the Navy from considering the matter? Should not the Navy be included, so that if it wants to take osteopaths into the service it can do so?

Mr. COSTELLO. It would not make any difference to me if the Navy is included in the language of the amendment. The original language was drawn to include only the Army, because section 20 included only the Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say the joint pay bill deals with both services, and as far as I am concerned, I have no objection because it is discretionary anyway, it is not mandatory, and probably they will not do anything about it. I am perfectly willing to have it in there, though.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be corrected to read "Medical Corps in the Army or Navy of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, as amended.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 23, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 60, line 9, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 21. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or of any other law, for the purpose of computing increase in pay for each period of 3 years' service of commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, and chief warrant officers who are paid under the provisions of section 1, 3, or 8 of this act, such service, in addition to the service required to be included by such sections for such purpose, shall include active Federal service rendered as an enlisted man and/or warrant officer in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve components there-

of and the National Guard: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to permit any commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, or chief warrant officer to receive pay and allowances in excess of the maximum limitations imposed upon the total pay and allowances of any rank or grade by any of the provisions of this act."

And in line 10, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "22."

On page 42, line 11, strike out all after the word "Reserve" down to the period in line 15.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation, if the Committee rises at this time, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be pending as the first order of business tomorrow morning, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, WILLIAMS, SPENCE, WOLCOTT, and GIFFORD.

APPOINTMENT OF CADETS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House has heretofore granted unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength might follow the pending pay bill. I now ask unanimous consent that the general debate on that bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking Member on the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TARVER. I object, Mr, Speaker. There ought to be full debate on that bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion in Committee of the Whole this afternoon I mentioned that at the proper time in the proceedings I should like to have printed in the RECORD at that point a schedule of rates of pay of enlisted men in the United States Army and in the various armies of the world. I now ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by me at Iowa City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If it is agreeable to the gentlemen who have special orders for today, the Chair will put the request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I made this afternoon and to include certain letters and extracts therefrom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by Dr. Raoul Herrera-Arango, secretary of the Cuban Embassy, Washington, at the Pan American Fiesta held under the auspices of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration at Gonzales, Tex., May 1, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a table compiled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour I ask unanimous consent that I may have the same amount of time tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any previous special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial on Mother's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for 20 minutes.

UNITED STATES AND THE DOMINION OF CANADA

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States and her neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada, stand at the crossroads with their backs to the wall fighting for a common ideal and for survival. It is foreordained that, as allies, we must fight with every resource in order to succeed and that nothing must stand in the way of the attainment of the objective which means our very existence. The rank and file of the people on both sides of the international boundary, our Allies in a common cause, realize the gravity of the situation and are giving their utmost. All barriers, inhibitions, restrictions, and impediments, at the peoples' demand, are being leveled and eliminated toward this end.

The people of the United States willingly are sacrificing pleasures and comforts. They are dispensing with the use of their automobiles, surrendering their tires, and submitting to a most rigid rationing of gasoline and other essentials. We face even the curtailment of fuel oil for domestic heating purposes and we are paying the highest rate of taxes in our history with a definite prospect of a further increase. We do not complain because our eyes are focused upon one objective and that is the winning of the war. Nothing else matters and nothing must stand in the way of the goal. Any opposition which might arise, for whatever cause or reason, must be set aside, must be crushed and completely liquidated. No selfish cause or petty interest of any clique, element, or faction should stand in the way of an all-out war effort, for the sooner this war is won, the lesser number of lives will be

lost and the sooner we may proceed with peaceful reconstruction and post-war problems.

I regret to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that certain uncontrolled, selfish, and downright brazen and unpatriotic interests have on occasion stood in the way of progress and even played the aggressive role of an obstructionist when the question of national existence was involved. I refer now to the railroads, which, in their blind and selfish course, have chosen and thus far succeeded in blocking truck transportation over Canadian territory between Detroit and Buffalo and Port Huron and Buffalo without regard to the pressing need for the most direct and economic transportation which this route affords. And might I say that this opposition has been successful in spite of the fact that the Province of Ontario has agreed that this short and direct route should be used because it is essential to the war effort, but the railroads, in spite of the favorable attitude of the Governments of the United States and of Canada, have succeeded up to this time, through the efforts of one man, to prevent the fulfillment of this understanding.

Ironic and unbelievable is the fact that the Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply of the Canadian Government at Ottawa, is the acknowledged spokesman for the opposition and the stumbling block toward the attainment of the objective in contravention of the will of the people because he is doubtlessly dominated and controlled by the railroad interests. In spite of the fact that Canada only recently and by a plebiscite unmistakably declared, by a vote of 2 to 1, her desire to go full length in the prosecution of the war, here is a Minister of Munitions and Supply of a sovereign government, by artifice, forestalling what must inevitably be brought to realization, and, in this connection, no consideration is asked for truck transport which the railroads do not themselves enjoy. Equality of treatment is all that is involved and all that is demanded.

American railroads traverse Canadian territory between these same points. Canadian railroads are accorded the same reciprocal treatment as they pass over American territory. The Michigan Central, the Wabash, and the Pere Marquette Railroads enter and pass through Canadian territory as the Grand Trunk, a Canadian system, operates over American territory. It must be evident and startling to the patriotic American people and their Canadian friends to the north to learn that this one-man opposition is responsible for the loss in time in transporting essential war materials urgently needed at the front, and that the time lost via the longer roundabout way along the southern shore of Lake Erie between the points mentioned of Port Huron, Detroit, and Buffalo amounts to anywhere from 6 to 10 hours per trip, and it is conservatively estimated that there is a waste of 35,000 transportation days per annum, plus millions of tire-miles and an additional uncalculated loss in the consumption of gasoline. The savings in mileage, mind you, between Detroit and Buffalo over the Canadian route, as compared with the longer all-American route, is the difference between 261 miles and 365 miles, or a savings over the Canadian route of 104 miles per one-way trip. The difference between Port Huron and Buffalo, using an all-American route, as compared with the short and direct Canadian route is the difference between 210 miles and 420 miles, or a waste in mileage of exactly 100 percent or 210 miles per one-way trip.

Why should the American people sacrifice the use of their automobiles, tires, and gasoline? Why should they forego the comfort of oil heat in their homes this coming winter only to have these essentials squandered needlessly because of an unpatriotic, autocratic, and brazen attitude on the part of a railroad spokesman clothed in the official robes of Minister of Munitions and Supply? This selfish railroad opposition, centered in Mr. Howe, as regards this question, is the very same opposition which stood in the way of the completion of the Alaskan Highway, so essential to the defense of the entire west coast of continental North America, and which was only recently broken by the rising tide of adverse public sentiment. The delay incurred has caused incalculable loss and exposed our peoples to great danger.

This same opposition stands in the way of the most essential development in the history of our country, the development of a great natural resource having to do with the deepening of the St. Lawrence waterway for navigation purposes and for the generation of essential hydroelectric power. This combined development will, when completed, accelerate the very heart throb of the richest industrial area in all of the world and will add prosperity to all of the people residing throughout all of the United States and Canada.

This identical opposition is responsible for the shortage of gasoline and oil along the entire eastern seaboard affecting the major portion of the American population. For, it was the railroads which, through their lobbyists—pernicious and meddling lobbyists—over a period of many years have blocked and are blocking right now the construction of pipe lines which can supply every gallon of need and which can add an additional margin to our Nation's security.

This is the very same element, ever present in its opposition to progress, which by foul means or fair, Mr. Speaker, sought to block the construction of the Panama Canal, a development which saved our country because it doubled the value of our Navy, vitalized the entire western part of the United States, and made more profitable railroad operations and more pleasant and prosperous the lives of all of our people.

This very same element, and let there be no mistake as to my reference, I mean the railroads, has stood in opposition to every move intended to bring about cheaper transportation and has attempted to smother and destroy competition. The railroads have opposed cheaper water transportation on our inland waterways and they have made every effort to stifle motor and bus transportation in this country and, I presume, in Canada. There can be no question about it; this is the final and decisive count in the indictment. The guilty parties are specifically named. They are the combination of railroads and their spokesman, the Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply. The people of our two great Nations should rise as one to crush this unjustified and unpatriotic restraint imposed on our defense effort. We cannot in conscience justify the imposition of restrictions on travel, upon the use of automobiles, tires, gasoline, and fuel oil, or any other essential unless and until special privileges are eliminated for the common good.

The railroads have no vested interest in transportation. Regulated truck transport, as well as aerial and steamship transportation, has a definite part in our continental fabric. If American railroads and air lines can operate over shorter geographical Canadian routes, certainly there is no justification for the artificial impediment which exists in Ottawa and which is centered in one man. I have waited patiently for the adjudication of this problem and it is with great reluctance that I take the floor at this time, but I cannot longer close my eyes to the fact that rubber, gasoline, and transport vehicles are being excessively used and depreciated because of unwarranted, selfish, and blind restrictions.

American tankers—and more important, American lives—are being sacrificed every day to supply the deficiency caused by the useless consumption of millions of gallons of gas which could be saved by the use of the approved Canadian route. I have waited a long time, Mr. Speaker, hoping that this problem would be worked out satisfactorily and amicably between the United States and Canada.

I have addressed a communication to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, on January 6 of 1941. The objective of my letter at the time was made the subject of conversations between the Honorable McKenzie King, Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, and our esteemed Secretary of State. All differences, if any ever existed, were ironed out. I am determined now to pursue this problem until it is finally and definitely settled. I shall insist that there must be no imposition of unnecessary sacrifices when special privilege still rides roughshod over the will of the people of both countries.

I want to appeal to the press of the United States and Canada to delve into this problem and to expose to view the scoundrelly opposition which has thus far succeeded in circumventing the expressed wish of the Governor of Michigan, the Premier of Ontario, and of the great bulk of our peoples. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we cannot be heard through the newspapers I shall feel constrained to treat this subject more fundamentally and thoroughly and to recite in detail the whole sordid history of this opposition even if I have to take to the air. This is not my problem, it is our problem. Pitiless publicity, thorough airing, will dissolve the opposition. The problem is one of trying to reach the people of Canada in order to inform them regarding the betrayal of their own best

interest. The Canadian people are determined to win this war at all costs. They are giving their full share of blood, sweat, and of tears. They will not tolerate selfish and unpatriotic opposition regardless of its source.

I think it is timely to suggest that this problem might become one for the Congress to investigate. I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, that it may be well to consider the appointment of a select committee of the House with the power to summon such witnesses as Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, J. B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, Milo Perkins, Chairman of the American Section of the Joint War Production Committee of the United States and Canada, and others, in order to obtain first-hand information with regard to the stricture which exists. In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that every responsible official of the Governments of the United States and Canada who has examined the problem has agreed that this short Canadian route is essential and must be utilized. No outlay of public moneys is necessary to inaugurate uninterrupted full-scale motor transport between Port Huron or Detroit and Buffalo over this Canadian route. Every possible controversial point has been thoroughly discussed and eliminated and a modus operandi agreed upon. The customs laws affecting the relations between the two countries and applicable to all forms of transportation are ample to safeguard the interests of all concerned and but one obstacle remains and that is the unwarranted opposition of C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply. It is a paradoxical situation which exists and which permits a lone cabinet officer to stand in the way of an all-out effort in war, in defiance of the will of the Canadian people where hundreds of thousands of young Canadians are in training for overseas service and where already thousands have left for distant shores to fight side by side with our our own boys for a common purpose and in defense of one ideal and of their respective countries.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] for 10 minutes.

POLITICS IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it would be interesting to the Members of the House, and it certainly is deserving of a permanent place in the archives of the United States through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to tell the interesting story surrounding the naming of a new Federal judge in New Jersey.

The President, under legislation which we passed 3 weeks ago, has just named for that position Thomas F. Meaney.

In discussing this matter I am in no way criticizing Judge Meaney. I do not know him personally, know nothing against his record, and understand he is a fine citizen; but as an exposition of how political considerations are paramount to this administration, even in wartime, the story is well worth repeating.

Four years ago, it was generally rumored that Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, was anxious to find a place for his son, Frank Hague, Jr., commensurate with the dignity of his father's position in the State. Young Hague having, if I remember correctly, been a member of the bar for only about 2 years, had had no great legal experience but he was a man of perfectly good reputation.

In due time there were two resignations: Judge Meaney resigned from the Hudson County Common Pleas Court, a $15,000-a-year position; and Judge Thomas G. Walker resigned from the Court of Errors and Appeals, a $9,000-a-year position.

This was the first step in the program. The second was the appointment by Governor Moore of Frank Hague, Jr., to succeed Judge Walker on the highest court in our State.

But this left Judge Walker out of a job, and the third step was his appointment to Meaney's former position in the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas.

But Judge Meaney was still out of a job, and the fourth step was his appointment as special counsel of the department of banking and insurance, at $20,000 a year.

Thus, a place was found for young Hague, and, at the same time, the others concerned were given satisfactory jobs at increased pay.

But, unfortunately for the Hague machine, last year Governor Edison appointed an anti-Hague Democrat in charge of the department of banking and insurance, and rumor hath it that he was able to find someone capable of carrying on Judge Meaney's special functions at less than half the price.

This left Judge Meaney with no reward for his part in the deal. So last week the administration rewarded this faithfulness to the Hague machine by appointing him to the United States District Court.

Thus we see how the administration will stoop to encourage such dubious methods when we are in an election year.

I am not blaming Judge Meaney for carrying out the wishes of the organization of which he was a part. I am not blaming Mayor Hague for using his utmost efforts to build up his political machine. But I do blame the administration for its alliance with this political organization. Politics, politics, always politics; wartime or no wartime!

The Newark Evening News, in an editorial, quotes from the President's Washington's Birthday radio address. Speaking of unified acceptance of sacrifice in war, President Roosevelt said:

> That means a national unity that can know no limitations of * * * selfish politics—

And they add:

> Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey!

There is now pending in the Senate a bill to authorize a sixth temporary judge in our district. If this proposed appointment is merely to be used to reward the faithful, merely to build up the Hague machine, we in this body must surely block this further authorization if it ever gets over here.

Mr. Speaker, our people today are asked to make great sacrifices. Every man, woman, and child must do his or her part toward winning the war. We should be able to have confidence in our leaders—in their integrity—in the sincerity of their professions of equal sacrifice for all—in the disinterestedness of their purposes.

The people of New Jersey have heard of this nomination by the administration with shocked surprise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks certain editorials from the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, and several New Jersey newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1942]

IN THE NATION—MANNA FROM THE WHITE HOUSE FOR HAGUE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—A depressing charge of politics as usual comes from New Jersey on the day of the fall of Corregidor. Though only a patronage deal is involved, typical of many administrations, such arrangements project the shadow of cynical politics into a time when the human spirit and character are being urged to the highest planes of idealism. On this ground strong protests are being made.

What happened is that the President over the objection of Governor Edison, appointed to a Federal judgeship the candidate of the Hague organization. One of the Governor's abiding efforts has been to keep politics out of the Jersey judiciary, and he depended on his choice for this judgeship to further the cause. Also, Governor Edison, in the interest of clean politics, has deprived the Hague machine of State patronage. This was weakening the influence of the machine. But now that influence is revived by a mark of favor from the President himself.

In choosing Mayor Hague's candidate for the Federal bench the President enabled Mr. Hague to repay a great personal favor as well as to point with pride to relations with the White House which he does not enjoy with Mr. Roosevelt's former Secretary of the Navy, Governor Edison. Thomas F. Meaney of Jersey City, who was selected over the field, is the Hudson County Common Pleas judge whose resignation in 1938 cleared a path to the State Court of Errors and Appeals for Mayor Hague's son.

A GAME OF MUSICAL CHAIRS

That deal was accomplished as follows: Thomas G. Walker resigned from the high State court, young Hague was named to succeed him, and Judge Walker replaced Judge Meaney in Hudson. Judge Meaney became special counsel to the Department of Banking and Insurance, but he lost this place when Governor Edison named a new Banking Commissioner. Now he has from the President's hand the reward the Jersey City organization owed and promised to him.

It is a familiar set of sequences in machine politics, the kind to which the American public has grown used over the years, whatever the label or moral professions of the administration at Washington. But, coming now, it seems to have made a profoundly bad impression in New Jersey.

Among the newspapers in the United States which are conceded in their own profession and by the public that reads them to be outstanding in courage, honesty, and public service, the Newark News holds a very high place. It has published this week two editorials about the judiciary deal. The following extracts, when there are borne in mind the conservatism and accuracy of the News and its strong support of the President's foreign policy, explain why this wartime episode transcends in importance the usual political deal:

Thus Mr. Roosevelt manifests his deep concern in the integrity of the judiciary. Thus Mr. Roosevelt plunks for Hague, Hague's candidate, and Hague's brand of government against the cause of honest, decent government, represented by Charles Edison.

In his radio address on Washington's Birthday, speaking of unified acceptance of sacrifice, President Roosevelt said: "That means a national unity that can know no limitations of * * * selfish politics." Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

In that same address, speaking of what Britain and Russia and China expected of us, President Roosevelt said: "They know that victory for us means victory for the institution of democracy * * * the simple principles of common decency." Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

THE OTHER SIDE

The News explains that the purpose of the appointment is "to get Hague's Hudson machine to help reelect Senator SMATHERS in November." This, of course, is the justification offered by those who counseled the President to recognize the machine in the very special way of a Federal judicial place and reject the Governor, his former Cabinet officer, with the further effect of checking Mr. Edison's efforts to starve out the Jersey City organization.

The end in sight is to assure the continued presence in the Senate of an unfailing administration vote, which has been steadily cast in support of the President's foreign policy and the war. There are many who will hold that such an end, in such a time, justifies the means employed. And, in weighing this side of the argument, another point should be considered by those who cannot join in the News' condemnation for the reasons assigned. According to the Attorney General, Mr. Meaney's qualifications to be a Federal judge were found, after diligent investigation, to be "far superior" to those of the other aspirants, the Governor's candidate included.

Having the Department's recommendation, therefore, the President decided that Mr. Meaney should not be rejected because of his peculiar services to and preference by Mayor Hague and the effect the appointment would have on Governor Edison's fight for clean politics.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 7, 1942]

"SUPERIOR" IN WHAT?

When President Roosevelt accepted Boss Hague's candidate for a Federal judgeship, it was doubtless thought at the White House that this patronage deal with a corrupt political machine would escape general attention in the midst of the terrible news from Burma and Corregidor. But, as it turns out, critical interest in this political partnership of Messrs. Roosevelt and Hague is no mere local or passing phenomenon. It obtrudes itself upon the national scene from which, against a contrasting war background, it is inseparable.

For example, Arthur Krock, in an editorial dispatch from Washington to The New York Times, writes as follows:

"A depressing charge of politics as usual comes from New Jersey on the day of the fall of Corregidor. Though only a patronage deal is involved, typical of many administrations, such arrangements project the shadow of cynical politics in a time when the human spirit and character are being urged to the highest plane of idealism. On this ground strong protests are being made."

A measure of the brazenness of the deal which put Thomas F. Meaney on the Federal bench is suggested in the following paragraph of Mr. Krock's comment:

"According to the Attorney General, Mr. Meaney's qualifications to be a Federal judge were found, after diligent investigation, to be 'far superior' to those of the other aspirants, the Governor's candidate included."

"Superior" in what?

What was it that made Mr. Meaney's qualifications outstanding? Had he a "superior" learning in the law, a "superior" judicial temperament, a 'superior' experience? None of these could be urged on his behalf as compared with other members of the bar of this State from whom a choice might have been made. No; what made Mr. Meaney "superior" was the fact that he was Boss Hague's candidate. That was the "superior" consideration that ruled in the calculations of Attorney General Biddle and of President Roosevelt.

What was it that made Mr. Meaney "superior" in Boss Hague's eyes? The fact that Mr. Meaney was amenable to Mr. Hague's will. When the boss put the finger on him Mr. Meaney resigned as judge of the court of common pleas in Hudson in a three-way deal to make a place available on the court of errors and appeals for Boss Hague's son.

Thus Mr. Meaney becomes a "superior" Federal judge. The grand object in view is, of ccurse, to roll up a "superior" vote for Senator SMATHERS in November. The President wants Mr SMATHERS' vote in the Senate. Mr. SMATHERS wants Boss Hague's vote in Hudson. All concerned vote Mr. Meaney a "superior" candidate and boost him onto the Federal bench. "S[illegible]ior" is a mild word for it. It's nothing short of superb.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 6, 1942]

A PRESIDENTIAL "WHISPER"

In his annual message on the state of the Union, describing our objectives in this war, President Roosevelt used the following language:

"There never has been—there never can be—successful compromise between good and evil."

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

In his radio address on Washington's Birthday, speaking of unified acceptance of sacrifice, President Roosevelt said:

"That means a national unity that can know no limitations of * * * selfish politics."

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

In that same address, speaking of what Britain and Russia and China expect of us, President Roosevelt said:

"They know that victory for us means victory for the institution of democracy * * * the simple principles of common decency."

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

When it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey President Roosevelt tosses his noble professions out the window and nominates the candidate of a corrupt political machine. "Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism," Mr. Roosevelt enunciates into a microphone, and his words, translated into nine languages, fan out starlike across the world. Then, in a quiet, private deal, he puts Boss Hague's man on the Federal bench. The wartime President, entitled to our full support, becomes a politician who invites judgment on the basis of his political acts.

Does Mr. Roosevelt think that morale can exist in a vacuum? Can sound morale exist on a combination of beautiful phrases and degrading political deals? The President demands a high standard of thought and conduct from all our citizens. Does he consider that a patronage deal with Boss Hague will inspire the decent citizens of this State with pride in their Government? Would Mr. Roosevelt be willing to have this deal heralded abroad as an example of how the democratic process works?

Yes, there's been politics in selecting Federal judges long before Mr. Roosevelt came upon the scene, and there will be afterward. But here, in this State, there is a Governor who served as a member of Mr. Roosevelt's own Cabinet, a Governor who stands for decent government, who has sought to keep politics out of the administration of justice. The President repudiates the Governor and in the issue of Edison against Hague uses a judicial appointment to back up Hague. The purpose, of course, is to get Hague's Hudson machine to help reelect Senator SMATHERS in November. Mr. Roosevelt shows that he is not unaware of the uses of brutal cynicism.

The President is fond of quoting Tom Paine on the subject of wartime morale. There is one quotation from Tom Paine that seems to have escaped Mr. Roosevelt's attention:

"Not an ability ought now to sleep that can produce but a mite to the general good, nor even a whisper to pass that militates against it."

Mr. Roosevelt's whisper to Boss Hague needs no amplifier to make it all too audible.

[From the Jersey City (N. J.) Journal]

Shocked, stunned, Governor Edison's office announced this morning that "it would take several days to frame a suitable answer" to President Roosevelt's action in appointing yesterday Hague's choice, former Judge Thomas F. Meaney, of Jersey City, to the Federal judgeship vacated by the retirement last winter of Thomas Glynn Walker, of Kearny.

If the gentlemen in Llewellyn Park were acquainted with the New Jersey political primer they would be able to appreciate what happened when the President appointed Mr. Meaney. Mr. Roosevelt doesn't need a primer. He knows the ropes.

With the President the man who delivers the votes is of more importance than a group of gentlemen who are up on truffles, steelhead salmon, and caviar, but lack acquaintanceship with the first rudiments of modern politics.

That is why Mr. Roosevelt, the qualifications of Mr. Meaney not being in question, accepted the recommendations of Mayor Hague and ignored the recommendation of

Mr. Edison, who wanted to show how he had "dethroned Hague" by getting the President to appoint Edison's friend, Joseph Kraemer, of Newark, and not Meaney.

Edison had taken several trips to Washington, more or less incognito, to help in his vain attempt to block Meaney, but the President had not much trouble in making a choice after the necessary congressional legislation opening the way for the appointment of a successor to Mr. Walker had been enacted last week.

Mr. Roosevelt, like all the boys and girls who know politics, realizes that New Jersey Governors come and go but powerful political machines have a longer tenure. The President, also, after looking over last fall's returns from some New Jersey counties where Charles Edison assumed to pose as the new Democratic leader in a "new day" or something like that, quickly concluded that Mr. Edison, as a political factor, cannot be taken seriously since his term is half over and the exit doors are already starting to open slowly and solemnly.

Roosevelt is with Hague. He prefers the mayor to his former Secretary of the Navy.

And thereby hangs another tale not yet told.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 9, 1942]

NO SIXTH JUDGE NOW

Before he went on the United States district court bench, Judge Smith was United States attorney for New Jersey. Therefore his opinion of the district attorney's office comes under the head of expert testimony. And what is Judge Smith's opinion? It is that the office of United States Attorney Phillips is guilty of rank inefficiency. Judge Smith so informed 50 men and women who had been called from their homes and jobs to serve as jurors in the trial of criminal cases in Newark, only to discover there were no criminal cases ready for trial. Mr. Phillips had none prepared. The Government lost $300 in fees and mileage and the jurors lost their time.

Senator SMATHERS is the political sponsor of Mr. Phillips. Mr. SMATHERS is the sponsor of the act which created a fifth judgeship for New Jersey, which President Roosevelt has just filled for Boss Hague. The Senator has still another bill to add still another judge to the Federal bench in this State. The contention is that these new judges are required to relieve congested court calendars in New Jersey.

Part of the court congestion seems to have been due to congestion, or, rather, lack of congestion, in the United States attorney's office. The first new judgeship was used at the White House to relieve congestion in Boss Hague's Federal patronage. If another new judgeship is created, there is no reason to believe that it won't be used for the same purpose.

The questions of congestion in Federal dockets, creation of new judges, conduct of the United States attorney's office—all have become enveloped in a strong political atmosphere and motivation, of which Senator SMATHERS' forthcoming campaign for reelection is the focus. The objective of swift, efficient administration of justice in this Federal district has become a consideration of minor consequence.

Under these circumstances Representative HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has ample justification in hesitating to approve a bill for creation of a sixth judgeship. The sixth judgeship should be held up.

[From the Newark Sunday Call of May 10, 1942]

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

Senator SMATHERS and Mayor Hague made a deal. The mayor promised SMATHERS support for reelection in return for the right to pick a new Federal judge. The President has ratified this deal by appointing Hague's candidate, a pedestrian product of Hudson County politics.

In so doing, President Roosevelt has repudiated Governor Edison's crusade to smash the Hague machine.

Only those who have not studied the President's record will be shocked by this. The President is full of noble sentiment and expounds a lofty concept of political ethics. But in action he is the most practical of practical politicians.

His benediction falls on all political machines which yield him their allegiance and support, and he forgives their transgressions, however dreadful. It is only upon those who oppose him that he visits the fury of righteous wrath.

That he should refuse to support a former member of his own Cabinet, a fine and decent man who believed what the President said about his political philosophy, and should discountenance his effort to demolish a pernicious political machine, is wholly in harmony with Mr. Roosevelt's record.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 11, 1942]

NUMBERS—AND A FACT

It is said in defense of Boss Hague's nominee for the new Federal judgeship that 440 letters and telegrams of endorsement were sent to Senator SMATHERS' office at Washington in proof of Thomas F. Meaney's fitness for the Federal bench. This is said to be 3 times the number of endorsements any other candidate received, and thus Mr. Meaney's fitness to be a judge is considered clinched. It's as simple as telephoning votes to Major Bowes for your favorite amateur.

If a numerical computation of endorsements is what counts, Boss Hague could have produced 44,000 letters and telegrams without much effort among his political machine cohorts. But this judicial numbers' game aside, it is further urged that Mr. Meaney is a nice, decent fellow. One or two persons have even written to this newspaper to inquire what the News has against him.

Mr. Meaney certainly is one of those pleasant, presentable personalities that so often flourish in the neighborhood of political bosses. Among the sum of qualities found useful in such an environment, being amenable to suggestion is one of the most vital. Mr. Meaney was amenable to Boss Hague's suggestion that he give up a $15,000 common pleas judgeship as part of a deal to put Mr. Hague's son on the court of errors and appeals. He was as responsive to a wave of Boss Hague's finger as a fluff of thistledown is to the first gust of a thunderstorm.

That explicitly is what is against him as nominee for a Federal judgeship, and that should be enough. No statistics about endorsements, no commendations of his pleasant, affable exterior, will blind decent opinion in this State to the fact that Mr. Meaney does not meet the fundamental test—that is, that to be a good judge the appointee must be independent; he must be his own boss.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1942]

MR. ROOSEVELT TO MAYOR HAGUE

If Thomas F. Meaney, of Jersey City, nominated by President Roosevelt for a Federal judgeship, is confirmed by the United States Senate, he will have attained this high office through political processes planned carefully by Mayor Hague, a circumstance which cannot fail to impair public confidence in the wisdom of his selection. This White House recognition of Mayor Hague, inexplicable in view of the President's intimate knowledge of the disreputable character of the Hudson County Democratic machine, comes at a peculiarly inopportune time—when the power and the prestige of the Jersey City boss are on the wane, when he is fighting what appears to be a losing fight to retain sufficient strength to put his own man in the Governor's office next year in the hope of retrieving his lost control. Coming, as it does, after 16 lean months, the nomination of Mr. Meaney for a place on the United States court, brings a measure of encouragement to the Hague machine.

Events leading up to the appointment of Mr. Meaney make quite clear the reasons for the criticism it has inspired. He was at one time a judge of the Hudson County court of common pleas, a highly desirable judicial post from which he resigned to make way for the appointment of another Hudson County favorite who, in turn, retired from the court of errors and appeals. It was to this place on the highest judicial tribunal in the State that Frank Hague, Jr., was named by former Governor A. Harry Moore, whom Mayor Hague has in mind for a fourth term when the administration of Governor Edison ends. Mr. Meaney, having displayed a properly obedient attitude a few years ago, is now to receive his reward.

United States Senator WILLIAM H. SMATHERS, who will be a candidate for reelection in November, has cooperated, either under pressure or voluntarily, in seeing to it that Mayor Hague's political designs were fulfilled. He needs the 150,000 margin which Hudson gives to those whom the mayor views with favor. Without these votes he could not hope to win, but the manner in which he has established his claim upon them will not be ignored when his candidacy is weighed in the balance in November.

In this latest phase of the battle against Hague, one which is being fought, incidentally by a former member of his own cabinet and a loyal supporter, President Roosevelt does not appear in an appealing light. The conclusion is inescapable that, in order to advance the political fortunes of Senator SMATHERS, he has compromised with his convictions. Governor Edison has reason to feel let down at this failure of support at a crucial stage of his fight. However, he still has it within his power to break the grip of the corrupt Hudson County machine upon the politics and the government of New Jersey, a purpose in which he should be helped by the Republican majority in the legislature.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, before this very large audience of six or seven Members of the House of Representatives, I am very reluctant to even take any notice of the parrotlike repetition of charges that have just been delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]. He is simply echoing the sentiments of a certain coterie, a modern Essex Junto, who repeatedly have been unsuccessful before the people in New Jersey in impressing upon them the iniquities of Hagueism, so-called, and are attempting to use the Congress of the United States as a sounding board for their own satisfaction. The gentleman whose name has been forwarded to the Senate by the President of the United States for appointment to a Federal judgeship is one whom I have known ever since our college days together. For over 35 years he has been well-known in our community.

For 16 years he has served our State in its courts. Four times he has been confirmed by a hostile legislature in the State

of New Jersey. Never has anybody dared to impeach his integrity, and nobody who knows him would attempt to discredit his remarkable and deep scholarship. After he has become a judge he will become a renowned judge of our Federal courts. He will take his place among the greatest judges of this Nation. He was not any part of any conspiracy as charged by the gentleman on this floor, in repetition of charges made by the newspaper to which he referred. That newspaper has carried on a constant warfare against Mayor Hague. It has been rebuked time after time by the people of New Jersey. Let the gentleman come forward in the next election as a candidate for United States Senator, as I understand his aspiration to have been at one time, and we will defeat him there as we have defeated other candidates whom his party has put forward; but let him not attempt to use this high body to attack the leadership of the Democratic Party in that State.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no conspiracy. The gentleman is simply repeating the statements of those who speak out of vindictive ignorance on this subject. Judge Walker, who has just retired from the Federal bench, was acclaimed by the very people who are now attacking Judge Meaney. If there was a conspiracy, which I deny categorically, Judge Walker was just as much a part of that conspiracy as was Judge Meaney. Everybody admits that Judge Walker made a splendid record as Federal judge. Everybody admits his high character, but his ability and his character are no higher, not by one iota, than the ability and character of Judge Meaney.

That is all I care to say, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a schedule of the pay of enlisted men of the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a poem entitled "America Eternal" and also a letter from Judge Taylor, the author of the poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DREWRY (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today and the rest of the week, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Dayee Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2097. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2275. An act to amend section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, to grant National Service Life Insurance in the cases of certain Army flying cadets and aviation students who died as the result of aviation accident in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2279. An act for the relief of O. R. Maxfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Lillian LaBauve Linney; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2446. An act to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2456. An act to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1053), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On Monday, May 11, 1942:

H. R. 4402. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

On Tuesday, May 12, 1942:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Senior;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An Act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An Act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Monday, May 18, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. to begin hearings on H. R. 6999, a bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable

barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the intracoastal waterway, and by deepening the intracoastal waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1632. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for the War Department, for the relief of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, amounting to $3,298.47 (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1633. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to determining whether any improvement of the Maumelle River and tributaries, Arkansas, for flood control is advisable, requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on August 2, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1634. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 4, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Fairfax-Kaw City, Osage County, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7066. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2119). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2121. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the Government. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GAVAGAN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr GAVAGAN:

H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEY:

H. R. 7078. A bill to regulate and permit the voting of soldiers and sailors in the military service of the United States of America, serving within continental United States of America; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7079. A bill to provide for the retirement of any officer of the National Guard who has served an aggregate of 25 years in the National Guard and who has served as Chief of the Militia Bureau or Chief of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr WHELCHEL:

H. R. 7080. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H R. 7083 A bill for a Universal Servicemen's Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 7084. A bill to exempt from Federal tax all tobacco, snuff, cigars, cigarettes, and any other commodities subject to Federal taxes sold to personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in uniform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7085. A bill to provide for the automatic issuance of national service life insurance to all persons in active service in all military forces of the United States, in the amount of $1,000 to each person during the period of the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7086. A bill to provide for the appointment of persons to guard bridges, railroads, reservoirs, and all other utilities necessary to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Dale McNeal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Klein; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2788. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to defeat proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2789. By Mr. GILCHRIST: Petition of Mrs. A. E. Steinhaus and 65 other citizens of Madrid, Iowa, relative Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2790. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. William M. Baumgartner, pastor, and 147 members of the First Methodist Church of Rochester, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 at an early date, in order to provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2791. Also, petition of Rev. Harold C. Smith, pastor, and 20 members of the United Presbyterian Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., petitioning an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2792. Also, petition of Rev. J. R. Mohr, pastor, Freedom (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, and 65 citizens, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 at an early date, to provide for the common defense in relation to sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2793. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by Irene Todd and sundry other citizens of Flora, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2794. Also, petition presented by Mrs. Hester Niccum-Bell, signed by Elder H. H. Mayberry and sundry other members of the Pin Oak Baptist Church, opposing the manufacture and sale of alcohol for beverage purposes for and during the duration of the war, as a part of our national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2795. Also, petition of Lucy Raglin and 63 other citizens of Carmi, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2796. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Rev. W. M. Martin and various other citizens of Ellensburg, Wash; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2797. By Mr. RICH: Petitions from citizens of Williamsport, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2798. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Commonwealth Club of California, relative to war-salvage financing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2799. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolutions of the executive board, Local No. 735, United Automobile Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., urging institution of enforcement of a fair retail price for food, clothing, and rent and the adoption of a progressive tax program to eliminate any unreasonable profits as a result of a war program, and the Michigan Federation of Labor, asking for Federal investigation to deteremine rubber inventories in trucking industry so that reasonable regulations can be made, if necessary, to conserve rubber; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2800. Also resolutions of the executive board and joint council of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, Local 69, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., urging the House and Senate to act immediately to remove the restriction so that small packinghouses can have an equal share in supplying the Government; and urging that the Congress and the President act jointly with the United Nations to open up a second front in Europe to win the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend J. P. Dell, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Valdosta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we give Thee thanks for the blessings of another day and for Thy loving kindness and tender mercies which have been ours all the days of our lives. We remember that "unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." We beseech Thee to look with favor upon our great country. Give wisdom to those to whom authority has been given to direct the affairs of this Nation in this crucial hour of our history. Drive back the forces of evil and bring in the reign of righteousness and peace and good will to men.

Bless the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and every individual in our armed forces. Make us willing to sacrifice and suffer until our great country and the nations of earth shall be saved from slavery and shall have the blessings of freedom, which is Thy own will for all peoples.

Let us go forth with faith, courage, and confidence, remembering that the God of our fathers is still our refuge. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6293. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States; and

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to authorize and direct the making of a correction in the enrollment of S. 210, an act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. O'NEAL, LEAVY, HARE, JOHNSON of Indiana, and STEFAN.

SALE OF WHEAT AND CORN AT LESS THAN PARITY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that an amendment has been offered to the agricultural appropriation bill providing for sale of wheat at less than parity.

Although proponents of the amendment assure us it is phrased to protect wheat income and corn prices, the Associated Press reports the price of both wheat and corn in a nose dive as result of publication of the text of the amendment.

The principle of parity has been barely established and now it is proposed to betray it in the house of its friends. We cannot yield parity on one commodity, and preserve it on another commodity. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. We must maintain parity for all or resign ourselves to parity for none.

"Divide and conquer" is a familiar slogan and a time-honored ruse of the enemies of agriculture. Agriculture will play into their hands if for the sake of a temporary advantage to one group the attempt is made to throw another group to the wolves. The only tenable policy is "One for all and all for one."

Parity is a principle and a principle compromised is lost.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership of House to a bulletin in yesterday's Baltimore News-Post, emanating from I. N. S., which reads as follows:

BULLETIN—CONGRESSMEN GET X CARDS FOR GAS

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Diplomats, Cabinet members, Congressmen, and other high officials of the Government had to register for gasoline rationing today, but that was as far as the similarity went. The difference—they got X cards, giving them an unlimited supply of gasoline.

Foreign diplomats and members of their staffs automatically received X cards upon a blanket registration for their embassy or legation.

This article is misleading and highly inflammatory. It does not do justice to the splendid tradition of the press built up in this Nation over many years. I believe it only fair and decent that the press, when it errs, or misrepresents, correct erroneous impressions conveyed to the reading public. It must be remembered that Congress did not decree rationing, and it is unfair to tar Congress with the stick of hate and odium. I do not have an X card, and I know of many Members of Congress who have applied for class A and class B cards.

Congress is glad to participate in the sacrifices that the Nation must undergo and is cheerfully doing its part.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, I secured permission to extend and revise my remarks. I ask unanimous consent at this time to include therein a letter from the Surgeon General of the United States Army on osteopathy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the press of the District of Columbia carried in flaming headlines news to the effect that Congressmen did not stand in line to get gasoline cards and that they had received cards entitling them to an unlimited amount of gasoline. The same press did not explain, however, where it would have served any useful purpose for some 500 Members of Congress to adjourn the public business in order to stand in line with some 30,000 other people in order that they might receive gasoline cards. Furthermore, may I say to the press and to the bureaucrats downtown who would like to define, limit, or circumscribe the duties of a Member of Congress that whenever a Member of Congress finds time to go back home to talk to the man on the street corner, the man in the corner grocery store, the man behind the plow, the man in the office, that is part of his official duties. Whenever he finds time from his duties here to go out and visit some Army camp or some naval station to see how they are being conducted and how the boys are getting along, that is also a part of his official duties. It is also part of his official duties to attend to the business of his constituents by doing their errands downtown, the opinion of any nit-witted bureaucratic clerk to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for the fall of France was that the press of that nation made a practice of holding the officials of that nation up as objects of contempt and ridicule until they had destroyed the faith of the people in their own form of government. Is our press trying to do the same to this Nation? They seem to be overexerting themselves lately in being unfairly critical of Congress.

As an elected Representative of the people, I resent any attempt upon the part of either the press or the bureaucrats to discredit representative government or to define the duties of those who are responsible to no one but those who elected them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address which I have prepared for delivery this evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

THE CASE FOR SILVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to advise the Members of the House that as a result of a great deal of research on the question of money and the use of silver, I have prepared an exhaustive treatise entitled "The Case for Silver" that will be delivered over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. this evening at 11:15 o'clock p. m. This represents a compilation of figures from the Treasury, prepared with a great deal of care, and I commend it to the careful attention of my colleagues.

[Here the gavel fell.]

BUREAUCRATS VERSUS THE CONGRESS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to address the House at this time for 1 minute and the other to address the House today for 25 minutes at the conclusion of all business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I hope that none of the Congressmen here have been chilled or scared into going over and asking any department head for permission to attend Congress this morning. I am going to talk about that subject this afternoon for 25 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the Congress showed the people of the United States that they are not going to take orders from the bureaucrats downtown. It is time the people of the United States were shown that we still have a constitutional form of government and that we are going to live by it. It is time that we told the people of the United States that a Congressman has a right to circulate in his district so that his constituents will not have to depend solely upon the reports that come out of the bureaus headed by 35,000 bureaucratic reporters for their only source of information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project and to include therein an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal dated May 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a letter written by a Dr. Packard, of Denver, Colo., to Mr. Leon Henderson concerning the price of commodities, and I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

WHEAT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about farmers profiteering under the war prices and under parity prices. Their prices for wheat do not place a burden on the consumer. Our aim has always been parity price for the farmer. The United States parity price for wheat today is $1.33½ per bushel. This means that at parity the farmer would receive less than 2 cents for the wheat in a loaf of bread. Or, in other words, if the farmers produced wheat absolutely free, the average person would save less than 1 cent per day on the cost of bread. Bread costs to the consumer are the same when a part of the price is paid in taxes and part in market price, as it would if he paid the full parity price to the wheat farmer.

I believe wheat is a typical case of farm products, namely, that the farmer gets less than 25 percent of the price that the consumer ultimately pays for his product. Therefore, the argument that the farmer is profiteering or receiving more than he is entitled to receive when he receives parity is absolutely without foundation.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The farmer gets less for the cotton that goes into a shirt than the man who wears the shirt pays for having it washed one time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe that the gentleman is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper ad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some amusement to the Members who have taken the floor and complained of the criticism which has been heaped upon us in the Washington morning papers. Why so thin-skinned?

One of the chief pastimes of the Washington and some other papers is to ridicule Congress, although none of the publishers or editors seems disposed to run for Congress and relieve us of our duties, give the country better Congressmen.

If a Congressman is not a Federal official, what is he? If he cannot be trusted with a gas card permitting him to use an unlimited amount of gas on official business, he is not fit to hold the office.

The boys in the Press Galleries, the columnists, and the newspaper editors must make a living. They can kick us around with impunity. Others might sue them for libel. Our hides should be thick enough to take it; cultivate a disregard for these unjust criticisms.

Back home, the boys, referring to that kind of abuse, told me, "Don't worry about this mud slinging. This is not your fight any more; it is our fight. We are going to skin them for you." I hope they do.

Do not worry about the boys in the Press Gallery when they sob about the amount of gasoline you may use. You know you will not use any more than is absolutely necessary to carry on your official duties, and, no doubt, some of these press boys who write so critically about you will be thumbing a ride up to the Capitol if they happen to see you coming back from one of the Government departments where you have been to serve your constituents.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress there was only one business I knew, and it is the only business I still know, and that is the newspaper business. I was a newspaper reporter for 20 years. I came off the city desk of one of the most courageous newspapers of America—the New Orleans States—which was praised nationally for courage in journalism.

That is the reason I come here this morning and say this: Unless something is done to curb that section of the press which holds in ridicule the keystone of the democracy which allows it free speech, our whole system of government is going to collapse. It is about time we Members of Congress take cognizance of it and let this Nation know whether we are men or mice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Houston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House seem to be very much concerned today about gasoline rationing and the X cards they have received. That does not worry me. When I asked for my card they asked me what kind of a card I wanted, and I said, "Just like all the other Congressmen get." So they gave me an X card. They said, "That is what they all ask for."

I have made up my mind that I am not going to worry about what the newspapers say, but I am going to be just as conservative in the use of gasoline as I know how to be. I am going to try to conserve every drop of it. That is my duty as an American citizen. We must conserve gas on the ground if we want our planes to fly in the air.

I never voted to give these bureaucrats this power you now so vehemently deplore. You fellows who did vote to give these bureaucrats that power ought now to begin to realize that if you do not want a dictatorship here, or a bureaucratic government, you should be very careful how you vote. I am afraid now that you have gone too far with legislation setting up a dictatorship. You should repeal much legislation you put through the last 8 years at the request of the New Deal if you are to preserve for the American people your liberty and your independence and our form of government that we all love and which has made America the greatest country on the face of the earth and the American people the happiest people and the most secure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune and Leader-Press, dated May 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER and Mr. TOLAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have the feeling that possibly it would have been best had the criticism of Members of Congress about gas-rationing cards been passed without notice being taken of it. The interests of the country would best be served as a result of a cordial relationship between the Congress and the press. We ought to avoid, and constantly strive to avoid, misunderstanding. I have a passion for freedom of the press and do not object to criticism. I get a great deal of it. I would not suppress the press in any wise, and still I do hope that our newspaper friends will take a more kindly attitude toward this House and deal more generously, if not more justly, with its Members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PAY READJUSTMENT BILL OF 1942

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2025, the pay-readjustment bill of 1942, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] had been read. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania seek recognition?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I want to submit a request that we agree upon some time for debate on this amendment, if that is agreeable to the gentleman. I would like to hear a suggestion from the gentleman as to how much time there should be for debate.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. About 15 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I also want 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be again read at this time.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Van Zandt amendment:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 60, line 9, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 21. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or of any other law, for the purpose of computing increase in pay for each period of 3 years' service of commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, and chief warrant officers who are paid under the provisions of section 1, 3, or 8 of this act, such service, in addition to the service required to be included by such sections for such purpose, shall include active Federal service rendered as an enlisted man and/or warrant officer in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to permit any commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, or chief warrant officer to receive pay and allowances in excess of the maximum limitations imposed upon the total pay and allowances of any rank or grade by any of the provisions of this act."

And in line 10, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "22."

On page 42, line 11, strike out all after the word "Reserve" down to the period in line 15.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during general debate, I announced that at the proper time an amendment would be offered to provide longevity credit to commissioned officers in the service who were appointed from the ranks. The longevity credit would cover not only their enlisted service, but likewise their commissioned service.

The amendment is designed to overcome the discrimination that now exists concerning officers who have been appointed from the ranks. Prior to July 1, 1922, men appointed to a commission from the ranks and who are still in the service, are given longevity credit for not only their enlisted service, but likewise their commissioned service; but those men who have been appointed to a commission since 1922, and who are still in the service, are denied longevity credit for their enlisted service. In other words, they are only given longevity credit for their commissioned service from the date of their appointment.

This bill is designed to establish uniformity as far as pay and allowances are concerned for the enlisted and commissioned personnel of the armed forces of our country. As I said yesterday in general debate, unless my amendment is adopted, such uniformity will not prevail.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman know how much the amendment would cost if it were adopted?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. No; I do not. I feel sure that the gentlemen who will follow me will be able to provide those figures.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to officers who are commissioned after June 30, 1939, or to all officers?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The amendment applies to all officers appointed from the ranks since July 1, 1922.

Mr. COLLINS. Those who were commissioned prior to that as well as those commissioned after June 30?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. I feel the best way to convey to the membership of the Committee the intent of the amendment is simply to use an illustration. Let us take, for example, John Doe, who enlisted in the United States Navy January 1, 1923. After serving 10 years as an enlisted man, he is appointed to a commission January 1, 1933. At the present time he is entitled to longevity credit for only his commission service since January 1, 1933. For the 10 years prior, during which time he was an enlisted man, he receives no longevity credit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman describe to us under what circumstances a man who enlisted in 1923 in the Navy got a commission in the Navy in 1933, after 10 years as an enlisted man, and at what age?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Time does not permit me to give the gentleman from New York a detailed answer because the situation affecting John Doe is only an illustration of how the present law affects commissioned personnel appointed from the ranks.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman not know that it will take about 15 years' service before a man can be a chief warrant officer, and that thereafter he will be entirely too old to get a commission as an ensign, and the chief warrant officer's pay under this bill may run as high as $5,500?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. My illustration is based entirely on an effort to show that enlisted service is not recognized as commissioned service is recognized for longevity purposes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman said he wants to make possible equality all along. Why not include the 4 years' service at West Point and the 4 years' service at the Naval Academy?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, in another section of the bill that service is excluded, and we have already passed over that. If you want to establish uniformity for all men, enlisted and commissioned, the adoption of this amendment will effect such a result and guarantee fair and equitable treatment of those officers who by perseverance, loyalty, and service have risen from the ranks.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has already been allotted and the time fixed for debate on this amendment.

Mr. BENDER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. But I am not speaking on this amendment. However, I want my time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Has all of the time been allotted?

The CHAIRMAN. All of the time has been allotted and the gentleman from Ohio states that he does not wish it on this amendment.

Mr. BENDER. I want the time after this amendment is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot save that time for the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

WHAT ABOUT OUR COLORED SOLDIERS?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, our country is fighting for the right of all people to human freedom. We are fighting for equal rights and for equal treatment. Yet within our own borders and within our own armed forces we permit conditions of shocking inequality.

On the evening of April 30 a train operated by the Louisville & Nashville Railway Co. stopped at Montgomery, Ala., and nine colored soldiers stationed at a camp in this vicinity boarded the train. They were coming north for a well-deserved furlough. They boarded the train at about 6:45 in the evening. The following morning, May 1, the train stopped at Bowling Green, Ky., at about 9 a. m. A large group of white soldiers got off the train at Bowling Green and went into the station for breakfast. The nine colored soldiers who were on this train entered the same station and asked to be served. They were willing to eat sandwiches and coffee; willing even to stand in line without sitting down with the other soldiers. They were refused service. They got on the train to resume their journey. At noontime the call for lunch was made in every car except the car in which the nine colored soldiers were seated. They never were given the opportunity to eat lunch. All that day they rode without food. From 6:45 p. m. on April 30 until 4:45 p. m. on May 1, when they arrived at Cincinnati, these men had gone hungry. These boys were coming home to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, wearing the uniform of the Army of the United States.

What justification can there possibly be for treating these men who are ready and willing to give up their lives for their country in this way? What possible reason can there be for denying them the right to eat with their fellow soldiers, who are drawn from the same American population?

In England today the system of rigid class barriers which has been established through centuries of unintelligent tradition is breaking down under the impact of war. It is high time that the refusal of white men and women in the South to treat our colored citizens as fellow human beings was broken down. Colored soldiers and white soldiers are fighting in the same cause. They have the duty to work together, to die together. This Government must see to it that they have the right and privilege of eating together. Any man who denies food to these soldiers is not working for the United States. He is working for the Axis.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman knows that neither he nor I nor anyone else here would ever deny any man food under any circumstances if we could help it, but I am curious to know just where the gentleman got this information, and whether he has investigated to see whether it is correct.

Mr. BENDER. I got that information from a lady, in fact, a group of ladies, headed by Mrs. Lillian Mason, of Cleveland, who happened to be on the same train.

Mr. MAY. Did the gentleman ask the War Department if they had made any inquiry about it?

Mr. BENDER. I have asked the War Department to make a thorough investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has already been allotted. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I would rather follow somebody who has something to say against the amendment, as I am with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Three Members are to be recognized under the unanimous consent, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], the gentleman from Kentucky, and the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking recognition at this time, but I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Being allowed 5 minutes myself for debate upon this amendment, have I the privilege of allocating that to other Members?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not yield time or allot it to other Members. He may take his time, and then yield for some purpose. Unless some of the three gentlemen referred to care to speak, the Chair will put the question. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] desire recognition?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching amendment and it is presented without opportunity for study. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] what his judgment is as to the effect of this amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from New York at this time for such explanation as he cares to make.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this question of granting longevity credit for enlisted service to a man after he becomes an officer was threshed out with great thoroughness by the joint committee of the Congress in 1922. It is true, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] says, that prior to 1922 the enlisted service was counted for longevity purposes after the man became an officer as well as service as an officer. Our committee at that time unanimously agreed that that was not sound practice. We did not, however, take away from men who then were enjoying that longevity credit the right to continue in it, but we laid it down in the law that after 1922 it should not prevail as a practice.

Now, here is the point: Take two lieutenants in the Navy of equal rank and equal responsibility. If it so happens that one of them has had 5 years of enlisted service, under the old practice that man would receive more pay as a lieutenant than his fellow officer, although both of them had had equal length of service as commissioned officers, carrying the responsibility of a commissioned officer.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot yield. Indeed, I have no right to yield. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is yielding to me.

Using as an illustration, to bear this out, the case cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], the gentleman contended that if a man had had 10 years of enlisted service in the Navy and then became an ensign, the act of 1922 with respect to its treatment of him should be repealed, and that he should get longevity credit, as contrasted with the other ensign who has had no enlisted service. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] pointed out, if there are any such cases left in the Army or the Navy, and there are very, very few left over from the period prior to 1922, they must be men who have had 10 or 15 years' enlisted service. If you are going to give them at this hour, all these men who have been commissioned since 1922 and who had enlisted service prior to their commission, in many instances the pay of one officer will be from $450 to $1,000 a year more than the pay of another officer of equal rank. Thereby you create a discrimination. You do not make the pay uniform. You make it uneven amongst the entire commissioned personnel who have had that prior military history. We made up our minds in 1922 that that was an unsound practice, and unanimously agreed to abandon it from that year on. The amendment now before us proposes to restore it and make it a part of the permanent law.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that can be added to strengthen the argument just made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. He is absolutely correct. In 1922 the joint pay committee eliminated what is known as the tacking on of enlisted service for longevity purposes, after men have received commissions. If you do what the Van Zandt amendment proposes, instead of having equality in pay and in rank it will be inequality, and you upset the very theory upon which the whole bill is based. Both departments, the Navy Department and the War Department, have been very much opposed to doing just exactly what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has suggested.

Mr. MAY. The bill without the amendment undertakes to equalize the pay all the way along the line.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Van Zandt amendment. I find myself in disagreement with my chairman and other friends on the floor.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] just made the point that two officers of the same rank, under the Van Zandt amendment and under my amendment, would be drawing different amounts of pay. That is certainly true. If an enlisted man serves in the United States Army or the United States Navy as an enlisted man and then, through meritorious service, is promoted, I cannot see where there is any justice in denying him that longevity credit. As long as he remains an enlisted man he draws his longevity pay. As soon as he is promoted to a commissioned officer you take away from him the longevity pay that he has already earned.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. No; I do not yield. When you make an officer out of that man why should you take his earned longevity pay away from him? It is 5 percent for 3 years' service, and after 30 years of service there is a limit of 50 percent increase that he can possibly get.

Let me show you how inconsistent you are if you do not pass this amendment. By unanimous consent in this House on February 16 of this year you passed a bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] which is now Public Law No. 538, giving to the Navy exactly what this amendment gives to both the Army and the Navy. That was fine on February 16. Now you come in here today to reverse yourself on the Navy and to preclude the Army from having the same status for noncommissioned personnel as the Navy now has under this act which was passed by the Senate on March 30 of this year.

This amendment has been endorsed by all the veterans' organizations. I have letters here from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and from the American Legion. If time were not so short, I would read a paragraph from the American Legion's letter, but it is simply a reiteration of what has been said here.

It seems to me a grave injustice will be done the enlisted men. Let us take, for instance, the case of a deserving sergeant who is made a second lieutenant. By the change you have not altered that man's make-up; you have not transformed him; he is no different when he gets a gold bar on his shoulder; he has not been improved a nickel's worth, yet you take from him what he has already earned in pay for honest, deserving service as soon as you make a commissioned officer out of him. Why, when he is made an officer, should you take credit from him for all the hard and faithful service he has given theretofore as an enlisted man?

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Is it not true that he is of much more worth to the United States Government from having served a great number of years in the enlisted grades than a man who has gone in the Army for about 2 weeks every year and given his service as a commissioned officer?

Mr. EDMISTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Another disadvantage that will grow out of this will be that many high-ranking noncoms of long service will refuse to take commissions because they will make more money in their noncommissioned grade than they would in a commissioned grade because of their longevity pay. Almost every industrial concern and business in America recognizes long and faithful service of its employees. I cannot see where there is any foundation or reason why our country does not recognize long and faithful service on the part of its soldiers and sailors.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to a statement recently made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from West Virginia that unless this amendment is adopted the bill creates an inequality between the Army and the Navy. I remind the gentleman that this bill seeks to cover both the Army and the Navy. Its provisions apply equally to both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BROOKS. In just a minute.

This illustrates, Mr. Chairman, the need for the resolution which your committee passed in reference to further study of the pay of the commissioned personnel of these six branches of the service. The subcommittee adopted this particular recommendation after lengthy study. The full committee adopted this recommendation, and finally, after it was all finished, we made the recommendation that further study be given to classi-

fication and pay in the commissioned services covered by the bill. In line with this, Mr. Chairman, I have this morning dropped a resolution in the hopper calling for the creation of such a committee and the further study and ironing out of inequality and such injustices as there may be in the pay of the commissioned branches of these services.

Let me add to what has already been said upon the subject a little illustration. Let us take the case of a man who comes from the enlisted service and is made a lieutenant. He may be a lieutenant for only 1 month, but he may draw almost one and one-half times the pay of another lieutenant sitting at the very same desk. Or, let us take the case of two captains, one drawing the pay of a captain, $2,400 a year, $200 a month, yet sitting next to him may be a man with the same rank drawing $3,600 per year, the extra $1,200 coming from longevity pay; yet these men sit at the same desk and do the same work. There should not be this difference in pay for doing the same work in either branch of the service.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Should there not be a difference in pay of two men who have rendered different terms of service? Should not their past service be taken into consideration?

Mr. BROOKS. It seems difficult to me to justify different pay levels for men in the same grade in the same work.

If you take as was the case in 1922 that Congress decided to take as a base from which to begin the commissioning of officers to apply the longevity, then you follow the bill as it is presently written.

Mr. EDMISTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. EDMISTON. I know this bill would put the Army and Navy in the same position, but what I referred to was that on February 16, in this House, by unanimous consent, we put this same provision in for the Navy. In this bill we wipe that out. We reverse ourselves on May 13 from February 16.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows the purpose of longevity is to recognize service. Why should this Congress discriminate against an enlisted man who was commissioned the hard way by denying him longevity for his enlisted service?

Mr. BROOKS. Congress has to make up its mind to begin as the base the commissioned service or begin as the base the over-all time a man enlists in the service. If you do the first, then you have these irregularities that immediately creep in. You will have cases where one man of a lower commission receives higher pay than his senior officer immediately above him.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Based upon service.

Mr. BROOKS. Based on the change brought about by the amendment.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER. This situation might arise also, might it not? I understand that under the bill the cadets at Annapolis and West Point are not given credit for longevity during the 4 years they spend in those academies. Is that true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HARTER. If that is true, then an enlisted man who has been in for 3 years and then is given a commission would get more pay if this amendment is adopted by reason of that 3 years of service as an enlisted man over the man from West Point who has gone through a strenuous course of training for 4 years. He would have an advantage over the West Point man?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. SAUTHOFF) there were—ayes 33, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: Page 60, after line 9, insert a new section, section 21, to read as follows:

"That officers commissioned in the Army or Navy or Coast Guard of the United States subsequent to June 30, 1939, shall be credited in the computation of pay for length of service for enlisted service in any or all of the services mentioned in the title of this act and for enlisted service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read again the amendment I have just offered, in order that it may be clearly understood:

SEC. 21. That officers commissioned in the Army of the United States or in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard subsequent to June 30, 1939, shall be credited in the computation of pay for length of service for enlisted service in any or all of the services mentioned in the title of this act and for enlisted service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President.

I am advised that an amendment will be offered later to limit the effectiveness of the provisions of this bill to a period extending 12 months beyond the termination of the present war. Therefore, my amendment only would apply to enlisted men commissioned during the war period and the emergency period immediately preceding it. Of course, I should like to have seen adopted the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] which has just been voted down. I voted for that amendment, and its adoption would have rendered mine unnecessary, because it was much broader in scope. However it is very manifest that there is strong opposition here to upsetting the procedure of long standing with respect to longevity credit for officers formerly serving in the ranks, and for that reason I have made my amendment more restrictive, and present it more in the nature of a substitute for the Van Zandt amendment.

My amendment applies to officers who have been commissioned in the Army of the United States—not the Regular Army—in the Navy, in the Marine Corps, or in the Coast Guard subsequent to June 30, 1939, which would take in all of the pre-war emergency period, and it undertakes to allow credit in the computation of pay for any prior enlisted service they may have rendered in any or all of the services mentioned in the title of this bill.

If a young man has become a warrant officer or a technical sergeant and he is elevated to a commissioned status he would get credit for pay purposes under my amendment for his precommissioned service. Everyone knows that a warrant officer or technical sergeant is a thoroughly experienced soldier. Everyone knows that men of that type will, as a rule, make better soldiers and better officers than men who have not had that type of training. As the bill stands now these men will be discriminated against.

The cost that would accrue as the result of the adoption of this amendment would be very slight. I have canvassed the matter of cost very carefully, and I give it to you as my deliberate judgment that it would be very small indeed. Certainly, in justice to those men who have qualified and proven themselves by experience in the ranks they should not be placed in the same pay status as men who have had no military experience whatever.

I have in mind hundreds of young men who have served in the National Guard in the top enlisted grades who have drilled and trained and become thoroughly proficient soldiers. They have been officer material in the National Guard but could not advance because there were no vacancies to which they could be promoted. The same would apply to hundreds of young men who have served in the ranks in the Regular Army, who likewise were stymied because of the limited number permitted to qualify for commissions under restrictive legislation that has long obtained. This training, Mr. Chairman, has given to such men a background of inestimable value in shaping up the armed services for actual war missions, and plain, common sense, it seems to me, dictates that they should have a pay status that recognizes this service.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, since March 3 the Ways and Means Committee has been working diligently on the new tax bill. In that time we have heard scores and scores of distressed businessmen who came here

to ask for relief in the way of taxation. Even housewives appeared before the committee in opposition to certain proposals in the way of new taxation. Notwithstanding the fact that we have been working on this bill since March 3, it will be the first of July before it is ready for presentation to the House.

We are asked to raise almost nine thousand million dollars, which is exclusive of two thousand million dollars that we will be called upon to raise later on for Social Security purposes. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] would say, "Where are you going to get the money?" Frankly, we do not know.

Taxes are already burdensome, being the heaviest in the history of the Republic. Some advocate a sales tax. The Treasury Department advocates a withholding tax at the source, which would include wages, salaries, dividends, and other income. Already we have added in a tentative way a considerable sum to the load that the employers of America must carry.

We propose to increase the corporation excess profits tax to 94 percent. In addition, we have tentatively agreed to increase the surtax on corporations from 24 percent to 40 percent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman will agree, in view of his experience on the taxing committee, that we ought not to load this Army pay bill with a few hundred million dollars more as contemplated by different amendments.

Mr. KNUTSON. I may say to the gentleman that I am inspired to make these remarks by the action of the House on yesterday, which has caused at least some of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means deep concern. While our committee labors with the tax problem you blithely go ahead and adopt amendments that will call for the good Lord only knows how many hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions. Only a few moments ago a gentleman offered an amendment, and when asked how much it would increase the cost he frankly stated he did not know.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to play politics. If you do so, you do it to your country's hurt and you hasten the day of reckoning. Already the credit of our country is being strained. If we are to avoid bankruptcy we shall have to pare appropriations and spending to the bone.

They tell us that we shall have a debt in excess of over $200,000,000,000 before this war is over, assuming that the end will come next year, which we all hope. Two hundred billion dollars is more by $70,000,000,000 than the total value of all the farms, farm buildings, and farm equipment in America, and it is about 65 or 70 percent of our total national wealth.

On top of that, we have local debts, debts of the States and their political subdivisions, that aggregate another twenty thousand million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we stop, look, and listen. It is time that this House stop adopting amendments that have not been considered in committee and the cost of which no one can estimate accurately. It is time that we stop playing politics and forget that November is in the offing. Let us concentrate on winning the war and saving the credit of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. This act may be cited as the "Pay Readjustment Act of 1942."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 60, lines 10 and 11, strike out section 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 21. This act shall remain in effect until the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and for 12 months thereafter."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to make this bill an emergency measure for the duration of the war and 12 months thereafter. The justification for that is borne out by the resolution the gentleman from Louisiana has just introduced to have appointed a joint committee to study the entire pay question.

No one can foretell what the conditions will be at the end of this emergency, or at the end of the war, and 12 months from that date; therefore we should have a temporary measure, not permanent law, and all these pay problems can then be readjusted in accordance with the economic conditions that confront the country at that time.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sympathetic with the gentleman's amendment, but, as a practical proposition, are not such matters as retired pay and longevity pay necessarily matters of permanent legislation? If you make this legislation temporary, are you not likely to run into the proposition at the expiration of the life of this legislation as to how you are going to figure the longevity and the retired pay contained in this measure?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, for the simple reason that there will be 12 months after the war is over for Congress to step in and deal with the entire subject matter.

I may say that pay is one of the most complicated pieces of legislation on the statute books. What do you have? You have seven pay periods. How many Members of the House who have not devoted some study to it know what a pay period is? You have longevity pay, you have different pay periods in different ranks, you have allowances, and you have retired pay; and the retired pay of Army officers and Navy officers today is $76,000,000.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. MAY. I am just studying about the question of whether or not the gentleman's amendment as written is not equally as indefinite and uncertain as the pay period. When will this war close, what is meant by its "closing" and what is a "closing," a declaration of peace or the signing of a treaty, or what?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say that when the war ends we shall all know it, and we should go then to legislating on a permanent basis. The speed-up bill and practically every other bill we have enacted recently have been based on the emergency and not enacted as permanent legislation. I say it is no time now to regulate pay, when no man knows how large the Army will be. Judge Patterson said there may be an Army of 6,000,000 men. I know there will be a Navy of at least 500,000, because we have already recruited up to that number. Why should you now try to fix the pay of these men, a problem of such magnitude, as a permanent proposition? The only sensible way to do is to make it an emergency proposition and deal with it when the emergency is over on a permanent basis.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. BROOKS. This is what disturbs me with reference to the gentleman's amendment. If we make this temporary and a man who is now in the service makes a career of the service, if he serves 20 or 25 years, he has no definite set-up that he can depend on with respect to retirement or with respect to longevity pay. Are you not throwing a terrific uncertainty into his career at a bad time or at a time when he should not be worried about such things?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All right, but what is the justification for your resolution? It is due to the uncertainty in this field. It is due to the questions that have to be threshed out and yet you now want to write a permanent law dealing with these questions. On the other hand, you say that we should have a committee to investigate these things. This matter of pay is a complicated one, and yet you are trying to pass a law to deal with the pay situation after the war is over. We are granting a 20-percent increase in base pay to the enlisted men for serving at sea. You do not know what the conditions are going to justify after the emergency is over. I say the only sensible thing to do is to make this important bill temporary legislation and then after the emergency is over deal with it on a permanent basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: After the amendment just adopted insert a new section to be known as section 22 and to read as follows:

"This act may be cited as the 'Temporary Pay Readjustment Act of 1942'."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is just a clarifying amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendment just adopted, I think the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] should be in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to the Senate bill as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, pursuant to House Resolution 480, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Rankin amendment on pages 42 and 43.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Rankin amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 42, line 25, after the word "grade", strike out "$48" and insert "$54"; and on page 43, line 1, after the word "grade", strike out "$42" and insert "$50."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOREN) there were—ayes, 95, nays 31.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present. I want a record vote on this matter. Let us let the privates in the Army know that we want them to have the major benefits this bill may provide. We have provided adequately for the officers. This is for the enlisted man, the man in the ranks. Let us let the record speak.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 28, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—332

Allen, Ill.	Arends	Bender
Allen, La.	Arnold	Bennett
Andersen, H. Carl	Barden	Bishop
	Barnes	Bland
Anderson, Calif.	Barry	Bloom
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bates, Mass.	Boggs
	Baumhart	Boland
Andresen, August H.	Beam	Bolton
	Beckworth	Boren
Angell	Beiter	Bradley, Pa.
Brooks	Hartley	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Pheiffer, William T.
Bryson	Heidinger	
Burch	Hendricks	Pierce
Burdick	Hill, Colo.	Pittenger
Burgin	Hill, Wash.	Ploeser
Butler	Hinshaw	Poage
Byron	Hobbs	Powers
Camp	Hoffman	Priest
Canfield	Holbrock	Ramsay
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes	Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	Hook	Randolph
Capozzoli	Hope	Rankin, Miss.
Carlson	Houston	Reed, Ill.
Carter	Howell	Reed, N. Y.
Cartwright	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Case, S. Dak.	Hunter	Richards
Casey, Mass.	Imhoff	Rivers
Celler	Izac	Rizley
Chapman	Jackson	Robertson, N. Dak.
Chenoweth	Jacobsen	
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Robinson, Utah
Claypool	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Clevenger	Johns	Rockefeller
Cluett	Johnson, Calif.	Rodgers, Pa.
Cochran	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Ind.	Rolph
Collins	Johnson, Luther A.	Romjue
Colmer		Russell
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Sacks
Cooper	Johnson, W. Va.	Sanders
Copeland	Jones	Sasscer
Courtney	Jonkman	Satterfield
Cox	Kean	Sauthoff
Cravens	Kee	Scanlon
Crawford	Keefe	Schuetz
Creal	Kefauver	Scott
Culkin	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer, Mich.
Cullen	Kelly, Ill.	Shanley
Cunningham	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sheppard
Curtis		Sheridan
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Sikes
Davis, Ohio	Kerr	Simpson
Davis, Tenn.	Kinzer	Smith, Maine
Day	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Dewey	Klein	Smith, Wash.
Dickstein	Kopplemann	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	Kunkel	Snyder
Dirksen	Lambertson	Somers, N. Y.
Ditter	Landis	South
Domengeaux	Lane	Springer
Doughton	Lanham	Starnes, Ala.
Douglas	Lea	Steagall
Downs	Leavy	Stefan
Dworshak	LeCompte	Stevenson
Eaton	Lesinski	Stratton
Eberharter	Ludlow	Sullivan
Elliott, Calif.	Lynch	Sumner, Ill.
Elston	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Engel	McGranery	Sutphin
Englebright	McGregor	Sweeney
Faddis	McIntyre	Talbot
Fellows	McKeough	Talle
Fenton	McLaughlin	Tarver
Fitzgerald	McLean	Tenerowicz
Fitzpatrick	McMillan	Terry
Flaherty	Maas	Thill
Flannagan	Maciora	Thom
Fogarty	Mahon	Thomas, N. J.
Folger	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Forand	Mansfield	Thomason
Ford, Leland M.	Marcantonio	Tibbott
Ford, Miss.	Martin, Iowa	Tolan
Ford, Thomas F.	Martin, Mass.	Traynor
Fulmer	Mason	Treadway
Gale	Merritt	Van Zandt
Gamble	Meyer, Md.	Vincent, Ky.
Gathings	Mills, Ark.	Vinson, Ga.
Gehrmann	Mills, La.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gerlach	Monroney	Vorys, Ohio
Gibson	Moser	Ward
Gilchrist	Mott	Wasielewski
Gillette	Mundt	Weaver
Gore	Murdock	Weiss
Gossett	Murray	Welch
Graham	Myers, Pa.	Wene
Grant, Ind.	Nichols	Wheat
Green	Norrell	Whelchel
Gregory	Norton	White
Guyer	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten
Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wickersham
Haines	O'Connor	Wigglesworth
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara	Williams
	O'Leary	Wilson
Hall, Leonard W.	Oliver	Winter
	O'Toole	Wolcott
Halleck	Pace	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hare	Paddock	Wolverton, N. J.
Harness	Patman	Woodruff, Mich.
Harris, Ark.	Patton	Woodrum, Va.
Harris, Va.	Pearson	Wright
Hart	Peterson, Fla.	Young
Harter	Peterson, Ga.	Youngdahl

NAYS—28

Andrews	Edmiston	O'Neal
Bell	Gifford	Rich
Boehne	Hancock	Robertson, Va.
Bulwinkle	Hess	Rockwell
Clark	Kilday	Taber
Coffee, Nebr.	Kleberg	Wadsworth
Cole, N. Y.	Knutson	West
Costello	Lewis	Whittington
Crowther	May	
Disney	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—71

Baldwin	Granger	Plumley
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Rabaut
Blackney	Harrington	Rankin, Mont.
Bonner	Healey	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Jarman	Rogers, Okla.
Bradley, Mich.	Jarrett	Sabath
Buck	Jenks, N. H.	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	Jennings	Schulte
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scrugham
Byrne		Secrest
Clason	Kennedy, Michael J.	Shannon
Cole, Md.		Short
Crosser	Kilburn	Smith, Pa.
Delaney	Kocialkowski	Smith, Va.
Dies	Kramer	Smith, W. Va.
Dondero	Larrabee	Sparkman
Drewry	McCormack	Spence
Duncan	Maciejewski	Stearns, N. H.
Durham	Magnuson	Tinkham
Eliot, Mass.	Michener	Vreeland
Ellis	Nelson	Walter
Fish	O'Day	Worley
Gavagan	Osmers	Zimmerman
Gearhart	Patrick	
Gillie	Plauché	

So the Rankin amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Michener.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Short.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Drewry with Miss Rankin of Montana.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Larrabee.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Byrne.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Schulte.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The question now is on agreeing to the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—360

Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	Johnson, Ind.
Allen, La.	Ditter	Johnson,
Andersen,	Domengeaux	Luther A.
H. Carl	Doughton	Johnson, Okla.
Anderson, Calif.	Douglas	Johnson, W. Va.
Anderson,	Downs	Jones
N. Mex.	Duncan	Jonkman
Andresen,	Dworshak	Kean
August H.	Eaton	Kee
Andrews	Eberharter	Keefe
Angell	Edmiston	Kefauver
Arends	Elliott, Calif.	Kelley, Pa.
Arnold	Elston	Kelly, Ill.
Barden	Engel	Kennedy,
Barnes	Englebright	Martin J.
Barry	Faddis	Keogh
Bates, Mass.	Fellows	Kerr
Baumhart	Fenton	Kilday
Beam	Fitzgerald	Kinzer
Beckworth	Fitzpatrick	Kirwan
Beiter	Flannagan	Kleberg
Bell	Fogarty	Klein
Bender	Folger	Knutson
Bennett	Forand	Koppleman
Bishop	Ford, Leland M.	Kunkel
Bland	Ford, Miss.	Landis
Bloom	Ford, Thomas F.	Lane
Boehne	Fulmer	Lanham
Boggs	Gale	Lea
Boland	Gamble	Leavy
Bolton	Gathings	LeCompte
Boren	Gehrmann	Lesinski
Bradley, Pa.	Gerlach	Lewis
Brooks	Gibson	Ludlow
Brown, Ga.	Gifford	Lynch
Brown, Ohio	Gilchrist	McCormack
Bryson	Gillette	McGehee
Bulwinkle	Gore	McGranery
Burch	Gossett	McGregor
Burdick	Graham	McIntyre
Burgin	Grant, Ind.	McKeough
Butler	Green	McLaughlin
Byron	Gregory	McLean
Camp	Guyer	McMillan
Canfield	Gwynne	Maas
Cannon, Fla.	Haines	Maciora
Cannon, Mo.	Hall,	Mahon
Capozzoli	Edwin Arthur	Manasco
Carlson	Hall,	Mansfield
Carter	Leonard W.	Marcantonio
Cartwright	Halleck	Martin, Iowa
Case, S. Dak.	Hancock	Martin, Mass.
Celler	Hare	Mason
Chapman	Harness	May
Chenoweth	Harris, Ark.	Merritt
Chiperfield	Harris, Va.	Meyer, Md.
Clark	Hart	Mills, Ark.
Claypool	Harter	Mills, La.
Clevenger	Hartley	Mitchell
Cluett	Healey	Monroney
Cochran	Hébert	Moser
Coffee, Nebr.	Heffernan	Mott
Coffee, Wash.	Heidinger	Mundt
Cole, N. Y.	Hendricks	Murdock
Collins	Hess	Murray
Colmer	Hill, Colo.	Myers, Pa.
Cooley	Hill, Wash.	Nichols
Cooper	Hinshaw	Norrell
Copeland	Hobbs	Norton
Costello	Hoffman	O'Brien, Mich.
Courtney	Holbrock	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cox	Holmes	O'Connor
Cravens	Hook	O'Hara
Crawford	Hope	O'Leary
Creal	Houston	O'Neal
Crowther	Howell	O'Toole
Culkin	Hull	Pace
Cullen	Hunter	Paddock
Cunningham	Imhoff	Patman
Curtis	Izac	Patton
D'Alesandro	Jackson	Pearson
Davis, Ohio	Jacobsen	Peterson, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson, Ga.
Day	Jensen	Pfeifer,
Dewey	Johns	Joseph L.
Dickstein	Johnson, Calif.	Pheiffer,
Dingell	Johnson, Ill.	William T.
Pierce	Scott	Tibbott
Pittenger	Shafer, Mich.	Tolan
Ploeser	Shanley	Traynor
Poage	Sheppard	Treadway
Powers	Sheridan	Van Zandt
Priest	Sikes	Vincent, Ky.
Ramsay	Simpson	Vinson, Ga.
Ramspeck	Smith, Maine	Voorhis, Calif.
Randolph	Smith, Ohio	Vorys, Ohio
Rankin, Miss.	Smith, Pa.	Wadsworth
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Wash.	Ward
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Wis.	Wasielewski
Reed, N. Y.	Snyder	Weaver
Rees, Kans.	Somers, N. Y.	Weiss
Rich	South	Welch
Richards	Springer	Wene
Rivers	Starnes, Ala.	West
Rizley	Steagall	Wheat
Robertson,	Stefan	Whelchel
N. Dak.	Stevenson	White
Robertson, Va.	Stratton	Whitten
Robinson, Utah	Sullivan	Whittington
Robsion, Ky.	Sumner, Ill.	Wickersham
Rockefeller	Sumners, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Rockwell	Sutphin	Williams
Rodgers, Pa.	Sweeney	Wilson
Rogers, Mass.	Taber	Winter
Rolph	Talbot	Wolcott
Romjue	Talle	Wolfenden, Pa.
Russell	Tarver	Wolverton, N. J.
Sacks	Tenerowicz	Woodruff, Mich.
Sanders	Terry	Woodrum, Va.
Sasscer	Thill	Wright
Satterfield	Thom	Young
Sauthoff	Thomas, N. J.	Youngdahl
Scanlon	Thomas, Tex.	
Schuetz	Thomason	

NAYS—1

Disney

NOT VOTING—70

Baldwin	Gearhart	Osmers
Bates, Ky.	Gillie	Patrick
Blackney	Granger	Plauché
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	Plumley
Boykin	Harrington	Rabaut
Bradley, Mich.	Jarman	Rankin, Mont.
Buck	Jarrett	Rogers, Okla.
Buckler, Minn.	Jenks, N. H.	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Jennings	Schaefer, Ill.
Byrne	Johnson,	Schulte
Casey, Mass.	Lyndon B.	Scrugham
Clason	Kennedy,	Secrest
Cole, Md.	Michael J.	Shannon
Crosser	Kilburn	Short
Delaney	Kocialkowski	Smith, Va.
Dies	Kramer	Smith, W. Va.
Dondero	Lambertson	Sparkman
Drewry	Larrabee	Spence
Durham	Maciejewski	Stearns, N. H.
Eliot, Mass.	Magnuson	Tinkham
Ellis	Michener	Vreeland
Fish	Nelson	Walter
Flaherty	O'Day	Worley
Gavagan	Oliver	Zimmerman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Michener.

Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Spence with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Short.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Drewry with Miss Rankin of Montana.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Worley.

Mr Delaney with Mr Larrabee.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Byrne.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Dies.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Schulte.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Flaherty.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], I ask unanimous consent that he may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 2250, known as the bill to aid small business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HOUSING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Federal Housing bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORPS OF CADETS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour and 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by myself as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the ranking member on the minority side, with the understanding that 30 minutes of that time will be allocated to those in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the gentlemen who control the time on the majority side and on the minority side will each yield 15 minutes to myself to be apportioned among those opposed to the bill.

Mr. MAY. We will yield it to the opposition. If you want to control it, I have no objection to it.

Mr. TARVER. I have no objection about who controls it, but I want someone who is opposed to the bill to be charged with yielding the time to the opponents of the bill, whether myself or somebody else.

Mr. MAY. I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6979, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for a long number of years the United States Military Academy at West Point has operated at an excessive overhead cost, due to the fact that during most of the time over the years they have not had a full quota of cadets, as authorized, in attendance.

The committee took the bill up in the regular order and conducted hearings upon it, at which hearings appeared the representatives of the War Department and the Superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point. Briefly stated, this bill authorizes an increase of one cadet for each Senator and Representative, and the regular number that was previously authorized to the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, to each Delegate in Congress, as well as the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

When the bill was originally introduced and referred to the committee, it was a little indefinite as to whether or not the present appointments that can be made by Representatives and Senators would remain subject to their disposition, notwithstanding the provision in the bill that authorizes the Secretary of War to make certain appointments. The committee was very careful in the study of the bill and determined that it would not report a bill that did not make certain the right of Representatives and Senators to retain their regular appointments and, in addition to that, increase the number of alternates from two to three.

Five hundred and thirty-six is the number of the increase, if I am not mistaken. That raises the attendance from 1,960 to 2,496.

When we come to the question of protecting the right of Members of the House to retain their appointments and not have somebody appoint someone to take their places, we wrote into the bill several amendments, and they are in a few words in section 2 of the bill. I am going to read that section and comment on it.

SEC. 2. When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified alternate candidates and other qualified candidates recommended by the academic board, not less than two-thirds thereof from qualified alternate candidates.

Now, here is the crux of the whole measure, in relation to questions I understand are to be raised by amendment that is to be offered from the floor:

Provided, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law.

Your appointments therefore are already authorized by law. The only thing this bill does is to increase that number by one and increase your alternates by one; so that when you have nominated somebody to go to West Point from your district and he qualifies he would remain your patronage, if you want to call it patronage, until he enters the Academy; and nobody can take him away from you, nobody can fill that vacancy, unless, of course, after accepting two-thirds of the number authorized—that is the total number of those to be admitted on the first day of July, which is the admission date—the Secretary of War, if you do not fill your appointment, can fill the appointment by taking two out of every three from the list that you have who are qualified.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I cannot quite understand why you leave it optional with the War Department to select candidates from any source other than qualified alternates until the list is exhausted.

Mr. MAY. That is just what is not done in this bill.

Mr. SOUTH. I may say to the Chairman that as I read the bill it states that the Secretary of War must select alternates up to a given number, which is two-thirds. I see no reason, from a hurried reading of the bill, why he could not, after having selected that number, get them from any other source. It reads "not less than two-thirds thereof from qualified alternate candidates."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman also read the proviso and tell me whether or not a proviso controls over the text of the section?

Mr. SOUTH. The proviso reads:

Provided, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman understand that any appointment—that includes all of them—made under this section—that is, the section the gentleman just read—shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law?

Mr. SOUTH. All right; how does that apply to the situation of an appointment to which your district is entitled where you have a qualified alternate? What is there in that language to keep the War Department from selecting somebody other than your qualified alternate?

Mr. MAY. Because he cannot select anybody until I have exhausted my list, both principal and alternates.

Mr. SOUTH. If that is correct, that is certainly all the protection the Members need; and that is the point I have in mind.

Mr. MAY. I just wanted to assure the gentleman that there is nobody on the floor of this House who was more diligent in his efforts to keep the appointments from being taken by the Secretary of War or anybody else, nobody more diligent than myself. The appointments are to be given to the Senators and Representatives. We studied the bill carefully and we wrote these provisions in it with that express purpose. The original bill did not have that proviso at all.

Mr. SOUTH. I have not had an opportunity to read the bill until just now and was not sure about it. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAPMAN. If this bill becomes law and a Member appoints a principal, does he appoint the same number of alternates?

Mr. MAY. No; three as against two that the Member now has.

Mr. CHAPMAN. A Member has two now.

Mr. MAY. A Member has a principal and two alternates now. This bill makes it one principal and three alternates.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Three additional alternates?

Mr. MAY. No; not three additional alternates; one additional alternate—a Member would have three altogether.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman another question if I may: In case a Member appoints a principal and three alternates, if this bill becomes a law and the principal and all those alternates fail, what becomes of the vacancy? Does it go over until next year, as it would under the present law, or is it to be filled by the War Department?

Mr. MAY. It would go over to next year and remain in the power of the Representative to fill the vacancy.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Is not the vacancy filled by the War Department?

Mr. MAY. No. If, however, the War Department finds a vacancy and fills it, it is an additional appointment that is not charged against the Representatives and Senators.

Mr. CHAPMAN. This keeps it, then, entirely for the Representatives and Senators?

Mr. MAY. We have the same number of principals but one additional alternate.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. In case a Member has a qualified alternate, may he, without regard to that fact, nominate a principal to take this new place?

Mr. MAY. I am not sure about that. The Member would have his principal's place, and he could fill it with a qualified

alternate if the principal for some reason did not qualify.

Mr. GREEN. But he would not automatically go there without renomination, would he?

Mr. MAY. No. You could renominate him, and I want to add this before I yield the floor: Arrangements have been made for appointments to be made to fill the class at West Point as of the first day of the coming July when there will be some 125 to 140 vacancies. They will be given an examination between now and that time in order to fill up the academy, or they can be admitted on certificate from colleges and other military academies.

I would like to talk at length about the cost of this academy by reason of the fact that we do not have it full. The overhead costs are increasing all the time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, doubtless some Members realize that one portion of this bill almost in exactly the same form was considered by the House last year and turned down. In all fairness to those who opposed the passage of that bill last year may I say that it is generally understood that many persons were uninformed.

This bill does only the following: It creates one additional appointment for every Member of the House and Senate over and above what we now have. These appointments will become effective immediately upon the enactment of this measure. The young men named will enter the academy on the second of July, if they have successfully passed a rush examination which will be held between now and July 1.

In addition, the bill will accomplish what we attempted to do last year. It will make it possible for a qualified alternate otherwise precluded from attending the academy to have a chance to go. I will explain that briefly in this way: There have been on the average in the last 10 years, and probably they have taken the figures for the last 10 years, anywhere from 90 to 170 deficiencies at the academy at all times. You may wonder how that could come about. It comes about through mortality, through physical failures, through discharges from the academy and various incidents of that type. So that every year there have been rather than the full total of of 1,964 an average of about 1,790, sometimes 1,820, young men at the academy. There have been that many deficiencies existing all the time.

The provisions of this bill will make it possible for any Member of Congress to name a new principal to fill the new vacancy and three instead of two alternates. Some Members of Congress may have qualified alternates already with a qualified principal candidate nominated last year who took the examination the past winter. He would be in the position of having his principal candidate go right away and his qualified alternate would also have an opportunity to go in addition to his principal candidate.

The provisions of the bill authorize the academic board at the academy to select from among the qualified alternates annually a number sufficient to fill the then existing deficiencies. It may be 90 or it may be 125, but they will come from the qualified alternates, two-thirds of whom must come off the congressional list and one-third may be taken from the Presidential competitive list.

Experience shows that there are about 230 or 250 qualified alternates on the congressional list each year and there is a comparatively smaller number that are qualified who have taken the Presidential examination and passed and who never have a chance to go to the academy. Among this number are some of the finest young men in the country. To be sure, a great many of them are sons of officers, but many of them do not have the opportunity to go to the academy.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Whom is the Secretary of War going to select?

Mr. ANDREWS. The academic board, as I understand it from the Superintendent of the academy, we will say as of June 2, will determine that the deficiencies for this year are 150. He will turn over to his academic board these deficiencies and it will classify all the alternates on the congressional list according to their merits.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will these appointees who are to be selected by the Secretary of War be taken from the Presidential list?

Mr. ANDREWS. They will come off the competitive list of those who have passed the Presidential examination. My guess is that that is the way it will work. There will be 150 deficiencies, for instance.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What about the ones who qualify through college certificates without examination?

Mr. ANDREWS. He will take 100 of the qualified alternates off the congressional list, if there are 150 deficiencies; he will take the next 50 who have passed the examination for West Point from the Presidential list.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There are some who have not passed the examinations who are qualified through certificates.

Mr. ANDREWS. It will only be the qualified alternates that the deficiencies will be filled with.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am speaking of alternates.

Mr. ANDREWS. They have either qualified or they have not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; but as I understand the gentleman the Secretary of War will select these according to their relative merit.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How will those who have been accepted on college certificates and who have not taken examinations fit into that picture? They have not taken examinations upon which they can be rated.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is what the academic board is supposed to be able to judge fairly.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. A Congressman is supposed to nominate three. He can nominate a principal and three alternates?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Regardless of whether we have alternates there already qualified?

Mr. ANDREWS. Any alternates you have qualified today are qualified.

Mr. GREEN. You can renominate him?

Mr. ANDREWS. There will be a new principal candidate.

Mr. GREEN. You can renominate him if you want to?

Mr. ANDREWS. If you have a qualified alternate and you want to make certain of his going, in addition to the qualified candidate, you take the qualified alternate and make him the principal candidate for the new vacancy.

Mr. GREEN. But he will have the opportunity to renominate?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In the case of districts that had no appointment this year, and consequently had no list of qualified alternates, will those districts be permitted to supply a candidate for this entrance in June?

Mr. ANDREWS. Not unless they have a vacancy, but every Member of Congress will have a vacancy this year because there will be one new vacancy for each Member.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In other words, he could recommend someone for entrance on a college certificate?

Mr. ANDREWS. He can recommend anyone.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman mentioned the Presidential list. Would this not also include the Army list?

Mr. ANDREWS. Any candidate who has passed the examination but did not attain an appointment on the Presidential list or the Army list would come within the one-third category of alternates.

Mr. PACE. Will the alternates who are selected by the academic board be taken from the States from which the member has the vacancy, or can you move about from one State to another?

Mr. ANDREWS. They could move anywhere they want, and they take them in order of merit alone.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In the event the nominees for the special examination all fail, will this new appointment effective July 1 lapse, or will the Member have the right to name appointees for the following year?

Mr. ANDREWS. The best way of saying it is that it is held in trust for you until the next year, just as it is now.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. How can the Secretary of War determine the relative standing of the applicants that qualify by college certificates? Either they qualify or they do not qualify.

Mr. ANDREWS. The academic board reviews the application by college certificate, the academic board of five at the Military Academy.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman means they examine the applicants' college grades?

Mr. ANDREWS. They have to; the grades are part of the credentials submitted.

To my mind there can be only one reasonable opposition to this bill, and doubtless we will hear of it on the floor; that is, the fact that we do not want to train any more men at West Point, or we do not need them, and that we prefer to take them from the Reserve officers.

My contention is that the West Point training is the best military training anyone receives in this country, along with V. M. I. I think we are in a situation today where we are not so completely winning this war at the moment, and I think we need every young man with at least 1 year's military training at West Point. We may come to the time when we may have to take all the young men at West Point and mix them into regiments, possibly as sergeant majors, before we get through, if things do not go better. I believe that in time of war, with that remarkable academy there and its system, we ought to take full advantage of all of its facilities.

The opposition to this bill, if any, should be on the ground that we do not want to take added advantage of West Point military training. So far as it interferes with the rights of any single Member of Congress, of course, there is nothing to that argument. This bill gives each Member of Congress an additional appointment, and, if he has an alternate qualified in addition to his principal candidate, he gives the alternate an opportunity to go to West Point, which he otherwise would not have.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Suppose a Member of the House or the Senate should nominate a principal and three alternates, and all of them fail.

Mr. ANDREWS. The appointment goes over to next year.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under this bill no appointment is taken from him at all?

Mr. ANDREWS. No appointment is taken from him at all. It goes over to next year, just the way it does as to all the other appointments..

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman may have answered this question, but I did not get the answer. These are brand new appointments, and the academic board is going to arrange to examine these appointees if they have not otherwise been qualified?

Mr. ANDREWS. If this bill passes today and is signed by this week, the War Department will immediately ask every Member of Congress to nominate a new principal candidate, with three alternates. They will be examined just as fast as they can be, the intention being that the successful candidate will enter West Point on July 1.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the principal, we will say, is already qualified, he will not be reexamined?

Mr. ANDREWS. He will not be reexamined.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. He will automatically go in?

Mr. ANDREWS. If you name a principal candidate who is already qualified, he automatically goes and there is nothing more to it; but if I were you, I would name a couple of alternates so you would have some qualified alternates on the list that would have a chance to go with the others.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Under the provisions of this bill, it is possible for the Secretary of War to appoint 180 candidates.

Mr. ANDREWS. If there are that many deficiencies, he can appoint that many, but 110 of them would have to be off of your list.

Mr. WHITE. I mean that if, under the provisions of this bill, he has the power to appointment for one-third vacancies of the total number of Representatives and Senators, it would be possible for him to appoint 180.

Mr. ANDREWS. No; he can only appoint to fill up the annual deficiency, which has never averaged over 125.

Mr. WHITE. But we are going to increase the number by 500 new cadets, and the effect of this bill is to establish two groups so far as the Members are concerned, and this appointing power of the Secretary of War is limited to this new group and the right of the Members of Congress to appoint at the present time under the present plan constitutes another group of candidates and alternates.

Mr. ANDREWS. No; they will all be the same. The gentleman misunderstands the matter. They will all be exactly the same.

Mr. WHITE. If I interpret correctly the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], there are two groups. One is the new candidates under this bill; the other group is the candidates to be appointed under the present law.

Mr. ANDREWS. There are two groups in the academy today, those who come from your list of appointments and those from the President's list.

Mr. WHITE. The language of the bill is that those named under the pending act shall be considered additional appointments, and that is what the gentleman from Kentucky based his whole argument on, and that proposition makes another group of nominees and alternates.

Mr. ANDREWS. No; that makes no difference whatever.

Mr. WHITE. If I get time to discuss the matter on the floor, I will demonstrate that situation.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. I am not quite sure as to the language here about "any qualified candidate." If a boy is allowed to become an applicant, he might be held by the board to be a qualified candidate even though he had not qualified either through a Presidential appointment or an appointment by a Member of the Senate or the House.

Mr. ANDREWS. The terminology there refers to the Presidential list. A person who has passed the Presidential examination is called a qualified candidate. In fact, all of them are candidates, even our alternates; but for a period of 100 years they have been referred to as congressional candidates or as an alternate candidate.

Mr. SOUTH. I think the gentleman must be right, and I accept his explanation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York to yield me 15 minutes, as agreed, so I may yield it to other Members?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of sincere regret with me that I find it necessary to take issue with the conclusions reached by the Military Affairs Committee and, apparently, reached with substantial unanimity. It is not a matter of any considerable personal interest to me. I have been here something over 15 years and I have followed the civil-service examination method in the selection of my cadets. I have never had a vacancy at West Point occasioned by the failure of all principals and all alternates to qualify. I do not anticipate that so long as I continue to use the civil-service method of selecting my appointees that the provisions of this bill insofar as they relate to appointments by the Secretary of War will ever be of any direct interest to me or to my district, but I hope that you will find time to read the hearings on this bill and to acquaint yourselves with the real purpose which is behind the proposed enactment of this legislation.

We had a bill of similar character before the House on July 16 of last year. It contained substantially all of the provisions that this bill contains except that it did not contain an additional appointment for each Member of the Congress, which this bill does. That bill was rejected by a vote of 197 to 92. From that time until within the last few days the Military Affairs Committee has not reported any legislation providing for the

appointment of additional cadets by Members of Congress. The Pearl Harbor catastrophe occurred on December 7, 1941, and 5 months elapsed without the reporting of any legislation seeking to increase the number of cadets at West Point and to give additional appointments to the Members of the Congress. This, I may assume from this and other facts to which I shall endeavor to call your attention, demonstrates that there is no military necessity for the enactment of this legislation.

What the Military Affairs Committee has done is to bring this back, just as it was last year, except in certain particulars, and ask us to swallow the hook, but this year they have put some bait on it, the bait being a new appointment for each Member of Congress. What is it they are trying to do? You ought to read these hearings. The whole trend of the argument that runs through the hearings is the idea that the officers in the Army do not have a sufficient opportunity to get their sons into West Point, that their sons take these Presidential examinations, and make much higher marks than do the congressional boys, and yet notwithstanding that fact so many of them do not have any opportunity to enter West Point. And this is the only way by which these officers' sons may be given the opportunity which they desire. Let me read from the testimony of Colonel Walsh, which is to be found on page 5 of the hearings. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] had asked him for certain information, and he replied as follows:

Mr. THOMASON. I would like to have that information in the record.

Colonel WALSH. Yes. That so-called competitive group has no alternates whatever. Those boys merely fight for the existing vacancies, and there are normally several hundred candidates that take the examination to compete for these vacancies; the highest go in; and the others, although they may have qualified, do not get an appointment. Now, it may be that many of them have passed the examination with a rating in the nineties. The congressional appointee who is named as principal or first or second alternate does not have to make any such grade; he may only make 66, just the passing grade in the examination, and yet with the 66 he receives the appointment, whereas there may have been a number of boys, in the example we have given, who have made a grade above 90. They all take the same examination. And the man with a grade of 90 would not get the appointment if he was not one of the highest in the group. They must all qualify mentally and physically to get the appointment. But we think this will help——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). It would place the competitive boys in a much better position to go to the academy than the congressional group?

Colonel WALSH. In some respects those who have made high grades——

What will it help? To place the competitive boys in a much better position to get into the academy than the congressional group.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this point. So there you have the Negro in the woodpile. According to the hearings last year there were 180 vacancies occasioned by the failure of the congressional appointees to make the grade. They say the average each year will be 100, but last year it was 180. This proposes to give authority to the Secretary of War to fill those vacancies. They say, "This does not make any difference to you if your principals and alternates have all been rejected,' 'because they will let you appoint a principal next year, the same as if the appointment had not been filled by the Secretary of War. That may be true, but there is here the vesting of additional authority in the Secretary of War, hertofore exercised by the Congress. Here is a further delegation of authority which has heretofore been vested in the Congress, to the head of a department, and here is the furnishing of an incentive to the board to reject your appointees and disqualify your appointees in order that the Secretary of War may, through this method, make provision for the appointment of the sons of Army officers. I have the utmost respect for the personnel of the officers of our Army, but they are human. I have heard Members of this House tell me about having named cadets to West Point, and allowed some Army officer to persuade them to name his son as an alternate, and in cases where they thought the principal was far better qualified, the principal was rejected, and the Army officer's son was qualified. I have had a good many candidates as principals and alternates rejected from West Point, not all of the nominees for any particular year, and I have appointed some officers' sons, and I have never yet had a son of an Army officer that I have named as a principal or as an alternate rejected. They have always been able to qualify. You are going to place an incentive at least in the War Department to reject candidates who do not measure up to the qualifications they feel these sons of Army officers have.

Colonel Walsh says that these congressional fellows make 66 percent and the Army officers' sons make 90 percent. They could reject them—the congressional appointees—and provide vacancies which may be filled by the appointments of the Secretary of War.

I feel that some of these boys from civilian life who have not had daddies making good salaries in the Army and the educational advantages those salaries could pay for, have minds naturally as good as some who have had better educational advantages, have bodies as sound, and are as well qualified for leadership of men. I want them to retain the chance they have always had to go to West Point through congressional appointment.

When it gets down to brass tacks, I want to ask you this question: What do you need with some more officers who are going to be graduated 3 or 4 years from now, as far as this emergency is concerned? Is not this war going to be over by the time those young men who enter in July 1942 or July 1943 get out?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not for the moment. I will yield later, but I do not want to yield now.

You are going to take boys in filling these appointments who are, in many cases, within the draft age and who, if they were not appointed to West Point, would be drafted into the Army, and you are going, by your appointment of them and by the appointments given by the Secretary of War, to put them in a bombproof shelter for the duration of the war, in all probability, because they will be there for 3 or 4 years. Then after the war is over, when you go to reduce the size of the Army the Army is going to say, "We do not need all of these officers that we have. We have to drop a large number of them, even though a great many of them want to continue in the military service." Who will be dropped first? They will first drop those boys who win their commissions in the service of their country during this emergency; those boys who go to officers' training schools and demonstrate their capacity to rise from the ranks and be leaders of men; those men who fight your battles during this emergency and earn commissions as officers in the process of doing it. They are going to be dropped in order to make room for these boys for whose appointment as cadets you are providing in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Those young men who will have been enjoying the protection of West Point during the time that those other boys were doing the fighting are going into the Army and take their places. I want to tell you that as far as I am concerned I think the fellow who is good enough to fight for us during the period of this emergency is good enough to serve as an officer in the Army after the emergency is over.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman please bring out that every year 28,500 second lieutenants come out of the R. O. T. C. from the colleges throughout the country? There is no shortage of second lieutenants for the Army at this time.

Mr. TARVER. Not at all. You have to fight this war with the commissioned officers you have and those you are getting by promotion from the ranks and in other ways. You are not going to fight this war with these young men you are thinking about sending to West Point in July of this year or July of next year, whether on your appointment or on the appointment of the Secretary of War. You have to fight this war with officers procured through channels which you now have.

The passage of this legislation is not going to help one bit insofar as the war effort is concerned, except that it may be putting 536 young men who otherwise would have been drafted into the military service up at West Point in a bombproof shelter for the remainder of the emergency.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I hope the Members will not overlook the gentleman's argument

that it will be an incentive to disqualify their nominees, because the human element enters into this, and it obtains in the War Department, as, indeed, in all other departments. I would like to know how many qualified alternates there were last year who were not able to receive appointments? Then, if we can get that information, I would suggest this as to that one-third that are to come from other qualified candidates, if there is to be any leeway at all there—and I would not object to some; I think 10 percent would be liberal—but any time you make it one-third you are going to wonder what happened to your supposedly qualified nominees. I have no doubt in the world about it.

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield further to the gentleman. My time is limited.

I want to point out one other thing in connection with this bill. The bill that was considered last year provided that when the Secretary of War did fill these vacancies he had to fill them with an alternate from your own State. He could not take a qualified alternate from my State, for instance, to fill a vacancy in Michigan, and vice versa. But this bill does permit that. This bill allows the academic board to make the entire selection of alternates on the basis of merit as they view it. They can select them all from one section of the country if they want to, and fill places which have arisen through vacancies occurring in other parts of the country.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEAVY. If section 2 were stricken from this bill entirely, would that leave legislation that would meet with the approval of the gentleman and leave the Members of Congress in the same relationship with reference to their appointments as they are now?

Mr. TARVER. If the bill is to be passed, may I say to the gentleman, section 2 certainly ought to be stricken from the bill. I have an amendment prepared proposing to strike it from the bill. But, as far as I am concerned, I am not interested in attempting at this time to provide officers for an army some 3 or 4 years from now to take the places of these men who have earned promotion through bloodshed and sacrifice during the period of this emergency. That is what you are going to do, if you undertake now, just because it gives you an additional appointment, to increase the number of cadets at West Point. In my judgment, you should not pass the bill at all, but if you do pass it, then certainly you should strike this additional authority for the Secretary of War out of it. If vacancies occur in congressional appointments, and if it is necessary that those vacancies be filled, let the Congressmen fill them. If they were competent to fill them in the first instance, they ought to be competent to make a reappointment in case their original appointees have been found disqualified. Why turn over to the Secretary of War the authority to nominate 180 cadets at West Point and thereby abdicate your own authority?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I at least admire the frankness of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who said when closing his remarks that he was opposed to the bill. I think the issue ought to be squarely drawn here. If you are opposed to any more boys going to West Point at this time, certainly you ought to vote against this bill. In my judgment, however, there is a complete misunderstanding about the provisions of this bill. In my judgment and in the judgment of the Military Affairs Committee as shown by their unanimous opinion this is an absolutely fair bill, if you want to avail yourself of the facilities at West Point that are not now being used.

What does the bill do? The bill gives to every Member of the Senate and the House an additional appointment regardless of any appointment that may be made from either congressional or competitive alternates. No Member of Congress under any conditions is going to lose that additional appointment. It does not make any difference what happens between now and the 1st of July when the next class enters; if a Member of Congress does not by that time get his additional appointment it will carry over to next year and he will get it at that time. There is no construction that can be possibly placed upon this bill by which a Member of the House or the Senate will lose his additional appointment.

For more than 10 years there has been in excess of 100 vacancies at the academy that you and the taxpayers whom you represent have provided facilities to accommodate. Money has been appropriated for the full quota. This has been due to a great many reasons: Boys have failed physically, failed in their studies; some Congressmen occasionally do not fill their vacancies but prefer to carry them over to another year; but for one reason or another there have been more than 100 vacancies there every year for the last 10. The Superintendent of the academy was before our committee last week and said that he could provide accommodations for 536 more boys.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. THOMASON. I will yield in just a moment.

Here is the way the bill will work out if it becomes law. If you have nominated your principal and two alternates for this year and your principal has qualified he will enter on the first day of next July. If your first alternate has also qualified you can name him for this extra appointment. If your second alternate has qualified he would be eligible for appointment by the academic board, but his appointment would not be charged against you.

Let us not be unfair to the Army. I know it is easy to get up here and talk about the Army and indulge in criticism of the officers and their selfish desire to get their sons in the academy. I have appointed the sons of Army and naval officers to both academies and they have made fine records. I am proud of them. In most instances their mothers were born in my district or if not born there at least resided there. Some of the boys have been born there. They are entitled to fair consideration. The only way in the world that the son of an Army officer can ever get to West Point is for some Congressman to appoint him—and that is seldom—or else take the Presidential competitive in which as a usual thing there are more than 300 applicants with an average of 7 appointments to be made.

The Senate adopted this amendment; the House had hearings upon it, and while this may not be exactly the same language it is substantially the same as the Senate provision. Under this bill you still get your original appointment, and nobody can take it away from you. At this critical time we need to train more young men for officers, and we should fill the academy. I hope you do not get the idea we are not going to have a great big Army for a good many years to come, for we are. You who belong to that group to which the gentleman from Georgia seems to belong who think we ought not to fill up West Point or that we do not need these highly trained young men, should vote against the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I will yield in just a second. In my judgment, the West Point graduates are the finest officers in the world, and this is with all due respect to these fine boys who are coming out of the academies and schools and colleges. West Point is rich in history and tradition. I am certain it is the finest school of its kind in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. According to the hearings had before the gentleman's committee on April 28 Colonel Walsh testifying about this bill said in answer to a question:

> There is an average of about 100 below the physical capacity of the academy to accommodate.

Yet you want to appoint 536 more.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. That is what they have provided room for.

Mr. TARVER. In addition you want to fill 180 vacancies.

Mr. THOMASON. No. I fear the gentleman has not read all of the hearings. On the average there are 100 vacancies at the academy every year with only two boys to the room. The superintendent testified that they have made arrangements and have the facilities that they could easily accommodate three boys in each room. He also testified there are ample accommodations there beginning on the 1st day of July for 536 new cadets.

I want to go ahead and refer to the appointment of these alternates. I am one of those who agree with the statements that have been made here that you cannot take selfishness out of human nature. Naturally these Army officers, when the only opportunity of getting

their sons into West Point is through some friendly Congressman or Senator, and there are very few who get appointments, or win a Presidential appointment, and there are still fewer of them, then under this bill those who are qualified would have a chance, and without hurting the chance of congressional alternates.

If you will read the bill carefully you will find congressional alternates, meaning the boys appointed by a Senator or Member of the House, will receive two-thirds of the appointments by the academic board. The competitive alternates are not only sons of Army officers, but they are the sons of others. You will remember that boys are appointed from the enlisted ranks every year. There are a number of boys appointed from the National Guard every year. There are 40 appointments made of sons of deceased veterans of the last World War. There are a lot more boys pass the examinations than get in, but this is the only way they will ever have a chance to enter.

Congress ought not to seize on every appointment, because the others are fine boys who are entitled to a chance. Two-thirds is more than our share. They cannot take that away from us. The result of it all is that you have a lot of boys on the Presidential list pass the competitive examination. Sometimes there are 300 or more who take the examination and many qualify. I am told only 7 appointments will be made this year from that list. Perhaps you have 30 or 40 sons of World War veterans, 30 or 40 National Guard boys, and 30 or 40 Regular Army boys. One-third of those on these various lists who have qualified may be appointed by the academic board on a strictly merit basis, but the remaining two-thirds have to come from qualified alternates who have been appointed by Senators and Members of the House. I also favor the appointments of more qualified boys from the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. I agree with the gentleman that the sons of Army officers ought to have some opportunity to enter the academy.

Mr. THOMASON. I refuse to believe that General Wilby or any other man big enough to be Superintendent of the United States Military Academy would be a party to any discrimination as between our boys and Army boys.

Of course, the human element enters into all of this, but I am sure high officials want to be both fair and just.

Mr. SOUTH. I do not deny that.

Mr. SHANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHANLEY. I know the gentleman wants to be correct in his figures. He stated that there are 30 or 40 appointments of sons of World War veterans who were killed in the last war. As a matter of fact, very few of them ever qualify. The further fact is that today there is no one living who is eligible for that commitment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SHANLEY. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] is going to offer an amendment in which this will be extended to include not only the sons of those killed in action but the sons of those disabled in action.

Mr. THOMASON. I know they have had the opportunity to take the examination. I will probably favor such an amendment.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] read a portion of the testimony on page 5, but he omitted a certain part and stopped short of this:

> The so-called congressional group therefore has to fill vacancies by alternate appointments, so that should the principal fail the alternate may enter.

Mr. THOMASON. That is correct.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. We have our appointments for this year. Your principal fails and, say, the first alternate qualifies. You have already received notice he is to enter on July 1.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. Now, when accepting these alternates and in determining the alternates that will go in from this list, if he was considered this year as one of the alternates to be accepted, would that give you the right to appoint a principal again?

Mr. THOMASON. If he has university or college credits to qualify him mentally and he passes the physical, you could still name him as your additional appointment under this bill. In addition to that, and in the case of the gentleman from Michigan, and, I take it, it was his own case, if your principal failed and your first alternate qualified, he is going in under your present appointment. If your second alternate qualifies you can appoint him yourself under this bill. Nobody suffers. The committee has gone over this carefully. Nobody is going to get hurt if you want to fill the academy. If you do not want to fill the academy, you ought to vote against the bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman remarked that the only way the sons of officers could be appointed was either through Presidential appointment or contact with a friendly Congressman. I have heard that proposition advanced many times, but I can never see anything to it. Every officer has a State of residence; every officer comes from some place. The trouble with it, in my experience, is that these officers never let you know that they are residents of your State until just before the time they want their sons appointed.

Mr. THOMASON. Many officers have been over in the Philippines and in Honolulu and down in Panama and they have no fixed residence. Therefore they do not have many opportunities to play any politics or contact their Congressman.

Mr. MOTT. I just appointed from my State an alternate whose father was in the Philippines.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. What does the gentleman say about the fairness of the criticism made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that the Secretary of War in taking these applicants from the two-thirds of the alternates can select them from one region of the country and not scatter them out?

Mr. THOMASON. The congressional alternates have to come from Congressmen. I do not know whether they would be from the East or the South or the North or the West. It seems to be immaterial if you are getting an additional appointment and also getting another boy appointed by the academic board.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I recall, about 7 years ago, in 1935, there was an increased allotment of one candidate to each Senator and each Member of the House. At that time I asked the gentleman if there was any increase in the allotments to the President.

Mr. THOMASON. I am unable to say as to that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing here to indicate that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In case a Congressman has not made an appointment this year of either a principal or an alternate, and has not had the privilege of making an appointment this year because he has three boys in the academy, then he would not have anyone get into the July 1942 class.

Mr. THOMASON. He would be entitled to this one additional appointment immediately if he had a boy who had qualified.

Mr. EBERHARTER. How could the boy qualify?

Mr. THOMASON. If he has college credits that meet the War Department's requirements and you name him and he passes the physical examination, he will get in as your new appointee under this bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. He could not qualify by competitive examination, however?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not think there would be time for that this year. I do not think there would be, as a practical proposition.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman said that if you get an extra appointment

nothing will take it away from you. If that is the case, what is the use of having section 2 in the bill?

Mr. THOMASON. The purpose is to fill up the academy each year and not have more than 100 vacancies there when there are fine, qualified boys over the country who want to go, and when the Army wants them and West Point wants them; and the gentleman and the rest of us are not hurt. That ought to be sufficient reason.

Mr. WHITE. I am not opposed to filling the academy, but I want to know how, if you are going to keep your appointment, the Secretary can proceed to fill it.

Mr. THOMASON. You absolutely are not affected in your right of appointment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I call attention to the fact that the amendment proposed in this bill creates an additional congressional appointment but does not increase the number of Presidential appointments. Had that been in the mind of the Army or in the mind of the committee, why would it not have been reasonable, then, to have extended a broad increase in regard to Presidential as well as congressional appointments?

Mr. THOMASON. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. The situation as it obtains in my congressional district is that I nominated a principal and an alternate, and both of them qualified for admission July 1. That will give me an opportunity to move up this alternate?

Mr. THOMASON. Your principal is going in right now, because he has already won, and the alternate will go in on this new appointment if you name him.

Mr. HAINES. It is not necessary for me to appoint a principal and three alternates by reason of my situation?

Mr. THOMASON. No; it is not necessary. The gentleman will still have the right to name alternates; but if the gentleman has a qualified alternate he is going to name, it is a sure thing he will enter the academy anyway. This is an absolutely fair bill, if you want to fill the academy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In my particular case, I say that this second section of the bill will give the Army authorities the power to fill additional vacancies.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; it will make use of existing facilities.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, the Army will have the power to fill my place because I have nobody who is qualified?

Mr. THOMASON. That is right, but the gentleman does not suffer as a result of it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I lose my appointment, do I not?

Mr. THOMASON. No; the gentleman does not lose anything.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Sure, I do.

Mr. THOMASON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; he does not lose anything. Sons of Army officers and other qualified alternates are entitled to at least an even break.

Mr. McINTYRE. I was just going to ask the gentleman in that connection if, after all, the gentleman does not believe that Congressmen, as the elected representatives of the people, ought not to have that responsibility.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; but I also think that the sons of Army officers ought to have some consideration too.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Has the gentleman ever given a thought as to whether it would be advisable for the Military Affairs Committee to get the War Department to follow the same procedure that the Navy has followed for so long and let the Representative in Congress and a Senator name the principal and alternates for examination on February 15 and if they fail give us another chance to name another set of principals and alternates on April 15?

Mr. THOMASON. I think that is deserving of study and consideration, I will say to the gentleman. That subject is being given study by the committee.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I know how futile it is to try to oppose this bill, but I cannot permit the bill to pass without voicing my objection to its passage.

I have been on the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for 6 years. A short time ago the War Department came before our subcommittee with a request for an appropriation to create a specialist corps. The subcommittee turned it down. It went to the Senate and the Senate reinstated it. A liaison officer from General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, came to me at that time and informed me that the bill was patterned somewhat after the German Army and that General Marshall wanted it passed. We all agree that the German Army has been very efficient and has proven so in the field. This officer told us that they wanted a specialist corps to avoid the commissioning of nonmilitary men, so that a second lieutenant or an officer who worked his way up the hard way to obtain his commission would not feel that this man or that man had picked a commission out of nowhere without having worked for it. He said that such appointments affected the morale of the Army. My thoughts went back to France and to Germany when a certain major came into general headquarters of the Thirty-second Division. This man had been refused a commission as a second lieutenant at the first officers' training school at Fort Sheridan, Ill., because he could not qualify. Yet in some way he was made a major of infantry, came over to Germany after the armistice, and took command of a battalion of the Thirty-second Division which had been commanded by a captain through the entire Battle of the Argonne, the battalion commander having been killed the second day of that battle.

We have been confronted during the years I have been on the Appropriations Committee with the question of trying to induce young men to take officers' training. We are now training and graduating 8,500 second lieutenants in our schools and colleges every year. During the 4-year period that it takes a young man to graduate from West Point, we will graduate 34,000 second lieutenants at a cost that will not equal one class at West Point.

The first 536 appointees under this bill will graduate on July 1, 1946. I do not believe there is anyone here who thinks the war is going to last that long. We are told that we are going to have a 6,000,000-man Army. The war is going to be fought by the second lieutenants and officers who come up through the National Guard and the Reserve Corps, and from among the selectees. These officers will have won their spurs in the field and in the service. When the war is over we are going to have to reduce the Army down to one-sixth or one-fifth of wartime strength.

This means that practically all temporary officers will have to go back to civilian life with only a few having a chance to obtain a permanent commission in the Army. On July 1, 1946, 536 of these young men are going to graduate as second lieutenants. That means that 536 more of these World War officers will have to be relegated back to private life; and on July 1, 1947, another 536, and on July 1, 1948, another 536. While I agree that West Point is a fine institution, this war will not be fought by West Pointers. It is going to be fought as a whole by the thousands of young officers coming up from the ranks, Reserve officers, officers who have come up through the National Guard and from selectees who have never seen West Point. Several years ago Congress passed the Thomason Act. We took a thousand young men from among the Reserve officers each year and gave them a year's training in the Regular Army. We then picked from that thousand a certain number for permanent commissions in the Army. They came up from the ranks. The opportunity to obtain a commission in the Regular Army helped to induce many young men to take Reserve officers' training. It helped to build up a corps of Reserve officers of 100,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Not now. A young sergeant who has had a year or two service in wartime will make a better second lieutenant than one of these boys who

may graduate from West Point in 1946 or 1947. He has been tried in battle and found true.

I have heard talk about thousands of Army officers' sons who do not have an opportunity to go to West Point. What about the thousands of boys in the 435 congressional districts—alternates who have qualified, but who never get to West Point? I want these young men to have a chance.

I feel strongly about the question of morale. I can see in the future, when the war is over, enough officers to command an Army of six, eight, or even nine million men. I can see those officers going back to private life—thousands of young men—men who are worthy, who have gone through action, perhaps wounded—men who will want to stay in the Army and make a career and who are qualified. When the Army is reduced these men will be let out. Only a certain number can remain in the Army. For every cadet you add here—for every extra cadet in 1946 and 1947—you are going to have to let one of these young veteran Army officers out. I would gladly go along with any bill which would give those extra commissions to the Reserve officers, to the National Guard, to selectees. Promotions from the ranks will do more for the morale of the Army than anything else we can do here.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to call attention to a point for your guidance in case this bill is enacted into law, a point regarding your procedure in selecting boys to take this examination.

I have just called the War Department to find out how soon you must submit your nominations in order to give them ample time to check up on the credentials of the boys so that they can take the examination that is given at West Point on June 22. Their best estimate is June 1. They need about 3 weeks to process those nominations, to qualify your nominees in time for them to report to West Point for the examination. That is not official. It is only an estimate.

You will note on page 11 of the hearings, in answer to one of my own questions, that Colonel Walsh stated that the June 22 examination would be given at West Point if this bill becomes law.

In addition to that, your nominees can take the college board certificate examinations at their homes or near their homes as a method of qualification if they so desire. There is no widespread giving of the examination of June 22 over the Nation. That is given at West Point. Any boy who is qualified on the list in the March examinations can be named by you up to June 30, as long as his name is on record at the War Department by June 30. He will be able to get in, provided he has already qualified on the mental and physical examination.

In the record of the hearings you will find that the average estimate of places unfilled, vacancies unfilled, has been about 100 per year. You will find also in the hearings on page 13 a list of the number of boys each year for the past 10 years, who were qualified for admission and for which no vacancies existed. That averages 161 per year. So on the basis of past experience you are offering a very sizable proportion of qualified boys an opportunity to enter, and that takes away a large part of this point that I have heard brought out today, the fear that they will go to certain sections over other sections. As a matter of fact, 100 in proportion to 160 qualified pretty well destroys that sectionalism, if you fear that factor.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman agree with me that there are two serious problems involved in this? The first that if we do not pass this legislation we will refuse thereby to utilize the facilities at West Point for the training of officers for war purposes?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That will be the case exactly.

Mr. MAY. And secondly we deny some young man in our district the opportunity to go to West Point.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is true. And in the third place, no Member of Congress is going to be deprived of any appointment under any section of this bill. Do not let that bugaboo scare you a bit.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not yet. I have another point and my time is very brief. Now, with reference to the proportion of West Point graduates to the rest of the officer personnel, you will find in the hearings at page 9 that Colonel Walsh gave the figure there. He said:

> The proportion of West Point graduates to other officers in the Army today is 41 percent.

Look ahead to the reorganization of the Army after this war and you can see that that percentage will reduce very definitely when the Regular Army is augmented following the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is of the Regular Army?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Of the Regular Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not the whole Army?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No. This 41 percent is the percentage of West Point graduates to the total officer personnel of the Regular Army. I thank the gentleman from New York for the correction.

I served as a provisional officer during the first World War. I served with other provisional officers and with many West Point graduates.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I had ample occasion to compare the graduates and former students of our various schools. I have had occasion to compare them in recent years as well. I have nothing but praise for the boys coming out of the civilian schools. I want to see them given every opportunity to qualify for our Regular Army. They have rendered magnificent service, especially those who have served under the Thomason Act. But I maintain that any percentage of West Point graduates less than 41 percent is out of line and it will be out of line after this emergency is over. We need a goodly percentage of West Point graduates, for the simple reason that they are given a very thoroughgoing, special course in preparation for a lifetime career. I do not think we will make any mistake in allowing a few more boys to go to West Point and bolster up the percentage of West Point graduates to other officers. That does not discredit these other officers one iota. I have nothing but praise for them, and I want them to have every chance to make the Army a career. I think a goodly percentage of them will be given a chance, following this war. But the number from West Point is a very small percentage now and will be still smaller when the Regular Army is increased after the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had not expected, Mr. Chairman, to consume that length of time.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this discussion with the deepest interest and have but a few comments to make upon certain points that have been brought up. The gentleman from Michigan has emphasized the contention that when this distressful war is over and the Army is again reduced—and I hope to heaven we do not make fools of ourselves to the extent we did in 1920 in the matter of reduction—that as the result of the passage of this bill—and incidentally the result of the maintenance of West Point during the war and the graduation of cadets from it, a considerable number of wartime officers, if I may use that phrase, will be displaced, will not be permitted to remain in the Army because West Pointers will come in and fill vacancies which otherwise those wartime officers would fill. He endeavored to create the impression that it was a serious prospect for wartime officers by resorting to a recital of the numbers which might be involved. I think his argument must be based upon the assumption that every young man who is now an officer in the Army of the United States, or a Reserve officer, when this war is over will want to stay in the Army as a career. Looking back to the events immediately following the close of the first World War when we had to sit down and write the National Defense Act of 1920 and provide for commissioned personnel of the then established Army, our experience was that not one officer out of 10 wanted to stay in the Army; they preferred to go back to their original business, callings, and professions. There will not be a tremendous percentage, if history is to repeat itself and it generally does, of wartime officers who will want to make the military profession a life career; so

the suggestion that by sending 536 additional boys to West Point at this time will result in the displacement of 536 wartime officers I think cannot be supported by our experience in the past.

When we passed the act of 1920 we provided for an increase in the officer personnel of the Regular Army from something like eight or nine thousand men to 18,000, perhaps from 10,000 up to 18,000 maximum authorized; and in that act the Congress provided that wartime officers, of which there were tens and tens of thousands, would be eligible for appointment into the Regular Army upon their application and upon their submitting excellent records and passing certain examinations. Five thousand six hundred were commissioned from the wartime Army and went into the Regular Army. I believe there were not over 10,000 applicants, yet we had 150,000 to 200,000 officers. Not 1 out of 10, not 1 out of 15, our experience shows, will want to stay in the Army for life. So this bill is not going to menace the career in the Army of any considerable number of men after this war is over.

According to some of the arguments that have been made here, it would seem that those who made the arguments would actually prefer to see West Point closed while this war is going on. It was said by one of those who spoke that the boy who goes to West Point is going to be of no use in this war. We cannot tell how long the war will last; but, Mr. Chairman, West Point will always be useful. Peace or war, it is one of the greatest institutions in the world. It carries on a tradition, it supports a standard of personal and military conduct which never should be allowed to perish. It should never even be suspended, no matter what menace confronts the United States. For, after all, when this war is over we shall go on living as a nation, we shall have to have an Army, and our experience over 140 years is to the effect that West Point graduates establish standards of military education and conduct which all other young men going into the Army in time of war or as Reservists in time of peace are happy to follow. So, let us keep this institution going full blast, keep it filled. It is a splendid investment, peace or war; and this, as I understand it, is the principal objective of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly am opposed to section 2 of this bill. The founders of our Government to keep the Army close to the people wisely provided that the young men to be trained for officers should be appointed by the Members of Congress. This system has given our country the best Army in the world. We can proudly match the record and tradition of our Army with the army of any country.

The thing that makes our Army strong and powerful is its freedom from the caste system, its democracy.

My sympathy is with the families of the Army officers, but we cannot afford to break down our democratic system by building up a caste system in our Army officer personnel. England has done that and what a pitiful showing the English Army has made when put to the test of real war.

For the best interests of our country, let us keep the Army close to the people. Let the Congress appoint our youth to West Point. The sons of Army officers are securing some of the appointments but the system we are following is the best that can be devised. Let us keep it and strike out section 2 from the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will not use any more of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, on and after July 1, 1942, there shall be allowed at the United States Military Academy four cadets for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, six for the District of Columbia, and two cadets to be selected by the Governor of the Panama Canal from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and the sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Co. residing in the Republic of Panama, in addition to the number now authorized to be appointed from the United States at large, and from the enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard, and from the sons of deceased officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Strike out the period after line 6, on page 2, and insert "*Provided*, That when the principal and the alternates designated by an appointing authority are rejected and refused admission to the academy, the appointing authority may within 10 days after receiving notice of such rejection submit additional appointments to fill the vacancy whose qualifications for admission shall be determined in the same manner as in the case of original appointment and that in instances where the principal and all alternates designated by appointing authority for entrance on July 1, 1942, have been rejected such additional appointments may be submitted within 10 days after the passage and approval of this act. This procedure may be repeated until the vacancy is filled or until in the opinion of the academic board it would not be possible for additional nominees to be examined prior to the date when in their judgment entrance should be completed."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TARVER. If it is not taken out of my time, I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. MAY. I do not know about that. I suppose it will not be. The gentleman handed me what he proposed to offer this morning as copy of an amendment. This amendment reads differently. Does the gentleman have two amendments?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. I will have another amendment. I am not going to yield to the gentleman for the purpose of taking issue with me about my amendment, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman will have time to do that later on, and I shall not object to his taking such time as he may desire. I handed the gentleman a copy of an amendment this morning, to which I have added additional language which during the course of the argument seemed to me to be appropriate. I did not assure the gentleman this morning I would offer no amendment except the one which I handed him.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is offered at the present time is one intended to preserve to the appointive authority, particularly to the Members of the House and Senate, the right to fill vacancies from their districts, in the case of Members of the House, and in the case of Senators from their States.

The ostensible reason for this bill is that West Point Academy is not filled to capacity, although the testimony of Colonel Walsh, as I pointed out awhile ago, was to the effect that at the time of his testimony on April 28 of this year it was just about 100 below capacity, and it is proposed here to authorize the appointment of 536 additional cadets.

Assuming that there is room there for 536 more, I am seeking by this amendment to have the appointive authorities fill those places, and if you send in the name of a principal and three alternates in your district and all of them are rejected that you have the right within 10 days after being notified of their rejection to send in another list, and if they are rejected to do the same thing until the place is filled or until such time as in the judgment of the academic board it may be too late to fill the vacancy.

I feel that the Members of Congress may be trusted to fill these places, otherwise Congress made a mistake in passing the law under which they were given authority to make such appointments. If they do have the capacity to make proper selections for service at West Point, then why not give assurance in the passage of this legislation that they will be permitted to do that? It will assure that your nominees will not be captiously rejected because if you have the opportunity of repeatedly submitting additional candidates there would be no reason for captious rejection in order to try to make way for some Army officer's son. It would assure that places from your district will be filled from your district, and that a place in one State will not be filled by the appointment of a cadet from another State.

I think it is fair. I think it is a proper reservation of authority that ought to remain with Congress. If you feel that way about it, you can effectuate that objective by supporting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 61, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified candidates recommended by the academic board: *Provided*, That any appointment made under

this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 10, after "qualified", insert "alternate", and after "candidates" insert "and other qualified candidates."

In line 12, after "board", insert "not less than two-thirds thereof from qualified alternate candidates."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 2, lines 7 to 16, inclusive, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, section 2 is, of course, the most controversial part of the bill, being the section which proposes to place certain authority in the Secretary of War in cases where vacancies exist on July 1 of any year. However, it is in conflict, or may we say, meaningless, when considered in connection with the amendment which has just been adopted.

That amendment provides that a Member of Congress or an appointive authority, which includes a Member of Congress, may, if his appointees are rejected, continue to submit appointees, repeating the procedure until in the judgment of the Academic Board it is too late for entrance to be effected for that particular class year. If the Member of Congress may do that until after it is too late for entrance to be effected for that class year, there is no point in giving to the Secretary of War the authority to fill any vacancy by his appointment, because he could not make an appointment until after that period had elapsed during which the appointive authority, the Member of Congress, was engaged in the submission of his appointees.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Would there not be a time when it would be too late to determine the qualifications of new appointees but when there would still be time for the War Department to fill the vacancies with the boys who were already fully qualified?

Mr. TARVER. There may be something in the gentleman's point, but without closer analysis I would not be prepared to say there is. My opinion is that the adoption of the amendment which has just been adopted by the House would substantially nullify section 2 of the bill, anyway, but if it will not, then it seems to me that the House ought to strike out section 2 and do away with this attempt to transfer its authority to an administrative officer of the Government, without regard to what construction may be placed upon the amendment just adopted.

I hope the House will see proper to take that action and retain to itself the duties and responsibilities which have heretofore belonged to it. Therefore, I hope that the amendment just offered will be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the retention of section 2 would be in conflict with the amendment that has just been adopted. The amendment that has just been adopted would, of course, greatly limit the application of section 2, but there comes a time when it is too late to determine the qualifications of new appointees, and there is at the same time a reservoir of boys already qualified, by our experience in the past several years. I am still anxious to keep the academy filled to capacity, for the purpose of getting as many well-qualified officers for our Army as possible.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. Section 2 starts with this language:

When on the date of admission of a new class—

What is the date of admission of the next new class?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. July 1, 1942.

Mr. LEAVY. If the provisions of section 2 are given application on July 1, 1942, would not that nullify what we have done in adopting a proviso to section 1?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I do not think it would nullify it but the amendment would greatly limit the application of section 2.

Mr. LEAVY. You are either going to have to give the amendment priority or section 2 priority because there is a conflict there.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I assume the amendment which has just been adopted would be given priority until its possibilities had been exhausted and then section 2, as now in the bill, would be used only as a filler or as an opportunity to fill up with those that could not be placed under the provisions of the amendment just adopted. That is my own interpretation of it.

Mr. LEAVY. The amendment we just adopted could not possibly become effective by July 1, 1942, on account of the machinery required to make it effective.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I do not think section 2 would cut in on the application of the amendment we just adopted.

Mr. LEAVY. I am fearful it would do that very thing, because on that date you would find a large number of vacancies and immediately section 2 would have to become operative, if it means anything at all, or else be stricken out, because it is in conflict.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY Of course, that may be true as to the class that would enter in 1942, but this is permanent legislation and hereafter there would be occasions when the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia would be operative.

Mr. LEAVY. That is true if section 2 were amended so as to take care of that situation, but the immediate situation confronting us is coming within the next 6 weeks and we have just adopted a proviso that will take care of that so far as Members are concerned, and here it is nullified.

Mr. SOUTH. May I ask the gentleman if the policy at the Naval Academy does not follow somewhat along the lines of the gentleman's amendment? That is, if a candidate fails to qualify, is he not given a second opportunity to qualify? I do not see why a similar policy should not be adopted in the case of the Military Academy. It would certainly go a long way toward establishing the plan that we all seem to be agreed ought to be followed.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I understand that is the will of the House at this time, that the amendment just adopted should be allowed to operate. I had no intention of speaking at this time against the amendment that has already been adopted, but my own interpretation is that section 2 has a real function to perform when it is still too late to determine the qualifications of new nominees.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be rejected and the provisions of section 2 of the bill should be permitted to remain. This matter has received very careful consideration by the members of the committee and I assure you that the other members of the committee and I are not bringing in here something to do away with any of the rights we have under existing law. The proposition is simply this: We have at West Point facilities which are not being used, and they should be used. We have been operating under a National Defense Act which provided for a maximum army of 280,000. I do not think we have ever reached appropriations for an army in excess of 220,000 up until the time of the expansion of the Army. Any man who thinks we are ever going to be able to drop back to either 220,000 or 280,000 is living in a fool's paradise, in my opinion. We must keep our supply of officers coming in a constant stream. We must be prepared to take care of an army, surely of one-half million, and in my opinion, more than 1,000,000, on a permanent basis. Our officer procurement heretofore has been geared to approximately 220,000 men in the standing Army. So if we are going to have a continuous supply of officers, we must increase the facilities for producing those officers.

You cannot sustain the argument that those who are fighting in this war are going to be eliminated from a chance to participate in the Regular Army. After the last World War a great many of the wartime officers were taken into the Regular Army and they were taken in at a grade which had no relation to their ages.

Right today the Army of the United States is suffering from a stagnation which existed for 15 or 17 years, when the men who were caught in the grade of captain or below were retained in their grades for extended periods of time. There was no opportunity for promotion.

There was no future in the Army. The leadership of our Army became stagnated. So when this war is over those who go into the permanent establishment—and there must be many of these temporary officers who will do so—are going to have to be distributed into the higher ranks and not into the lower ranks of second lieutenants or first lieutenants where the officers trained at West Point under this bill are going to have to be placed. The men now entering the academy are younger than any man now serving in a commissioned capacity in the Army. They will constitute new blood coming along, and they will go into the lower ranks. We should permit the academic board of the academy to fill up the facilities which they have. None of my boys at the Point, none of my friends, and I am sure none of your appointees, have ever been the object of unjust treatment at the Point. I cannot follow the argument that the members of the academic board or the Army heads are going to eliminate your appointees and mine in order to take care of sons of Army officers. They have not done it in the past. They have had full control and you have never known of a case in which a boy has been subjected to an injustice at the hands of these men in the past. I know of no reason why we should suspect them in the future. Surely they are honorable gentlemen and would not resort to anything like that.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. There is no sort of criticism on the part of any of us of the committee reporting the bill, but the difficulty with many of us is that we can see no reason why these additional appointments to West Point should be handled differently or the procedure should be any different from that which has existed heretofore.

Mr. KILDAY. There is no distinction.

Mr. LEAVY. There is in the matter of discretion.

Mr. KILDAY. No; the additional appointee is controlled exactly and positively the same as your appointees now, but the lag of 100 average each year that is carried at West Point through the failure of some Members to appoint, carrying over to the next year, perhaps, or the failure of other appointees to qualify, has caused the academy to operate at an average of 100 below strength. This section proposes to permit the academic board to fill that up, two-thirds of them from those men that you and I designate, and one-third from all other sources, whether the sons of Army officers or deceased veterans, or whatnot.

Mr. LEAVY. But they must be filled 100 percent.

Mr. KILDAY. But you have not been filling them; you have been leaving 100 vacancies. Under this section existing facilities for those 100 would be utilized.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 2, in line 8, after the word "authorized", insert "and same has been filled insofar as possible as provided in section 1."

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in offering this amendment is to keep section 2 from clashing with the amendment which has just been adopted. It is to bring them into agreement and make it subordinate to the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia offered, which has been adopted.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. If my colleague will pardon me, I appreciate the objective that he has in view, but I think there would be considerable difficulty in the construction of the phrase "insofar as possible," and that if we leave the construction of that to the Secretary of War, that the Secretary of War would construe it in favor of his authority and to the detriment of the original appointing authority of the Members of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's point of view, but I am offering it only to keep the amendment that he has had adopted here from clashing with section 2 and still letting section 2 perform its function. That is the only purpose that I have in offering it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. The amendment offered by the gentleman, while referred to as a substitute for the amendment offered by myself, is in reality a perfecting amendment and could not be offered as a substitute for the amendment to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is a perfecting amendment and not a substitute. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to so change his amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I offer it as a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: On page 2, line 8, after the word "authorized", insert "and same has been filled insofar as possible, as provided in section 1."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I shall take only a moment or two. I think that the objective of the gentleman is good, but I think his amendment is too indefinite to be capable of strict construction. It provides that "insofar as possible," the Secretary of War shall do so and so, without leaving it in anybody's discretion as to what is the exact situation, except that of the Secretary of War. It occurs to me that nothing would be added to the language of the section by the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, and whether it is adopted or rejected, I sincerely trust that the delegation of authority to the Secretary of War contained in this section, to the detriment of congressional authority heretofore exercised in such matters, may be stricken out and that the motion to strike out the section will be agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the amendment which the gentleman offered, and which has been adopted to section 1, involve a similiar degree of uncertainty?

Mr. TARVER. No; because it did provide that the academic board shall determine when it is too late for entrance for that particular class.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In other words, when it is impossible?

Mr. TARVER. When it is too late for a candidate to enter the class for that year. This just says "as far as possible," without leaving it to anybody's determination as to what is possible, unless it be implied that the determination by the Secretary of War is final.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. As I understood the amendment which you first offered, it provided definitely what should be done by the Secretary of War and the board. If they do that, then they have done all that they possibly can. Then this perfecting amendment to the second section becomes effective?

Mr. TARVER. No. I believe the gentleman is in error. The language "when on the admission of a new class" would be determined to be July 1 of the particular year. The date of the admission of a new class would not be too late for appointees to enter under the terms of the amendment which has been adopted, because they could enter up until such time as the academic board determined it would be too late for them to enter the class for that particular scholastic year. If we leave section 2 in here it conflicts with that amendment, because it purports to give the Secretary of War authority on the 1st of July of that year to fill vacancies, although we have in the preceding amendment just given authority to a Member of Congress who made the original appointment, to continue endeavoring to fill the vacancy until such time as entrance into the class for the next scholastic year could not be effected.

Mr. JOHNS. But under the present law that is practically what the academy does, is it not? If everybody fails they notify you and you appoint somebody else.

Mr. TARVER. They permit some candidates to enter as late as September of

the year. Yet the new class enters on July 1, supposedly. There are instances in which the entrance is delayed. The purpose of the amendment which has been adopted is to allow the appointive authority, whether it be a Member of Congress or some other appointive authority as long as he may be allowed, in the judgment of the academic board, to submit the name of a qualified candidate for entrance into the class of that year. If you leave section 2 in here you negative the amendment which has just been adopted, which proposes to give the Member of Congress that leeway by giving the Secretary of War authority to take the place away from him on the first of July.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The House will recall, of course, that when we brought the bill here last year without the judge's bait, as he says, the enacting clause was stricken out and we had 160 vacancies in the academy during the past season, and we have them now. The only effect of the amendment as offered by the gentleman is to preclude the Secretary of War from making any appointment during the time intervening between now and July 1, notwithstanding the fact that every Congressman and every Senator may make his appointment wherever he has a qualified appointment.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and a division was demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. A parliamentary is not in order when we are taking a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wanted to be sure that the House understood the question.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) there were—ayes 36, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Do I understand the parliamentary situation to be that the vote just taken was on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. Do I understand also that the present parliamentary situation is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is now in order to be voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. And a vote "aye" is to adopt the amendment and a vote "nay" is against it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 71, noes 38.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. Any Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, or Resident Commissioner may designate a principal candidate and not more than three alternate candidates for any appointment allowed for him at the United States Military Academy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMISTON: After section 3, on page 2, add a new section, No. 4, to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926, entitled 'An act to establish a department of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., and to amend chapter 174 of the act of Congress of April 19, 1910, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes"' (44 Stat. 704), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"'That the number of cadets now authorized by law at the United States Military Academy, and the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy, are each hereby increased by 40 from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, including members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active service by the War Department or Navy Department who are suffering from compensable service-connected disabilities or who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated in line of duty during World War No. 1 or World War No. 2: *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of disability or death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of Navy, respectively.'"

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, there is in existing law a provision that sons of World War soldiers or sailors, 40 to each academy, or an average of about 10 per year, should receive Presidential appointments to both academies. It is very apparent that at this time so long after the first World War there are practically no sons of veterans killed in action who are within the age limit, under 22 at West Point and under 21 at Annapolis, to permit them to take advantage of this law. This amendment merely extends that provision to sons of veterans of World War No. 1, which veterans have died since the war of a service-connected disability, and it includes sons of veterans of the present war which veterans have been or may be killed in action and whose sons can qualify for either academy.

This amendment is similar to a bill I introduced on December 5, 1941. The Senate passed a similar bill on April 4, 1941. It seems to me this amendment is germane to the Military Academy's bill we are now considering. All it does is to include sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and sons of Army or Navy nurses.

The War Department in a letter to the Senate on this same bill endorsed it; and the Navy Department reported that they had no objection to the legislation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I have the greatest sympathy for the gentleman's objective in offering this amendment, but it does not mean much, does it, except to permit them to take the Presidential examination?

Mr. EDMISTON. It provides also that 40 of them must be appointed.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman's amendment merely extend a provision which has the backing of the World War veterans' organization?

Mr. EDMISTON. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It has the backing of the American Legion, does it not?

Mr. EDMISTON. It has the backing of the veterans' organization. I know it has the backing of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. All it does is merely extend the operation of already existing law.

Mr. EDMISTON. The gentleman is correct. It extends it to the sons of veterans who may have died of service-connected disability and also includes veterans of the present war, World War No. 2.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order and state to the Chair that the amendment is not germane to the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The amendment offered is an amendment to the act of June 8, 1926, to establish a department of economics and history in the Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. It seems to me my amendment is germane to the present bill, which is a regulation for the appointment of cadets to the Military Academy.

This is certainly a regulation on the appointment of these sons of veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the reference in the pending amendment to matters pertaining to the Naval Academy and the appointment of cadets to the Naval Academy takes it too far afield to make it germane to the pending bill; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6979, to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the section numbers.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "A National Program for the Physically Handicapped."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a communication from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

WHY ARE WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS CONTINUALLY "SNIPING" AT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute?

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of other gentlemen who have special orders. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the News, published here in Washington under date of May 13, has this to say:

GAS FOR CONGRESS

In Washington yesterday, as in other eastern communities, the Government started issuing gasoline ration cards. And who do you suppose were among the first to demand, and get, X cards, entitling them to all the gasoline they want?

Why, to be sure, Congressmen and other Government officials.

That statement is a first-hand, hand-sowed lie. I was one of the Congressmen who received an X card. I made no demands of any kind. I appeared in the rotunda of the Capitol and filled out an application, and when the secretary taking the application examined it she issued me a card designated as an X card. Nothing was said by me about what kind of a card I wanted. I made no demands. I simply stated the facts in my application. The essential facts were as follows:

First. That I lived 20 miles from the Capitol and came in to Congress every morning and went home every night.

Second. That I did not use my car for pleasure trips, but that 40 miles per day was the necessary mileage I had traveled and would have to travel to get to and from the Capitol.

I was then issued an X card, and that is all that took place.

This morning I took my X card back and asked if any mistake had been made, and the whole program was explained to me. I offered to return my card if any mistake had been made. I found then that the next card issued, which would give the greatest amount of gas up to July 1, was a B–3 card. A B–3 card entitles the owner to 57 gallons between now and July 1, and no more. The other cards, of course, allow a less amount.

Applying a B–3 card to my own case, where I make 40 miles per day for 6 days a week, would be 240 miles per week, and for 6 weeks up to July 1 would be 1,440 miles. The only car I have is a 4-year-old Chrysler and 12 miles per gallon is the best mileage I can get. This means that in order to come to the Capitol without going a mile out of my way would require 120 gallons between now and July 1. No other card issued would cover this situation except an X card. I therefore retained this card and expect to use it for business purposes. The fact that there is no limit to the amount of gas I can buy does not change the situation with me in the least. I will buy only what I must use to get in and out of the Capital.

Later it may be found that it is unnecessary for Congressmen to attend Congress—there might be some merit to that contention—but until that time arrives I will drive in and out of the Capital as I have done for over 7 years.

If the newspapers can get any relief in pouncing on Congressmen, it is their privilege, but when they publish a barefaced lie I propose to call it by its first name.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SHAFER of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES A REPUBLIC, NOT A DEMOCRACY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that so many Members of Congress when speaking refer to our country as this "great democracy" instead of using the correct expression, "this Republic."

Members of the Constitutional Convention, over which Washington presided, created a republic and not a democracy.

I respectfully suggest that Members of the House who are guilty of such error examine their dictionaries again and learn that a republic is a government where the sovereignty resides in the citizens, and is exercised through representatives chosen by the citizens; while a democracy is a government where the sovereignty also resides in the citizens, but is exercised directly, without intervention of representatives.

The United States is a government of laws, and not a government of men. A pure democracy is a government of men, ruled by the decisions of the majority in all things.

A republic has a written constitution which places checks and balances upon all three branches of the government, legislative, executive, and judicial. The constitution is the supreme law of the land adopted by the people for the protection of all, and especially for the protection of the inalienable rights of the individual, which no government has right to abridge.

In a pure democracy the will of the majority is the law whether it refers to man's relationship with man or his relationship to God and religion. The majority in a pure democracy rules all men in all things without checks or balances and without any limitation on legislative power. The tyranny in a pure democracy is no less terrible than the tyranny of an absolute monarchy or despotism. Whoever would legislate without regard

to the constitution does, of necessity, "fly to anarchy or despotism."

The late Leslie M. Shaw, former Secretary of the United States Treasury, in his book, Vanishing Landmarks, says the distinction between a republic and a democracy, briefly and concisely stated, is this:

> One is direct government, the other representative government. Under a democratic form of government, the people rule, while in a republic, they choose their rulers. In democracies, the people legislate; in republics, they choose legislators. In democracies the people administer the laws; in republics, they select executives. In democracies, judicial questions are decided by popular vote; in republics, judges are selected and they, and they only, interpret and construe laws and render judgments and decrees. I might add that in republics the people do not instruct their judges, by referendum or otherwise, how to decide cases. Unless the citizens respect both the forms of law and likewise judicial decisions, there is nothing in a republic worth mentioning.
>
> In very recent years we have been using the word "democracy" when we have meant "republic." This flippant and unscientific manner of speaking tends to lax thinking, and is fraught with danger.
>
> Only socialists, near-socialists, anarchists, and bolsheviki clamor for "democracy." Every true American is satisfied with representative government, and that is exactly what the term republic means.
>
> The Constitutional Convention was a republican body, and not a mass meeting. Washington speaks of "the delegated will of the Nation"—never of the popular wish of the people.
>
> The discussion in the convention makes it abundantly clear that the fathers sought to save America from the monarch, and to protect her from the mass. They chose the middle ground between two extremes, both fraught with danger. They even went so far as to guarantee that no State should be cursed with a democratic form of government, or a monarchial form of government, or any other kindred system. The provision is in this language: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." That excludes every other form.

Every protestant church and every public school in America is a republic. Their affairs are managed by representatives—by boards. Otherwise there would be no churches and no public schools. Every bank and every corporation is a republic, managed by boards and officers selected by stockholders. The United States of America is a great corporation, in which the stockholder is the voter.

Mr. Speaker, another error that is being made by public speakers, newspapers, and radio commentators is the frequent reference to the fight of the democracies against the Axis Powers. Would it not be better to speak of the Allied Nations opposing the Axis Powers? I know of no democracy that is fighting the Axis Powers.

In setting up this republic, the fathers provided for a government of three coordinate branches with no subordinate branch. Let each coordinate branch keep its hands off the sacred prerogatives of the other. Only by so doing can this republic be preserved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

COAL MINE DISASTER IN WEST VIRGINIA; COURAGEOUS WORKERS ARE PAID TRIBUTE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday there occurred another in the long history of disasters that have taken a large toll of life in the coal-mining industry of the United States. This latest tragedy occurred near Morgantown, W. Va., in the congressional district which I have the responsibility to represent. We read today that 54 miners were caught beneath the earth and died.

I take this occasion to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that on the home front these men are engaged in a hazardous occupation. They bring coal to the surface of the earth to be used in factories turning out the vitally needed implements of war. Often here at home we forget the sacrifices made by strong men who toil daily in the shadows of accident and death. I pay tribute to the courage of the men who mine the coal of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GEARHART, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. GAVAGAN, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANASCO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee by the Speaker of the House to make a study and investigation of the civil personnel in the departments of Government in an effort to determine which employees and which jobs are necessary in the public interest, and for more effectively carrying on the war effort. The committee would also recommend transfers, coordination, simplification of work, and elimination of unnecessary jobs.

Mr. Speaker, at the peak of World War No. 1 there were 900,000 civil employees in Government. That figure was reduced to 500,000 by 1930. At that time there were less than 50 bureaus, agencies, and commissions. From 1933 until the beginning of our defense program, Government employees had increased to a little over a million, and in 1939 our bureaus, commissions, and agencies had increased to 135. Today we have approximately 1,850,000 civil employees in Government, 250,000 of them are in the District of Columbia. New workers are coming to Washington at the rate of several thousand per month. In addition, we have a large number of men in uniform employed in the departments effecting the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, we realize the situation is not like it was 24 years ago. Many more employees are required. The Government should have just as many employees as are needed. There is no dispute or argument about that. Neither should Government workers be expected to do more than their fair share of the task to be performed, but they should do that.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, our Government should be engaged only in activities that are for the public interest, and these activities should be measured in the light of our present situation, and their necessity in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, not only do we have too many agencies, but too many of them are doing practically the same thing. There is too much duplication and waste of effort. There is too little cooperation and coordination among the departments and the various branches of Government.

There are many instances where as many as a half dozen agencies, as a part of their services, do the same kind of work.

Mr. Speaker, I grant the greater number of employees in Government are efficient and conscientious and are really trying to accomplish the tasks assigned. On the other hand there are too many who are working at jobs that are unnecessary; and still too many who, through no fault of their own, have little or nothing to do a great share of their time.

Mr. Speaker, our Government is still trying to carry on a lot of things that might do in peacetime but certainly are not needed now. If I had the time I could call your attention to scores of such activities. Tell me, for example, why we should spend $50,000 annually for salaries to people whose jobs are to study the food habits of wild birds. Why spend several thousand dollars for a United States Travel Bureau? I tried to knock that out when it was continued a few weeks ago. Why have a Travel Bureau when people are being asked to stay at home. These are small items but they are examples of other activities of no more importance or value to the people of this country.

We have publicity agencies galore. It has become the fashion for every department and agency to have its own publicity bureau. A lot of the material is, more or less, propaganda, and much of it unnecessary.

Let me call your attention to one item of $2,402,000 spent for the Office of Government Reports. Certainly we must have Government reports. Here is the reason for the expenditure, according to the hearings on the bill when it was considered:

> The purpose of this item is concerned with channeling to the President information as to the reaction of the public to Government programs and activities.

As I have said, we need information, but why run it on such a high scale? Not long ago it was brought out on the floor of this House that approximately $30,000,000 was spent for Government publicity last year. That sort of thing ought to be examined. One of the lucrative jobs in Government is that of information specialist. We need specialists but not so many, I think.

A distinguished Senator from Virginia a short time ago said:

> The waste and extravagance caused by multiplicity of bureaus approaches a national scandal.

Mr. Speaker, certainly there is bound to be extravagance and waste when a nation is building a war machine on such a large scale. We all understand that. But, after all, too much waste for too long is likely to lead to corruption.

Mr. Speaker, there is lack of effective organization and close cooperation among the divisions of Government. Many of the agencies have become a sort of "law unto themselves." They lost sight of their relationship to other groups. In many cases there is sort of rivalry for authority, detrimental to the best interests of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many people in many of our bureaus and agencies. Not nearly so many would be required if they would streamline their methods and eliminate duplicate and unnecessary activities and really run them on a business basis.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principal reasons for our failure to do this very thing is that those who head the various departments and subdivisions, including the hundreds of supervisors, are reluctant to suggest these changes. It is because it may affect their salaries or chance of promotion. The tendency is to continue to build up personnel and increase activities, rather than trim to the minimum. It follows that each agency makes bigger requests for funds in order to take care of the increased activities and additional personnel. This is not true in most departments but is done in far too many of them.

Mr. Speaker, there is a big expansion in the offing right now. Thousands of additional employees will be added to the pay roll to handle the rationing program and other programs relating thereto. More and more employees will be needed to carry on the expanding war pragram.

I think it might be well right here to call attention to the acute problem of congested living conditions for Government workers here in Washington. It has come about because of the unprecedented increase in population, occasioned by the expansion I have just mentioned. It is necessary that rather prompt attention be given this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a place where the problem of employment in Government is of great importance. It should be studied and examined and should be pretty carefully worked over. It should be done in the light of public needs and for more efficiently prosecuting the war program.

Mr. Speaker, we should have enough people to carry on the necessary activities of our Government, but an inconsidered increase of more persons on the pay roll could be a hindrance in our war effort. We need reorganization in many departments. We must cut nonessential activities.

We should see that these employees are transferred from nonessential to required activities, where they are so much needed right now. Those who are incompetent should, after proper consideration, be dismissed. As I have stated, we need cooperation, coordination, and streamlining. We must have less waste of time, of energy, manpower, and money.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new problem. It has been with us for a long time. Attention has been called to it before, but only feebly. No action has really been taken. A committee in another body, I am informed, is giving the matter some study by a questionnaire method. That will help, but will not get to the bottom of the thing. The situation has become accentuated by reason of the tremendous expansion of recent months. It cannot be made to improve from the inside. That has been tried and with little results.

Mr. Speaker, a committee appointed under my resolution, could render invaluable service to the Government, and to the people of this country, in devoting some time and energy in helping to handle and solve a problem of vital importance. It is a problem that is becoming of more consequence every day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SAVE THE WHEAT CROP

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is confronted with a very critical situation in connection with the food-production program for the war effort, and I call the matter to the attention of Congress with the urgent plea that immediate action be taken either by this body, the Department of Agriculture, or other Federal agencies concerned.

Throughout a broad flat inland empire extending from North Dakota to Texas, from the Mississippi to the Rockies, we have prospect of the biggest wheat crop in history. The farmers of the Nation are rallying to the call of their Government in a food-production program that is perhaps without parallel in the history of man.

Our production of wheat, for example, is expected to be such that there will develop an acute and critical shortage of storage space. Something must be done, and done now, to provide the additional storage space that will be needed. It would certainly be a tragic commentary on the efficiency of our war effort if we permit millions of bushels of wheat—"the staff of life" and our most important grain crop—to be wasted after our farmers have so loyally done their part on the production lines.

Unless something is done immediately to relieve the storage situation, there is a real danger that that is exactly what will happen. The grim fact is that the wheat farmers of America may be forced to dump a major portion of the 1942 crop on the ground because of critical deficiencies in storage and transportation facilities.

To give you an idea of just what we are up against in my State of North Dakota, the major spring wheat producer of the Nation, it is estimated that approximately 85 percent of existing wheat-storage capacity is already occupied by the carry-over from last year's crop. As of April 1 of this year, we had in storage on farms and in country elevators, 103,000,000 bushels of wheat, which is more wheat than we ordinarily produce in an average year. Terminal storage facilities are equally congested. In the Twin Cities, for example, out of a total storage capacity of 52,000,000 bushels, storage capacity for less than 3,000,000 bushels was available as of April 1. Similarly at the head of the Lakes, only four to five million bushels of storage space was vacant out of a 54,000,000-bushel capacity. Eastern terminals at Buffalo and Albany are also glutted, and the situation has been so bad this winter that a considerable amount of wheat has had to be stored on barges. With farm bins, country elevators, and terminal elevators bursting almost to capacity with last year's crop, it means that wheat farmers will be forced to store a substantial part of the 1942 crop on his farm. To do that, the farmer will need help.

I am advised that representatives of the Department of Agriculture at meetings out in the Wheat Belt have tried to "pass the buck" by saying that the job of providing storage space for the 1942 crop is "the farmers' problem." Such an attitude is not in keeping with the realities of the situation. The problem is such that the individual farmer cannot possibly cope with it. The Federal Government must step in and help him.

In the first place, the individual farmer is not in a position to undertake risk and expenses involved in building additional storage space in excess of his normal needs. The same holds true for his local country elevator. In the second place, both the farmer and the country elevator are up against the problem of getting the necessary building materials.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that the farmer, even though he were financially able to do so, and even though he could get the necessary material, he could not be held responsible for building additional storage space for the 1942 crop until he is reasonably assured that such space will be needed. Many things may happen between now and harvesting, but the moment that the farmers have the assurance of harvesting a crop, there will be a concerted rush to local lumber yards for building materials. These local yards cannot possibly anticipate such a last-minute demand, with the result the supply of such building materials will be depleted overnight. It will then be too late to bring in additional building materials, and the farmer will have to dump his wheat on the ground where it will be subject to all kinds of weather, and it may be months before elevator storage space will be available.

True, the War Production Board will unquestionably grant priorities on such building materials, but I submit that this is more than a question of mere priorities on lumber and nails. The farmer and his local lumber dealers may have a whole sack full of priorities, but that will not save the situation, or provide the necessary storage space when the demand comes.

Priorities are not a guaranty that a sufficient supply of building materials will be on hand when needed, nor are they a guaranty that such supplies can be brought in at a moment's notice in view of present congested transportation conditions. Incidentally, transportation is one of the factors which is giving the farmers most concern. The peak traffic load for our rail carriers comes at almost the same time when the wheat crop would ordinarily be moving to market. Furthermore, western railroads report a shortage of freight cars. Not only that, but under a recent Government order the movement of western wheat to eastern terminals by Great Lakes shipping has been drastically restricted. All available shipping is to be used for transportation of iron ore.

In view of these many complicating factors it is evident that this is a situation in which the Federal Government and its agencies must come to the rescue.

I believe that the Department of Agriculture in collaborating with the War Production Board and the Surplus Commodity Corporation, should take immediate steps to establish stock piles of necessary building materials throughout the Wheat Belt.

These stock piles could be strategically located at central points which would be easily accessible by rail or truck carrier to local communities where the storage problem becomes most acute. I am sure that managers and operators of local lumber yards would be glad to cooperate with Federal agencies in supervising the accumulation and distribution of materials in these stock piles. Such a program, immediately undertaken, would mean that these building materials will be on hand when needed to assist farmers in erecting temporary storage facilities.

One by one we have seen our farm surpluses disappear under the stress of wartime. These surpluses, once a headache, are now a blessing. Let the Axis Powers worry about food deficiencies. We can glory in our abundance. That does not mean, however, that we can afford to throw away our advantage by permitting any portion of our wheat crop to be lost through waste and spoilage. We should set about immediately to conserve every kernel against the day when the world will be crying for wheat and against the possibility that a repetition of the 1934–36 drought may wipe out our present surplus in short order.

It will be a national disgrace if we let any part of the 1942 wheat crop go to waste simply because of inadequate storage and transportation facilities.

It will be more than a disgrace if while our boys prepare to lay down their lives on far-flung battle fronts of the war, we fail them on the production lines at home. Food is vital to victory. Let it not again be said of our efforts that they were "too little and too late." Let it not be said that we were so careless and short-sighted here at home that we permitted vital food supplies to be lost because we failed to provide the necessary storage facilities. The loss of such food supplies by submarine attack on the high seas is one thing, but to suffer such losses here at home with no one to blame but ourselves and our negligence is quite another. At what it costs to build one destroyer we can guarantee adequate storage facilities for the 1942 wheat crop. That guaranty should be forthcoming from the Government as soon as possible.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a very serious problem that will confront the American people, especially the poor people of the country, and we have plenty of them today in every congested city of our land.

Donald Nelson called upon the coal users to stock up coal to the limit of storage capacity, as transportation difficulties may prevent them from being able to secure coal when actually needed to keep their fires burning. As I understand it, next year the facilities of the railroads and other vehicles of transportation will be used mostly for war materials and no coal, or, rather, as little as possible, is to be shipped from the mines to the big cities for private consumption. In other words, Donald Nelson tells the country that it is a patriotic duty of all persons who are users of coal to obtain it now and stock up their bins and their cellars, in order that they may keep the home fires burning during the coming winter.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of people in the United States, in my city, and I am sure in every other city, who have no place to stock up their coal and have not enough money to buy the coal. They live from week to week or from month to month. I know that in many cities and in many communities coal is purchased by the bagload, 100 or 200 pounds, and that coal is carried from the coal dealer, maybe, to the second or third flight of steps to keep the family warm and supply the home with heat. I am not worried about the man who owns an elevator apartment or a man who occupies a building of the better class. He has bins and he is going to stock up with coal and he has the money to do it; but there are millions of people in this country who, unfortunately, are not in a position financially to stock up on anything. Most of them get their coal on credit and are still paying for their last winter's coal. Of course, the average coal dealer who is confronted with this problem of having to wait for his money is in no position either to pay cash for a large supply of coal. As I understand, coal dealers in many instances have to pay cash before the coal is actually delivered to them if they want to receive a certain discount. How then can they be expected to cope with this emergency situation?

I propose, Mr. Speaker, if necessary, to introduce a bill calling upon Donald Nelson and the Government to subsidize a group of coal dealers and let the coal come in now, paid for and subsidized by the Government of the United States, so these millions of people who cannot afford otherwise to obtain coal now may be able at such time as may be necessary to go and buy their little bundles of coal to keep the family fires going. Otherwise you will see much suffering in this country. I honestly believe that the Government ought to come to the help of these poor people, the part of our population that can least help itself and that is entitled to a fair consideration, and solve this problem by subsidizing the coal dealers so that they will be able to stock up coal and take care of their customers who are depending on them. It would mean a short-term loan only as it would have to cover, at most, about 6 months.

We have been subsidizing almost everything in this country, and there is no reason to my way of thinking and, I believe, to every man's way of thinking, why the Government should not make sure and provide the necessary warmth in communities where people are living from hand to mouth. That goes for food and every other commodity also. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], who just spoke, mentioned the warehousing of the farm products of that great State for 1942. We may conclude from his argument that there is

plenty of food, but, Heavenly Father, the food prices are so high today, and it looks as if they are going to be higher, with all of the price ceilings, that the poor people cannot get enough food on the money they make. It seems to me that with all this abundance, the Government ought to take some steps by which the people of the country who are ill-fed and ill-clothed should be given an opportunity to be able to buy food at the lowest price. To come back to the coal situation, coal is a necessity to a great part of our population, and I believe it is our duty to assist these people and assure their well-being by making every effort to see to it that they will not have to go through unnecessary hardships to secure this essential commodity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MANUEL QUEZON

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to learn from press dispatches of the arrival upon our American soil of Manuel Quezon, patriot and distinguished wartime President of the Philippine Commonwealth. With him is his steadfast, loyal, and devoted wife and family, all of whom, thanks be to God, are safe and sound.

President Quezon is known personally by many Members of this House for here he served his people, fruitfully and with great tact and distinction. His repeated visits to the Capital have furthered his acquaintance, increased his influence, and endeared him to an ever widening number of Members. Brilliant, gentle, and always considerate of his colleagues he sought at all times and eventually attained the one and only great objective of his life, the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Those of us who served upon the Insular Affairs Committee at the time of the consideration and passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, recall the doubts, confusion, and the opposition with which we were beset. Concerned, particularly, were we who aimed to redeem the pledged word of the American Government and who at all times sought the liberation of the Filipino people, for we feared the madmen of Japan.

In spite of our suspicions and fears, among others I voted for the bill in fulfillment of our American pledge and honor. Always, I felt, Mr. Speaker, that it was my solemn duty as an American citizen and as a Member of the House to vote for the bill; and, too, at all cost to provide for the happiness, security, and permanence of the liberated people. Since that action by the Congress the Philippine Islands began their pleasant and peaceful journey toward eventual and complete independence which was ruthlessly, sinfully, and without provocation interrupted by treacherous German-Japanese attack.

Today the fair and peaceful domain of the Filipino people lies smoldering and in ruins. Its patriot President, his family, and his worthy aides are scattered and seeking refuge among us. And I want to extend the hand of cordial welcome and to assure them of the warmth of our wholehearted reception, praying all the while for the early day when the Japanese shall be driven to their bamboo shacks and hovels, and to everlasting destruction by the victorious armies of the United Nations.

As I look into the future I can foresee the day when the Philippine government, free and progressive, shall exercise among the family of nations a dominating influence for the good of its people and of all mankind, guided by the steady hand and the brilliant mind of President Manuel Quezon, the statesman and patriot of his people, who will be given his place in history beside José Rizal and other great Filipino patriots.

I can envision the peaceful and permanent and undisturbed cooperation between the people and the Governments of the United States and the Philippine Islands, bound by the peace and blessed by the prosperity of our peoples.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, "Mabuhay Quezon."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as a part of his remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to extend in the RECORD an editorial which appears in the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Congress has granted many powers to the administration for the very definite purpose of carrying on, first, that which was our defense program, and now that which is our war program. This power and authority were granted and were to be used for efficient operation and the acceleration of the whole program. I think I bespeak the sentiment of Congress when I say this Congress is wholeheartedly, without any consideration of partisanship, for an efficient war program. At the same time, there is a tremendous difference between the use, misuse, and abuse of power and authority.

At no time, and that still holds good, did Congress ever grant any authority or power that would change the American form of government and supplant it with those Europeanisms which many would like to throw upon us, and which some are attempting to do.

I think this Congress is faced today with consideration of one of the strongest principles of our Government. That principle is, Shall the bureaus, more commonly known as bureaucratic groups, have the power to determine what is and what is not the duty of Congress?

The Constitution of the United States clearly sets forth that Congress is to be an independent branch of our Government, and that means that no administrative bureau has any power to define the duties of Congress or change the Constitution.

More specifically, we are faced today with a department of O. P. A., under the administration of Mr. Leon Henderson, attempting to define the duties of Congress and Congressmen. If he is successful in this attempt, it means that the Congress will have to abdicate and will have to turn over the duties of their offices, to not only these bureaucratic groups, but, in the long run, to many others. It can clearly be seen that if Congressmen cannot attend to their duties, the result will be further confusion worse confounded, as we find it in many of these bureaus today, which are thoroughly and completely disorganized, and which are headed by inexperienced, badly informed theorists, who have never made a success in any line of business in their lives, and who are thoroughly saturated with European philosophies, as opposed to the American form of government. I believe this to be true, and this Congress had better remember—and I call it to their specific attention—that Congress itself is the last bulwark standing between its people and the American form of government.

Every Congressman knows that there is a positive and determined effort to undermine and discredit Congress in the eyes of our people and to destroy it through propaganda. I offer as evidence of this the present attempt to fix the duties of Congress by these bureaucracies. Taking a plain view of this whole situation, does it mean that these bureaucrats are now attempting to keep Congressmen from freely communicating with and circulating through their districts in order that the people throughout the land may not be informed of the facts, but that our people must become the victims of a vast European propaganda machine backed by 35,000 departmental reporters, and, according to some people's plan, that would be the only means of gaining any information whatsoever.

Let this Congress and these bureaucrats not forget that any power or authority that has been granted can be rescinded and withdrawn when abused and misused.

Misuse of power is the most dangerous thing that any nation ever faced. We have no fight with the proper use of power, but it must be in the hands of those who know what they are doing, and know how to do it.

I ask this Congress today to stop, look, and listen, to see that we do not meet the fate that small business in this country is meeting. In this connection I believe the power has been misused, for a tremendous number of businesses are being bankrupt and put out of business on account of the methods that have been used to obtain an objective which may be desirable. This would not have been true had men of experience and men who knew the functions of small business been in power. Under proper management, the assets, machinery, tools, and organization of these small businesses could have been used to accelerate, perfect, and deliver a complete war program. We have to face the facts and not intentions.

Hell is paved with good intentions. The facts are that the theorists, through ill-conceived, half-baked, theoretical operations, conceived in many instances by crackpots, have destroyed business rather than have used it for our benefit.

This Congress and the people of the country certainly know how the crackpot plans, in many instances, have worked; and I do not have to tell them what they are.

Now comes the O. P. A., under Mr. Henderson—and I have talked to him personally and confirmed in substance such statements as these: That X cards will be granted for gasoline for essential uses; that cars operated by Members of Congress do not fall in this category.

Right here Mr. Henderson attempts to define the duties of Congress. Can it be that this man has become so saturated with power that he comes out now boldly and says that Congress is not essential?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you ask Leon whether or not a Congressman coming down to a session to appropriate money for his department was engaged in essential business?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I asked him a question that resembled that, and his answer was "No."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why not cut off his appropriations, if it is not essential for us to come here to make them?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Further on I am going to suggest that we put a ceiling on some kinds of people in the country and some of their activities.

Perhaps it may not be to him, according to his philosophy. I say this, not personally, for I never met the man except to talk to him over the phone, but I say it as a principle, Who is he to determine the duties of Congress? From that statement it would appear to me that he does not know any more about the business of Congress than he knows about that which he is trying to control.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I note in the paper this afternoon that one of these O. P. A. officials, when asked whether running errands at Government departments for constituents could be classified as official business, said, "Decidedly not." Now if the people send us down here, for instance, if a factory in my district has some business with a department on war orders, would that not be official business?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes. I have covered that a little later on. I believe it shows definitely and positively the philosophy that these people have and that they are going to try to control Congress, try to tell Congress what it must do; and I say we should not submit to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think that some of these gentlemen think that our only purpose is to do their will and make appropriations for them, instead of representing our constituents?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Apparently so. They think that our duty consists of appropriating enough money for them to carry out their European ideas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not suggest to them that they go to that place you said was paved in a certain way?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I think it would be a good place for them to go. I think we would all be better off. Does not Mr. Henderson know that Congress was elected by the people and under the Constitution of the United States, and that they have their duties to perform and are expected to perform them, by their people? Does he think they should now abdicate in favor of the crackpots and riffraff of political appointees? Does he think that he can destroy Congress and their duties by his decisions, particularly in view of the way in which some of his programs are working out? Again I say, Congress is not against the objectives that are to win this war, and I represent my people when I say we will make any sacrifice and do without anything that is necessary, to win, but my people do object to inefficient bungling that would destroy them and its Congress, in trying to carry out this program.

My people are against any such methods and I ask that people who know their business be placed in power, and then they will be glad to follow their leadership.

Henderson's department was asked the question whether a Member of Congress was on official business when he was going to the different departments in behalf of his constituents. The answer was, "Decidedly not." Whose business should we attend to if not the business of every person in the United States? Is not every person in the United States represented by Congressmen, Delegate, or Senator?

Is Congress as essential to this Government as are its bureaus and bureaucrats? Look at the consistency of this program. The statement is made that gasoline will be given to Congressmen "only if Congressmen use their cars for the official business of the Federal Government, which they certainly do not."

Who is the O. P. A. to make any such statement as this? Any half-baked idiot should know that automobiles today have been necessary to carry on all business. What would happen to Congress, or any necessary business, if this form of transportation were taken away.

In the same interview it is stated that "B cards should have been issued to Congressmen; that B cards were for those who had to travel from and to their work."

In the same interview it is stated that a Congressman could not obtain a card to drive to his work. One of these statements must be wrong, for in one instance it is stated that Congressmen are entitled to drive from and to their work, and in the next one it is stated that they are not. This is just a sample of the way things are done by those who do not know how to do them.

Now, when it comes to departmental consideration, Mr. Ickes says this will be over in a short time because we will have enough gasoline. Mr. Henderson says it will not. One of them must be wrong, and without going into the merits of either argument it appears to me that this kind of statement would indicate, in the minds of our people, that the whole thing was being done for political purposes, and this certainly will not inspire confidence in our people.

Can it be again that the terrific push for publicity and power by these bureaucratic heads is the main objective, and they refuse to give up any such powers after the necessity for them has ceased? To the people here in Washington, who know conditions, it can be said that there is at least some merit in that line of thought.

By those who know and see what is going on, I think there is a great deal of merit in the statement that the bureaus are now attempting to govern Congress with the same iron and dictatorial hand that they are using to govern and browbeat the people in our country, by threats of jail terms and fines. This sort of program was used to "soften up" the people of Europe before the dictators moved in. In my opinion, these methods are entirely unnecessary, uncalled for, and are definitely wrong. This is not the first war that our people have engaged in, and we have never lost one. In every other instance, our people have voluntarily done these things, and they will do it again, and as often as is necessary, provided they see that their Government is not going to be swept away from them and replaced with the dictatorial power of bureaucrats.

I, for one, refuse to abdicate, and as long as I am an elected Congressman I expect to come to the protection of my people, and if the bureaucrats carry me out, it is going to be feet first, and even after they do that they will know they have been some place.

The principles involved here are greater than gasoline, or sugar, or anything else. They are, as I see them, whether we are, or whether we are not, going to maintain constitutional government, and I, for one, do not believe and do not admit that the time has come when these bureaucrats can move in and destroy Congress or define its duties, or do anything else they are not permitted to do under the Constitution of the United States. I am going to help my people as long as I am here, and I am not going to "stay home" or "walk" in doing that, because some bureaucrat says I must.

I do not believe the time has come when Congress has to bow down and lick the boots of the bureaucrats or get their permission to do their official duty.

Did the people of the United States elect Congress to look after their interests, or do these people expect Congress to take orders from Mr. Henderson or any other bureaucrat?

Is this the time to slow down this country in its war efforts, or should we accelerate our program?

Do you think the overloaded transportation systems can carry this additional load, or will they finally break down?

If they break down, what kind of a crackpot scheme will be offered as an excuse for another failure?

Is there so much departmental seeking of publicity and departmental jealousy that the vital problems cannot be prop-

erly solved? If the answer to this question is "Yes," I say then a ceiling should be put upon departmental jealousies and ambitions to replace constitutional government.

If this handling of the gasoline situation, the sugar situation, and the rubber situation is a sample of Government ownership and control, then God help this country and save it from such mismanagement. Do you think the country as a whole is thoroughly tired of the failures, mismanagement, poor judgment, and experimentation on the part of these bureaucratic heads in handling Government business?

Do you think the people of this country are tired of and are going to continue to accept crackpot excuses for failure instead of production?

Do you think they are going to accept regimentation in lieu of ability to perform?

If these failures, mismanagement, and attempt to destroy the American form of government are to continue, I suggest that Congress get into this picture, rescind much of this authority that has been handed to these bureaucrats, where it is being abused, and handle this country in the American way.

I say again, when this authority was granted it was with the thought that it would be used properly, not misused and abused. If this authority is going to be misused and abused, then it is high time that Congress take it back and stop this mismanagement and theoretical experimentation by those who are incompetent to do the job.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you recall that picture that was in the Washington papers, showing Mr. Henderson riding his secretary around on the handle bars of a bicycle?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In your conversations with him did he suggest that a Congressman, regardless of his age or physical condition, should get his secretary to work that way, or to transact other errands with a bicycle, or did he not say anything about that?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Well, I did not give as much thought to that then as I do now. I did not realize the incompetence and inefficiency of that department.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean as the operator of a bicycle, or what?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Well, even as the operator of a bicycle.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He seemed to be getting along all right.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. He did not to me. I do not think he can even ride a bicycle properly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, if they have it correctly, we cannot even get bicycles.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That is right, and perhaps we cannot get secretaries either, if the bureaucrats decide that we do not need them in our official duties.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It would seem that if the folks sent us down here and paid us $10,000 a year, that we should be trusted with cards for gasoline.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. You are using the old-fashioned idea that this is still an American constitutional form of government, the same as I have, but under the European philosophies of these new bureaucrats and these crackpots they do not accept your theory of government or the American form of government, but they accept the European form. Under the European idea that is their program.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why did you not ask Leon what you ought to do every morning before you come here?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. If I did that, I might tell him what to do and where to go.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think that would be a good thing? Why not tell him? It would be a good thing.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an excerpt from a newscast over station WMAL this morning by Mr. Earl Godwin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2477. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6293. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 210. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE RATIONING PROGRAM AND CONGRESSMEN

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there have been some pretty caustic things said on this floor today about the press and some recent publicity given Congress and Congressmen. It is well that we remember that "no pancake is so flat but that it has two sides."

Condemnation of the free press of this country, and this city in particular, seems to be the sentiment felt by many in this body, but I am deeply grateful that the press in our country dares to speak up even though the criticism should be directed at me. How would the people at home know how we behave in Washington if the press were not completely free to "pan or praise" as it sees fit. Personally, I like people and institutions who "call 'em as they see 'em," and just because the decision affects me does not change my appreciation of fairness.

Through the press the people of the country spoke to Congress and set it right on the "pensions for Congressmen" matter, and this body had to admit that it was wrong and the people were right, or at least a repeal vote of 389 to 7 would seem to indicate that it made such an admission.

Now we have the problem of gasoline rationing and what the press has said about unlimited cards being granted to Members of Congress. Personally, I consider it a privilege to cooperate in this rationing order, and by cooperation I mean cooperation on the same scale as when I tried to do my bit in the rubber shortage situation; I took my car home, stored it, and there it sits on blocks, and the Government can commandeer it as it sees fit if it will help win this war.

Some of you have said that you needed your cars and unlimited gasoline supplies for your work, I am afraid that is an excuse which is hardly a credit to men in our positions. Even school children grow expert at alibis, but men, especially leaders in a country at war, should never offer them as reasons.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down, for he is, as a matter of fact, charging Congressmen with lack of sincerity and good faith.

Mr. WILSON. Very well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANASCO). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Monday, May 18, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. to begin hearings on H. R. 6999, a bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable

barge canal across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the intracoastal waterway, and by deepening the intracoastal waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1635. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting reports of contracts entered into or modified under authority of public law cumulative through the period ending March 31, 1942; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1636. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2122. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2123. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TOLAN: Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration. Report pursuant to House Resolution 113. Resolution for the continuation of the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLAHERTY: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 2127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7007. A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs: H. R. 7036. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 2132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 313) to create a joint committee to study the pay of the commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

Resolution (H. Res. 482) establishing a select committee to conduct a study of the utilization of personnel in the executive branch of the Government in relation to the carrying on of the war effort; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their concurrent resolution dated April 19, 1942, relative to raw materials for civil purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WELCHEL introduced a bill (H. R. 7087) for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2801. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the United Polish Societies, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., pledging loyalty to the President of the United States and rededicating its members to the cause of freedom and human rights; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2802. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition relative to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2803. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. George K. Davies, pastor, and 64 members of the Woodlawn Presbyterian Church, Aliquippa, Pa., urging the passage at an early date of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2804. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of J. W. Ditterline and sundry other citizens of Equality, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2805. Also, petition of Hulda Bosley and 63 other residents of Carmi, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2806. Also, petition presented by Ottie Kison and signed by 64 residents of Galatia, Ill., and surrounding communities, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2807. By Mr. JACOBSEN: Petition of the City Council of the City of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on April 20, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2808. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. Ira E. Nicklin and 70 others of the Zion Methodist Church of Robinson, Kans., appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and liquors, and especially asking the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2809. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of William A. Loeffler, clerk of session, First Westminster Presbyterian Church of Keokuk, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, regarding the moral conditions surrounding the training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2810. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of California State Council of Defense, San Francisco Bay Region, Metropolitan Defense Council, asking the Federal Government authorities at the earliest possible moment to provide additional fire apparatus and such other necessary equipment as will properly and adequately protect the port and water front of San Francisco against increased fire hazards due to said port and water front being now used and occupied by Federal, military, and naval authorities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2811. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the Michigan Federation of Labor, favoring a national system of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2812. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of C. H. Bowers, of Ontario, Ohio, and others, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a protection to the men of the United States Army and Navy against the insidious influences of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1942

The Reverend Dr. Howard Hyde Russell, Congregational clergyman of the Central Ohio Association of Congregational Churches, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou who dost bestow Thy love and care upon all Thy children, we come to Thee this morning asking for Thy blessing upon all the people of our Nation. May they "love it, obey its laws, respect its flag, and defend it against all enemies."

Bless our beloved President; inspire our fearless Congress; continue to nerve our soldiers and sailors and all the forces of our Allied Nations, until our united efforts shall be crowned with victory. Then inspire us with vision and strength to effect a lasting peace. In the name of Him who came to bring peace on earth, Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 12, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. HARE, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, and Mr. STEFAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 210. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders; and

H. R. 6293. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO (H. DOC. NO. 722)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico.

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the recommendation of the Secretary of State in which I concur.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1942.*

[Enclosure: Report.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 cumulative through the period ended March 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON THE RED-CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, submitting, in response to Senate Resolution 79, Seventy-seventh Congress, its report on an investigation with respect to "the effect upon the red-cedar shingle industry in the United States of importations of red-cedar shingles from Canada" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Justice, Navy, and Interior (4), and the War Production Board, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Jay O. Ferch, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution to request the War Department and the War Production Board and other competent authorities to favor Puerto Rican industry in orders for supplies that can be produced locally for the armed forces

"Whereas due to the scarcity of various raw materials the War Production Board has established control in the production and distribution of said raw materials, so that the same may be used in the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces;

"Whereas numerous industries established in the continental United States, although they have suspended production for civil uses, due to the scarcity of some raw materials, continue nevertheless to operate, manufacturing supplies for the armed forces;

"Whereas Puerto Rican industries to which the privilege of priority in the importation of raw materials has not been granted, will necessarily have to close their doors at a near date, numerous workmen being left without work; and

"Whereas such Puerto Rican industries could subsist and continue to operate, although in a limited form, during the present emergency if they were given an opportunity to manufacture some of the supplies used by the armed forces in Puerto Rico, the greater part of which supplies are now purchased by the War Department from the industries established in the continental United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring):

"First. To request the War Department and the War Production Board, for the purpose of preventing a total collapse of a great number of Puerto Rican industries which cannot import raw materials for civil purposes, as said raw materials are frozen for the use of the armed forces, to order from Puerto Rican industries a part of such supplies as the military authorities in Puerto Rico may need and which can be manufactured in Puerto Rico.

"Second. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of War, to the Chairman of the War Production Board, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United

States, to the Chief of the Division of Territories and Insular Possessions, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Resident Commissioner in Washington, and to the Governor of Puerto Rico."

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the enactment of legislation to increase the Federal taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of La Harpe and Oil Hill, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a petition signed by a large number of members of the First Christian Church of Ottawa, Kans., urging the Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary in order to protect our men in military training from the menace of liquor, prostitution, and gambling. I am wholeheartedly in favor of such constructive legislation and hope favorable action will be taken at an early date.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

MAY 1, 1942.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens, members of the First Christian (Disciples of Christ) Church, Ottawa, Kans., respectfully appeal to you as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and to the Members of Congress, to take whatever steps are necessary to protect our men in uniform from the menace of liquor, prostitution, and gambling. We are greatly disturbed by the multiplied reports, as to the immoral conditions surrounding our men in camp. The church has made a great investment in her men, and she feels that the Government should protect them, while serving it.

(Signed by Rev. David H. Shields and members of the First Christian Church of Ottawa, Kans.)

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, this petition was accompanied by a brief statement by Rev. David H. Shields, pastor of the First Christian Church, of Ottawa, Kans., which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is a growing demand, all over the country, that our Government furnish as much protection, at least, to our men in uniform, as it did during the last war. It seems reasonable that the parents of these men should demand a "safety zone" around the camps and war industries, from which liquor, prostitution, and gambling should be excluded.

DAVID H. SHIELDS,
First Christian Church, Ottawa, Kans.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. BANKHEAD presented a resolution adopted by the congregation of the First Methodist Church of Anniston, Ala., at a union service on April 19, 1942, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: The congregation assembled at the union service at the First Methodist Church, Anniston, Ala., on April 19, 1942, requested the undersigned to write to you, informing you of the action taken by the congregation.

The congregation, composed of members of various churches in Anniston, voted to petition the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 860, or protective legislation for our armed forces from the liquor and vice traffic similar to that adopted in 1917.

The congregation requested that you report this action on the floor of the Senate and have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

W. G. Henry, pastor, First Methodist Church, Anniston, Ala.; S. O. Kimbrough, district superintendent, Anniston district; Melton Clark, pastor, Presbyterian Church; Festus N. Wolfe, pastor, Church of Disciples of Christ; J. F. T. Brown, pastor, McCoy Methodist Church; C. L. Cash, secretary, Pastors Union, Anniston, Ala.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present for noting in the RECORD and appropriate reference numerous petitions from 4,362 citizens of the United States, praying for the prompt and favorable consideration of Senate bill 860, in relation to the liquor traffic in the vicinity of military camps, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Texas will be noted and lie on the table.

The petitions presented by Mr. O'DANIEL are as follows:

	Number of signers
Alabama: Birmingham	273
California: Los Angeles	16
Iowa:	
Clarinda	11
Green Mountain	68
Illinois: Salem	235
New York:	
Buffalo	60
Chadwicks	2,256
Honeoye Falls	11
Johnsonburg	38
Newburgh	248
Owego	41
Ransomville	26
Rochester	43
South Otselic	19
Syracuse	23
Watervliet	17
Wellsville	7
Tennessee: Maryville	365
Washington:	
Acme	44
Bellingham	50
Blaine	51
Longview	7
Seattle	182
Snohomish	128
Sumner	132
Miscellaneous	11
Total	4,362

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY—LETTER FROM POLISH AMBASSADOR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the Constitution Day of Poland the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] prepared a statement of greetings and felicitations addressed to the Polish people. The Senator from New Jersey had the statement translated into several languages, and sent it to the people of Poland. The statement was transcribed on two records.

In appreciation of the act of those two Senators and their tribute to Poland's contribution to liberty, the Ambassador of Poland wrote a very complimentary note, which the Secretary of State has sent to the Secretary of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 13, 1942.

Secretary, United States Senate:

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Secretary of the United States Senate and encloses a copy of a note dated May 6, 1942, from the Ambassador of Poland expressing appreciation of the many messages of support which were addressed to Poland and the people of Poland on May 3, Poland's Constitution Day.

[Enclosure from Polish Ambassador, May 6, 1942.]

MAY 6, 1942.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

SIR: I have the honor to convey on behalf of the Polish Government as well as in my own, deep gratitude and highest appreciation for the numerous expressions of friendship and support addressed to Poland and the Polish people in the course of the last few days on the occasion of May 3, Poland's Constitution Day. These powerful manifestations of American friendship on the part of the United States administration, of Members of the United States Congress, of State and local authorities, and of the American press and radio, will greatly encourage the Polish people. They will regard them as new and valuable proofs of American friendship and support extended to them at a time when they are straining all their efforts, in the face of brutal oppression and tyranny, to carry on the fight as one of the United Nations in defense of the highest principles of humanity.

I have the honor to request you kindly to convey my thanks to the Government departments, the military and civilian authorities, and the Congress of the United States.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

J. CIECHANOWSKI.

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 12th instant,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it on May 13, 1942, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1323) thereon.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of the Committee on Claims were submitted:

By Mr. ROSIER:

S. 2420. A bill for the relief of Isabelle Fuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1324);

H. R. 4941. A bill for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1327);

H. R. 6033. A bill for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1328);

H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325); and

H. R. 6748. A bill for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326).

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of G. C. Barco; with amendments (Rept. No. 1334);

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita M. Lary; without amendment (Rept. No. 1329);

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Jones; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1332);

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of George P. Crawford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330);

H. R. 2646. A bill for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1333); and

H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of L. H. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331).

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2432. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1335);

H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Walter P. Williams, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337);

H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338);

H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339); and

H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of E. A. Williams; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1336).

By Mr. TUNNELL:

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340);

H. R. 4953. A bill for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta; with amendments (Rept. No. 1341); and

H. R. 6557. A bill for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore; with amendments (Rept. No. 1342).

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2165. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lila A. Wemp; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343);

S. 2470. A bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344); and

H. R. 6797. A bill for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

APPOINTMENT OF JAMES W. MURPHY AND JOHN D. RHODES AS OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the Committee on Printing I report a resolution from that committee and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 249) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That James W. Murphy and John D. Rhodes are hereby appointed Official Reporters for reporting the proceedings and debates of the Senate until further order of the Senate, subject to all the duties and obligations of the contract made with D. F. Murphy, deceased, late reporter of the Senate, and to the supervision and control of the Committee on Printing on behalf of the Senate in all respects therein provided, and to receive payment for such services according to law: *Provided*, That said James W. Murphy and said John D. Rhodes be paid for services rendered in reporting the proceedings and debates of the Senate at the rate allowable by law for such services from May 6, 1942, to the date upon which this resolution is agreed to by the Senate, both dates inclusive: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of either said James W. Murphy or said John D. Rhodes during any recess or adjourned period of the Senate, the survivor shall discharge all the duties and obligations imposed upon the Official Reporters appointed by this resolution, and said survivor shall receive payment for such services according to law until the further order of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE, as in executive session, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the following nominations:

Senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

John D. Reichard, May 12, 1942.
Vance B. Murray, July 26, 1942.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Winfield K. Sharp, Jr., June 27, 1942.
Fred T. Foard, June 27, 1942.
Ralph L. Lawrence, June 30, 1942.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2522. A bill to amend section 385 of the act of 1938, as amended, so as to facilitate farmers in the service of the United States receiving the benefits of the farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2523. A bill for the relief of John E. Creighton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2524. A bill to allow an additional period of six months in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, or their beneficiaries, may make claim for benefits under the act of July 18, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, it seems that some consideration ought to be given by the Congress to the question of enabling the men in the Army and the Navy to vote in the coming congressional elections. So I introduce a bill bearing on that subject for reference to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from West Virginia will be received and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. ROSIER:

S. 2525. A bill to regulate and permit the voting of soldiers and sailors in the military service of the United States of America, serving within continental United States of America; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2526. A bill to amend Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bill 2527, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. BARKLEY. On behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is absent because of death in his family, I present a bill to provide for the settlement of the claims by the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. CONNALLY):

S. 2528. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution providing an authorization for an appropriation of an additional million dollars for the fiscal year 1943 for the purpose of carrying out the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 2, 1920, as amended. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize an additional appropriation of $1,000,000, for the fiscal year 1943, for the purpose of carrying out the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 2, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

WOMAN'S AUXILIARY NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, recently the House of Representatives passed a bill, H. R. 6807, entitled "A bill to establish a Woman's Auxiliary in the Naval Reserve," and a similar bill, S. 2388, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate.

The committee was informed that these bills were not introduced at the request of the Navy Department. Thereafter the Committee on Naval Affairs communicated with the Navy Department

making some suggestions for changes in these bills, and asked the Navy Department to consider the same and to make recommendations to the committee as to just what form of legislation was desired with reference to the establishment of a Woman's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy.

On May 11, 1942, the Bureau of Navigation sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs setting forth its views and recommendations.

I now introduce the bill proposed by the Navy Department and ask unanimous consent that the bill and the letter of the Bureau of Navigation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2527) to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding after section 401 thereof an additional title as follows:

"TITLE V. WOMEN'S AUXILIARY RESERVE

"SEC. 501. A Women's Auxiliary Reserve is hereby established which shall be a branch of the Naval Reserve and shall be administered under the same provisions in all respects (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Auxiliary Reserve, or as specifically provided herein) as those contained in this act or which may hereafter be enacted with respect to the Volunteer Reserve. Appointments and enlistments in the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall be made only in time of war and for periods to expire not later than 6 months after the termination of war.

"SEC. 502. Members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, corresponding to those of the regular Navy, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That there shall not be more than 1 officer in the grade of lieutenant commander, nor more than 35 officers in the grade of lieutenant, and that the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall not exceed 35 percent of the total number of commissioned officers: *And provided further*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this act may be exercised over women of the Auxiliary Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve.

"SEC. 503. The Reserve established by this title shall be composed of members who have attained the age of 20 years.

"SEC. 504. Members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty only and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft.

"SEC. 505. Members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall not be used to replace civil service personnel employed in the naval establishment, but shall be composed of women trained and qualified for duty in the shore establishment of the Navy to release male officers and enlisted men of the naval service for duty at sea.

"SEC. 506. The benefits provided by section 4 of the act approved August 27, 1940 (Public, No. 775, 76th Cong.), and by the act approved March 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 16, 77th Cong.), shall not be applicable to members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve who suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease or injury while employed on active duty: *Provided*, That if any member of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve suffers disability or death from disease or injury incurred in line of duty while employed on active duty, she or her beneficiaries shall be entitled to all the benefits prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States who are physically injured or who die as a result thereof.

"SEC. 507. The Secretary of the Navy shall fix the money value of the articles of uniform and equipment which members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve are required to have upon their first reporting for active duty: *Provided*, That he may authorize such articles of uniform and equipment, or parts thereof, to be issued in kind, or, in lieu thereof, that payment in cash of the money value fixed in accordance with the foregoing, not to exceed $200, be made to members so ordered to active duty, for the purchase of such articles of uniform and equipment."

The letter presented by Mr. WALSH in connection with Senate bill 2527 is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1942.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am pleased to have your views, and those of the members of your committee, expressed in your letter of April 30, 1942, regarding the establishment of a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy. These views have received careful consideration and study.

As the Chief of the Personnel Bureau of the Navy Department I am charged with supplying trained personnel to man the fleet and personnel to man the shore establishment to support this fleet. In carrying out my duties it is imperative that I plan sufficiently in advance to insure the availability of adequate trained personnel to man this establishment effectively.

In this total war effort it is inevitable that manpower must be conserved for use in the most effective manner to promote this effort.

The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, months before the declaration of war, issued instructions to all shore activities to employ civil-service personnel wherever practicable in positions then being filled by enlisted personnel. This has been done, but there are still many billets which must be filled by service personnel.

A survey of personnel assignments indicates that many officers and enlisted men are now serving on shore in billets requiring young, active individuals. Their service can be used at sea. It is considered necessary that they be members of the Naval Reserve because of—

1. The nature of their duties;
2. The necessity for their being available at any time or place;
3. Discipline; and
4. Permanency of personnel.

Civil-service personnel do not meet these particular requirements. They may resign at any time and are not subject to transfer to stations where their services may be required.

I have been aware of many of the objections mentioned in your letter, such as the numbers in the various ranks, and the combatant status of such women. It was planned to cover these objections in the regulations for administering the bill.

To meet most of your objections, I have prepared a substitute measure which includes, in the form of legislation, many of the regulations which it was contemplated to issue in administering this Reserve and which are satisfactory to the Bureau. A copy of the proposed substitute is submitted for consideration.

An analysis of the proposed substitute is presented:

(a) Section 501 authorizes the establishment of a new branch of the Naval Reserve, to be known as the Women's Auxiliary Reserve. Except as hereafter provided, this Reserve is to be administered under the same conditions as are now applicable to the Volunteer Reserve. Appointments and enlistments may be made only in time of war; no later than 6 months after the termination of war, personnel so appointed or enlisted are to be discharged.

(b) Section 502 provides for the commissioning or enlistment of women in ranks or rates corresponding to those of the Regular Navy. The highest rank is to be that of lieutenant commander, with only one such appointment authorized. No more than 35 members may serve in the grade of lieutenant. Of the total number of officers appointed, no more than 35 percent may serve in the rank of lieutenant (junior grade). It is further provided that the military authority of officers appointed under this act will be exercised only over women of the Auxiliary Reserve and is limited to the administration of this branch of the Reserve.

(c) Section 503 provides a minimum age of 20 years for members appointed in this Reserve.

(d) Section 504 restricts the performance of duty of women of the Reserve to shore duty only and specifically prohibits assignment on board ships of the Navy or in combat aircraft.

(e) Section 505 provides that members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve may not replace civil-service personnel employed in the Naval Establishment, and that they may be used only to replace males of the Reserve on shore duty.

(f) By the provisions of section 506, members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve who suffer disability or death in line of duty will receive the same benefits prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States. This section specifically makes inapplicable the provisions of the present law governing the Naval Reserve wherein male members receive retirement and other benefits the same as personnel of the Regular Navy.

(g) Section 507 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to establish the articles of uniform and equipment which members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve are required to have. Such articles may be provided in kind or cash in lieu thereof. The money value of the full outfit of uniform and equipment is estimated to be about $200.

I shall be pleased to discuss further any of the features of the Bureau's new proposal with you at your convenience if you should so desire.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Bureau.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6071) to grant a preference

right to certain oil and gas lessees, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 80, after line 25, to insert the following:

"Reimbursement of participants in cotton producers' pool: Not to exceed $682,344 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for the purpose of enabling such Corporation to pay, and such Corporation is authorized and directed to pay pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, to any holder of record, as of May 1, 1937, of a participation trust certificate (Agricultural Adjustment Administration Form C-5-I) of the 1933 cotton producers' pool a sum equal to $2.40 per bale for each bale which such certificate evidenced that such holder held in such pool. Payments made under the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed to be in full and complete satisfaction of the claims of the payees against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts charged to them as carrying charges on the cotton which they held in such pool."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 7, line 18, after the word "Solicitor", to insert the following: "including salary of the Solicitor at $9,200 per annum, and".

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 77, line 2, after the word "payments", to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1942 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION AS TO PROGRESS IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE ALASKAN HIGHWAY

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 246), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the progress being made in constructing the so-called Alaskan Highway and the measures which are being taken and which are necessary to expedite the construction of such highway. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 247), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs hereby is authorized to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of $3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, a copy of which I have left at the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 248), as follows:

Whereas wartime difficulties in transporting petroleum products to the Atlantic States have become so acute as to necessitate the rationing of gasoline; and

Whereas the only sound and just basis for such rationing of gasoline is that of need; and

Whereas the granting of special privileges or exemptions to Government officials with respect to the use of gasoline which relieve them from the restrictions applying to the people as a whole is a violation of democratic principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, Mr. President; there is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thought I still had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin insist on the point of no quorum?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I insist on the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Rosier
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Herring	Schwartz
Bone	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lee	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman Committee.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the resolution which I have offered was read just prior to the quorum call. The resolution merely states as the policy of the Members of the Senate of the United States that they will consider themselves in honor bound to use such gasoline as they may receive under their cards only for essential purposes. I wish to declare that the resolution is not an implied criticism of any Member of the Senate, it is not a discussion of who is or who is not entitled to an X card; it is the declaration of this body that in the receipt of our gasoline we will consider ourselves subject to the same standards which apply to the other people of this Nation.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill proposing to give to the President of the United States the discretionary power to commandeer automobiles and parts thereof. I introduced the bill because I know this Nation is approaching a desperate condition in respect to gasoline and rubber.

All tankers have now been taken off the Atlantic coastal route; the seriousness of this action is revealed by the fact that 95 percent of our eastern petroleum products used to come in by those tankers. The reserves of our petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard consequently are steadily falling. What 90 days or 6 months may bring to this Nation no one can say. Unless we act with unselfishness and energy to conserve the gasoline, rubber, and cars we have and can secure, we will find ourselves passing into a crisis from which we may not easily recover.

Here on the Atlantic seaboard from today forward millions of our citizens face the loss of their businesses and their means of livelihood. The daily life of every family in this great segment of the United States will be altered and disturbed in large or small degree by this rationing of gasoline.

I assume that under these trying war conditions every Senator of the United States will wish to declare to the people of the Nation that the same regulations which will be applied to them will be applied to us, and that the same sacrifices made by them will be made by us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not happen to be the holder of an X card, but I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that any Member of the Senate who is the holder of an X card has signed a statement that he will not use his card for anything except official purposes. I also wish to inquire whether the Senator thinks his colleagues who have thus given their word over their signatures are untrustworthy and need to be rededicated to the objective which he correctly describes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Replying to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I answer unequivocally, "No"; I do not consider my colleagues untrustworthy or that there is a necessity of rededication; but I do say to the Members of this distinguished body that we should here officially declare to the people of this Nation what our own policy is. We should let the newspapers of America carry, under the same banner headlines in which they have carried the stories of the X cards, our solemn official declaration of policy.

Mr. President, I say that if the people of the United States should even suspect that we here in Washington were exercising special privileges not granted the people as a whole, we could never enforce any rationing program. I can imagine no way of so rapidly breaking down the morale of the American people as by leading them to believe that we are enjoying in this matter of gas rationing rights denied to them.

I am willing to assume that what the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has said is entirely true, that not one single Senator will consider using his card except to secure gasoline for essential purposes. So I am merely stating my own humble opinion that, for the confidence of the American people in the Senate, for our national morale and well-being, it would be a wise policy for this body to declare officially to the people of the United States that we do intend to abide by the common rule—the rule of need—in the rationing of gasoline.

Mr. President, it is my desire to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I wish to express a few views which I entertain with reference to not only the proposed resolution, but the tea-pot explosion which brings it forth.

I am not one of those Senators who feel that it is necessary for the Senate to pass a resolution binding the membership to be honorable men. If I thought it were necessary to pass a resolution to make us honorable, I would not want to be a Member of this body. I have not yet registered; I shall register before the day is over, and I do not know what sort of a card I shall take, but I shall take whatever I am entitled to, without any apologies to anyone, in Washington or outside Washington.

Every time something is done that even recognizes Members of Congress as officials of the Government, some one throws a fit. I remember when it became necessary, a few years ago, because of the crowded conditions on the streets in Washington, for Members of Congress to park their cars in front of Government buildings in order that they might go into them and transact business, for which they are paid, and which it is their duty to transact.

Congress passed a law giving to every owner of a car which has a congressional tag upon it the right to park that car in front of a public building if the owner is there on official business. I have here a card which I think contains the language of the law giving Members of Congress the right to park their cars in front of the Treasury and State Department Buildings and other public buildings. At the time those cards were issued certain persons raised cain about it. They said that Members of Congress were enjoying a privilege which no one else enjoyed; that is, the right to park in front of public buildings their cars which they drove there on official business. Of course, when that law was passed, the newspapers in the District of Columbia proceeded at once to denounce Members of Congress because they were enjoying a special privilege which no one else in the District of Columbia enjoyed—the right to park a car in front of a public building. I have very rarely exercised that right, but I have done so on a few occasions, and I make no apology for that either.

Mr. President, we are supposed to be busy men here, and I know that we are busy men here, regardless of opinions to the contrary expressed by some persons who do not follow us in our work day by day or week by week. We might waive the right to park our automobiles with congressional tags on them in front of a public building. We might go down into Potomac Park and park our automobiles and walk to the public buildings in order to transact public business. I presume there are some persons in the District of Columbia who think that is what we ought to do. When we were accorded that privilege we were denounced here in the District of Columbia, and some photographs were taken of automobiles with congressional tags upon them, parked in front of the Treasury Department, or the State Department, or the District Building, in order to try to create the impression that we were enjoying a right which no one else enjoyed, and that we were not entitled to enjoy it, notwithstanding we were at those buildings on official business.

Mr. President, I think I have as much right to park my car in front of the Treasury of the United States as the Secretary of the Treasury has to park his car in front of the Capitol, or as much right to park in front of other departmental buildings as the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or one of the undersecretaries, or first, second, third, fourth, or fifth assistant secretaries have to park their cars in front of the Capitol.

Simply because I do so park my car does not mean that I am enjoying a privilege which any other official may not enjoy. But the same hullabaloo was raised about that which is now being raised about the classification of a United States Senator or a Representative as a Federal official.

What are we if we are not Federal officials? Are we State officers? We did not classify ourselves. We passed a law providing for price regulation and rationing, but we did not put ourselves in any class. We did not exempt ourselves in the law, but in the regulations which were issued by the Price Administrator, he specified certain persons who were entitled to what he called X cards. Until I saw all this publicity in the newspapers, I did not know there was an X card. I did not know the difference between an X card and a Y card or an A or B card. The Price Administrator, however, made a classification, which is contained in a statement issued yesterday I believe by the Price Administrator, after one of the local newspapers all the way across the front page in a headline announced that Congressmen had been denied their X cards, and they had been taken away from them, which is not true. This is a statement which the Price Administrator issued yesterday:

Section 1394.32 of the Emergency Gasoline Rationing Regulations authorizes the issuance of a class X card if all or substantially all of the use of the vehicle in question is certified by the applicant to be for the official business of a Federal, State, local, or foreign government or government agency.

I suppose we come under the classification of Federal. The statement however goes on to say that any State organization or State official may also get a class X card. Not only the governor, but the lieutenant governor, and all State officers and all State employees who are using their cars on official business can get X cards.

Mr. President, is there anything more important than transacting the business of the people? Perhaps there is something more important than that. On the first day of registration, day before yesterday, 6,000 persons were given X cards in the District of Columbia. About 200 of them happened to be Members of Congress, and they were the only members of the 6,000 group who received any publicity. They were denounced; 5,800 others who received X cards came in for no denunciation, for no criticism. Not only the governor and all State officers can get X cards, but the mayor of every town, and city commissioners, and all other city officers who travel on official business, can receive X cards, and representatives of foreign governments or foreign agencies are also entitled to X cards.

Mr. President, I do not know what the experience of other Senators is, but I think that even if we were not honorable men, and must agree to resolutions declaring ourselves to be honorable, the very physical facts make it impossible for any of us to go on a gasoline spree under an X card. It takes 2 gallons of gasoline a day for me to travel from my house to my office and back. If I call at a Government department, as I frequently do, it takes more gallons. I am only giving my own case, because I know it better than that of anyone else but I imagine every other Senator finds himself in a similar situation. What good would a 3-gallon a week card do me? If I were limited to such an amount of gasoline I would have to park my automobile for the duration of the war and ride in taxicabs, but I would not save any gasoline by so doing, because it takes as much gasoline for a taxicab to convey me from my house in Washington to my office and back again as would be consumed in using my own car for that purpose. And if I should be obliged to go to the White House, or to the War Department, or the Navy Department, or the R. F. C., or any other Government department or agency, and I did not have any gasoline in my car, and took a taxicab, it would require as much gasoline to take me there and back as it would if I were driving my own car.

Mr. President, I drive my own car. I have no chauffeur. I never have had one in my life. I cannot afford one, and the Government does not give me one, and I would not have one if it did. I drive my own car and I enjoy driving it. I park it myself. Last night I was on my way to my office to transact some public business, and I found my gasoline tank empty. I drove into a gasoline station to buy some gas, and those in charge there would not let me have any. I then drove to another gasoline station, and the attendant there would not let me have any. I finally turned back and drove home and parked my car for the night, and this morning I went to a gasoline station where I could obtain only 2 gallons, and that amount of gasoline took me to my office and will carry me home tonight.

Mr. President, we are denounced as a lot of unworthy men, men who cannot be believed; who cannot be trusted even to administer the gas card honestly. That is because some newspaper in Washington started another campaign to undermine the faith at least of the people in the District of Columbia, if not in our States, in the Congress of the United States. That is going on all the time. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to be cowed by it. I do not propose to be intimidated by it. I do not propose to apologize to anyone in Washington or elsewhere if I this afternoon take an X card and sign my name on the pledge not to misuse it. If I have to be "resoluted" into honesty here I do not want to stay here any longer, and I do not think any of us ought to. Our constituents ought to send some honest men here if we cannot be trusted to buy only the gasoline we need in the performance of our duties to the people who sent us here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator think that if it is necessary for Congress to agree to a resolution pledging its Members to adhere to the understanding by which we obtained these cards, we also ought to include in the resolution a pledge by the Members of the Senate not to go out and hold up a train, or rob a bank, or commit any other offenses against public laws or public decency?

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be more reason for doing the latter, because the commission of such offenses is a violation of the law, and if any such thing were necessary we ought to obligate ourselves every day not to violate the law. What we have now before us, however, is a proposal to make us honest by a resolution with respect to a regulation governing the use of gas in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. President, I have not had my car outside the District of Columbia since the 7th day of December, when I drove it back into Washington from my home in Kentucky. I have not had it beyond the boundaries of the District of Columbia in 5 months or more, and yet I use on the average of from 14 to 25 gallons of gasoline in the week riding around to the departments in Washington in the performance of my duty and in coming to and from my home to my office in the Senate Office Building.

I suppose it might be said that it is not the duty of Members of the Senate to go to the departments. There are some persons in this country who do not think Senators ought to go to the departments. A bill was introduced not long ago whose provisions would make it a felony not only for a Member of the Senate to go to a department but to call up one on the telephone to have some service performed for his constituents. Theoretically, it may be that Members of the Senate have no business except to legislate. But, Mr. President, the people in our States as a rule do not know anyone in Washington but their Senators and their Representatives, and the Government of the United States now of necessity is coming in closer contact with them in the transaction of their business and in their lives than ever before. Most of these people do not know to whom to write except to us. Of course, it does not do much good, because there is a feeling abroad in the

District of Columbia that if a Senator undertakes even to call up an executive officer and make a suggestion or a request, he is undertaking to handle the business of the executive department.

I have often advised my constituents—by and large I think it may be true—that the effort of a Senator or Representative to aid his constituents frequently does more harm than good. It is difficult to convince our constituents of that; and we must go ahead and make the effort. They do not know anybody in Washington except their Senators or Representatives. They have no lobby. They cannot hire lawyers to come here.

When one of my constituents writes me a letter calling attention to priorities or any other subject which may be under consideration by any of the executive departments, I not only take it to be my duty to render such assistance as I can but I find pleasure in doing so. Frequently I can do it over the telephone; but often I have to go downtown. I go in my own car. I drive it and park it myself. If I should leave it over at the Senate Office Building or at home, and take a taxicab, would I be saving any gasoline? Would the Government be saving any gasoline? Would the people be saving any gasoline?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator think it would please the enemy to see Congress undermined by this process or any other process?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would please a great many of our enemies here at home.

Mr. McFARLAND. How about the enemies abroad?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not displease them. However, I am concerned at the moment with some of our enemies right here. In good time we shall attend to our foreign enemies.

I am not willing, by anything I say or do, or by any vote I cast as a Senator, to announce to the people of the United States that I am unworthy, or that any other Senator is unworthy of belief or credit, or that he cannot be trusted to conserve gasoline or anything else which it is necessary to conserve in order to win this war.

I am sorry that my good friend from California seems to think it is necessary to adopt a resolution of this sort in order that we may get headlines in the newspapers as big as the headlines of yesterday denouncing us. If the only business of the United States Senate is to compete in the size of "boxcar" letters in headlines, we ought to quit. In the first place, we cannot do it. We have no newspapers. I am willing to bet my head against a hole in a doughnut that what I am now saying will get no headlines in the newspapers. [Laughter.] I am not interested in headlines. I am not going to vote here because there have been headlines or because there have been no headlines. I shall vote here according to my conscience and according to what I believe to be the proprieties. I will not vote to denounce the United States Senate or the House of Representatives because their Members are classified as Federal officials, as more than 6,000 others have been classified, not by us, but by the agency which is administering the law.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In one respect I feel that the distinguished Senator has failed to comprehend certain language in the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall read it.

Mr. DOWNEY. The language of the resolution applies to all public officials—not the part, of course, in which the Senate pledges itself to be bound by the common rule but the statement that all public officials should be bound by the same rule as the rest of the Nation. Consequently, the resolution is a statement referring to millions of public officials. If the distinguished Senator has not the vision to foresee what gasoline rationing and rubber rationing will bring forth in 60 or 90 days, he will see it at the end of that time, when millions of public officials in villages, cities, counties, and States are turned loose with X cards entitling them to unlimited amounts of gasoline when their neighbors are held to a minimum amount, or to none at all.

I believe that the Senate could afford to set aside for one moment its dignity, and the question of whether or not its honor has been impugned, and put itself on record in a statement of policy to all other public officials and to the people of this Nation that we shall be bound by the rule of need, and will match the rest of the country, sacrifice for sacrifice, hardship for hardship. If that is calling upon the Senate for something which is dishonorable and self-contemptuous, I would regret what I am doing. But I cannot see it that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator. It may be that I do not have as much vision as I ought to have; but if I can see far enough ahead of me to visualize the time when it will be necessary for all those who are receiving X cards—and I am not speaking of Senators and Representatives, but taxicab drivers and everybody else—to be put on a stricter ration, or even required to walk, I shall join that caravan or parade with as much grace, resignation—and I hope dignity—as is possible under the circumstances.

However, the Senator's resolution has no effect on other public officials. It has not the effect of law on anybody. It is a declaration of policy. After some "whereases" the resolution states:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline-rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

Certainly that resolution has no application to anybody except Senators. It does not ask anybody except Senators to do anything. It asks us, as Senators, to declare it to be the sense of the Senate to waive any special rights. Are we enjoying any special rights, privileges, or exemptions?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will read the prior portion of the resolution, he will see a general statement of the opinion of the Senate that all officials should be judged by the one standard, that of need.

Mr. BARKLEY. The "whereases" have nothing to do with the resolving part. The "whereases" might talk about anything. Usually the "whereases" are a stump speech. It is the resolving clauses which carry the weight, if any.

Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senate. I am opposed to the resolution. If the Senate is to consider it, I shall vote against it. I wished to express a few of the views which I entertain with respect to this contemptuous and contemptible attitude and effort on the part of many persons to make it appear that Members of the Senate have to be watched, and chained like thieves in order that they will not waste gasoline under a card to which they may be entitled as officials, and prove unworthy of the great cause which has been entrusted to our keeping.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I hold in my hand a clipping from the final edition of last night's Evening Star. I read:

> Senator DOWNEY showed newspapermen a copy of the resolution he plans to introduce tomorrow. It stated that "need, and need alone" is the only just basis of rationing and that "the privileged exemption of Government officials from restrictions applying to the people is a violation of democratic principle."
>
> "Now, therefore," the resolution concluded, "be it understood as the sense of the Senate that the Members of this body shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, perquisites, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the common rule."

Does not the Senator from Kentucky realize, without pursuing this subject further, why this resolution was shown to newspaper men? Does the Senator from Kentucky think that the Senator from California merely met the newspapermen in the hall somewhere, whipped out this resolution, and said, "This is what I am going to do tomorrow"? Does the Senator suppose for 1 minute that we ought not properly to amend the resolution and declare that it is the sense of the Senate that we seriously and sincerely deprecate any effort, in a cheap demagogic political fashion, to capitalize at the expense of other Members of this body?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, I think probably we might as well take up the resolution and vote on it and get rid of it one way or the other. If the Senate wishes to adopt such a resolution, I should like to know it as soon as

possible. If it does not wish to adopt it, I think the country ought to know that for once in our history we are not to be driven into a brush pile merely because we hear some howling going on; that we are not to be driven under the porch because we fear to come out and meet our fate. I am willing to meet mine right now on the floor.

Let me say that if the resolution is taken up it will be subject to amendment. Any Senator may offer any amendment he desires in an effort to approach the stupidity of the original document.

Mr. DANAHER. Which, of course, is inane.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that on Wednesday last a very considerable number of us in the Senate were interested in the attempt to get gasoline and fuel oil into the 17 rationed States. We sought to open up the inland and coastal waterways to barge transportation so as to carry fuel oil and gasoline to the States which are so badly in need of them.

While we were pursuing that endeavor, and the Senate was adopting an amendment to try to get gasoline into those States, the Senator from California was not present. That is his business. He has a perfect right to be absent for any reason. No doubt he was absent on important public business; but we were here trying to get gasoline into those States.

Mr. BARKLEY I appreciate the Senator's contribution. He always contributes to every debate which he deigns to adorn with his remarks I am glad to have the benefit of his views, particularly at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. They substantially coincide with those of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Substantially; with the accent on "substantially."

Mr. President, I have no desire to consume further time——

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator. I am willing to vote now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

The Senator from Connecticut made some remarks about a Senator who gives out a press release concerning a bill or resolution which he intends to introduce in the Senate. It is my custom to do so. The Senator from Connecticut seems to think that such a course is prejudicial and an extraordinary violation of something. If the distinguished Senator from Kentucky desires to amend this resolution to declare that I am a demagogue in suggesting that the Senate should declare its policy, I invite him to do so and to submit his case to the people of his State and of the Nation. I believe I know something about what is going to happen to Connecticut people and Connecticut industry within the next 6 months. If the Senator is so affronted by the fact that I seek to increase the morale of the American people in this respect, I have no objection to his submitting to the Senate an amendment to the resolution. I shall be happy to have him do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had no thought of offering an amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I referred to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had no thought of offering an amendment declaring the Senator a demagogue. I had not thought of submitting such a resolution any more than I had thought of submitting one declaring that I am an honorable man. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might state to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that my remarks were not in reference to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said, "The Senator from Kentucky."

Mr. DOWNEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I meant the Senator from Connecticut. Taking the implication of his remarks as they now appear in the RECORD, I invite the distinguished Senator, if he desires to do so, to submit to the Senate the type of amendment which he has suggested, and see whether or not it will meet with the approval of the people of his State and of this Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, having expressed myself, I do not care to occupy the floor any longer. I shall not have any objection to a vote, if it can be had at once, on the resolution of the Senator. I hope we may vote on it today.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I intended in my remarks a while ago to read a statement issued by the Price Administrator. I ask that it appear at the end of my remarks, and I should like to read it now for the information of the Senate. It is as follows:

Section 1394.32 of the Emergency Gasoline Rationing Regulations authorizes the issuance of a class X card if all or substantially all of the use of the vehicle in question is certified by the applicant to be for the official business of a Federal, State, local, or foreign Government or Government agency.

A car is deemed used for official business to the extent that it is actually driven on Government business in carrying out the functions of the particular agency or office.

In my opinion the use of a private car by a Member of Congress or any other Federal or State employee in order to transact business with a Government agency is official business.

That is the Price Administrator speaking, and he has issued this statement in response to the attacks which were carried in the newspapers with respect to the use of these cards.

Use of a car by any Federal or State employee for driving to and from his work entitles such person to an appropriate A or B card, and if necessary he may file an application with his local board for a supplementary ration. Such use is not official business. But if a person is otherwise eligible for an X card he may use that card for gasoline necessary to get to and from work.

Persons who have received an X card under an erroneous or mistaken interpretation of the intent of the regulation may return the X card to any registration place and apply for a card of the proper class.

I am relying on the good faith and patriotism of those who hold X cards to see to it that the privilege is not abused for private use.

That is the statement issued by the Price Administrator. I ask that it be made a part of my remarks and appear at the end thereof before the Senator from Wisconsin began his statement. It is an interpretation of the regulation which is made and applies not only to us but to thousands of Federal, State, local, county, and city officers all over the United States.

I reiterate what I said and agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, that it would seem to be incredible that the United States should select itself for condemnation by exercising the right accorded to its members by an administrative agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has covered this subject very fully. I do not wish to speak at any length, but I do desire to take this opportunity to make a few observations in connection with what seems to me a deliberate campaign that is being carried on in certain sections of the press of this country to undermine the faith of the people in their elected representatives in the Congress of the United States. Of course, I do not charge that the Senator from California is a part of that campaign; but I have observed, Mr. President, not only on this occasion, but recently on the occasion when the Congress voted the privilege of entering the annuity system to Members of Congress, along with other officials, that a similar campaign was taken up and carried on all over the country.

I, of course, would be the first to rush to the defense of any person or any organization or any publication that desired to criticize any Member of Congress or any group of Members of Congress or the Congress itself for any position which might be taken on a public question. That is the essence of democracy. However, Mr. President, no one can study the type of articles which have been printed and the type of editorials which have been employed in connection with these attacks upon Congress and its membership without coming to the conclusion that they are calculated not to oppose the stand of Congress or of any individuals in Congress upon public questions, but rather to undermine the faith of the people in the integrity and the character of the men who occupy positions in this body, and the one at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. President, if you will study the trend of the decline of democracy in this recent period of time you will find that one of the first things which has been attempted in each one of the cases in which dictatorship has come into power has been the undermining of the faith of the people in the integrity and the responsibility and the statesmanship and the capacity of men who have represented them in legislative bodies.

I only want to utter a few words of warning to the press of the United States. I wish to warn the press that if their right to criticize Members of Congress, if their right to exercise the privileges, guaranteed by the Constitution, of full

and free expression of what they believe in and stand for, ever comes into question in this country, the only place in which it will find adequate defense will be in the halls of the legislative branch of the Government; for, inherently, there grows with executive power a desire to suppress criticism, even though it be legitimate. I speak, of course, impersonally; but I say that the Congress has already been forced by the circumstance of war to surrender to the Chief Executive of the United States powers which are not wielded by another individual on this earth.

I repeat, it has been necessary by the force of circumstance of total war that the legislative branch of government should divest itself of these powers. True, we have tried to safeguard them in most instances by providing that they shall exist only for the duration of the war; but let us not forget, Mr. President—and I hope I will not be misunderstood, but I say it just the same—that in the last analysis war is the enemy of democracy, for it requires a democratic government to yield the powers which are lodged in the representatives of the people—in Congress—and to vest them in the Executive in order that he may carry on war.

There is not a person who has studied the history of the United States who does not know that in each and every war in which we have been engaged there has been a necessity for greater and greater concentration of power in the hands of the Executive; and following each of the past wars in which we have been engaged the powers yielded have never been entirely retaken by the Congress. If there were to be drawn a chart showing the concentration of power in the hands of the Executive from the beginning of the history of this country down to now, there would be disclosed upon the chart a constantly rising curve, which would be found to rise abruptly at each period when the Nation engaged in war and to fail to recede entirely thereafter.

So I say, Mr. President, that in considering matters of this kind we are not concerned with ourselves as individuals, but we do represent, we do hold, however unworthily, the power delegated to us by the founding fathers as the present wielders of the legislative power of government. Unless we have the courage to resist, unless we have the courage to withstand these attacks which are made upon the legislative branch of the Government, I say that in the end the vision about which the Senator from California talked will demonstrate ultimately that we have been derelict in our duty and have contributed to the decline, if not to the fall, of republican government in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I resent this resolution on another score. I think it impugns the motives of every Member of the United States Senate. I assume, of of course, that the Senator from California did not so intend; but I say that one cannot read this resolution without coming to the conclusion that if it is adopted the Senate of the United States will have taken legislative action to declare that the individual Members of this body are not to be trusted as are the other 5,800 officials in the city of Washington to carry out the pledge to which they signed their names when these cards were issued.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, for whom I have high admiration and deep affection, that I think he does with gross unfairness interpret the meaning of that resolution. The effect of agreeing to the resolution would be to declare the policy of the Senate of the United States in this rationing of gasoline to be that we shall be bound by the same rules and sacrifices as those by which the rest of the Nation is bound. That is all that resolution would do. If that impugns the honor of the Senate, if that in any way strikes at democracy, I fail to see it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Was not the policy of the Senate of the United States and of Congress declared at the time each individual Senator took his oath of office?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I assume that to be true. I do not wish to do the Senator from California an injustice, and, at the risk of being repetitious, I shall read again the resolving clause of his resolution, which, after all, is the only important part of it, for usually "whereases" to a resolution are not even agreed to when the resolution is adopted:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

Mr. President, I cannot read this language and come to any other conclusion than that, if we adopt the resolution, we will have taken legislative action to declare that we, as a body, are not to be trusted to carry out the individual agreements which we made at the time we signed applications for ration cards.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the effect of it? If a Senator who has signed one of the X cards cannot be trusted with his original pledge, why should he be trusted when he "resolutes" that he meant what he said when he signed his card?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot answer that question; I find it impossible to answer it. The Senator's question is an argument for the resolution being voted down.

Mr. President, I should like to say a further word. I know the Members of this body, I think, pretty well. As a group of men, I am proud to be associated with them. The Senators from any given State will stand high compared to any two men in their State, selected from any group of bankers or manufacturers, any group of laboring men, any group of farmers or any group of people from any walk of life. I have said on previous occasions, and I now repeat, that it has been my observation that the Members of this body, as a group, are as hard a working body of men as I know of in the United States. I know they are patriotic, and I know that if the time comes when it is necessary to help the war effort even by one iota the Members of the Senate will be in the forefront of those who insist that they shall make personal sacrifices to that end. I do not question that every man in this body would be delighted to lay down his life at this hour if he thought his country could thereby attain a victory in this war.

Mr. President, when there are 5,700 other officials in this community who, by order of the man charged with the responsibility of administering this law are to receive these cards and are to be trusted to utilize them only for the transaction of essential business, I say that it would be a shame and a disgrace for the Senate of the United States to befoul its own nest by adopting such a resolution as has been proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The 5,800 applied only to the first day's registration. It did not include today's. We will not know finally the number of those who receive X cards until the registration has been completed. The number I gave awhile ago represented only the first day's registration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The number is sufficient to prove the point. I wish to say that, as the impact of the orders of the very gentleman who issued this regulation begin to strangle the normal activities of life all over the United States, it will become more and more important daily for Senators and Representatives to be in such a position that they can efficiently and quickly present the legitimate cases, the legitimate arguments which are to be made in behalf of their constituents.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the war may be a long one and that concentration of power will become more and more necessary, as will the need for sacrifice. I can think of no better guaranty for the survival of democracy and for the elimination of a voluntary dictatorship, which is necessary in war, than to have the legislative branch given all the means of communication and transportation which its members can be afforded, so that they may keep in constant touch with the people at election and other times and keep them informed.

We must not lose sight of the fact that there are numerous propaganda agencies set up as a part of this war effort which are continually flooding the electorate

with all kinds of information, and I think it would be a serious matter if the legislative branch, made up of only elected representatives, except for the President and the Vice President, were denied every facility to visit and talk to their people, to talk to them in Rotary Clubs and Lions Clubs and chambers of commerce and workingmen's organizations and farm organizations, in order to keep the light of democracy burning and continually to put the people on guard against giving up more than is necessary. Although we will quickly give up all that is necessary, we must recapture it instantly when the circumstances warrant its recapture. No greater evil, in my judgment, could befall this country than that the prerogatives of the legislative branch should be curtailed. That would make us like the Reichstag, like the Japanese Parliament, like Mussolini's rubber-stamp assembly in Italy. We want this representative Government to function and, even though it may be dormant as to many of its legislative rights, we want to be in a position to exercise them with full vigor whenever occasion and opportunity demand that they shall be so exercised.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, as I view it, the adoption of the pending resolution will be tantamount to the Senate admitting by legislative action that the word of its individual Members is not good.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that interpretation, and I think that would be the effect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, the point is that if our individual word is not good, our collective word is not good.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; because our collective word is spread out thinner than our individual word.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. When we sign a pledge to do a certain thing and then adopt a resolution saying we will do the same thing, the effect is to divide it by 96, whereas my signature is divided only by 1.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I agree wholeheartedly with everything the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Wisconsin have said. So far as the statement of Price Administrator Henderson, which we all received this morning, is concerned, it seems to me to be an unexceptionable declaration of policy, but I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in yesterday's morning newspapers some anonymous understrapper, who was afraid or ashamed to give his name but was designated as the official spokesman of the Office of Price Administration, stated that Senators were not performing official business when they visited departments and bureaus of the Government, that they were not engaged in official business when they went to the departments to talk about legislation or to talk about the interests of their constituents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall yield in a moment. Mr. Henderson does not repudiate that statement directly in his statement, as it seems to me he ought to do. It appears to me to be a very dangerous development in the history of this Government, Mr. President, if some anonymous whippersnapper in one of the Government bureaus or departments can define the official duties of the Congress of the United States. Every Member of this body, when he stood at the rostrum and took the oath of office, took an oath that he would well and faithfully perform the duties of the office upon which he was about to enter. I say that it is not the function of some underling in any Government bureau to undertake to define the duties and official business of the Congress of the United States, and such a thing should not be tolerated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely desired to ask the Senator from Missouri, as well as the Senator from Wisconsin, if the Senator from Missouri or I should go down to call upon this anonymous individual—I do not know whether he is a whippersnapper or not——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I judge he is, from his statement. I do not know who he is, but I judge from his statement that he is a whippersnapper.

Mr. BARKLEY. There may be other descriptions which might be even more appropriate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; which probably should not be used in debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. He is anonymous, at least so far as we know. Suppose the Senator from Missouri or I or any other Senator should go down to see him about some matter pertaining to his department, would he say that was official, or would he regard it as a personal, social call?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that if the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Wisconsin or I myself went down to talk to this whippersnapper, or understrapper, or whatever he may be, about the business of his office, we would pay for our own gasoline and use our own cars, and that would not, according to him, be official business. But if he should come to the Capitol to appear before a Senate committee, or to talk to the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Wisconsin or to me in the interest of an appropriation, or some legislative proposal which he wanted to slip into a bill, he would ride in an official car, the Government would pay for his gasoline, and that would be official business; and he probably would have a chauffeur paid by the Government. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to conclude with one final statement. I believe the people of this country are more dependent today upon the services of their Representatives in Congress, and their United States Senators, than at any other time in the history of the Republic. It is due to the fact that we are engaged in a total war, and total war affects the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country. The only people in Washington outside the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, and a few others in high official position, whom the people know, are their Representatives in the House of Representatives and the Members of the United States Senate. To whom are they to turn if they desire to have their cause properly presented, unless they turn to their Senators or to their Representatives?

Having recently been in Wisconsin, I do not hesitate to say that the people of this country are concerned with regard to the war as they never have been before. Let no Member of this body, or any other person, get the impression that the people of this country are complacent about the war. They are not. Their flesh and blood is involved in the war, and they bitterly resent any imputation from Washington, by officials or others, that they are not sufficiently concerned about the war.

Mr. President, the people are determined to win the war and they are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to that end, but they want more than ever that their Representatives in Congress should be in a position to discharge in an efficient manner their responsibilities as representatives of the people.

Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be voted down by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. GILLETTE. Before the Senator takes his seat, I wonder if he will yield to me momentarily in connection with the general picture he has been discussing, and the very clear statement of the picture as presented by the majority leader?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think it would be illuminating, in discussing the very apparent purpose to discredit the Congress of the United States in the minds of the people, and to destroy the confidence of the people in their governmental agencies, to direct attention to the current issue of Fortune magazine, in which appears an unsigned article entitled "The Case Against the Seventy-seventh Congress."

I take the time to quote just two statements from the article:

> Is there a statesman in the House—or Senate? Here are the facts. * * * It is true that for collective brains, guts, vision, and leadership the Seventy-seventh would stand pretty close to the bottom in any ranking of the seventy-seven Congresses that have assembled biennially since 1789. * * * It is true that, along with a number of able, patriotic, hard-working legislators, this Congress contains an overflowing measure of hacks, demagogues, and timeservers.

The same article proceeds to name some of the Members of Congress, casting aspersions on them, not only collectively but individually.

I wish to ask the Senator whether he can conceive of any greater disservice to this Nation, at a time when it needs

the support of every citizen, than destroying the confidence of the American people, or attempting to destroy it, in the agencies which are carrying on representative government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would defend with my last breath the right of the magazine quoted by the Senator or any other publication in the United States to classify me, as an individual, in any manner they saw fit, but when they attempt to classify Congress as a whole, and when they make statements that give the people the impression that Congress is not worthy of the confidence of the people of this country, they are helping to undermine democratic government, and they are playing into the hands of those who are opposed to democracy, both at home and abroad.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a further question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in full accord with what the Senator has said, and I should like to ask him whether he does not think it would be a good idea, and a valid exercise of his duty, for the Attorney General to ask a Federal grand jury to investigate newspapers, columnists, and others who are trying to destroy the confidence of the people in any branch of the Government, on the ground that it is seditious conduct, and should be brought to the attention of the court.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that is a question I should not wish to answer offhand. I am assuming, of course, that the Department of Justice will enforce the law and protect the Government against any activity aimed at it. On the other hand, I am so jealous of the essential prerogatives and rights and privileges which go with the democratic form of government that I would rather suffer all sorts of condemnation and calumny, so far as I am concerned as an individual, than to have the engine of the law utilized to suppress the right of free speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, or freedom of religion. Therefore, I say that the question is not one which I should care to answer offhand; but I feel that I am within my rights, and I am not in any way impinging upon those sacred privileges when I issue a solemn word of warning to those who are indulging in this campaign to destroy the faith of the people in Congress, that they are destroying, or helping to destroy the only branch of government which, in the last analysis, will go down fighting, if need be, for the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] for their remarks. I wish to say at the outset that I should be opposed to any effort such as that suggested by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the country cannot protect themselves, if we have to have the Department of Justice, or any other department of the executive branch of the Government, take care of us, then we are in a bad way.

I am opposed to the resolution of the Senator from California, and I shall vote against it. I believe in the Constitution of the United States. I believe in the laws of the country which are passed by the Congress of the United States, even those measures which have become law without my vote. If a law is once placed on the statute books, I believe in that law.

I have been elected to the Congress by the people of the State of New Mexico and not by newspapermen in the city of Washington or elsewhere, and my responsibility is only to the people of New Mexico. I took my oath of office, and I meant it, swearing that I would respect and obey the Constitution and that I would obey the laws of the country without any reservation whatsoever.

That is exactly my position in this body today. Under my oath as a Member of the Senate what I resolve has nothing whatsoever to do with the case. It is not possible to make a man honest by resolution. It is not possible to make a man an American by resolution, or to make a man patriotic by resolution. He either is patriotic or he is not patriotic. We take it for granted that when a Senator-elect walks up to the rostrum of the Senate and signs his name, after taking the oath of office, he knows what he is doing and means faithfully to fulfill his promise. What I promised when I took my oath is the only pledge I wish to give the people of this country.

The newspaper boys have their good times. After all, they have to make a living, and they write anything which they think may interest people, sometimes even those with perverted minds. But if they have reached the point, in writing about Congress, when what they write affects the dignity of the Congress and the faith of the American public in the Congress, in my opinion, and in my opinion only, I think it is possibly our fault, in that perhaps we do not take our oaths of office with sufficient seriousness and respect.

Many a time when we knew we were right in taking a certain position, some newspaper said, "Boo," and we took it for granted that the newspaper was representing the public. After all, the article which appears in a newspaper is written by an individual. There is a vast difference between public opinion and editorial or newspaper opinion. Any Senator can sit down with a typewriter before him and write his opinion on a subject. That is an individual opinion. The average reporter in the press gallery, trying to do the best he can, after listening to debate in the Senate sits down and with his typewriter writes out a story for his newspaper. Does that story represent even the opinion of the people of the city of Washington? No, Mr. President, it represents only the individual thoughts and ideas of the man who wrote the story after listening to the debate in the Senate. Such individual thoughts and ideas do not necessarily represent public opinion. Simply because an article appears in the Washington Post, or the Star, or the Times-Herald, or the News, does not mean that it represents the views of the people of the city of Washington. It represents, as I have said, the views of the individual newspaper boy in the Senate press gallery. He might have meant what he wrote, he might have written his article in good faith, but it does not necessarily represent public opinion.

Mr. President, during my public life I have had some experience with newspapers. During my last election campaign, which was a tough one, there were two country weeklies on my side. I venture to say that one of those weeklies did not have more than 250 subscribers, and the other one possibly 400 subscribers. The so-called press, with its great prestige, one representative thereof being a newspaper which could afford a 50,000-kilocycle radio station, was against me. But I was elected. That is why I venture to say that the press does not represent public opinion, because public opinion is the collective opinion of the people as a whole.

Mr. President, who write the editorials for the New York Times, or for the New York Herald Tribune, or for the local newspapers? Individuals write the editorials. The writer of an editorial has certain ideas, and, God bless him, under our laws, he may express his ideas freely. Whether he condemns Congress or praises Congress, we would fight to preserve his right to express his opinion. But we seem to take it for granted that the whole world is against us when one or more newspapers say "boo" to us, and we become frightened. Such things do not scare me. I sometimes wish newspaper men would say to me individually what they say about me collectively, but they do not do so.

Until we stand up as Senators of the United States and do our duty, irrespective of what any newspaper may say, we are going to lose face. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to take only 2 or 3 more minutes of the time of the Senate, and I shall discuss my own case because it is personal to me. While the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has disclaimed any intention of offering criticism by the article which appeared in the press and by discussion of his projected resolution in advance of its coming here, the fact remains that it did constitute criticism, that it was on the air, that it was in the mouths of many commentators, that it was discussed in various newspapers in the country, and so it is an inevitable result of the action taken by the Senator from California that that particular criticism took the form and the direction and the extent it did.

Mr. President, take my case. I live 9 miles from the Capitol. I do not live on a bus line. It takes approximately an hour and a half to come here by bus, with three changes. On the other hand, I live only 3 miles from the Silver Spring Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Station. So I bought a commutation ticket that my

wife may take me by automobile over that 3 miles and I can ride in on the train on the days when I may not otherwise need a car, even though Mr. Henderson's rationing order expressly stated that if a person is otherwise eligible for an X card he may use that card for gasoline necessary to take him to and from his work.

But, Mr. President, when an engineer in Connecticut of vast experience believes that he can render patriotic service to the Government and to the Marine Corps, and it becomes essential that I drive from the Chevy Chase line all the way across to Arlington on the Columbia Pike and discuss the matter with a Marine officer there in charge, in order to ascertain whether the qualifications of the particular applicant meet the requirements of the Marine Corps, I consider that to be public business; so would the Marine Corps officer with whom I talked.

Then, Mr. President, when I go to the W. P. B., as I have on many occasions, I go there on public business. To illustrate, recently I went there about a cutlery concern which has been some 60 years in existence, employing 150 or 160 trained and skilled men. They cannot get steel with which to continue their business. The men are to be forced out of work. They did not have the kind of machinery which is readily convertible to war production perhaps, and it became essential that we ascertain on what basis we might put that plant to the most effective use for the Government of the United States. It required a conference, and that was official business.

I had occasion to go down to the W. P. B. in another instance with reference to a corporation which is engaged in moving machinery for defense industries. That corporation serves the navy yards, it serves the Quonset Point torpedo station, it serves various of the New England arsenals and defense industries. I sought a priority rating for a power crane, but the net result, Mr. President, in connection with all my activities in such behalf is that many, many hours were spent and driving was an essential.

In those instances—and I am simply giving a few assorted and typical illustrations of the kind of official use to which Members of the Senate put their cars—I submit that that is an essential, necessary, and proper use of the automobile of an individual Senator. Consequently I need the car, but I will ration myself down to the bare bone. I am prepared to show day by day what mileage I get and how much gasoline it takes to accomplish the necessary business. I will conserve in every proper way, and so will every other Senator. Every right thinking, honorable Member of this body will naturally expect and know that his colleagues will follow that course.

Mr. President, it is on that account that I dislike the criticism, and have said so publicly, and say so now. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall impose upon the Senate for only 2 or 3 minutes longer. When this rationing order went into effect it became apparent that millions of our people on the Atlantic seaboard would be forced into unemployment and bankruptcy. Tens of millions of people will have to submit themselves to extraordinary sacrifices and unhappy deprivation. The Members of the Senate of the United States may say what they desire here. Nevertheless, today in every hamlet, grocery store, crossroads, village, town, and city on the Atlantic seaboard the people are wondering in their own minds, "Will public officials submit to the same regulation as the rest of us?" They do not realize what honorable gentlemen we are. In the dark and unhappy days ahead tens of millions of our people will be questioning what we and other public officials will do.

When I submitted this resolution I could not conceive that the Members of this body would think that it impugned their honor or was an insult to their honesty. I thought every Member would want to declare to people who must suffer great hardship, that, whatever comes, we Senators will abide by the common rule and make the common sacrifice. I know that such a declaration would have increased the esprit de corps and morale of this Nation. But Members of the Senate say that a simple declaration to our people that, "In the dark days which lie ahead your sacrifices will be ours, your rules will be ours," impugns the honor of this great body.

Mr. President, I do not conceive that to be the effect of the resolution. I thought that every Senator would be glad to have the opportunity solemnly to declare by a resolution, as a matter of public policy, what we, the leaders of the Nation, would be doing here in Washington when bankruptcy and unemployment and deprivation cut into the ranks of our people in the coming months.

I merely wish to assure the Senate that I had no intention of impugning the honor of anyone, or of arraigning the Senate. I thought I was proposing something that every Member would want to do. But under the manifest sentiment of this body there remains nothing, so far as I am concerned, except to submit the resolution and to allow it to be voted upon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request for consideration of the resolution has not yet been granted, has it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). It has not.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement. I do not believe we can decide this question by a resolution. Personally, I did not ask for a ration card, and did not receive any, because I did not want any. I walk from the hotel to the Capitol and back every day. If it is raining I ride in a taxicab. However, I do not wish, by a resolution, to undertake to impugn the motives or honesty of any Member of the Senate, because I do not believe the people have any right to assume that we are less anxious than anyone else to make every reasonable sacrifice necessary to victory in this war.

I dislike to see articles by commentators who frequently hold up Congress to ridicule. I read one recently which stated that there was no Clay or Webster here, and nobody who could compare with statesmen which the country has produced in the past. CARTER GLASS is here; and there are many others here who have made just as good a record as was made in the past by anyone of whom we can think. It is always easy to make a great man out of somebody after he is dead. We always have a tendency to undervalue, underestimate, and depreciate the living. That is something which does not contribute to good will, or to the welfare of the country. It is open season on men in public office. I have spent most of my life in public office. I am not very old; but I have learned that the people have a right to call us whatever they wish to call us, and that we ought not to bother about it. We ought to expect it, and not become angry about it.

Mr. President, I will not vote for the resolution of the Senator from California for the reason that I do not believe a single Member of the Senate would abuse the little privileges which are accorded him under the rationing system. I know that Members of Congress need their cars, and need gasoline, and that their constituents expect them to represent them on important matters before the various boards, bureaus, and commissions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator has used the wrong word. There is not a single privilege involved. On the contrary, there is an unlimited obligation to use the supplies for nothing except official business. In other words, an X card is more restrictive than the other cards.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator from Michigan. The words he has chosen are better than the ones I have used.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Provided that the man who signs the card is a man of honor. If he is not a man of honor, and if it is not enough for him to make a pledge over his own signature, it certainly is not enough to adopt this resolution once. It ought to be read every morning immediately following the prayer.

Mr. CHANDLER. I join in the expression of the Senator from Michigan. I have respect for the honor and integrity of Members of the Senate. I do not believe they would abuse their privileges. I know that the people in other States have had experiences similar to those which my people have had. One hundred and four boys from my immediate neighborhood were trapped at Bataan or Corregidor. I do not know what fate has befallen them. They are either dead or captured. In Harrodsburg, the oldest town in Kentucky, there is hardly a home which does not mourn for a son, a brother, a father, an uncle, a nephew, or a cousin. It is unthinkable to me, when

sacrifices of blood, tears, and deprivation are common all over the country, that any man would cheat on 25 or 30 gallons of gasoline.

I am not willing to say by my vote that I think that Members of Congress would do so, because I do not think so. I think just the opposite. I believe that every Senator will realize how valuable is this treasure of ours, and how important it is that it be saved to provide materials and implements of war for a speedy and final victory for the United Nations in this great conflict.

I am sorry that my friend from California believes that this is the way to handle this matter. I know he is sincere. I shall join other Members of the Senate in voting against the resolution, because I wish to express the confidence which I feel in Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. I think they are entitled to that confidence, not only from their fellow Senators but from the people of the country.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the resolution would not change the standing of any Senator who may have applied for a different kind of card than that to which he is entitled. It would have no legal effect. I cannot see that it would have any other effect. As I understand, an applicant for a card signs an application for whatever class of card he desires, except possibly in the case of the A cards. His signature is on the application. He states the circumstances under which he applies for the card. If we should adopt this resolution it would not change the procedure. It would not add to the responsibility of any applicant who signs an application blank.

It seems to me that the resolution reflects upon the membership of the Senate. Why should we adopt a resolution saying that we are to do something, when we know that it would have no legal effect? I do not believe we ought to waste time on the question. We have already spent nearly half of the day discussing this subject. The resolution is not yet before the Senate. I understand there is a unanimous-consent request for its present consideration. I rise to object to the request. I have no objection to referring the resolution to a committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California, and the resolution will go over under the rule.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES FOR DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask that it be read. I ask unanimous consent that it be immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 250), as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, May 25, 1942, at the conclusion of the morning business, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of permitting the delivery of memorial addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late Senators Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; Andrew Jackson Houston, of Texas; Alva M. Lumpkin, of South Carolina; and Alva B. Adams, of Colorado, respectively.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES OF THE ARMY—LETTER FROM LOWELL H. PATTERSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Lowell H. Patterson, of Indianapolis, Ind., complimenting the hospital facilities of the United States Army. The letter is so entirely complimentary that I should like to place it in the RECORD. From time to time criticisms have been directed against various activities of the Army. For that reason it gives me pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION,
Indianapolis, May 6, 1942.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Several months ago I had occasion to advise you how well our local induction center at Fort Harrison is being operated under the official management of Colonel Drysdale.

Since that time my son has been sent on to Fort Monmouth, N. J., where he has received his preliminary training in the Signal Corps, and then detailed for special work in what I believe is called the personnel division. Last week an injury developed in his knee and he has been placed in the Tilton General Hospital at Fort Dix under the direct supervision of Maj. A. Miller, chief of orthopedic section, but the hospital is under command of Col. S. J. Turnbull.

My son has advised me, particularly since he was home on a short furlough, of the efficient and competent way that Fort Monmouth is being operated from the viewpoint of a private. This morning comes a letter about the hospital at Fort Dix, and I think you should know just what he says, as he hasn't the slightest idea that I am writing to you.

In part: "The hospital is spick and span. Very neat and clean. The nurses and orderlies are very cooperative and decent. The food is the best I've had since I've been in the Army and is as good as any restaurant I have ever been in. We get fresh towels and linens and pajamas every day. Twice a day in the ward, at 11 a. m. and 3 p. m., milk is served (plain or chocolate). The library at the Red Cross is extensive and contains modern up-to-the-minute fiction, biography, etc., and is well planned. (Very few of the old books which have been in someone's attic for 20 years.) I hope you will check over our books and give any of mine to the Red Cross, as all are appreciated. Twice a week there are movies in the Red Cross. The P. X. is complete and has full services for all."

There is nothing that I want now or shall be wanting from your office, so there is no ulterior motive in my giving you this information except, as I told you before, men of your position are very apt to hear the worst about everything but very few words when things are going in first-class shape, and you are entitled to know that as well. Furthermore, I do not know and have never seen either Colonel Turnbull or Major Miller, but when men are doing a job like this for our sons in the Army you responsible powerful men in Washington should get reports which are unprejudiced and I know to be factually true, for my son has had every advantage for 25 years that is available in this country. If it is good enough for him it is good enough for anybody else in the world. Of that I am positive.

Kindly do not bother to reply.

Respectfully,

L. H. PATTERSON.

STATEMENT ON LABOR POLICY BY NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on May 11, 1942, by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, on labor policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PATENT SYSTEM—ARTICLE BY RALPH D. MERSHON

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ralph D. Mershon, on the patent system, published in the New York Herald-Tribune of April 30, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2025) to adjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. DANAHER, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is concluded.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Rosier
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Herring	Schwartz
Bone	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lee	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 6709, being the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6709), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate time to make an inquiry, and probably to accompany it by an observation to the able Senator in charge of the bill. I have no objection to his request save the fact that I should like to ask that the committee amendment on page 80, lines 23, 24, and 25, be deferred for consideration until the meeting of the Senate on Monday next.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the provisions of the bill referred to by the Senator from Oregon are likely to produce more controversy than any other item in the bill. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to having consideration of the amendment deferred until Monday. However, I hope that we shall be able to proceed today to dispose of the other amendments to the bill, so far as possible.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall cooperate with the Senator to that end. My request was made because several Senators and some of the farm leaders spoke to me about the matter. I think it would be well to postpone until Monday consideration of the amendment to which I have referred; and I hope that if consideration of the amendment goes over until Monday, the matter may be adjusted among those who are concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to having consideration of the amendment go over until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think that the consideration of all amendments relating to the disposition of surplus commodities now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation should go over.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Amendments in addition to the committee amendments may be offered, and the entire section would be involved.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand that that order has been made, and that that is the order of the day; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to make a similar request with respect to the amendment relating to loans to be made under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which amendment is found on page 83.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the bill with those amendments cannot be disposed of this afternoon, I have told the Senator from Virginia that I would be willing to have them go over; but I think we can dispose of them today, and not have them go over until next week.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia is entirely too optimistic if he thinks that this afternoon we can dispose of all the amendments to the bill other than those referred to by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was basing my remark on what the Senator from Virginia told me. He told me that he was not desirous of discussing the amendments at any length, but that if they could not be disposed of today he desired to have them go over until Monday. I said I was willing to take that course.

Mr. BYRD. It is understood, then, that if the amendment is not reached this afternoon in time for action today, it will go over until Monday; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to taking that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Georgia will make an explanation of the details of the bill; will he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill has innumerable details. It would be impossible to undertake to discuss all of them in one statement. However, I shall point out that for the first time in many years the Committee on Appropriations has reported to the Senate an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture which is considerably below the Budget estimates. I should further point out that, taking the pending bill as a whole, when we consider the direct appropriations of new money which are proposed by the measure, and do not consider the reappropriations or the standing appropriations and trust funds, the amount is $447,240,159 below the appropriations provided for the Agricultural Department and its activities in the act for the current year. No other department or agency of the Government has accepted a reduction in expenditures in any wise approaching the very drastic reductions which have been made in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. Many of us who have stood on the floor of the Senate in years past have fought for a program which would permit the farmers of the Nation to approach something akin to equality with other groups have been very reluctant to see these very drastic reductions made and have accepted them only in view of the very dire extremity and emergency in which our Nation finds itself today.

The bill appropriates $680,383,695 of new money, as compared with Budget estimates of $693,454,129 and the appropriation for the current year of $1,127,623,854. It will be seen, Mr. President, that the bill is, therefore, approximately $13,070,434 below the Budget estimates.

The members of the subcommittee conducted hearings at some length on the bill. We endeavored to deal conservatively and fairly with all the many amendments which were proposed. The bill would be much further below the Budget estimates but for the fact that the committee has proposed the appropriation of substantial sums for items which were not included in the Budget estimates, covering matters which have arisen since the outbreak of the war. For example, the committee has included in the appropriations for the Forest Service an increase of $5,500,000 over and above the Budget estimates, in order to enable the Department to deal with forest fires which might reduce the assets of the Nation which will be so sorely needed in the long and trying days which may lie ahead. Representations were made to the committee by a number of Members of the Senate and by officials of the Department that this has been a year of unusual fires in our forests. Losses running into the millions of dollars have been sustained by virtue of forest fires which have depleted the timber resources which are so immediately needed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. How does the figure fixed by the committee compare with the figure that came from the other House? Has there been a decrease or an increase in this item?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to point out that there are five and a half million dollars provided in the bill dealing with the forest-fire problem over and above the appropriation in the House bill and above the Budget estimate. That is one item as to which the committee thought the change in circumstances since the Budget estimate was submitted justified our action in exceeding the Budget estimate.

There are a number of small items to the same tenor and effect. It was represented to the committee by officials of the War Department and in the Bureau of Plant Industry that unusual losses were being sustained in the vicinity of the various fields where young men are being trained and where air squadrons are stationed for national defense, because of the fact that no turf or grass has been found which will withstand the terrible backwash from the spin of the propeller of the high-speed engines which are placed in the airplanes of today. The committee, therefore, submits to the Senate for consideration an appropriation of $50,000 over and above the Budget estimate so as to enable the Bureau of Plant Industry to survey the various airfields and to determine the type of grass which is best fitted for the soil and for the climate which obtain in the location of each airfield, and also to investigate and promote the production of a turf or grass which will be able to withstand the terrific impact of planes landing upon the ground as well as the backwash of the propellers.

Mr. President, another item the committee has considered and dealt with at some length is the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. The House inflicted rather drastic reductions in the appropriations for the Farm Security Administration. Since the bill has passed the House of Representatives, the executive departments have sent to the committee additional estimates of approximately $119,000,000 over and above the estimates which were originally submitted so as to provide funds for administration purposes and for loans by the Farm Security Administration. The committee, after examining the matter very carefully, has allowed some portion of those supplemental estimates and has restored, in part, some of the reductions which have been made by the House. Inasmuch as it has been indicated that there will probably be considerable discussion and attack made on the action of the committee with respect to the Farm Security Administration, I shall not dwell longer on those items at this time.

There are a number of items involving relatively small sums of money, anywhere from three to fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, which affect research work and the effort to find means with which to combat certain diseases which attack plant life as well as to combat insects which have caused losses, in some cases running into the millions of dollars by virtue of their destruction of plants which produce food and clothing. By and large, these items do not amount to any considerable total. The committee felt that they were justified in recommending these slight increases in view of the increasing demands which have been made upon the farmers of the country to produce food and clothing not only for domestic use but also in order to sustain our Allies and to fulfill our commitments under the lend-lease program. We have, therefore, made these small increases in the bill as it passed the House.

By and large, Mr. President, the bill, as I have stated, is substantially below the Budget estimate; it is almost a half billion dollars below the appropriation for the current year. These reductions could only be justified by the fact that the farmers of this Nation are making an unusual sacrifice, a greater sacrifice than has been made up to date by any other class of people who benefit directly from any specific appropriation bill. We make the exception only because we feel the reduction is commensurate with the dangers which threaten our Nation.

Mr. President, I believe that this is the best balanced bill, all in all, that the Committee on Appropriations has ever submitted for the Department of Agriculture. I hope that the amendments will all be agreed to. If any question arises as to any specific amendment, I shall be glad to undertake to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Office of the Secretary—Salaries," on page 3, line 24, after the word "forecast", to insert "except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Salaries and expenses," on page 9, line 1, before the word "together", to strike out "$490,144" and insert "$400,144"; in line 9, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$455,891" and insert "$467,291"; in line 14, after the name "United States", to strike out "$70,832" and insert "$60,832"; and on page 10, line 20, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That in the preparation and distribution of duplicated and photographic material for the Department, the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Information', current at the time such services are rendered or when payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from the applicable appropriations, to cover charges for personal services, materials, equipment (including depreciation, maintenance, and repair) and other necessary expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 11, line 11, before the word "including", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,300,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment at the bottom of page 10?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment just read involves the printing bill for all the bulletins as well as all the forms which are issued by the Department of Agriculture. In the program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration several sets of forms are necessary for every farmer in the Nation. I think that there are entirely too many of them; we have insisted that the Department simplify the procedure, and some steps in that direction have been taken. The Budget estimates in this matter were $1,500,000. The House committee, after careful investigation, approved the full amount of the Budget estimates, but when the bill reached the floor of the House an amendment was offered reducing the printing item in the sum of $500,000 as the result of a mistaken impression that the $500,000 appropriation would wipe out the Year Book which Members of Congress send to their constituents. As a matter of fact, the Year Books, which are sent out by Members of Congress, are not provided for in the agricultural appropriation bill but are provided for in the legislative appropriation bill. The committee, after going into the matter very carefully, felt that we would have been justified in restoring the entire Budget estimate, but we restored only a part of it, and the item, as provided in the amendment, is $200,000 below the Budget estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 11, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, at the end of line 19, to increase the total appropriation for Office of Information, from $1,490,144 to $1,700,144.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia in regard to the Office of Facts and Figures. It seems that the Agricultural Department obtains certain parts of the appropriation provided for the Office of Facts and Figures. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with that; I do not know exactly what the fund is; but I assume it is money which was allocated for the purchase of certain publications of the Department of Agriculture, just, as in the case of the legislative appropriation bill, a substantial sum is always carried for the purchase of Agricultural Year Books, which are distributed by Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. BYRD. That does not seem to be the case in this instance. On March 12 the Senator from Virginia received a letter from Mr. Archibald MacLeish in which he says:

> Similarly I have not listed as employees of the Office of Facts and Figures the personnel of the Survey Division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture. This Agency, as explained in the attached statement of organization on page 9, performs services for the Office of Facts and Figures through a transfer of funds.

I was wondering what the transfer of funds was from the Office of Facts and Figures to the Agricultural Department for the employment of personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL. That item is not as yet under consideration. The Senator from Virginia has referred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I may say that that bureau is the only statistical agency of the Government which accumulates statistics in regard to every phase of

agriculture in the United States. There are a number of other agencies of the Government which use the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as a fact-finding and statistical agency. I assume that the funds were allocated for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reimbursed for the money which it spends in that way, and, if so, what would be the total amount the Bureau of Agricultural Economics would receive?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question; I have no idea how many other agencies of the Government use the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. BYRD. The point I am making is that those expenses are not covered by this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume they are not.

Mr. BYRD. I think it would be very interesting if the Senator could obtain for the RECORD tomorrow a statement showing to what extent funds are transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from other departments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to undertake to do so, with the limited facilities at my command. The Senator from Virginia and his committee probably have facilities which are much more adequate than those at my disposal.

Mr. BYRD. I assume this is an agricultural appropriation bill, and, since the money is spent by the Agricultural Department, there ought to be some way of ascertaining the facts.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure that the Agricultural Department, at my request or that of the Senator from Virginia, will be very glad to furnish the statement. Did Mr. MacLeish estimate how much money he had transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics?

Mr. BYRD. I have a memorandum somewhere here. I think he gave an estimate for one quarter. Unfortunately, I do not have it on my desk. If the Senator can obtain the figures from the Department of Agriculture, I wish he would do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be delighted to undertake to obtain from the Department of Agriculture a statement of all funds transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from any department for furnishing statistical or other statements as to agricultural questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 12, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee on appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations," on page 15, line 24, after "(7 U. S. C. 427–427g), to strike out "$2,263,708" and insert "$2,463,708: *Provided*, That of this amount $63,708 allotted in the fiscal year 1942 to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population shall be apportioned in the fiscal year 1943 in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from such sum in the fiscal year 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "$6,726,208" and insert "$6,926,208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, at the end of line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of Experiment Stations, from $6,982,705 to $7,182,705.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Special Research Fund, Department of Agriculture," on page 18, line 24, after the word "act", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not more than $5,000 of this appropriation shall be used to further the chemical phases of the soybean investigations, except the routine analytical work for plant production, now being conducted at Urbana, Ill., and such $5,000 shall be available only for the expenses incident to the transfer of such investigations to Peoria, Ill., for absorption by the Northern Regional Research Laboratory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico", on page 19, after line 20, to strike out:

Extension work, act of April 24, 1939: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work", approved April 24, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 343 c–l), as amended, $203,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 2 to insert:

Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $555,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 7, after "343f–343g)", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$128,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the words "extension work", to strike out "$13,806,950" and insert "$14,186,950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, at the end of line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the Extension Service from $14,453,408 to $14,833,408.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics", on page 22, line 21, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$278,798" and insert "$778,798", and on page 23, line 22, after the word "Department", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for cooperative agricultural program formulation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 15, to increase the grand total appropriation, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, from $25,612,730 to $26,902,730.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses", on page 26, line 4, after the word "experiments", to strike out "$794,080" and insert "$811,000"; in line 12, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "$229,080" and insert "$246,000", and in line 14, after the word "amount", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$47,420."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 22, after the word "products", to strike out "$721,500" and insert "$715,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 21, after the words "cattle ticks", to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$276,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 12, after the word "Industry", to strike out "$12,671,967" and insert "$12,688,387."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, at the end of line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry from $12,671,967 to $12,688,387.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Dairy Industry," on page 33, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$377,400" and insert "$397,400", and in line 10, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$764,757" and insert "$779,757."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry—Salaries and Expenses," on page 34, line 19, after the word "control", to strike out "$575,475" and insert "$572,580", and in line 20, after the word "which", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$37,685."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "control", to strike out "$308,500" and insert "$358,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 2, after the word "application", to strike out "$258,460" and insert "$243,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 11, after the word "surveys", to strike out "$293,903" and insert "$308,903."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 17, before the words "of which," to strike out "$5,130,277" and insert "$5,177,382", and in line 18, before the words "may be", to strike out "$1,122,360" and insert "$1,136,860."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and

Expenses," on page 43, line 23, after "Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act", to strike out "$11,266,446" and insert "$14,286,446."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 13, after the word "therefore", to strike out "$124,350" and insert "$133,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 14, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$14,321,425" and insert "$17,350,075", and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$879,730" and insert "$892,337."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest-Fire Cooperation", on page 47, line 15, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000" and in line 16, before the word "and", to strike out "$68,800" and insert "$74,830."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, at the end of line 26, to increase the total appropriation for the Forest Service from $17,175,635 to $22,704,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest roads and trails," on page 48, line 8, before the word "which", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,500,000."

Mr. BYRD. Will not the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment? Does this amount include any new construction work on roads and trails?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not; it merely provides $4,300,000 for the maintenance of existing roads and trails, of which there are thousands of miles, and a sum sufficient to complete existing contracts which are already under way.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was shown that the large number of these roads were built by the Civilian Conservation Corps and by W. P. A. labor, and that they must be maintained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 48, line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering—Salaries and expenses", on page 50, line 15, after the word "agriculture" and the semicolon, to insert "for the investigation, development, experimental demonstration, and application of methods for the prevention and control of dust explosions and fires during the harvesting, handling, milling, processing, fumigating, and storing of agricultural products, and of other dust explosions and resulting fires not otherwise provided for;"; and on page 51, line 12, after the word "reports", to strike out "$318,733" and insert "$333,733."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 1, after the word "Engineering", to strike out "$892,484" and insert "$907,484"; and in line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$508,133" and insert "$516,133."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and Expenses," on page 53, line 8, after the word "nuts," to strike out "$390,285" and insert "$408,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 10, after the words "Japanese beetle," to strike out "$82,275" and insert "$432,275: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Will not the Senator from Georgia explain this amendment? Is this for the control of the Japanese beetle and to what extent does it increase the appropriation above that of last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. This is exactly the same amount that is available for the current year. There is a slight increase, but it is due to promotions under the Ramspeck Automatic Promotion Act. It is also the amount of the Budget estimate. When the bill was pending in the House, an amendment was offered reducing the appropriation for Japanese beetle control by $350,000. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses that only a very brief statement was made concerning the amendment. Its author stated that we should stop fighting the Japanese beetle and center all our attention on the Japs. Therefore he moved to cut the appropriation by $350,000, for the purpose of affording money with which to buy a bombing plane.

The evidence before our committee disclosed that the Japanese beetle is inflicting damages in this country which run into the millions of dollars, and that if nothing is done to stop or control the pest, the loss might become so severe that it would be worse than the damage inflicted by the Japs themselves. The committee thought it was fully justified in recommending the amount in the bill.

Mr. BYRD. The recommended appropriation is the same as that of last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 15, after the word "moths," to strike out "$382,570" and insert "$420,070."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 20, after the name "Ohio Valley," to strike out "$356,475" and insert "$406,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 13, after the word "quarantines," to strike out "$92,190" and insert "$109,790."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 4, after the word "shrubs," to strike out "$184,680" and insert "$199,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 10, after the words "corn borer," to strike out "$349,395" and insert "$399,395."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 15, after the word "purposes," to strike out "$185,970" and insert "$207,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 1, after the word "cotton," to strike out "$123,895" and insert "$148,439."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 12, after the word "stock," to strike out "$75,100" and insert "$82,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment on page 57, in line 17, in the item which reads:

Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting man, household possessions, and animals, $175,105.

The Budget estimate for that item was $190,000. The House reduced it to $175,105. The Senate committee reported it as the House had passed it. What I wish to do at this time, if I may by unanimous consent, is to amend the figure by adding $6,000, making the sum $181,105.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that he may now offer the amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me explain that the purpose of the proposed increase is to complete work which is being done at Clear Lake, in California, in the extermination of some very troublesome gnats. Those engaged in the work think they have found a way to eradicate them and that it can be done in another year. The $6,000 is needed for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the name "Mexico", to strike out "$716,300" and insert "$719,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 1, after the word "Quarantine", to strike out "$4,749,100" and insert "$5,343,589."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Marketing Service—Salaries", on page 66, line 2, after "(7 U. S. C. 471–476)', to strike out "$471,945" and insert "$481,945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 17, after the word "agreements", to strike out "$477,483" and insert "$486,483."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 23, after the word "Act", to strike out "$456,415" and insert "$481,415."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 16, after "(7 U. S. C. 181-229)", to strike out "$389,544" and insert "$397,665."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 23, after the word "Service", to increase the total appropriation for salaries and expenses, Agricultural Marketing Service, from $6,760,512 to $6,812,633.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act", on page 69, line 19, after "(54 Stat 1059)", to strike out "$569,587" and insert "$469,587", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$207,525" and insert "$157,525."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 72, line 8, after the word "installations", to strike out "$1,314,429" and insert "$1,364,429."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 17, after the word "information", to strike out "$20,510,812" and insert "$19,510,812."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 9, after the word "Service", to reduce the total appropriation for salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, from $22,402,204 to $21,452,204.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a question. The $21,452,204, salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, does not include, as I understand, the payments made to the county associations composed of committee men?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it has no direct connection with that. This is the Soil Conservation Service, under which the farmers who live within the watershed of a stream will form a corporation for the purpose of carrying out an over-all conservation program within the area. This item is considerably less than the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is speaking of line 9, page 73?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am speaking about the appropriation in line 9, page 73, which is a total. The total involves the two items found on page 72. The committee increased the item in line 8 on page 72 by $50,000, which is still below the Budget estimate, and in line 17 we reduced the amount $1,000,000 below the Budget and the House figures. These items have to do with the operation of the Soil Conservation districts and not with the A. A. A. Of course, they are in a measure related to the activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration because the districts furnish the A. A. A. with expert opinions, and the result of all their studies as to soil conservation in the various districts, but they have no relation to the expenses of the county committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. Salaries and expenses, $21,452,204, is in the nature of overhead expense, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the total for all salaries and expenses which are incurred by the Soil Conservation Service. A considerable part of it is represented by salaries, because of the fact that the Soil Conservation Service endeavors to furnish an expert engineer to each and every one of the soil conservation districts. I do not know exactly what the proportion is. I know all of it is not for salaries and expenses, but there is a large item for salaries involved.

Mr. BYRD. Does it not say "Total, salaries and expenses"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it says "Total, salaries and expenses," but if the Senator will read the purposes involved, for example, on page 72, beginning in line 9, he will find them to be as follows:

Soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $20,510,812.

Mr. BYRD. But it is for salaries and expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is for salaries and expenses. Every appropriation in the bill in a measure is for salaries and expenses, except the ones providing for payments to farmers.

Mr. BYRD. Then the payments made by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to the county committees, of course, would be in addition to any overhead expenses included in this $21,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; because the Soil Conservation Service is one bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which makes payment to county committees, is another bureau.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator figures of the expenses of the county committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have considerable information on that subject. Most of it was furnished by the able Senator from Virginia to the committee. We printed in the record considerable information as to the expenses of the county committees.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia and the members of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures have been greatly disturbed over what is regarded as the very excessive costs of these county committees. It was developed before the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures that there were 100,000 committeemen——

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the figure was 90,000.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that the testimony by Mr. Wilson, who I think is the assistant to the Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, indicates that there are 100,000. On page 339 of the hearings will be found the following:

Mr. WILSON. I want to say one thing more about our committeemen of over 100,000 that are located in all the farming areas. We are constantly increasing the duties under this defense program—

And so forth. Then the chairman asked:

What is the total cost of these 100,000 committeemen?

Mr. WILSON. Forty-four million five hundred thousand dollars, most of which is wages of committeemen, and help in the county offices.

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-four million dollars? On what basis are they paid?

That question was answered by Mr. Duggan, who is with the Department:

Mr DUGGAN. That is for the entire cost, which includes the clerical help as well as committeemen.

The CHAIRMAN. On what basis are the committeeemen paid?

Mr. WILSON. They are paid on a per-day basis, on the days they actually work. Some of the county committeemen—there are three of those to a county—may work all the way from a month to something like full time in Illinois, where they have a big corn-loan program in addition to the ordinary program

The CHAIRMAN. They get $5 a day?

Mr WILSON. It varies somewhat.

Mr. DUGGAN. In the southern region, nine Southern States, the county committeemen get $4 a day, without any travel pay, and the community committeemen get $3 a day, without any travel, for the days actually worked.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no travel allowance?

Mr. DUGGAN. There is no travel allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. They have to travel around to look at the farms?

Mr. DUGGAN. They have to do a good bit of traveling.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not charge anything for the automobile expenses?

Mr. DUGGAN. No expenses, except when they travel outside of the county to a special meeting.

That is about 10 percent of the amount of money appropriated for the soil-conservation program, and I was wondering if the Senator from Georgia has made any investigation as to whether that is an excessive cost, bearing in mind, of course, that that amount is deducted from the checks which are given the farmers under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The expenditures for administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act seem at first blush to be very large. I confess the first time I heard that the total amount of the administrative expense of this organization was over $40,000,000 I was not only startled—I was shocked. The committee went into this question at some length. The Senators from agricultural States, of course, are aware of the set-ups within their States. There is a community committee within the community. There is a county committee which has general supervision over the entire county. There is an office of the A. A. A. in each agricultural county of the United States. In that office there is an assistant administrator, who is usually the assistant to the county agent, who is the secretary of the county committee. It depends upon the size of the county, but all counties have at least one clerk, and some of the larger counties have seven or eight clerks to carry on the very involved and intricate

program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The amount of the expenditures in the several counties varies somewhat due to the size of the farms, and the amount of production per acre per farm, and the number of those with whom the county committee and the local committees are compelled to deal.

Several witnesses appeared before us on this question. We went into the matter rather fully, as I think the hearings will disclose. While the present system is subject to criticism, and while it does seem that the cost is excessive, the Appropriations Committee was not able to present any better system in an agricultural bill.

I wish to point out that the individual farmers are notified as to the amount which is deducted from their checks to pay for the county committee and for all the administrative expenses in the county.

There is a great deal more involved in the operation of this program than appears at first blush. Every farm must be measured every year.

Mr. BYRD. That is done by airplane photography, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. In some sections of the country it is, but in others it is not done by airplane. Often a farmer will complain that his land has not been measured accurately by airplane. The county committee must then remeasure it. If the farmer is correct, the expense is borne by the county committee. If the committee is correct, the farmer must pay the cost of the survey of his tract of land, or the plot which he has planted to one of the commodities embraced within the control program. If any better system can be evolved for dealing with the question of administration I wish some Senator would suggest it. I do not think the Appropriations Committee can deal with it, because the procedure is set up by statute. We have a statute which regulates expenditures for the administration of this program. I was the author of an amendment which had something to do with bringing that statute into being. When the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was under consideration on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment which limited the total amount of administrative expenses to 5 percent of the total appropriation. When the bill went to conference it was decided that the limitation should be changed; that a limitation of 1 percent of the total appropriation should be placed upon the expenses of the A. A. A. in Washington; that not more than 2 percent of the appropriation should be spent for field work outside Washington, in the regional and State offices, but that the amount which might be spent by the county committees required a degree of flexibility which prohibited placing any fixed percentage upon it. The law provides that each farmer shall be notified of the percentage of his check which has gone into county administrative expenses. I think the farmers of the United States are pretty much the same, but if there is any place where the farmers have to watch every nickel, it is in the section from which I come.

I must say that up to this good day I have never had a single complaint from a farmer that too much had been deducted from his check for administrative expenses within the county.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have had exactly the same experience. I have not had a single complaint since the law was enacted.

Mr. BYRD. Last week end I took occasion to discuss the matter with some of the farmers in Virginia. They did not know to what extent deductions had been made. In the State of Virginia 15 percent of the entire soil conservation appropriation is deducted. In other States, as the Senator knows, the percentage is greater. It varies from 40 percent in one county to 4 or 5 percent in another. It is inconceivable to the Senator from Virginia that with such a tremendous variation, the same work is being done in each county. I think that if the farmers knew definitely that $42,000,000 was coming off their checks for administrative expenses they would object. The money comes out of the Treasury of the United States; and even if the farmers do not object to it, the Congress should do so, provided the expenditure is extravagant. If the farmers understood that $42,000,000 was taken off their checks by reason of the expenses of the 90,000 or 100,000 county committeemen—or whatever the number may be—I think very strenuous objection would be raised.

Mr. RUSSELL. When we state the total, it seems much larger than the deduction seems to the individual farmer in the county when he is told what percentage of his check has been deducted for county administrative expenses. The law requires that the farmer be apprised of the amount deducted; and if the law is not being observed by the State committee or State organization in Virginia, someone should be brought to bar for it. Let me read the provision of the act:

> In the event any administrative expenses of any county or local committee are deducted in any fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, from Soil Conservation Act payments, parity payments, or loans, each farmer receiving benefits under such provisions shall be apprised of the amount or percentage deducted from such benefit payment or loan on account of such administrative expenses. The names and addresses of the members and employees of any county or local committee, and the amount of such compensation received by each of them, shall be posted annually in a conspicuous place in the area within which they are employed.

Mr. BYRD. Does that apply to the county committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what it says.

Mr. BYRD. Read it again.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to read it again. It not only applies to county committees, but also to local and community committees within the county.

> In the event any administrative expenses of any county or local committee are deducted in any fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, from Soil Conservation Act payments, parity payments, or loans, each farmer receiving benefits under such provisions shall be apprised of the amount or percentage deducted from such benefit payment or loan on account of such administrative expenses.

Listen to this:

> The names and addresses of the members and employees of any county or local committee, and the amount of such compensation received by each of them, shall be posted annually in a conspicuous place in the area within which they are employed.

There is a very plain and clear mandate in the law that the percentage which is deducted from each farmer's check, as well as the compensation going to each committeeman, and to every employee of the committee, shall be posted in a conspicuous place within the county. We cannot handle the matter in the agricultural appropriation bill. If there is a condition which should be remedied it should be approached through general legislation which will go to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. For my part, I do not want the job of trying to draw a bill to change the present system.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think it has been thoroughly established by the testimony before both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies of the Government that the county committeemen actually draw, in expenses and salary, the sum of $44,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no, Mr. President. That is not a correct statement. The $44,000,000 does not go to the committeemen. That is the total expenses of the administration within the counties.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. It is the administrative cost of the county associations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That includes several clerks who keep up with the various forms, and all the employees.

Mr. BYRD. It is the expenses of the county organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The major part of it goes to the county committeemen.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator is mistaken. A very small percentage of it goes to the county committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. A large percentage of it goes to the county committeemen. There are only one or two clerks in each county. This amount does not include the cost of the county agents' offices. It does not include the cost of the A. A. A. office.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does include the cost of the A. A. A. office.

Mr. BYRD. I mean it does not include the cost of the Soil Conservation Office or the Farm Agent Office. That is $21,000,000. It includes only the A. A. A. office, and one or two clerks. We could probably get a break-down of it. The major part of it undoubtedly is the $5, $3, or $4 a day which each of the 100,000 committeemen draws, plus traveling expenses, which alone amount to $2,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia is absolutely in error. On an average, the various county committees throughout the United States do not meet more than once or twice a month.

The great bulk of this expenditure is for personal services, for clerical hire within the county committee. A great many States have a limitation on the number of days the committee may be in session in any one year. There is very keen competition among the several counties as to how long the committees may be in session; and while the total amount of the expenditure is enormous, as the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, I venture to say that not 20 percent of the total ever gets into the hands of the committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. I have a list showing what each county committeeman receives. The list is in my office. I shall be glad to have it inserted in the RECORD later. The list gives the names of the county committeemen, and the amount which each receives.

Let us assume that the amount is for the cost of the county organization, which is independent of the other overhead costs of the Agricultural Department, independent of the farm agent's office, and other things. The total varies tremendously from county to county and from State to State. Take Alabama as an example. The average cost there is 8 percent. The cost in that State is $1,036,000, out of total payments to the farmers of $12,914,000. In Arizona the cost is 3.8 percent. In Arkansas the cost is 4.4 percent, making a total of $625,000 out of payments to the farmers of $14,000,000. In other words, in Alabama $2,000,000 less is received by the farmers, and about $400,000 more is paid for the cost of the county organizations, as compared to Arkansas.

In California the average cost is 10 percent of the amount given to the farmers under the Soil Conservation Act. In Colorado the cost is 8½ percent; in Connecticut, 10 percent; in Delaware, 5.9 percent; in Florida, 10.7 percent; and in Georgia, 9 percent. Out of a total expenditure of $12,000,000, $1,094,000 is paid for the expenses of the county organizations.

In Idaho the cost is 10.7 percent; in Illinois, 4.9 percent; in Indiana, 7 percent. There are great variations as between county and county, in all the States. In Iowa the cost is 4.8 percent. In Kansas it is exactly the same as in Iowa—4.8 percent. In Kentucky it is 11.6 percent. The variations between the counties in each State apparently run as high as 18, 20, and sometimes 25 percent, and down to 4 and 5 percent, as between individual counties. There must be some reason for the great variation. The Senator from Virginia and the committee with which he is associated have made a very diligent effort to find out why these variations occur between the States and the counties, but as yet have been unable to do so.

In Louisiana the cost is 7.4 percent; in Maine 7.4 percent; in Maryland 7.6 percent; in Massachusetts 13.3 percent; in Michigan 12 percent; in Minnesota 5.9 percent; in Mississippi 4.7 percent; in Missouri 10.1 percent; in Montana 5.8 percent; in Nebraska 7 percent; in Nevada 5.2 percent; in New Hampshire 14.3 percent; in New Jersey 10.1 percent; in New Mexico 9.9 percent; in New York 11.2 percent; in North Carolina 11.9 percent; in North Dakota 5.1 percent; in Ohio 9.3 percent; in Oklahoma 6.7 percent; in Oregon 10.3 percent; in Pennsylvania 12.1 percent; in Rhode Island 20.6 percent. Of course, Rhode Island is a small State, but it has the highest overhead expense of all. In South Carolina the cost is 6.4 percent; in South Dakota 6.6 percent; in Tennessee 12 percent; in Texas 5.8 percent; in Utah 11.5 percent; in Vermont 12 percent.

Now let us take Virginia. I desire to make some references to Virginia. I know the State thoroughly. The average cost in Virginia, for the entire State, is 15.1 percent. Four million eighty-two thousand eight hundred and sixty-two dollars was disbursed, with the county association expense being $614,407. Six hundred and fourteen thousand four hundred and seven dollars as expenses for these county organizations was deducted from the checks received by the farmers of Virginia.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to some of the variations occurring between counties with which I happen to be familiar. For example, Clarke County, the county in which I live, had expenses of 5.8 percent. The expense for Culpeper County was 31 percent. Both of them are strictly agricultural counties, and as between them there is a variation between 5.8 percent to 31 percent.

Arlington County, which is a small county next to Washington, is joined with Fairfax County in this compilation. Fairfax County is a considerable agricultural county. The expense there is 41.2 percent. Forty-one and two-tenths percent is deducted on account of the expenses of the county committees from the check that every farmer in Arlington and Fairfax Counties receives. In Franklin County, which is a great tobacco-raising county, and entirely an agricultural county, the expense is 26 percent. Yet Frederick County, another agricultural county, has expenses of only 10 percent. In Giles County the expense is 21 percent. Similar variations exist as between all the counties.

I am unable to understand how one county under similar conditions can operate at 6 or 8 percent, and other counties at 20, 30, and 40 percent; and thus far, so far as I know, no satisfactory explanation has been made to any committee with respect to such variations.

Let us take Pittsylvania County, in Virginia, which is one of the largest tobacco-raising counties in the United States. In Pittsylvania County the expense is 13 percent, while in Patrick County, which is near it, the expense is 36 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desired to inquire about the payment to the county committees to which the Senator refers. Am I to understand that there are 100,000 men in the United States who are paid more than $40,000,000, or does the $40,000,000 also include the amounts to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. BYRD. The $40,000,000 includes the expenses of the county organizations, but that amount is entirely independent of expenses of other agricultural organizations which are set up and paid for in every county of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator have any idea as to how much on an average is earned by those 100,000 members of the county committees in the United States?

Mr. BYRD. I have an itemized statement of what every county committeeman received last year, but at this moment the statement happens to be in my office. I will present it to the Senate tomorrow.

I think the sum is very substantial; because it is unquestionably true, I think, from my knowledge of the operations of these county organizations, that the main cost arises in connection with the payment of the county committeemen. A county committeeman has one or two clerks, perhaps. The surveying is almost entirely done by aerial photography. That was testified before the committee of which I am chairman. That work was not placed upon the members of the county committees. However, there has always been a question about how much these payments are. They do not function through the Budget. The Senator from Ohio understands that. There is a provision in the Budget whereby a deduction is made from the $5,000,000 provided for soil conservation for the purpose of paying these county committeemen.

Mr. TAFT. Do they also receive a percentage of the parity payments which are made?

Mr. BYRD. They also receive a percentage of the parity payments, and that is included in the $44,000,000.

The break-down of the county association costs is as follows:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, $27,693,459; parity payments, $8,855,177; sugar payments, $407,267; crop insurance, $2,071,990; supplemental cotton, $2,916,983; making a total for the fiscal year 1941 of $41,944,876.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any other department of the Government with anything like that number of employees outside of Washington?

Mr. BYRD. I do not know of any. The figure varies; but certainly it is between 90,000 and 100,000. As a matter of fact, a Mr. Wilson testified before the committee that his estimate was 100,000.

I also desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio the fact that these committeemen draw very substantial mileage payments, at the rate of 3, 4, or 5 cents a mile for their traveling expenses.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell me whether they also receive X cards under the gasoline rationing plan?

Mr. BYRD. I shall soon be able to find out.

Mr. TAFT. I should assume they do, so far as I have read the regulations.

Mr. BYRD. Travel expenses vary enormously in different States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject, let me say that I noted his inquiry, and I wondered whether there was any explanation about the variation in the sums of money expended in the different units. So far as

the expenses in the counties are concerned, I have observed the difference in the quantity of work in the various counties or districts in my State. I took an interest in this particular subject, and I went about and saw the work being done at river bends, where erosion occurred during storms and freshets, and on roads where ground was denuded by the wind; those conditions differed in the various counties.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I am referring to the cost of the county associations which have operated under the Agricultural Adjustment Act program.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thought the Senator was referring to the amendment on page 72.

Mr. BYRD. No; I was referring to the cost of the county associations operating under the Agricultural Adjustment Act program. I have never been able to obtain a satisfactory explanation, and neither has the Senator from Georgia, as to the reason for the variation in these costs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say with reference to the costs of the county organizations in the various States that the larger the agricultural units the smaller the costs for administration. For instance, Montana, with large agricultural units, has an administrative cost of only 5 percent, whereas Rhode Island, where the agricultural units are necessarily small, has an administrative cost of approximately 28 percent. In other words, if the farmer receives twenty $5 checks the administrative costs might be $7 or $8—I do not know what the exact amount is—whereas in some of the western States, or in States in which there are large orchards, for instance, if the farmer were to receive a check for several hundred dollars the administrative cost might not be much more than $7 or $8. I think that is the explanation as to why the cost is more in some States than it is in others.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont why should the cost in Ohio be 9.3 percent, while in Illinois the cost is 4.9 percent, although the agricultural conditions are almost completely identical in the two States?

Mr. AIKEN. I suppose there are more small farms in Ohio than in Illinois. There are more small centers of population in Ohio. Around every large center of population there is a myriad of small farms. Illinois has the great city of Chicago, and in that State one can go almost 100 miles south of Chicago without coming to any city of appreciable size.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Senator will find that there is any great difference between conditions in Illinois and in Ohio, and certainly so far as I can observe, nothing to justify a nearly 100 percent increase in cost in Ohio over what the cost is in Illinois.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, another explanation might be that the activities might be better administered in one State than in another.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that that must be the explanation, that there is a large amount of waste in some places and no waste in other places, and that is the waste the Senator from Virginia is trying to eliminate.

Mr. BYRD. We will take the State of Virginia, for example: Most of the farms of the State of Virginia are fairly large, yet the cost in the State of Virginia is 15 percent. That is not due to smaller payments, because the State of Virginia receives $4,082,000, which is practically the average of what is received by the other States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think, perhaps, some of the difference in the expenses can be accounted for by the fact that the program in the various counties is operated differently. There are certain extracurricular activities, perhaps, which are possible under the act which are not taken advantage of in some counties but are taken advantage of in others. For instance, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if the list he expects to furnish tomorrow of county committeemen includes a list of farm field women who are active in some counties but are not employed in other counties?

Mr. BYRD. Are they farm demonstrators or are they members of county committees?

Mr. BUTLER. They are employees of the A. A. A. organization of the county. I myself would appreciate knowing exactly what the service to be rendered is supposed to be. I might suggest that it would be interesting when the Senator is making a statement of the comparison of the cost of distribution of payments to farmers to indicate why the percentage not only varies as between the States and as between counties in the States but varies over the years. For instance, why should it cost 13 or 14 percent to administer a certain farm in Nebraska in an election year and cost only 7 or 8 percent in an off year? I use that as a practical illustration. That is one of the questions which many of the farmers in my State are beginning to ask.

Mr. BYRD. I will try to get the information for the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was a member of the committee that prepared the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938; I took an active part in its consideration and enactment, and was a member of the conference committee between the two Houses on that bill. The conference committee was in session for an entire month, working as best it could, without regard to political division, for politics never entered into the consideration at any time, in an effort to develop a program that could be administered satisfactorily. There had been general complaint over the country in farm areas about the administration of the program prior to 1938, when there were not any legal standards of formulas for administration, but it was left very largely to the discretion and judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and put into operation the program and the method of administering it. That resulted in charges of partiality and favoritism, of mistakes being made, of inadequate reviews, and appeals, and things of that sort. So those responsible for agricultural legislation felt that some uniform plan applying equally as best it could to the varying conditions should be developed.

Among the things the committee agreed on was to develop, so far as possible, a program which would be administered by the farmers themselves. In other words, Congress had set aside a certain amount of money for expenditure among farmers, for soil conservation, to prevent soil depletion, and for practices of that sort. Then, the two Houses, working in a conference committee whose report was later ratified after protracted debate on the floor, developed the plan we now have for the farmers themselves to administer, so far as possible, their own agricultural program, freed so far as possible—it was not entirely possible in all cases and under all circumstances—from the necessity for any regulation which, in large measure, had to be uniform but which did not fit each locality alike.

So it was decided, in the first place, that this program should be administered by representatives of the counties. The county agent is not in charge; he is secretary of the county committee. It was decided that the county committee should be elected by the farmers themselves, three for each county to constitute a county committee. Then, the county should be divided into areas to be administered by community committeemen, usually composed of three members of the community.

The community committeemen are also, under the law, mandatorially elected by the farmers of the community. If they do not administer fairly, if they incur unnecessary expenses, or if their practices do not appear to be fair and just, they are subject every year to rejection by their neighbors.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, those elections are absolutely perfunctory. In my State a small percentage of the farmers attend an election, frequently not more than 20 or 30 to a county.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think in Virginia they generally do what the junior Senator from Virginia tells them to do. In a great many other States, they do not want to do that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia would tell them to vote to cut these extravagances out. The truth is, however, no one can tell the Virginia farmers what to do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In my judgment, then, the Senator has not told the farm-

ers all; he has said less to the farmers than he has said to the Congress and the committees of Congress, I am sure.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. I have said in Virginia exactly what I have said in Congress and have been saying it for 9 years. The Senator is wrong, and he knows nothing about it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know something about the farmers of the country.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not know what I say to the farmers of my State.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said it was my judgment.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator's judgment is wrong; it is not based on any knowledge of the facts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will let the Senator have it his way. If I had known the Senator was going to take it so seriously I would not have said what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is going to make a plea in behalf of the official reporters, and ask that Senators kindly address the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, I will observe the rule, Mr. President, but I am speaking in the time generously accorded me by the Senator from Virginia because he said he had not been able to find out certain facts and had not had any satisfactory explanation. While I am sure I could not make any explanation which would satisfy him, still I thought because of my close contact with this whole problem I would submit at least some facts in connection with the farmers who are involved.

Whether the farmers of Virginia or elsewhere attend the election is just as it is in the case of a general election. Perhaps 20 or 30 percent vote. A great many good citizens never participate in a general election. But it is their fault if they do not. They have the privilege of voting. If they do not participate they have no one to blame but themselves. So it is in the case of the election of committeemen under the farm program. A day is set for the election throughout the agricultural area. Such farmers as feel any interest in the matter attend the meetings, and generally in my section more or less interest in the election is stirred up by virtue of the ambition of different farmers to represent the farmers on the committee.

While on that subject, I may be permitted to say to Senators who are seriously looking into this subject that service both on the community committee and on the county committee is in a large measure an honorary and noncompensated service. Three dollars a day is what a committeeman receives.

Mr. BYRD. Five dollars a day in some places.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think they receive that much in my State. It is from $3 to $5.

Mr. BYRD. From $3 to $5.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I referred to my own State. I think they receive $3 a day, but the provision is for payment of from three to five dollars. In my State the service is limited to 5 days a month. The committeemen do not receive any traveling expenses. Not only do they not have X cards, but they do not receive any free gasoline. Anyone may judge from this that the farmer who neglects his own personal affairs and undertakes to render this service is not doing it because of any profit involved. He is rendering the service in order to do his part.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me finish the sentence. He is doing it in order to do his part toward his neighbors, and in the effort to promote a good and satisfactory agricultural program, his benefit coming from the program itself, rather than from a return from this special and extra service to his neighbors. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Alabama is listed as receiving in travel expenses, in the matter of agricultural adjustment administration mileage, $19,596.86, and the county office travel amounts to $3,104.36.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the Senator will realize that that is nominal.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated there were not any travel expenses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The community committeemen do not receive expenses, but they have to travel from one place to another. They have conferences, they go to the State and land-grant colleges on various occasions, and then some traveling allowance is made. I am talking about the regular, usual mileage, the mileage which Federal and State officials ordinarily draw.

There are 67 counties in Alabama, and there is an average of 30 members in each county on these committees. Then think of traveling expenses of only $19,000. It is nothing, as we all know, for a year's program, with this large number of men, covering such a large area.

Let me point out that there are about 3,000 counties in the United States, some small, some large, some with very small farms, some with very large farms. In some areas, where the farming is largely truck farming, or other special production, or down in the southeastern part of the country, the farms are very much smaller than they are in the grain area of the West. A cotton farmer may plant 15 or 20 acres in cotton—that is about the average—but in the West, in the wheat section, a farmer may plant a whole section, of 640 acres. There are more than 6,000,000 farmers. Each one of those farmers, under the law—I do not know how it would be possible to justly administer the law in any other way—must be visited, not once, but two or three times, at least, during the year. There are more than 6,000,000 of them, remember, some near the county seat, some 50 to 60 or 100 miles away from the county seat, where the county committee is located and has its headquarters.

Under the law the committeemen have to measure each farm—over 6,000,000 of them—for there is no other way to determine the facts required. There are many complaints about excessive acreage, about one farmer cheating against his neighbor in the matter of acreage put into production in excess of the allotments. So the committees—and we have approved it—decided that the only fair and just way, not only as between neighbors, but in the matter of having satisfactory programs to continue from time to time, was not continually to take ex parte statements of the farmers, but to provide for obtaining accurate information. Therefore measurements are made, not only in respect of the main crop, but as to other soil-depleting crops, because one of the elements in soil conservation is a requirement for rotation in the use of particular land from time to time, in order to let the land either be fallow or to rebuild, by having it planted in some crop which is not so soil depleting. Therefore, we are not limited to the measurement of acreage devoted to wheat, or cotton, or potatoes, or peanuts. The agents measure the other soil depleting crops, because the program specifies how many acres in each farm is to be planted in different crops, and excessive production in other things than the main crop is penalized. That is the only way of bringing about compliance, as has been shown by a number of years of experience.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I desire to do. Like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee, I was utterly dumbfounded when I learned that we take away from the fund provided for soil erosion payments what would otherwise go to the farmers and spend the enormous sum of forty-four and a half million dollars, out of the farmers' money, for the administration of this activity. It was so astounding to me—and it is still so astounding to me—that I asked a great many questions about it from time to time before the several committees before which the matter has arisen. It strikes me that there should be a better and a more economical administration. I was very much impressed by the statement made by the Senator from Georgia a moment ago that if a more economical plan could be evolved he would like to have it proposed for he knew there was an enormous amount of expense connected with this activity.

As the Senator from Alabama knows, and as every other Senator knows—there is not one who is not familiar with the fact—there are county agents in every one of the 3,000 counties of the country. Each county agent has to go on to every farm in his county, he is constantly in touch with every farmer in the county. I know the one in my home county, Shelby County, Tenn., is a man who keeps in touch with every farmer and every farm, as well as any man could do it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is done by his office, rather than by the agent himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. He goes to all parts of the county. He is a very excellent man. The question I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama, as well as the

Senator from Georgia, is, Do they not think we could take the county-agent plan, and have this matter taken care of by the county agent in each county, who is already concerned and tremendously interested in the very same work, and presumably is one of the best men in the county? Why could not this work be done by the county agent at about one-tenth the cost?

I note from the figures read, and from the testimony, that it costs all the way from 4 percent up to 11 percent to administer this program in the various counties in the country. Why could we not evolve a plan which would be less expensive than the present one? The present plan seems to be very expensive. I am not familiar with the agricultural appropriation bill, as are the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia. I know they are as fine friends of the farmer as there are in the world. I have the greatest respect and esteem and admiration for their ability, and for their loyalty to the farmer. When we are spending such an enormous amount of money for the prevention of soil erosion, which very properly goes to the farmers, why should we pay an excessive cost, by some 7 or 8 percent, for this relatively uneconomical activity?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I recognize the good faith of the Senator in his suggestion. I know that his heart is with the farmer. I have seen that tested time and time again. I know what he proposes is suggested in good faith and in the interest of the farmers. No one who knows the Senator and is familiar with his record could doubt that.

There are two difficulties with his suggestion. In the first place, no human being could perform all the duties in an average agricultural county which the Senator seems to want to delegate to the county committeemen. I know that Senators from the agricultural section will confirm my statement that the office of the county agent in nearly every county is the busiest office in the county seat. My travels in this connection have been limited largely to my State, but wherever I have gone in my State I have found in the last few years that the space in the court house assigned to the county agent was not adequate. In nearly every section of the country small houses have been erected for the county agents, because farmers were there all day long consulting the county agent about the management of their farms and other farm matters.

The county agent is both an administrative officer and an educational officer. He is the representative of the experiment stations and the land-grant colleges. He is the man who promulgates new information to the farmers about profits and farm purchases, about new developments, and everything of that sort. He has to hold conferences all over the county from time to time.

There is another phase of the matter which has not been suggested. In addition to the subject of acreage to be planted, the county agent also has the responsibility—and exercises it largely through his community committeemen—of checking the work done on each farm, what is known as adjustment practices, which entitle the farmer to pay in addition to the general conservation payments.

If the farmer plants certain cover crops, such as Austrian peas and vetch, if he works the land so as to interrupt the flowage of water, and terraces his farm in the interest of preserving the soil, that is looking to the future, that is looking to the replacement of plant food which is taken from the ground when it is overflowed and soil is eroded from it, and eventually is carried to the sea. The Government is doing all it can to encourage the farmer to engage in soil erosion prevention, and soil protection, and rebuilding of its fertility. That is a job too great for any one man in a county to do. Someone must report on those practices. Someone has to check the acreage on each farm, what sort of work was done on it, how much was done, the estimated expense of each of those practices, which we know to be the very best part of the soil-conservation program. We must look not only to increased production on the farm, but to the preservation of the soil so we may produce food in quantities sufficient to feed the growing urban population of this country.

I shall touch on one other phase if the Senator from Virginia, who has been very kind, will permit me. I thought while I had this opportunity I would submit what I have to say on this subject, and it will obviate the necessity of listening to me later. I refer to the question of the percentages which the Senator from Virginia emphasized so much. That is a situation which could not under any circumstances be avoided. The quantity of work to be done is the major factor in the cost in each county, and the number of farms is the major factor in determining the percentage to apply to each farm. Take a county which has 5,000 small farmers. It is necessary three or four times a year to go to the 5,000 farms to check compliance, to check the actual soil-conservation practices, to check the other crops, to check production. Do not forget that. It is necessary to secure information about the production on every farm as the basis for division of the soil-conservation money and the parity appropriation, and that is a tremendous task in itself.

The percentage will, of course, vary with the number of farmers and the size of the farms. It cannot be made to work out exactly the same in all counties. There is no desire on the part of anyone of whom I have ever heard to favor one county at the expense of another in the matter of the percentage of the appropriation for a county. It simply works out according to the number of farms, the size of the farms, the conservation practices, and the number of crops produced on each farm. It is easier to check a great wheat acreage than it is an acreage on which a farmer has a half a dozen or more crops which must be checked.

Mr. President, this is not the measure in connection with which to undertake a settlement of this difficult and complicated problem. That is a legislative matter. We worked on the problem for months, and the program evolved has stood the test until now. I have had no complaints from the farmers of my State. They look to me in large measure, as Senators can well understand, for a satisfactory farm program. For a short time after the program was adopted, and until it became properly adjusted my desk was covered every day with protests and objections. Now they have disappeared. The farmers are administering their own affairs. They know if administration needs improvement it is within their power to make the improvement. All they have to do is to elect those whose views are in line with theirs. So, on the whole, the matters which are worrying the Senator from Virginia are not worrying the farmers in my section of the country, and I doubt if many Senators have received letters from farmers making complaint of these matters which are totally and wholly within their control.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Before the Senator from Alabama concludes his remarks I should like to correct one impression which has resulted from some statements which have been made. It has been stated that the appropriation in question was only four hundred and fifty-odd million dollars, of which $44,000,000 was for administrative expense. That impression is erroneous. It involves not only the $450,000,000 for the soil conservation program, but it also includes $212,000,000 which was paid last year for parity payments. It includes forty-seven and a half million dollars which was paid for sugar payments in certain counties. More than $2,000,000 of local committee expense was involved in administering the crop-insurance law for wheat, and that expense will increase undoubtedly as other commodities are added. There were also additional expenditures incurred in the Cotton Belt in administering the special cotton program this year, under which cotton goods were paid to farmers who reduced their acreage below their allotted acreage. So the statement that this is merely for administering the soil conservation program is entirely in error. Not only do those in charge administer parity payments and other funds amounting to $728,000,000, but the local committees have assumed responsibility for the success of the food-for-victory program. They are going to each farm to encourage the farmer to plant a garden, and to increase his acreage in the specialty crops which the Secretary of Agriculture has stated were required for the success of the war program. It is not simply a soil conservation program. It has to do with the production program within every agricultural county in the Nation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am delighted that the Senator from Georgia has brought out that point. It is familiar, of course, to those of us on the committee, but I might not have mentioned it. This expenditure covers every activity in the whole Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator ought to make it clear that that is the

expense of the county committee. I read into the RECORD exactly what the Senator from Georgia said and gave a statement as to how much was chargeable for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources, how much for parity payments, how much for sugar—and only $407,000 goes for sugar—how much for crop insurance, and how much for supplemental cotton. The expense of $41,944,876 is expense of the county organizations. There is no question about that. That information was furnished by Mr. Wilson of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the fiscal year 1941.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The percentage of expense for this program cannot properly be compared with the percentage of expense for any other program because here the administration consists of nearly six and one-half million units which must be visited from time to time throughout the year. The whole administration of the program is totally different from that of any other agency in the Government, because of its far-flung activities, because of the numerous and complex subjects involved, and because of the number of facts that must be developed on each of the more than 6,000,000 farms in order to find, among other things, the amount of parity payments to which each farmer is entitled.

All farmers do not receive the same amount. The payments are based on 5 years' previous production. Those are the records the field agents must obtain. They must bring in the evidence of the amount of production of crops which participate in soil-conservation and parity payments, for each farm, and that in itself is a tremendous task.

In conclusion, I wish to say that this is a legislative question. If this program is to be changed in its administration in any vital or material way, the question should have careful consideration, with hearings properly conducted by the committees charged with this type of legislation. As I have stated, the committees which formulated the program held protracted hearings. The program was the subject of protracted debate, both on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House. Now it is the idea of a Member of the Senate that arbitrary reduction should be made in the operating expenses of the Department of Agriculture, and I presume some Senator will put it in the form of an amendment. I submit to the level-headed Members of this body who are interested in the subject of economy that that is not the orderly way to determine what reduction, if any, should be made, and what changes, if any, should be made in the total administration cost of all these agricultural programs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is the function of the Appropriations Committee, if it thinks the act can be administered by an expenditure of 5 percent rather than 10 percent, to cut the appropriations to accomplish that end. I do not see how the Senator can say that it is not a proper subject for the Appropriations Committee to consider. Of course, if such action would result in the destruction of the system, I agree with him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what the result would be.

Mr. TAFT. The only question raised by the Senator from Virginia is, If the act can be administered for 5 percent in one State, why not have a limitation of 5 percent in all the States, in the hope of obtaining proper administration of the act, which is obtained in those States where only 5 percent is spent? Why is not that a function of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am not surprised at the attitude of the Senator from Ohio. He has never gone into these agricultural problems. I suspect that he has never gone to the farms and the fields. His interest in and acquaintance with these problems are not the same as those of many Members who have devoted the greater part of their time to the study and investigation of agricultural problems.

I have shown how the program was built up, and how it is based upon statutory requirements. I recognize the Senator from Ohio as one of the ablest men in this body. Whether he is interested in the farmer or not, he is a great man. I respect and like him. However, the Senator must realize the existence of a complicated statutory structure, covering every acre of land in America outside the cities, and embracing nearly 25 percent of the total population of the United States.

The agricultural industry now faces unusual circumstances because of war conditions. In the successful administration of the agricultural programs the Senate cannot afford arbitrarily to change the whole program without hearings, and without a change in the statutory structure. To do so would endanger the production of the food requirements for the coming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 73, line 9.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in order to have a complete statement in the RECORD with respect to the deductions in each State and county, I wish to continue.

In the State of Washington the deduction is 8.1 percent; in West Virginia 18.5 percent; in Wisconsin 7 percent; and in Wyoming 11.8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The statement was obtained from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. It shows the amount of deduction in each county for administrative expenses, and the percentage thereof of the total payment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator frim Virginia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the investigation which I have made shows that there are numerous misprints in the record which the Senator from Virginia has. For example, in Choctaw County, Ala., the record which the Senator from Virginia has shows a deduction of 1.3 percent.

Mr. BYRD. That record was sent to the Senator from Virginia from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand; nevertheless, there are errors in it. I do not claim that the Department of Agriculture is perfection itself in preparing reports.

It also developed that there was an error in the statement with regard to North Dakota. The Senator from North Dakota was very much disturbed by a difference between two counties, which appeared to be due to the decimal point being in the wrong place. I think the statement should be checked. With respect to nine counties in Alabama, reviewing that one State, the decimal point was in the wrong place.

Mr. BYRD. The clerk of the committee informs me that the statement has been corrected by the Department. I shall substitute the corrected statement for the statement which I have just offered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wanted the RECORD to show the facts.

Mr. BYRD. However, let me say that the corrections do not result in any material changes in the State figures as read by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with some of the statements of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with reference to the variation in cost as between certain areas. However, there can be no excuse for the differences in percentage in some of the States. For example, the figure for North Dakota and Montana is 5 percent. When we go over into Wyoming, in practically the same kind of territory, we find a higher cost for administration. As a matter of fact, the farms in Wyoming are larger than those in Montana or North Dakota; and yet we find a much higher percentage.

I am interested in the farm program; but I am also interested in the efficient operation of the program. I say to Members of the Senate that unless the program is operated with efficiency and on a businesslike and systematic basis, sooner or later the Congress will eliminate the program. In my opinion, no one can read the figures in this report without coming to the conclusion that in some States there has been great extravagance and mismanagement, while in other States the program has been managed fairly efficiently.

We are appropriating huge sums of money every year for the Department of Agriculture. Many of the bureaus which have been created in the Department of Agriculture have not been operated efficiently or in the best interests of the people of the country as a whole. If the agricultural program is not operated efficiently, and if the expenses are not cut down, it will be the farmers of the country that will suffer. The people of the United States will not stand for continued inefficiency in the departments.

As I stated before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the other day, we are in the midst of a war, and we find

ourselves short of alcohol, rubber, starch, sugar, and other vital materials.

We have been appropriating millions upon millions—running into the billions of dollars—for the Department of Agriculture. Yet the Department has not proposed any legislation looking toward a study of the use of various surplus agricultural products for the purpose of converting them into alcohol or synthetic rubber. I am told that the Congress almost had to force upon the Department of Agriculture appropriations for the purpose of building pilot plants to be used for the purpose of experimentation along this line.

In the past 20 years the Department of Agriculture has been asleep at the switch. The only thing it has brought forward has been the idea of paying the farmers not to produce.

For the past 20 years I have been a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A few years ago representatives of the Department came before the committee and said, "We want to teach the farmers how to make two blades of grass grow where one grows now." We spent millions of dollars of the taxpayers money for that purpose. Then we started to spend money to pay the farmers not to produce.

We pay the farmers not to produce sugar, and we find we are short of sugar. I do not know whether this statement is true, but the other day a very distinguished citizen of my State, who had just returned from Cuba, said that while he was in Cuba he visited some of the warehouses where sugar was stored. He said that there was not room enough in those warehouses for another grain of sugar; and yet we are short of sugar in the United States. The War Production Board has been producing alcohol from molasses derived from sugar. The use of alcohol has been increasing year after year. If the Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to look after the farmers of the country, had not been asleep at the switch it might have worked out some process for using surplus wheat, corn, potatoes, and other things for the purpose of producing alcohol.

If they had worked out these processes we would not now be faced by the problem of the shortage of alcohol, we would not confront the problem of a shortage of sugar, we would not have the problem of the shortage of starch, and we would not be short of a number of other things.

Mr. President, a short time ago we were boasting that we were ready to lick the world; yet all of a sudden we find ourselves short of alcohol, short of rubber, short of transportation, short of everything else under the sun. The situation certainly presents a confusing picture to the American people. Here we are, the richest Nation on the face of this globe, blessed as no other nation under the sun has been blessed by the Creator of all men and of all things; and yet we have to ration gasoline because we are short of transportation; and we have to ration sugar, although our farmers have been pleading for years and years, in my State and elsewhere in the country, for an opportunity to produce more sugar in the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was not the Senator from Montana a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which brought in the sugar bill?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was not that bill passed at the request of the sugar producers, under the leadership of the late Senator Adams?

Mr. WHEELER. No, indeed; it was not. It was accepted because it was the best they could possibly get through, because of the opposition of the Department of Agriculture and the State Department; and they took it because they had to take it, because it was the best they could get.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They got what they asked for, did they not?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; they did not. It was not what they asked for.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, they never presented any other bill to Congress, did they?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; other bills were presented, and a fight was made on the floor of the Senate to get more; but they were told they could not get anything better. They took what they could get, because that was the best they could possibly get under the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I know the Senator from Montana has a very keen memory; but if any bill has ever been presented here which had the support of the Senators from the sugar-producing States, which was not passed, it was certainly at a time when I was not present.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I am quite familiar with the situation regarding sugar.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me ask the Senator when any such bill was ever defeated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. It was not defeated on the floor of the Senate; but I repeat that we were definitely told what the program was and what we had to take.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said that on the floor of the Senate it was stated they could not get a bill through.

Mr. WHEELER. No; if I made that statement, I was in error; I never intended to make such a statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. If there has ever been a bill before the Senate which the sugar producers supported, and which was not passed, I do not know of it.

Mr. WHEELER. We were definitely told that was all we could get, that that was what we had to take. No Senator from a Western State has been entirely satisfied with the sugar legislation which has been passed by the Congress. The Senator knows that in the past 10 years we could not pass sugar legislation through both branches of Congress and have it become a law if the President opposed it. We could not pass it over the veto of the President, so we did the next best thing—we took what we could get.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator has said, "We were told it could not pass the Congress." I should like to know who told that to the Senator. I simply want to remark in this connection that since I have been a Member of the Senate I have always been ready to vote for any sugar bill which has been proposed.

Mr. WHEELER. We were definitely given to understand by the Department of Agriculture and by the administration that we could not get what we wanted with reference to sugar; and there is not a Senator from a Western State who has not been pleading for larger quotas for sugar. That statement is true with respect to every Senator from the sugar-beet producing areas, and likewise every Senator from the Southern States, in which cane is produced. That has been repeatedly stated.

Mr. HUGHES. I have been ready at all times to vote to enable the farmers of America to produce as much cane sugar and beet sugar as they could produce, and as much as the country needed.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may have been willing to do so; but I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and other Senators who have been interested in the sugar problem have known definitely that such a proposal could not be gotten through the Senate, and, of course, could not be finally enacted into law. I do not know of a Senator from a beet-sugar producing State who has not been trying to obtain and who has not repeatedly gone to the Department of Agriculture and asked for larger quotas. We have been asking for them in the last year or so. We have tried to get a sugar factory in the city of Great Falls. We have tried to have a sugar factory located in Miles City, so as to take care of the area there; but we were not permitted to do so. This year the sugar farmers are permitted to raise all the sugar beets they want to raise, but the difficulty is that refineries are not available in which to process the beets.

The State Department has always taken the position that we had to take over so much of the sugar from the Philippine Islands, from Cuba, and other places, in order to placate those countries. They said our foreign policy—whatever that was—demanded that the farmers of America curtail the production of sugar. As a result of this program we are short of sugar.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I have heard the Senator's statement. Let me say it is my understanding that at the present time the Government owns all the Cuban sugar. Does it not? Is it not true that we have bought all the Cuban sugar?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether we have bought all of it; but my understanding is that we have an option on it if we have not bought it outright.

Mr. HUGHES. The statement the Senator made, as I understood it, was that there was plenty of sugar there, and that the warehouses were bursting. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. WHEELER. What I said was that a very distinguished gentleman from my State, a man who is very reliable, has just returned from Cuba within the last 3 weeks, and he told me that the warehouses in Cuba were filled to overflowing with sugar, and that he had visited the various warehouses.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator know of any reason why we should not get that sugar and bring it here?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not; but I say to the Senator that I mean to inquire why that sugar has not been transported to the United States, when we are short of sugar at the present time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me ask him if he does not suppose that Mr. Hitler had a hand in that matter. Have not the shipping facilities been rapidly destroyed?

Mr. WHEELER. Although Mr. Hitler has without a doubt destroyed some of the shipping facilities, I do not think that is a valid excuse for keeping the sugar in Cuba, and not bringing it into the United States. I do not think the situation is so serious from that standpoint. Perhaps I am wrong about that, but I do not believe I am. If that is the case, then certainly we are in a very, very difficult position. If we cannot bring the sugar from Cuba to Florida or to other parts of the United States, then we are in a very difficult position.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to interpose at this point to say that it is not a question of lack of ships to convoy the freighters which carry sugar from Cuba to the United States, or which a little earlier were convoying from Hawaii, or even earlier from the Philippines, but it is a question of lack of freighters themselves. Those ships are being used for other purposes, purposes considered more vital than the carrying of sugar.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Michigan may be correct about it so far as the Philippines and the Hawaiian Islands are concerned, but it certainly does not seem to me that we should be short of sugar if there is plenty of sugar in Cuba, and there should be means of bringing the sugar from Cuba to the United States.

The gentleman to whom I have previously referred said, in addition, that the new Cuban sugar crop is coming on, and that the sugar in the warehouses would have to be moved in order that facilities might be afforded in which to store the sugar which is coming on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps it is only fair to say that the situation with respect to the Cuban sugar crop is complicated by the fact that there are several uses to which sugar must be put at the present time. In the first place, part of the Cuban crop of necessity has been used in the manufacture of alcohol which is needed in the war program. I was one of those who believed that the War Production Board should have been a good deal more active than it was in transforming the distillation facilities of the United States so that grain, rather than sugar, would be used for the manufacture of alcohol. I think the conversion was made rather slowly, but it is being made, I am advised, to some extent.

In addition to the amount of sugar needed for the manufacture of industrial alcohol, there is also the amount needed for shipment to Great Britain and to others of the United Nations. Not only is a portion of the Cuban crop being used for the United Nations, that is to say, for Great Britain and also for Russia, but, I am advised, that those who have been handling the lease-lend program have endeavored to make the distribution of the Cuban crop, relatively, upon the basis of the previous record. Before the war a considerable portion of the Cuban crop and of some of the crop from other islands in the Caribbean Sea was used for transportation to Europe. The shipping problem, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] has indicated, has made such transportation difficult.

So far as the domestic consumption of sugar is concerned, the Senator from Montana is quite right. Those of us who represent beet-growing States have never been satisfied with the amount of sugar which was allowed to us; we were always asking for a larger quota and we always felt that it seemed a little anomalous, so to speak, that, with the United States unable to produce more than one-third of the amount it consumed, we should not at the same time be expanding the production of sugar beets and sugarcane wherever possible. As the Senator from Montana has already stated, however, the policy of the State Department has been to restrain the expansion of our domestic industry so as to preserve a degree of the offshore industry in Cuba and elsewhere; but when all is said and done, no one, I think can deny that the Sugar Act has been one of the most successful of all the agricultural acts passed by the Congress. While probably no element of the sugar industry has ever been satisfied with what has been secured under that act, the fact remains that the sugar industry, as a whole, has been tremendously benefited by that act and the interest of the consumer has also been preserved. By and large, it can be said that if one were to take the average of the production of sugar in continental United States during the 3 or 4 years prior to the passage of the so-called Jones-Costigan Act in 1934 and compare it with the production of sugar in continental United States in the last 4 years, he would find that the continental production has been increased by more than 600,000 tons, or in excess of 20 percent, as the Senator from Michigan suggests to me. The beet area has never been actually restricted in terms of acreage except in 1941.

The Senator from Montana, the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Colorado, myself, and others, in June, a year ago, stood on this floor and predicted the shortage of shipping which now has cut off all our supplies from the Philippines. We urged at that time that any deficit in the amount allotted to the Philippine Islands should be allotted to the domestic producing area. The Senate of the United States agreed with us; the bill was passed; it went to the House, and there it died; but fairness again compels us to acknowledge that in 1941 the Department of Agriculture probably could not foresee, and certainly few of us thought, that we would be involved in the war as soon as we were, although many of us believed, as the RECORD at that time will show, that shipping was constantly becoming more and more difficult. Still the fact remains that the year 1941 was the only year under the Sugar Act when the planting of sugar in the West was restricted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHEELER. I have the floor, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely desire to ask a question for information. Is the unrestricted use of sugar-beet land permitted now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Could as many sugar beets be raised as might be desired by those who cultivate them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is not any restriction in effect at all now. That is true also of cane sugar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator advised as to what will be the increase of sugar production in the beet-sugar States this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be very difficult to make a prediction because there are other factors which enter into the situation; for example, lack of agricultural labor, and then the restrictions which have been placed upon the manufacture of farm machinery by the W. P. B. The Senator from Tennessee will be interested, as, I think, all other Senators will, in a case which came to my attention about 3 months ago. About 1938 or 1939 a machinist in the little town of Torrington, Wyo., which is the center of an irrigated area where sugar beets are raised in profusion and where there is a sugar factory, invented what he called a beet loader. In the year 1940 he manufactured and sold 70 of these machines. They were so efficient that a great demand for them arose among the farmers of that area. In 1941 he manufactured and sold 220 of those machines; this year, 1942, he had orders in his shop for more than 500 of them; he had the material in his shop with which to manufacture not fewer than 350; but the restriction order which was issued by the War Production Board limited him to the manufacture of 90 percent of what he manufactured in 1940; so that, with the material in his shop to make not fewer than 350, with the orders on hand, and, in many instances, payment for them already received, he was prevented from making more than 70 machines. I am glad to be able to say that the War Production Board modified that order, and he has been permitted to manufacture, as I recall, 140 or 150; but still the demand cannot be met. That is a circumstance which illustrates the difficulties the beet farmer

must overcome in order to expand his acreage.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask one more question if the Senator from Montana will permit me.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I was seeking to ascertain was whether if a tremendous crop of sugar beets should be raised this year, sufficient machinery would be available to extract the sugar from the beets?

Mr. O'MAHONEY Of course, many areas in the West would like to have sugar refineries constructed—that is to say, sugar mills such as the one to which the Senator from Montana was referring. In Montana, in Nebraska, in Wyoming there are great areas in which no such sugar factory has been constructed, and, as a result, the beets have been transported a great distance to the factories, and now, because of priorities, it is impossible to build additional mills.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there sufficient machinery in the country to extract the sugar from the beets if a good crop shall be raised?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would be possible to process all the beets which might be raised.

I thank the Senator from Montana for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much, indeed. I know the Senator from Wyoming has probably given greater study to the sugar question than has any other Member of the Senate. I did not intend to get into the sugar question when I rose, but the situation in the Northwest is that in the irrigation districts, where the land has been irrigated in many instances by the Government, which has succeeded in inducing people to go there and settle, those who have gone there and taken up the land found that during the years of the depression practically the only cash crop they could raise was sugar beets. They wanted to raise sugar beets but they could not raise them because they could not get the refineries.

The refinery interests, as was stated on the floor of the Senate last year, were willing to build, so I am informed, a refinery in the city of Great Falls and also a refinery in another section of the State of Montana to take care of the increased sugar acreage, but they cannot do it unless they are sure that, after they build the refinery, the sugar-beet acreage will not be curtailed again as it was in 1941. They cannot afford to go ahead and build a sugar refinery and then have the Department of Agriculture deprive them of the opportunity of getting sugar beets.

Now, the Department says that the farmer can raise all the sugar beets he wants to, but the trouble is the farmer cannot find a place where he can have his sugar beets processed, because there are no factories in the particular district and they cannot afford to ship the beets long distances in order that they may be processed. The Department comes along now and says, "You can raise all the sugar beets you want to." The trouble is that the farmer cannot find a place where his sugar beets may be processed, because there are no factories in that particular district, and they cannot afford to ship the beets the long distance necessary to reach a refinery.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator puts his finger on a very vital matter. We have to make some sort of a legislative and administrative determination of the very question he raises, whether or not we are to permit the construction of additional sugar-beet and sugarcane refineries.

The situation in Florida well illustrates the condition. There is no question that the United States Sugar Beet Corporation could produce a tremendous additional amount of sugar in Florida if they knew that the policy of the Government would be such as would permit the continued production of sugar in the years after the war. I think the industry is in a very unstable condition because of the uncertainty of what is to be the policy. I am glad the Senator from Montana has called attention to the question, because I believe those of us who have constituents who are interested should get together and seek some solution of the problem; determine whether the sugar policy is to be the policy of 1932 to 1940, or whether we are to permit the addition of a great many sugar beet processing plants, and whether we are to permit the expansion of the sugarcane industry in Florida, in Louisiana, and at other places.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. Along that line, as I stated a moment ago, I am informed by leading members of the chamber of commerce in the city of Great Falls that refining interests came there and said, "We are willing to come in and build a sugar refinery provided we can have some assurance that we can get the sugar beets to process in the refinery for 3 or 4 years." As I recall, it was 3 or 4 years; I forget the exact length of time. They could not get any assurance, so some of us went to the Department of Agriculture to see if we could not get some assurance there, but they could not give us any. Now they say, "Of course, you can go ahead and produce all the sugar beets you want to produce," but we cannot get a refining company to put up a refinery unless they know they can operate it for at least 4 or 5 years. Secondly, they cannot get priorities on materials now, because the steel is needed in other activities.

Go to a large group of farmers in the Northwest, who desire to produce sugar beets, and, when they are facing an economic depression and are being driven off their farms, and their places are being sold under mortgages, try to explain to them how we have to buy sugar from the Philippines and from Cuba and from other countries, and that we will not permit American farmers, who are losing their farms, and whose families are being driven off the farms, to grow sugar, because of the policy of the State Department in Washington. It is said we have to take care of the Cubans, but these American farmers would say, "After all, we are the ones who pay the taxes in this country, we are the ones who build the homes and schools and the churches here, and we are the ones, here in the United States, this country should look after, before it looks after some other people."

There is no member of the Senate who can go to those farmers, when their mortgages are about to be foreclosed and they are going to be driven off their farms, when their farms are being sold for taxes, and say to them, "We have to do this because we have to protect the Philippine Islands, or some other place."

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I have no personal interest, nor have my constituents, in the sugar-producing business, because we produce neither sugar beets nor sugarcane in my State, nor do we refine sugar. I am rather interested in the subject, however, having come in contact with it first in Louisiana, and later in Florida, and still later when I was in the West.

I learned in Florida that the people there could produce a vast amount of sugar, but they do not have a refinery in the State, the nearest refinery being in Georgia, an adjoining State. It takes about 2 years, after the cuttings are put in, to raise a crop of cane. Then the cane would be taken to Georgia, and the refining done there. I think the same situation prevails in Louisiana. I do not think there is a refinery there, from what I have understood, but they can produce a great quantity of sugar in that State. They could produce much sugar to meet our needs if they were given the opportunity.

It would require an expenditure of a sizable sum of money to plant the sugarcane, to grow it to maturity, and to have refineries built; and the people in Florida and Louisiana, like those in the West to whom the Senator has referred, hesitate to go into that line of business unless they have assurance that it will continue, and will justify the investment of money. I found the same condition in the West when I made inquiry there.

I have always felt that it was a very unusual condition for the people of a country to be able to produce a commodity in quite sufficient quantity to take care of the needs of its own people, and yet not be allowed to do it, making us dependent on an uncertain supply from a distant source. For that reason, as I stated a while ago, I early became convinced that those who want to grow sugar beets and those who want to grow sugarcane in this country should be permitted to do so, to take their sugar to the market, and to sell it to our people.

I understand the argument about our having to take care of the Philippines and to take Cuba into consideration. Of course, we know the Philippines are out of the picture at this time, so far as the supply of sugar is concerned, but we are told that the warehouses in Cuba are bursting with a large supply of sugar, while we are rationing our people. We do not get the sugar from Cuba, although we have an option on it. Why is that sugar not brought in?

Mr. WHEELER. I must confess that when I was told about the sugar supply in Cuba—and, as I have stated, the statement was made to me by an exceedingly reputable man from my State—I was astounded, and could hardly believe it. If it had come to me from almost any other source I would not have believed it.

Mr. HUGHES. I should be willing to see steps taken to give our people assurance that if they went into sugar production they would not lose by it, that they would not be shut off later on. I have been ready to vote for such legislation, and whenever an opportunity has been afforded to do so, I have seized the opportunity.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. As I have said, we find ourselves in the same situation in regard to other products. We find ourselves short of copper; we find ourselves short of manganese; but away back in 1933 I took up with the War Department and the Navy Department the matter of the supply of those necessary metals, urging them, when they were putting miners on the W. P. A. rolls at $56 a month, to buy copper, which was selling at that time for 5 cents a pound, and put it in a stock pile and keep it for defense purposes. I made the same suggestion in reference to manganese. In all fairness to the Navy Department and the War Department, both were anxious to put in a stock pile of manganese, but we were never able to get anything done about it.

I think the time is coming when our people are going to have to look to their own efforts, and produce everything they can produce here in the United States, rather than depend upon some other country. As the Senator from Wyoming has said, many of us from the Western States have time and time again pointed out that if anything should happen, if war should break out between the United States and the Japanese, the Philippine sugar supply would be cut off, and that consequently it was necessary, for our own protection, that we permit the farmers of this country to produce in the United States, as they could produce it, the sugar our people need.

If we had developed our manganese mines in 1933 to the extent to which we should have developed them, we would not now find ourselves short of manganese; and the same is true as to copper. We would have had stock piles of copper in the United States, and we would not have had to depend upon other countries for either copper or manganese. Of course it is easy to look back now and say what should have been done.

Mr. President, what I rose to say was that it is all very well to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that we should not legislate on an appropriation bill with respect to this matter; but if the farmers of the United States must depend upon the Congress of the United States for appropriations year after year they will not receive them unless the farm program is carried out in the most businesslike and economical way possible. All sorts of excuses can be found for the present way of handling the program, but I cannot understand why there should be such a tremendous variance between the cost in one State compared with the cost in another State. It may cost more in a State which contains many small farms than it does in a State where the farms are large; but when we find great disparity in costs of administering the program in adjoining States it is hard to understand why that difference should exist. In my opinion, such differences should not exist. I am afraid there has been too much laxity in the administration of the law. I ask the Senator from Virginia what the figure of cost for the State of Rhode Island is?

Mr. BYRD. Twenty percent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I saw for a moment a copy of the table to which the Senator from Virginia referred, and naturally I looked at the figure for the State of Delaware and compared it with a State farther up the coast, Connecticut. The cost in Delaware was 5.9 percent and the cost in Connecticut 10 percent. In other words, the cost is about 5 percent higher in Connecticut than in Delaware. Why does that difference exist? I do not understand it.

Mr. WHEELER. The cost in the State of Rhode Island is 20.6 percent—Bristol County, 25 percent; Kent County, 21 percent; Newport County, 21 percent; Providence County, 18 percent; Washington County, 17 percent.

I see that the cost in South Carolina is 6.4 percent.

I shall mention certain counties in the State of Tennessee. Anderson County, 21 percent; Bedford County, 7 percent; Benton County, 17 percent. The cost runs as high as 27 percent in other counties.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the average for Tennessee?

Mr. WHEELER. The average for Tennessee is 12 percent.

I look at the figures for the State of Texas. Certainly the farms in Texas are not small ones. In some counties the cost runs as high as 22 percent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. The cost in the State of Connecticut is 10.3 percent, whereas in the State of Delaware it is 5.9 percent. Why does such a difference exist?

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot answer the question. In Utah the cost is 11 percent, whereas in the State of Montana it is 5 percent. The farms in the States of Montana and Utah are in practically the same category. The cost in the State of Virginia is 15 percent. I do not know why it should cost 15 percent in Virginia when it costs less than 6 percent in the State of Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. We are more economical in Delaware than they are in Virginia.

Mr. WHEELER. The cost in the State of Oregon is 10.3 percent. In Pennsylvania it is 12 percent. Pennsylvania is one of the large farming States of the East, and its cost is 12 percent, whereas the cost in the State of Rhode Island is 20 percent. The cost in the State of Oklahoma is 6.7 percent, and in Ohio 9.3 percent. The cost in North Dakota is 5.1 percent. It seems to me the farmers in Montana, where the cost is 5 percent, must be a more honest class than those in the East in States where the cost is 15 percent, 18 percent, and 20 percent. I have always contended that our people in the West were a little more intelligent than those in some of the Eastern States, without specifying any particular State.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator think that all those constituting the "economy bloc" from Virginia have come to the Capitol and that none are left at home? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. In New Jersey the cost is 10 percent, in New Hampshire 14 percent, and in Nevada 15 percent. Certainly there are no small farms in the State of Nevada. In Nebraska the cost is 7 percent. The explanation given on the floor of the Senate of the wide divergence in the various percentages of cost certainly does not make sense to me.

The cost in one county in Montana runs as high as 21 percent. I know that county very well. In another county in Montana the cost runs as high as 52 percent. There is no excuse for the cost running as high as 52 percent in any county.

Mr. RUSSELL. What was the total amount paid in the county where the cost is 52 percent?

Mr. WHEELER. Gross payments $7,630. Association expense $4,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. What county was that?

Mr. WHEELER. That was in Lincoln County.

Mr. RUSSELL. And what State?

Mr. WHEELER. Montana.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the highest percentage I have heard of.

Mr. WHEELER. It is 52 percent. There certainly is something wrong with the association or with someone when the charge for association expenses is $4,000 out of the $7,630 paid to the farmers. In another county in the same State the total payment is $189,000, with $9,000 paid out in association expenses, or 4 percent.

In St. Louis County, Mo., the cost is 33 percent. In a county in the State of Michigan the cost is 37 percent. There the gross payments were $4,000 and association benefits $1,500. In another county the cost is 44 percent, $8,700 being the gross payments, and $3,867 going to the association.

Mr. President, no one can convince me that there is not something wrong when such conditions are not checked up and stopped by the Department of Agriculture. Sooner or later the people of the United States will cease to stand for such conditions and the whole agricultural program will break down. Those of us who are interested in the farm program cannot come to Congress and ask for appropriations of millions of dollars to help the farmers, when in some counties 50 percent goes into the expense of distributing the money, in other counties 40 percent, and in other counties 33 percent. Think of a cost of $4,000 to distribute $7,000 gross payments.

Mr. President, there is something "rotten in Denmark" when such a condition is permitted to continue. Whether the condition exists in my State or in some other State, I say there is no excuse for such a high percentage of cost. A variance of from 20 percent in the State of Rhode Island to less than 6 percent in Delaware is something which cannot easily be explained away. I do not believe any Senator can justify such a variance.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Montana that I am not familiar with the sugar situation, but it happens that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has before it two bills dealing with the rubber situation. One is a bill offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] proposing to prohibit the operation of a motor car in excess of 40 miles an hour and providing that the car shall be forfeited to the Government for violation of the prohibition. The other bill is the bill of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] providing that the Government shall be given the power to requisition private cars for the purpose of taking them over and acquiring the rubber that may be in the tires on the cars. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs has had a number of hearings on those bills and on the question of rubber. As the result of the hearings I was interested in ascertaining just what was the record so far as rubber was concerned, and what had been done by the Government, and more particularly by the Department of Agriculture, with respect to rubber and a rubber supply. I find from the record that the Department of Agriculture has been working for some time in an effort to free us from our dependence on the East Indies in the matter of rubber. The fact is that the Department of Agriculture, when the distinguished Vice President first became Secretary of Agriculture, laid down a program looking toward providing a supply of rubber.

The program was divided into four parts: First, encouragement of the production of natural rubber in Latin America; second, encouragement of the production of natural rubber in the United States; third, development of synthetic rubber in the United States; and fourth, building up a rubber stock pile against the day of need.

Through the years former Secretary WALLACE sought to carry out that program, and came to Congress not once, but a number of times, in an effort to obtain appropriations looking toward the fulfillment of the program. In many instances the money was denied. In some cases the money was granted. In one or two instances in which the House had denied funds the Senate granted at least a part of the funds requested.

I think the position of the Department was perhaps best summarized by a statement which the Secretary of Agriculture made, and which appeared in the New York Times under date of July 9, 1939. The then Secretary WALLACE voiced these views:

> It would seem wise for the Americas to begin to plan at once for the gradual assertion of rubber independence. It will be a slow job because in Latin America they have what is known as the South American leaf spot disease, which is absent in the rubber-growing sections of the East Indies; but by using scientific methods it will undoubtedly be possible to develop in Latin America strains of rubber plants which are both high-yielding and disease-resistant. This will require the utmost cooperation between Latin American people and resources and North American science and capital, but the job can and will be done to the satisfaction of all concerned within a few years after the will to do it definitely appears.

As I have said, we find from the record that prior to that statement the Secretary had appeared before various committees of Congress, including the Appropriations Committees. For example, on June 7, 1938, the Secretary appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and discussed the question of rubber. He made a plea for funds with which the Department might carry on its program.

On April 10, 1939, we find the Secretary again before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate with another plea for funds to carry forward this program in an effort to free us from our dependence for rubber supply on the East Indies, so that we might have a supply of rubber within the Western Hemisphere, and, so far as possible, within the United States itself.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, when the plea was made, was it for money to build plants to produce alcohol from grains, and then convert it into synthetic rubber?

Mr. HILL. One of the programs was for the development of synthetic rubber.

Mr. WHEELER. How much was asked for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. I do not know that I can give the Senator the break-down of the figures; but I know that one phase of the program was the development of synthetic rubber, bearing in mind, as the Senator well knows, that in order to produce synthetic rubber a certain amount of natural rubber is necessary. It is necessary to have a certain amount of natural rubber in combination with the synthetic rubber produced from alcohol, petroleum, or any other source of supply for synthetic rubber.

The record clearly shows that the Department of Agriculture has been working for some years in an effort to make us independent of the supply of rubber in the East Indies in order that the Western Hemisphere, and more particularly the United States, might be independent.

I am sure the Senator will recall that several years ago the Department of Agriculture, working in conjunction with the distinguished then Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Byrnes, and Mr. Baruch, of New York, put through a trade deal by which we exchanged cotton for rubber, as one effort to try to build up the stock pile which the Department said we should have—at least a 2-year supply. So the Department of Agriculture certainly has been diligent in its efforts to give us an independent supply of rubber in order that we might not be forced to depend upon the East Indies.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have the Senator give me those facts. However, I happen to be a member of the Gillette committee, which is studying this question. We have had before us numerous experts, as well as representatives of the Department of Agriculture, including the Secretary of Agriculture. The only thing that has been done by the Department of Agriculture has been done by a pilot plant which was established only a few years ago, at the insistence of certain Senators who introduced bills appropriating money for pilot plants. As I understand, four such plants are now in operation.

Mr. HILL. I think we established four agricultural laboratories. One was at New Orleans, and three in various other places.

Mr. WHEELER. One is in California and one at Peoria, Ill.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator suggested, the idea was to conduct experiments at one of those plants looking toward the production of synthetic rubber.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. According to the testimony before our committee, the pilot plant in Illinois has worked out a process by which we could develop synthetic rubber in the United States. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Nebraska are members of that committee. We have had experts from various universities before the committee. We have seen the letters which have been written to the O. P. M. by the University of Nebraska, or the State of Nebraska, and by the State of Idaho, asking for materials. They already had practically 90 percent of the materials. They wanted to go ahead and build plants for the production of alcohol from which synthetic rubber could be produced; but they received no help and were turned down flatly by the O. P. M.

Mr. HILL. The record which I was discussing was the record of the Department of Agriculture. As to the O. P. M., I have had the rubber question up with the O. P. M. In my State of Alabama there was a concern which was interested in entering upon the production of synthetic rubber. I pursued the matter as diligently as I could. I found that the reason the O. P. M. could not go forward with the synthetic plants was that the construction of synthetic plants required a great amount of steel. That is the information which was given to me.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me correct the Senator. The production of synthetic rubber from gasoline requires much more steel than is used when it is produced from grain. That is the evidence before our committee. I am sorry the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is not present, because he has the facts at his fingertips. We have had hearings, and the evidence has been brought out. We have had experts from the O. P. M. and from the R. F. C., and they have all admitted that less steel is required to build a plant for the production of alcohol from grain than for the production of alcohol from gasoline or oil. However, the materials are not available. The production has been turned over to the oil companies, rather than to plants in the Middle West

where corn and other grains are produced.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps the plants for making synthetic rubber from petroleum had already been established before the plea was made to make it from corn. The Senator may know more about that subject than I do.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is in error.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps I am. The O. P. M. may feel that, although less steel would be required for a plant producing synthetic rubber from corn than by a plant producing synthetic rubber from petroleum, all the steel which now is available for synthetic-rubber production has already been allocated or put in use. We have only a certain amount of steel available. There is a tremendous demand for steel for ships, tanks, guns, and many other things which we need to win the war. That being the case, only a certain proportion of the available steel can be used for the production of synthetic rubber. I am wondering whether the part which can be allocated for the production of synthetic rubber has not already been allocated and whether that is the reason we cannot go further with the construction of rubber plants, whether they be plants to produce synthetic rubber from corn, petroleum, or any other source.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is not familiar with the facts, because the facts are not in accord with his statement if the testimony before our committee is correct.

Mr. HILL. What is the testimony before the Senator's committee?

Mr. WHEELER. The testimony before the committee—and I hope the Senator from Nebraska will correct me if I am in error—is that the University of Nebraska and other agencies in that State have been asking for allocations for material for a long time. They were turned down flatly. I am told that, as a matter of fact, they have practically all the material. A plant in Philadelphia has been asking for material. It has been turned down, and allocations have been made to other places.

Mr. HILL. Did the Philadelphia plant use the corn method?

Mr. WHEELER. The grain method. It is not produced entirely from corn, but from corn, wheat, and other grains.

Mr. HILL. As I have said, I am not familiar with the story of the O. P. M. However, I did wish to call attention to the record so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, and the efforts of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to be fair with the O. P. M. The testimony shows that it probably would cost more at the present time to produce alcohol from grain than from gasoline; but the main point which it seems to me should be taken into consideration is that we have surplus grains on hand while we are short of sugar. While the process is still in an experimental stage, the R. F. C. experts testified that the process is a good process, and is being used, and could be used more extensively. When there is a transportation shortage, it would be cheaper and easier to have the alcohol manufactured in factories in the Middle West, where the grain is produced, and then shipped east, rather than to ship the raw materials to the East. In addition, the evidence showed that there are by-products from the grain which could be used on the farms in the West and in the Middle West for the feeding of cattle.

There is much confusion with respect to rubber. One day we find someone issuing a statement to the effect that there is not a shortage of rubber, and the next day we find someone issuing a statement to the effect that there is a decided shortage of rubber; so I think the people of the country are extremely confused. However, I repeat what I said about the Department of Agriculture. In my judgment the Department of Agriculture has not been on the job. If it had been on the job it would have been here asking the Congress for appropriations for these purposes. It seems to me it would have come before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I have been a member for 20 years, and asked for such legislation. I do not remember that anyone ever came before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and asked for such legislation or ever pointed out the need for legislation to permit the use of this country's surplus grains for the purpose of making alcohol, starches, synthetic rubber, or anything else.

In the last 4 years the four pilot plants which have been established have done a very excellent job so far as they have gone. I think the men in charge of the pilot plant at Peoria, particularly, have done excellent work. I have forgotten the name of the town in California where one of the plants is located; but I think the men in charge of the plant there are doing a very remarkable job. They are not only discovering one or two uses to which various grains and grasses can be put, but are manufacturing articles in the production of which they are using surplus grains, and I am told by the experts there that they have made some really exceptional discoveries with respect to the use of such grains.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the Senator, as I have previously stated, that I do not know particularly about the manufacture of such articles from grain; but, as I have said, the record clearly shows that the Department of Agriculture and, more particularly, the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. WALLACE, was appearing before the Appropriations Committees of Congress as far back as 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940, seeking funds in order that the Department might carry out its program, a fourfold program as I have said, one for the production in this country of natural rubber, the production in South America of natural rubber, the production of synthetic rubber, and the accumulation of a stock pile. During all those years, as the record will show—and I have referred to certain dates—the then Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the various Appropriations Committees of the Congress seeking funds in behalf of that very program.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall appreciate it very much if the Senator will later call my attention to the appearance of anyone before the Appropriations Committees——

Mr. HILL. I will call the Senator's attention to it right now.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish my question, because I am sure the Senator cannot understand my question until I finish it.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator does not know what I am going to ask him until I have finished asking the question.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator sometimes engage in mental telepathy? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to be shown the testimony of anyone who has asked for money—and I should like to know how much money has been requested—for the construction of plants to manufacture either alcohol or rubber from grain. That is what I was discussing. I was not discussing requests for appropriations of money with which to develop the production of rubber in South America, Central America, or Mexico.

Mr. HILL. Or in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. I was talking about the development of factories for the production of industrial alcohol in the United States, for the purpose of using up the surplus grains, and also for the purpose of making rubber and other articles of that kind. I am not nearly so much interested in such production in South America; but I and a number of other Senators from the Middle West and the West have for a long time been vitally interested in the development of the use of grains in the manufacture of various articles in the United States. I am convinced that such uses can be developed, and can be made of great benefit to the farmers of this country, and that we can use surplus grains in the manufacture of various vital commodities needed by the people of the United States.

I think that is one of the matters which the Department of Agriculture should take into consideration, and must take into consideration in the immediate future. If that had been done in the past we should not now find ourselves short of alcohol and rubber, because we should have rubber plants which would have been developing synthetic rubber in the United States.

Other countries have established such plants; but instead of doing so ourselves, we have depended upon the East Indies; we have depended upon England; and we have depended upon the rubber trust. All of a sudden we find ourselves cut off. Today we find that we are operating on an economy based upon rubber. The supply of rubber cannot be cut off overnight without causing chaos in this country. The farmers of the country are dependent upon rubber. The operation of their machinery is dependent upon rubber. The farmers depend upon rubber in order to get their products from the farms to the elevators. They are dependent upon rubber, particularly in my section and in the Middle West, where

sometimes they live 30 or 40 miles from a railroad, and have no wagons or busses to use. They must use automobiles. If, overnight, their supply of tires and other rubber products is cut off, we shall find a decrease in the production of grain and other food supplies all over the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator said that at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory, since the establishment of that laboratory, experiments had been carried on for the production of rubber from grain. Of course, that work has been carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; and in my judgment those experimental stations have done very excellent work.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. The only trouble is that they were created only in the past 4 years. I do not know whether it is true, but the other day someone stated before the committee that these research laboratories were forced upon the Department of Agriculture. I do not know whether that statement is correct.

Mr. HILL. I do not think it is correct, because, as I very distinctly remember, the Department of Agriculture supported the establishment of those laboratories.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not sure about that.

Mr. HILL. I think there is no question that the Department of Agriculture supported the establishment of those laboratories. As the Senator says, that bill was introduced by a Member of this body. It had to be introduced by a Member of this body, because, of course, the departments do not introduce bills. However, I am sure that if the Senator will examine the record he will find that the bill providing for the establishment of those regional laboratories had the wholehearted support of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEFLER. I hope the Senator is correct. Of course, I have simply repeated—and perhaps I should not have done so—what a distinguished Member of this body said to me the other day with reference to that matter; but I have not had time to check the record. However, that is not material.

Those three or four laboratories are doing a very fine work. I want to see them expanded, because I think that such activity is one of the most essential and important things the Department of Agriculture can engage in for the benefit of the future development of the farms of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I merely wish to make a unanimous consent request in connection with an amendment. On April 27, I gave notice of a motion to suspend the rule in order that I might offer a certain amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill. I now find that I should change the total amount stated in the amendment, and may have the notice applied to it: Namely, on line 5, to strike out $53,000,000, and insert in lieu thereof $46,949,756.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 73, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have now received the corrected statement from the Department of Agriculture with respect to the payment of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I wish to say that the corrections are inconsequential, most of them relating to the decimal point not being correctly placed in the figures as to some of the counties. The percentages of the State payments have not been changed. These figures relate to payments, by counties, in the State of Alabama, the State of Arizona, the State of Arkansas, and several other States.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the body of the RECORD, and I should like to have the Senator from Georgia, if he cares to do so, examine it. It has come from the Department of Agriculture, but the corrections are more or less inconsequential, and do not affect any of the State totals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed.

The statement is as follows:

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program

ALABAMA

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Autauga	$162,856	$14,003	8.6
Baldwin	68,142	11,216	16.4
Barbour	203,207	19,204	9.4
Bibb	77,040	12,459	16.2
Blount	237,611	15,256	6.4
Bullock	136,250	13,358	9.8
Butler	184,026	13,729	7.5
Calhoun	159,917	15,407	8.3
Chambers	185,641	12,558	6.8
Cherokee	240,836	12,724	5.3
Chilton	156,581	12,545	8.0
Choctaw	99,875	12,435	13.0
Clarke	126,870	14,188	11.8
Clay	106,508	11,913	11.4
Cleburne	79,179	8,468	10.6
Coffee	219,678	15,584	7.1
Colbert	177,946	15,787	8.8
Conecuh	153,233	13,236	8.7
Coosa	72,492	11,654	16.0
Covington	231,323	16,570	7.2
Crenshaw	184,294	14,508	7.9
Cullman	414,638	27,985	6.7
Dale	128,914	14,590	11.3
Dallas	297,365	17,835	6.0
De Kalb	380,903	21,614	5.7
Elmore	249,715	18,244	7.3
Escambia	134,539	14,714	11.0
Etowah	202,629	14,656	7.2
Fayette	141,441	13,790	9.8
Franklin	184,986	17,988	9.7
Geneva	223,300	15,134	6.8
Greene	134,637	13,736	10.2
Hale	218,041	12,167	5.6
Henry	183,618	10,360	5.6
Houston	306,014	18,100	5.9
Jackson	266,101	21,529	8.1
Jefferson	71,625	13,237	18.4
Lamar	169,234	12,177	7.2
Lauderdale	288,571	26,338	9.2
Lawrence	283,117	17,627	6.2
Lee	167,699	11,045	6.6
Limestone	405,952	21,947	5.4
Lowndes	162,100	15,278	9.4
Macon	208,325	17,067	8.2

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

ALABAMA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Madison	$472,966	$25,111	5.3
Marengo	240,455	17,583	7.3
Marion	165,346	16,014	9.7
Marshall	375,056	20,933	5.6
Mobile	59,163	9,605	16.3
Monroe	235,878	19,597	8.3
Montgomery	183,899	16,223	8.8
Morgan	294,937	19,557	6.6
Perry	192,180	15,404	8.0
Pickens	224,026	19,136	8.5
Pike	238,920	11,975	5.0
Randolph	172,495	15,265	8.8
Russell	143,655	14,986	10.4
St. Clair	115,734	11,258	9.7
Shelby	90,882	8,287	9.1
Sumter	174,755	16,041	9.2
Talladega	223,045	18,333	8.2
Tallapoosa	168,294	16,659	9.9
Tuscaloosa	229,573	22,820	9.9
Walker	109,580	15,222	13.9
Washington	42,684	7,610	17.8
Wilcox	164,292	12,751	7.8
Winston	110,291	12,031	10.9
Total or average	12,914,355	1,036,361	8.0

ARIZONA

Apache	$83,535	$6,485	7.8
Cochise	73,537	5,052	6.9
Coconino	43,143	2,527	5.9
Gila	20,329	2,049	10.1
Graham	142,717	6,492	4.5
Greenlee	14,808	2,264	15.3
Maricopa	944,655	24,889	2.6
Mohave	51,747	4,634	9.0
Navajo	52,879	1,941	3.7
Pima	82,396	3,578	4.3
Pinal	374,028	11,924	3.2
Santa Cruz	10,967	575	5.2
Yavapai	74,940	3,843	5.1
Yuma	137,649	3,498	2.5
Total or average	2,107,360	79,751	3.8

ARKANSAS

Arkansas	220,437	$9,736	4.4
Ashley	219,883	8,317	3.8
Baxter	33,187	4,012	12.1
Benton	173,324	4,465	2.6
Boone	82,119	4,532	5.5
Bradley	85,739	6,392	7.5
Calhoun	68,137	5,100	7.5
Carroll	89,758	4,368	4.9
Chicot	307,528	10,144	3.3
Clark	135,456	6,758	5.0
Clay	368,898	11,691	3.8
Cleburne	91,370	5,937	6.5
Cleveland	107,525	7,339	6.8
Columbia	223,327	11,632	5.2
Conway	188,398	8,018	4.2
Craighead	506,641	15,481	3.0
Crawford	95,549	5,175	5.4
Crittenden	678,616	15,202	2.2
Cross	280,906	11,694	4.2
Dallas	54,988	5,499	10.0
Desha	288,163	9,078	3.1
Drew	138,328	7,900	5.7
Faulkner	231,597	8,945	3.9
Franklin	99,345	5,256	5.3
Fulton	65,383	4,387	6.7
Garland	30,131	5,155	17.1
Grant	46,405	5,060	11.0
Greene	265,634	10,166	3.8
Hempstead	222,910	11,602	5.2
Hot Spring	62,513	4,397	7.0
Howard	113,752	6,798	6.0
Independence	150,532	9,187	6.0
Izard	93,865	4,499	4.8
Jackson	288,646	14,308	4.9
Jefferson	447,557	13,485	3.0
Johnson	111,919	5,284	4.7
Lafayette	167,514	7,680	4.6
Lawrence	198,137	9,708	5.0
Lee	330,670	13,803	4.2
Lincoln	252,467	11,890	4.7
Little River	118,034	6,542	5.5
Logan	137,411	7,432	5.4
Lonoke	372,362	14,441	3.9
Madison	71,140	3,796	5.3
Marion	44,619	4,680	10.5
Miller	190,883	9,885	5.2
Mississippi	1,418,213	31,687	2.2
Monroe	205,164	11,928	5.8
Montgomery	38,513	4,346	11.3
Nevada	144,728	7,305	5.0
Newton	27,245	4,148	15.2

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

ARKANSAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Ouachita	$82,162	$8,555	10.4
Perry	58,894	5,779	9.8
Phillips	441,865	10,990	2.5
Pike	63,550	5,218	8.0
Poinsett	464,254	15,020	3.2
Polk	46,644	5,012	10.7
Pope	171,196	6,911	4.0
Prairie	123,051	10,258	8.3
Pulaski	237,236	8,455	3.6
Randolph	141,089	8,048	5.7
St. Francis	425,481	18,566	4.4
Saline	37,443	5,386	14.0
Scott	63,492	5,823	9.2
Searcy	33,148	4,364	13.2
Sebastian	96,243	5,472	5.7
Sevier	64,750	4,666	7.2
Sharp	78,873	5,911	7.5
Stone	26,609	3,995	15.0
Union	129,143	8,328	6.4
Van Buren	92,790	5,328	5.7
Washington	140,989	5,958	4.2
White	307,069	13,277	4.3
Woodruff	245,341	9,397	3.8
Yell	169,965	8,455	5.0
Total or average	14,066,933	625,441	4.4

CALIFORNIA

Alameda	$49,829	$8,200	16.5
Alpine	624	268	42.9
Amador	10,413	2,526	24.3
Butte	204,178	18,077	8.9
Calaveras	7,052	1,921	27.2
Colusa	201,289	15,302	7.6
Contra Costa	86,122	16,216	18.8
Del Norte	3,588	1,459	40.7
Eldorado	10,406	2,649	25.5
Fresno	1,024,895	73,798	7.2
Glenn	153,702	12,681	8.3
Humboldt	48,047	8,989	18.7
Imperial	295,977	26,313	8.9
Inyo	1,261	434	34.4
Kern	809,770	50,208	6.2
Kings	462,334	29,074	6.3
Lake	23,927	7,149	29.9
Lassen	30,864	6,482	21.0
Los Angeles	190,616	29,790	15.6
Madera	510,339	25,196	4.9
Marin	11,668	2,219	19.0
Mariposa	7,951	1,824	22.9
Mendocino	67,608	10,961	16.2
Merced	439,931	38,054	8.6
Modoc	38,846	5,721	14.7
Mono	1,354	448	33.1
Monterey	110,545	9,961	9.0
Napa	63,067	10,849	17.2
Nevada	3,800	1,050	27.6
Orange	160,533	25,243	15.7
Placer	66,129	7,022	10.6
Plumas	4,190	1,424	34.0
Riverside	206,466	46,373	22.5
Sacramento	162,833	17,174	10.5
San Benito	70,945	7,126	10.0
San Bernardino	176,317	26,890	15.3
San Diego	161,448	41,823	25.9
San Joaquin	305,501	41,022	13.4
San Luis Obispo	118,978	15,988	13.4
San Mateo	24,657	4,882	19.8
Santa Barbara	69,311	8,077	11.7
Santa Clara	186,154	21,181	11.4
Santa Cruz	39,719	6,988	17.6
Shasta	20,193	4,259	21.1
Sierra	1,566	743	47.4
Siskiyou	65,403	7,142	10.9
Solano	94,714	8,829	9.3
Sonoma	77,774	11,756	15.1
Stanislaus	237,579	39,275	26.5
Sutter	153,680	17,526	11.4
Tehama	84,936	11,832	13.9
Trinity	5,857	1,936	33.1
Tulare	1,116,849	65,560	5.9
Tuolumne	3,861	1,521	39.4
Ventura	132,439	9,562	7.2
Yolo	117,523	7,949	6.8
Yuba	39,781	5,195	13.1
Total or average	8,775,339	882,117	10.1

COLORADO

Adams	$128,822	$8,740	6.8
Alamosa	67,659	4,846	7.2
Arapahoe	73,716	6,449	8.7
Archuleta	6,565	2,349	35.8
Baca	316,893	19,885	6.3
Bent	79,646	6,834	8.6
Boulder	86,629	6,043	7.0

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

COLORADO—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Chaffee	$5,653	$792	14.0
Cheyenne	104,709	8,640	8.3
Conejos	58,203	7,284	12.5
Costilla	10,941	3,982	36.4
Crowley	27,958	5,075	18.2
Custer	11,344	2,883	25.4
Delta	32,070	8,711	27.2
Dolores	1,987	1,772	89.2
Douglas	25,989	2,884	11.1
Eagle	16,342	2,602	15.9
Elbert	107,819	12,073	11.2
El Paso	124,554	10,146	8.1
Fremont	16,514	5,688	34.4
Garfield	33,174	7,684	23.2
Grand	13,759	1,938	14.1
Gunnison	5,341	1,197	22.4
Huerfano	14,809	5,602	37.8
Jackson	20,991	906	4.3
Jefferson	24,056	2,921	12.1
Kiowa	98,150	8,166	8.3
Kit Carson	225,186	16,586	7.4
La Plata	39,971	8,810	22.0
Larimer	123,662	9,817	7.9
Las Animas	102,268	12,452	12.2
Lincoln	173,849	11,447	6.6
Logan	258,836	14,506	5.6
Mesa	18,108	4,883	27.0
Moffat	24,403	5,303	21.7
Montezuma	15,827	4,968	31.4
Montrose	57,158	7,681	13.4
Morgan	185,758	14,371	7.7
Otero	62,866	6,463	10.3
Ouray	9,316	2,145	23.0
Park	24,007	3,599	15.0
Phillips	196,655	8,038	4.1
Pitkin	10,541	2,170	20.6
Prowers	179,484	11,992	6.7
Pueblo	66,418	10,473	15.8
Rio Blanco	12,547	2,978	23.7
Rio Grande	159,469	6,221	3.9
Routt	20,772	4,201	20.2
Saguache	74,023	3,463	4.7
San Miguel	4,350	1,531	35.2
Sedgwick	123,253	6,496	5.3
Summit	3,391	660	19.5
Teller	13,131	2,832	21.6
Washington	261,120	17,870	6.8
Weld	594,003	41,445	7.0
Yuma	306,295	15,604	5.1
Total or average	4,860,960	415,099	8.5

CONNECTICUT

Fairfield	$36,707	$5,066	13.8
Hartford	233,088	18,159	7.8
Litchfield	57,328	5,419	9.4
Middlesex	30,218	4,666	15.4
New Haven	51,642	8,221	15.9
New London	63,370	6,470	10.2
Tolland	45,953	5,430	11.8
Windham	32,538	3,516	10.8
Total or average	550,844	56,947	10.3

DELAWARE

Kent	$151,330	$7,492	5.0
New Castle	106,103	4,427	4.2
Sussex	230,529	16,629	7.2
Total or average	487,962	28,548	5.9

FLORIDA

Alachua	$48,094	$13,601	28.0
Baker	7,680	2,451	32.0
Bay	2,520	635	25.0
Bradford	15,837	2,023	12.7
Brevard	53,769	2,765	5.1
Broward	67,611	4,156	6.1
Calhoun	9,107	2,629	28.8
Charlotte	37,730	1,288	3.4
Citrus	3,988	1,366	34.2
Clay	10,290	745	7.0
Collier	7,612	219	3.0
Columbia	41,852	10,204	24.0
Dade	81,343	4,402	5.4
De Soto	38,820	5,648	15.2
Dixie	3,200	798	25.0
Duval	3,524	456	13.0
Escambia	24,788	2,440	10.0
Flagler	13,795	1,145	8.3
Gadsden	33,166	9,904	30.0
Gilchrist	21,703	4,806	22.0
Glades	27,142	1,254	5.0

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

FLORIDA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Gulf	$558	$117	21.0
Hamilton	59,193	7,248	12.2
Hardee	42,834	7,039	16.4
Hendry	5,432	659	12.1
Hernando	20,380	1,515	7.4
Highlands	97,040	4,289	4.4
Hillsborough	58,033	14,096	24.3
Holmes	40,742	5,711	14.0
Indian River	20,247	1,461	7.3
Jackson	114,535	21,201	18.5
Jefferson	39,317	8,619	21.9
Lafayette	27,295	4,077	15.0
Lake	78,774	8,268	10.5
Lee	16,513	3,403	20.6
Leon	27,035	7,334	27.1
Levy	27,577	5,408	19.6
Liberty	699	394	56.3
Madison	86,564	8,931	10.3
Manatee	52,929	4,609	8.7
Marion	51,154	10,474	20.1
Martin	3,594	593	16.4
Nassau	5,499	1,645	30.0
Okaloosa	25,010	4,119	16.5
Okeechobee	2,739	1,360	50.0
Orange	103,886	9,123	9.0
Osceola	54,750	1,612	2.9
Palm Beach	98,850	5,211	5.3
Pasco	64,017	5,786	9.0
Pinellas	22,199	3,054	13.7
Polk	183,603	14,000	7.7
Putnam	26,643	3,727	14.0
St. Johns	22,410	1,883	8.4
St. Lucie	33,972	2,997	8.8
Santa Rosa	30,460	5,281	17.3
Sarasota	18,686	1,674	8.9
Seminole	48,081	8,149	16.9
Sumter	17,282	5,483	31.7
Suwannee	108,485	10,500	9.7
Taylor	7,894	2,469	31.3
Union	21,377	3,696	17.3
Volusia	30,062	2,723	9.0
Wakulla	1,757	761	43.3
Walton	35,493	7,531	21.2
Washington	17,640	4,706	26.7
Total or average	2,404,811	305,862	12.7

GEORGIA

Appling	$84,446	$8,917	10.5
Atkinson	39,097	2,683	6.9
Bacon	46,902	5,738	12.2
Baker	25,900	4,688	18.1
Baldwin	43,324	6,188	14.3
Banks	55,628	5,712	10.3
Barrow	96,419	4,706	4.9
Bartow	151,149	11,723	7.7
Ben Hill	44,338	5,163	11.6
Berrien	98,832	8,781	8.9
Bibb	27,750	6,379	23.0
Bleckley	64,640	4,285	6.6
Brantley	18,045	3,427	19.0
Brooks	97,266	15,817	16.3
Bryan	7,912	1,797	22.7
Bulloch	218,922	12,826	5.8
Burke	350,440	10,254	2.9
Butts	59,307	4,033	6.8
Calhoun	57,674	6,414	11.1
Camden	397	137	34.5
Candler	86,274	8,051	9.3
Carroll	255,624	15,026	5.9
Catoosa	39,439	5,248	13.3
Charlton	5,216	1,837	35.2
Chatham	7,677	1,784	23.2
Chattahoochee	9,372	1,851	19.7
Chattooga	83,297	7,932	9.5
Cherokee	81,662	4,396	5.4
Clarke	37,778	3,602	9.5
Clay	42,660	5,093	11.9
Clayton	31,243	3,491	11.2
Clinch	8,764	1,475	16.8
Cobb	106,655	9,728	9.1
Coffee	133,675	9,921	7.4
Colquitt	182,516	23,673	13.0
Columbia	69,688	4,320	6.2
Cook	64,202	6,555	10.2
Coweta	130,838	5,884	4.5
Crawford	43,150	4,171	9.7
Crisp	92,969	9,514	10.2
Dade	15,705	3,196	20.3
Dawson	16,546	2,512	15.2
Decatur	27,817	10,618	38.2
De Kalb	40,795	7,173	17.6
Dodge	141,979	11,179	7.9
Dooly	147,006	12,415	8.4
Dougherty	39,368	7,210	18.3
Douglas	52,549	2,860	5.4
Early	110,529	12,532	11.3
Echols	8,561	2,835	33.1
Effingham	32,592	5,865	17.9
Elbert	106,220	9,476	8.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

GEORGIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Emanuel	$245,470	$11,460	4.7
Evans	48,287	5,288	10.9
Fannin	23,867	2,546	10.7
Fayette	71,889	3,296	4.5
Floyd	149,012	10,325	6.9
Forsyth	92,131	3,888	4.2
Franklin	128,155	5,921	4.6
Fulton	96,222	5,769	6.0
Gilmer	13,891	3,915	28.2
Glascock	52,059	5,567	10.7
Glynn	506		
Gordon	137,201	8,948	6.5
Grady	40,048	10,535	26.0
Greene	59,293	4,659	7.8
Gwinnett	159,621	8,366	5.2
Habersham	30,660	3,674	12.0
Hall	106,476	7,862	7.4
Hancock	84,486	8,126	9.6
Haralson	87,148	8,359	9.6
Harris	51,298	4,467	8.7
Hart	159,826	8,708	5.4
Heard	66,314	3,530	5.3
Henry	147,112	6,533	4.4
Houston	64,162	10,437	16.3
Irwin	77,986	11,440	14.7
Jackson	123,845	9,505	7.3
Jasper	54,476	4,163	7.6
Jeff Davis	51,729	7,656	14.8
Jefferson	202,064	13,436	6.6
Jenkins	134,134	11,527	8.6
Johnson	125,493	9,828	7.8
Jones	31,502	5,113	16.2
Lamar	55,274	3,435	6.2
Lanier	28,289	5,489	19.4
Laurens	263,683	18,920	7.2
Lee	44,436	6,488	14.6
Liberty	12,328	2,773	22.5
Lincoln	55,434	5,195	9.4
Long	13,833	2,158	15.6
Lowndes	91,727	14,647	16.0
Lumpkin	17,788	2,637	14.8
McDuffie	85,778	5,704	6.6
McIntosh	80		
Macon	141,941	12,518	8.8
Madison	120,136	8,357	7.0
Marion	28,099	3,408	12.1
Meriwether	125,448	9,952	7.9
Miller	36,036	6,663	18.4
Mitchell	133,816	25,151	18.8
Monroe	40,675	4,664	11.5
Montgomery	69,789	6,437	9.2
Morgan	119,523	6,410	5.4
Murray	65,283	6,063	9.3
Muscogee	17,592	2,499	14.2
Newton	96,574	7,527	7.7
Oconee	70,380	4,903	7.0
Oglethorpe	108,020	6,380	5.9
Paulding	86,897	7,674	8.8
Peach	65,393	6,540	10.0
Pickens	33,646	4,467	13.3
Pierce	68,980	5,157	7.5
Pike	90,078	6,803	7.5
Polk	108,273	6,484	6.0
Pulaski	59,701	8,782	14.7
Putnam	37,297	5,648	15.1
Quitman	19,148	2,794	14.6
Rabun	10,667	1,820	17.0
Randolph	89,635	9,600	10.7
Richmond	57,979	6,085	10.5
Rockdale	49,735	3,768	7.6
Schley	37,788	3,916	10.4
Screven	188,313	9,186	4.9
Seminole	27,556	5,376	19.5
Spalding	61,591	4,951	8.0
Stephens	36,036	1,978	5.5
Stewart	42,657	5,336	12.5
Sumter	130,039	10,135	7.8
Talbot	33,865	4,174	12.3
Taliaferro	38,317	4,249	11.1
Tattnall	90,578	10,557	11.6
Taylor	83,698	4,302	5.2
Telfair	93,084	6,995	7.5
Terrell	109,719	8,174	7.4
Thomas	82,181	15,703	19.1
Tift	86,774	7,893	9.1
Toombs	103,099	9,737	9.4
Towns	9,100	2,549	28.0
Treutlen	66,327	4,966	7.5
Troup	69,376	6,704	9.7
Turner	33,148	9,174	27.7
Twiggs	28,719	6,252	21.8
Union	22,398	3,145	14.0
Upson	48,651	4,397	9.0
Walker	89,727	7,349	8.2
Walton	182,557	6,859	3.7
Ware	37,010	7,377	20.0
Warren	118,886	8,305	7.0
Washington	175,965	11,416	6.5
Wayne	60,778	6,895	11.3
Webster	26,571	5,419	20.4
Wheeler	83,573	4,360	5.2
White	27,817	4,202	15.1
Whitfield	73,380	8,682	11.8
Wilcox	$94,082	$10,258	10.9
Wilkes	103,522	9,265	8.9
Wilkinson	45,473	4,490	9.9
Worth	113,885	19,843	17.4
Total or average	12,138,968	1,094,467	9.0

IDAHO

Ada	$67,949	$8,177	12.0
Adams	12,879	3,455	26.8
Bannock	81,851	17,565	21.5
Bear Lake	46,441	7,427	16.0
Beneway	45,369	5,730	12.6
Bingham	146,759	11,805	8.0
Blaine	16,415	3,815	23.2
Boise	6,889	2,253	32.7
Bonner	12,584	7,847	62.4
Bonneville	150,478	7,993	5.3
Boundary	56,135	4,797	8.5
Butte	16,010	3,521	22.0
Camas	24,875	3,028	12.2
Canyon	119,452	13,422	11.2
Caribou	36,190	4,182	11.6
Cassia	93,923	9,412	10.0
Clark	8,176	2,413	29.5
Clearwater	25,245	6,784	26.9
Custer	11,514	2,966	25.8
Elmore	26,377	6,531	24.8
Franklin	67,247	7,555	11.1
Fremont	113,877	9,794	8.6
Gem	26,276	5,711	21.7
Gooding	55,246	6,441	11.7
Idaho	137,998	8,107	5.9
Jefferson	101,287	8,156	8.1
Jerome	69,051	6,454	9.3
Kootenai	34,455	8,372	20.5
Latah	165,475	9,233	5.6
Lemhi	18,457	5,507	29.8
Lewis	123,743	3,380	2.7
Lincoln	32,831	4,553	13.9
Madison	109,057	6,398	5.9
Minidoka	45,499	6,462	14.2
Nez Perce	147,694	10,485	7.1
Oneida	92,393	6,542	7.1
Owyhee	51,769	8,432	16.3
Payette	22,768	5,612	24.6
Power	107,551	6,301	5.9
Teton	59,294	5,868	9.9
Twin Falls	163,427	16,805	10.3
Valley	21,252	3,640	17.1
Washington	48,186	9,033	18.7
Total or average	2,821,044	301,964	10.7

ILLINOIS

Adams	$293,541	$20,909	7.1
Bond	95,509	11,652	12.2
Boone	148,359	9,859	6.6
Brown	122,816	10,077	8.2
Bureau	455,616	13,244	2.9
Calhoun	81,345	8,562	10.5
Carroll	265,741	9,391	3.5
Cass	219,253	5,922	2.7
Champaign	694,561	14,550	2.1
Christian	295,586	14,666	5.0
Clark	176,044	11,293	6.4
Clay	131,916	11,014	8.3
Clinton	160,679	10,892	6.8
Coles	247,449	7,478	3.0
Cook	83,964	9,444	11.2
Crawford	124,210	11,761	9.5
Cumberland	118,332	15,512	13.1
De Kalb	386,174	14,841	3.8
De Witt	237,427	3,837	1.6
Douglas	220,665	10,193	4.6
Du Page	58,258	6,704	11.5
Edgar	354,782	14,194	4.0
Edwards	107,640	4,320	4.0
Effingham	131,171	17,695	13.5
Fayette	136,206	15,070	11.1
Ford	394,466	14,195	3.6
Franklin	68,376	12,305	18.0
Fulton	429,479	23,284	5.4
Gallatin	126,632	6,938	5.5
Greene	232,762	9,120	3.9
Grundy	219,088	3,778	1.7
Hamilton	98,736	8,749	8.9
Hancock	355,230	20,860	5.9
Henderson	235,368	13,802	5.9
Henry	502,404	16,567	3.3
Iroquois	721,657	14,896	2.1
Jackson	148,047	10,113	6.8
Jasper	139,357	11,524	8.3
Jefferson	141,807	18,912	13.3
Jersey	129,524	9,039	7.0
Jo Daviess	186,337	14,344	7.7
Johnson	90,294	8,699	9.6
Kane	$233,436	$11,226	4.8
Kankakee	261,917	9,722	3.7
Kendall	146,135	5,338	3.7
Knox	377,979	24,690	6.5
Lake	109,228	8,759	8.0
La Salle	614,970	12,201	2.0
Lawrence	121,657	12,298	10.1
Lee	444,330	16,596	3.7
Livingston	720,299	−2,936	
Logan	497,820	14,374	2.9
McDonough	315,766	22,270	7.0
McHenry	315,476	12,815	4.1
McLean	880,976	8,355	1.0
Macon	442,763	9,499	2.1
Macoupin	290,701	21,465	7.4
Madison	128,773	19,074	14.8
Marion	130,832	10,993	8.4
Marshall and Putnam	309,533	9,531	3.1
Mason	347,004	13,089	3.7
Massac	66,785	7,500	11.2
Menard	211,963	10,271	4.8
Mercer	340,907	11,562	3.4
Monroe	115,916	14,977	12.9
Montgomery	216,108	12,536	5.8
Morgan	336,486	16,146	4.8
Moultrie	217,174	6,524	3.0
Ogle	406,887	17,697	4.3
Peoria	296,969	10,670	3.6
Perry	81,601	11,767	14.4
Piatt	346,140	−1,611	0.0
Pike	249,274	18,847	7.6
Pope and Hardin	102,989	11,547	11.2
Pulaski and Alexander	137,742	13,551	9.8
Randolph	175,097	15,697	9.0
Richland	110,318	10,094	9.1
Rock Island	184,930	11,699	6.3
St. Clair	195,355	21,796	11.2
Saline	119,722	11,105	9.3
Sangamon	550,120	22,391	4.1
Schuyler	205,278	14,218	6.9
Scott	143,811	4,705	3.3
Shelby	261,980	22,332	8.5
Stark	166,338	7,466	4.5
Stephenson	282,458	15,637	5.5
Tazewell	455,292	12,663	2.8
Union	106,940	9,926	9.3
Vermilion	611,304	23,373	3.8
Wabash	107,647	6,235	5.8
Warren	362,887	13,067	3.6
Washington	173,286	13,597	7.8
Wayne	140,875	16,064	11.4
White	179,589	10,011	5.6
Whiteside	395,035	22,021	5.6
Will	163,116	8,136	5.0
Williamson	63,870	17,434	27.3
Winnebago	249,023	11,376	4.6
Woodford	327,164	7,758	2.4
Total or average	25,114,779	1,230,389	4.9

INDIANA

Adams	$116,693	$8,313	7.1
Allen	183,006	14,305	7.8
Barthelomew	212,690	7,635	3.6
Benton	242,550	7,570	3.1
Blackford	67,211	5,631	8.4
Boone	254,436	17,574	6.9
Brown	25,750	9,099	35.3
Carroll	227,432	10,599	4.7
Cass	230,105	11,870	5.2
Clark	72,255	13,133	18.2
Clay	71,875	12,360	17.2
Clinton	240,482	13,215	5.5
Crawford	49,300	8,421	17.1
Daviess	125,242	11,658	9.3
Dearborn	73,226	11,266	15.5
Decatur	217,273	10,864	5.0
De Kalb	104,835	11,631	11.1
Delaware	182,566	10,273	5.6
Dubois	127,876	10,592	8.3
Elkhart	122,024	13,845	11.3
Fayette	102,779	8,306	8.1
Floyd	32,074	7,338	22.9
Fountain	207,231	10,594	5.1
Franklin	124,722	9,127	7.3
Fulton	213,312	10,960	5.1
Gibson	158,131	13,181	8.3
Grant	200,360	12,185	6.1
Greene	151,541	13,859	9.1
Hamilton	232,774	12,920	5.6
Hancock	162,425	6,894	4.2
Harrison	76,743	12,986	16.9
Hendricks	204,525	14,210	6.9
Henry	151,639	10,672	7.0
Howard	155,475	10,472	6.7
Huntington	159,866	8,863	5.5
Jackson	154,845	9,820	6.3
Jasper	178,882	10,729	6.0
Jay	162,509	8,898	5.5

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

INDIANA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Jefferson	$92,941	$14,793	15.9
Jennings	88,362	10,801	12.2
Johnson	218,340	6,240	2.9
Knox	210,629	14,776	7.0
Kosciusko	213,399	13,874	6.5
Lagrange	153,419	8,951	5.8
Lake	122,062	7,359	6.0
La Porte	243,520	14,426	5.9
Lawrence	110,480	9,822	8.9
Madison	256,734	10,982	4.3
Marion	108,962	11,009	10.1
Marshall	221,062	13,556	6.1
Martin	78,256	7,407	9.5
Miami	205,715	11,408	5.5
Monroe	88,875	9,982	11.2
Montgomery	293,974	13,433	4.6
Morgan	156,070	9,144	5.9
Newton	196,912	6,975	3.5
Noble	135,091	11,704	8.7
Ohio	21,690	6,233	2.9
Orange	106,131	5,879	5.5
Owen	78,344	8,364	10.7
Parke	163,131	11,489	7.0
Perry	59,020	9,963	16.9
Pike	79,799	9,109	11.4
Porter	116,479	8,771	7.5
Posey	135,817	10,608	7.8
Pulaski	145,311	10,881	7.5
Putnam	185,054	13,724	7.4
Randolph	229,206	13,645	6.0
Ripley	113,847	9,639	8.5
Rush	248,268	9,561	3.9
St. Joseph	138,382	8,569	6.2
Scott	51,726	3,172	6.1
Shelby	219,810	10,637	4.8
Spencer	117,723	11,334	9.6
Starke	94,089	10,703	11.4
Steuben	97,483	12,621	12.9
Sullivan	175,446	9,251	5.3
Switzerland	51,879	8,644	16.7
Tippecanoe	239,474	12,167	5.1
Tipton	142,675	7,883	5.5
Union	68,867	4,249	6.2
Vanderburgh	68,907	4,942	7.2
Vermillion	68,342	6,842	10.0
Vigo	111,748	10,562	9.5
Wabash	184,307	11,031	6.0
Warren	216,015	6,897	3.2
Warrick	90,733	8,394	9.3
Washington	139,801	9,263	6.6
Wayne	187,024	12,356	6.6
Wells	151,331	10,593	7.0
White	226,189	11,627	5.1
Whitley	112,834	8,004	7.1
Total or average	13,608,845	946,217	7.0

IOWA

Adair	$386,637	$19,251	5.0
Adams	268,530	14,488	5.4
Allamakee	211,040	13,311	6.3
Appanoose	204,342	12,557	6.1
Audubon	327,809	15,723	4.8
Benton	529,445	20,523	3.9
Black Hawk	373,762	20,903	5.6
Boone	466,450	20,498	4.4
Bremer	177,237	13,794	7.8
Buchanan	349,359	15,222	4.4
Buena Vista	492,134	24,430	5.0
Butler	303,918	19,660	6.5
Calhoun	530,993	43,831	8.3
Carroll	417,099	16,639	4.0
Cass	374,532	14,376	3.8
Cedar	345,499	11,534	3.3
Cerro Gordo	320,642	24,102	7.5
Cherokee	329,031	25,074	7.6
Chickasaw	222,187	11,071	5.0
Clarke	216,128	11,368	5.3
Clay	443,672	12,059	2.7
Clayton	390,058	12,742	3.3
Clinton	458,196	16,453	3.6
Crawford	363,602	20,875	5.7
Dallas	466,896	14,906	3.2
Davis	171,118	12,564	7.3
Decatur	226,868	12,599	5.6
Delaware	359,703	15,922	4.4
Des Moines	220,269	10,064	4.6
Dickinson	288,770	9,819	3.4
Dubuque	316,506	14,476	4.6
Emmet	299,711	19,560	6.5
Fayette	369,634	18,433	5.0
Floyd	236,287	6,822	2.9
Franklin	443,917	26,731	6.0
Fremont	399,257	12,654	3.2
Greene	454,686	17,243	3.8
Grundy	316,738	22,690	7.2
Guthrie	381,881	26,626	7.0
Hamilton	488,345	17,527	3.6
Hancock	403,211	22,056	5.5
Hardin	471,308	12,105	2.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

IOWA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Harrison	$422,741	$26,618	6.3
Henry	254,282	8,325	3.3
Howard	202,459	10,290	5.1
Humboldt	376,034	21,823	5.8
Ida	271,905	17,500	6.4
Iowa	399,461	11,419	2.9
Jackson	311,430	18,535	6.0
Jasper	607,033	22,201	3.7
Jefferson	212,720	13,908	6.5
Johnson	361,544	9,288	2.6
Jones	357,343	14,593	4.1
Keokuk	373,246	16,436	4.4
Kossuth	773,381	32,576	4.2
Lee	163,640	11,159	6.8
Linn	394,050	15,314	3.9
Louisa	233,706	11,383	4.9
Lucas	185,145	8,455	4.6
Lyon	331,803	16,633	5.0
Madison	346,657	24,971	7.2
Mahaska	412,494	16,061	3.9
Marion	373,002	18,511	5.0
Marshall	442,170	18,530	4.2
Mills	338,892	24,020	7.1
Mitchell	255,417	9,663	3.8
Monona	468,385	31,662	6.8
Monroe	173,393	7,954	5.9
Montgomery	324,150	11,228	3.5
Muscatine	237,595	19,296	8.1
O'Brien	429,115	8,173	1.9
Osceola	319,009	13,841	4.3
Page	333,143	23,425	7.0
Palo Alto	440,555	10,687	2.4
Plymouth	355,495	19,911	5.6
Pocahontas	532,053	39,722	7.2
Polk	430,822	23,765	5.5
Pottawattamie (E)	318,185	18,255	5.7
Pottawattamie (W)	387,938	11,558	3.0
Poweshiek	462,610	22,853	4.9
Ringgold	277,042	10,994	4.0
Sac	443,170	22,361	5.0
Scott	243,583	10,459	4.3
Shelby	457,681	20,060	4.4
Sioux	346,199	16,707	4.8
Story	567,592	3,845	.7
Tama	492,316	13,869	2.8
Taylor	291,570	19,688	6.8
Union	226,377	17,829	7.9
Van Buren	160,798	11,984	7.5
Wapello	200,054	12,732	6.4
Warren	329,177	15,842	4.8
Washington	331,571	12,985	3.9
Wayne	247,593	16,362	6.6
Webster	570,124	24,801	4.4
Winnebago	280,911	1,816	0.6
Winneshiek	383,697	17,386	4.5
Woodbury	526,118	22,091	4.2
Worth	209,419	11,053	5.3
Wright	494,861	24,562	5.0
Total or average	35,530,263	1,691,349	4.8

KANSAS

Allen	$107,832	$7,994	7.4
Anderson	124,793	6,766	5.4
Atchison	152,703	9,278	6.1
Barber	184,756	9,963	5.4
Barton	330,748	2,877	.9
Bourbon	119,156	11,805	9.9
Brown	291,984	10,606	3.6
Butler	140,980	13,292	9.4
Chase	64,957	5,228	8.0
Chautauqua	61,942	8,904	14.4
Cherokee	57,474	6,719	11.7
Cheyenne	216,372	8,010	3.7
Clark	193,154	10,964	5.7
Clay	111,791	6,778	6.1
Cloud	139,318	10,166	7.3
Coffey	145,620	8,055	5.5
Comanche	185,268	7,396	4.0
Cowley	98,415	12,914	13.1
Crawford	110,716	9,055	8.2
Decatur	231,242	8,580	3.7
Dickinson	181,856	6,603	3.6
Doniphan	192,585	12,135	6.3
Douglas	83,489	8,916	10.7
Edwards	249,499	8,659	3.5
Elk	75,202	7,771	10.3
Ellis	276,569	10,042	3.6
Ellsworth	182,363	8,086	4.4
Finney	330,292	11,093	3.4
Ford	431,628	14,826	3.4
Franklin	140,075	7,814	5.6
Geary	61,624	3,353	5.4
Gove	223,550	10,829	4.8
Graham	228,964	10,808	4.7
Grant	198,851	5,559	2.8
Gray	336,572	9,356	2.8
Greeley	174,339	8,864	5.1
Greenwood	125,948	11,166	8.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

KANSAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Hamilton	$193,537	$6,351	3.3
Harper	151,583	5,864	3.9
Harvey	82,389	5,592	6.8
Haskell	240,087	4,386	1.8
Hodgeman	229,718	6,861	3.0
Jackson	176,749	10,749	6.1
Jefferson	173,967	13,944	8.0
Jewell	202,975	10,059	5.0
Johnson	88,336	18,684	12.1
Kearny	164,875	9,253	5.6
Kingman	182,624	7,852	4.3
Kiowa	239,495	7,382	3.1
Labette	113,345	8,459	7.5
Lane	216,981	7,881	3.6
Leavenworth	83,690	6,969	8.3
Lincoln	187,433	8,263	4.4
Linn	138,393	7,565	5.7
Logan	127,002	7,252	5.7
Lyon	156,335	12,467	8.0
McPherson	171,434	6,536	3.8
Marion	110,064	6,566	6.0
Marshall	242,597	16,363	6.7
Meade	284,278	5,561	2.0
Miami	171,676	6,444	3.8
Mitchell	221,899	9,286	4.2
Montgomery	77,643	9,961	12.8
Morris	115,168	8,529	7.4
Morton	165,753	6,633	4.0
Nemaha	296,166	12,716	4.3
Neosho	110,863	10,451	9.4
Ness	338,465	8,422	2.5
Norton	303,003	12,008	4.0
Osage	158,673	11,460	7.2
Osborne	212,749	12,277	5.8
Ottawa	125,604	11,139	8.9
Pawnee	315,287	3,808	1.2
Phillips	291,442	14,212	4.9
Pottawatomie	150,845	6,904	4.6
Pratt	279,824	9,704	3.5
Rawlins	258,116	9,378	3.6
Reno	275,527	12,562	4.6
Republic	132,899	8,856	6.7
Rice	182,510	10,022	5.5
Riley	62,938	7,255	11.5
Rooks	211,743	11,607	5.5
Rush	290,790	7,577	2.6
Russell	256,627	9,859	3.8
Saline	158,665	7,243	4.6
Scott	201,221	6,732	3.3
Sedgwick	204,784	3,186	1.6
Seward	191,191	6,251	3.3
Shawnee	96,103	9,913	10.3
Sheridan	229,471	6,368	2.8
Sherman	230,255	7,652	3.3
Smith	263,064	14,224	5.4
Stafford	291,224	5,621	1.9
Stanton	224,243	5,656	2.5
Stevens	213,658	9,452	4.4
Sumner	164,186	9,838	6.0
Thomas	347,391	9,774	2.8
Trego	234,911	8,987	3.8
Wabaunsee	131,509	10,172	7.7
Wallace	101,198	6,003	5.9
Washington	202,773	14,798	7.3
Wichita	155,432	6,150	4.0
Wilson	74,339	10,053	13.5
Woodson	58,244	4,401	7.6
Wyandotte	13,870	4,909	35.4
Total or average	19,313,856	922,544	4.8

KENTUCKY

Adair	$72,391	$11,849	16.4
Allen	75,332	11,879	15.8
Anderson	53,436	7,120	13.3
Ballard	108,807	9,143	8.4
Barren	184,569	18,320	9.9
Bath	85,501	6,825	8.0
Bell	15,412	4,519	29.3
Boone	65,307	9,690	14.8
Bourbon	150,638	12,533	8.3
Boyd	27,714	4,765	17.2
Boyle	71,451	7,492	10.5
Bracken	75,066	6,596	8.8
Breathitt	46,344	7,898	17.0
Breckenridge	135,870	11,713	8.6
Bullitt	47,539	4,682	9.8
Butler	78,931	10,939	13.8
Caldwell	94,114	7,699	8.2
Calloway	147,294	15,566	10.6
Campbell	29,954	7,754	25.9
Carlisle	69,055	8,725	12.6
Carroll	50,578	5,484	10.8
Carter	74,614	13,723	18.4
Casey	88,758	21,586	24.3
Christian	212,764	17,520	8.2
Clark	101,381	8,741	8.6
Clay	112,244	13,293	11.8
Clinton	48,530	7,908	16.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

KENTUCKY—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Crittenden	$74,809	$11,778	15.7
Cumberland	40,945	10,449	25.5
Daviess	207,621	16,806	8.1
Edmonson	50,769	7,965	15.7
Elliott	52,703	6,797	12.9
Estill	21,611	5,161	23.9
Fayette	146,150	7,975	5.4
Fleming	108,983	11,265	10.3
Floyd	30,404	5,997	19.7
Franklin	78,550	8,884	11.3
Fulton	151,652	9,181	6.0
Gallatin	27,108	6,025	22.2
Garrard	99,017	6,638	6.7
Grant	90,890	11,877	13.1
Graves	208,733	24,483	11.7
Grayson	109,220	12,620	11.5
Green	105,210	14,556	13.8
Greenup	46,354	10,239	22.1
Hancock	53,078	8,288	15.6
Hardin	140,266	16,276	11.6
Harlan	8,943	2,387	26.7
Harrison	123,316	10,972	8.9
Hart	121,921	14,058	11.5
Henderson	240,487	16,904	7.0
Henry	109,634	16,066	14.6
Hickman	116,683	9,962	8.5
Hopkins	99,155	12,100	12.2
Jackson	52,352	7,382	14.1
Jefferson	85,660	8,695	10.1
Jessamine	76,099	8,346	11.0
Johnson	54,528	6,725	12.3
Kenton	33,821	7,144	21.1
Knott	26,129	4,502	17.2
Knox	62,173	8,711	14.0
Larue	82,766	10,108	12.2
Laurel	66,781	11,309	16.9
Lawrence	47,582	5,759	12.1
Lee	18,526	4,480	24.2
Leslie	14,977	4,988	33.0
Letcher	19,327	3,364	17.4
Lewis	53,156	10,732	20.2
Lincoln	91,989	9,472	10.6
Livingston	86,722	11,667	13.4
Logan	214,777	16,642	7.7
Lyon	47,222	5,533	11.7
McCracken	47,815	9,026	18.9
McCreary	13,095	2,886	22.0
McLean	102,690	8,686	8.4
Madison	162,952	7,870	4.8
Magoffin	57,771	10,523	18.2
Marion	84,919	8,755	10.3
Marshall	76,506	11,619	15.2
Martin	8,499	2,640	31.1
Mason	114,363	8,570	7.5
Meade	61,491	7,557	12.3
Menifee	25,127	5,372	21.4
Mercer	109,140	10,002	9.2
Metcalfe	80,369	12,630	15.7
Monroe	70,506	10,596	15.0
Montgomery	91,733	7,589	8.3
Morgan	112,011	15,385	13.7
Muhlenberg	69,907	12,909	18.5
Nelson	102,578	11,708	11.4
Nicholas	75,658	8,883	11.7
Ohio	114,845	15,724	13.7
Oldham	55,563	5,091	9.2
Owen	109,828	12,078	11.0
Owsley	45,602	8,471	18.6
Pendleton	77,370	8,339	10.8
Perry	33,206	5,556	16.7
Pike	30,814	8,186	26.6
Powell	22,251	3,299	14.8
Pulaski	126,802	14,550	11.5
Robertson	37,505	5,022	13.4
Rockcastle	74,791	6,861	9.2
Rowan	29,507	5,729	19.4
Russell	60,698	12,254	20.2
Scott	105,777	8,878	8.4
Shelby	155,203	13,716	8.8
Simpson	110,997	10,833	9.7
Spencer	63,011	4,579	7.3
Taylor	88,556	16,163	18.2
Todd	126,298	9,309	7.4
Trigg	110,538	7,887	7.1
Trimble	54,928	6,821	12.4
Union	147,345	10,653	7.2
Warren	149,720	16,343	10.9
Washington	101,951	11,346	11.1
Wayne	69,177	10,747	15.5
Webster	116,694	11,402	9.8
Whitley	49,914	7,809	15.6
Wolfe	51,879	9,845	19.0
Woodford	119,386	8,663	7.2
Total or average	10,029,669	1,164,650	11.6

LOUISIANA

Acadia	$291,068	$18,709	6.2
Allen	42,283	6,067	14.3
Ascension	42,937	3,977	9.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

LOUISIANA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Assumption	$28,173	$1,107	3.9
Avoyelles	284,461	20,366	7.2
Beauregard	29,995	7,556	25.2
Bienville	186,443	16,036	8.6
Bossier	251,716	15,349	6.1
Caddo	400,178	13,980	3.5
Calcasieu	56,542	7,415	13.1
Caldwell	59,811	7,903	13.2
Cameron	34,622	5,312	15.3
Catahoula	123,828	6,700	5.4
Claiborne	218,230	15,504	7.1
Concordia	124,883	6,646	5.3
De Soto	210,877	19,401	9.2
East Baton Rouge	54,125	8,613	15.9
East Carroll	258,254	10,819	4.2
East Feliciana	84,174	8,170	9.7
Evangeline	231,562	16,582	7.2
Franklin	384,098	24,680	6.4
Grant	55,850	7,281	13.0
Iberia	48,780	2,647	5.4
Iberville	25,211	1,932	7.7
Jackson	59,346	8,757	14.7
Jefferson	3,914		
Jefferson Davis	123,496	13,533	10.9
Lafayette	224,469	10,335	4.6
La Fourche	47,609	1,452	3.0
La Salle	18,283	3,572	19.5
Lincoln	163,512	13,186	8.1
Livingston	30,879	6,438	20.8
Madison	202,936	11,177	5.5
Morehouse	249,237	15,212	6.1
Natchitoches	299,511	16,329	5.4
Orleans	915		
Ouachita	142,893	12,159	8.5
Plaquemines	7,309	1,236	16.9
Pointe Coupee	156,731	7,188	4.6
Rapides	229,052	12,951	5.6
Red River	176,583	12,989	7.3
Richland	331,310	25,503	7.7
Sabine	100,642	15,324	15.2
St. Bernard	2,904		
St. Charles	7,703	1,914	24.8
St. Helena	47,811	8,583	17.9
St. James	28,783	1,230	4.3
St. John the Baptist	14,086	222	1.6
St. Landry	437,286	26,317	6.0
St. Martin	114,941	6,029	5.3
St. Mary	25,688	704	2.7
St. Tammany	30,468	3,891	12.8
Tangipahoa	75,480	12,549	16.6
Tensas	225,528	10,120	4.5
Terrebonne	22,428	843	3.8
Union	175,017	16,090	9.2
Vermilion	199,733	15,558	7.8
Vernon	51,168	9,880	19.3
Washington	145,715	15,242	10.5
Webster	152,304	13,753	9.0
West Baton Rouge	17,253	1,544	8.9
West Carroll	223,566	11,593	5.2
West Feliciana	35,293	6,088	17.2
Winn	50,517	6,696	13.2
Total or average	8,180,400	608,909	7.4

MAINE

Androscoggin	$37,779	$5,088	13.5
Aroostook	1,098,820	51,117	4.6
Cumberland	42,979	7,196	16.7
Franklin	28,486	4,055	14.2
Hancock	20,576	3,058	14.9
Kennebec	55,341	6,103	11.0
Knox	12,675	1,864	14.7
Lincoln	18,312	2,189	11.9
Oxford	43,226	7,172	16.6
Penobscot	108,022	9,146	8.5
Piscataquis	40,075	3,374	8.4
Sagadahoc	11,767	2,362	20.1
Somerset	61,944	5,507	8.9
Waldo	39,489	4,887	12.4
Washington	31,120	4,386	14.1
York	44,391	7,569	17.0
Total or average	1,695,002	125,073	7.4

MARYLAND

Allegany	$19,007	$3,403	17.9
Anne Arundel	44,586	4,361	9.8
Baltimore	76,780	7,652	10.0
Calvert	31,334	2,036	6.5
Caroline	78,130	6,280	6.0
Carroll	83,801	8,051	9.6
Cecil	57,427	3,062	5.3
Charles	29,986	3,369	11.2
Dorchester	73,843	4,950	6.7
Frederick	140,145	8,865	6.3
Garrett	41,716	5,147	12.3
Harford	52,578	5,163	9.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

MARYLAND—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Howard	$50,059	$3,251	6.5
Kent	91,918	4,060	4.4
Montgomery	86,663	5,794	6.7
Prince Georges	51,267	5,973	11.7
Queen Annes	113,917	4,738	4.2
St. Marys	32,587	4,888	15.0
Somerset	45,764	2,990	6.5
Talbot	80,916	5,435	6.7
Washington	88,795	3,997	4.5
Wicomico	73,030	7,515	10.3
Worcester	66,301	4,021	6.1
Total or average	1,510,550	115,021	7.6

MASSACHUSETTS

Barnstable	$11,568	$1,721	14.9
Berkshire	35,232	4,045	11.5
Bristol	45,521	7,788	17.1
Dukes	1,035		
Essex	44,185	7,438	16.8
Franklin	80,722	9,405	11.7
Hampden	46,045	6,957	14.5
Hampshire	109,377	10,780	9.9
Middlesex	68,867	10,413	15.1
Nantucket	210		
Norfolk	26,135	3,616	13.8
Plymouth	39,370	6,947	17.6
Worcester	62,867	6,992	11.1
Total or average	573,134	76,102	13.3

MICHIGAN

Alcona	$24,981	$4,093	16.4
Alger	6,549	2,237	34.2
Allegan	168,712	24,307	14.4
Alpena	36,155	6,133	17.0
Antrim	40,824	4,411	10.8
Arenac	41,678	5,466	13.1
Baraga	7,861	2,715	34.5
Barry	132,225	15,108	11.4
Bay	69,584	9,989	14.4
Benzie	34,684	4,783	13.8
Berrien	185,069	24,753	13.4
Branch	166,133	15,288	9.2
Calhoun	172,334	20,899	12.1
Cass	165,650	17,870	10.8
Charlevoix	28,162	4,438	15.8
Cheboygan	26,829	4,704	17.5
Chippewa	71,882	9,024	12.6
Clare	32,196	4,872	15.1
Clinton	163,082	13,195	8.1
Crawford	20,802	3,122	10.5
Delta	33,523	5,694	17.0
Dickinson	17,430	4,631	26.6
Eaton	173,104	13,442	7.8
Emmet	20,008	4,783	16.5
Genesee	142,096	16,483	11.6
Gladwin	56,415	6,701	11.9
Gogebic	7,199	3,264	45.3
Grand Traverse	68,994	6,988	11.6
Gratiot	109,359	10,154	9.3
Hillsdale	158,244	17,468	11.0
Houghton	29,184	6,293	21.6
Huron	137,587	15,314	11.1
Ingham	123,175	15,241	12.4
Ionia	179,748	12,234	6.8
Iosco	20,389	4,271	20.9
Iron	8,702	3,867	44.4
Isabella	95,083	11,402	12.0
Jackson	172,548	16,830	9.8
Kalamazoo	142,211	12,809	9.0
Kalkaska	25,325	3,173	12.5
Kent	191,588	19,620	10.2
Lake	19,500	2,716	13.9
Lapeer	127,138	8,428	6.6
Leelanau	47,968	4,103	8.6
Lenawee	151,732	17,395	11.5
Livingston	113,272	14,198	12.5
Luce	4,032	1,529	37.9
Mackinac	11,802	2,190	18.6
Macomb	73,040	10,109	13.8
Manistee	46,256	5,831	12.6
Marquette	8,950	3,444	38.5
Mason	55,526	5,448	9.8
Mecosta	90,892	11,372	12.5
Menominee	69,939	9,228	13.2
Midland	44,926	6,344	14.1
Missaukee	53,359	5,176	9.7
Monroe	123,156	12,824	10.4
Montcalm	161,933	16,472	10.2
Montmorency	15,242	4,091	26.8
Muskegon	43,968	8,433	19.2
Newaygo	63,349	10,807	17.2
Oakland	101,813	12,206	12.1
Oceana	85,829	10,864	12.7
Ogemaw	31,922	4,659	14.6
Ontonagon	35,173	6,850	19.5

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

MICHIGAN—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Osceola	$78,368	$9,023	11.5
Ottawa	128,487	15,287	11.9
Presque Isle	39,772	6,493	16.3
Saginaw	123,047	14,335	11.7
St. Clair	104,669	15,372	14.7
St. Joseph	145,048	11,552	8.0
Sanilac	146,467	18,589	12.7
Schoolcraft	7,393	1,941	26.3
Shiawassee	115,575	13,187	11.4
Tuscola	118,441	12,821	10.8
Van Buren	137,756	23,807	17.3
Washtenaw	148,777	12,124	8.1
Wayne	37,339	11,413	30.6
Wexford	43,462	6,229	14.3
Total or average	6,480,622	775,129	12.0

MINNESOTA

Aitkin	$49,661	$10,243	20.6
Anoka	74,218	8,610	11.6
Becker	185,458	17,346	9.4
Beltrami	62,928	8,508	13.5
Benton	92,598	9,839	10.6
Big Stone	239,212	11,516	4.8
Blue Earth	355,026	25,176	7.1
Brown	313,731	12,722	4.1
Carlton	55,558	12,842	23.1
Carver	180,885	10,424	5.8
Cass	70,191	14,232	20.3
Chippewa	350,606	10,175	29.0
Chisago	102,276	9,427	9.2
Clay	345,108	15,762	4.7
Clearwater	68,401	8,560	12.5
Cottonwood	417,469	19,456	4.7
Crow Wing	52,635	10,589	2.0
Dakota	262,630	11,590	4.4
Dodge	177,600	7,196	4.1
Douglas	194,055	15,052	7.8
Faribault	375,330	20,482	5.5
Fillmore	349,343	25,574	7.3
Freeborn	338,804	15,905	4.7
Goodhue	360,510	17,429	4.8
Grant	244,308	11,387	4.7
Hennepin	131,516	15,037	11.4
Houston	170,374	13,387	7.9
Hubbard	58,722	9,758	16.6
Isanti	129,709	14,136	10.9
Itasca	61,918	13,853	22.4
Jackson	501,568	16,825	3.4
Kanabec	72,615	11,910	16.4
Kandiyohi	371,075	12,829	3.5
Kittson	207,377	8,066	3.9
Koochiching	32,956	6,538	19.8
Lac Qui Parle	385,177	14,981	3.9
Lake	5,795	2,871	49.5
Lake of the Woods	33,108	3,377	10.2
Le Sueur	151,168	10,370	6.9
Lincoln	280,160	18,346	6.5
Lyon	400,045	13,841	3.5
McLeod	209,082	13,853	6.6
Mahnomen	65,629	6,210	9.5
Marshall	337,113	16,759	5.0
Martin	405,997	18,157	4.5
Meeker	253,679	12,314	4.9
Mille Lacs	86,958	10,004	11.5
Morrison	193,625	18,649	9.6
Mower	345,826	17,576	5.1
Murray	434,015	17,733	4.1
Nicollet	200,511	10,906	5.4
Nobles	522,157	28,470	5.5
Norman	324,426	9,601	3.0
Olmsted	303,963	16,439	5.4
Otter Tail (E)	270,264	21,871	8.1
Otter Tail (W)	270,294	24,470	9.1
Pennington	145,568	9,841	6.8
Pine	109,205	16,790	15.4
Pipestone	238,332	8,346	3.5
Polk (E)	444,136	11,986	2.7
Polk (W)	181,331	12,292	6.8
Pope	268,478	16,864	6.3
Ramsey	19,543	4,198	21.4
Red Lake	116,406	8,492	7.3
Redwood	478,311	18,671	3.9
Renville	540,466	16,526	3.1
Rice	217,807	13,349	6.1
Rock	271,193	7,315	2.7
Roseau	187,897	18,429	9.8
St. Louis (N)	47,270	15,605	33.0
St. Louis (S)	60,285	11,643	19.3
Scott	132,243	9,172	6.9
Sherburne	103,156	9,499	9.2
Sibley	252,789	12,690	5.0
Stearns	431,081	17,767	4.1
Steele	196,566	8,124	4.1
Stevens	292,003	13,305	4.6
Swift	340,963	10,563	3.1
Todd	211,467	16,780	7.9
Traverse	265,911	5,243	2.0
Wabasha	236,547	15,764	6.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

MINNESOTA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Wadena	$74,767	$7,231	9.7
Waseca	136,587	4,949	3.6
Washington	151,550	12,684	8.4
Watonwan	272,150	17,404	6.4
Wilkin	270,264	6,239	2.3
Winona	211,530	18,339	8.7
Wright	164,225	16,806	10.2
Yellow Medicine	457,526	21,482	4.7
Total or average	20,063,356	1,183,562	5.9

MISSISSIPPI

Adams	$63,486	$5,933	9.3
Alcorn	132,631	9,678	7.3
Amite	147,934	10,421	7.0
Attala	151,232	12,866	8.5
Benton	79,313	8,911	11.2
Bolivar	1,087,835	14,467	1.3
Calhoun	130,539	6,892	5.3
Carroll	143,329	9,599	6.7
Chickasaw	176,199	12,501	7.1
Choctaw	75,970	6,281	8.3
Claiborne	89,244	6,553	7.3
Clarke	84,070	7,198	8.6
Clay	96,841	6,558	6.8
Coahoma	760,478	11,467	1.5
Copiah	158,894	10,468	6.6
Covington	150,701	10,959	7.3
De Soto	312,661	11,347	3.6
Forrest	39,988	4,074	10.2
Franklin	66,038	5,932	9.0
George	34,459	2,098	6.1
Greene	27,254	4,512	16.5
Grenada	97,467	8,987	9.2
Hancock	8,084	695	8.6
Harrison	8,703	3,844	44.2
Hinds	332,387	12,870	3.9
Holmes	342,116	16,883	4.9
Humphreys	407,763	13,013	3.2
Issaquena	137,708	4,833	3.5
Itawamba	129,602	10,199	7.9
Jackson	5,622	2,618	46.6
Jasper	135,450	11,045	8.2
Jefferson	102,889	7,285	7.1
Jefferson Davis	155,281	10,028	6.4
Jones	195,598	9,286	4.7
Kemper	132,153	7,687	5.8
Lafayette	116,873	12,061	10.3
Lamar	63,093	5,062	8.0
Lauderdale	119,942	7,710	6.4
Lawrence	116,223	6,551	5.6
Leake	167,768	11,556	6.9
Lee	229,600	13,537	5.9
Leflore	650,302	12,700	1.9
Lincoln	165,231	10,212	6.2
Lowndes	157,265	9,972	6.3
Madison	313,203	13,362	4.3
Marion	148,266	8,490	5.7
Marshall	190,177	11,298	5.9
Monroe	253,307	12,784	5.0
Montgomery	89,142	10,096	11.3
Neshoba	215,794	12,430	5.8
Newton	158,405	12,737	8.0
Noxubee	158,546	9,005	5.7
Oktibbeha	91,393	8,812	9.6
Panola	293,623	10,380	3.5
Pearl River	82,576	5,274	6.4
Perry	39,207	4,389	11.2
Pike	129,376	10,832	8.4
Pontotoc	188,010	13,221	7.0
Prentiss	124,879	10,871	8.7
Quitman	431,662	13,207	3.0
Rankin	146,430	8,646	5.9
Scott	147,868	8,341	5.6
Sharkey	287,324	6,651	2.3
Simpson	164,375	10,032	6.1
Smith	143,969	12,490	8.7
Stone	16,749	2,768	16.5
Sunflower	1,021,688	20,501	2.0
Tallahatchie	471,981	11,954	2.5
Tate	202,583	10,431	5.1
Tippah	141,268	11,217	7.9
Tishomingo	85,640	10,691	12.5
Tunica	451,146	7,452	1.6
Union	169,561	9,881	5.8
Walthall	173,704	6,726	3.9
Warren	98,148	6,227	6.3
Washington	800,720	20,612	2.6
Wayne	80,774	4,981	6.2
Webster	95,165	8,814	9.3
Wilkinson	60,430	5,484	9.1
Winston	125,205	11,589	9.2
Yalobusha	100,189	8,490	8.5
Yazoo	420,852	13,496	3.2
Total or average	16,299,551	772,056	4.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

MISSOURI

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Adair	$150,141	$15,745	10.5
Andrew	143,866	12,056	8.4
Atchison	352,175	14,091	4.0
Audrain	258,494	15,444	6.0
Barry	112,164	14,283	12.7
Barton	73,756	10,134	13.7
Bates	170,835	21,190	12.4
Benton	118,684	13,318	11.2
Bollinger	52,200	10,374	19.9
Boone	202,664	15,186	7.5
Buchanan	131,412	14,989	11.4
Butler	125,129	22,438	17.9
Caldwell	104,893	13,211	7.9
Callaway	158,010	12,161	7.7
Camden	31,227	7,411	23.7
Cape Girardeau	119,004	16,202	13.6
Carroll	208,525	15,965	7.7
Carter	20,531	4,104	20.0
Cass	144,480	16,807	11.6
Cedar	67,132	8,293	12.4
Chariton	235,731	17,182	7.3
Christian	99,941	9,647	9.7
Clark	131,333	12,674	9.7
Clay	92,429	9,459	10.2
Clinton	155,457	10,556	6.8
Cole	68,038	13,629	20.0
Cooper	168,817	16,328	9.7
Crawford	55,109	10,493	19.0
Dade	98,106	8,909	9.1
Dallas	70,020	13,735	19.6
Daviess	117,086	15,073	12.9
De Kalb	148,282	10,206	6.9
Dent	53,839	12,947	24.0
Douglas	60,725	15,917	26.2
Dunklin	599,552	29,538	4.9
Franklin	123,887	14,805	12.0
Gasconade	53,959	8,527	15.8
Gentry	135,691	12,936	9.5
Greene	165,421	14,022	8.5
Grundy	98,846	13,383	13.5
Harrison	192,573	19,152	9.9
Henry	145,855	19,936	13.7
Hickory	44,042	10,336	23.5
Holt	190,014	14,882	7.8
Howard	148,724	13,817	9.3
Howell	116,275	24,023	20.7
Iron	32,865	6,074	18.5
Jackson	120,644	18,746	15.5
Jasper	104,283	10,307	9.9
Jefferson	63,012	11,169	17.7
Johnson	167,608	15,921	9.5
Knox	176,569	12,934	7.3
Laclede	74,563	14,649	19.6
Lafayette	298,341	22,489	7.5
Lawrence	118,503	15,216	12.8
Lewis	161,952	13,221	8.2
Lincoln	142,880	14,574	10.2
Linn	144,019	16,419	11.4
Livingston	136,969	11,393	8.3
McDonald	59,304	11,208	18.9
Macon	218,340	20,859	9.6
Madison	30,536	6,504	21.3
Maries	57,077	10,381	18.2
Marion	161,575	11,571	7.2
Mercer	114,615	15,303	13.4
Miller	75,277	10,968	14.6
Mississippi	343,700	15,851	4.6
Moniteau	100,998	10,189	10.1
Monroe	224,588	13,797	6.1
Montgomery	126,941	12,546	9.9
Morgan	61,225	10,924	17.8
New Madrid	735,553	32,515	4.4
Newton	96,135	14,483	15.1
Nodaway	367,970	22,923	6.2
Oregon	83,420	10,203	12.2
Osage	76,774	10,979	15.5
Ozark	42,906	10,570	24.6
Pemiscot	847,433	45,129	5.3
Perry	76,593	14,178	18.5
Pettis	209,066	14,285	6.8
Phelps	56,537	13,835	24.5
Pike	203,428	15,259	7.5
Platte	158,639	20,155	12.7
Polk	113,949	13,961	12.3
Pulaski	47,840	10,263	21.5
Putnam	116,144	11,191	9.6
Ralls	159,378	13,562	8.5
Randolph	133,014	14,558	10.9
Ray	183,545	13,061	7.1
Reynolds	39,961	6,985	17.5
Ripley	63,966	12,703	19.9
St. Charles	135,469	12,595	9.3
St. Clair	103,636	13,619	13.1
St. Francois	59,667	10,527	17.6
St. Louis	60,632	17,177	28.3
Ste. Genevieve	37,400	6,972	18.6
Saline	306,431	22,810	7.4
Schuyler	68,064	10,058	14.8
Scotland	107,535	13,038	12.1
Scott	224,963	16,468	7.3
Shannon	40,886	7,443	18.2
Shelby	173,933	15,478	8.9
Stoddard	317,279	31,161	9.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

MISSOURI—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Stone	$61,833	$8,261	13.4
Sullivan	165,869	18,525	11.9
Taney	40,356	9,969	24.7
Texas	85,610	19,011	22.2
Vernon	111,234	18,102	16.3
Warren	41,463	6,931	16.7
Washington	44,749	6,965	15.6
Wayne	43,707	7,422	17.0
Webster	103,273	12,705	12.3
Worth	86,281	11,286	13.1
Wright	76,228	13,971	18.3
Total or average	15,924,207	1,610,019	10.1

MONTANA

Beaverhead	$38,555	$4,800	12.4
Big Horn	140,901	7,412	5.3
Blaine	141,783	7,730	5.5
Broadwater	21,467	3,767	17.5
Carbon	84,489	8,222	9.7
Carter	111,868	7,219	6.5
Cascade	160,706	6,035	4.8
Chouteau	363,466	10,857	3.0
Custer	106,140	8,894	8.4
Daniels	210,180	8,228	3.9
Dawson	189,016	7,842	4.1
Deer Lodge	1,581	882	56.0
Fallon	144,143	5,374	3.7
Fergus	370,399	12,302	3.2
Flathead	70,885	7,612	10.7
Gallatin	174,185	7,676	4.4
Garfield	135,736	9,424	6.9
Glacier	17,284	5,494	32.0
Golden Valley	49,567	6,083	12.3
Granite	5,741	1,203	21.0
Hill	342,315	15,552	4.5
Jefferson	15,448	2,518	16.3
Judith Basin	171,713	6,343	3.7
Lake	60,606	7,553	12.6
Lewis and Clark	39,267	4,459	11.4
Liberty	82,589	5,945	7.2
Lincoln	7,630	4,001	52.4
McCone	189,277	9,116	4.8
Madison	31,555	5,870	18.6
Meagher	39,116	4,395	11.2
Mineral	2,658	1,235	46.5
Missoula	20,219	5,443	26.9
Musselshell	55,572	6,921	12.5
Park	65,767	5,754	8.7
Petroleum	49,646	4,091	8.2
Phillips	142,306	9,013	6.3
Pondera	147,518	8,747	5.9
Powder River	130,060	10,206	7.8
Powell	12,696	2,604	21.5
Prairie	65,294	5,292	8.1
Ravalli	38,991	5,214	13.4
Richland	234,095	6,136	26.2
Roosevelt	299,855	12,287	4.1
Rosebud	130,783	11,104	8.5
Sanders	18,965	5,215	27.5
Sheridan	356,941	5,818	1.6
Stillwater	134,092	8,392	6.3
Sweet Grass	43,809	4,060	9.3
Teton	183,840	6,385	3.5
Toole	124,850	8,827	7.1
Treasure	40,866	3,722	9.1
Valley	300,760	13,245	4.4
Wheatland	68,952	3,934	5.7
Wibaux	104,054	6,532	6.3
Yellowstone	209,263	15,081	7.2
Total or average	6,507,250	378,066	5.8

NEBRASKA

Adams	$242,264	$16,261	6.7
Antelope	307,586	23,756	7.7
Arthur, Logan, and McPherson	115,122	13,012	11.3
Banner	114,374	8,452	7.4
Blaine, Grant, Hooker, and Thomas	143,926	14,375	10.0
Boone	348,583	19,889	5.7
Box Butte	235,870	15,481	6.6
Boyd	106,503	7,665	7.2
Brown, Keya Paha, and Rock	180,740	18,186	10.1
Buffalo	329,989	23,724	7.2
Burt	333,713	21,844	6.5
Butler	373,245	23,980	6.4
Cass	312,530	20,641	6.6
Cedar	354,779	19,644	5.5
Chase	213,409	12,446	5.8
Cherry	195,226	20,156	10.3
Cheyenne	348,000	11,469	3.3
Clay	283,657	15,194	5.4

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

NEBRASKA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Colfax	$234,905	$14,691	6.2
Cuming	333,003	21,828	6.6
Custer	592,653	41,683	7.0
Dakota	148,960	13,409	9.0
Dawes	152,610	13,967	9.2
Dawson	292,800	21,854	7.5
Deuel	130,793	7,980	6.1
Dixon	249,888	19,415	7.8
Dodge	329,390	17,449	5.3
Douglas	131,005	12,250	9.4
Dundy	110,259	9,322	8.5
Fillmore	298,982	17,453	5.8
Franklin	183,827	16,232	8.8
Frontier	250,298	19,399	7.8
Furnas	264,417	19,855	7.5
Gage	323,351	20,209	6.2
Garden	127,866	8,672	6.8
Garfield, Loup, and Wheeler	97,114	12,366	12.7
Gosper	149,247	11,005	7.4
Greeley	180,967	18,996	10.5
Hall	202,595	15,906	7.9
Hamilton	320,168	14,739	4.6
Harlan	206,398	16,837	8.2
Hayes	141,535	16,157	11.4
Hitchcock	179,525	15,031	8.4
Holt	202,592	22,773	11.2
Howard	187,983	16,183	8.6
Jefferson	198,254	15,343	7.7
Johnson	133,317	18,093	13.6
Kearney	216,599	16,972	7.8
Keith	155,201	7,647	4.9
Kimball	221,451	8,741	3.9
Knox	389,063	24,909	6.4
Lancaster	360,600	18,708	5.2
Lincoln	303,115	29,194	9.6
Madison	323,452	21,379	6.6
Merrick	169,131	12,463	7.4
Morrill	114,797	11,799	10.3
Nance	221,470	13,707	6.2
Nemaha	168,710	14,488	8.6
Nuckolls	230,933	18,969	8.2
Otoe	248,925	14,250	5.7
Pawnee	146,675	18,160	12.4
Perkins	341,529	8,793	2.8
Phelps	235,849	15,126	6.4
Pierce	289,601	20,952	7.2
Platte	422,068	15,976	3.7
Polk	292,664	16,715	5.7
Redwillow	219,774	14,363	6.5
Richardson	251,025	23,695	9.4
Saline	241,863	17,005	7.0
Sarpy	119,807	6,930	5.7
Saunders	354,219	22,198	6.3
Scotts Bluff	135,219	11,071	8.2
Seward	344,600	13,585	3.9
Sheridan	230,924	16,422	7.1
Sherman	203,325	20,204	9.9
Sioux	117,016	12,733	10.9
Stanton	225,828	15,808	7.0
Thayer	218,171	16,350	7.5
Thurston	266,090	16,900	6.4
Valley	182,031	15,755	8.7
Washington	264,243	13,563	5.1
Wayne	275,086	18,643	6.7
Webster	213,027	16,349	7.7
York	357,437	15,990	4.5
Total or average	19,968,766	1,391,284	7.0

NEVADA

Churchill	$19,275	$2,890	15.0
Clark	3,487	1,893	54.3
Douglas	8,028	1,012	12.6
Elko	47,732	3,987	8.4
Eureka	5,560	767	13.8
Humboldt	13,350	1,444	10.8
Lander	4,518	731	16.2
Lincoln	1,944	1,356	69.8
Lyon	18,123	2,386	13.2
Mineral	1,788	286	16.0
Nye	7,636	1,752	22.9
Ormsby	241	46	19.1
Pershing	10,516	1,942	18.5
Storey	114	64	56.1
Washoe	14,892	2,098	14.1
White Pine	11,604	2,922	25.2
Total or average	168,808	25,576	15.2

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Belknap	$20,677	$3,463	16.7
Carroll	19,023	2,150	11.3
Cheshire	30,546	5,025	16.4
Coos	48,756	5,906	12.1
Grafton	55,478	8,183	14.7
Hillsboro	51,627	7,290	14.1
Merrimack	36,212	5,549	15.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

NEW HAMPSHIRE—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Rockingham	$63,340	$8,621	13.6
Strafford	20,005	2,963	14.8
Sullivan	24,375	3,785	15.5
Total or average	370,039	52,936	14.3

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic	$29,276	$4,891	16.7
Bergen	13,686	1,291	9.4
Burlington	104,723	8,279	7.9
Camden	30,099	4,022	13.4
Cape May	9,621	1,819	18.9
Cumberland	106,728	11,764	11.0
Essex	5,068	404	8.0
Gloucester	101,046	11,450	11.3
Hunterdon	66,751	7,008	10.5
Mercer	53,161	6,199	11.7
Middlesex	55,165	5,945	10.8
Monmouth	112,131	9,114	8.1
Morris	19,836	2,233	11.2
Ocean	8,726	1,428	16.4
Passaic	8,225	752	9.1
Salem	71,219	5,788	8.1
Somerset	26,432	2,557	9.7
Sussex	48,873	4,125	8.4
Union	3,392	398	11.7
Warren	37,868	3,104	8.2
Total or average	912,026	92,571	10.1

NEW MEXICO

Bernalillo	$20,522	$7,308	35.6
Catron	49,148	5,250	10.7
Chaves	281,465	17,365	6.2
Colfax	113,158	10,619	9.4
Curry	257,681	11,404	4.4
De Baca	63,026	5,384	8.5
Dona Ana	381,464	21,263	5.6
Eddy	200,498	14,608	7.3
Grant	28,740	3,818	13.3
Guadalupe	72,506	8,117	11.2
Harding	78,726	8,477	10.8
Hidalgo	30,848	3,223	10.4
Lea	82,911	5,331	6.4
Lincoln	59,726	6,720	11.3
Luna	32,000	3,714	11.6
McKinley	33,285	3,249	9.8
Mora	45,476	6,814	15.0
Otero	45,558	3,729	8.2
Quay	186,939	18,403	9.9
Rio Arriba	20,838	9,075	43.6
Roosevelt	230,234	22,013	9.6
Sandoval	12,494	7,463	59.7
San Juan	14,473	5,572	38.5
San Miguel	82,459	11,412	13.8
Santa Fe	26,034	5,520	21.2
Sierra	18,763	5,066	27.0
Socorro	50,232	11,535	23.0
Taos	7,714	4,567	59.3
Torrance	70,979	11,051	15.6
Union	201,609	16,370	8.1
Valencia	90,367	12,285	13.6
Total or average	2,889,873	286,725	9.9

NEW YORK

Albany	$46,593	$4,562	9.8
Allegany	111,934	9,998	8.9
Broome	76,111	9,580	12.6
Cattaraugus	136,443	17,027	12.5
Cayuga	83,216	12,522	15.0
Chautauqua	143,777	14,550	10.1
Chemung	51,963	6,574	12.6
Chenango	114,527	12,774	11.1
Clinton	70,909	7,473	10.5
Columbia	69,188	6,396	9.2
Cortland	78,754	8,599	10.9
Delaware	141,087	8,794	6.2
Dutchess	73,607	4,722	6.4
Erie	84,293	10,318	12.2
Essex	20,700	2,135	10.3
Franklin	68,194	8,176	12.0
Fulton	17,776	1,891	10.6
Genesee	65,715	9,765	14.8
Greene	53,133	5,086	9.6
Herkimer	44,109	4,053	9.2
Jefferson	128,637	8,226	6.4
Lewis	64,304	3,504	5.4
Livingston	79,029	9,876	12.5
Madison	81,729	10,352	12.7
Monroe	75,775	10,829	14.3
Montgomery	35,141	3,345	9.5
Nassau	67,823	3,810	5.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

NEW YORK—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Niagara	$82,792	$14,160	17.1
Oneida	128,466	15,481	12.0
Onondaga	110,423	14,233	12.8
Ontario	63,529	15,414	24.3
Orange	103,360	10,964	10.6
Orleans	83,752	10,763	12.8
Oswego	85,030	12,102	14.2
Otsego	112,314	10,956	9.7
Rensselaer	59,771	4,408	7.4
Rockland	9,111	476	5.2
St. Lawrence	172,434	11,100	6.4
Saratoga	42,637	5,727	13.4
Schenectady	19,879	2,296	11.5
Schoharie	59,926	6,529	10.9
Schuyler	40,189	4,472	11.1
Seneca	66,200	9,494	14.3
Steuben	209,444	25,602	12.2
Suffolk	133,658	11,724	8.8
Sullivan	49,963	5,350	10.7
Tioga	69,053	5,465	7.9
Tompkins	53,315	7,566	14.1
Ulster	70,789	10,490	14.8
Warren	2,995	324	10.8
Washington	94,833	8,715	9.2
Wayne	136,237	18,174	13.3
Westchester	20,137	3,682	18.3
Wyoming	88,076	11,284	12.8
Yates	44,520	7,349	16.5
Total or average	4,297,300	479,237	11.2

NORTH CAROLINA

Alamance	$81,631	$18,756	23.0
Alexander	72,258	9,004	12.5
Alleghany	45,574	5,388	11.8
Anson	217,681	17,087	7.8
Ashe	87,871	11,854	13.5
Avery	39,978	7,112	17.8
Beaufort	183,396	29,873	16.3
Bertie	117,060	15,037	12.8
Bladen	131,896	21,875	16.6
Brunswick	49,818	12,238	24.6
Buncombe	81,372	13,933	17.1
Burke	34,655	7,852	22.6
Cabarrus	128,372	10,443	8.1
Caldwell	39,440	8,387	21.3
Camden	46,160	4,373	9.5
Carteret	33,665	7,714	22.9
Caswell	125,974	13,199	10.5
Catawba	143,728	12,065	8.4
Chatham	96,822	13,596	14.0
Cherokee	31,548	6,646	21.1
Chowan	44,688	7,399	16.5
Clay	19,438	3,271	16.8
Cleveland	392,883	23,570	6.0
Columbus	281,449	35,769	12.7
Craven	126,437	20,724	16.4
Cumberland	208,500	15,528	7.4
Currituck	34,886	4,211	12.1
Dare	777	27	3.5
Davidson	113,222	21,952	19.4
Davie	83,600	12,969	15.5
Duplin	275,292	38,570	14.0
Durham	61,415	10,484	17.1
Edgecombe	293,629	21,779	7.4
Forsyth	98,288	24,471	24.9
Franklin	254,580	25,239	9.9
Gaston	125,443	10,957	8.7
Gates	52,491	7,427	14.1
Graham	11,110	3,179	28.6
Granville	183,818	25,666	14.0
Greene	198,212	13,101	6.6
Guilford	152,192	19,743	13.0
Halifax	232,061	33,874	14.6
Harnett	328,274	44,849	13.8
Haywood	62,179	10,439	16.8
Henderson	42,377	6,700	15.8
Hertford	82,650	12,137	14.7
Hoke	158,122	12,660	8.0
Hyde	40,611	6,303	15.5
Iredell	240,219	19,378	8.1
Jackson	37,369	4,960	13.3
Johnston	536,158	51,784	9.7
Jones	96,465	12,541	13.0
Lee	87,008	9,745	11.2
Lenoir	244,258	12,926	5.3
Lincoln	161,245	10,318	6.4
McDowell	19,157	2,857	14.9
Macon	37,982	5,128	13.5
Madison	83,738	21,769	26.0
Martin	156,616	12,676	8.1
Mecklenburg	194,297	17,029	8.8
Mitchell	37,596	5,653	15.0
Montgomery	59,067	6,410	10.8
Moore	85,811	11,849	13.8
Nash	365,598	26,790	7.3
New Hanover	12,160	5,365	44.1
Northampton	137,071	20,185	14.7
Onslow	103,230	15,834	14.6
Orange	67,537	10,004	14.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Pamlico	$63,702	$9,065	14.2
Pasquotank	41,325	5,239	12.7
Pender	62,086	17,940	28.9
Perquimans	57,740	7,641	13.2
Person	127,536	19,963	15.7
Pitt	388,554	36,676	9.4
Polk	44,658	8,052	18.0
Randolph	89,354	14,400	16.1
Richmond	124,352	13,441	10.8
Robeson	585,225	49,766	8.5
Rockingham	183,468	32,908	17.9
Rowan	173,276	25,531	14.7
Rutherford	195,273	21,222	10.9
Sampson	415,636	47,780	11.5
Scotland	172,859	9,791	5.7
Stanly	114,864	11,191	9.7
Stokes	162,932	27,040	16.6
Surry	164,145	28,707	17.3
Swain	13,374	4,289	32.1
Transylvania	19,797	3,149	15.9
Tyrrell	24,369	3,742	15.3
Union	316,436	18,908	6.0
Vance	136,383	18,627	13.6
Wake	346,718	41,863	12.1
Warren	175,382	29,159	16.6
Washington	37,918	5,946	15.7
Watauga	56,284	6,458	15.0
Wayne	341,628	34,116	10.0
Wilkes	63,769	17,796	27.9
Wilson	314,819	24,955	7.9
Yadkin	132,741	31,092	23.4
Yancey	45,276	6,994	15.4
Total or average	13,694,042	1,636,098	11.9

NORTH DAKOTA

Adams	$187,459	$13,025	6.9
Barnes	438,795	18,373	4.2
Benson	374,791	17,017	4.5
Billings	79,919	6,230	7.8
Bottineau	409,847	11,634	2.8
Bowman	146,355	12,391	8.5
Burke	245,405	18,455	7.5
Burleigh	209,639	17,250	8.2
Cass	723,327	21,500	3.0
Cavalier	466,268	13,775	3.0
Dickey	245,689	13,222	5.4
Divide	300,205	14,406	4.8
Dunn	237,793	19,424	8.2
Eddy	137,958	6,207	4.5
Emmons	265,071	20,866	7.9
Foster	158,517	7,645	4.8
Golden Valley	135,145	9,193	6.8
Grand Forks	512,723	17,574	3.4
Grant	236,998	15,781	6.7
Griggs	199,031	8,033	4.0
Hettinger	254,137	14,080	5.5
Kidder	209,212	14,836	7.1
La Moure	308,480	19,997	6.5
Logan	169,717	10,473	6.2
McHenry	350,489	17,167	4.9
McIntosh	189,447	13,748	7.3
McKenzie	268,611	15,644	5.8
McLean	471,529	13,173	2.8
Mercer	156,033	17,299	11.1
Morton	260,800	28,005	10.7
Mountrail	314,080	21,172	6.7
Nelson	305,806	12,282	4.0
Oliver	95,300	13,160	13.8
Pembina	361,892	18,112	5.0
Pierce	280,715	13,051	4.6
Ramsey	432,994	17,716	4.1
Ransom	211,313	15,429	7.3
Renville	238,054	14,898	6.3
Richland	441,604	18,560	4.2
Rolette	166,716	11,071	6.6
Sargent	225,440	16,732	7.4
Sheridan	199,493	8,919	4.5
Sioux	90,765	10,134	11.2
Slope	153,700	8,985	5.8
Stark	290,463	13,843	4.8
Steele	226,389	7,251	4.2
Stutsman	529,987	14,531	2.7
Towner	327,882	10,257	3.1
Traill	376,033	13,373	3.6
Walsh	461,749	17,471	3.8
Ward	455,432	19,074	4.2
Wells	387,891	12,634	3.3
Williams	389,773	26,989	6.9
Total or average	15,312,861	782,065	5.1

OHIO

Adams	$122,258	$12,654	10.4
Allen	119,259	12,536	10.5
Ashland	119,446	12,866	10.8
Ashtabula	139,321	20,394	14.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

OHIO—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Athens	$38,950	$11,688	30.0
Auglaize	182,293	11,773	6.5
Belmont	66,811	17,092	25.6
Brown	142,560	13,382	9.4
Butler	177,612	11,151	6.3
Carroll	54,684	12,572	23.0
Champaign	204,708	6,895	3.4
Clark	195,315	9,451	4.9
Clermont	151,611	12,897	8.5
Clinton	206,574	7,979	3.9
Columbiana	103,966	12,842	12.4
Coshocton	112,544	16,955	15.1
Crawford	135,857	11,258	8.3
Cuyahoga	25,605	6,728	26.3
Darke	227,242	16,869	7.4
Defiance	104,511	11,464	11.0
Delaware	164,662	11,392	6.9
Erie	72,592	9,757	13.4
Fairfield	212,197	10,718	5.1
Fayette	218,170	5,463	2.5
Franklin	173,518	10,743	6.2
Fulton	91,475	12,080	13.2
Gallia	69,116	12,967	18.8
Geauga	64,502	12,126	18.8
Greene	219,846	9,018	4.1
Guernsey	78,417	14,400	18.4
Hamilton	48,731	8,380	17.2
Hancock	175,651	12,661	7.2
Hardin	166,512	12,709	7.6
Harrison	39,387	7,895	20.0
Henry	186,076	10,760	5.8
Highland	138,510	9,168	6.6
Hocking	29,852	6,141	20.6
Holmes	74,008	7,864	10.6
Huron	114,683	9,954	8.7
Jackson	66,888	6,626	9.9
Jefferson	32,511	9,735	29.9
Knox	158,300	10,096	6.4
Lake	25,268	6,732	26.6
Lawrence	50,279	11,055	22.0
Licking	206,524	19,587	9.5
Logan	164,392	11,897	7.2
Lorain	137,723	11,952	8.7
Lucas	77,893	9,983	12.8
Madison	241,382	7,274	3.0
Mahoning	67,799	13,810	20.4
Marion	175,834	11,818	6.7
Medina	102,189	11,241	11.0
Meigs	59,438	11,992	20.2
Mercer	197,613	10,921	5.5
Miami	160,594	10,356	6.4
Monroe	50,373	9,899	19.7
Montgomery	180,873	13,869	7.7
Morgan	37,509	9,790	26.1
Morrow	122,384	11,990	9.8
Muskingum	147,512	18,417	12.5
Noble	56,541	11,263	19.9
Ottawa	47,324	10,208	21.6
Paulding	154,254	12,751	8.3
Perry	83,976	9,721	11.6
Pickaway	265,058	12,114	4.6
Pike	82,066	8,615	10.5
Portage	113,855	13,128	11.5
Preble	202,536	12,235	6.0
Putnam	222,114	18,899	8.5
Richland	122,041	12,904	10.6
Ross	248,289	14,240	5.7
Sandusky	145,376	9,414	6.5
Scioto	90,506	11,112	12.3
Seneca	193,495	15,180	7.8
Shelby	168,948	10,025	5.9
Stark	114,483	16,616	14.5
Summit	53,371	13,415	25.1
Trumbull	126,331	16,831	13.3
Tuscarawas	100,208	17,754	17.7
Union	170,568	11,820	6.9
Van Wert	159,457	10,654	6.7
Vinton	21,430	7,995	37.3
Warren	145,706	10,902	7.5
Washington	79,753	20,814	26.1
Wayne	161,728	14,447	8.9
Williams	118,979	11,032	9.3
Wood	227,531	20,692	9.1
Wyandot	133,264	11,853	8.9
Total or average	11,241,498	1,049,316	9.3

OKLAHOMA

Adair	$38,668	$7,462	19.3
Alfalfa	271,421	4,731	1.7
Atoka	96,187	14,064	14.6
Beaver	414,455	11,812	2.8
Beckham	376,700	15,722	4.2
Blaine	250,824	14,569	5.8
Bryan	220,202	24,046	10.9
Caddo	507,064	21,722	4.3
Canadian	227,467	13,807	6.1
Carter	106,509	9,899	9.2
Cherokee	65,104	9,420	14.5

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

OKLAHOMA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Choctaw	$119,114	$16,338	13.7
Cimarron	302,729	10,556	3.5
Cleveland	113,607	9,911	8.7
Coal	81,368	9,991	12.3
Comanche	216,970	13,144	6.0
Cotton	222,745	12,099	5.4
Craig	114,063	14,814	13.0
Creek	147,294	18,196	12.3
Custer	247,400	12,182	4.9
Delaware	64,128	11,955	18.6
Dewey	202,513	10,488	5.2
Ellis	227,762	12,447	5.5
Garfield	141,530	9,607	6.8
Garvin	264,544	22,052	8.3
Grady	408,176	18,992	4.6
Grant	150,212	7,680	5.1
Greer	272,887	10,252	3.7
Harmon	226,373	10,024	4.4
Harper	216,711	11,882	5.5
Haskell	110,095	9,882	9.0
Hughes	176,904	15,422	8.7
Jackson	382,567	13,164	3.4
Jefferson	202,712	13,045	6.4
Johnston	101,323	11,283	11.1
Kay	95,161	5,930	6.2
Kingfisher	171,056	9,407	5.5
Kiowa	391,689	16,347	4.2
Latimer	31,318	4,456	14.2
LeFlore	158,896	17,363	10.9
Lincoln	179,639	19,849	11.0
Logan	130,272	12,787	9.8
Love	110,704	9,069	8.2
McClain	228,305	16,412	7.2
McCurtain	150,917	16,019	10.6
McIntosh	208,778	17,434	8.3
Major	127,730	10,878	9.2
Marshall	86,731	7,361	8.5
Mayes	95,634	11,445	12.0
Murray	74,641	7,229	9.7
Muskogee	255,505	16,508	6.5
Noble	78,970	4,950	6.3
Nowata	53,471	5,223	9.8
Okfuskee	180,117	13,920	7.7
Oklahoma	103,338	8,416	8.1
Okmulgee	162,943	12,246	7.5
Osage	188,203	14,319	7.6
Ottawa	47,819	9,498	19.9
Pawnee	70,574	7,791	11.0
Payne	113,375	9,860	8.7
Pittsburg	168,275	15,179	9.0
Pontotoc	139,644	18,370	13.1
Pottawatomie	164,452	13,511	8.2
Pushmataha	55,755	8,621	15.5
Roger Mills	269,168	13,333	4.9
Rogers	77,652	9,029	11.6
Seminole	120,705	12,768	10.6
Sequoyah	101,641	10,790	10.6
Stephens	216,295	14,846	6.9
Texas	590,870	15,572	2.6
Tillman	455,290	10,643	2.3
Tulsa	73,600	11,654	15.8
Wagoner	179,274	15,879	8.8
Washington	31,345	8,305	26.5
Washita	454,942	20,010	4.4
Woods	234,127	6,884	2.9
Woodward	189,740	11,730	6.2
Total or average	14,307,299	954,438	6.7

OREGON

Baker	$123,647	$7,160	5.8
Benton	64,247	9,755	15.2
Clackamas	118,607	27,475	23.2
Clatsop	7,956	990	12.4
Columbia	29,897	6,750	22.6
Coos	37,016	4,727	12.8
Crook	63,433	4,957	7.8
Curry	13,318	769	5.8
Deschutes	39,751	7,878	19.8
Douglas	77,769	12,456	16.0
Gilliam	116,774	3,284	2.8
Grant	25,521	2,409	9.4
Harney	41,278	5,487	13.3
Hood River	25,138	1,824	7.3
Jackson	75,081	6,656	8.9
Jefferson	42,785	1,727	4.0
Josephine	25,303	3,536	14.0
Klamath	154,131	9,245	6.0
Lake	35,364	5,758	16.3
Lane	115,522	20,164	17.5
Lincoln	15,154	2,755	18.1
Linn	160,167	15,349	9.6
Malheur	90,016	9,518	10.6
Marion	186,121	32,329	17.4
Morrow	165,243	3,197	1.9
Multnomah	25,580	3,824	14.9
Polk	116,128	16,644	14.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

OREGON—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Sherman	$194,112	$371	0.2
Tillamook	19,966	3,624	18.2
Umatilla	520,221	15,311	2.9
Union	107,289	6,300	5.9
Wallowa	68,297	6,415	9.4
Wasco	109,738	6,212	5.7
Washington	114,231	40,635	35.6
Wheeler	21,732	2,064	9.5
Yamhill	140,568	30,913	22.0
Total or average	3,286,811	338,468	10.3

PENNSYLVANIA

Adams	$111,301	$11,437	10.3
Allegheny	36,879	7,444	20.2
Armstrong	61,197	8,504	13.4
Beaver	30,162	3,852	12.8
Bedford	71,416	8,149	11.4
Berks	137,650	16,633	12.1
Blair	47,586	6,907	14.5
Bradford	149,000	16,149	10.8
Bucks	71,730	9,342	13.0
Butler	103,396	13,744	13.3
Cambria	59,777	8,693	14.5
Cameron	2,070	294	14.2
Carbon	26,195	3,371	12.9
Centre	40,870	5,511	13.5
Chester	137,045	14,027	10.2
Clarion	66,322	8,735	13.2
Clearfield	39,507	5,702	14.4
Clinton	18,934	3,693	19.5
Columbia	37,557	8,844	15.4
Crawford	125,308	14,360	11.4
Cumberland	102,927	9,842	9.6
Dauphin	63,170	6,787	10.7
Delaware	12,114	1,583	13.1
Elk	15,454	2,188	14.1
Erie	137,257	17,399	12.7
Fayette	62,604	9,666	15.4
Forest	6,160	1,181	19.2
Franklin	139,674	12,907	9.2
Fulton	45,747	5,378	11.7
Greene	67,682	10,552	15.6
Huntingdon	61,851	8,184	13.2
Indiana	118,892	14,320	12.0
Jefferson	68,095	9,290	13.6
Juniata	41,506	5,074	12.2
Lackawanna	34,821	4,258	12.2
Lancaster	305,729	26,726	8.7
Lawrence	62,542	10,639	17.0
Lebanon	67,382	7,102	10.5
Lehigh	90,676	11,023	12.1
Luzerne	57,979	9,615	16.6
Lycoming	87,364	11,614	13.3
McKean	17,144	2,027	11.8
Mercer	134,886	16,128	11.9
Mifflin	20,412	3,221	15.8
Monroe	19,180	3,876	20.2
Montgomery	31,939	7,901	24.7
Montour	21,759	3,470	15.9
Northampton	57,711	9,861	17.1
Northumberland	64,572	6,926	10.7
Perry	57,832	4,354	7.5
Philadelphia	4,069	282	6.9
Pike	6,065	2,074	34.2
Potter	50,865	5,495	10.8
Schuylkill	64,409	7,624	11.8
Snyder	41,156	5,370	13.0
Somerset	102,570	8,560	8.3
Sullivan	22,320	3,125	14.0
Susquehanna	110,499	11,831	10.7
Tioga	110,168	10,661	9.7
Union	33,138	4,823	14.5
Venango	41,999	6,067	14.4
Warren	46,698	7,361	15.8
Washington	85,832	12,360	14.4
Wayne	83,152	8,726	10.5
Westmoreland	118,634	16,771	14.1
Wyoming	37,734	3,659	9.7
York	148,398	10,945	7.4
Total or average	4,576,649	554,217	12.1

RHODE ISLAND

Bristol	$1,924	$484	25.1
Kent	7,316	2,296	31.4
Newport	14,955	3,195	21.4
Providence	21,283	3,885	18.2
Washington	16,420	2,881	17.5
Total or average	61,898	12,741	20.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

SOUTH CAROLINA

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Abbeville	$137,408	$7,865	5.7
Aiken	299,695	15,426	5.1
Allendale	104,037	7,712	7.4
Anderson	510,636	21,712	4.3
Bamberg	162,938	7,735	4.7
Barnwell	210,766	9,835	4.7
Beaufort	31,926	4,546	14.2
Berkeley	56,640	5,781	10.2
Calhoun	175,031	8,755	5.0
Charleston	23,559	10,516	44.6
Cherokee	200,570	14,287	7.1
Chester	160,068	7,726	4.8
Chesterfield	279,455	18,776	6.7
Clarendon	225,735	18,794	8.3
Colleton	131,512	10,355	7.8
Darlington	309,275	20,131	6.5
Dillon	252,740	12,720	5.0
Dorchester	81,016	6,473	8.0
Edgefield	136,661	9,194	6.7
Fairfield	103,099	11,508	11.2
Florence	354,366	33,757	9.5
Georgetown	38,337	4,940	12.9
Greenville	360,234	16,622	4.6
Greenwood	108,692	6,735	6.2
Hampton	107,204	9,628	9.0
Horry	315,419	29,615	9.4
Jasper	22,486	4,709	21.0
Kershaw	199,919	16,734	8.4
Lancaster	150,020	9,417	6.3
Laurens	287,240	16,699	5.8
Lee	266,539	11,007	4.1
Lexington	175,238	9,066	5.2
McCormick	63,258	5,951	9.4
Marion	165,462	5,721	3.4
Marlboro	294,987	16,675	5.6
Newberry	175,267	11,874	6.8
Oconee	179,292	8,727	4.9
Orangeburg	560,599	19,693	3.5
Pickens	185,477	10,754	5.8
Richland	107,614	7,037	6.5
Saluda	139,510	6,443	4.6
Spartanburg	488,653	29,178	6.0
Sumter	308,379	25,887	8.4
Union	115,345	9,347	8.1
Williamsburg	278,128	24,470	8.8
York	248,760	13,031	5.2
Total or average	9,289,192	593,564	6.4

SOUTH DAKOTA

Aurora	$158,955	$10,596	6.7
Beadle	321,891	28,780	8.9
Bennett	152,259	14,191	9.3
Bon Homme	231,880	16,872	7.3
Brookings	362,943	15,396	4.2
Brown	519,724	24,102	4.6
Brule and Buffalo	172,960	22,687	13.1
Butte	124,262	16,766	13.5
Campbell	152,969	9,334	6.1
Charles Mix	325,410	17,634	5.4
Clark	309,086	10,899	3.5
Clay	214,434	12,595	5.9
Codington	237,177	12,360	5.2
Corson	224,675	18,329	8.2
Custer	58,020	9,225	15.9
Davison	151,923	7,464	4.9
Day	347,129	13,534	3.9
Deuel	234,640	9,410	4.0
Dewey	137,905	10,903	7.9
Douglas	138,175	8,946	6.5
Edmunds	226,172	19,473	8.6
Fall River	111,034	12,421	11.2
Faulk	207,376	12,054	5.8
Grant	234,952	5,801	2.5
Gregory	201,270	19,472	9.7
Haakon	144,155	12,135	8.4
Hamlin	220,386	11,957	5.4
Hand	260,918	18,840	7.2
Hanson	134,878	8,891	6.6
Harding	137,293	13,963	9.9
Hughes and Stanley	149,774	15,713	10.5
Hutchinson	275,600	19,296	7.0
Hyde	96,553	7,614	7.9
Jackson and Washabaugh	119,739	8,621	7.2
Jerauld	124,198	9,726	7.8
Jones	81,710	9,627	11.8
Kingsbury	309,643	12,432	4.0
Lake	270,821	9,920	3.7
Lawrence	46,161	7,129	15.4
Lincoln	289,292	6,144	2.1
Lyman	190,312	14,484	7.6
McCook	232,537	13,049	5.6
McPherson	191,918	13,718	7.1
Marshall	221,216	9,572	4.3
Meade	306,510	33,503	10.9
Mellette	121,766	13,234	10.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

SOUTH DAKOTA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Miner	$186,643	$12,748	6.8
Minnehaha	398,063	11,537	2.9
Moody	235,260	13,489	5.7
Pennington	190,403	19,369	10.2
Perkins	253,398	26,238	10.4
Potter	189,565	12,850	6.8
Roberts	320,605	16,017	5.0
Sanborn	159,378	10,147	6.4
Shannon and Washington	78,084	8,219	10.5
Spink	427,313	19,405	4.5
Sully	180,630	13,006	7.2
Todd	118,213	13,177	11.1
Tripp	316,806	20,553	6.5
Turner	287,562	13,950	4.9
Union	261,127	13,479	5.2
Walworth	150,275	7,275	4.8
Yankton	193,338	13,051	6.8
Ziebach	129,061	15,234	11.8
Tota or average	13,558,915	888,156	6.6

TENNESSEE

Anderson	$24,959	$5,282	21.2
Bedford	81,728	5,811	7.1
Benton	67,236	11,629	17.3
Bledsoe	30,639	2,685	8.8
Blount	62,444	8,431	13.5
Bradley	53,840	8,349	15.5
Campbell	25,482	6,035	23.7
Cannon	33,503	5,363	16.0
Carroll	196,795	24,475	12.4
Carter	51,376	7,993	15.6
Cheatham	30,911	5,418	17.5
Chester	95,912	9,659	10.1
Claiborne	78,395	13,424	17.1
Clay	41,276	8,519	20.6
Cocke	61,062	13,495	22.1
Coffee	64,833	8,941	13.8
Crockett	228,537	17,014	7.4
Cumberland	33,402	3,921	11.7
Davidson	59,256	14,076	23.8
Decatur	64,891	8,912	13.7
De Kalb	60,084	12,085	20.1
Dickson	83,744	11,511	13.7
Dyer	347,306	18,381	5.3
Fayette	306,300	22,854	7.5
Fentress	21,235	3,402	16.0
Franklin	99,717	10,546	10.6
Gibson	409,850	29,048	7.1
Giles	154,103	27,620	17.9
Grainger	50,016	13,840	27.7
Greene	134,601	25,596	19.0
Grundy	12,230	1,707	14.0
Hamblen	57,273	10,250	17.9
Hamilton	31,979	7,110	22.2
Hancock	36,536	7,395	20.2
Hardeman	181,055	19,657	10.9
Hardin	85,159	11,438	13.4
Hawkins	54,858	18,523	33.8
Haywood	312,994	25,973	8.3
Henderson	169,409	21,547	12.7
Henry	176,710	16,680	9.4
Hickman	38,604	6,710	17.4
Houston	23,603	2,488	10.5
Humphreys	43,857	3,758	8.6
Jackson	35,960	9,244	25.7
Jefferson	71,175	10,845	15.2
Johnson	49,740	7,991	16.1
Knox	69,616	14,361	20.6
Lake	161,488	9,639	6.0
Lauderdale	268,493	20,476	7.6
Lawrence	208,006	22,461	10.8
Lewis	11,514	2,542	22.1
Lincoln	163,952	20,602	12.6
Loudon	51,291	5,529	10.8
McMinn	101,242	10,884	10.8
McNairy	170,644	19,088	11.2
Macon	45,778	8,377	18.3
Madison	269,566	23,490	8.7
Marion	25,464	3,441	13.5
Marshall	57,817	7,764	13.4
Maury	124,715	16,519	13.2
Meigs	24,000	4,956	20.7
Monroe	55,672	8,900	16.0
Montgomery	159,706	17,643	11.0
Moore	27,407	4,936	18.0
Morgan	17,072	4,667	27.3
Obion	204,411	18,603	9.1
Overton	63,289	12,960	20.5
Perry	24,028	4,952	20.6
Pickett	22,856	5,189	22.7
Polk	41,982	5,041	12.0
Putnam	62,746	8,796	14.0
Rhea	26,516	3,323	12.5
Roane	39,007	5,556	14.2
Robertson	148,869	15,771	10.6
Rutherford	146,198	19,627	13.4

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

TENNESSEE—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Scott	$13,675	$2,768	20.2
Sequatchie	10,143	327	3.2
Sevier	72,247	11,338	15.7
Shelby	404,631	27,215	6.7
Smith	72,483	12,771	17.6
Stewart	57,918	8,881	15.3
Sullivan	64,557	9,755	15.1
Sumner	132,301	21,002	15.9
Tipton	367,101	24,209	6.6
Trousdale	33,102	3,252	9.8
Unicoi	11,231	3,249	28.9
Union	27,331	5,942	21.7
Van Buren	11,615	1,797	15.5
Warren	64,437	13,245	20.6
Washington	86,975	16,196	18.6
Wayne	47,899	12,960	27.1
Weakley	178,661	11,686	6.5
White	65,490	8,177	12.5
Williamson	91,290	19,143	21.0
Wilson	107,486	15,849	14.7
Total or average	9,148,583	1,101,476	12.0

TEXAS

Anderson	$201,317	$20,749	10.3
Andrews	33,159	916	2.8
Angelina	100,714	23,043	22.9
Aransas	7,284	582	8.0
Archer	86,120	5,806	6.7
Armstrong	163,708	2,785	1.7
Atascosa	184,002	11,888	6.5
Austin	174,406	14,477	8.3
Bailey	290,128	11,015	3.8
Bandera	54,602	5,016	10.7
Bastrop	155,253	16,284	10.5
Baylor	143,146	7,463	5.2
Bee	132,534	9,862	7.4
Bell	502,517	24,267	4.8
Bexar	139,047	12,903	9.3
Blanco	58,994	6,280	10.6
Borden	81,252	4,493	5.5
Busque	210,720	13,261	6.3
Bowie	256,761	20,954	8.2
Brazoria	113,893	14,681	12.9
Brazos	175,115	8,252	4.7
Brewster	126,552	3,999	3.2
Briscoe	148,212	8,869	5.9
Brooks	40,990	1,815	4.4
Brown	143,893	11,091	7.7
Burleson	240,187	19,124	8.0
Burnet	130,816	14,056	10.7
Caldwell	209,064	14,991	7.2
Calhoun	73,255	3,428	4.7
Callahan	119,660	9,916	8.3
Cameron	416,204	45,656	10.9
Camp	64,565	8,096	12.5
Carson	227,471	2,913	1.3
Cass	271,663	21,215	7.8
Castro	295,311	11,408	3.9
Chambers	25,175	5,608	22.3
Cherokee	251,429	44,056	17.5
Childress	219,878	12,107	5.5
Clay	236,851	12,709	5.8
Cochran	160,046	4,526	2.8
Coke	110,010	6,941	6.3
Coleman	299,284	19,100	6.4
Collin	603,406	25,454	4.2
Collingsworth	330,042	7,882	2.4
Colorado	160,991	14,185	8.8
Comal	60,642	4,624	7.6
Comanche	120,110	22,802	19.0
Concho	183,832	9,701	5.3
Cooke	233,946	22,822	9.7
Coryell	283,991	18,550	6.5
Cottle	200,129	9,378	4.7
Crane	8,174	489	6.0
Crockett	121,706	3,119	2.6
Crosby	390,862	13,806	3.5
Culberson	80,301	2,766	3.4
Dallam	279,371	8,559	3.0
Dallas	366,218	29,343	8.0
Dawson	498,743	14,453	2.9
Deaf Smith	351,427	7,775	2.2
Delta	217,485	10,484	4.8
Denton	352,842	20,846	5.9
De Witt	220,491	15,610	7.1
Dickens	220,945	8,428	3.8
Dimmit	100,278	4,955	4.9
Donley	208,807	11,851	5.7
Duval	127,598	6,565	5.1
Eastland	69,325	13,384	19.3
Ector	23,200	658	2.8
Edwards	113,159	3,536	3.1
Ellis	717,291	29,510	4.1
El Paso	327,570	11,538	3.5
Erath	157,067	21,457	13.7
Falls	446,862	22,848	5.1
Fannin	561,497	24,690	4.4
Fayette	268,586	22,750	8.5

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

TEXAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Fisher	$330,479	$10,022	3.0
Floyd	357,663	13,374	3.7
Foard	140,995	6,678	4.7
Fort Bend	354,806	12,886	3.6
Franklin	84,088	8,020	9.5
Freestone	198,353	14,302	7.2
Frio	99,761	8,936	8.9
Gaines	92,958	6,137	6.6
Galveston	13,281	2,517	18.9
Garza	181,338	8,766	4.8
Gillespie	88,849	10,341	11.6
Glasscock	55,171	2,800	5.1
Goliad	98,786	7,930	8.0
Gonzales	251,334	13,071	5.2
Gray	180,991	4,109	2.3
Grayson	480,595	28,215	5.9
Gregg	52,876	5,991	11.3
Grimes	208,363	20,566	9.9
Guadalupe	244,906	13,523	5.5
Hale	474,265	13,097	2.8
Hall	320,072	9,731	3.0
Hamilton	196,296	13,867	7.1
Hansford	241,225	7,816	3.2
Hardeman	233,156	8,739	3.7
Hardin	4,854	2,865	59.0
Harris	114,504	16,944	14.8
Harrison	263,874	21,981	8.3
Hartley	178,374	4,714	2.6
Haskell	405,237	11,907	2.9
Hays	105,758	9,892	9.4
Hemphill	106,584	4,258	4.0
Henderson	245,827	23,518	9.6
Hidalgo	568,261	29,403	5.2
Hill	567,842	25,466	4.5
Hockley	449,267	16,107	3.6
Hood	57,456	11,340	19.7
Hopkins	328,566	21,477	6.5
Houston	297,399	29,383	9.9
Howard	222,839	7,745	3.5
Hudspeth	119,258	5,391	4.5
Hunt	564,271	27,515	4.9
Hutchinson	105,177	3,046	2.9
Irion	53,187	2,732	5.1
Jack	84,381	11,854	14.0
Jackson	163,789	8,070	4.9
Jasper	36,658	8,089	22.0
Jeff Davis	78,255	2,950	3.8
Jefferson	63,492	7,962	12.6
Jim Hogg	48,647	1,676	3.4
Jim Wells	165,754	6,918	4.2
Johnson	278,376	20,115	7.2
Jones	437,915	15,666	3.5
Karnes	275,722	16,955	6.1
Kaufman	412,416	22,735	5.5
Kendall	42,214	5,336	12.6
Kenedy	5,543	106	1.9
Kent	100,400	5,887	5.9
Kerr	65,833	4,497	6.8
Kimble	77,023	4,249	5.5
King	64,836	4,381	6.7
Kinney	56,192	2,442	4.3
Kleberg	68,280	2,319	3.4
Knox	265,463	9,211	3.5
Lamar	428,772	20,987	4.9
Lamb	658,217	12,873	1.9
Lampasas	93,251	6,479	6.9
La Salle	102,130	3,482	3.4
Lavaca	215,107	24,740	11.5
Lee	103,089	13,127	12.7
Leon	178,772	15,721	8.8
Liberty	79,287	9,941	12.5
Limestone	442,414	20,678	4.7
Lipscomb	164,616	4,882	3.0
Live Oak	164,593	8,146	4.9
Llano	60,272	4,571	7.6
Loving	14,493	678	4.7
Lubbock	698,429	16,480	2.3
Lynn	602,602	8,337	1.4
McCullock	213,419	10,861	5.1
McLennan	561,875	26,228	4.7
McMullen	49,996	2,538	5.1
Madison	131,166	12,323	9.4
Marion	59,746	9,017	15.1
Martin	208,277	8,617	4.1
Mason	70,716	6,292	8.9
Matagorda	168,967	8,551	5.1
Maverick	58,035	4,288	7.4
Medina	116,036	12,800	11.0
Menard	58,245	5,412	9.3
Midland	90,566	4,662	5.1
Milam	404,640	17,100	4.2
Mills	105,732	11,261	10.6
Mitchell	247,731	9,010	3.6
Montague	130,899	11,596	8.9
Montgomery	39,236	6,439	16.4
Moore	167,157	3,717	2.2
Morris	79,560	5,164	6.5
Motley	152,636	7,353	4.8
Nacogdoches	209,806	20,382	9.7
Navarro	574,616	33,237	5.8
Newton	22,789	4,502	20.0
Nolan	198,635	7,788	3.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

TEXAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Nueces	$646,507	$12,485	1.9
Ochiltree	274,069	2,073	.8
Oldham	106,946	4,527	4.2
Orange	8,510	4,600	54.0
Palo Pinto	86,250	8,539	9.9
Panola	202,175	21,230	10.5
Parker	109,616	27,983	25.5
Parmer	260,033	13,021	5.0
Pecos	163,680	5,096	3.1
Polk	82,323	12,231	14.8
Potter	84,939	3,391	4.0
Presidio	98,670	6,930	7.0
Rains	85,650	6,919	8.1
Randall	239,363	5,143	2.2
Reagan	38,694	1,611	4.2
Real	38,215	2,351	6.1
Red River	304,125	19,698	6.5
Reeves	84,999	4,704	5.5
Refugio	104,899	5,551	5.3
Roberts	81,399	1,911	2.3
Robertson	285,765	15,673	5.5
Rockwall	119,052	6,992	5.9
Runnels	429,301	26,295	6.1
Rusk	241,399	30,499	12.6
Sabine	55,269	10,549	19.0
San Augustine	82,451	15,131	18.3
San Jacinto	61,754	7,111	11.5
San Patricio	383,108	10,927	2.8
San Saba	134,718	12,925	9.6
Schleicher	98,647	4,412	4.5
Scurry	256,716	9,023	3.5
Schackelford	65,621	4,764	7.2
Shelby	210,942	25,134	11.9
Sherman	237,482	5,170	2.2
Smith	297,489	23,607	7.9
Somervell	24,339	4,129	17.0
Starr	97,817	6,043	6.2
Stephens	64,702	7,168	11.1
Sterling	49,240	2,318	4.7
Stonewall	158,309	7,628	4.8
Sutton	76,923	2,919	3.8
Swisher	304,515	8,211	2.7
Tarrant	168,846	16,249	9.6
Taylor	272,772	16,737	6.1
Terrell	86,366	2,734	3.2
Terry	374,482	11,939	3.2
Throckmorton	82,407	5,301	6.4
Titus	118,582	12,150	10.3
Tom Green	241,673	10,236	4.2
Travis	250,585	21,334	8.5
Trinity	84,720	10,892	12.8
Tyler	31,917	6,739	21.1
Upshur	162,516	14,674	9.0
Upton	47,423	1,809	3.8
Uvalde	123,563	7,079	5.7
Val Verde	157,069	4,620	2.9
Van Zandt	314,297	21,223	6.7
Victoria	158,061	10,638	6.7
Walker	103,923	7,398	7.1
Waller	82,127	7,913	9.6
Ward	65,845	4,226	6.4
Washington	243,754	16,549	6.8
Webb	139,483	3,734	2.7
Wharton	402,193	29,357	7.3
Wheeler	277,060	7,022	2.5
Wichita	142,759	9,858	6.9
Wilbarger	313,569	9,535	3.0
Willacy	337,106	9,758	2.9
Williamson	584,925	16,568	2.8
Wilson	160,380	12,260	7.6
Winkler	16,909	1,201	7.1
Wise	168,748	16,554	9.8
Wood	174,463	16,062	9.2
Yoakum	56,835	2,321	4.1
Young	160,256	11,240	7.0
Zapata	42,848	3,796	8.8
Zavala	73,900	3,962	5.4
Total or average	49,196,449	2,851,434	5.8

UTAH

Beaver	$9,911	$1,815	18.3
Box Elder	171,024	5,681	3.3
Cache	82,703	6,914	8.3
Carbon	16,465	2,239	13.6
Daggett	2,829	577	20.4
Davis	16,105	3,213	19.9
Duchesne	49,102	5,103	10.4
Emery	24,246	3,962	16.3
Garfield	17,413	2,768	15.9
Grand	6,260	1,201	19.2
Iron	31,269	4,921	15.7
Juab	46,674	3,619	7.8
Kane	7,491	1,488	19.9
Millard	48,974	5,914	12.1
Morgan	12,173	1,165	9.6
Piute	6,872	1,796	26.1
Rich	24,350	2,147	8.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

UTAH—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Salt Lake	$37,317	$5,560	14.9
San Juan	16,377	2,298	13.9
Sanpete	43,853	6,153	14.0
Sevier	22,138	3,178	14.4
Summit	19,102	2,866	15.0
Tooele	18,243	2,380	13.0
Uintah	24,193	4,066	16.8
Utah	74,576	12,858	17.2
Wasatch	17,592	2,260	12.6
Washington	18,594	3,802	20.1
Wayne	7,877	1,386	17.6
Weber	39,226	3,958	10.1
Total or average	514,339	105,288	11.5

VERMONT

Addison	$75,135	$9,933	13.2
Bennington	28,227	3,381	12.0
Caledonia	71,064	6,954	9.8
Chittenden	67,886	7,331	10.8
Essex	22,637	3,014	13.3
Franklin	83,971	7,978	9.5
Grand Isle	14,043	1,991	14.2
Lamoille	47,119	5,163	10.9
Orange	65,376	8,208	12.2
Orleans	102,207	15,348	15.0
Rutland	74,035	8,151	11.0
Washington	75,796	8,929	11.8
Windham	43,263	5,454	12.6
Windsor	62,082	8,490	13.5
Total or average	833,441	100,325	12.0

VIRGINIA

Accomac	$131,606	$13,670	10.4
Albemarle	50,690	6,512	12.8
Alleghany	10,110	1,565	15.5
Amelia	38,982	5,661	14.5
Amherst	30,236	4,596	15.2
Appomattox	36,944	5,627	15.2
Augusta	113,014	9,306	8.2
Bath	9,882	1,635	16.5
Bedford	54,829	10,178	18.6
Bland	18,990	1,963	10.3
Botetourt	25,875	4,225	16.3
Brunswick	107,684	11,768	10.9
Buchanan	11,950	2,868	24.0
Buckingham	31,085	7,510	24.2
Campbell	55,283	10,361	18.7
Caroline	29,502	4,527	15.3
Carroll	71,217	11,902	16.7
Charles City	8,007	1,511	18.9
Charlotte	73,102	11,041	15.1
Chesterfield	21,727	4,508	20.7
Clarke	24,950	1,438	5.8
Craig	11,465	855	7.5
Culpeper	39,169	12,152	31.0
Cumberland	27,982	5,894	21.1
Dickenson	7,781	3,968	51.0
Dinwiddie	59,736	7,002	11.7
Elizabeth City, York, and Warwick	13,284	2,836	21.3
Essex	28,174	3,184	12.6
Fairfax and Arlington	24,923	10,279	41.2
Fauquier	86,653	6,915	8.0
Floyd	35,999	8,620	23.9
Fluvanna	17,284	3,790	21.9
Franklin	66,434	17,596	26.5
Frederick	46,805	4,714	10.1
Giles	19,298	4,233	21.9
Gloucester	16,396	3,265	19.9
Goochland	19,561	4,366	22.3
Grayson	46,827	5,970	12.7
Greene	12,660	1,477	11.7
Greensville	42,448	3,009	7.1
Halifax	186,960	22,975	12.3
Hanover	33,236	7,398	22.3
Henrico	12,867	2,222	17.3
Henry	22,197	6,371	28.7
Highland	15,623	1,762	11.3
Isle of Wight	28,117	2,821	10.0
James City	9,510	866	9.1
King and Queen	22,041	4,535	20.6
King George	12,682	2,274	17.9
King William	18,115	2,937	16.2
Lancaster	7,334	2,026	27.6
Lee	59,606	9,169	15.4
Loudoun	74,814	6,012	18.0
Louisa	23,736	3,146	13.3
Lunenburg	81,808	12,663	15.5
Madison	28,476	3,596	12.6
Mathews	9,723	3,014	31.0
Mecklenburg	174,585	24,606	14.1

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

VIRGINIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Middlesex	$11,750	$2,304	19.6
Montgomery	28,500	4,638	16.3
Nansemond	56,602	5,712	10.1
Nelson	36,515	4,255	11.7
New Kent	6,154	1,484	24.1
Norfolk	31,935	2,631	8.2
Northampton	92,140	5,350	5.8
Northumberland	17,245	4,045	23.5
Nottoway	42,367	6,517	15.4
Orange	28,860	2,415	8.4
Page	32,143	2,566	8.0
Patrick	47,062	17,091	36.3
Pittsylvania	216,361	29,184	13.5
Powhatan	13,404	2,367	17.7
Prince Edward	45,682	7,603	16.6
Prince George	28,786	3,631	12.6
Prince William	32,340	17,826	55.1
Princess Anne	47,969	4,197	8.7
Pulaski	36,362	4,659	12.8
Rappahannock	36,445	6,171	16.9
Richmond	17,613	2,615	14.3
Roanoke	31,314	3,876	12.4
Rockbridge	37,612	2,882	7.7
Rockingham	83,146	7,655	9.2
Russell	78,518	13,011	16.6
Scott	58,130	12,247	21.1
Shenandoah	53,837	4,998	9.3
Smyth	41,547	5,606	13.5
Southampton	80,308	9,291	11.6
Spotsylvania	19,112	2,878	15.1
Stafford	12,818	2,320	18.1
Surry	19,733	1,584	8.0
Sussex	33,860	6,056	17.9
Tazewell	39,392	7,108	18.0
Warren	17,699	1,924	10.9
Washington	88,254	14,622	16.6
Westmoreland	24,137	3,492	14.5
Wise	15,121	3,447	22.8
Wythe	45,115	13,259	29.4
Total or average	4,082,862	614,407	15.1

WASHINGTON

Adams	$100,333	$5,425	2.8
Asotin	53,024	1,934	3.6
Benton	51,311	9,163	17.9
Chelan	31,602	6,130	19.4
Clallam	16,265	3,431	21.1
Clark	54,153	11,259	20.8
Columbia	148,394	4,535	3.1
Cowlitz	18,109	4,376	24.2
Douglas	74,498	8,672	11.6
Ferry	14,302	3,435	24.0
Franklin	122,170	5,382	4.4
Garfield	103,504	3,413	3.3
Grant	80,366	7,090	8.8
Grays Harbor	14,680	4,170	28.4
Island	16,245	2,304	14.2
Jefferson	5,524	1,630	29.5
King	31,562	9,147	29.0
Kitsap	5,542	1,325	23.9
Kittitas	98,225	7,237	7.4
Klickitat	80,130	5,801	7.2
Lewis	42,205	11,094	26.3
Lincoln	194,808	9,955	5.1
Mason	5,902	1,021	17.3
Okanogan	106,069	14,444	13.6
Pacific	10,426	1,200	11.5
Pend Oreille	11,233	3,393	30.2
Pierce	21,912	5,639	25.7
San Juan	7,445	2,051	27.5
Skagit	38,981	8,911	22.9
Skamania	4,539	2,171	47.8
Snohomish	31,482	5,555	17.6
Spokane	246,187	11,513	4.7
Stevens	89,006	8,522	9.6
Thurston	23,693	6,590	27.8
Wahkiakum	8,057	2,678	33.2
Walla Walla	308,949	6,794	2.2
Whatcom	56,829	11,631	20.5
Whitman	583,936	13,854	2.4
Yakima	249,566	29,877	12.0
Total or average	3,251,164	262,752	8.1

WEST VIRGINIA

Barbour	$27,064	$5,535	20.4
Berkeley	43,379	3,414	7.9
Boone and Logan	20,558	4,981	24.2
Braxton	46,953	8,280	17.6
Brooke	6,046	1,402	23.2
Cabell	30,869	8,726	28.3
Calhoun	26,671	7,283	27.3
Clay	15,056	3,067	20.4
Doddridge	29,036	3,971	13.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Fayette	$24,363	$7,134	29.3
Gilmer	23,457	5,837	24.9
Grant	21,900	3,177	14.5
Greenbrier	48,654	5,573	11.4
Hampshire	36,516	4,071	11.1
Hancock	5,832	1,154	19.8
Hardy	25,241	3,795	15.0
Harrison	67,837	7,223	10.6
Jackson	41,673	8,128	19.5
Jefferson	54,660	2,698	4.9
Kanawha	20,439	7,284	35.6
Lewis	45,182	8,203	18.1
Lincoln	31,209	9,317	29.8
Marion	29,980	6,056	20.2
Marshall	26,305	5,022	19.1
Mason	35,682	7,769	21.8
Mercer, McDowell, and Wyoming	33,918	7,643	22.5
Mineral	19,520	2,417	12.4
Mingo and Wayne	28,589	7,279	25.5
Monongalia	21,904	4,629	21.1
Monroe	37,375	5,280	14.1
Morgan	12,235	1,653	13.5
Nicholas	28,775	5,698	19.8
Ohio	7,005	1,705	24.3
Pendleton	33,571	4,497	13.4
Pleasants	13,637	1,988	14.6
Pocahontas	33,909	4,910	14.5
Preston	40,428	7,077	17.5
Putnam	21,257	8,742	41.1
Raleigh	50,711	11,272	22.2
Randolph	32,204	5,124	15.9
Ritchie	39,960	6,977	17.5
Roane	52,923	7,535	14.2
Summers	24,740	5,954	24.1
Taylor	14,150	4,151	29.3
Tucker	15,890	2,014	12.7
Tyler	24,644	4,283	17.4
Upshur	46,032	8,335	18.1
Webster	18,251	3,678	20.1
Wetzel	25,978	7,508	28.9
Wirt	18,535	4,546	24.5
Wood	29,187	5,876	20.1
Total or average	1,509,790	279,871	18.5

WISCONSIN

Adams	$75,526	$7,702	10.2
Ashland	30,859	6,202	2.0
Barron	255,263	22,622	8.9
Bayfield	39,982	7,931	19.8
Brown	177,621	15,086	8.5
Buffalo	175,673	12,070	6.9
Burnett	118,308	10,334	8.7
Calumet	133,201	8,993	6.1
Chippewa	246,096	20,569	8.4
Clark	259,059	21,553	8.3
Columbia	352,274	12,920	3.7
Crawford	138,012	7,958	5.8
Dane	620,649	24,372	3.9
Dodge	303,254	22,143	7.3
Door	109,015	11,983	11.0
Douglas	57,924	7,433	12.8
Dunn	274,420	16,202	5.9
Eau Claire	170,625	12,312	7.2
Florence and Forest	29,629	7,046	23.8
Fond du Lac	258,062	17,192	6.7
Grant	455,161	13,285	2.9
Green	244,867	7,934	3.2
Green Lake	113,830	6,208	5.5
Iowa	244,512	9,565	3.9
Iron	6,715	2,117	31.5
Jackson	155,302	12,884	8.3
Jefferson	214,581	10,644	5.0
Juneau	131,245	11,804	9.0
Kenosha	57,973	6,369	11.0
Kewaunee	102,939	8,278	8.1
La Crosse	118,630	7,582	6.4
Lafayette	299,443	9,540	3.2
Langlade	83,770	9,560	11.4
Lincoln	63,408	7,688	12.1
Manitowoc	209,085	11,588	5.5
Marathon	365,268	31,141	8.5
Marinette	104,012	14,548	14.0
Marquette	90,865	5,956	6.6
Milwaukee	44,976	7,277	16.2
Monroe	197,485	17,948	9.1
Oconto	141,521	15,874	11.2
Oneida	23,999	4,779	19.9
Outagamie	207,309	17,274	8.3
Ozaukee	80,265	7,107	8.8
Pepin	68,306	4,416	6.5
Pierce	196,244	15,430	7.9
Polk	201,812	18,776	9.3
Portage	228,276	15,420	6.8
Price	53,527	9,683	18.1
Racine	76,323	7,635	10.0
Richland	126,471	9,464	7.5
Rock	457,499	14,026	3.2
Rusk	77,788	13,004	16.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

WISCONSIN—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
St. Croix	$274,387	$15,803	5.8
Sauk	304,228	13,408	4.4
Sawyer	22,651	5,180	22.9
Shawano	208,507	15,777	7.6
Sheboygan	183,445	13,601	7.4
Taylor	105,642	13,621	12.9
Trempealeau	224,697	13,269	5.9
Vernon	238,044	19,184	8.1
Vilas	6,018	1,626	27.0
Walworth	289,059	11,699	4.0
Washburn	45,129	7,766	17.2
Washington	161,430	13,010	8.1
Waukesha	179,685	11,418	6.4
Waupaca	230,625	15,040	6.5
Waushara	159,772	11,599	7.3
Winnebago	125,236	11,771	9.4
Wood	143,003	11,739	8.2
Total or average	11,950,686	842,033	7.0

WYOMING

Albany	$78,920	$4,221	5.3
Big Horn	45,924	10,266	22.4
Campbell	185,172	21,179	11.4
Carbon	121,390	14,563	12.0
Converse	148,602	13,864	9.3
Crook	114,450	12,085	10.6
Fremont	69,016	13,376	19.4
Goshen	207,665	16,965	8.2
Hot Springs	25,721	4,025	15.6
Johnson	90,613	8,314	9.2
Laramie	151,042	15,155	10.0
Lincoln	59,074	12,317	20.9
Natrona	94,798	10,073	10.6
Niobrara	85,231	7,627	8.9
Park	65,775	12,230	18.6
Platte	145,280	12,843	8.8
Sheridan	94,182	14,294	15.2
Sublette	59,352	7,425	12.5
Sweetwater	24,993	5,404	21.6
Teton	8,751	3,613	41.3
Uinta	40,195	5,764	14.3
Washakie	20,591	2,845	13.8
Weston	88,521	9,832	11.1
Total or average	2,025,267	238,282	11.8

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources, Department of Agriculture," on page 75, line 17, after the word "thereof," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That no payment or payments shall be made from funds appropriated hereunder, for seed delivered to agricultural producers except as provided for in Public Law 121, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, on purchase orders to regularly established jobbers and dealers or to farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations for a reasonable and fair compensation except in areas where such services are not available or for the distributing of such seed used in an introductory or experimental way," and on page 76, line 13, after the word "Government", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder, to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $1,000, but in applying this limitation there shall be excluded amounts representing a landlord's share of a payment made with respect to land operated under a tenancy or sharecropper relationship if the division of the payment between the landlord and tenant or sharecropper is determined by the local committee to be in accordance with fair and customary standards of renting and sharecropping prevailing in the locality. In the case of payments to any person on account of performance on farms in different States, Territories, or possessions the limitation shall be applied to the total of the payments for each State, Territory, or possession for a year, and not to the total of all payments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Parity payments," on page 78, line 22, after the numerals "1942", to insert: "and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement, the amendment on page 80 will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amendment is to go over, by agreement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment at the bottom of page 75. Was that the one offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the amendment which relates to the method of distributing seed.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask for an explanation of the amendment at the bottom of page 76.

Mr. RUSSELL. An amendment was offered on the floor of the House which undertook, in about seven or eight lines, to rewrite and change all the laws relating to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the method of handling those laws. There is a statute at the present time which provides a limit of $10,000 on the amount which can be paid any one producer. The amendment offered on the floor of the House undertook to change that provision, to limit it to $1,000, unless, according to some formula which is very difficult to understand, the farmer might have done certain things.

The Committee on Appropriations is always very loath to legislate, and if we had undertaken to revise all the laws relating to payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and had been fair to all parties, we would have been compelled to hold hearings extending at least over 3 months. We did not have the time to do that, and we were not the committee to do it. The standing committee on Agriculture and Forestry would be the proper committee to handle the subject. So we struck the provision out. I do not think it has any place in an appropriation bill, and it was adopted in the House after a very brief discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations to be considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the items relating to the Farm Security Administration were to go over, under the agreement.

Mr. BYRD. Beginning with the item of "Farm Tenancy," on page 83.

Mr. RUSSELL. The items in the bill between pages 83 to 88 have gone over.

Mr. BYRD. It is understood, I think, that they will be considered Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I do not think we can consider them this afternoon. I had been hopeful we could conclude their consideration today, but if it meets the convenience of the Senator from Virginia, they may go over until Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Not only the Senator from Virginia but many other Senators will be away tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. No Senator except the Senator from Virginia has mentioned it to me.

Mr. BYRD. But others have mentioned it to me, and they desire to be present when the matter is discussed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next amendment to be considered under the agreement, as I understand, is to be found on page 90, line 21.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration", on page 90, line 21, after the word "reports", it is proposed to strike out "$3,750,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, at the end of line 15, to reduce the total appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration from $3,750,000 to $3,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interchange of appropriations," on page 92, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "5" and insert "10"; and in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "5" and insert "10."

Mr. BYRD. Will not the Senator from Georgia give an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to do so. For some 20 years this item appeared in the bill with a limitation of 10 percent on the amounts to be exchanged between the several Budget estimates within a bureau. Last year the figure was reduced to 5 percent. This year, some of the bureaus which have very small appropriations thought it was necessary to have a little more elasticity in this item, in order to permit them to do some work that is important, due to shortages caused by the war. For example, in the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, under which there are no very large appropriations, requests have been made that the Bureau develop certain drugs of which there has been a shortage in this country. It cannot involve any very large amount of money. The 10-percent provision refers to what is done within any bureau. It does not mean 10 percent can be transferred from one bureau or subdivision in the Department to another, but merely that within a bureau a transfer can be made from one item to another of as much as 10 percent, to enable them to meet conditions which are changing very rapidly every day. I may say that this language has been in the bill for some 12 or 15 years. I have inquired into it for some years myself, and I have found it has never been abused in the 9 years or so I have been on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Was the reduction to 5 percent made in the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. The reduction was made in the House. It was made last year for the first time.

Mr. BYRD. Has the 5 percent been in effect for a year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the 5 percent has been in effect for 1 year.

Mr. BYRD. Has it worked any hardship?

Mr. RUSSELL. It had not until this year. It had not worked any hardship, but it was anticipated that it might. The Department has suggested that we set up an emergency fund of $50,000 or $100,000 to enable them to deal with new matters which have just come up. I did not like to increase the appropriation; I thought it would be better to give them a little more leeway in transferring the funds within the several bureaus than to make an increased appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. Which means then that after the Congress has appropriated money for specific purposes, it can be transferred within a particular department, to the extent of 10 percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; within a particular bureau; that is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I wonder if the Senator would not let that matter go over until tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, if the Senator from Virginia objects to it, we shall have to let it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. I think to that extent Congress will lose control over the appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true to a certain extent. Of course, the control of the Congress over the various 1,800 activities of the Department is fixed by the Budget estimates which are sent up by the Bureau of the Budget, because the bill does not contain a break-down of how all these funds should be spent within a bureau. That is fixed by the Budget estimate. This language does not change anything the Congress has done, except insofar as we approve of the estimates which have been sent in to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. I talked to the Senator from Georgia earlier in the day about the travel expenses, and he said the Budget estimates controlled the amount of the travel expenses. This provision would certainly prevent that control to the extent of 10 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would as between the several bureaus; yes.

Mr. BYRD. I think if the Senator does not mind we had better let the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky then that the Senate take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, there is another provision in the bill dealing with the travel expenses. It is found on page 102. I wonder whether that has something to do with limitation on travel expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. The item on page 102 reduces travel expenses by $1,500,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he wants the Senate to meet tomorrow or to go over until Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the objections which have been raised, I think we had better recess until tomorrow, and conclude consideration of the bill then.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state that ordinarily when a bill is under consideration I would move that the Senate take a recess until the next day, but, under the rule, a vote cannot be had upon the Downey resolution if the Senate takes a recess, whereas if the Senate adjourns the resolution comes up automatically; and since it is practically the unanimous desire of the Senate that we have a vote on the resolution, I shall move that the Senate adjourn, instead of taking a recess, but shall not do so at this moment.

I wish to say that when we conclude the business of today I shall move to adjourn. That will give us a morning hour tomorrow, and during the morning hour the Downey resolution comes automatically before the Senate without any motion, and I hope we can vote on it tomorrow. It was the desire of practically every Senator to vote on the motion today. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] exercised his right in objecting to it being considered. I have great respect, of course, for the Senator from Nebraska, and I do not question his motives in any way, but it is regrettable that we could not have voted on the resolution today. I hope it will come to a vote tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia today inquired as to the amount that had been transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from other departments. I submitted an inquiry to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and I am advised that in March 1942, $25,651.58 was transferred from the Lease-Lend Administrator to enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to conduct special surveys for the Lease-Lend Administration of the production and capacity of milk-processing plants, canning plants, and preserving plants, as well as a survey of sources of vegetable seed and special stocks, and other production surveys.

In addition to that the Office of Facts and Figures has transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics the sum of $117,864.67 so far this year, and it is proposed to transfer another $121,000, making a total of $239,000.

These transfers were made because the Office of Facts and Figures requested the Department of Agriculture to make field surveys for it. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics already had a staff trained in this work, and it was considered that it could do the work much more economically than could the Office of Facts and Figures, had they undertaken to set up an entirely new organization. So far as I am advised, that is the total amount of funds which have been transferred from other agencies.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagree-

ment to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LEE, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEBT AND TAXES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times today entitled "Debt and Taxes." The editorial is worth reading by every Member of the Senate. It calls attention to a vital omission in our present income-tax law. I say vital omission because, with rapidly rising tax rates, with exceedingly high tax rates, provision must be made for deductions from the gross income of taxpayers to meet debts contracted prior to this period. The editorial calls attention to that matter.

I am pleased to say that repeated conference with the Treasury leads me to believe that the Secretary of the Treasury will recommend to the Ways and Means Committee of the House the inclusion of some suitable provision allowing deductions of payments made on existing debts. Under the present law, deductions are permissible only for interest paid upon debts, and not upon any amortization of the debts. That has been bearable so long as the general level of income taxes has remained reasonably low, but as that level advances, the debtor taxpayer is simply unable to liquidate his debt unless some deduction is allowed for payments upon existing debts.

I wish to take this occasion to say that the ability of the taxpayer to liquidate his debt, whether it be an individual or corporation, determines the capacity of the taxpayer to borrow. In other words, it goes to the basis of the whole credit system, and the credit system is the basis of the free enterprise system as we know it in the United States.

I should like to say at this point also that the whole American industrial machine is now undergoing depreciation and obsolescence at a rate more rapid than ever before in the history of American industry, perhaps in the history of industry in the world. It therefore is doubly necessary not only that provision be made for payments upon existing debts against the taxable income of taxpayers, but it is likewise necessary that additional provision be made for reserves, in order that there may be some possible cushion after the war is over, when the whole industrial machine will have become more depreciated and will have become obsolescent in a degree higher than ever before in the history of American industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection; the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT AND TAXES

None of us is wise enough to know exactly what problems we shall face when the need for war production ends. But it is certain that whether we face contraction or expansion, we shall meet the test more successfully if we have utilized a portion of our wartime income to reduce private debt.

There are two aspects to this question. One is the factor of the future financial strength of our economy. The burden of debt under which the railroads of the country labored in the nineteen thirties was a brake upon all industry and all finance. If there is one lesson that we should have learned from that experience it is that a period of increased income should be utilized to get out of debt in order that a depression period may find us stronger. The other factor is the general problem of inflation. Essentially, the danger of inflation arises from the fact that Government is greatly expanding its debt, particularly its borrowing from commercial banks. To the extent that the proceeds of this expanding Government credit, flowing out in payment for war orders and expanding the national income, is used to repay private debt, the total potential of inflation is checked. This applies particularly to the reduction of bank debt, but in the long run all debt reduction tends to be counter-inflationary.

The President recognized this in the seventh point of his anti-inflation program, which called for encouraging the paying off of debts. But as yet nothing effective has been done to carry this policy into action. On the contrary, our tax laws work in the opposite direction. They encourage debt by permitting the deduction of interest payments from taxable income, but afford no relief to the debtor who seeks to repay principal. This condition becomes of increasing importance as the tax rates are lifted.

The House Ways and Means Committee, which has repeatedly given proof of its understanding of this type of problem, might well consider a provision in the 1942 tax bill to carry out the President's recommendation for encouraging the repayment of debt. The precise method can best be determined by the committee; but the net effect should be to exempt from taxation some part of current income, provided it is employed in reducing debt. Such a provision would not merely fit the requirements of wartime taxation but would be an important practical contribution to post-war planning.

POSTMASTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar, and I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination of Glennie Flathers Whites to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak., be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado.
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Spencer C. Young, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Arthur G. Jaeger, term expired.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Paul A. Roach, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex. Reappointment.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named senior sanitary engineer to be a sanitary engineer director in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Ralph E. Tarbett, July 23, 1942.

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Capt. Robert H. English to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 8th day of May 1942.

Capt. Donald B. Beary to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of December 1941.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. James L. Kauffman to be a rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Clarence E. Voegeli	Melville E. Eaton
Harvey T. Walsh	Leo B. Farrell
Kenneth L. Forster	Edwin A. Taylor
John J. Curley, Jr.	Lucien Ragonnet
Joseph C. Hubbard	Donald S. Evans
John G. Winn	Frank T. Watkins

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William H. Ashford, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Milton A. Nation, January 1, 1942.
Robert V. Hull, January 1, 1942.
Carl L. Steiner, January 1, 1942.
William Loveland, January 1, 1942.
Clinton S. Rounds, January 1, 1942.
Claren E. Duke, January 1, 1942.
John E. Clark, January 1, 1942.
William A. Sutherland, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Francis R. Jones, January 1, 1942.
David W. Shafer, January 1, 1942.
Patrick Henry, January 1, 1942.
Gordon L. Caswell, January 1, 1942.
William W. Outerbridge, January 1, 1942.
Oscar H. Dodson, January 1, 1942.
John T. Brown, Jr., January 1, 1942.
James P. Walker, January 1, 1942.
Richard E. Myers, January 1, 1942.
Wilton S. Heald, January 1, 1942.
Calvin E. Wakeman, January 1, 1942.
George W. Willcox, January 1, 1942.
Joseph D. McKinney, January 1, 1942.
Joseph R. Rubins, January 1, 1942.
William S. Maxwell, January 1, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John S. Lehman, December 13, 1940.
Marion H. Eppes, November 1, 1941.
Clifford S. Foster, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Bruce P. Ross, January 1, 1942.

Frederick N. Phillips, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Frederick J. Harlfinger 2d, January 1, 1942.
Frederick M. Stiesberg, January 1, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 2d day of June 1941:

James S. Cooley
John C. Eckhardt, Jr.
William J. Bush

Medical Inspector John L. Frazer, Jr., to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Surgeon Harry D. Templeton to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Passed Assistant Surgeon James J. V. Cammisa to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Assistant Surgeon George J. Kohut to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of August 1941.

Paymaster George W. Bauernschmidt to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John R. Lewis, September 1, 1941.
Richard B. Winfield, January 1, 1942.
Henry L. Muller, January 1, 1942.

Gunner Robert R. Snyder to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of February 1942.

Machinist Charles F. Vance to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of February 1942.

The following-named rear admirals to be rear admirals in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

William R. Munroe, December 8, 1941.
John F. Shafroth, Jr., January 1, 1942.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

John J. Cunningham, May 1, 1940.
Robert F. Robertson, February 17, 1941.
John C. Hart, February 17, 1941.
John W. Albrittain, February 17, 1941.
John P. Dobson, February 17, 1941.
Curtis H. Carter, February 17, 1941.
Rodney R. Gleysteen, February 17, 1941.
Marion L. Connerley, February 17, 1941.
John S. Cowan, February 17, 1941.
Walter M. Weber, February 17, 1941.
Robert Z. Collings, Jr., May 26, 1941.
Hunt B. Jones, May 26, 1941.
Robert A. Freyling, May 26, 1941.
Victor C. Stratton, May 26, 1941.
John R. Gateley, May 26, 1941.
William D. Yavorsky, May 26, 1941.
Ronald N. Shelley, May 26, 1941.
Lawrence C. Day, May 26, 1941.
Charles Shafiroff, May 26, 1941.
William S. Baker, Jr., May 26, 1941.
Wallace L. Chesbro, May 26, 1941.
John B. Toepfer, Jr., May 26, 1941.
Alfred G. Sherman, May 26, 1941.
Raymond F. Higgins, May 26, 1941.
Harold A. Smedal, May 26, 1941.
Henry C. Hunley, Jr., May 26, 1941.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

George C. Rader, February 17, 1941.
Samstone Holmes, February 17, 1941.
William E. Ludwick, February 17, 1941.
Irvin M. Blue, February 17, 1941.
Earl A. Goldsmith, February 17, 1941.
Charles H. Bercier, February 17, 1941.
John N. Boege, February 17, 1941.
Morgan F. McAfee, Jr., May 21, 1941.
John P. Arthur, May 21, 1941.
Angus W. Grant, May 21, 1941.
Edward J. Sullivan, May 21, 1941.
Daniel E. LaMothe, May 21, 1941.
Carl W. Rasmussen, May 21, 1941.
Vernon L. Anderson, May 21, 1941.
Harold G. Green, May 21, 1941.
William R. Curry, Jr., May 21, 1941.
William A. McLennan, May 21, 1941.
Charles E. Meyers, May 21, 1941.
William M. Thomas, May 21, 1941.
Albert B. Larson, May 21, 1941.
Baker M. Hamilton, May 21, 1941.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 5th day of November, 1940, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Francis M. Fahy	Daniel R. McComish
Douglas C. Skaife	Shelby C. Leasure, Jr.
Albert B. Johnson	Philip W. Evans
Leonard F. Burrage 3d	William M. Sander
Fred Coleman	

The following-named assistant civil engineers to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Raymond B. Krum, December 4, 1939.
John W. Gordanier, December 4, 1939.
Richard E. Harris, December 4, 1939.
Charles G. Prahl, December 14, 1940.
James A. Fitzgerald, December 14, 1940.
Joseph C. Luppens, December 14, 1940.
William J. Thompson, December 14, 1940.
Joseph B. Barnwell, May 17, 1941.
James S. Marsh, May 17, 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harry J. Alvis, February 17, 1941.
Harold W. Fleischer, February 17, 1941.
Frank S. Ashburn, January 25, 1942.
Edward T. Haslam, January 25, 1942.
Robert C. Abrams, January 25, 1942.
Nelse O. Olson, January 25, 1942.
Robert H. Leeds, January 25, 1942.
Joseph G. McWilliams, January 25, 1942.
George Jacobson, January 25, 1942.
Sidney L. Arje, January 25, 1942.
Harry C. Helm, January 25, 1942.
George F. Fraser, January 25, 1942.
Sam R. Burnett, May 5, 1942.
Eugene P. Cronkite, May 5, 1942.
James R. Dillon, Jr., May 5, 1942.
John F. Merritt, May 5, 1942.
Frank T. Sheehan, May 5, 1942.
Rieber C. Hovde, May 5, 1942.
Bassel N. Blanton, May 5, 1942.
Benjamin F. Lee, Jr., May 5, 1942.
Paul V. Breitenberger, May 5, 1942.
Thomas S. Barnes, May 5, 1942.
John W. Mills, May 5, 1942.
Maurice A. Canon, May 5, 1942.
Clifford N. Crawford, July 1, 1942.
John W. Lyons, Jr., July 1, 1942.
James H. Trolinger, July 1, 1942.
Richard H. Williamson, July 1, 1942.
Samuel J. Garfield, July 1, 1942.
Charles H. Klamer, July 1, 1942.
Robert W. Kullberg, July 1, 1942.
Roderick L. Tondreau, July 1, 1942.
Frederick W. Rayburn, July 1, 1942.
Myron H. Nourse, July 1, 1942.
Watson B. Larkin, July 1, 1942.
James L. Richardson, July 1, 1942.
Bronislav M. Lazich, July 1, 1942.
Clyde L. Boice, July 1, 1942.
Richard C. Morrison, July 1, 1942.
George N. Ketcham, July 1, 1942.
Philip J. Byrne, July 1, 1942.

The following to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Joseph A. Thimes, May 21, 1941.
Nicholas E. Homichko, May 21, 1941.
Walter J. Demer, January 12, 1942.
Arthur S. Turville, January 12, 1942.
Roger G. Gerry, January 12, 1942.
Robert B. Wolcott, January 12, 1942.
Paul W. Suitor, January 12, 1942.
Frederick S. Brown, Jr., January 12, 1942.
Milton H. Brown, January 12, 1942.
Clarence H. Blackstone, January 12, 1942.
William P. Thomas, January 12, 1942.
Elmer F. Morton, January 12, 1942.
William J. Manion, January 12, 1942.
Ramon J. Wallenborn, January 12, 1942.
Guy Hughes, January 12, 1942.
William D. King, January 12, 1942.
Patrick G. Cronin, January 12, 1942.
Edmund B Carleton, January 12, 1942.
Sidney R. Howell January 12, 1942.
William E. Dennard, January 12, 1942.
Felix H Norton, January 12, 1942.
Charles M. Heck, January 12, 1942.
John H. Atkins, January 12, 1942.
Robert H. Loving, January 12, 1942.
Joseph F. Link, January 12, 1942.
Lee E. Krieger, January 12, 1942.
Alexander D. Bunn, January 12, 1942.
John E. Dwyer, January 12, 1942.
Robert I. Phillips, January 12, 1942.
Arne G. Nielsen, January 12, 1942.
Gilbert F. Gorsuch, January 12, 1942.
Carl A. Ostrom, January 12, 1942.
Charles R. Shea, January 12, 1942.
David J. Kennedy, January 12, 1942.
Walter A. Weaver, May 5, 1942.
Walter F. Hadtke, May 5, 1942.
Paul A. Moore, May 5, 1942.
Donald T. Balkema, May 5, 1942.
John W. Pepper, Jr., May 5, 1942.
Charles R. Bates, May 5, 1942.
John L. Keeshan, May 5, 1942.
Herbert J. Towle, Jr., May 5, 1942.
Clarence E. Dawson, May 5, 1942.
William S. Rusk, May 5, 1942.
Charles W. Miller, May 5, 1942.
Edward J. Muller, May 5, 1942.
James J. Kestly, May 5, 1942.
Paul C. White, May 5, 1942.
Robert S. Collins, May 5, 1942.

Ensign Richard P. Jeffrey to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939.

The following to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Austin H. Barnett, Jr., November 6, 1940.
Donald T. Rohde, November 6, 1940.
George A. Reinhalter, November 6, 1940.
Harold H. Blackman, November 6, 1940.
Arromanus C. Lyles, Jr., November 18, 1941.
William H. Bates, November 18, 1941.
John T. Dollard, November 18, 1941.
Julian W. McClure, November 18, 1941.
Frederick A. Lyon, November 18, 1941.
John S. Butler, November 18, 1941.
Charles R. Ernst, November 18, 1941.

Lt. Comdr. George P. Hunter to be a commander in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Lt. Eldon C. Mayer to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Robert S. Mandelkorn, November 1, 1941.
Constantine A. Karaberis, January 1, 1942.

Surg. Robert K. Y. Dusinberre to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Assistant Paymaster Glenn W. Clegg to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

Malcolm D. Balbirnie, December 2, 1941.
William F. Moore, March 1, 1942.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

Loren Henderson, March 1, 1942.
George S. Watson, May 1, 1942.

Carpenter Roy C. Parlier to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of May 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 2d day of June 1941:

Joseph W. Frorath
James Douglas

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939:

Arthur B. Chilton, Jr.
Richard T. Pratt
Luther S. Reynolds

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 14, 1942:

POSTMASTER

Glennie Flathers Whites, Iroquois, S. Dak.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend John M. Alexander, D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, N. C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, we thank Thee for our country and for the ideals upon which it was founded and for which it stands. Help us to be worthy of our heritage.

Keep always before us the conviction that the powers of government are ordained of God and that we are to render unto this Government the things that pertain thereto and to God the things that pertain to God.

Be with the President of these United States, with the Congress, and with all those who are entrusted by the people with the authority to rule over them. Give us that wisdom that comes down from above. Purify us of self-interest and may we be willing to lose ourselves in the preservation of that which we hold dearer than life.

We pray for Thy protection over our citizens called to the armed service, over those that are prisoners of war, over the wounded, and those preparing for battle. Grant that those who die may not have died in vain and that through their sacrifice we may build a new world wherein dwelleth right.

This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 28, 1942:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1942:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

On May 2, 1942:

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates a partnership;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former Acting Chief Disbursing Clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

On May 4, 1942:

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of James A. Quillinan;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard, and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; and

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.

On May 5, 1942:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.;

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935; and

H. R. 6166. An act to approve act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board.

On May 6, 1942:

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 3767. An act for the relief of Frank Sheppard; and

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky.

On May 7, 1942:

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

On May 9, 1942:

H. R. 139. An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases.

On May 13, 1942:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram received by me and one sent by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. PAGÁN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under no conditions should there be any argument about the necessity of Congress attending congressional sessions, or going therefrom and thereto. This principle is definitely and positively settled under article I, section 6, of the Constitution of the United States, which says:

They—

The Senators and Representatives—

shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of the respective houses, and in going to and returning from the same.

The principle set up here was to see that Congressmen and Senators actually reach their respective houses in order that no Congressman could be denied his vote, and no section be left unrepresented. It is self-evident that if means of transportation, and that means automobile travel today, were denied, Senators and Congressmen could not fully perform their duties.

This is an old principle and definitely settled many years before those who would deny Congressmen transportation were born. The point in the case today is whether we have or have not a Constitution and are going to live by it. The newspaper commentators, radio stations, and all other sources of news had better watch this definite and positive effort of those who are trying to destroy Congress and throw the Constitution aside, and let them not forget that, under that same Constitution, freedom of the press will be lost if the Congress and the Constitution are destroyed.

Great stress has been laid upon the X cards issued to Congress. There are only 435 Congressmen. My understanding is that some 5,800 X cards were issued on the first day, and the Department says this is now secret information. Why secret? Is this a form of Gestapo procedure? Who are these people who have immunity through secrecy against Congress? Are their duties higher than those of the Congress of the United States, that they enjoy such privileges? Turn the spotlight upon those who give this secrecy.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the acting minority leader asks that question. There will be nothing before next Wednesday. As a matter of fact, there is nothing on the program at this time for next week. I know of nothing now that will come on during the week. There will be nothing before Wednesday, and I doubt if there will be anything on either Wednesday or Thursday of next week.

Answering the question, I can definitely say there will be nothing before next Wednesday. Of course, there might be requests of a unanimous-consent nature where everybody agrees. That is, where all the minority Members are agreed and the majority leadership agrees, and the Speaker recognizes someone to bring up a matter by unanimous consent, something that is not controversial. There will be nothing controversial, and there will be nothing before Wednesday of a controversial nature. I know of nothing for the remainder of the week.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

GASOLINE RATIONING FOR ENTIRE COUNTRY

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there have been intimations from official circles in Washington to the effect that gasoline rationing would be extended to the entire country. Rationing is necessary along the eastern seaboard at this time. This is because of a shortage of transportation, not gasoline. There are adequate supplies of gasoline in the Middle West and along the Gulf coast. There are no transportation difficulties in connection with its distribution. As far as supply is concerned, there are excessive quantities in storage, and in many instances producing wells are shut down to a point where they are permitted to produce 5 percent or less of their potential production. Certainly under these conditions rationing is not justified. Such a program will not help the war effort. It will hinder it by tying up essential transportation and interfering with agricultural production, which in that area is largely mechanized.

There have been intimations that there should be rationing of gasoline, even if not otherwise needed, to conserve rubber. There is no justification for such a proposal. Conservation of rubber is one thing, conservation of gasoline is another. The American people are perfectly willing to abide by such restrictions as may be necessary to conserve rubber. They are obeying cheerfully the regulations which have been imposed in connection with tire rationing and tire use. They will continue to do so. To even intimate that in order to conserve tires it is necessary to deny gasoline is a reflection upon both the intelligence and patriotism of the American people.

A Washington newspaper recently suggested in its editorial columns that gasoline rationing should be imposed upon the entire country on the theory of equality of sacrifice. What a ridiculous position to take. On that theory, people along the Atlantic seaboard should not be permitted to use bathing beaches because we do not have any in Kansas and Oklahoma. I can conceive of nothing which would more injuriously affect the morale of our people than to impose unnecessary restrictions which not only would not help the war effort, but which would distinctly injure it. In times like these many mistakes will be made with the best of intentions, but there is no excuse for the deliberate adoption of policies which cannot be justified under any conditions. To impose gasoline rationing on those parts of the country where it is not needed would undermine morale, lessen confidence in Government, and seriously impede the war effort.

EXCELLENT

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Jeffrey Manufacturing Co., in Columbus, Ohio, was awarded the Navy E for excellence in the production of vital naval equipment. I wish to record here my pride and gratification at this award. It is a well-deserved tribute to a splendid organization. It will be an inspiration to others to excel in the struggle for victory, which demands the best in all of us.

This award, however, has a broader significance. This was the tenth plant in Ohio to receive the Navy E out of 80 which have been awarded in the Nation.

Here in Washington we read a lot of columnists who say that the Middle West is apathetic about the war. The Navy apparently thinks differently. They have said of production in plants in my district and my State, "Production is excellent."

Here is a comment from a British source, from the Memorandum of Information on Foreign Affairs and the World Crisis, issued by the Research Group, London, England, in their May 1942 issue, which is devoted to a worldwide survey of the war situation. Referring to the war effort in America, the Memorandum says:

The most realistic people are to be found in the Middle West, where there is a calm and sound understanding of the war. Moreover, they are getting on with their difficult task far better than any other part of the country. In the East and West there is, of course, tremendous activity, but it is spasmodic and too little coordinated. Production only goes up when there is bad news and a sense of danger and dies down again when things look calmer. In the Middle West, on the other hand, there are really well-planned efforts, with production steadily increasing. Our observer visited some war factories in the big Middle West cities, and was deeply impressed with the progress and the

efficiency and foresight with which it has all been planned.

One of the reasons for the contradictory reports which are constantly arriving from America about the efficiency and progress of production is the wide gap between the performance of the middle western cities as against those of the far West and the East.

Apparently Britain and the American Navy think Ohio and the Middle West are doing all right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD upon four subjects and to include the necessary insertions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Pierre Van Paassen at a dinner tendered to him by the committee for a Jewish army. The Public Printer advises me that this will exceed the legal limit, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

RUBBER PRODUCTION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, made a significant suggestion a few days ago in a statement before a Senate subcommittee.

Mr. Wickard proposed that a big share of the millions of bushels of surplus grain be turned into synthetic rubber by way of industrial alcohol. The other principal ingredient is cotton of which there is ample supply.

He proposes that if existing plants, the distilleries now in operation, were used to the limit for making industrial alcohol, 80,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn could be turned into 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol that would produce enough butadiene—a substitute for rubber—to produce 240,000 tons of rubber, after allowing a sufficient production of alcohol for war purposes.

Why not follow Mr. Wickard's suggestion? Why not use this equipment to the limit and produce synthetic rubber along with alcohol for munitions and forget about alcoholic liquor for the duration. Mr. Wickard's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLAUDE R. WICKARD BEFORE A HEARING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY INVESTIGATING USES OF FARM CROPS IN PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Scientists of the Department of Agriculture have been investigating commercial possibilities of manufacturing rubber substitutes from grains and other farm products. Originally these researches were part of a broad effort to find new uses for agricultural surpluses. Since war broke out in the Far East the Department's work on rubber substitutes has been intensified because of the pressing need for augmenting the Nation's supplies of rubber for military and civilian use. Maintenance of adequate supplies of tires is especially important to agriculture. Unless tires are available, particularly next year and thereafter, crop production will be considerably hampered and the movement of farm products to processors and consumers will be seriously threatened.

In recent months most of the Department's work on possible rubber substitutes has been centralized in the Peoria, Ill., regional research laboratory. I visited that laboratory recently and can report that much progress is being made in exploring many phases of the manufacture of rubber substitutes from plentiful farm products.

After full discussions with members of my technical staff at the Department, I am convinced that immediate attention should be given to expanding the present program for butadiene production from grain alcohol, so as to make possible greater production of synthetic rubber during the calendar year 1943.

I believe that use of part of our reserve stocks of corn and wheat as raw material for butadiene offers the best possibility of greatly increasing our production of synthetic rubber as early as next year.

Large stocks of wheat and corn are available. In fact, it is likely that thousands of bushels of wheat will be lost through lack of suitable storage space unless they can be put to use quickly. Scarcity of materials is adding to the huge problem of constructing sufficient storage for this year's wheat crop. The manufacture of ethyl alcohol from grain is a well-established commercial process. The process of converting 95-percent alcohol to butadiene is technically established, although to my knowledge it has not heretofore been used on a commercial basis in this country. I understand, however, that the Rubber Reserve Company already has made an allocation for a substantial amount of butadiene to be produced from ethyl alcohol and that a plant for this operation is under construction. Alcohol has been used in Russia, Poland, Germany, and other European countries for the production of butadiene.

As I have said, the raw materials—corn and wheat—are readily at hand. Considerable expansion of facilities for making alcohol out of grain is possible in existing plants with the use of relatively small amounts of copper and steel. Available data indicate that if existing plants were converted to high-proof alcohol production at least 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol for making butadiene could be produced after allowing for production of alcohol for war purposes. It should be understood, however, that production of this total quantity of alcohol would require complete mobilization of the entire alcohol industry.

About 80,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn would be required to produce 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol, which, in turn, could produce 220,000 tons of butadiene. This would make approximately 240,000 tons of synthetic rubber. That is the approximate volume of synthetic-rubber production which could be obtained from grain through existing distilling plants converted to high-proof alcohol production by the use of a minimum quantity of critical metals. Beyond production of about 240,000 tons of synthetic rubber, processing facilities would be a limiting factor. Supplies of raw materials—wheat and corn—are sufficient for expanding synthetic-rubber production by many times that amount.

Supplies of corn and other feed grains are ample, and our wheat supply is the largest in our history. We will start the new crop year July 1 with a wheat carry-over of 630,000,000 bushels. When this year's crop comes in, we will have a total supply not far from 1,500,000,000 bushels. That is enough to meet all normal needs for about 2 years. With such an oversupply of grain and such a critical situation in rubber, we surely should explore every possible means of turning some of the surplus wheat into synthetic rubber. Use of grains for making additional alcohol would not in any way cut into possible uses for other war purposes.

Incidentally, we also have plentiful supplies of the second most important raw material in tires. Ample cotton is available for use in any additional tires made possible by increased supplies of synthetic rubber. Despite the heavy production in most branches of the cotton-textile industry, I am told that the equipment for making tire fabric is now largely unused. It cannot be adapted for other purposes.

In view of the facts which I have outlined, we should move ahead at once on a program of making synthetic rubber from grain by way of alcohol. Of course, there are other possibilities. In this Department, alone, much work is being done in the Peoria laboratory which looks to improvement of the method I have outlined, and to other methods of making rubber substitutes from grain that in the long run may prove to be quicker and more efficient. This research work is going ahead all the time, and I believe it holds great possibilities. Meanwhile, information already is available on a process which is practicable now.

Therefore, I am urging strongly that serious consideration be given to using at least 80,000,000 bushels of grain, and if possible more, as soon as possible, in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

GASOLINE SUPPLIES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to read a letter from the Secretary of the Binghamton Automobile Club with regard to the gasoline supply in my territory:

BINGHAMTON AUTOMOBILE CLUB, INC.,
Binghamton, N. Y., May 13, 1942.

Congressman EDWIN A. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: In reply to your telegram with reference to the available amount of gasoline to our community, it looks very good. I have been trying to get information with reference to pipe lines and where they would come from but everybody seems to be very cagey about giving out any information. However, I believe that with the Sun Oil pipe line and the

new pipe line that the Standard Oil Co. has put in, which is now in operation, it would be ample to supply our needs if their facilities were open to other companies.

I understand that the Sun pipe line is pumping the gasoline from Marcus Hook through to Syracuse, which also supplies the Sun Oil Co. here in Binghamton. If this line was reversed, a great deal of gasoline could be pumped into this area from supplies that are coming from the West. This, of course, would eliminate the use of truck transports which would help to preserve tires and also gasoline which are the two essentials which we are trying to preserve at the present time.

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, and hoping that you will be successful in securing an exemption for this area, I am

Very truly yours,
BINGHAMTON AUTOMOBILE CLUB, INC.,
A. L. JACOBS, *Secretary*.

P. S.—The Standard Oil pipe line pumps from Buffalo to Willow Point.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in Tuesday's Chicago Tribune entitled "Somebody Else, Not Me"; also a release from the Indiana Tax Study Committee entitled "Government As Usual."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have been informed by the majority leader that we have nothing to do from now until next Wednesday. I think I can suggest something the Members of the Congress might do. If you will look at the Treasury statement you will see that we have gone into the red up until May 11, $15,500,000,000, and that we are going into the red faster every day. Then you might try to study out some way of stopping the inequalities and the enormous extravagances that are going on.

If you will read the RECORD of day before yesterday you will find that I showed that the Pennsylvania farmers got 2 percent of the value of their farm marketings whereas those in Mississippi got 23 percent. Yesterday's RECORD shows that the farmers in the State of Michigan got 3 percent, Alabama 24 percent, and Texas 16 percent.

If you will make a comparison of the amounts going to the States, you will find that a large amount of money is being expended in some of the States in a way that seems to me to be very unethical. The amounts involved in the contracts that have been let are enormous. We should try to stop this extravagance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. A. A. Potter on war finance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 722)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico.

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the recommendation of the Secretary of State in which I concur.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1942*.

[Enclosure: Report.]

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is Jesse Jones going to do with the $5,000,000,000?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is going to be spent principally in promotion of the war program.

Mr. RICH. In what way? The war program is a pretty large program.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. We have appropriated $80,000,000,000 since January 22.

Mr. STEAGALL. That did not go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as the gentleman knows. I have sent for the testimony so that I can give figures on this matter, if desired, but I may say that a large portion of this fund has already been committed in connection with the purchase of materials, the development of plants, and other things in connection with the war program. Mr. Jones was before the Committee on Banking and Currency and made a complete statement and gave figures in detail covering what has been done up to this time and what is expected to be done with this fund. The committee unhesitatingly gave the measure a unanimous report.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the Members of Congress should not turn all this power over to a committee or to Jesse Jones without all of us having an explanation of it. We certainly ought to be informed about what is going on. Since we declared war, on December 8, we have appropriated fabulous sums of money. We have turned it over to the President, the Army, and the Navy, and we see the results. We find an enormous amount of waste and extravagance has been going on under the contracts that have been let. This is certainly a responsibility of Congress and we should not permit anything of that kind. But when we turn it over to one of the bureaus or to the President or to the Army or the Navy, then a responsibility that was ours ceases to be our responsibility.

Mr. STEAGALL. As the gentleman understands, the bill does not carry any appropriation. It is simply an extension of the authorization with respect to the lending powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and for other activities in connection with the war program. I think the gentleman recognizes that the membership of the House has the utmost confidence in the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. RICH. I am not questioning the ability of Jesse Jones. He is a great man, as they all say he is, but the trouble is he has 18 different jobs that have been handed over to him. He has 10 times more than any man, even as big a man as Jesse Jones can handle. I do not know that he has time to see that everything that is done in the R. F. C. is correct or not. Possibly it is, and I am not criticizing them; but with all the available men in the country, I do not believe we should turn over 18 or 20 large jobs to one man, because we have other men that ought to be equally responsible who can give their time and attention to the details of these offices. I think we are running ourselves loose in the heel here. We are squandering money, and some day the taxpayers of this country are going to be in a terrible fix. And not only the taxpayers, but everybody else in America. If you are going to win this war, you have got to give the very best you have, and I think you ought to make a report to the Congress and tell us how he is going to use this money. I do not think we should permit these unanimous-consent requests to go through like this.

Mr. Speaker, until the gentleman presents to the House some figures, I shall object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection and yield to me a moment?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This matter was thoroughly thrashed out in committee and the figures show that up to the present time, commitments have been made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for all purposes, principally defense purposes, of nearly $13,000,000,000.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Nearly $14,000,000,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Thirteen billion six hundred million dollars, or some other major fraction. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has a lending capacity of about $9,100,000,000. There is no question but what the defense program is being held up because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has exhausted all of its available lending authority. This report was a unanimous report from the Banking and Currency Committee, not only because we had every possible faith and confidence in Mr. Jones to administer it—and I might say parenthetically that even though Mr. Jones has been given a great many other jobs to do he has never lost contact with the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He is, to my way of thinking, doing one of the most splendid jobs in the war effort of any of the agencies of Government. I do not want to take the responsibility of holding up plant expansion. I do not want to take the responsibility of holding up the acquisition of strategic and critical materials. I do not want to take the responsibility of holding up the marketing of essential materials or the acquiring of essential materials to carry on the war effort. I think the gentleman knows me and the other members on this side of the Banking and Currency Committee well enough to know that unless we had been thoroughly convinced that there was immediate need for this increased authorization we never would have consented that this bill be brought up in this manner. We are withholding any objection to it because we have been thoroughly convinced that there is immediate need for this money. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The chairman of the committee has available the figures which can be put into the RECORD, but they are substantially as I have given them, and I am not so sure but that they are available at the present time, so that perhaps the chairman of the committee can give within reasonable limits a break-down of the activity of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which I think will convince the gentleman that there is justification for increasing this authorization. I wish the gentleman would yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] for that purpose, because of course it should go into the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I shall do that, but I say that we should realize that the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have their responsibilities, and we have no reason to doubt that they are fulfilling them to the best of their ability. I do not question Mr. Jesse Jones and his ability. I am not doing that at all, but I do know that since January 1 we have appropriated $70,000,000,000 to the President and the Army and the Navy, and the gentleman knows and I know that the contracts that have been let have been proven to be exorbitant, and that the profits have been so great that contractors are turning them back by the millions of dollars. We do not want anything like that to happen. It was because of our desire to help the country 100 percent that we permitted these bills to go through. We find that in giving a clean sweep to it, we were wrong. If the responsibility rests on the Army and the Navy and the President to see that the contracts that are made are made with due diligence and care, so that we have no waste and no extravagance, then I want to know if the gentleman will give assurance that the $5,000,000,000, to be passed by unanimous consent, will be wisely and judiciously expended, and that we will have no graft or exorbitant profits made by anyone. We want to help this country 100 percent, but I want to be sure of that, and I want somebody to give us that assurance. I think the chairman of the committee owes a duty to do that and give that assurance to the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that the Committee on Banking and Currency is unanimously of the opinion that such is the case. The bill comes here with a unanimous report, after full attendance of the committee, and after the committee considered the figures in detail.

Mr. RICH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection; but I do hope, if for any reason anything we pass here now has the name of national defense or the prosecution of this war upon it, that the Members of the House will do their duty, because it will require the best that is in each and every one of us if we are going to win this war and save this country, and everybody knows that the thing to do is to do our best and that will test us to the limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I recall in the reports made on the spending of the lease-lend funds that great amounts had been expended for extension and building of munitions plants. We have also been given to understand that large portions of the $170,000,000,000, which the Congress has appropriated for national defense, has been expended for similar purposes. The remarks of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is the first intimation I have had that it has been necessary to secure funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with which to build an extension to an already existing plant, or to build new plants. That is the first intimation that I have had of that condition, and inasmuch as we have appropriated the amount of money we have for the different war activities, including the activity under discussion, it seems to me that it ought not to be necessary to further arm the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose, in addition to the funds the War and Navy Departments already have to do this particular type of work.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, we have thought it desirable to do as much as possible by private capital in carrying out the war program. I think that is the desirable thing to do. That is what we have been doing down to this time, and it has resulted in saving enormous sums of money for the Government.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say that while I am reluctant to permit this bill to be passed by unanimous consent, I will withhold an objection only because of the fact that I know the members of the gentleman's very fine committee are every one of them endowed with good judgment and a high degree of integrity. As the bill was reported by their vote, I bow to their superior judgment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEAGALL. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the benefit of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], permit me to say if they will refer to the report issued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under date of March 21 last, they will find one of the most illuminating, clear-cut statements of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that has ever been published. In that Mr. Jones, Chairman, points out the expenditures in connection with the War Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and several other activities. You will find that several billion dollars have been spent and committed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the specific purpose of building great defense plants throughout the United States, several of which have been located in Michigan, and that from the very beginning of this program we authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to set up the Defense Plant Corporation, so that that agency of government could proceed to build these plants. It has done so. It has operating agreements with the people who are now operating the plants. They are owned by an agency of the United States Government. This additional amount of $5,000,000,000 is to be used in further expanding the operations as set forth in detail by the March 21, 1942, report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I call that to your attention because I think you should have that information.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wish to say that nothing I have said in any way casts any reflection upon Mr. Jones. I consider him a public official of a very, very high type. While I am willing to approve this bill under the circumstances that exist and the request by the chairman of the committee, I am at least in part impelled to do that by my admiration for the man who will have administration of these funds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the chairman will yield for one other observation.

Mr. STEAGALL. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We should keep in mind that under the lend-lease operations certain types of plant have been and are now being constructed. Under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Defense Plant Corporation other operations are conducted. Then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is making loans to corporations for the purpose of expanding their own facilities where those plants are owned by corporations which are adding additions to their plants. Commercial banks and Federal

Reserve banks are making loans for several purposes to the corporations of this country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee if it is not a fact that the hearings on which you are basing this unanimous consent request to extend the loaning power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were public? They were public hearings?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Everybody seems to know something about them except Members of the House. I wonder if it would not be in order, in order that we all might know something about them, to put those commitments or what you think is public, into the RECORD, so that we will know something about them?

Mr. STEAGALL. I will be glad to extend my remarks and incorporate the figures. It would take some time to read them at the moment.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, is it not a fact that it is absolutely necessary to make rubber today, to get steel and many other critical materials that the Army now needs?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes; one reason for the request for this legislation by this method today is the fact that if it is not done it will be delayed a week. That should not be done.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the membership of the House the amount of money that is in this bill for the allocation of money to make synthetic rubber? How much is there in this bill to the petroleum interests to make rubber? Is there not a matter of $650,000,000 for synthetic rubber alone?

Mr. STEAGALL. I think it is something like that. I can supply the exact figure.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman in his extension of remarks will include those figures?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes. I will say this, that commitments have been made to a point that will probably exhaust the funds provided for under this bill, but we have the assurance of Mr. Jones that as far as they can see at this time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not be required to ask for additional lending authority very soon.

Mr. STEFAN. The fact of the matter is that $350,000,000 for synthetic rubber is merely a drop in the bucket? It will have to be more than that, will it not?

Mr. STEAGALL. They have made extensive plans already for the production of rubber, that runs up to 800,000 tons annually.

Mr. STEFAN. That is 700,000 with the petroleum interests and 100,000 tons by Union Carbide?

There is going to be a demand for additional synthetic rubber. It is absolutely necessary to get bills like this passed so that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can get this work started. The gentleman in the extension of his remarks should convey some information to the membership.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if, as a part of the gentleman's remarks, he will not include the statement made by Jesse Jones before the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday; and if he intends to do that, in his behalf I will ask unanimous consent that in the revision and extension of his remarks he be allowed to include the statement made by Mr. Jones as a part of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday. I believe this will completely answer all of the questions in respect of the break-down and the reason why this additional $5,000,000,000 of authorization is needed

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Jones made the following statement:

We have authorized expenditures in connection with the war program of something like $13,000,000,000. That is much more than we have funds available to pay for.

Our present borrowing authority is approximately $9,100,000,000. We now owe about $3,750,000,000. So that would not leave enough to pay for the things that we will have to pay for, that we are already committed for. The $5,000,000,000 would just about be enough if we do not make any more commitments. But we are making more commitments every day.

However, we will be getting back something. We are getting back something now from the plants that we have built. We are getting back rents or payments as the case may be. On the materials that we buy and sell we are getting back some money.

I hope that we will not have to come back for any more than this amount, although it depends entirely on how much more work we do in connection with the war program.

I will name some of the items that make up that total. I am sure that you will be interested in knowing them.

There are approximately $2,000,000,000 for the construction of plants for the manufacture of aircraft, $360,000,000 for the manufacture of magnesium, $700,000,000 for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, $734,000,000 for the expansion of the steel industry, $468,000,000 for plants for the manufacture of ordnance, and $182,000,000 for building shipyards.

The expenditure for the production of aluminum with which to make airplanes will increase the capacity in this country of aluminum to 2,100,000,000 pounds a year. Two years ago it was 300,000,000 pounds. One year ago it was 540,000,000 pounds. So it is multiplying by seven times its status 2 years ago.

The magnesium will run about 600,000,000 pounds. That is about 20 times the capacity a year ago.

The money allocated for the synthetic rubber should bring in about 800,000 tons of rubber.

We contracted to buy 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum from Canada. Including the immediate capacity, that is, the capacity today of aluminum manufactured in this country, plus the modest amount that we are getting from Canada, it will give us about a billion pounds at this time.

So that the program now has not been retarded and is not being retarded for the lack of aluminum. But, of course, the program increases in that respect. The plants manufacturing planes next year will be double what they are this year. But we expect to have the aluminum.

Those plants will all be completed—there are several more coming in the next two or three months—they should all be finished in the very early part of next year. I do not think that we will have any draw-backs from that source.

The rubber plants, depending upon getting the materials, should all be finished in 1942 and 1943. That does, however, depend upon getting the materials with which to build the plants.

A very large item in our commitments is one that we do not have to draw upon very much, and that is the purchase of machine tools.

As most of you probably know, the lack of machine tools in converting our peacetime manufacturing enterprises into war required retooling all the plants. First and last, we have bought and agreed to buy $1,395,000,000 worth of machine tools. But that money is not invested very long, because someone buys these tools usually as soon as they are ready. Some industry buys them right away. But the manufacturer of the tools must have gotten unqualified orders or he cannot borrow the money and buy the material to do the manufacturing.

I might say, too, that the machine-tool situation is improving very rapidly.

We started operating our tin smelter about a month ago. We have more than a year's supply of ore on hand in this country, which we have gotten from Bolivia.

We have accumulated a substantial amount of all kinds of critical and strategic materials. We have gotten out and bought everything that we needed that we could buy anywhere in the world.

Either England or ourselves have been getting all the critical materials and metals from South America for more than a year. We bought some 30 or 40 different kinds of critical material from that many countries.

We brought into this country some three or four hundred million pounds of wool from Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. The trade in this country is also buying wool, and has been buying wool from South America. There will undoubtedly be a shortage in wool.

We contracted to buy the entire crop of sugar of Cuba this year, and will probably do the same next year. That will entail about $200,000,000. That, of course, is outside of what they need for their own use.

We are buying hides, probably $40,000,000 worth of hides.

We financed some 48 aviation schools for teaching primary courses in aviation. On completion of these courses the students go to the Army advanced schools where they get their finished training.

We bought practically all of the privately owned airplanes in this country and turned them over to the Army.

As you know, we have through recent legislation been undertaking to buy and finance automobile purchases, tires, and other such things as are frozen and will be frozen.

We are financing the construction of aviation hundred-octane gasoline plants. We have spent from two hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and fifty million dollars in that respect.

Then we agreed to buy the product from these plants for a period of 3 years; and our obligation in that respect runs to $1,100,000,000.

That is necessary, because the Army and the Navy can only buy what they have appropriations to buy; and the manufacturers must have a definite order in that case, the same as with the machine tools. They cannot go ahead and manufacture this product without knowing that it is going to be sold.

In our plan industry is putting in about $100,000,000 of new equipment.

We are salvaging scrap materials and metals of all kinds. We are planning now to buy tires, if anybody has an extra tire. I do not know whether they have or not. But we are planning to do that at the request of the War Production Board.

We are building additional plants. We financed a nickel mine and smelter in Cuba at a cost of some $20,000,000. We spent more than that in increasing the copper production in Chile, Peru, and other places in South America. We have a large mine in Mexico that we are going to open up.

We have commitments for developing our own metals and materials, in the West principally, running probably $1,100,000,000. In fact, we are doing a little bit of everything and a good deal of many things.

As I said, these commitments to date aggregate some thirteen or fourteen billion dollars, and we need the five billion that we have asked for, or will need it.

We paid out about two and one-fourth billion dollars up to date, and it is going out now pretty fast. It is going out at the rate of about ten or twelve million dollars a day.

Everything that we are doing is done at the request of the policy-making agencies and the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, and the Board of Economic Warfare. We make no policies, but we carry out the plans and recommendations made by these other agencies.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency a question in regard to S. 2250 which was passed by the Senate a long time ago, and I believe the gentleman's committee has passed on it. I wonder whether it is the gentleman's plan to bring that bill up today immediately after this $5,000,000,000?

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I sought on yesterday to reach an agreement by which that legislation might be taken up today, but in view of the plans that have been agreed upon by the leadership of the House, and which I am sure would meet with the approval of the gentleman, it was thought we could not take up that legislation before probably Wednesday of next week. This would depend, of course, upon the program.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to say as one Member of the House that I believe this bill should be expedited. It has been held up for a long time. The conversion of business to war production is just as important to the advancement of this war as the approval of the $5,000,000,000 for the R. F. C.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that the Committee on Banking and Currency gave prompt attention to the legislation and held only what we considered necessary hearings to get desired information. We hope to get the bill up before many days. We are ready to do it now if the program of the House would permit.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman this question: As I understand it, when the Defense Plants Corporation decides to build a plant, the plant is built for the purpose of leasing it to a certain corporation under the terms, generally speaking, of a 5-year lease, with the understanding that at the conclusion of that period or at the conclusion of the war that corporation should have the option to purchase that plant at cost plus depreciation if it wants to, but if it does not choose to, then the Defense Plants Corporation may dispose of it in any way it sees fit.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct as to the general practice, but not in every case.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is that the general purpose of these contracts?

Mr. STEAGALL. I think so, but there are cases where the option is reserved to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman know, or can he get for us the information as to what happened in the case of the contract with the Bethlehem Steel Corporation at Sparrows Point regarding which my information was that this plant was to be built upon land belonging to the Corporation and that the lease was to run for a very long period of time indeed?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have not inquired into the particular transaction to which the gentleman refers, but I should be glad to do so and furnish the gentleman the information.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. A great many of these contracts have been entered into with corporations and the terms of the contract were reasonable. I believe we ought not to allow any single instance to arise wherein that is not the case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time under existing law is hereby increased by $5,000,000,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4476) to provide for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio broadcast out of Great Falls by Mr. Fred Atter, of Montana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BUCK, for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 18, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will hold hearings commencing Monday, May 18, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 6999, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida to connect the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterways, thus providing a through inland channel for the transportation of oil, gasoline, sulfur, and other war materials.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1637. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7088. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 2 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7089. A bill to safeguard the health of persons in military service by requiring that registered pharmacists be placed in charge of Army dispensaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 7090. A bill to provide an engineering study of the mine-water problem of the Pennsylvania anthracite mining area for the purpose of obtaining information and presenting a solution relating to the health, safety, and economic conditions of the area, State, and Nation as affected by the encroachment of water which progressively floods the mines, threatens to destroy the anthracite coal reserves of the Nation, contributes to a waste of a valuable natural resource, contributes to excessive acid mine water and silt in the Pennsylvania streams, and seriously affects the whole economy of the anthracite mining area; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 7091. A bill to provide for improving the functioning of the cooperative features of the Federal Land Bank System; to relieve Federal land-bank borrowers of stock liability; to organize the Federal land banks

and the national farm-loan associations as membership corporations and to provide for placing Federal land banks on a self-supporting basis, and for increasing the functions and responsibilities of national farm-loan associations; to establish a method for determining the interest rates on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to provide for refunding and guaranteeing certain bonds of such banks; to establish a method for adjusting certain agricultural indebtedness; to provide for limiting the taking of deficiency judgments by Federal land banks and by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 7092. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims suits for payment for the use of inventions used by or for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LESINSKI introduced a bill (H. R. 7093) for the relief of Christ Paul; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2813. By Mr GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. Remo I. Robb, pastor, and 54 members of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church, urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2814. Also, petition of 56 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860 to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps, and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2815. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Mrs. R. G. Putnam, of Eldorado, Ill., signed by some 400 representative citizens of southeastern Illinois, urging the adoption of Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2816. Also, petition of Marjorie Gray, signed at the Church of the Nazarene of Flora, Ill., by Maggie Odell and sundry other members of the church, requesting the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2817. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Associated District Newspapers of the southern area of the State of California, of which Harry A. Lawson, publisher of the Eagle Rock Sentinel, Eagle Rock, Calif., is an officer, earnestly and urgently requesting the United States Treasury to carry on a newspaper advertising campaign designed to sell securities in order to stabilize the newspaper industry, who has cooperated so generously in advertising the need for the buying of United States Government securities for the successful prosecution of the war effort; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2818. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Irrigation Districts Association, of California, San Francisco, adopted April 17, 1942, regarding the California State guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2819. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Conrad Roediger, Anna Roediger, Bertha Smith, and Cloice Smith, of route 2, Wapakoneta, Ohio, in behalf of the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1942

Rev. William H. Pinkerton, D. D., pastor of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we rejoice to believe that Thy presence is extended to us through the operations of Thy Holy Spirit, which radiates as assuredly from Thy personality as the quickening energies from the sun make strong the oak as well as beautiful the flower. We approach Thee only that our hearts may join in prayer, because we feel our need of Thee in these strenuous times. We pray that the hearts of the Members of the Senate may be opened to Thy presence, and that the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit may guide them in all the transactions of this great body, which is so essential today, and feels the weight of heavy responsibility. Bless them, we pray Thee, and direct them, we ask in Thy dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 14, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bulow	Danaher
Andrews	Bunker	Downey
Austin	Burton	Doxey
Ball	Butler	George
Bankhead	Byrd	Gerry
Barkley	Capper	Gillette
Bilbo	Caraway	Glass
Bone	Chavez	Guffey
Brooks	Clark, Idaho	Gurney
Brown	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Hill	Millikin	Spencer
Holman	Murdock	Stewart
Hughes	Norris	Taft
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Truman
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Langer	Pepper	Tydings
Lee	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
McCarran	Reynolds	Van Nuys
McFarland	Rosier	Wagner
McKellar	Russell	Walsh
McNary	Schwartz	Wheeler
Maloney	Smathers	Willis
Maybank	Smith	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of members of the McCune Christian Church, of McCune, and sundry citizens of St. John and Hoisington, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by a special meeting of the Executive Board and Joint Council of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, Local No. 69 (C. I. O.), in the State of Michigan, favoring the removal of restrictions from small packing companies so that they may have an equal share in furnishing supplies to the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by a special meeting of the Executive Board and Joint Council of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, Local No. 69 (C. I. O.), in the State of Michigan, favoring prompt action by the United States in conjunction with the United Nations to open a second war front in Europe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by union delegates representing the trucking industry in the State of Michigan favoring the adoption of measures for the conservation of rubber tires; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by about 100 members of the Harrison Street Methodist Church in the city of Wilmington, Del., asking for the passage of Senate bill 860. I ask unanimous consent to have the petition printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

DEFEND OUR DEFENDERS

WILMINGTON, DEL., *May 10, 1942.*

The Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Harrison Street Methodist Church, most respectfully appeal to you as a Member of the United States Senate to vote for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors.

Especially we ask you to use your influence in securing the passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860.

EARL M. SHOCKLER,
Pastor.
MABEL S. DONAHOO,
G. D. BACON.
(And sundry other members of the Harrison Street Methodist Church, Wilmington, Del.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a summary of the resolutions adopted as legislative recommendations by the seventy-fifth annual session of the National Grange held in Worcester, Mass.

There being no objection, the summary of resolutions was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

1. GENERAL POLICY

America's first and foremost task is to win the war. All the energies and resources of the Nation must be harnessed and utilized with this end in view. To play the role that destiny has thrust upon us, we must develop a striking force that will be irresistible, and it must be done with the greatest possible speed.

With all the world turned into an armed camp and with the forces of destruction unleashed on an unprecedented scale, an adequate food supply becomes a matter of first consideration. Agriculture asks for fair treatment rather than special privilege, and it seeks economic justice rather than subsidy. The National Grange advocates the following program:

(a) Adequate labor, supplies, machinery, repairs, transportation, and credit facilities must be made available to enable farmers to achieve production goals which have been set.

(b) Farmers must receive compensatory prices for their products to insure adequate supplies for our own population and to make up the deficiencies of our Allies.

(c) Food production must be recognized as a defense industry and treated as such.

(d) Skilled farm labor should be given deferment under our Selective Service System on an equal basis with skilled labor in other defense industries.

(e) There must be an end to strikes, boycotts, embargoes, "hot cargoes," and similar devices designed to force the will of a minority on the majority, interfering with the normal production and marketing of food and materials.

(f) Agriculture should have equal protection with labor and industry in tariff matters and in the formulation of trade agreements.

(g) Give agriculture its fair share of the national income. This calls for the adoption of a more equitable plan in figuring price parity than that which is now in use.

(h) Agriculture should be given adequate representation on all boards and commissions dealing with farm problems.

(i) Proper steps must be taken to control inflation, utilizing economic devices as far as possible. However, if arbitrary price fixing is necessary, all should be treated alike, including agriculture, labor, and industry.

(j) Unnecessary nondefense spending must be eliminated and the wasteful use of public funds under any circumstances must be discountenanced.

(k) Maintain an adequate system of transportation, giving free play to the forces of legitimate competition.

(l) Encourage the further development of farmer-owned and controlled cooperative associations to reduce the present excessive spread between producer and consumer.

(m) Maintain the family-sized farm as the standard of American agriculture and discourage large-scale or corporation farming, thus upholding America's greatest bulwark of democracy.

(n) Encourage cooperation, goodwill and mutual understanding between agriculture, industry, and labor to promote the common welfare.

2. CURBING INFLATION

The interest of the Nation demands that all reasonable economic means should be employed to curb inflation. If arbitrary control is necessary, the administration should be under a bipartisan board. Congress should reserve the right to revoke the powers granted by concurrent resolution, and there should be a definite date of termination. Congress should fix certain standards for the guidance of any price-control agency and provide for a court of appeals. The purpose should be to establish and maintain a just and workable relationship as between the various groups. Farmers should not ask for more, nor agree to accept less, than actual parity. Some flexibility in administration will be necessary to assure the desired results. Justice and the success of the whole undertaking require that all groups should be included in any scheme for price control.

3. ECONOMY OF PLENTY

The best interests of the Nation demand plentiful production. The first duty of agriculture is to produce strategic crops in abundance to win the war.

4. LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Agriculture must prepare to meet the surplus problem when the war demand ceases. Means must be developed to establish a floor under farm prices to prevent a collapse. This floor must be established at a level fair to agriculture, to industry, and to labor. This requires a reasonably balanced production and a means of removing surpluses from the market, so that they will not depress prices below an equitable level.

5. NEW PARITY FORMULA

The formula which is now in use for determining price parity on agricultural products is largely obsolete, being based on conditions which existed 30 years ago. It is unfair to agriculture. A comprehensive survey should be made to determine the proportion of the national income to which each of our major economic groups is equitably entitled. Pending the outcome of such a survey, it is essential that we establish a temporary method of determining parity, based on a sound economic foundation. Any new formula should be kept modern, and the aim should be to give agriculture its just proportion of the national income.

6. STABILIZING PRICES

Prices of nonsurplus crops can be stabilized at equitable levels by sound marketing practices, employing cooperative marketing, marketing agreements, and commodity loans.

Stabilization of prices of surplus crops requires a two-price system made effective by different methods best adapted to individual commodities. Such a system should provide means to expedite the flow of surplus crops either to foreign markets or to special uses. A sliding scale of domestic prices based on volume can be employed as a self-enforcing economic means of production control.

7. GOVERNMENT CROP CONTROL

Pending the development and adoption of a more permanent plan, such as the two-price system advocated by the National Grange, many features of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration should be continued. Crop control should ordinarily be based on volume rather than acreage. A truly democratic system of administration should be developed, with local, county, and State committees selected by producers or their duly authorized representatives.

Soil conservation practices should be continued, but conservation should not be used as a means of enforcing acreage control in any farm program. In no case should surpluses held by the Government be disposed of with deliberate intent to depress farm prices below parity levels determined on a sound basis.

8. COMMODITY LOANS

Crop loans that build dangerous surpluses either nationally or regionally are unsound. Until the return of more settled conditions, we favor retention of the 85-percent loan feature of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. There should be adequate appropriations for crop loans and for Surplus Commodity Corporation projects.

9. FARM CREDITS

We urge the restoration of independent status for the Farm Credit Administration, and favor the creation of a bipartisan board with staggered terms to administer its affairs.

We favor a cooperative credit system, operated on a sound business basis, under the ownership and control of farmer borrowers, as the most practical means of meeting the

needs of agriculture. Adequate Federal supervision is necessary to assure that the provisions of the law and the purpose of Congress are complied with. The activities of the supervisory agency should be strictly limited to supervision, and all responsibility for operation should be placed in the boards of directors of the cooperative institutions in the field.

The principle of individual and joint responsibility of borrowers should be retained as one of the strongest bulwarks for the safety of the system.

More responsibility should be placed on the national farm loan associations in the making and collecting of loans, and a sufficient portion of income should go directly to the associations to enable them to meet their legitimate costs of operation.

Under prevailing conditions, we favor the continuance of the present interest rate of 3½ percent on Federal land bank and Commissioner's loans.

10. FARM CHEMURGY

The dislocations caused by the war render it necessary that we should produce domestically various commodities which we formerly imported. This is particularly true of rubber. We favor specific appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations to develop new crops to meet existing needs. We likewise favor continued research to find new industrial uses for surplus farm crops.

11. AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

We approve of proper appropriations for the land-grant colleges and for the support of extension work in agriculture and home economics, together with adequate funds for State experiment stations. We likewise approve of the expanded program for vocational education and for 4-H Club work. The allocation of Federal funds should be made on such a basis as to equalize educational opportunity so far as practicable.

Extension workers should be paid entirely from public funds, leaving them free to serve the people without favoritism or discrimination. The facilities of the Extension Service should be available to all farmers on an equal basis without regard to farm organization membership. Under no circumstances should any farm organization be allowed to dominate the Extension Service to serve its own ends.

12. FARM TENANCY

The Grange favors continued efforts for the development of a sound program for the relief of farm tenancy. In attacking this problem, proper emphasis should be placed upon the correction of conditions which annually cause many thousands of home owners to slip into the tenant class.

13. FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

We favor continuance of the work of the Farm Security Administration within its legitimate sphere. However, there should be more adequate safeguards to prevent any improper or wasteful use of public funds.

14. TRANSPORTATION

The Grange firmly believes that each type of transportation should be allowed to develop and operate without any undue restrictions or handicaps imposed by the Government. Carriers should not be allowed to charge a higher rate than is necessary to produce compensatory returns.

We favor continued private ownership and operation of the railroads, and permitting the consolidation of competing lines in the interests of economy, where such consolidations do not adversely affect the public welfare.

We oppose the repeal of the long-and-short haul section of the Transportation Act.

We favor uniformity as between States in codes regulating traffic, as well as size, weight, and speed of motor vehicles using the public highways.

We favor the speedy elimination of all arbitrary and unnecessary transportation barriers as between States.

We approve of the appropriations made by the Federal Government for highway construction and urge the allocation of a just proportion of such funds for the improvement of farm-to-market and post roads.

Every special tax collected for highway improvement should be conserved for that purpose alone. No diversion of such funds should be allowed. No taxation or regulation of motor vehicles should be permitted which has for its purpose any increase in cost or restriction of use in order to equalize competitive conditions as between different types of carriers. We oppose placing supervision of farm trucks under the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We favor the speedy elimination of all artificial and unnecessary transportation barriers as between the several States.

Since the Federal Government over a long period of years has expended large sums of money for the development and improvement of our inland waterways, which, in addition to their great value in times of peace, enter into our scheme of national defense, we are opposed to the adoption of any policy which will destroy the value of this wise investment. Our water-borne commerce should not be hindered or restricted by unnecessary regulation or interference on the part of the Government.

15. TAXATION

Taxes should be levied in proportion of ability to pay and benefits received, and the policy of pay-as-you-go should apply to all cases except those connected with present war needs, or self-liquidating projects.

We recognize the fact that the national emergency with which we are confronted calls for the highest taxes in our history. Such new taxes as may be imposed in this connection should be levied as fairly and equitably as possible.

These levies should be of such a character as not to destroy our system of private enterprise, upon which the security and well-being of the Nation so greatly depends. On the other hand, no one should be allowed to make any undue profits in connection with Government contracts or otherwise.

We oppose a general sales tax because it is a tax on the necessities of the people and ignores the principle of ability to pay. While we favor broadening the tax base, the Federal Government should not dry up the sources of revenue upon which the States and their subdivisions must depend to finance their activities. Tax policies that would pauperize State and local units would strike a deadly blow against the very foundations of our system of Government.

16. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We heartily approve of the efforts of the Government to promote the cause of rural electrification through the agency of the Rural Electrification Administration. In the making of loans, the present policy of giving preference to public power districts and nonprofit cooperative associations should be continued.

17. FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION

As an aid in the development of a long-time forestry program for the Nation, we recommend—

(a) Aid to forest land owners in such matters as protection against insect pests, fire, and disease; technical advice in the production and marketing of forest products; suitable credit provisions; equitable taxation; research, and the speedy completion of the forest survey of the United States.

(b) Speeding up acquisition and additions to the national forests of forest and submarginal land unsuitable to private ownership, under conditions that will be fair to the land owners, the States, and to local governmental units.

(c) Adequate Federal reimbursements to counties in lieu of taxes during readjustment of the tax program.

(d) Placing the Prairie States forestry project on a permanent rather than an emergency basis.

(e) Proper encouragement and assistance to the owners of farm wood lots, comprising one-fourth of all our forest lands.

(f) Needed steps to conserve watersheds, soils, and wildlife.

(g) The Forest Service must remain in the Department of Agriculture, and all Federal forest activities should be consolidated thereunder. The administration of the Taylor Grazing Act should be transferred to this Department.

18. FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

To improve the banking system of the Nation, we recommend:

(a) Making the Federal Reserve Board more strictly responsible to Congress, with proper safeguards against temporary interruptions of policy for purposes of political expediency.

(b) Preventing the manipulation of bank credit for private profit.

(c) Making the banking system of the Nation more responsive to the needs of agriculture, industry, and business, with no unnecessary monetary barriers to foreign commerce.

(d) Giving agriculture proper representation on the Federal Reserve Board and on the boards of the 12 Reserve banks.

19. NATIONAL CATTLE THEFT ACT

We believe that the National Cattle Theft Act should be broadened to include other livestock in addition to cattle.

20. IMITATION DAIRY PRODUCTS

It is of vital interest to the dairy industry, as well as to the consuming public, that all legislation for the control and regulation of manufacturers of and dealers in imitation dairy products should remain in full force and effect.

21. CROP INSURANCE

We favor broadening of the Crop Insurance Act to include other crops The granting of insurance under this legislation should not be contingent upon compliance with Government control programs.

22. ARGENTINE SANITARY PACT

Since agriculture in the past has suffered heavy losses from the foot-and-mouth disease, brought in from other countries, we are opposed to relaxing regulatory measures.

23. RADIO BROADCASTING

With more than 70 percent of the farm homes of the Nation dependent upon service from "clear channel" radio stations, we urge that nothing be done to curtail these stations in order to give more service to the big cities, which are already well supplied.

24. LABOR AND INDUSTRY

There is urgent need for revamping Federal legislation with reference to labor and industry and to eliminate all bottlenecks that in any way retard the successful prosecution of our war effort. Disputes between labor and management in our defense industries should be promptly settled without the stoppage of work.

We believe organization of labor is necessary to assure fair treatment but we condemn strikes, boycotts, hot-cargo edicts, and general racketeering that interfere with the orderly marketing of farm products, the production of war supplies, or the free flow of commerce. We ask for the enactment and vigorous enforcement of more stringent legislation to prevent abuses in this connection.

25. COTTON SALES

We favor the enactment of legislation for the sale of cotton on a net-weight basis.

26. SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

While approving group health insurance on the voluntary basis, we are opposed to what is commonly known as State medicine.

27. LOTTERIES AND GAMBLING

We ask for the strict enforcement of the law against lotteries, whether foreign or domestic, and oppose gambling in all its forms.

28. MOTION PICTURES

The Grange advocates the enactment of legislation prohibiting block-booking and blind-selling of motion pictures, and asks for more rigid censorship to prevent the showing of pictures that are indecent and demoralizing.

29. TEMPERANCE

We recommend that the Granges throughout the land join with other organizations in a campaign of education, calling attention to the evils of strong drink, and emphasizing the truth that decency and sobriety are virtues that bring their own reward. We urge that the sale of intoxicating beverages, with all its demoralizing influences, be strictly forbidden in the vicinity of military training camps. Since we are confronted with many serious shortages of material and labor, we urge the use of strict priorities in dealing with the manufacture of liquors.

30. ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

While the exigencies of war make it absolutely necessary that our national debt should be expanded to unprecedented proportions, waste and prodigal expenditures must not be tolerated.

With the Government asking the people to make sacrifices, those in authority should set a good example by practicing rigid economy in the use of public funds.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2495) extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1346) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 14, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. LANGER introduced a bill (S. 2529) to extend for 10 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

WOMEN'S AUXILIARY NAVAL RESERVE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BARBOUR to the bill (S. 2527) to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 123, line 18, to strike out "$194,740" and insert in lieu thereof "$366,740, of which $25,000 shall be available immediately."

On page 128, line 13, to strike out "$4,297,110" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,469,110."

On page 129, line 17, to strike out "$5,547,110" and insert "$5,719,110."

On page 129, line 20, to strike out "$893,605" and insert in lieu thereof "$902,005."

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

At the proper place under the caption "Civilian Pilot Training," to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That $2,000,000 of this appropriation may be restored to the emergency fund for the President, created by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, in reimbursement of a like amount advanced therefrom."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6599, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, fiscal year 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 40, in line 23, after the word "laws", to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for alterations, improvements, and repairs to premises occupied for detention purposes without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 278a), when authorized or approved by the Attorney General, and for all necessary expenses incident to the maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such aliens to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6599, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, fiscal year 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

SENATOR BYRD—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. GLASS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frank R. Kent, dated May 7, 1942, and dealing with the economy proposals of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which appears in the Appendix.]

GASOLINE RATIONING—EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a radio broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on May 14, 1942, on the subject of gasoline rationing, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE WALTER FORD REYNOLDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of May 5, 1942, entitled "Public Servants Worthy of the Name," which appears in the Appendix.]

SILVER BULLETS — EDITORIAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMER-GLOBE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Richland County Farmer-Globe, Wahpeton, N. Dak., of May 12, 1942, entitled "Silver Bullets," which appears in the Appendix.]

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 248) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on May 14, 1942, was read as follows:

Whereas wartime difficulties in transporting petroleum products to the Atlantic States have become so acute as to necessitate the rationing of gasoline; and

Whereas the only sound and just basis for such rationing of gasoline is that of need; and

Whereas the granting of special privileges or exemptions to Government officials with respect to the use of gasoline which relieve them from the restrictions applying to the people as a whole is a violation of democratic principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline-rationing order, and shall consider themselves

bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is unavoidably detained on official business. If he were present, he would vote "nay." He has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am not advised how the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote if present.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am free to vote and vote "nay."

Mr. GILLETTE (when Mr. HERRING's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] is necessarily detained. He has requested me to announce that if present he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is absent attending to Government business at one of the departments. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. My colleague the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained on important business. Were he present, his vote would be in the negative.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—2

Downey	Pepper

NAYS—66

Aiken	George	Murdock
Andrews	Gerry	Norris
Austin	Gillette	Nye
Ball	Glass	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Rosier
Brooks	Holman	Russell
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Doxey	Millikin	Willis

NOT VOTING—28

Bailey	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Lodge	Tobey
Bridges	Lucas	Tydings
Chand'er	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Murray	Wallgren
Davis	Overton	White
Ellender	Reed	Wiley
Green	Schwartz	
Hatch	Shipstead	

So Mr. DOWNEY's resolution was not agreed to.

RETIREMENT PAY FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the country was very much excited over the subject of congressional pensions. Recently I read an article published in the New Republic. The article was written by our colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the body of the RECORD; but for the information of Senators who disagree with the purposes of the measure which was recently before Congress, I shall read two excerpts from the article:

One of the principal promoters of the "Bundles for Congress" movement was a man who had for many years represented Japanese business interests in this country, while another active participant was a man who at one time was the accredited representative to this country of one of the Axis nations.

I read a sentence from another paragraph of the article:

The Civil Service Retirement Division of the Government, which would administer the law, states that the cost would not exceed $80,000 a year, of which a large proportion would be paid in by the Members of Congress themselves. The 5 percent of salary, or $500 annually, that a Member of Congress would have to pay is the maximum rate paid by anyone into any retirement system in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that the article in full be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic of May 11, 1942]

ABOUT THOSE CONGRESSIONAL PENSIONS

(The New Republic has criticized Congress vigorously and expects to do so again when the occasion justifies. It is partly for this very reason that we welcome the opportunity to publish in this issue the article by Senator JAMES M. MEAD on the so-called Pensions for Congress Act. Few congressional measures have ever been so distorted by the press and consequently so misunderstood by the public. A flood of violent ridicule was let loose upon its proponents, including high-minded and progressive Members of both Houses. One of these was Senator MEAD, to whom fell the chairmanship of the subcommittee and the duty of piloting the measure through the Senate. Yet no Member of either House was less open to criticism, both because of his outstanding liberal record and his disinterested position. The act specifically excluded from its benefits those "already subject to another retirement act," and Senator MEAD has long been covered by the retirement act of New York State, where he was a member of the legislature.—The Editors.)

It is both a gracious and a rare act for a public journal voluntarily to reopen a presumably closed issue, especially when that issue has been settled by the verdict of the press as a whole. In this case it is a particularly just act of the New Republic, just not only to the factual record but to a misinformed public and a misrepresented body of public officials.

I shall not take advantage of your appreciated invitation by dwelling upon my own position, save as it is represented—and still represents—the position of many of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress. The records of these men are open to the public. They are clean records, characterized by singularly disinterested service to the public good. Most of these records are marked by untiring devotion to causes opposed by powerful special interests and in behalf of the aged, the unemployed, the underprivileged, and the general public. It is unthinkable that these public servants should suddenly belie their past records and betray their sense of public duty for the sake of short-sighted self-interest. It is also contrary to the facts. That these facts were not fairly or fully given to the public is not the fault of Congress but of a considerable portion of the press, of certain partisan interests, and of undercover forces taking advantage of war psychology to breed discord and disunity.

Some of the sinister influences that injected themselves into the situation have been pointed out by Mr. Henry Strickland, industrial secretary of the Railway Mail Association. Probably the most vicious and damaging of these influences was that of the "Bundles for Congress" campaign that was so widely featured by the daily press. Says Mr. Strickland: "One of the principal promoters of the 'Bundles for Congress' movement was a man who had for many years represented Japanese business interests in this country, while another active participant was a man who at one time was the accredited representative to this country of one of the Axis nations." I need not remind your readers of the part played by this movement in stirring up discord and disunity and heaping ridicule upon the legislative branch of the Government.

What is revealed by a calm examination of the record? The legislation in question was not a scheme to provide substantial pensions by the Government to Members of Congress. In the first place, approximately 100 Members could not have qualified for any benefit. In the second place, those eligible would have to pay 5 percent of their salaries—$500 per year—into the retirement fund, just as all other Government officials and employees would have to do. In the third place, the law did not provide for pensions in any sense. It simply broadened the present retirement system to include those Members of Congress who should comply with its strict and sound provisions.

The present Federal retirement law requires participants to contribute 3½ percent of their salaries. The recent so-called pension grab strengthened the actuarial soundness of the old law and raised the percentage of salaries paid into the retirement fund from 3½ to 5 percent.

It is not a new thing to provide retirement annuities for legislative and other elective officials. For many years the State of New York has had such a system, which has been embodied in the State constitution by a referendum vote of the people. I happened to come under that system as a member of the Legislature of New York, and would not therefore participate in a Federal retirement system. It was partly because of my experience in handling such legislation as a Member of the House that I was designated by the Civil Service Committee of the Senate to pilot the legislation through that body. It was not my bill in the first place; its provisions were of no personal benefit to me; and it did not provide pensions for any Member of Congress. It was merely an extension of the old retirement law to include, among others, elective officials of the Government who were not covered by some other contributory retirement system.

It was also widely charged that the cost to the Government of these contributory annuities would run anywhere from twenty to thirty million dollars a year. This also is untrue. The Civil Service Retirement Division of the Government, which would administer the law, states that the cost would not exceed $80,000 a year, of which a large proportion would be paid in by the Members of Congress themselves. The 5 percent of salary, or $500 annually, that a Member of Congress would have to pay is the maximum rate paid by anyone into any retirement system in the United States.

Wide circulation was given to the allegation that this amendment was secretly slipped into a bill that was in the process of being enacted. This is untrue. Late in 1940 the retirement experts of the Civil Service Commission prepared a bill that opened the Federal retirement system to all Government departments. At that time a large percentage of the Government employees were not included in either the retirement or the social-security system. In February 1941 this measure, which provided for the participation of elective officials, was introduced in the House by Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK. Hearings were held in June and August 1941. Although these hearings were open, there was no opposition to the provision for including elective officials. Following the report of the House Civil Service Committee, the bill was placed on the calendar in October. It remained there until the House passed it on December 1, 1941. The high-minded character and splendid record of its sponsor, Mr. RAMSPECK, of Georgia, are not open to question.

Following my appointment as chairman of the Senate subcommittee to consider this measure, I summoned for conferences heads of Government departments, as well as leaders of labor, postal, civil service, and other groups. All of these gave assurance that the provision in the bill relating to elective officials had their support. The raising of the salary deductions from 3.5 to 5 percent to be levied against lower-paid employees met with some criticism. I considered this a valid grievance that should be remedied. Meetings of the subcommittee were held, following which the bill was reported to the full committee and then to the Senate. Throughout the debate on the floor of the Senate not one amendment was offered to strike out section 3, which covered elective officials.

A Member of Congress must have served 5 years or more and have attained his sixty-second birthday as well as being involuntarily separated from the service before he can even qualify for retirement benefits. The actuarial soundness of this legislation, as well as its fairness to the Government, would seem to be amply assured by the fact that it was recommended by the Budget Bureau, the Retirement Board, and the Civil Service Commission. It was also endorsed by many groups of organized labor and civil-service employees, the Federal Bar Association, and the National Civil Service Reform League.

Let me illustrate how very difficult it would be for any Member of Congress ever to obtain even relatively substantial retirement benefits. To obtain the annual benefit of $3,000 he would have to serve 21 years (retiring at the age of 70), and to pay into the retirement fund an amount equal to 5 percent of his salary for his entire term of service—or a total of $10,500. These provisions invite comparison with other retirement systems, especially that of Federal judges, who are retired on full salaries at the age of 70, though they may have served only 10 years. They receive these generous retirement benefits without being required to contribute one dollar of their salaries into a retirement fund. In other words, a Federal judge, either in active service or retirement, receives a full maximum salary from the Government or, if you will, the taxpayers. The Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey also enjoy pensions paid for by the Federal Treasury. Employees in the railroad retirement system pay 3 percent and workers covered by social security 1 percent of their salaries.

Elective officials will some day be permitted to contribute to a soundly safeguarded retirement system and to receive its properly restricted benefits. It will be the same sane and equitable system whose recent repeal was forced by a public from whom the facts were withheld or to whom they were misrepresented. The fight for such a system will be led by those who in the past have fought for old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, social security, and other progressive legislation in behalf of human justice and democratic ideals.

JAMES M. MEAD.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6709, the Agricultural Appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to consideration of the committee amendment on page 76.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senate has under consideration at this time another committee amendment to the bill. I should feel constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request until the amendment now under consideration has been disposed of.

Mr. LEE. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 92, line 9, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out the figure "5" and to insert the figure "10"; and in line 14, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out the figure "5" and to insert the figure "10."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendments will not be agreed to. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate what I regard as the necessity for controlling these administrative expenses of the different governmental departments. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures sent an interrogatory to each department of the Government to ascertain the number of passenger automobiles in each of the departments, the cost of operating the automobiles for the past fiscal year, and the number of miles traveled by them. Answers to those interrogatories have been received. They have come directly from each department, and they have been compiled by the clerk of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures.

The Department of Agriculture on February 28, 1942, had 4,513 passenger automobiles. In addition to that, the Department reported that on December 31, 1941, it had 13,505 trucks. The cost of operating the trucks for the past fiscal year was $2,646,612. None of these trucks was used in connection with the C. C. C. camps. The passenger automobiles, 4,513 in number, cost to operate in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, $1,142,456.25.

They traveled 54,677,935 miles. The passenger automobiles of the Department of Agriculture alone traveled nearly 55,000,000 miles. The Department had 15 full-time chauffeurs. In addition to that, Mr. President, it is the policy of many of the departments to rent use of automobiles at a cost of 3 to 6 cents per mile, and these figures do not include cost of such rented automobiles.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know that I understood the Senator correctly. Did he say that the Department of Agriculture had 15 chauffeurs?

Mr. BYRD. The Department of Agriculture had 15 full-time chauffeurs.

Mr. WHEELER. Who are the officials to whose service these chauffeurs in the Department of Agriculture are available?

Mr. BYRD. That information, I think, is available to the committee, but I do not have it at hand now. I can furnish it to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would be interesting to have similar information with respect to some of the other departments, such as the War Department and the Navy Department, for instance. Will the Senator tell the number of chauffeurs and cars in the other departments?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I will do so. I wish to say that the Department of Agriculture has more passenger automobiles than any other department of the Government. That is the reason I put it first.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator say that the Department of Agriculture has more passenger cars than the War Department or the Navy Department?

Mr. BYRD. I am not including the War Department and Navy Department. I am only including the nondefense activities of the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia if the figure he gave includes the automobiles owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. BYRD. It does not. I am coming to that.

The Department of Agriculture has 4,513 passenger automobiles, every one of which will have an X card, or an unlimited right to purchase gasoline. For the last fiscal year those cars traveled, as I stated, nearly 55,000,000 miles.

I will give the figures for each department and agency. The Bureau of the Budget has three automobiles. The cost of operating these automobiles in the same period as I have previously given was $353.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has 17 automobiles. The cost of operating them for the full year was $3,210.87, and they traveled 220,332 miles. The Board has 1 full-time chauffeur.

The Commerce Department has 312 automobiles, costing to operate $70,247.38 during the last year, and traveling 3,904,311 miles. The Department has 5 full-time chauffeurs.

The Coordinator of Information has 6 automobiles, and the cost of operating the automobiles for the fiscal year beginning July 1, of last year, to February 28, 1942, was $801. For these 6 automobiles there were 17 chauffeurs.

The Board of Economic Warfare has three automobiles.

The Federal Communications Commission has 134 automobiles, costing to operate for the full year $16,640, and they traveled 851,271 miles.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has 67 automobiles, costing to operate $25,000, and they traveled 500,000 miles in the last year.

The Federal Loan Agency has 4 automobiles, costing to operate $602. It has 5 full-time chauffeurs and 4 automobiles.

The Federal Power Commission has 15 automobiles, costing to operate $3,537 for the last year, and they traveled 137,000 miles. The Commission has 2 full-time chauffeurs.

The Federal Security Agency—I hope Senators will listen to this—has 3,104 automobiles, costing to operate $669,641.19 in the past year, and they traveled 35,441,876 miles. The Federal Security Agency has 66 full-time chauffeurs and 8 part-time chauffeurs. The cost of the 66 full-time chauffeurs was $91,149.06, and of the part-time chauffeurs $2,561.81. The 3,104 automobiles owned by the Federal Security Agency traveled, as I said, 35,000,000 miles. All those cars will travel this year on X cards, or receive unlimited gasoline. The Agency has 66 full-time chauffeurs. What could that Agency do with 66 full-time chauffeurs to take these bureaucrats around the country at the expense of the Government?

The Federal Works Agency has 982 automobiles, costing to operate $108,282, and traveling 5,888,518 miles. The Agency has 41 full-time chauffeurs and 1 part-time chauffeur.

The General Accounting Office has two automobiles, costing only $127 to operate for the past year.

The Government Printing Office has four automobiles, costing only $1,286 to operate.

The Interior Department is second to the Department of Agriculture among the nondefense agencies in the matter of passenger automobiles. It has 3,252 automobiles, costing $815,291.57. Last year they traveled 36,060,907 miles with 8 full-time chauffeurs.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has 130 automobiles; the Department of Justice, 2,352 automobiles, costing $324,000, and traveling last year, roughly, 21,282,000 miles, with 4 full-time chauffeurs.

The Labor Department has four automobiles, costing $1,348 for operation, with four full-time chauffeurs—a full-time chauffeur for each automobile.

The Library of Congress has one automobile, with one part-time chauffeur.

The Maritime Commission has 13 automobiles, costing $1,151, with 5 full-time chauffeurs.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has 10 automobiles, costing $481, with no full-time chauffeurs.

The National Archives has one automobile, with one full-time chauffeur.

The National Park and Planning Commission has two automobiles, with one full-time chauffeur.

The National Housing Agency has 11 automobiles, with 7 full-time chauffeurs.

The Office for Emergency Management has 35 automobiles and 42 full-time chauffeurs.

The Office of Government Reports has two automobiles.

The Panama Canal has 212 automobiles, costing $181,000. Last year they traveled 2,666,000 miles. There are 150 full-time chauffeurs for 212 automobiles.

The Post Office Department has two automobiles and two full-time chauffeurs.

The Railroad Retirement Board has five automobiles and five full-time chauffeurs.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has one automobile and one full-time chauffeur.

The Selective Service Commission has five automobiles and three full-time chauffeurs.

The Smithsonian Institution has one automobile and no full-time chauffeur.

The State Department has four automobiles and four full-time chauffeurs.

Mr. President, these figures do not include trucks or vehicles carrying materials.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] referred the other day, has 877 automobiles, costing $423,000. Last year they traveled 10,200,400 miles. That agency has 3 full-time chauffeurs.

The Treasury Department has 2,472 automobiles, costing $851,000. Last year they traveled 34,902,000 miles. That Department has 18 full-time chauffeurs.

The Veterans' Administration has 389 automobiles, costing $133,000, with 103 full-time chauffeurs and 330 part-time chauffeurs.

The total of passenger cars, not including trucks or cars used to transport materials, rented used cars or those of War, Navy, executives offices, or legislative, is 18,948. The operating cost for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, was $4,813,561. The cost based upon today's figures would be greater.

Those automobiles traveled, for the full year, 211,866,978 miles. That does not include a large number of automobiles which are rented by the various departments at 3 or 6 cents a mile. The committee is attempting to prepare and present to the Senate figures in that connection. For last year there was a total of nearly 19,000 automobiles, costing for operation nearly $5,000,000, and traveling nearly 212,000,000 miles.

I wish to call attention to the chauffeurs. There are 522 full-time chauffeurs and 340 part-time chauffeurs. The cost of the chauffeurs for the various departments is more than $1,000,000, out of the Treasury. That is the cost of transporting public officials around, looking after public business. I do not question the fact that some of the expense is necessary; but I say that the travel by employees of the Government over the country is far in excess of what it should be. These figures do not include the cost of travel of the county committeemen about whom we were talking yesterday, who number some 90,000. Their travel cost, if they have any, is paid out of another fund, and is paid not by furnishing cars, but by an allowance of 5 or 6 cents a mile. When those figures are added to the figures I have given, and when the figures for rented cars for which the Government pays 5 or 6 cents a mile are added, the cost is tremendously increased.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. In addition to the passenger cars operated by the various departments, last year the Government spent $147,000,000 for travel pay, most of it being in addition to the amount the Senator has shown was spent for automobiles.

Mr. BYRD. I think nearly all of it is in addition.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Practically all of it.

Mr. BYRD. Furthermore, Government employees are traveling by airplane. Most of the departments have the right to travel by airplane. They have priority in airplane travel, and frequently make use of it, sometimes depriving a businessman of his seat on an airplane, even though he may be engaged in important business for the war effort.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. A few minutes ago we had a vote on another subject, indirectly relating to automobiles. What is the entire cost which the Senator gave?

Mr. BYRD. For the 19,000 automobiles?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. What is the cost?

Mr. BYRD. The mere cost of operating them, which does not include the cost of the chauffeurs or of the cars, is $4,813,560.94. That represents only the cost of the gasoline and tires, and does not include the cost of the cars or the cost of the chauffeurs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as we had a vote a few minutes ago referring indirectly to automobiles, can the Senator state how much Senators receive by way of automobiles, chauffeurs, gasoline, and upkeep costs? How much do the 96 Senators of the United States, about whom such a hullabaloo has been raised in the past day or two, receive from the Government for operation of automobiles? How much do they cost the Government, or are all the cars of Senators privately owned and operated at their own expense?

Mr. BYRD. Senators receive no allowance whatever for the cost of cars or their purchase.

Mr. McKELLAR. While $147,000,000 is spent by the administrative departments for travel pay, in addition to the amount spent for passenger automobiles for officials of the Government, is it not true that Senators are not allowed any cars, that they are not allowed any upkeep for their own cars, and are not allowed any gasoline for their own cars? So far as the 96 Senators are concerned, about whom such a hullabaloo has been raised, the operation of their cars does not cost the Government a cent.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Can the Senator tell me why this matter has never been called to the attention of the Senate before? How do such amounts for chauffeurs get into appropriation bills?

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will read the pending appropriation bill, he will see that it provides for new cars for the Department of Agriculture, in addition to the 4,500 which the Department now has.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator was present a few years ago when I made a similar speech. It was not one-tenth so good as the one the Senator is now making, or one-tenth so effective. I made not one, but many speeches against the indiscriminate use of automobiles and travel pay. For years I have been speaking against such practices, and the resulting enormous expense. Time and again I have brought the matter to the attention of the Senate, with very little result.

Mr. WHEELER. It is no wonder that the Congress is criticized when it stands for anything of that kind. I can understand why the various Cabinet members and the heads of other agencies may have to have chauffeurs; but there can be no excuse whatever for some of the departments having 15 or 16 chauffeurs. I think the State Department has only 4 automobiles and 4 chauffeurs; but some of the departments have hundreds of automobiles and great numbers of chauffeurs. What excuse can there be for some of the minor departmental heads traveling around in a Government car in the city of Washington and having a chauffeur. It does not make sense. There is no reason or excuse for it, and it ought to be stopped.

Mr. BYRD. The total number of full-time and part-time chauffeurs is 862, and the cost of salaries of such chauffeurs is more than $1,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. There is no excuse for it under any circumstances or conditions; and there is no reason why the Congress should stand for it. If it does stand for it, there is no reason why the people of the United States should not condemn Congress and say that we are lacking in patriotism when we permit such a thing to be done right under our noses in the city of Washington.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked how the authority is given for the purchase of these automobiles. If he will refer to page 93 he will see that this bill provides the authority to purchase additional automobiles for the Department of Agriculture. At the top of page 93 it says:

> Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia.

There is the provision and the authorization. The funds for that purpose are to be taken out of the total sums to be appropriated by the bill. The reason I am opposing this amendment is that it gives the Department the right to transfer to the extent of 10 percent the appropriations within the various bureaus and divisions of the Department of Agriculture. It takes away the right of Congress to control to that extent the appropriation of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A similar provision, as I understand, has been carried in the appropriation bills for years.

Mr. BYRD. The provision has been for 5 percent, but this bill makes it 10 percent. I am opposing raising it to 10 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about the merits of raising it to 10 percent; but it seems to me that there is some merit in providing some flexibility so that, within a department, appropriations may be shifted from one bureau to another, as requirements may develop during the year.

Mr. BYRD. If there is any flexibility, it should be held to the minimum. This amendment proposes to increase the percentage of funds which may be transferred from 5, as it has been, to 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the Senator from Virginia and other Senators the history of the 5-percent flexible clause, as it was formerly called. It was first brought up during the Harding administration. I made as vigorous and as active a fight against it as I could. The records will show that I made not only one, but several; but I was "tanned" as thoroughly as a Senator ever was "tanned," for even suggesting that there should not be some leeway, as it was then called. At that time the Senate overwhelmingly repudiated my efforts to stop this very practice, and it has been continued in large part ever since.

I am not sure that the transfer provision is applicable to the Post Office Department. I do not believe it is; if my memory serves me correctly, it does not apply to the Post Office Department, and probably that is the reason the Post Office Department uses so few cars.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to point out, Mr. President, that the figures I have read relate only to passenger cars. There are thousands and thousands of trucks owned by the Government, as to which the committee has not yet received a full statement.

The Department of Agriculture, on December 31, 1941, had 13,505 trucks; 13,505 trucks were owned by that one Department.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The figures the Senator has read are imposing; and, if left alone, they might sound more formidable than if there were a detailed explanation by the various departments as to the use of the cars. We are dealing with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and we can deal only with the appropriations provided in this bill. The cars have been bought by authority of Congress; they have been bought by authority of the appropriation bills which the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations have considered. I presume that every year the Department has been called upon by the Appropriations Committee to justify the expenditures it has proposed to incur for the purchase and operation of automobiles; so that Congress must share its part of the responsibility if more of the appropriation has been used for that purpose than should have been used.

Mr. BYRD. I am not trying to place the responsibility, let me say to the Senator. I am trying to call attention to a condition which should be corrected.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, the appropriations for the various other departments, to take effect after the 1st of July, have practically all been passed, and I do not recall that the Senate's attention was to any considerable degree called to the items for automobiles when the appropriation bills for the various departments were considered.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator that it has been very difficult to obtain the information; it is not available. The committee of which I have the honor to be chairman had to send a special inquiry to every branch of Government, and the branches located in Washington had to communicate with those in the field. It took some time to obtain the information; and so far as I know, this is the only complete record of the total number of automobiles used by the departments.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that each year, when the appropriation bills have come up, the Appropriations Committees, in considering items for automobiles, have required the respective departments to justify or to give reasons for the expenditures. Of course, as in the case of a great many other things, they grew like Topsy; and sometimes no particular person regarded it to be his duty to inquire into the necessity for any or all the expenditures; but I assume that the Appropriations Committee of the two Houses, with their efficiency in going into minute details, have required the departments to justify such expenditures.

In order for the statement to be fair to the departments, it should not simply show a large number of cars, with a large mileage, and a large number of chauffeurs, and other things pertaining, but it should show the departments' side of the matter by giving the reasons they have assigned for the use of the cars.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator from Virginia, but let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that before this discussion shall have ended I intend to place in the RECORD a break-down showing the various uses to which these cars are put, and I shall also undertake to show why and how the 13,000 trucks are used for governmental purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that the Senator will present a break-down as to such items contained in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill of which he is in charge; but the statement of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] covers the appropriation bills for all other departments for which we have already appropriated money.

The Senator from Georgia probably could not give the facts as to each of the other departments, since he was not in charge of bills making appropriations for them; so the break-down which the Senator from Georgia will present will leave unmentioned, so far as this record goes, all the departments except the Department of Agriculture; and the break-down will show what is apparently, and on the surface, this enormous number of cars and the expenses incident to their operation, without there being in the record anything to show what may be the Department's claim as to the need for the cars. Such a showing could not be done during the consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, but it seems to me the facts should have been developed and revealed in connection with the consideration of each of the departmental appropriation bills, as they have been considered by Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Kentucky will pardon me, let me say that so far as my experience goes, I have found that when the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill comes along, it usually has to bear the burden of criticism for all Government expenditures for any purpose. There is more discussion of expenses and appropriations for automobiles and for all other purposes when the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is up for consideration than during the consideration of any other appropriation bill, and that has been the case in times past. Of course, I could not undertake to explain the items relating to any department other than the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a great deal about the pending bill that I do not completely understand; but I shall point out the break-down as to the cars and trucks used by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that; and I am sure the Senator will do it correctly. I agree that the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill sometimes has to bear the brunt of all the criticisms which might properly have been hurled at other departments when their supply bills were under consideration; and it is not quite fair to the Department of Agriculture or to the agricultural program simply to use it as a vehicle for a parade of automobiles before the country and before the Senate, when such a parade would have been more appropriate and probably more effective if it had been made when the supply bills of other departments were under consideration.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that there are a number of other supply bills to come along. The information would have been made available sooner, but the statement has been very difficult to prepare.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not criticizing the Senator from Virginia; but it seems to me that during the consideration of each appropriation bill we should have the record as to both sides of the question whether we are spending too much money for travel and for automobiles. It may be that the Appropriations Committee has such information; but this is the first time that items of travel expense and expenses for automobiles have been discussed, and the pending bill is the only appropriation bill during the consideration of which such items have been discussed except during the consideration of the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, I assume that there is no possible objection on the part of the Senator from Kentucky to making the facts public.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I am not objecting at all. However, I do say that in order to present a true picture the record should show the claim of the department involved as to the necessity for the expenditure of money for automobiles. The amount involved sounds enormous.

Mr. BYRD. I have no doubt that every official and every department will assert that the expenditures are necessary; but, nevertheless, we as Senators can have our own opinions as to this.

Mr. BARKLEY. They should not only be required to assert the justification, but they should be required to prove it before the committees; and I have no doubt that they are prepared to prove it.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that takes us back to the question of what is a revenue bill, and whether an appropriation bill is a revenue bill. I say it is not. A revenue bill is a tax bill. However, the House has claimed the privilege of originating all appropriation bills, and the Senate committee does not know a damn thing about them. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I would hardly agree that any committee of which the Senator from Virginia is chairman does not know everything about any bill which comes before it.

Mr. GLASS. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee disclaims knowing anything about them or the Senator from Kentucky or anyone else knowing anything about them. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I never claimed that I knew anything about anything. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. However, let me say, if the Senator will pardon me, that I feel—and I am not saying this in a spirit of criticism—that the expenditures cannot be made unless they are authorized by Congress. Congress will not authorize them, as a rule, unless they are recommended by a committee.

Each one of the appropriation bills should be scrutinized meticulously in order to determine whether we ourselves are, innocently or otherwise, authorizing the expenditure of more money for these purposes than should be authorized.

Mr. BYRD. Before I yield to the Senator from Tennessee, I should like to make a brief explanation of what the members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures believe their duty to be, and that is to present facts to the Senate. The resolution which created the committee placed upon the committee the responsibility of presenting to the Senate and to the Congress such items as we regard as proper to consider in the effort to bring about a reduction of nonessential spending, and for that reason this report is made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. I am not criticizing even remotely the committee or the Senator for making public the information. I think the country and the Senate are entitled to it, and the committee undoubtedly is trying to do an honest job in ascertaining the unnecessary nondefense expenditures. What I am concerned about is that all the facts in each one of these cases be submitted. It is not altogether the whole fact to say that a department has so many automobiles without submitting its justification for the automobiles. I wonder whether the committee of which the Senator is chairman has gone into that?

Mr. BYRD. The committee has sent an interrogatory to all the departments asking how many automobiles they have as a basis for an investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the committee makes an investigation as to how many

the departments have, does it give the department or the officer in charge an opportunity to explain why he has that many?

Mr. BYRD. If he desires an opportunity, the committee gives it to him; we then submit a report to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and they refer it to the respective appropriations committees, which, I assume, make proper investigations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that the question of travel pay, which is intimately connected with the use of passenger-carrying automobiles, has been brought up continuously. Someone handed me a RECORD of March 17, 1942, in which I set out the enormous amounts for travel pay. I wish to say for the Committee on Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations especially, that they have incorporated a provision in this bill which I think is desirable. I pointed out on March 17 that the Agricultural Department spent for travel pay, for instance, last year $16,000,000. The committee has cut the appropriation for travel pay by 10 percent, making a saving of $1,600,000, if I recollect the sum exactly; perhaps I may be wrong about it; I cannot be positive.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amount is $1,500,000

Mr. McKELLAR. Which is about a 10-percent cut in travel pay. It is a step in the right direction which ought to have been taken. I wish publicly to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the committee for taking that course. I think now the item could, perhaps, be cut further with caution. We did not have the facts before us about automobiles, except as to some of the departments. I presented them here some time ago. We have not materially reduced the number. So far as the departments are concerned, every single year they come and ask for more automobiles for their use. We know how it is. They demand greater appropriations for the purposes in which they are interested.

Mr. BYRD. While it is true, as the Senator said, there is a reduction of a million and a half dollars for travel expenses, this amendment, as I read it, will permit 10 percent of that to be diverted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia was never more wrong in his life. I am afraid he has not read the provision.

Mr. BYRD. That is what the Senator from Georgia himself admitted yesterday.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I said it was permitted to transfer a travel fund from one agency to another, but there could not be a transfer of a fund appropriated for any other purpose to the travel fund, because the provision on page 92 reads:

> Not to exceed 10 percent of the foregoing amounts for the miscellaneous expenses——

Mr. BYRD. What are "miscellaneous expenses"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will permit me to conclude reading the provision.

Mr. BYRD. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. The provision continues:

> of the work of any bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects—

A budget estimate is sent up for appropriations for the various objects—

> included within the general expenses of such bureau, division, or office.

In other words, the department could not assign funds appropriated for salaries to travel expenses or for the purchase of supplies or to transfer funds for travel expenses to pay the salaries of employees. The interchange must be for the same object.

Mr. BYRD. Though it is included within the general expenses of such bureau?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because of the language in line 12, which reads:

> Interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included within the general expenses of such bureau.

Mr. BYRD. I asked the expert of the drafting bureau today what that meant, and he said he could not tell me; that he did not know, first, what miscellaneous expenses were. Can the Senator explain that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield to me for a moment, I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Georgia. Is the Senator from Georgia certain that this language will result in covering into the Treasury a million and a half dollars from the reduction of travel pay?

Mr. RUSSELL. There cannot be any question about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so, too. May I ask the Senator, in all caution, will he not put in the amendment words which will make it beyond the cavil of doubt that that much will be saved? I think that could be very easily done, and I hope the Senator will do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to entertain any suggestion which will improve or strengthen the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator will, and I thank him for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia referred to the drafting service. I may say to the Senator that the committee consulted the drafting service, that this language was prepared by the drafting service, was approved by the committee, to accomplish the very purpose the Senator from Tennessee desires.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator from Georgia inform the Senate how many new automobiles may be purchased by the Department of Agriculture for next year?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is proposed that the Department of Agriculture will purchase automobiles in the coming year by the Budget estimates. I cannot tell the Senator from Virginia the number of automobiles that have been cut out, but, as this bill is reported, the appropriation is $13,000,000 below the Budget estimate. Undoubtedly some new automobiles may be purchased, but the Budget estimates were reduced by the Senate committee. The Department proposed to purchase 807 new cars, but to turn in on the purchase of the new cars 786 old cars; so the increase in cars amounts to but 21 of the total number of cars for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. How old are the old cars?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question; I am not advised as to the age of the cars, and the information before the committee did not disclose the fact.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator explain the item at the top of page 93? Where is the limit on the purchase of new cars?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may state that the hearings disclose that cars are turned in normally after they have been operated for from 4 to 5 years.

Mr. BYRD. Where is the limit in the bill saying that only 21 new cars may be purchased?

Mr. RUSSELL. The matter, as I have said, will be governed by the Budget estimates, but I understand the number will be 21 more cars purchased or exchanged. I have no doubt some of the cars will be junked.

Mr. BYRD. They have 4,513 cars now and they will get 21 new ones. Where is the limitation in the bill, or is there any limitation on the purchase of automobiles?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only limitation on the purchase of automobiles contained in the bill is that found in the Budget estimates submitted to Congress.

Mr. BYRD. Is there anything to prevent the Department from purchasing as may new automobiles as they choose within the limit of the appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course there is.

Mr. BYRD. Where is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is in the Budget estimates.

Mr. BYRD. The Budget estimate does not control it. Here is the language of the bill itself:

> Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee did not write into the bill the number of shovels that could be purchased for the Forest Service for combating forest fires; it did not include in the bill the number of feet of rubber hose that could be used for that purpose or the number of vehicles that could be used in soil conservation work in the many soil conservation districts throughout the country; it did not provide the number of needles that could be used by the Bureau of Animal Industry in combating Bang's disease and tuberculosis in cattle; or how much could be used in regard to plant investigation; it did not go into details and place in the bill the amount in each instance, because all those matters are covered under the Budget estimates which are sent to the committee.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has said that only 21 new automobiles can be purchased. I ask him to point out to me in

the bill where the number of automobiles is limited to 21?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Virginia think that the Department of Agriculture is going to take the law and absolutely disregard it, and also disregard the Budget estimates?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator take the position that any department is governed in its expenditures by the Budget estimates and not by the appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia is an expert in the field of appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. I have never claimed to be.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that the law actually requires each department to set forth in the Budget estimate the number of cars it will buy and a detailed break-down of all expenditures.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia likewise knows that under this amendment 10 percent can be transferred within each bureau.

Mr. RUSSELL. For the same object.

Mr. BYRD. It does not have to be for the same object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have pointed out heretofore that there can be no transfer from appropriations for salaries to pay for automobiles.

Mr. BYRD. But there is no appropriation for automobiles.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is an appropriation for automobiles.

Mr. BYRD. There is a blanket appropriation, but no specific appropriation. There is not a dollar earmarked in the bill for automobiles.

Mr. RUSSELL. All automobiles to be purchased are set out in the Budget estimate sent to Congress each and every year by the President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct in his statement that no department is bound by its Budget estimates. Any department can, under the authority given here, use any amount of money for automobiles. The Senator from Georgia is completely wrong in his statement of the law. There is no requirement, except what we impose by law, and there is no limit by law that I know of, which would prevent any department from spending money for automobiles from lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any specific law, but can the Senator from Ohio state a specific instance in which a department has taken funds that were placed in the Budget estimates for a specific law, but can the Senator from committee, and used them for any other purpose?

Mr. TAFT. I have not such an instance within my knowledge, and I could not be expected to know; but that is not the question. The question is, Can they do it under the law? The Senator says they cannot, and I say they can.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia made the specific statement that the Senator from Virginia was wrong, and that they could not do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, any man can violate the law, but he has to take the consequences of his action.

Mr. BYRD. They would not be violating the law. If we appropriate a lump sum, they can use it as they please.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Some time ago the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, stated that the agricultural appropriation bill was always picked on for economies. That, I think the Senator recognizes, is not at all accurate. The appropriation bills for the other departments have not yet been passed this year. We have passed only two appropriation bills, one, I think, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, which is largely a formal matter, and the other the independent offices appropriation bill. The appropriation bills for all the other departments are still to come before us, and it seems to me the Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct in taking the first appropriate bill to raise questions of principle involved in attempting to secure an economical administration of government. It is no reflection on the Department of Agriculture, or on any other particular department.

The criticism is of a practice which has gradually grown up. The question is as to 21 automobiles, a very small number, but this practice has gone on year after year. Of course, Congress may be to blame; but it is not a question of who is to blame. The question is whether we should endeavor to correct a condition which has arisen. There is no more reason why we should not correct it as to the Department of Agriculture than as to any other department.

It seems to me the Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct in raising the question in regard to the first bill in which the matter is seriously involved. The only other bill we have had before us as to which the question has been raised was the independent offices bill, and I think it should be pointed out that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] did a magnificent job in cutting every appropriation in that bill. I have never seen a bill passed by the Congress in which practically every House appropriation was cut as the Senate cut the items in that bill. On the other hand, the committee increased the House appriations in the pending bill. The travel pay allowance alone is increased by six and a half million dollars. The House allowed only $8,000,000, as I understand, and as the bill now reads it would give approximately fourteen and a half million dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House provision relating to travel expenses did not save a single dime. It merely limited the amount that could be used for traveling expenses, and did not limit the appropriation by 5 cents, whereas the Senate committee provision has reduced the total appropriation by a million and a half dollars.

Mr. TAFT. Then perhaps the Senator would be willing to restore the House provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I would not, because I do not want to disrupt absolutely the work of the Department of Agriculture.

The Senator from Ohio says the Senator from Kentucky was in error in stating that this bill was "picked on." The Senator from Kentucky needs no defense at my hands, but any Member of the Senate who has had the slightest interest in agricultural appropriations knows that the Senator from Ohio always withholds his fire until the agricultural appropriation is in process of being passed, and for the past 3 or 4 years he and the Senator from Virginia have exerted great efforts to reduce the agricultural appropriations.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to deny that I have had any more interest in appropriations in the agricultural appropriation bill than in any other bill, and the RECORD will so show. There has been only one question I have always debated with the Senator, the question of parity payments, which is not a question of money but a question of principle. Apart from that, I know of no particular interest I have ever had in agricultural appropriation bills.

The point I wish to make is that this is a question of general principle, a question whether the Senate is now going to start to try to cut the expenses of all departments, not only the Department of Agriculture. There is no more emphasis in this question on agriculture than on any other activity. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia tell us why it is necessary to increase this 5 percent to 10 percent, when no other department, apparently, so far as I know, has had a similar item increased from 5 percent to 10 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I undertook to point that out yesterday. The Senate has before it a bill which has been decreased by $460,000,000 below current appropriations. New questions are arising constantly with respect to the duties, obligations, and responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture under the war program.

Let us take, for example, the little Bureau of Plant Industry, which has submitted to it from time to time requests to investigate the use of certain plants in an effort to develop plants for drugs. Would it be wise to have them running to Congress for deficiency appropriations, increasing expenses, and delaying their important work?

This item as to the 10 percent, the amount they can exchange for the same objects within a bureau, has been in the law for more than 30 years, and under neither Republican nor Democratic administrations has there ever been any charge that the power was abused. The proposal is merely designed to allow the Secretary of Agriculture some flexibility in discharging the extremely important

duties which rest upon him in this war period, in view of the great reductions which have been made in his appropriations.

This bill has been cut $460,000,000. Of course, I admit what the Senator from Virginia will soon say, that $212,000,000 of that is involved in the parity appropriation. A hundred small items for scientific research have been drastically reduced, and therefore the committee thought the Secretary should have some leeway in transferring funds to be used for the same object within the same bureau. He cannot take money from the Bureau of Plant Industry and transfer it to the Bureau of Animal Industry. He can make a transfer only within a bureau. So far as I can see, there is certainly no reason for believing that this power will be abused. The Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Ohio have both lectured the Senator from Georgia, and strenuously controverted my statement that cars could not be purchased under the law in excess of the number set up in the Budget. To my friend, the great lawyer from Ohio, I should like to read a few words from the statute. I read from section 78 of the United States Code, 1940 edition, which has been on the statutes for some 12 or 14 years:

> There shall not be expended out of any appropriation made by Congress any sum for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for any branch of the public service of the United States unless the same is specifically authorized by law. In the estimates for each fiscal year—

The Senator from Ohio, as well as the Senator from Virginia, has stated within the last 5 minutes that there was no law in existence on the subject, and never had been.

> In the estimates for each fiscal year there shall be submitted in detail estimates for such necessary appropriations as are intended to be used for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of all motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, specifying the sums required, the purposes for which said vehicles are intended, and the officials or employees by whom the same are to be used.

This is a requirement of law, and if the Senators had studied the Budget estimates, in their great economy drive, they would have found that immediately succeeding the provision for each and every bureau of the Department of Agriculture there is a specific item stating the number of cars to be purchased, the cost of the cars, the allowance on the old cars that are to be turned in, the maintenance and repair, the old vehicles that are to be used, and the purposes for which the cars will be used.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. So, the Senator from Georgia did have some slight familiarity with this subject, despite the fact that the condition does not obtain in Virginia; and the Senator from Ohio knew nothing about it when I suggested that it was required by law.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad the Senator read the statute, because it supports everything I said. It requires that each department submit its estimates; that is all. It does not say they are bound by those estimates, or could not spend more after Congress acted. Congress could act and give them specific authority to buy twice as many as are in the Budget.

Congress is asked to provide in the bill now before us:

> Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia:

The law the Senator has quoted is dealt with. The Department cannot take the action without our authority, but here we are asked to give them authority, and we are not asked to limit the authority in any way. There is nothing in the statute—at least as it was read by the Senator from Georgia—which indicates that any estimates they have submitted are not entirely superseded by the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is just as much in the law that deals with this subject as in the laws relating to malfeasance or any other matter connected with the Government.

Mr. TAFT. There is no prohibition. All the statute says is that they must submit estimates. Those estimates are entirely superseded by the law Congress passes. The statute says they cannot buy automobiles without express authority. The proposal here made would give the express authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. But does the Senator from Ohio brush aside the language which says, "There shall not be expended out of any appropriation made by Congress any sum for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation" of automobiles unless it is set up in the estimates? It says, "There shall not be expended."

Mr. TAFT. Unless what?

Mr. RUSSELL. That was in the first language I read.

Mr. TAFT. Read it again.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; I shall be glad to read it again.

> There shall not be expended—

"There shall not be expended"—

> out of any appropriation made by Congress any sum for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for any branch of the public service of the United States unless the same is specifically authorized by law.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, but the Senator changed the words. He just said that the words were, "unless it is set up in the estimates."

Mr. RUSSELL. I am going to read the rest of it. Certainly that is what it said.

> In the estimates for each fiscal year there shall be submitted a detailed estimate for such necessary appropriations as are intended to be used for the purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of all motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, specifying the sums required, the purpose for which the vehicles are intended, and the officials or employees by whom the same are to be used.

That is the law, and it is very clear to me——

Mr. TAFT. It is very clear to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. That if the Secretary of Agriculture were to take funds which were appropriated to him to pay the salaries of employees, and use them for the purchase of automobiles in excess of the number of cars which were set out in the Budget estimate he would be guilty of very flagrant misconduct in the discharge of his duties.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely deny that conclusion drawn from the statute. It is perfectly clear that the Department officials are required to supply estimates for the information of the committee, so the committee may decide what to do, and when the committee decides what to do and does so, and says that this money may not be used for automobiles, that is the end of the estimates. The estimates have no effect after that, and there is no statutory requirement or moral obligation that I can see for the Department to comply with the estimates after Congress has exceeded the estimates and has not attempted to hold the Department down in the number of automobiles.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it would be impossible for the committee when making appropriations to hold the Department down to every detail submitted in the estimates. These estimates are submitted in November or December, and they expire on July 1 of the year after the next year. How in the world can the Department say 18 months in advance of the expiration of the estimate that they need only 10 automobiles.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was going to say that if they had to follow the detailed report of the estimate then the provision giving them the right to transfer from one object to another would entirely upset the Budget estimate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to reiterate that the provision does not give them authority to transfer from one object to the other.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not say it did.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the Senator just made that statement.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon, I did not say that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will leave it to the reporter.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well; leave it to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reporter will read.

The Official Reporter (Fred A. Carlson) read as follows:

> Mr. WHEELER. I was going to say that if they had to follow the detailed report of the estimate then the provision giving them the right to transfer from one object to another would entirely upset the Budget estimate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was called out of the Senate Chamber and did not hear the beginning of the debate on this provision. I just listened to the reading of the statute by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and it seems to me to be inescapable, from a legal standpoint, that this bill, while in terms an

appropriation bill, becomes also a statute when passed, and to the extent to which it is inconsistent with any previous statute it pro tanto repeals that statute.

If the proviso which I heard referred to a moment ago—

Provided further, That the limitation on expenditures for purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles in the field service shall be interchangeable between the various bureaus and offices of the Department, to such extent as the exigencies of the service may require—

is taken in connection with the beginning of the section—

Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia—

it seems to me that the statute read by the Senator from Georgia has no efficacy whatever, because to the extent to which it is inconsistent with the provisions of this measure, when it shall have become a law, the statute will have no effect whatever. This measure will be the statute which will govern the conduct of the Department, and not any statute passed heretofore, which is repealed to the extent necessary by the language of the pending measure.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to say what I had in mind a moment ago, and I desire to know if I am correct in my statement. Let us assume that an estimate is made for 24 automobiles, and that it is specified where the automobiles are to be used in each individual case. If we place a provision in the law saying that the amount which is now contained in the estimate can be transferred from one bureau to another bureau in the Department, it means that they can upset the estimate by purchasing the automobiles for some division other than the one specified in the Budget estimate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana was undoubtedly discussing one provision of the bill and I was discussing another.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was discussing the amendment on page 92, and not the language relating to passenger-carrying vehicles on page 93. I said that under the language on page 92 they can transfer the funds for the purchase of automobiles anywhere they wish to in the Department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I beg the Senator's pardon. When I made my statement, I thought the Senator from Georgia was discussing the language on page 93.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language on page 92 specifically says that the funds must be used for the same object. They are interchangeable within the Department. The language on page 93 gives them wide discretion within the Department. But, Mr. President, I was doing something which was rather unusual in the Senate; I was discussing the amendment which was pending before the Senate, which is on page 92.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was going to ask the Senator about this rather shocking total of 18,000 or 19,000 automobiles operating under the Department. If there is any threat to gasoline rationing from the issuance of unlimited gasoline cards, would not these 19,000 automobiles, each one of which undoubtedly will travel under a so-called X card, represent the maximum hazard in that respect?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It leads me to observe, Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will permit me, that I think the O. P. A. makes a mistake by issuing so-called unlimited gasoline cards to anyone. I do not think there ought to be any X cards for anything or for anyone. Every card should be geared to the necessities of the man who gets it.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. If the O. P. A. would completely eliminate so-called unlimited cards, whether they are unlimited or not, and gear every card to the necessities of the man who gets it, they would not only save a great deal more gasoline but would obviate much argument and controversy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will go a step further than the Senator from Michigan has gone. I think a list of those who receive X cards should be made public. In each State a list of those who received X cards should be posted in front of the courthouse in every county and city.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since we have come to a discussion of X cards I may say that those of whom the Senator has been speaking who ride in Government automobiles and burn Government gas do not need X cards or any other sort of cards. Cabinet officers do not need X cards. The Vice President and the Speaker of the House do not need X cards. None of those who use Government gasoline have to have X cards, do they?

Mr. BYRD. I think everyone has to have some kind of a card.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], has made a reference to the Senator from Virginia which makes it appear that the Senator from Virginia has been a consistent opponent of agricultural appropriations. I wish to say that that is not a fair statement, and is not a correct statement, because there are many parts of the appropriation bills which I have never opposed. I have been strongly in favor of the soil-conservation program. Simply because I do not see eye to eye with the Senator from Georgia in the plans he favors for the progress and advancement of the farmer, he is attempting to classify me as an enemy of the farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. BYRD. I simply wish to make this statement, Mr. President, because time and time again those of us who rise on the floor of the Senate and state our conscientious convictions with respect to waste and extravagance which exist in departments of the Government are branded by some other Senator as being against the objective for which the expenditures are made. That is not correct. I have been a friend of the farmer all my life. I could not be in the Senate of the United States if I were against the farmer.

I represent an agricultural State, a great agricultural State, one of the greatest States in this Union in agriculture in the diversification of its different crops. It is a great trucking State, a great potato-producing State, a great apple-producing State, a large cattle-, wheat-, and corn-producing State. It produces as great a variety of different foods as does any other State in the Union.

I may say that I was elected to the State Senate of Virginia 27 years ago by a purely agricultural district. I have stood for what I believe to be the true and the best interests of the farmers of my State. That does not mean that I am going to support every extravagant proposal made here. That does not mean that I am going to close my eyes to the fact that $44,000,000 is being taken each year from the farmers of America in this extravagant plan of the A. A. A. It does not mean that. I am going to denounce extravagance wherever it may be, whether in the Department of Agriculture, the War Department, or in any other branch or department of the Government.

Mr. President, it is characteristic of some Senators that when some of us rise here and point to what is an obvious extravagance on the part of any department of the Government, we are then branded as being opposed in toto to the work the department is doing. I resent it. I do not think it is a fair criticism to make. I have made no criticism of the Senator from Georgia because of his advocacy of the things I oppose. When peace comes to this country, when the farmer has to meet the conditions which will exist after this war, I think that many of the things which have been done will be shown not to have been for the best interests of the farmers of America. Those are my conscientious views, and I have no apologies to make to anyone for them.

Mr. President, I say that the Department of Agriculture, while performing in many instances very valuable work for the farmers of this country, is extravagantly operated, notably in farm-security branch and the A. A. A., if we consider the overhead expense of the Department.

This does not apply to the old established branches of the Agricultural Department.

Without taking up too much of the time of the Senate, I wish to show some of the other extravagances—as I regard them—of the Department of Agriculture. I have before me a statement signed by Mr. Grover B. Hill, Acting Secretary of Agriculture. I say this in no particular criticism of the Department of Agriculture, as all the bureaus in Washington are extravagantly administered. In my judgment there is hardly a single bureau in Washington administered with anything approaching the efficiency of private business enterprise. Perhaps that is a fault inherent in our system of government, but it is true.

I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked him for the cost of the publicity activities of the Department. I do not mean information. Many of the departments attempt to classify publicity as "information." I asked him for the cost of publicity, and nothing else. I have before me the estimated expenditures for press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions for the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1942.

For giving notices to the press, $325,568 was spent for salaries. This is not an information service, except to the extent to which information as to some of the objectives of the Department of Agriculture is given through the medium of the press. In many instances it is propaganda. There is no question about it.

For radio, $159,008 was spent for salaries; for motion pictures, $133,733; and for electrical transcriptions, $11,679. The total estimated press, radio, motion-picture, and electrical-transcription expenditures for the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1942 were $823,700. That represents pure publicity, and nothing else, for that one Department. It is not claimed to be anything else but publicity.

I have before me a list of 667 employees engaged either wholly or partially in that activity. I ask unanimous consent, as part of my remarks, to have printed in the RECORD the statements to which I have referred, which were furnished to me by Grover B. Hill, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, including the letter sent by Mr. Hill, which is explanatory, and presents his side of the question. The statement shows the list of employees, and the salaries chargeable to the various publicity activities of the Department of Agriculture. The total is $823,700.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 27, 1942.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The attached tabulations give the information called for in that portion of your request of February 23, 1942, relating to expenditures for press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcription activities of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1942.

I have previously forwarded requested reports on expenditures for passenger cars and trucks and also for art consultants.

A short statement is attached showing the estimated salary, contractual service, and overhead expenditures chargeable to the specific information media. I have also had included, as requested, a list of employees, their salaries, and a brief description of the duties of each, whose entire or part-time duties are to prepare and distribute through the specified media information which will enable citizens to make use of the services carried on by this Department. Clerks, stenographers, and others (in the field and in Washington) carrying on office or other services in connection with information work are included, as well as those who actually prepare the information materials.

This report reflects a reduction in estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1942 for press and radio activities below the estimated expenditures on these media for the fiscal year submitted to your committee the past December. Several circumstances are responsible for the estimated reduction. Few replacements have been made of personnel who have transferred to other agencies or who have been called to the armed services, since qualified personnel have been hard to get; funds available for expenditure during the remainder of the fiscal year have been reduced, and the volume of matter issued has been reduced. Also, not listed in this report but figured in the December report were a number of technicians and administrative personnel who, in addition to their regular duties, prepare occasional press or radio material and on a few occasions grant a press interview about the operation of a particular phase of a bureau program in a specific locality. In no instance is more than 1 percent of their time so spent. The majority of these people are with the Forest Service and the Agricultural Marketing Administration. Forest Service, for example, previously reported technicians at the Madison (Wis.) Laboratory who write up the results of their research for trade journals. The estimated annual salary expenditure was $23,000 for this purpose. These technicians are not listed in this report as information personnel and the $23,000 expenditure is not shown.

I want to report to your committee that we have centered the information work of the Department through press, radio, motion pictures, and all other media on the war job of helping farmers and other citizens play their full part in the war program.

The war job of American farmers is the production of food for freedom, and also many strategic and critical war materials other than food. The war job of the Department of Agriculture is to help farmers produce these things. Press, radio, motion pictures, and other media are employed in getting the facts to farmers about the national goals for each farm product, the reasons why the goals are established at the levels announced, the price supports proclaimed under the law, the arrangements for Government help in obtaining labor, machinery, and supplies, the arrangements made for new market outlets, and other information that will help producers to turn out the greatest amount per hour of man labor.

Food needs of the United Nations require new and better farming methods. How-to-do-it type of releases giving scientific recommendations for efficient farming are supplied the rural press through Extension editors in every State. Much of the information materials originate in the Department field offices throughout the country so that they may carry the most pertinent and valuable locally adapted information to farmers in each community.

Eating the right food to keep fit is the foundation of high wartime health for the whole population. Building that foundation requires widespread distribution of information on how to use the available foods in making the most nutritious diet for the family. It also requires distribution of information on how to produce from town and farm gardens and from farm flocks and herds the foods required to round out the family diet. Every family producing part or all of its needed food relieves the strain on the Nation's transportation and distribution system and makes available more food for our Allies.

Farm families and city families must be informed of impending shortages on consumption goods caused by converting American industry from civilian production to war production and instructed in how to substitute for the civilian goods no longer available and how to conserve the goods that cannot be replaced or substituted for. We use press and radio in carrying on this wartime job.

These and similar responsibilities are carried by the information workers as a part of the Department's wartime work.

The transfer of certain agencies from Washington delayed the submission of this complete report. I will be glad, of course, to forward any additional material your committee would like to have.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Secretary.

[Enclosures.]

Estimated press, radio, motion-picture, and electrical transcription expenditures for the Department of Agriculture during fiscal year 1942

Media	Salary costs	Contractual service expenditures	Other overhead costs	Total
Press	$325,568	$16,084	$22,344	$364,896
Radio	159,008	250	15,375	174,633
Motion pictures	133,733	50,466	78,110	262,309
Electrical transcriptions	11,679	4,666	5,517	21,862
Total	629,988	72,366	121,346	823,700

667 employees.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Darrow, Wayne H	$7,000	$1,050	Director. To plan, direct, and be responsible for the informational activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.
McCormick, James H	4,000	400	Assistant to the Director. To assist the Director in carrying out functions of Division.
DuFrane, Beatrice A	2,040	306	Secretary to the Director.
Pieper, Daisy M	1,620	162	Secretary to the Assistant to the Director.
Lamphere, Willard H	4,800	1,680	Chief of Regional Contact Section. To plan and direct field activities.
Sill, V. R	4,400	1,320	To plan and direct visual programs for administration.
Collin, Carleton W	2,600	910	To prepare special articles, radio talks, news items, etc.
Poole, Gregory	2,600	780	To assist in conceiving and developing visual information programs for the administration.
Levine, Charles J	2,600	2,600	Motion-picture photographer.
Scoular, Grillett	2,400	960	To initiate and create free-hand drawings for mats, posters, publications, etc.
Flax, David M	2,300	460	Do.
Doyle, Merrill D	2,300	230	Do.
Schatt, Roy	2,000	200	Do.
Clinkinbeard, Celia P	1,860	651	Secretary to Chief of Regional Contact Section.
Dornhoefer, Viola C	1,800	360	Assistant clerk-stenographer. To take and transcribe dictation; to prepare correspondence on own initiative.
Goldberg, Bettye L	1,620	405	Do.
Mayo, Richard F	1,440	144	Classifies and catalogs photographic prints.
Lewis, Harold R	4,250	2,763	Chief of Publication, Press, and Radio (part of year).
Overby, Kermit O	3,800	2,280	To prepare addresses, press releases, and interpretive materials.
Roberts, Joyce O	4,000	2,400	Do.
Olson, Kenneth W	3,200	1,920	To prepare press releases and other material for publication.
Gilbertson, G. Herman	853	85	Do.
Richter, Jay J	2,861	1,717	Do.
Bernhard, Charles H	3,000	1,800	Do.
Booth, A. Lea	2,600	1,560	Do.
Heinen, Ray W	1,624	1,299	Do.
Thompson, Seth	2,600	1,560	Do.
McMahon, James E	1,308	654	Do.
Mills, Lillian G	1,710	1,026	Secretary to Chief of Publication, Press, and Radio Section.
Bordow, Ruth A	1,592	955	Assistant clerk-stenographer. To take and transcribe dictation; to prepare correspondence on own initiative.
Mowrer, S. Ethel	1,740	174	Obtain information to prepare releases and other information material.
Atkinson, Adolph A	1,440	72	To maintain ready reference file on press and radio material.
Myers, Charles T., Jr	2,933	879	As Chief of Administrative Section responsible for budgets, personnel, purchases, supplies, distribution, and other administrative matters.
McCarten, Mary E	1,750	88	Aid in preparation of budgets, initiate personnel actions, and other administrative matters.
Sabatini, Bernice G	1,620	162	Preparation of travel vouchers in connection with radio and motion pictures.
Eastman, Viola A	1,440	576	Distribution clerk for information materials.
Divelbiss, Phyllis M	1,440	864	Stenographer working on press releases, addresses, and other information material.
Galvin, Catherine D	1,440	144	Do.
Knox, Cornelia	1,440	360	Do.
Cupps, Florence L	1,440	144	Do.
Morrissey, Marie E	1,440	792	Do.
Rapchinsky, Adele A	1,440	144	Typist working on press releases, addresses, and other informational material.
Gulliver, Dorothy E	1,440	216	Do.
Seidel, Edward J	1,915	1,054	Responsible for purchase of supplies and equipment and the ordering of materials.
Herman, Leonard	1,620	810	Distribution clerk for informational materials.
Orshack, John	1,570	628	Purchase clerk and responsible for recording machine.
Howard, George	1,525	1,525	Distribution clerk on motion pictures.
Diener, Marion J	1,530	228	Stenographer working on press releases, addresses, and other informational material.
Chifotides, Helen	1,570	158	Preparation of requisitions for mimeograph and printed material.
Flaherty, Francis	190	190	Motion-picture specialist.
Dryden, Burke	448	157	Multilith operator for informational material.
Shegogue, Raymond	1,344	134	Distribution clerk for informational material.
Flaherty, Robert J	1,837	1,837	Motion-picture director.
Peterson, Edgar A	1,404	1,404	Do.
Burnford, Paul H. M	3,194	3,194	Do.
Griswold, Oliver	4,066	4,066	Motion-picture specialist.
Scott, Walter K	1,975	1,975	Motion-picture photographer.
Parlett, Barbara G	576	576	Motion-picture distribution clerk.
Riley, William J	682	68	Distribution clerk for informational materials.
Faucette, William A	840	840	Inspecting and shipping motion-picture prints.
DuMars, Maurice L	1,034	723	To plan and direct radio informational material.
Clark, Harry P	2,122	1,273	Prepare and write press releases and informational materials.
Everett, Evelyn M	337	201	Assistant clerk-stenographer. To take and transcribe dictation; to prepare correspondence on own initiative.
Gordon, Harriett E	972	583	Secretary to Chief of Press-Radio Section.
Webster, R. Lyle	2,595	1,558	Chief of Publications, Press, and Radio Section; responsible for materials for the press and interpretative material.
Arthur, Helen E	548	329	Stenographic work consisting o. typing speeches and press releases.
Abel, Ashley	2,600	2,600	Motion-picture photographer.
Baldwin, Harold W	4,750	1,851	Regional representative of the Northeast region to carry on a news service reflecting the news policies, and work of the administration and the formulation of informational programs.
Bennett, Elinore C	1,620	648	Secretary to regional representative o. the Northeast regional office.
Hartline, Jack R	3,200	640	To prepare special articles, radio talks, and news items; to contact cooperating agencies in furthering information services.
Hogan, Tom	4,600	4,600	Motion-picture director.
Lomasney, Eileen D	1,620	405	Secretary to regional representative of western regional office.
MacDermid, John L	3,800	1,520	To prepare special articles, radio talks, and news items; to contact cooperating agencies in furthering information services.
Nikkel, Earll H	3,200	960	Do.
Reynolds, James E	3,450	1,035	Do.
Clark, Harry P	1,583	474	Regional representative of the East Central region to carry on a news service reflecting the aims, policies, and the work of the administration, and the formulation of informational programs.
Ewing, Quincy	3,200	960	To prepare special articles, radio talks, and news items; to contact cooperating agencies in furthering information services.
Robertson, Donald L	2,533	760	Regional representative of the southern region to carry on a news service reflecting the aims, policies, and work of the administration and the formulation of informational programs (part of year).
Van Dongen, Helen V. R	915	915	Motion-picture specialist.
Howle, Sarah F	1,620	486	Secretary to regional representative of the southern region.
Bush, Guy L	5,150	1,287	Representative of western region to carry on news service reflecting aims, policies, and work of administration, and formulation of informational programs.
Murray, Beatrice A	1,680	420	Secretary to regional representative of North Central region.
Hedge, Porter M	1,645	658	Regional representative of the North Central region to carry on a news service reflecting the aims, policies, and work of the administration and the formulation of information programs (part of year).
Hook, James W	1,112	445	To prepare special articles, radio talks, and news items to contact cooperating agencies in furthering information services.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION—continued

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Roelofs, Garritt E	$4,600	$1,840	Regional representative of the southern region to carry on a news service reflecting the aims, policies, and work of the administration and the formulation of informational programs (part of year).
Hancock, Carl	4,000	4,000	Prepare material for press.
Arnold, Harold	3,950	395	Do.
3 mimeograph operators	3,780	3,495	Process releases.
Einstein, Robert S	3,800	2,850	See note.
Ahlswede, Lester H	2,600	1,040	Do.
Burson, Marion M	2,300	920	Do.
Salzarulo, Frank	2,600	1,560	Do.
Campbell, Harry	1,278	959	Do.
Evans, Paul L	2,600	1,430	Do.
Riley, William J	742	482	Do.
Kennedy, Thomas D	2,600	910	Do.
Smaltz, Eugene A	1,800	990	Do.
Aspleaf, Harry D	2,600	940	Do.
Carlson, Robert W	2,300	1,185	Do.
Brigham, David L	2,600	980	Do.
Kent, Stanley R	2,000	1,200	Do.
Jones, Richard D	1,800	350	Do.
Norberg, Donald A	3,200	1,280	Do.
Frederickson, H. M	2,600	1,560	Do.
Condon, George E	1,800	1,260	Do.
Bangerter, John G	2,600	1,430	Do.
Moffitt, Cyril L	2,300	920	Do.
Stewart, William E	2,000	1,100	Do.
Welch, John D	1,800	900	Do.
Haynes, Kit H	2,300	1,380	Do.
Yarbrough, William G	2,600	1,560	Do.
Jackson, Pendleton	2,900	1,160	Do.
Watson, Leighton G	2,600	1,560	Do.
Chestnutt, Robert R	2,000	600	Do.
Copeland, E. W., Jr	2,900	725	Do.
Tubbs, John P	2,600	1,170	Do.
Price, Charles W., Jr	2,300	690	Do.
Hurst, Fred J	3,000	1,050	Do.
Leigh, Robert T	2,000	1,000	Do.
Ludrick, Jack N	2,600	1,170	Do.
McCully, John D	2,600	1,170	Do.
Alexander, Bob R	2,000	660	Do.
Livingston, James S	2,600	940	Do.
Alder, Fagan D	2,000	600	Do.
Schonborn, Jack R	2,600	910	Do.
Daly, Walter J	2,600	1,430	Do.
Crouse, Charles H	2,600	650	Do.
Maupin, Donald F	2,600	650	Do.
Solson, H. Rex	2,000	1,000	Do.
Denny, John L	2,300	805	Do.
Mangum, Milton	2,600	940	Do.
Arneson, Eadore A	2,000	700	Do.
Hinckley, John T	320	96	Do.

NOTE.—State office assistants. Under general supervision to search for, select, assemble, and clarify information related to Agricultural Adjustment Agency programs as contained in county, State, and National reports and records of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, and from publications, speeches, press releases, pamphlets, circulars from the Department of Agriculture, and from information received from contact with agricultural leaders; to outline and prepare this material in form for use by agricultural groups; to make critical examination of inquiries received and prepare proper replies and to perform such other duties as may be assigned. In addition to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency work State office assistants devote considerable time to informational programs required by U. S. D. A. war boards.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY AND ENGINEERING

Teuton, Frank L	$5,600	$560	Supervisory, in charge of information preparation and dissemination.
Gapen, Charles E	5,200	2,080	Supervision, selection, and preparation of material.
Ervin, Guy	3,200	160	Editorial and some preparation work.
Cramer, Lucille	1,750	350	Office work—records, contacts; secretary to chief of unit.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Carmody, Catherine C	$2,160	$108	Editor of Inside BAE.
DeVries, Peter H	4,550	137	Editor, Commodity Situations.
George, Frank F	4,600	920	Editor, Agricultural Situation, and economic writer.
Johnson, William Bert	3,800	190	Agricultural planning writer.
Kheel, Ann S	2,250	68	Do.
Smith, Russell	5,600	280	Head of Information Division.
Youngman, Wilbur H	3,800	38	Visual information specialist.
Addison, Alice M	2,275	23	Draftsman for press material.
Narpp, Sara K	1,620	97	Clerk-typist for press and radio material.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Sandstrom, M. M	$5,600	$1,120	Administrative, in charge of information preparation of material.
Rowell, E. J	4,600	3,250	Radio and administrative.
Henderson, H. W	4,341	434	Editorial and publications.
Perdue, Phil	2,482	869	Press and publications.
Leaming, Miss	1,950	391	Publications.
Towers, Jack	2,935	2,348	Radio work.
Sisco, Miss	2,076	1,557	Do.
Runkle, Mrs	2,076	208	Clerical and administrative work for Information Section.
Hammelman, Miss	1,845	185	Clerical and secretarial for Information Section.
Stueckradt, Miss	1,560	78	Clerical for Information Section.
Larson, Miss	1,500	150	Do.
Meadows, Roy	1,080	378	Messenger for Information Section.
Hooks, Lance G	3,200	2,560	Assembling and distribution of market news.
Silverman, Miss T	1,500	1,125	Do.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE—continued

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Eshbach, C. E	$1,700	$1,530	Assembling and distribution of market news and other agricultural information.
Fleming, P	1,200	1,080	Do.
Stubbs, Miss	800	560	Do.
Roquemore, Perry C	1,300	78	Market News (publication).
Frugh, A. E	3,800	114	Do.
Kingsbury, F. O	1,750	105	Do.
Keyes, Rosa	1,020	40	Do.
McDowell, A. M	3,300	165	Do.
Schneider, William E	1,590	128	Do.
Thomas, Miss Florence	1,620	64	Do.
McCampbell, F. H	4,150	291	Do.
French, H. W	3,800	280	Do.
Gifford, Mrs. Nannie	1,740	105	Do.
Morris, Bryce	3,300	264	Do.
Carson, Beulah M	1,620	65	Do.
Stambaugh, Aaron	2,300	69	Do.
Dunagin, George	3,800	266	Do.
Doss, Frances	1,680	101	Do.
Surry, B. E	3,200	192	Do.
Harlan, A. D	3,300	1,320	Assembling and distribution of market news.
Crow, Mrs. Julia	1,620	648	Do.
Smith, David	3,200	292	Do.
Poole, W. R	1,680	64	Do.
Campbell, J. S	4,800	384	Market News (publication).
Goodman, Fannie	1,680	101	Do.
Thomas, M. M	3,300	198	Do.
Simpson, F. R	3,400	170	Do.
Hess, E. K	3,800	228	Do.
Paugh, C	1,980	96	Do.
Woodruff, L. M	3,100	155	Do.
Rufenacht, H. O	1,680	67	Do.
Paden, A. R	3,200	288	Do.
Fuller, K. J	1,620	81	Do.
Urban, K. L	3,800	266	Do.
Frins, Betty A	1,620	81	Do.
Hale, J. D	3,500	315	Do.
Wells, Carrol	1,680	117	Do.
Gibson, L. O	3,000	210	Do.
Kirkland, R. P	1,440	72	Do.
Fundis, G. B	3,000	300	Do.
Tafflinger, G. E	1,620	97	Do.
Smith, David L	2,700	324	Do.
Russell, S. W	3,300	231	Do.
Harrison, W. E	3,200	256	Do.
Foster, M. T	3,400	272	Do.
Cicero, Rose E	1,440	86	Do.
Higgins, E. S	3,200	160	Do.
Kelley, Rose E	1,980	116	Do.
Henning, M. E	2,600	352	Do.
Lannan, W. E	1,620	97	Do.
Bredin, A. K	2,700	81	Do.
Christensen, G. W	3,800	1,178	Do.
Westerdahl, D. T	3,800	456	Do.
Finander, Doris E	1,920	135	Do.
Corbin, R. E	3,400	680	Distribution of market news.
Webber, Rose	1,680	252	Market News (publication).
McWhinney, Ted	1,860	149	Do.
Orr, E. A	3,500	875	Do.
Thomas, Lillian	1,860	260	Do.
Bruce, Charles	3,800	342	Do.
Osborn, L. H	1,980	118	Do.
Ryan, R. J	3,000	240	Do.
Salisbury, Laura E	1,440	72	Do.
Schoolcraft, C. D	3,300	495	Do.
Cast, Charlotte	1,500	225	Do.
Cummins, D. G	4,600	368	Do.
Goldshlager, Frances	1,980	118	Do.
Champlin, L. F	4,800	240	Do.
Keller, Jay C	3,200	256	Do.
Mosier, W. H	3,300	264	Do.
Tieman, Annie	1,860	112	Do.
Skeffington, L. T	3,200	352	Do.
Blackman, Jack	1,620	146	Do.
Butts, T. R	2,700	216	Do.
Frazier, Marion	1,680	84	Do.
Richardson, E. H	2,900	145	Do.
Zahowiek, J. R	1,620	81	Do.
Swenson, T. T	3,100	341	Do.
Bergwin, Mary M	1,800	216	Do.
Harris, C. M	3,500	105	Do.
Gettz, Myra B	1,800	36	Do.
Sutton, R. L	3,800	190	Do.
Coppus, John P	2,700	189	Do.
Leonard, Ann	1,980	99	Do.
McWhorter, Clyde	3,800	342	Do.
Duke, Alam	1,680	101	Do.
Larson, Harry	2,900	261	Do.
Boyce, Naomi L	960	58	Do.
McLendon, Frank	3,800	304	Do.
Richardson, Hattie	1,680	84	Do.
Gohmert, S. H	3,800	152	Do.
Smeby, Warren	3,200	288	Do.
Pope, Rose E	1,980	119	Do.
Byerly, S. L	2,900	290	Do.
Cook, L. E	1,860	148	Do.
Ellison, G. L	1,025	102	Do.
Bray, Stephen	3,300	264	Do.
Lindstrom, Ina L	1,620	114	Do.
Cudmore, W. B., Jr	2,000	200	Do.
Posey, Margaret	480	48	Do.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Burch, D. S.	$5,100	$1,275	Administration, editing, and writing.
Erskine, Ralph	3,275	1,310	Writing and editing.
Smith, Ada L.	2,875		Editing.
Allen, R. S.	2,875	431	Exhibit and visual work.
Sands, Laura A.	1,980	158	Correspondence and records for press.
Pipes, Edith G.	1,965	196	Correspondence and office management for press and radio.
Elkins, Ersie M.	1,845		Proofreading for information material.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATION

Dorsey, R. Corbin	$4,600	$690	Senior administrative officer, writing of market reports, and special articles.
Alexander, Lorraine	1,860	279	Secretarial, typing reports, routine correspondence for Information Section.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Dunn, Read, Jr.	$4,600	$2,300	Preparation and dissemination of information for the press.
Brennan, Blanche	2,100	1,050	Administrative and public relations activities.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Richardson, L. S.	$4,800	$720	In charge of information and editorial matters, which includes editing and clearing popular and technical manuscripts, writing addresses, special statements, and annual and quarterly reports on Bureau's work to meet numerous requests.
Metcalf, M.	1,860	279	General clerical work, such as typing manuscripts and clearing publications, handling correspondence requests for information, telephone requests, and information files.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Annand, P. N.	$8,000	$40	Reviewing and approving information materials.
Hoyt, A. S.	7,250	36	Do.
Rohwer, S. A.	7,500	38	Do.
Bishopp, F. C.	6,500	33	Do.
Popham, W. L.	6,500	33	Do.
Spencer, F. H.	6,400	32	Do.
Hyslop, J. A.	6,000	1,200	Approval for subject matter for information material.
Marshall, Nellie M.	1,980	594	Stenographic and clerical work for Information Section.

EXTENSION SERVICE

McClure, Harry B.	$3,475	$3,475	Motion-picture director and editor.
Gilbert, Raymond	1,593	1,593	Principal title photographer.
Payne, Seymour B.	1,334	1,334	Title draftsman and assistant title photographer.
Evans, Raymond	4,950	4,950	Chief of Information Section.
Lindstrom, C. A.	4,550	4,550	Associate chief of section.
Vacancy	1,150	1,150	Motion-picture specialist (originates and develops new ideas for the popular presentation of agricultural subjects in motion-picture form)
Vermont, Boris	894	894	Motion-picture director.
Scott, Walter	950	950	Assistant in motion-picture production.
Rogers, Edwin L.	53	53	Motion-picture narrator.
Vickers, Lee E.	127	127	Do.
Blair, Frank S.	42	42	Do.
Romero, Amada	11	11	Do.
Marquez, Gregorio	32	32	Do.
Concepcion, Gilberto	32	32	Do.
McDonald, Arch	106	106	Do.
Vacancies (3)	527	527	Do.
Owen, Nancy	21	21	Motion-picture actress.
Emerson, Mary	21	21	Do.
Goergens, George R.	2,305	2,305	In charge of laboratory.
Sloat, Harry K.	2,900	2,900	Senior film technician.
Ford, Reuben	1,787	1,787	Sound technician.
Ricker, Maurice	2,675	2,675	Motion-picture editor.
Carrello, Calle A.	1,722	1,722	Motion-picture cameraman and senior film technician.
Baldwin, Alice B.	2,675	2,675	Chief clerk of section.
Sintzenich, Arthur H. C.	961	961	Motion Picture Section.
Turvey, Carl F.	1,528	1,528	Motion-picture cameraman and technician.
Potter, George E.	1,279	1,279	Assistant sound technician.
Brown, Myrtle A.	2,181	2,181	In charge of film distribution.
Davis, Joseph W.	1,334	1,334	Assistant motion-picture cameraman and film technician.
Boswell, Ruth E.	1,139	1,139	Film editorial clerk.
Kellogg, Maude D.	1,165	1,165	Do.
Schlinger, Alice A.	982	982	Budget, personnel, and record clerk for information material.
Alford, James E.	785	785	Do.
Howe, Stanley M.	1,090	1,090	Secretary to Chief, Information Section.
O'Dea, Elsie E.	1,712	1,712	Secretary to Associate Chief and Chief.
Tourek, Violet M.	491	491	Secretary to Associate Chief.
Barstow, Wade M.	396	396	Film-distribution clerk.
Parlett, Barbara G.	1,083	1,083	Do.
Hurley, Elizabeth S.	1,620	1,620	Stenographer and file clerk for Information Section.
Urciola, Paul A.	1,072	1,072	In charge of inspection and film technician.
Moses, Henry B.	450	450	In charge of film library service.
Trumble, Robert	405	405	Film-distribution clerk.
Vacancy	360	360	Film-distribution stenographer.
Hill, Gordon D.	635	635	In charge of inspection and film technician.
Newsom, Jack	831	831	Shipping clerk for Information Section.
Geiss, Jarry J.	568	568	Do.
Sanders, Joseph J.	815	815	Film inspector for Information Section.
Pasciuto, Joseph	305	305	Do.
Johnson, Charles	353	353	Motion-picture projectionist.
Madson, Max T.	403	403	Do.
Miller, Harold D.	571	571	Do.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

EXTENSION SERVICE—continued

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Moore, Albert S	$183	$183	Messenger for Information Section.
Machrone, Thomas J	904	904	Messenger, film inspector.
Vacancy	270	270	Messenger for Information Section.
Fulghum, R. M	4,825	386	In charge Information Division.
Thacker, A. E	2,700	270	Principal clerk Information Section.
Burgess, J. A	1,680	168	Stenographer for Information Section.
Ramsey, M. L	1,980	198	Assistant clerk photographic library.
Caughey, A. B	1,500	75	Junior clerk, photographic library.
Ackerman, G. W	2,800	280	Chief photographer.
Hunton, E. C	2,100	105	Senior photographer.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mackenzie, D. R	$4,600	$253	To initiate, plan, develop, layout, write, and produce publications and information programs involving the use of written and visual materials for all available media.
Eve, J. Lovelace	2,300	150	Do.
McCammon, Beryle	2,000	70	Editorial and research.
Morley, Helen	2,000	30	Illustrations for information section.
Rist, Inez B	1,620	48	Clerk stenographer for information section.
Stone, Virginia H	1,620	56	Do.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Marquis, J. C	$6,000	$300	In charge. Principal information duty is in preparing and transmitting special information for other Government agencies. Half of time is engaged as adviser, foreign agricultural relations, international agreements, organizations, and post war planning
Schaben, L. J	3,300	165	Handling foreign information, inquiries of State Department, collection of information for war agencies, preparation of confidential reports on foreign agricultural conditions and general correspondence from Members of Congress and the public
Braiovich, L	1,440	72	Secretary to the Head of Division.

FOREST SERVICE

Parkinson, Dana	$6,200	$124	Chie. of Washington Office Information.
Duthie, George A	5,400	540	Chief of Education Section in office.
Hood, Ramona B	1,860	186	Clerical work for information material.
Clancy, Carl S	4,000	4,000	Produces motion pictures.
McDonald, Charles	4,000	4,000	Do.
James, Virginia	1,620	1,620	Clerical work for information material.
Randall, Charles	4,800	2,400	Chief of Information Section.
Pitt, Elizabeth S	4,000	2,000	Education adviser on women's conservation programs.
Smith, W. S	4,000	3,200	Articles for farm magazines and other material.
Bergoffen, W. W	3,200	3,200	Farm and Home Hour scripts.
MacDonald, G. A	3,800	3,040	Articles on special projects.
Rowe, Dorothy	2,000	600	Articles on Farm Flashes and other assigned material.
Hessel, Joseph N	3,800	456	Writes, writes scenarios, publications.
Phillips, Margaret	1,980	1,030	Clerical work for Information Section.
Campbell, L. A	4,800	1,056	Regional chief of Information and Education Division.
Swan, K. D	3,400	544	In charge visual education.
Bullard, Ida S	1,920	250	Clerical work for Information Section.
Johnson, Fred R	5,200	624	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education.
Shoemaker, L. C	2,800	448	Assistant to division chief.
Coulter, Rosalee	1,980	495	Clerical work for Information Section.
King, Rex	5,800	348	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education.
Dwire, Carroll	4,100	492	Assistant, division chief.
Jones, Irene	2,040	244	Clerical work for Information Section.
Mains, Guy	4,400	2,200	Educational work, fire prevention, especially in southern Idaho.
Porter, Wilford	3,500	1,750	Writing and editorial work.
Olsen, C. J	5,800	696	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education.
Koziol, Felix C	4,000	920	Assistant division chief.
Sorensen L. M	1,860	261	Clerical work for Information Section.
Hutchinson, W. I	5,800	754	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education.
Broksch, M. B	2,160	237	Clerical work for Information Section.
Phillips, P. P	1,800	360	Do.
Daigle, R. D	2,800	980	Assistant division chief.
Kuhns, John	5,800	696	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education
Griffith, George E	4,200	714	Assistant division chief.
Morton, Emma H	2,200	242	Clerical work for Information Section.
Bailey, Edith	1,560	171	Do.
Connolly, Frank	4,000	600	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education.
Gordon, Helen W	2,700	675	Conservation programs for women's clubs.
Leech, Florence	1,620	211	Clerical work for Information Section.
Davis, Clint	3,800	646	In charge of Section of Information and Education.
Barbour, W. R	3,400	306	Assistant head of section.
Parr, Ruby L	1,680	252	Clerical work for Information Section.
DeJarnette, Tennie	2,600	208	Conservation programs for women's clubs.
Howell, Ruth C	1,620	194	Clerical work for Information Section.
Isola, Vico	3,800	228	Regional chief, Division of Information and Education.
Blair, Maurice	1,860	149	Clerical work for Information Section.
March-Mount, M	3,200	640	Conservation programs for women's clubs.
Hafemeister, A	1,680	336	Clerical work for Information Section.
Perry, E. L	4,800	816	In charge of Information and Education Section.
Dundis, E. K	1,920	192	Clerical work for Information Section.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mobley, Clay	$4,600	$230	Preparing dramatic scripts for educational transcriptions, and other radio material explaining the benefits of cooperative organizations.
Kuipers, Josephine	1,660	1,660	Distributing records of above programs, which are circulated to about 600 stations.
Price, Frances	1,480	1,480	Do.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION—continued

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Hoag, W. G	$4,000	$880	General extension and educational activities in connection with the cooperative credit institutions and cooperative marketing, purchasing, and business service organizations.
Fuhs, Catherine	1,660	83	Do.
Reid, E. B	8,500	2,125	Do.
Hollabaugh, Beall	2,160	108	Do.
Sherman, Val C	4,600	460	Do.
Hardy, Catherine	1,770	89	Do.
Randell, C. G	6,200	1,550	Cooperative research and service livestock specialist.
Mitchell, R. G	1,860	93	Secretary for information work.
Scott, Walter	2,800	1,560	Full-time, part-year, filming, directing, and editing motion pictures.
Ortlieb, George	2,600	780	Do.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Beers, Marvin	$3,800	$3,040	Chief of Radio Section.
Bryan, Jack H	5,055	1,011	Directs activities of Division.
Burr, Charles	2,700	54	Prepares and assembles material.
Conaway, Orin B	1,155	35	Do.
Dick, Gerry	3,482	1,741	Do.
Fox, Frances	2,267	1,927	Prepares and assembles material for radio.
Garside, Edward	2,780	139	Prepares and assembles material.
Goding, Harriet	2,441	195	Do.
Lloyd, Carl	1,810	36	Do.
Patterson, Alice E	944	28	Types informational material.
Putney, Bryant	971	49	Supervises information specialists.
Stahl, Joseph	1,190	12	Prepares and assembles material.
Brown, Philip S	2,107	126	Assists Director of Information.
Thompson, Shelby	2,325	209	Supervises information specialists.
McKinney, Edna	964	19	Types informational material.
McMillan, Virginia	1,329	51	Prepares and assembles material.
Zlotnick, Sylvia	1,541	31	Types informational material and answers phones.
Clevelan , Harlan	1,716	86	Prepares and assembles material.
Fischer, John	2,737	192	Directs activities of Division.
Gilbert, Mildred	1,786	71	Supervises typing of informational material.
McConnell, Leslie	824	25	Prepares and assembles material.
Schill, Ruth	2,934	352	Do.
Evans, Eva Knox	550	6	Do.
Bennett, Nellie	1,800	180	Prints photos for reproduction.
Cassell, Charles	1,800	180	Do.
Daley, Mary Rita	1,605	321	Selects photos or publication.
Lettau, Bernard	2,025	203	Prints photos for reproduction.
Older, Andrew	830	83	Selecting, editing, captioning photos, and preparing explanatory statements.
Stryker, Roy E	5,750	575	Supervision of section.
Adams, Mark	1,111	111	Selecting, editing, captioning photos, and preparing explanatory statements.
McGrady, Patrick J	2,300	805	Supervises region I information office, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Hewlett, Gregory	2,300	805	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Banfield, Edward	2,900	1,595	Do.
McDonald, John F	1,692	254	Do.
Goldstein, Sabina	1,620	243	Preparing material and answering inquiries.
Pastore, Mary J	1,350	68	Typing informational material.
Brown, Philip	966	174	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Older, Julia	1,082	379	Do.
Garside, Edward	1,691	85	Do.
Isaksen, Elmer	3,800	2,280	Supervising region II, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Jones, Lloyd W	2,396	1,378	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Hill, Christine S	1,800	360	Preparing material and answering inquiries.
Hartl, Jane C	1,440	115	Typing informational material.
Picard, Ralph	4,600	2,300	Supervising region III, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Day, Ledford	3,200	1,440	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Kimberly, Daisy W	900	54	Do.
McBride, Wilma S	1,440	43	Typing informational material.
Dilworth, Donald	1,092	164	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Johnston, William W	1,441	432	Preparing material and answering inquiries.
Trapnell, Edward R	2,600	1,092	Region IV, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Thompson, Marshall	3,370	2,292	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Tracy, Leonard	2,128	958	Do.
Doak, Eleanor D	1,809	1,266	Do.
Honeycutt, Margaret	1,485	163	Typing, keeping records.
Kendrick, Bertie B	1,280	64	Typing informational material.
Collier, Edward T	4,600	2,760	Region V, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Dent, William H	3,600	1,440	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Stoney, George C	2,174	935	Do.
Johnson, Miriam	1,530	352	Typing, keeping records.
Blackman, Elizabeth	1,320	66	Typing informational material.
Henderson, J. Lewis	3,255	1,302	Supervising region VI information office.
Rutland, Eugene	3,600	1,872	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Smith, Joy	1,800	774	Preparing material, answering inquiries.
Taylor, Elva	945	151	Typing, keeping records.
Wolf, George	1,900	760	Region VI, supervising, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Crawford, Sophia	508	51	Typing informational material.
Lynn, Floyd H	3,800	2,090	Region VII, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Edwards, Evan	2,900	2,088	Handling contracts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Ryan, Joseph V	1,400	210	Do.
Reckmeyer, Margaret	1,500	555	Preparing material, answering inquiries.
Dieh, Irene H	1,440	101	Typing, keeping records.
Ritchey, June M	840	42	Typing informational material.
Purnell, John	3,800	2,090	Supervising region VIII information office.
Herron, Leonard	2,300	1,265	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Nay, Zona	1,500	405	Typing, keeping records.
Soule, Frederick R	4,100	2,050	Region IX, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Albee, Ernest S	2,900	1,885	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Klee, Victor	600	78	Preparing material, answering inquiries.
Winebrenner, Ralph	2,300	1,035	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Harris, Elizabeth L	1,800	1,116	Preparing material, answering questions.
Thunen, Margaret	1,260	126	Typing, keeping records.
Paxton, Susanna H	495	40	Preparing material, answering inquiries.
Tolbert, William H	3,300	1,485	Region X, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Wilson, Duane	2,600	390	Super. Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—continued

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
O'Rourke, William	$2,027	$1,115	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Stahl, Catherine	1,800	846	Preparing material, answering inquiries.
Costello, Gladys	1,400	210	Information work in northern area.
Lyons, Isabelle C	812	97	Typing and keeping records.
Staats, Wilbur	4,750	2,375	Region XI, handling contacts, inquiries and preparing material.
Clemes, William W	1,432	501	Handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Maughn, Helen	1,800	846	Do.
Platt, Rhoada F	1,440	139	Typing and keeping records.
Wilkinson, Garford L	3,800	2,280	Region XII, handling contacts, inquiries, and preparing material.
Mueller, Olga	820	139	Typing and keeping records.
Mazzoranna, Rafael Torres	2,177	697	Region XIII, handling contacts, inquiries and preparing material.

BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

Van Deman, Ruth	$4,150	$2,200	In charge information work of Bureau including weekly radio broadcasts, National Farm and Home Hour, on such subjects as food, nutrition, textiles, clothing, household equipment, family budgets.
Davis, Emily C	1,620	640	Preparing releases and magazine articles, providing information to representatives of the press.
Van Horn, Elma K	2,540	2,029	Writing consumer information material on effective buying and use of food and other materials, for use in newspapers, magazines, and on radio.
Hoseit, Mildred	1,614	113	In charge of photographic files.
Horsey, Irma G	1,920	576	Secretarial and clerical work.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Salisbury, Morse	$8,000	$3,200	Director of Information.
Tharin, Whitney	5,600	5,600	Chief of Press Service.
Charles, William K	4,600	4,600	Assistant Chief of Press Service—writing, editing, supervision.
Smith, Palmer	3,800	3,800	Scientific writing.
Smith, Katharine A	3,800	3,800	Research writing; particularly supplemented by pictures.
Tate, John	2,132	2,132	General writing and editing.
White, Leslie	3,200	3,200	Research writing, particularly for weekly press.
Wharton, Edna H	3,200	3,200	Home economics—writing and editing.
Forsythe, William J	3,200	3,200	Illustrations and photographs.
Briscoe, Sherman	2,600	2,600	Research writing for Negro press.
Hill, Ira B	2,300	2,300	Clerical work for Information Section.
Arnold, Alice	2,200	2,200	Daily Digest editor.
Bingham, Russell B	2,000	2,000	Clerical work for Information Section.
Phelps, Edna	1,980	1,980	Do.
Collins, June Y	1,620	1,620	Stenographic work for Information Section.
Large, Orville	1,620	1,620	Clerical work for Information Section.
Strickland, Louise	1,620	1,620	Stenographic work for Information Section.
Dieter, Dorothy M	1,440	1,440	Do.
Messenger	1,080	1,080	Messenger, operating mimeograph machine.
Mimeograph operator	1,260	1,260	Operating mimeograph machine.
Jarrett, Henry	5,600	5,600	Special articles on Department policy, secretarial statements, etc.
Arnett, Betty	1,440	1,440	Stenographer for Information Section.
Wing, DeWitt	5,200	1,300	Prepares articles for farm journals.
Kadderly, Wallace L	5,800	5,800	Chief, Radio Service, administrative supervision, directs participation of Department in network programs and arranges Department's part of National Farm and Home Hour.
DuMars, Maurice L	4,600	3,066	In charge of distribution of syndicated services to individual radio stations; relation with radio station farm program directors. Assists in National Farm and Home Hour. Correlates radio broadcasting of the Department and the 48 State agricultural extension services.
Baker, John	5,600	1,800	Do.
Coffin, Tristram	5,600	560	Liaison information officer between O. A. D. R. and Office of Information.
Gapen, Kenneth L	3,800	3,800	Western radio-program director.
Herndon, Charles A	3,700	3,700	Writes and supervises writing staff and service to radio and press associations.
Reynolds, Dana D	3,300	3,300	Writer of agricultural information.
Briggs, Cyrus R	3,300	3,300	Do.
Douglass, Helen C	3,100	3,100	Writer of home-economics information.
Downer, Viva T	1,800	1,800	Stenographer for information material.
McHale, Leona H	1,680	1,680	Do.
Spencer, Mabelle G	1,620	1,620	Stenographer for information material (San Francisco).

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Barnes, George A	$2,045	$614	Plans, directs, and supervises information program for Soil Conservation Service.
Zimmerman, G. K	3,181	954	Plans and directs current information program, including press and radio material.
Daily, Alan	4,800	2,640	Plans, directs, and supervises information education program for region.
Susott, Arthur	4,600	3,450	Do.
Hammett, James	4,600	1,472	Do.
Combs, Leslie R	4,600	230	Do.
Dale, Tom	4,600	1,380	Do.
Dunning, George F	4,600	1,380	Do.
Bissell, Paul	2,154	215	In charge of visual information program.
Rankin, Forney	2,375	594	Information specialist, writes special reports, speeches, articles, press releases, radio programs, etc.
King, Barrington	3,800	3,230	Prepares informational material for press, radio, farm papers, periodicals, and other similar media engaged in disseminating news and information.
Jones, Ewing	1,900	950	Supervised information and education work in region; writes radio scripts and press releases.
Beck, Virgil	2,068	1,241	Supervised current information activities in region; prepared material for press, radio, farm papers, periodicals, etc.
McGinnis, B. W	3,800	570	Prepares material on soil conservation for use in educational institutions; writes radio scripts.
Emerson, Arthur W	3,800	494	Plans, directs, and supervises information and education program for region.
Simms, D. Harper	3,380	1,352	Supervises information activities in region.
Carr, Harry L	3,200	320	Information specialist, prepares special reports, speeches, press releases, etc.
Pryor, William C	3,300	495	Do.
Radford, Rodney	2,693	404	Assists in visual information activities.
Maits, Charles	3,300	1,485	Writes press and radio material and prepares picture panels, exhibits, posters, etc.
Reitz, W. W	3,300	330	Educational relations work; supplies teachers and schools with material on S. C.
Robinson, Bert	3,300	825	Supervises educational relations and visual information activities.
Jenkins, H. L	3,200	1,920	Supervises information activities, writes press and radio material for region.
Davis David O	3,300	561	Supervises educational relations and visual information activities of region.

A list of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture whose full- or part-time duties include the preparation or distribution of information by the media of the press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions—Continued

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—continued

	Estimated salary received in 1942	Salary chargeable to press, radio, motion pictures, and electrical transcriptions	Duties
Webb, Charles	$3,200	$2,400	Writes material for press and radio.
Loyd, F. G	3,200	2,500	Prepares information for press and raido.
Swan, H. J	3,200	2,880	Supervises current information program in region; writes material for press and radio.
Sandoval, Angel	400	20	Special Spanish-American information work.
Harper, Frank B	3,400	3,400	Production and dissemination of press and radio material.
Lloyd, Walter	3,300	2,310	Supervises press and radio activities in region.
Lillard, John	3,200	320	Educational relations and visual information specialist in region.
Sisk, Leon	2,700	2,565	Prepares radio scripts; Farm Flash material; press releases; special reports.
Lathrop, William H	2,900	290	Prepares charts, slides, film strips, exhibits, displays, distributes same and movies.
Hufnagle, R. W	2,600	208	Regional photographer.
Jarrett, Alfred W	2,775	2,775	Motion-picture photographer.
Jones, Myers	2,597	779	Visual information work in region; distributes motion pictures.
Lowary, George	2,400	240	Photography for Information Section.
Welch, Orin	2,400	360	Photographer.
Jenkins, Elvin	2,000	720	Do.
McLean, B. C	2,500	500	Regional photographer.
Scott, Duncan	1,500	1,125	Press and radio writing.
Branstead, Robert	2,000	500	Still- and motion-picture photography.
Bonner, Catherine	1,680	672	Stenographer for Information Section.
Jones, Laura	1,620	567	Do.
Wilkin, Ella	1,620	648	Do.
Bonner, Martha	1,920	1,152	Do.
Lee, Lyda	1,500	150	Stenographic and clerical duties of Information Section.
Busch, Elsie	1,500	75	Do.
Hathaway, Maxine	1,680	336	Do.
Shaw, Evelyn	1,680	117	Do.
Moore, Elizabeth	1,500	225	Do.
Daniel, Lorena	1,680	386	Do.
Jacob, Leta	1,620	567	Do.
Grover, Angeline	1,740	348	Do.
Harman, Ruth	1,440	576	Do.
Clark, Marjory	1,680	168	Do.
Rutledge, Sue	1,440	720	Do.
Newland, Dorothy	1,620	1,296	Do.
Moore, Lucile	1,680	84	Do.
Spear, Nan P	1,620	340	Do.
Wood, Mildred	1,613	1,210	Do.
Bortfeldt, Donald	400	40	Do.
Fletcher, Pauline	1,620	356	Do.
Brittain, Elaine	1,080	162	Performed librarians' duties in addition to stenographic and clerical work
Felder, Xina	1,800	180	Stenographic and clerical duties for Information Section.
Herman, Marion	1,300	65	Do.
Samuel, Claire	1,620	243	Do.
Smilow, Ann	1,725	517	Do.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Walters, Allyn A	$4,600	$2,760	Has administrative responsibility for information services.
O'Brien, Eileen	2,000	500	Secretary and office assistant.
MacLeod, Lorna	1,620	648	Stenographer for information section.
Frederick, Marjorie	1,620	972	Do.
Hartogensis, Harold	3,800	2,850	Radio and press releases.
Molarsky, Osmond	3,200	2,400	Radio writer.
Wolfsohn, Leo	3,200	2,400	Press releases.
Lambert, Robert	3,800	2,850	Press releases and special articles.
Weeks, James J	3,200	2,400	Do.
Lorton, Dale Etter	3,200	2,400	Do.
Jessie Dame	1,800	180	Cleriel services and motion-picture work.
Seksar, Peter	2,900	290	Photographer.
Stephens, A. Norris	2,600	130	Do.
(4 vacancies)	1,633	816	Press and radio writers.

SURPLUS MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Hasselman, J. B	$5,950	$1,488	Administrative duties.
Koenig, Nathan	4,750	2,375	Administrative and press duties.
Snell, George F	3,950	2,370	Press and publications.
Morris, George A., Jr	3,950	1,975	Press and reports.
Hall, Clyde C	3,200	1,600	Editorial and reports.
Parker, William J	3,200	1,800	Editorial and illustrations.
Dodge, Philip J	2,600	1,040	Special publications.
Ward, William B	2,600	1,690	Press and reports.
Lyons, James Grant	2,600	520	Do.
Fraber, Lucia M	1,845	184	Secretarial duties.
Dozier, Adelyn D	1,725	345	Clerical and typing work.
White, Miriam M	1,530	459	Stenographic work.
Hackney, George	1,440	360	Clerical work.
Trachman, A. M	3,950	150	Press, radio, and reports.
Walsh, J. Don	3,500	1,400	Do.
Hansen, Dorothea W	2,700	1,620	Radio work.
McCaffrey, Rose G	1,680	336	Stenographic duties.
Purvis, Beatrice A	1,440	144	Clerical work.
Typist	1,440	288	Typing work.
Berry, Evelyn J	1,620	324	Stenographic work.
Freyman, V. P	3,200	1,600	Press, radio, and reports.
Wallace, D. A	3,200	800	Reports and publications.
Stenographer	1,440	432	Stenographic work.
Faught, Millard	3,200	1,600	Press, radio, and reports.
Ramsey, C. F., Jr	2,600	910	Press and reports.
Feldman, J	2,000	400	Press work.
Polikoff, Lilly	1,440	432	Stenographic work.
Schoenbach, Meno	3,750	2,250	Press, radio, and reports.
Justice, O. E	2,600	910	Press and reports.
Erwin, Loretta R	1,620	486	Stenographic work.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Alford, E. J	$845	$845	Distributing films to camps.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not criticizing the Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, because in all fairness to him I think he has worked hard and has done a very conscientious job. I have not been one of those who have criticized the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture; but I must confess that when the figures for the various departments were presented to me, showing the number of chauffeurs, the number of cars used, and the number of miles traveled, I was shocked.

If I correctly read the figures, in 1942 the Office for Emergency Management had 35 cars and 42 chauffeurs. The Panama Canal had 150 full-time chauffeurs. The Veterans' Administration had 103 full-time chauffeurs.

My understanding is that there is a very decided shortage of rubber in the United States, and that in order to preserve what rubber we have, probably by the 1st of July gasoline will be rationed all over the United States, not because of the shortage of gasoline, but because of the shortage of rubber.

What will the people of the United States say when gasoline is rationed from one end of the country to the other for the purpose of preserving rubber, when they see that the various departments of the Government have such great numbers of automobiles and chauffeurs, and that the total amount of travel is 211,886,978 miles?

Let us stop and ask ourselves what the people will say. Does any Senator think that they will sit by complacently and say that the Government of the United States may furnish chauffeurs to all the bureaucrats in Washington? One of the departments has 35 cars, with 42 chauffeurs. Does any Senator think that the people will sit by complacently and say that each of the many officials in the departments is to be permitted to have an unlimited supply of gasoline, with an X card, and travel wherever he pleases, from one end of the country to the other?

Let us stop and think of it from the standpoint of the effect on the people of the country. We hear much talk about unity. We shall not have unity in the United States if the Congress, the various departments, and the Bureau of the Budget permit such things to go on. Let us make no mistake about it.

I fear for what may happen to our form of government if we do not put a stop to some of the wasteful and extravagant expenditures by the Government departments, when the rank and file of the people are asked not to use their automobiles and to submit to rationing to the very limit. We must stop such waste; and the time to stop it is before public opinion is aroused to such an extent that the very structure of government may be torn down. We ought to stop it before it is too late.

I entirely agree with the statement which was made a moment ago by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], that it was a mistake for the O. P. A. to give an unlimited supply of gasoline to anybody. Estimates should have been made, and those who use gasoline should have been held to the absolute minimum.

When we permit an unlimited supply of gasoline to all the departments, all the secretaries, and all the officials who are traveling around over the country, whether in the Indian Service or the Department of Agriculture, piling up a total of 211,000,000 miles of travel, Senators know that there will be bootlegging of gasoline.

It will be transferred from one person to another, and we shall not be able to stop it. Bootlegging in gasoline will reach a point equaled only by the bootlegging which existed during prohibition. The condition will become chaotic.

Many persons are denouncing the newspapers because they are criticizing the Congress. I think that much of the criticism which has been directed against Congress is absolutely unfair. Many persons in the Government departments are hanging on to good jobs and receiving better pay than they could obtain anywhere in private industry. Many of the officials and employees of the departments receive cards entitling them to an unlimited supply of gasoline. They do not have to furnish their own cars; they do not have to furnish their own tires. The man who works in the shop or the store must furnish his own car, his own gasoline, and his own tires, and pay the expenses of taking care of his car; but many of those who are running around over the country and receiving better salaries from the Government than they could get in private industry are furnished cars, gasoline, and repairs. A great many of the officials in the departments never had a chauffeur before in their lives. They never knew what it was to have a chauffeur. I will venture the assertion that some of them were very lucky even to have automobiles. Some of them could not make their salt in private industry, and yet they are being driven around by chauffeurs.

Look at the number of cars in Washington with Government tags, used by Government officials who are driven around by chauffeurs. In ordinary times it would not be so bad to spend money for such purposes; but at a time such as this, in the crisis which we are now facing, I think it is little less than criminal to permit such a thing to go on.

I think the Senator from Virginia has done fine work in showing the facts to the people and to the Congress. If the facts were not brought to light such practices would continue.

I venture the assertion that very few Members of Congress were aware how many automobiles were being operated by the various departments, and how many chauffeurs were employed. Are the cars and chauffeurs used only for official business? Certainly not.

All of us have attended private dinners at which we have seen departmental officials driven up in official cars by official chauffeurs. They have not been used solely for official business.

Members of the Senate have been criticized regarding the use of gasoline for their automobiles. Departmental officials do not have to be elected to office. They do not have to spend money in campaigns; they do not have to make campaigns. Oh, no. They are appointed to fat jobs. They do not have to make any donations. They are appointed to fat jobs, and then they are driven around by their official chauffeurs. Yet they come here and try to say to the Congress of the United States, "You must vote for this bill as it came down here without the crossing of a 't' or the dotting of an 'i.'" They have their publicity bureaus, for which we furnish the money. We provide them the money for the publicity bureaus, which attack Members of Congress. Is it any wonder that the newspapers say that Members of Congress are spineless and weak when we do things of that kind?

It is time for Congress to assert itself and put a stop to some of these things; and if the Congress does not do it, the people of the United States will say—and rightfully so—"What is the use of having a Congress? What is the use of having a parliamentary government?" While we are talking about fighting for the four freedoms all over the world and fighting for democracy, parliamentary government is being undermined right here in our own country not only by the newspapers, about which we have been talking, but by the departments in Washington, with their publicity bureaus and agents. Other Senators can "take it" if they wish to do so; but, so far as I am concerned, I am not going to "take it" from the departments.

What I have said has not been said with the slightest degree of criticism of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], because I think the Senator from Georgia, as the head of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, has done a conscientious job and has worked hard. The responsibility is not his alone; it is the responsibility of every Member of the Senate and it is the responsibility of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget has more responsibility in the matter than anyone else, because the Bureau of the Budget is supposed to examine these items; and when it finds that 14 or 44 chauffeurs are employed, to inquire as to the need for them. What excuse can the Department of Agriculture give to the Bureau of the Budget for the employment of 44 chauffeurs in one bureau and 15 in another? What justification can it assert for saying, "We need 15 chauffeurs to drive these bureaucrats around"? What excuse can it give for having in some of its bureaus and agencies a large number of automobiles, many of which are not at all necessary? There is no excuse. The Bureau of the Budget is supposed to advise the Appropriations Committee as to what is necessary and to furnish the details, because no Appropriations Committee, and no other committee, has the time to examine the details and to ascertain whether this automobile or that automobile is absolutely necessary in a particular department. The Bureau of the Budget is set up for that purpose, and it is supposed to act in that capacity. I say that the Bureau

of the Budget has not done its duty when it sends to Congress a recommendation for appropriations of this kind.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in order to complete the record with respect to automobiles, I desire to make it clear that the figure of 18,948 automobiles covers only the strictly nondefense agencies of the Government and is as of February 28, 1942. The figure is compiled from statements sent in over the signature of the head of each department. It does not include trucks; it does not include any automobiles in the service of agencies connected with the War Department or the Navy Department. I assume that quite a number of automobiles have recently been purchased for the Office for Emergency Management and the Office of Price Administration. The figures relative to such automobiles are not available in this report.

With respect to trucks, the Civilian Conservation Corps camps alone have 23,003 trucks, and other departments also have trucks. Likewise, the report does not include automobiles which are rented by the departments, for which payments of from 3 to 5 cents a mile are made. There are many such automobiles.

My objection to the amendment, Mr. President, is that it gives to the departments an unnecessarily great latitude in interchanging appropriations which are made by Congress. I think a latitude of 5 percent is sufficient. That has been the law. It is proposed to change it to 10 percent. The House passed the bill with the 5-percent provision, and I hope very much that the Senate will reject the committee amendment.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Rejecting the pending amendment would not remedy the situation which the Senator has pointed out ir. mentioning chauffeurs and automobiles, would it?

Mr. BYRD. Not at all. It would simply impose a little additional restriction—not much, but a very little.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator think that any money would be saved if the amendment were rejected?

Mr. BYRD. I think money would be saved in the sense that the will of Congress would be more accurately carried out if a transfer of 5 percent rather than 10 percent were permitted.

Mr. LEE. The Senator has made an amazing revelation to us with regard to automobiles and chauffeurs used by the departments. I wonder if the Senator has in mind amendments which he will offer, or which will later come up, so as to give us an opportunity to vote to correct this situation. I should like not simply to hear about the situation but to do something about it. Some weeks ago on the floor of the Senate I made the statement that unless the departments go through their own lists and eliminate everything which is not essential, we shall do it for them, and we may not have time to do it as carefully as they could do it. I hope the Senator has in mind some amendments or some recommendation whereby we can correct the situation. It is quite all right for us to talk about it and to protest against it; but if the Senator has some amendments, I should like to have him offer them, so that we shall have a chance to vote against the expenditure of money for unnecessary automobiles and chauffeurs.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator, Mr. President, that the difficulty about correcting the situation by an amendment to this bill, or attempting to control the purchase of automobiles by an amendment to this bill is that such an amendment would be subject to a point of order, I suppose, on the ground that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. If the Senator will support it, I shall be perfectly willing to offer an amendment providing that neither the Department of Agriculture nor any other Department may purchase new automobiles at this time. Individuals are not now permitted to purchase them. We are required to do with our old automobiles, so why should the departments be permitted to purchase new automobiles, especially when the Department of Agriculture now has 4,500?

Mr. LEE. Would not the Committee on Appropriations be the correct place to go in order to have that situation taken care of?

Mr. BYRD. In view of the power which the departments have to transfer funds, I do not think such a course would be adequate.

Mr. LEE. That is the point to which I was leading up. Would the rejection of this amendment prohibit the use of unnecessary automobiles or chauffeurs?

Mr. BYRD. No; I think it would only limit to 5 percent the transfer of funds to be used for such purposes. The amendment proposed by the Appropriations Committee doubles the amount which the agencies of the Department may now transfer within each bureau or division. I do not think that rejecting the committee amendment would wholly remedy the situation. We happened to be discussing this amendment, and I brought up these facts because I thought the Senate should know of the necessity, as I see it, of controlling administrative expenses of the departments in a more effective way than is now being done.

Mr. LEE. Then if the amendment should be rejected, the amount which could be transferred for such purposes would remain at 5 percent; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Five percent is the amount provided in the present law, and in the pending bill as it was passed by the House. The Senate Appropriations Committee desires to increase it to 10 percent.

With the support of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Virginia will be very glad to offer an amendment next week to provide that the Department of Agriculture shall not purchase new automobiles for the coming year, and a similar amendment to apply to other departments when their respective appropriation bills come up. Why cannot they do with their old automobiles, just as we are required to do?

Mr. LEE. Would what the Senator from Virginia suggests correct the situation as to the employment of chauffeurs?

Mr. BYRD. No; of course it would not correct the situation as to the employment of chauffeurs.

Mr. LEE. I do not believe that the people of this country would approve of the employment of so many chauffeurs unless their employment can be justified.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia offers a suggestion relative to the purchase of automobiles, why does not the Senator from Oklahoma offer an amendment prohibiting the employment of chauffeurs?

Mr. LEE. The Senator from Virginia has studied this matter, slept with it, lived with it so long, and is so familiar with it, that I think he is in a better position to offer such an amendment.

Mr. BYRD. All the Senator from Virginia wants is some assurance of support, and then he will be glad to offer such an amendment.

Mr. LEE. I am sure of that. Let me say that I was not attempting to embarrass the Senator in any way.

Mr. BYRD. I am not embarrassed in any way. After all, we should not permit the employment of unnecessary chauffeurs and the departments should not be permitted to buy new cars.

Mr. LEE. I am not only against unnecessary expenditures such as those which the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, but I want to do something about them. I should like to have the Senator offer an amendment or introduce a measure which would give me an opportunity to express my feelings in a more concrete and definite way than simply by expressing myself verbally.

Mr. BYRD. I shall be glad to confer with the Senator next week relative to that matter. In the meantime I think it is our duty to do something by way of expressing ourselves with reference to the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to thank the Senator from Virginia for placing in the RECORD yesterday a complete statement of county agricultural conservation association expenses in connection with the 1940 agricultural conservation program. I notice that a county in Colorado, Dolores County, has the distinction—it is not an honor—of having a higher percentage for administrative expenses than any other county in the United States. Its percentage is 89.2. That takes almost all the money. Agriculture in that county is new, and the farms are very large, and I simply cannot understand why 89.2 percent should be taken for administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was greatly impressed by the very moving and eloquent defense by the Senator from Virginia of his friendship for the farmers of this Nation. It was one of the finest illustrations I have ever seen of putting up a straw man to knock him down. The Senator from Georgia had not said that the Senator from Virginia was an enemy of the farmers of this

country. When he rose to make the correction in the course of the statement of the Senator from Virginia the Senator from Virginia declined to yield to enable the Senator from Georgia to clarify his position and permit him to make a statement at that time, because, of course, it might have destroyed the effect of his very eloquent speech pledging his eternal allegiance and fealty to all that promotes the welfare of the agricultural interests of the Nation.

No one here has said that the Senator from Virginia was an enemy of the farmer. I had stated, and I reiterate, and the RECORD will bear it out, that the Senator from Virginia has opposed very vigorously the provisions of agricultural appropriation bills. As to whether he was working in the welfare of the farmer or whether he was opposed to the best interests of the farmer must be merely a matter of opinion of each individual; but I have not stated that he was an enemy of the farmer. I appreciated and enjoyed his speech, and I am glad he would not yield at a point which might have destroyed its continuity, for I think his speech should be preserved to posterity. Many of us who will go on the stump in the campaign this summer and fall might well profit by the address of the Senator from Virginia, showing his loyalty and allegiance to the farmer.

Mr. President, the pending question with regard to automobiles has to do with the interchange of appropriations, as provided on page 92. As I have said heretofore, until 1939, beginning back in 1909, more than 30 years, the Department has been allowed authority to interchange appropriations, not exceeding 10 percent, within each specific bureau provided the money was interchanged for the same purpose and object which was specified in the Budget.

In other words, it is impossible to transfer an appropriation which has been made for salaries and personnel to the purchase of automobiles; it is impossible to transfer a travel item to some administrative expenses or for the purchase of paper or equipment or office supplies. The provision merely permits some small latitude within a bureau in dealing with questions which might arise in the course of a year.

I have never been a very great advocate of the 10-percent interchange appropriation provision. When it was placed back in the bill in 1939, I succeeded in having it made 5 percent, the amount that it is today; but I have thought that, in view of the fact that there have been drastic reductions made in all branches of the scientific and research work the Department can do for the coming year they should be allowed some small leeway in dealing with emergencies which might arise.

No charge has been made that this authority has ever been abused in the years that have gone. It has been in the bill for more than 30 years. The Department of Agriculture, in coming before the Appropriations Committees of the Congress each year, points out the transfers and exchanges they have made under this authorization. It will be found from page 476 of the House hearings, part II, that in the year 1937, with the authority to transfer 10 percent within a bureau, the total transfers amounted to $6,200; in 1938 the transfers amounted to $108,000; in 1939 there were no transfers made whatever. So it is not a power which has been abused.

I asked the Department to submit a statement as to the reason for this authority. I shall undertake to read some portion of the statement:

NATURE OF AUTHORITY

The authority so proposed would permit interchanges between subappropriation items within an appropriation of not to exceed 10 percent. Under no conditions could a subappropriation be decreased by more than 10 percent, but in cases of extraordinary emergency a subitem could be increased by more than 10 percent.

In other words, the Department could not, under any conditions, transfer more than 10 percent of any one of the subitems of appropriation.

For example, there are 16 subappropriation items included in the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry" and should an emergency arise (an illustration of which, relating to the need for emergency hemp production, will be found at page 1115 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate) it would be possible to transfer to the subappropriation "cotton and other fiber crops and diseases" an amount not exceeding 10 percent from the other subappropriations under the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry."

I asked the Department to submit an example. They had stated that they had two or three emergencies before them at the present time. I should like to be allowed to read one of the examples the Department has cited:

ILLUSTRATIONS

Additional examples illustrating the need for 10 percent instead of 5 percent limitation on the interchange of appropriations:

1. Emergency castor-bean production in the United States, which is imminent if transportation facilities from South America become more restricted, will call for a large expansion of acreage, possibly up to 200,000 acres. Seed supplies are being produced this year in anticipation of possible acreage expansion requirements in 1943. The technical guidance and supervision of this expansion would be part of the work done under subappropriation "Drug and related plants," Bureau of Plant Industry. To provide enough technicians properly to discharge this function, however, would necessitate the temporary assignment of additional qualified men from such subappropriations as "Cereal crops and diseases" and "Forage crops and diseases."

In other words, frequently there is no actual transfer of funds, but merely a transfer of personnel, which is paid with the funds which are allocated for one purpose to do work upon some new and desirable objective which has been called to the attention of the Department since the enactment of the appropriation bill.

Since similar assignments would have to be made from these same subappropriation items to "Cotton and Other Fiber Crops and Diseases" in order to meet emergency hemp production problems, as already cited, it is doubtful if both the castor-bean and hemp projects could be handled suitably within the 5-percent limitation.

There is also another illustration given of the importance of this authority for dealing with such things as the production of morphine, guayule, Hevea rubber, waxy corn, and other plants.

I may point out as one of the Senators who have been most vigorous in his opposition to this power of transfer and most critical of the department for not making research into rubber, that, under the existing law, it was absolutely impossible for the Department of Agriculture to transfer funds from one function to another so as to make investigation into rubber.

NO AUTHORITY TO EXCEED SPECIFIC LIMITATIONS

The authorization for the interchange of appropriations gives no authority to increase the amounts established in the pending appropriation bill for expenditure for specific objects, such as travel, or personal services in the District of Columbia, etc., on which the Congress has placed a ceiling. In particular, by section 4 of the pending bill the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to cover into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, the sum of $1,500,000 of the amounts set up in the 1943 Budget for travel expenses, thereby establishing a ceiling on the amount that may be expended therefor. The authorization contained under "Interchange of Appropriations" would not permit the Department of Agriculture to increase the amount so made available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portions of this statement which I have not read to the Senate may be printed in the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

INTERCHANGE OF APPROPRIATIONS

This paragraph contains authority permitting transfers, between the various appropriation items, of appropriations made for the work of any bureau, division or office. It has been carried in the bill for 30 years and constitutes an essential administrative arrangement, especially when emergencies arise such as the present war, when the Department must take immediate steps to meet problems of finding substitutes for products formerly imported, increased demands for supplies of products already produced in insufficient quantities, etc. Prior to the fiscal year 1939 the limitation for such interchange was fixed at 10 percent. In that fiscal year the limitation was reduced to 5 percent.

SCHEDULE OF TRANSFERS

A schedule of the transfers made under this authorization during the fiscal years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, appears at page 476 of part 2 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1943. By the very nature of the interchange authorization, it is impossible to provide a schedule of amounts which would be so transferred in the future since the purpose of the authority is to provide for contingencies which cannot be foreseen in sufficient detail to include the changes in the Budget and in the act. However, it has been the custom of the Department to make a complete report to the Congress on the use of this authority each year, and this practice will of course be continued so that the Congress can review in detail the use made by the Department of the authority provided.

* * * * *

2. Emergency propagation of plant materials of strategic importance, for use in the

United States and tropical America, is calling for the conversion of greenhouse space at Beltsville from work normally done under the subappropriation item "Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases," to work done under the subappropriation items "Drug and related plants," and "Cereal crops and diseases; and to special projects, as rubber investigations and vegetable seed production. The plant materials being propagated include cinchona (for morphine), guayule, hevea rubber, waxy corn (a special source of starch), and biennial vegetable seed crops of which supplies in this country are limited. It is barely possible that these necessary temporary adjustments could be accomplished under the 5-percent limitation, but there is sufficient doubt to warrant an increase in the limitation in order not to limit unduly the efforts to meet urgent requirements.

TEN PERCENT WOULD BE USED SPARINGLY

The foregoing examples are cited to illustrate extreme types of adjustment deemed necessary in the present emergency. Other needed adjustments, within subappropriation items, involving financial, work, or line projects, probably can be accomplished within the 5-percent limitation. It would be the intention not to exceed 5 percent except where circumstances warranted, as in the examples cited.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, now I shall deal very briefly with the statements which have been made with reference to the use of automobiles by the several departments.

I desire to see effected every economy possible. If we can reduce the number of automobiles under the Department of Agriculture, they should be reduced in number, just as in the case of any other department or agency of the Government. But I wish to point out that the Department of Agriculture is the one agency of the Government which deals with people in the great open spaces; it is the one agency charged with the responsibility of carrying on a program of work which touches every one of the 3,000 counties of the 48 States of the Union.

Let us look over the statement that was submitted to the House committee showing the uses to which these automobiles will be put. It is found on page 526 of the House hearings.

The office of the Secretary of Agriculture has three automobiles. It may be that the Secretary's office should not be afforded any automobile. I should have no particular complaint if the Secretary of Agriculture and all the other Members of the Cabinet were placed on the same footing with Senators, and compelled to buy their own cars and their own gas; but certainly the Secretary of Agriculture should not be singled out among all the members of the Cabinet and discriminated against in this or in any other respect.

The Office of Experiment Stations has three automobiles. I assume that no one would say that three automobiles for the Office of Experiment Stations was an excessive number of cars for that important work.

The special research fund has to do with research work that is done in every State of the Union, work in the State of South Carolina in dealing with blue mold and other diseases of tobacco plants, work in the State of California performed in conjunction with State agencies in attempting to solve some of the problems of the citrus growers. That agency has 18 automobiles.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has two automobiles.

We come next to the Bureau of Animal Industry, which has 800 automobiles. When it is stated that the Bureau of Animal Industry has 800 automobiles, to one who had absolutely no knowledge of the work done by the Bureau, that would sound like a great many cars. However, one of the most important essentials in this Nation today is the preservation of the health of our people. The Government, recognizing that fact, has appropriated millions of dollars in years past to enable its agents to visit every dairy farm in the United States so as to inspect the herds of dairy cattle, to see whether they are infected with tuberculosis or Bang's disease, or other diseases which are likely to bring ill health to the youth who drink milk. That program alone, covering the inspection of every one of the dairy farms in the United States, would be dragged out almost to eternity, certainly for more than a thousand years, if the employees of the Department of Agriculture had no automobiles in which to make the inspections.

Under that agency also is a considerable appropriation for eliminating the cattle tick. Anyone who is familiar with the problems of owners of cattle which are infested with ticks knows that it would not be possible to drive the cattle to Washington to have them dipped in order to kill the ticks. It is necessary to go to the fields where the cattle are, and it is not at all unreasonable that cars should be furnished to expedite this program, and thereby hasten the day, which is almost at hand, when the cattle tick will be entirely eliminated in the United States

Also under this agency, which has 800 cars, is a hog cholera control program. The officials and the veterinarians are compelled to go into every county of the United States where there are farmers producing hogs and pork to inspect their animals, and to see whether they are infected with the hog cholera. Naturally it requires a number of automobiles, and many miles of travel, to make such investigations.

It may be said, Mr. President, that we can force the farmer who is producing hogs, and the dairy farmer who has cattle which are being destroyed by tuberculosis and by Bangs disease, and cattle which are infected with the cattle tick, to take over the expense of treating their own animals. If we wish to reverse what has been the policy of this Government for a great number of years, that is one thing, but certainly we would put ourselves in a ridiculous and absurd situation if we said we were going to do away with cars, and then make appropriations available to carry on the police work on far-flung fronts where it would be absolutely necessary to have some means of reaching the points where the animals were located in order that the diseases might be eliminated, and the health of the people preserved.

Other items under this Bureau include the inspection of meats, discharging the provisions of the Virus-Serum-Vaccine Act, and the eradication of the foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals, which each year bring about losses running into millions of dollars, not only to the owners of the stock, but affecting the very economy of the Nation.

It might be well to consider the question whether the Government of the United States has the slightest responsibility for aiding those who are suffering losses by virtue of these many diseases of animals, but certainly it would be the height of absurdity to appropriate huge sums for carrying on the work of treating the diseases all over the United States, and then do away with all the automobiles and all means of transportation for reaching the farms where the animals are located. That is particularly true now, when we are engaged in a great war, and when calls are going forth every day to the farmers to increase their production of hogs and cattle, not only in order to feed our own people, but to discharge our obligations and commitments under the Lend-Lease Act, and to enable our Allies in the war to continue fighting.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss in detail every bureau of the Department of Agriculture, and the uses to which the cars assigned it are put. I do ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the break-down statement by bureaus showing the number of automobiles in each of the agencies, and the number proposed to be purchased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Passenger-carrying vehicles, 1942, and estimated, 1943 [1]

Item	Total			Number and cost of new cars, 1943					Maintenance		
	Estimated, 1942	Estimated, 1943	Net change	New cars to be purchased	Old cars to be exchanged	Estimated, gross cost of new cars	Estimated, allowance for old cars	Estimated, net cost of new cars	Estimated, maintenance cost, 1942	Estimated, maintenance cost, 1943	Net change in estimated maintenance cost
Office of the Secretary	3	3	0	1	1	$1,500	$700	$800	$1,750	$1,750	----------
Office of Experiment Stations	3	3	0	1	1	935	50	885	625	625	----------
Special research fund	−18	16	−2	3	3	2,245	340	1,905	3,700	3,850	+$150
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	2	2	0	0	0	----------	----------	----------	400	400	----------

[1] Includes estimated total of trucks for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943.

Passenger-carrying vehicles, 1942, and estimated, 1943—Continued

Item	Total			Number and cost of new cars, 1943					Maintenance		
	Estimated, 1942	Estimated, 1943	Net change	New cars to be purchased	Old cars to be exchanged	Estimated, gross cost of new cars	Estimated, allowance for old cars	Estimated, net cost of new cars	Estimated, maintenance cost, 1942	Estimated, maintenance cost, 1943	Net change in estimated maintenance cost
Bureau of Animal Industry	800	789	−11	189	189	$127,575	$18,900	$108,675	$228,000	$224,865	−$3,135
Bureau of Dairy Industry	5	4	−1	0	0				600	500	−100
Bureau of Plant Industry	159	167	+8	24	24	18,000	2,125	15,875	33,300	36,310	+3,010
Forest Service	729	735	+6	93	93	63,685	7,280	56,405	132,030	125,649	−6,381
Forest roads and trails	58	67	+9	15	15	10,775	830	9,945	10,680	10,920	+240
Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering	21	20	−1	2	2	1,450	150	1,300	3,950	3,600	−350
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	287	284	−3	45	45	31,725	3,535	28,190	71,750	67,465	−4,285
White pine blister rust control	73	73	0	9	9	6,300	750	5,550	17,400	16,620	−780
Agricultural Marketing Service	294	303	+9	65	65	47,125	6,500	40,625	58,800	60,600	+1,800
Soil Conservation Service	1,790	1,814	+24	285	285	207,125	7,125	200,000	620,000	625,830	+5,830
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land (Soil Conservation Service)	105	47	−58	5	5	3,635	125	3,510	67,500	16,215	−51,285
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	7	7	0	0	0				1,000	1,085	+85
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation (Northeast timber salvage)	30	30	0	0	0				11,000	12,000	+1,000
Farm Security Administration	[2]234	232	−2	35	35	28,650	3,065	25,585	60,369	105,000	+44,631
Water facilities	42	30	−12	10	10	7,620	250	7,370	13,608	10,350	−3,258
Cooperative farm forestry	21	22	+1	11	4	7,800	100	7,700	7,200	7,590	+390
Water conservation and use	12	26	+14	14	0	11,900		11,900		13,000	+13,000
Rural Electrification Administration	1	1	0	0	0				250	250	
Beltsville Research Center	4	5	+1	0	0				600	750	+150
Farm Credit Administration	4	4	0	0	0				950	850	−100
Total, passenger-carrying vehicles	4,702	4,684	−18	807	786	578,045	51,825	526,220	1,346,062	1,346,674	+612
Total, trucks, estimated [3]	16,340	16,340									
Total, all automotive equipment	[4]21,042	21,024	−18								
Deduct passenger cars purchased and exchanged and cost thereof, 1942				−917	−896	611,915	67,006	544,909			
Reduction in passenger cars and cost 1943 as compared with 1942				−110	−110	−33,870	−15,181	−18,689			

[2] The 1942 fleet shown in the Budget estimates last year totaled 194 cars. This figure was in error, as 40 old cars which were retained were inadvertently omitted, and is corrected here to show the estimated total fleet for 1942 as 234 units.

[3] Trucks are listed entirely for informational purposes—not implemented in the estimates in same manner as the passenger automobiles—the figure for 1943 is same as for 1942 entirely for purpose of comparability as to grand total.

[4] Of this total, 488 passenger-carrying vehicles and 686 trucks, or a total of 1,174 units remain to be purchased as of Dec. 31, 1941. There is reason to believe that the Department will not be able to obtain the balance of its requirements for these cars due to present conditions. Therefore, based on 1942 estimates, it is possible that total cars available will be inadequate for the present fiscal year. (Prepared by Office of Budget and Finance, Jan. 6, 1942.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Forest Service has a great many automobiles—729 cars being under that service. That sounds like a staggering number of automobiles. Let us cut them off, do away with the automobiles, and let the 600,000,000 acres of forest land in this country, a greater resource than all the gold mines and all the gold stored at Fort Knox, be burned up and destroyed, and that great resource of the Nation lost to us.

Another agency which has a considerable number of cars is the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. I could enumerate its various activities, dealing with the quarantine laws which are in effect, in an attempt to stop the ravages of the Japanese beetle, the Mormon cricket, the Dutch elm disease, the grasshopper, and the other insects which have caused losses running into millions of dollars.

This agency has in the neighborhood of 300 automobiles. We could be pennywise and pound foolish and cut off these 300 cars, and have the Japanese beetle or some similar insect inflict damages running into hundreds of millions of dollars and destroy valuable food products and clothing materials which are absolutely essential in the conduct of the war.

The Soil Conservation Service has 1,790 automobiles. That agency had under its direction several hundred C. C. C. camps. I think it is absolutely safe to state that the reduction which has been made in the C. C. C. camps, and the fact that all of them now are being transferred to war work, under the direction of the War Department and the Navy Department, makes it absolutely impossible for the Soil Conservation Service to use so many cars next year, and I have no doubt that if the department were asked they would say they could, and intend to, and will dispense with some of those automobiles because the C. C. C. camps will not be available to them.

Mr. President, the statement I have embraces practically 90 percent of the automobiles which are contained in the figures referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The Senator has also made the point that there are some 15,000 trucks which are the property of the Department of Agriculture.

We have told the Department of Agriculture to go into the 177,562,000 acres of national forest lands, and to protect them, to see that poachers do not go on them, that the timber is not destroyed, that collections are made for the sale of timber, and that this great asset of the Nation is preserved. We have told them to build various roads and trails through the national forests, and down through the years we have appropriated a staggering sum, as I recall, $188,000,000, for the construction of various roads and trails in the forests, so as to make it possible properly to supervise and protect the forests. It is impossible to build thousands of miles of roads, of the value of $188,000,000, without having trucks, and so, if the Forest Service were to own seven or eight thousand trucks, for use in the construction of roads and forest trails, there would certainly be nothing unusual about it. In fact, they would have been derelict in their duty, and could not possibly have carried out the duties imposed on them by Congress, unless they had several thousand trucks.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does not the Senator believe that this attack on operating agencies of the Government in carrying on actual operations would be somewhat analogous to a stockholder criticising the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey for having trucks and cars?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Forest Service is a tremendous agency, spending each year about $25,000,000, and how could it possibly be expected to perform its duties in the woods, dealing with roads and the transportation of timber, without the use of a large number of trucks? Work is done by the Forest Service in conjunction with agencies of the States on 428,000,000 acres of State and private forest lands, and it is impossible to carry on that work except by the use of automobiles and trucks.

The Soil Conservation Service, in the various conservancy districts, which today embrace almost every watershed in the United States, have sought to preserve the fertility of the soil of the farms of this Nation in order that they would not be depleted and eroded, so that for the generations to come there may be produced food to eat and clothing to wear.

Mr. President, without using trucks it is not possible efficiently to build terraces to prevent the erosion of soil, or to plant hundreds of millions of trees on bare hillsides in order that they may be restored and made usable. So, while I do not have any break-down of the division of the 15,000 trucks, I will say that I am astonished that the Forest Service alone, not considering all the many other activities of the Department, does not have that many trucks.

Mr. President, that item is not now up for consideration. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] indicated that he would offer an amendment dealing with the automobile question next week, so I shall advert briefly to the pending amendment and say again that such a provision has been in the appropriation bills for 30 years; that the Department of Agriculture has used the power which is conferred by this provision very sparingly; that not in a single case has there been any evidence of abuse of the power to transfer funds within a bureau. I wish to reiterate, at the risk of becoming very tiresome, that this does not mean that the funds can be transferred within the Department, but only that the funds which are set up for one purpose within a bureau can be transferred to another purpose in the same bureau.

Mr. President, we have cut this bill $460,740,000. It is 40 percent below the appropriation for last year. No other bill and no other agency has taken a cut which is in anywise comparable to this one. I think that, with the increasing responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture, it should be allowed the leeway proposed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how long has the 5-percent provision been in effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Since the fiscal year 1939.

Mr. BYRD. Has it been working well?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has not been hampering the Department because it has had ample funds. It was quite different when the Department had $460,000,000 more than this bill provides. Then the 5-percent leeway covered the situation; but 10 percent is certainly comparable when we consider the reduction which has been made in the total appropriation.

Mr. President, I think the criticism of this interchange and the talk about the large number of cars and chauffeurs which is being indulged in all over the country, are likely to becloud the issue. The purpose of the amendment is merely to try to make the Department of Agriculture operate efficiently with greatly reduced funds, and I cannot conceive of any solid or substantial reason why it should not be placed in the bill. There have been brought before the Senate for consideration bills providing enormous appropriations for the War Department and the Navy Department, including a bill for $32,000,000,000. Day after day not a Senator rose even to inquire as to the totals of the bills. Those bills go through without the slightest question.

Mr. President, the agricultural program in this country for producing food and clothing is just as essential to the conduct of the war and to ultimate victory for our democracy as are shipyards and the Army and the Navy, because the Army and the Navy cannot operate unless they have food and clothing. Yet it is proposed to cut the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture to the bone, yea to the marrow, and expect it to continue to function in carrying on the program of producing food and clothing for victory, not only food and clothing for this country, but for all those associated with us in this great fight for freedom.

I hope the amendments will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. How long would it take to find out what the automobiles in question were used for, where they went, and what they accomplished?

Mr. RUSSELL. That information is all contained in the Budget estimates submitted to the Senate. If any Senator wishes to go through the Budget estimates he can learn the history of every one of these cars and the duties they perform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments on page 92, in lines 9 and 14.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Nye
Andrews	Glass	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bilbo	Holman	Rosier
Bone	Hughes	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lee	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McKellar	Tunnell
Caraway	McNary	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Gerry	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments on page 92, in lines 9 and 14. Without objection, they will be voted upon together.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. The Presiding Officer stated that there were two amendments to be voted on together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are in lines 9 and 14. In both instances the figure "5" is amended by the committee amendment to "10."

Mr. BYRD. Both amendments relate to the same matter, do they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both amendments relate to the interchange of appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, a vote of "nay" means a vote against 10 percent, and a vote of "yea" means a vote in favor of 10 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and will vote. I vote "nay." I am not advised how the Senator from Texas would vote.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GILLETTE. My colleague [Mr. HERRING] is necessarily detained. I am authorized to say that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. My colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily detained on official business. If he were present, he would vote "yea." He has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am not advised how the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote if he were present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "yea."

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—45

Andrews	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Hughes	Rosier
Brooks	La Follette	Russell
Brown	Langer	Schwartz
Bulow	Lee	Smith
Bunker	McCarran	Spencer
Capper	McFarland	Stewart
Caraway	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Maybank	Truman
Doxey	Murdock	Tunnell
Gillette	Norris	Van Nuys
Guffey	Nye	Wagner

NAYS—22

Aiken	Gerry	Taft
Austin	Glass	Tydings
Ball	Johnson, Calif.	Vandenberg
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh
Butler	McKellar	Wheeler
Byrd	Maloney	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	
Danaher	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—29

Bailey	George	Reed
Barbour	Green	Shipstead
Brewster	Hatch	Smathers
Bridges	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Tobey
Connally	Lucas	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 76 of the bill was agreed to. It is my understanding that the Senate committee amendment was agreed to yesterday, thus eliminating the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oklahoma ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the amendment or unanimous consent to move to reconsider the action of the Senate?

Mr. LEE. What would be the difference in the result?

Mr. RUSSELL. There would be considerable difference in the result. If the Senator asked and received unanimous consent to reconsider the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment, the amendment would then be before the Senate; whereas if the Senator were to move to reconsider the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment, a majority vote would be required.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the committee amendment on page 76.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should not like to give my consent to do so.

Mr. LEE. Very well; I withdraw my request, and now move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 76 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, is such a motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the motion. I am addressing my remarks to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. The House amendment imposes a ceiling of $1,000 on the amounts which any one farmer or corporation may draw from the Government for soil-conservation payments. By the action taken yesterday by the Senate in rejecting the House amendment the ceiling is left at $10,000 upon the amount of such payments which may be received by any one farmer or corporation.

In 1937 the Senate adopted an amendment which placed a ceiling of $600, with a provision for graduated payments above that amount. That amendment was agreed to by unanimous consent. It went to the House, and the House conferees and the Senate conferees agreed to a ceiling of $10,000.

Now the House has agreed to an amendment placing a ceiling of $1,000 as a limit on the amount of payments which any one farmer or corporation may receive as soil-conservation payments from the Government. The figures which I submitted when I presented the original amendment in 1937 showed that 97.5 percent of the farmers of this country receive from the Government less than $100 worth of both parity and soil-conservation payments.

This amendment would simply limit soil-conservation payments. The purpose of the whole agricultural program is to help the little fellow, the family farmer.

This amendment of the House would place a ceiling of $1,000 on the payments which any one farmer or corporation might receive as soil-conservation payments. The argument was made originally that if we should do that, the big landowner would turn off his tenants, the tenants would lose their homes, and the landowner would farm by hired labor; or it was argued that the result of agreeing to the amendment would be to discriminate against the tenant farmers, since the owner would reach his ceiling before tenant A, tenant B, and tenant C would reach their ceilings, and, therefore, it would limit what they could receive. However, the language of this amendment corrects that. Let me read to the Senate the provision, as follows:

But in applying this limitation—

That is the limitation of $1,000—

there shall be excluded amounts representing a landlord's share of a payment made with respect to land operated under a tenancy or sharecropper relationship if the division of the payment between the landlord and tenant or sharecropper is determined by the local committee to be in accordance with fair and customary standards of renting and sharecropping prevailing in the locality.

I should like to present to the Senate an illustration of what that would mean. Let us say that the landlord has five tenants. If his agreement with the tenant were a sharecropper's agreement, which is half and half, or so that he received one-half of the farm produce, and, in turn, received one-half of the payments, then, with respect to a landlord operating with several tenants, this provision would not apply to limit him. In other words, it would exempt him, provided that his agreement with the sharecroppers or the tenants were in accordance with the customary agreements and sharecropping arrangements made in that community, as determined by the local committee. So this amendment answers the argument that it would be unfair to the sharecroppers and would exempt them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. If the Senator desires to ask a question on that point, I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I do. The Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the fact that the arrangement would not be unfair to the sharecropper and to the tenant. But how about the landlord? The Senator is proposing to amend the provision relating to the payment of such funds, and to place these restrictions on the payments for 1942; because the payments will be made on the basis of this year's crops. I think there may be some necessity for revision of the existing statute on the basis of present soil conservation practices, but the Senator is proposing to limit payments on this year's crop. There are any number of cases in which men have already gone to more than $1,000 expense in order to comply with the soil-conservation requirements of their local committees.

If any limitation is imposed this year and a man had bought a thousand dollars' worth of phosphate and had advances from the Soil Conservation payments for that amount, it would be necessary for the Department of Agriculture to sue him for the return of the money.

This question should not be handled on an appropriation bill; it should be considered in a legislative measure so that farmers would have an opportunity to make plans for their crops with a knowledge of what the result would be. There is a plan which has been announced by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration of payments of so much per acre; they have made advances for phosphate, seed, and trees, and lime in some cases on the strength of this year's program. The amendment could not possibly help anybody; it could not help the small

farmer, because his payment has already been fixed, and nothing we could write into this bill would increase what the small farmer will get; but the adoption of the amendment would certainly subject us to the charge of bad faith on the part of the man who has gone ahead and made arrangements for farming in 1942 and has incurred large expenses in making his preparations and arrangements. The adoption of the amendment would not help anybody but would hurt everybody. It would hurt the Government, because the Government would have to increase its administrative expenditures we have heard so much talk about, by revising the entire farm program for 1943. It would have to revise it from top to bottom, because of the fact that, under this limitation, the language which follows it relates to the landlord and tenant.

I am very sympathetic with what the Senator from Oklahoma has in mind, but the appropriation bill should not be used for rewriting a statute which is so complicated as is the one which would be affected.

It is one small segment of farming, but in the Southeast there are what are known as naval stores and naval stores operators who have planted and are planting a great many pine trees.

They have planted as many as a million pine trees a year in order that they may produce turpentine and rosin, and the Department has called on them this year to increase their production of both turpentine and rosin because they are essential in the war effort. Those people would be under the Soil Conservation Act. They do not get a great deal of money. The total, as I recall, is only two or three hundred thousand dollars out of $450,000,000 appropriated, but they have to work their places by day labor. They have incurred large expense this year in anticipation of receiving this payment in compliance with the program which has been announced, and if the Senator's amendment should prevail it would saw those payments off and those people would have to sustain large losses. In my judgment, there is a very definite moral obligation if not a legal obligation. As to this year's crops, there would undoubtedly be innumerable claims bills from these people seeking to be reimbursed for expenditures incurred on representations made by a department of the Government.

I repeat I am sympathetic with what the Senator from Oklahoma has in mind if we can approach this matter in the right way in the form of a legislative proposal, which would go to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; it is entitled to the most serious consideration; but I do not think that we should undertake on this bill to legislate relative to a matter the consequences and effect of which I doubt if a single Member of the Senate could tell on every one of the many crops in every different section of the country covered by the pending bill.

Mr. LEE. As to the amendment not helping anybody, it would save money, and that would help everybody.

I realize the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, is himself usually found advocating just such legislation as I am now advocating; in fact, he was a strong supporter of the original ceiling, which was $600.

Mr. President, the adoption of this amendment could not possibly do any damage, because every soil-conservation move that any man makes on his place improves the soil and benefits the man who makes it.

As to not carrying out the contracts, the war has caused us, in many cases, to terminate continuing contracts. I cannot see that is going to hurt anyone. Furthermore, 97½ percent of the farmers would not be affected by it, because they already draw less than $100.

Let me give some figures. I read from an article which was published in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Daily News. It is stated in the article that the average payment to 3,750,000 farmers was $75. We are providing a ceiling of $1,000. I do not see how we will hurt any farmer who has practiced soil conservation and improved his own land if we give him merely $1,000. While we are economizing, I believe it is time for us to take a step that is definitely in the direction of helping the farmer who needs help—the little family farmer who farms with his family and for his family and lives on the farm and operates it.

The amendment, of course, if adopted, would cut off some of the payments reaching up to $10,000. They reached to up over $100,000 until we put the first ceiling on the payments. This amendment would only affect a small percentage of the acreage of this country; it would only affect 2½ percent of the farmers of this country; but it would save money and be taking a step in the right direction in our legislative program of putting the grease where the squeak is.

I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator if we should put a limit of $1,000 whether farmers who applied would be able to get loans?

Mr. LEE. I do not believe it would affect loans.

Mr. LANGER. It would not affect loans at all. The farmers could have 100 percent of loans.

Mr. LEE. It is not a parity payment. The farmers will get their parity payments; this amendment affects only conservation payments.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Caraway
Andrews	Brown	Chavez
Austin	Bulow	Clark, Idaho
Ball	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Burton	Danaher
Barkley	Butler	Doxey
Bilbo	Byrd	Gerry
Bone	Capper	Gillette
Glass	McNary	Schwartz
Guffey	Maloney	Smith
Gurney	Maybank	Spencer
Hayden	Mead	Stewart
Hill	Millikin	Taft
Holman	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Hughes	Norris	Truman
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Tydings
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Langer	Pepper	Van Nuys
Lee	Radcliffe	Wagner
McCarran	Reynolds	Walsh
McFarland	Rosier	Wheeler
McKellar	Russell	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE].

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the House provision would merely place a ceiling of $1,000 on the payment to any one farmer or corporation for soil-conservation work. It would not affect parity payments under the Triple A; it would merely affect soil-conservation payments. A farmer could still draw up to $10,000 of other payments. It would merely limit to $1,000 payments for a man improving his own soil.

I have moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate approved the committee amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to make a long statement in surrebuttal. I merely desire to repeat that I think it would be unfortunate, as well as unfair, to reconsider the vote and agree to the amendment. It would be changing the rules in the middle of the game.

The Department has announced a program for this year, to extend throughout the United States. The provision in question does not affect only the five basic commodities, it affects other commodities which are not in the category of basic commodities under the Soil Conservation Act. There are dairy producers who draw more than a thousand dollars. I have referred already to the naval-stores operators who draw more than a thousand dollars.

I have always thought the formula should be rewritten, and I still hold to that conviction, but it should only be rewritten after the most careful investigation and scrutiny by a standing committee. The Committee on Appropriations could not spend the time necessary to go into all the details of this matter.

Furthermore, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration issues what are known as purchase orders, in anticipation of soil-conservation payments. In some cases the Department itself supplies nitrates and phosphates. There are cases in which more than a thousand dollars' worth of phosphates have been advanced to a farmer in anticipation of the soil-conservation payment he will receive this fall. What is going to happen in such a case? Is the Government to sue the farmer for the difference between a thousand dollars and the value of the phosphates already delivered to him?

What is to be done in cases in which people have already adapted their farms to conform with a standing program of the Department of Agriculture? A man may say, "I have incurred an expense of $2,000 based on an offer which you made me, an offer made by my Government, and then I have my payments reduced to only a thousand dollars, not enough to compensate me for my expense." I do not think we should undertake to deal with so intricate a matter in this shotgun fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the committee on page 76, beginning with line 13, was agreed to. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called. My colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am advised that if present and voting my colleague would vote "nay." I am not advised how the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote if present.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who, I understand, would, if present, vote the same way I intend to vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GILLETTE. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] is necessarily absent. I am not advised how he would vote on this question if he were present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—15

Ball	Hughes	Radcliffe
Bulow	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Tydings
Danaher	Maloney	Vandenberg
Gerry	Norris	Walsh

NAYS—47

Aiken	Doxey	Murdock
Andrews	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Guffey	Pepper
Barkley	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Schwartz
Brown	Holman	Smith
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Burton	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McFarland	Taft
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—34

Bailey	Hatch	Shipstead
Barbour	Herring	Smathers
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Kilgore	Tobey
Chandler	Lodge	Wagner
Connally	Lucas	Wallgren
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Willis
George	Reed	
Green	Reynolds	

So Mr. LEE's motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farm Credit Administration—Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation", on page 102, line 6, after the words "existing law", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Not more that a total of $8,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this act may be spent for travel expenses, either by railroad, privately owned automobile, steamship, or airplane, including the per diem allowance for hotels, subsistence, or other incidental traveling expenses.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 4. Of the total amount available under this act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the sum of $1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this act below the Budget estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, was any action taken on the amendment on page 81, after line 2, relating to the Surplus Marketing Administration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment was passed over yesterday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand that any request was made for that amendment to go over. The only two items which I understood went over yesterday were those relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. I did not understand that this item went over, and I was on the floor of the Senate all day during the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a notation at the desk to the effect that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] requested that the amendment go over.

Mr. MCNARY. I did request that that item go over. I also requested later consideration of the amendment regarding the disposal of wheat for feeding purposes. That was all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Some confusion resulted. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Oregon appears on page 80, just next to the amendment which is under consideration. I ask for the present consideration of the amendment on page 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Exportation of Domestic Consumption of Agricultural Commodities", on page 81, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out:

Administrative expenses: Not to exceed $775,000, in addition to the funds provided by section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of said section 32, as amended, and the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), including personal services in the District of Columbia.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, there is hereby reappropriated for the fiscal year 1943 the unobligated balances of the funds made available for the purposes of such section 32 for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. Such sums shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other appropriations made by such section or for the purposes of such section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire of the able Senator in charge of the bill whether that is the amount which was appropriated last year, or is there a slight increase?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a decrease in the amount available for these same purposes in the current year.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of the decrease as compared to the amount appropriated for the current year?

Mr. RUSSELL. During the current year the Surplus Marketing Administration had available a cash appropriation of $125,000,000, in addition to 30 percent of the customs receipts, which amounted to $97,000,000. In other words, the sum of $222,879,589 was available for the fiscal year 1942.

As the bill came to the Senate from the House that amount had been reduced, as well as the amount of the customs receipts which could be devoted for this purpose in the fiscal year 1943, to $131,429,833. That is a reduction of approximately $91,500,000. The committee went into this question. This is a very far-flung program, but the matter we subjected to especial scrutiny was the effect this reduction would have on what is known as the school-lunch program, as well as the stamp plan, and the direct distribution of surplus commodities. It was very apparent that the school-lunch program would be affected adversely if additional funds were not provided. For the current fiscal year the Bureau of the Budget in effect defeated the full purpose of the Congress by impounding thirty-two and one-half million dollars of the appropriation. For the preceding fiscal year $12,000,000 had been impounded. So the committee made available for the Surplus Marketing Administration a total sum of $44,500,000 in addition to the $131,000,000 that was available. That is a very drastic reduction of $46,000,000 in the current appropriation. The fact that no subsidies can be paid on the exports of surplus commodities should not affect in any great degree the stamp plan, or the direct distribution of surplus foods, or the school-lunch program. As a matter of fact, we have placed in the report instructions to the Surplus Marketing Administration to see that the school-lunch program is not impaired in any way.

Senators are familiar with the results of physical examinations made of selectees proposed to be taken into the Army. The figures show a perfectly appalling condition. Due to the fact that boys had not had sufficient food in their childhood, literally thousands of them were unable to qualify for military service. In this extremity even England is providing a school lunch for every child in the English schools. Certainly, with that condition obtaining in England, when we are feeding the school children there very largely from lease-lend funds, the committee did not feel that we should reduce the school-lunch program in the United States. For that reason we made the arrangements which are provided in this amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 102, beginning in line 13, was agreed to. The Senator from Virginia was called from the Chamber by a constituent, and he desires to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not understand the purpose for which the unanimous-consent request is made.

Mr. BYRD. It is made for the purpose of offering an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very glad to agree to the request; but I have just objected to a similar request made by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] with regard to another amendment.

Mr. BYRD. If a Senator is called from the Chamber, should he not have the privilege of asking for reconsideration, when there was no roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to reconsider is in order.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 102, beginning in line 13, was agreed to, be reconsidered, for the purpose of permitting me to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 102, beginning in line 13, was agreed to. [Putting the question.]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is a very unusual procedure to deny to a Senator who is called from the Chamber the privilege of reconsidering a committee amendment when he has an amendment to offer to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced the result. That is all the Chair can do.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think I can recall another instance of that kind in the Senate since I have been a Member of this body. I simply wish to make my protest against such action.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the same thing just happened in the case of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], who asked unanimous consent to reconsider another amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that was not the same thing. The Senator from Oklahoma was not present when that amendment was agreed to. It was agreed to a day or so ago. I was called out of the Chamber by a constituent for about 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to let the matter go over, if the Senator from Kentucky wishes to move a recess, and let the Senator from Virginia make his motion to reconsider next week, when a record vote can be had on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should have no objection to such a unanimous-consent agreement; but I cannot make fish of one Senator and fowl of another.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted with the Senator from Virginia to give him an opportunity to offer his amendment. I do not know what it is. I should probably vote against it if it were offered; but I am willing to give him an opportunity to offer it.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Virginia was rejected be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 102, beginning in line 13, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall have to object to such a request, even though it is made by the Senator from Kentucky. I objected to a similar request by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate can pass on that question by a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we cannot pass on that question today.

As I understand, all the amendments have been disposed of except those which went over until Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the committee amendments have been disposed of except those which have been postponed until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot finish consideration of the bill today. I have no desire that the Senate meet tomorrow. Therefore, in a moment I shall move a recess until Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement concerning the number of automobiles in the nondefense agencies of the Government, and the cost of operating them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Automobiles (passenger)

Agency or department	Number		Cost of operating, fiscal year ending June 30, 1941	Cost of operating, this fiscal year to date	Number of miles traveled, fiscal year 1941	Number of miles traveled this fiscal year to date	Number of chauffeurs		Chauffeurs' salaries	
	1941	1942					Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time
Agriculture Department	4,433	4,513	$1,142,456.25	$619,825.25	54,677,935	28,483,819	15		$15,360	
Alley Dwelling Authority (none)										
Board Investigation and Research (none)										
Bureau of the Budget	2	3	353.23	312.00	19,000	13,000				
Civil Service Commission (none)										
Civil Aeronautics Board	13	17	3,210.87	2,727.50	220,332	161,243	1		1,380	
Commerce Department		312	70,247.38	59,129.46	3,904,311	3,213,539	5		7,980	
Coordinator of Information		6		801.88		51,711	17		20,520	
Board of Economic Warfare	2	3	63.00	310.00	1,950	18,788	4		5,040	
Employees' Compensation Commission, U. S. (none)										
Federal Communications Commission		134	16,640.00	19,628.00	851,271	981,401				
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation		67	[1] 25,000.00	[1] 16,500.00	[1] 500,000	330,000				
Federal Loan Agency	2	4	602.49	488.58	9,498	14,303	5		7,140	
Federal Power Commission	14	15	3,537.78	2,239.78	137,020	145,935	2		2,640	
Federal Real Estate Board (none)										
Federal Security Agency		3,104	669,641.19	433,071.06	35,441,876	32,607,003	66	8	91,149.06	$2,561.81
Federal Trade Commission (included in Commerce Department)										
Federal Works Agency		982	[2] 108,282.00	58,385.00	5,888,518	3,203,852	41	1	54,660	12.60
General Accounting Office		2	127.25	76.44	8,058	6,369	1		1,560	
Gorgas Memorial Institute		1								
Government Printing Office		4	1,286.93	387.16	29,838	19,358	4		6,739	
Interior Department	3,250	3,252	815,291.57	520,692.63	36,060,907	24,273,249	8		10,200	
Interstate Commerce Commission		130	29,704.10	17,744.68	1,477,603	900,607				
Justice Department	1,688	2,352	324,514.23	289,927.42	21,282,143	16,680,044	4		6,060	
Labor Department		4	1,348.58	1,070.34	72,000	42,000	4		6,640	
Lend Lease Administrator (included in O. E. M.)										
Library of Congress		1	39.40	43.60	3,886	3,104		1		630.00
Maritime Commission	12	13	[3] 1,151.00	[3] 811.09	[3] 62,178	[3] 27,515	5		7,140	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5	10	481.44	736.77	24,492	38,209				
National Archives		1	79.00	38.00	4,891	3,215	1		1,320	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission		2	197.50	42.04	6,750	300	1		1,440	
National Housing Agency		11	2,173.14	718.81	62,158	44,309	7		8,280	
National Labor Relations Board (none)										
National Resources Planning Board (none)										
National War Labor Board (included in O. E. M.)										
Office of Agricultural Defense Relations (included in Department of Agriculture)										
Office of Civilian Defense (included in O. E. M.)										
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (included in O. E. M.)										
Office for Emergency Management	35		3,828.00	8,726.00	76,554	202,512	42		50,400	
Office of Facts and Figures (included in O. E. M.)										
Office of Government Reports	2		1,250.00	290.89	31,697	14,248				
Office of Price Administration (included in O. E. M.)										
Panama Canal	212		181,065.00	184,786.00	2,666,573	2,241,532	150		140,764	
Post Office Department		2	846.21	651.41	29,000	14,457	2		3,000	
Railroad Retirement Board		5	482.67	890.62	16,722	12,959	5		7,060	
Securities and Exchange Commission		1	46.30	23.14	6,542	2,901	1		1,200	
Selective Service System	2	5	223.14	1,316.38	[4] 20,000	[4] 34,985	3		3,720	
Smithsonian Institution		1	150.00	140.00	5,000	3,000				
State Department		4	508.38	454.61	12,808	13,169	4		5,400	
Tariff Commission, U. S. (none)										
Tennessee Valley Authority	779	[5] 877	[5] 423,655.00	[5] 340,238.00	[5] 10,200,400	[5] 8,360,107	3		3,420	
Treasury Department		2,472	851,174.91	506,253.31	34,902,998	22,787,382	18		28,440	
U. S. Board of Tax Appeals (none)										
U. S. Courts—Administrative Office (none)										
U. S. Supreme Court, office of marshal (none)										
Veterans' Administration		[6] 359	133,903.00	244,835.00	3,152,069	2,707,954	103	330	138,180.00	440,607.00
War Production Board (included in O. E. M.)										
Total		[7] 18,948	[7] 4,813,560.94	[7] 3,334,312.85	[7] 211,866,978	[7] 147,659,279	[7] 522	[7] 340	636,832.06	[7] 443,811.41

[1] Estimated.
[2] This figure does not include operating cost or miles for W. P. A. or Division of Construction and Division of Housing Management.
[3] As of Dec. 31, 1941.
[4] Estimated.
[5] As of Jan. 31, 1942.
[6] Includes station wagons, busses, ambulances.
[7] Does not include War Department and Navy Department.

Source: Reply to questionnaire of joint committee on reduction of nonessential expenditures dated Feb. 23, 1942, submitted to each agency of Federal Government, exclusive of Army, Navy, legislative agencies, and Office of the President. Rental and mileage payments for use of private cars are not included.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Austin S. Imirie, for appointment as a principal administrative officer in national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of law; and

Earl D. Krickbaum, of Pennsylvania, for appointment as a principal statistician in the Selective Service System, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, sundry temporary officers for appointment, and several citizens to be second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Roy L. Nolen to be postmaster at Montgomery, Ala., in place of R. L. Nolen.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Executive Calendar, which has only three or four names on it, be considered as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has favorably reported the nomination of Roy L. Nolen to be postmaster in my home city of Montgomery, Ala. In view of his exceptional record as a postmaster, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination may be acted upon at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this a reappointment or a new appointment?

Mr. HILL. It is a reappointment.

Mr. McNARY. Has the nominee served heretofore?

Mr. HILL. He has previously served and has an exceptional record.

Mr. McNARY. In view of that statement, I withhold my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senate from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to the overwhelming confidence which the citizens of one of the United Nations expressed several days ago in the statesmanship of their chosen leader.

I speak of that hardy race of men and women of Dutch and British ancestry who dwell in the Union of South Africa.

I speak also of their great leader, that world statesman of high vision and noble principles, Gen. Jan Christian Smuts.

The menacing shadow of Japan creeps ever westward across the Indian Ocean, threatening the happy and prosperous Afrikanders with the rapine and mass murder which Nippon has visited upon the people of China.

What happened to Nanking may happen to Johannesburg unless bold and decisive steps are taken to stem the flood tide of Jap invasion.

With this menace staring them in the face, the free citizens of the Union of South Africa went to the polls last week and by their ballots signified their support of the wise policies which their Prime Minister, General Smuts, has initiated since the war started.

In 12 contests for vacancies in the Volksraad, the voters elected 9 representatives of General Smuts' party.

The result of this vote of confidence has a significance which transcends by far the domestic political issues which were settled by the South African electorate.

The peoples of the other 25 United Nations are heartened by this endorsement of General Smuts' policies, and by the knowledge that those policies will be continued until the final victory of the United Nations over the Japanese and German war lords.

By their free choices, the citizens of the Union of South Africa indicated the approval of two highly important steps recently taken by their Government in its conduct of the war.

Those steps were, first, the announcement by General Smuts that the South African military units would continue to fight in Africa against Axis armies; and, second, South Africa's severance of diplomatic relations with Vichy France after the Quisling, Pierre Laval, was forced on Marshal Petain by Adolf Hitler.

Now United Nations forces, in which South African units were undoubtedly represented, have occupied Madagascar, in order to prevent Laval from turning over to the Japs this strategic island which lies in the Indian Ocean off the east coast of Africa.

The people of the Union of South Africa are therefore to be particularly commended for their support of General Smuts' positive and far-seeing statesmanship in the light of the encroaching Japanese menace.

At this point it may be well to recapitulate some of the remarkably effective military contributions already made by South Africa toward winning the war.

When Mussolini entered the war in June 1940 South Africa already had strong striking forces in readiness in Kenya Colony, bordering on the territories of Italy's cherished East African Empire.

Forty-eight hours after the news came that Italy was at war with Great Britain, the South African air force struck at Fascist bases in Abyssinia and Italian Somaliland from bases in Kenya.

Shortly afterward the advance units and air force in Kenya were reinforced by a strong and well-equipped expeditionary force from the home bases.

Immediately began the remarkable campaign in which the South Africans, joining forces with other United Nations' troops, liberated Abyssinia, Eritrea, and Italian Somaliland, and toppled once and for all the Fascist tyrant's dream of a great Italian East African empire.

The campaign opened in January 1941 and was fought through to a victorious conclusion against Italian armies greatly superior in numbers. The battles were fought on some of the most difficult terrain in the world—from the blistering heat of the Danakil Desert to the lofty mountain plateaus of northern Ethiopia.

Early victories at El Yibo and El Sardu gave the South Africans possession of strategic wells and opened the way for the attack on Abyssinia.

Gorai Crater fell next, then Hobok, Italian stronghold in the Dakkamunna Mountains; then Mega, the headquarters of the "black shirt" divisions in southeastern Abyssinia; then the strategic city of Moyale.

Other South African detachments pushed into Italian Somaliland, forced their way across the Juba River, and breached the strong Italian defenses. Mogadiscio, capital of Italian Somaliland, next fell to them, and the South Africans continued their triumphal march over the Strada Royale—the military road built 5 years earlier by the Italians under Marshal Graziani for the conquest of Abyssinia.

With other allied units, the South Africans forced the Marda Pass, doorway to the Abyssinian highlands, and advanced on Addis Ababa. Haile Selassie, driven from his throne by the Italians 5 years before, reentered his capital in triumph.

The fall of Addis Ababa broke the back of Fascist resistance in east Africa. In a few months the South Africans and other Imperial units had forced the Combolvia Pass and captured Dessye and Amba Alagi. At the latter city the commander in chief of the Italian Army, the Duke of Aosta, surrendered.

The decisive actions of the east African campaign were carried through in 3 months, although desultory fighting continued for about a year.

The capitulation of the Duke of Aosta released large bodies of South African ground and air forces for duty in Libya and Cyrenaica, where they have distinguished themselves against Rommel's armored divisions.

In common with the other peace-loving democracies, the Union of South Africa was not prepared when Hitler plunged the world into this war.

South Africa's economy lacked the very sinews for the type of warfare which is waged today—the war of machines.

When General Smuts took the reins of government in his hands on September 4, 1939, he had little time for the business of recruiting, training, and equipping an army.

General Smuts and his aides had to set up at once machinery for the production of textiles, foodstuffs, arms, munitions, and motor transport, on a scale heretofore undreamed of in South Africa.

At the same time General Smuts had to levy upon South Africa's small population of about 2,000,000 for the army which was being hammered into shape.

These heroic efforts have been justified by valiant deeds.

Today the Union of South Africa musters a well-equipped, hard-fighting army of 160,000 soldiers, 50 percent of them Afrikaans speaking.

Before the war South Africa's engineering industry consisted in great part merely of maintenance shops.

Today South Africa is manufacturing antitank guns, armored cars, heavy guns, shells, pontons, and rifle and machine-gun ammunition.

The railroad shops of South Africa are machining long-range guns, gun carriages, fuses, aerial bombs, gun sights, field electrical equipment, and mortar components.

There is little doubt that the speedy success of the Abyssinian campaign was due, in large part, to the armored cars manufactured in the Union and now in service in the African campaign.

In addition, South Africa has a large program under way to provide clothing, boots, blankets, and canned foodstuffs for the United Nations' forces.

Finally, and of prime importance, is the contribution to military strategy of the Commando type of warrior originated by military leaders during the Boer War.

The world has come to admire this unique and effective type of attack, copied so successfully by British and other Empire forces in lightning raids on the European Continent and in North Africa.

We learn from Australia that our own American troops are being schooled in Commando tactics, and we are happy to acknowledge our debt to the Afrikanders.

A strong feeling of comradeship has always linked the people of South Africa and the people of the United States.

Ours, also, is the pioneer tradition, the heritage of a virgin continent tamed to the ways of civilization. We have close blood ties with both the British and the Dutch.

The rugged, democratic spirit of the South African, like that of the Australian and New Zealander, is close to our own national temperament and outlook on life. Their problems are known to us, for we also have conquered nature and vast distances.

We understand each other.

In the face of the trying times ahead, in the face of Japan's deadly menace to civilization, it is timely to reassure our South African comrades in arms of our warm friendship, our admiration, and our gratitude.

Let the heroic people of South Africa be sure that the people of America will never forget their signal contributions to the certain victory which shall be our common reward.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 18, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15, 1942:

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Lincoln MacVeagh, of Connecticut, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

John P. McGee, Carrollton, Ala., in place of J. P. McGee. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

James T. Monnier, Demopolis, Ala., in place of J. T. Monnier. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Robert G. Davis, Gordo, Ala., in place of R. G. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Samuel J. Sanders, Fayette, Ala., in place of S. J. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Dezzie A. Littlejohn, Jemison, Ala., in place of D. A. Littlejohn. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

Maurice F. Law, Linden, Ala., in place of M. F. Law. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Roy L. Nolen, Montgomery, Ala., in place of R. L. Nolen. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

William F. Beverly, Sweet Water, Ala., in place of W. F. Beverly. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

Thomas O. Smith, Jr., Wilsonville, Ala., in place of T. O. Smith, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1941.

Roy G. Carpenter, Winfield, Ala., in place of R. G. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Ruby E. Page, Woodville, Ala., in place of R. E. Page. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1942.

ALASKA

Howard W. Wilmoth, Wasilla, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

ARIZONA

Chester H. Layton, Thatcher, Ariz., in place of D. D. Phillips, deceased.

ARKANSAS

John R. Harkness, Belleville, Ark., in place of J. R. Harkness. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

William L. Walton, Black Oak, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Robert D. Reagan, Danville, Ark., in place of R. D. Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Shelby L. Jones, Emmet, Ark., in place of W. R. Beaty, transferred.

Walter R. Dunn, Foreman, Ark., in place of W. R. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Halton B. Stewart, Greenwood, Ark., in place of H. B. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Floy R. Parr, Jonesboro, Ark., in place of F. R. Parr. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

George O. Yingling, Searcy, Ark., in place of G. O. Yingling. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

Elizabeth Horton, Washington, Ark., in place of Elizabeth Horton. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Eileen B. Cardiff, Altadena, Calif., in place of E. B. Cardiff. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

Thomas V. Holmes, Duarte, Calif., in place of T. V. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Chester W. Seely, Hamilton Field, Calif., in place of C. W. Seely. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

J. Edward Huston, Huntington Beach, Calif., in place of J. E. Huston. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Helen P. Haines, Jacumba, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Bertha Hilbert, La Habra, Calif., in place of Bertha Hilbert. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Rollie A. Petty, Mountain View, Calif., in place of R. A. Petty. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Ryland M. Gorham, Palm Springs, Calif., in place of R. M. Gorham. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Arthur E. Flint, Penryn, Calif., in place of A. E. Flint. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

Mabel B. Mosgrove, Perris, Calif., in place of M. B. Mosgrove. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Walter A. Hornbeck, Red Bluff, Calif., in place of W. A. Hornbeck. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

John H. Fairweather, Reedley, Calif., in place of J. H. Fairweather. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Leslie J. Thomas, Richmond, Calif., in place of L. J. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Charles D. Golvin, Riverbank, Calif., in place of K. C. Osgood, removed.

John H. Kelley, San Mateo, Calif., in place of J. H. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

John M. Eliason, San Quentin, Calif., in place of M. G. Newby, retired.

Charles D. South, Santa Clara, Calif., in place of C. D. South, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

Robert H. Frost, Sausalito, Calif., in place of R. H. Frost. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

M. Frances Shuler, South Laguna, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Herbert P. Pritschke, Wasco, Calif., in place of H. P. Pritschke. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Frank A. Lauer, Westwood, Calif., in place of F. A. Lauer. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

COLORADO

Joseph B. Sella, Estes Park, Colo., in place of J. B. Sella. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Arthur J. Elmgreen, Evergreen, Colo., in place of A. J. Elmgreen. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Benjamin H. Snyder, Gunnison, Colo., in place of B. H. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Robert E. McCunniff, La Jara, Colo., in place of R. E. McCunniff. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Willard A. Teller, Littleton, Colo., in place of W. A. Teller. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1942.

Frank Brady, Manassa, Colo., in place of Frank Brady. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Grace E. O'Neill, Platteville, Colo., in place of G. E. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Matthew W. Huber, Victor, Colo., in place of M. W. Huber. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

Julius Woodruff Johnson, Georgetown, Conn., in place of J. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Helen K. O'Brien, Glenville, Conn., in place of H. K. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1942.

Joseph M. Halloran, New Britain, Conn., in place of J. M. Halloran. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Mary P. Beauregard, Wauregan, Conn., in place of L. E. Beauregard, resigned.

FLORIDA

Anna W. Lewis, Everglades, Fla., in place of A. W. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Norma F. Hutchenson, Fort Barrancas, Fla., in place of Nannie Moye, resigned.

William R. Vosburgh, Lutz, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

GEORGIA

Alexander S. Chamlee, Bartow, Ga., in place of A. S. Chamlee. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Ruth A. Redmond, Chatsworth, Ga., in place of R. A. Redmond. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Robert H. Manson, Darien, Ga., in place of R. H. Manson. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

William T. Adkins, Edison, Ga., in place of W. T. Adkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Sara B. Green, Fairburn, Ga., in place of S. B. Green. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Charles Clements, La Fayette, Ga., in place of Charles Clements. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Ernest L. Wilson, Leslie, Ga., in place of E. L. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

George W. Cornwell, Monticello, Ga., in place of G. W. Cornwell. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

C. Heard Tolbert, Omega, Ga., in place of C. H. Tolbert. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Irene S. Walker, Patterson, Ga., in place of M. M. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

Susie M. Lunsford, Smithville, Ga., in place of S. M. Lunsford. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Mamie G. White, Stone Mountain, Ga., in place of M. G. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Roy D. Smith, Tennille, Ga., in place of R. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

Carleen S. Bell, Trion, Ga., in place of C. S. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Arthur E. Horn, White Hall, Ga., in place of A. E. Horn. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

IDAHO

James W. Dyar, Elk City, Idaho. Office became Presidential October 1, 1941.

Claude L. Ballard, Fairfield, Idaho, in place of Claude Ballard. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Frederick J. Rodgers, Midvale, Idaho, in place of F. J. Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Edith R. Morgan, Paul, Idaho, in place of Wheeler McGill, transferred.

ILLINOIS

William R. Fisher, Chapin, Ill., in place of J. R. Cooper, deceased.

Clarence B. Muchmore, Charleston, Ill., in place of C. B. Muchmore. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

James M. Allen, Decatur, Ill., in place of J. M. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Rufus A. Carrell, Greenup, Ill., in place of L. L. McMorris, transferred.

Deane J. McAlister, Greenville, Ill., in place of D. J. McAlister. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

John F. Foster, Lovington, Ill., in place of J. W. Hines, deceased.

John H. Priepot, Mendon, Ill., in place of J. H. Priepot, April 26, 1942.

Winifred G. Whitham, Ontarioville, Ill., in place of W. G. Whitham. Incumbent's commission expired December 2, 1941.

John J. Hart, Ottawa, Ill., in place of J. J. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Hazel E. Strobel, Ransom, Ill., in place of H. E. Strobel. Incumbent's commission expired December 2, 1941.

Fred E. Battershell, Roodhouse, Ill., in place of A. H. Barrow, deceased.

John R. Slater, Savanna, Ill., in place of J. R. Slater. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Fred N. Mayer, Virden, Ill., in place of F. N. Mayer, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

INDIANA

Irven V. Tyler, Georgetown, Ind., in place of I. V. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Lueldo R. Davis, Marengo, Ind., in place of L. R. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Clarence R. Nagel, Milan, Ind., in place of J. E. Herbst, deceased.

Harry S. Glump, New Harmony, Ind., in place of H. S. Glump. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Fred J. Merline, Notre Dame, Ind., in place of F. J. Merline. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Earl M. Miller, Princeton, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

IOWA

Ralph N. Shott, Birmingham, Iowa, in place of W. R. Shott, deceased.

Helen B. Rutledge, Blairsburg, Iowa, in place of H. B. Rutledge. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Bernard G. Remmes, Charter Oak, Iowa, in place of B. G. Remmes. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

William E. Shontz, Correctionville, Iowa, in place of D. J. Riordan. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1936.

Grace V. Fellers, Fremont, Iowa, in place of Juanita Perdue, resigned.

Lillian E. Wicks, Minburn, Iowa, in place of L. E. Wicks. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Alvin J. Tisdale, Union, Iowa, in place of P. V. Hall, transferred.

Logan B. Urice, Vinton, Iowa, in place of L. B. Urice. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

Myrtle C. Stockmann, West Burlington, Iowa, in place of C. P. Lietsch, removed.

Viola L. Eaton, Woden, Iowa, in place of V. L. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

KANSAS

George O. Hunt, Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of G. O. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

William E. Gallanaugh, Gardner, Kans., in place of W. E. Gallanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1942.

Samuel N. Nunemaker, Hesston, Kans., in place of S. N. Nunemaker. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

George E. Smysor, Mulvane, Kans., in place of G. E. Smysor. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Amos A. Belsley, Wellington, Kans., in place of A. A. Belsley. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Clyde V. Ross, Hardyville, Ky., in place of J. B. Pendleton, transferred.

Robert L. Case, Mount Olivet, Ky., in place of R. L. Case. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Virginia B. Pittman, Perryville, Ky., in place of V. B. Pittman. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

LOUISIANA

Milton E. Kidd, Choudrant, La., in place of M. E Kidd. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Ralph N. Menetre, Covington, La., in place of L. L. Morgan, Jr., resigned.

Roberta M. Duffy, Montgomery, La., in place of C. J. Calhoun. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Henry F. Couvillon, Moreauville, La., in place of H. F. Couvillon. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1942.

Ernest S. Jemison, Slidell, La., in place of E. S. Jemison. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1941.

MAINE

George I. McIntosh, Lisbon Falls, Maine, in place of G. I. McIntosh. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Helen C. Donahue, Portland, Maine, in place of H. C. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Eddie J. Roderick, Rumford, Maine, in place of E. J. Roderick. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Allie D. Richards, Strong, Maine, in place of A. D. Richards. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

MARYLAND

Patrick E. Conroy, Barton, Md., in place of P. E. Conroy. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

John Hershberger, Boonsboro, Md., in place of J. W. L. McAvoy, deceased.

Charles S. Moxley, Brentwood, Md., in place of B. P. Nash, deceased.

Margaret M. Williams, Lutherville, Md., in place of C. J. Thomson, Jr., transferred.

Helena R. Guyther, Mechanicsville, Md., in place of H. R. Guyther. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Eva Fitzpatrick, Allerton, Mass., in place of Eva Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Amy A. Hawks, Bolton, Mass., in place of C. F. Wissenbach, resigned.

Clarence R. Halloran, Framingham, Mass., in place of C. R. Halloran. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Mildred D. O'Neil, Hyannis Port, Mass., in place of M. D. O'Neil. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

John E. Roche, Orange, Mass., in place of J. E. Roche. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

John R. Parker, Rockland, Mass., in place of J. R. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Rosella Webb, South Lincoln, Mass., in place of Rosella Webb. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

John J. Easton, South Walpole, Mass., in place of J. J. Easton. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Nellie G. McDonald, Ward Hill, Mass., in place of N. G. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Felix A. Dalmas, Wellfleet, Mass., in place of F. A. Dalmas. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Roger W. Cahoon, Jr., West Harwich, Mass., in place of R. W. Cahoon, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

John T. Sheehan, Worcester, Mass., in place of J. F. Healy, retired.

MICHIGAN

Janet C. White, Essexville, Mich., in place of J. C. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Glenn O. Donner, Garden City, Mich., in place of G. O. Donner. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Allgot B. Johnson, Ironwood, Mich., in place of G. A. Curry, removed.

Maud B. Perham, Lakeside, Mich., in place of M. B. Perham Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1941.

Leo W. Arnestad, Marenisco, Mich., in place of L. W. Arnestad. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Mary E. Devins, Michigamme, Mich., in place of M. E. Devins. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

George D. Mason, Montague, Mich., in place of G. D. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Peter Trudell, Jr., Negaunee, Mich., in place of Peter Trudell, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Charles P. Sawyer, Newaygo, Mich., in place of C. P. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Eva A. Wurzburg, Northport, Mich., in place of E. A. Wurzburg. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Victoria Jesionowski, Posen, Mich., in place of Victoria Jesionowski. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Lulu H. O'Rourke, Richmond, Mich., in place of L. H. O'Rourke. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1941.

George E. Judd, St. Johns, Mich., in place of C. S. Clark, Jr., resigned.

Louis J. Braun, South Range, Mich., in place of L. J. Braun. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

MINNESOTA

Vera L. Tabaka, Longville, Minn., in place of R. N. Tabaka, resigned.

Arthur Conlin, Monterey, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

MISSISSIPPI

Margaret L. Henry, Anguilla, Miss., in place of Margaret Henry. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Will N. Guyton, Blue Mountain, Miss., in place of W. N. Guyton. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Ivy G. Hill, Cleveland, Miss., in place of I. G. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Harry L. Callicott, Coldwater, Miss., in place of H. L. Callicott. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

James M. Thames, Decatur, Miss., in place of J. M. Thames. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Allison P. Shoemaker, Jr., Edgewater Park, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

John B. Vinson, Magee, Miss., in place of J. B. Vinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Johnnie L. Posey, Philadelphia, Miss., in place of J. L. Posey. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Charles E. Crook, Vicksburg, Miss., in place of H. H. Mackey, deceased.

MISSOURI

Leslie B. Kincaid, Braymer, Mo., in place of L. B. Kincaid. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Nat M. Snider, Cape Girardeau, Mo., in place of N. M. Snider. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

Ora Lee Dean, Dearborn, Mo., in place of O. L. Dean. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

Max Clodfelter, Dexter, Mo., in place of Max Clodfelter. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Thomas F. Herndon, Hume, Mo., in place of T. F. Herndon. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Alexander W Graham, Kansas City, Mo., in place of A. W. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

William D. Groom, Kearney, Mo., in place of W. D. Groom. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Charles E. Sears, Macon, Mo., in place of C. E Sears. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Ruth Vandiver, Orrick, Mo., in place of Ruth Vandiver. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Rose M. Hall, Parma, Mo., in place of R. M. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Leonard D. Dyer, Rushville, Mo., in place of L. D Dyer. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Gertrude R. Maupin, Watson, Mo., in place of G. R. Maupin. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

MONTANA

Margaret M. Westlund, Frazer, Mont., in place of M. M. Westlund. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1941.

Hugh H. Waldron, Froid, Mont., in place of H. H. Waldron. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Vernon G. Wager, Arlington, Nebr., in place of G. I. Pfeiffer, deceased.

Louis F. Kreizinger, Bellwood, Nebr., in place of L. F. Kreizinger. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

Esther A. Carlson, Mead, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Joseph W. Hazeltine, Contoocook, N. H., in place of J W. Haseltine. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1942.

Dorothy D. Clark, Hancock, N. H., in place of M M. Warner, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Frances E. Schmidt, Emerson, N. J., in place of F. E. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1941.

Martin Kenneth Collins, Marlboro, N. J., in place of M. K. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Robert T. Lentz, National Park, N. J., in place of R. T. Lentz. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1942.

Willie E. Austin, Ocean Grove, N. J., in place of H. O. Moore, deceased.

William Dudley Carleton, Ringwood, N. J., in place of W. D. Carleton. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1942.

Kathleen R. McCabe, West Trenton, N. J., in place of K. R. McCabe. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1942.

Walter W. Lance, White House Station, N. J., in place of W. W. Lance. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

Cora A. Hanagarne, Shiprock, N. Mex., in place of A. C. Evans, retired.

NEW YORK

Burdette G. Dewell, Catskill, N. Y., in place of B. G. Dewell. Incumbent's commission expires May 14, 1942.

Albert E. Olson, East Moriches, N. Y., in place of M. S. Tower, resigned.

Laurence D. Brown, Eastview, N. Y., in place of L. D. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1942.

Fred J. Burns. Jr., Glenwood Landing, N. Y., in place of F. J. Burns, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Beth I. Henry, Newfield, N. Y., in place of R. S. Pearson, deceased.

Francis X. Desmond, Niagara University, N. Y., in place of F. X. Desmond. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1942.

Hugh M. Bulger, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. M. Bulger. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Clarence T. Cahill, Palisades, N. Y., in place of C. T. Cahill. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

Rosaleen O'Halloran, Sag Harbor, N. Y., in place of C. F. Schreier. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Charles A. Pickard, Wantagh, N. Y., in place of C. M. Mills, removed.

John H. Joyner, White Sulphur Springs, N. Y., in place of J. H. Joyner. Incumbent's commisison expired November 30, 1941.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Bonner, Aurora, N. C., in place of J. A. Bonner. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

T. Coleman Galloway, Brevard, N. C., in place of T. C. Galloway. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1942.

G. Leslie Hensley, Burnsville, N. C., in place of G. L. Hensley. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Clinton E. Bolick, Conover, N. C., in place of C. E. Bolick. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Samuel T. Stough, Davidson, N. C., in place of S. T. Stough. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1942.

Carroll E. Kramer, Edenton, N. C., in place of C. E. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1942.

Cleveland C. Hines, Hollyridge, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

May Calvert, Jackson, N. C., in place of May Calvert. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1942.

William W. Hampton, Leaksville, N. C., in place of W. W. Hampton. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1941.

Oscar L. Phillips, Matthews, N. C., in place of O. L. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1942.

Columbus L. Biggerstaff, Rutherfordton, N. C., in place of C. L. Biggerstaff. Incumbent's commisison expired March 24, 1942.

James H. Howell, Waynesville, N. C., in place of J. H. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alvin N. Anderson, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

George B. Vermilya, Towner, N. Dak., in place of G. B. Vermilya. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

OHIO

Michael J. Callaghan, Bellevue, Ohio, in place of M. J. Callaghan. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Edward V. Hartmann, Holland, Ohio, in place of E. V. Hartmann. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Carson D. Faber, Jeromesville, Ohio, in place of C. D. Faber. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1941.

Olin B. Stahl, Jewett, Ohio, in place of O. B. Stahl. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Harry D. Arnold, Leetonia, Ohio, in place of H. D. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

Fred W. Justus, Massillon, Ohio, in place of F. W. Justus. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Paul M. Keyser, Shadyside, Ohio, in place of P. M. Keyser. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Arnold M. Speir, State Soldiers Home, Ohio, in place of A. M. Speir. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

William E. Passmore, Washington C. H., Ohio, in place of W. E. Passmore. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Frank A. Hawkins, West Farmington, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

OKLAHOMA

James T. Norton, Nowata, Okla., in place of J. T. Norton. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Guy E. McClain, Perkins, Okla., in place of G. E. McClain. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

OREGON

Gardner T. Hockensmith, Albany, Oreg., in place of G. T. Hockensmith. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

George E. Diehl, Chambersburg, Pa., in place of G. E. Diehl. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

William H. Heacock, Marcus Hook, Pa., in place of W. H. Heacock. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1942.

Frank G. Christopher, Smithton, Pa., in place of F. G. Christopher. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1941.

RHODE ISLAND

Thomas F. Burke, Barrington, R. I., in place of T. B. Hallman. Incumbent's commission pired February 15, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas B. Hallman, Aiken, S. C., in place of T. B. Hallman. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Pretto H. White, Ehrhardt, S. C., in place of P. H. White. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

John B. O'Neal, Fairfax, S. C., in place of J. B. O'Neal. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Lorna M. Hutson, Hardeeville, S. C., in place of L. M. Hutson. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

George M. Faile, Kershaw, S. C., in place of H. B. Taylor. Resigned.

John W. Willis, Lynchburg, S. C., in place of J. W. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

James M. Muirhead, Mount Pleasant, S. C., in place of J. M. Muirhead. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

William S. Gibson, Sharon, S. C., in place of W. S. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Earle M. Wharton, Ware Shoals, S. C., in place of E. M. Wharton. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

George C. Cartwright, York, S. C., in place of G. C. Cartwright. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

J. Edward Meyer, Mobridge, S. Dak., in place of Carl Hildebrandt, deceased.

George D. Blake, Spearfish, S. Dak., in place of J. P. O'Neill, removed.

TENNESSEE

Lillian G. Freemon, Leoma, Tenn., in place of L. G. Freemon. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1942.

William S. Fields, Milan, Tenn., in place of W. S. Fields. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

James H. Davenport, Soddy, Tenn., in place of J. H. Davenport. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1942.

Phil W. Campbell, Tiptonville, Tenn., in place of P. W. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1942.

Floyd Mitchell, Tullahoma, Tenn., in place of Floyd Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1941.

James K. St. Clair, White Bluff, Tenn., in place of J. K. St. Clair. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1941.

TEXAS

Marie E. Parker, Anahuac, Tex., in place of M. E. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

John R. Griffin, Blooming Grove, Tex., in place of J. R. Griffin. Incubent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Emory D. Cotten, Brownsboro, Tex., in place of E. D. Cotten. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Minnie P. Irving, Center Point, Tex., in place of M. P. Irving. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Lee M. Feagin, Colmesneil, Tex., in place of L. M. Feagin. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1941.

Kathleen H. Godsey, Crockett, Tex., in place of K. H. Godsey. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Carlos D. Berry, Dawson, Tex., in place of C. D. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Gordon Keith Denman, Dumas, Tex., in place of G. K. Denman. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Oscar W. Koym, East Bernard, Tex., in place of O. W. Koym. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Edgar W. Brooks, Eldorado, Tex., in place of E. W. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Lonnie Childs, Fairfield, Tex., in place of Lonnie Childs. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Gladys M. Waters, Grandview, Tex., in place of G. M. Waters. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Warren C. Fargason, Hermleigh, Tex., in place of W. C. Fargason. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Julius D. Gibbs, Kingsville, Tex., in place of J. D. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Willie L. Nelson, Mount Vernon, Tex., in place of W. L. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Mae Whitley, New Waverly, Tex., in place of Mae Whitley. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Lizzie F. Grissette, North Zulch, Tex., in place of L. F. Grissette. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Stella Jarrett, Olden, Tex., in place of Stella Jarrett. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

Theodore M. Herring, San Angelo, Tex., in place of T. M. Herring. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Edgar F. Bonorden, Sinton, Tex., in place of E. F. Bonorden. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Marcus E. Cannon, Thornton, Tex., in place of M. E. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Walter J. Huff, Trenton, Tex., in place of W. J. Huff. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Samuel M. Peacock, Wickett, Tex., in place of B. A. Wristen, resigned.

VERMONT

David A. Aubin, Vergennes, Vt., in place of W. K. Powers, resigned.

VIRGINIA

R. Milton Crump, Chester, Va., in place of A. T. Organ, deceased.

Ira D. Newcomb, Clarksville, Va., in place of I. D. Newcomb. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Kenneth H. Woody, Crewe, Va., in place of K. H. Woody. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Burley M. Garner, Emporia, Va., in place of B. M. Garner. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

James H. Ashby, Exmore, Va., in place of J. H. Ashby. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Alfred C. Darden, Fort Monroe, Va., in place of A. C. Darden. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

E. Keith Taylor, Hanover, Va., in place of L. L. Jacobs, deceased.

Margaret H. Hardy, McKenney, Va., in place of M. H. Hardy. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Joseph W. Harvey, Montrose, Va., in place of J. W. Harvey. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Leslie N. Ligon, Pamplin, Va., in place of L. N. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942

John P. Mugler, Phoebus, Va., in place of J. P. Mugler. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

James V. Lewis, Prospect, Va., in place of J. V. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Joseph F. Judkins, Surry, Va., in place of J. F. Judkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942

Jesse F. West, Jr., Waverly, Va., in place of J. F. West, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

R. Tyler Bland, West Point, Va., in place of R. T. Bland. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

WASHINGTON

Mable R. Clothier, Burien, Wash., in place of M. R. Clothier. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

Orris E. Marine, Colton, Wash., in place of O. E. Marine. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Adrian C. Gehres, Connell, Wash., in place of A. C. Gehres. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Mary E. Brown, Sequim, Wash., in place of M. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

George P. Fishburne, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Grover C. Houtchens, Waitsburg, Wash., in place of G. C. Houtchens. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Joshua E. Leander, White Bluffs, Wash., in place of J. E. Leander. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Warren H. Miller, Spencer, W. Va., in place of L. A. Douglas, deceased.

Myrtle W. Orndorff, Wardensville, W. Va., in place of M. W. Orndorff. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1941.

WISCONSIN

Charles N. Cody, Antigo, Wis., in place of C. N. Cody. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Joseph O. Goff, Bristol, Wis., in place of J. O. Goff. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Ted Cole, Cashton, Wis., in place of Ted Cole. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Frank N. Scherer, Kohler, Wis., in place of F. N. Scherer. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Hilary T. Karis, Norwalk, Wis., in place of H. T. Karis. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Clifford T. Peterson, Poplar, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Charles F. Heald, Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of C. F. Heald. April 12, 1942.

Howard F. Vande Hei, West De Pere, Wis., in place of H. F. Vande Hei. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1942:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

John D. Reichard
Vance B. Murray

TO BE SENIOR SURGEONS IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Winfield K. Sharp, Jr.
Fred T. Foard.
Ralph L. Lawrence

POSTMASTER

Roy L. Nolen, Montgomery, Ala.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 18, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1942)

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thy life is the breath of our being; Thy love is the light of our homes; Thy righteousness alone is the glory of our Nation: Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pettiness and prejudice and pride and from the ugly sins that doth so easily beset us. Lift us above the mud and scum of mere things to the beauty of Thy holiness, where even daily drudgery may be edged with crimson and gold. Lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things that matter most—the golden currency of faith and hope and love. In these

times that try our souls, our faith, our loyalty, as we gird the might of the Nation to defend the things we hold nearest our hearts, may we take care to strengthen the spiritual roots of our democracy. Give us eyes to see that all the values we have solemnly vowed to preserve at any cost are rooted in the eternal realm. So in a torn and troubled day may we toil in these fields of time in the sense of the Eternal. In the name that is above every name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 15, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 16, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Alabama, Iowa, and New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of members of Trinity Methodist Church, of Iola, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. DOWNEY):

Petitions signed by 89 citizens of Stanislaus County, and 45 members of the Emmanuel Bible class, First Methodist Church, of Oakland, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Broome County, N. Y., favoring the use of a portion of excess grain now in storage for the making of alcohol for war industries in place of sugar needed for human consumption; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens and members of religious organizations, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6599. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1347).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

S. 2471. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348).

By Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2310. A bill for the relief of Roy Chandler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2437. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public, No. 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1350);

S. 2488. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1351); and

H. R. 6979. A bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1352).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2530. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2531. A bill for the relief of Lenora B. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 2532 A bill for the relief of John Wilkes Booth 2d; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2533. A bill to provide for the temporary use by the United States Navy of the Indian school at Wahpeton, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2534. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S 2535. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2536. A bill for the relief of Harriet B Rickards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 2537. A bill for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2538. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2539. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 2540. A bill authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to create a subsidiary corporation to be known as the War Distress Finance Corporation, to deal with cases of business distress and financial hardship attributable to the war and causes related thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

APPLICATION OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS TO ASSISTANT OR DEPUTY HEADS OF CERTAIN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUREAUS—AMENDMENT RELATING TO CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3488) to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

WOMEN'S NAVAL RESERVE CORPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment which I intend to propose to the bill (S. 2527) to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes. On March 19, 1942, I introduced a bill (S. 2388) to establish a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy, and for other purposes. This bill was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and by that committee referred to the Navy Department for recommendation and approval. On April 16, 1942, the Navy Department reported that it recommended enactment of Senate bill 2388, and advised there would be no objection by the Bureau of the Budget to the submission of its recommendation.

After the introduction of Senate bill 2388, I received numerous requests from interested persons that the name "Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy," be changed to "United States Navy Women's Reserve Corps" in order to avoid conflict with the name "Coast Guard Auxiliary," which had been in existence as a department of Reserve since February 19, 1941. Among these requests was one from Vice Admiral R. R. Waesche, Commandant, United States Coast Guard, which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD at this point. It sets forth the reason for the change.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 18, 1942.

Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There are appended hereto a copy of letter dated April 17, 1942, from Mr. Elliott M. Feinberg, 230 West Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y., together with copy of my reply to him, in which concern is felt over the introduction of the word "auxiliary" in the naming of the Navy women's reserve organization.

The membership of the Coast Guard Auxiliary is composed almost solely of men who are owners of motorboats and yachts, the pertinent law establishing the Coast Guard Auxiliary and prescribing its duties being appended hereto for your ready reference.

I can very easily appreciate the concern of the membership of the Coast Guard Auxiliary that the public might regard it as a women's organization through the use of the word "auxiliary" in the proposed naming of the women's reserve organizations of the Army and Navy. One of the suggestions received at this office, and which would seem to take care of the situation, would be the naming of the organization as "United States Navy Women's Reserve Corps."

Very sincerely yours,
R. R. WAESCHE,
Vice Admiral, United States
Coast Guard, Commandant.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in order to meet certain objections to Senate bill 2527, I ask that the letter I have presented, together with the amendment intended to be proposed by me, be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs for consideration. I also ask that the amendment may be printed and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be received, printed, and printed in the RECORD, and, together with the letter, will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The amendment submitted by Mr. WILLIS was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr WILLIS to the bill (S. 2527) to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes, viz: On page 1, to strike out line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Title V United States Navy Women's Reserve Corps"

Strike out the words "Women's Auxiliary Reserve" "Auxiliary Reserve", and "Reserve" wherever they appear in said bill and insert in lieu thereof the words "Women's Reserve Corps."

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. WALSH (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 251), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor is hereby authorized to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, an additional clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate.

HELP WIN THE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEE

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on May 14, 1942, on the subject Help Win the War, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS TO JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS to the Jewish War Veterans, New York City, May 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE NATION AT WAR

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Seventh District American Legion Conference at Adams, Wis., May 3, 1942, on the subject The Nation at War, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALCOHOL AND BUTADIENE—ADDDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared to be delivered by him on the subject of alcohol and butadiene, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE BY THE LATE DR. ZEBARNEY T. PHILLIPS TO PERCY E. BUDLONG

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the last public utterance of Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips, late Chaplain of the Senate, in tribute to the late Official Reporter of debates of the Senate, Percy E. Budlong, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOOL-PRODUCTS LABELING ACT—STATEMENT BY HENRY MILLER

[Mr. SCHWARTZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made over the radio by Henry Miller, Director, Trade Practice Conferences Division, Federal Trade Commission, on the subject of the new wool-products labeling act, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter to President Roosevelt, relative to the control of liquor traffic and suppression of vice around military camps, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE WEST POINTS AND ANNAPOLISES—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of May 18, 1942, entitled "More West Points and Annapolises," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RELEASE OF BROWDER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 18, 1942, entitled "The Release of Browder," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REYNOLDS METALS CO.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, 2 years ago today an old friend, Hon. Marion M. Caskie, former Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, then vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co., brought to my office the president of his company, Mr. R. S. Reynolds. It was my first meeting with Mr. Reynolds, but with great earnestness he asked me to make a few notations. In the light of subsequent history I wish to repeat them to the Senate and to the country. Mr. Reynolds said:

First. This is a light-metals war and will be won or lost in the air. France, England, and America have ignored for 5 years the sensational increase in production of aluminum and magnesium metals by Germany and her allies. As a consequence of this tragic failure, France is now doomed. Unless we quickly awake to the peril of this new type of aerial warfare, England will fall, and America will follow.

Second. This is a mechanized war. Here in America we hold in our hands the salvation of the world. Here, and here alone, exist the trained manpower, the machines, and the genius that has made this the greatest mechanized nation on earth. The Government, with full protection to labor and owners, must take over immediately this magic army of mass production and convert it quickly to the manufacture of airplanes and tanks. If we act quickly, we shall save millions of lives and billions of dollars.

So spoke Mr. Reynolds 2 years ago this day. Rebuffed by some who should have given him unstinted support, Mr. Reynolds set an example which he hoped others might follow.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. I can testify from evidence before the committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, that Mr. Reynolds risked all he had in order to help the country obtain the necessary aluminum supplies for the construction of planes, tanks, and guns. Mr. Reynolds is a patriotic citizen. He risked everything he had. He was dependent absolutely on the Aluminum Co. of America for his supplies of aluminum for his own business, and he took the chance of losing everything he had.

Mr. HILL. In other words, his private business without the supply of aluminum from the Aluminum Co. of America would have absolutely passed out.

Mr. TRUMAN. It would have passed out, and he risked his private business and mortgaged it in order to make aluminum for the benefit and welfare of the country as a whole.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for his words. He is familiar with the record before his committee, and has given the facts as they are. As he has stated, the Reynolds Metals Co. mortgaged every private plant they had to the R. F. C. in 1940 in order that they might go into the aluminum

business. They asked for no Government subsidy; they asked for no favor at all; but, instead, for a loan of money for which, as I have said, they gave a mortgage on every plant they had.

The Reynolds Metals Co. mortgaged 20 large factories for an R. F. C. loan in June 1940. In record time 5 mammoth aluminum-reduction plants were built—2 in Alabama and 3 in the State of Washington. These plants are producing today at the rate almost of 100,000,000 pounds per annum. Late this year this company's production should reach a total of 160,000,000 pounds of virgin aluminum. This is about as much aluminum as the combined production of France and England and almost half as much as the Aluminum Co. of America produced as late as 1939. All of this metal and more is being fabricated by Reynolds into wrought aluminum sheet, rod, and extruded shapes for airplanes and ships in its expanded fabricating facilities and in defense plants it is operating for similar production.

At the time of Pearl Harbor, Reynolds Metals Co. was ready for the challenge, and since that momentous date has furnished to our country and the United Nations approximately 40,000,000 pounds of fabricated aluminum which, translated into fighter planes, represents 5,000 of them.

One year later, in May 1941, Mr. Reynolds, after having built the great aluminum production plants in the States of Alabama and Washington, and after being engaged in actual production, still not satisfied that there would be enough aluminum to meet the impending war requirements, addressed a letter to the Office of Production Management in which he stated that, although he had done what he could at the time, he felt that our production of aluminum would not be sufficient to win the war and, in order to meet the emergency, urged the Office of Production Management to go further and convert the automobile industry and other industries into the production of aluminum and into the production of aircraft.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter set out in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the turn in world affairs, I have once again become alarmed. I am alarmed because of the position in which the United States may soon find itself in this hungry and war-mad world. I am alarmed as a member of the aluminum industry at the magnitude of the responsibility we must face immediately. With these thoughts in mind, I am led to submit the following suggestions:

First. We should plan immediately to double the present production of aluminum and multiply by 10 our present production of magnesium. This is the absolute minimum if we hope to preserve our independence and way of life.

Second. The greatest weakness, as I view it, in the production of aluminum is that there are today only two large and one small alumina plants in the United States—one at Mobile, one at St. Louis, and our small plant at Listerhill, Ala. (producing its first alumina this week). If the large alumina plant at Mobile should be closed by strike, accident, or sabotage, it would wreck all of your calculations on aluminum. I feel constrained to urge again, at this time, that the Government itself finance at least 10 "stand-by" alumina plants, at different locations well within the safety zone. (This, in addition to any increase in regular production.) These plants should be equipped with stocks of bauxite and be ready for operation should the emergency arise.

Third. It is my firm conviction that production of light metals (aluminum and magnesium) can be expanded as fast as the aviation, automotive, and other direct contractors can expand. Of course, the metal manufacturers should have the same length of time to meet expansion programs as the defense contractors.

Fourth. The peace of the world, in my opinion, can only be secured and maintained by America making war so horrible that no country or man will ever again take up arms. We have the will, we have the production capacity, and I feel that America only awaits the command of our President.

Mr. HILL. Following this eloquent appeal of Mr. Reynolds, the Office of Production Management within a few weeks announced that the Government would build plants to produce an additional 600,000,000 pounds of aluminum per annum, and this has been more recently followed by even further increases.

The record of the Reynolds Metals Co. stands distinct and alone, because this company was the first to realize that enormously increased quantities of aluminum metal would be absolutely vital if victory is to be won. Without waiting for firm orders, cash down payments, or Government protection, the company mortgaged all its peacetime factories to increase the supply of aluminum at the very time America was being lulled to sleep as France had been lulled to sleep—lulled by assurance of those in authority—and by statements and press notices that America's supply of aluminum would be ample for defense as well as for civilian requirements.

In the light of what has happened since May 1940 I want my colleagues and the Nation to know that Reynolds Metals Co. is the only company in the United Nations that dared to enter, on its own resources, the hazardous business of producing aluminum metal from bauxite. This company now has 30 plants, located in 13 States, with 16,000 employees, and has never had a strike. I am proud of the fact that its largest plant is located in Alabama. I hope my colleagues may have the pleasure of visiting this mammoth plant, and seeing it in continuous operation. The plant is unique, for in all the world it is the only one where raw bauxite goes in at one end and comes out at the other end finished wrought aluminum sheet for airplanes.

I am sure the Congress and a grateful Nation will long remember its one and only aluminum volunteer—the Reynolds Metals Co.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. As a member of the Truman committee, I am quite familiar with the subject which has been so well discussed on the Senate floor this morning by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama. I wish publicly to commend Mr. Reynolds for his foresight and leadership, as well as for the splendid contribution he made to the well-being of our country. When officials of the O. P. M., high officials in the Government, and leaders of industry, were telling us that we had all the aluminum we needed with which to meet present and future demands, this man Reynolds was a great power, stating to us, and reiterating with emphasis, that we would be short of aluminum, and needed more aluminum production. Supporting him and his contention, and meriting our wholehearted commendation, is the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who sustained this pioneer, making a splendid contribution to the story that was well written by the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his kind words as a member of the Truman committee, which investigated thoroughly the aluminum situation. He knows the facts.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. How much time is consumed by the process the Senator has described, the aluminum coming out a finished product? How far does the material have to travel from the raw product to the finished product?

Mr. HILL. Some of the raw product, the bauxite, comes from the State of Alabama, about 200 miles from the plant.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not mean that; I mean, what is the distance traveled in the plant? How far does the material travel before it becomes aluminum?

Mr. HILL. There are really three different processes in the great plant in Alabama. First they make the alumina, then they get the aluminum, then it is converted into sheet aluminum. There are three different processes, and from the time the raw bauxite enters the plant until it comes out covers a period of only 2 weeks.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That such mortgage shall not in any event exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed

physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of off-site public utilities and streets, and organization and legal expenses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I entered the Capitol today I was told by the able Senator from Maryland that he desired to present this conference report. I should like to have him detail what was done in conference, as I know he is capable of doing, so that we may understand the difference between the bill as it passed the Senate and as it is now, as it comes back in the form of a conference report.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill as agreed to by the conferees varies only very slightly from the form in which it passed the Senate. The House conferees receded on some points and the Senate conferees receded on one amendment, which attempted to specify the various kinds of expense and costs which would be considered in connection with the 90 percent basis used in establishing the standard by which loans should be made in connection with the large properties designed for renting, primarily to war workers. There was no special objection on the part of the Senate conferees to receding from language of the Senate on that point, as the Senate provision might be considered as unnecessary on the theory that the subject was covered by general language.

As the Senator from Oregon will recall, the Senate added an amendment providing a cumulative method of finding the bases for loans. The loans which are authorized under the proposed amendment of the act must meet two requirements. One method was specified by the House, and the second was added by the Senate. The one stipulated by the House provided that the loans should not exceed 90 percent of the reasonable cost of reproduction of the property, including the land. The Senate added another requirement which, as I have said, is a cumulative provision. It provided that loans should not exceed 100 percent of the cost of the improvements, specifying that certain items should not be considered as costs of improvements.

The House conferees thought such restrictions were rather rigid, and after some consideration the Senate conferees agreed to modify some of the requirements. For instance, in computing the 100-percent basis of the cost of construction, offside roads and sewers will be excepted, as well as legal expenses and organization expenses. Of course, land would be excepted anyway, because the provision is that the 100 percent shall be based on the cost of the improvements only. Therefore, in addition to the elimination of cost of land, such items as costs of offside sewers and street improvements, as well as such other items as were incurred by way of legal expenses and organization expenses, could not be included in the total upon which the 100-percent standard is set up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AS A PREREQUISITE FOR EMPLOYMENT IN DEFENSE WORK

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to call the attention of the Senate to the barriers which exist in the employment of men over 45. I referred to the age limits which had been fixed in the various agencies and also to the questionnaires submitted some time ago by the War Department to men who had served as officers in the World War. The purpose of these questionnaires was to obtain satisfactory applicants for administrative employment so that younger men could be released for combat service.

I also referred to the difficulties which these men over 45 are having in obtaining employment. Many companies having war contracts require birth certificates as a prerequisite to employment. As no adequate record exists in many of the States to prove the date of birth of men of this age, they are practically debarred from employment. For instance, in my own State, we had no recognized registration of vital statistics before 1915. Even men who had served in the Army and were given honorable discharges are being denied employment because they do not have birth certificates.

In response to an inquiry from me relative to the treatment of these ex-service men, I received the following advice from the War Department:

> This refers to your letter of April 21, 1942, regarding the requirement of birth certificate as a condition of employment.
>
> This is a matter which has been very carefully considered by the Department, and I am pleased to say that within a very short time, a memorandum will be issued to war production plants regarding the use of an approved "declaration of citizenship" form which, when properly signed and witnessed, will serve, for the purpose of employment, as acceptable evidence of citizenship.
>
> The use of this form, I believe, will in large measure solve the difficulty with which numbers of applicants have been faced in regard to securing employment.

Mr. President, it is hoped that the Department will expedite action in the employment of these older men and also in the issuance of this certificate to be regarded as a "declaration of citizenship" for the relief and assistance of this large number of men who have served honorably in our Army and Navy.

I believe also that the Congress should give its attention to the establishment of a Federal system which will remove the embarrassments that confront American citizens in the establishment of their citizenship and their rights therewith. It is an injustice when men whose forbears came to the United States before the American Revolution or who fought in the American Revolution, and many more who served honorably in the armed service themselves, are denied employment because they are unable to prove birth in this country, which would enable them to obtain the full rights and privileges of citizenship.

MINE EXPLOSION AT OSAGE MINE, MONONGALIA COUNTY, W. VA.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, last Tuesday afternoon, May 12, a mine explosion of undisclosed origin occurred at the Osage Mine of the Christopher Coal Co., in Monongalia County, W. Va., resulting in the instant death of 56 miners who were employed in the mine. This marks another major mine disaster in the coal regions of our State. According to reports, there is no suspicion of sabotage, and the accident occurred in a mine in which had been installed every modern safety appliance. The mine had been thoroughly inspected a few days before the explosion.

In recent years a great deal of scientific study has been given to the cause of mine explosions, but so far no solution of the problem has been found. An explosion in a coal mine is produced by a combination of factors, and this particular combination may not occur in many years. An explosion results when a flame comes into contact with gas which ignites the highly inflammable coal dust. In every mine which liberates gas there are moments when the gas is capable of ignition, and the same is true of dust. The fatal flame is usually a spark made by machinery in loading coal, such as a glancing blow of metal against a piece of slate or stone which becomes mixed with the coal, or it may be a spark from a mine motor, or a carelessly lighted match. As I have said, it is doubtful if the most careful investigators of mine disasters can determine just exactly what causes a mine explosion.

Mr. President, I mention this most recent tragedy because I think the people of our country ought to be reminded of the hazards of labor in one of our most vital industries. Over 100,000 miners in my State go daily to their work in the mines. They are not only subjected to the occasional major disasters, resulting in great loss of life, but individual miners continually lose their lives or are maimed and injured. Coal mining is little less hazardous than participation in active service in our armed forces. It requires the same type of courage for a miner to go miles under the earth as it does for a pilot of a great bomber to carry his machine over hostile territory. In this last disaster 56 men gave up their lives. Many widows and orphans have been left behind. These men are the unsung heroes of our great fight for production. In face of danger our thousands of miners daily produce the coal which fires the steel furnaces of the Nation and makes the wheels go round in our defense plants. As a result of organization and the passage of laws for the control of coal prices, the miners are receiving fair wages. In

view of the great dangers which accompany mining, I do not believe any fair-minded person in our country can justly charge that these men are lacking in patriotism and courage, and surely all of us will agree that the wages received by them are not excessive.

As these 56 men, whose lives were snuffed out in an instant, are carried to their graves, I want to pay a tribute to the mine workers of my own State and of the country. Engaged as they are in the most vital of all productions for our defense program, they go forth every day to face danger in their occupation. They may be truly classed as the soldiers of industry, and no phase of our war effort requires more courage than must be possessed by the miners of our country. Those who do not live in mining sections are probably not conscious of the hazards involved in coal mining. The men who gave up their lives in the Osage mine have passed on to their reward. The industry to which they devoted their labor and energies goes on. In spite of accident and disaster, the men in the mines labor with indefatigable energy. Other groups of workingmen no doubt are entitled to great credit for the contribution which they are making to our great program of production, but today I pay my tribute of respect to the men who deliver the coal to our mills and to our defense plants. In the face of grievous loss and bereavement the widows and orphans of these dead miners, thanks to modern laws, will receive compensation that will prevent poverty and distress. No one can restore the loss which the bereaved ones have sustained, but it is a comfort to the State and to us to know that, in the presence of their sad bereavement, their physical wants will be provided for.

May the coal miners who have given their lives in the pursuit of a hazardous occupation rest in peace. They may not enjoy military glory and honor, but they have made a heroic contribution to our fight for victory.

ARMY-NAVY RELIEF FUND BASEBALL GAME

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, with the desire to be helpful in advancing the cause of Army and Navy relief, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a baseball game which will be played at Griffith Stadium Saturday next. This game, according to a distinguished athletic authority, Shirley Povich, writing in the Washington Post of May 18, will be played for the benefit of—

> The wives and kids of those guys who got shot up at Pearl Harbor. Or maybe daddy was one of the fellows who stuck it out on Bataan, hungry for mule meat, until they ran out of ammunition and the Japs moved in with hot lead and bombs. Or maybe they were the men who were trapped on Wake Island or Midway without much of a chance to fight back.

That is what this game will be played for.

Mr. President, the sponsors of the game are hoping to sell 50,000 tickets to the ball game. There are not 50,000 seats in the park, but only 32,000. It is not necessary for all those who buy tickets to go to the game. We can buy the tickets with the realization that the contribution will be to good cause As an example, in Brooklyn 6,000 more tickets were sold for such a ball game than there were seats in the park, and a fine example has thus been set.

The same sort of ball game is being staged in every big city, and in every city in the United States where baseball is played. The United States capital has a big stake in this cause. Anything less than a complete sell-out will be, as Mr. Povich wrote, "tough to take." In Australia, in Honolulu, in Ireland, in Iceland, and aboard ships of war men will be happier because we buy these tickets.

Mr. President, in this connection, and in testimony of our appreciation for what baseball is doing in advancing the cause of Army and Navy relief, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial published in the Sporting News of May 14, 1942, entitled "MacPhail and Brooklyn Again Show the Way."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sporting News of May 14, 1942]

MAC PHAIL AND BROOKLYN AGAIN SHOW THE WAY

Once more, Larry MacPhail and the Brooklyn club have shown the way for organized ball. Selling more than 42,000 tickets and packing Ebbets Field to capacity, and collecting almost $59,000 for the greatest financial return yet realized from 1 day of league competition at Ebbets Field, MacPhail and the Dodgers did an amazing job in the first of the Army-Navy Relief Fund games to be played in all of our major league parks this summer.

The first benefice MacPhail achieved for baseball and for the service fund was to set aside one of the most opulent games of the season for the war cause. He played the Giants, the biggest attraction in Flatbush, year in and year out. He could have tossed to the fund a contest with the Phils and forced the entire burden of the benefit on the shoulders of the fans. But MacPhail set out to break records. So he gave the Navy fund a game with the Giants, set about promoting the event and the day with his characteristic showmanship, and packed the park to suffocation.

It was Navy Day in Brooklyn by official mandate. It was a parade day, a holiday, a tremendous show downtown, a vast spectacle and a grand game at Ebbets Field. The Giants were beaten, 7 to 6, but they had the tying run on second when Hugh Casey retired the last man.

Not to be outdone in generosity by MacPhail, Horace Stoneham of the Giants has scheduled the Dodgers for his Army fund benefit at the Polo Grounds in August. Thus, two clubs within the city limits of New York have set an example for the entire country.

The tremendous success of the Brooklyn benefit redounded to the credit of baseball, which proved again that it was doing its part in the war effort. To thousands of persons who yet had remained doubters, the game demonstrated in this way it had a right to live; that it was justifying its existence in a time of national stress and world hostilities.

For all the other clubs in the majors, the 42,000 fans paying almost $59,000 at Ebbets Field set a standard which will excite the utmost efforts toward emulation.

To all the other clubs, MacPhail proved that showmanship could achieve incredible results. He did not merely announce that the Dodgers would play the Giants for the relief fund. He did not challenge the interest of the fans. He excited it so sharply that nobody wanted to miss that day game. It is up to all the other club presidents to organize a similar furor over their fund games.

The Brooklyn benefit was played at 4:45 p. m.—the first real twilight game scheduled in the majors. With night ball likely to go by the board in New York City for the duration of the war, the marvelous reaction to the game in the gloaming hints that at least in Brooklyn the 14 contests slated for the arcs may be shifted to 4:45 starting time.

MacPhail, first to give night ball its place in the majors; pioneer of twilight ball, trail blazer in the game's war effort—truly Larry is an empire builder of the diamond.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a recent editorial published in the Kansas City Times, warning against extending gasoline rationing to parts of the Nation where there actually are surplus supplies of gasoline. The editorial points out that such rationing is more likely to slow down the war effort than to speed it.

The editorial, I think very properly, asks:

> Why, then, extend rationing to the Middle West, where not only there is no need for it but where such rationing actually would seem to be contrary to the national policy?

Arguments in favor of gasoline rationing in the Middle West, the Kansas City Times maintains, are flimsy. Tire rationing is already conserving rubber.

Another argument is the statement by a minor Government official that the "Nation must learn discipline." That is poppycock, says the Kansas City Times.

Mr. President, there are entirely too many stories going the round about gasoline rationing. The whole proposition has received more heat than light from the multiplicity of conflicting statements. There is even doubt whether such drastic gasoline rationing as now is in effect in the Eastern States would be necessary if available transportation facilities were being intelligently utilized. It seems to many of those more or less familiar with the oil industry that pipe-line facilities are available to carry oil and gasoline at least as far east as Chicago and St. Louis. Why not then use railroad tank cars from these points to the east coast only, instead of using tank cars for transportation from points a thousand miles west of Chicago and St. Louis, as I am informed is being done?

I am in favor, and I believe all Americans are in favor, of every necessary sacrifice to win this war; but I fail to see the sense in "sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice," as suggested by those who would impose rigid and drastic gasoline restrictions in territory where there are surplus supplies of gasoline. It seems to me there should be a better and more concrete case made for Nation-wide gasoline rationing before it is put into effect.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times of May 11, 1942]

WHY RATION GAS HERE?

Now comes the threat to extend the gasoline rationing order beyond the Atlantic seaboard to the Middle West.

Obviously the release of information that the War Production Board has such a proposal under consideration is a "feeler" to find what the reactions of the Midwest will be. If so, the reactions should be prompt and outspoken, for if ever a Government scheme was without logic or valid reason, this is it.

The occasion for gasoline rationing on the Atlantic seaboard is understood by the Nation, although there may still be some doubt that the conditions are as serious as have been implied. For example, the last issue of the Oil and Gas Journal states that, even if all tanker deliveries to the east coast are stopped, the supply of gasoline for motorists will average 5.5 gallons per car per week for the next 5 months.

Remember that tanker deliveries have not increased—at present tankers are delivering an average of more than 500,000 barrels of petroleum products a day. Even so, there is a conceivable emergency. Ultimate contingencies should be provided for. Since essential users should get more than nonessential users the present proposal of limiting gasoline to less than 3 gallons a week per user is probably in the line of safety and judgment.

But the shortage in the East, as understood by the entire Nation, is due to a local condition of transportation. There is no national shortage of gasoline supply. There is no shortage of national gasoline manufacturing facilities. There is no shortage of petroleum production.

Why, then, extend rationing to the Middle West where not only there is no need for it, but where such rationing actually would seem to be contrary to the national policy?

Arguments in favor of such a drastic rationing are flimsy. One is that "rubber should be conserved in the Middle West." It already has been conserved up to the limit, by tire rationing. Another is a minor Government official's statement that the "Nation must learn discipline." That is poppycock. The Nation has learned discipline, and is ready to do every sensible thing to further the war.

As a matter of fact, gasoline rationing over the country may be actually damaging to the war effort. Already some refineries are reported closing down because they cannot market their surplus gasoline. We have been at war now for 5 months. Yet today our gasoline supply is greater than it was a year ago. The first week of May 1941 showed supplies of gasoline totaling 96,000,000 barrels. The supplies in the first week of May 1942 totaled 101,000,000 barrels in spite of all withdrawals for the war machine.

Further rationing will inevitably close more refineries, and the making of high-octane gasoline for airplanes is dependent on the refinery processes. The Nation can ill afford to curtail its manufacturing facilities for this needful war fuel at this time. Yet that will be the inevitable effect of Nation-wide rationing.

Americans will do anything to win the war but they don't enjoy being pushed around by bureaucrats. Washington had better think up some real reason before attempting to extend gasoline rationing to parts of the country where no shortage exists.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Norris
Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Gillette	O'Daniel
Bailey	Glass	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Brown	Kilgore	Stewart
Bulow	La Follette	Taft
Bunker	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lee	Truman
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Wagner
Chavez	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Doxey	Millikin	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is detained on business in one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent attending a conference at the White House.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 102, lines 18 to 24, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, late in the afternoon of last Friday, in the absence of the Senator from Virginia from the Chamber, a committee amendment was agreed to relating to the traveling expenses of the Department of Agriculture. I appeal to the Senate to reconsider that action so that the Senator from Virginia may have the privilege of offering an amendment to the committee amendment, making a greater reduction in the traveling expenses of the Department of Agriculture than was made by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The Senator from Virginia remained in the Chamber during the entire session on Friday, without any lunch. He was unexpectedly called from the Chamber on a very important official matter. He was absent from the Chamber for only 5 or 10 minutes, and during that time the committee amendment was agreed to. I hope, as a matter of senatorial courtesy, the Senate will reconsider that action and permit the Senator from Virginia to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The House reduced the traveling expenses of the Department of Agriculture by 50 percent. Last year such expenses were more than $16,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee struck out the House reduction of 50 percent, and made a reduction of less than 10 percent—a reduction of $1,500,000 out of $16,000,000. All the Senator from Virginia is asking is reconsideration of the committee amendment. If the Senator from Virginia had not been present in Washington and had not attended the session of the Senate on Friday, he would perhaps not make this request.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this matter must be voted upon one way or the other. I have no objection to the amendment being reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 102, line 21, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,200,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the effect of my amendment would be to make a 20-percent reduction in the traveling expenses of the Department of Agriculture. As I have already stated, the House made a 50-percent reduction, reducing such expenses from approximately $16,000,000 to $8,000,000. My amendment would make a 20-percent reduction, as a substitute for the reduction of 10 percent recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Certainly it is possible for many of the branches of the Department of Agriculture materially to reduce their expenses for traveling. The total expense last year was $16,595,435. I shall read a few of the larger items:

The Office of the Secretary spent $108,000; the Bureau of Agricultural Economics spent $665,000; the Bureau of

Animal Industry spent $756,000; the Bureau of Plant Industry spent $237,000; the Forest Service spent $878,000; the Agricultural Marketing Service spent $473,000; the Soil Conservation Service spent $1,348,000; the Agricultural Adjustment Administration spent $1,859,000. I think this was the largest amount spent by any of the nondefense agencies of the Government for traveling expenses. The Surplus Marketing Administration spent $1,148,000, and the Farm Security Administration spent $6,607,000 for traveling expenses alone. As I have stated, the total was $16,595,435.

Mr. President, I think the time has come when some of the overhead costs of the departments in Washington should be reduced. I believe that in the main the Department of Agriculture performs an excellent service for the farmers; but in certain respects I think its overhead expense is out of all proportion to the service rendered. I am speaking of the A. A. A., the Farm Security Administration, and some of the other agencies. I believe that 20 percent could easily be eliminated from the total amount of traveling expenses without any material injury to the agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

This is a time when the citizens of the country, those of us at home, are asked not to travel. We are asked not to use gasoline. We are asked not to deplete the rubber supply; yet, so far as I can observe, if the bill were passed in its present form there would be only a small reduction in the traveling expenses of the Department of Agriculture. There must be some way for the representatives of the various branches of the Department of Agriculture to double up and still get around. Many times one bureau of the Department of Agriculture will send an automobile to a certain place on the same day some other agency sends an automobile to the same place.

I hope the Senate will adopt my amendment, which would mean a reduction of only 20 percent, as compared with the reduction of 50 percent made by the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope Senators have read the language on page 102 of the bill. As I stated on Friday, when this matter was first discussed, the House did not save a single dime by the adoption of its amendment. It merely placed a limitation on the amount which could be expended for travel. It did not reduce the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture by 5 cents. If the Senate should reject the Senate committee amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, and adopt the House provision, the total amount of the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture would not be reduced in any amount whatever. A limitation would be placed on the amount to be expended for travel.

The House provision was offered as an amendment on the floor of the House by a Member of the House who had offered amendments to reduce, item by item, the travel expense of every agency within the Department of Agriculture. The House rejected the amendments to reduce the specific appropriations, and then, on the last day of the debate, adopted the over-all amendment, which does not affect any economy whatever, but merely places a limitation on the amount which may be expended for travel.

The Senate committee very carefully went into the matter of travel expenses for the Department of Agriculture.

Despite the impression that seems to prevail in some quarters, this committee was trying to be just as economical as it was possible to be, and not to propose the appropriation of any more money for the Department of Agriculture for travel purposes than was absolutely essential. We did, however, wish to see any reduction which we made in travel expenses amount to a real saving; and we therefore proposed the amendment which will be found at the bottom of page 102, directing the Secretary of Agriculture to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the sum of $1,500,000. Notice the language which follows that provision—

which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this act below the Budget estimates.

In other words, any reductions below the Budget estimates which were made by the committee and on the floor in appropriations which were set up in the estimates for traveling expenses should also be saved, in addition to the $1,500,000.

This bill, as reported to the Senate, is more than $13,000,000 below the Budget estimates. Within that amount is $649,925, which was set up for travel expenses. Therefore this amendment saves in travel expenses for the coming fiscal year the sum of $2,350,566, or a total of 14 percent of all the money which is set up for travel expense for the Department. If we have erred in this matter, Mr. President, we have reduced these travel expense estimates by too great an amount. Why do I say that? If we cut only the amounts available for travel expenses and do not affect the salaries of the men who are supposed to carry on the vast field program of the Department of Agriculture, we shall have in the bill appropriations of many millions of dollars which will go for salaries to men who will not be able to go into the field and do the work, and we shall defeat the very purposes of the program which is contemplated by this bill. The real extravagance, therefore, would result if we were to reduce this item by any more than the amount the Senate Committee on Appropriations has already reduced it. The Department of Agriculture is essentially a field agency. It has representatives to perform work which is being carried on in every one of the 3,000 counties of the United States. It has agencies collecting statistics.

The large item read by the Senator from Virginia for the Bureau of Animal Industry is incurred by veterinarians and others who are going about the country inspecting the dairy herds, combating Bang's disease, combating tubercular disease in cattle, combating the foot-and-mouth disease, and conducting all the other manifold activities of the Department of Agriculture. Would it not be foolish to cut off all the money available for travel expenses of a veterinarian who must go out to test for Bang's disease or for tubercular cattle. It would really be most wasteful; because we would have the agent so tied up that he could not go out into the field and carry on his work.

The Department of Agriculture has repeatedly been referred to as a nondefense agency. I maintain that the Department of Agriculture and its activities have a very direct relation to the national defense. The production of food and clothing to achieve the goals which have been fixed in the food-for-freedom program, so as to make sure that our own people shall have food and clothing and that our commitments to our Allies under the lend-lease program shall be discharged is certainly a most important contribution to the winning of this war. Today we are shipping vast quantities of food and clothing materials not only to England but through the icy waters of the Arctic Ocean and the Barents Sea to Russia. We are sending such materials to other places at which it is absolutely necessary that they be lodged if we are to carry on this fight against the Axis Powers. Certainly, it would be most wasteful for us in a moment of hysteria to reduce the travel expenses of this department so that its high-salaried employees could not go out into the field and discharge the duties which Congress has imposed upon them. We have gone just as far as we can go with safety in the matter of reduction of the amounts available for such purposes. The 13 percent reduction we have made is probably too great. Certainly it is greater than any reduction made in any other appropriation bill. In the Independent Offices appropriation bill, which has already passed the Congress, the amounts available for travel expenses for such special agencies—the Federal Trade Commission and all the other independent agencies—were reduced on an average by only 10 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that some of the items were reduced by 20 percent, and I believe one was reduced by as much as 33⅓ percent. The committee used some discretion about it. I agree as to the importance of the Department of Agriculture; but since the tirade was made against the Senate and the House a few days ago by the newspapers, I am rather inclined to think that we had better be a little saving about gasoline; and I think that probably more crops would be raised if we kept a greater number of Federal agents out of automobiles, and thus kept them from using up the country's gasoline.

The newspapers have about converted me to the idea that we should be saving gasoline, and I am inclined to think that it probably would be wise to cut these items for travel expenses as much as 20 percent. I think the agencies could readily get by with that. I think that probably they will have to do it anyway, but I think the Congress should take that position. That is the way the matter strikes me.

I am sorry to differ with the Senator, but I expect to vote for the greater cut.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also was a member of the subcommittee which handled the Independent Offices appro-

priation bill. I asked the clerk of that committee what the travel-expense reduction amounted to. He stated that there was no reduction whatsoever in the amounts available for travel expense for some four or five of the agencies covered by the independent offices appropriation bill, and that the average reduction in the case of agencies covered by the Independent Offices appropriation bill was 10 percent. That information came from the clerk of the committee and was in accord with my own views about the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the clerk of the committee said that he is correct because he is one of the most accurate men I know; and I yield to his superior information.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of the larger items of travel expense for some of these agencies were not reduced at all. Some of them for the very small ones were reduced as much as 33⅓ percent.

However, here we have a large department; and, even if some Senators do not think so, I believe that in the winning of this war the proper administration of the Department of Agriculture is just as important as the successful administration of the War Department and the Navy Department. We cannot prevail if we cannot be the granary as well as the arsenal of the United Nations.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I remember, the only agency whose travel-pay allowance was reduced was the F. B. I., which was considered to be absolutely a war agency at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is now talking about the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriations bill. I was referring a moment ago to the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The appropriation for the F. B. I. is carried in a bill which has not as yet been reported.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Georgia what other department of Government has as intimate relations with every county and every State in the Union as has the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of none; and as I have heretofore stated, 83 percent of all the money appropriated by this bill for travel expenses will be spent for travel in the field, within the counties. Of course, the bill contains a large appropriation for travel expenses; but when we have told a department to perform 1,860 different projects which have been authorized by the Congress and have been imposed on that Department by law, projects affecting every county in the United States, it is impossible to carry them out from Washington, and to transport the men on the trains. In order to do the work the men must be in the field.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My information is that the Department is working out a reorganization of the method by which they contact farmers in their self-controlled operations in the soil-conservation and the agricultural programs, and that instead of employing even as many salaried men as those now employed, they are working out a program by which the farmers themselves will take over a certain committee in a county and will do the visiting among their fellow farmers in order to organize the work, instead of having all the farmers visited by salaried men. In that way the amounts expended for salaries will be reduced. However, my information is that they propose to pay the actual expenses incurred by the farmer in going from his place to other farms to organize the committees in the counties and to carry on the program. Is it the Senator's understanding that such a reorganization is being worked out by the Department?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have understood that the county committees will undertake to perform a large amount of the duties now being performed for the Government by the regular officials of the Department, but that will not reduce the travel expenses any.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand; but the result might be as much or more than would be saved for salaries as would be expended for traveling expenses in the counties by the local committees which to a very large extent will be appointed and chosen by the farmers themselves. So although they will be expected to travel among their fellow farmers in the county, and the Government may pay the expense of the travel, there will be a considerable saving in the salaries of the regular salaried employees who up to now have been doing that work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Department of Agriculture is making every effort to economize. I have heretofore pointed out that at the hands of the Bureau of the Budget this bill has already suffered a reduction much greater than that suffered by any other bill which comes before the Senate or before the House. At the hands of the Bureau of the Budget and the House and the Senate it has already had a reduction, including the reduction for parity payments, $460,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator should make it clear that following this bill there is bound to be an appropriation for parity payments. When he says there has been a reduction of $460,000,000, including the reduction for parity payments, that is not entirely accurate.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is entirely accurate when we consider the amount of money which is stricken out of the bill, as compared with the appropriations last year; and I have so stated twice before on the floor of the Senate. Just a few minutes ago the Senator from Virginia referred to his punctuality in being here on Friday; and, since he was here, he should know that the pending bill includes appropriations for the parity payments for which there was a contractual obligation which the Government would have to discharge. No man can say what that amount will be next year.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia estimated it this morning at $150,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not.

Mr. BYRD. That is what I understood the Senator to say.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said I thought there would probably be a saving of that much, that the total amount would perhaps be between that sum and $175,000,000; but that was merely my guess; the guess of anyone else would be as good.

Mr. BYRD. What is the estimate for the amount of money that must be appropriated for the next fiscal year for parity payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not going to make any estimate of that. In my judgment, it will be a sum that will be much below the $212,000,000 which was appropriated for that purpose last year.

Mr. BYRD. From the evidence in the House hearings it appears that the estimate is from $136,000,000 to $150,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that in the House hearings there was such a statement, but since the House hearings were held prices of farm commodities have somewhat advanced and, undoubtedly, therefore, the amount necessary to be paid because of parity payments will be reduced.

Mr. BYRD. In view of the total reduction the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House have made in the bill, I think it ought to be made clear that in considering the $426,000,000 reduction——

Mr. RUSSELL. Four hundred and sixty million dollars.

Mr. BYRD. Very well; a reduction of $460,000,000 from the bill of last year; it should be remembered that this bill does not include any amount for parity payments, while last year, as I recall, $212,000,000 were included in the appropriation bill for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have referred on two or three occasions to the fact that there is no specific appropriation for parity payments in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator stated a moment ago that the House provision limiting the traveling allowance to $8,000,000 saved money; in other words, that the Department could not spend more than $8,000,000 for travel but could spend the balance for something else within the limits of the bill. How does the Senator's committee figure that as a saving?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because we direct the Secretary of Agriculture before the first of August to go through this bill and the Budget estimates and deduct a million five hundred thousand dollars and cover it into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that, while the House provision makes no saving, the committee amendment at least saves a million and a half dollars which will be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. It saves a million and a half dollars in addition to the amount provided for travel expenses in the Budget estimates which was disallowed, and, as I have pointed out, that amounts to $649,000. So that the Senate committee has already reduced the travel bill by $2,350,566, which represents a real saving

and a reduction of 14 percent in the bill. If we cut the traveling expenses any more, all we will do will be to immobolize the Agricultural Department in drawing funds from the Treasury to carry out the work which Congress has placed upon them and hamper the field program. The Bureau of Animal Industry would be crippled in carrying out their campaign against the Japanese beetle and against all the other pests which has to be carried on in the field, because such pests, as well as animal diseases, are not going to be kind enough to come to Washington where the experts can deal with them; they are in the field where the farmers live; and if the Department is to carry out the duties Congress has imposed on it, representatives must be sent into the field and the work must be continued.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the mathematics of the situation, then, adding the six-hundred-and-odd-thousand dollars and the million five hundred thousand dollars results in a saving by the bill as reported of over $2,000,000, which represents a 14-percent saving, whereas if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia should be adopted it would be $3,200,000 plus $600,000, which adds up to nearly $4,000,000, which would represent about 25 percent reduction.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would represent a reduction of approximately 25 percent, which is much greater than Congress has asked any other agency of the Government which is engaged in field work to take. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague from Georgia yield for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, and having had something to do with similar items of the Independent Offices bill, I can say that I supported the chairman of the committee in the reduction of every travel item which he brought to our attention. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee and the subcommittee itself gave personal and considered attention to every one of those items. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee, whose bill is now before the Senate, gave considered attention to all those items, and, therefore, he knows whereof he speaks when he tells the Senate that these items have been pared to the limit, and that we will probably be on dangerous ground if without sufficient evidence, we go further than the committee proposes.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the farming situation in my State. Farm labor is becoming a problem there; the Department has already taken cognizance of it and is establishing centers where farm labor may be provided and transported where needed. In my State farm machinery is also becoming a problem, and means will have to be provided in order that the labor and the machinery necessary for the operation of our farms may be properly dispatched and cared for. There is looming a shortage of fertilizer, and it will require considerable attention on the part of the farm agency if we are going to supply agricultural products to the armies of the world.

If food is going to be a major factor in the determination of the victory, as I know it will be, then I think that we ought to follow the wise leadership of the chairman of this committee who has given consideration to every one of these items. I commend him for the saving he has made; and I commend him also for the consideration he has given to all these appropriation items.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New York for his observations.

I may say, Mr. President, that the reason this matter was handled in this manner directing the Secretary of Agriculture to return these funds to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts was due to the tremendous number of some subitems involved in the agricultural appropriation bill. There are something like 150 of them. If the committee had undertaken to deal with these items, which range in amount from $100 up to a million or more in some instances, it would have required careful investigation. We felt that leaving it in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, with direction as to the amount he should take out of the bill and return to the Treasury, allowed to a degree a flexibility which would reduce to the minimum the confusion the reduction would cause.

If the committee has erred in this matter, we reduced the appropriation for travel too greatly when we cut approximately two and a half million dollars out of it. Certainly any further reduction would seriously impair the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that it seems to me a 25-percent reduction in traveling expenses is not too much to request any Government official to make. So far as I am concerned, I expect to see made a great deal more saving in the total amount of gasoline and rubber than that. After all, as I understand, 80 percent of this item is for travel in localities which involves the use of automobiles, and therefore of gasoline and rubber. Each one of these cars, apparently, will have an unlimited amount of gasoline; the Department will not be restrained by law in any way in the use of gasoline and rubber. It seems to me that a cut of 25 percent, and a request to them to plan their activities in such a way as to spend 25 percent less for traveling expenses and thus save gasoline and rubber, is certainly a very reasonable request to make. I cannot see any reason why the Senate should not adopt the proposal of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia were adopted, there would be available for traveling expenses in the Department of Agriculture approximately $13,000,000. A great deal of traveling can be done with $13,000,000. Much of the traveling expense is incurred by renting automobiles at 3 cents a mile, which is the amount in most localities. I think $13,000,000 is sufficient. If it is not sufficient, then, Congress will remain in session continuously, and the Department of Agriculture can ask for special appropriations; but I think the Department should be compelled to reorganize their traveling and their overhead expenses and make every possible reduction that can be made. There will be $13,000,000 available for traveling, if my amendment be adopted.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. TAFT and Mr. BYRD asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], but being assured that he would vote as I am about to vote, I am permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HAYDEN (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I have voted. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GILLETTE. My colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], is necessarily detained. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hamsphire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washing-

ton [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business in his State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is detained on business in one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained in a conference at the White House. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]; and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—25

Austin	George	Taft
Bail	Gerry	Vandenberg
Brewster	Glass	Walsh
Brooks	Kilgore	Wheeler
Brown	Lee	White
Bunker	McFarland	Wiley
Byrd	McKellar	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	
Danaher	Radcliffe	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Gurney	Nye
Andrews	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Holman	Rosier
Bilbo	Hughes	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Schwartz
Bulow	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lucas	Spencer
Caraway	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Maybank	Truman
Doxey	Mead	Tunnell
Ellender	Murdock	Wagner
Gillette	Norris	

NOT VOTING—27

Barbour	Guffey	Reynolds
Bridges	Herring	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tobey
Davis	Murray	Tydings
Downey	Pepper	Van Nuys
Green	Reed	Wallgren

So Mr. BYRD's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 102, beginning with line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments relating to the provision covering surplus commodities, found on page 80, be passed over temporarily, and that we consider next the remaining amendments under the Farm Security Administration provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the next amendment passed over under the Farm Security Administration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 83, line 15, after the word "act", it is proposed to strike out "$1,250,000" and to insert "$2,000,000."

Mr. BYRD. I take it the Senator from Georgia is to make an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very happy to undertake to make an explanation.

The pending amendment is found on page 83, under what is known as the Farm Tenant Act. It relates to activities of the Department of Agriculture carried on under the direction of the Farm Security Administration, to comply with the congressional authorization found in what is generally known as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, a program which was instituted by the Congress to enable farm tenants to purchase their homes.

As one member of the committee, Mr. President, I deeply regret that in the stress of war it has been found necessary to reduce this appropriation in the slightest degree. To my mind, this has been one of the most valuable activities of all those under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. All I know about the activities of the Department in this particular is as they relate to my own State; but, so far as my State and the whole Northwest are concerned, these activities have constituted one of the most valuable contributions made by the Department of Agriculture to the underprivileged—the poor farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have that observation from the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, the loans under this authorization have been made for a number of years. The first year only $10,000,000 was authorized as a loan fund. The following year it was increased to $25,000,000. The maximum amount of the authorization is $50,000,000, and that has been the amount provided for the past several years. The limitation on administrative expenses is fixed at 5 percent of the amount available for loans.

This year the amount provided for these loans is $40,000,000. I think that almost every Member of the Senate who has investigated this matter will agree that this is one of the best programs carried on by the Department of Agriculture. The amount to be available for the next year will be less than what has been provided in the past. My own view was that we would have been amply justified in making available $50,000,000 for this purpose instead of $40,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Purely for the purpose of making the matter clear, will not the Senator explain the difference between the appropriation found on page 83 and that on page 87, and how the programs differ? The increase on page 87 is from $70,000,000 to $125,000,000. Both provisions seem to be for loans to farmers, and I thought perhaps the Senator could explain the difference between them.

Mr. RUSSELL. The loans which are provided for on page 83, under the heading of "Farm Tenant Act," are loans to enable farm tenants and sharecroppers to become landowners and are loans for the acquisition of real estate, to enable sharecroppers and tenant farmers over a period of 40 years to become home owners.

The item on page 87 covers the rural rehabilitation loans. Such loans are not made for the purpose of acquiring lands but to provide capital for farmers who have no capital, and to enable underprivileged farmers who have no credit resources elsewhere to obtain the tools and the food and the other things which are necessary to enable them to operate their farms and thereby become self-sustaining.

The first item relates to purchase of land and the other relates to loans for the acquisition of personal property and for the maintenance of the farms.

Mr. President, I was about to point out that of the total loans which have been made under the Farm Tenant Act, 99 percent are current today. That is an amazing statement to make, when we consider that there have been sections of the country in which farms have been acquired where there have been droughts, or floods, or the ravages of grasshoppers, or Mormon crickets, or of the boll weevil, which have wiped out the farmers' crops, but despite all the hazards to which these farmers have been subjected, over 99 percent of them have their loans current today. This is a graphic illustration of that hunger which is in the heart of every American, which is inherent in us as a people to own our homes. These people in appreciation of this program which has been provided by the Government have anticipated the maturity of their loans to an extent greater than 20 percent. There is no possibility whatever of the Government ever losing any money on these loans under this program, because in the place of the exceptional individual who falters and is unable to carry his loan there will always be other tenant farmers or sharecroppers who will be willing to step into his place, and some of them will make good.

Mr. President, I may say that in spite of all the controversies which have raged before the committee, and all the criticisms of some features of the Department's program which were submitted to us, not a single witness appeared before the committee, whatever his views, who advocated that this program be curtailed or eliminated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to associate myself with all that the Senator from Georgia has said about the farm-tenant program. As the Senator from Georgia has said, the program was created by a measure introduced by my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], which is known as the Bankhead-Jones

Act. To my mind, no finer program is being carried out today by the Government, or one which is doing more for human welfare and for human beings. I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not a fact that last year the Farm Security Administration had 20 times more applications than it could take action upon? In other words, where an application was filed the applicant had only 1 chance out of 20 to come in under this program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The period for taking applications was very brief, but I understand that 176,000 applications were submitted, when it was only possible to make some seven or eight thousand loans.

Mr. HILL. And the committee itself, in recommending the $40,000,000, has really made a reduction of $10,000,000, has it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. A reduction of 20 percent.

Mr. HILL. The reduction is 20 percent, as my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama suggests. The committee, in acting on the bill, has itself made a cut of 20 percent in what was proposed in the program for this work.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the amount reported by the committee is the amount of the Budget estimate. It is a reduction of $10,000,000 below the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. HILL. It represents a reduction of $10,000,000 below the appropriation for the current year. As the Senator from Georgia well recalls, of course, when the basic act was passed it was contemplated there should be $10,000,000 appropriated the first year, $25,000,000 the second year, and $50,000,000, for each year thereafter. So what the committee is doing in its effort to economize and in its efforts to cut down as much as possible is to make a reduction of 20 percent in what was contemplated as the program when it was established. Is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has correctly stated the committee's position. It was my own position that there was no economy in reducing appropriations for loans with respect to which repayments were being made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations on page 83, in line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 18, before the word "which", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert $40,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land", on page 85, line 10, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,591,182" and insert "$795,575."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, at the end of line 11, to reduce the total appropriation under the Farm Tenant Act, from $3,341,182 to $3,295,575.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", on page 85, line 21, after the word "facilities" and the semicolon, to insert "and (6) not exceeding $1,400,000 for operation and maintenance of existing migratory labor camps."

Mr. BYRD. I assume the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will wish to make an explanation of the loans granted for rural rehabilitation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the item on page 85 consists of two portions. One is a limitation on the amount of the appropriation which may be expended for the operation and maintenance of migratory labor camps, and the other involves the appropriation for maintenance and grants to be administered by the Farm Security Administration. The Budget estimate for the operation of the migratory labor camps, as contained in the original bill, was three and a half million dollars. The committee went somewhat fully into the question of migratory labor camps. We were convinced that under the existing circumstances an appropriation in such amount could not be justified.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think a number of Senators who are interested in this item are absent from the Chamber. I should like to suggest to the Senator that it might save him some time if he were to yield and permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I know there are some Senators absent who would like to be present when this matter is considered. I just now requested the clerk of the committee to call up two who I knew were interested in the matter, but there may be other Senators who are interested, and who are not present. Therefore I think it might be wise to have a quorum call.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Schwartz
Bone	Hughes	Smathers
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Spencer
Brown	La Follette	Stewart
Bulow	Langer	Taft
Bunker	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
Ellender	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 85, line 21.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I was stating before the absence of a quorum was suggested, the committee felt that a reduction should be made in the appropriation for the maintenance of migratory labor camps. We do not believe that present conditions justify the expenditure of large sums of money for additional migratory labor camps. Every Senator who has an agricultural constituency knows that there is no surplus of farm labor anywhere in the country. Any farmer who wishes to get a job working on a farm can get one today. We have all had complaints about the effect of the high wages which obtain on war projects and the effect of the draft on the question of having a sufficient supply of labor on the farms to produce and gather the crops which are so essential to the war effort.

I think those apprehensions are well founded. In considering the effect of the draft on farm labor, and in considering the income of the farmers, we must recognize that we cannot place agriculture in a class by itself if we expect to have the food and clothing which are necessary in the war effort.

The migratory labor camps came into being when we had a very unusual condition. It was immediately after the awful disasters in the Dust Bowl, which were so graphically portrayed by Mr. Steinbeck in his book The Grapes of Wrath, which most Senators have read.

The migratory labor camps were established to provide a haven for those who could not secure farm work elsewhere. When the first provision was adopted for the creation of migratory labor camps I stated on the floor of the Senate that I accepted the provision with a great deal of reluctance because I apprehended that as time went on they would become merely an adjunct of the large corporate farms, and that the Government would merely be spending money in providing such farm workers with shelter which should be provided for them by the owners and operators of the large corporate farms. I have seen that prediction borne out. Of course, the Government does not provide for camps for migratory labor for all the corporate farms, but in a great many cases the Government is providing housing facilities and furnishing free water and light for migratory workers who work on corporate farms whose owners should be providing such facilities.

The committee felt that it might properly limit to $1,400,000 the appropriation available for such labor camps.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that certain members of the committee wanted to strike out the item altogether. I was one of them, because I think it is one of the most wasteful, extravagant, unnecessary, and improper appropriations we have made.

Mr. RUSSELL. A number of members of the committee earnestly sought to abolish altogether the migratory labor camps. That was done so far as the House was concerned, because the House struck out all the appropriation and au-

thorization for the conduct of such camps.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me ask him what reduction that would make for this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. The regular 1943 estimate proposed an appropriation of $2,766,565 for the operation, maintenance, and management of migratory labor camps, of which amount the committee has allowed $1,400,000. The Budget estimate also proposed an appropriation of $733,435 for development and construction of migratory labor camps, and the committee has disallowed that amount in its entirety. Thus, the total amount of the regular 1943 estimate disallowed by the committee is $2,100,000.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that the sum available for construction of the camps is disallowed. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee in its report definitely indicated that no funds would be spent for the construction of any new migratory labor camps.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that I am very much in favor of the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator will be interested in the fact that the appropriation for the current year, 1942, was $5,000,000 for the migratory labor camps, and under the language provided by the committee that amount has been reduced to $1,400,000.

I did not favor the proposal absolutely to abolish the migratory labor camps. There are very definite reasons why I took that position. In some instances farmers are utilizing for the harvesting of their crops the men who are made available by reason of the existence of the camps. There would be a very great dislocation in the agricultural economy of those sections if the Senate should follow the action of the House and abolish the camps in their entirety.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there before the Senate any amendment to change the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. No amendment has yet been proposed; but the Senator from Virginia has requested that I explain the action of the committee on these items; and I was attempting to justify what the committee has done. However, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I had been notified by members of the committee that they proposed to submit amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope they will not do so. I think the committee has really reached a very wise decision, and has resolved every doubt in favor of this very large appropriation, as it seems to me, of $1,400,000 for migratory labor camps. Surely the amount should not be increased.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the next amendment on page 85 relates to the total appropriation, not only for the migratory labor camps but for grants to farmers who are in distress.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I am wondering if we cannot vote on the amendment relating to the migratory labor camps, and then take up the other amendment, which relates to a number of matters. Probably the Senator's explanation as to the others would be more timely if we were first to vote on the amendment with regard to the migratory labor camps, especially if we have any discussion about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to taking such a course. I can conclude my entire explanation very briefly, I assure the Senator from Virginia. However, I have no objection, Mr. President, to doing as the Senator from Virginia suggests, if the Senator wishes to vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 85, commencing in line 21, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, line 21, after the word "facilities;", it is proposed to insert "and (6) not exceeding $1,400,000 for operation and maintenance of existing migratory labor camps."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, line 23, after the word "camps", it is proposed to strike out "$25,319,557" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,319,557."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment relates to appropriations for the maintenance and administration of a number of activities of the Farm Security Administration, including operation and maintenance of migratory labor camps, and grants to farmers who live in areas in which great losses have occurred due to unusual conditions over which those farmers have no control. Such appropriations for grant have been made for a number of years.

I am sure that farmers in the Northwest are familiar with how important such grants were in the days of the droughts when the crop production in those areas was about 10 percent of what it ordinarily is. I have had occasion to know that in areas in which floods and unusual ravages of the boll weevil have occurred, these grants have been most helpful, and have enabled farmers to stay on their farms and prepare to make another crop under better conditions, rather than go into the cities and get on the W. P. A. rolls.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am in entire accord with what the Senator has said. I simply desire to say that in eastern Montana, western North Dakota, and South Dakota, when the drought occurred, and was followed by the grasshopper plague, the drought lasted for 5 or 6 consecutive years, and, because of foreclosures, many of the farmers had to leave their farms. They lost their farms and were driven into the cities and put on the W. P. A. rolls. In the sections in which they were permitted to get some help, and did get it, the farmers were fine, high-type, first-class farmers, but because of the drought and the grasshopper situation which existed there for a period of 5 or 6 years, the Farm Security Administration, when it did aid the farmers there, helped to rehabilitate them. As I understand, the House has limited to $1,000 the amount available to any such farmer. As a matter of fact, a limit of $1,000 may be all right in some places, but I submitted an amendment asking that the minimum to be granted should be $3,000. The committee fixed it at $2,500. Frankly, I am gratified that the committee increased the amount to $2,500, but I think it should have been more. I felt that the $3,000, which I recommended, was a very modest sum. Particularly in the Midwest section of the country, in order to rehabilitate a farmer and to enable him to become really able to make a living, he must have cattle and other livestock. The Senator will remember that during the droughts which occurred in eastern Montana, western North Dakota, and South Dakota conditions became so bad that all the cattle the farmers had were taken off the farms and killed, bought for the Government, and made into soap and other products. So at that particular time the farmer was left not only without any crops but without any cattle, horses, or any other livestock. The farmers simply could not get hay or other necessary feed for their livestock.

The Farm Security Administration has tried to rehabilitate such farmers by giving them a few chickens, cows, and other livestock in order to put them back on their feet, and I think that the sums appropriated should be increased over the proposed $2,500 limit.

However, the committee has increased the amount to $2,500, which is probably the best it could do, and I shall not ask the Senate to increase the amount, notwithstanding the fact that, frankly, I feel that in the particular section of the country to which I have referred a larger amount should be made available.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee thought that it was rather generous with the Senator from Montana. It increased the amount from $1,000 to $2,500. However, less than 2½ percent of all the loans which have been made would be affected.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately 98 percent of all the loans which have been made in the country have been for less than $2,500.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with that statement. The only place where larger loans are necessary is in the northwest section of the country. The farmers there are the highest type which can be found anywhere in the United States. They are largely Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes who in the early days came out from Minnesota, North Dakota, and other parts of the Middle West, took up homesteads, and developed that section of the country, only to find that the drought came along. For 6 or 7 years it simply wiped them out completely. Thousands of them are driven off the farm and are forced to go into California and various other sections, many of them into the cities, and frequently to go on the rolls of the W. P. A. with their entire families.

I hope $2,500 will be sufficient; but many farm organizations of that section requested of me that the amount be made not only $3,000, but, in some instances, they wanted it to be made as high as $4,000. I shall not, however, press for the $3,000 limit, in view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has probably done the best it could.

As I said a moment ago, of all the activities of the Agriculture Department, the one that has done more to help the poor farmer is this particular activity. Even if the Government loses money in the effort to rehabilitate the poor farmers who cannot get along, many of whom have been wiped out because of their economic conditions or because of weather conditions, I am more willing that a loss be incurred to help them than I am to help many others who are getting money out the Treasury of the United States for a much less worthy cause.

I cannot conceive of anyone opposing this program who wants to help the poor farmer rehabilitate himself and become established so that he may live upon his farm. When the farmers live upon their own farms eventually there follows the building of schools and churches, the establishment of homes, and the enjoyment of home life throughout the country. That is much better than to draw farmers into industrial centers where they not only do not feel at home, but where many of them eventually have to go upon the W. P. A. rolls.

I want to thank the Senator and the committee for raising the amount to $2,500, and I hope that it will be maintained at that figure as the minimum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I can assure the Senator from Montana that very likely we will see that limit retained in the final enactment of the bill, because the House committee gave very lengthy hearings to that subject, and agreed also on the sum of $2,500. When the bill reached the House floor this activity became the subject of very general attack, and on the floor of the House an amendment was offered reducing the amount to $1,000.

The Senator from Montana knows, of course, that the average loan to all the approximately 430,000 borrowers in the Farm Security Administration is about $800. The committee felt that the administration should be enabled with the funds provided to reach as many people as possible, and that something should be done to prevent 1 person getting a loan of such size as might defeat the rehabilitation of 3 or 4 others who could get along on less money. I think $2,500 is a very fair compromise, and I can assure the Senator that I shall do all within my power to see that it is retained in the bill when it finally becomes the law.

Mr. President when this bill was before the House of Representatives an amendment was offered on the floor which reduced the appropriation of this agency from $50,319,000 to $25,319,000. The House committee opposed the amendment. That committee had conducted hearings and evidently thought that the larger appropriation was justified. The Senate committee also conducted hearings for several days on this item. There have, undoubtedly, been numerous isolated instances of mistakes being made in the operation of this program, but I think the Senate should bear in mind that this is a comparatively new program, and not only that but it deals with the most underprivileged and helpless people of this Nation, people who have never had any opportunity whatever in life to become self-sustaining or who have been victims of conditions beyond their control which have wiped away all they have possessed.

While the matter was pending in the committee the President sent a supplemental Budget estimate requesting the appropriation of $180,000,000 for the loan item which appears on page 87, and requesting an increase in the appropriation appearing on page 85 for administrative expenses of $14,778,000. The committee only allowed $50,000,000 of the increase that was requested by the President for the purpose of making loans and allowed only $2,100,000 of the amount requested for administrative expenses. For that reason the figure on page 85 does not reflect the reduction that was made in the appropriation for the operations of the migratory labor camps, because the same amount was allowed in the supplemental estimate for administrative purposes.

The supplemental Budget estimate of the President urged an additional appropriation of $14,778,000 and an additional loan authorization of $105,000,000 on the ground that it was necessary as a part of the food-for-freedom program. I quote from the supplemental Budget estimate:

> In order to meet our food requirements and those of our Allies, it is clearly apparent that every effort must be made to increase our production of agricultural commodities to the fullest possible extent. No farmers should be precluded from doing his part because of lack of credit. To this end the Department of Agriculture has informed both private and Federal credit agencies of our food needs and urged their maximum cooperation in the extension of the necessary credit. However, notwithstanding the facilities presently available, there are thousands of low-income farmers who cannot obtain sufficient credit to participate fully in the food-for-freedom program.
>
> Studies of the Department of Agriculture reveal that, even with all other farm groups operating at maximum production, the production of the low-income farm group is vitally needed to assist us in reaching the food-production goals required for the successful prosecution of the war. It therefore proposes a strong attack on this problem which will make use of the facilities of the Farm Security Administration and will quickly and effectively reach the maximum number of low-income farmers with guidance, supervision, and adequate credit.

Witnesses appeared before the committee and pointed out that the last unused reservoir of labor in this country was the labor on the farms and that the low-income farmers did not have the capital to utilize their labor. In other words, in the West there might be a farm family that, due to the lack of capital, was only able to have 20 cows, whereas with adequate labor available within the family they could raise at least 60 or 70 beef cattle if they only had the capital to expand their operations. In other words, these low-income farm families might have 2 or 3 members of the family, young boys or old men, who are not capable of going into defense plants or who are not subject to the draft, but who are potential assets as farm laborers, but, due to the lack of capital, such labor cannot be utilized.

It was a very persuasive argument. The committee, however, realizing the necessity for careful husbanding of all the credit resources of the country, as well as the necessity for the utmost economy in all operations, disallowed all the supplemental estimates for administrative expenses, except the sum of $2,100,000 out of the $14,778,000 recommended, and we cut the amount of the estimate for the loans by $55,000,000. We feel that, while we have not allowed the entire Budget estimate, we have allowed sufficient to enable the Farm Security Administration to utilize the great amount of this labor that is today going to waste because of lack of capital on the farms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, while it is, perhaps, utterly futile to speak against any of the appropriations contained in this bill, I desire to make an explanation of the action of the Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures which recommended the abolition of the Farm Security Administration and the transfer of the duties and obligations of this particular agency to the Agricultural Department within other branches of that Department.

The Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Spending was established by an act of Congress, and this mandate was given to the committee:

> To make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date.

Carrying out that mandate of Congress, the committee made an exhaustive investigation of the different activities of the Government for the purpose of recommending to Congress and to the President a reduction of nonessential spending in the period of great crisis which now confronts us.

Of course, it is easy to talk about economy in generalities, but it is very difficult to point to specific instances where the economies may be effected, and the committee had a most difficult task to accomplish.

Economy is always painful. I know of no economizer who has been popular. There are no bands to welcome him on his return home, because there are always those who are adversely affected by any economy the Government may institute.

When spending is entrenched in every nook and corner of America, as it now is, it makes economy most difficult to accomplish; but when we consider that we are now confronted with the most colos-

sal expenditures in the history of this country, expenditures which were unbelievable even a few months ago, when we realize that in the next year we will spend, we are told, if it is possible to do so, for the promotion of our war effort, from sixty to seventy billion dollars in 1 year, it seems to me that every possible economy should be effected in our nonessential, nondefense spending.

The House Committee on Ways and Means has now adopted a proposal, to be inserted in the next revenue bill, making subject to income taxes an individual with income of only $500, and a married couple with an income of only $1,200. Everything above a net income of $500, in the case of a single individual, or $1,200 in the case of a married couple, will be taxed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator might add at that point that in spite of that cruel burden, there will still be a deficit of $50,000,000,000 in that fiscal year.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Michigan is correct. Notwithstanding that terrific taxation, we will pay less than one-half the total expenditures of our Government. We are reaching the point, Mr. President, when it can be predicted that before the emergency is over we will have a debt of perhaps not less than $200,000,000,000, and perhaps more.

After all, I think we must recognize that solvency is the very foundation stone upon which representative democracy is founded. Destroy the solvency of a nation, and those freedoms for which our forefathers fought and died that we might enjoy will go. Solvency depends upon the ability of the private enterprise system to pay the costs of operating our Government. Whenever taxation becomes so excessive that the costs of the Government over a period of time cannot be paid, then the solvency of our Government is destroyed.

We must recognize the fact, too, that there have been deficits in our Federal revenue for 9 years, and the time will come, at the conclusion of the war, when we must balance our Budget if we are to maintain the system of government which we now have. The foundation stone upon which it is founded, in my judgment, is the system of free private business enterprise. When free private business enterprise cannot support the activities of the Government, when it cannot pay the interest and other obligations the Government has to pay, then we must go to some kind of state socialism, which will destroy the freedoms we now have.

To go back to the report of the committee created to recommend the reduction of nonessential spending, I wish to say that the members of the committee on the part of the Senate were appointed by the Vice President, and those on the part of the House by the Speaker of the House; and the resolution creating the committee made the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget members of the committee.

The recommendation of the committee that the Farm Security agency be abolished, and that its duties be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, that part relating to loans transferred to the Crop and Seed Loan Division, that part relating to education to the Extension Service, was made and signed by Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, as vice chairman of the committee, who is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and it was signed by Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, with the reservation, however, that the reductions recommended by the committee insofar as agriculture was concerned were not as much as they should be. Mr. Morgenthau, whose letter is printed in the report, indicated that he thought a reduction of at least $500,000,000 should be made in the appropriations for agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury requesting that, if the occasion arose, he would like to have me make clear his position as to the Farm Security Administration. Because of that request, I wish to read his letter, which strongly endorses all the appropriations, including those disallowed by the committee.

Mr. BYRD. All I can say is that the Secretary signed the report with the reservations contained in his letter which was made a part of the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary asked me to make his position clear, and I think that, in justice to him, I should read his letter. It is addressed to me, is dated Washington, D. C., May 1, 1942, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I understand your subcommittee has under consideration the bill providing appropriations for the Farm Security Administration's program during the fiscal year 1943, and that the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I am a member, has been called to the subcommittee's attention.

I might interpolate that I did not tell Mr. Morgenthau that the matter had been called to the attention of the subcommittee. I do not know how he received his information. The letter continues:

In this connection I would like to state that last winter I submitted several recommendations to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and among such recommendations I urged that we should make drastic cuts in our agricultural expenditures.

In making this recommendation I stated that I did not refer to the bulk of activities undertaken by the Farm Security Administration and that I believed there should be no reduction in our help of the sharecroppers and farm tenants who are in urgent and continuing need of economic rehabilitation. It was my feeling then, and it is still my feeling, that substantial reductions could be made in our agricultural expenditures without striking out those parts of the agricultural program which are helping the undernourished and which are doing so much for the sharecroppers, farm tenants, and other persons who can only be rehabilitated with the continuing assistance of the Government through the activities which are being carried on by the Farm Security Administration.

Furthermore, I feel that the Farm Security Administration's program has now assumed a new importance because of the war and our anti-inflation efforts, in that it is assisting a sizable group of our low-income farming population to expand agricultural production and thereby help increase the food supply and avoid inflated prices.

I would appreciate it, if the occasion arises, that you would make my position clear.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

In response to the request of the Secretary, inasmuch as the Senator from Virginia has referred to him, I thought I should make his position clear.

Mr. BYRD. I referred to him because he signed the report; and this was the exception he made:

I am willing to sign the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures subject, however, to my disagreement with the recommendations under Agriculture. I disagree with the recommendations with respect to agriculture, and in lieu of the recommendations contained in the committee's report, I desire to suggest the following:

When I appeared before the committee on November 14, I stated that expenditures included in the Budget under the farm program which was initiated in 1933, after the catastrophic fall in prices in 1932, were designed mainly to meet conditions involving low prices for farm products, surplus production, and loss of export markets. Present conditions are radically different from those which the farm program was designed to meet. It is estimated that in 1941 the farmer's share of the national income will be 20 percent greater than in 1932, notwithstanding a reduction of almost 10 percent in the proportion of the farm population to the total population of the country. Although governmental aid was necessary in order to bring the farmer's net income from three and one-fourth billion dollars in 1932 up to eight and one-half billion dollars or more in 1941, certainly after having reached this goal there does not appear to be any reason to continue spending at the same rate. The farmer is getting his share of the total expenditures made by the Government, as the increase in his net income indicates. In addition, there are substantial benefits that will accrue to the farmer from the lend-lease program.

In view of all these circumstances I feel at this time that we should make drastic cuts in our agricultural expenditures, and I would recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture be required to operate the agricultural program included in the Budget with an annual appropriation of $500,000,000 less than authorized for the current fiscal year.

With respect to that part of the agricultural program carried on with funds borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I would want the committee to make a more thorough investigation of these activities before I make any definite recommendation for reductions in the amounts available for this purpose.

That was written on December 22.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the chairman of the subcommittee asked Mr. Morgenthau to specify just what it was he did think could be cut, and whether any information was received as to which of the other appropriations, rather than that for the Farm Security Administration, should be cut.

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked nothing of Mr. Morgenthau. I never regarded Mr.

Morgenthau as a great expert on agricultural questions, and it never occurred to me to invite him before the committee in regard to any agricultural questions. Mr. Morgenthau wrote me this letter, but not at my solicitation. I do not know what impelled him to do it, but I felt that, in justice to him, I should put the letter in the RECORD, inasmuch as he had been referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. TAFT. I am surprised at the Senator's statement regarding the Secretary of the Treasury, because I understood he had graduated from the agricultural school at Cornell, that he was a specialist on agricultural matters, and was one of the best advised men on agricultural questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. In times past I have had occasion to differ very widely with the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to particulars of the farm program. When I stated that I did not consider him an expert, it was perhaps an opinion formed because his views so far varied from my own.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If anything has been made clear it is that the Secretary is not very clear himself in anything he is trying to make clear.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a query?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. In the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury which the Senator from Virginia just quoted there was a comparison made between 2 years, and the relative share of the national income which the farm group had received in those 2 years, which showed that in 1941 there was a 20-percent increase. I wonder if the Senator will refer to the letter and read that sentence again.

Mr. BYRD. What I read was as follows:

> It is estimated that in 1941 the farmer's share of the national income will be 20 percent greater than in 1932, notwithstanding a reduction of almost 10 percent in the proportion of the farm population to the total population of the country.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to state for the RECORD that the Secretary of the Treasury signed the report, subject to the letter which I read, recommending the reduction of $500,000,000 in the farm appropriation. This report was signed without reservation by CARTER GLASS, chairman Senate Committee on Appropriations, WALTER GEORGE, chairman Senate Committee on Finance, KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democratic ranking Member, Senate Appropriations Committee, CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Democratic ranking Member, House Appropriations Committee, THOMAS H. CULLEN, Democratic ranking Member, House Ways and Means Committee, ALLEN H. TREADWAY, Republican ranking Member, House Ways and Means Committee, JOHN H. TABER, Republican ranking Member, House Committee on Appropriations, and GERALD P. NYE, Republican ranking Member, Senate Committee on Appropriations, who dissented with respect to the recommendations concerning agriculture.

As I previously said, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] submitted minority views.

The Budget Director was preparing a budget for the President, and he asked that he be relieved from signing the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the signatures of those who signed it, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

DECEMBER 24, 1941.

Report to: The President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States, President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, a preliminary report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

This committee was established pursuant to title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, approved September 20, 1941, which directed it to "make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date."

PROCEDURE

The committee has had the benefit of the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, a member of the committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, and various other officials of the Government regarding the possibility of specific savings in existing departments and agencies. It has had before it for study the report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, also a member of the committee, submitted in response to the request of August 28, 1941, from the Senate Finance Committee, as well as other data submitted directly to this committee by the Budget Bureau. The committee has received also suggestions of economies from civic agencies, taxpayers' clubs, and private citizens. It has collected, in addition, evidence from its own sources, and it has devoted considerable time to a survey of the problems. This report is made on the basis of all the information thus collected.

INITIAL REPORT

Directed to report to the President and to the Congress at the earliest possible date, the committee considers it highly desirable to present now a preliminary report. The committee emphasizes that this report is only its first, and that other departments, agencies, funds, programs, and items will be examined by the committee and treated in subsequent reports.

This is only a partial report. While the committee has worked diligently since its organization, the magnitude of the labor involved as well as the vital legislative matters before Congress in recent weeks have prevented due consideration to further reductions and eliminations, which will be reported on later. Subjects considered in this report are limited largely to those established originally as depression measures.

The committee believes that in view of the improved economic situation and the vital new war conditions the agencies of Government and the Members of Congress should have at the earliest practicable time the benefit of conclusions thus far reached by the committee, and any possible economies which now can be effected should not be deferred.

Before the war, economy in nonessential spending was important. Now it is vital. There is no room for nonessentials in a government stripped for action. Our united purpose is to produce sufficient armament and trained personnel to win this war. Nothing can be permitted to interfere with this objective. The American people are being asked to pay extremely burdensome taxes which will become greater; they are being asked to make great sacrifice and endure hardships. The Government should set the example.

The United States Treasury is facing the tremendous task of financing the war. We must decrease its difficulties, not increase them. All nonessential spending must yield to the needs of our defense program.

Strenuous efforts are being made to prevent serious price inflation. To continue consumer subsidies created during depression years without urgent necessity will pour fuel on a disastrous inflation fire.

The committee believes substantial reduction in nonessential spending would be of material aid in holding down inflationary price increases.

We shall have to draw on all our resources and accumulated wealth, as well as manpower to fight a long war. In addition to equipping our own armed forces and establishing at home our own defenses, we have undertaken to furnish military supplies of every description to all nations fighting the forces of aggression. We must continue this without stint. But it is a colossal obligation.

FEDERAL DEBT

We started this war with a direct Federal indebtedness of about $55,000,000,000.

Today the ultimate cost of the war is unpredictable, but to date we have appropriated and authorized $75,000,000,000 for national defense. This is only the beginning. Every dollar now added to the public debt without imperative defense need makes it more difficult for America to meet post-war-period problems in both domestic economy and foreign trade.

In this titanic world struggle with totalitarian forces, democracies must not only conquer, they must preserve their democratic system. That means the preservation of solvent government. National solvency—difficult in this emergency and so essential to the preservation of the democratic system—is of no necessary concern to totalitarian governments.

Necessary expenditure of billions for national defense has changed abruptly the reasons and advisability for continuing certain agencies, services, and functions of Government.

Amounts expended for defense soon will be so large as to obviate much of the necessity for spending in relief and other items for which the committee recommends elimination or reduction.

Judged by national income, estimated at $105,000,000,000, 1942 will be the most prosperous year in American history. This may be compared with the national income of approximately $82,000,000,000 in 1929. That is one reason to believe that much of the relief expenditure continued from the so-called depression years now can be eliminated. Continuation of public works and some other types of projects during the war emergency would require diversion of vital man-power and materials from defense to nondefense projects.

The Federal Government alone must pay the cost of national defense. For years the Federal Government has been carrying a

heavy load of State and local responsibilities. The committee believes that during this emergency the States and localities should reassume, where necessary, responsibilities historically theirs.

THE FUTURE PROGRAM

In general, the committee will continue its investigation as follows:

1. It will continue its examination of all Federal expenditures to determine where further curtailment or elimination of expenditures can be made, in the light of defense needs, increasing industrial production and employment, and other factors.

2. It will examine further and in detail the activities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to determine whether all functions performed by departments and agencies are essential under existing conditions, whether duplications and corresponding functions can be consolidated, and the extent to which contraction can be substituted for expansion.

3. It will scrutinize Government-owned corporations to determine whether present loan policies are advisable in view of changed conditions, whether loans are being made efficiently, with proper regard to security, repayment, and other terms, and whether salaries and expenses of such corporations are reasonable.

4. It will examine purchasing, classification, salaries, transportation, publicity, and other items of expense and practice to determine whether they are being administered in an economical manner.

5. It will review all permanent agencies in an effort to determine the necessity and the efficiency of their administration and the advisability of more effective controls.

6. It will review defense expenditures and make recommendations for the elimination of waste and inefficiency in administration.

The committee's views on these subjects and possibly others will be embodied in subsequent reports.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. New adventures

The committee recommends that no new adventures or commitments in public works or costly Government programs be undertaken during the period of the war emergency, except those imperatively necessary to national defense.

The committee cautions against the futility of retrenching in existing nonessential spending and subsequently appropriating for programs or projects that could be deferred until after the emergency.

2. Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, Office of Education, Work Projects Administration

The committee recommends that the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the national-defense training activities of the Office of Education be abolished, effective as soon as possible and not later than July 1, 1942, and that there be established in some suitable agency facilities for training persons for work in defense occupations; this activity to be limited strictly to national-defense work and confined to those fields and to numbers to be certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as necessary for that purpose; also that there be merged in this new program any necessary part of defense training now under the Work Projects Administration as shall be certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as necessary to national defense; and further that all portions of previously appropriated funds for these agencies now held in reserve by direction of the Bureau of the Budget (totaling $132,000,000) be covered into the Treasury.

3. Work Projects Administration

The committee recommends that there be appropriated to the Work Projects Administration the sum of not more than $50,000,000 per month for 3 months beginning July 1, 1942. Any work now being carried on by the Work Projects Administration for account of national defense after July 1, 1942, should be carried on under the direction of the War and Navy Departments and the amount here recommended for the Work Projects Administration reduced accordingly.

The committee believes that with defense expenditures constantly increasing, Work Projects Administration appropriations should be on a quarterly basis beginning July 1, 1942, and that as employment increases the quarterly appropriations should be reduced accordingly.

4. Civil departments

The committee recommends that every possible retrenchment be made in the administrative costs of the civil departments and agencies. There has not been sufficient time for the committee to investigate fully these administrative costs. This will be done as promptly as possible.

The Budget Bureau report before this committee estimates that under a plan to reduce Federal nondefense spending $1,500,000,000, the allotted reduction in regular appropriations to civil departments and agencie would be $100,000,000. This would reduce total appropriations from $830,000,000 for civil departments to $730,000,000.

The cost of publicity activities in the civil departments and agencies is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget to be at least $30,000,000, and should be carefully reviewed for reductions and eliminations.

5. Agriculture

The committee at this time considered in detail expenditures by the Department of Agriculture, among the regular departments, because of the large programs and far-reaching activities established within and transferred to that Department during the depression period. The committee based its study on material furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget and its agricultural examiners, and by Department officials who work with the programs and activities. This study will be continued, and as a partial report the committee now recommends:

(a) Elimination of all land purchases by the Department of Agriculture during the period of the emergency.

(b) Review of administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture and elimination of all unnecessary overhead, and especially the wages and overhead incident to the employment of nearly 100,000 Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen.

(c) Reduction of $100,000,000 in the appropriation for "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities" program.

(d) That rates and premiums of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation be made actuarily sound in a manner to carry losses and that the Corporation be made self-supporting.

(e) Abolition of the farm-tenant program with an annual administrative cost of $7,122,570 and authorization to borrow $50,000,000.

(f) Abolition of the Farm Security Administration with $70,500,000 in direct appropriation and authority to borrow $120,000,000; its national defense activities, to the extent that they are necessary, to be transferred to some more suitable agency.

(g) Deferment of rural electrification expansion to the extent that it conflicts with national-defense priorities on materials.

6. Federal highway and public works

The committee recommends that during the emergency one-half of the Federal highway appropriations and authorizations be deferred, at a saving of $64,000,000.

The committee believes all appropriations and authorizations for all public works, including Federal dams, flood control, reclamation projects, and public buildings not directly essential to national defense should be deferred until after the emergency.

Such appropriations and authorizations, including highway funds, total approximately $160,000,000. These items immediately should be reviewed carefully.

7. Reserves impounded

The committee recommehds that all funds impounded by the Bureau of the Budget from previous appropriations and held in reserve now be covered back into the Treasury.

The committee recommends that legislation be enacted which would authorize the Director of the Budget to set up reserves out of any future appropriation, at such items and in such amounts as the Director may determine.

8. Government corporations

The Government, more and more, is relying upon the thirty-odd Federal corporations for financing both defense and nondefense operations. Most of the funds thus used, amounting to many billion dollars, are not subject now to the usual budgetary and audit control, nor does Congress have control over disbursements of funds through these corporations, except in blanket authorizations. Receipts derived from collections on loans made by these corporations return to their credit. They are subject only to control by the corporations themselves outside of any congressional jurisdiction.

These corporations already have authorization substantially to obligate the credit of the Government. These obligations constitute an indirect Federal debt to the extent that they are guaranteed by the Federal Government and that they are not met by the institutions themselves.

The committee recommends coordination of these corporate activities; legislation subjecting the corporations to budgetary and audit control; and that Congress assume tangible and direct control over their funds by means of its constitutional appropriating machinery.

The committee will deal with the disbursements of Government corporations and make more specific recommendations in subsequent reports.

TABULAR RECAPITULATION

If the specific recommendations by the committee are adopted, the appropriations for the next fiscal year will be less than in the current fiscal year by the following amounts:

	Savings
Civilian Conservation Corps (abolished)	$246,960,000
National Youth Administration (abolished) (nondefense)	91,967,000
Work Projects Administration (present appropriation $875,000,000 annually). Recommendation for quarterly appropriation including defense activities for first 3 months of next fiscal year of $50,000,000 monthly and further reduction as employment improves due to defense expenditures should save at least for the year	400,000,000
Agriculture:	
Deferment of land purchases	3,000,000
Savings in overhead expenses of Department as indicated	50,000,000
Reduction in appropriation for exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities	100,000,000
Farm-tenant program (abolished) (cash)	7,122,000

Agriculture—Continued.	
Farm-tenant program (abolished) (loan authorization cancelation)	*Savings* $50,000,000
Farm Security Administration (abolished) (cash)	70,500,000
Farm Security Administration (abolished) (loan authorization cancelation)	120,000,000
Public works and Federal highway: One-half deferment in public roads	64,000,000
Other public works:	
Deferment of public buildings for nondefense	43,164,000
Deferment of Department of the Interior items	26,727,000
Deferment of rivers and harbors and flood control items	27,835,000
Cash savings	1,131,075,000
Cancelation of loan activities	170,000,000
Total	1,301,075,000

In addition, if funds impounded by the Director of the Budget were covered into the Treasury by legislative action, as this committee recommends, there would be immediate savings of $415,890,061.

These savings specifically recommended are partial in scope and leave a field of economies in which further substantial reductions will be recommended.

In the field for future investigation by this committee, where no recommendations are as yet made, are reductions in administrative costs of civil departments as referred to above and noted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his report to the Senate Finance Committee. The committee has lacked time for investigation into many other expenditures which are and will be under study.

The committee is deeply grateful, especially for the cooperation of Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the Secretary of the Treasury, and Hon. Harold D. Smith, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as members of the committee, and for the expert information which they have made available to the committee. The committee is grateful also for the cooperation of the heads and officials of the various departments in the committee's deliberations.

This preliminary report is based upon the great amount of factual information, testimony, and other documentary evidence which will be incorporated from time to time in additional forthcoming reports.

Harry F. Byrd, chairman, member Senate Finance Committee; Robert L. Doughton, vice chairman, chairman House Committee on Ways and Means; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury (subject to qualifications as stated in his letter, which is attached); Carter Glass, chairman, Senate Committee on Committee on Appropriations; Walter F. George, chairman, Senate Committee on Finance (see attached comment); Kenneth McKellar, Democratic ranking member, Senate Appropriations Committee; Clifton A. Woodrum, Democratic ranking member, House Appropriations Committee; Thomas H. Cullen, Democratic ranking member, House Ways and Means Committee; Allen H. Treadway, Republican ranking member, House Ways and Means Committee; John H. Taber, Republican ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations; Gerald P. Nye, Republican ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations (approves recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8, but makes exception to recommendation 5. See attached comment).

Senator GEORGE's comment:

"In my opinion the defense activities of the National Youth Administration and educational activities relating strictly to defense activities in the Bureau of Education should be continued in the agencies respectively unless a substantial saving could be made by combining the two."

Senator NYE's exception:

"I take exception respecting recommendation No. 5, relating to reductions in the Department of Agriculture.

"While I am confident that large savings can be accomplished in that Department, I am not ready to recommend just where and in what amount the savings shall be undertaken, without chance for searching study of the subject of effect in each recommended reduction.

"We must keep agriculture strong and ready for the adjustment that must follow the war. When we let agriculture down during and after the last war, we contributed largely to the economic break-down which finally encompassed the whole country. We must not repeat that experience."

Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, participated actively in the preparation of the report, and was unexpectedly called home. The opportunity was not available to present the report to him for signature.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 22, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am willing to sign the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures subject, however, to my disagreement with the recommendations under "Agriculture." I disagree with the recommendations with respect to agriculture and in lieu of the recommendations contained in the committee's report, I desire to suggest the following:

When I appeared before the committee on November 14, I stated that expenditures included in the Budget under the farm program which was initiated in 1933, after the catastrophic fall in prices in 1932, were designed mainly to meet conditions involving low prices for farm products, surplus production, and loss of export markets. Present conditions are radically different from those which the farm program was designed to meet. It is estimated that in 1941 the farmer's share of the national income will be 20 percent greater than in 1932, notwithstanding a reduction of almost 10 percent in the proportion of the farm population to the total population of the country. Although governmental aid was necessary in order to bring the farmer's net income from $3,250,000,000 in 1932 up to $8,500,000,000 or more in 1941, certainly after having reached this goal there does not appear to be any reason to continue spending at the same rate. The farmer is getting his share of the total expenditures made by the Government, as the increase in his net income indicates. In addition, there are substantial benefits that will accrue to the farmer from the lend-lease program.

In view of all these circumstances I feel at this time that we should make drastic cuts in our agricultural expenditures and I would recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture be required to operate the agricultural program included in the Budget with an annual appropriation of $500,000,000 less than authorized for the current fiscal year.

With respect to that part of the agricultural program carried on with funds borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I would want the committee to make a more thorough investigation of these activities before I make any definite recommendation for reductions in the amounts available for this purpose.

I also raise a question about the recommendation (par. 1 of item No. 7, "Reserves impounded") to cover into the Treasury all reserves set up by the Bureau of the Budget. Reserves are set up primarily to meet unforeseen contingencies and to avoid deficiencies. Many times these reserves result in large savings. It seems to me that if a general recommendation of this kind is adopted it would defeat the very purpose for which reserves are created.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: While I have cooperated with the committee by making available the facilities of the Bureau of the Budget, in view of my position as head of the Bureau and my official participation in the preparation of the President's forthcoming 1943 Budget to be submitted January 3, I obviously cannot join in a report which may contain recommendations at variance therewith.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with respect to the Farm Security Administration, let me say that the committee was in session for nearly 12 hours on this one agency, the Farm Security Administration, and those in favor of its continuance had 6 hours and 19 minutes, and those opposed had 5 hours and 15 minutes.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two resolutions, one adopted by the National Grange at its seventy-fifth annual session at Worcester, Mass., November 12–21, 1941; and the other by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its twenty-third annual convention at Chicago, Ill., December 11, 1941.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE AT ITS SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL SESSION AT WORCESTER, MASS., NOVEMBER 12–21, 1941

12. Unnecessary nondefense spending must be eliminated because of increased demands upon tax-paying ability.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES AT THEIR FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING AT ATLANTA, GA., JANUARY 12, 1942

Eliminating nonessential Federal services

In the interest of conserving all available strength of our Governmnt as to facilities, services, and personnel, for maximum application to the needs of our program, we urge that agricultural cooperatives join all other interests in foregoing services of such nature, not of immediate necessity, during the present emergency; and urge that present governmental activities along the above lines be reviewed with the purpose of possible curtailments for the duration.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION AT ITS TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION AT CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 11, 1941

Nondefense spending and economy

In view of the great expansion of all Government bureaus, and since the emergencies for which many were set up have largely decreased or ceased to exist, we recommend that the activity of such agencies and bureaus as have served their major function, be curtailed in proportion to the reduction in necessity for the work they have been performing.

The mounting public debt and the necessities of war require that every administrator of Government be unusually zealous in his efforts to eliminate waste, extravagance, duplication, and unnecessary expenditure.

Agriculture is setting the example by reducing substantially its request for appropriations in line with the improvement in agricultural conditions. It calls upon all economic groups and all administrators responsible for the expenditure of public funds to seek through every legitimate means, the highest degree of efficiency and economy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the Farm Security Administration and its predecessor agencies made loans in the rural-rehabilitation program of an aggregate of $576,765,000, and gave away $137,326,000 in grants; a total of loans and grants in the amount of $714,092,000.

In addition, during this period from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, $275,861,000 was expended by the F. S. A. for personnel and other expenses, making a total expenditure by this agency of loans, grants, and administrative expenses of nearly $1,000,000,000.

Mr. President, the question is, Can the results obtained possibly justify the continuation of such huge appropriations? There is no agency of the Government, so far as I am aware, which has so high a percentage of overhead or administrative cost as the Farm Security Administration.

The Senate Appropriations Committee wiped out all the economies adopted by the House with respect to the Farm Security Administration.

With respect to the farm-tenant program, the House reduced the funds for loans to farmers to $25,000,000 compared to $40,000,000 which was proposed in the 1943 Budget, and $50,000,000 provided in 1942. The House reduced the funds for administrative expenses for this program to $1,250,000 compared to $2,500,264 proposed in the 1943 Budget, and $2,488,912 provided for 1942. The Senate Appropriations Committee increased the funds provided for farm-tenant loans to $40,000,000, and the fund for administrative expenses to $2,000,000. With respect to the so-called Rural Rehabilitation Program, the House reduced the funds for loans to farmers to $70,000,000, compared to $75,000,000 originally proposed for the 1943 Budget, and $120,000,000 provided for 1942. The House reduced the funds for expenses and grants to farmers to $25,000,000, in round figures, plus the $5,000,000 in unexpended balances, compared to $50,000,000 proposed in the 1943 Budget, plus $5,000,000 unexpended balances, and $64,000,000 available for 1942, plus six and one-half million dollars in unexpended balances.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations restored the funds for expenses and grants to $50,319,000, plus $5,000,000 unexpended balances, of which $10,000,000 is budgeted for grants, and the remaining $45,319,000 is available for expenses. The committee made available for rural-rehabilitation loans a total of $125,000,000.

The F. S. A. is in effect a W. P. A. for the farmers, although W. P. A. is still operating in the farming areas of the country, and in some instances, at least, some farmers obtain relief from the W. P. A. and likewise obtain relief from the F. S. A.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I know the able Senator from Virginia has made a careful study of this problem. I wonder what his investigation has disclosed relative to the benefits which the Farm Security Administration renders to the individual farm family. What is the kind of work it does?

Mr. BYRD. I will come to that a little later, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Virginia said the loans had been about $500,000,000 between 1935 and 1939. I wonder if the Senator has any information as to the amount which has been repaid from those loans?

Mr. BYRD. I shall furnish that in a few moments.

Mr. AIKEN. I happen to know that in my own State about 50 percent approximately—it may vary 1 or 2 percent one way or the other—has been repaid, so that $500,000,000 cannot be considered as an amount given to farmers who have been in distress.

Mr. BYRD. That figure was the figure of the loans. The grants represented $137,326,000. That amount represents straight gifts.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; the $137,000,000 represents outright gifts.

Mr. BYRD. I think the amount of loans outstanding as of this time is approximately $550,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Five hundred and sixty-four million dollars.

Mr. AIKEN. But the figures the Senator gave with respect to the years 1935 to 1939, as I recall——

Mr. BYRD. The balance of the loans outstanding, as the Senator from Georgia said, and it is my recollection also, is about $564,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. That includes loans which have been made in the last 2 or 3 years. I expect that, like in any other banking business, although perhaps not to so great extent, loans are made here which are being repaid from year to year, so that there will be this amount outstanding.

Mr. BYRD. But the outstanding loans represent approximately the figure I gave the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not that true of other lending agencies? Is not that true of the local banks also? They have outstanding loans of about the same amount year after year.

Mr. BYRD. The outstanding loans today are $564,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The total amount of loans that were made up through January 31, 1942, is approximately $600,000,000. Repayment of $255,000,000 has been made.

Mr. BYRD. But the outstanding loans now are about $564,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount actually repaid is $255,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator figures as to the percentage of repayment of matured loans which has occurred?

Mr. BYRD. I am coming to that part of the presentation in a moment, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Virginia know how many of the beneficiaries of the W. P. A. appropriations have repaid their benefits?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot give that figure.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the repayment of loans made by the Farm Security Administration reflect distinct credit on that class of farmer which is supposed to be the poorest class of farmer. The fact that those farmers try to repay their loans and have repaid about one-third of them, reflects great credit upon them.

Mr. BYRD. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it is absolutely impossible to ascertain what loans have been repaid out of the operation of the farms, because the grants are made to the same clients who obtain the loans. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to discuss that question later.

The real justifiable need for continuing the type of relief assistance extended by the Farm Security Administration has, to a large extent, ceased.

During the depth of the depression, when there was a large amount of unemployment in the cities, extremely low prices, low farm incomes, and a surplus of labor backed up on the farms, some kind of relief assistance was needed temporarily to prevent destitution and to assist persons in becoming self-supporting.

Today we have an entirely different situation. The total national income is the largest in the history of our Nation. There is an acute shortage of labor in the factories and on the farms. Total cash farm income in 1941 amounted to $11,771,000,000, and for 1942 it is estimated that cash farm income will reach a level of approximately $13,800,000,000—the highest on record except for the year 1919.

If there ever was a time when we could dispense with relief assistance, such as provided through the rural rehabilitation loans and grants of the F. S. A., it is now. Certainly there is no justifiable reason for continuing the enormous expenditures at the high levels at which they

have been carried heretofore. If this agency has been as successful as its proponents claim, then it seems strange indeed, after more than 7 years of enormous outlays, over $1,000,000,000, that this agency should continue to require more and more field employees, more and more money for travel expenses, and still greater appropriations for rehabilitation loans.

The table before me compares the total funds appropriated or allocated to the F. S. A. from 1935 down to date, the total number of permanent employees, and the total expenditures for this purpose, the total money loaned to farmers, the total amount of outright grants, and the total cash farm income from year to year.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures and appropriations of the Farm Security Administration in comparison with farm income

Fiscal year—	Total funds appropriated or allocated to F. S. A.[1]	Total number permanent employees [2]	Expenditures for permanent personnel [2]	Rural rehabilitation loans [3]	Farm tenant loans [4]	Grants	Farm income	
							Calendar years	Millions
1935-36	$218,925,000			$76,964,940		$15,343,325	1935	7,615
1936-37	204,118,153	13,285	$20,461,949	74,501,314		34,929,939	1936	8,571
1937-38	170,107,473	9,786	15,262,708	70,194,682	$8,992,659	23,094,868	1937	9,176
1938-39	208,055,484	13,235	20,636,583	119,186,607	23,622,622	23,603,215	1938	8,130
1939-40	201,875,730	15,467	24,025,312	98,053,243	36,441,370	24,222,075	1939	8,658
1940-41	240,790,407	17,281	28,207,716	125,150,358	48,166,111	17,130,006	1940	9,120
1941-42 estimate	237,236,000	20,452	36,116,359	120,000,000	50,000,000	17,925,000	1941	11,771
1942-43:								
House bill	122,069,557			70,000,000	25,000,000	[5] 10,000,000	1942	13,800
Bill as reported by Senate Appropriations Committee	222,819,557			125,000,000	40,000,000	10,000,000		

[1] Direct appropriations allocations from emergency relief funds, and authority to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. No attempt was made to adjust from reappropriations and funds returned to the Treasury.

[2] Compiled from the Budget. Since recent Budgets contain more complete data on Farm Security Administration than those for earlier years, the data for 1936-37 and 1937-38 may not be entirely comparable with that for later years.

[3] 1935-36 to 1940-41 figures are from p. 282, pt. 2, of the hearings on the 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.

[4] 1937-38 to 1940-41 figures are from p. 190, pt. 2, of the hearings on the 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.

[5] Assuming that all of the cut made by the House was in funds for salaries and other expenses.

Mr. BYRD. This table shows very strikingly that the total number of employees and the total expenditures for employees have been greater in recent years, when the need was much less, than was the case in the more difficult years of 1935, 1936, and 1937.

For example, in the year 1936–37, when farm income was only $8,571,000,000 and when there was a great amount of suffering in the Great Plains area, due to the succession of disastrous droughts, the total funds appropriated or allocated to the F. S. A. amounted to $204,118,153, of which $74,501,314 was available for rural-rehabilitation loans, and no funds were available for farm-tenant loans. In those difficult years, when farmers were far more needy than they are today, F. S. A. had 13,285 permanent employees at a cost of $20,461,949.

By the fiscal year 1941, when farm income was in excess of $9,000,000,000, the total funds appropriated or allocated to the F. S. A. aggregated $240,790,407, of which $125,150,358 was available for rural rehabilitation loans, and by that time the F. S. A. had built up its permanent personnel to a total of 17,281 employees at a cost of $28,207,716.

I think the farm tenancy part of the Farm Security Administration has fewer defects in its administration and is much more valuable than the rehabilitation part of the program. The farm tenancy part has already been passed upon by the Senate.

In the fiscal year 1942, after farm income had advanced to a level of $11,771,000,000 in the calendar year 1941, the F. S. A. was given a total of $237,236,000, which was $33,000,000 more than it had in the fiscal year 1936–37, and the F. S. A. increased its permanent personnel to 20,452 employees at a total cost of $36,116,359.

To some extent this is regarded as one of the minor agencies of the Government. It has 20,452 employees, at a total cost for personnel of $36,116,315.

Now, when it is estimated that farm income in the calendar year 1942 will reach $13,800,000, it is proposed in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 to spend in expenses, loans, and grants $222,000,000. The 1943 Budget also would provide this agency with 20,489 permanent employees, at a cost of $36,536,378, the largest number and the greatest expenditure that this agency has ever had for this purpose. The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee would continue the same high level of funds for rural rehabilitation loans as in 1942, and the largest number of employees in the history of this agency.

Is the F. S. A. a war agency? I submit that it is not, and that a much greater contribution can be made toward increasing the food supply of the country, at far less cost, through other means. I read to the Senate one of many communications which the committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has received with respect to that question. This is a telegram from Mr. Hamner Cobbs, editor of the Greensboro Watchman, at Greensboro, Ala.:

GREENSBORO, ALA., *April 23, 1942.*

Senator HARRY BYRD,
Washington, D. C.:

Urban newspapers pleading for restoration of Farm Security appropriation cuts on basis of clients needed to produce food. Black belt of Alabama can offer congressional investigators hundreds of cases of proof that Farm Security Administrator program not only failing to produce food in quantity but actually retarding food production by supporting army of Negroes in virtual idleness and bringing on acute labor shortage for farmers who are really trying to turn out food for armed forces. If Congress doesn't believe this let it send representatives south who can see for themselves.

GREENSBORO WATCHMAN,
HAMNER COBBS.

The esteemed Presiding Officer of the Senate, Vice President WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, in his 1940 annual report, on page 108, in speaking of the number of farmers receiving additional aid through the rehabilitation program, said:

> This increase has not added materially to the production of commercial crops. It has chiefly augmented production for consumption on the farms.

Any one who sees the equipment which is given to the farmers must see that the main result is to produce food for consumption by farmers who live on the farms, and who obtain this relief.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the date of the report to which the Senator refers?

Mr. BYRD. It was the 1940 annual report.

Mr. PEPPER. That related to the previous fiscal year, did it not, from 1939 to 1940?

Mr. BYRD. It was for the year 1940.

Mr. PEPPER. I was wondering if that was not a period when we had farm surpluses generally in the country as a whole. Naturally the emphasis of the Farm Security Administration was upon making the various farm families self-supporting. Its efforts were aimed at raising their standard of nutrition and living by making them more self-supporting on the farms upon which they lived. That does not at all negative the wisdom of the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and of the President that such families be now used, at a time when there is a tendency toward a shortage of foodstuffs, to make it possible to produce surpluses to meet the national and international demand. I do not think it is quite fair to use as a standard of comparison a period of peace

in relation to a recommendation pertaining to a time of war.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Secretary had in mind the objectives of the program as it then was.

In the testimony of Mr. Baldwin before the committee on this point the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asked him whether or not the Farm Security Administration received any appropriation for so-called defense work [reading]:

Senator McKELLAR. I see another question here: It is marvelous to me.

The question is:

"Has Farm Security Administration received any appropriation for so-called defense work?"

And here is your answer:

"The Farm Security Administration has not received any direct appropriation for defense work, but, as indicated above, has participated in defense housing activity by designation of the Federal Works Administrator and of the President, respectively."

Is that your answer?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir; that is the answer we gave.

Senator McKELLAR. But you haven't had any direct appropriations at all. Are you asking for them? If you are not, I believe you are the only official in the Government that is not asking for extra appropriations on account of the defense activity, whether they have any work in connection with defense or not. Have you asked for it?

Mr. BALDWIN. No, sir.

The point I wish to make—and I shall try to elaborate on it later—is that the equipment given the farmers is not sufficient to make possible any large production of crops, as I shall attempt to show later. The loans are limited in amount.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, in a supplementary request to the Appropriations Committee the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation make available $105,000,000 for the Farm Security Administration. No doubt if that recommendation of the President had been carried out it would have been possible for many farmers to have received equipment the absence of which has handicapped their efforts in the past.

Mr. BYRD. In my judgment, other agencies of Government could very much more effectively accomplish that purpose.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement from the committee with respect to what it regards as the unwarranted claims of the F. S. A. as a war agency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNWARRANTED CLAIMS OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AS A WAR AGENCY

The Farm Security Administration, confronted with the prospect of losing most of its clients because of the greatly improved economic situation, is now trying to perpetuate its pay rolls and its bureaucracy by posing as a war agency.

In support of the request of the President for the supplemental appropriation for Federal Security it was stated that these additional funds were needed to provide credit to farmers to secure increased production of food in the food-for-freedom program as a part of the war effort. It is very significant, however, that the language suggested to be added to the appropriation bill—while appearing to provide funds for the specific purpose of increasing the production of food for the war effort, specifically provided that these additional sums shall be expended "for the same purposes and to be available for the same objectives and to be expendable under the same conditions" as provided in the regular rural rehabilitation loan and grant program.

Under this program the scope of authority is so broad that apparently the Farm Security Administration can loan money to farmers for almost any purpose under the sun. The word "rehabilitation" is construed so broadly by the Farm Security Administration that it apparently can give almost anything that Mr. Baldwin and his employees believe is necessary to the rehabilitation of their clients. When Mr. Baldwin was before our committee, he admitted that he would approve as allowable items of expense as a basis for rural rehabilitation loans such items as movie tickets, lodge dues, poll taxes, gasoline for running an automobile, etc., on the theory—according to Mr. Baldwin—that "these items are the normal cost that go toward living in a democracy." Mr. Baldwin did not say whether these items are specifically included in the allowable budget which must be approved by the Farm Security Administration and on which the loans must be based to balance the client's budget, the end result is the same. The loan is made for the purpose of balancing the Budget which is made out and approved by the employees of the Farm Security Administration.

At this point I would like to insert in the record the following excerpt in the hearings of our committee. (Hearings, Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, pp. 718–719.)

I would like to call attention also to the fact that the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee, in providing additional funds for the program of rural rehabilitation loans and grants, states that these additional funds are to be used "for food production and rehabilitation." If these additional funds are so vitally needed to secure increased food production, why were they not limited in the President's Budget entirely to this purpose? And why were they not limited in the report of the committee entirely to the production of increased food supplies? Under the language of the supplementary estimate submitted by the President and under the language contained in the committee report, every dollar of this money could be used by the Farm Security Administration for all sorts of purposes which it claims under the broad term "rehabilitation," which are far removed from producing increased food supplies.

The plain truth of the matter is, that the Farm Security Administration has seen the handwriting on the wall, that its work as a relief agency is playing out because of the improved conditions in agriculture and in the country generally; they have found it increasingly difficult to expend the large appropriations which Congress has hitherto provided, so much so that they have had to go out and use high-pressure methods to solicit clients and importune them to get on the Government and accept loans and even outright grants of money. Our committee found at its investigation repeated instances where low-income farmers had been heavily burdened with debts far beyond their ability ever to repay. I don't want to take the time to get into this point but later on I expect to show how this agency has had to resort to high-pressure methods to expend its appropriations.

Confronted with this situation, the Farm Security Administration, just like most of the other temporary relief agencies, then looked around for new fields to invade. They saw the day coming when the public would demand the curtailment of all expenditures that are not essential to the war effort, and so they began to devise ways and means by which they could be classified as a war agency. When it became evident that public sentiment for the curtailment of nonessential expenditures had become so overwhelming that Congress was going to drastically curtail the expenditures of this relief agency, they then devised this scheme to maintain and even greatly expand their pay rolls and expenditures. Now we are told that this agency is vitally necessary to the winning of the war.

The absurdity of this claim is evident from the review of the record and the facts that are available to anyone who will take the time to investigate. If this agency were so vitally necessary to the winning of the war, strange indeed that this request for increased funds for food production was not submitted to Congress until after the appropriations for the Farm Security Administration had been curtailed, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture announced the increased production goals in the food-for-freedom program on September 8, 1941, more than 8 months ago; and he announced the revised goals for increased farm production on January 16, 1942, more than 5 months ago.

If this agency was so vital to the attainment of the increased production of food in the food-for-freedom program, why did the Budget Bureau in its recommendations to Congress, submitted by the President on January 5, nearly 4 months after the original production goals had been announced by the Department of Agriculture, recommend a reduction of $45,000,000 in the funds for rural rehabilitation loans to farmers? If the need was so great and if this agency was so vital, it is strange indeed that the Budget Bureau should then recommend such a substantial reduction in the funds for loans.

Furthermore, both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration Administrator appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on January 30, and again on February 12, in support of the Farm Security Administration appropriations, and neither of them at that time made any request for such a supplemental appropriation, although in defending the Farm Security Administration appropriations they used the argument that this agency was an important factor in promoting the food-for-freedom program. Furthermore, the House Appropriations Committee, after giving very extensive consideration and thoroughly reviewing all of the testimony, made a further reduction in the funds for rural rehabilitation loans from $75,000,000, which was recommended by the Budget, to $70,000,000. Evidently the House Appropriations Committee did not believe any additional funds were needed to produce increased food when it approved a reduction in the funds.

Later, the House of Representatives, after further extensive debate and consideration of the needs of the Farm Security Administration, reduced its appropriations for salaries and expenses.

When the House sharply reduced the funds available for personnel and expenses, the Farm Security Administration became thoroughly alarmed. They evidently decided that offense is the best defense to save their appropriations and so we are now confronted with a request for a large increase in funds

to this agency in the name of the war effort, presumably that this will result in the restoration of enough funds so that they can maintain their enormous bureaucracy intact.

Let us not be deceived by this smoke screen which this bureaucracy has thrown up to conceal the real issues involved. The truth of the matter is, there is no need for any increased funds to the Farm Security Administration to promote the increased production of food. It is claimed that these increased funds are needed in order to provide credit to low-income farmers who cannot obtain the credit they need to produce additional food. Perhaps the best refutation to the validity of this claim is the statement of the United States Department of Agriculture itself in an official release to the press issued on March 9, 1942, which stated:

"Reports to Farm Credit Administration also indicate that farmers generally are using more short-term production credit than in recent years, due largely to their greater efforts to produce food for defense, but that lending facilities throughout the Nation are adequate to meet all of their needs."

This release was issued by the Department of Agriculture 2 months after Secretary Wickard's revised food production goals were announced on January 16, and 5 months after the original production goals were announced on September 8.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, which is the largest and most widely organized national organization of farmers, had its economists examine the validity of the claim that the Farm Security Administration rural rehabilitation loan program is vitally essential to the attainment of the production goals in the food for freedom program. This analysis showed that these claims are entirely unwarranted. At this point I would like to insert in the record an excerpt from a letter submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the federation, opposing this supplemental increase and exposing the fallacy of these claims.

I also wish to insert in the record a summary of this analysis made by the Farm Bureau's chief economist which shows that the States where farm income is the lowest and where the income of Farm Security Administration clients is the largest have been asked to contribute very little of the needed increase in the production of most food crops.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the assertion made by the distinguished Senator from Florida with respect to farm equipment which is to be received by tenants who are to get the benefit of this appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, I should like to make one observation.

For some time I have attempted, through the War Production Board, to obtain an increase in priorities so far as farm implements are concerned. I do not know what the figures show at this moment. The latest information I have is that farm implements had been reduced to 80 percent of the amount available last year. They are presumed to be primarily for the farmers who raise the basic commodities of this country. I am wondering just what is to happen in connection with farm machinery to take care of the farmers about whom the Senator from Florida was speaking, in view of the priority situation which exists in the War Production Board at the present time. In other words, it seems to me that we have a very peculiar situation. We have the Secretary of Agriculture asking for more food to be produced in this country, and contending that that will win the war, while on the other hand we have the War Production Board cutting down on the priorities for farm machinery, which is so indispensable and essential in the preparation of the basic crops. I simply want to pass on that information for whatever it is worth.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct in what he says. I happen to be in the farming business, and it is becoming increasingly difficult day by day for the farmers to get even the most ordinary farm equipment, and especially they have difficulty in getting parts with which to repair their farm equipment.

Mr. President, of course I do not want to hold the Farm Security Administration up to a very high standard of perfection, but I do say that some of the activities of that organization should not be approved by Congress. I have in my hand information and affidavits relative to solicitation of clients in order to expand the appropriations. I do not think that any department of this Government should send out agents to solicit people to receive what that agency offers. I think that requests for aid should come from the people themselves.

Instead of the need for increased funds for the F. S. A., there is abundant evidence to show that in many areas, at least, F. S. A. employees have resorted to high-pressure methods, including the assignment of quotas and the widespread solicitation of clients, in order to expend their appropriations.

For example, an affidavit of Mr. W. D. Bynum, former Farm Security Administration assistant rural rehabilitation supervisor in Jackson County, Ala., stated that Mr. E. S. Morgan, regional director of the F. S. A., in a bidistrict meeting of F. S. A. employees at Huntsville, Ala., told them that "regardless of the reason for which clients had been dropped from the program in the past, it would be the duty of the supervisors to contact every one of them and offer them a new loan. He said that if they owed a thousand dollars and had no collateral, it would make no difference in getting a new loan approved."

In another affidavit, one of S. L. Griffin, assistant county rural rehabilitation supervisor in Hale County, Ala., it was stated:

Mr. Morgan further stated that he would have other fights to hold our appropriations. Mr. Morgan said that those on the program at this time plus those who had been dropped were equal to about one-seventh of all farm families in the region. He stated that Farm Security Administration was now authorized to reinstate all of those former clients who had been dropped. He said these should become qualified voters, and that any client who wished to borrow money from Farm Security Administration for the payment of poll taxes could do so. Mr. Morgan said that we would have that many more voters.

During the hearings of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, considerable evidence was offered showing the widespread solicitation of clients and the assignment of quotas for the expenditure of F. S. A. funds. This evidence revealed the use of high-pressure methods by F. S. A. officials to get their employees to produce more business. I have in my hand a memorandum which summarizes this evidence, and I ask unanimous consent that this report on the part of the committee be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSIGNMENT OF QUOTAS AND SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Instead of Farm Security Administration funds being insufficient to meet the needs for rural rehabilitation, as claimed by Farm Security Administration officials, conclusive evidence has been obtained indicating that, in some areas at least, Farm Security Administration employees have engaged in widespread solicitation of clients to accept Farm Security Administration loans and grants and that quotas have been assigned to Farm Security Administration supervisors which they are expected to reach in order to expend the funds available to Farm Security Administration.

An investigation of the Farm Security Administration in Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, by Mr. William G. Carr, a trained and reputable investigator employed under the direction of Mr. Donald Kirkpatrick, general counsel of the American Farm Bureau Federation, early in 1942, revealed widespread solicitation of clients and assignment of quotas. The reports of Mr. Carr, together with a summation of the reports of other investigators who assisted Mr. Kirkpatrick in the Farm Bureau investigation of the Farm Security Administration in several Midwestern States, were presented to the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures during its hearings on February 10, 1942, by Mr. Kirkpatrick. Additional reports were submitted later by Mr. Carr to Mr. Kirkpatrick reporting further findings obtained later in Alabama and also his findings in Georgia.

ALABAMA

In Alabama, Mr. Carr reported:

"There has been a widespread program of solicitation of clients for rural rehabilitation loans. This is due to the fact that the assistant county supervisor of the Farm Security Administration is given a quota to fill and the only way he can fill this quota is to go out and solicit clients.

"This is done in various ways. The assistant supervisors go to the prospective clients themselves. They also go to the people who are known to lend money to the farm tenants and find out the names of the tenants who are indebted to them. They can then approach the tenants, telling them of the advisability of getting 'on the Government.'

"Some county supervisors go to the local storekeeper and find out who his debtors are and then approach the debtors, asking them to become clients."

Mr. Carr cited several specific cases by way of illustration of these practices in Alabama. Among them were the following:

"One client informed me that when he was solicited to go 'on the Government' he owed $60, that he could have paid off that $60 debt, but now he is 'on the Government' he owes

over $900, and that he doesn't know how he will ever pay it off. * * * He stated that the assistant supervisors of the Farm Security Administration combed the country soliciting Negroes to 'go on the Government.' He told me the name of the man who solicited him. I saw this individual and he admitted that he not only solicited this client but solicited about 30 others as well." (P. 22, transcript of hearings, February 10, 1942, Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.)

In order that there can be no question as to the authenticity of this interview, Mr. Kirkpatrick supplied the name of this person who told Mr. Carr he had solicited these clients; the name was Mr. Brockway, former assistant, Farm Security Administration supervisor, of Hale County, Ala. (P. 22, transcript.)

Another case was cited by Mr. Carr and substantiated by the original letter of W. H. Washburn, dated January 24, 1942, photostatic copy of which was supplied to the House Appropriations Committee, as a further specific illustration, from which the following is quoted from this letter:

"Last summer I was plowing in my field that I rent from Mr. W. N. Cummings, of Suttle, Ala., when Mr. Grady L. Wise, of the Farm Security Administration, came to see me and told me that someone had given him my name as a good prospect to take a farm on a place that the Farm Security Administration had an option on more than 2,000 acres of land that belongs to Dr. R. C. Hanna, and that they were trying to find enough good clients to take the farms on this place, and asked me if I would not come and make an application for one of these farms.

"This I did and was going to take one of them but after some investigation I found that if I did take one of these places that I would be unable to buy a cow, chickens, hogs, or farming implements, nor could I sell any of my farm products or personal property without first going to the Farm Security Administration office and get their permission. To me this amounted to slavery, as I would have signed away all my rights."

Mr. Baldwin attempted to explain away this signed statement by submitting to the House Appropriations Committee an affidavit of W. D. Mims, who states that he was county supervisor of Perry County and that in April 1941, W. H. Washburn came into the office of the Farm Security Administration and "asked whether he would be eligible for a tenant-purchase loan" and he states further that Washburn was asked to put in an application for a loan and that his application was approved by the county committee.

Mr. Baldwin attempted to explain away this signed statement by the following reply which he submitted to the House Appropriations Committee:

"That letter nowhere states that Mr. Washburn was first approached by representatives of the Farm Security Administration."

Yet it is difficult to see how any other interpretation can be drawn from the Washburn letter which states specifically that Farm Security Administration representative, Mr. Grady L. Wise, "came to see me and told me that someone had given him my name as a good prospect to take a farm." If Mr. Washburn's story is correct, then it appears obvious that this visit by Mr. Wise was the initial approach to the prospective client, because of the statement made by Mr. Wise.

Mr. Baldwin admits that Washburn's story is correct but claims that Mr. Carr's interpretation is wrong. The following is quoted further from Mr. Baldwin's statement about this incident:

"The story in Mr. Washburn's letter is correct. The implications which Mr. Carr sought to derive from it are completely unfounded."

But Mr. Baldwin fails to produce any conclusive evidence to refute the plain statement contained in the Washburn letter. Mr. Baldwin sought further to explain away this incident, as follows:

"As far as our records indicate, he came to our county office and asked for an explanation of the tenant-purchase program. After receiving this, he filled out an application. Later he was approved by the county committee. He was then visited by an assistant county supervisor, who advised him that the county committee would certify him if he cared to buy a farm." (P. 784, Hearings, House Appropriations Committee, agricultural appropriations bill.)

Mr. Baldwin filed an affidavit of Mr. W. D. Mims who stated that he was county Farm Security Administration supervisor in Perry County, Ala., in April 1941, when he claims this incident occurred and that Grady L. Wise was assistant supervisor at that time. Mr. Mims recites a visit of W. H. Washburn to his office to inquire about his eligibility for a tenant-purchase loan, that he was given an application and his application was approved, but it is obvious that Mr. Mims was unable to specifically refute the statement of Washburn that he was approached by Assistant Supervisor Wise before Washburn looked into the matter further. Mr. Mims states in his affidavit that "To the best of my knowledge, this applicant was not contacted until he made application for this loan." Such a statement is valueless in refuting Mr. Washburn's statement, as Mr. Wise is the one who is alleged to have made the initial contact and no affidavit was obtained from him for the reason that "he is now in the Army." It is not surprising that Mr. Mims would not have knowledge of a contact that was made by Mr. Wise.

Mr. Baldwin's refutation therefore is very inconclusive.

Mr. Baldwin further told the House committee:

"I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the Washburn case is the only case in which a specific allegation was made regarding the solicitation of clients." (P. 787, hearings.)

This statement is not correct. Numerous specific instances were cited, in addition to reports of general conditions based upon visits to a large number of counties by Farm Bureau investigators. A number of these specific cases will be cited in this summary. The case of Mr. Brockway has already been cited, who admitted he solicited 30 clients. Mr Baldwin ignores this and other cases.

Mr. Baldwin admitted a handbill had been circulated by a Farm Security Administration supervisor in Centre, Ala., advertising for farm-tenant clients. This was another specific allegation submitted by Mr. Carr. Among the statements in this handbill were the following:

"ATTENTION FARMERS

"Tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers make application now for purchasing farm through tenant-purchase program of Farm Security Administration.

"Any farm family who does not already own a farm is eligible to make application.

"There is no limit as to the number of farms that can be bought in Cherokee County this year.

* * * * *

"If you know a friend who might be interested, don't fail to tell him. It may be his only chance.

"Farms for sale should be listed with us. (P. 23, transcript.)

"FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
"Centre, Ala."

Mr. Baldwin conceded that this was improper and explained that the employee had been "overzealous." He said that the cost of paper and printing for this handbill had been paid for by the employee. Mr. Baldwin further admitted that the information in this circular, that there was no limit to the number of farms that could be bought in Cherokee County, was false, as in fact the number of loans was limited to 24 in that county. Mr. Baldwin said he would call the matter to the attention of the employee, whereupon Chairman TARVER made this comment:

"Mr. TARVER. That is certainly a light tap on the wrist for what seems to me is a very flagrant violation of any rule of common sense, whether it is a violation of any rule of the Farm Security Administration or not, to call it to his attention. Is that all you intend to do?"

In reply Mr. Baldwin said he wanted to look into the man's record further and to be fair with him, but "From what little I know about this, I did not think it would merit the discharge of the employee concerned." (P. 781, hearings.)

The question may well be raised as to why an employee should spend personal funds on such a circular unless he was reacting to pressure from above to get more clients.

In a later supplementary report submitted by Mr. Carr giving further instances in Alabama as a result of further investigation by him, the following cases are cited:

In a letter to Mr. Carr, signed by J. C. Webb, of J. C. Moore Mercantile Co. and Webb Bros., Marion, Ala., the solicitation of Miles Lapsley, Jr., a tenant of the Webb place, is described as follows:

"In March of 1941 the county director of Farm Security Administration of Perry County, Ala., Mr. W. D. Mims, and their home-demonstration agent, Miss Jennie Mary Bates, stopped on a country road that goes through our plantation and called Miles Lapsley, Jr., a tenant on our place, out of their car from the field in which he was plowing. They told him they were looking for good tenants, and they would like for him to make application with them. He explained to them that he had a good home and was doing well. After this statement from him Mr. Mims and Miss Bates showed him plans of a home, barn, etc., stating that they would furnish him two mules, several cows, fertilizer, considerable cash, and everything he needed with which to make a crop. After he refused to sign the application they left it with him and told him to think it over and if he decided to sign, to bring it into the office. They also gave him several plans and asked that he pass them out among his friends.

"This is one specific case of the way in which the Farm Security goes about getting their clients. There are others that I could mention, some of which did sign applications and have moved to other farms." (See copy of letter attached hereto.)

Apparently the Farm Security Administration supervisors had great difficulty in getting clients, if they had to resort to such solicitation. It is interesting to note, in view of Mr. Mims' affidavit about the Washburn case, that Mr. Mims is charged in this letter with soliciting the client referred to above.

Another important piece of evidence from Alabama, submitted by Mr. Carr, which illustrates the assignment of quotas and the use of high-pressure sales methods to get Farm Security Administration employees to sign up more clients, is a photostatic copy of a circular letter addressed as follows:

"UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
"FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
"Tuscaloosa, Ala., March 4, 1941.

"MEMORANDUM

"To: All employees, District 4.
"From: J. C. Lewis, district supervisor; Edith A. Hurd.
"Subject: Progress on rural-rehabilitation loans."

The letter complains that some of the employees are not producing as much as others

and warns them to get more clients signed up:

"I am enclosing a report showing the number of plans written by each farm and home supervisor in the district. * * * There are some reasons for some of you being where you are in this calculation. There is no use for me to mention who you are for you already know, but the greater majority of you can see from the figures themselves that some of our people have been producing more than others. From these figures, I note that some of our assistant supervisors, who have been in the work only from 3 to 6 months, have written, in some cases, about twice as many as some of our older employees. I believe it will be well for you to study these figures and act accordingly."

The letter states that a definite quota had been set for the number of applicants to be aided in the Fourth District of Alabama that year:

"We have ample personnel in this district to do the job that we originally set out to do; that is, aid about 4,000 needy families in this district."

The letter then complains that the latest report indicates they will fall short of the original goal set and tells them that this is not enough for the personnel in this district:

"From the study of these figures I am enclosing, we are not planning on aiding more than 3,410 applicants in all. This is not enough for the personnel we have in this district. With the farm supervisors we have, counting two colored who will probably have a maximum load of 100 to 125, we should aid about 3,800 clients in this district. This is about 400 more than is anticipated.

"These practices must be started if you have not started, in order to get this job moving faster. We are, roughly, about one-half through with the anticipated case load, and it is the 1st of March. I can't too strongly urge you to give your preferred attention to getting these farm and home plans written."

Then the letter adds some additional pressure in the form of a quotation from a memorandum received from Mr. Pearson as of this date which outlines our responsibilities to the new applicants of this district," as follows:

"You will recall that on several occasions in recent weeks we have discussed the matter of new applicants and increased case load. You have been advised that we have available sufficient personnel and funds to make several thousand new loans.

"We are somewhat concerned here over the apparent attitude the field is taking with reference to increasing our case load. It would seem from letters, telephone calls, and your daily reports that some of the folks in the counties are advising applicants and the public that we will not be able to increase our case load this year due to lack of funds and personnel. We cannot too strongly urge you to correct any such rumors as they are certainly not based on facts.

"We are in a very strategic position this year especially and should tune up all of our forces to exert every bit of the manpower we have to take care of all families possible who are our responsibility."

This statement is significant in that it reveals that the district office was being pressed from higher up in the Farm Security Administration organization to get more loans, the situation had been discussed several times in recent weeks, and that strong pressure is exerted to get more loans. It is evident from this letter that district 4 was lagging behind its quota, as the letter states that it has "available sufficient personnel and funds to make several thousand new loans" and concern was expressed because the staff had not loaned as much as expected. This further confirms the fact that the Farm Security Administration has had dificulty spending its appropriations instead of having a shortage of funds in that area.

After quoting from Mr. Pearson's memorandum, the district circular letter of Mr. Lewis concludes:

"You can see from it that he is concerned about the progress we are making and the news we are spreading among our people. I have recently written you asking the number of applications you have and the number you anticipated taking on our program and if you need more help in order to do the job that your county is supposed to do you should let this office know immediately so that plans can be made to get some help to your county."

This further confirms that a quota is assigned each county. More help is promised to reach the goal if necessary, although earlier in the letter, they are told that they should be making more loans than they are with the amount of personnel they have. Then the letter contains a typewritten figure which evidently was filled in separately in this form letter to each county, and which constitutes the county quota for each county that year:

"With the personnel you have in your county already you should write approximately 940 loans this year and if you do not have enough personnel to take on the new clients that have applied above this amount, I would appreciate your letting me know immediately and as you probably already know, I will do all in my power to get them for you."

Another case of solicitation of clients in Alabama is contained in a statement of Ellis Fondren, as follows:

"My name is Ellis Fondren. I live at Sprott, Ala. In the month of March 1940 a man from the Farm Security Agency came to my home and asked me if I didn't want to buy a farm; I told him that I did.

"I was told by Mr. Mims, of the Farm Security Administration, that I could buy a farm on the Dr. Hanna tract for $20 an acre. I agreed to buy 78.93 acres.

"When the papers were drawn up, I found that the land alone would cost me $49.72 per acre, and with the home it would cost me $57.55 per acre. After I found out what the farm would cost I told the Farm Security Administration that I didn't want the farm. They asked me to take the farm and the day I took it I could sign it over to someone else."

Another case of solicitation in Alabama is contained in a statement of Carlos Ingram, dated February 18, 1942, from which the following is quoted:

"My name is Carlos Ingram. I live on rural free delivery No. 3, Marion, Ala.

"In February 1936, Mr. Lewis of the Farm Security Administration asked me if he couldn't loan me some money so I could make a crop. I signed up with the Farm Security Administration and was on their rural rehabilitation program for 4 years * * *.

"Last month Mr. Mims of the Farm Security Administration wanted me to sign up as a client again. I told him I would rather work for 50 cents a day than to never be able to call anything my own."

Another case cited by Mr. Carr is contained in the statement of Will Knight, dated February 14, 1942, and attested by R. W. Young, Burkville, Ala., who says he was present "when this was taken and it is a true statement of Will Knight and a true signature by him." The following excerpt is quoted:

"In 1935 I was living in Mount Willing, Ala. In the fall of 1935, a lady who was working for the Farm Security Administration came to see me and asked me to go 'on the Government.' I believe the lady's name was Miss Walton."

From Mississippi, as a result of his field investigation, Mr. Carr reported as follows:

"There is widespread solicitation of clients by the employees of the Farm Security Administration. This is done in several ways—by contacting the prospective clients to meetings and explaining the advisability of becoming clients.

"The county home supervisor and assistant county home supervisor, as well as the assistant county supervisor, are told how many clients are needed and are told to go out and get them.

"In Washington County I found instances where the Farm Security Administration has gone to Negroes in the fall and told them that they could come into town where they would be on relief during the winter if they would agree to become clients of the Farm Security Administration in the spring" (p. 47, transcript of hearings, joint congressional committee).

Following his investigation in Louisiana, Mr. Carr reported:

"Clients are being openly solicited in East Carroll Parish, La. The employees of the Farm Security Administration call upon the prospective clients and try to talk them into accepting loans and becoming indebted to the Farm Security Administration.

"One of the employees of the Farm Security Administration told one of the local Farm Security Administration committeemen, who is a landowner and a member of a committee which has never met, that he almost acquired two of his tenants, but they refused to leave." (P. 62, transcript, hearings, joint congressional committee.)

As a result of his field investigation in Arkansas, Mr. Carr reported:

"The assistant supervisors in the counties of the State of Arkansas are given quotas to fill, and are told to go out and fill them. In order to get their required number of clients they use about every possible means of solicitation. They call upon prospective clients, hold meetings, and expound their theories and ask clients themselves to solicit their friends, neighbors, and relatives.

"An assistant supervisor's salary is determined by the amount of clients he can produce. If he wishes to get into a higher salary bracket the one and only qualification is that he produce a larger clientele." (P. 68, transcript, hearings, joint congressional committee.)

ILLINOIS

Mr. Ernest R. Simmerman made affidavit on January 28, 1942, in which he states that in February 1941 he "received a letter from William Armstrong, assistant to superintendent of the Farm Security Administration in this county, requesting that I call to see him on a set date in Anna, Ill." He further states:

"When I called there was an official of the Work Projects Administration from Herrin, Ill., in his office. He and Mr. Armstrong suggested to me the renting of a farm owned by L. F. Lentz, Belleville, Ill.; and when I told them I could not because I had nothing to start with, they suggested to me that the money to start farming would be available through Farm Security Administration."

Mr. Baldwin said that the case of Mr. Simmerman, whom he erroneously referred to as "Zimmerman," would appear to be a case "where our supervisor and a Work Projects Administration representative had solicited the making of a loan to this individual. Now the information I have on the case indicates that there has been very close cooperation in that county between the Work Projects Administration and the Farm Security Administration representatives; that there have been frequent cases in which the Work Projects Administration people have thought

that individuals on their rolls were better suited to farming and they have referred them to our office for consideration; that they wanted to get them off the relief rolls and the work relief rolls, which I think is a proper activity."

Apparently Mr. Baldwin favors the practice of a Farm Security Administration supervisor going to the Work Projects Administration rolls to obtain additional clients. Is the Farm Security Administration supposed to rehabilitate actual farmers, or make farmers out of Work Projects Administration clients?

NORTH DAKOTA

According to an affidavit submitted by William Rauscher, New Leipzig, N. Dak., dated February 1, 1942, he was solicited in 1939 by a Farm Security Administration employee to sign up for a share in an elevator which the farmers' union proposed to start in Elgin, N. Dak. He alleges that his grant payments from Farm Security Administration were forthwith discontinued when he refused to sign for this stock, although he had been receiving regular monthly grant checks to help support a family of nine children, and his neighbors who signed up for the elevator continued to receive grants after his was stopped The following excerpt is quoted from his affidavit:

"In the early part of 1939 Henry Sullivan, the County Supervisor of Farm Security Administration for Grant County, N. Dak., came to see me and told me that I should sign up for a share in an elevator which the farmers' union proposed to start in Elgin, N. Dak. I told him that I didn't want to have anything to do with any more elevators because I lost $700 in one several years ago.

"Mr. Sullivan told me I'd better think it over but I told him that my mind was made up. I did not receive my grant the following month and never received any more grants."

Then he adds this significant comment:

"While they denied it, I believe that my grants were stopped because I refused to sign up for this elevator. Neighbors of mine who signed up for the elevator continued to receive grants after mine were stopped."

He stated that he wrote Senator NYE about this matter on March 3, 1939. (See pp. 41-42, transcript, hearings, joint congressional committee, for copy of this letter, which gives these events in more detail.)

Mr. Baldwin told the House Appropriations Committee, when asked about this alleged solicitation to buy stock in the elevator, stated:

"That was also investigated several years ago, and we found that there was no substance to his complaint and this is a matter that has been discussed before this committee from time to time each year. I think 3 years ago the making of loans for the purchase of stock in grain-elevator associations was discussed before the committee and debated in Congress." (P. 811, hearings.)

Mr. Baldwin stated also that the grant payment was discontinued because of the decision of a review committee composed of local people that he was not in such need as to justify continuing him as a grant client, and they believed that he had more wheat on hand than he claimed to have. Regardless of whether the grant payment was or was not discontinued because of his refusal to buy the elevator stock, Mr. Baldwin submitted no evidence or information to refute the sworn statement of Mr. Rauscher that he was solicited by the county Farm Security Administration supervisor to buy this stock and urged to do it. Mr. Baldwin attempts to dismiss this sworn charge merely by saying: "That was also investigated several years ago, and we found that there was no substance to his complaint." (P. 811, hearings.) It is significant that notwithstanding whatever "investigation" Mr. Baldwin may have made, Mr. Rauscher renews his charge with a sworn affidavit, dated February 1, 1942.

Another similar case is that of Mr. John Zeh. In a sworn affidavit dated February 1, 1942, he states, in part:

"My name is John Zeh and I reside on a farm a few miles south of Elgin, N. Dak.

"During 1938 and 1939 I was forced to apply to the Farm Security for assistance in the form of grants. These grants were allowed me for awhile and then the county supervisor's assistant, a Mr. Stewart, told me that before I could receive further grants I must join the Farmers Union.

"I protested but finally had to borrow enough money to pay the dues of $3.50 to the Farmers Union. I did this because I knew that I would receive no further grants until I joined the Farmers Union. After I joined the Farmers Union and paid my fee, I had no more trouble obtaining grants.

"I wrote Senator Frazier a letter about this treatment and understand that Walter Maddox, State Farm Security Administration director, denied the truth of my statement. In answer to this I must say that Mr. Maddox is mistaken."

When asked about this, Mr. Baldwin told the House Appropriations Committee that this case, too, had been "investigated" in 1938 and "investigated" again in 1939 when it was again called to their attention. Mr. Baldwin gave his explanation of why Mr. Zeh was cut off from receiving grant payments, but he offered no evidence to rebut the charge that Mr. Zeh was solicited by an employee of the Farm Security Administration to join the Farmers Union with the alleged threat that his grant payments would be cut off if he did not join. Mr. Baldwin said: "The complaint was found to have no substance"; but he offers no proof of this statement, so far as the solicitation angle is concerned. His explanation deals with the reasons for cutting of Mr. Zeh's grants.

In view of Mr. Zeh's sworn affidavit, dated February 1, 1942, renewing this charge under oath and stating specifically that notwithstanding Mr. Maddox's alleged denial, that Mr. Maddox is mistaken, Mr. Baldwin's explanation is unsatisfactory and unconvincing on this point.

Most of the foregoing information was presented either to the Joint Congressional Committee for the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures or to the House Appropriations Subcommittee and therefore was available to Mr. Baldwin. Yet he told the House Appropriations Subcommittee:

"Mr BALDWIN. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the Washburn case is the only case in which a specific allegation was made regarding the solicitation of tenants." (P. 787, hearings on 1943 agricultural appropriations bill.)

If Mr. Baldwin's alleged "investigations" of the complaints and his other categorical denials of specific charges against the practices carried on by various Farm Security Administration employees are as inaccurate as this statement, they are very inconclusive indeed.

One of the most flagrant examples of solicitation reported by Mr. Carr is the case of Mr. R. C. Rose, of Roseland, Ark. Mr. Rose received a letter from David C. Neal, Rural Rehabilitation supervisor, and Frances W. Jones, Home Mortgage supervisor, which read in part as follows:

"We have some money set aside as a grant to do sanitary work on your place. * * * We feel sure that any landowner could not possibly afford to pass up this opportunity."

Mr. Carr reports that "Mr. R. C. Rose operates about 4,000 acres of land. His buildings are in excellent shape, and if they were not he has the facilities to repair them."

This is a case where the Farm Security Administration is apparently using grant money, appropriated by Congress for the relief of destitute farm people, to improve the facilities of well-to-do landowners. Mr. Baldwin completely ignored this case in his rebuttal to the Farm Bureau testimony.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the employees of the Farm Security Administration have not hesitated to circulate vicious attacks on Members of Congress and other persons who dared to advocate reductions in the appropriations of the Farm Security Administration, and they have done so under the Government frank and at Government expense.

I have in my hand an article from the New Republic, of February 23, 1942, the title of which is "Who Speaks for the Farmers?" The article has imprinted on it "United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, Division of Information, Little Rock, Ark." The article makes some references to me, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them. It makes some references to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and then it has this to say about the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]:

Senators MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, and GEORGE, of Georgia, made equally determined noises to indicate that tenants and croppers are not going to be forced to own their own farms, paint their houses, or feed their children balanced diets so long as they are in the Senate to ward off such a fate.

I think it is very reprehensible, Mr. President, that any bureau of this Government should take an article from a newspaper or magazine, put on it the imprint of the Department of Agriculture, as has been done in this instance, and then send the publication through the mails, under Government frank, so as to discredit Members of Congress who are exercising their constitutional privileges and rights by stating their views with respect to appropriations pending before the Congress.

That is what this agency has done. I will not take the time to read all the article to the Senate, or to tax the members of the committee who do not agree with me on the subject. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reprint from the New Republic, February 23, 1942]

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE FARMERS?

The Byrd economy committee of Congress has been busy recently trying to make certain that the tenant farmers and sharecroppers of southern poll-tax States are kept as voteless as they are now. The committee has been looking into charges brought before it by the American Farm Bureau Federation and Probate Judge Bob Green, of Hale County, Ala., that the Farm Security Administration has been paying poll taxes for some of its clients in Alabama.

When Senator BYRD called his fellow Virginian, C. B. Baldwin, Federal Security Ad-

ministrator, before the committee, Mr. Baldwin testified that the Farm Security Administration was approving loans to clients who needed money to pay present or back poll taxes. In Alabama, poll taxes are cumulative up to $36, which is a very large sum to farmers of whom more than half are still earning less than $500 per year. Baldwin also said that the Farm Security Administration was charged with rehabilitating those farm families to which it was making loans and that the Farm Security Administration considered full voting status an essential part of such rehabilitation. The Byrd committee's all-star cast of Senators from poll-tax States were horrified by such brazen belief in constitutional guaranties, and CARTER GLASS was quick to assert that if the Department of Agriculture solicitor agreed that such procedure was legal, Mr. Baldwin had better get himself a new solicitor.

Senators MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, and GEORGE, of Georgia, made equally determined noises to indicate that tenants and croppers are not going to be forced to own their own farms, paint their houses, or feed their children balanced diets so long as they are in the Senate to ward off such a fate. Some cynics attending these hearings pretended to see a connection between the attitude displayed by the four senior statesmen from the South on the committees and their own personal electoral problems. They pointed out that at their last reelection, Senators MCKELLAR and BYRD were returned to the Senate by the votes of approximately 17 percent of the population over 21 in their respective States; that 15 percent of adult Virginians were enough to send CARTER GLASS back to his old seat in Washington, and that in the off-Presidential year of 1938, when he last ran, WALTER GEORGE came in first with only 3 percent of Georgians over 21 casting votes for him.

More seasoned Washington hearing-goers could think of further explanations for the Byrd committee's all-out attack on the Farm Security program. They recalled other occasions on which Ed O'Neal, Farm Bureau Federation president, has played a star role.

They remembered the time last year when Ed O'Neal and his organization declared war against the Department of Agriculture and especially against their chosen enemy, the Farm Security Administration, sometimes referred to as "the poor man's extension service." Their suggestion then was that the Farm Security Administration be abolished and its functions divided between the Farm Credit Administration and the Extension Service of the Department. O'Neal and his boys lost that round, but there is very little reason to believe that they accepted the defeat as final. The Farm Bureau is now making the same recommendations before the Byrd committee. Perhaps it is time to ask why the Farm Bureau is so persistent in its attack on the Farm Security Administration. What is the Farm Bureau Federation anyway?

The first chapter in the history of the American Farm Bureau Federation was written in Binghamton, N. Y., in 1909—prophetically enough, under the sponsorship of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce. From that time to this the Farm Bureau has consistently stood for the interests of the well-to-do farmer and his friends in industry. Baldwin was safe in saying, as he said before the Byrd committee the other day, that "Mr. O'Neal cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered a representative of the low-income farmers." Essentially, Farm Bureau philosophy has followed the school of thought which holds that "poor farmers are poor because they are lazy."

In its first stages, the Farm Bureau operated on a county basis to spread knowledge and practice of scientific farming methods, as they were developed by agricultural departments of the land-grant colleges which had been established by westward-looking settlers. At a very early period, Farm Bureau activities were closely interwoven with those of the Extension Services of the land-grant colleges, so that it was quite natural, when the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 came along, for the Farm Bureau to take rapid advantage of its benefits. The Smith-Lever Act provided grants for extension work to States which were willing to match Federal funds, either with State, county, or local funds, or with funds supplied by "interested groups of citizens." Because the Farm Bureau was financially able and quite willing to answer to this last description, the American Farm Bureau Federation, with scarcely any effort at all, was able to obtain virtual control of our national agricultural machinery. And after more than 25 years, it has yet to be dislodged from that position. By supplying the matching funds called for in this early act, the Farm Bureau controls farm organization in 11 key States. Now, by contributing approximately a million dollars out of a total annual expenditure of close to $33,000,000 for extension work throughout the country, a private organization thus is able to control a public service.

Well-to-do farmers quickly realized the advantages which could come from close contact with the State agricultural colleges, and by the time of World War No. 1, they had moved to consolidate their control of these institutions. The World War put the Farm Bureau on the map, calling as it did for lightning-like expansion of the infant Extension Service. Following the war, the Bureau adopted a legislative program and began to look far beyond the field of scientific agriculture. By 1922, there were probably 1,250,000 Farm Bureau members, and the organization was ready to get into big-time lobbying company in Washington. It succeeded. A good indication of its progress can be seen from the important role the Farm Bureau Washington lobby, headed by Chester Gray, played in determining the disposition of Muscle Shoals after the war.

By 1928, Chester Gray had established the Farm Bureau as a lobbying factor that Congressmen had to reckon with. By that time, the big-business sympathies of the Bureau had been clarified in several election campaigns, and it came as no surprise to men like Senator NORRIS to find the Farm Bureau fighting against the real interests of American farmers on the question of the disposition of Muscle Shoals. This was a long and bitter struggle. Farmers had more to gain by proper disposition of the Shoals than almost any other group, yet by intrigue and deception, Farm Bureau representatives were able to throw the weight of the organization over to the side of the power lobby, which had every intention of fleecing the farmer as shortly as possible.

The record was clearly presented by Senator NORRIS in a series of masterly statements on the floor of the Senate in 1930, and was even more clearly laid bare in the lobby investigation conducted by Hugo Black, then Senator from Alabama. Senator Black exposed Gray as an agent of the American Cyanamid Co. and the Fertilizer Trust, while he was supposed to be representing Farm Bureau members on the same matter. An interesting part of the same record is the correspondence, indicating intimate and frequent contact, between Gray and Ed O'Neal, then president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation.

As the Coolidge and Hoover regimes slid off into history, the Farm Bureau began to suffer real losses in membership and standing. By 1934, it was down to some four hundred thousand members and lacked the kind of program needed to attract the dissident farmers of the period. The Farmers' Union began to gather strength, and very early in the New Deal farm problems seemed to divide into a three-way proposition: wheat, corn, and cotton. The Farmers' Union was soon established as the spokesman for wheat. Farm Bureau strength had long centered in and unquestionably dominated the corn country. The cotton South remained virtually unorganized. The Farm Bureau in 1933 had practically no strength in the South. The next move was obvious to politically astute Farm Bureau bosses like Earl Smith of Illinois, who had headed the organization as long as a corn boss could do the job. As soon as he understood the score, Smith looked around for a likely cotton man to front for him. Ed O'Neal, then a national vice president, seemed made to order.

If you have ever seen Ed O'Neal, you know that Earl Smith was a good picker. Even if you have not seen him, his record since 1931 proves that Smith was right. When the New Deal came in with its newfangled notions of how to make American agriculture a paying proposition, the Farm Bureau was in a more strategic position than its declining membership rate indicated. From years of infiltration and careful organization, the Farm Bureau had a corner on most of the trained professionals in the agricultural field. When the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the rural rehabilitation programs came along, their choices of field personnel were fairly well limited to those trained by agricultural colleges, and consequently in all probability touched to some extent by Farm Bureau philosophy and organizational controls.

Regardless of how good programs were when they came out of the Washington office, they were translated on the operating level into a Farm Bureau version of the original idea. But in spite of these basic controls, the Farm Bureau needed to bolster its membership, so someone thought of adapting the check-off principle to farm organization. In many Southern States it has worked like this. Big planters who have always been Farm Bureau members and understand that the bureau is working for their interests have agreed to sign up all their tenants and croppers for the bureau. The member rarely knows he has joined; his $2 dues are just deducted from his crop or his Agricultural Adjustment Administration check and turned over to the bureau directly. Under this ingenious system, membership in the South has shot up, and the Georges, Byrds, Glasses, and McKellers have an equivalent respect for the Farm Bureau interpretation of agricultural economics.

As things stand now, Ed O'Neal and the five-hundred-thousand-odd members he has now are lined up against the Farm Security Administration and its 600,000 low-income farm families. O'Neal's well-to-do planters are producing almost to capacity at present. If we are to meet the requirements of our victory food program, it will have to be through increasing production by the 3,000,000 farm families who now fall in the under $600 annual income group. It is the Farm Security program which is capable of doing this—not the Farm Bureau program. It is our Baldwins who can win the war for us; our O'Neals who can lose it.

HELEN FULLER.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. BYRD. Let me point out to the Senator from Tennessee that the article to which I have just referred was sent at Government expense to a large number of the clients of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that, so far as I am concerned, the statement made in that article is just as false as the other many falsehoods which have been circulated by this same organization. I think it is the worst set-up that we have in the Government. I want to be perfectly frank. The Senator knows that I usually speak my mind. I shall speak my mind right now. I think Mr. Baldwin is a Communist. I do not think he is really in favor of our American institutions. I think he is doing the poorest job of almost any job performed by anyone connected with the Government. To my mind the Farm Security Administration is the most wasteful and extravagant agency or activity we have. I have no confidence in Mr. Baldwin as an administrator, and I know that he is giving enormous sums of money to some very trifling people. I do not believe in his philosophy of life. I think it is hurting the morale of the farmers, the morale of the youth, and of people generally. The teachings of Mr. Baldwin in regard to it being the duty of the Government to give away its money to people who will not work for it is fallacious and indefensible. I forget how many hundreds of millions of dollars this young man has given away; I do not have the exact information at hand at the moment.

Mr. BYRD. I think it has been nearly a billion dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia says it has been nearly a billion dollars. I do not know the exact figures. I think Mr. Baldwin is the most extravagant administrator of all administrators of activities in the Government, barring none. I do not believe he is doing the farmers a particle of good. I think he is injuring them in the greatest degree. That is one of the reasons why in the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I voted to put a brake on this man.

What he may have said about me or what he may have published and passed through the mails about me, at Government expense, is wholly immaterial; it makes no difference in the world what Mr. Baldwin thinks about me, or what he does not think about me. I have but one idea in the world in what I am doing in this body, and that is to see that the work of the Government is administered honestly and as fairly and as justly and as economically as it is possible to administer it. At a time such as this, for us to throw away money for such things as the trailer systems and migratory farm camps, which do not bring in any return, to my mind is indefensible, and I am willing to vote to abolish the whole thing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course I will not interrupt the Senator from Tennessee if he prefers not to be interrupted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; so far as I am concerned I am glad to have the Senator interrupt in any way he pleases.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we often speak about bureaucratic agencies doing injustice to those of us who serve in the legislative branch of the Government; and yet ofttimes we rise on the floor of the Senate when the victim of our views is not here to defend himself, and, with the light-heartedness of a cavalier, denounce him as a Communist. Of course, being a Communist is an offense; one who is a Communist is diametrically opposed to our form of government, and membership in the Communist Party disentitles a man to the right to draw a dollar of pay as a Government official; and under such circumstances the acceptance by a Government official of any Government money as pay would make him a criminal. All of us know that to be a fact; and yet we offer to our colleagues or to the country or to the official under criticism no itemization or justification whatever for the claim, so far as I understand. I think it is only fair that such justification be stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will read the hearings, he will see that, in substance, I have made exactly the same statement to Mr. Baldwin to his face when I have cross-examined him.

Mr. BYRD. I can certify to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no secrets; I am not saying anything in this body that I will not say anywhere else in the world.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not question the right of a Senator to make any statement he may desire.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only the right, but, if Mr. Baldwin wants to sue me, let him go ahead; I will waive the fact that I am a Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. As one Senator, I should like very much to hear the Senator produce some evidence of the basis upon which he charges a public official with being a Communist. I know that in one instance that was involved in the Senator's remarks, but I do not agree with his statement of fact.

Because he referred to throwing away money that goes for the benefit of the migratory workers of this country, I wish to say that, as a personal observer of the improvement in living conditions the Farm Security Administration has brought to the migrant workers who work in my State, I know of no agency of the Government that is doing more good and is more deserving of support from the Congress than is the Farm Security Administration. If that work be called extravagance, it is to belittle the dignity of a human being living in a decent house and not being compelled to wash his clothes in the same stream in which the refuse from his body is carried away.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if it be a matter of giving Government money, other people's money, to these people for a purpose which betters their condition temporarily, the Senator is right in his defense, but, to my mind, it is indefensible for the Government to make these vast appropriations for men who are gallivanting around the country doing nothing but drawing their support from the Public Treasury through grants from this young man. The Senator can have his own views about it; I am not criticizing him; every man thinks about these things as he pleases, but, so far as I am concerned, I still think, notwithstanding what the Senator has said, that the little good it may do—and it is like a kind-hearted person giving a hand-out to a man who asks for it—is very insignificant indeed compared to the injury to the morale of the farmers of this country and to their independence. Causing men to travel over the country in automobiles or trailers and having the Government, in part, support them in that kind of work, I do not believe contributes one single particle to the produce grown on the farms of this country. Can the Senator tell me of any organization of this kind the efforts of which have resulted in farm products being secured for anybody?

Mr. PEPPER. I can say to the Senator that, quoting from the United States census report, in the spring of 1940 in the State of Florida alone many thousands of those itinerant workers were engaged in the cultivation and the harvesting of vegetables which were sent forth from that State to various consuming areas of the Nation. Those migrant workers, not so fortunate as some of us to be able to reside in satisfactory and sanitary homes, follow the market and follow the vegetable and fruit crops which come into maturity at various times in various sections of the country. They go from the Southeast up the Atlantic seaboard; some of them reach the State of Kentucky and perform there a kind of work different from that which they perform in Florida.

The question is not whether they are going to keep on migrating. Mr. Baldwin did not start them migrating. They were migrating when Mr. Baldwin came in; they were migrating when some of us came to the Senate years ago, when this type of agriculture developed in America, and when there was need for a large number of people, more than the area could normally support as a stable population, to go into certain areas at certain seasons. Consequently they move from period to period and place to place. The only thing Mr. Baldwin has done, the only thing the Congress has done, since this administration has taken cognizance of their poverty, their squalor, is to take them out of insanitary houses, out of squalid conditions, and give them decent abodes in which they may repose while they are at a given place.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about——

Mr. PEPPER. I hope the Senator will excuse me for a moment. Let me finish this statement; then I will gladly yield.

I never knew a great deal about these migratory labor camps until 2 or 3 years ago when I happened to be driving across the highway in the area of Lake Okeechobee in Florida, which is a great vegetable-producing area. I saw a little chain of houses on the banks of a stream, which

was used in one instance for the washing of clothes and in the other instance for the sewers of the area. I cannot conceive of a Negro community, I can hardly conceive of a peasant area in any country in the world more deplorable, more obnoxious than that area was. Yet just a short time before I passed there that was the abode, the residence of men, women, and children who are American citizens, who had come there in response to the seasonal demand to aid in the cultivation and harvesting of the vegetable crops. About a half a mile away from there I was shown a camp, neatly laid out, with grass on the ground, with little houses, sufficiently large for two families, with the privies back a proper distance from the residences, and then, in front of that picture was a flagpole on which was floating the American flag. I said in my heart, "Thank God for a country that will take its citizens out of squalor and put them in decent abodes where they may have repose in the nighttime and while they are home in the daytime resting from their labors in the field."

In everyone of those camps the United States Employment Service has put its own representative. Those in the camps do not lie there in idleness and indolence; they are assigned to a field not by the person who comes for their labor but by a public representative, and, if they do not work, they are thrown out of these houses.

So the man who says they are permitted to indulge themselves at public expense and do nothing is not informed. I have seen them, as other Senators in this body have seen them. It is not fair to those people to have them held up to ridicule and scorn because they happen to migrate for particular crops and seasons from one section of the country to another.

As it is now, this appropriation has been cut down to a point where only half the existing camps can be maintained unless the occupants are required to pay a charge for the use of the facilities.

This is one agency, Mr. President, that gets down into the humble class of American citizens who are making less than $500 and less than $750 a year and even less than $500. It is all right to give a subsidy to the big farmers, as we do give a subsidy for soil conservation and other benefits; it is all right to subsidize business and manufacturers, but if we give a poor devil $75 a month on W. P. A. or if we teach him to be self-sustaining upon a tenant farm, in the opinion of some able Senators it is squandering public funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I know as much about the poor people of this country as does the Senator from Florida, for I am one of them; I have been poor all my life; I have gone through the school of hardship and I know what I am talking about. I have seen these camps, too, I will say to the Senator from Florida, and I think many of them, especially the trailer camps, are a stench in the nostrils of decent people. Those whose homes are in the localities are regretful that the camps are there, and the only reason they are there is that they are upheld by our Government.

We are just as much to blame as are the migrants themselves when we keep them there at Government expense.

When times were hard, when there was real necessity for helping these people because of the depression which came upon us several years ago, we all voted for all that was necessary to take care of them because their plight was not their fault. But times have changed; there is no man who wants work in this country today who cannot get it. Why should we be subsidizing any group of our people when the work of all groups is necessary? Any man who is strong enough to work, who is physically able to work, has an opportunity to work just as much as the Senator or I have. For the Government to support these people in the way we are doing, to my mind, I say again, is indefensible. It is hurtful to the young men of our country; it is hurtful to the very men to whom we give these benefits in such large measure. It affects them so that they are dependent upon the Government, and do not depend upon themselves.

Mr. President, for these reasons I believe that these appropriations should not be made. I voted in the committee to cut them down in every way possible, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], knows. I feel the same way now. I wish to add that I think I am quite as sympathetic with the class of people in question as are those who take the opposite view.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee if I may.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice at the top of page 74, line 3, a provision for $450,000,000, which apparently has come to us from the House without change in any way by the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I note the provision.

Mr. DANAHER. That is a considerable sum of money. Did the Senate committee make any effort to change the amount?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to refer that to the Senator from Georgia. I am not on the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not hear the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator from Connecticut repeat his question?

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from Tennessee this question, then, if he cannot answer the first: Can the Senator from Tennessee tell me who is to get the $450,000,000?

Mr. McKELLAR Again I shall have to refer the Senator to the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, because I am not on the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amount is to be paid to the six-million-odd thousand farm families for meeting certain definite requirements of the Department of Agriculture in order to preserve the fertility of the soil of this Nation. It is paid out only to those who comply with the requirements of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. There have been many people who have been much concerned at the great depletion of our lands. We know from the history of other nations which have come and gone, empires which have risen and fallen, that the basic, underlying cause of many of the tragic happenings of history which wiped out great civilizations has been the depletion of the fertility of the soil. The money here appropriated is to be paid out, as it has been for years past, to those who conform to the requirements of the Department for preserving the soil.

I may say to the Senator that this year for the first time, recognizing the very unusual conditions which obtain, a reduction of $50,000,000 has been made in the appropriation. For the past 7 years the appropriation has been $500,000,000. This year, in the effort to economize in every case where money could be saved, this appropriation has been reduced by $50,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. That was a reduction the House put into effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it was recommended by the Budget Bureau, approved by the House committee and the House, and approved by the Senate committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Without change?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I direct attention to page 77, where I see the language in line 8, "there are hereby reappropriated the unobligated balances of the appropriations made under this head by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1945. How much money is represented by those unobligated balances?

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately $2,000,000—to be exact, $2,015,000.

Mr. DANAHER. What is the purpose, then, of providing that they shall be reappropriated until June 3, 1945?

Mr. RUSSELL. I really know of no necessity for their being made available until June 30, 1945. I can tell the Senator the reason why this has been done in the past.

The parity payments are made to farmers who comply with the crop-reduction program and the soil-conservation program of the Department. Ofttimes there has been a controversy within a county as to whether a farmer has earned his parity payments. In such case the county committee passed upon the matter. If a farmer is dissatisfied with a decision of the committee, he has a right to appeal to his State committee.

Sometimes it takes a considerable period of time to develop all the facts, and to conduct a hearing before the State committee. If the State committee decides against the farmer, he has a right to appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture. In some cases the question whether a farmer was entitled to a parity payment has been involved in the process of appeal for more than 2 years; so that funds were made available for a period of 3 years to enable the Secretary to take care of such appeal cases.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, under this language, such farmers will be guaranteed, I take it, full parity payments. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. DANAHER. In each of the instances mentioned we are paying part of the $450,000,000 to farmers who already own their farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator is entirely in error in that respect. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 the payments are not confined to farmers who own their land, but the small farmer or the tenant farmer gets increased payments over and above that received by the farmer who is a large operator. The payments are not confined to landowners; the money goes to all those who work upon farms.

Mr. DANAHER. Under this parity program we give a guaranty to those who produce in accordance with the requirements of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; do we not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Do we make any provision for a farmer reducing acreage as a condition to receiving any part of these payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; that is true with respect to wheat and cotton. Due to the great surpluses which have been piled up, there has been a very drastic reduction in wheat acreage and in cotton acreage. The cotton acreage has been reduced from 16,000,000 acres, and the wheat acreage was reduced this year to approximately 55,000,000 acres. I do not recall the aggregate acreage prior to the reduction.

Mr. DANAHER. I am impelled to ask these questions by the observation of the Senator from Tennessee, who thereafter referred my questions to the Senator from Georgia, let me recall. He had been talking about the need for production in wartime, with which I fully agree, and about the need of our doing everything we could to stimulate production. Yet we find these enormous sums—$450,000,000, on the one hand—to be paid to farmers who are already established on farms, whether they own them or not, and, on the other hand, a guaranteed minimum of parity payments is provided for others who reduce their quotas in certain instances.

I assume that when we are doing that much for those people it is eminently proper that we take into account yet one other class of farmer, as to whom the Congress hitherto has not declared a policy. I do not understand, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, that either he or the Senator from Georgia, or anyone else, is making any attack here on the policy represented by the appropriation. Their quarrel is one with the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; our objection is to the way in which certain amounts of it are paid. So far as concerns the appropriation which the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Georgia have discussed, they are entirely right; the appropriation applies to large farmers, small farmers, all farmers. It applies to farmers who want to buy land and who are helped, and that is a fine thing. The evil about which I had something to say was the evil of the so-called migratory farmers. They are not farmers; they are merely migrants who are going all over the country. They get automobiles and go to various sections of the country and stop at trailer camps, and the Government helps support them. I do not think that should be done. They are not attempting to make homes for themselves; they are not trying to become farmers; they are not trying to help the country produce things which will be of aid to the country. Collecting together and making nuisances of themselves, they are undertaking to get something from the Government to which they are not entitled. That class of farmers we cannot help. What we give them is thrown away. They are no good from an economic standpoint, and, to my mind, the system followed is destroying the morale of those who receive the money from the Government without compensating return.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Tennessee tell me who will harvest the crops if these migrants do not?

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be a sufficient number of farmers to harvest the crops. We would be disappointed if we depended on these migrants, who go over the country in old Ford cars, collecting in migratory stations, taking their cars into trailer camps. By the way, these camps are most unsanitary. Talk about the Government furnishing better sanitation for them; anyone who will go near one of the camps will observe that the Government is not furnishing the sanitation for the camps, at any rate. These people are a nuisance to those around them; they are no good to the farmers; they are not workers; they are migrants. They are naturally roving people, who are not farmers, and many of them do not claim to be farmers.

Mr DANAHER. Many of them?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; many of them.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for another question?

Mr. BYRD. I should like to proceed with my statement, Mr. President.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator to yield for only one further question, and I thank him for his forbearance. Is there any provision in the bill for the payment for sugar quotas this year and, if so, how much?

Mr. BYRD. There is a provision for paying on the same basis as last year. The amount is $47,000,000, is it not, I ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is only $500,000 below the amount for the current year. It is some forty-odd million dollars.

Mr. BYRD. Forty-seven million dollars, I believe.

Mr. DANAHER. And that sum is to be paid to those who keep their sugar quotas within limit; is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an expert on the sugar question. In our committee we have several experts on that question, one of them being the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and one or two other Senators. This year we have reversed the policy. This year we pay for increased production rather than pay the farmers to decrease their production.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Connecticut that there seems to be an erroneous impression that this $450,000,000 is received entirely by farmers. It is my understanding that much of it is received by landowners, who are not necessarily farmers, and it applies to owners of forest land, and particularly it applies to a great many banking institutions and insurance companies in the East that own land in the West on which they collect soil-conservation payments. In my State there are two companies which collect the maximum of, as I recall the amount, $10,000. If the Senator from Connecticut examines the record, I believe he will find a great many such institutions in his State which are collecting $10,000 each from this $450,000,000 appropriation. Senators will notice that there was a proposal made to cut the maximum payment to $1,000, but that was not agreed to. The $450,000,000, however, is not all paid to farmers; it is paid to landowners for improving their soil and protecting the soil. Part of it goes for control of riverbank erosion, at least for supervision of the work, and for other purposes which cannot directly be called farming operations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order to make my position perfectly plain, let me say that some years ago, when the country was going through very hard times, when it was in the greatest depression the world has ever known, I happened to be on a return voyage from the Philippine Islands, together with my distinguished friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and some other gentlemen. We were on the Red Sea when I received a cablegram stating that the Appropriations Committee was divided 12 to 12 on the question of the big W. P. A. project. When I came home I voted for that project. Why did I do so? Because, Mr. President, people actually needed the help provided by it. The country was in

a sad plight, and it was a matter of humanity to vote for the W. P. A., and I have continued to vote for it when it was necessary to do so. But at such a time as this, when we do not have the labor which we need on our farms, when we do not have the labor which we need in our factories, when any one who wants to work can get work and receive a good return for his labor, I do not think we should continue to give out money to those who do not want to labor, who wish to traipse around the country, to idle around the country in such cars as they can get, or such other means of transportation as they may find. At such a time as this I do not think they should be continued as wards of the Government, and treated as we are treating them under the provisions of the bill. I am glad the amount has been reduced. It ought to be reduced. I am in favor of doing anything to help suffering humanity, but I am not in favor of letting persons who are not working take advantage of the Government by being made the recipients of Government payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to conclude my statement. I have yielded for nearly an hour now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If I am to say anything on the subject I wish to do so now.

Mr. BYRD. Cannot the Senator do it in his own time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to say something about Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. BYRD. How long will the Senator take to make his statement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If no questions are asked me, I shall make the statement in about 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia yields for 4 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, within that time limitation voluntarily imposed I shall not attempt, of course, to go into a discussion of the philosophy of the Farm Security Administration or its great advantages to the under dog in rural life. I am not content, however, to let this phase of the debate close without saying something about Mr. Baldwin in view of the very vigorous assault upon him made by my beloved friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

The Senator from Tennessee has boldly expressed the opinion—and he always, as he says, has the courage to do so, but I think sometimes a little bit too vigorously—that Mr. Baldwin is a Communist, and he doubts the propriety and the wisdom of vesting any judgment, or discretion, or administrative power in Mr. Baldwin. I, of course, hold no brief for Mr. Baldwin. He is not from my State, but for the last 4 or 5 years I have had very intimate contact with Mr. Baldwin in his administration of the Farm Security Administration in both phases of its work, in connection with the Farm Purchase Act, which has been so fully approved by everyone, and which is under Mr. Baldwin's administration, and in the administration of the rehabilitation program.

Mr. President, I have never seen any indication, nor have I ever heard any statement made by Mr. Baldwin which indicated in any way that he was a Communist, or that he was not in full accord with American institutions and the American form of Government. I have at all times found him to be a gentleman, a Virginia gentleman, and if any criticism could be made of him it is because of his generosity, possibly, his tender heart toward relieving the sufferings of the poor farmers who could not obtain credit, who had no standing, who had no means to enable them to stay upon the farm, and who, except for his assistance, would have been obliged to go to town and get on the W. P. A., but who preferred to stay on the land and make their own living for themselves and their families.

Mr. President, I feel that in justice to Mr. Baldwin I should make that statement, especially in view of the charge made by my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee that, in his opinion, Mr. Baldwin is a Communist. I have seen nothing at all in my close contact with Mr. Baldwin to justify such a charge. I do not think the Senator from Tennessee has had as close contact with him as I have had, otherwise he would not have entertained the opinion he has expressed. So Mr. President, I feel it is my duty to make the statement I have made, and I very cheerfully and gladly do so, regardless of other issues which may be involved in this controversy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the American Farm Bureau Federation, which represents perhaps more farmers than any other organization in the country, has recommended the abolishment of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, that is not true at all. The American Farm Bureau Federation is in accord with the principles under which that Administration works.

The Federation opposes the spending of the volume of money which is spent, and also opposes some of its practices, but it does not recommend the abolishment of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia again yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under the circumstances I should like to read the recommendations which the executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation made, as follows:

While we thoroughly agree that the activities under the farm-tenant purchase program and the Farm Security Administration should be drastically and severely curtailed, we believe that at least part of the work of these agencies should not be forthwith abolished.

This is the American Farm Bureau Federation speaking through its official representative:

The work being done under the Farm Security Administration should certainly be restricted to the needs of deserving farmers who are not eligible for other lines of credit, or who cannot find their places in industrial production. Unquestionably the need for relief assistance such as that provided by the Farm Security is very greatly reduced. Purchasing of large areas of land, the establishment of cooperative purchasing and selling organizations, and other activities of the Farm Security which are already being carried out effectively by other agencies—governmental and private—are not warranted and should be discontinued. We believe that farm tenant purchase activities should be confined chiefly to the servicing of loans already made, and that few, if any, additional commitments should be made during the present war emergency.

This is the American Farm Bureau Federation speaking. This is said in the name of the American farmer:

It is obvious that there is great need to reduce the overhead and administrative expenses for carrying on these activities.

That is what the Senator is trying to do in cutting this appropriation from $50,000,000 to $25,000,000.

For this reason and also in order to coordinate such activities with other agricultural efforts, we believe that the merited parts of these programs should be handled by other agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture which have for many years been engaged in such activities. This would prevent overlapping and duplicating and greatly reduce overhead and other administrative expense.

The Federation does recommend the abolition of the Farm Security Administration and Mr. Baldwin's administration of it. The American Farm Bureau Federation goes on to say:

We have had a preliminary investigation made of the Farm Security program, as we have had many complaints of waste, extravagance, and abuses in the administration of this program. While we did not have the time nor the facilities to make a complete investigation, the preliminary findings indicate some startling and shocking conditions of waste, extravagance, and indefensible practices in the administration of this program, including:

(1) Assignment of quotas of the number of clients to be secured in counties in order to expend funds appropriated by Congress and to maintain personnel employed by the agency.

(2) Widespread solicitation of clients in order to meet quotas.

Referred to by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

(3) Burdening of clients with excessive loans beyond their ability ever to repay, resulting in a complete loss of hope and breakdown of morale.

(4) Establishment of impractical collective-farming projects.

(5) The policy of making grant payments from Federal emergency relief funds, for which the Farm Security appears to be a certifying agency, as a means of enabling clients to repay loans rather than using such funds to relieve destitution, and in this way substituting funds intended for direct relief to repay loans which have become delinquent.

(6) Use of numerous devices, such as the substitution of grant payments, renewal notes, and the 5- and 10-year variable payment plans as a means of showing that loans have been collected when actually little or no collections have been made; or in many cases showing loans fully paid where the indebted-

ness of the borrowers has actually been increased.

(7) Flagrant attempts to build up pressure groups to maintain congressional appropriations and local political and community support through various devices and practices.

There are several other items. From reading the hearings that seemed to be the most significant charge made. It is a charge made by the farmers, not against the general theory of making loans to farmers who need loans but against the particular administration of the Farm Security Administration. The statement indicates a distinct willingness on the part of this farm organization, at least, to have the appropriation substantially reduced, as sought by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I have yielded quite often. I should like to be permitted to say a few words. I have not said anything for nearly an hour. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not like to interrupt the Senator. I realize how tiresome it is. I have had the experience of having general debate in my time. However, I should like to make a brief observation.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Ohio is aware of the fact that while he is stating the representations of the national organization of the Farm Bureau Federation, in the State of Ohio the Farm Bureau went on record as fully endorsing all that the Farm Security Administration is doing. The head of the Farm Bureau from the State of Ohio appeared before the Senate committee and made that statement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, evidently the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House, at least, agree with much that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] says with respect to the activities of the Farm Security Administration. In reporting the appropriation bill to the House, the House committee stated:

The Administration—

That is, the Farm Security Administration—

is also carrying on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appears to resemble the plan of collective farming in Communist Russia. The committee believes this is wholly contrary to the spirit and the genius of the American way of life and ought to be stopped.

So perhaps the Senator from Tennessee has some very solid ground for the statement he made with regard to Mr. Baldwin. While the House committee does not state that Mr. Baldwin is a Communist, it states that the plan of collective farming—

appears to resemble the plan of collective farming in Communist Russia. The Committee believes this is wholly contrary to the spirit and the genius of the American way of life and ought to be stopped.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, the hearings showed that all these collective farming arrangements, or practically all of them, have been abject failures.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They also showed that they were instituted by Mr Tugwell, and not by Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know by whom they were instituted. They are now run by Mr. Baldwin, and they have been absolute failures. I believe that any other communistic plan of that kind would be a failure. That is why I am opposed to it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall have to decline to yield further. I should like to complete my statement. The Senator may then have the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me to make one comment, I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the Senator can explain what is meant by the collective farming to which he has referred? What actually was done?

Mr. BYRD. Collective farming is being carried on. I cannot explain it any better than that. Farms have been purchased and run collectively. It is being done now.

Mr. PEPPER. Did not the administration simply acquire land, permit a man to cultivate a particular part of the land, and then jointly market the produce of the several farms?

Mr. BYRD. It is collective farming. As I understand, a farm is purchased, and the farmers are placed on it to operate it collectively.

Mr. PEPPER. I have visited one of the projects. The plan may not be a good idea; but, as I understand, each tenant had an opportunity, if he chose, to have a particular piece of land, which he might farm, or which he might begin to purchase, and occupy as a prospective purchaser, in which case the joint agency acted as a marketing instrument for the sale of what was produced on the several farms. Meanwhile the farmers had an opportunity to live in communities, where each one had his own house and had an opportunity to participate in some kind of industry, such as carpenter work, or work in a shop.

Mr. BYRD. There are a number of instances of collective farming, which was condemned by the House committee.

Mr. PEPPER. How does the Senator distinguish between collective farming and cooperative farming?

Mr. BYRD. In collective farming the farmers all work together. There is no ownership of land, and the project is conducted as similar projects in Communist Russia are conducted. The products of the farm are pooled, and the individuality of the farmer is lost.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Can the Senator tell us where such projects are being carried on?

Mr. BYRD. I can furnish that information. The farmers do not own the land at all. The Government owns the land.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Government owns the land, and collects the people to live on it. Two of such projects were tried out in Tennessee.

Mr. BYRD. It is collective farming on Government land.

Mr. McKELLAR. One of the projects was on what is known as the Cumberland Plateau. Fine stone houses were built for those who had charge of the project, which was an utter failure. The houses are not occupied even to this day, or they were not the last time I saw them, which has not been a great while ago. The projects were a failure and a nuisance to the entire community, destroying the morale of the farmers.

Another project was in west Tennessee, in Haywood County. I think it was partly in two other counties, Hardeman and Henderson. The project did not even get started. The land was bought, but those in charge of the project could not get anybody to occupy it along communistic lines, so the land is still owned by the Government. The project has been an utter failure. I am speaking from experience in my own State.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sure that in the interest of fairness and justice the Senator will agree that those projects were not built under Mr. Baldwin, but were instituted by the old Resettlement Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, Mr. Baldwin was not the head of the Department.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He had no control over it.

Mr. McKELLAR. He was not the head of the Department when it was done, but he was a member of the official staff of the Department when it was done, and he has had the project in charge ever since. Nothing has been done with it.

Mr. BYRD. As I shall show, collective farming is now being carried on.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there is a similar project in Arkansas which has been an eyesore and a heartache to Arkansas ever since it was established.

Mr. BYRD. It may have been inherited from Tugwell, but it continues.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he did not develop, in his interrogation of Mr. Baldwin, that in at least one instance the officials went to the courthouse and examined the records of those who had made applications for loans, to see if they had paid their poll tax. They were not going to lend them any money unless part of it were used to pay the poll tax. That was confined only to the white residents of the county, and it was a discrimination against any colored farmers who might need help. If we are to reach down to the underdog farmer of America, should we not reach down to all of them, regardless of their color?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, to a very great extent I agree entirely with what the Senator from Illinois has said, with one little amendment. The incident to which he refers did not happen in my

State but in the State of Alabama. As I remember, Mr. Baldwin said that money was loaned to rehabilitate farmers. I shall have to refer to the record to be absolutely accurate. He said he loaned money to rehabilitate farmers, and that included in the loan was an amount, varying from $2 to $6, to pay poll taxes. It was confined to the white people of the community. The colored people were left out.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator will not say that any colored man who ever applied for a loan was rejected on the ground of color, will he?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, Mr. Baldwin said that none of them had applied for a loan.

Let me read from the testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. If it is such a good thing, this eleemosynary institution for which the Government is paying the bill, if it is such a wonderful thing for white people, why do you limit it to white people?

My good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], whom I love very dearly, says that Mr. Baldwin was a kind-hearted man. It is easy to be kind-hearted with other people's money. Mr. Baldwin is handling $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 of the Government's money, and it is very easy to be kind with it.

I read further from his testimony:

"Senator McKELLAR. * * * If it is such a good thing, this eleemosynary institution for which the Government is paying the bill, if it is such a wonderful thing for white people, why do you limit it to white people? Why do not you include the colored people? There are a lot of colored people in Alabama. I was born in that State, and there are many colored people there, as I remember. I am wondering, if it was such a good, splendid, kindly, generous plan—and evidently is all those things—why had you excluded the poor colored people down there?

"Mr. BALDWIN. I think it is a pretty good plan, Senator McKELLAR.

"Senator McKELLAR. Yes; but why did you exclude the colored people?

"Mr BALDWIN. I am not the one to judge that. The colored people, of course, are not excluded. We have thousands and thousands of Negro clients.

"Senator McKELLAR. Did you pay any poll taxes for colored people?

"Mr. BALDWIN. We do not want to see these families make any expenses that do not contribute to their rehabilitation."

That was his answer. Does that answer appeal to Members of this body?

Senator BANKHEAD. Now, Senator McKELLAR——

Senator McKELLAR. Will you wait one moment?

Senator BANKHEAD. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Until I get through with this.

Senator BANKHEAD. Yes. (Continues reading:)

"Senator McKELLAR. The question is serious. I am not asking you what you want to do and what you do not want to do; I am trying to find out what you have done and what you propose to do. Have you paid poll taxes of any colored people in Alabama, in Greene County, Ala., or any other county in Alabama?

"Mr. BALDWIN. As far as I know, we have not done it, sir, and the reason it has not been done is because they would not qualify as voters, they probably would not be able to qualify. I want to make this matter very clear, sir, if you will let me."

If that is not made clear, how can it be made any clearer? He did not do it because, as a practical matter, he thought the colored farmers might not qualify as voters. He was lending money to some because they could qualify as voters and not to others because he did not think they could qualify as voters. Is that the way we want the money of the Government spent? I am very outspoken about it. I do not want the Government's money spent by a man who has that sort of view.

I asked him if he was lending money to migrants.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you include movie tickets—tickets to the movies for proper recreation?

I said to the committee, in quoting that testimony:

These are agricultural loans.

Here is the reply:

Mr. BALDWIN. No, sir. There is a miscellaneous column there that might include such an item.

Lending farm money so that people might go to the movies?

Mr. Baldwin continued:

I think these people are privileged to go to the movies; yes.

I then said to the committee:

Well, he answered both no and yes, and then I said:

"So you would include the movies? Would you include the travel expenses to town for a chance of recreation in the city nearby?"

Mr. BALDWIN. Well, I think, sir, the rule of reason would be followed.

Lending the Government's money, the money of the American people, at a time when we are assaulted as we never before have been assaulted in the history of time; lending our money to enable people to travel into the city in order to go to the movies or have other kinds of recreation!

Next I asked this question:

Senator McKELLAR. Would you include the Knights of Pythias dues, and Masonic dues, and chamber of commerce dues, and things like that?

Mr. BALDWIN. These items are the normal cost that go toward living in a democracy.

I said Mr. Baldwin was a Communist. I have just read his testimony, not mine.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was any allowance made for the purchase of hard and soft drinks?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not a drinking man, and for that reason I perhaps did not remember to ask him about the purchase of hard and soft drinks. [Laughter.] But I did say this to the committee:

Now, gentlemen, we are appropriating vast sums, millions of dollars—I forget how much was the amount last year, but some enormous amount, and the year before that even more than that—I do not remember the exact figures—to a man like that now who is lending a part of it and just making grants of the other part, and I want to call your attention to that.

Awhile ago the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] suggested that I was making statements in this body which I would not make to Mr. Baldwin. When Mr. Baldwin came before us I made to him the same statements that I am making here. I do not make a statement behind a man's back that I would not make to his face.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee, out of fairness to me, should let me correct that impression, if I inadvertently gave it to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I am glad to have the Senator correct it.

Mr. PEPPER. No one questions the courage of the Senator from Tennessee. I simply said that it seemed to me the Senator from Tennessee should give to the Senate the basis for his accusation that the man is a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that such a man, who is using other people's money in the way he is using it, lending it out, not to farmers, but to pay poll taxes, to pay dues to various organizations, to pay for driving into town on Saturday afternoons and other times for recreation, should be permitted to handle Government money. I do not think that sort of loan for farm purposes is accomplishing its purpose; and I am very much opposed to the man who makes such loans. I have no apologies to make for the position I take. It is based on solid ground, and, in my judgment, no other Member of the Senate feels that such loans should be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I will yield, if the Senator from Tennessee has concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am through.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it should be pointed out that the making of loans of money with which a farmer paid his poll taxes was not a specific policy of the Farm Security Administration. There was not a great deal of difference between the way such loans were made and the way loans were made when I was a boy, when a farmer would apply for a loan at a supply house or a country bank down in Georgia. A man would go into a bank and say to the banker, "I want to borrow $100." The banker would ask him, "What are you going to use the money for?"

The farmer would reply, "I want to buy a wagon, and it will cost me $25. I have to get a cow, and that will cost $25; and then I have to pay my taxes, and that will cost a few dollars; and I am 'way behind with my Masonic Lodge dues, and I want to pay them, and that will cost me $6." The note would be made out and signed at the bank, and the money would be given to the farmer.

When a man goes to the Farm Security Administration to obtain a loan he tells what he wants the money for, and he submits the information on a little slip of paper. In many cases, probably thousands in Alabama, a man who wanted to borrow would write on the slip that he wanted to pay his poll tax, but a great

many more said they wanted to pay their property taxes.

Mr. President, in the operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Land Bank this country pumped out literally hundreds of millions of dollars that went to land owners and home owners all over the United States, and let them use the money to pay their taxes—poll taxes and all other kinds of taxes. We did not hear a word of criticism about that, although in the case of loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration there was a requirement that the borrower borrow from his Government sufficient money to pay his taxes of all kinds—his property taxes, his poll taxes, and any other taxes which might have been assessed against him.

However, when we come to consider loans to these poor, pathetic, pitiful people who have a mule, a horse and wagon, and a shote, and who want to borrow sufficient money to pay their poll taxes, they are held up to ridicule.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. I suppose that conditions in my State are very much like those in the Senator's State: As a rule the tenant farmer borrows money every year in order to make his crop and pay his bills. When he receives a loan at a bank, of course he pays his poll tax out of the money thus loaned to him. If he did not, he would not pay it at all. He uses the money thus obtained to pay all his other expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, there is no requirement here as to what he shall do with the money after he receives it. As was suggested by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] some of the farmers might have bought hard or soft drinks with some of the money obtained from such loans, or they might have used it for almost anything else; but if such a farmer is going to spend it at all, it seems to me that to integrate himself into the Government machinery and pay his poll tax and remain a voting citizen is a very desirable thing.

In respect to the question of the colored voters who do not have their poll taxes paid, let me say that, in addition to paying a poll tax, they have to register, and perhaps take a literacy test, and do other things of that kind. Unless they want to pay their poll taxes, no one is going to make them pay them. As I understand the testimony, Mr. Baldwin said that in the cases of such colored voters there was no request for money with which to pay poll taxes.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understood the testimony, it was that when they came in and told what they wanted to spend the money for, they did not say they wanted to spend the money to pay poll taxes; and, to be absolutely realistic about it, most of them could not qualify under the State law to vote, anyway.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; and most of them did not want to waste their money by paying a poll tax if they could not qualify to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. With respect to the circular which the Senator says was circulated, if it was circulated by the Farm Security Administration it was indeed a most reprehensible thing; a man who circulated such a circular, speaking in terms of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Virginia, should be disciplined. However, since the matter was brought up on the floor of the Senate, I communicated with Mr. Baldwin, and he said he did not have anything to do with the distribution of the circular.

Mr. BYRD. It was distributed from the Division of Information at Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a regional office. I say that the man who sent it out should be disciplined.

Mr. BYRD. It was sent out on February 23, and I have in my hand several other circulars which were distributed by other regional offices.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment further, I should like to say that I have known Mr. Baldwin from the time when he was in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. I have had some very violent differences of opinion with him as to the manner in which the Farm Security Administration should be administered, and I have been very critical of him before the committee over which I have had the honor to preside, the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. However, in my judgment, Mr. Baldwin is as far from being a Communist as any man could possibly be. I believe he is an honest, sincere, patriotic American. He has had some theories which were not pleasing to me, and with which I disagreed; but I believe that Mr. Baldwin is a patriotic American, and that his sole aim has been to administer the program in the interest of the most underprivileged people on earth; because let me say to the Members of the Senate, and let me ask them to bear in mind, that this program deals only with persons who have no credit resources anywhere on earth. Even to obtain what is called a feed loan, a man must have a statement from the Federal land bank, which makes chattel mortgages, that they will not make a loan, before he will be able to secure a loan under the program.

It is true that the Farm Security Administration does keep a check on the man to whom it makes a loan. The statement was made to me by my State farm bureau that when a man has repaid a certain amount in a given year, it is felt that the supervision should be removed. I think that a provision to that effect would be a good one. There should be other changes in the program.

However, certainly there has been nothing in this program which I believe would justify any idea that Mr. Baldwin is a Communist merely because he would take no exception to a man going to a bank, asking for a loan from the bank, and stating that he wanted the money so that he could pay his poll taxes along with other taxes.

If that makes him a Communist, I do not know a single small-town rural bank in the South that is not communistic, because at one time or another they have loaned to tenant farmers and sharecroppers money with which to pay their poll taxes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, recurring to collective farming there is a project involving the purchase of what was known as the Lord Scully tract in Bates County, Mo., and another known as the Lake Dick, Ark., project. About this project Mr. TARVER had this to say:

> Now, do you conceive that under the law, the language under which the appropriation has been made, that it is possible to take funds appropriated for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation and make the purchase of land to be held in common by a number of rehabilitants without any prospect of any rehabilitant ever securing title to any particular acreage included in the tract, and operated upon the basis of a Communistic community where all of the rehabilitants located on the land are to labor jointly and share jointly (without regard to the industry or lack of industry of any particular rehabilitant) in the proceeds from the joint operation? Do you or do you not consider that a transaction of that kind is justified under the law and the language under which the appropriation is made?

So they are still engaged in such projects. It is not the old resettlement project, but the Farm Security Administration went into a county in Missouri, and purchased 3,963 acres of land at a price of $158,000 which they propose, as I understand, to turn into a collective farm, for they put a mortgage of $735,000 on it a few days later, although they paid only $158,000.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more comment with respect to the policies of the Farm Security Administration along the line of collective farming. Mr. Baldwin, in his testimony before the committee, admitted that there were distributed over the country at various meetings and elsewhere a statement prepared by his department which was entitled "Long-time Tenure Objectives." Included in the statement is the recommendation that the Government exercise the right of eminent domain as a means of securing the subdivision of large land holdings. In other words, the Government should be given the right to condemn property for the purpose of redistributing it.

Furthermore, it was recommended that the Government acquire title to as much land as possible, and retain all the land now held by the Government.

In cross examination, Mr. Baldwin at first denied that the pamphlet was prepared with his knowledge, but he said it had been distributed to organizations, and when the question was asked him as to whether he favored it, he said:

> Mr. BALDWIN. I favor such methods as can be taken to support the traditional family type of farming operation in the country. I think that that might be considered.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. If the man is not willing to sell the farm, a farm that he has owned, perhaps his ancestors for generations had owned, he is not willing to sell it himself, would you be inclined to favor the proposition that the Government, by the right of eminent domain, could take the farm away from him?
>
> Mr. BALDWIN. I certainly would not, sir. If he is not living on it, however, if he is an absentee owner, if it is owned by an insurance company or was owned by someone who did not have any interest in working the land, I

think that such a step might not be inconsistent with the traditions of this country. I do not know, sir. That is a matter certainly that would be up to the Congress.

Senator GEORGE. If he owned too much, would you be in favor of taking some of it?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not know whether I would or not.

Senator GEORGE. The philosophy of that long-time program is exactly that.

Mr. BALDWIN. Senator George, I have not endorsed that program completely. As I said, it was prepared for discussion of the tenure problem. The tenure problem is the most serious thing we have to content with in trying to rehabilitate farm families. Congress has given a great deal of attention to it. Secondly, I favor no steps to take any action on anything that is recommended in that paper without congressional authority to do it, but I do think that we should not hide our eyes to the steps that might be taken to bring about greater security for a great mass of people in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres do you think a man should have under your plan?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no plan, sir; I have no plan.

The CHAIRMAN. Whose plan is it? You say you endorse it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not know. In some parts of the country 40 acres of land is adequate to support a family with some decency.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do they have a formula for this?

Mr. BALDWIN. In other sections of the country, in some of the Great Plains sections of the country it will take several thousand. In your section of the country I expect a few hundred acres will be required, although I am not so sure about it. You would be a better authority on that than I would, sir.

So there has been a discussion evidently within the Farm Security Administration as to the question of publicly condemning land for the purpose of redistributing it under certain plans which they no doubt have in mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, was it not openly testified to before our committee? That is my understanding, and that is how we got our idea of Mr. Baldwin. He publicly testified there was such a plan in his set-up, but that he had not given it his entire approval.

Mr. BYRD. He admitted that the document had been published and distributed at the expense of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it was published and distributed at the expense of the Government. If that is not communism, I do not know what it is.

At this point, Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Virginia will permit me to ask that the opinion of the American Farm Bureau Federation as it appears on page 727 and the top of page 728 may be printed in the RECORD. The Farm Bureau Federation takes exactly the same position we took in the matter that this part of the program ought to be very greatly curtailed, if not entirely abolished.

Mr. BYRD. I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection the matter presented by the Senator from Tennessee will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. O'NEAL. * * * It is therefore imperative to curtail all nonessential expenditures and eliminate duplication, overlapping, and waste in administration. There are some activities which, though useful and appropriate in normal peacetimes, can be dispensed with or postponed during the war. Farmers want economy in the administration of all agricultural programs and services, as well as economy in other governmental activities.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has taken an aggressive position in support of constructive economies in governmental expenses.

At the last annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago, December 9, 10, and 11, 1941, the following resolution was adopted:

"In view of the great expansion of all Government bureaus, and since the emergencies for which many were set up have largely decreased or ceased to exist, we recommend that the activity of such agencies and bureaus as have served their major function be curtailed in proportion to the reduction in necessity for the work they have been performing.

"The mounting public debt and the necessities of war require that every administrator of Government be unusually zealous in his efforts to eliminate waste, extravagance, duplication, and unnecessary expenditure.

"Agriculture is setting the example by reducing substantially its request for appropriations in line with the improvement in agricultural conditions. It calls upon all economic groups and all administrators responsible for the expenditure of public funds to seek, through every legitimate means, the highest degree of efficiency and economy."

It is shocking and distressing in these times of grave national peril to see agencies of Government created to do specific jobs—some of them designed purely for temporary purposes—constantly seeking to continue and expand the scope of their operations far beyond the justifiable need and resist the efforts to discontinue unnecessary services and to reduce expenditures to merited need. There has been an alarming tendency for these relief agencies, which comprise a large and varied number of governmental agencies, to try to inject themselves into the war program for the obvious purpose of perpetuating their organizations and pay rolls.

The time has come for the Government to set the example in converting its operations fully to a wartime basis by eliminating the unnecessary services, the duplication, overlapping, and all unnecessary governmental expenditures.

During the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations I appeared, together with several of my associates, and presented specific recommendations for constructive economies in agricultural appropriations.

We also recommended an over-all policy of coordination, which would eliminate unnecessary services, duplication, and overlapping in the administration of agricultural programs, and result in very substantial savings in manpower and funds.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I referred a little while ago to the attack that was distributed at the expense of the Government upon the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and other members of the committee. In addition to that I received copies of a similar criticism, an attack upon other members of the committee sent out by Mr. Jesse B. Gilmer, who is area director at Amarillo, Tex. So I sent a telegram to Mr. Gilmer in which I said:

MARCH 9, 1942.

JESSE B. GILMER,
Assistant Regional Director, Farm Security Administration, Amarillo, Tex.:

Please advise me promptly who sent you the three attachments which you included in your letter of February 6 addressed to dear committeemen whether this literature was sent out under Government frank and how many copies were sent. Give same information with respect to the enclosure contained in your undated letter addressed dear committeeman and which relates to the annual Agricultural Adjustment Administration dinners to be held on or about March 9.

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate.

Mr. Gilmer replied as follows:

AMARILLO, TEX., *March 12, 1942.*

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Re telegram March 9 attachments my letter addressed to dear committeeman referred to by your wire were mimeographed in my office at my direction; about 600 copies of each letter were mailed under Government frank; information was copied from the Nation of January 17, 1942, the Hutchison Daily News, Hutchison, Kans., of January 5, 1942, Amarillo Daily News of January 8, 1942, and February 28, 1942.

JESSE B. GILMER,
Area Director.

I then submitted the correspondence and the enclosures to the Postmaster General and asked him whether the matter was properly frankable. I received this letter from him on April 13:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1942.

Hon. H. F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have your letter of April 4 submitting copies of extracts from various publications, and inquiring as to their mailability free of postage under the penalty privilege.

The law governing the exercise of such privilege, embodied in section 615, Postal Laws and Regulations, restricts the use of penalty envelopes to "officers of the United States Government" solely for the purpose of transmitting in the mails free of postage "matters relating exclusively to the business of the Government of the United States."

The matter submitted by you does not appear to relate exclusively to the business of the Government within the contemplation of the law, and, therefore, it is not entitled to free transmission in the mails.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

I then asked Mr. Walker, the Postmaster General, to take the proper procedure either to collect from Mr. Gilmer or to prosecute him for having sent out these communications, which I am told have been mailed all over the United States under the franking privilege.

Mr. President, I will take only a little longer.

PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, the Farm Security Administration is fostering and promoting projects and objectives which are contrary to the spirit and genius of the American way of life.

It is fostering class prejudices in agriculture. Its continual assaults upon commercial farming, its promotion of subsistence agriculture, and collective farming projects similar to those in Communist Russia, its flood of propaganda tending to pit small farmers as a group against big farmers as a group, all tend

to create disunity and create class antagonisms, instead of promoting unity of action of all farmers to aid each other in improving the lot of all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, for further exposure of the philosophy and objectives of the Farm Security Administration.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Philosophy and objectives: The nature of some of the projects being promoted by the Farm Security Administration and the manner in which they are being carried on is aptly described by the House Appropriations Committee as follows:

"The hearings disclosed that the Farm Security Administration is carrying on many projects of a character which are not viewed with favor by the committee. Among these is the lending of money to farmers for the purchase of farms from funds provided for distress loans and in amounts aggregating as much as $7,500 in individual cases for farms and improvements thereon. The committee does not believe that Congress intended to authorize such a farm-purchasing program with these funds. In the case of the Lord Scully estate lands in Missouri, the Administration formed a corporation of its own employees and bought 42,000 acres of land at $26 per acre ostensibly for the purpose of selling farms to farmers removed from defense areas, but only six of such farmers had been selected up to the time of our hearings. We were advised that 361,000 acres of land have been bought in a similar manner throughout the United States and that the amounts of loans to individual farm families buying subdivisions of these tracts would run around $7,000 to $7,500.

"The Administration is also carrying on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appears to resemble the practice of collective farming in Communist Russia. The committee believes this is wholly contrary to the spirit and the genius of the American way of life and ought to be stopped." (P. 20, report to House Committee on Appropriations on 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.)

That the Farm Security Administration officials hesitate to abandon the philosophy which led to the establishment of these collective farming projects is repeatedly revealed in the testimony of Mr. Baldwin before the House committee.

Although Congress intended that these resettlement projects should be liquidated as soon as practicable, Mr. Baldwin stated that "there is effort being made to carry out the purpose for which they were originally built." He also stated, "We feel it would be the part of folly to abandon the few experimental attempts at cooperative farming that have been undertaken, until experience was sufficient to indicate whether they represent a hopeful pattern or not." It appears clear that it is the purpose of the Farm Security Administration, unless checked by Congress more vigorously than heretofore, to continue to carry on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appeared to the House Appropriations Committee "to resemble the practice of collective farming in Communist Russia."

Additional evidence of this purpose is given in an article entitled "National Land Tenure Objectives," published in the July 1942 Land Policy Review, a publication issued monthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. The article was written by Mr. Paul V. Maris, an official of the Farm Security Administration. After listing a catalog of objectives, Mr. Maris states that the fulfillment of such objectives would result in—among other things—"possibly 1,000,000 farm families on farms operated cooperatively under long-term leases. It is difficult to predict at this time the proportions to which this new tenure pattern may ultimately expand."

Information on the philosophy and objectives of the officials of the Farm Security Administration is not only revealed in the article of Mr. Maris, but also in a statement entitled "Long-time Tenure Objectives," which Mr. Baldwin stated "was prepared by various people in my organization." He also stated that the "document does not represent necessarily the views of my staff or my organization," and that "I think it is a very intelligent discussion of tenure problems generally and, on the whole, I think it is a very fine report on the matter of Government ownership of land." If it is agreeable, I would like to insert a copy of this document in the record at this point. It was distributed by representatives of the Farm Security Administration from Washington at a meeting of Farm Security Administration employees in attendance at a meeting at Columbus, Ohio, in May 1941. I assume it was distributed in other regional conferences. Most of the objectives in this document are also included in the article written by Mr. Maris in Land Policy Review, which obviously is an official publication of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Several of the long-time tenure objectives are especially significant. One of them refers to collective farming and reads as follows: "Expand cooperative farm leasing and purchasing associations as rapidly as experience justifies. See to it that low-income groups not well adapted to operation and management of independent farm units are included among those served by leasing co-ops."

A good many of the objectives outlined are, of course, meritorious. Two, however, are somewhat startling. One of these reads: "Exercise of the rights of public domain as a means of securing the subdivision of large land holdings. * * *" The other is as follows: "Acquire Government title to as much land as possible. Retain land now held by the Government." One result of expanding Government ownership of land would be the necessity of adding Government employees to manage it.

LOBBYING ACTIVITIES OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION IN BEHALF OF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, according to the testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, an article in the New Republic magazine, February 23, 1942, entitled "Who Speaks for the Farmers?" containing slurring attacks upon various Senators and Ed O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was reprinted and distributed under Government frank by the F. S. A. to its employees in Arkansas. The article evidently was reprinted at Government expense.

According to reports from various sections of the country, representatives of the F. S. A. have been busily engaged in contacting farmers to get support for their activities. For example, in Arkansas the executive committee of the Johnson County Farm Bureau were approached by a representative of the F. S. A. with a typewritten prepared statement which they were asked to sign, endorsing the work of the F. S. A.

During the hearings of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures Judge R. K. Greene, probate judge of Hale County, Ala., presented two affidavits, one by Mr. W. B. Bynum, who was formerly employed as Assistant Rural Rehabilitation Supervisor in Jackson County, Ala.; and another by Mr. S. L. Griffin, Assistant County Rural Rehabilitation Supervisor in Hale County, Ala. In Mr. Bynum's sworn statement he stated that in October 1941 F. S. A. employees were called to a bi-district meeting at Huntsville, Ala., during which Mr. E. S. Morgan, the Regional Director, in an address, "praised the supervisors for their part in winning the fight to prevent consolidation of agricultural agencies" and "he specifically praised them for getting letters written to their Senators and Congressmen opposed to consolidation." Mr. Bynum also stated that Mr. Morgan told the F. S. A. employees "that every client should be a voter and should be contacted and urged to pay his poll tax up-to-date, explaining that Farm Security already has the appropriation for the current year, but that these clients may be needed in the future for new appropriations and to maintain the F. S. A. as a separate organization."

Mr. Bynum also reported that Mr. M. H. Pierson, State Farm Security Administration director, addressed the Farm Security Administration employees after Mr. Morgan, asking "How many of you people present have your poll taxes paid?" and stating that every employee should see that his own poll taxes were paid.

A copy of the sworn statement by Mr. Bynum appears on page 708, part 3, of the hearings of the joint committee.

The sworn statement of Mr. Griffin states that he attended a bidistrict meeting of farm and home supervisors of the Farm Security Administration held in Birmingham, Ala., in September 1941, at which time Mr. E. S. Morgan, regional director, addressed the group "recounting a history of a recent fight which the Farm Security Administration had had" and complimenting "the supervisors on the good work they had done in contacting political influences and having sufficient political influences exerted on Congressmen and Senators." Mr. Griffin's affidavit further stated:

Mr. Morgan further stated that he would have other fights to hold our appropriations. Mr. Morgan said that those on the program at this time plus those who had been dropped were equal to about one-seventh of all farm families in the region. He stated that Farm Security Administration was now authorized to reinstate all of those former clients who had been dropped. He said these should become qualified voters and that any client who wished to borrow money from Farm Security Administration for the payment of poll taxes could do so. Mr. Morgan said that we would have that many more voters.

Mr. R. L. Vanzant, assistant regional director, also addressed the meeting and stated that if any loan docket was turned down in the loan-approval office because of poll-tax loans, to write him a personal letter and that he would see that such loans were approved. (Hearings, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, pp. 708-709.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram and a letter with an accompanying statement relative to this matter.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARKSVILLE, ARK., *April 24, 1942.*

W. R. OGG,
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Robert Plugge and I agreed to give Farm Security Administration a personal statement for local use intended to clear the county unit of some of the accusations made generally. We started to compose this statement and same was not typed at that time. We therefore did not sign or authorize anyone to sign the statement for us. Later five copies of a prepared and typed statement were presented to us by county Farm Security Administration supervisor with the request that we present it to the county farm bureau executive committee for approval and signatures. The implications of the statement were such that we and the entire membership of the executive committee could not afford to sign.

J. W. WILSON,
President, Johnson County Farm Bureau.
ROBERT PLUGGE, *Secretary.*

JOHNSON COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Clarksville, Ark., April 23, 1942.

Mr. W. R. OGG,
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OGG: In complying with your request in telegram of April 23, please find enclosed copy of statement which the local farm-security supervisor requested the executive committee to approve and sign.

Yours very truly,
J. W. WILSON, *President.*
ROBERT PLUGGE, *Secretary.*

We note in the February issue of the Arkansas Gazette various statements criticizing the farm-security program, this information having come from R. E. Short, president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau, and William C. Carr, investigator for the National Farm Bureau. While the Johnson County Farm Bureau would have no knowledge of the farm-security projects in other States or other parts of the State, we do know, because of services that we have had in the Johnson County Farm Security Administration, that the program in this county is doing a wonderful lot of good.

We also know that the statement, "the rural-rehabilitation supervisor's salary is based upon the number of clients in his particular county" is definitely not true so far as Johnson County is concerned. We would like to add that the supervisors in this county have never made solicitations to get applicants on the program. The local farm bureau has always been able to work in harmony with the farm-security set-up in our county.

We appreciate helpful criticism and know that the Farm Security Administration is trying to be a help to the people instead of a hindrance; therefore, we would like to say that the articles that appeared in the Arkansas Gazette regarding the farm-security program do not apply to this county.

JOHN W. WILSON,
President, Johnson County Farm Bureau.
ROBERT PLUGGE, *Secretary.*

BROADENING OF ELIGIBILITY OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CLIENTS AS NEED DECLINED

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, another evidence of the declining need for F. S. A. funds and the resourcefulness of the agency in devising ways and means to increase its large appropriations and its enormous pay roll to expend these appropriations is the expansion of the eligibility for free grants of money to farmers which was made by the F. S. A. in 1941 in connection with its appropriations for the fiscal year 1942.

Comparison of the justification statements submitted by F. S. A. in behalf of its appropriations for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation for the fiscal years 1940, 1941, and 1942, shows that for 1942 the eligibility of persons entitled to receive free grants was greatly broadened. Previous to that time, grants were supposed to be confined to "victims of natural catastrophes" and to "indigent families living in rural areas who cannot obtain aid from other sources and who, but for these emergency grants, might suffer hunger or disease." But for 1942 this was broadened to include "to aid standard rehabilitation loan borrowers" whenever in the judgment of F. S. A. this was necessary, and even extended to other farm families who "are on the brink of becoming standard rural rehabilitation clients." (See excerpts.)

Thus, when farm income had increased so greatly that the need for grants had greatly declined, the eligibility was broadened so that grants could be made to more people.

The table shows that even in 1941 before the eligibility for grants was broadened, only $5,723,846.59 was expended for "distress and emergency" out of a total of $16,998,832.12 expended for grants.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION GRANTS

1940 appropriation

Rural rehabilitation direct relief: Direct relief under the rural rehabilitation appropriation is extended not only to farm families who are the victims of natural catastrophes, such as drought or flood, but to indigent families living in rural areas who cannot obtain aid from other sources and who, but for these emergency grants, might suffer from hunger or disease. Past experience has shown that major catastrophes occur somewhere in the country every year. These cash grants cease when the families can begin their own rehabilitation or can be assisted through rehabilitation loans based on farm and home plans. Cash grants of direct relief are administered on investigation and determination of need in individual cases. (P. 1214, House hearings on 1940 agricultural appropriation bill.)

1941 appropriation

Rural rehabilitation direct relief: Direct relief under the rural rehabilitation appropriation is extended not only to farm families who are the victims of natural catastrophes, such as drought or flood, but to indigent families living in rural areas who cannot obtain aid from other sources and who, but for these emergency grants, might suffer from hunger or disease. Past experience has shown that major catastrophes occur somewhere in the country every year. Droughts and floods have disastrously affected large portions of many States this year. These cash grants cease when the families can begin their own rehabilitation or can be assisted through rehabilitation loans based on farm and home plans. Cash grants of direct relief are administered on investigation and determination of need in individual cases. Employable recipients of such payments are required to perform work on useful public projects, under authority of section 3 (c) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939. (P. 983, House hearings on 1941 agricultural appropriation bill.)

1942 appropriation

Project 2. Rural Rehabilitation Grants

Objective: To extend direct relief to farm families who are victims of natural catastrophes, such as drought, flood, freeze, or insect ravages, and to indigent families living in rural areas who cannot obtain aid from other sources and who, but for emergency grants, would suffer from hunger or disease; and to aid standard rural rehabilitation loan borrowers where rehabilitation can be accomplished only by such additional aid, usually where unforeseen emergencies not anticipated in the farm management plan arise. * * * Many other farm families are on the brink of becoming standard rural rehabilitation clients, these being generally those families who have a very low present but substantial future prospective income and earning ability. With some assistance through rehabilitation grants and substantial aid and assistance through the preparation of adequate farm and home plans, a rehabilitation loan may be made to these families to, and thereby more rapidly, assist them to become self-supporting. * * * Also when rehabilitation can be accomplished only by such additional aid. (P. 135, pt. 2, House hearings, 1942 agricultural appropriation bill.)

Source: House hearings on the Department of Agriculture's appropriation bills for the fiscal years 1940, 1941, and 1942.

GRANTS NO LONGER CONFINED TO DISTRESS AND EMERGENCY CASES

The attached table shows that the outright gifts of money to farmers which was started during the depression to relieve extreme cases of distress and destitution due to unavoidable disasters are no longer confined to such cases, but, in fact, this kind of cases constituted only one-third of all the expenditures for grants to farmers during the fiscal year 1941, while payments to farmers in connection with farm and home operations accounted for over one-half of all grant payments that year.

Of the $16,998,832.12 expended for grants, $5,723,846.59 went to distress and emergency cases, $9,072,404.77 went to farm and home operations, and the remainder to health and medical and to sanitation.

This is an amazing situation in view of the official justification submitted to Congress in 1940 by the F. S. A. in support of its appropriation for grant payments for the fiscal year 1941. In this statement Congress was told that this money was to be given only to "victims of natural catastrophes" and to "indigent families living in rural areas who cannot obtain aid from other sources and who, but for these emergency grants, might suffer from hunger or disease." The whole import of this statement is that the money was to be used for such types of extreme destitution arising out of catastrophes and other emergencies. The statement further said that—

These cash grants cease when the families can begin their own rehabilitation or can be assisted through rehabilitation loans based on farm and home plans.

Mr. Baldwin, in his testimony before the Joint Committee for the Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures and in his testimony before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, admitted that grant payments were made to rural rehabilitation clients who also had ob-

tained rural rehabilitation loans. Evidence was submitted to the joint committee in the form of original copies of F. S. A. farm and home plans, which revealed that in some areas at least there is a general practice of making outright grants to rural rehabilitation-loan clients who are operating on a farm and home plan, although the F. S. A. told Congress, as indicated above, that grants cease when clients "can be assisted through rehabilitation loans based on farm and home plans.

Rural rehabilitation grants by purposes, July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1941

Distress and emergency	$5,723,846.59
Health and medical	1,248,394.00
Sanitation	954,186.76
Farm and home operations	9,072,404.77
Total	16,998,832.12

Source: Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, pt. 2, p. 370.

Data submitted to the joint committee showed that in some areas, at least, there is extensive use of the grant payments to help repay loans and thereby make the loan records look better. Specific cases were cited wherein clients were forbidden to cash their grant checks and were told by F. S. A. employees that these grants would be used to help repay their loans.

In Mississippi an F. S. A. employee admitted that the grant check was used for the sole purpose of improving the financial status of clients—page 821, hearings, joint committee. Similar use of the grant payments were reported in Alabama and Arkansas—pages 830–831, hearings, joint committee.

FEBRUARY 14, 1942.

My name is Will Knight. I live at Burkville, Ala.

In 1935 I was living in Mount Willing, Ala. In the fall of 1935, a lady who was working for the Farm Security Administration came to see me and asked me to go on the Government. I believe the lady's name was Miss Walton.

The Farm Security Administration set me up and gave me 2 steers, 1 milk cow, 100 baby chicks, 1 plow, a pressure cooker, and 23 dozen fruit jars.

The value of my crop sales since 1935 would not exceed $175. This amount would not pay my rent. I haven't raised enough to pay the Farm Security Administration anything on my indebtedness.

I have received grant checks each year. Mr. Sallee, of the Farm Security Administration, told me to sign the grant checks and give them back, and they would be put in the bank, and used to pay off my payments when they came due.

WILL KNIGHT.

On margin:

I was present when this was taken and it is a true statement of Will Knight and a true signature by him.

R. W. YOUNG,
Burkville, Ala.

FEBRUARY 21, 1942.

My name is George Fuller. I live at Talledega, Ala., rural free delivery No. 2.

I got on the Government in 1938. I had enough money left over each year to make my payments to the Government. I have received grant checks each year for the past 3 years. I was told by the Farm Security Administration to bring the grant checks to them and they would put them in the bank with the rest of my money, and then use it to pay off my payment to the Government.

I haven't been able to make a crop, because the Farm Security Administration doesn't give me my money to plant the crop until 3 months after it should have been planted.

his
GEORGE X FULLER.
mark

Witness to mark:
JOHN CASTLEBERG.

CASE OF SANDY GARRETT, CHILDERSBURG, ALA.

The attached photostat of the farm and home plan of Sandy Garrett, Childersburg, Ala., shows a work grant of $84 and a new loan of $274.20, making his total loans $1,107.55 and his total grants $202.65. He has made a repayment of $27.79.

There is also attached a copy of a letter from the county rural rehabilitation supervisor of the F. S. A. to Sandy Garrett, in which the supervisor tells him to bring the check to the Farm Security office. He also says that this grant was necessary to balance the 1940 farm and home plan.

This shows clearly that the grant payment is used to balance farm and home plan of rural rehabilitation loan clients. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM AND HOME PLAN

PART I.—PERSONAL DATA

Form FSA 5-RR-14
For Year 1941.
Type of Loan: New..... Sup. x
Std..... Coop.... Subs....

Case No. 1-61 36472
Race: Colored

Name: Sandy Garrett. Wife, Lena.
Ages: Applicant, 41; Wife, 39; Boys, 20, 15, 5; Girls, 13, 9, 7, 2.

Address: Route 1 Childersburg. (Last year) Route 2 Talladega. (Present)

We are renter of 60 acres. We have a written lease for 1941 to 1945 with renewal clause. It provides for ¼ share and/or $..... annual cash rental payments. We will not operate the same farm this year.

PART II—ANALYSIS OF PREVIOUS LOANS

TABLE A

Year	Loan	Grant	Operating capital to be deposited	Amount deposited	Repayment	Balance due	Estimated income	Actual income	Net worth
1939	$553.70	$20.00	$253.70	$41.25	$27.79	----------	$379.25	$73.25	$260.40
1940	279.65	99.65	----------	56.77	----------	----------	345.80	150.00	71.58
Total	833.35	119.65	----------	----------	27.79	$805.56	725.05	223.25	----------

PART III.—CROP, FOOD, AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

TABLE B.—*Estimated production and disposal of crops for coming year*

Crop	Acres		Seed		Fertilizers		Yields		Operator's share	Home use		For sale		
	Planned	Planted	Kind	Amount	Kind	Amount	Acres	Total		Units	Value	Units	Price	Value
Sorghum	¾	----------	T. S. L	1 pk	6-8-4	100	80	60	45	40	$12.00	----------	----------	----------
S. Pot	¾	----------	Porto R	1 bu	4-10-7	100	80	60	60	60	30.00	----------	----------	----------
I. Pot	¼	----------	Cobbler	2 bu	4-10-7	200	120	30	30	30	18.00	----------	----------	----------
Peas	1	----------	Crowder	1 bu	----------	----------	8	24	18	10	12.50	----------	----------	----------
Garden	1	----------	Home use								60.00	----------	----------	----------
Peanuts	1	----------	Spanish	1 bu	6-8-4	100	16	16	16	8	4.80	----------	----------	----------
Oats	(5)	----------	T. R. P	10 bu	----------	1,942	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Wheat	(2)	----------	A. B. S	2 bu	----------	1,942	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Grass	5	----------	Wild hay	----------	----------	----------	½T	2½T	1⅞T	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Soy B	4	----------	O-Too-Tan	60 lbs	----------	----------	4	4	3T	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Corn	25	----------	Mixed	2½ bu	Soda	400	14	350	2,625	36	21.60	----------	----------	----------
Cotton	15	----------	D. P. L	15 bu	6-8-4	3,000	240	3,600	2,500	----------	----------	2,500	$0.08	$200.00
C. S	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	360	5,400	6,750	----------	----------	2,500	20.00	25.00
A. W. Peas	(8)	----------	A. W. P	150	Turn under									
Total	49½	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	158.90	----------	----------	225.00

TABLE C.—*Production and disposal of livestock and livestock products*

Kind	We own	Will buy	Will produce	Number of producing animals	Production per animal	Death loss	Total	Farm use	Home use		For sale		
									Units	Value	Units	Price	Value
Work stock	1	1					2						
Hogs	2		5	1	5	2	5	1	4	$48.00			
Cows	1		1	1	1		2						
Poultry	10	12	88	22	4			20	68	20.40			
Cream													
Milk			360	1	360		360	60	300	30.00			
Butter									105	21.00			
Eggs			110	22	5		110	14	96	14.40			
Total										$133.80			

Total All Cash Sales From Farm (tables B and C), $225.00.

TABLE D.—*Canned food*

Has pressure cooker.

Containers on hand				Quarts to be canned							Standard for family
Pints	Quarts	Half gallons	Total quarts	Vegetables	Tomatoes	Fruits	Sweets	Meats	Total	Value	
	24	133	145	170	90	140	10	(25)	410	$60.25	705

Total value food produced at home (tables B, C, and D) $352.95.

TABLE E.—*Feed to be consumed for 12-month period, ending Dec. 31, 1941*

Kind of livestock	Number	Feeding period	Corn	Oats	Hay	Cottonseed meal			Pasture	
									Acres	Carrying capacity
Work stock	2	10	120		3				2	2
Sows	1	10	30							
Other hogs	3	8	45							
Cows	1	10	20		2	2,000			2	1
Poultry	22	10	15							
Total feed needs			230		5	2,000			4	3
Amount on hand			20.00		1½T				5	
To be purchased			40.00							

Total feed purchased $40.
Landlord plans to furnish pasture.
Operating capital being reduced within client's ability to repay.

PART IV.—FINANCIAL PLAN FOR COMING YEAR

TABLE F.—*Farm operating*

Item	Total expenses	We can pay	Paid from operating capital	We need to borrow
Seed	$27.00	$8.00		$19.00
Feed	40.00			40.00
Fertilizer	52.20			52.20
Threshing and ginning	25.00	25.00		
Recording fee	2.00			2.00
Rent				
Machinery repairs	8.00			8.00
Machinery hire				
Hired labor				
Taxes and insurance				
Livestock expenses	4.00			4.00
Total for farm	158.20	33.00		125.20

TABLE G.—*Cash living*

Item	Total expenses	We can pay	Paid from operating capital	We need to borrow
Food	$61.00	$16.00E (25.00)G 25.00E		$20.00
Clothing	45.00	(20.00)G		
Personal	18.00	18.00E		
Medical	27.50	(27.50)G		
Household operation	8.50	8.50E		
Household upkeep				
Household furniture	6.50	6.50E		
Canning equipment	11.50	(11.50)G		
Education	12.65	12.65E		
Total for home	190.65	170.65		20.00

TABLE H.—*Capital goods for farm and home*

Item	Total expenses	We can pay	We need to borrow
Livestock, 1 mule	$125.00		$125.00
Machinery, 1 spool wire	4.00		4.00
Household equipment			
Pressure cooker			
Old debts (not F. S. A.)			
Total capital goods	129.00		129.00

TABLE I.—*Financial summary*

RECEIPTS:		
Work	$50.00E	
Total from farm (tables B and C)	225.00	
A. A. A. payment this year 1941	112.00	$45.00E
1940 rental	60.00	
Cash repayment	45.12	
Work grant	84.00	
Total cash receipts		576.12
EXPENSES:		
Operating capital deposit	$145.20	
Amount due on F. S. A. loan this year	54.84	
We can pay (tables F, G, and H)	203.65	
Amount to be paid on past F. S. A. loans	172.12	
Amount to be paid Corporation		
Total expenditures		575.81
Balance		.31

TABLE J.—*Repayment schedule*

ITEM	Total loan	First year	Second year	Third year	Fourth year	Fifth year	Sixth year	Seventh year	Eighth year	Ninth year	Tenth year
Farm Security Administration loan this year:											
Capital (tables F and G)	$145.20	$29.04	$29.04	$29.04	$29.04	$29.04					
Capital goods	129.00	25.80	25.80	25.80	25.80	25.80					
Operating capital deposit	(274.20)	145.20	145.20	145.20	145.20	145.20					

PART V.—FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF ----------, 19----

ASSETS

Cash on hand		$	Growing crops		$
Accounts receivable			Seed		
R. E. and buildings (----a)			Feed		
Machinery			Food on hand		
Small tools			Household goods		
Mules	No. ----		Other		
Cattle	No. ----				
Sheep	No. ----				
Sows	No. ----				
Other hogs	No. ----				
Poultry	No. ----				
Total assets		$			$

LIABILITIES

Item	Unpaid balance	To mature this year	Date due	Amount past due	Total to be paid this year
Real estate liens:					
1st	$	$		$	$
2d					
Liens, personal property:					
Taxes					
Judgment:					
Other					
Total					

Total liabilities $ Net worth $

PART VI.—REPORT OF LAST YEAR'S BUSINESS

Value of food on hand last year was $64; is $34.70.

Total estimated and actual income last year		Income from crops last year	$40.00
Farm operating expenses last year	$60.00	Income from livestock last year	
Payment of FSA loan last year	45.12	Income from other sources	110.00
Payment, other debts last year		Total	150.00
Cash living expenses last year	44.88		
TOTAL	150.00		

Per acre yields last year were: Cotton 120 on 13 acres; Peanuts 20 on 1 acre; Tobacco ----on----acres; Corn 8 on 16 acres; Hay ½ on 6 acres; Wheat ----on----acres; Oats ----on----acres.

I hereby certify the above statements to be correct. I have read, or have had read to me, the above plan and I agree to operate my farm accordingly in crop rotation, soil-building practices, and other necessary changes to be adjusted with an annual supplement for a period of 5 years.

Applicant, Sandy Garrett; Homemaker, Lena Garrett. Date 3- 5-41
Approval Recommended: Rural Rehabilitation Supervisor, H. P. Hines. Date 3- 5-41
Home Supervisor, Martha S. Tinney. Date 3- 5-41
Approved: District Farm Supervisor, Boadman N. Ivey. Date 3-14-41
District Home Supervisor, Sally V. Partrich. Date 3-14-41

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Talladega, Ala., April 5, 1940.

Subject: Grant.

TO SANDY GARRETT, ROUTE 1, CHILDERSBURG, ALA.:

We have requested a grant for you in the amount of $99. You should receive this check within a few days. This check will come directly to you. When the check comes be sure to bring it to the Farm Security Administration Office and we will deposit it with your loan check. This grant was necessary to balance your 1940 farm plan.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. HOCUTT, Jr.,
County Rural Rehabilitation Supervisor.

CASE OF T. D. WILCOX, LINCOLN, ALA.

Mr. BYRD. I present the farm and home plan of T. D. Wilcox, Lincoln, Ala., which shows that he received a work grant of $94.70, also a loan that year of $182.33. The farm and home plan would not balance so the first year following he was not required to make any payment. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM AND HOME PLAN

PART I—PERSONAL DATA

From FSA 5-RR-14. Case No. 1-61-31451
For year 1940. Race: White.
Type of loan: New ---- Sup. x
Std. x Coop.---- Subs. ----
Name: T. D. Wilcox. Wife: Belle.
Address: Lincoln, Ala., Route 1.
Ages: Applicant, 57; wife, 55; boys, 14, 10, 7; girls, 19, 16. Lincoln, Ala., Route 1.
We are renter of 145 acres. We have a written lease for 1940 to 1941 without renewal clause. It provides for 1,000 pounds lint cotton. We (will) (will not) operate the same farm this year.

PART II—ANALYSIS OF PREVIOUS LOANS

TABLE A

Year	Loan	Grant	Operating capital to be deposited	Amount deposited	Repayment	Balance due	Estimated income	Actual income	Net worth
1939	$515.00	----------	$268.00	$106.35	----------	$515.00	$415.50	$204.85	$215.50

PART III.—CROP, FOOD, AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

TABLE B.—*Estimated production and disposal of crops for coming year*

Crop	Acres		Seed		Fertilizers		Yields		Operator's share	Home use		For sale		
	Planned	Planted	Kind	Amount	Kind	Amount	Acres	Total		Units	Value	Units	Price	Value
Cane	1½	----------	Ga. R. C	1 gal	6-8-4	100	80	40	40	40	$12.00	----------	----------	----------
*1 Pot	¼	----------	Cobbler	1 sk	6-8-4	100	60	15	15	15	9.00	----------	----------	----------
S. Pot	⅛	----------	Porto R	1 bu	6-8-4	100	80	40	40	40	20.00	----------	----------	----------
Peas	⅛	----------	Table	½ bu	----------	----------	6	3	3	3	10.80	----------	----------	----------
*Garden	½	----------	Home use	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	40.00	----------	----------	----------
*Peanuts	½	----------	Spanish	1 bu	----------	----------	20	10	10	10	6.00	----------	----------	----------
*Oats	5	----------	R. P	10 bu	----------	----------	1,000	5,000	5,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
*Soy Beans	4	----------	O-too-tan	1 bu	----------	----------	1,500	6,000	6,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
*Cotton	14	----------	D. P. L	12 bu	6-8-4	4,000	230	3,220	2,220	----------	----------	2,220	$0.08	$177.60
C. S	(14)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	350	4,900	4,900	----------	----------	4,900	20.00	49.00E
Corn	20	----------	Hastings	3 bu	soda	600	15	300	300	18	10.80	----------	----------	----------
Total	45¾	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	108.60	----------	----------	226.60

TABLE C.—*Production and disposal of livestock and livestock products*

Kind	We own	Will buy	Will produce	Number of producing animals	Production per animal	Death loss	Total	Farm use	Home use		For sale		
									*Units	Value	Units	Price	Value
Work stock	2						2						
Hogs		2					2	2	400	$24.00			
Cows	1						1						
Poultry	35		175	35	5	35	175		75	22.50			
Cream													
Milk	1			1	250		250	50	200	40.00			
Butter	1		75	1	75		75		75 lb.				
Eggs	35		175	35	5		175	15	140	28.00	20	$20	$4.00E
Total										114.50			4.00

Total all cash sales from farm (tables B and C) $230.60.

TABLE D.—*Canned food*

Containers on hand				Quarts to be canned							Standard for family
Pints	Quarts	Half gallons	Total quarts	Vegetables	Tomatoes	Fruits	Sweets	Meats	Total	Value	
			222	100	50	72		(20)	242	$34.70	505.

Total value food produced at home (tables B, C, and D), $257.80.
Will buy pressure cooker.

TABLE E.—*Feed to be consumed for 12-month period, ending Dec. 1, 1940*

Kind of livestock	Number	Feeding period	Corn	Oats	Hay	Cottonseed meal			Pasture	
									Acres	Carrying capacity
Work stock	2	10	100		4T				50	P
Sows										
Other hogs	2	8	20							
Cows	1	10	20		2T	1,000 lbs.				
Poultry	35	range								
Total feed needs			140							
Amount on hand										
To be purchased			$74.00			$16.00E				

Total feed purchased, $90.
Operating capital decreased because he received grants.

PART IV.—FINANCIAL PLAN FOR COMING YEAR

TABLE F.—*Farm operating*

Item	Total expenses	We can pay	Paid from operating capital	We need to borrow
Seed	$30.00	$9.00E	$21.00	
Feed	90.00	16.00E		$74.00
Fertilizer	70.70			70.70
Threshing and ginning	21.00	21.00E		
Recording fee	4.00		4.00	
Rent	1,000#			
Machinery repairs	5.00		5.00	
Machinery hire				
Hired labor				
Taxes and insurance	3.00	3.00E		
Livestock expenses				
Vet. Ser	5.00		.37	4.63
Lien Search	1.00			1.00
Pigs	6.00		6.00	
Total for farm	235.70	49.00E	36.37	150.33

TABLE G.—*Cash living*

Item	Total expenses	We can pay	Paid from operating capital	We need to borrow
Food	$45.00	$(45.00G)		
		22.00G		
Clothing	32.00	10.00E		
Personal				
Medical	17.00	(17.00)		
Household operation	10.00	10.00E		
Household upkeep				
Household furniture	5.00	(5.00G)		
Canning equipment	5.70	(5.70G)		
Education	10.00	10.00E		
Total for home	124.70	124.70		

TABLE H.—*Capital goods for farm and home*

Item	Total expenses	We can pay	We need to borrow
Livestock			
Machinery			
Turn plow	$20.00		$20.00
Household equipment			
Pressure cooker	12.00		12.00
Old debts (not FSA)			
Total capital goods	32.00		32.00

TABLE I.—*Financial summary*

RECEIPTS:		
Total from farm (tables B and C)	$230.60	
AAA payment this year 1940	76.00	$30.00E
Cash repayment, 1939	75.14	
Work Grant	94.70	
Total cash receipts		476.44
EXPENSES:		
Operating capital deposit	$186.70	
Amount due on FSA loan this year	36.46	
We can pay (tables F, G, and H)	173.70	
Amount to be paid on past FSA loans	75.14	
Amount to be paid Corporation		
Total expenditures		472.00
Balance		4.44

TABLE J.—*Repayment Schedule*

Item	Total loan	First year	Second year	Third year	Fourth year	Fifth year	Sixth year	Seventh year	Eighth year	Ninth year	Tenth year
F. S. A. loan this year:											
Capital (tables F and G)	$150.33		$30.06	$30.06	$30.06	$30.06	$30.09				
Capital goods	32.00		6.40	6.40	6.40	6.40	6.40				
Operating capital deposit		$263.00	186.70	186.70	186.70	186.70					

PART V.—FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF _____, 19____

ASSETS

Cash repayment $75.14

Cash on hand		$111.51	Growing crops		$20.00
Accounts receivable			Seed		
R. E. and buildings (...a)			Feed		30.00
Machinery		35.00	Food on hand		51.90
Small tools		6.00	Household goods		50.00
Mules	No. 2	200.00	Other		
Cattle	No. 1	30.00			
Sheep	No.				
Sows	No.				
Other hogs	No.				
Poultry	No. 35	10.50			
Total assets					544.91

LIABILITIES

Items	Unpaid balance	To mature this year	Date due	Amount past due	Total to be paid this year
Real estate liens:					
1st					
2d					
Liens, personal property:					
FSA	$515.00	$60.60	12-31-40		$60.60
Int	14.54	14.54	12-31-40		14.54
Taxes					
Judgments					
Other					
Total	529.54		x x x		75.14
Total liabilities	529.54	Net worth			15.37

PART VI.—REPORT OF LAST YEAR'S BUSINESS

Value of food on hand last year was $50; now $51.90.

	Estimated	Actual
Total estimated and actual income last year	$415.50	$204.85
Farm operating expenses last year	$231.00	
Payment of F. S. A. loan last year	60.60	
Payment other debts last year		
Cash living expenses last year	45.00	
Total	336.60	
Income from crops last year		124.85
Income from livestock last year		
Income from other sources		80.00
Total	415.50	204.85

Per acre yields last year were: Cotton 2 on 14 acres, peanuts ____ on ____ acres, tobacco ____ on ____ acres, corn 20 on 10 acres, hay ____ on ____ acres, wheat ____ on ____ acres, oats ____ on ____ acres.

I hereby certify the above statements to be correct. I have read, or have had read to me, the above plan and I agree to operate my farm accordingly in crop rotation, soil-building practices, and other necessary changes to be adjusted with an annual supplement for a period of 5 years.

Applicant: T. D. Wilcox; Homemaker: Belle. Date 12-27-39

Approval recommended: Rural rehabilitation supervisor: M. E. Bishop. Date 12-27-39

Home supervisor: Lillian B. Jenkins. Date 12-27-39

Approved: District farm supervisor: A. A. Hester. Date 12- 2-40

District home supervisor: Rubye N. Brook. Date 2- 2-40

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate a comparison of the work done by the Farm Credit Administration with respect to loans made with that of the Farm Security Administration:

APRIL 28, 1942.

For a great many years the Farm Credit Administration, through its Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, has been making loans to low-income farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere without building up an enormous bureaucracy or imposing extreme controls over its borrowers. This is in striking contrast to the enormous cost and the extreme controls over borrowers imposed by the Farm Security Administration, through its rural rehabilitation loan program.

Both agencies loan money to low-income farmers who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere. It is interesting to compare the record of these two agencies.

The Farm Credit Administration, through its Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, from 1929 through 1941 made a total of 3,604,637 crop and feed loans aggregating $405,282,820. The Farm Security Administration, up through June 30, 1941, had made a total of 1,856,275 loan agreements, aggregating a total of $564,051,844 (p. 279, House hearings on 1943 Agricultural appropriation bill).

Up to December 31, 1941, the Farm Credit Administration had collected 2,468,064 of these loans, and a total amount of principal repaid amounted to $289,743,680, or a total of 71.5 percent of the total amount of principal that was loaned. The Farm Security Administration, as of June 30, 1941, had collected $180,964,361, which represented 32 percent of the total principal loaned. (Data from table submitted by the Farm Security Administration, House hearings, 1943 Agricultural appropriation bill p. 282.)

The Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration on December 31, 1941, was serving a total of 1,136,573 loans outstanding, amounting to $115,539,140. The Farm Security Administration, according to the testimony of Administrator Baldwin before the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, in January 1942 had approximately 759,000 rural rehabilitation loans outstanding.

The difference in cost of handling the programs of these two organizations is very striking. The Farm Credit Administration, which is servicing 1,136,573 crop and feed loans to low-income farmers, in 1941 had only 1,300 employees all told, at a total yearly expense of $3,618,692, and the average number of unpaid loans per employee was 1,164, its average yearly cost per unpaid loan was $2.39, and the average number of loans services per field supervisor was 3,170.

In striking contrast, the Farm Security Administration employed a total of 18,382 employees at a total cost of $32,205,167.

COLOSSAL EXPENDITURES FOR TRAVEL

Mr. President, I now wish to direct attention to the travel expenses of the Farm Security Administration.

The 1943 Budget allowed the F. S. A. $5,290,000 for travel expenses in connection with its program of loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation, compared to expenditures of $3,950,786 for this purpose in 1940, an increase of 34 percent.

The total amount to the F. S. A. allowed for travel by the 1943 Budget in connection with all of its activities amounted to $7,414,024, compared to $5,796,495, or 28 percent more than was expended in 1940.

The 1943 Budget allowance of $7,414,024 to the F. S. A. for travel expenditures amounted to nearly one-half of the total funds allowed to the entire Department of Agriculture for travel expenses, aggregating $16,595,435.

The House of Representatives restricted the total expenditures for travel in the Department of Agriculture to not to exceed $8,000,000, which will bring about a very substantial saving to the Treasury and to the American people.

The estimate of traveling expenses for the Farm Security in 1942 is seven and a half million dollars. The actual expenses in 1941 amounted to $6,742,000. I ask that the table be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures for travel, Farm Security Administration

	1943 Budget	Estimate, 1942	Actual, 1941	Actual, 1940
Farm-tenancy program	583,246	627,500	537,389	417,418
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects	55,182	89,725	194,825	219,484
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation	5,290,000	5,291,900	4,825,226	3,950,786
Farm-debt adjustment	315,000	424,290	339,977	387,952
Rural-rehabilitation projects, including technical services	6,350	11,950	13,797	32,003
Migratory-labor camps	149,300	118,000	89,041	76,500
Water-utilization projects, including technical services	57,280	57,935	49,043	46,143
Administration	695,750	694,750	610,886	574,112
Emergency fund for President, defense housing, temporary shelters	58,508	40,544		
Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects	135,908	103,820	16,313	3,756
State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation funds	67,500	67,500	66,128	88,341
Total	7,414,024	7,527,914	6,742,625	5,796,495

Mr. BYRD. I further ask that another report of the committee entitled "Enormous Increase in Expenditures Despite Reduced Need," be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENORMOUS INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES DESPITE REDUCED NEED

Despite the fact that farm income in 1942 will likely reach the highest levels since 1919 and the need for relief assistance such as that provided by the Farm Security Administration has largely disappeared, this agency is seeking a large increase in the number of its permanent employees and in the expenditures for this purpose, as well as a large increase in funds for loans to farmers.

The Bureau of the Budget evidently recognized the decreased need for rural rehabilitation loans when it prepared the 1943 Budget, as it reduced the funds for loans to $75,000,000 compared to $120,000,000 in 1942, and compared with actual expenditures of $98,211,022 for loans in 1940. Certainly no one could properly contend that the need for relief assistance of this kind is greater now than it was in 1940. Yet the 1943 Budget proposed to allow the Farm Security Administration a total of $18,705,623 for home and farm management services compared to $11,871,196 for this purpose in 1940—an increase of approximately 60 percent in the expenditures for this purpose.

Similarly the 1943 Budget allows a total of $12,533,204 for expenditures by the Farm Security Administration for investigations of applications for making, collecting, and servicing loans and grants compared to expenditures of $7,431,543 for this purpose in 1940—an increase of about 16 percent for 1943 as compared to 1940.

SIX-YEAR RECORD

During the period of April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1942, the Farm Security Administration loaned a total of $576,765,183.52 and expended for personal services, supplies and materials, rentals, communication, travel, transportation of things, printing and binding, advertising, heat, light, and other miscellaneous expenditures, a total of $275,861,889.27. In addition, the Farm Security Administration expended a total of $42,363,162.35 for land acquisition, $13,937,011.76 for construction, maintenance, and repair contracts, $11,379,781.44 for equipment purchases. These constitute expenditures made by the Farm Security Administration out of funds appropriated under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts from their inception April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, and do not include expenditures made since July 1, 1941, when the appropriations for Farm Security Administration were placed under the Department of Agriculture appropriations.

The foregoing figures cover a 6-year period of expenses and loans, which necessarily include the cost of servicing outstanding loans as well as making new loans during this 6-year period.

The 1943 Budget allows a total of 13,821 permanent field employees at a cost of $24,070,064 compared to 9,686 permanent field employees at a cost of $14,043,740 in the year 1940. Thus the Budget for 1943 allows 43 percent more permanent field employees and 71 percent more expenditures for this purpose than in 1940, yet the total number of clients to be served in 1943 should be very much reduced below 1940, if assistance is restricted to legitimate need.

In the fiscal year 1940 the Farm Security Administration had 1,077 employees in its Washington office, 3,497 employees in its 12 regional offices, 437 employees in its 42 State offices, 554 employees in its 222 district offices within the States, and 8,825 employees in its 2,097 county offices. These employees were engaged in the Rural Rehabilitation program and does not represent a complete roster of employees.

The 1943 Budget allows a total of 19,448 permanent field employees at a cost of $34,131,375 compared to 14,586 permanent field employees in 1940 at a cost of $22,119,347.

The total expenses for personal services, travel, and all other purposes except loans and grants, which are allowed in the 1943 Budget, amount to $44,346,282.

Consolidated schedule of obligations under "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation"

By projects or functions	Obligations			
	Estimate, 1943	Estimate, 1942	Actual, 1941	Actual, 1940
1. Rural-rehabilitation loans, Farm Security Administration	$73,580,000	$118,150,000	$124,219,670	$97,676,025
2. Rural-rehabilitation grants, Farm Security Administration	9,850,000	17,745,939	17,114,144	24,053,985
3. Rural-rehabilitation services:				
(a) Farm and home management assistance:				
Farm Security Administration	18,705,623	18,557,418	14,713,962	11,871,196
Forest Service	8,182	8,182	5,476	4,192
(b) Investigation of applications, and making, collecting, and servicing loans and grants: Farm Security Administration	12,533,204	12,434,400	9,546,486	7,431,543
4. Farm-debt adjustment, Farm Security Administration	1,796,580	2,400,000	1,777,000	1,902,933
5. Rural-rehabilitation projects, including technical services:				
(a) Improvements to existing projects: Farm Security Administration	275,000	350,000	335,180	748,224
(b) Special and work relief projects: Farm Security Administration	75,000	250,000	168,915	241,628
6. Migratory-labor camps:				
(a) Operations, maintenance, and management: Farm Security Administration	2,766,565	1,907,000	1,396,193	
(b) Development and construction: Farm Security Administration	733,435	3,093,000	3,191,648	5,010,733
7. Water-utilization projects, including technical services:				
Farm Security Administration	1,810,000	2,270,000	1,117,050	829,970
Soil Conservation Service		240,000	340,909	790,158
8. Administration: Farm Security Administration	7,202,693	7,159,500	6,596,620	6,509,823
9. Reimbursements for work done for other bureaus and agencies	60,000	60,000	23,484	
Grand total obligations	129,396,282	184,625,439	180,546,737	157,797,694
Reimbursements for work done for other bureaus and agencies	−60,000	−60,000	−23,484	
Net total obligations	129,336,282	184,565,439	180,523,253	

Expenditures for permanent field employees, Farm Security Administration

	Budget, 1943		Estimate, 1942		Actual, 1941		Actual, 1940	
	Number of employees	Expense	Number of employees	Expense	Number of employees	Expense	Number of employees	Expense
Farm-tenancy program	507	$1,102,002	556	$1,205,771	622	$1,223,880	495	$923,635
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects	79	164,572	147	321,052	443	883,640	589	1,077,891
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation	13,821	24,070,064	13,887	23,906,070	11,622	18,046,074	9,686	14,043,740
Farm-debt adjustment	640	1,148,365	906	1,549,205	749	1,254,020	861	1,335,660
Rural-rehabilitation projects, including technical services	13	28,120	16	29,401	22	40,957	74	127,304

Expenditures for permanent field employees, Farm Security Administration—Continued

	Budget, 1943		Estimate, 1942		Actual, 1941		Actual, 1940	
	Number of employees	Expense	Number of employees	Expense	Number of employees	Expense	Number of employees	Expense
Migratory labor camps	781	$1,355,990	548	$947,593	399	$672,026	225	$391,944
Water utilization projects, including technical services	94	175,860	96	176,359	100	150,609	85	128,990
Administration	2,080	3,702,654	2,061	3,629,898	2,017	3,262,377	2,181	3,453,725
Water conservation	185	326,392	101	177,295				
Emergency fund for President, defense housing, temporary shelters	605	810,685	433	557,938	.8	1,116		
Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects	514	945,551	440	791,252	230	371,719	173	279,806
State rural rehabilitation corporation funds	159	300,420	164	312,717	182	332,199	217	356,652
Total	19,448	34,131,375	19,355	33,604,551	16,386.8	26,238,617	14,586	22,119,347

Source: The Budget of the U. S. Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

HOW RURAL REHABILITATION MONEY HAS BEEN SPENT

The following table, taken from Treasury reports, indicates how much money was loaned or given away in the Rural Rehabilitation program of Farm Security Administration and its precedessor agencies from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, and how much has been spent in administration:

An aggregate, according to the rural-rehabilitation-loan program principal account has been loaned in the sum of	$576,765,183.52
During this same period there were grants to individuals in the sum of	137,326,848.00
Total	714,092,031.52
During this period from Apr. 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the following funds have been expended by Farm Security Administration for purposes other than loans or grants to farmers (excluding expenditures from July 1, 1941, to date):	
Farm Security Administration personnel	193,022,826.66
Supplies and materials	30,864,896.60
Rentals for equipment, buildings, and land	9,452,394.59
Communication	2,356,486.18
Travel, including subsistence	28,769,439.19
Transportation of things	1,323,869.21
Printing and binding	1,844,304.53
Advertising	20,914.83
Heat, light, power, water, and electricity	759,385.47
Miscellaneous	2,447,372.01
Pay-roll and operating costs	275,861,889.27

This record shows that it cost the Government $275,861,889.27 to carry on the Farm Security Administration and its predecessor agencies in nearly 7 years while making rehabilitation loans and grants of $714,092,031.52. Can the results obtained possibly justify the continuance of such huge appropriations? Under the terms of the Budget for 1943, the Farm Security Administration would have had available for administrative expenses, roughly, $1 for nearly every $2 to be loaned or given away.

Source: Compiled from report of the President of the United States to the Congress, showing the status of funds and appropriations under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1935–42, inclusive, as of December 31, 1941, VIII–E, page 211, and table I, page 490, covering rural rehabilitation loan program, principal account, status of loans receivable as of December 27, 1941.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask to have another report inserted in the RECORD, with respect to the complete control and regimentation of clients.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLETE CONTROL AND REGIMENTATION OF CLIENTS

Information and supporting evidence was presented to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures showing that the Farm Security Administration has organized its program of loans and grants in such a way that Farm Security Administration employees exercise rigid control of the business and farming plans and even the home management of their clients. The extreme extent to which this control is exercised tends to destroy the initiative and self-respect of the clients. The clients themselves frequently complain bitterly about this extreme regimentation.

This attempt to regulate in the minutest detail all the farming and home operations of clients, is one of the main reasons why this program is so extremely costly. The 1943 Budget proposes to allow and the Senate committee has approved sufficient funds to provide over $38,000,000 for three items alone in connection with the rural rehabilitation program—$18,705,623 for farm and home management assistance, $12,533,204 for investigation of applications, making, collecting, and servicing loans and grants, and $7,202,693 for "Administration."

The Farm Security Administration has organized all its programs insofar as possible, so as to get the maximum number of clients under this minute supervision and control. This so-called farm and home management service is not only applied to rural rehabilitation clients but also to tenant purchase clients, and to clients on the so-called resettlement projects, and more recently, it is being applied to clients on the so-called relocation projects where families displaced by defense projects are being relocated by Farm Security Administration.

The Farm Security Administration seeks to justify this because these loans are usually made to low-income farmers. The record of the Crop and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Division which has been engaged in making loans to low-income farmers who could not obtain credit elsewhere, disproves this argument. This agency with only a small staff of about 1,400 employees and expending only about $3,500,000 all told, is servicing twice as many loans outstanding as the Farm Security Administration with its more than 16,000 employees and expending over $38,000,000 for rural rehabilitation, and its collection record is equally as good if not better. (See examples of regimentation attached.)

EXAMPLES OF REGIMENTATION OF CLIENTS BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

In Mississippi Mr. William C. Carr, an investigator employed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, reported:

"They (clients) are told where to keep their bank accounts. They are not allowed to get a bank statement or to get their canceled checks. A number of clients have received bills from the Farm Security Administration. Sometimes they receive two or three with the same date but calling for different amounts." (P. 820, Hearings, joint committee.)

In Alabama Mr. Carr reported:

"Clients have no knowledge of their financial standing. Cancelled checks are picked up in the bank and kept in the Farm Security Administration office as is the client's bank statement."

One client moved off the Transylvania farm (Arkansas) because the Farm Security Administration refused to permit him to keep a calf which was given to his little daughter by her grandfather. It was their contention that this calf was subject to mortgage as an asset of his, and he contended that the calf was given to his daughter, that it was her personal property and the Farm Security Administration did not have anything to do with it.

Another case in Arkansas was that of a client who, after picking his own cotton and having no work to do on his farm, went out and picked cotton for a private landowner for which he was paid a wage. His sole purpose in doing this was to bolster his income in order that he might pay off his indebtedness and provide better conditions for his family. The Farm Security Administration stopped him from doing this outside work. (P. 828, Hearings, joint committee.)

CASE OF A. P. ROBINSON, LOWNDES COUNTY, ALA.

Mr. A. P. Robinson, Lowndes County, sold a mule to Henry Tubner, a Farm Security Administration client. All checks were signed by the client and the Farm Security Administration supervisor. Such a check was issued to Mr. Robinson. The check came back marked "N. S. F." Mr. Robinson took it to the Farm Security Administration office. While he was standing there and while the client was 25 miles away he was given a new check signed by the supervisor and by the client.

THE HALL RANCH,
Richland Springs, Tex., February 8, 1942.

Mr. E. A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I see by the papers you have investigated the Farm Security Administration and paint a picture of national disgrace. Congratulations!

I thrilled at the news report of February 7, 1942, in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram—I wish I could add my knowledge of Farm Security Administration in this community. I wrote Senator O'DANIEL about our case last

December, and a little research around here would add loads of new evidence of rank inefficiency, waste, vicious practices high and low in the Farm Security Administration.

More power to you and sincerely,

MILTON M. LEACH.

MARSHALL, MO., *February 18, 1942.*

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest your criticism of the Farm Security Administration in the Kansas City Star of February 6. I am the operator of 800 acres of land owned by my immediate family and have had 2 years of employment by this organization and its predecessor, the Resettlement Administration.

I think I have had a good insight as to the waste of money that has taken place through its administration by a group of men who have had no practical training in the agricultural field.

I have had two tenants who were borrowers from the Administration and have been in a good position to see how they were made loans with the understanding that they would be closely supervised, but due to the enormous amount of office work the supervisor was never given the necessary time to carry out the supervision as planned and the borrower went on as he had been doing before his loan was made, eventually getting another loan to keep him in position to carry out his original program.

I believe your stand is a justifiable one; however, you must remember this organization is old enough at present that they know how to pull the congressional strings pretty well. I imagine by this time this Administration has had its supervisors throughout the country go out and contact almost everyone that is on its pay roll and wire their Congressmen as to the necessity of the continued existence of the Administration.

We have four Government loaning agencies in our city of Marshall, all of which are handling agricultural loans, each has a separate office force, maintains a separate office, and carries on a separate line of work. I have often wondered why these offices couldn't be consolidated and the operating expense cut at least one-third.

I hope you will continue your crusade against waste; I wish I could be of help to you, and if you could use any information I may have I will be glad to give it to you in detail.

Very truly yours,

R. S. SPRINGGATE.

PUEBLO, COLO., *February 12, 1941.*

Mr. EDWARD O'NEAL,
American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I saw an article in our local paper (the Pueblo Star-Journal and Chieftain) last Saturday. This report concerned your investigation of the F. S. A. In my estimation you stated it very mildly. I can show you not one but practically every case in this county as bad or worse than you said; I would be glad to do it. Men who have been successful farmers and ex-service men are conspicuous by their absence. While I know a man who has been a successful farmer could not be handled the way they want, I do not know just what they have against the ex-service men. We positively know of people who were not even citizens getting a loan.

I think there should be a very intensive investigation, that it should not be dropped here. People in general here are already wondering why they should buy bonds and stamps to buy guns and ammunition when the F. S. A. is throwing away money with both hands to would-be farmers in the guise of "food for freedom." Congress does not need to worry about losing votes by helping you, as they would gain a lot of votes. I would be glad to assist in any way I can.

Very respectfully,

J. L. TORRENCE.

MANOR, TEX., *March 28, 1942.*

Mr. EDWARD A O'NEAL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The enclosed editorial explains my letter.

There are two Farm Security Administration farms in our vicinity and those of us who approved this Government venture are appalled by Farm Security Administration methods.

In view of farm conditions in our section, the debt load is top-heavy. On one farm a trench silo was built below the barn lot, across the hill, and a windmill installed, instead of the cheaper, more efficient electric pump. Waste of money for the farmer and the taxpayer.

The other, a new home site, is established in defiance of all common sense and extension service rules for house building, viz., near their line at the foot of a muddy hill, thus wasting fertilizer. Early and late frost will hamper fruit and vegetables and chickens thrive better out of a low atmosphere.

The barn and back premises of a small cottage are the main view from the front of the home; in this climate dairy odors can be very disagreeable. This set-up was endorsed by the trained home planners of the Farm Security Administration and the Austin-Travis County health unit.

The dairy sewage is illegally carried by the roadside ditch to a creek, where it pollutes that farmer's water, thus breaking another Texas law. Such proceedings would indicate that Farm Security Administration needs revamping from Washington to the committeemen, who seem to be only figureheads used to democracy's hurt.

If there is any way that an on-the-ground farm woman can assist to clean such Augean stables be assured of my willingness to aid.

Yours truly,

BROWN GREGG.

STARKVILLE, MISS., *February 14, 1942.*

I certify the following statement to be true of my experience and dealing with the Farm Security Administration:

The Farm Security Administration solicit clients by use of clients who are already on the Farm Security Administration. They solicit possible clients because of special favors extended them from Farm Security Administration. The man who solicited me received a nice grant from some cause.

The Farm Security Administration recommended and insisted that I borrow more money than there was any necessity for. When I went to them they promised that I could do all of my building except the house. They did not do this. They let contracts for all the building and forced the contractor on a labor scale to pay wages higher than was customary in our locality. I believe that I could have built my house and other building for less than one-half of what they cost me. They forced me, because of a ruling, to buy my mules from one man unless I found mules that the owner had raised and had them for sale. I believe I could have bought mules cheaper elsewhere, but did not try because I knew it was needless to try. They delivered the mules—a pair of fresh shipped, unbroke, 3-year olds—about the 1st of April, and then gave me hell because I didn't make a good crop that year as some of the other clients who had their tools and mules before the first of the year. The mules have never been satisfactory, but they have refused to let me trade for others. The buildings cost so much and they spend my borrowed money so freely that it ran the price per acre of the land so high that it is impossible for it to ever pay out. They promised me that I could have hired help, since I had no children to help me farm 70 acres of new crop and meadow and milk 20 cows. As soon as they found out that I had a hired man, they raised hell until he left.

The Farm Security Administration plans and policies are so expensive and impossible that I realized that I could not ever pay out and left.

FRED T. JONES.

Witnessed:
WM. M. WHITE.
J. A. RANDLE.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

GENTLEMEN: It would be a travesty on justice to let the Farm Security Administration win a majority report from six members of the committee making an investigation of charges made by the Farm Bureau against the Farm Security Administration. Following facts can be substantiated provided members of this six-member committee render impartial decisions.

Facts as charged before the Byrd committee regarding the Jerome projects.

The Arkansas Farm Bureau has charged the Farm Security Administration is wasting money. It is my opinion that a majority of the people here agree fully with the charge made by the Farm Bureau. The Farm Security Administration, I think, should be abolished. If the investigation is continued, I think it will be disclosed fully and completely that the Farm Security Administration is a failure and corrupt. Why don't the Arkansas Farm Bureau investigate the supervisors of this Farm Security Administration and see how they are accumulating stock that is sold at auction and the hook-up between certain merchants, and how they buy and sell to the Farm Security Administration clients and how they will not let them buy with their own money the same things at the same price from other merchants with the Arkansas Farm Board investigating these charges in each county. We have had men of the Farm Security Administration investigate and they got the facts but would not turn in the facts to the Farm Security Administration head offices. They would whitewash everything. The clients were bluffed into making statements, were told that they would be cut off and everything else and they were cut out and had to sell their stock and everything back to the Farm Security Administration at auction and with the hook-up they were bought back at a low figure and sold to other clients at a large figure. Who can do or say anything against them when the Farm Security Administration clients are scared out of their rights to talk.

Arkansas Farm Bureau put the pressure on them, send some of these supervisors to the pen and they will stop.

Send me a man or men that is not connected with the Farm Security Administration and let us help you get some of this rotten stuff.

Yours respectfully,

DR. H. D. CAMMACK,
JESS ETHRIDGE,
Hamburg, Ark.

SENECA, S. DAK., *February 9, 1942.*

Mr. ED A. O'NEAL,
Washington, D. C.

MY FARMER FRIEND: I read the charge you made about Farm Security Administration and I know you are 100-percent right. The disgrace the way they place these loans is not no business about it, just a big graft and red tape. No, they announce the red tape is done away with and everyone can get a seed and feed loan. I can't see why anyone here has to get a loan of that kind as we have so much crop and feed we don't know what to do with it but the Burns can get Government money to waste. Which they have done for 2 or 3 years. I hope you will be successful so it will save the taxpayers money; they

want us to buy stamps and bonds so they can waste it on these Farm Security Administration loans. I wrote LA FOLLETTE.

Yours truly,

J. H. BEAM.

RAVENNA, NEBR., *February 16, 1942.*

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President of A. F. B. F.,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have been a very interested reader of the charges brought against the Farm Security Administration. I live in Sherman County, Nebr. They have not raised a crop for the last 7 years. I am 38 years old, have two boys and twin girls. Four years ago I went to the Farm Security Administration for help, and at the present time I am satisfied that I made a terrible mistake. It would take me days to tell you all the dirty, rotten things that I have had to endure through the commands and directions of the local Farm Security Administration, located at Loup City, Nebr. The truth will never come out or it would tear this country wide open.

When this was started they took men out of town, gave them more money to spend than was good form, men from the Work Projects Administration, Public Works Administration, or what have you—men that did not know how to farm. Then put men in office that did not know how to farm to run this project. This doesn't sound true, but that can be proven because that is the way it started.

After years of drought, failure of banks, farmers had to have help. Where could we get it? The Government would help us; they were helping everyone else, why not help a good farmer. Sure, we got help in the form of a 1-year plan set-up. Could you make a plan for a farm for 1 year and never change it to meet the conditions of changes of weather and other elements that come up? I can't.

We were never consulted as to what we should raise, but were told to raise this, that, and the other, whether the farm was adapted to this or that. I have seen as good a farmer as you could find, ordered to a Farm Security Administration meeting and be forced to listen to some swelled-up pup that never had a dollar till he got this job, tell these men how to farm. This up-fellow did not know how to milk a cow, believe it or not. You may wonder how this could be enforced; here it is: A great many farmers at one time or other have received grants. They were told that if they did as told they would get grants if they needed them. Now, if they did as told they would sure as hell need them in a very short time. For 3 years I tried to do as told. It cost me $500 to do this. It sure burns me up to be run like this, lose money, and then have to listen to them tell you how they made us money or helped us. I do not know of any farmers that went to the Farm Security Administration for help but what will say this is the truth. A great many of these farmers are afraid to talk.

I don't mean to tell you that every farmer in this Farm Security Administration is pure white. I have found dead-enders in every line of business. I can find a number of farmers like myself that can tell of this or a lot more. I am not a lawyer or would write a better explanation. I am just a plain American farmer and try to live and keep my word so this will be a better country to live in. If it would help I will put $50 to get this going. We hear about how bad it will be if Hitler takes us over, but the Farm Security Administration makes us wonder if this is really America or the tail end of Hitler's war machine?

If necessary I will have to sell out and try to get square with them, otherwise they are trying to get me to borrow money to buy $100 cows. I can't do this, the risk is too great because we may have a failure, then would have to sell these cows and lose a lot more money or borrow more money from them to buy feed, thus keep going in deeper and deeper till it would be impossible to ever get out.

No doubt you have found a lot worse things than I have explained. I have been ordered to report every so often, and with tires off the market and the family needing the money spent for gas, it seems that they are not trying to help us in any manner. Feelings are running pretty high, and it seems to me that if something is not done before long the Farm Security Administration will certainly be responsible for a blot on the name of American citizens.

In closing I will refer you to men that I have had dealings with to confirm the fact that I am not crazy or over-rating the truth. First National Bank, Loup City, Nebr.; C. L. Dunn, Greenslit Lumber Co., Ravenna, Nebr.; J. L. Daley, Hazard, Nebr.; Pete Rerzina, commissioner of Sherman County; Judge Moehnart, Loup City, Nebr.

Now, if there is anything that you want me to do in the line of getting evidence and the kind of evidence you would want, just let me know.

Yours truly,

GUY EARNEST.

SUMNER, MISS., *March 7, 1942.*

Mr. ED O'NEIL,
President of Farm Bureau,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to have the honor to write to you in regard to the Farm Security Administration which exists in this part of the Nation.

I was evicted from the Sunflower Plantation, Merigold, Miss., in the spring of 1940 for political reasons.

Otis B. Casonava was supervisor of the project. He would not let me state my case to the committee; he also took my money and paid the cost of the court. I moved back to Tallahachie County and brought my mules and tools and in December 1941 my mules and tools were turned over to the farm supervisor at Charleston, Miss., and to this day they have not yet been sold. The expenses are eating them up.

Sir, please put my case before your committee.

If you need any further information, I will be glad to let you hear from me again.

Yours truly,

BRYAN NEWTON.

CASE OF W. H. WASHEURN

W. H. Washburn, Negro, of Suttle, Ala., in a statement dated January 26, 1942, stated that he was solicited by a Farm Security Administration representative while he was plowing in his field and urged to purchase a farm on a tract of land on which the Farm Security Administration had an option. He filed an application but refused to complete the sale when he learned how he would be regimented. He said:

"After some investigation I found that if I did take one of these places that I would be unable to buy a cow, chickens, hog, or farming implements, nor could I sell any of my farm products or personal property without first going to the Farm Security Administration office and get their permission. To me this amounted to slavery as I would have signed away all my rights."

(Photostat copy of letter attached.)

Mr. Baldwin submitted an affidavit of another Farm Security Administration employee who said that he did not believe this man was solicited until after he had come to the Farm Security Administration office, but no affidavit was obtained from the employee whom Washburn stated solicited him in his field. The affidavit therefore proves nothing. Moreover Washburn's letter makes clear his attitude toward the extreme regimentation of Farm Security Administration. This regimentation is costing the Government over $18,000,000 per year.

SUTTLE, ALA., *January 24, 1942.*

Mr. WILLIAM C. CARR,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. CARR: In regard to your request for information as to how the Farm Security Administration obtain their clients in Perry County, I wish to relate to you my experience with the matter.

Last summer I was plowing in my field that I rent from Mr. W. N. Cummings, of Suttle, Ala., when Mr. Grady L. Wise, of the Farm Security Administration, came to see me and told me that someone had given him my name as a good prospect to take a farm on a place that the Farm Security Administration had an option on more than 2,000 acres of land that belonged to Dr. R. C. Hanna, and that they were trying to find enough good clients to take the farms on this place, and asked me if I would not come and make an application for one of these farms.

This I did and was going to take one of them but after some investigation I found that if I did take one of these places that I would be unable to buy a cow, chicken, hog, or farming implements, nor could I sell any of my farm products or personal property without first going to the Farm Security Administration office and get their permission. To me this amounted to slavery as I would have signed away all my rights.

Yours truly,

W. H. WASHBURN.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted a report on Excessive Costs and Debts Placed Upon F. S. A. Borrowers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCESSIVE COSTS AND DEBTS PLACED UPON FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION BORROWERS

The Farm Security program was intended to assist low-income farmers in becoming self-sustaining and to get out of debt. In all too many cases it has resulted in piling up excessive debts upon clients far beyond their capacity to repay. So long as they are "on the Government" and the bills are paid by Farm Security Administration, which balances their farm and home plans by means of renewal notes and outright grants whenever necessary, their standard of living is raised temporarily, but the piling up of debts finally results in discouragement and despair on the part of such clients. The clients themselves complain bitterly of these tendencies. Among the complaints against the Farm Security Administration on this score are:

1. Tendency to spend too much money on buildings and other improvements on farms purchased for resale to low-income tenants under the tenant-purchase program. Many instances were reported where good buildings were torn down against the wishes of the clients and new buildings erected. Such excessive expenditures are reflected in the cost to the borrower who has to repay these costs out of the earnings of the property.

2. Pressure exerted on clients to trade with certain business firms or with Farm Security Administration-sponsored cooperative enterprises, even though clients could have purchased goods cheaper elsewhere.

3. Losses occasioned by clients due to excessive managerial supervision by Farm Security Administration which prevented client from exercising his discretion or planning his farming operations most efficiently.

4. Encouragement and solicitation of clients to get further in debt, sometimes beyond their ability to repay out of the proceeds of their farm.

(See examples attached.)

EXAMPLES OF EXCESSIVE COSTS AND DEBTS PLACED UPON BORROWERS

Case of George Cateige, Haynesville, Ala.: George Cateige, Haynesville, Ala., purchased a farm with a tenant-purchase loan. He paid $15 per acre for the 160 acres. Farm Security Administration tore down a house which he begged them to leave standing and built a new one. He needed his married son at home to help till the land. There was an extra house on the farm. He begged the Farm Security Administration to leave that house standing but they tore that house down also. His debt ran to $4,800. He moved off the land because he saw he never would be able to pay off the indebtedness. He states very emphatically that both of the houses standing on the farm were as good as he would ever want and he feels he could have paid off the Farm Security Administration and owned the farm if they had not doubled the cost by putting on unnecessary improvements and refused to permit the house which he needed for his son to stand. (From supplemental report of Investigator William C. Carr.)

Case of C. M. Horn, rural free delivery 1, Alpine, Ala.: C. M. Horn, rural free delivery 1, Alpine, Ala., was a successful farmer. He owed $600 on a tractor which he had purchased. He was talked into becoming a client of the Farm Security Administration. After 3 years they had him so deeply in debt that he knew he would never get out. He stated that it was impossible to get seed loans in time to plant his crop. They called him to town three times a week to fill out different blanks. He had mortgaged all his livestock and implements and the Farm Security Administration foreclosed and the public in general in the vicinity in which he lives feel that he is justified in his bitter denunciation of Farm Security Administration practices. He could have obtained credit anywhere and could have paid off his indebtedness. He now feels that at his age he is handicapped by having to start all over. (From supplemental report of Investigator William C. Carr.)

Case of Carlos Ingram, rural free delivery No. 3, Marion, Ala.: Carlos Ingram, rural free delivery No. 3, Marion, Ala., in a statement dated February 16, 1942, stated that "in February 1936, Mr. Lewis of the Farm Security Administration asked me if he couldn't loan me some money so I could make a crop. I signed up with the Farm Security Administration and was on their rural rehabilitation program for 4 years." He was deeply in debt and saw no chances of getting out—so he quit. In the 2 years that he has been working for himself he has paid off $1,500 of old debts, in addition to making a living for himself and his family. This year—1942—they solicited him to become a client again. He refused. He said: "Last month Mr. Mims of the Farm Security Administration wanted me to sign up as a client again. I told him I would rather work for 50 cents a day than to never be able to call anything my own." (From supplemental report of Investigator William C Carr.)

Case of Buss Myatt, tenant-purchase client, Marion, Ala.: Bus Myatt, tenant-purchase client, Marion, Ala., desired to have the old house remain on the land but was told that it would be necessary to build a new home. Consequently, he is in a very bad financial condition at the present time. He feels that there was a chance of seeing daylight if he hadn't been forced to pay for something he didn't need. (From supplemental report of Investigator William C. Carr.)

Case of George Fuller, Talladega, Ala.: In a statement dated February 21, 1942, George Fuller, rural free delivery No. 2, Talladega, Ala., said: "I haven't been able to make a crop, because the Farm Security Administration doesn't give me my money to plant the crop until 3 months after it should have been planted." (From supplemental report of Investigator William C. Carr.)

OTHER EXAMPLES OF INCREASED INDEBTEDNESS

In Hale County, Ala., an investigator copied a list of the first 11 Farm Security Administration mortgages on the first index page of the current index record in the probate office. This list showed the amount of the mortgages in 1939 and the amount of each corresponding mortgage in 1941. In each of these 11 cases there has been an increase, as follows:

	1939	1941
A. T.	$953.35	$1,326.79
W. W.	75.00	794.68
W. T.	328.80	761.30
J. H.	692.10	906.47
C. Mc.	317.36	516.25
J. H. H.	623.97	748.80
C. J.	448.82	640.31
D. E.	432.65	603.15
J. W.	993.00	1,358.98
James W.	300.15	441.65
W. H.	270.00	848.86

This investigator further reported: "In looking through the records of the probate offices in several counties I did not find a single case in which a mortgage had been satisfied. Almost invariably they were increased." He also reported that he went over the whole list of the Hale County, Ala., mortgage index and that he was unable to find a single case where the mortgage had been satisfied. (Report of Investigator William C. Carr, p. 28. hearings, joint committee.)

EXCESSIVE COSTS ON PULASKI COUNTY TENANT PURCHASES

In Pulaski County, Ark., where six tenant purchase units were set up the tenant purchase committee estimated, after obtaining figures of the improvements that would be necessary, that each unit would cost $3,800. In the end each unit cost over $7,000. When inquiry was made as to why the price ran that high, a high official of the Farm Security Administration said that everything had to be tiptop, so that they would really have something when they took the land back. (P. 831, hearings, joint committee.)

Mr. Baldwin, in his reply submitted to the joint committee, admitted the costs were excessive, but he blamed the responsibility upon the local committee. It is difficult to see how the Farm Security Administration can escape responsibility for developing improvements to the extent that the units cost double the amount originally estimated by the committee.

Case of Tony Walton, Auvergne, Ark.: Tony Walton, Auvergne, Ark., in Jackson County, is a tenant purchase client of the Farm Security Administration and has been in the program 4 years. This man works 120 acres of land and has been working it successfully. On his farm he has a house other than the new one built for him by the Farm Security Administration. This house has been repaired, a new roof put on, and is in a livable condition. It is necessary for Mr. Walton to have help on his farm as he cannot farm the entire tract himself in addition to caring for his livestock. The Farm Security Administration will not allow Mr. Walton's wife to assist him in his work outside. This house is being used to house an employee. In spite of these facts the Farm Security Administration has ordered the house torn down by February 15. A copy of the letter to this client notifying him that the house would have to be torn down is attached hereto.

Mr. Baldwin, in his reply submitted to the joint committee, denied that the Farm Security Administration had ever prohibited Mrs. Walton from working in the fields, but admitted that the Farm Security Administration would not permit its clients to employ sharecroppers. He did not deny that this client was required to tear down this house.

NEWPORT, ARK., *January 2, 1942.*

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned Tenant Purchase Committee for Jackson County, have investigated some of our tenant-purchase borrowers and find that they still have old houses on their farm which have not been torn down.

It was set out very clearly in the regulations and explained to you at the time you were approved for a tenant-purchase loan that it would not be possible for you to retain any house on your farm other than the one you were living in.

We are asking that you make your plans to get these houses torn down by February 15, 1942. Unless this is done, necessary action will have to be taken after this date to get these houses torn down.

Yours very truly,

W. E. RENIX, *Chairman.*
HENRY BAILEY.
CLYDE HODGES.

CASE OF LOCH LOMOND PLANTATION

The Loch Lomond Plantation in Leflore County, Miss., was taken over by Farm Security Administration and turned into a tenant purchase project. According to information submitted to the joint committee:

"It was one of the show places of the State of Mississippi. It had 4 six-room houses, 1 seven-room house, 12 three-room houses, and 8 four-room houses. These houses were made out of the finest hard cypress. They had copper screen on the windows and doors. They were in excellent condition when the Farm Security Administration took over the property. These houses were all torn down and the lumber, which is practically extinct today, was used for fuel. The people in general in this community feel it was nothing short of a crime to destroy these houses, which they say were built to last a hundred years.

"The erection of new buildings on this farm increased the financial load placed upon the clients, and bearing in mind the production figures which I have already given, it is practically impossible for them to ever pay off their notes." (P. 822, hearings, joint committee.)

Mr. Baldwin in his reply submitted to the joint committee admitted that in 1940, 26 families lived on the farm while in 1941, 15 tenant purchase borrowers lived on a portion of the farm, and the remainder of the farm was occupied by 5 families in addition to day labor which was used by the operator to the equivalent of 2 families. He also admitted that buildings were torn down and new ones erected, but he justified this on the ground that his employees with the approval of the local committee found that the buildings were not worth keeping and should be torn down. However, he submitted no proof or supporting data to refute this charge other than listing the buildings and making a categorical statement with respect to the findings of his employees and the committee.

CASE OF SUNFLOWER PLANTATION

Another case reported to the joint committee was the Sunflower Plantation in Mississippi (Sunflower County):

"Buildings were torn down on the Sunflower Plantation in Sunflower County and new buildings erected. Land was purchased at $60 per acre. I was told that these unnecessary improvements have run the value of the land to as high as $129 per acre. This burden of course is being carried by the clients." (P. 822, hearings, joint committee.)

Mr. Baldwin in his reply submitted to the joint committee admitted that the cost of the land and improvements did cost approximately $126 per acre as set forth and he did not deny that existing buildings were torn down and new ones erected. He made the categorical statement that they were flimsy and not worth repair and that they were inspected by Farm Security Administration representatives, but he offered no evidence to substantiate this statement as to their condition or value. He further admitted that before the Farm Security Administration took

over this plantation it supported 223 families and that now there are only 149 families on it. He explained this by saying that it had been divided into larger units.

OTHER EXAMPLES

A landlord named Sumners in Lincoln County, Miss., had built a new barn just a few years before the Farm Security Administration acquired the property. The barn was giving adequate service but was torn down and a new one built. (P. 822, hearings, joint committee.)

Mr. Baldwin did not refute this instance.

In the village of Lake Providence, La., there is a Farm Security Administration purchasing and marketing cooperative. The clients are practically forced to join it. The dues are 25 cents per year. There has been a great deal of discontent over the way it has been operated. "One client, Mr. P. D. Ruffin, refused to join the cooperative because he could buy a pressure cooker cheaper from an adjoining store than he could from a store designated by the cooperative."

"Mr. T. C. Gist said he gave the cooperative 25 cents dues in order to 'keep them off his neck' but he wouldn't trade at their designated stores. He gave as an example the fact that the co-op required that fruit jars be purchased from the Piggly-Wiggly store and he could buy them 10 cents a dozen cheaper at Epp's Mercantile Co." (P. 826, hearings, joint committee.)

In his reply submitted to the joint committee, Mr. Baldwin denied that clients were compelled to join the cooperative although they were urged to do so. He failed to make any answer to the charges that certain stores were designated for the patronage of clients, and he offered no refutation of the charges of higher costs to clients at such designated stores.

CASE OF ED LEWIS

The attached farm and home plan of Ed Lewis, a client of the Farm Security Administration and a member of the Black Belt Leasing Cooperative, shows that this client borrowed from the Farm Security Administration $2,406.50 over a period of 3 years, as follows:

	Loans	Grants	Total received	Total paid
1939	$894.00	$30	$924.00	$163.46
1940	277.00	165	442.00	None
1941	1,235.50	185	1,420.50	
Total	2,406.50	380	2,786.50	[1] 163.46

[1] 1941 plan does not show actual payment if any in 1941.

Thus, in 3 years this client borrowed $2,406.50, of which he had repaid only $163.46. The 1941 plan called for a payment of $340.50 the first year on this accumulated debt, but, of course, it does not show what client actually paid, if anything. In addition, he secured grants every year totaling $380, or a total of $2,786.50. His net worth at the end of the first year was $111.89, and at the end of the second year it was $687.19 in the red.

It is interesting to note that the amount due on Farm Security Administration loan in 1941 was $187.10, and he received a work grant of $185. There was also a payment of $92.48 called for on past Farm Security Administration loans and his Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments totaled $95.

When asked what he thought about the situation this client stated that he knew he could never pay off his indebtedness, but that he thought he would "stick" another year or maybe longer if he could get by. (P. 805, hearings, joint committee; see farm and home plan attached hereto.)

In his reply submitted to the joint committee, Mr. Baldwin submitted no evidence in rebuttal to these facts, but made a general denial that this client was overburdened with debts. He said that the client was "progressing as rapidly as possible in view of the fact that he was considerably in debt when he came under our program, and in view of the fact that he has had two successive crop failures." The foregoing record shows that the client was getting deeper and deeper in debt instead of getting out of debt, under Farm Security Administration guidance. Mr. Baldwin submits no figures to substantiate his claim but merely refers to "our records." It is therefore difficult to see how this man can be "in better shape than he has ever been before in his life," as claimed by Mr. Baldwin in his statement.

OTHER CASES

The case of Carlos Ingram has already been cited elsewhere. He saw no chance of getting out of debt, so he quit. In the 2 years that he has been working for himself he has paid off $1,500 of old debts in addition to making a living for himself. This year he was solicited by Farm Security Administration to become a client again, and he refused.

The case of C. M. Horn has also been cited.

Investigator William C. Carr in his supplemental report of his additional investigations in Alabama reported:

"Clients as a general rule are quite disgusted with the way things are being handled. One big objection is the fact that they get their money for seed so long after the crop should have been planted. Those who are hard working and conscientious abhor the fact that they will never be able to have anything of their own.

"They feel that they are being deliberately kept in debt. * * * The large majority of the clients of the Farm Security Administration have had their spirit broken. * * * Clients have no knowledge of their financial standing. Canceled checks are kept in the bank and picked up by the Farm Security Administration office, as is the client's bank statement. He never sees them." (From supplemental report of Investigator William C. Carr.)

CASE OF WILLIS ELLIS

In a statement dated February 26, 1942, Willis Ellis, Burkville, Ala., who is a Farm Security Administration client, stated:

"Since I have been 'on the Government' I have been in the worse shape than I have ever been in my life."

FROM MISSISSIPPI REPORT

Investigator William C. Carr reported on his findings in Mississippi, with respect to the attitude of clients, as follows:

"The great majority of the clients of the Farm Security Administration are dissatisfied. They are noncommittal concerning its policies but are very bitter in the denunciation of the methods used in administering same. The actions of the Farm Security Administration are clearly predicated along the lines of destroying any individual initiative which a client might have." (P. 828, hearings, joint committee.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to refer to another report, concerning illegal land purchases, which I should like to read to the Senate:

ILLEGAL LAND PURCHASES

The reckless manner in which this agency embarks upon gigantic enterprises under the broad grant of authority for rural rehabilitation loans, is illustrated by what it has done in using these funds to purchase large areas of land on which to relocate farmers displaced by reason of defense projects. For example, in the case of the Lord Scully estate lands in Missouri, the Administration formed a corporation of its own employees and bought 42,000 acres of land out of Rural Rehabilitation Loan funds, passed the title to this land to this corporation composed of its own employees, ostensibly for the purpose of selling farms to farmers removed from defense areas. The House Appropriations Committee investigated this situation and found that 361,000 acres of land had been bought in a similar manner throughout the United States. The committee charged that the Farm Security Administration had carried out this program in violation of the law and requested the Comptroller General of the United States to rule on the legality of these objectives. The Comptroller General, after investigation, submitted a ruling that these land purchases by the Farm Security Administration were illegal. The Comptroller General said that this activity "clearly resembles the resettlement project of the type, the prosecution of which was restricted by section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act." He held that it was illegal to use Rural Rehabilitation Loan funds for this purpose.

What the Farm Security Administration has done in this field is only the beginning of what it could do if it could get enough funds from Congress. Farm Security Administrator Baldwin testified that his organization really needed $300,000,000 for this purpose in order to do the job as he thought it ought to be done.

The fact is the Farm Security Administration plan for relocating these families was devised in such a way as to require the maximum Government investment and the maximum cost for supervision and assistance. Instead of assisting farm owners to buy other farms, and tenants to obtain suitable locations as tenants or purchase farms where practicable and ending the Government's part in this undertaking as soon as these families were satisfactorily settled in their new locations, the Farm Security Administration devised a scheme by which they would purchase large tracts of land and settle these families on these tracts under sales agreements whereby it would require 40 years to repay the Government's investment during which time the Farm Security Administration would have to maintain a staff of personnel to closely supervise the farming activities of these families over a 40-year period. The cost of this supervision, management, and overhead expense will be borne by the Government for the next 40 years.

All of this could have been avoided with much more satisfactory results if the Farm Security Administration had followed the same plan for relocating these families as the Tennessee Valley Authority pursued in relocating thousands of farm families who were displaced by dams constructed in the Tennessee River Valley. Instead of building up a great bureaucracy to last for 40 years to do this job and asking Congress to appropriate enormous sums of money, the Tennessee Valley Authority used the agencies already available in the States; namely, the Agricultural Extension Service, the agricultural credit agencies already established; the county agents set up committees of farmers to help appraise the land and to help these families get relocated. They helped land owners find new farms and they helped tenants get located in satisfactory locations on other farms. The entire cost averaged less than $18 per family to relocate these families, and the Government had no further investment or expense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert some exhibits with respect to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCESSIVE EXPENDITURES BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION IN RELOCATING FARM FAMILIES FROM DEFENSE AREAS ACQUIRED BY GOVERNMENT

The work done by the Farm Security Administration in relocating farm families displaced from various areas which have been acquired by the Government in connection with the defense program affords another example of excessive expenditures and extension of bureaucratic control over farmers by the Farm Security Administration.

When the problem of moving several thousand farm families displaced by Government purchases of land for defense purposes arose, the question of assisting these people in getting relocated was given consideration by the Agricultural Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission. Representatives of the farm organizations were called into consultation. As a result of the study of this problem, the advisory committee, representing all of the national farm organizations, recommended unanimously that the same plan be followed as was carried out by the Tennessee Valley Authority in relocating families displaced by the construction of the Tennessee Valley Authority's hydroelectric projects. Under this plan the Tennessee Valley Authority utilized the county agents and local committees of farmers to assist in relocating these displaced families. There is no area in the United States where the task would be more difficult, due to the fact that so many of these families were in very low income brackets and were highly individualistic in their attitude. Nevertheless, the job was done very successfully at a very nominal cost to the Government by utilizing the agencies and facilities already available. No special loan funds were required—no huge additional purchases of land.

The Farm Security Administration, however, was very anxious to obtain control of this program and offered to make available several million dollars for this purpose.

Instead of following the recommendations of the farm organizations, based on the practical experience in the Tennessee Valley Authority area, the Farm Security was delegated this task. Instead of following these plans provided by practical experience, they have formulated a gigantic scheme involving the purchase of large areas of land. According to a statement submitted by Mr. Baldwin (Hearings, p. 313, Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1943), the Farm Security's plan would require over $100,000,000 to relocate 23,000 farm families, or an average cost of $5,000 per farm family. The following is quoted from Mr. Baldwin's statement (p. 313):

"Our experience thus far indicates that, on the average, it requires at least $5,000 to relocate a farm family. Assuming that approximately 23,000 farm families need relocation assistance, it is apparent that a complete job of relocation would require over $100,000,000."

Mr. Baldwin further revealed that the Farm Security Administration has already arranged to purchase 372,300 acres at a cost of $11,946,000, plus additional development costs of $11,054,000, or a total cost of $23,000,000 to relocate 3,542 families. (P. 304, hearings, Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1943.)

Relocation corporations have been established in 20 States by the Farm Security Administration. Apparently the plan of the Farm Security Administration is to buy up large areas of land and move these displaced farm families on to these lands, make extensive "improvements" to these lands, and extend long-term loans and short-term loans to borrowers, thereby bringing all of these families under the control and jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration over a long period of time.

The experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority shows that such a program is entirely unnecessary. The Tennessee Valley Authority was able to relocate thousands of farm families during the acute years of financial depression without any such costs or grandiose resettlement projects. The attached data show, for example, the Tennessee Valley Authority working through the county agents and committees of farmers and the established credit agencies, was able to relocate 525 families in the Wolf Creek Ordnance area, Milan, Tenn., at a total cost of $3,246 or an average expense per family of $6.21. It evacuated and relocated families in the Watts Bar area at a total cost of $18,367.60, or an average expense of $18.19 per family for relocating 890 families, assisting 600 families with readjustment problems, and assisting 1,010 on an equivalent relocation basis. At a cost of $17,951.11, or an average of $18.76 per family in the Cherokee area, it relocated 793 families, assisted 820 families with readjustment problems, and gave assistance to 957 families on an equivalent relocation basis.

Expenses for evacuating and relocating families in the Cherokee area

	Salary	Travel
E. S. Permenter, Sept. 15, 1941, to Jan. 1, 1942	$3,012.50	$943.71
O. M. Watson, Nov. 1, 1941, to Jan. 1, 1942	2,800.00	1,033.29
Gussie Smith, Feb. 15, 1941, to Jan. 1, 1942	2,150.00	830.11
Edward Garland, May 1, 1941, to Jan 1, 1942	1,200.00	651.00
Miscellaneous: Supplies, etc	100.00	
Total	9,262.50	3,458.11

Total salary and travel	$12,720.61
Supervision and assistance from headquarters	2,577.50
Appraisal assistance	2,653.00
Grand total	17,951.11
Families relocated	793
Families with readjustment problems	820
Families on equivalent relocation basis	957
Expense per family	$18.76

Expenses for evacuating and relocating families in the Wolf Creek Ordnance area, Milan, Tenn. (1941)

	Salary	Travel
Dave Price, 7 months, at $235	1,645.00	$350.00
Miss Manner, secretary, 7 months	409.00	
L. J. Strickland, Jan. 29 to Mar. 21, 1941	560.00	300.00
Total	2,614.00	650.00

Total salary and travel	$3,264
Families relocated	525
Expense per family	$6.21

Expenses for evacuating and relocating families in the Watts Bar area

	Salary	Travel
P. J. Wood, one-half time:		
Jan. 1 to July 1, 1940	$600.00	$300.00
July 1, 1940, to Feb. 15, 1941	1,500.00	612.92
Stanley Ezell, one-half time, Jan. 1 to Aug. 1, 1941	700.00	380.00
Raymond E. Cobble, one-half time, Feb. 1, to Oct. 1, 1941	722.50	354.85
J. E. Moody, May 1, 1941, to Jan. 1, 1942	1,600.00	683.65
Thomas H. Davidson, one-half time, Oct. 1, 1941, to Jan. 1, 1942	225.00	83.14
Max H. Falkner, one-half time, July 1, 1940, to Jan. 1, 1942	2,475.00	89.24
Clerk, Aug. 1, 1940, to Jan. 1, 1942	1,335.00	
Miscellaneous: Telephones, etc	300.00	
Total	9,457.50	2,504.60

Total salary and travel	$11,962.10
Supervision and assistance from headquarters	3,752.50
Appraisal assistance	2,653.00
Grand total	18,367.60
Families relocated	890
Families with readjustment problems	600
Families on equivalent relocation basis	1,010
Expense per family	$18.19

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to insert a statement concerning liquidation of resettlement projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIQUIDATION OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

For several years the Farm Security Administration has been charged by Congress with the responsibility for the liquidation of the so-called resettlement projects which were inherited from the Division of Subsistence Homesteads and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Instead of liquidating these projects as Congress intended, the Farm Security Administration has been busily engaged in promoting and even expanding these projects, and reorganizing them in such a way that the Government will probably have an investment indefinitely and the Farm Security Administration will have a continuing managerial and supervisory responsibility.

The failure of the Farm Security Administration to liquidate these projects in accordance with the specific intent of Congress is an amazing and astounding record. Anyone who will take the time to read the record of the hearings of the Appropriations Committee on this matter for the past 5 or 6 years cannot fail to be impressed with the deception that has been practiced upon Congress by the administrators of this program. The way in which Congress has been misled and its obvious intent evaded is astounding, indeed.

These resettlement projects consisted of certain projects inherited from the Division of Subsistence Homesteads and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. According to the testimony of former Farm Security Administrator Alexander, about 50 projects were inherited from the Division of Subsistence Homesteads and about 34 projects from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. A "Mystery of the Farm Security Administration," issued on October 10, 1940, stated that 33 projects were inherited from the Subsistence Homesteads Division and 19 projects from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. In January 1937 the Resettlement Administration was moved to the Department of Agriculture and in September of this year it was converted into the Farm Security Administration. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 2, 1937, contained a provision for the liquidation of these projects with a provision for the completion and management until such time as they could be liquidated. In 1938 there was inserted an item in the 1939 Agricultural appropriation bill headed as follows: "Liquidation and Management of Resettlement Projects."

Since that time Farm Security Administration officials have been admonished repeatedly by members of the Appropriations Committees to take effective steps to liquidate these projects, and Farm Security Administration officials have repeatedly given assurances that these projects would be liquidated.

Instead of liquidating these projects they have actually been expanded. According to the information submitted in the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee at the request of Congressman TARVER, the total acreage in these resettlement projects has been expanded from 753,408 acres to 954,670

acres, an increase of approximately 200,000 acres. In 1938 Farm Security Administration officials told Congress that they expected to complete all the projects by July 1, 1938, but by July 30, 1941, this program had been expanded into 193 projects to accommodate 15,169 family units at a cost of $30,321,918.50, for land totaling 961,094 acres, which, together with other development costs aggregating $105,815,062.34, brought the total investment to $136,136,980.84.

The manner in which the so-called liquidation of these projects has been carried out is not a bona fide liquidation in the ordinary interpretation of that term. Instead of selling these properties outright to bona fide purchasers, in some cases they have been leased to so-called homestead associations for as long as 100 years in some cases, under a plan wherein the Farm Security Administration will have a resident management to supervise the operations of these projects; in other cases these projects have been transferred at a fraction of their cost to so-called homestead associations organized by the Farm Security Administration, generally without any down payment and in some instances at least supplemented by large additional loans for operating expenses. (See exhibit III for a summary of the facts showing the failure of the Farm Security Administration to liquidate resettlement projects.)

It is evident that if these projects are to be liquidated in the true sense of the word that a more specific mandate must be given to the Farm Security Administration to require it to carry out the will of Congress. There should be a reasonable time limit provided to liquidate these projects entirely, and the liquidation should be bona fide and not spurious liquidation in which large Government investments will be turned over to associations of clients in name only while the Government in reality continues financial and managerial responsibilities.

FAILURE TO LIQUIDATE RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

Origin of Farm Security Administration responsibility for liquidation of projects

The origin of these so-called resettlement projects and the responsibility of the Farm Security Administration to bring about their liquidation is set forth briefly in the following excerpts from the testimony of Farm Security Administration officials. First, as to their origin, W. W. Alexander, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, in a statement to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the 1938 agricultural appropriation bill, stated:

"Mr. ALEXANDER. * * * There was a Division of Subsistence Homesteads set up in the Interior Department in an attempt to take care of industrial workers as part-time farmers or to aid in the development of part-time farms. There was in the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, I believe, an agency to carry out a program of land retirement, or submarginal-land retirement, for lands unsuitable for agriculture. There had also been an effort at debt adjustment. The debt-adjustment work was, I believe, originally under the Farm Credit Administration. A year ago last April, the President threw these programs together into one agency. They were related activities, and, in order to take care of them, the President created by Executive order the Resettlement Administration.

"Mr. TARVER. What was the date of that order?

"Mr. ALEXANDER. It was April 30, 1935. He threw all those activities together to handle the various problems of debt adjustment and subsistence homestead work, and the work the Federal Emergency Relief Administration had been doing. He threw all of them together into one program under the Resettlement Administration, and we have undertaken to work these various activities into a related program. The Division of Subsistence Homesteads had initiated through the purchase of land approximately 50 part-time farm projects (p. 1286)."

A list of these 50 projects inherited from the Division of Subsistence Homesteads appears on page 1287, Hearings of House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1938 agricultural appropriation bill.

In addition, 34 projects were inherited from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, according to Mr. Alexander's testimony, as follows:

"Mr. ALEXANDER. Then the Federal Emergency Relief Administration had attempted to aid some of those people who had been on relief to move onto farms and into communities where they could maintain themselves. There were 34 of these projects in various stages of development when they were handed over to us (p. 1287)."

The Resettlement Administration was placed in charge of Prof. Rexford G. Tugwell, whose philosophy is well known.

Later, Mr. Alexander testified that about 40 of such projects were started by the Resettlement Administration. (P. 1093, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1939 agricultural appropriation bill.)

Bankhead-Jones Act provides for liquidation of projects

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937, contained a provision for the liquidation of these projects, with provision for the completion and management until such time as they could be liquidated.

That it was the intention and desire of Congress to liquidate these projects, and that this was the ultimate purpose of this provision of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act are evident from the statements of members of the Appropriations Committee and from admissions in the testimony of Farm Security Administration officials. In 1942 Farm Administration Administrator, C. B. Baldwin testified:

"Mr. TARVER. I do not at the moment recall exactly the language of section 43 of title 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Do you have that language before you?

"Mr. BALDWIN. No, sir; I do not, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. TARVER. Give the substance of its provisions.

"Mr. BALDWIN. As I recall the act, this authorizes the appropriation of funds for carrying out of certain management and other activities on projects that had been inherited by the Resettlement Administrator.

"Mr. TARVER. Well, it contemplated the liquidation of these projects?

"Mr. BALDWIN. The liquidation of these projects and the management of them. The management of them in various ways; yes, sir." (P. 223, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.)

It is further significant that after the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Act in 1937 there was inserted an item in the 1939 agricultural appropriation bill which was considered by Congress in 1938. This item was officially designated as follows: "Liquidation and management of resettlement projects." The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, described it as follows in the hearings:

"Mr. CANNON. The next item covers liquidation and management of resettlement projects and is as follows:

" 'To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 522–533), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as authorized by said act, $2,000,000.' " (P. 1089, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1939 agricultural appropriation bill.)

The official justification of estimate submitted in behalf of this proposed item by the Farm Security Administration stated:

"The 1939 estimate provides for a new appropriation of $2,000,000 for liquidating and managing resettlement projects, which have been financed heretofore entirely under emergency funds." (P. 1089, hearings.)

Farm Security Administration took over Resettlement Administration

In January 1937 the Resettlement Administration was moved to the United States Department of Agriculture and was operated as an agency of that Department. In September 1937 this agency was converted into the Farm Security Administration. (Testimony of W. W. Alexander, Farm Security Administrator, p. 1094, Hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on agricultural appropriation bill for 1939.)

Repeated instructions by Congress and promises by Farm Security Administration Officials to liquidate these projects

Farm Security Administration officials have been admonished repeatedly by members of the Appropriations Committee and Farm Security Administration officials have repeatedly promised during the consideration of their appropriations to liquidate these projects. The following significant excerpts are quoted from the testimony on appropriations requested for this purpose:

In 1938, Farm Security Administrator Alexander testified:

"Mr. UMSTEAD. * * * I assume therefore that the items covered on the justification sheet referred to either will have been completed by the end of the present fiscal year or there will be funds available from the estimated 1938 allocations to enable you to finish those projects?

"Mr. ALEXANDER. We expect to get them completed by the 1st of July, sir. We are not asking for money for further expansion of these projects." (P. 1094, Hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1939 agricultural appropriation bill.)

In 1939, Assistant Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, Mr. Baldwin, testified:

"Mr. BALDWIN. * * * The purpose of this appropriation is to enable us to furnish management and collection services, technical services, and supervision of land development and property maintenance.

"Mr. CANNON. There is no extension or expansion of any kind; it is merely a process of eventual liquidation?

"Mr. BALDWIN. Eventual liquidation and management; yes, sir.

"Mr. DIRKSEN. By liquidation you mean what?

"Mr. BALDWIN. For instance, Mr. Dirksen, in the last year, or little over a year, we have actually disposed of 2,559 properties—individual units.

"Mr. DIRKSEN. You have sold them.

"Mr. BALDWIN. We have sold them; yes. And that process will be continued. We do not think it is well for us to move too fast, because we have not had enough experience with some of the people located there to know whether they will make good owners or not." (P. 1188, Hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1940 agricultural appropriation bill.)

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this testimony is that Congress intended for the Farm Security Administration to close out these projects by means of individual sales and that the Farm Security Administration officials pledged Congress to sell out these projects as rapidly as feasible. In view of the fact that these statements were made in connection with the appropriation of funds for this work, such pledges are all

the more significant and binding, as an obligation on the part of the Farm Security Administration.

Again in 1940, Assistant Farm Security Administration Administrator Baldwin testified:

"Mr. CANNON. When do you expect to complete liquidation of these projects?

"Mr. BALDWIN. Well, Mr. Cannon, there were 160 of these projects, and we are moving as rapidly in that direction as we can, but it is going to require several years to liquidate these properties. I would not care to venture an answer as to just how long." (P. 967, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee, on 1941 agricultural appropriation bill.)

Again in 1942, Farm Security Administration Administrator Baldwin testified:

"Mr. LEAVY. And it is your intention and your policy and part of your program to liquidate them?

"Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir." (P. 268, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee, 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.)

EXPANSION INSTEAD OF LIQUIDATION OF THESE PROJECTS

Notwithstanding the repeated admonitions from Congress and the repeated assurances given to Congress when additional appropriations were requested from Congress for this work from year to year, as indicated above, the record discloses that the number, acreage of land, number of family units to be provided for, and the Government's investment was increased. Instead of liquidating these projects, the Farm Security Administration actually extended the scope and extent of the Government's operations and investment. It would appear that this has been done under the guise of completing projects and management of projects.

After the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Act in 1937 and the insertion of the appropriation item for "Liquidation and management of resettlement projects" in estimates for the fiscal year 1939, Farm Security Administrator told Congress, as quoted above that they expected to complete all these projects by the 1st of July 1938, and added: "We are not asking for money for further expansion of these projects." (P. 1094, hearings.)

Assistant Administrator Baldwin likewise told Congress in 1938 there would be no extension or expansion of any kind. He said:

"Mr. CANNON. There is no extension or expansion of any kind; it is merely a process of eventual liquidation.

"Mr. BALDWIN. Eventual liquidation and management; yes, sir." (P. 1188, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee, 1939 agricultural appropriation bill.)

The addition of the words "and management" to Mr. Baldwin's reply to Congressman CANNON's question is of particular significance, as it sheds light on the apparent purpose which even then seems to have begun to take form, namely to see to it that the original purpose of these resettlement projects be continued in one way or another and that the Farm Security Administration maintain its management or control or supervision over them over a very long period of years, or even indefinitely.

It is obvious, however, from the testimony given at that time, that Congress was led to believe that these projects would not be expanded and would be disposed of by sale and the Government's investment liquidated as rapidly as possible.

What is the record?

In 1942, Farm Security Administrator Baldwin, after 4 additional years of liquidation and management of these projects, was asked for an accounting. Members of the House Appropriations Committee, during its consideration of Farm Security Administration appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 requested full information with respect to the status of these projects to be inserted in the record of the hearings. In response to the request of Chairman TARVER, Mr. Baldwin inserted the following information:

"The total acreage transferred from the predecessor organization to the Farm Security Administration was 753,408 acres.

"The total acreage of projects which have not been fully conveyed or sold is 954,670 acres. However, of this acreage, 29,226 acres have been sold in individual farm units to individual farm families." (P. 223, vol. II, House Appropriation Subcommittee hearings, 1943, agricultural appropriation bill.)

Thus the total acreage in these projects, while they were supposed to be under liquidation by Farm Security Administration, was expanded from 753,408 acres to 954,670 acres, an increase of approximately 200,000 acres. This does not include lands already conveyed to Homestead Associations, etc., under the process of "liquidation." This would appear to indicate that the expansion of land acquisitions by Farm Security Administration might exceed 200,000 substantially during that 4-year period of liquidation.

Furthermore, a comparison of the data submitted by Farm Security Administration officials at the request of members of the House Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the 1943 Agricultural Appropriations bill (p. 226, insert No. 1) with earlier testimony of Farm Security Administration officials yield further significant information:

In 1937, Farm Security Administrator testified that 50 projects were inherited from the Division of Subsistence Homesteads, that 34 projects were inherited from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. (Pp. 1286–1287, hearings, House Appropriation Subcommittee on 1938 agricultural appropriation bill). In 1938 Mr. Alexander testified that about 40 of such projects were started by the Resettlement Administration, which agency was later taken over by Farm Security Administration. This makes a total of 124 projects which were reported to Congress up to 1938.

Although Farm Security Administration officials told Congress in 1938 that they expected to complete all projects by July 1, 1938, and that no money was asked for further expansion of existing projects, the official Justification of Estimate submitted by Farm Security Administration in support of its appropriation for this work for the fiscal year 1940, which was submitted to Congress in 1939, stated:

"The current construction and development program, which is virtually completed, consists of more than 140 projects located throughout the continental United States, providing homesteads for approximately 14,000 families." (P. 1187, hearings.)

By another year, a further expansion had taken place. According to the official justification of estimates for 1941 submitted by Farm Security Administration in 1940 in support of its requested appropriation, appears this statement:

"The current construction and development program, which is virtually completed, consists of more than 160 projects located throughout the continental United States, providing homesteads for approximately 16,000 families." (P. 968, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee, 1941 agricultural appropriation bill.)

A complete list of all the projects from their inception, the capitalized value, and the disposition made of them, was inserted by request of Congressman DIRKSEN in the 1941 hearings. (Pp. 978–981.)

By another year, a further expansion had taken place. According to the official justification submitted by Farm Security Administration in 1941 in support of its 1942 appropriations, the total number of projects had been expended to 193 projects with a total acreage of land aggregating 970,394 acres. The following is quoted:

"At the present time, there are a total of 193 projects under the administrative jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration. The projects are scattered throughout the United States in nearly all States, crop areas, and climates.

"Of the 193 projects there are 72 community projects, 30 subsistence homesteads projects, 3 suburban resettlement projects, 6 stranded group projects, and 82 scattered farms projects. A total of $135,189,835.47 has been expended in the purchase of land for, and in the development of, these 193 projects. This includes all expenditures made by all prior Federal agencies, State emergency relief, and rural rehabilitation corporations, and the Farm Security Administration. Of this total cost, $30,294,210.58 was expended for the purchase of 940,394 acres of land on which the projects are located. All other costs of developing these projects totaled $104,895,-624.89. The projects as now complete consist of 14,703 family units." (P. 108, hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee, 1942 agricultural appropriation bill.)

By June 30, 1941, a further expansion of these 193 projects had been made to accommodate 15,169 family units, at a cost of $30,-321,918.50 for land totaling 961,094 acres, which together with other development costs aggregating $105,815,062.34, brought the total investment to $136,136,980.84. (Insert No. 1, facing p. 226, hearings, vol. II, House Appropriations Committee, 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.)

Methods of liquidation

The manner in which the liquidation of these projects has been carried out up-to-date could scarcely be called a bona fide liquidation in the ordinary interpretation of that term as evidently construed by Congress.

Instead of selling these properties outright to bona fide purchasers, either as a whole or in individual units to responsible purchasers on a basis that would relieve the Government from further participation or control or supervision of such properties, they have been handled or disposed of in various ways, with the apparent objective of continuing experiments in collective farming on an expanded scale, of maintaining the Government's investment for a long period of time, or for an indefinite period, and maintaining a system of supervision or control over these properties and the clients operating them for a very long period of time, if not indefinitely.

As shown by the foregoing excerpts from the hearings of the Appropriations Committee, it is clearly evident that Congress intended that these properties should be completely disposed of and the Government's interest eliminated as soon as practicable.

A number of these projects have been transferred to Homestead Associations. It appears that in such cases corporations are organized by Farm Security Administration known as Homestead Associations, and that the properties are transferred by Farm Security Administration to such associations in many cases, if not all, without any down payment and in some instances at least supplemented by additional loans for operating expenses. In a large number of cases these projects have been transferred to such associations at sales prices, if they can properly be considered as bona fide sales, which are far below the Government's investment.

For example, Mr. Baldwin told the House Appropriations Subcommittee during its hearings on the 1940 agricultural appropriations bill (p. 1188) that "in the last year, or little over a year, we have actually disposed of 2,559 properties—individual units." The plain inference to be drawn from this statement would be that individual units had been sold by the Farm Security Administration to individual persons, thereby eliminating the

Government's investment and terminating the collectivized project idea, so far as these units were concerned.

But when Mr. Baldwin was requested to submit further information concerning these sales he inserted in the record a statement which contained the following significant information:

"With very few exceptions, however, the individual sales price of each of these units has been equal to the cost of the farm site plus the cost of any improvements made thereon. These farm sites are sold under a contract providing for the payment of the purchase price in equal annual installments over a period of 40 years. It is our policy to offer these farm sites to our rural rehabilitation farm clients and in conjunction with the sale of the farm to consider and provide for his other rehabilitation needs.

"To date the following 14 projects have been sold and conveyed under sales contracts to incorporated homestead projects" (p. 1189).

The list appended thereto showed that the development cost to the Government of these 14 projects totaled $3,383,029 and the "selling prices" to these homestead associations totaled $1,958,388. In addition, it is admitted that in some cases, the selling prices by the associations to individual purchasers of some of these units was less than this cost.

Thus, instead of an outright sale by the Farm Security Administration of 2,559 properties to that many individuals, these properties were grouped into 14 projects and these properties transferred to homestead associations, which in turn were to sell individual units on a 40-year-repayment basis. Mr. Baldwin later testified that in the case of sales to homestead associations it is necessary for the Farm Security Administration to maintain management supervision to see to it that sales are not made less than the prices set by Farm Security Administration on the individual units. Thus, this method of "liquidation" serves the dual purpose of perpetuating the cooperative farming project idea and making necessary to maintenance of a staff of managers by the Farm Security Administration to supervise these projects.

A revised list of projects that have been conveyed to homestead associations was inserted in the record of the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee on the 1943 agricultural appropriation bill. This statement showed that 18 projects had been transferred at sales prices which totaled $2,627,989, whereas, the total Government investment in these properties amounted to $———.

That the real purposes in this method of liquidation was to continue to carry on in another form, these cooperative farming or resettlement projects so as to carry out their original purposes, with little or no consideration to the amount of the Government's investment, and to continue indefinitely the Government's management responsibilities, is indicated by the following statement of Mr. Baldwin during the 1943 hearings:

"Mr. LEAVY. And it is the plan to liquidate them so far as the Government is concerned?

"Mr. BALDWIN. To liquidate them insofar as is possible, Judge Leavy. However, the Government will continue to have an investment. We will continue to have certain management responsibilities that will continue indefinitely; for one reason, because of our creditor relationship, because you cannot, you just do not, dispose of these things and forget about them. It is not a matter of cash transaction and there is effort being made to carry out the purpose for which they were originally built. We think that should not be lost sight of." (P. 239, Hearings, 1943 agricultural appropriation bill, House Appropriations Committee).

Another method of "liquidation" has been to lease some of these projects to community farm cooperatives. In several of these projects they are operated on a communal basis, in whole or in part, wherein the occupants engage in collective farming, producing crops in common. These collective farming associations which have been organized presumably for this purpose by Farm Security Administration are given leases on these properties for varying periods of time, some of them running for nearly 100 years. At the request of Congressman TARVER, Mr. Baldwin submitted for the record a list of these leases, which reveals that one lease expires October 21, 2037; another December 31, 2038; another December 31, 1979; another December 31, 2038; another March 31, 2042; and another January 1, 2038. (See p. 257, Hearings, House Appropriations Subcommittee on 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.)

With leases entered into for nearly 100 years, it is obvious that this method of liquidation will assure that the Farm Security Administration will have management and supervision responsibilities for an indefinite period. This is a very clever scheme to assure continuation of these collective-farming projects and at the same time to provide a reason for continuing the Farm Security Administration organization to supervise these projects. Obviously, this is not liquidation in the ordinary meaning of the term.

The House Appropriations Committee in its report to the House commented on the collective-farming experiments being carried on by Farm Security Administration, as follows:

"The Administration is also carrying on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appears to resemble the practice of collective farming in Communist Russia. The committee believes this is wholly contrary to the spirit and the genius of the American way of life, and ought to be stopped." (P. 21, report on 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.)

An example of these collective-farming projects is the Lake Dick project in Arkansas. The following information with respect to this project and the way it has been liquidated is taken from information obtained from Mr. Baldwin by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the 1943 agricultural appropriation bill:

Mr. Baldwin revealed that "the first year of operation there were 65 farm families in residence on Lake Dick. There are only 26 families there now" (p. 242). There are 4,523 acres in the entire project (p. 243). This tract, which cost the Government $126,000 for the land and $545,000 for improvements, or a total investment of $671,000, was turned over to a farm-operating cooperative organized by the Farm Security Administration, and composed of persons residing on the project. They put no money in it. In addition, they were advanced $93,000 as an operating loan, out of which they bought equipment and furnished advances to the residents for food and subsistence. Mr. Baldwin testified that they had paid no interest, that the interest was waived for the first 3 years "because they were unable to make a payment," and that up until 1943, after more than 3 years of operation, none of the advances for subsistence had been repaid "because the association has not been until this year able to pay them" (pp. 245–246).

The project was leased to this association for 5 years on the basis of the cash equivalent of one-fourth of the cotton and cottonseed, and a third of all the crops," Mr. Baldwin stated. But when asked to supply information as to the amount received as rental, he inserted a statement which gave the crop production for 1940 but stated that the information for 1938 and 1939 was "not available." This is a remarkable situation, when the agency responsibility for administering and safeguarding the Government's investment in a 4,523-acre project in which the Government had $671,000 invested, does not have available the crop production after more than 2 years have elapsed (p. 247).

Mr. Baldwin further revealed that under this collective-farming plan there is no way by which the individuals who go on these lands can purchase the land under their contract; they go out there and use the lands in common and share the proceeds in common according to the amount of labor devoted to the farming operations by each of the individuals who are located on the lands. In direct response to such inquiry, Mr. Baldwin stated: "It is a joint enterprise of that type; yes, sir" (p. 248).

ILLEGAL PURCHASES OF LAND FOR RELOCATION PROJECTS

Instead of really liquidating all resettlements projects, the Farm Security Administration has embarked upon another far-reaching program of developing additional projects for relocation of farm families displaced by defense projects. The nature of these projects as described by the House Appropriations Committee in its report on the 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.

Chairman TARVER submitted a transcript of Mr. Baldwin's testimony with respect to these projects to the Comptroller General, who, after investigation, ruled that the Farm Security Administration had no legal authority to make loans to these various "relocation corporations" which were organized by employees of the Farm Security Administration for the purpose of buying land, utilizing the rural rehabilitation loan funds for this purpose. The Comptroller General of the United States said that these undertakings were of a type which "clearly resembles the resettlement projects of a type, the prosecution of which was restricted by section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to present to the Senate now copies of a crop and cattle mortgage to show the method of operation of the F. S. A. This relates to a loan to Samuel Wert Johnson, of Greensboro, Ala., Hale County. These are the official copies, taken from the court house, showing that a client of F. H. A. made one loan, and then made other loans in order to pay the interest on the loan he had already gotten.

This man, Samuel Wert Johnson, made his first loan in 1935. Then on the 15th of March 1939 he had a total loan of $732.72. The security for that loan was a mare mule named "Kate," a horse mule named "Jim," a cow named "Nancy," a heifer, 1 plow, and 1 wagon. That was the security given for a loan of $732.72.

On the 1st of May 1940 the same man increased his loan to $903.44 and gave a new deed of trust, and included in the deed of trust $56.59 of interest which he owed. He still had the mare mule named "Kate," but the horse mule named "Jim" had disappeared somewhere, was not there. He had the cow named "Nancy" and another named "Tiny," and a calf, along with some second-hand farm machinery, which would probably be worth practically nothing if put up for sale. Let us put the value at $100. That was the security.

The same man gave another deed of trust on June 6, 1941. This time he increased the loan to $1,220.18. The cow named "Nancy" was still there, but both the mules, the mare mule named "Kate," and the horse mule named "Jim," had gone somewhere else, because they were

not included in the deed of trust. He then had a horse named "Harry" and a mare mule named "Stocking Feet." He still had some farm machinery.

These loans were supposed to be made in order to rehabilitate farmers, to put them on a self-supporting basis. This man got his first loan in 1935, then it was gradually increased year by year until he owed $1,220.28 on the 6th of June 1941, with 1 cow, 1 calf, 1 horse, and 1 mule as security, along with some second-hand farm machinery. That demonstrates that the Farm Security makes additional loans in order to pay interest and to continue the loans the clients now have.

Furthermore, out of the $18,000,000 of grants to this organization last year, eight and a half million was given to the same people who had made rehabilitation loans. In other words, grants were given to those who owed money, and no one can say to what extent the loans, when they are repaid, are paying off by grants.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted a list showing the use of grants to repay loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF GRANTS TO REPAY LOANS

In addition to rehabilitation and tenant purchase loans, which are supposed to be repaid, the Farm Security Administration makes grants which are not repayable. Funds have been made available by Congress for grants to relieve destitution, to enable the Farm Security Administration to meet emergency situations such as result from crop failures and floods and to provide for medical care in emergencies. In actual practice, however, the Farm Security Administration appears to use grants as a means of balancing its borrowers' farm and home plans. That is, the grants are frequently used to improve a borrower's financial condition or enable him to repay a part of his loan.

Mr. Baldwin attempted to answer this charge by saying that total repayments have greatly exceeded the grants made to borrowers. This evades the issue. The Farm Bureau did not charge that all loans were repaid by grants It merely said that grants were in some cases used to reduce indebtedness and improve the client's financial position.

The evidence that this has been done still stands.

Writing from Mississippi, Mr. Carr says:

"In the State of Mississippi the grant check is openly used as a means of improving the financial status of clients. Grant checks are not issued the first year a man becomes a client, regardless of how poor he is or how great his needs are.

"The grant check is supposed to be given for canning equipment, food, clothing, personal and medical expenses, etc. This money is placed in the bank account with the other moneys and is not distributed or disbursed by the county home supervisor or the assistant county supervisor, who are the only persons who call upon the client and judicate his needs as far as the above-mentioned items are concerned."

Mr. Baldwin has not attempted to explain why grants are not issued until after a man has been a client for a year. If Farm Security Administration is only dealing with people who cannot get credit elsewhere and is rehabilitating them, it would seem they should be much less in need of charity after having had the advantages of Farm Security Administration supervision for a year.

Concerning this, Mr. Carr writes:

"It was admitted by a Farm Security Administration employee with whom I talked that the grant check was used for the sole purpose of improving the financial status of clients, inasmuch as these people needed food, medical aid, clothing, personal items, and canning equipment much worse when they were taken over by the Farm Security Administration than they did in later years."

In his report from Alabama, Mr. Carr described a number of specific cases where grants were used to improve the client's financial position and not to relieve destitution.

Joe Davis, of Tyler, Ala., became a Farm Security Administration client in 1939. At that time he received a loan of $257. In 1940 he was given a loan of $191.25, and a grant of $84.40. In an interview Mr. Davis stated that his mode of living was the same in 1940 as it was in 1939. He stated further that if he needed any help of the type for which grant payments are supposed to be made he certainly needed it in 1939 but he did not receive a grant check at all that year.

Ed Lewis, a client of the Farm Security Administration, and a member of the Black Belt Leasing Cooperative, Hale County, Ala., borrowed $2,406.50 from Farm Security Administration over a period of 3 years and repaid $163.46 in that time. In these 3 years he was given grant checks totaling $380. In all he received $2,786.50. The fact that a $30 grant was made in 1939 (his first year) and grants of $165 in 1940 and $185 in 1941 shows very clearly that the grant checks are used to decrease the amount of indebtedness of delinquent borrowers. If grants were made solely to relieve destitution the largest check would have been issued in 1939 when Lewis first became a client as he was certainly in greater need at that time. Asked to comment on his situation Mr. Lewis stated that he knew he could never pay off his indebtedness, but that he thought he would stick another year or maybe longer if he could get by.

Neither of the above cases has been refuted by Mr. Baldwin.

Additional evidence, if any is needed, is contained in a letter which was written to Sandy Garrett, a Farm Security Administration client at Childersburg, Ala, by A. M. Hocutt, Jr., county rural rehabilitation supervisor. This letter reads in part as follows:

"We have requested a grant for you in the amount of $99. You should receive this check within a few days. The check will come directly to you. When the check comes be sure to bring it to the Farm Security Administration office and we will deposit it with your loan check. This grant was necessary to balance your 1940 farm plan."

(A copy of the letter is attached.)

This letter clearly stated that the "grant was necessary to balance your 1940 farm plan." It doesn't say anything about relieving destitution, meeting an emergency, or providing medical care for the client's family. This checks with Mr. Carr's finding that—

"In making up this farm and home plan the first thing that is done is to estimate the amount of money the client will need as against prior indebtedness. The grant check is then used as a method to balance this farm and home plan, and, consequently, reduce the indebtedness."

Further evidence is contained in a statement made to Mr. Carr by George Fuller, rural free delivery No. 2, Talledega, Ala. Mr. Fuller says:

"I got 'on the Government' in 1938. I had enough money left over each year for the past 3 years. I was told by the Farm Security Administration to bring the grant checks to them and they would put them in the bank with the rest of my money and then use it to pay off my payment to the Government.

"I haven't been able to make a crop because the Farm Security Administration doesn't give me my money to plant the crop until 3 months after it should have been planted."

A similar case is that of Will Knight of Burkville, Ala., who told Mr. Carr that:

"I have received grant checks each year. Mr. Sallee of the Farm Security Administration told me to sign the grant checks and give them back and they would be put in the bank and used to pay off my payments when they became due."

Mr. Carr also reports that in Alabama—

"There are also the so-called work grants. This is a means of improving the status of the borrower by paying him for some supposed labor. Grant check given in this type of case does not cover material but is the labor alone. * * * Willis Ellis first became a client in 1941. He borrowed $340.50. Prior to the time he became a client through some bad luck, he became indebted in the amount of $170. * * * The Farm Security Administration sent him a letter * * * stating that he should put up shelves for canning, put up garden fence, and repair the fence for the lot. For this work he was paid the sum of $103.80 by grant check. * * * I took a statement from Mr. Ellis. * * * He states that he already had a good garden fence as well as shelves for canned goods, and that he repaired the lot fence in about an hour. For this work he was given $103.80, which is a rather high price for day labor in Alabama—or anywhere else. Mr. Ellis never saw the grant check, and he couldn't understand how it was deposited in his bank account without his signature."

Reporting on his findings in Arkansas, Mr. Carr says:

"The grant check is used in Arkansas to improve the status of delinquent borrowers in practically the same manner it is used in the State of Alabama.

"At the time the farm and home plan is made up and an estimate as to the amount of money a client will need is arrived at, the grant check is then used as a means of balancing this amount with prior indebtedness. * * *

"The grant check is sent to the client who endorses it and turns it back to the Farm Security Administration. The check is then placed in his bank account with the rest of his money and is used for whatever purposes is found necessary.

"Its effect in reducing indebtedness is twofold. In the first place, the client doesn't have to borrow as much money as he would without the grant check, and in the second place grant-check money can be used to pay off his indebtedness."

INSTANCES OF REFUSAL TO ACCEPT PAYMENT OR RETURN OVERPAYMENTS

In its investigation the Farm Bureau found that in a number of complaints Farm Security Administration officials have refused to accept the repayment of indebtedness in full or have kept overpayments without the consent of the client. Apparently such practices are used to keep the individual as a client under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, under the claim that his rehabilitation is not yet completed.

In Louisiana Mr. Carr found that—

"There are numerous instances of attempted payment on the part of clients and refusal on the part of Farm Security Administration to take the money. Mr. T. C. Gist, tried to pay his note three times. They took it the third time after he had been advised by an attorney as to what steps to take.

"Mr. J. W. Martin tried twice to pay off his indebtedness. The Farm Security Administration refused to take the money and also refused to give a reason as to why they don't take it. He also retained an attorney, made the offer to pay the money in legal tender in the presence of witnesses and then they accepted it."

In Mississippi Mr. Carr found that—

"Some clients have found it necessary to get lawyers to assure themselves of obtaining

credit for cotton which they sold. They produce the slip they received when they hauled in the cotton but were never given credit for it in their accounts with the Farm Security Administration."

Mr. Carr also "found several instances [in Mississippi] where landlords had gone to the Farm Security Administration and attempted to pay up a client's rehabilitation loans and they were refused the right to pay this."

Apparently the Farm Security Administration is more interested in keeping clients on its rolls than in receiving repayments on its loans.

Concerning overpayments, Mr. Carr writes from Mississippi as follows:

"There were numerous other cases where the client's check was for a larger amount than the payment due the Farm Security Administration. This difference was kept by the Farm Security Administration and the client's account credited with an overpayment. The overpayment remains as such during the following year. In the meantime client is loaned such sum as he needs to carry on his operation for the next year. I can see no reasonable explanation for this. The only thing it accomplishes is that it keeps the clients on the Farm Security Administration rolls and enables the Farm Security Administration to spend more money. In some cases this works a very distinct hardship.

"I am enclosing a farm-and-home plan of Nero Tyler, Jonestown, Miss., marking it "Exhibit 4," which shows in 1941 he was to make a payment to the Farm Security Administration in the amount of $732.56, his cotton check amounted to over $900. After the deduction was made for cash rent and after a $30 mule waiver, this entire sum was credited to his account, the difference being shown as 'overpayment,' he could not get the money. * * * I also was told of another case of a tenant-purchase client by the name of Mr. Chalmers Hill, who resided in the same county. He had a scheduled payment due of $920. His check amounted to almost $1,300, the difference was shown as 'overpayment' without the consent of the client."

All of these cases were placed before either the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures or the House Appropriations Committee, so they were available to Mr. Baldwin. No attempt was made to refute any of these cases except that of Nero Tyler. Referring to this case Mr. Baldwin merely said, "We have no record that he was dissatisfied with the repayments required of him." Obviously this is not a conclusive answer.

Concerning the general charge that Farm Security Administration has in some instances refused to accept payment in full or refund overpayments, Mr. Baldwin admits, "There may be instances of this," although he stated, "I would not approve the practice." (P. 769, pt. 2 of the House Hearings on the 1943 agricultural appropriation bill.) Nevertheless Mr. Baldwin admitted that sometimes they don't think a family is "completely rehabilitated" even though it is in a position to repay its loan. The inference is that it is Farm Security Administration's policy to try to keep such families on its rolls.

Mr. Carr reported instances wherein the Farm Security Administration did accept payments where clients clearly demonstrated that they know their rights. For example, he writes from Mississippi:

"Clients on the Sunflower Plantation have had a great deal of trouble in paying their loans. One client had to hire an attorney, took two witnesses, and made the offer of payment in legal tender, and it was accepted.

"There were several instances brought to my attention where the clients had tried several times to pay their indebtedness and were refused the right. They then acted on the advice of an attorney, took two witnesses, and made the offer of payment in legal tender and it was accepted."

Mr. Carr reported numerous other instances in Louisiana as follows:

"There were numerous instances of attempted payment on the part of clients and a refusal on the part of the Farm Security Administration to take the money. Mr. T. C. Gist tried to pay his note three times. They took it the third time after he had been advised by an attorney as to what steps to take.

"Mr. J. W. Martin tried twice to pay off his indebtedness. The Farm Security Administration refused to take the money and also refused to give a reason as to why they wouldn't take it. He also retained an attorney, made the offer to pay the money in legal tender in the presence of witnesses, and then they accepted it.

"Mr. Martin borrowed $125 in 1941. This money was placed in a bank in his account. He withdrew $100 of it and used it for the expenses necessitated by production of his crops. He attempted to draw the remaining $25 but was refused the right to obtain it. The only reason the county supervisor would give him for the refusal was that he was doing very well. He never did get the $25 and had to borrow money from a private individual in order to finish the harvesting of his crop."

If the purpose of Farm Security Administration employees is to get clients rehabilitated and self-supporting as rapidly as possible, it is obvious that they should encourage clients to pay their debts as rapidly as possible and get off of Farm Security Administration rolls as rapidly as possible, instead of discouraging or attempting to prevent such action by clients.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted a comparison of agencies assisting small farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF AGENCIES ASSISTING SMALL FARMERS

The claim has been made that the Farm Security Administration is the only agency which assists small farmers. The fact is small farmers have received far more assistance from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration than they have from the Farm Security Administration. The assistance offered by the Farm Security Administration has been in the form of loans, grants and farm management advice. The assistance from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has been in the form of conservation and parity payments, price supporting commodity loans and increased income through the higher prices for farm products which have been brought about by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program. Agricultural Adjustment Administration records show that in 1940 more than 6,000,000 conservation checks were issued to farmers operating almost 80 percent of the cropland in the United States. The bulk of the conservation and parity payment money paid out that year went to the operators of small family sized farms. Approximately 81 percent of the conservation checks and 94 percent of the parity payment checks were for less than $100. In contrast to the 6,000,000 cooperators receiving conservation checks in 1940 the records show that on January 1, 1941, only 737,204 families had outstanding rural rehabilitation loans from the Farm Security Administration.

The effect which the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program has had on the income of small farmers is well illustrated by the case of cotton. In 1932–33 the 10,000,000 members of cotton-producing farm families received $526,059,000, or about $53 per capita from the production of cotton. In 1940–41 cotton farmers received $905,922,000, or $91 per capita from the production of cotton. After the enactment of the 85 percent of parity loan law last May cotton farmers in 1941–42 received $1,245,159,000 from cotton, or $125 per capita. Thus with the enactment of the 85 percent of parity loan law cotton income increased by about 40 percent from 1940–41 to 1941–42, despite the production of fewer bales in 1941, yet we are told that the Farm Security Administration is the only agency which offers help to the farmer on the small family-sized farm.

The bulk of the cotton farmers who received this increased income as a result of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and 85 percent of parity-loan program are small farmers who operate family-sized farms. Data supplied by Dr. O. C. Stine, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, indicates that 16 percent of all cotton farms contain less than 20 acres; 57 percent have less than 50 acres, and 80 percent contain less than 100 acres. Only 6 percent of all cotton-producing farms contain 175 acres or more.

Another indication of the small size of the average cotton farm is the high percentage of cotton farmers receiving small payments under the parity-payment program. Agricultural Adjustment Administration records show that 50.7 percent of all payees receiving cotton parity payments under the 1940 program received less than $20, while 78.1 percent received less than $40, 87.9 percent received less than $60, and 94.5 percent received less than $100. Translated into terms of bales, these figures mean that 50.7 percent of all the payees receiving cotton parity payments were paid for a production of less than 2.8 bales, 78.1 percent were paid for less than 5.5 bales, 87.9 percent were paid for less than 8.1 bales, and 94.5 percent were paid for less than 13.5 bales.

The best way to help the farmer is to get him a fair price for the things he has to sell. This is what the Agricultural Adjustment Administration's program is designed to do.

Approximately one-third of our farm population lives in the South and their major source of income is cotton. A large proportion of all low-income farmers are cotton producers. In 1940 the average per capita cash income of farmers in the South was only $166 in comparison with an average of $299 for all farmers.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Baldwin's "Rebuttal" to Farm Bureau Charges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BALDWIN'S REBUTTAL TO FARM BUREAU CHARGES

The reply of Farm Security Administrator Baldwin to the testimony and data submitted to Congress by representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation fails to refute successfully the charges made by the Farm Bureau.

Mr. Baldwin first attacks the manner in which the investigation was conducted and attempts to discredit it by name-calling and slurring attacks. Instead of making a thorough and impartial investigation or having one made to determine the extent of such charges with a view to correcting them and disciplining the employees involved, as one would properly expect the administrator who is responsible for the handling of over 900,000,000 acres of land, the collection of hundreds of millions of dollars in loans outstanding, and the supervision of over 18,000 employees, Mr. Baldwin seemingly has sought

principally to try to discredit and minimize the importance of the evidence cited.

In the first place, as President O'Neal explained and as General Counsel Donald Kirkpatrick explained to the joint congressional committee when this information was presented, this investigation was never intended to be a complete investigation on a Nation-wide scale of the operations and activities of the Farm Security Administration. As explained, an organization such as the Farm Bureau could not undertke such a complete investigation, as it had no power of subpena or power to command records, letters, or testimony of either Government officials or private individuals. Nor did it have the finances with which to conduct a Nation-wide investigation on a far-reaching scale. Every reasonable effort, however, was made to obtain as much information as possible within a comparatively short time, by sending investigators to numerous States to make a first-hand investigation of the practices and operations of the Farm Security Administration in these States.

A considerable amount of information was obtained by visiting a large number of counties and interviewing clients, Farm Security Administration employees and former employees, and reputable citizens within these States who had first-hand information of their own.

In some instances the information was given by Farm Security Administration employees or by clients, who, for obvious reasons, did not wish their names to be disclosed, and consequently the source of such information was kept confidential. In many cases, however, specific names and incidents were cited, and in many cases supporting evidence was submitted in the form of sworn affidavits, original signed letters, or photostatic copies thereof, and photostatic copies of official records and other documents. While, as already stated, no one ever pretended that this was a complete investigation, it did disclose startling and shocking conditions existing to such an extent as to merit a full and sweeping investigation of the practices, operations, objectives, and administration of the Farm Security Administration by an appropriate agency of Congress, with full authority to subpena witnesses, compel testimony, and records.

As stated repeatedly, the purpose of the Farm Bureau has been, not to abolish any needed assistance to farmers that is being rendered by this agency, but to correct the abuses, waste, and unnecessary costs in administering this program.

An examination of the rebuttal submitted by Mr. Baldwin to the evidence submitted by the Farm Bureau shows that he failed to successfully refute these charges. He attempts to dismiss many of the findings as idle gossip and rumor. He answers other charges, even where specific names, incidents, and even sworn affidavits were submitted in substantiation, by merely making categorical denials that the charges were true. In some cases he states that he has investigated certain charges and has found that the charges were unfounded, but he failed to submit proper refutation in evidential form, such as affidavits, records, or photostatic copies of record to show whether the alleged refutation is well-founded. Since Mr. Baldwin tries to discredit the investigation because affidavits or other documentary evidence were not furnished in every case, he should be consistent and furnish such evidence in every case, inasmuch as his organization should be in possession of detailed information with respect to dealings with all clients.

It is shocking indeed to find a public official charged by Congress with administering such large sums of Government funds for the welfare of destitute and low-income farm families taking so lightly these serious charges, supported as they are by a very substantial record of specific information, affidavits, and documents. His attitude is indicated by his statement that "if everything the American Farm Bureau Federation representatives said about those cases were true, * * * they would have no bearing on the significance and validity of the Farm Security Administration as a whole." (P. 893, pt. 3, hearings, Congressional Joint Committee for Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures.)

He says that they represent "at the most, a series of unconnected and widely scattered instances of bad judgment on the part of local officials of the Farm Security Administration." But when such serious conditions are reported on such a widespread scale and when they are coupled with the statements and testimony of Farm Security Administration officials themselves, they cannot be so lightly dismissed or the blame placed entirely upon "bad judgment on the part of local officials." In this connection, attention is invited to the statement made by Judge TARVER, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, during hearings on the 1943 bill in connection with an investigation which that committee conducted into the practices and affairs of the Farm Security Administration. Referring to certain specific instances cited by representatives of the Farm Bureau, Judge TARVER stated to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard:

"These may or may not have been isolated instances of bad judgment on the part of the farm supervisors and other officials in the field in making loans, but these are circumstances which should be sufficient to put you on guard to investigate the affairs of the Farm Security Administration and determine whether or not policies are being followed in the field which are contrary to the spirit and purpose of the program and which indicate wastefulness which ought to be curbed." (P. 743–744, hearings.)

"Mr. TARVER. That impresses me as a rather imposing record, when you say that among your employees there have been 346 cases referred to the Department of Justice.

"Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir; but that is over a period of 6 years.

"Mr. TARVER. Do you know of any other agency of the Government that has a comparable record, or in which there have been acts of embezzlement committed by 346 of the employees? To have 346 cases of embezzlement among your employees in 6 years time, it seems to me, would indicate a lack of care in the selection of your employees.

"Mr. BALDWIN. Every employee of the Farm Security Administration who handles any money at all is required to be bonded.

"Mr. TARVER. It is better not to have a crook, even if the crook has a bond on him." (P. 777, hearings.)

Mr. Baldwin caustically criticizes the Farm Bureau evidence because there are some cases in which the names of the individuals concerned are not given, or affidavits or other such documents are not given. Yet, again and again in his rebuttal he fails to present any such documentary evidence as he demands and in many instances merely makes a categorical denial of charges, so that we have only to depend upon his unsworn statement of the case, so far as the record is concerned.

For example, with respect to the case of Clifford Hamilton, whose sworn statement was submitted in evidence, Mr. Baldwin did not submit any affidavit in refutation but merely refers to an alleged statement "to our investigator" whose name is not given and who makes no oath nor submits any other evidence to attest the veracity of the circumstances. Mr. Baldwin merely says that Mr. Hamilton "stated to our investigator that he did not state that Mr. Lumbrick's only interest was to secure new Farm Security Administration clients. He said: 'What I did state was that Mr. Lumbrick's major interest was to get Farm Security Administration clients to participate in the artificial insemination project.'" No refutation is offered by Mr. Baldwin to that part of Mr. Hamilton's affidavit which reads as follows:

"This is to certify that I, Clifford Hamilton, Shelby County, Ill., was instructed by Arthur Lumbrick, supervisor of Farm Security Administration, to cooperate in the Artificial Breeding Association even though I objected to this cross of Guernsey bulls on my milking Shorthorn cows. Also instructed on that same occasion that unless I did cooperate in this service that the chattel mortgage held by the Farm Security Administration would be closed and I would be sold out in September 1940; for this same reason he told me I could not get a loan for seed beans to plant for hay and refused to consider it that same year."

The one thing in the affidavit which Mr. Baldwin attempted to rebut in the manner indicated above was the following statement:

"His interest was only for clients, not for service to farmers." (Affidavit reproduced on p. 788, House hearings, 1943 appropriation bill; Mr. Baldwin's rebuttal on p. 895, hearings, joint congressional committee, pt. 3.)

In regard to the case of Ed Lewis, a client of the Farm Security Administration and a member of th Black Belt Leasing Cooperative, Hale County, Ala., which was cited by the Farm Bureau investigator and a copy of supporting documents filed with the House Appropriations Subcommittee, including a copy of the farm and home plan of this client, marked "Alabama Exhibit 2," which showed that he had borrowed from Farm Security Administration $2,406.50 over a period of 3 years, that he had repaid $163.46, that he had received $380 in grant checks ($30 in 1939, his first year; $165 grant his second year; and $185 grant his third year) wherein it appeared that the grants had been used to aid the client to decrease the amount of indebtedness he otherwise would have owed, and it was alleged that Mr. Lewis stated he knew he could pay off his indebtedness, the only rebuttal offered by Mr. Baldwin to this case was the following statement:

"The case of Ed Lewis was discussed in somewhat haphazard fashion on page 805 of the hearings. It was charged that grants were made to repay his loan. I have already explained our policy of making grants to borrowers. (Hearings, pp. 914–916.) There is nothing in our records to indicate this policy has not been followed in the Lewis case" (p. 896, hearings, congressional joint committee).

No factual information is submitted concerning this case—only Mr. Baldwin's assertion "there is nothing in our records to indicate," etc.

In the case of William Rauscher, who made a sworn statement that he was solicited by a Farm Security Administration supervisor to buy stock in a proposed Farmers Union elevator but refused to do so, whereupon his grants were discontinued, Mr. Baldwin states that the Farm Security Administration "investigated this complaint in March 1939," and he adds: "It then appeared that there was no substance to the complaint." Mr. Baldwin states then that a review committee had decided that Rauscher did not need a continuation of his grant, but Mr. Baldwin does not deny the sworn statement that a Farm Security Administration supervisor solicited the client and put pressure on him to buy this stock. Such solicitation is in violation of Department of Agriculture regulations and the making of loans or grants for purchase of stock was probably illegal as there was no authorization either in the appropriation act or in the official justification submitted to Congress by Farm Security Administration stating the purposes for which loans would be made, to expend Rural Rehabilitation Loan funds for such purpose.

Similarly in the case of John Zeh, who submitted a sworn statement, Mr. Baldwin says "the complaint was found to have no substance," but again he does not deny or furnish any evidence to refute the sworn statement that this client was solicited by a Farm Security Administration representative to join the Farmers Union and told that before he could receive further grants, he must join and pay the $3.50, and that he borrowed enough to pay this sum.

In both of the above cases, the clients have made sworn statements, in February 1942, which reiterate the charges, despite the denials of local Farm Security Administration officials.

Although Mr. Baldwin made a general assertion that he did not endorse the solicitation of clients and that "if they should be called to my attention, I would take immediate administrative action to have the practice stopped, he does not indicate that he took any action to stop the solicitation referred to in the two foregoing cases nor to discipline the employees concerned, nor does he refute the charges of solicitation.

Mr. Baldwin complained to the House committee that "the committee does not even have the reports of the investigators" of the Farm Bureau. This statement was incorrect, as a file of these reports with copies of exhibits was filed with the committee. The receipt of this evidence is acknowledged by Chairman TARVER on page 761 of the hearings from which the following is quoted:

"Mr. TARVER. Before the committee begins its hearing of Mr. Baldwin, I wish to call the attention of the committee to a letter with attached documents, which was transmitted to me under date of February 12, 1942, by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. * * * It will be noted that the letter requests the incorporation in the record of the hearings of a very great volume of documentary matter, to which I called the attention of the committee during the examination of Secretary Wickard, regarding this same subject matter, a few days ago. Part of the mass of documentary matter consists of the reports written by Mr. William G. Carr, an attorney at law, who, it is stated by Mr. O'Neal, was employed under the direction of the general counsel of the American Farm Bureau Federation, with reference to matters alleged to have been investigated by him in the States of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, in connection with the administration of the affairs in those States of the Farm Security Administration." (Pp. 760–761, hearings.)

The fact is that Mr. Baldwin is guilty of the very thing that he inaccurately accuses the Farm Bureau. As already indicated in numerous instances, and there are many other cases, Mr. Baldwin did not submit the reports of his investigators to the committee for incorporation in the record. We must rely upon his statements, frequently of a very general character, as to what facts were found by his investigators.

With respect to the charge that grant payments are used as a means of aiding borrowers in repaying their loans, Mr. Baldwin stated: "Of course, we follow no such policy," but he did not offer evidence to refute the specific cases cited; in some instances, the clients themselves reported that they were instructed by Farm Security Administration employees not to cash their grant checks but to endorse them and return them to the Farm Security Administration office so they could be credited on their loans. A former Farm Security Administration employee admitted, according to Mr. Carr's report, that the grant check was used for the sole purpose of improving the financial status of clients.

In the case of Ed Lewis, whose farm and home plan for 1941 was offered in evidence by the Farm Bureau, showing in detail his increasing indebtedness, a grant of $30 in 1939 a grant of $165 in 1940, and a grant of $185 in 1941, a net worth of −$687.19, in support of his statement to Mr. Carr that he knew he could never pay off his indebtedness, Mr. Baldwin in rebuttal states "He is in better shape than he has ever been before in his life, and he intends to remain under the program which has been worked out with him"; but Mr. Baldwin supplies no financial statement for this client. Mr. Baldwin further revealed that "he has been recently visited by our representatives, and states that he is satisfied with his participation in our program." Mr. Carr had reported that Lewis stated that he thought he would stick another year or maybe longer if he could get by.

In the case of Joe Davis of Lowndes County, Ala., Mr. Baldwin states: "It is not clear why the farm and home plan of Joe Davis, of Lowndes County, Ala., was introduced. We assume that the purpose was to show that too heavy a debt burden was placed on Mr. Davis." The purpose was clearly stated in Mr. Carr's report as follows:

"I am enclosing the farm and home plan of Joe Davis of Tyler, Ala., marking it exhibit 3–a. This shows that he became a client of the Farm Security Administration in 1939. At that time he received a loan of $257. In 1940 he was given a loan of $191.25, and in 1940 was made a grant of $84.40. I talked with this client at some length and found that his mode of living was the same in 1940 as it was in 1939. He stated that if he needed any help for the items which grant checks are supposed to be given for he certainly needed it in 1939 but he did not receive a grant check at all for that year. In 1941 he received a grant check of $84.10 and in 1941 his indebtedness, evidenced by notes, increased from $448.25 to $702.25, less payments of $139.98, as is shown by exhibit 3.

"This case, I feel, is further evidence of how the the grant check is used to decrease the indebtedness, rather than the purpose for which it is intended."

Mr. Baldwin in his reply after giving the amount of his loans and payments, but making no mention of grant payments, says that the client is slightly delinquent and adds "his latest financial statement indicates that his loan is well secured." (P. 896, hearings, joint congressional committee.)

He offers no refutation or information with respect to the alleged use of grants to improve the loan status of the client, nor did he submit for the record a copy or attested summary of the client's financial record. We merely have Mr. Baldwin's statement that "His latest financial statement indicates that his loan is well secured."

In the case of K. T. Thomas, in which it appeared from evidence submitted by Mr. Carr taken from mortgage records of the probate court of Hale County, Ala., that a loan had been made on insufficient security and that the client had been burdened with too heavy a loan, Mr. Baldwin states that "Our records indicate that the loan as a whole is well secured; that the borrower has a substantial net worth; and that he has met all repayments on his loan," and that his position was so good "that he will not require a production loan for the coming crop year." Again, no factual information is submitted for the record to test the statement that "the loan as a whole is well secured," etc. Mr. Carr submitted specific data from court records in support of his statement; in fairness, Mr. Baldwin should have given detailed information as to what the Farm Security Administration records showed with respect to this case.

With respect to the charge that numerous houses were torn down on the Loch Lomond Plantation when it was taken over by Farm Security Administration, and that these houses were in excellent condition, made out of the finest hard cypress, built to last a hundred years, and with copper screens on windows and doors, and that new buildings were erected with resultant increase in the financial burden of the tenant purchasers, Mr. Baldwin states that "our records and the judgment of our experts is to the contrary."

Mr. Baldwin admits that production was reduced on several plantations taken over by Farm Security Administration and divided upon into tenant-purchase units, but he blames this upon the overcrowded condition of the plantations prior to Farm Security Administration control and to the subdivision into individual tracts. He explains, significantly, "Under previous management it was possible to concentrate the cotton on the best cotton land. Under the present system of operation, each operator has to produce cotton on his own farm. Some of the cotton may, hence, be produced on relatively poor cotton land." (P. 398, hearings, congressional joint committee.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a statement made by the Farm Credit Administration with respect to the number of loans handled by them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHEDULE A

Loan years (calendar)	Loans made		Loans repaid as of Dec. 31, 1941				Unpaid as of Dec. 31, 1941		
	Number	Amount	Number	Percent of number made	Principal amount repaid	Percent of amount loaned	Number	Amount	Percent of amount loaned
State of Virginia:									
1929	2,435	$255,913							
1930									
1931	19,886	2,313,335							
1932	12,372	1,106,479							
1933	18,127	1,428,936	65,142	72.5	$6,293,993	80.2	24,686	$1,550,745	19.8
1934	10,909	760,070							
1935	9,895	741,665							
1936	7,785	525,505							
1937	8,419	712,835							
Total 1929 to 1937, inclusive	89,828	7,844,738							

SCHEDULE A—Continued

Loan years (calendar)	Loans made		Loans repaid as of Dec. 31, 1941				Unpaid as of Dec. 31, 1941		
	Number	Amount	Number	Percent of number made	Principal amount repaid	Percent of amount loaned	Number	Amount	Percent of amount loaned
State of Virginia—Continued.									
1938	8,468	$718,800	7,499	88.6	$664,223	92.4	969	$54,577	7.6
1939	8,024	741,265	7,101	88.5	683,189	92.2	923	58,076	7.8
1940	7,225	714,535	6,400	88.6	655,800	91.8	825	58,735	8.2
1941	7,014	726,605	4,685	66.8	[1] 534,878	73.6	2,329	191,727	26.4
Total, all Virginia loans	120,559	10,745,943	90,827	75.3	8,832,083	82.2	29,732	1,913,860	17.8
Entire United States (including Hawaii and Puerto Rico):									
Crop and feed loans:									
1929	46,067	5,758,680			3,935,678	68.1		1,823,002	31.9
1930	45,300	5,340,727			3,719,580	69.6		1,621,147	30.4
1931	438,952	55,787,096			41,694,443	74.7		14,092,653	25.3
1932	507,631	64,204,503			42,535,986	66.3		21,668,517	33.7
1933	633,585	57,375,939	1,999,003	67.0	48,153,450	83.9	984,000	9,222,489	16.1
1934	445,189	37,891,586			24,455,900	64.5		13,435,686	35.5
1935	424,441	57,419,914			31,782,820	55.3		25,637,094	44.7
1936	188,944	16,629,190			13,156,908	79.1		3,472,222	20.9
1937	252,894	32,503,280			21,862,652	67.3		10,640,628	32.7
Total 1929 to 1937, inclusive	2,983,003								
1938	174,557	19,647,535	134,328	76.9	15,678,072	79.8	40,229	3,969,463	20.2
1939	139,452	15,079,509	118,814	92.4	13,680,542	90.7	20,638	1,398,967	9.3
1940	160,789	19,516,630	128,141	79.7	17,060,519	87.4	32,648	2,456,111	12.6
1941	146,836	18,128,231	87,778	59.8	[2] 12,027,070	[2] 66.3	59,058	6,101,161	33.7
Total all crop and feed loans	3,604,637	405,282,820	2,468,064	68.4	289,743,680	71.5	1,136,573	115,539,140	28.5
1934–35 drought feed loans	300,614	72,008,540	92,755	30.8	24,119,333	33.5	207,859	47,889,207	66.5
Total, all loans	3,905,251	477,291,360	2,560,819	65.5	313,863,013	65.8	1,344,432	163,428,347	34.2

[1] Collections on the 1941 loan in the State of Virginia at Mar. 31, 1942, are $600,821 or 82.6 percent of amount loaned.
[2] Collections on the 1941 loan at Mar. 31, 1942, are $13,762,223 or 75 percent of amount loaned.

Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

SCHEDULE B

Calendar year	Average number of regular employees	Total yearly expense	Average yearly expense per employee	Average number unpaid loans per employee	Average yearly cost per unpaid loan	Average number of loans serviced per field supervisor
Baltimore office: [1]						
1929						
1930						
1931	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
1932						
1933						
1934						
1935	72	[3] $183,136	$2,543	861	$2.95	1,790
1936	77	223,772	2,906	789	3.68	2,014
1937	79	245,322	3,105	809	3.84	2,420
1938	88	267,730	3,042	725	4.20	2,170
1939	83	244,319	2,945	766	3.84	2,390
1940	83	251,826	3,034	783	3.86	2,330
1941	87	266,742	3,066	802	3.82	2,340
Entire United States (including Hawaii and Puerto Rico):						
1929						
1930	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
1931						
1932	2,188	5,183,194	2,369	380	6.23	1,480
1933	2,282	5,160,341	2,260	593	3.82	2,190
1934	1,893	5,879,450	3,106	876	3.55	3,220
1935	1,831	5,698,184	3,112	913	3.42	3,120
1936	1,542	4,139,483	2,685	999	2.69	3,070
1937	1,423	3,884,881	2,730	1,096	2.49	3,320
1938	1,384	3,771,546	2,720	1,104	2.47	3,750
1939	1,333	3,576,029	2,690	1,125	2.38	3,340
1940	1,280	3,505,966	2,750	1,182	2.34	3,380
1941	1,300	3,618,692	2,783	1,164	2.39	3,170

[1] Baltimore office serves 5 States—Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; also Puerto Rico office opened July 1935.
[2] Baltimore office opened Sept. 21, 1934.
[3] 1935 yearly costs low for the reasons: (1) Puerto Rico office not opened until July 1935. (2) Virginia field force on Memphis regional office pay rolls until spring of 1935.
[4] Not available.

Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like first to say a word of commendation of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, having charge of the pending bill, as well as to commend the members of his subcommittee. There is no chairman of a subcommittee who brings a bill on the floor of the Senate who has a more thorough or more intimate knowledge of the bill, of its different provisions, and who makes a more intelligent presentation of the provisions of the bill, than the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

I wish to dissent sharply from the statement of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in his statement that Mr. Baldwin is a Communist. I have known Mr. Baldwin for 8 or 9 years. When I was a Member of the House of Representatives I worked in close collaboration with Mr. Baldwin on many different matters. I have sat in many meetings and conferences with Mr. Baldwin. I have heard him express his views many times. I have never heard him utter one word or express one single thought and I have never known of him to do one single thing which would in any way give the basis for any such charge. On the contrary, everything I have ever heard Mr. Baldwin say and everything I have ever known him to do have been absolutely such as to make it apparent that he has full and absolute belief in America and in her institutions.

Mr. Baldwin has within his heart the gospel of humanity. He has a great passion to help and to do something for disadvantaged and underprivileged and exploited men, women, and children. If he has erred, his errors have been due, in my opinion, more to his zeal and to his devotion to human welfare, human rights, and human progress, than to any other thing.

Mr. President, I wish to say on the floor of the Senate, to the Members of the Senate, and to the Nation, that, in my opinion, Mr. Baldwin has not only been an able, devoted, and faithful public servant, but that he has at all times been an able, devoted, loyal, and patriotic American.

I have often thought that perhaps the finest passage in the Bible is to be found in the words—

Where there is no vision the people perish.

Mr. Baldwin has vision. He has the ability to project his mind and look down the corridors of time. If there is any one thing that America needs and has needed it is men of vision as her leaders in places of public trust in her Government. Mr. Baldwin is this type of public servant and leader.

Mr. President, "by their fruits" we are told, "we shall know them." Seven years

ago nearly one-half of the 32,000,000 farm people of our country were living in tenancy, sharecropping, or by day-to-day labor, with no land of their own, the masters of not a single acre and with little or no encouragement to save the soil or make better homes for themselves and their families. There had been a constant and tremendous increase in farm tenancy, particularly in the great wheat and corn and cattle sections of the country.

The Congress established the Farm Security Administration and during the past 7 years more than 1,000,000 farm families, either once on relief or dreadfully near the necessity for relief, have been started toward permanent self-support through the different programs of the agency. These farm families received from Farm Security Administration small loans that enabled them to revise their farm operations so that they no longer had to depend on the old one-cash-crop system which had held them poverty bound.

The Farm Security Administration taught them the importance of producing their own food and the feed for their livestock; taught them to develop at least two cash farm enterprises, so that they would have some cash income; taught them methods which rebuilt soil fertility. Thirty-eight percent of these farm families did not even have a cow when they got their loans—their children had no milk to drink; 43 percent of them did not possess a single hog, and 30 percent had no garden of any kind.

Last year the average one of these farm families produced 391 gallons of milk; 397 pounds of meat for home consumption, and canned a total of 226 quarts of fruits and vegetables, and they and their children at last began to live.

Farm Security Administration embarked upon a program to make medical care available at prices that low-income farm families could afford to pay, working under agreements with State and county medical associations. A survey made in Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Florida shows that because of this program and balanced diets only 23.3 percent of the boys from Farm Security Administration families have been found unfit for Army service, whereas, on the contrary, 35.9 percent of all draftees in the area were rejected.

To date the Farm Security Administration has loaned $574,000,000 to farm people who could not get credit from any other source. Based on past repayments, it is conservatively established that at least 80 percent of all Farm Security loans, both principal and interest, will be repaid.

Contrast the Farm Security Administration loan, with its rehabilitation, its repayment, its rebuilding of the citizen, with the expenditure of $350 a year that it costs to maintain a farm family on direct relief, with no rehabilitation, no repayment, and no rebuilding of the citizen.

It is declared that the work of the Farm Security Administration must be abolished in the name of economy. We are told that our expenditures must go into war effort.

The President and the Department of Agriculture are calling for an all-out agricultural production program to win the war. We must have 3,000,000 additional acres in peanuts to take the place of oil we cannot import and 3,000,000 more acres of soybeans. We must have 9,000,000 more pounds of milk, 9,000,000 more hogs, and billions more eggs—more and more foodstuff of all kinds.

The real contribution to this all-out production necessity can be made only by the small farmer. The large commercial farmers are already producing almost to their capacity, their herds and fields are getting near maximum yield, while new difficulties face them because of lack of skilled and unskilled labor.

It is the small farmer—the low-income farmer—who, with his own and his family's labor, must supply the large amount of our war food increases. To do this the low-income farmer must have financial help from the Farm Security Administration to get fertilizer, work stock, machinery, and seed, and he must have direction from the Farm Security Administration on how to use these things for greater production.

The Farm Security Administration must continue its work to enable the low-income farmer to do his part in winning the war.

Many as are the problems facing us in this hour, we must not forget the lessons of the past. We must not permit the displacement or destitution of our farm families. We must preserve at all costs the democratic concept of the free American farmer on his own plot of land. We must preserve our American rural life, for when the present struggle is over we can have a sound and healthy economic existence only if we have a sound and healthy agriculture.

We fight for the "four freedoms."

I am proud that the Farm Security Administration has helped so many of our farmers to prove the mettle of their pastures and has helped by friendly assistance and leadership to nurture them to freedom from want, enabling them to again stand erect, independent, self-supporting and useful citizens for agriculture and for all the best interests of our country—enabling them to salvage and to save their children and "rebuild in them the music and the dream."

What shall the sacrifices of our boys in the far islands of the sea, yes, in the struggle for our own land; what shall their sacrifices, their sufferings avail us; what shall it avail us if we gain the whole world but lose our own soul?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know of no class of our people whom Burns might have had more completely in mind when he said:

> Man's inhumanity to man
> Makes countless thousands mourn.

than the underprivileged farm class of this country. I do not have the statistics before me relative to farm income exclusively, but I know that as of recent date the statistics generally indicate that about 14 percent of the 29,000,000 American families have an annual income of less than $500 a year; 42 percent less than $1,000; 65 percent less than $1,500; 87 percent less than $2,500; 97 percent less than $5,000; and that only 1 percent of the whole 29,000,000 families have an annual income of $10,000 or more.

In other words, so far as annual income is concerned, Members of Congress are privileged to be in the class which constitutes 1 percent of America's 29,000,000 families. Nearly half of America's families have an annual gross income of less than $1,000. It is to those homes, to a large extent, to which we must look not only for the citizenry but the soldiery of America. Indeed, upon them, to a large degree, depends the issue of the struggle for freedom which today shakes the world.

What are we fighting for? A little while ago we saw in certain parts of the world no great enthusiasm for the side with which we are associated in this war, perhaps due to the fact that the natives saw no great preference in the choice they had to make between their then masters and the would-be masters who were knocking at their doors. Perhaps those associated with us, whose friendship and cooperation we esteem, had not made it sufficiently clear to those people that if our cause prevails new horizons of life will be opened up, even to the savage, the slave, or the underprivileged citizenry of a subjugated land.

On the contrary, in the areas where we had granted the boon of freedom, where we had lent the helping hand in good will with honesty, we have found a quality of courage, bravery, and sacrifice which has been an epic in human heroism. All of us, of course, know that what I have said relates to our comrades in the Philippines. So it seems that from a people who have enjoyed favor and fortune at our hands we have militant support. In other areas, where freedom has not been held out as an assurance, we do not find that kind of sacrificial comradeship in arms.

Here at home, in my opinion, is a good place to begin to show what we offer to the human race if our cause, God helping us, is victorious in this contest. If in a rich land like the United States we cannot offer adequate health to our people; if we cannot give sufficient housing to our citizenry; if we cannot bestow upon them the elemental advantage of a decent education; if we cannot open unto them the beckoning doors of economic opportunity, I wonder if we are worthy to be depended upon by the less fortunate peoples of the earth as harbingers of a new day for the rest of mankind. In our own country, in my own State, American families are living in squalor which should be obnoxious to the sensibilities of any man. Yet too often when we propose to lift them up, to give them the advantage of their country's concern, guidance, and help, well-intentioned but uninformed men say that it is an extravagance and a profligacy, and that we are wasting our substance upon riotous living for the benefit of undeserving people.

Mr. President, the Farm Security Administration appropriation is a guide; it is a straw in the wind to indicate the way. We are thinking about democracy. A few evenings ago I had the privilege of listening to the distinguished Minister

from New Zealand, Mr. Nash. I had heard of him by repute. I heard him tell an epic tale of what was being done in his country to make democracy work for its people. I honor the experiments and the success they have shown. If the Government wills it, and its leaders are intelligent, courageous, understanding, and patient, the Government may be a boon to man, may lift up the downtrodden, and hold the light for those who have struggled in darkness all the days of their life.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. It might interest my friend from Florida to have suggested to him some figures with respect to farm income which appeared in the National Grange Monthly for May 1942. This article refers to the 1940 census, which reveals figures as to housing conditions, concerning which the Senator is speaking, and the farmers' rather unfavorable income position from that angle.

In 1940 the per capita net income of the country was reflected in a nonfarm income of $700. The farm income from crops including an allowance for rent and produce used from the farm, was $169, and Government payments were $183. Among the farm homes 16.1 percent were overcrowded. Thirty-three and nine-tenths percent of the homes were in need of major repairs, and, according to this table, 89.4 percent were without a private bath, which will give us some idea of what the American farm home is like.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, why have these conditions not been improved in the United States? Is it because we do not know the facts? I regret to say that there are some who will not admit them, and unhappily others not informed of them, because the highway upon which they have trod has not led them by the low places where humble men and women have lived in abject poverty.

I hear some of my colleagues speak about having come up through the humble walks of life, as did many of the others of us, but it has been a long while since my able friend, the Senator from Tennessee, has had an income of less than $5,000 a year. It is easy to sit on the Appropriations Committee and talk about what is demoralizing the farm family when we are spending $10,000 a year for our own sustenance, living in commodious hotel surroundings, eating too much food, and having other conveniences and comforts. It is a very easy pastime to speculate, as a philosopher, on what is good for the impoverished and wonder if we are not being too generous with him, letting him have too many benefits, too comfortable a bed, too good a home, or too many visits to the motion-picture theater.

When governmental agencies are fixing living wages for workers in factories and defense plants we talk in terms of an American standard of living, and rightly so. I am glad to see every additional dollar which has been added to the income of the worker in the factory. In most cases he deserves it. I am glad to see the children of the factory worker, the skilled laborer, and the artisan able to go to school and live the life which American children deserve to live. Yet I hear Senators scorn a program which would include the possibility of the child of a poor family occasionally going to a picture show. A little provision is made for his health. A pittance is included for payment of doctors' bill for the health of the family. There is even included an allowance for paying a dentist, in order that the children in the Farm Security home may have some chance of having their teeth taken care of. The whole income has been budgeted and balanced, insofar as possible, so that recreation, health, and living conditions may all be provided for.

We take good care of the members of the farm federations. Oh, they have their eloquent and distinguished spokesmen here in advocacy of the cost of parity. Do we deny to them in the consideration of the parity price a chance for their children to go to the picture show or to pay a doctor's bill or to enjoy a little recreation generally; or do we, as the Senator said, make provision for them to pay their membership fees in the Knights of Pythias lodge, or even as the distinguished Senator from Maryland indicated, perhaps take a hard drink every now and then?

Too often when we speak about aid to agriculture we are talking about the type of farmer who needs help, but not more so than do others who happen also to be chained to the soil of the farm, to the good earth.

There are other farmers who are even more needy than they, if preference must be shown I would not take away a dime from the benefits which go to the farmers of this country. They deserve all the benefits they receive, and more. I want to see the mandate of this Congress indicated to Mr. Leon Henderson and to anyone else concerned. The protection which the Congress has intentionally and designedly thrown around farmers in respect to what they are to receive for the products of their labor and their farms must not be taken away from them.

It seems to me that this group of our citizens more than any other should appeal to the sympathy and understanding of Congress and the country. Mr. Baldwin assures me in a letter which I have on my desk, that the particular appropriation has now been cut to such a point that only one-half the migratory-labor camps which are already constructed and in existence can be operated in the fiscal year for which this bill makes appropriations, whereas the Bureau of the Budget recommended that $105,000,000 be made available to these little farmers by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order that they may aid in the defense effort, the prosecution of the war, by the production of food. That appropriation has been cut to $50,000,000 by the committee.

I do not know why the committee chose to ignore the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, accompanied by a letter from the President. I do not know what special knowledge it may have had which was not available to the Bureau of the Budget or to the President. Mind you, Mr. President, that request was a supplemental request, evidently related to a need which the Bureau of the Budget and the President knew to exist. However, I suppose it would avail nothing if I should offer an amendment to increase that amount, in the face of the action which the committee has taken. Such action simply means a continuation of the poverty and lack of opportunity to which many of our citizens have so long been accustomed. I suppose perhaps we might remember with some comfort and consolation to them the lines which Byron used in the Prisoner of Chillon:

> My very chains and I grew friends,
> So much a long communion tends
> To make us what we are—even I
> Regain'd my freedom with a sigh.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is now nearly 5 o'clock, and a number of Senators have left the Chamber with the understanding that probably there would not be a vote on the amendment today. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what his preference is in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not prepared to insist on a vote. However, I point out that the attendance of Senators is amazingly large for this hour of the day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; there is a rather good attendance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know when I have seen so many Senators present in the Senate at so late an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment were to be voted on this evening, and if a yea-and-nay vote were called for, which would probably be the case, it would be necessary to have a quorum call before the vote was taken. It is immaterial to me whether the amendment is voted on tonight or tomorrow. I am ready to vote now or tomorrow, whichever the Senator prefers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator advised that the yeas and nays will be requested on the amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has indicated that a record vote will be called for.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of that statement, I think we might as well let it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very much disappointed if the vote is postponed, inasmuch as I have already made arrangements to leave the city tonight. Of course, I know that we cannot adjust matters to meet the convenience of a single Senator, but I should dislike to lose a chance to cast my vote on the questions presented in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, I had hoped that we might vote on the whole bill today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky consider asking that a time be fixed when we may vote on the matter tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to vote on it as soon as we meet.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that at least one Senator now in the Chamber wishes to speak on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder if we can agree to vote on it not later than 1 o'clock tomorrow. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I had intended to discuss the subject matter involved in the Farm Security Administration controversy. I am perfectly willing to forego that privilege if it is desired to vote tonight; but if it is to go over until tomorrow I should much prefer that the time not be limited, because it is always possible for one or two Senators to take up all the time.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection to having a vote tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I suggest that we have a vote tonight.

Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum. I think we may get a quorum and vote tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Murdock
Andrews	Gerry	Norris
Austin	Glass	Nye
Bailey	Green	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Bilbo	Hill	Pepper
Bone	Holman	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hughes	Rosier
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brown	Kilgore	Schwartz
Bunker	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Lee	Spencer
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Doxey	Millikin	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 85, line 23.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the vote on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 85, line 23.

Mr. TAFT. To increase the appropriation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To increase the appropriation from $25,319,557 to $50,319,557.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], is unavoidably absent. If present h would vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Being assured that if present he would vote as I intend to vote, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I shall vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] had to leave the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago on an important matter. I have a pair with the Senator from Maryland on this vote. If I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea." If the Senator from Maryland were present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho was called). The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on business in Government departments.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Danaher	Murdock
Andrews	Doxey	Norris
Austin	Ellender	Nye
Bailey	Green	O'Daniel
Ball	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hughes	Pepper
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Rosier
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Schwartz
Brown	Lee	Smith
Bunker	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McNary	Truman
Chavez	Maybank	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Wheeler

NAYS—16

Brooks	Holman	Spencer
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	McFarland	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Willis
Gerry	Millikin	
Glass	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—32

Barbour	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Herring	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hill	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Chandler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Murray	Wagner
Downey	Reed	Wallgren
George	Reynolds	White
Gillette	Shipstead	Wiley
Guffey	Smathers	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the vote on the amendment on page 85, line 23, communications from the Railway Labor Executives' Association, from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and from the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, supporting the amendment which the Senate has just agreed to.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1942.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In our letter to you and all members of the committee, dated April 2, our association expressed its support in behalf of adequate appropriations for Farm Security Administration.

We now commend your committee for its recommendations for an enlarged Farm Security Administration food-for-victory program. We hope that the Senate will adopt your recommendations. We shall undoubtedly need maximum production of every farm family to meet our food and fiber needs in 1943.

A vote against your recommendations, we feel, will be a vote favoring ration cards for many food products in 1943, and be a blow at our war production and efficiency.

Very sincerely yours,
J. G. LUHRSEN, *Executive Secretary.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 16, 1942.*

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

May I reiterate the stand of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in support of more adequate assistance to the 2,700,000 low-income farmers of the Nation, especially

through the essential aid given by Farm Security Administration. The Congress of Industrial Organizations supports the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in increasing the food-for-victory program by $55,000,000 in loan authorization. This portion of President Roosevelt's request will promote the efficient use of human and land resources in 1943 and prevent the necessity for ration cards for meats and other foods. The Congress of Industrial Organizations commends your committee for restoring to the Agricultural Marketing Administration $44,500,000 which will allow expansion of the school-lunch program and continuation of the stamp plan, both of which are greatly needed. Although the committee has not seen fit to press for appropriations equal in adequacy to the provisions made for production of other war materials, such as planes, guns, and tanks. The committee is to be thanked for repulsing and rebuking those interests and spokesmen who would have used the war emergency to promote economic disfranchisement of working farmers. They are the same interests who have been defeated in their attempts to handcuff labor. The Congress of Industrial Organizations urges the Senate to stand firm on the recommendations of your committee.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Secretary, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1942.*

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
410 Senate Office Building:

Congratulations to you and your committee for your statesmanlike decisions on farm-supply bill. Our organizations and I, as their legislative chairman, are standing 100 percent behind you and the committee's recommendations. We are rallying all possible support for you. Please stand firm on the record and we will have won half of the battle for food. The farmers of the Nation will help you win the other half as the need arises. Our thanks to you for such leadership in time of world crisis.

M. W. THATCHER,
Legislative Chairman, National Farmers' Union; President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment, on page 87, line 5, in effect, is a part of the one just agreed to, providing, as it does, a part of the loan fund, and I think we should vote on it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 7, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. The only other committee amendment left, involving as it does the disposition of surplus commodities, could not possibly be acted upon this afternoon. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that it go over until tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Henry Grady Vien, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Arthur Roe, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Austin S. Imirie, to be principal administrative officer in national headquarters, Selective Service System.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl D. Krickbaum, of Pennsylvania, to be principal statistician in the Selective Service System.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there recently occurred a vacancy through death in the office of the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Illinois. The President has nominated Henry Grady Vien, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois. That nomination has been approved by the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate and was favorably reported from that committee earlier today. Under the rule of the Senate, that nomination must lie over for 24 hours. In view of the fact that the Federal grand jury for the eastern district of Illinois is in session at this time, I ask that the nomination be considered and confirmed today notwithstanding the rule.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, has the nomination been reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I so stated, I will say to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Grady Vien, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

INCREASED USE OF INLAND WATERWAYS FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 241, submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] on April 30, 1942, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported previously from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "seventh", to strike out "and succeeding Congresses," and to insert "Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "exceed" and the dollar sign, to insert "5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of means by which the inland waterways of the United States may be more fully utilized, with a particular view toward providing for increasing the use of existing waterways for the transportation of petroleum products and other articles and commodities. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee,

which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 245, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution, submitted by Mr. HATCH on May 12, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is hereby authorized to employ, beginning June 1, 1942, for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,880 per annum.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK J. BOLAND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 483) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
May 18, 1942.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 35 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS and Mr. GUFFEY], I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 252) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the terms of the resolution, the Chair appoints the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS and Mr. GUFFEY] the committee on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, May 18 (legislative day of May 15), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William Langdon Sands, of Florida, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Clarence W. Ogle, of Oregon, to be register of the Land Office at Lakeview, Oreg. (reappointment).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, CAVALRY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Second Lt. William Sayers McCauley, Cavalry Reserve.

APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Kenneth Earl Thiebaud, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from June 14, 1937.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Oscar Rawles Bowyer, Infantry (temporary major, Army of the United States, with rank from June 12, 1938.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Severin Richard Beyma, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1937.

First Lt. John Rigden Van Dickson, Infantry (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

Capt. Elwin Herklas Eddy, Field Artillery, with rank from June 11, 1941.

First Lt. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. Francis Carlton Truesdale, Infantry (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from July 3, 1940.

Second Lt. Jack Curtright McClure, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Marshall Warren Carney, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Curtis Francis Betts, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Samuel Wilson Parks, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Paul Allard Kirk, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM MAY 1, 1942

Lt. Col. Henry William Harms, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. John Earl Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Walton Harris Walker, Infantry (temporary major general, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Millard Fillmore Harmon, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Air Corps; temporary major general, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. John Duncan Kelly, Cavalry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 18 (legislative day of May 15), 1942:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry Grady Vien to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Austin S. Imirie to be a principal administrative officer in national headquarters, Selective Service System. (Compensation to be $5,600 per annum.)

Earl D. Krickbaum to be a principal statistician in the Selective Service System. (Compensation to be $5,600 per annum.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Philip H. Torrey et al. for promotion in the Marine Corps, which were referred to the committee on May 12, 1942.

(NOTE.—A full list of the persons whose nominations for promotion in the Marine Corps were confirmed today may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 4093.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 18, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Thou who hearest prayer and knowest our need, open our hearts and minds, making us aware that the whole earth is ablaze with Thy glory. Thou dost shed light upon every path and dost reveal the majesty of every common task. Continue to raise our conceptions of righteousness and justice and hold us beneath their sway for the sake of humankind and with an abounding realization that human liberty is hard to get and easy to lose. Come, dear Lord, from whom the living waters flow, and course through our deeds and purposes and make them pure.

Look Thou upon the afflicted ones who are stricken with grief and must take up their burdens again, finding strength and comfort in the blessed name of the Lord. Thou hast called unto Thyself, dear Father, one of our own; he loved his country, his church, and his Redeemer. To his memory we give unstinted tributes of personal worth and appreciation. "Thy will be done" in the name of St. Mary's Holy Child. Vouchsafe unto all his loved ones the peace and rest which flow from Thy holy presence. In the precious name of Jesus, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 14, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4476) entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LEE, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6927) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. DANAHER, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in this act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. War Production Board.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Thursday, May 14, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6293. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

THE LATE PATRICK J. BOLAND

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read House Resolution 483, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 35 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our beloved friend PATRICK J. BOLAND is a tremendous shock to all of us. We all realize the personal loss it is to his wife and children. His sudden death is also a personal loss to the House and to each Member of it, and particularly to myself.

It is difficult for me to express in words the thoughts that run through my mind. However, there are a few pertinent observations I wish to make on this sad occasion in paying tribute to the outstanding service of our late friend during the years he has been a Member of this body.

For several years he occupied one of the most trying positions in the organization of the House, that of majority whip. Very few people outside of this body realize the importance of this position, and very few people, probably, realize the tremendous burdens that are imposed upon any Member who occupies it. Many great Members of this body, in both parties, during the generations of our constitutional history have filled that important and powerful position with honor, distinction, and dignity. Our late friend filled it in the highest manner and with the greatest degree of dignity humanly possible. As majority whip he lived up to the great reputation made by all the great majority whips of both parties of the generations of our constitutional government.

PAT BOLAND was majority whip during the most trying period in the history of our country. He performed his duties in a manner which speaks for itself. During normal days, the position of majority whip is one of outstanding importance. It has been particularly so during the past 2 years. During the past 2 years, he had to devote many hours to trying to achieve the results, unnecessary for me to refer to now in detail, which have been attained in this body; results so necessary for the welfare of our country. I know the arduous duties that were imposed during this period upon our late friend, and so does our beloved Speaker, because on many occasions it was necessary for the three of us to work into the early hours of the morning planning the passage of legislation recommended by the President, and so essential for the Nation's best interests.

The name of our late friend, PAT BOLAND, will occupy a very prominent page when the historians of the future come to write the history of these days, and properly so, because of the powerful contribution he made toward the enactment of legislation necessary for our national defense.

There is no question in my mind but what his sudden and unexpected death was precipitated, in part at least, by the arduous tasks imposed upon him during the past 2 years. He faced those tasks in the same spirit as the soldier who goes forth to perform a task from which he does not expect to return. PAT BOLAND stuck by his job and performed it well. It might well be said of him that from a legislative angle he is a casualty of the present war.

I know that when I send Mrs. Boland and the other members of our late colleague's family a message expressing my profound sympathy in their bereavement I shall be voicing the sentiments of all my colleagues. Their loss is our loss, the loss of the House of Representatives as such, and the loss of each and every one of us as individual Members. Without regard to party, every Member of this body respected our late distinguished colleague. In addition, his loss is a great blow not only to his city of Scranton, to his district, and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but to the entire Nation. Pat, you are gone but not forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our beloved Presiding Officer, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of PATRICK BOLAND I have lost one of the most faithful and dearest friends I have had in all my lifetime. He stood the test. He was capable of giving friendship, because he was that loyal, that fine, that devoted type of human being. God never made a truer man than PATRICK BOLAND. I have seen him tested as if by fire; he stood with his face to the storm when it was necessary and his back was never turned to the enemies of good government or of his country.

His loss is deeply personal to me because it was my privilege and my pleasure to make him majority whip of the House of Representatives, or rather, to continue him in that place, and the majority leader and the whip and the Speaker must work very, very closely. I never knew a time when he was too tired to respond to a call and be at his post of duty. I have never known a greater majority whip than was PATRICK BOLAND. We will miss him; his genial personality, his engaging traits will be missed by all of us. To his family, his loss is an irreparable one. I have seen PATRICK BOLAND in his home, with his wife and his children and his brothers and his sisters. He was the ideal type of husband, of father, of brother, and of friend. I have seen no better type of American citizen than PATRICK BOLAND, and I have not seen an overwhelming number of his equals. His loss is not only a tremendous personal loss to all of us and his friends, but for the country in a time like this, to lose a public servant like PATRICK BOLAND is a great blow to the country that he lived in, that he served, and that he loved.

I say, in closing, as I said about another friend who had passed from this chamber—old friend, fine friend, great friend—hail and farewell!

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the acting minority leader the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT].

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I learned of the death of the Honorable PATRICK BOLAND, of Pennsylvania, the majority whip of the House of Representatives. He was a talented Representative and served his people with skill and sincerity. He was untiring in his efforts and served his party with devotion and loyalty. With him country came before party and his patriotism and love of country were an inspiration to all Members of the House. As minority whip I had an intimate friendship with Mr. BOLAND as we cooperated on numerous occasions for the advancement of legislation pertaining to the welfare of the Nation. He was earnest, sincere, and a gentleman of the old school, a man of the highest qualities of leadership. His devotion to his family was well known, and I extend my deep sympathy to his fine wife and children.

In the passing of PAT BOLAND the House of Representatives has lost one of its outstanding Members, and in this hour of national crisis his death is a loss to the entire Nation. The duties of whip are extremely arduous and he never shirked his duty even though his personal health and welfare were in danger. PAT BOLAND had a warmth of character and rare sense of humor that made him loved by his friends and colleagues. The House of Representatives will miss him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense and feeling of personal loss that I pay a word of tribute to one of the outstanding Members of this body, who has fallen in line of duty and passed to his final reward.

As chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means I had an opportunity to know and appreciate the genuine worth of PATRICK BOLAND, or PAT BOLAND, as we all lovingly called him.

No member of our committee and, so far as I know, no Member of this House, approached his duties with a higher concept of his responsibilities to the committee and to the House and to the country than Mr. BOLAND. He was an able, diligent, faithful, capable member of our committee. We all had a most profound respect for him because of his conscientious devotion to duty as well as a devotion to those things that he considered would promote the welfare not only of the citizens of his own district but of the entire country. I have never known a man who was more conscientious or more faithful in the discharge of his every duty than was Mr. BOLAND. Moreover, his unvarying courtesy, his uniform kindness, will ever be remembered and appreciated by his colleagues on the committee. His place on the committee and in this House and as a servant of his district and the country will be a most difficult one to fill. His fine conception of what was right and proper as a Member of the Congress was surpassed by no one. I know that in extending to his widow and each member of his family our deepest sympathy in their great bereavement I am expressing the sentiment of each Member of this House. May a kind and merciful Providence comfort and console them in their greatest of all sorrows. I am sure that I also express the unanimous sentiment of the House in saying that not only the Committee on Ways and Means, the House of Representatives, the district which he represented, but the entire country in the passing of our beloved colleague has sustained a great loss. I know he will be missed in our committee not only for his fine personal traits, fine traits of character, his geniality and fine companionship, his lovable disposition, his courtesy and consideration for every member of the committee, but each Member of this House will recall, in his official position as whip of the majority party, his unvarying courtesy and gentleness, his stern devotion to duty, his conscientious conception of those things that he conceived to be right. In fact, I have known no man in my more than 30 years of service here who possessed to a larger degree every requisite of mind and character, head and heart, to make an able, useful, conscientious, and outstanding public servant.

By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I send to the Speaker's desk a resolution unanimously adopted by our committee this morning, and ask that it be read for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

The Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, at a special meeting held on May 18, 1942, unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has heard with profound sorrow of the death of their colleague and fellow member, the Honorable PATRICK J. BOLAND, of Pennsylvania; and

"Whereas Mr. BOLAND was elected to the Seventy-second Congress and had served with distinction continuously from the 4th day of March 1931 until his death in Scranton, Pa., on May 18, 1942; and

"Whereas Mr. BOLAND had filled with credit and distinction positions of trust and honor in his State of Pennsylvania and was loyally and efficiently serving his Nation in a critical period of war; and

"Whereas through his qualities of leadership he had risen high in the councils of his party, and had contributed in a large measure to the formulation of its policies; and

"Whereas his faithful service as a member of this committee, his knowledge of governmental problems, his sincerity of purpose, his fidelity to duty, and his genial, affable character endeared him to every member of the committee: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we express to the bereaved widow and members of the family of our late colleague our heartfelt sympathy in the loss of a husband and father who was an honorable, capable, and useful public servant; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to his widow and that they be spread upon the minutes of the committee."

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I realize, with the messages that have come to the House from those who have preceded me on both sides of the aisle, that there is nothing I can add in words to the expressions of sympathy and regret that have already been filed by those gentlemen. I can, however, bring you the outpourings of my own heart. I do not think I ever felt more deeply the announcement of anyone's death than I did that of PATRICK J. BOLAND, when I was informed of it early this morning. There was a sympathetic cord between Mr. BOLAND and myself that I feel at liberty to express to this membership, and it is largely this: That while the majority leader and the Speaker, of course, have referred to him as the majority whip, I want to refer to him only as the whip of the House, because of the manner in which he has treated me over a period of years. I have been to PAT BOLAND numerous times and asked for information. He was as willing to impart it to me as to any member of the majority. Therefore, I feel that he filled his position with such fidelity and trust that he did not recognize the middle aisle in any manner. I was just as much a Member of Congress to him as the Speaker himself or any other of his party associates. He was not a partisan in any sense of the word, and I honor him for that method of procedure with our membership.

One other thought I wish to leave with the House, and that is the expression of regret as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. We have been intimately associated over a period of years, and you other gentlemen know what that means as you grow up in the meetings with your committee associates. PAT BOLAND has been one of our most intimate and friendly members. When it was suggested this morning that the committee meet in special session, I am not breaking any confidence when I say that our membership had no inclination whatsoever to undertake any part of the great duty which we have on our hands, namely, the consideration of the new tax bill. There was no spirit, no heart, no mind on any thought of that kind. We were entirely wrapped up in the fact that one of our best Members had left us. So I feel the poignancy of the loss of PATRICK J. BOLAND, not only to the House and to the Nation as a whole, but to me personally, and I appreciate the honor of saying these few words of personal sorrow on the passing of a great man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden taking off of PATRICK J.

BOLAND, I have lost a great friend and a fine leader, because as his chief assistant in the House, I was intimately acquainted with him and the strenuous tasks he was called upon to perform. There was never a critical period when he did not call in his whips and tell them what he wanted, and we went out feeling we had the inspiration of a great leader to accomplish that which was necessary for the progress of legislation which we deemed essential to the welfare of the country. Mr. BOLAND was not only a great American, he was a great democrat, and I do not mean that in a party sense at all. I mean it in the broadest sense of the word, in the sense that Jefferson and Lincoln were great democrats. In his taking off his family lost a great head, his wife a great and loving husband, his children an indulgent and kindly father, and his brothers a great and loving brother, and I extend to them my heartfelt and deepest sympathy, and say that they have the consolation in this black hour, that Pat—we all called him Pat—their beloved, has contributed not only to their happiness and welfare, but to the happiness and welfare of the great country which he has had the honor to represent in this great body. All I can say is, Pat, good-bye, God be with you; may we meet again. You were a splendid citizen, a lovable colleague, and above all a great American.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following resolution unanimously agreed to by the whip organization:

Resolved, That the whip organization of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States of America has learned with profound sorrow of the death of its distinguished leader, the Honorable PATRICK J. BOLAND of the State of Pennsylvania; be it further

Resolved, That the whip organization of the House of Representatives desire to record their deep appreciation of the patriotic, untiring, faithful, and devoted service of the Honorable PATRICK J. BOLAND as whip of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That in the death of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, of Pennsylvania, the Nation has sustained an irreparable loss, the House of Representatives a wise counselor and guide, the State of Pennsylvania an ever loyal son and democracy everywhere one of its most courageous champions.

Resolved further, That PATRICK J. BOLAND added a new luster to the office of majority whip of the House by his fair, courteous, and vigorous administration of the duties of that important office, in which he was always impelled by the highest ideals and the loftiest patriotism; therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the whip organization of the House will always cherish pleasant memories of their service with PATRICK J. BOLAND, and will find in his outstanding service in these most trying times an example and an inspiration; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that a copy be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

Thomas F. Ford, California, chief assistant whip; district assistants: 1. James A. Shanley, Connecticut; 2. Jos. A. Gavagan, New York; 3. William H. Sutphin, New Jersey; 4. H. C. Cooley, North Carolina; 5. R. A. Green, Florida; 6. Overton Brooks, Louisiana; 7. David D. Terry, Arkansas; 8. Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; 9. William T. Schulte, Indiana; 10. Edward A. Kelly, Illinois; 11. Wm. S. Jacobsen, Iowa; 12. John M. Houston, Kansas; 13. R. Ewing Thomason, Texas; 14. Lawrence Lewis, Colorado; 15. Warren G. Magnuson, Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if our Republic is to be an edifice of security, grandeur, beauty, and nobility it must stand upon the solid foundation of character. Hon. PAT BOLAND has contributed the very elements of strength that give stability and perpetuity to the foundation upon which the superstructure of a free government must stand if it is to survive the storms of domestic passion and international intrigues and wars.

There is one comfort that comes to those who mourn Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND's death and that is to be found in the thought that "Life is not merely a floating shadow, a momentary spark, a dream that vanishes. Nothing can be grander than a life filled with great and noble thoughts—with brave and honest deeds. Such a life sheds light, and the seeds of truth sown by great and loyal men bear fruit through all the years to be."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there is within the words of the twenty-third psalm great security, compassion, tenderness, and strength for all who read. I believe there is also depth of real understanding when I repeat words from memory on the twenty-third psalm:

In green pastures? No; not always; for sometimes he who knoweth best in kindness leadeth me in weary ways where heavy shadows be.

And by still waters? No; not always so; for sometimes the storms rougher grow and o'er our souls the waves dash to and fro.

And when those storms beat loudest and I cry aloud for help my Master standeth by and whispers to my soul, "Lo, it is I."

And so where He leads me I can safely go.

And in the blest hereafter I shall know why in His wisdom He did lead me so.

It is my feeling that PAT BOLAND believed and lived those words. It was my privilege to have been a part of the whip organization presided over by PAT BOLAND and his assistant the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD]. It was my good fortune, also, pursuant to the request of PAT BOLAND, to visit his district, and on that journey and subsequent visits, three in number, to his home community, I learned to know his family, his friends, and the constituency which he represented.

Personally, I loved and admired Pat. I believe this House, in the passing of PAT BOLAND, has lost another in its list of Members who have contributed natural dignity and sincere leadership and genuine Christian living to the concepts of the positions of trust which we hold in the governmental structure of the Republic.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a sturdy oak has fallen.

This is one of those occasions when words are inadequate to express our feelings and our deep sense of loss. Our departed friend is just as much a casualty of this war as are those heroes who fell at Bataan.

His death is most untimely because we can ill spare a man of his ability, of his fine character, of his steadfastness of purpose at this particular time, when the Republic is passing through the crucible. It will be a long time before we shall see his like again, and with my colleagues I join in expressing deepest sympathy to the bereaved wife and children who must carry on. I can only express the hope that the Supreme Pilot who guides us through the storms of this life will comfort them. May He continue to guide our ship to that mystic harbor beyond the realms of human ken until that day when we shall meet again. Until then, Aloha, aloha.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] in expressing my own personal sorrow, and I am sure that of the entire whip organization, in the passing of our beloved friend.

My acquaintance with our late friend was only casual until the Speaker appointed me to the whip organization. That association with PAT BOLAND grew into an intimate friendship.

I have seen PAT BOLAND in the whip meetings in days gone by when there were sharp issues not only in the House and throughout the country, but even in that organization, when he proved himself a master of strategy and good judgment. His fairness always inspired confidence. His word was as good as his bond. To me, PAT BOLAND was the type who was absolutely incapable of doing a little or mean thing. I have seen him in the whip meetings, on the floor and in the cloakrooms, and likewise on fishing trips, where his fine Irish wit always sparkled, and, above all, his friendship, his honor, and his convictions knew no bounds. He had a heart of gold and he was as kind, gentle, and thoughtful as a woman. I loved him and shall miss him more than I am able to express.

So I want to join with all of my colleagues who have spoken and I am sure those who did not speak, in saying that by his fine character, his lofty principles and devotion to duty, PAT BOLAND has builded for himself a monument that will last throughout eternity.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week our departed colleague PAT BOLAND made a short statement to the Ways and Means Committee, saying that he was taking his departure to take part in the primaries in Pennsylvania and going to his home city. With that irrepressible sense of humor with which he was possessed "he hoped that we might be able to continue our deliberations without his valuable assistance." As he left the committee room we all waved our hands and said, "Goodbye, Pat; we are all for you." This morning we were shocked at the news of his sudden death.

During the discussion of economic philosophies that are involved in taxation problems Pat was always for the average man, the everyday fellow, and his family. To him the folks of this country were the real problem that we had before us, and the consideration of their happiness and their prosperity. Truly, as has been said, he was a great Democrat along those lines. He rendered splendid service as a member of our committee, and we all listened to him with attention whenever he desired to discuss any of the various projects we had before us. We shall miss him in our councils.

Death has been described as a camel that kneels before every man's tent; and sooner or later we all must answer the call when the great white messenger shall come and beckon us to the great adventure. We, as Members of this House, and especially the members of our committee, again with a wave of the hand say: "Pat, good-bye and God bless you; and may the reward that is due for your fine, consistent performance of duty be meted unto you by the Great Ruler of the universe."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, one would have to know something of the close intimate relationship that existed between our departed friend and myself to be able to form anything of a correct idea as to the severity of the blow that came to me a few minutes ago when I learned of his passing.

Pat was pure gold that passed current in every market everywhere. He was a man who made of himself a warehouse in which he stored the merchandise of the world but without displacing those high gifts of God—faith, love, mercy, and worship. When he went away he took with him the love of his comrades and his colleagues who are now bemoaning his passing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a pleasant smile, a mild and sonorous voice, embodied in the genial personality of PATRICK BOLAND, has departed from this Chamber but the impression made upon the membership of this House can never be eradicated and will live with us as long as one of us survives.

I want to take this occasion to express my heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved wife and family of my beloved friend and to extend this sentiment further to include the people of PAT BOLAND's district, for they have lost a genuine champion of their cause and a real Representative. My equity in this untimely loss, however small it may be in comparison, is nevertheless priceless and I falter in my ability to express my grief. I hope and pray that God may sustain the family, that they will in true Christian fortitude bow to His will until such a time as we may all meet again.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the whip organization during the past 6 years I want to say that PAT BOLAND was one of the finest characters I have ever known. Not only was he devoted to his family and to the welfare of his country, but he was devoted to his duty as the majority whip of this House. He was always available for counsel and advice; he was considerate of every man's position. He was in a tough job and he did it well. PAT BOLAND stuck with the ship; he never left the course. Not only shall I miss him, but I shall regret his absence as will every member of this House. I am sorry at his passing; but the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BARNES].

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise here today to pay my tribute to one of the best friends I ever had.

PAT BOLAND was a great statesman and a great leader. His work and his guidance in the Halls of Congress have carved for him a niche in the Hall of Fame along with the great of this Nation. He measured his whole course of life by the yardstick of the general welfare of the people of America.

It is not from the angle of his service to this Nation of ours that I want to say a few words, but it is of him as a man and a friend. He was always unselfish in his thoughts, always trying to do something for someone else. His was the soul of honor and integrity. He never deserted a friend nor struck foully at an enemy.

I had the privilege this past week of attending a small dinner with Pat and his family. Pat's family life and family are ever a tribute to him. The love and affection, good fellowship each had for the other, the complete harmony, the guidance he used in rearing his children—all are part of a character as great as I have ever known. His record is secure in the Hall of Fame—his character will be perpetuated through his family.

For you and me he has left behind a record of service—of friendship, as a husband and father—that it would be well for all to emulate. Words will not express our feelings today, but we are all in our hearts saying:

Good-bye, good friend,
In God's good time,
In God's good clime
We'll meet again.

And in that land
Where we shall know
No pain or woe,
We'll understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, in long years of service in this House the greatest reward personally that I have enjoyed here is the fellowship and friendship of my colleagues. I have often wondered, in the admiration and respect I have felt for so many of the men and women of this House, how it has been possible that over the country we occasionally have a wave of unmerited depreciation and misunderstanding.

Among all the Members of this representative gathering of real Americans and real men and women, I know and have known none for whom I have cherished a more profound affection and esteem than PAT BOLAND.

He had a sense of humor that was fascinating, but he was motivated by a stern sense of duty which drove him to a service far beyond his strength. As one of the speakers said a moment ago, PAT BOLAND is a casualty of this war as truly as if he had fallen in the trenches at the battle front.

I watched him with profound appreciation and sorrow actually day by day laying down his life here for his country. It was only the other day that, troubled by his appearance of physical weariness, I went to him and besought him to go home and rest. When I walked away from him I thought of a little poem of my youth in which a vision of the closing hours of a good man's life and the welcome of his divine Redeemer was presented by the good New England poet:

And when in life's late afternoon,
Where cool and long the shadows grow,
I walk to meet the night, that soon
Shall shape and shadow overflow.
Shall I not see Him waiting stand,
And, white against the evening star,
The welcome of His beckoning hand?

Pat saw that heavenly vision this morning. God rest his soul. And God help us who are left to join ranks in rededicating ourselves, as he did, to the great cause of our country and of the world at this tragic moment, and to be as worthy as he was when the final call comes to us all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the passing of our late beloved colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Later in the day the Chair will appoint the funeral committee and have their names published in the RECORD.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER subsequently announced the appointment of the following Members of the House to attend the funeral: Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. BARNES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZER, Mr. RICH, Mr. DITTER, Mr. FADDIS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WALTER, Mr. HAINES, Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. JARRETT, Mr. McGRANERY, Mr. MOSER, Mr.

SACKS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FENTON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERIDAN, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr VAN ZANDT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCANLON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WRIGHT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 20, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing as per attached press release.

Today Representative CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, announced a hearing to be held next Wednesday, May 20, by the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation.

The purpose of the hearing is to develop three phases due to shortage of supplies of petroleum products and rubber.

The first purpose is to develop the facts as to what is being done to provide petroleum products to sections of the country where there are now shortages.

The second purpose is to bring out the facts as to what is actually being done to meet the Nation's need of rubber and rubber substitutes in view of the shortage of the rubber supply.

The third purpose is to develop the facts as to the dislocations and economic consequences that result from deficient supplies of petroleum and rubber and to consider how the effect of such dislocations can be minimized.

Representatives of Government departments and others will appear as witnesses before the hearing on these questions is completed. The hearing will begin Wednesday and it is expected will be continued in 2 other days within the next 10 days

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1638. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 7, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Gilmore Creek, Winona County, Minn., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1639. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 6, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Hobolochitto River, Miss., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1640. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 21, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Green River and tributaries, Wyoming, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1641. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the 1943 Budget for the Federal Security Agency and the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 724); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1642. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the 1943 Budget for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 725); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1643. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend subsection 3 of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1644. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942"; approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1645. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by him from certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committee were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. PIERCE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6315. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 2134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 7094. A bill to prevent the spread of false information in political campaigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr BONNER.

H. R. 7095. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7096. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7097. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr MACIORA:

H. R. 7098 A bill for the relief of Norfolk Plumbing & Heating Co. et al.; to the Committee on Claims

By Mr ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H R. 7099 A bill for the relief of the Calnan Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2820. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Westchester County (N. Y.) Volunteer Firemen's Association, to have volunteer firemen who in the course of their duty use their automobiles to attend fires and drills given special consideration in the proposed rationing of gasoline, in order that their efficiency may not be impaired or insufficient fire service rendered; to the Committee on Ways and Means

2821. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. Ernest R. Anderton, pastor, and 42 members of the Presbyterian Church of Aliquippa, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2822. Also, petition of L. C. Shane, superintendent, Raccoon United Presbyterian Sunday School, of Aliquippa, Pa., and 34 citizens of Beaver County, urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2823. Also, petition of 31 members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2824. Also, petition of 78 members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Beaver, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2825 Also, petition of Rev George Grant, pastor, and 49 members of the Baden (Pa.)

Methodist Church, urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2826. Also, petition of 25 residents of Slippery Rock, Butler County, Pa., deploring the sale and gifts of liquors to our boys in camps and in the Army, respectfully urging that the Members of Congress do everything in their power to prohibit its use in the Army and Navy and help honor mothers by assuring them that their boys will not become drunkards while answering their country's call; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2827. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Seymour, Iowa, urging cooperation with the Federal authorities in tightening law enforcement around military, naval, and other training camps and in joining a national defense movement against prostitution and liquor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2828. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Allerton, Iowa, in the interest of preventing the sale or gift of intoxicating liquors, including beer, to soldiers and sailors in uniform; to bring about the discontinuance of the sale of beer in Government commissaries; to create dry zones around military and naval establishments; to set up dry zones around industrial establishments in which airplanes, ships, tanks, arms, and equipment must be produced with the utmost precision and speed for the support of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2829. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Eldon, Agency, and Ottumwa, Iowa, deploring the use of sugar in the making of alcohol to be placed near the Army and Navy camps of our boys in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2830. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Mount Ayr, Iowa, in the interest of preventing the sale or gift of intoxicating liquors, including beer, to soldiers and sailors in uniform; to bring about the discontinuance of the sale of beer in Government commissaries; to create dry zones around military and naval establishments; to set up dry zones around industrial establishments in which airplanes, ships, tanks, arms, and equipment must be produced with the utmost precision and speed for the support of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2831. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Rev. Lester H. Bill, pastor of the Methodist Church, Crawfordsville, Iowa, and the people of the Methodist Church, urging the prohibiting of liquor and prostitution around our Army and Navy camps and cantonments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2832. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Motion Picture Projectionists of San Francisco, supporting postal employees bill (H. R. 6486); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2833. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 124 citizens of St. Clair, Mich., urging enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2834. Also, petition of 64 citizens of Harbor Beach, Mich., urging enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2835. Also, petition of 22 citizens of Bloomfield and vicinity, Huron County, Mich., expressing interest in Senate bill 860 and urging its enactment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2836. Also, petition of 34 residents of Sandusky, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2837 By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. G. Martin and J. Dale Curry, of Santa Ana, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the United States Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2838 Also, petition of the American Legion, Memphis Post, No. 1, of Tennessee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commissions in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2839. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appropriations for the Children's Bureau; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2840. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Grocers Association, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend A. J. Burggraff, C. S. P., Ph. D., superior of St. Paul's College, Catholic University of America, offered the following prayer:

Direct, O Lord, all our actions by Thy gracious inspiration and further them by Thy continual help, that every word and work of ours may from Thee begin and through Thee be brought to a perfect ending.

O God, to Thy almighty protection we commend our beloved country and particularly the Members of this legislative body who bear the grave responsibility of our Government in this universal crisis. At a time when pagan ideals prevail in other lands may this assembly become the instrument of Thy peace and love by adherence to Christian principles, that all men created to Thine own image and likeness may come to realize their divine dignity and true glory. Through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 18, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Kilgore
Andrews	Clark, Idaho	La Follette
Austin	Clark, Mo.	Langer
Bailey	Connally	Lee
Ball	Danaher	Lucas
Bankhead	Doxey	McCarran
Barkley	Ellender	McFarland
Bilbo	George	McKellar
Bone	Gerry	McNary
Brewster	Gillette	Maloney
Brooks	Glass	Maybank
Brown	Green	Mead
Bulow	Gurney	Millikin
Bunker	Hatch	Murdock
Burton	Hayden	Norris
Butler	Hill	Nye
Byrd	Holman	O'Daniel
Capper	Hughes	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Pepper	Spencer	Vandenberg
Radcliffe	Stewart	Van Nuys
Reynolds	Taft	Wagner
Rosier	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh
Russell	Tobey	Wheeler
Schwartz	Truman	White
Smathers	Tunnell	Wiley
Smith	Tydings	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AUSTIN:

The petition of Mark Sumner and sundry other citizens of Randolph, Vt., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Beloit and Bunker Hill, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR HOUSING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PETITION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to file with the Senate and have referred to the Committee on Appropriations a petition which has been handed to me today by a delegation of war workers in the District of Columbia, signed by 10,000 employees of the Government who are here engaged in war work in the various departments. They are petitioning Congress for the appropriation of the $50,000,000 recommended by the President and the Budget for housing in the District of Columbia for the benefit of war workers who have been brought here in this emergency.

This petition was presented to me today by a group of very intelligent young people who are in the Government service. They could have gotten many more signatures to the petition if they had thought it necessary, but there are 10,000 names signed to the petition, all of them of war workers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Kentucky will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Committee on Appropriations this morning recommended to the Senate an increase in the appropriation for housing for these workers to $25,500,000, which represents an increase of $13,500,000 over the appropriation of $12,000,000 made by the House.

In the second item relating to this matter, a $20,000,000 Budget estimate, the House allowed $17,500,000, and that amount was approved by the Senate committee. The report will be handed in this morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate this action, and the increase over the House provision is gratifying. Yet that is about $8,000,000 short of what the President recommended.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is short by about that sum.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—MEMORIAL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a memorial signed by 3,249 persons in the State of Wisconsin remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000. I ask that the heading or body of the memorial be printed in the RECORD, and that the memorial be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to lie on the table and the body thereof to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas certain bills (notably S. 860 and H. R. 4000) have been introduced into Congress "To provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments;" and

Whereas military authorities now possess all necessary power to control the sale of alcoholic beverages to members of the land and naval forces; and

Whereas certain sections of these bills are, we believe, unconstitutional; and

Whereas the control of alcoholic beverages and the control of prostitution are unrelated, and therefore ought not to be combined in one piece of legislation;

Whereas we believe the enactment of these bills into law would establish an unwise and dangerous precedent, and would be opposed to the general welfare of citizens of the several States and obstructive to the common defense of the United States:

We, the undersigned, citizens of Wisconsin, respectfully request that these bills be reported unfavorably.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the pastors of three churches in Clarksville, Va., in reference to legislation dealing with the traffic in liquor and vice in the immediate vicinity of military camps. In accordance with their request, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARKSVILLE, VA., *May 5, 1942.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing you at the request of the congregation assembled at the Baptist Church, Clarksville, Va., on April 26, 1942. We are writing you not personally, but officially as the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

The congregation assembled voted to request the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 860 (commonly known as the Sheppard bill), or similar protective legislation for our armed forces against the liquor and vice traffics similar to that enacted by Congress in 1917. The congregation also requested that you read this action on the floor of the Senate and have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours sincerely,

WM. J. CRAIN,
Pastor, Baptist Church,
FOREST H. MEAD,
Pastor, Methodist Church,
F. M. ALLEN,
Pastor, Presbyterian Church.
(All of Clarksville, Va.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2508. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1353).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 2369. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1354).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; with amendments (Rept. No. 1355); and

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1356).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2526. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); without amendment (Rept No 1357)

By Mr McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1358).

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, yesterday the Vice President laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended. By inadvertence the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The National Service Life Insurance Act originated, respectively, in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the letter laid before the Senate yesterday relating to it should be referred to the Committee on Finance. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the letter, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 2541. A bill to incorporate the United States Army Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2542. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs, Bertha Jacobs, and Harry Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2543. A bill to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

PAY OF SOLDIERS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there appears a very good editorial on soldiers' pay, which seems appropriate at this time. It reads as follows:

SOLDIERS' PAY

We cannot possibly compensate the men in uniform for the type of service they are rendering. The simple fact is that few of the soldiers in our Army could be hired on a dollars-and-cents basis to shoulder a gun and go off to foreign lands to endure the terror of a blitzkrieg. They accept this responsibility for one reason only: their fighting strength is necessary to preserve the civilization of which they are a part. So, in large measure their compensation will be the blessings of peace and freedom which must be regained once more on the battlefield.

With this principle firmly established, however, rates of pay in the services ought to be adjusted to present-day realities. Prices have risen substantially since Congress last fixed the rates of pay for soldiers and sailors. Since the man in the ranks is provided with food, clothing, and shelter, he may in part escape the effect of rising prices. But a Government which has permitted substantial wage increases for workers who are not risking death for their country certainly cannot object to a reasonable increase in the pay of men at the front.

On the whole, the Senate bill providing a base pay of $42 for Army and Marine Corps privates and Navy and Coast Guard apprentice seamen seems to be preferable to the House bill raising this figure to $50. Congress would do well to remember that it must

still deal with the problem of aiding dependents of soldiers who have no other means of support. And the necessity of curbing inflation enters into every question of putting more dollars into the hands of consumers. Regarded from the viewpoint of the soldier, $50 a month is certainly not overgenerous. If Congress decides to go that far, however, it should resolve at the same time to reach a little deeper into the pockets of workers in civilian life to counteract the inflationary influence of so sharp an adjustment in service pay.

Mr. President, the Senate will soon be faced with the alternative of accepting the House action or sustaining our own, which provides for $42 a month, the House having voted $50 a month. It seems to me a good solution would be for the Senate to accept the House provision of $50 a month and make the additional pay of $8 a month payable to the soldier in the form of a war bond, which would certainly not add to the argument that it would increase inflation in the country. It would also provide an after-war soldier bonus which would absorb some of the after-war depression. It seems to me that would be a wise solution of the pay problem at this time.

MINUTE MEN OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Wisconsin and Upper Michigan Peninsula Youth Conference of the Salvation Army at Milwaukee, Wis., May 16, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUILDING FOR FREEDOM AND SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Upper Mississippi Valley Safety Conference on May 14, 1942, at Chippewa Falls, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY THROUGH UNITY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Council Against Intolerance in America at Cleveland, Ohio, May 16, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPRECIATION OF SENATOR BARKLEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE KENTUCKY POST

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kentucky Post of Cincinnati, Ohio, in commendation of Senator BARKLEY, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENDATION OF CONGRESS BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Friday, May 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIVING OFF THE FAT—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 11, 1942, entitled "Living Off the Fat," which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, line 15, after the word "the", it is proposed to strike out "provisions of this act" and insert "foregoing proviso."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we now approach the amendment on page 80 of the bill, which relates to the disposition of the surplus commodities which are under the control or ownership of the Commodity Credit Corporation. All the amendments in this provision are necessary to effectuate the purpose which the committee has in mind. I do not think there could be any possible objection to combining the amendments and voting upon them all at one time, rather than having separate votes, because each of them will stand or fall by the action taken by the Senate on the others. I therefore ask unanimous consent that we may vote on the amendments en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment commencing in line 23, page 80, by adding the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator propose that as a committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have conferred with all the members of the subcommittee, with one or two exceptions; I was unable to see them all. The committee report stated that what is proposed in the amendment to the amendment was to be the effect of the action of the committee, and the language I now propose merely expresses in the bill the understanding the committee had with the Commodity Credit Corporation as to the disposal of these commodities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may understand, therefore, that the amendment is offered as a committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not like to offer it as a committee amendment when I have not consulted all the members of the committee, but I may say that it has been approved by a majority of the members of the committee. It is an amendment to a committee amendment, and I think it is therefore in order under the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Is the word "grain" used in the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The word "grain" is used in the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. That would include corn, wheat, oats, rye, and barley.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. At one time a question was raised in the committee, as I recall, that corn probably would not come under the term "grain"; but it is a term which is broad enough to include corn. That should satisfy those interested in the production of corn that this amendment places a floor under corn at 85 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. There could be no question as to that. Corn is defined as grain in the original Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The pending amendment and the proposed amendment thereto presented the most difficult question which the subcommittee was compelled to handle in dealing with this problem. It was particularly embarrassing to those of us who do not come from States which are in the commercial corn area, or States which do not produce considerable quantities of wheat for sale.

A number of conferences were had with practically all the Senators who represent States which are primarily agricultural States. A conference was called by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has been generally recognized as one of the great leaders in this body of those who are particularly interested in agriculture and the welfare of the farmer. Every effort has been made to work out an agreement or compromise which would be acceptable to all those whose constituencies are greatly affected by the action the Senate may take on this amendment. I regret very much that it has been impossible to come to a complete agreement or meeting of minds of all those who have a primary interest in this proposition, and it will therefore be necessary for the Senate to pass upon and decide the course to be pursued.

Mr. President, I shall now briefly outline some of the facts which were brought to the attention of the committee in its consideration of this question, as well as the effect which the language proposed by the committee will have. As pointed out by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the effect of the committee's amendment is to permit the sale of surplus corn and wheat for feeding purposes at a price not below 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time the sale is made. It does not permit the sale of corn for any purpose other than feeding at below full 100 percent of corn parity. It may be said, however, that that pertains or relates only to the very small portion of the corn which is purchased in the United States. Approximately 90 percent of all the corn produced in this country is used for feed, and 75 percent of it is fed on the farm where the corn is grown. The amendment would not permit the sale of wheat for flour at a price below 100 percent of wheat parity, but would permit the sale of not exceeding 125,000,000 bushels of wheat at a price not below 85 percent of corn parity.

Mr. President, I will be frank and say that this proposal deviates in degree from the provisions of the bill which the Senate enacted some time ago, known as the Bankhead-Gillette-Thomas-Russell bill, which prohibited the sale of any of these farm products at below 100

percent of parity, but conditions have arisen and facts have been submitted since the consideration of that bill which have prompted me, and I am sure other members of the Senate, to view this matter in a slightly different light. We are confronted today with the greatest surplus of wheat that has ever been known in all our history. It is estimated that the carry-over of old wheat on June 30 will be over 630,000,000 bushels. In other words, the carry-over of wheat will amount almost to a full year's consumption of wheat within the United States. The crop of wheat now in prospect is unusually good, and, it is estimated, will yield approximately 800,000,000 bushels or more. That will give us in this country a total supply of wheat sufficient to meet all our domestic needs, as well as for the export of the same quantity of wheat that is exported in normal times, for more than 2 years. That wheat will be on hand. I hope Senators will bear that in mind, that there will be in this country a supply of wheat exceeding 2 years' normal requirements for domestic use and export, as the result of the crop which will be harvested this year.

Mr. President, the bald fact is that there is not any place in this country in which to store this amount of wheat. Production and carry-over are so great that all the elevators, the bins on the farm, all storage facilities available, are full today, and it will be necessary to leave a considerable amount of this wheat in the fields if some method cannot be found to dispose of it.

In normal times we may be able to preserve the principle of full 100-percent parity in the market place, and see millions of bushels of wheat go to waste in the fields, but in these abnormal times, in these times when we are proposing to be the granary of the world, when we are told that the country which has the surplus foodstuffs will be able to write the terms of the peace which will come after this awful war in which we are now engaged, it certainly seems to me that we cannot justify the economic loss and waste of perhaps 100,000,000 bushels of wheat if any possible way can be found to preserve it or to translate it into foodstuffs.

The Department of Agriculture has called upon the farmers for a tremendous increase in the production of pork and pork products, of dairy products, of poultry products, as well as of beef cattle. As I stated on the floor of the Senate the other day, in response to that call, and showing the patriotism of the farmers, there are 10,000,000 more hogs in this country today than there have ever been before. The average hog which is being marketed is larger and heavier than ever before. But even with the increase in pork production, with the increased production of vegetable oils which will result from acreage which will be devoted to peanuts and to soybeans, the country will face a very critical situation with respect to fats and oils if the war lasts for the next 2 years. Our source of supply of over 1,000,000,000 pounds of vegetable oil from the Orient has been cut off by the march of the Japanese Empire. The supply of oils, affecting not only the diet of the American people, but the production of soap and of many absolute essentials for waging war, is a matter which is causing very grave concern in Government circles today. Therefore, the Department of Agriculture is naturally interested in seeing that nothing is done which is likely to reduce the production of pork and squeezing out the hundreds of marginal pork producers who are able to produce pork at present-day prices of feed, and with the present price ceiling, but who would be eliminated if the price of feed were changed.

Mr. President, I wish to make another thing perfectly clear. While this amendment does present an abandonment of the parity concept in the market place as provided in the legislation enacted earlier this year, it does not represent an abandonment of the parity principle, because under the terms of this measure the corn farmer who sells his corn for 85 percent of parity will receive from the Federal Treasury a parity payment of 15 percent, and the corn farmer's income will not be diminished in any degree by virtue of the adoption of the amendment. It cannot result in any injury to him in the matter of income, because he will be paid from the Treasury a subsidy which will be sufficient to enable him to receive 100 percent of parity, and the only difference that is involved between the amendment and the principle which is represented by those who oppose it is as to where the corn farmer shall receive his income. If the amendment is defeated, he will receive his income in the market place for the sale of his product. That will result, we were told by the witnesses who came before us from the Department of Agriculture, in putting up feed prices to such a high level that it will have a very drastic effect on the program of increased production, and will not enable the Department to reach its goals. If the committee amendment is adopted, the prices of these grains for feed purposes only will be held at 85 percent of parity, and the corn farmer will receive a parity payment equivalent to 15 percent from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it also not a fact that the relationship, or the ratio, as it is sometimes called, between the various segments of the agricultural industry that are producing or purchasing corn for feed, is out of line? In other words, the ratio for feeding hogs, let us say, is about 12, as I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the normal. Today it is about 15. The Department is trying to keep it up as high as possible.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is about 15 today, whereas for dairy products, for example, it is about 24, when it should be 30.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct. The same thing is true with respect to beef.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. I certainly should not want to see any injustice done to the corn producers, but on the other hand, it seems to me that there should not be such an adamant adherence to a principle as to work an injury to certain portions of the food-for-victory program. It is partly this ratio, partly the lack of available labor, which is causing the dairy industry to fail to achieve the goal set out for it in the food-for-victory program. It has attained only about one-half of the increase which was set for it. I wish to repeat what I said before the committee, if the Senator from Georgia will bear with me, that that is not due to any lack of patriotism on the part of the dairy farmers. They are as anxious to reach these goals as are any other farmers. But if we disadvantage them by this ratio situation, and do not do something to relieve the labor problem, then we cannot blame the farmers for their inability to attain the goal they have been asked to reach.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wisconsin has well stated one of the arguments which moved the committee to make this recommendation. Of course, if we permit the price of feed to increase and still further squeeze the farmers who produce beef or dairy products or pork, against the price ceilings which have been imposed, we will squeeze out many farmers, and thereby greatly reduce the production of these essential foodstuffs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. On page 77 is the provision authorizing the Secretary to make full parity payments, which I understand applies to the 1942 crop. Can the Senator give us any estimate of what the additional appropriation for parity payments would be if the price of corn were held down, say, to 75 cents instead of 90 cents? Also, has any additional estimate been made for parity payments on wheat?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, it would be a rank guess for anyone to undertake to predict the course of markets in such a time of economic upset. If corn should stay strictly at 85 percent of parity, and should not rise above it, my recollection is that the corn farmers would receive approximately $65,000,000 in parity payments to make up the difference between 85 percent of parity and 100 percent of parity. I do not have the figures before me, but I have them among my papers, and I shall be glad to get them during the course of my remarks. Despite the fact that wheat might sell for 85 percent of parity, the demand for corn might become so great that the market price of corn might be 95 percent of parity, and in that event the parity payments would be small.

Mr. TAFT. Will there also be a large parity payment for wheat? There is a much larger percentage of wheat sold, and I do not suppose it will be sold at anything like parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not undertake to predict the course of the wheat market any more than I would that of the corn market; but present indications are that, without regard to the action taken on this amendment, with the present tremendous production of wheat this year, wheat will sell at considerably below parity. However, the Senator from Ohio must bear in mind that under the 85-percent loan any farmer who is pro-

ducing a basic commodity is entitled to take it to the Commodity Credit Corporation and obtain a loan of 85 percent of parity. So in no event could the parity payments amount to more than 15 percent of the parity price, whatever it might be, for the particular commodity. As everyone knows, the parity price of wheat is considerably more than the parity price of corn. The parity price of wheat is about $1.355 a bushel, whereas the parity price of corn is about 97 cents a bushel.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The observation which the Senator made with respect to the wheat farmer being able to obtain 85 percent of parity under the loan program suggests to my mind this consideration: As I understand, the warehouses and bins of the country are now full to overflowing. I wonder what the wheat farmer is to do with the crop which is coming on, so far as attempting to obtain a loan on it is concerned, if he cannot store it anywhere. That seems to be one of the great problems. I wonder if the Senator has anything to say about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois submits a question which is a very persuasive argument in favor of the amendment. I stated earlier in my remarks that no public storage facilities are available today. Under the loan regulations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I believe that the wheat farmer and the corn farmer are the only producers of basic commodities who are permitted to store on the farms. However, such a situation prevails that the wheat farmer cannot obtain priorities on material which would enable him to build storage bins. For that reason, the committee, in attempting to protect the interests of all concerned, has brought in a provision to dispose of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, making room for the new crop, to enable the wheat farmers to obtain the benefit of the loan.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understand the situation as it exists today with respect to the wheat which is in storage, if this amendment should become law, with the wheat crop which is now coming on, certainly there would be a surplus of wheat in corn communities, so far as feeding is concerned; and it seems to me that, as a result of the surplus wheat, corn would never have an opportunity to reach parity. I doubt if it would reach even 85 percent of parity.

We all know that the bins and warehouses of the country are full to overflowing with wheat which is now in storage. If this amendment should become law, it would mean that surplus wheat would be dumped into the corn districts.

Probably cattle and hogs constitute the greatest reservoir for feedstuffs. Hogs will eat wheat. I doubt if wheat is as good as corn for fattening hogs, but it is almost as good, and hogs will eat it. The wheat must go somewhere. It will be going into the Corn Belt, where there are many hogs and cattle. Considerable wheat is raised in my section of the country, but I cannot see any hope for corn if this amendment should become law. I do not think corn would reach even 85 percent of parity once the surplus wheat crop started pouring into the Corn Belt. I think we are penalizing the corn farmer for the benefit of the wheat farmer. I appreciate that it is a very difficult problem to work out. I want to see the wheat farmer obtain what he is entitled to, but I do not like to see the corn farmer penalized. He seems to be the only one who would be penalized if the amendment should become law.

I do not think there can be any argument against the proposition that the corn producer would suffer as a result of this amendment if we should permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to dump all the surplus wheat it could dump into the corn and hog area when no other market can be found for it. I make that observation in passing, because it seems to me to be pertinent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are two ways of viewing this question. The corn farmer may suffer some reduction below 85 percent of parity, but it occurs to me that in an area where both wheat and corn are produced, this amendment would be a protection to the corn farmer. I say that because if the wheat farmer cannot dispose of his wheat in the loan because of lack of storage facilities, he will not stand by and see it rot on the ground. He will put it on the market, if necessary at 40 cents a bushel in order to realize something on it, and it will come into competition with other grains used for feed. Such a condition might have a much more disastrous effect on the corn market than disposing of it through the regular channels.

The Commodity Credit Corporation assures us that it is endeavoring to dispose of wheat for feed. Today wheat is being sold in areas where no considerable amount of grain for feed is produced. Up to the present time the wheat which has been sold for feeding has been shipped largely into the New England States, and it has been disposed of to the dairy industry.

I confess that it is impossible to put one grain in competition with another for feed without affecting both of them to a certain degree; but if it were done intelligently, and if the wheat were shipped into areas where there was no corn, the adverse effect on the corn market would certainly be less than would be the case if wheat were dumped wherever it happened to be produced.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I appreciate the industry and devotion with which the Senator from Georgia has worked on this bill. Such industry and devotion always characterize his work on the agricultural appropriation bill. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not a fact that breaking the prices of agricultural commodities is the end in itself, rather than an incident in the disposal of surpluses? Is it not a fact that all the surplus grain now held or likely to be held by the Commodity Credit Corporation could be effectively utilized in the manufacture of alcohol, for example, to relieve the sugar shortage? Could it not be used in the manufacture of rubber? As I understand, the testimony before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], completely demonstrates the fact that all the surplus could be immediately used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. We all know that it could be made into alcohol, which could be just as effectively used in the manufacture of munitions as alcohol made from sugar. Therefore I repeat the question. Does it not appear that the use of surpluses to overhang and depress the market at any time when that is deemed desirable in the opinion of some bureaucrat is the end and not the means in disposing of the surpluses?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot agree with that statement. As I have stated, I am trying to be as frank as possible, because I am representing the committee in presenting this amendment. I do not think that would necessarily be the effect. If the Senator from Missouri has any hope that any considerable part of the surplus of wheat can be utilized this year in the production of rubber, it is based on knowledge of facilities which the committee could not find.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It could be utilized instead of sugar in the manufacture of alcohol, could it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I know, that statement has never been contradicted to this good day.

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly has not; and I do not contradict it now. However, I say that the amount which might be used in the production of alcohol is not appreciable when we consider a surplus of 1,500,000,000 bushels of wheat. One hundred million bushels of wheat would make an enormous quantity of alcohol.

There are no factories today to transform wheat into rubber; and by the time we could get factories operating to make rubber out of wheat we should have suffered a tremendous economic loss in wheat which would go to waste in the fields. I do not know of any method of producing rubber which would enable us to use rotten wheat which has been in the field for a year. Today we are confronted by a real condition, and not a theory or a long-range program. The problem before us is to try to save 100,000,000 or 125,000,000 bushels of wheat which, according to the evidence presented to us, is likely to be a total economic loss to the country if some method of disposal cannot be found.

We cannot wait here until we can obtain priorities on steel for the building of factories in which this wheat or this corn may be used in the production of rubber. If we do, we shall lose this year's crop and this year's carry-over, both of which we are trying to conserve.

I may say that no Member of the Senate is stronger than is the Senator from Georgia in advocacy of the utilization for

the manufacture of alcohol as well as the manufacture of rubber of every bushel of corn and every bushel of wheat which can possibly be devoted to those purposes. I think that some persons have been derelict in their duty. I have not been able to study the situation with sufficient care to be able to put my finger on the weak point; but certainly there has been a weak point somewhere in this program, inasmuch as we have not already utilized our surplus grain in the production of alcohol. Apparently we are faced with a sugar shortage in this country, and a program of rationing sugar, which could have been averted if someone had devoted grain, rather than sugar, to the production of alcohol; but I do not think that argument is particularly conclusive on this amendment which, of course, would be in effect for only 1 year, and relates to only 125,000,000 bushels of wheat which cannot be utilized for the production of rubber or alcohol at the present time.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I was struck with the Senator's statement that with the close of this year's crop harvest we would have enough on hand in this country to meet the country's domestic requirements and the demands for export purposes for 2 years. Just what percentage of the normal crop of wheat will be absorbed by the lend-lease program? There will not be enough wheat to feed the whole world.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very little of this wheat will be absorbed by the lend-lease program. There is a very substantial reason for that. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, which is a part of the British Empire, averages a greater surplus than we have in this country; and, naturally, if a dominion of the British Empire can supply the wheat, we should not be likely to put it into the lend-lease program, nor would the British wish to receive it under the lend-lease program.

The only wheat which is being exported today is that which is being shipped to Russia, and that is very limited in amount. Some Russian ships have been loaded on the west coast and have taken their wheat directly to Vladivostok. Of course, we cannot ship there, because our ships would have to go through the Japanese-controlled waters; but Russia is still nominally at peace with Japan, and can ship directly from the west coast to the Siberian coast.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. While we are on that subject, it may be well to remind the Senator that another possession of England—Australia—which is always one of the largest exporters of wheat, has surpluses comparable to our present surplus; and Argentina, the next largest exporter of wheat, is in a similar situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only does Australia have a surplus, but in South America, as well, there are tremendous quantities of wheat. This war has, of course, stopped all the normal channels of transportation, and has prevented the shipment of wheat from the countries which ordinarily have a surplus, to those which ordinarily have a deficiency of wheat. Such a condition is not one which is limited to America alone. Canada has an enormous surplus—sufficient, as I understand, to feed the people of the British Isles for almost 2 years. Argentina has a great surplus. Argentina does not even have an 85-percent parity level; and any wheat available for purchase for export and shipment abroad could probably be bought today in Argentina at prices which would be ridiculously low even considering the 85-percent-of-parity level in the United States.

Mr. BILBO and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Let me ask the Senator where the 420,000,000 people of Europe and the Balkan States are getting their wheat?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that news from Germany and the occupied countries is very scarce; but I have been led to believe that the unfortunate people who have come under the unholy domination of the Fascist states are being denied almost the necessities of life, and have practically nothing whatever in the way of foodstuffs, or a mere pittance, scarcely sufficient to hold body and soul together.

I yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I appreciate very sincerely the difficulty which has been presented by the surplus of wheat and the lack of further storage facilities; but I shall vote against the pending amendment, as I opposed this amendment in the committee, because I believe it marks the beginning of a definite penalty which will be imposed on the corn farmers of America. The chairman of the subcommittee has told the Senate that there are in the United States 10,000,000 hogs more than we have ever had before. Thus, with the prices of corn and wheat as they are now and with wheat and corn being sold at the present price for feed, there will be no retrogression at all in the production of hogs. There has been an increase in beef cattle, and this amendment, if agreed to, will in no way decrease the production of beef cattle. For the purpose of feeding dairy cattle and poultry, I believe the testimony will bear out the statement that pound for pound there is about the same value in wheat as there is in corn.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. If there is any urge for patriotic service on anyone's part, I think it should be a campaign on the part of the Government to say to the people of America that there has been a failure to utilize this great quantity of wheat, and urge its use in the development of poultry and dairy cattle, and not make it available to be sold in order to break down the structure of the corn farmer of America.

Certainly, the farmer is going to pay a great penalty as a result of this war, in view of the difficulty in getting farm machinery, the increased price of labor, the resistance on the part of the Government to have anything to do with the fixing of wages, the constant drain by industry pulling the young men off the farm, and the necessity the farmer faces of paying double the wages for less competent help.

I hate to see this process started, because under the blanket of war production and under the slogan "food for freedom" I fear the foundation will be torn from underneath the corn farmer of America.

I desire to emphasize, Mr. President, that if the pending amendment shall be agreed to, and we let this wheat be sold in competition with corn, knowing that the prices of both are going down, and knowing that the lack of facilities for shipping is the real bottleneck of America, I believe that the Senate should now inaugurate a special committee investigation to ascertain why we have not developed the machinery to utilize the farm products of America so as to make alcohol out of the grain of America, to produce synthetic rubber. The new uses of old products and new products of the farm would relieve the situation and would make this Nation self-sustaining, capable of spreading its benefits over all the world after this war shall have ended.

We shall be derelict, indeed, if we tear this foundation from under the corn farmer, and the wheat farmer, too, by continued operation without utilizing these commodities to help make the products with which to conduct this war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot appreciate the argument of the Senator from Illinois about tearing any floor from under the prices received by the corn farmer or the wheat farmer, because I know of no law today that in any wise controls the prices at which the commodities in question may be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation. As a matter of fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation is selling wheat today in the New England States and in the Northeast generally at a price which is equivalent to 85 percent of corn parity for feed; and we shall not be tearing out anything by agreeing to this amendment. On the contrary, we shall be establishing a floor for the benefit of the corn farmer at 85 percent of parity. The corn farmer does not have that protection today. Under existing law, he has absolutely no floor. The Commodity Credit Corporation, if that agency should so desire, could market corn tomorrow at 40 cents a bushel. There is not a word of law to the contrary; and I challenge the Senator from Illinois to point to a statute which in any wise controls the Commodity Credit Corporation in the disposal of these surpluses. There is no such law today; but if this amendment shall be agreed to there will be a prohibition against the sale at below 85 percent of parity, and to that extent protection will be afforded the corn producers.

I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I have never regarded any part of this amendment as being very effective, and that I thought this whole matter should be treated by means of general legislation. However, insofar as protection is concerned, the creation of a floor of 85 percent of corn parity will be the first time the Congress has made any expression whatever in a law passed by it which would limit the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to the sale of these commodities.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the Senator from Georgia misunderstood me. I said that this is the beginning of the process of tearing the floor from underneath the corn farmer and the wheat farmer, because there is a policy of the Congress which has at least provided a theoretical floor or a theoretical goal which has resulted in pulling prices toward parity; but with the increased wages which are going to come and the increased cost of living which is going to come because of the scarcity of materials and the bidding for them in the country, and with the increase of other prices, I will state now that within 1 year we shall hear objections on this floor to paying parity prices to farmers. The farmer does not want the Government to pay parity prices to him. The farmer wants fair prices for his goods; he wants equal prices for his labor.

If the pending amendment be agreed to, it will start the process of lowering farm prices, and I say that within a short time we shall hear arguments on this floor to prevent Government parity payments to the farmers which will be necessary to keep the prices they receive within proper relationship to the income of the rest of the people of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to say to the Senator from Illinois that if it becomes apparent that the necessary amount of money will not be available to pay the corn farmers the difference between 85 percent of parity and 100 percent of parity, I shall certainly be happy to join him in upsetting any plan or program which would permit the sale of these commodities for less than parity; but I do not anticipate that in the future the opposition to parity payments, particularly when they are made in connection with such a program as this, will be any more bitter than it has been in the past.

Mr. McNARY rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am pleased at the statement of the able Senator from Georgia. I think, perhaps, he overlooked the wisdom of placing emphasis on the categories in which these crops fall. Any farmer may obtain a loan of 85 percent of parity; or he is free to sell his corn or wheat at any price he chooses.

I may add further that we are not today dealing with free corn; we are dealing with corn that is owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, of which there were but 66,000,000 bushels on the 1st day of May 1942, amounting to 5 percent only of the corn on hand in America on that date. In other words, on May 1, 1942, there were in corncribs and bins 1,400,000,000 bushels of corn, all of it free corn, that may be sold at any time the farmer desires at the price of the Government loan, or 85 percent of parity.

Of that amount of corn, 66,000,000 bushels only are controlled by the Federal Government, and the 66,000,000 bushels are less than 5 percent of the corn in the country in stock or invoices on the 1st day of May 1942. So we are dealing now with 5 percent of the corn, and that is all owned by the Government.

I did not favor the amendment proposed by the committee until today, when the able Senator placed a floor under corn and under wheat, which is about 85 percent of corn parity, or 84 cents a bushel.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has sold 72,000,000 bushels of corn owned by it since January 1 at 84 cents, which is exactly 85 percent of parity. They have now 66,000,000 bushels left. The floor now proposed will prevent that grain, corn or wheat, from being sold at less than 85 percent of the parity of corn.

I do not see now where the corn grower has very much to complain about. If this amendment shall be adopted, I think he will receive something he has not heretofore possessed by statutory law. The Commodity Credit Corporation may today sell corn for a nickel a bushel if it wishes to, but if this amendment shall be adopted it cannot sell corn at less than 85 percent of parity. It could today sell its own wheat at a nickel a bushel. After this amendment shall have been adopted, it cannot sell wheat for feed for poultry or for livestock or to the dairy interests at less than the parity on corn, which is 84 cents a bushel.

That is a new protection which the growers of corn and wheat will receive if this amendment shall be adopted. They would not have had that assurance had the amendment first reported been adopted. Since the able Senator has proposed this amendment I firmly believe that the growers and producers of corn will, under it, receive a new protection that has heretofore been denied them.

I have not much sympathy for those who would cling to the idea that the structure we have placed around the price of corn is going to be demolished. I think that structure has been fortified with a foundation of cement, and if those interested will quiet themselves and take this amendment as modified, I feel they will have greater assurance than they have ever had heretofore and that there can be no dumping of wheat at less than the parity price of corn at 84 cents a bushel, and there can be no dumping of corn at less than the parity price, which is a protection which does not exist today. After all we are dealing with only 5 percent of all the corn in existence in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon for his observations. We all know that in his approach to any problem affecting any of the farmers of this Nation anywhere the Senator from Oregon is not only fair but he is recognized as an outstanding authority on all farm questions.

I had a notation here as to the amount of corn owned by the Government today; it slipped my mind to call it to the attention of the Senate, but had I done so I would not have expressed myself nearly so well as the Senator from Oregon has done. As he has well said, the Government today has control of only 66,000,000 bushels of corn, which is the entire amount it could sell at any price. Under existing law the Government could sell it for 10 cents a bushel. If the committee amendment should be adopted it would place a floor under the price of that corn which would prevent the Government from selling it below approximately 83 cents a bushel, which is 85 percent of corn parity. I appreciate the Senator from Oregon calling that matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to encroach further upon the time of the able Senator from Georgia, although he is always generous; but I may say that the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat permitted to be sold for feed will go to the dairy, cattle, and poultry industries of the country, and the amount is infinitestimal compared with the 1,300,000,000 surplus which will be on hand on August 1 this year.

Let me remind the Senator from Georgia and other Senators that those three industries, the cattle industry, the poultry industry, and the dairy industry are the three industries in America that bring the largest gross income of all agricultural activities and commodities.

Mr. RUSSELL. The statement of the Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct.

As I have stated, the consideration of this amendment in the committee has been an unpleasant task. This compromise is not absolutely agreeable to anybody, so far as I know, and for that reason I infer that it is a reasonable and fair compromise. It is not altogether pleasing to the administration. The administration wished to have an absolutely free hand in dealing with these surplus commodities. The amendment places a limitation of 85 percent of parity price at which the corporation may sell grain for feed. It also limits the amount of wheat that may be disposed of to 125,000,000 bushels. While it is not altogether pleasant to them, this proposal will be accepted by the administration, and the Department of Agriculture believe that it will enable them to relieve the pressure for storage of wheat in the Nation without too adverse an effect upon the market value of corn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire, if I may, what did the evidence disclose and what did the Agricultural Department say as to what they would do with this corn and wheat when they sell it for feed purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. The sales are of two types. One is a class of sale to those who

grind and prepare feed for animals and poultry. In such cases the sales are made under license, and the mill where the mixing or preparing is done is supervised or policed by a representative of the Department of Agriculture in order to make sure that the grain actually goes into feed.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield further, how long has that been going on? I refer to the practice of having the processing supervised or policed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it has been going on ever since the sale of some 20,000,000 bushels of corn to someone who made a profit of 5 cents a bushel out of it. The Senator from Illinois is familiar with that instance.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I wanted to bring out in order to ascertain whether the Agricultural Department was still selling corn or wheat to processors who in turn were selling it back to the market, without actually feeding it or actually processing it, and making a profit on it. That has been done in the past, as I understand. I wanted to ascertain from the able Senator just what safeguards the Agricultural Department itself will set up in order that there may be no repetition of such an occurrence.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois mentioned to me the incident referred to involving the sale of twenty-odd million bushels of corn. I, therefore, sent for officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation after the hearing had closed and examined them to ascertain what steps were taken to prevent the repetition of such an occurrence.

I was advised that in connection with sales to the feed manufacturers they were policing to see that the grain sold for feed was actually devoted to that purpose.

The other sales are made to the farmers on the farms. There are many cases of a hog farmer having some wheat on storage. He can go to his county agricultural committee and request the sale of some of this wheat for feed purposes, and if the local committee approves his application and his showing that he does not have corn available in sufficient amount to feed the livestock on his own farm, the committee might permit him to purchase a sufficient amount of wheat with which to feed. If he does not have the wheat on his own farm and does not have sufficient for feed, the county committee will permit him to purchase from his neighbors' bins, or will approve his application for a certain amount of wheat, after a showing that it will be fed to livestock on the farmer's place. I was impressed that if the Department was doing what it said it was doing, it was examining and policing this matter about as well as it could be done.

As I have said, while the pending proposal is not what the administration ask, they do say it will enable them to take the pressure off wheat, and I am advised that it would be accepted.

The proposal is not altogether pleasing to the wheat interests. Some of our friends from the wheat-producing areas were very much opposed to the limitation of 85 percent of corn parity. Some of them were very much opposed to placing any limitation on the amount of wheat which could be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In an effort to deal fairly with the corn producers, and place a limitation of 125,000,000 bushels as the total which could be sold, we also provide by the amendment pending that it could not be sold below a price equal to 85 percent of corn parity.

The representatives from the States which are primarily devoted to the production of corn have indicated that they do not approve this amendment, and other statements to the same effect will be made by some of those who have not as yet expressed themselves on the floor of the Senate. But I wish to point out to the Senate that, while they are interested in preserving this principle of 100 percent parity in the market place on the feed corn and wheat now being discussed, as well as on all corn and wheat used for other purposes, they cannot fairly complain that the action of the Senate in adopting this amendment would reduce the actual income of the farmers below 100 percent of parity, for under the terms of the bill, parity payments will be made in an amount sufficient to supplement the price, and to enable the corn farmer to have 100 percent parity of income.

The committee has done the best it could with this question, and I have endeavored to give the facts, as well as I could remember them, as they were presented to the committee.

Some question arose as to the amount of parity payments necessary to be made to bring the corn farmer to full 100 percent of parity. According to the table which I have here, if the agricultural conservation program payments are included as provided in the bill, and the worst comes to the worst, and the corn is all sold for as low as 85 percent of parity, it will require $97,000,000 to bring the corn farmers' income to full 100 percent of parity. As I stated earlier, no man can say today what the market trend of commodities will be within the next few weeks or months, or, indeed, in the next few days, because we are living in a very abnormal period.

I think the amendment is fair, that it will enable the wheat farmer to find a place in which to store his grain, and to take advantage of the 85-percent loan, and that it will save for the Nation a great income loss which is bound to result if there is no place of storage for the wheat.

It may cause the corn farmer to get less than 100 percent of parity in the market place, as our friends apprehend, but it assures to him full parity income from parity payments, and, more than that, the amendment will put a floor of 85 percent of parity under corn, whereas there is absolutely no protection whatever to the corn producer today, and no limitation upon the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The committee has done its best, and I hope that the amendment as amended will be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss a few phases of the pending question, but before speaking of particular elements I wish to discuss I preface my remarks by the statement that, contrary to the hopes expressed by some of the newspapers in Washington and elsewhere, there is not a fight going on in the so-called farm bloc. I have been in this body for several years, and was a member of the House for several years, and in the time I have been in Congress, if there has been a farm bloc, I have not been invited to join it. I am one of the dirt farmers, as I have stated here time and time again. I represent in part the greatest agricultural State in the United States. That statement is not made with any invidious purpose, but is based on the record. If there were a farm bloc here and a bloc system of legislation in vogue, a proper one, I should like to be a member of it.

I have sat on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry year after year with Members of this body from the cotton-growing sections, from the wheat-growing sections, from the vegetable-growing sections, from the fruit-growing sections, from the corn and the wheat and the livestock-growing sections, and I have never found a time when the Senators from those constituencies were not ready to make every reasonable concession, and give their support to the enactment of legislation for the welfare of the country, and in many instances they have made concessions which they would not have made if they had been selfish in their attitude for their particular constituencies. So I wish to say to the Washington newspapers and to any of the other newspapers which are making similar statements that there is no fight in the agricultural bloc, if one exists, and there is no greedy agricultural group.

If there is anyone any more patriotic, more willing to make concessions, than the men representing these constituencies, I do not know who they are. If there are any people in the United States who are any more patriotic, any more ready to make concession and to give help to the war program than those living in the agricultural sections, I do not know who they are. If the proposal in the pending appropriation bill which we are now discussing, placed there by the House, were left as it came over from the House, I should not be on the floor of the Senate today saying a word. I should then feel as I feel now, that the provision placed in the bill is an ineffectual, useless thing; but I should like to have the Members of the Senate keep in mind that it was an expression of opinion.

What is the provision as it came from the other House? It provides:

> That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks.

To what agency does the appropriation make these funds available? To the Commodity Credit Corporation. What is the Commodity Credit Corporation? It is a private corporation set up under the laws of the State of Delaware, under governmental authority. It is a legal child, born in lawful wedlock, under a statute enacted by the legislative body and signed by the Executive. The pres-

ent administration is a child born out of wedlock, with Executive parentage, under Executive order. The powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation were turned over to the Department of Agriculture, again by the President's Executive order, issued under authority we conferred on him under the act for the reorganization of Government departments. By Executive order he turned the authority over to the Agricultural Marketing Administration. That can be changed tomorrow by Executive order and the power placed elsewhere. The powers do not exist in this group by authority of law except as the law has been exercised on authority delegated by the Congress to the executive department.

I am not criticizing the exercise of the authority we gave to the President, and he has probably reposed the authority in the proper place, but I am calling attention to the fact that the language as drafted merely prohibits the use of the funds in the payment of administrative expenses in connection with the sale of these Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities.

How is a check to be made to determine whether the Agricultural Marketing Administration is abiding by the instruction? Is a check to be made by the General Accounting Office? All in the world they need to do is to step to the telephone and call. An entry may be made by a bookkeeper, a letter may be written by a stenographer, but the payments are made out of the general administrative appropriation.

It is not necessary to use a nickel of this amount; so as a matter of fact the proposal is absolutely ineffective; but, it is an expression of legislative attitude.

Some time ago, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said that he, the eminent Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the present speaker joined in presenting a substantive proposal in the Senate prohibiting the control of these stocks of farm commodities so as to utilize them in driving down the farmer's price below parity, possibly, and I shall allude to that in a moment. We did not try to come in by the back door and place in an appropriation bill a limitation on departmental expenditures, but we provided for an out-and-out prohibition against certain action being taken. The proposal to which I referred passed the Senate by more than a 2-to-1 vote. There we find the expression of the Senate's viewpoint. The measure went to the House. The House has not as yet acted on it. The only time the House acted on anything approaching this proposal was by placing a provision in this appropriation bill in the ineffective way to which I have alluded.

Why was it done? Because when our proposal was adopted by the Senate by more than a two-thirds majority certain executive powers in the Government served notice that if the measure were passed it would be vetoed. That is a constitutional and a proper exercise of power on the part of the Executive department. In the place of such a proposal as that submitted by the four Senators to whom I referred, which was adopted by the Senate, we find this abortive thing which has been placed in this appropriation bill in the hope that the President will not veto it, because at the same time he would be vetoing a departmental appropriation bill. That is what is before us. I will say to the able Senator from Georgia that, even if the measure had been reported in that way, ineffective, useless, improper as I think the proposal is, I should have made no objection to it, because it would be, so far as the record shows, a 100-percent expression of the opinion of the associate branch of the Congress that it did not want to see an agency of this Government which had taken surpluses off the market to support prices drive down the prices of the farm commodities in question and prevent them from reaching a parity position. It was a 100-percent expression of opinion on the other side of the Capitol, and a better than 2-to-1 expression of opinion by the Senate.

Mr. President, I say this in all kindness to the Senator from Georgia. I love him. He cooperated with us. While he did not express himself, my esteemed brother Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] did, and fought here manfully hour after hour to maintain the principle for which we have fought here for 10 years in trying to put agriculture in a parity position with other industry.

Mr. President, in the face of that better than 2-to-1 expression of opinion in the Senate, in the face of a 100-percent expression of opinion, so far as the record shows, on the House side, as embodied in the bill, the Senate committee now comes forward and abandons that for which we fought, the structure which it took 10 years to build. The committee proposes to undermine that structure and to destroy it.

Senators, do not think it is simply to provide for an exigency now existing in the wheat situation; what is proposed to be done would result in destroying a principle. Perhaps my judgment is wrong; perhaps the principles for which I stand are wrong; but I never traded them off to meet an emergency situation. Representing, as I do, a corn constituency, I will say that the corn farmers will make any concession which it is proper to make, but we shall take a firm position against any proposal which involves the destruction of a principle in which we believe.

I do not know whether all Senators favor the crop-control method of handling the farm problem, but that is the policy of this Government, and has been its policy ever since 1933. That is why the Senate and the House rose up and said, "When you take off the market farm surpluses to enable the farmers to reach a parity position with industry we will not permit you to use the same surpluses to drive down the market."

When surpluses are taken off the market for the purpose of keeping them out of the market in order to maintain prices, the surpluses, if they are allowed to be a threat, hang like a sword of Damocles over the market and drive it down. Let me say to the Senate that whenever there is a mention in the press that Congress is about to reverse itself on the maintenance of the parity principle, the market for wheat and corn breaks in Chicago from one and a half to three cents. Every time John Jones takes a load of corn to the elevator in a little town in Iowa or in a little town in some other State, or Bill Smith in Oklahoma takes a load of wheat to town, or a farmer in Montana or in Oregon takes a load of grain to town, he suffers that loss, because the price is made for him—where? It is not made by him, but by the grain exchange.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Iowa is making a very able argument for the maintenance of parity, for which the Congress of the United States has worked for a period of from 10 to 15 years. Everyone in Congress has been in agreement with respect to that principle. A moment ago the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], in speaking of the amendment now pending providing that only 125,000,000 bushels of wheat shall be permitted to be sold, said that is simply an infinitesimal amount compared with the half billion bushels of wheat which are in the bins at the present time in reserve, along with the 1,000,000,000 bushels expected to be produced this year. I, however, in this premise must assume that the war will last for a long time, though I hope it will not.

Mr. GILLETTE. God forbid, but it may last for a long time.

Mr. LUCAS. The only way we can plan successfully to win the war is to look at it on the basis of a long period of time. If the amendment is agreed to, and the Department of Agriculture is permitted to sell 125,000,000 bushels of wheat anywhere and everywhere, including the corn area, which in the final analysis is going to need more of it than any other place, that will be just the beginning. If we have another year of war, and another bumper crop of wheat, which we will probably have next year, it may mean 250,000,000, or 300,000,000, or 400,000,000 bushels which the Department will want to sell under this program. Under such legislation I visualize the possibility of a distinct injury to the corn farmer of America. I do not care how much he raises or how much he feeds, if the proposed legislation is enacted into law it seems to me it will be the beginning of a threat which will hang over the corn farmer, so far as the corn farmer being able to obtain a near parity or parity price for his corn is concerned.

Mr. President, if there ever was a time in the history of the country when the American farmer should receive parity price for his grain, it is now. There is more money in the country now than there ever was before in its history. More people are working now than ever before. People are more able to pay parity price in this country than they ever were before in its history. I have stood on the Senate floor time and time again and said that the American farmer

did not want a dole, that he did not want a hand-out, and if the time ever came when, through the law of supply and demand, the American farmer could obtain parity price for his corn, his wheat, and his cotton, I for one would be the first individual to urge the repeal of legislation existing on the statute books which is not in harmony with the law of supply and demand, and urge that we forego the legislative machinery which exists in the Department of Agriculture and throughout the country, and permit the law of supply and demand once again to rule. This, Mr. President, is not an inflationary amendment. This will in no way disturb or dislocate a fundamental economy now existing.

Mr. President, let it be understood that I am not against soil conservation and all the other beneficial laws affecting agriculture which have been enacted under President Roosevelt's administration. I think what this administration has done for the American farmer has been the greatest boon to the agricultural community in the history of our country. Many times the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I, along with other Senators, have stood on the floor of the Senate and fought for this very thing which it seems to me we are now beginning somewhat to abandon through what seems to be a sort of an innocent amendment, the purpose of which is to bring the wheat out and permit it to be sold and fed throughout the country.

Mr. President, I simply wanted to make this statement at this point in the argument, for whatever it is worth, because I believe that once we permit the nose of the camel to come under the tent, through this amendment, we may rue the day, and that is especially true if we have a long, sustained war.

Let me make a further observation. There was a basic reason, and always has been, for mandatory corn laws in this country, because of the fact that we feed 85 percent of the corn we raise in the Corn Belt section to the cattle and the hogs. But if we bring in wheat to compete with corn for feeding we shall begin to see a larger surplus of corn. The 85 percent we feed will be substantially decreased because wheat will be in competition with corn. The basic soundness of mandatory corn loans is seriously challenged. The entire loan program may fail through its own excessive weight. Heretofore surplus wheat has gone abroad, and Liverpool has furnished the market for wheat; but Liverpool never furnished a market for corn.

A mandatory corn loan is economically sound and socially desirable, but I have always doubted the economic soundness of the mandatory loans on cotton and wheat, because the surplus had to be sold abroad. The foreign market controlled the market here.

Let me say in conclusion that after all the thing in which we are all interested more than anything else is the war effort. No one in the Senate has been more insistent in attempting to eliminate the differences which exist among Members of the Senate on all these questions in order to promote harmony, thereby promoting the war effort. However, in justice and fairness, I believe that the corn farmer has a right to make this protest at this particular time.

The able Senator from Georgia is an expert on cotton. If the cotton farmers of the South were in the same position as are the Corn Belt farmers in the North, there would be a pretty hot fight on the floor of the Senate. I do not blame Senators representing the cotton farmers. I like them. They certainly protect their constituents every time a measure is before Congress which might be adverse to the cotton farmers. They fight against it. That is what they should do. The other day a distinguished Senator from the South said to a friend of mine from Illinois, "You have nobody in the Corn Belt who will fight for his rights." My record for fighting for the American farmer in the 7 years I have been a Member of the Congress speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I conscientiously believe that what little contribution I am making, if any, or what vote I may make here is in no way crippling the war effort.

I am not attempting to promote any argument on the floor of the Senate. I merely wish to state our position as I see it. I am willing to abide by the decision of the Senate, and let it go at that. We will get along as best we can. I realize that we all have to give and take. In my State we have one and a half million acres of wheat. I have wheat on my farms in Illinois. I do not know what we are going to do with it. Nevertheless, we have it. However, corn is the chief product, and it is one of the basic products of America. I dislike to see legislation which may injure the future price of corn. And may I say that in this assumption I hope that I am wrong?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his correct and very helpful presentation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the statement which the Senator from Illinois has made about the fight which Senators and Representatives from cotton-producing States make to protect the interests of their constituents. My only regret is that the Senator from Illinois did not make that statement down in Georgia or in the Cotton Belt. I can assure him that we have been subjected to the most serious criticism by our constituents because of the fact that the payment per acre for land which is taken out of corn cultivation, and the payment per acre for land which is taken out of wheat cultivation under the conservation program are more than the amount of the payment for land taken out of cotton production.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator, and I only wish they were true. I wish we had been able to protect and promote our interests. However, I do not think that discussion serves any useful purpose. Farmers producing each commodity naturally feel that they are discriminated against in certain cases. I think that, by and large, those of us who have been interested in giving the farmers of the Nation an opportunity to exist and to have an income even remotely comparable to that of those engaged in other lines of endeavor have been rather unselfish, on the whole, in our approach to the problem. I am certainly not striking at the corn farmers in any way in promoting this amendment.

I was interested in hearing the Senator from Illinois say that the effect of the amendment would be to get the camel's nose under the tent with respect to selling certain commodities at less than parity. The whole camel is now under the tent. There is no limitation or restriction anywhere which would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling surplus stock at any price it might deem proper. The effect of the amendment would be to get the camel out from under the tent and put a floor of 85 percent of parity under the sale of grains for feed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely wish to make a brief reply to my able and distinguished friend from Georgia, for whom I have the utmost respect.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator that the feeling is reciprocated.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me assure both Senators that each of them has good reason for his respect for the other, if that will be of any help to them.

Mr. LUCAS. No one is more capable or more interested in agricultural problems than is the Senator from Georgia. I merely wish to say to him that if his constituency in Georgia is giving him any trouble in connection with the cotton problem, I know a couple of corn-fed Senators who would be glad to go there sometime and help him out in a campaign.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GILLETTE. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to endorse everything the Senator from Illinois has said concerning the Senator from Georgia, if he needed any such endorsement. His labors have been ceaseless and valuable in all phases of the farm problem.

The fact remains that cotton may not be sold below a parity position; rice may not be sold below a parity position; tobacco may not be sold below a parity position; but, under the terms of the proposal now before the Senate, the other two commodities, wheat and corn, may be sold below parity. The proposal before us would do away with the position of 85 percent of parity for wheat. Parity for wheat is $1.33 plus. Eighty-five percent of parity is $1.13 plus. The price of wheat on the farm today is 99.6 cents; and under the terms of the amendment sound wheat could be sold for feed at 83.2 cents, or 85 percent of parity for corn. It is called a floor. There is no floor under the Commodity Credit Corporation today in selling such products.

In that connection I should like to quote from an editorial writer in yesterday morning's Washington Post. When I read the editorial pages of Washington

newspapers I often think of the lines from Oliver Goldsmith's Deserted Village:

And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew.
That one small head could carry all he knew.

I have been astounded at the wisdom which is concentrated in the minds of the editorial writers of some of the Washington newspapers. They are omniscient. Yesterday morning one of them delivered himself of this valuable nugget of wisdom:

The utter outrageousness of the proposal to bar sales of corn and wheat below parity is easily demonstrated. For instance, the Government now owns about 320,000,000 bushels of wheat. Recently it offered wheat for sale as livestock feed at prices equivalent to about 85 percent of parity. It managed to dispose of only 1,560,000 bushels. What chance, then, for disposing of wheat at parity levels? And what excuse can the farm bloc offer for trying to boost feedstuff prices to levels that would squeeze the farmers themselves as well as other consumers?

If the Commodity Credit Corporation was able to sell only 1,560,000 bushels of wheat at 85 percent of parity why did it not lower the price? It has full authority to do so. It sold corn and shipped it to an alcohol-distilling company in Philadelphia, paid 41 cents a hundred freight on it from the Mississippi River, and 33 cents to the distiller for processing it, netting less than 5 cents a bushel to the marketing corporation.

Why does it not lower the price? Because it does not want to fly in the face of an expression by the Congress in support of a principle for which we have fought for 10 years to put agriculture in a parity position. Two-thirds of the Senate said, "You cannot do it." One hundred percent of the House said, "You cannot do it." The Corporation does not have the "guts" to do it without coming to Congress, and it wants us to give it legislative authority. Then when it breaks the market its officers will say, "You directed us to do it. You receded from your position to break the market. You took away the prohibition and told us to go ahead. We are proceeding under your authority."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The trouble with my good friend from Iowa is that he has fallen into the error which so many others have committed, of believing what he reads in the editorial columns of the Washington Post.

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no. Accuse me of anything but that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator stated that the Corporation had not sold any considerable quantity of wheat for feed. As a matter of fact, before the hearings on this bill were concluded it had sold 22,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed, at a price 4 cents below 85 percent of corn parity. Under the terms of this amendment it could not sell it below 85 percent of corn parity. Today it is proceeding to sell all the wheat it can for feed. It was stated before the committee that it had already sold 22,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed, and was proposing to sell as much of it as possible for feed.

So the things to which the Senator refers as having a deterring effect on the Department have absolutely proved to be no restraint whatever. They have not restrained the Department. It is selling wheat for feed today.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well. Let me say to the Senator that it is perfectly all right with me. Whether the committee amendment is agreed to or whether it is voted down, I shall move to strike out that provision, which is an attempted sanction by the legislative branch of Government of the destruction of the Nation's agricultural economy. Then if the Department wants to take the onus, and fly in the face of the expression of the Senate and of the other House, and sell 1,560,000 bushels, let them go ahead. I desire to refer to that in a moment; but before doing so I see that my good friend the senior Senator from Montana is present. He will do some yeoman work. I want him to come to my support, because I become frightened when I am on my feet, and I need his support.

In that connection, speaking of the parity provision, let me read the report of the Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, written the first of this year. I refer to Mr. Evans, who is now the farm member of the Federal Reserve Board. He said:

Parity remains the goal, and the abundant production of American farmers is the best possible assurance to consumers and others that food is going to continue to be forthcoming at prices fair to both consumers and farmers. To the extent that increases in food prices represent parity prices to farmers, these increases are justified, and prices which consumers in fairness should be willing to pay.

However, the price paid to the farmer represents only a portion of the price paid by the consumer. The rest of the consumer's dollar goes to middlemen, such as processors, handlers, and distributors. Actually, the middlemen collectively get a larger portion of the consumer's food dollar than does the farmer. Thus, the farmer properly is as much concerned with the margin going to the middlemen as is the consumer.

During the first half of 1941 farmers received only a little over a cent from the sale of a loaf of white bread retailing at almost 8 cents on the average. The producer's share of a 7-cent package of cornflakes averaged less than a cent and a half. Cotton growers got about 8 cents for producing the material in a dollar cotton shirt.

The average workingman paid $415 for food in 1929, but at the prices prevailing in the first half of 1941 the same food cost only $327, or about a fifth less. Thus, in spite of some rises in food prices, the city consumer's food-buying power in 1940–41 was the highest since the World War.

To digress for a moment, let me call the attention of Senators who come from wheat-producing States to Mr. Evans' statement as to the position of the administration on wheat surpluses:

Three measures are designed to keep excess wheat off the market:

(1) The farmer is encouraged to store the production in excess of his quota on his farm or in a public warehouse. To guarantee that he will keep this wheat in storage, he is asked to deposit a bond or cash with the county Agricultural Adjustment Administration committee. As an inducement for storing his excess, he is offered a loan on the excess at 60 percent of the regular rate, provided it is stored in a granary approved for loans. * * *

(2) The farmer may turn his marketing excess over to the Government to be taken out of trade channels and used for relief purposes or other noncommercial uses.

(3) The farmer may pay the marketing penalty, which in 1941 was 49 cents a bushel, 50 percent of the national basic loan rate of 98 cents.

If the farmer wanted to go ahead and market it and pay the penalty for the amount over the quota, he had the right to do so.

Before I leave the question of relative income, let me say that yesterday the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]—I wish he were present here—quoted from a letter from Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, in which he referred to the 20-percent increase in farm income and suggested that the farmers should be satisfied with such an increase.

In that connection, let me say that I draw a salary of $10,000 a year, perhaps under false pretenses, but nevertheless I draw a salary of $10,000 a year as a Senator from the State of Iowa. If, out of that $10,000, I were to give Mrs. Gillette $1 for household expenses, and then were to decide, in generosity, to increase it 20 percent, and give her a dollar and twenty cents, what good would that do her?

When we are talking about a 20-percent increase, the question arises, What is the relative position? Let me cite figures stated by an esteemed Representative of the State of Missouri, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, as his remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of recent date.

In Mr. Morgenthau's letter which was quoted yesterday a comparison was made between farm income in 1932 and the increased farm income in 1941. Listen to this:

The total national income in 1932 was $48,355,000,000. The national income in 1941 was $80,350,000,000—almost double, representing an increase of approximately 170 percent.

In 1932 the nonfarm income was $46,000,000,000, out of $48,000,000,000. In 1941 it was $75,000,000,000 out of $80,000,000,000.

The farmers represent approximately 33 percent of the population; but in 1932 the farmers' share of the national income was 3.7 percent; and in 1941, the figures for which the Secretary of the Treasury pointed as a wonderful factual presentation of the improved position of the farmer, the farmers, representing substantially one-third of the population of the Nation, received 5.8 percent of the national income.

Oh, we are told that the cost of living is going up, and that to meet the increased costs of living, wages must be increased. Wages have been increased, and I am not raising any objection to that. Wages have been increased to meet the increased cost of living. Today there is a bill before Congress which proposes, in order to meet the increased cost of living and to provide increased purchasing power, that the salary of every one of the Federal employees shall be increased so much a year. That bill,

designed to enable the Federal workers to meet the increased cost of living, will be before the Senate in a very short time.

The farmers constitute one-third of the population of the country. They are consumers as well as producers. They are originators of every nickel's worth of new wealth which is produced; yet, instead of putting them in a comparable relative position with other consumers Senators sponsoring the amendment come before the Senate under cover of an exigency—and I say that in all kindness; they do not do it purposely—and say, "We will take the props out from under your purchasing power as a consumer. We will not let you have the parity position for which you fought for years."

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. GILLETTE. I see that the Senator from Georgia is on his feet. I shall yield to him in a few moments. In the meantime I ask him, please, to wait.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can well understand why the Senator does not want to yield to me at this juncture.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator will be patient with me, I shall yield to him in a moment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can understand why the Senator does not want to yield to me at this time.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator will be patient with me I shall give him every chance to reply. Perhaps the Senator may consider that I am being unkind to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator has made a statement which is not justified by the facts; and it was for the purpose of calling attention to that matter that I rose.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well; I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said that this amendment, if agreed to, would impair the purchasing power of the farmer. I pointed out that the 15-percent difference between the 85 percent of parity and the 100 percent of parity would be paid to the farmer out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Therefore, as a result of feeding grain at a lower price, the farmer would be able to buy more commodities. The corn farmer would have a 15-percent additional parity payment.

So certainly the figures which the Senator quoted in regard to the corn farmers' parity position income are not correct. I have voted year after year to increase the farmers' income; but the pending amendment does not involve any question of increasing the farmers' income. If the sale of wheat at 15 percent below the parity price of corn should beat down the corn farmer's income to 85 percent of parity, under this bill provision is made for the payment of 15 percent of parity to the farmer from the Federal Treasury.

So, in supporting the amendment proposed by the committee, I am not opposing the farmers.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall yield in a moment, but I ask the Senator to wait until I reply to the Senator from Georgia.

The Senator from Georgia is correct in the statement that it is intended to supplement the farmer's income by parity payments from the United States Treasury, if and when made.

In an adjunct to the table which was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative CANNON, it was shown that the farmer's share of the national income, when parity payments and soil-conservation payments were added, was 6 6 percent of the entire national income. In addition, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that the agricultural communities do not want to be on a dole. All they want is an opportunity to work as the rest of the Nation works and to receive a fair return. They do not want to depend on a position based on "if and when" parity payments are made available.

I say to the Senator that in this bill authority is provided to reappropriate unexpended balances of sums previously made available for parity payments, and such other sums as may be necessary to give the farmers full parity; but that depends on future action, if and when such sums are made available by the Congress. The farmers do not want any "if and when" position. All they want is an opportunity to work and to receive a fair return.

Before I yield to the Senator from Montana let me point out that the Secretary of Agriculture was quoted many times as saying that if corn and wheat prices were allowed to go to parity the result would be to add $1,000,000,000 to the cost of living of the consumers of the country. I do not have before me a copy of the letter which I addressed to the Secretary asking him on what basis his assertion was made that allowing grain and foodstuffs to go to parity would mean an increase of a billion dollars in the consumer's cost of living. I read this excerpt from his reply, which was dated March 4, 1942:

> In answer to your request of February 27, I am enclosing a copy of the statements upon which the estimates of certain possible increases in the cost of food to consumers were based.

I skip to this point in the letter:

> I should also call your attention to the fact that these estimates make some allowance—

Mark this—

> these estimates make some allowance for an accompanying advance in the margins or charges of processors, wholesalers, and retailers based upon typical behavior in the past. But I believe, and I think you will agree, that any substantial increase in raw product prices will certainly be used as a basis for pyramiding or increasing middlemen's costs, at least as soon as current inventories are worked off.

There is the answer to the assertion that an increase in farm prices will result in an increased cost of a billion dollars to the consumers. The Secretary of Agriculture, who made that statement, says that he envisioned distribution costs, processing costs, the middlemen's costs, the handlers' costs, the profiteers' costs, and the racketeers' costs, which would be piled on to take their toll of the consumers' dollar. All that is envisioned in the assertion of a billion-dollar increase in living costs.

Mr. President, the livestock industry has been referred to as being placed in an unfortunate position. I have before me a letter from the United States Livestock Association, from which I read the following excerpt:

> Farmers do not want subsidies; they merely want fair prices for the sale of their products. Farmers want to conserve financial resources to win the war, believing it unnecessary to burden the Treasury. This is the first time in many years the farmers can obtain equitable prices for their products.

I also have a letter of the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and, Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that it and the tables accompanying it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the April 15 position of hogs, cattle, and feed. On April 15 the United States parity price for hogs was $10.98; the average farm price was $13.48. For cattle on the 15th of April the United States parity price was $8.18; the average farm price was $10.71. For beef steers at Chicago, choice and prime, the parity equivalent was $13.33; the average price $15.56. For cattle rated as good the parity equivalent was $12.02; the average price $13.70. The point is that the livestock interests have no objection whatever to this proposal; they are now in a price position where they are supporting the proposal, and have so advised me, so that the grain farmers may receive a fair return.

Mr. President, I do not want to speak unduly long on this question. I desire to go back to the basic question which is at issue, but before doing that let me say that, for one, I was opposed to the production control method of meeting the farm problem. I believed then, and I believe now, that the ultimate solution is in the development of new uses. I should have been glad if the Senator from Montana had remained in the Chamber while I discussed this matter, but I do not blame him for leaving.

By the direction of the Senate, under orders to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there was set up a subcommittee to study the uses for farm products. During the last 3 or 4 weeks we have developed astounding information, and I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to ask Senators for help. We are not coming here, as some subcommittees have done, to ask for more money to carry on our very excellent work. The committee was given $5,000; we have spent less than $500, and I believe we will not spend any more than another hundred or two hundred dollars. It has been developed before the subcommittee that the war needs of this country in the way of rubber are so acute as to be almost desperate. The estimates of the needs have been raised by the rubber board from 100,000 tons in December to 800,000 tons now, with the probability of 1,200,000 tons in 1943. We have demonstrated by a procession of scientists, without exception and without

dispute, that there can be produced synthetic rubber from petroleum sources and from agricultural sources on a competitive basis. It has been shown to our committee that plants could be established for the utilization of farm products.

Mr. WHEELER entered the Chamber.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator from Montana has returned. Let me say to him that I was referring to the very excellent work that he, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and my own humble self have been trying to do in connection with the utilization of farm surpluses. We have had demonstrated to us that plants for the utilization of farm products can be established at one-tenth the cost of the critical materials, in one-third the time, and that synthetic rubber and alcohol can be produced from that source on a competitive basis with any other type or process. Let me say to my colleagues, in the face of that, that our rubber defense agency has asked the R. F. C. to allocate $650,000,000 for the establishment of plants to develop the production of synthetic rubber or to produce butadiene from which it is made. Where do you think, Mr. President, the allocation was made? Every dollar of the $650,000,000 was allocated to the petroleum industry, not one nickel of it to the agricultural industry. Group after group have come to Washington from Nebraska,, from Missouri, from Oklahoma, from South Dakota, from Illinois, and other States and asked for means to establish plants in their territories. One group from Nebraska came here and said they were ready to put in five 10,000-gallon plants. They were told here that they could not have the money. They returned home and raised the money—every dollar of it. They came back to Washington and said, "We have the money." They were told, "Well, we have not the critical materials; you cannot have it." They went back home. optioned old plants, got 90 percent of the material, and returned to Washington, and said, "We own 90 percent of the materials. We want 10 percent; in fact, we do not care if it is only 2 percent. Yet they were told, "You cannot have it."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad the Senator has brought up the subject. I was going to say that if the Government wanted to get rubber badly and cheaply, they could take the surplus wheat that they now hold and use it for the making of alcohol and butadiene, and they could then get a very large quantity of rubber in a short time, and by doing so they would use all the surpluses of wheat so that they would not constitute any problem at all for the wheat farmers of the country. The Government could take all the surplus of wheat now on hand and make it into alcohol. The Government has it on hand and owns it. If it is kept, it will deteriorate in value. Furthermore, there is another large crop of wheat coming on.

With the Government already owning the wheat, they could use it and convert it into alcohol. They could build the plants for less money than it would cost to build the plants to manufacture alcohol out of oil or gasoline, and by reason of the fact that they own the wheat and that it is deteriorating, and they wish to sell it at a low price, they could by using it in this manner get rid of the whole surplus of wheat they have, could they not?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is absolutely true.

Mr. WHEELER. But instead of that, they are granting money to the oil companies and to others to enable them to manufacture alcohol out of gasoline, shipping the gasoline in many instances from the West, and using it in various plants, thereby tying up transportation, whereas if they built the plants where the wheat is stored, they could eliminate the long hauls, and the bottleneck we are sure to have in railroad transportation. Yet, as the Senator has said, we have not been able to get anyone in the departments in Washington to do a thing about it. They have turned a deaf ear to people from Nebraska and the other States who wish to use these surplus grains for the manufacture of alcohol, and are turning all the money over to the oil companies and the others who are going to use gasoline.

The only reason we can imagine for this is the powerful influence the oil companies have in the O. P. M. and various other departments of the Government.

If grain were used, and the farmers were permitted to produce all the wheat and corn they desired to produce, we would be keeping the farmers on the farms, and in times of depression we would be giving more work to a great many people on the farms, and would be helping the farmers. But instead of that, the money is being turned over to one of the greatest monopolies that ever existed in the history of the United States.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. While we are speaking of the $650,000,000 provided for the construction of these plants by the petroleum industry under the existing contracts—and the testimony is that the amount will eventually be eight or nine hundred million—I might add that at the conclusion of the war the plants are to be in adjusted ownership for the petroleum companies which have them, whereas if plants were built in the agricultural sections they would be there for the utilization of recurring surpluses.

The Senator from Georgia said, "I am in favor of that, but it is a question of time." We have the testimony of the greatest producer of grain alcohol in the world today that existing facilities, without the construction of new plants, can produce 200,000 tons of the needed rubber, and utilize 24,000,000 bushels of wheat. We do not desire to shut off the petroleum industry. We shall need every pound of rubber the petroleum industry can make and every pound of rubber any other industry can make, we shall need every pound of natural rubber we can get, but those who would use the grain are shut out of the picture.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that in the committee amendment there is no limitation on the amount of grain which may be sold for the production of alcohol. Even with the amendment it could all be sold to industries for the production of alcohol if that is desired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In my opinion, the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Montana have been telling an amazing story, one which should be carried to every corner of the country. If I understand the Senator correctly, he is telling us that the R. F. C. and the W. P. B. are not cooperating in the efforts of citizens of the Corn Belt to establish plants which can use the surplus grain. Am I correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator is correct. They have not been cooperating. I shall explain that in a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator whether these individuals of whom he spoke as having come to Washington came with an organization capable of furnishing the management for the corporations which could use the grain out of which to make rubber.

Mr. GILLETTE. In most instances they came with a complete prospectus and an organization with which to carry on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did any one such organization present itself here?

Mr. GILLETTE. To the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To the committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. They have done so, and it will appear in the record of the hearings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to get it into this RECORD, because, as I have said, the Senator is telling an amazing story.

Mr. GILLETTE. I refer particularly to a group, a cooperative organization, from the State of Nebraska, which was prepared to put in five plants. They were thoroughly organized and the money was available.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the interesting point, if I may interrupt the Senator. The Senator says the money was available. Did they have the capital?

Mr. GILLETTE. They raised it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How much did they raise?

Mr. GILLETTE. I could not tell the amount from memory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator say approximately?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; I cannot. When they were advised that they could not be financed from this end, they went home, and raised all that was necessary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All they were told was necessary?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; all their engineers estimated to be necessary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] that they have retained an engineer.

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So the picture we have taken here is that of individual citizens of the State of Nebraska who had formed an organization capable of conducting a plant and were applying for a

Government loan through the R. F. C. in order to produce a very necessary commodity by a process which every scientific witness before the committee testified was feasible, and the loan was rejected?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only was the loan rejected, but they were turned down by the W. P. B. when they applied for strategic materials. Is not that correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. I would not say that the loan was turned down by the R. F. C. They were advised—and I will use the name—by Mr. Fraser Moffat, Chief of the Chemical Division of the War Production Board—that money would not be forthcoming from any governmental agency for the establishment of their plants. They went home and raised the money, returned to Washington, and said, "We have our funds, and we do not ask for Government financing." They were told, "You cannot have materials. We need them in the war effort." They went back home and found old plants, which they optioned or bought, and again returned and said, "We have 90 percent of our materials. All we have to have is 10 percent." The reply was, "I don't give a damn if you need only 2 percent." The testimony shows that. That is not language I ordinarily use on the Senate floor——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is under emotional stress, and we will excuse him. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. They said, "You cannot have even 2 percent."

Mr. WHEELER. That is not the Senator's language; that is the language that was used by the W. P. B.; is it not?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the language they were quoted as using.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator long enough to make an additional comment. The story which he tells with respect to the failure of O. P. M. and W. P. B. to cooperate in the development of new sources for producing materials which are needed is a story as old as the establishment of O. P. M. itself. More than a year ago the experts of O. P. M. said we had enough aluminum with which to fight the war. They were wrong. They told us that we could get enough rubber for the war. They were wrong. They told us that we had enough steel to last to provide the needs of the Nation in the midst of war. They were wrong.

Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives for more than a year have been endeavoring to bring about the development of raw materials. There is a story with respect to iron at this very moment which is about to be told. There is pending before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the Interior Department appropriation bill a proposal to make it possible to utilize the so-called sponge-iron process for the manufacture of iron which is necessary, not only to build warships and tanks and other munitions but to provide the strategic materials for such a plant as that the Senator has in mind, as well as to build a pipe line to carry petroleum and gasoline from where it is being wasted—in the West—to the eastern seaboard States, where it is needed, and to furnish the Army and the Navy with the gasoline which they need in order to win the war. But at this very moment the effort to secure a test of the sponge-iron process is being resisted by those who have investments in a different process.

Those who are interested in the coke-oven process of producing pig iron do not want to see another process even tested. I have a feeling that before the Interior Department bill shall be passed the Senate will approve the estimate. It is now pending in the Bureau of the Budget, and I am confident that the Bureau of the Budget will see the importance, indeed, the absolute necessity, of making certain that these processes shall be completely tested.

I am happy to have the Senator make this reference, because if the country fails to realize the basic truth of what he says, the tremendous importance of using agricultural products for the production of materials which we need, and for which agricultural products can readily be used through the advances in chemistry, when the war shall have ended this country will find itself more firmly in the grip of monopoly than ever before, and every vestige of the free democratic system for which we are fighting this war will have been destroyed by reason of the short-sighted, if not selfish, attitude of men in the W. P. B. who are more interested in preserving the opportunity for large aggregations of capital to exploit the people than they are in winning the war. I am told that $100,000,000,000 has already been given out in contracts in this war effort to 300 corporations, and little businesses are being allowed to die in every State of the Union, because the men who are at the head of this effort have not been willing to listen to suggestions such as the Senator's committee has made for the utilization of these materials.

I hope the Senator from Iowa will not weaken in the fight. I know him well enough to know he will not do so.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the contribution made by the Senator from Wyoming. He has painted the picture of what faces this country infinitely more clearly than I could have done. When I answered the Senator's question as to whether the W. P. B. had refused to cooperate in bringing agriculture into the picture, I qualified my statement, and I will tell why. After some effort, we had a representative of rubber from the War Production Board come before the committee last Friday, and he very frankly stated that he was ready and anxious to see agriculture brought into the picture, and read a statement to that effect. I asked him, "When did you prepare that statement?" He said, "Yesterday." That man had begged off from coming before the committee for 2 weeks, but on the day before he came before the committee he made a statement of willingness to bring agriculture into the picture and to utilize wheat and corn in the production of synthetic rubber, and he prepared his statement, as he said, yesterday for the purpose of making it before the committee. That deathbed repentance is agreeable to me if they only will bring agriculture into the picture. The surplus will then disappear within a few months' time. Not only do we have a surplus at present but it is a recurring surplus year after year.

We have a need, and failure to supply it will jeopardize the entire war effort. We have a most dire need. Today the United States has the only rubber stock pile, not only for our own use but for the use of our Allies. We cannot get natural rubber in time to be of use in the war effort. It takes time to develop production of natural rubber. We have possibilities for production of synthetic rubber, and there is agreement concerning those possibilities. There is no difference of opinion with respect to them. There is some difference of opinion as to the matter of chemical processes but no difference with respect to the net result.

Mr. President, if I had known when I rose to speak that I would go off on this tangent I would have brought with me some samples of synthetic rubber to show the Senate the article which has been produced from corn and wheat. There are scattered around in Germany on farms some 36,000 small plants which utilize potatoes and rye for the production of synthetic rubber and the production of alcohol to be used for power. There were 1,600 such small plants existing in Poland up to the time of the invasion of Poland by Germany. The committee attempted to have appear before it the Polish scientist who perfected the process for producing synthetic rubber from potatoes and rye. When we attempted to reach him we learned that he was at the Government experimental laboratory in Peoria. We called up to learn if he was there, and we received a reply that he had received a telegram from Washington advising him to leave there and keep his mouth shut. We found that those who told him to leave and keep his mouth shut were the honest people who wanted to get agriculture into this picture, but were handicapped by agencies here which were preventing agriculture from being given consideration. They had to keep him under cover. They had to pull him out by subterfuge. They had to hide him in Philadelphia so that the upper classmen, the officers of some of these agencies, would not know where he was hidden. They brought him into this country by way of Rio de Janeiro. They sneaked him in. It is a romance, but it is a sordid romance.

There is much talk about agricultural surpluses, and much talk about our present need. Mr. President, I want help for the committee to which I have referred. It does not need monetary help. I have already said that it has more money than it needs, but I want every Senator to get behind this program. We have reached such a point in this country that the need could not be more acute or more dire. We find $650,000,000 allocated to the petroleum industry, but not one nickel allocated to agriculture. We find an absolute refusal to give a nickel to agriculture. Agriculture is ready to produce for our greatest need, and asks the Government to release only one-tenth of the critical

materials necessary to build the plants. Agriculture, with existing facilities, is ready to produce 200,000 tons of rubber; yet we find that up until last Thursday those in control absolutely refused to let agriculture take any part.

Mr. President, we have had the misfortune in the last few weeks of seeing the President of the United States being circumvented and bypassed in the move which he attempted to make in the war effort, by some of those who have set themselves in position of authority and dominance, and who put forward their special interests, in violation of the express wishes of the President of the United States I do not accuse these men of lack of patriotism; they are just as patriotic in the main as you or I; but when a man in one of the departments is drawing $10,000 a year from the United States Government, and at the same time drawing $45,000 a year from a private interest, when the Government's interests and the private interests clash head on, who will he represent?

I care not how honest and honorable he may be. I care not how sincerely he wishes to be fair; as between the Government and the private institutions he cannot in such circumstances be fair. There is not a judge on the bench anywhere who would not disqualify himself from hearing a case involving interests in which he was specifically and personally interested. Yet these men ask for the privilege of deciding whether agriculture shall have a chance.

Mr. President, I wish the President of the United States would create a coordinator to handle the situation, and do away with advisory boards. I think that is one of the most essential things to be done at this time. God knows it is essential. I wish Senators could realize how essential it is. I wish the President of the United States would tomorrow set up a coordinator, and get away from advisory boards, advisory boards, if you please, of the type of a 23-member board which advised the Government to consent to settle a one-and-a-half-billion-dollar damage suit against its members. Twenty-two of the 23 members were defendants in the suit. They advised the Government to settle the suit, and the Government settled it. What has been done in that connection is past and gone. That is water which has gone under the bridge. That case was ended by a consent decree. It is a matter of court record. How could any board, 22 of whose 23 members were defendants in a suit to recover one and one-half billion dollars, act in an impartial way in recommending what the Government ought to do. I hope the President does not allow such a situation to continue.

I hope the President will set up this program for agriculture immediately, and, Senators, I bespeak support on behalf of my committee so that action may be brought about, not merely for the benefit of agriculture alone, though I am convinced the institution of the program we propose for agriculture would solve our difficulty for all time. The program will be of benefit not alone to agriculture, but to the United States of America, to her institutions, her philosophies, her people, and her future. The things which are so dear to every one of us are being jeopardized by selfish interests, though not intentionally.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Iowa is more familiar than I am with the whole situation, and remembers the figures which have been brought out in connection with the hearings. It was stated at first that a certain amount of alcohol was needed for the war effort, and that that amount would be all the alcohol needed. Then witnesses appeared before the committee who said that at least one-third more alcohol was needed. Now the statement is made that much more alcohol is needed. I wish to say that every word the Senator from Iowa has uttered on the floor of the Senate is absolutely correct, and is in accordance with the testimony which has come before our committee.

Mr. President, I do not wish to question the patriotism of some men, but we find that the adviser to the R. F. C. is a man who has been and is now connected with the Mellon Institute. I do not question his patriotism, but Senators must remember that the Mellon Institute is supported to a large extent by the oil interests, and he is one of those who have been advising what should be done about rubber.

When we tried to pin it down to a particular department or board, each one gave us the "run-around" and said that some other board was responsible. It was impossible to tie it down to any responsible person in the Government, because each one "passed the buck" to the other.

When we asked this man to come and testify before the committee he did not give us any information which the world could not have known; and yet it was insisted that his testimony should be given behind closed doors, in executive session, because otherwise some military secret might be revealed. If he gave any testimony which was not already known to every expert in the country I do not know what it was. He is one of the men who has been advising with reference to the rubber situation. If we are to get anything done in carrying on a successful production of many of these materials we cannot have a dozen different boards overlapping one another, each one "passing the buck" to the other.

A few moments ago I referred to the wheat situation. We have been discussing the sale of surplus wheat. The Government now has a great amount of surplus wheat on hand. If it needs rubber badly it can use the wheat which it owns, and on which it is going to take a loss. It can build plants to make industrial alcohol and butadiene much more quickly and cheaply than by giving the money to the oil companies. Such plants can be spotted around the country so as to be of permanent benefit to the farmers, not only during the war but after the war.

One of the leading chemists of this country, a man of vast experience, testified before the committee this morning. He said that if the chemists were given some help they would be able to produce rubber in the United States more cheaply than natural rubber could be obtained from foreign countries.

That is the reason I stated the other day that the Department of Agriculture had been "asleep at the switch." We have been appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars every year—sometimes as much as $1,000,000,000—for the Department of Agriculture.

The only thing with which it has come forward to help the farmer has been a plan to say to the farmer, "We will pay you to cut down the acreage of your product so as to raise the price." That statement applies not only to this administration, but to every administration during the past 50 years.

We look upon some of the other countries as being backward. What do we find? As the Senator pointed out, we find that Poland had set up industrial alcohol plants so as to use the grains produced by the farmers. Germany and Russia are doing the same thing. Because of the hold which some of the monopolies have had upon the political and economic life of this country such industries have not been encouraged in the United States. That is the reason we find ourselves today without the necessary materials successfully to carry on the production of war materials. We boast of our intelligence, when the people in many of the so-called backward countries have gone much further toward solving their problems than we have.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Montana. He made one reference which stimulates an associated train of thought.

When representatives came from the agricultural sections and got in contact with the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board they were told that grain could not come into the picture, because there were available ample supplies of blackstrap molasses, the residue from the refining of sugar. When that product disappeared from the market the Reconstruction Finance Corporation went into the Cuban market and bought 1,200,000 long tons of cane sugar to prevent its being refined, thus bringing about a sugar shortage on the east coast.

We were faced with rationing of sugar when we had supplies of grain which could have been used for the production of alcohol. Later a portion of that sugar was released; but the fact remains that after the farmers were told that grain was not needed, and that we had all the alcohol we needed, the R. F. C. optioned or took possession of 1,200,000 long tons of Cuban cane which could and should have been utilized in the production of sugar. Some of the grain should have been utilized in the production of alcohol.

A little while ago I referred to a certain gentleman by name. I am not accusing him of lack of patriotism; but the fact remains that he made the statements to which I have referred. If my memory correctly serves me, he had been vice president of the United States Distillers Corporation, which was owned and controlled by the Air Reduction Corporation, which in turn was owned and controlled

by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. He was in a position to make the decisions with reference to this matter, and did make them.

This country has been shut off from 450,000 tons of cassava-type starches which we formerly obtained from the Dutch Indies, and which we desperately need. In western Kansas, western Nebraska, Wyoming, and Oklahoma, we have a type of sorghum from which it is said 25 percent of our starch requirements can be supplied. In the same plants alcohol can be produced for 10 cents a gallon from the residue. There is not a nickle available for the assistance of such plants.

The farmers in my State and in several of the other Midwestern States have been asked to expand their production of soybeans in order that we may take up the slack caused by lack of copra and other sources of oils referred to by the Senator from Georgia a moment ago. The farmers have responded. The seed is in the ground. The expanded production is now growing; but not a nickel has been allocated to processing plants. The suggestion has been made that possibly the soybeans will be moved from Nebraska, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan, and Ohio to processing plants in California, and the finished product will then be brought back, using hundreds upon hundreds of freight cars, at a cost of $475,000 in freight charges for one of such plants.

That is the picture; and it is not a pretty one. It is not a pleasant one. I am glad that I digressed long enough to present the picture. In the face of the situation which confronts us in this war effort, I plead with Senators to join with those who have been doing this very wonderful work. The members of my committee are not alone. The Truman committee has done superb work. The work of my committee was specifically connected with the utilization of farm products.

I plead with Senators to come to the support of agriculture and bring it into the picture so that it may take part in the war effort. In that event the farm surpluses of wheat and corn will disappear overnight. As I suggested a little while ago to the Senator from Georgia, if this amendment should be adopted there would be no limitation whatever on the amount of grains which could be sold for alcohol.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am heartily in accord with what the Senator says about alcohol; and after the committee amendment shall have been disposed of I propose to offer an amendment which would clarify the word "alcohol" by adding "ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber" so that there may be no question as to the use of surpluses for the manufacture of alcohol and rubber.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. If the Senate should so far forget itself as to adopt the committee amendment, I think the amendment which he has suggested would be very helpful.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I should like to say a word by way of résumé of what I have said.

Today there is an expression of opinion by more than two-thirds of the Senate prohibiting the Commodity Credit Corporation from destroying the farm structure built on a parity relationship. There has been a vote of 100 percent on the House side to the same effect. In the face of such an expression of opinion, if the Commodity Credit Corporation wants to sell wheat or corn to dairy farmers in the northeast section, it has a perfect right to do so. It has done so, at a return of 4 cents a bushel.

The Commodity Credit Corporation wants Congress to go on record as reversing itself in its 10-year position in the effort to bring the agricultural industry into a parity relationship with other industries. It wants to be able to say, "You told us to use the surpluses and destroy the price structure. You told us to use them for the purpose of undermining and sapping the structure of protection which was built up for agriculture."

I will never give my permission to destroy what we have done over a 10-year period. As I previously stated, whether or not the amendment is adopted, I intend to move to strike out the provision. It is window dressing. Its only purpose is to ask the Congress to reverse itself, so that the Commodity Credit Corporation may point to such action as its authority for destroying the farmers' position.

Let me say, in amplification of what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] said in speaking of those who have worked together for the whole farm industry, that it is a long lane that has no turning.

The situation which will face wheat today if such influences are left in the control of some of the executive agencies, will face cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, and Senators will point to the record which has been made in abandoning the principles which they have established and supported—abandoning them in the face of a very real exigency, it is true, but an exigency in which under the law such agencies have full and complete authority to dispose of the commodity wherever they want to, on any basis on which they want to, without action of the United States Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator to explain more fully exactly what he proposes to do. A moment ago he said he was not concerned with respect to the action which may be taken upon the committee amendment, and that if the committee amendment should be agreed to he would later move to strike out the whole provision. What does he propose to move to strike out, if that is his purpose?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to explain. My motion, which is on the desk, will be in line 9, on page 80, after the word "amended," to change the colon to a period, and to strike out all the remainder, to the bottom of the page, including line 25.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then is it the purpose of the Senator's proposed amendment to close the door to any sale below parity by a Government authority?

Mr. GILLETTE. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the Senator's purpose?

Mr. GILLETTE. The authority to make such sales would be left wide open, as it is today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. There is no limitation to it. The Senate has gone on record in a substantive proposal which was presented here by my former "compatriots," who deserted me unintentionally and against their wishes. Four of us joined in presenting to the Senate a substantive proposal prohibiting the agencies from selling the commodities at below the parity price, and thus depressing the market. That measure was passed by the Senate by more than a two-thirds vote; but the House has not acted upon it. The House put in this appropriation bill a prohibition against sales being made below parity price, in the hope that the President would not veto it, if he had any intention of opposing anything of the kind. That, however, is a mere expression of opinion. The House has put in an appropriation bill a provision prohibiting such sales at below the parity price.

The committee has brought in a modified version of the proposal. Its version provides that sales can be made below the parity price, provided wheat is not sold below the parity price of corn.

If all the provision is stricken out, as I shall move to do, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Agricultural Marketing Administration, which today exercises the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, will have exactly the authority which they have now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator in order to ask if it is his theory that, in the event the Senate should strike out this provision for which he first urged Senate support, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Surplus Marketing Administration would not exercise that power.

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know whether they would exercise it or whether they would not exercise it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator says they will have the power which they now have.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator says they still will have the power to sell at any price at which they choose to sell.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senate has said, "You should not exercise the power which you now have."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. We have said it by a substantial vote. While I did not contribute much to it, I fought for it, along with those who at the present time are deserters. I fought with them for that provision; and the House has gone on record regarding it. But today there is no legislation which prohibits the exer-

cise of such power and there will not be any if this amendment be agreed to.

If the provision is stricken out, the agency will be in the same position as that in which they were before, but they will be faced with the expression of opinion by both bodies of the Congress, an expression to the effect that they should not exercise that privilege. It would amount to the expression of an opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, since the House Appropriations Committee suggested, and the House apparently without dissent or serious division directed, that no sales should be made below parity, if the Senator now induces the Senate to follow him and to destroy the prohibition which has been sent over to us by the House, will he not then be fighting against the very principle for which he has so eloquently and ably argued here today?

Mr. GILLETTE. I hope the Senator from Iowa is not inconsistent in the position he has taken. If the Senator from Wyoming had done me the honor to listen to me when I first started to speak, perhaps he would better understand the position I take.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that I came to the floor of the Senate as soon as I heard the accents of the Senator's elcquent voice.

Mr. GILLETTE. I assure the Senator that he lost nothing. I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that I stated that had this measure come here with the House provision in it, a provision which I thought was ineffectual except as an expression of opinion inasmuch as it simply prohibits the administrative use of the funds in connection with the disposal of these surpluses——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is the only way the Appropriations Committee of the House could act, without suspending the rule.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; and I said, that however ineffectual I might have thought it to be, I would have made no objection to it, because it was an expression of opinion and would have value only as an expression of opinion. All the House did was agree to an expression of opinion, instead of taking action on the substantive measure which we sent to the other body.

I would have had no objection; but our friends have brought in a proposal for a very substantial change, abandoning the very principle for which we have fought. If that proposal is agreed to—and I expect it will be agreed to—I shall immediately move—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator should not be a defeatist. The Senator should not concede the battle while he is making it so ably.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I have no intention of being a defeatist; but several times in my life—in my family affairs, in courts, and in parliamentary bodies—I have had the misfortune to contend for certain measures, and I found that I was defeated by my wife, by the judge, and by my colleagues in the legislative bodies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that in every such case in which the Senator suffered defeat he went into the battle believing that he should be defeated. I do not think he believes that now.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am sure the Senator does not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether his argument is directed against the immediate amendment in lines 23 to 25, at the bottom of page 80, the proviso permitting the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I am definitely opposed to that amendment; because that would destroy the thing for which we have contended. First of all, it would permit the sale of corn at below a parity price; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and others of us contended and fought for the parity price, and had the endorsement of the Senate by a vote of 50 to 23 for maintaining the position at parity rather than at 85 percent. The amendment would not only permit the sale of corn at 85 percent of parity, using Government surpluses to drive down the price, but it would permit the sale of wheat at below a parity price for wheat, which is $1.13 a bushel; it would permit the driving down of the price of wheat to 82.3 cents, which is the parity price of corn. Not only that, let me say to the Senator, but our position as corn farmers would be an adjustment position. I want the Senator to listen to what I am about to say, because I shall repeat the one thing I have said which may be worth listening to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not agree with that.

Mr. GILLETTE. I want the Senator to listen. The position of the corn farmer, the adjustment of his production, and the estimated needs of our whole farm program, are based on the assumption that he has a feeding market. By agreeing to the amendment, the Senate would not only be allowing the agencies to destroy the market by selling Government-controlled surpluses which were taken off the market in order to support it, but it would be allowing them to bring in a competitive grain to be sold at 40 cents below the parity price for such grain, 30 cents below its own 85-percent parity position, and they would be allowed to take over the market on the basis on which our production and consumption were adjusted. It is absolutely impossible to do such a thing unless it is desired to destroy the whole farm program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me ask another question, if the Senator will yield to me. Am I to understand that the Senator feels that the producers of corn would not agree to the proviso which the chairman of the agricultural subcommittee intends to offer to the committee amendment, reading as follows:

Provided further, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made.

Does the Senator wish to convey to the Senate the impression that the producers of corn are opposed to that provision, too?

Mr. GILLETTE. They are opposed to any provision which would allow an agency of the United States Government—a government which is assisting them in a program to support their market and to take surpluses out of the market—to use the same surpluses to undersell the market and to drive it down. Let me go further and say that they are opposed to bringing in a commodity which was not envisioned when their production was adjusted to the consumptive needs. The programs for cotton, wheat, and everything else are based on that adjustment. They are opposed to allowing the bringing in of a competitive commodity to destroy their market and to have sales made at below the parity position for corn.

They are opposed to that—selfishly, it is true. I am speaking as a representative of the corn-producing community, but the issue is far broader than that. I can say with considerable truth that the taking of such a step would result in destroying 10 years of effort of this Nation and of the Democratic Party.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me ask one other question. The argument in support of the authority of the Government to sell the surplus stocks is that it is necessary for the production of foodstuffs which we need in order to win the war, and that it is the patriotic duty of agricultural producers to submit to such sales. What does the Senator say about that?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, there is no sacrifice the farmers of Iowa and all the other States would not make for the war effort; but, as I have said over and over again, we are reversing ourselves on an advantage they now have, giving legislative sanction to the reversal and abandoning our position, which it is not necessary for us to do.

The Department can go ahead and sell the grain for alcohol at any price they want; they can now sell it for 2 cents a bushel, if they want to do so, but when they do it, when they utilize the surpluses to destroy a parity position, I do not want them to say, "Congress abandoned its previous attitude in the question and told us to do as we have done."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

EXHIBIT A

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1942.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We are keenly disappointed that the agricultural appropriation bill as reported to the Senate has been modified so as to permit the unlimited release of corn for feed and the release of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feeding purposes, without any price limitation.

This proposal violates the action taken by the Senate by more than two-thirds vote in the passage of S. 2255 and the action taken later by the House by more than 2-to-1 vote in adopting a provision in the agricultural appropriation bill which had a similar objective.

The objective of organized agriculture and—we had reason to believe—the objective of Congress and the administration has been to encourage the stabilization of price levels of basic farm commodities at parity levels. We regard this action as a great step

backward, in that it will undoubtedly have a depressing and demoralizing effect upon the price level of feed grains. Any policy of Government which has for its purpose the deliberate attempt to hold down the price of feed grain substantially below parity will in the early future have a similar influence upon the price level of all livestock and livestock products. It will also have the effect of destroying justified confidence in the parity-price objective of the Federal Government for farm commodities. It will tend to result in sectionalism and disunity of agriculture because of the failure to provide comparable protection for all commodities.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, after conferring with farm leaders from Wheat and Corn Belts, recommended an amendment to this bill that would limit the release of Government-owned or controlled wheat at a price not less than the parity price for corn and then only in such amounts as would not have the effect of depressing the basic corn market below parity levels.

We, therefore, urge that this bill be amended on page 80 by striking out the word "or" in line 19 and inserting the word and", and by inserting a comma after the word "purposes" in line 25 and adding the following: "but at not less than the parity price for corn."

We respectfully urge your support of this amendment. We are counting on Congress to keep faith with farmers in protecting the parity-price principle.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

April 15, 1942, price situation—Corn and wheat

	Cents per bushel
Wheat:	
United States parity price	133.5
85 percent of parity	113.5
Average farm price	99.7
Corn:	
United States parity price	96.9
85 percent of parity	82.3
Average farm price	79.7

Source: Midmonth Local Market Price Report, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, April 29, 1942.

April 15, 1942, price situation—Hogs and cattle

	Per hundredweight
Hogs:	
United States parity price	$10.98
Average farm price	13.48
Cattle:	
United States parity price	8.18
Average farm price	10.71
Beef steers at Chicago:	
Choice and Prime:	
Parity equivalent	13.33
Reported average price	15.56
Good:	
Parity equivalent	12.02
Reported average price	13.70
Medium:	
Parity equivalent	10.72
Reported average price	11.96
Common:	
Parity equivalent	9.41
Reported average price	10.27

Hog-corn ratio now extremely favorable to hog growers; unfavorable to corn growers

The 1909-14, or parity hog-corn ratio (number of bushels of corn which can be purchased with the price of 100 pounds of live hogs) was	11:5
The 1940 hog-corn ratio was	9:4
The 1941 hog-corn ratio was	14:2
The April 1942 hog-corn ratio was	16:9
The April 1942 average farm price of hogs was (per hundredweight)	$13.48
If corn had been selling at parity, the April 1942 hog-corn ratio would have been	13:9

Hog producers would have still enjoyed an extremely favorable feeding ratio if corn prices had been at parity in April.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am glad to express my appreciation of the enlightened and patriotic contribution of the Senator from Iowa. Personally, I believe that his committee has done a great work, and it should be given our wholehearted support.

Mr. President, I am moved at this point to participate, as justly as I know how, in what the President described to Congress nearly 3 weeks ago as "our effort to be fair in all phases of price control."

Surely, there is not one of us who was not in agreement with the President when he declared to us on April 27 that "safeguarding our economy at home is the very least that our soldiers, sailors, and marines have a right to expect of us civilians in government, in industry, on the farms, and in other walks of life."

I should be derelict in my responsibility if I were to encourage any group in our society to follow the course of special advantage.

I should betray the confidence of the people of my State if I were to sanction unequal sacrifice.

We are all in agreement, then, in holding to a common major premise: That there is a compelling necessity today for sacrifice of personal and group ambitions which are not in tune with the military and economic imperatives for the common welfare of all of our people, and that such sacrifice must be made in equal share by all groups, with special advantage to none.

But government itself, being by nature composed of men, must also be considered as a group with ambitions—as much so as labor, or farm, or management. If it is our binding duty to guarantee equitable postponement of the special ambitions of all groups in our society, as indeed it is, then it behooves the group known as government not to determine the degree of sacrifice by other groups in accord with its own special ambitions of a more normal day, but, indeed, it behooves the group known as government to sacrifice its own ambitions in the common fire.

Unfortunately, however, none but the government group can determine the amount of sacrifice to be made, or not to be made, by the government group itself. Yet it is also to the government group that remains the power of deciding what sacrifices must be made by the labor group, the management group, and the other groups, including the farm group. It is to be hoped that the government group will not seek largely to serve its own long-term desires in its determination of what sacrifices shall not be made by some groups and what sacrifices shall be made by the farm group, which, after all, has no voice but the Congress of the United States.

Farmers are not happy about receiving parity-payment checks from the Government. They will welcome the day when parity is attained through the operation of economic laws rather than by subsidy. I have received scores of pledge cards signed by farmers in my own State declaring that patriotism forbids them accepting Government checks for farm benefits of any kind during the war.

We are not here concerned with what gains it would be nice for the farmer to make. There has been too little concern with the elements which would make for real farm stability, but this is not the time for their discussion. We should be concerned here, however, with whether the farmer is being asked to make more than his share of sacrifice.

For nearly 9 years—

The President reminded us on April 27—

it has been the policy of the Government to seek an objective known as parity—farm prices that give the farmer an assurance of equality in individual purchasing power with his fellow Americans who work in industry.

And he added the recommendation that farm prices be permitted to rise to parity, but not in excess thereof.

If it were not for a confusion of two distinct senses in which the term "parity" is here used, there could be no basis of argument. No fair-minded American can insist that farm prices should be permitted to rise above parity, if parity means equality in individual purchasing power. But when those who wish to keep farm prices at parity use the term, they are not speaking of equality in individual purchasing power. Rather, they are speaking of an arbitrary ratio between farm and industrial prices of 1909–14.

But prices the farmer must pay for his purchases today are in reality higher than in the period from 1909 to 1914. They were 47 percent higher on February 15; 50 percent higher on March 15; and 51 percent higher on April 15.

Mr. President, it will be argued that the artificial parity concept is flexible; that parity prices are now adjusted so as to remove that discrepancy; that for every dollar the farmer got for his crops between 1909 and 1914, he now gets $1.51. But, even at best, this only means that the farmer is still enabled theoretically to buy the necessities comparable today to those he needed 30 years ago. It does not mean that his ability to buy War Bonds, or drive to town for his sugar ration, or to meet his enormously increased wartime taxes is thus placed on a parity with the comparable ability of the other segments of society. The artificial parity arbitrarily determined by conditions 30 years ago keeps pace, then, with only some, not all, of the aspects of the farmer's subsistence life today.

Suppose for a moment that a Roman farmer of 251 B. C. was better able to buy his plow and seed than a Roman farmer of 271 B. C. or 231 B. C. Does it follow that Mussolini's multiplication of the farm prices of 251 B. C. by the commodity index of 1942 would give the Italian farmer parity today under the definition of "equality in purchasing power"?

Making due allowance for the adjustable sliding scale, it remains true that when the farmer asks, in some instances, for as high as 110 percent of yesterday's parity, he asks no more than the President says he should receive when the

President defines parity as "equality in purchasing power" today. Parity under the 1909–14 definition is decidedly subparity under the President's definition.

It is precisely because I agreed, and still agree, with the President's recent definition of parity, that I was opposed in 1933, and am still opposed today, to gearing American agriculture to a wholly artificial parity determined by conditions of 30 years ago.

The expressed objective of the administration's farm policy was to raise and hold agricultural prices above world levels. Its means to that objective have been production controls, commodity loans, surplus commodity purchases, export subsidies, and marketing quotas.

In a nation confronted with conditions which could not always wait for perfect theories, some of these mechanisms undoubtedly have served valid short-time purposes; but even their sincerest defenders must admit that they have been price techniques suited only to an underlying philosophy of scarcity. Because scarcity is artificial and plenty is natural, these techniques led to increased, rather than decreased, surpluses—while at the same time discouraging natural development of new outlets for the surpluses with which the farmer was thus saddled.

Nor were these techniques attaining the goal even of an out-of-date concept of parity. For, just prior to the outbreak of war, the prices of veal, lamb, chicken, beef, and wool, which were unrestricted by Government, averaged 94.5 percent of parity, while the prices of corn, cotton, hogs, and wheat, restricted by Government, averaged only less than 56 percent of parity.

It was argued by those who said they favored parity prices for the farmer that farm curtailment would serve to maintain farm prices, just as curtailment in industry served to maintain industrial prices. But it was overlooked that industry could make up for curtailment by dismissing labor, or reducing labor's wages, whereas the farmer, for the most part, was his own labor, and could hardly find salvation by cutting himself off his own pay roll.

There was, and is, only one answer, of course, for both farmer and labor, and that is increased, rather than decreased, production. In arguing that crop curtailment would maintain farm prices as industrial curtailment maintained industrial prices, defenders of that farm program were offering the final proof that theirs was a philosophy of scarcity. For loss of industrial labor means less market for farm crops, and less farm production means still less industrial production. On the other hand, increased farm production and the use of farm surpluses as the raw materials of industry, made possible by the genius of plant genetics and organic chemistry, mean more labor in industry and still more farm production for food as well as for industrial use.

It has not yet been officially recognized that neither agriculture nor labor presents an isolated problem in itself which can be solved by isolated solutions. So long as we persist in this sort of domestic isolationism, 20,000,000 Americans can be expected to remain in the tragic position of having no more than 15 cents a day to spend on food, as was the case in 1939, and the farmers, who constitute one-fourth of our population, can be expected to remain in their tragic position of possessing only one-eighth of the national income, as was the case in 1940 and 1941, because their fellow Americans who work in industry cannot afford what they want to eat.

It is to be hoped that when the war is past we shall move on toward such a common-sense philosophy of plenty, and ignore forever the old, discordant melodies of scarcity which have fooled us because they poured forth from new juke boxes.

Just now we are engaged in a war which bids us forget for the present our self-interested determinations for the future. We are fighting to preserve the opportunity to repair past mistakes and to inaugurate future improvements in our own way. These hopes will not matter if we do not win the opportunity to realize them.

So we must sacrifice now—all of us—management, labor and farm.

Management is asked to forget business as usual.

Labor is asked to confine its demands to the restricted economy in which it now operates, and to postpone its demands for the new system of plenty which promises so much.

The farmer is asked to postpone realization of the new society in which farm and labor alike stand to gain so much by the increased use of farm crops to expand industry.

Those are the sacrifices—and they are real sacrifices—which we must make. They are made willingly by all. But, as well as sacrificing our desires for the justice of plenty, we must also be certain that our sacrifices under present conditions are also made equally by all groups.

Fortunately, most groups can at least be certain that their sacrifices have been comparable. Fortunately for the Nation, labor has not been deterred, amid rising costs of living, from seeking a parity subsistence determined in 1942, not in 1909 or 1914. Unfortunately for the Nation, however, it is now urged by some that the farmer be prevented from operating on the basis of a 1942 parity—under which he would still forego willingly an equitable share of the nonwar income—and be harnessed instead to the irrelevant parity of 30 years ago.

Farm prices have often dropped in direct ratio with pay-roll drops. Should they not also rise in direct ratio with pay-roll increases—not as a matter of selfishness, but as a matter of preserving the balance of equitable sacrifice among groups in an already strained economy?

Mr. President, we are toying with potential tragedy. The American decade from 1930 to 1940 was the first since 1790 which did not produce more real wealth than the preceding decade; and it is the farmers, one-fourth of our population, who constitute the largest group engaged in a single productive activity in this Nation.

Already, 3,000,000 of the 6,000,000 farm units in the United States produce only 11 percent of our total agricultural output, and more than one-half of them produce too little to be classed as stable economic units.

The finger of science points to these farms as possibly the most important social and industrial factors of the post-war world. Dare we load them with a still more unjust share of the sacrifices which must be made today? Or would we thereby pack a still greater long-run burden on all groups together?

From 1920 to 1921, the national income dropped 16 percent, while the farm income dropped 37 percent.

From 1925 to 1929, the national income increased $10,000,000,000, while the farm income dropped from 12.4 percent to 9.1 percent of the total national income, even while farm prices were comparing favorably with those of the 1909–14 "golden era," whence "parity" is derived.

From 1929 to 1932 the national income dropped 38 percent, while the farm income dropped 47 percent.

In 1940 the national income was $77,000,000,000. The 25 percent of our population which was on the farms got only $9,000,000,000, or less than 12 percent of the national income, about one-half their share.

In 1941 the national income increased 17.4 billion dollars, but the farm income still was only slightly more than 12 percent of the total.

An involved complex of reasons can be cited for these facts, not excluding overexpansion in wartime, return to price criteria in post-war periods of scarcity theories, minimum use of agricultural products in industry, and other causes, but it is universally recognized that the farmers have traditionally received a shockingly low share of the Nation's income, and it is not readily apparent how the farmer's post-war stability can be in any measure jeopardized by guaranteeing him only the bare parity level now which other groups already enjoy. Indeed, it is possible that the farmers' instability will not be so long in coming unless he is relieved now of all but his just share of the burden. After the war, only an unjustifiable return to the restrictions of scarcity can contribute to his collapse, for the compelling truth of science, which will be hard to ignore, is already urging industry to clamor for those farm products so often incorrectly known as surpluses. Already the cry for use of grains for industrial alcohol and synthetic rubber is beginning to rise above the din of battle.

At this very moment, however, we are confronted with a proposal that Government-owned surpluses be permitted to sell on the market for less than parity, and for no higher. Obviously, the effect of flooding the market with commodities at subparity prices would be inevitably to drive the prices of all privately owned commodities also beneath parity. The Government then would flood the mails once again with hand-out checks to the farmer to make up the difference. So far as the total amount of money is concerned, what difference does it make whether the farm income is derived from Government hand-outs or whether it

comes about as the result of the operation of the few remaining vestiges of natural economic intercourse?

Apparently the main difference is that such a successful operation of free enterprise would rob the Government of its golden opportunity to maintain political control of the farmer and to keep on using him as a political football. Is it possible that there is fear in some Government quarters—fear that if a greater part of the farmer's income should come from natural sources rather than from Government hand-outs, a valuable political weapon might be dulled? It will be hoped that such is not the case. Our people are showing a spirit of sacrifice worthy of the Nation's greatest tradition. In return they ask only that all groups make equal sacrifice. For them it is unthinkable that the group known as Government should not also sacrifice its own special desires—its desires to maintain political control over othe. groups.

The farmer asks no special privilege at the cost of the common welfare. He asks only the patriotic privilege of being part of a society whose members recognize a just parity of sacrifice even where they do not recognize a just parity of enjoyment. I therefore support the proposal for full parity prices for commodities of first-grade condition sold by the Government, and shall oppose the amendment to the bill.

If parity is determined in 1942 for all but the farmer, then the farmer should be permitted to trade in his wobbling 1909–14 concept for a new model.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will ask the Chair to state the amendment now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment of the committee on page 80, proposing, in line 25, after the word "purposes", to add the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are so few Senators present that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Hill
Andrews	Caraway	Holman
Austin	Chavez	Hughes
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Kilgore
Bankhead	Connally	La Follette
Barkley	Danaher	Langer
Bilbo	Doxey	Lee
Bone	Ellender	Lucas
Brewster	George	McCarran
Brooks	Gerry	McFarland
Brown	Gillette	McKellar
Bulow	Glass	McNary
Bunker	Green	Maloney
Burton	Gurney	Maybank
Butler	Hatch	Mead
Byrd	Hayden	Millikin
Murdock	Russell	Tunnell
Norris	Schwartz	Tydings
Nye	Smathers	Vandenberg
O'Daniel	Smith	Van Nuys
O'Mahoney	Spencer	Wagner
Overton	Stewart	Walsh
Pepper	Taft	Wheeler
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	White
Reynolds	Tobey	Wiley
Rosier	Truman	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have just been advised that the question before the Senate is an amendment submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having charge of the bill. The amendment which is now pending was not passed upon either by the subcommittee or by the main committee. Therefore I feel free to discuss the amendment and to oppose it, and to offer something in its place. I shall try to clarify the issue, if I may, and I do so for the best of reasons.

This is a rather practical proposition. In my State we grow cotton, corn, and wheat. We can produce 10 percent of the cotton that is grown in America. We can produce a very large percentage of the corn that is grown in America, and a very large percentage of the wheat grown in the country. As I view the situation now, the amendment does not affect cotton, but it does affect corn and wheat. The amendment as it is now before the Senate is a rope with two nooses on the end, one noose designed to strangle the corn farmer and the other noose to strangle the wheat farmer. Coming from a cotton-producing State I am not willing to be a party to strangling the corn section, because if I did I would strangle some of my own people in my own State, and I am not willing to undertake to strangle the wheat farmer, because if I did I would strangle some wheat farmers in my own State.

The amendment proposes to drive the price of wheat down and to use the falling price of wheat to drive the corn price down. I am not willing to be a party to either proposal.

Mr. President, we have striven for 10 years to establish in the law and in the minds of the people the parity concept with regard to agricultural prices, and we have made a fair success in that effort. The people understand, I think, in the main what parity prices are. They are now incorporated in the law of 1938, and reincorporated in the recent price-fixing measure, and the bill now before the Senate proposes to carry the full parity concept, save in some particulars, which I shall state. Under the bill the Commodity Credit Corporation, acting under the Department of Agriculture, can sell and dispose of wheat, under certain conditions, below parity prices.

The parity price for wheat is about $1.33. Under the terms of this bill the administration could sell wheat for relief purposes. That is all right. I do not object to that. I favor it. Under this bill the administration could sell wheat which is deteriorated and is not worth its full value. That is all right. I favor that provision. Under this bill the administration could sell wheat for the manufacture of alcohol. I support that proposition. There is no division on that question. It could sell wheat for seed. Of course, no one can complain about that.

The provision in this bill to which I object is that which would permit the administration to sell 125,000,000 bushels of wheat at 85 percent of the parity price for corn. The parity price for corn is 97 cents a bushel. Taking 85 percent of 97 cents, that brings the price of wheat down to 82 or 83 cents a bushel.

Mr. President, that is 51 cents below the full parity price for wheat. If the bill should be passed with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the administration would be authorized to sell an unlimited amount of wheat at about 82 cents a bushel, or 51 cents below parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The amount would not be unlimited, because my amendment is an amendment to an amendment which limits the total sales which may be made for those purposes to 125,000,000 bushels.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is for relief purposes; but there is no limitation on sales for relief purposes. It may all be sold for relief. There is no limitation on the sale for the manufacture of alcohol. There is no limitation on the sale of wheat which is not up to standard. So my statement stands, that under the terms of the amendment the administration could sell any amount of wheat it chose to sell at 85 percent of the parity price for corn.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to say that he has no objection to the sale of wheat for making alcohol, or for seed, or to the sale of grain which has deteriorated in quality. I, therefore, assume that he would not object to the sale of any amount for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am objecting to using wheat to drive down the price of wheat, and using wheat to drive down the price of corn, because if this amendment should become law the price of wheat would fall. It has already fallen. The price of corn would fall. It has already fallen. When the prices of those two commodities fall, the price of cotton will follow, because the moment the administration desired to bring the price of cotton down it would have the machinery to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, the Senator is opposed to the sale of any wheat at less than parity.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Really I am not; but, as a matter of compromise, I must be, as a matter of compromise, it seems that we have more wheat than we can really use efficiently.

Less than 18 months ago we had a 3-year supply of cotton on hand. We were not using much cotton a year and a half or two years ago, before the war started. We were using 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bales a year. We had nearly 18,000,000 bales of cotton on hand; and the wheat producing States and the corn producing States came to the rescue of cotton and enabled those who represented the Cotton States directly to get the price of cotton up, to keep cotton off the market, and get a fair price for it.

What has happened to cotton in only a few months time? Instead of having a 3-year supply, as we had less than 2 years ago, the demand for cotton has been such that cotton has disappeared. We are now using 1,000,000 bales of cotton a month in our mills, and that is not sufficient. There is now a demand for more cotton than the mills of America can weave. As a result of the demand for 1,000,000 bales of cotton a month the 3-year supply has dwindled until now there is not a 1-year supply of cotton on hand. At the end of the recent cotton marketing season we had 15,000,000 bales. We are using approximately 1,000,000 bales a month. At the present time we have scarcely 10,000,000 bales of cotton on hand. If we use 1,000,000 bales in May, 1,000,000 bales in June, 1,000,000 bales in July, 1,000,000 bales in August, and 1,000,000 bales in September, when the new crop comes on the market 5,000,000 bales more will have been taken from the 10,000,000 bales we have on hand. So on the first of September we shall have scarcely 5,000,000 bales of cotton on hand.

However, we have a rather large supply of wheat. We have on hand probably 650,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is perhaps a little more than 1 year's supply. If we have a large crop this year, we shall raise probably another 700,000,000 or 800,000,000 bushels of wheat. That will be only a year's supply.

We do not know what kind of a crop of wheat we shall raise this year. In my State the green bugs are present. In the southern part of Oklahoma and the northern part of Texas there is scarcely anything green in the way of oats, wheat, or barley The green bugs have killed the crops. If that condition should prevail throughout the country, or if the rust should come, or if droughts should occur in some sections and floods in others, we might not have a great oversupply of wheat produced this year. If we do have a large supply of wheat, I shall not complain.

What will face America when this war is over? We shall have 130,000,000 people to feed in America. What about Canada? Canada now has a rather liberal supply of wheat. Canadian young men have gone to war. If something should happen to Canada, her supply might be depleted this year. It is true that I am only dealing in speculation, but the Canadian supply of wheat might disappear, as did the supply of cotton in the United States.

When the war is over there will be a great demand on the United States for wheat. France is not raising much wheat. She must have wheat. Russia is not raising an oversupply of wheat. Russia must have wheat. I understand that the Russian wheat growers are busy right now trying to defend themselves, and I do not look for a large oversupply of wheat in Russia.

It is now fall in Australia. The farmers of Australia are sowing wheat, if there is anyone to sow wheat in Australia at this time. I understand the Australians are also busy right now. I doubt if they can sow a large crop of wheat this fall. If they do sow a large crop of wheat, what will happen when spring comes? They may be too busy to harvest it. Certainly they will need wheat when the war is over. France will need wheat. Our friends—such of them as are still our friends—in Europe will need wheat. Russia will need wheat. Canada will need wheat. Australia will need wheat; and our friends in India and China will need wheat.

Is there any justification for anyone saying that we must throw our wheat away, burn it, destroy it, or give it away, when we have only a year's supply on hand, and when there may be a great demand for wheat in less than 12 months?

I am glad we have a surplus of wheat on hand. I am glad we have the prospect of raising a fair crop of wheat in America this year. Even so, we should not now provide for using wheat against wheat. By that I mean using wheat to drive down the price of wheat, and then using wheat in competition with corn to drive down the price of corn.

If I were to support this amendment, I should be supporting an amendment for lowering the price of wheat in Oklahoma. I should be supporting a provision to drive down the price of corn in Oklahoma. We have worked for 10 years to get the parity concept into law and established throughout the country; and now, when we are up on that high pedestal, I am not in favor of legislation to drive down the price of wheat to a point 51 cents below parity, and drive down the price of corn to at least 15 percent below parity.

Mr. President, I desire to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two or three paragraphs, which I should make my text if I were delivering an extended address, which I have no intention of doing. These paragraphs were placed in the RECORD by the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. I think I have not seen a clearer statement of the objective of the farm group in the Senate and in the House than is found in these two or three paragraphs from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1942, page 4138.

I read:

> The principle of parity has been barely established and now it is proposed to betray it in the house of its friends. We cannot yield parity on one commodity and preserve it on another commodity. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. We must maintain parity for all or resign ourselves to parity for none.
>
> "Divide and conquer" is a familiar slogan and a time-honored ruse of the enemies of agriculture. Agriculture will play into their hands if for the sake of a temporary advantage to one group the attempt is made to throw another group to the wolves. The only tenable policy is "One for all and all for one."
>
> Parity is a principle and a principle compromised is lost.

Mr. President, when we come to vote on the pending amendment this afternoon, if it shall be voted on today, we shall vote upon the principle stated in this quotation. The statement I have just read, that if a man can divide his opposition he has a better chance of winning, is about the first thing a man in public life learns when he starts to run for office. If a candidate believes that the opposition is numerically stronger than he is, what is the first thing he does? He gets three or four or five or six or a dozen candidates to declare they will run, and thus divides the opposition. Then, relying on the votes which he knows he has—and if he does not know he has them he is on thin ice—he proceeds to divide the opposition; and when the election returns are in, the man of whom I speak will find that he has more votes than any one of his opposition, although the opposition in toto may have 8 or 10 times the vote which he has received. Such a situation is the occasion for the so-called run-off primaries in some of the States.

In this issue, Mr. President, an effort is being made to divide the three groups interested in agriculture. The cotton farmers are now in fairly good shape. They are sitting back in the high seat behind the driver; and the cotton farmers, as I see the picture, are permitting the man in the front seat to use wheat to drive down the price of corn; and in using wheat to drive down the price of corn the price of wheat itself is being driven down.

I am not in favor of that, and, coming from a cotton-producing State, I fear that if we, the elected representatives of the farm section, become divided, and if now the corn farmers are injured and damaged, they will not feel very cooperative, at least, when some cotton issue arises; and if the wheat farmers are injured and damaged, I doubt if the wheat group will feel very cooperative when some problem with respect to cotton comes before the Congress. In view of the fact that all Members of the Senate who are interested in corn, wheat, or cotton have fought for and have succeeded in obtaining a law setting forth the parity concept, I am in favor of standing by that concept.

I agree that perhaps there is some reason at this time why we should make a temporary dislocation in the parity concept in the public interest. That is suggested in the bill as it passed the House. Wheat can be sold for relief purposes, and no one would deny the administration the right and the opportunity to sell wheat for relief purposes. Deteriorated wheat should be sold for what it will bring. That is good business. We need alcohol, and wheat can be sold for use in the production of alcohol. That is good business. We must have alcohol; and to the extent to which we can manufacture alcohol from wheat a future demand for wheat may be developed. We can also sell wheat for seed, and we must have wheat for seed. So I am perfectly willing to make some temporary dislocations because of the fact that we have a large supply of wheat, and with a fairly good prospect for another good supply, a situation with which I am delighted. But I am not willing to say in the law that the Government can sell as much wheat as it may want to sell at 51 cents below parity and at a price of 85 percent of the parity price for corn.

Mr. President, if such a provision goes into the law, we shall have wheat competing with corn—wheat that will be sold at a price 15 percent below the parity

price for corn. I do not know what the effect of such a procedure will be. I cannot support such a proposal.

In a few moments I shall offer an amendment proposing to change in only two particulars the amendment which is now before us. The pending amendment provides that the surplus wheat may be sold for certain purposes, and it changes the word "and" to "or." I am opposed to the change of the word "and" to "or"; and I shall call the Senate's attention to the language in the bill.

On page 80, in line 19, we find the point at which the change is proposed to be made. I shall read one or two lines, so that the Senate may understand what I mean. Provision is made that the administration may sell "grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality," at which point the House used the word "and"; but the Senate committee struck out the word "and" and inserted "or." I shall read the provision as the House put it in the bill:

> Grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of alcohol.

I approve of that. The Senate committee has changed that to read as follows:

> Grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality or is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of alcohol.

The slight change of the word "and" to "or" makes a substantial change in the provision. I am opposed to striking out the word "and" and in the insertion of the word "or".

The second provision to which I have referred, the amendment submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, the Senator in charge of the bill, provides that the surplus wheat may be sold at a price of 85 percent of the parity price for corn, or about 82 cents a bushel.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the discussion of the change of the word "and" to "or," I should like to interrupt him, if he will yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not given this particular matter the thought I should perhaps have given it, but it appears to me that, as the Senator has read it, the proposal of the Senator from Georgia is better, that "or" makes the provision better than it would be with "and." If the word "and" is left in the bill, then, in order to have the wheat sold, both conditions would have to be complied with. If the word "or" were substituted, only one condition would have to be complied with, but both might be complied with; that would not be interfered with.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Any Senator who desired to have the largest possible number of bushels of wheat sold would be in favor of having the word "or" in the bill. I am not in favor of selling at the depreciated price all the wheat which can be sold.

Mr. NORRIS. If it is to be sold, let us say, for the production of alcohol, if the word "or" is placed in the bill it will not be necessary to comply with the other condition which is attached; compliance with one of the conditions will be sufficient. It strikes me that if wheat has deteriorated, the fact that it has deteriorated should be sufficient reason to allow its sale, because otherwise it will steadily become worse, and eventually become worthless. Why should we provide that it shall not only be deteriorated, but that some other condition shall attach before it may be sold. I think that illustrates the difference between the use of the two words, "and" and "or."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator understands the purpose of the language. It is simply a question of intent. If any Member of the Senate or any other person desires to have the largest possible number of bushels of wheat sold, then he will be in favor of removing as many restrictions as possible. I am in favor of restricting such sales, for fear that we ourselves may need the wheat later on.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the Senator's point, and perhaps he is correct about it. Would the Senator put any limitation on the sale of wheat if it were found to be deteriorating, so that it would soon become worthless?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Government can sell all they want to sell at the full parity price of corn. They can sell it for the production of alcohol, or they can sell it for relief purposes, or for any other purpose; but it must be for a specific purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. If wheat is deteriorating, for instance, the Senator would not require that it would have to be deteriorating and be sold for relief purposes, would he? If the word "or" were in the law, the wheat could be sold for either one of the purposes mentioned or both.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator correctly interprets the provision. If it is desired to throw this matter wide open, we should repeal many laws which we have on the statute books.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And we should give the authorities all the control they may desire to have in order to be able to drive down the price of wheat to any point to which they see fit to drive it.

Mr. NORRIS. I would not agree to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That would be the result. Not long ago announcement came from high authorities that they are going to keep the prices of farm commodities at around parity prices, and in a New York newspaper I notice a heading reading as follows:

> Staples drop with United States threat to hold prices near parity.

Just a threat to do it caused the price of wheat, the price of corn, the price of cotton, and the price of rye to fall.

Mr. NORRIS. All that may be, but I do not think that demonstrates that we should have the word "and" in the bill instead of the word "or." For example, let us say that it was discovered that a large portion of the wheat held in storage was deteriorating—for any reason. Would the Senator be in favor of putting any restriction on the sale of such wheat for feeding people as a matter of charity?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; not for feeding purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Would the wheat have to be used for charity, and would it also have to be deteriorated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No, Mr. President; that question answers itself. No one would want to feed deteriorated wheat to persons on charity, or to anyone else.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I should not think so, but it would be necessary to use the word "and" in the bill instead of the word "or."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not think so. Deteriorated wheat could be used only for feeding, and I think it should be processed and the bad taken out. That is ordinarily done as to wheat. When wheat comes in during the threshing season it ordinarily contains more or less foreign matter.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is apparent—at least it seems to be so to me—that we shall have a very large amount of wheat on hand, and if the crop now growing shall be of the average size, there will be, as I understand, no place within the United States in which to store it. So I think no one can deny that we will have on hand a large amount of deteriorated wheat. It would be wrong, it seems to me, not to utilize it for whatever we can get out of it rather than to lose it entirely.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. We can still make provision for that; we can dispose of the deteriorated wheat for what we can get out of it. If it is beyond reclaiming, it would not bring very much, of course; if it contains a certain percentage of good wheat, the bad wheat can be separated from the good wheat and the good wheat can be utilized. So if it is the desire of the country and the administration to drive the price of wheat down, then, of course, the provisions of this amendment I think will do the job; but I am not willing, Mr. President, in times such as we find throughout the world, to try to drive the price of wheat down.

It may be true that we have 600,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand, but we use more than that in continental United States; we use about 650,000,000 bushels, or approximately that amount. If we raise a large crop this year, we will find some place to put it. During the last war I saw piles of wheat in my State for which there were no storage facilities; no graneries or elevators were available; but that condition has been largely remedied in the last 25 years. If we had to put wheat on the ground in 1917 and 1918 in order to take care of it, which we did, we may have to do that again this year, but, if so, there will be no substantial injury done, because the wheat can be taken from the ground, loaded on cars, and shipped, and what little dirt there may be in the wheat can easily be removed by running it through the proper machinery.

So, Mr. President, it resolves itself into this question: If we want to drive the price of wheat down, this amendment

can be used to do it; if we want to use wheat to drive the price of corn down, this amendment obviously will do it. I am not in favor of doing either one. For 10 years we have been trying to get the price of corn, wheat, and cotton to parity and now, when we have just about attained that goal, those who have always been against the parity concept are trying to divide those who are trying to help the agricultural interests, by using one group against the other, using wheat against corn. Cotton is out of this picture for the time being, but Senators from the cotton-growing section, it seems to me, are favoring the use of wheat to drive the price of corn down, and the use of corn to drive the price of wheat down. As a practical proposition, coming from a State that grows all three crops, I cannot subscribe to either of those proposals.

Mr. President, I desire to offer a substitute. First, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. I believe there is a unanimous-consent agreement to consider all amendments to the five or six or seven lines on the bottom of page 80, and then vote on all the amendments en bloc. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that unanimous consent was granted to vote on all the amendments to the Commodity Credit Corporation section as one amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, Mr. President, before I could ask for a vote on my amendment, the proponents of the amendment pending would have the right to perfect those lines and the proponents of the committee amendment and of the amendment submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee would have an equal right before I could offer my substitute, as I understand. Then I think I am right in saying that I would have the right to offer as a substitute an amendment to strike out the lines, as amended, before they are finally voted upon en bloc. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the parliamentary inquiry, but my own idea of the rules is that if the amendments pending were adopted, a substitute would not be in order. I do not know, of course, what the Chair is going to rule, but I should have no objection to the Senator from Oklahoma offering a substitute after the amendment is perfected, if he desires to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute would be in order when individual amendments are reached.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the method under which we are proceeding is a departure from the ordinary parliamentary procedure. In other words, at the request of the Senator from Georgia, we are considering these amendments to the committee amendment en bloc. It seems to me, that being true, that a substitute for those amendments ought to be considered as one amendment, just as, by unanimous consent, the committee amendments themselves are considered as one amendment. If the Senate chooses to grant consent to consider various amendments en bloc then the ordinary parliamentary rules ought also to apply to considering a substitute for the various amendments en bloc.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, perhaps I can submit an inquiry that will enable me to proceed a little more in order. On page 80, line 14, the committee inserts the words "Provided further." I inquire if that amendment has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that those words are a part of the House text.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Very well. In line 15, the words "provisions of this act" are stricken out and the words "foregoing proviso" inserted. Has that amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is one of the amendments included with the one at the bottom of the page.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Very well; in line 19 the word "and" is stricken out and the word "or" inserted. I understand, then, that that is an amendment that is pending. Then in lines 23, 24, and 25 there is a new provision inserted by the committee, reading as follows:

Provided further, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes.

I understand that that amendment is likewise pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, the last amendment is the one submitted by the chairman of the committee, providing that the wheat shall not be sold below 85 percent of the parity price for corn. That is the amendment now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to offer a substitute for the language following the colon in line 14, page 80, to strike out the remainder of line 14 and all of lines 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and insert a substitute; and, for the RECORD, I ask now to submit the proposed substitute. Let me say that the only two changes in the language proposed to be stricken out are that I have restored the word "and" in place of "or" and I provide that the wheat shall not be sold below the full parity price for corn, which is 97 cents a bushel, in lieu of the pending provision for 85 percent of parity, which amounts to about 82 or 83 cents a bushel. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 80, line 14, after the colon, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 14 and all of lines 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity to or by the Agricultural Marketing Administration for distribution exclusively for relief purposes, nor to grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of alcohol, or commodities sold to farmers for seed, and sales of cotton required in connection with the present new uses program being carried on by the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes, but at not less than the parity price for corn."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in support of the amendment which has just been read, I submit a letter of date May 15, signed by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and addressed to the United States Senate. The letter justifies the text of the amendment just read. I submit it for the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1942.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We are keenly disappointed that the agricultural appropriation bill, as reported to the Senate, has been modified so as to permit the unlimited release of corn for feed and the release of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feeding purposes, without any price limitation.

This proposal violates the action taken by the Senate by more than two-thirds vote in the passage of S. 2255 and the action taken later by the House by more than 2-to-1 vote in adopting a provision in the agricultural appropriation bill which had a similar objective.

The objective of organized agriculture and—we had reason to believe—the objective of Congress and the administration, has been to encourage the stabilization of price levels of basic farm commodities at parity levels. We regard this action as a great step backward in that it will undoubtedly have a depressing and demoralizing effect upon the price level of feed grains. Any policy of government which has for its purpose the deliberate attempt to hold down the price of feed grain substantially below parity will in the early future have a similar influence upon the price level of all livestock and livestock products. It will also have the effect of destroying justified confidence in the parity price objective of the Federal Government for farm commodities. It will tend to result in sectionalism and disunity of agriculture, because of the failure to provide comparable protection for all commodities.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, after conferring with farm leaders from Wheat and Corn Belts, recommended an amendment to this bill that would limit the release of Government owned or controlled wheat at a price not less than the parity price for corn and then only in such amounts as would not have the effect of depressing the basic corn market below parity levels.

We, therefore, urge that this bill be amended on page 80 by striking out the word "or" in line 19 and inserting the word "and", and by inserting a comma after the word "purposes" in line 25, and adding the following: "but at not less than the parity price for corn."

We respectfully urge your support of this amendment. We are counting on Congress to keep faith with farmers in protecting the parity-price principle.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is merely a perfecting amendment, Mr. President, and, as I understand, the substitute offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be a substitute for the committee proposal as amended, if the amendment I have offered shall be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I to understand that the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is a substitute for the entire provision on page 80, beginning with line 14?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And that if the perfecting amendment which the Senator from Georgia has offered shall now be adopted, the question will then arise on the substitute offered by the Senator from Oklahoma?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will not be in order until all committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think this is the last committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is the last, then the Chair understands that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be the question before the Senate after action on the committee amendment now pending.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is one difficulty which might arise. I desired to propose an amendment which would clarify the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell these grains at less than parity for the purpose of making ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber, and I should not like to be precluded from offering that amendment by the pendency of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A perfecting amendment would take precedence over the substitute offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma whether he believes that it is a matter of little importance, in connection with the principle for which he has been arguing, whether these perfecting amendments shall be adopted?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should have no objection to the amendment just submitted by the Senator from Georgia, and if it shall be agreed to, I shall be very glad to have it transferred to my substitute, because my substitute and the committee amendment are identical, save in two particulars.

Mr. RUSSELL. And only two particulars.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding now that the issue which was presented here first this afternoon by the Senator from Iowa, and again by the Senator from Oklahoma, will arise upon the substitute offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I assume we are about to vote and before we do so I wish to make a brief statement. I think there are some phases of the situation the facts in relation to which are not properly understood, and I think that is possibly due to some statements made by the Senator from Oklahoma about Senators representing cotton-producing States, or any other Senators, driving down the price of wheat. The Senator used the expression time and again as to both wheat and corn, but he did refer particularly to wheat; did he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. To both.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He referred to driving down the price of wheat and, in addition to that, driving down the price of corn.

What is the real situation about that? I hope to speak without any thought of feeling, because this is a practical proposition, and I regret to find myself in disagreement, even in the slightest degree, with my associates here with whom I have cooperated for some years in all measures relating to the welfare of the farmers of our country. Whatever may be said on this subject here, whatever may be said outside this body by farm leaders or farm representatives, I do not propose to bear any of those things in my heart, and hereafter when proposals for legislation shall come before us which involve the welfare of any group of farmers, whether in the North or East, the South or the West, and I feel that they are for the welfare of the farmers, I shall work shoulder to shoulder with my fellow Senators for the advancement of any such proposals, or for the defeat of any proposed legislation which may appear to be injurious to any body of farmers throughout the country.

So far as I am concerned, when the vote shall be taken upon this measure, the matter will all be past history with me. I hope my colleagues will understand that I am serious and earnest about that. It is my judgment that what I have said reflects the feeling in the hearts of Senators who have disagreed with me.

I do not believe any of the Members of the Senate, because of any difference of opinion, have any purpose to retaliate or to undertake penalizing legislation against any group of farmers. Some newspapers have carried reports that that is the situation. I was called over the long distance telephone today by a friend in Alabama who said the report had gone out over the wires today that the farm bloc had broken up, was divided up into factions, and that hereafter it would lose some of its effectiveness, to the injury of all farmers; and he said that as a result of the report there was some recession in farm prices. If anyone is making use of an argument of that sort, it is not supported by the facts, in my judgment. We have some honest differences of opinion, but such differences do not involve what some Senators seem to think they do.

It is admitted—the Senator from Oregon pointed it out with clearness, the Senator from Georgia has also developed the same proposition with force—that at present there is nothing in the law to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling any of the Government-owned crops at any price it sees fit to ask. Does the pending amendment, then, give it any more power? Does it tend to drive down the prices of any commodities? Does it give the Corporation any instructions of any sort to sell at prices lower than those at which they are now selling?

On the contrary, the amendment establishes a floor which does not now exist. So, instead of abandoning the farmers in either of the groups, instead of abandoning the parity concept, we are proposing by this amendment, I believe, to afford some additional protection for all the groups. We are putting wheat on a basis with cotton. The only protection cotton has had since 1938 has been a limitation on the quantity of cotton which could be sold each calendar year. There has been no floor. By this measure it is put on the same basis with wheat, and in addition to the quantity provision, we are including a floor for wheat, which has never been on the cotton program.

What is the situation? The House inserted this provision, and we had to deal with it. As we all know, and as has been referred to here several times today, the Senate passed a bill to prevent the sale of the commodities covered by the bill at prices less than parity. For some reason, the House never considered the bill. It was never reported by the Committee on Agriculture of the House. Many have suggested today that that was probably because of a statement or a threat of some kind that the President would veto the bill if it were passed. I do not know why it was not considered. It contains the same principle that is involved in the measure before us, and if anyone thinks the President would have vetoed that bill why does he think he would not veto the pending bill, when we have 6 weeks longer in which to pass another agricultural appropriation bill before the fiscal year shall expire?

There is another thing which I do not recall having been discussed. The bill merely authorizes the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat. The evidence shows that 25,000,000 of that amount is deteriorated wheat, and only 100,000,000 bushels of sound wheat are included in the authorization. The new crop is coming on pretty soon. If there are those who listen to the arguments made and the prediction that the administration is going to drive the price of wheat down, I refer them to the bills passed by the Congress putting a floor under all agricultural commodities, through loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation up to 85 percent of the parity price.

The committee amendment provides that not more than 125,000,000 bushels

of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes. In the meantime, with a new crop coming in, what farmer will sell his wheat at 85 percent of the parity price of corn when he can walk up to the Commodity Credit Corporation and obtain 85 percent of the price of wheat itself? Instead of getting 82 or 83 cents a bushel, the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation will sell wheat for feeding purposes, the farmer can get 113½ cents a bushel for every bushel of wheat he produces in this year's crop.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wonder how the Senator expects the wheat farmer to handle his wheat if the bins and the warehouses of the country are now full of grain, as several Senators have disclosed in their statements?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator knows that that is the Government's problem, and one reason why the Government is interested in the removal of some of this wheat, is so that storage space may be found for the producers who are entitled under the law to the loan of 85 percent of parity price.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that it is a problem for the Government to solve, but it is apparently a problem for the Senate to solve also, or we would not be discussing it here now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We all admit that it is a problem.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I wish to make is that it seems to me the wheat farmer would have a rather difficult time in getting 85 percent of parity through a loan unless he complies with conditions as they exist today. Certainly the Government is not going to give him 85 percent of the price of wheat if there are no storage facilities for it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would the defeat of the amendment provide any more storage space for wheat? Would not the adoption of the amendment and diverting a great amount of wheat into feed create more storage space for the wheat farmers?

Mr. LUCAS. I think we will find that the wheat will be sold for feeding purposes just as freely under the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] as it will under the amendment proposed by the committee. If the farmer needs the wheat for feeding purposes, I think there can be no question that he is in a position, as a result of what he is getting for hogs and cattle and poultry at this very moment, to pay the price suggested in this amendment and still make a profit. That is my opinion. In other words the hog farmer today is getting above parity for his pork, the cattle farmer is getting above parity for his cattle, and they have been getting above parity for some time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not take my time to make an argument.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may conclude my remarks briefly, let me say that it is my opinion that so long as the hog farmer gets parity for his hogs and the cattle farmer gets parity for his cattle, they can pay parity price for feed and still make a profit. From the beginning that has been the basic theory of all farm legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator mentioned the problem of storage for wheat. The Senator is no doubt aware of the fact that practically all storage facilities are now crowded with wheat, which leaves practically no storage facilities for the incoming crop, and as a result some of the wheat now in storage must be disposed of, or the incoming crop must be sold, or forced on the market for lack of storage facilities, or it must be left exposed to the elements where it may likewise become damaged as well as that which is now on hand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Those facts were presented to the committee by the Secretary of Agriculture and by Mr. Hutson, the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Very frankly, those facts had considerable bearing upon the decision which I reached in respect to this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Alabama and also the Senator from Kentucky have been talking very much about the matter of storage facilities for the surplus wheat, which, of course, is a matter of concern to all of us. Does not the Senator, though, agree with me that if the Government could shake itself loose from the influence of certain sugar representatives in the W. P. B., and would be willing to convert this surplus grain into alcohol for munitions purposes, it would be entirely possible both to relieve the sugar shortage in the country and to provide the Government with a great deal of industrial alcohol for munitions purposes? I should like to get at the bottom of the reluctance on the part of the Federal Government to use this surplus grain for useful purposes, and insisting on it overhanging the market for the purpose of keeping the price from going up at any time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am thoroughly in accord with the views of the Senator from Missouri on that point, and agree with him in his hopes and ambitions. I also think the Senator from Iowa is entitled to very great credit for the developments he has made and presented to the Senate. I have no doubt that all Members of this body are willing to do anything they can do to promote the use of wheat and corn and other grains in the production of alcohol and synthetic rubber. But, Senators, it is impossible to work out all the problems involved and bring about satisfactory production before we conclude action upon the pending bill. We do not know, with certainty, whether such proposals will develop satisfactorily. We do not know how long it will take to develop the use of grain to the purposes suggested. As soon as satisfactory processes are developed, of course, the sale of grain by the Commodity Credit Corporation for feeding will stop, and I have no doubt the grain will then be diverted to the purposes for which it is most needed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think the W. P. B., or anyone, will ever start to develop the use of grain for the purposes in question unless the Congress takes some action?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Action cannot be taken by Congress in the pending bill at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We are trying to take action.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We cannot legislate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, what the Senator says is true, but the House provision itself is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Senate has as much right to legislate on an appropriation bill as the House has. The only way this is going to be handled is by legislation by the Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe any Senator is more anxious than am I to have the surplus agricultural products, particularly wheat, used for the production of alcohol. Unfortunately, the prospect of having that done does not seem to be very bright, and, as the Senator has said, we could not do anything to bring it about in this bill. The Secretary of Agriculture has testified—and I am relying on his statement—that estimating the production of the crop now growing, there will be on hand, when it reaches the market, one and one-half billion bushels of wheat. We have no place on earth in which to store that quantity of wheat or keep it. I wonder what we are going to do about it? I should like the Congress to enact legislation, if it can be done, providing that alcohol shall be produced from wheat, but no one can give us any assurance that we shall be able to do so. We are now confronted with the situation that we shall have such a large surplus of wheat as to make it physically impossible to take care of it, and under such circumstances what would an ordinary businessman do with the wheat he has now on hand? It seems to me it is necessary to dispose of some of this wheat.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the position I take, and I am glad to hear the Senator from Nebraska confirm what I have said.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think the Senator unfortunately made a statement which was not quite in accordance with the law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to be corrected if I made a misstatement.

Mr. GILLETTE. I know the Senator made the statement unintentionally when he said that any producer of wheat could negotiate a loan for 85 percent of the parity price. That, of course, is not true with respect to the noncooperatives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are but few of those. I agree with the Senator's statement, but that is not the group we are trying to protect primarily and it is not a very large group. A noncooperative can obtain a loan, but not of 85 percent. The Senator from Iowa is correct

in his statement. I did not have the noncooperatives in mind. I am glad the Senator corrected the record in that respect.

Mr. President, some assertions have been made in the Senate about the committee amendment, including some things not contained in it. I mean by that purposes for which wheat, corn, and other grains may be disposed of by the Commodity Credit Corporation in addition to grain for feeding. I have before me the Bankhead-Gillette-Thomas-Russell bill, and hurriedly during the debate have tried to compare it with the amendment, and find that the only substantial difference, if there is any difference, is in the use of the word "or" instead of "and." Disposition of any commodity for relief purposes, which has been criticized here as throwing the gates wide open, was included in the bill which we passed by such a large vote.

The language in the original bill was:

Substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for the purpose of feeding or manufacturing alcohol.

That amendment was offered by the Senator from Vermont, and I accepted it. It was not the intention to limit the sale of deteriorated wheat to feeding, but it was the intention to provide for the sale of deteriorated wheat, and also the sale of wheat for feeding. That is the only practical construction. No one would want to feed rotten wheat to stock. It has been my view that that language in the original bill was intended to cover what we have covered by the provision in this bill which has raised such a storm.

Whether that is the proper construction or not, the only step forward is to make it clear that grains may be sold for feeding. The bill originally had no limit as to quantity. The committee proceeded to set a limit of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat which might be sold for feeding. So it seems to me that the amendment is protective of the farm groups.

What will happen when the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat have been sold? Is this a permanent dislocation of the parity price situation? Is it an abandonment of the program which we undertook to install through the bill which was never considered in the House? On the contrary, Mr. President, instead of being an abandonment of that plan it is a long step toward its realization. We concede only the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat below parity, and the bill provides that no further sales may be made at a price less than parity.

Is that an unreasonable dislocation to make in order to obtain what we have been so anxious to establish? Is it unreasonable when the administration tells us that it needs wheat and corn at present prices, without increasing them, but without reducing them?

In the committee we were assured that prices would not be reduced below present prices. To make that certain we inserted a provision preventing the reduction of prices below present prices. The bill provides for 85 percent of the parity price of corn, which is the price at which both corn and wheat are now selling. The Commodity Credit Corporation agreed not to reduce the price. We said, "Let us put it in writing," and the Senator from Georgia offered the amendment. So if this bill is passed the price may not be reduced. The price will not be driven down, because under the terms of the bill it cannot be driven down. The floor of 85 percent is slightly above the present selling price, instead of being below it. The Department stated that it needs this provision not only because of lack of storage space, but in order to prevent serious increases in the prices of both wheat and corn.

The Department is interested not only in relieving the storage situation, but also in holding down the cost of living. It is anxious to keep the cost of living as low as possible. I think the administration has made a wonderful concession. It has agreed to the program for the sale of 100,000,000 bushels of good wheat.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a question for my own information. As I remember, when the question of the prohibition of sales of certain farm commodities below parity came up some time ago, the Senator from Alabama took a very decided stand. The measure was passed by a very large majority. As I remember, the three commodities affected were wheat, corn, and cotton. What has happened to cotton in the present discussion? Why is it not involved?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator thinks he has a good sectional question, I shall be very glad to let him raise it.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am asking a plain question, and I think I am entitled to an answer. I do not think I need to be told that I am insinuating anything sectional.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I leave it to the Senator as to whether he is.

Mr. TUNNELL. I notice that nothing is being said about cotton.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be very glad to discuss that question. I am glad the Senator raised it, because there may be some misinformation about it.

In 1938, when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed, a large surplus of cotton was held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. No other agricultural commodity was held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. So a section was put in the act in 1938 limiting the amount of cotton which might be sold each calendar year to one and a half million bales, and limiting the amount which might be sold each month to 300,000 bales. The purpose was to bring about an orderly disposition of the cotton, and to avoid dumping too much of it on the market at one time. My good friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and I helped to put that provision in the law. Probably he was the chief author. I am glad to credit him with it, because it has been a splendid protective provision, and the result has been that the Government has made a profit instead of a loss on cotton.

This year the Commodity Credit Corporation, without any floor on the sale of cotton—it could sell cotton at 5 cents a pound if it saw fit to do so—has proceeded to sell all the cotton it could—one and a half million bales—on the open market.

That is what has happened with respect to cotton. It was not necessary to put anything in this bill with respect to cotton. The Commodity Credit Corporation had already sold what the law allowed. This is an appropriation bill. No further legislation was necessary with respect to cotton because in due course the cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation is being placed in competition with new crops everywhere.

Does that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think that shows why cotton is not being discussed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; because the question is settled. It was settled in the same way in which we are now trying to settle the wheat question.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand the argument advanced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]—and I have not heard it answered—this amendment would drive down the prices of both wheat and corn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the Senator been present since I first took the floor?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did the Senator hear me discuss that subject?

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not hear any real answer to that argument.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I pointed to the provisions of this amendment, which would put a definite floor of 85 percent of the parity price of corn on the sale price of both wheat and corn. I further pointed out that corn and wheat are both selling a little under that price, and that there is no way of driving down the price of either by the adoption of this amendment.

If we should not adopt the amendment the Commodity Credit Corporation would have authority, if it should desire to do so—I do not think it would do so, but we are talking about authority—to drive the prices of wheat and cotton down as low as they could be driven through the sale of the stocks of those commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TUNNELL. Some time ago I noticed a statement by the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that he favored parity. I understood that the Senator and his associates in the debate favored 110 percent of parity when a certain measure was under consideration sometime ago. Now, as I understand, they would reduce the price to 85 percent of parity.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator is not better informed before he criticizes his brother Senators.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the Senator does not want to answer the question, I will wait and discuss it in my own time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have in my hand a copy of the measure to which the Senator refers. If he can find 110 percent of parity in it, he will find something which I have never found in it.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the Senator does not wish to answer my question, I will discuss it in my own time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will answer any question the Senator asks; but he is criticizing.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not criticizing, and have not criticized. I asked a respectful question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry, if that was the Senator's motive.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not seem to get a respectful answer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry, and I express my regret to the Senator if that was his motive.

Mr. TUNNELL. I certainly did have that motive.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it satisfactory for me to express my regret after being informed that the Senator's motive was not critical?

Mr. TUNNELL. I shall be very glad to answer in my own time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I do not care to take up any more time. I do not see the necessity for such a serious storm. There is very little involved in adopting this amendment, and much benefit to be derived after the quantity of wheat which is permitted to be sold is sold. In the meantime, 1,400,000,000 bushels of wheat are in prospect, and 600,000,000 bushels have been carried over, with an annual commercial use or consumption of only about 500,000,000 bushels, and about a million and a half bushels being consumed for feed on the farms. With 650,000,000 bushels of wheat to be consumed, and with 1,400,000,000 bushels in prospect, how does anybody expect the law of supply and demand to make the price of wheat substantially higher than it is now?

How does anyone expect the law of supply and demand to put the price of wheat substantially higher than it is now, when we have more than 2 years of supply for the usual consumption? I am submitting that as a reasonable question to reasonable men.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator expect that wheat would be sold below the loan value or above it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It might be sold at prices below the loan value, or it might be put under loan and later abandoned. This bill could not hold the returns below the loan value; but I have seen prices stay considerably below the loan value because farmers are reluctant to put their commodities under loans. They prefer to sell them and get the cash, rather than put them under loans; that is their feeling about the matter.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is discussing the law of supply and demand. The only reason I interrupted him——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am always glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. HATCH. My only reason for interrupting the Senator was to raise a question as to the loan value. Frankly, I think that if it had not been for the loan value of wheat, in the past 12 months the price of wheat would have been down to the level of 1932.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I think the loan value is what has held up the price of wheat and will hold it up this year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the Senator; and I agree with the corn, wheat, and cotton producers. I think this amendment ultimately will result in advantage to all of them. It will not result in prices lower than the prices for corn or wheat would be if they were not affected and if the Department were left free to sell wheat without limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment on page 80, beginning with line 23.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I rose some time ago with the idea of obtaining some information which I have not been able to obtain during the debate. The Senator from Alabama has apparently been engaged in a heated discussion with someone else—certainly not with me—and he had the idea that I was attempting to criticize him or his ideas.

I still do not understand why it is that a short time ago the Senator from Alabama and many other Members of the Senate—in fact, a large majority of the Members—were extremely anxious to maintain parity for all three of the agricultural commodities. We were interested in wheat and corn, and many Members of the Senate were interested in cotton. Now, apparently there is no interest in maintaining parity for grain.

We are told that no facilities are available for the storage of wheat, that 800,000,000 bushels of wheat are about to be harvested, and that it is necessary to relieve the wheat situation by disposing of 125,000,000 bushels now held in storage so that room may be made for 800,000,000 bushels. I do not understand an argument of that kind. I was attempting to find out something about it, but I did not find it out.

In view of the fact that the President has declared for parity, the Secretary of Agriculture has declared for parity, and Congress has declared for at least parity, it seems to me that we are entitled to know something about a sudden change which seems to remove all idea of parity so far as grain—either wheat or corn—is concerned.

I do not know; I am not supposed to know as much about this matter as Members of the Senate who are on the committee. They have studied these questions, and yet when I asked for some information I did not receive it. I was told that I was criticizing. Since I have been in the Senate I have learned that in most cases one of the particular qualifications of a critic is to know nothing. I think the best critics are those who do not know anything about a matter. After listening to some of the debate in the past few days I am more convinced than ever that the best critics are those who do not pretend to know. We have been told that certain appropriations in this very bill should be less. We have never been told how much less they should be, or what the particular amounts should be.

In the present case we are told that the Senate should agree to this amendment, which would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, and it has been stated that the effect of selling such wheat would be to drive down the price of corn and also to drive down the price of wheat. I do not know whether that is true, but I believe the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma and his reasoning on that point, and I cannot see how the situation could be otherwise.

Are we now going to get away from the principle of parity? Some of us were criticized a good deal for joining with other Senators some time ago in advocating passage of the measure, in which they seemed to be so much interested, and which I think they want. We joined in that effort because we believed it was right.

If the pending amendment should be agreed to, would not Senators who vote for it be getting entirely away from the position in which they were placed? I believe that the criticism which many of us received at that time was of little value to us, because I think we were right. I think we were right when we voted to pass the measure and when we added to the bill then before the Senate a prohibition of the sale of certain commodities for less than the parity price. I think we were right then, and I have not been shown why it still is not right. I do not quite understand the sudden change which seems to have taken place in the Senate. I have listened to the discussion, and I do not understand why a matter which such a preponderance of the Members of the Senate a few weeks ago deemed to be right is now scarcely mentioned.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have refrained from entering into the debate for reasons very satisfactory to me. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I told the members of the committee who represent corn-producing States and wheat-producing States that I would go along with them in whatever they agreed upon and united upon. I have been greatly disturbed by the exhibition of certain feeling. My State does not grow any wheat or any corn for the market. We take our corn mostly in the liquid form. [Laughter.]

However, Mr. President, it seems to me that we are so confused about the issues that we cannot see the forest for the trees. Whatever else may be said, we are proposing by this amendment to give the Government the right to dispose of certain commodities which the Senator has just mentioned, at below the price which we overwhelmingly agreed upon should be the price. If it suits the Senators representing wheat-producing States and Senators representing corn-producing States, it is all right with me; but I think we are sowing the wind and will reap the whirlwind.

I think my friend the Senator from Alabama remembers the time when we put cotton into the pool. He had certain very positive statements to make about that; and the fact is that we passed the measure in the form of a law. The Senator from Alabama made

very positive statements to the effect that if the farmers would plow up a certain amount of their cotton they could buy an equal amount of surplus cotton at 6 cents a pound, with the understanding that if cotton went below 6 cents a pound the Government would absorb the loss, but that if it went above 6 cents a pound the farmers would receive the benefit of the increase, and would have no overhead charges to pay—no insurance, no interest, and no storage. Senators remember the outcome of all that, do they not?

Those who handled their cotton in that way were charged full storage, $2.40 a bale, and that amount was deducted from the amount the cotton brought.

So I am afraid we are getting into a position similar to that of the Negro who had a mule. There was an epidemic of sore throat among mules. The Negro went to a veterinarian and said, "My mule is sick, sir." The veterinarian said, "What is the matter with him?" The Negro said, "He has a sore throat."

"Oh, yes," the veterinarian said; "there is an epidemic. I will give you this rubber tube. It is filled with dust. Put it carefully in the mule's mouth, and blow. That is all you need to do. It will cure him, and that will be all there will be to it."

The next morning the veterinarian went along the road, and saw the Negro sitting under a mulberry tree, all drawn up.

"Jim," he said to the Negro, "did you give the mule that powder?"

"Yes, sir," said Jim. "I stuck the tube in his mouth. But, by God, he blowed first." [Laughter.]

The trouble is that we enact laws, but "they blow first." [Laughter.]

Of all the ridiculous procedures engaged in by the Government, I think the most ridiculous was reneging on the farmers in connection with the "plow-under agreement."

I have no confidence in Government bureaus. I think every other Member of the Senate will ratify what I am saying. I was a little amused at their saying what an enormous crop of wheat there is. I am not pretending to argue for the wheat and corn raisers; if this proposal suits them, it suits me; but I want the bureaucrats here to keep their hands off our product.

Think of saying that with a crop of several hundred million bushels the sale of 125,000,000 bushels will relieve the situation. In other words, we are going to sell 125,000,000 bushels at 85 percent of corn parity. Anyone can figure out how much that would mean for wheat. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] says it would mean about fifty-some-odd cents a bushel below the parity on wheat.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Forty-nine percent below the 110 figure.

Mr. SMITH. And that we will go into the Treasury; that is, every man in the United States will have his opportunity to pay the difference between the parity on corn and the market price of corn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator was a Member of the Senate during the last war.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He knows all that happened at that time under the Food Administration of Mr. Hoover. The Senator also knows, I am sure, that when Hoover fixed a minimum price on wheat and corn it became the maximum price. I am sure the Senator knows also that when Congress by legislative authorization fixes a price of 85 percent of parity on corn and compels wheat to conform to that, we are fixing a new parity for both.

Mr. SMITH. Not parity; we are fixing a new price.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We are fixing a new parity for both corn and wheat, and if anyone thinks that when that is done we are not also establishing a precedent for fixing a new parity on cotton, he is very badly mistaken.

I think my colleague and myself are the only two Members of the Senate who represent a State in which the cash revenue from wheat, corn, and cotton, from feeding cattle, and from the dairy industry are almost equal. We produce all these commodities in our State. As we produce cotton, I am interested in what is done about cotton. I am also interested in corn, I am interested in wheat, and I would not do anything for one agricultural industry which would discriminate against another. But I say to the Senator from South Carolina—and I defy successful contradiction—that when we start into the business of authorizing men in the bureaus in Washington to use the agricultural surpluses, not as a means of disposing of the surpluses, but as an end to break the market, what they do to corn today they will do to wheat tomorrow, what they do to wheat tomorrow they will do to cotton day after tomorrow, and they will do the same thing to beef, and will do the same thing to dairy products. It seems to me the real issue in this whole matter is whether we are to maintain the theory of parity, which has been adopted by the Congress on the very strong recommendation of the President of the United States and the administration, or whether we are to authorize some bureaucrat at his will to destroy the whole principle of parity.

When we say 85 percent of parity, that means that 85 percent of parity is to be the maximum. If we do that as to corn, tomorrow it will be done as to wheat, and eventually it will be done as to every other agricultural commodity.

Mr. SMITH. Since we have been so economical in every department—we owe only about $100,000,000,000, and that does not amount to anything!—since we have been so economical, I wonder why we did not propose that the surpluses of wheat and corn should be taken and disposed of at parity. What are we doing? We are saying, "You can dispose of yours below parity, but we are going to hold ours at parity." You will play the devil doing it, I am telling you.

I was very active in the passage of the bill during the last war to which the Senator from Missouri has referred. I became very much elated because we had left the sky the limit as to wheat, had left other agricultural products without a lid.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did not the minimum price turn out to be the maximum price?

Mr. SMITH. Wait a moment; let me tell the story. Old Uncle Knute Nelson, a very capable legislator, who had been here much longer than I had, was discussing wheat with me, and he said, "The Senator from South Carolina has not cut his eye teeth." He said, "There is in this bill a provision for a minimum of two and a half dollars a bushel"—I think that was the figure, at any rate, we will use that for illustration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was $2.

Mr. SMITH. Two dollars, then. He said, "That will be the maximum." I said, "You were never more mistaken in your life, and you will find that out."

I was not familiar with jokers in bills at that time. When the market opened for wheat, there was discovered in the bill a proviso that the Food Administrator could fix a figure above which a commodity could not be priced. So he promptly said that anything above $2 a bushel for wheat would be penalized under the law. And there it was.

I do not feel like adding to the confusion. I think everyone has an idea just about as clear as mud regarding this whole business. I do know, however, that if this amendment shall be agreed to, even if it were for but a bushel of wheat or a bushel of corn, if those in authority are permitted to sell below the price for which we all fought and finally agreed upon, we will have abandoned the principle, we will have said: "So far as the Government is concerned, it can sell at one price, but the farmer must sell at some other price."

I do not know what will happen to corn and wheat. One very prominent man—so far as publicity goes he is prominent—said to me, "That is for a floor under our wheat." C. K. Berryman, the well-known cartoonist, drew a cartoon showing me standing on a ladder higher than the Washington Monument, and the President was saying, "Say, ED, are you fixing a ceiling?" I was shown as replying, "Hell, no; I'm fixing a floor."

Just as certainly as that we are here, we are giving up what we have fought for, I do not care what the exigencies are. If we want to lower the price, let us lower it, but not grant the privilege to someone outside. We are being criticized by the newspapers as being a worthless body. The chickens are coming home to roost.

We in Congress have given cause for the criticism which is made that we rubber stamp everything, and that we say "yes, yes" and "me, too." To whom do the people look to make laws establishing equitable relations and justice so far as it lies in mortal ability to do? Do the

people look to the officials in the bureaus, or to you and to me in the Congress?

Mr. President, I think it is our duty to say, "We are sorry, but we cannot get away from the fact that we have stood for parity for wheat, for corn, for cotton, and for tobacco, and we shall continue to stand for it." Other Senators who wish to vote otherwise may do so, but I thought that when we stood for parity we were incorporating a principle into the law. For 10 years we have fought for that principle. Now it is proposed to say that we shall grant surpluses for charity, and for this, and for that, and the other, and that the Department may sell this grain in contradiction of what we have stood for, and what we have fought for, and what we have won.

Some Senators have made a great to-do about the country not having facilities for converting agricultural products into alcohol. Mr. President, according to what certain rulers have said, the farmers are not entitled to anything.

There is much talk about 110 percent of parity. Not a half a dozen farmers, and I am afraid not all Senators, know what 110 percent of parity in its final analysis means. One hundred and ten percent of parity does not come within 200 percent of the income of other classes in this country. However, I do not wish to discuss that question now.

Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the demand for the utilization of grain in the production of things which are so necessary for the war effort. We are rationed with respect to sugar, though I understand sufficient storage space does not exist for all the sugar in the country. We are rationed with respect to gasoline, and gasoline is being burned out in the West in order to get rid of it. We are rationed with respect to tires. I think there is a scarcity of tires. We are not using American ingenuity in getting the material which is available for the production of those things which are almost as essential in our organized life as food, and which are essential to the production of food. Our American civilization moves on rubber wheels. Before the committee presided over by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] it was demonstrated that we could convert all sorts of grains and potatoes into an element which could be used in making tires. Why do we not do it? Why have not the bureaus which are running the Government suggested that certain appropriations be made so as to give the people of America that great sine qua non—rubber? Whatever else may be said, a spirit which is dangerous to the country will be created if we do not convince the people that we are using every means in our power, even drastic means, to get the wherewithal to make synthetic rubber.

How many synthetic rubber plants are now in full operation, and who owns them? It might be interesting if some Senators were to inquire into that matter. But, Mr. President, I am getting off the subject.

If we agree to the amendment which grants to the Government the right to dispose of these commodities at a price under parity, we shall give away all we have stood for during all these years. Senators may argue concerning the question of how many angels can stand on the point of a pin, but that does not interest me. The bold fact stands out that we cannot make this concession now for no more reason than has been urged, without giving away what we have stood for and fought for during all these years. I will vote with the Senators from the Wheat and Corn States for whatever they want, but let them stand for parity. If the wheat farmers have produced too much wheat, that is their lookout.

I have very strong feelings with respect to the great and learned organizations which are saying, "But the farmer will not lose anything." My God, most of the farmers do not have anything to lose.

Members of the Senate, I have not burdened the Senate with many speeches. I have sat in my seat and let this thing run until it seemed to me it is about to run clear over the falls. I have fought relentlessly against any encroachment on parity. I do not want the Government to be paying me out of the Treasury the difference between what it is thought I ought to have and what I receive in the market. I am under no obligation to anyone except to my country and to myself. What I can get in the market ought to satisfy me.

If cotton goes to 5 cents and is worth only 5 cents, and I am fool enough to continue to make it, I ought to receive 5 cents, and not have the Government come in and say, "We are going to take a certain amount out of the taxes of the people and pay it to you." That is not right. Let all producers be on an equality, and let them share and share alike in the market place.

Mr. President, we sit here and discuss whether we will permit certain bureaus of the Government to sell grain below what we think it is worth, and hear the foolish assertion made that the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat will open the way for 1,800,000,000 bushels.

Mr. President, I may be like the man who was on the jury, which when it came in to make a report that it could not agree was asked by the judge why it could not reach a verdict. That man said, "Judge, there are 11 of the damndest fools on this jury that I ever saw. I can't get them to agree with me." [Laughter.] That may be my position, but God helping me, I am not going to turn around and eat my words and vote against a principle for which I have united with Senators from the corn- and wheat- and cotton-producing States, the principle of obtaining parity for agriculture.

Mr. President, if we are not going to get parity, let us throw up our hands and quit. We have 125,000,000 bushels of wheat which it is proposed to sell for feed—enough wheat for charity and enough for this and for that. I am sorry to see some of my good friends falling by the wayside. I do not know what has frightened them. I think perhaps a visit some of them made played the devil with them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A what?

Mr. SMITH. A certain visit they made.

Mr. President, I have been in the Senate for a long time. I have been here longer than I ought to have been here, but never, before the God who made me, have I gone back on what I have conceived to be a principle. What is now involved is a principle. If Senators are going to turn around like a set of whipped curs and run away from that principle and say "Yes; you can have 125,000,000 bushels and sell them for certain specified purposes, but we will fix the price way below parity," go to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The hour of adjournment has arrived. Obviously we cannot complete action on the bill today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am frank to say, Mr. President, that I think some of the remarks I intend to make may provoke a little discussion. Probably it will be difficult to finish this evening.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to move that the Senate take a recess at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his motion, it is my understanding that the majority leader is about to move that the Senate take a recess, and that we shall meet tomorrow at noon and resume consideration of the pending measure?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If there is no objection, I shall resume the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow.

LIMITATIONS ON COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF ARMY AND NAVY LIVING QUARTERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there are two measures on the calendar which have been reported from the Military Affairs Committee. They have been on the calendar for some time. We are extremely anxious to have them passed.

One of them relates to certain military structures which are now in operation, but which cannot be completed unless a certain limitation is lifted. The matter has been considered by the Military Affairs Committee, and the measure has been favorably reported.

If there is no objection, I should like to dispose of these two measures at this time. It will require only a moment. I have spoken to the minority leader. Some time ago, because proper explanation was not made, he objected to the consideration of these measures, and quite properly at the time.

The other measure relates to the appointment of cadets to the United States Military Academy at West Point. At the present time there are many vacancies, attributable to the fact that Members of Congress have not taken advantage of the opportunity to fill vacancies. The bill has been passed by the House, and has been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what are the numbers on the calendar?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Calendar No. 1088 is Senate Joint Resolution 129, to remove certain limitations on the cost of construction of Army and Navy living quarters; and Calendar No. 1394 is House bill 6979, to authorize an increase of the

number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

With respect to Senate Joint Resolution 129, there is a limitation upon the construction of Army and Navy living quarters for officers and enlisted men. The limitation varies in different sections, depending upon the location of the buildings and the terrain. In certain instances the establishments cannot be completed because the buildings which have been completed must be connected with gas lines, electric lines, or sewer lines. The War Department has made a very reasonable explanation. The committee has unanimously reported the joint resolution favorably. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are present in the Chamber. I am confident that they will both recall the testimony of the Army officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution provided it will not require much time. The other measure may lead to some discussion. The West Point bill had probably better go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the West Point bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senate passed a bill, which went to the House. About the time the Senate passed the Senate bill, the House passed its own bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. That frequently occurs. A bill passed in the House will meet under the dome a bill passed in the Senate, and one will say to the other, "Let me by this time, and I will let you by the next time." [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is asking for the passage of the House bill with an amendment in the identical language of the Senate bill which the Senate passed a few days ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under those conditions, I have no objection to either measure.

Mr. McNARY. I do not recall that the two measures were objected to on the regular call of the calendar some weeks ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. They were not called.

Mr. McNARY. Personally I see no objection. Any Senator who may object can move to reconsider tomorrow. So long as there is an emergency, as stated by the Senator from North Carolina, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 129?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to remove certain limitations on the cost of construction of Army and Navy living quarters was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That limitations heretofore or hereafter placed upon the cost of construction of quarters for commissioned officers, commissioned warrant or warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army and Navy shall not be construed to prohibit or exclude additional expenditures for equipment and work outside of such quarters, including, but not limited to, providing for the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, sewage disposal, and for roads, walks, grading, and drainage.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6979, to authorize an increase in the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof to insert:

That, on and after July 1, 1942, there shall be allowed at the United States Military Academy four cadets for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, six for the District of Columbia, and two cadets to be selected by the Governor of the Panama Canal from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and the sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Co. residing in the Republic of Panama, in addition to the number now authorized to be appointed from the United States at large, and from the enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard, and from the sons of deceased officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines.

SEC. 2. When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board, two-thirds thereof from qualified alternates and one-third thereof from qualified candidates: *Provided*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the committee amendment is the identical language of the Senate bill passed by the Senate several days ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

STUDY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SMALL AIRPLANE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to read a letter which I have received. It is very brief:

AIR FACTS,
New York, N. Y., May 4, 1942.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, I believe you will be interested in giving consideration to the fact that the proper study and development of the small airplane as both a weapon and important unit in the auxiliary air services is being almost wholly neglected.

Many of us in aviation feel that this is a serious defect in our war effort; that, in fact, the small airplane is a vital link in air power.

In the editorial beginning on page 5 of the enclosed issue of Air Facts the case for and against the small airplane is set down at some length.

Could you possibly find time to review this?

We must be the first to learn to use air power decisively.

Most truly,

LEIGHTON COLLINS, *Editor.*

I have read the editorial with a great deal of interest. In view of the fact that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the Military Affairs Committee, is mentioned in the opening paragraph of the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

XIF-1

I

In presenting the Frank M. Hawks Memorial Award of Air Service Post 501 of the American Legion to Mr. Thomas H. Beck of Collier's recently, Senator Thomas of Utah, a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, made a very interesting point of the fact that among pilots we have no counterpart of the suggestion box which is doing such wonders in speeding up production in factories all over the country. He was inclined to urge that aviation people should accept the responsibility to think through this thing of how we are going to win the war, what new strategy, what new tactical principle, what new adaptation of the airplane will put us ahead long enough to turn the tide before an effective defense can be set up. Wars usually begin to be won only after such a turn, usually a rather imaginative one at first.

The assertions and confidence of laymen about military matters is, of course, largely proportional to their lack of information. But as among us pilots, this is anybody's war—that is as to ideas—for there are no experts yet. The game is too new. The adaptation of the modern airplane to military uses is still in its infancy. For that reason the thousands of pilots who are today earnestly talking new ideas are not talking out of turn, or simply sawing on the Government for want of something better to do. They are performing a useful function in giving impetus to any idea which their particular background of experience brings forth, for who else has the benefit of that particular experience and consequently that particular viewpoint? Out of every thousand or so such ideas one will be sound, will lean intuitively into the future, will find its place in the war effort.

Thus to build an idea box on how to win this war among this audience of pilots.

II

Our tendency today seems to be to think maybe too much in terms of the strength of air power and too little in terms of its weaknesses. Unquestionably the war has demonstrated a good deal of both, in fact enough for us to pause to think of just what air power will and what it will not do.

In listing some of the evidence of the strength of air power you would probably start off with the relentlessness of the Stukas in the fall of France; the part played by light observation planes as they guided the racing armored divisions through Poland; the transportation of troops into Norway by air; and again the Stukas in Greece.

Even more spectacular are the accomplishments of air power at sea: the *Bismarck*, Pearl Harbor, the *Repulse*, the *Prince of Wales*, the *Dorsetshire*, and *Cornwall*, the carrier *Hermes*,

the *Haruna*, General MacArthur's squadron of two P–40's each with a 500-pound bomb carried in a home-made rack.

But there are also evidences of the weakness of air power. England has built up an air force under constant bombardment, equipped an army prepared to fight. What then has Germany gotten for the man-hours of labor and materials and men which have brought forth only a disheveled but stronger England? And now, with a sufficient concentration of antiaircraft and fighter planes for defense, the raids over England have even become comparatively infrequent. Actually Germany may have weakened herself by this use of air power. May we not then well ask whether long-range, or even short-range bombing can alone ever bring a decision? It appears, in fact, to be unprofitable beyond a certain point.

The reason that the profitableness of bombing can properly come into question at some point is that you cannot pass off lightly the fact that a four-motored bomber represents around 300,000 man-hours of labor not to mention a great deal in the way of critical materials. If you lose 10 such units a day over all the world's battle fronts it means 525,000 people must work 40 hours a week to furnish replacements. Maybe the primary value of the long-range heavy bomber is in hit-and-run raids, and to keep heavy naval forces far enough out at sea to become prey to the aircraft carrier and the torpedo plane. Maybe it is not something which can be used profitably on heavily defended areas at all. Could we finally suffer from having too many heavy bombers and too few something else?

Maybe no one really knows. But in reviewing thus briefly both the strength and the weakness of air power one thing does stand out. In the theaters where air power has scored decisively it worked in conjunction with either naval or land units. That suggests that our real problem in the effective use of air power is always one of coordination and adaptation. It seems that our experiences to date reveal that we have coordinated air power with naval forces and the aircraft carrier much better than we have coordinated it with land operations. On the battlefield of Russia, for instance, where the final outcome of the war has doubtless been more definitely shaped than anywhere else, air power seems to have been deficient. Maybe it was from lack of equipment for sustained operations along a 2,000-mile front, or maybe it was from something else. But looking back at France, and Poland, and Greece it can be seen that where the airplane has delivered in land operations so far it has done so because it was turned to fit the needs of the ground forces.

About a year ago someone wrote a forceful article giving point to the fact that all wars are finally won by a man with a knife in his hand, that all else is simply preparatory to his final effectiveness. Certainly artillery is not decisive without the charge, nor does it appear that high altitude fighting, indiscriminate bombing, or air raids in general will be except insofar as they are eventually tied in directly with the movement of ground forces. There is no sweeter morsel than the bombing of Tokyo, but after such a barrage we still have our war to win and must face the fact that air power's decisiveness will grow out of and only out of adapting the airplane better and better to the needs of the man with a knife in his hand. Air power's greatest weakness lies, in fact, in a failure to do that for the reason that it is too costly a weapon to use indecisively.

III

We have only four things with which we can win this war: Man-hours or labor, materials, fighting men, leadership. There are definite limitations on the first three of these items, especially the first two. We are prone to overlook that fact because in thinking of ourselves as a wealthy nation we forget that our wealth was in terms of what money would buy in peacetime. That money is not any good today, in fact does not exist. We now have only man-hours and materials as our currency and not so much of it but that every unit of it must be used with full realization of how desperately valuable it is.

It is for such reasons of man-hour and materials economy, as well as effectiveness, that those of us who know small airplanes best feel so strongly that we are doing something dangerous in neglecting to adapt and coordinate fully the small airplane to the needs of the ground forces. There is, of course, some question as to just how potent a weapon the small airplane might turn out to be. It may or may not be potent. Military people say not, that is the older ones. But that is not the important thing at the moment. The important thing is that the military development of the small airplane is now being almost wholly neglected and that such neglect is not based on either experiment or established fact. The real trouble is that in making its military debut the small airplane is up against the same thing it was when it first reached the commercial market: There is a psychological resistance to it.

There was a time when the salesmen of small airplanes were actually run off airports by commercial operators. The small airplane threatened their investment in expensive equipment. Equally objectionable to them was the fact that the small airplane also tended to depreciate the importance of their profession, or at least they felt that way.

In the military field the latter factor is operative against the small airplane. And there are others. There is the psychological factor that size and sound relate themselves in our minds with strength and ferocity. We instinctively want the highest powered, the fastest, the heaviest gunned, the loudest airplane which can be made—to simply blow hell out of them with. You can understand, too, that from both the standpoint of emotional satisfaction as well as a career an A/C would rather dream of being the pilot of a Thunderbolt or a B–24 or the commanding officer of a force of such airplanes than similarly connected with small airplanes. The analogy in the Navy would be a midshipman's dream of commanding the largest, most powerful, most heavily gunned, most heavily armored, most unsinkable battleship ever built.

Naturally those in the high councils fall under the same burden of the race in trying to think objectively. Yet, it was a mosquito boat which took General MacArthur out of Bataan when the mightiest battleship afloat could not have gotten him out.

The psychological resistance to the small airplane makes itself evident in even as primary a situation as that of flight training. An official inquiry would bring forth a wealth of expert testimony that the small airplanes do not make good pilots, that to fly hot stuff a man should start on and come up on heavy equipment. Actually, that simply is not true. What were once small-plane pilots are flying air liners today; American small-plane pilots who went to the Royal Air Force early in the war were fighting with Spitfires in 6 weeks; some of the most precise and deft flying of our pursuit ships today is being done by ferry pilots who were small-plane pilots until they went through a check flight in a PT, then a BT, and some of them an AT. Today it is a truism that it is not what a pilot learns on but how he is taught.

Here is the real meaning of small plane versus heavy plane in primary training. The small trainer represents 400 man-hours of labor and a correspondingly small amount of materials. The usual PT represents around 4,000 man-hours of labor and much more in the way of materials, especially critical materials. Then in use you have, due to the phenomenal dependability and ruggedness of the small engines, only about one-twentieth of the need for mechanics for maintenance purposes as you have in connection with heavy trainers. The heavy trainers will, of course, still be needed, and in great numbers, for acrobatics and transition.

The difference in man-hours and materials in starting out on small planes is not just a minor point. Half of those who start are washed out anyhow, so that is all lost. Of those who do get through, certainly not one of them is gaining anything in ability by having been trained at a needless loss of man-hours and materials which could have just as well gone into fighting equipment.

You can even go a step further and consider that something like the Culver, still close to the 400 man-hour level, could be used just as well as not as an initial basic trainer, where you would have an even larger man-hour and material saving. Actually around 90 percent. And fuel and its transportation and production also enter the picture: Five gallons an hour against 35. And oil. And tires. And critical materials, the Culver being primarily a wooden airplane. Were we a rich nation it would not matter, but we are not.

Training, however, is only one possible military function of the small airplane. Already some excellent ambulance adaptations are being demonstrated by the manufacturers on their own initiative. Already, somewhat under duress of the Artillery, a good many small planes have been acquired for liaison and observation work. Some say they will not be used under service conditions and some say they will. But at least they are as expendable as the much more expensive mechanical units with which they work. Would it not be cheaper to lose a few readily replaceable small planes of this type each day than at the end of a week lose a whole mechanized division from simply having driven headlong into a trap? And certainly the small 400 man-hour observation plane is no more defenseless than its 10,000 man-hour equally slow predecessor.

The question of vulnerability of low-flying small planes, however, does not enter into their use for off-shore patrol, and by now most everyone has had his say about that. But just to show how far ideas can go once they start kicking around, a further innovation of the patrol idea down in Florida was to have a small plane circle each coastwise tanker for a few hours and then have another small plane come out from a shore base and take over, and so on. The cost of such convoying would be trivial. The question is whether it would be effective. Among other things, no one has said just why these small planes cannot carry at least a 100 pound depth charge. At any rate, an oil company has made a contract with a small seaplane owner to circle one of its tankers all the way up the coast and to put in each night with the tanker at some port. For the man-hour cost at which the military would provide this same protection for just one trip you could build an additional 50 to 100 small seaplanes. Nor has there been any mention yet of small plane carriers from converted freighters for really intensive anti-submarine patrol, or whatever else the small plane might become adaptable to at sea. Remember always: wherever they can serve they release vital man-hours and materials for more decisive operations.

Another point at which the small airplane has been left out in the cold is in connection with the need of troop transports, a field in which it might prove especially adaptable. In that connection a lot is being said about troop-carrying gliders. Somehow it seems that a 12-place 120′ wingspread glider limited to a 100-miles-per-hour towing speed is not something that is going too far as a weapon. The large wingspread alone seems incongruous with the avowed purpose of going into small places. On the other hand, it seems that trailer planes might be on the target if something must be pulled. If you threw the engine, gas tanks, and related accessories out of a standard Beechcraft bi-plane you

would have an eight place trailer plane which could be towed fast and could get down on a road at a reasonable speed. But why jump the small plane entirely all the way to trailer planes and gliders?

Just one of our small-plane factories could have since last December built by now 2,000 500-man-hour 100 miles per hour 8-place troop carriers You cannot build a 12-place glider on 2,000 man-hours of labor, besides the small planes can come back under their own power and shuttle. They have Commando raids with naval and air protection and use open barges. Why couldn't there be airborne Commando raids to interior points with air protection? This sort of thing would be fitting the airplane more into the hand of the man who eventually wins wars. And, mind you, these 2,000 small troop carriers mentioned would represent a man hour investment equivalent to that of only 3½ four-engine bombers. Also mentionable is the fact that these 2,000 small troop carriers could move 1,000,000 pounds of cargo 100 miles per hour any time they were called upon. You can't do that with 3½ four-engine bombers

It would be a fair question to ask how small ships could be gotten to where they would likely be used in actual service. The solution to that problem seems to be no different than getting pursuit planes across. You simply can't expect to float airplanes across, for that will never get them there in numbers in time. At least there is behind us the fact that a man named Jones flew an Aeronca Chief nonstop from Los Angeles to New York several years ago. Even 3 light plane carriers spaced between Brazil and Africa to be used as refueling bases would mean only 500 miles in a jump, and there are no better engines than the small ones.

IV

The most vital thing to find out about the small airplane, though, is whether it can be made into a weapon. If it can, it may be the most important airplane of all, because it can be made to fit more closely than any other into the needs and problems of the ground forces. Behind the artillery power of the heavy bomber, behind the 16-inch never-used guns of the fleet, behind something must come the man. The small plane can go with him. It can be a form of cavalry of the air When he advances it can provide an overhead flank attack. Or it can attack from behind. Essentially it is cavalry which has become free of the ground, the flexibility and striking power of which even on the ground has often turned the tides of history.

Is the small plane a potential assault weapon? It would be subject to air attack, but its field of operation would be up to only 100 feet and it would never go over the enemy lines except when coordinated with an advance of the ground units it was supporting. It would therefore have protection from the ground most of the time. If a high-speed ship should dive at it, the former would have to start pulling out before it got within range, else it would strike the ground. If the fast ship came in level and fast, it would still be subject to ground fire and at the same time would be robbed of its maneuverability, for you are simply in a groove at three to four hundred miles an hour and can get out of it only very slowly. If the fast ship came in slow it would get licked, for it is clumsy.

Even so, cavalry losses often run high. In some of the most decisive cavalry charges in history losses ran to 50 percent, but they often meant the beginning of the end of a war. The thing we must get over is the fact that 1 pilot can be lost halfway around the world and be written up in every newspaper in the country, whereas the public never knows the name of even 1 of the 500 infantrymen lost fighting on the ground below him during the same afternoon. There is not that disparity—in fact, any disparity—in what they are doing, and the fact there even appears to be any is merely evidence of how oddly we sometimes act only on mention of the word "airplane." Around this psychic phenomena might also lie the real reasons for much of our failure to put the airplane in the hands of the man on the ground. But looking at it from the soldier's standpoint, if he is riding 30 miles an hour in a jeep and is under fire, or is running afoot in a charge, he would not turn down a chance to move up 50 feet and fly 100 to 150 miles per hour. There is as big a gap today between him and air power as there is between crop dusting and the operator of an air line. Yet both are essential.

Many of the questions as to the combat potentialities of the small airplane are, of course, open to argument. So long, however, as there is no real proof either way, it does seem a pity that rather than having the small airplane more or less persona non grata with the military and having it force its way into their thinking in overdemonstrated merit in small ways, it should be taken hold of vigorously, experimented with, and, if possible, forged into a weapon which may have a vital place in the final turn of the tide. If it is a weapon, it has the advantage of being adaptable to easily and quickly trained pilots (it could be spin proof) and certainly it would be no trick to be soon turning out thousands of them a month as needed. Otherwise we might exhaust our productive capacity in building 5,000 a month of something which would still leave us with a war to win simply for the reason that it cannot work closely enough to the ground soldier. The small plane in war paint obviously would not supplant any present type equipment such as fighter planes, interceptor planes, medium or heavy bombers. They are just as necessary as ever and for the same good reasons. That, however, should not obscure the fact that the function of the small plane is to perform a job which the large plane cannot do, and which apparently must be done if we are ever to end a war of air attrition.

L. C.

USE OF AUTOMOBILES IN THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, none of our domestic problems is of more serious concern at the moment than that of maintaining adequate transportation. The present furor over gasoline rationing is evidence enough of the vital part the automobile has in the war effort. It is the opinion of competent authorities that a great number of present vehicles must be maintained for war production and essential civilian life. We could expect a greater degree of public appreciation of conditions and public cooperation if there were not such widespread confusion. An organization which is dealing realistically with the problem of automotive transportation in the face of the very critical rubber situation and the shortage of gasoline supplies in the East is the American Automobile Association. It is the opinion of the American Automobile Association that if statements giving the public the real picture as it exists were emanating from an authoritative source much of the current confusion would be eliminated.

The executive committee of the American Automobile Association met in Washington last week. The committee was given factual information by Joseph B. Eastman, Director, Office of Defense Transportation; Arthur B. Newhall, Coordinator of Rubber; and Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Coordinator. The committee is composed of Thomas P. Henry, president of the A. A. A.; Howard W. Hughes, president of the Pennsylvania Motor Federation, Pennsylvania; Henry J. Brunnier, California State Automobile Association, California; William G. Bryant, Automobile Club of Michigan, Michigan; Paul J. Gnau, president of the Ohio State Automobile Association, Ohio; Charles M. Hayes, president of the Chicago Motor Club, Illinois; Matt F. Morse, president of the Automobile Club of St. Louis, Missouri; Arthur D. Smith, Automobile Club of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Clarence Werthan, Rocky Mountain Motorists Association, Colorado; John H. Wright, president of the Jamestown Automobile Club, New York; John L. Young, managing director, Cleveland Automobile Club, Ohio; and Edgar F. Zelle, vice president of the Minnesota State Automobile Association, Minnesota.

At the conclusion of its sessions the committee issued a highly constructive statement of policy, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, MAY 16, 1942

There is accumulating from day to day overwhelming evidence that America's fleet of 28,500,000 passenger cars will be called upon to play a vital role in connection with the effective prosecution of the war and the maintenance of a sound civilian economy back of the war effort.

Up to the present time it does not appear that some of the policy makers in Government have had a clear appreciation of the importance of the automobile. This was indicated by constant references to pleasure cars, which, as a matter of fact, are things of the past.

To the extent that some policy makers have made this mistake, they have overlooked the fact that this Nation, over a quarter of a century, has built up a social and economic system centering largely around the passenger automobile, and that violent disruption of its use would bring disastrous consequences.

From now on it is of the most urgent importance that all governmental agencies which have a responsibility for transportation efficiency should concentrate their attention on maintaining in necessary and useful service as many passenger cars as possible. The demobilization of any great number of passenger cars would place a tremendous burden on mass transportation facilities. These facilities cannot be greatly expanded, due to scarcity of critical materials. Thus, a breakdown in passenger-car use would inevitably retard war production, demoralize our civilian economy, and hamper the whole war effort. Nor must it be forgotten that State revenues, particularly as they affect road building, maintenance, and bond issues, are almost wholly dependent on the taxes paid by motorists.

It is incumbent upon every owner of a passenger car in America to use the car as a public trust, to conserve the vehicle and the tires so that their life and usefulness can be extended for the duration of the emergency. But public cooperation in a conservation program can only be had if the motorists understand what is expected of them and if Government gives them a clear picture of the shortages that exist in critical materials.

Unfortunately, untold damage has been done to the cause of conservation by a welter of conflicting statements emanating from Government officials as to actual shortage conditions pertaining to rubber and gasoline. The country is today in an utter state of confusion as to shortages, rationing objectives, and rationing inequities. It is imperative that Government give the people a consistent story as to the facts and that the telling of it be not left to subordinates but come from the people vested with authority, if necessary, the President of the United States.

The Chief Executive should naturally have the power, if he does not already have it, to acquire any and all instrumentalities of transportation in the interest of efficient prosecution of the war, and this includes passenger automobiles. But it should be made clear that this wartime power would be exercised by the President and his responsible agents only when it is absolutely necessary, and that the objective be not merely to accumulate a mammoth pool of automobiles to be kept in idleness to meet a demand that may never eventuate.

The motorists of the country are perfectly willing to assign their vehicles for war purposes when they are needed. In the meantime there should be an end to threats of confiscation and commandeering, the only effect of which has been to cause millions of people to question the value of conserving property that might be taken from them overnight.

Confiscation of automobiles has been widely publicized as a means of enforcing a proposed Federal speed limit of 40 miles an hour. There is every reason for lower speed limits on the highways as a means of conservation, but this is being secured in substantial measure now through a unique degree of motorists' cooperation and through State action. The need for a Federal statute which would be all but unenforceable and with such a penalty as is proposed is highly questionable.

If it be the policy of the Government, as it should be, to maintain as many passenger cars as possible in service, it naturally follows that the needs of these cars should be related to the plans of the Government as regards rubber. Specifically, the synthetic rubber program should be extended as a bulwark against the day when conservation as such is not enough to maintain an adequacy of passenger-car transportation.

The Government should inaugurate an aggressive campaign for the collection of enormous quantities of scrap rubber, for the lack of which the reclaiming plants are faced with a shut-down in a few months. Similarly, it should be made clear that once a formula for essential use is developed, existing stocks of tires will be rationed out on the most liberal basis that a prudent regard for the future will permit, and not held for 8 years or more as the public is now being told. Inequities in tire-rationing regulations should be speedily removed and steps should be taken to get into circulation the enormous number of used tires that are now frozen because of established price ceilings. Inventories of tire stocks, new and used, should be completed and made public as an essential part of the information the people should have to understand the rubber situation.

As regards gasoline, in spite of the shortage on the Atlantic seaboard, a commendable effort has been made to supply this area with gasoline through the development of overland and safe water transportation. It is now clear that because of military requirements, we cannot depend upon the tanker fleet. The time has come for the policy makers to consider again the wisdom of providing materials for a pipe line that would bring petroleum supplies up to essential requirements into an area of the country which is called upon to play an outstanding role in the industrial war effort. Immediate attention should also be given to the petroleum requirements for the Pacific Northwest.

In the event that gasoline rationing on a Nation-wide scale is considered, the question should be approached from the standpoint of an over-all policy closely related to a program of vehicle and rubber conservation and not as a measure of economic repression.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of May 15, 1942):

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Eva Fitzpatrick, Allerton.
Amy A. Hawks, Bolton.
Clarence R. Halloran, Framingham.
Mildred D. O'Neil, Hyannis Port.
John E. Roche, Orange.
John R. Parker, Rockland.
Rosella Webb, South Lincoln.
John J. Easton, South Walpole.
Mary E. Joseph, Truro.
Nellie G. McDonald, Ward Hill.
Felix A. Dalmas, Wellfleet.
Roger W. Cahoon, Jr., West Harwich.
John T. Sheehan, Worcester.

MISSOURI

Alexander W. Graham, Kansas City.
Fred King, Queen City.

SOUTH DAKOTA

J. Edward Meyer, Mobridge.
George D. Blake, Spearfish.

TENNESSEE

Lillian G. Freemon, Leoma.
William S. Fields, Milan.
James H. Davenport, Soddy.
Phil W. Campbell, Tiptonville.
Floyd Mitchell, Tullahoma.
James K. St. Clair, White Bluff.

TEXAS

I. J. Burns, Brady.
Joseph Morris Woolsey, Yoakum.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our fathers, refresh Thy people on their toilsome way that their lives may be filled with patience and faith. O look upon the mass of human suffering and imperfection which mutely cries unto Thee; let their unworded pains break forth into the music of that eternal hope which never dies. Grant that the chasm between the poor and the rich, the fortunate and the enslaved, may soon be lessened, giving vision hours in which sacrifice is transfigured and man everywhere is lifted up to behold the possibilities of human life.

Mercifully look upon our historic institutions and blot out all strife, all antagonisms, that they may not surge through the arteries of our national life. Cleanse all hearts of the spirit of selfishness, and grant that their dim and entangled threads may be unraveled in the clear light of day. Disarm all fears and discouragements, blessed Lord, and give hidden power to the souls of men. Our country 'tis of Thee, sweet land of liberty, for thee we pray, and may we lay our very lives, clean and spotless, on the altar of human freedom. For the love of Thine only Son, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 252

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 18 (legislative day May 15), 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the Vice President appointed Mr.

DAVIS and Mr. GUFFEY members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes."

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 15, 1942.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the letter of the Secretary of State of May 13 enclosing copy of a communication from the Ambassador of Poland expressing appreciation of the many messages of support which were addressed to Poland and the people of Poland on May 3, Poland's Constitution Day.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MAY 13, 1942.

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and encloses a copy of a note dated May 6, 1942, from the Ambassador of Poland expressing appreciation of the many messages of support which were addressed to Poland and the people of Poland on May 3, Poland's Constitution Day.

MAY 6, 1942.

SIR: I have the honor to convey on behalf of the Polish Government as well as in my own, deep gratitude and highest appreciation for the numerous expressions of friendship and support addressed to Poland and the Polish people in the course of the last few days on the occasion of May 3, Poland's Constitution Day. These powerful manifestations of American friendship on the part of the United States Administration, of Members of the United States Congress, of State and local authorities, and of the American press and radio, will greatly encourage the Polish people. They will regard them as new and valuable proofs of American friendship and support extended to them at a time when they are straining all their efforts, in the face of brutal oppression and tyranny, to carry on the fight as one of the United Nations in defense of the highest principles of humanity.

I have the honor to request you kindly to convey my thanks to the Government departments, the military and civilian authorities and the Congress of the United States.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

J. CIECHANOWSKI.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

THE LATE PATRICK J. BOLAND

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this recognition to pay a deserved tribute to the memory of my friend, Hon. PATRICK BOLAND. When I came to my home last evening, after spending the day on official business in my district, my wife gave me the sad news of the passing of this dear friend of mine.

At first I could scarcely believe it and thought it must be a mistake. I immediately made it my business to make further inquiry, only to have it confirmed.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to express my deep sorrow at his passing, for he was my friend and a friendship that began when he and I came to Congress together in 1930. During the years that we served together here that friendship deepened, and I feel his loss very keenly.

To me he was always "Pat" and one to whom I could always go for comfort and advice whenever I needed it.

What he said upon the passing of a former colleague I can say with equal sincerity today:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

This House has lost a most valuable Member, one whose every ambition was to bring credit upon the membership and one whose every action was prompted by what he believed to be in the best interest of our great country. Pennsylvania has lost a distinguished citizen, and the district he represented a most valuable and untiring servant. In these trying days we cannot afford to lose men like PATRICK BOLAND.

He was a fine Christian gentleman, loyal to his church, for which I feel every Member of this distinguished body honors him. To his devoted family I express my most profound sympathy and pray that God will guide and strengthen them in this dark hour.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute with reference to the filing of a request for a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain correspondence in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1942, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Jones asserted that I wanted him to lend a friend of mine $60,000 on property he paid only $8,000 for.

Not recalling such a case, I demanded the details of Mr. Jones, there and then at the committee, and the next day followed up my request in a letter.

Up to May 6, I did not hear from him and thereupon wrote him a second letter for the details to substantiate his charge.

On May 7 he wrote me citing the application of the Hartford Battery Sales Corporation at Milldale, Conn., and referred to several letters written by me in support of the company's application.

The impression given by Mr. Jones to my colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee was that the application was too outlandish to warrant consideration that a loan of $60,000 on assets of $8,000 was simply out of the question for any self-respecting lending agency to grant. And so it would have been, had such been the fact. But the facts, according to Mr. Jones' own letter to me and according to the file on the case, were far different than the situation as he attempted to have the committee believe it was.

In his letter, Mr. Jones admits that a loan of $10,000 was made against the collateral originally offered to the concern, and an additional loan of $25,000 was authorized against the pledge of certain receivables which were not offered as security in the original application.

Furthermore, Mr. Jones writes that the application was for $50,000, and not for $60,000, as he originally asserted.

If the collateral originally offered was only $8,000, as Mr. Jones charged, how did he come to make a loan of $10,000 against it? Mr. Jones is not given to excessive generosity to small business, and certainly no influence on my part could have prevailed on him to give this or any other concern a chance to get on its feet again.

The Hartford Battery Sales' loan application was filed in July 1934. Upon receipt of Mr. Jones' letter citing this concern, I sent to my Hartford office to have the files taken out of the archives there. Also I wrote to Mr. E. B. Lewis, head of the concern, as I did not want to make any statement until I had his permission to use his name and the name of the concern where necessary. Before I had received a reply from Mr. Lewis, Mr. Jones released his letter to me to newspapers in Connecticut, obviously having no qualms about publicly using an ill-fated company to bolster himself against charges to which he has been constantly subjected of late because of his failure and shortsightedness in the administration of various important Government activities which had been placed in his hands to carry out the will of Congress.

Small businesses in America which had gone into bankruptcy during the depression, and which were facing the wall because of inability to operate without financial help, were under extensive study during 1933 and 1934. Some 180,000 such concerns were under study by various independent economic groups and Government departments as in need of financial help. Many of them were located in small communities, and, employing up to 250 persons, represented in many instances the chief economic activity of the community. When they went out of business it meant more families for the relief rolls in those critical days.

The situation was acute in Connecticut, where many concerns long established, which had managed to weather previous depressions, were now up against it.

The Manufacturers Association of Connecticut enlisted my help for remedial legislation during the fall of 1933. I was told then, and I have letters to this effect, that efforts to obtain loans for these Connecticut concerns through then existing R. F. C. loan facilities were unavailing, and that legislation to provide direct,

long-term loans to industry was immediately imperative if the small enterprises in America were to be saved from disaster.

The Hartford Battery Sales Corporation was one on the list given me by the Connecticut Manufacturers Association as a concern for whom a loan would be a sound economic proposition.

In March of 1934 there were hearings on my bill to grant direct loans to small industry. Mr. Lewis came at his own expense to urge the committee to adopt this legislation for the sake of small business the country over.

The chief purpose of my bill was incorporated in the Banking Act of 1934. By the time Congress convened in January of 1935 there was widespread dissatisfaction with the failure of the R. F. C. to disburse the funds Congress allocated for loans to business and industry. At that time, when the need was greatest, an insignificant amount of the funds had actually been disbursed, an insignificant number of firms had been helped, and the red tape and expense of investigations which had to be borne by the applicants were discouraging firms from applying for help. Thousands of small concerns the country over went out of business because they could not obtain the working capital to carry on.

A Connecticut banker, who had studied the Hartford Battery Co.'s record, told me emphatically that the loan should be granted and regretted that the banks at that time had such tight restrictions against business loans that the company had to seek Government assistance, instead of help from a local bank.

Mr. Jones told the committee that this company had but $8,000 in assets. Let me quote from a letter from this concern following the rejection of the application, before the case was reconsidered.

> We are certainly at a loss to know how they could possibly reach this decision. We have a surplus of over $90,000 and our property, consisting of real estate, buildings, and equipment, was appraised by the best appraiser in the State for over $100,000 and is entirely free of any encumbrance. * * * One objection which was mentioned in both Boston and Washington was that our property did not have the value shown, for we had purchased it for a small part of the figure at which it is appraised. Nevertheless, this should have very little bearing on the case, for we purchased it from the receiver of a bankrupt concern. We have a letter which was submitted with our application from the Phoenix State Bank of Hartford regarding the qualifications of the appraiser who furnished the figures which accompanied our application.
>
> * * * Our business is better now than it has been for several years at a corresponding period. We have 2,000 unfilled orders on our books and our salesmen have been advised not to solicit new business, for we have not been able to fill the orders with our limited amount of capital. Our export business is way ahead of a year ago, and anyone at all familiar with our operations will frankly admit the prospects for the future, provided we have additional working capital, are bright.

I did everything I could to help this company, because I was satisfied from the information given me, that if this concern could be saved by governmental help, it would prove my point that it is the many thousands of small concerns located in every State of the Union which form the backbone of our economy and make for the prosperity or the prostration of a community; and that 20 concerns operating as separate units in any given State are far more desirable for our economic and social progress than, say, 3 concerns which had concentrated into themselves the assets and operations of those 20.

Throughout this loan's negotiations I emphasized in my letters to Mr. Jones and others in the R. F. C. that the money made available by Congress in June 1934 to aid distressed business and industry must be disbursed immediately in order to strengthen our economy, which you will well recall at that time was in a desperate situation—that these small businesses in the country could be depended on not only to retain their workers but to give jobs to hundreds of thousands of new workers who were on the relief rolls. Small amounts of capital were needed by thousands of individual concerns which had proven their ability to operate successfully over a period of years but were unable to cope with the depression which had prostrated the Nation.

Mr. Jones claims to have given some loans to small business. Thousands and thousands of such concerns, many of them which had operated profitably for years were forced to go out of business or sell out to larger companies—as eventually happened to the Hartford Battery Sales Corporation. Was that a deliberate intention—or were these companies victims of a shortsightedness which has handicapped the country in other respects?

I quote now from a letter sent me by Mr. Lewis on July 27, 1935—8 months after his loan had been authorized:

> Our tie-up with Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been very unsatisfactory.
>
> We started our work on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan back in 1933. Nothing was really accomplished until new legislation was passed in June 1934, and on July 16, 1934, our final application was filed. * * * We were finally advised on September 15 that the Boston agency would not approve our application.
>
> On September 24, an appointment was made by you for us with Jesse Jones, and on October 1, in spite of promises that were received that we would obtain assistance, Washington turned down our application. On October 15, another trip to Washington resulted in contact with Mr. Ben Johnson and Mr. C. H. W. Mandeville. Through the very hearty cooperation of Mr. Mandeville, Washington finally approved our application and authorized $35,000 to our corporation, $10,000 on the property and the balance to be paid on a basis of one to one and one-half against receivables pledged.
>
> After considerable work by ourselves and our attorneys, we finally received the first disbursement of $10,000 on November 30.
>
> We had been fighting for nearly 6 months to obtain this money so necessary for our operations and had we been able to obtain it at the start of our busy season, rather than at the end, we would have been able to show a substantial profit to carry us over our dull 6 months from the beginning of the year.
>
> Unfortunately the assistance came too late to be of much benefit even though we went to work full time the month of December.
>
> We should call attention to the actual amount of money we had to use from this first $10,000. The expenses in connection with the granting of the loan were over $2,300, all of which expenses were approved by Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In addition to this we were obliged to immediately pay out $2,100 for taxes, so that finally we had only about $6,000 additional working capital—really an insignificant amount.
>
> Only $10,000 would be advanced on the property in spite of the fact an appraisal by one of the most reputable firms in the State showed a value of over $100,000.
>
> On December 28 we obtained an additional disbursement of $8,000 on which we were required to pledge $12,000 in receivables.
>
> Acting on recommendations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Boston to try and find an additional line to fit in with our business we finally found a line which appeared to be very attractive and one which required a very small investment. Boston was advised about this and we had their verbal approval to go ahead with the deal. * * *
>
> Not being in a position to fight we met this unreasonable requirement with receivables and payment of $800 in cash which then resulted in our actually having $7,200 instead of $8,000 and receivables pledged of $14,800—almost a 2-to-1 basis, and were still charged 6 percent on the $8,000.
>
> Taking everything into consideration we regret that we ever attempted to get any Federal assistance. We know of no manufacturer in this State who is at all satisfied with the hookup with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The agency has been more unreasonable than any of the banks and absolutely unfair in many respects, and we certainly would not advise any manufacturer in need of assistance of any permanent benefit to go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
>
> Even though we are entirely discouraged and resent the attitude of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation we certainly must acknowledge that you have worked hard and done everything possible to help the Connecticut manufacturers, even though our Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan has been of questionable benefit. We appreciate your work in our behalf, and you may depend on our continued friendship and support regardless of what happens to us.

But even with the granting of the $10,000 loan—minus the $2,300 which had to be paid out for expenses, and the $2,100 which had to go for taxes, the story has a tragic sequel. The $6,000 did the concern little good; there was repeated trouble with the Boston R. F. C. which apparently expected the company to start making handsome profits at once, and the consequence was that within 6 months R. F. C. was demanding that the company sell out to a larger concern, which was willing to take over the Millidale Co. at a price which meant a total loss to the stockholders of the Hartford Battery Sales Corporation.

Mr. Lewis wrote to Mr. C. H. Mandeville, then on the board of the R. F. C., stating his inability to understand why the R. F. C. cannot see the possibilities here, whereas a wealthy concern was willing to invest whatever money was necessary as working capital to operate our business.

At the time, Mr. Lewis wrote me:

> It appears to us that Mr. Carney (of the Boston Reconstruction Finance Corporation) is trying to sell us out to the Ekholm Corporation, a financial syndicate of Boston. They advised that Mr. Carney is willing to work with them in almost any way that they desire, and their proposal is to take over the business, settling with the suppliers and the

Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the best possible advantage to themselves. To do this they would require 100 percent of the outstanding stock and the present stockholders would receive nothing. In other words, they would take over the whole business for nothing. We have agreed to this as a last resort to keep the business going. It certainly is a pretty raw deal to be sold out this way by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

We are naturally very bitter about the whole deal for we felt that when our loan was finally authorized that our troubles were over, which they would have been had Reconstruction Finance Corporation held to the agreement originally made. Instead of permitting small businesses to continue, they are making it possible for financial syndicates to absorb them, which we believe is entirely contrary to the intention of the industrial loan legislation.

A few days ago Mr. Lewis informed me that the inadequate loan granted his company, the R. F. C. insistence on immediate profits, and lack of cooperation from the R. F. C. in working out business problems during the dull season forced them into bankruptcy and the company was taken over by the Perrine Battery Co., of Waltham, Mass., which is still manufacturing the battery which was being made by the Milldale concern.

Mr. Lewis and the other stockholders surrendered their interests.

The R. F. C. was paid in full.

I have always maintained that administration of a law means its success or its failure.

It is obvious that the present command of the R. F. C. has never had much sympathy with this law, and the general dissatisfaction with Mr. Jones' attitude toward small business is plainly evidenced in the Senate having voted to place the operation of the Murray small business bill in the hands of the War Production Board. The House Banking and Currency Committee unanimously supported the Senate's recommendation.

Mr. Jones had to dig through 8 years of files in order to find a case which approximated the charge he made against me in the committee. But the facts of the case Mr. Jones himself cited bear little relation to the statements he nebulously recited to the Banking Committee.

Obviously, as a reporter for the Chicago Tribune, who was present at the time, wrote, I was the victim of his irritability, but I daresay I am in excellect company in having been such a target. It takes more than an amiable disposition to hoodwink all of the people all of the time, and certain actions of Mr. Jones—or should I say lack of action—have resulted in increasing criticism, with a resultant diminution of Mr. Jones' affability.

And his skeptical attitude toward small business was obvious at the committee hearings on the Patman bill to help automobile dealers. I asked him then if it would not be less embarrassing to the administration if the handling of current business-aid legislation were placed in the hands of another department more sympathetic to little business. Mr. Jones retorted that there was no such department.

Mr. Jones apparently chose to overlook that in the War Production Board plans have been afoot for the administration of the Murray bill and that there is a group of men in the W. P. B. definitely sympathetic to small business and anxious that they be sustained and helped during the war by loans and contracts. Mr. Nelson's statement to the committee was clear and definite on that point.

Small business faces another crisis now. It can be helped through loans and contracts to play its part in the war effort and to keep going through the war emergency, so as to pick up its peacetime threads when the war is over. That happy goal will be achieved so long as men administering legislation to help business will recognize that small business is the backbone of our economy and that the concentration of business in the hands of a few large corporations eventually would lead to the extinction of a very important part of our democracy—small enterprise, each operating as a free and independent unit, each playing its vital part in the economy of its community, and all playing their vital part in the economy of a free nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein three short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief article by Bob Davis from the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a poem by Dr. Jay William Hudson, professor of philosophy, University of Missouri, who graphically portrays the hellishness of Hitlerism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks twice in the RECORD, in one extension to include an editorial from the Kansas City Star, and in the other a statement by Lachlan Macleay, president of the Mississippi Valley Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from New York [Mr. BEITER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHELCHEL] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief letter from himself to Mr. Harrison, of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit while the House is in session during the balance of the legislative week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one extension to include a letter from a soldier in the Army, and in the other to include a statement by the junior Senator from my State before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore

entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HISTORIC HOUSE CHAMBER CEILINGS—LET US PRESERVE ALL OUR HISTORIC ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the membership of the House the fact that the $27,800,000 legislative appropriation bill is now in conference and that another body had so amended that bill as to add $331,880 to it in order to install modern ceilings in place of the present skylights in both the House and the Senate Chambers. In other words, they intend to streamline these historic ceilings with concrete and plaster.

I am opposing these amendments and will endeavor to give you my reasons therefor.

The Congress has provided the Architect of the Capitol with approximately $500,000 to rebuild the old cast-iron and wrought-iron roofs on both wings of the Capitol because it had been stated that the iron which was installed 80 years ago was showing some signs of "fatigue." Some of us opposed this construction, but after being convinced by experts that the roof should be repaired and made safe the money was provided.

There is no objection to completing the repair of the roofs, but we find that after another body finished with our bill it had made many changes in same, including amendments for new ceilings along with the new roof superstructure. If I recall correctly, after funds were voted for the repair of the roofs over both Chambers so they could be made safe we were assured there would be no attempt made to change these historic ceilings or eliminate any other historic art or architecture.

I will not discuss what other changes another body wants in the bill affecting the other side of the Capitol because we are told it is unethical to discuss the appropriations for that side. I do wish to make some argument to the membership of the House as to why there should be no demolition of the ceiling in this historic House Chamber.

Since the Chamber of the House was completed and occupied December 16, 1857, there has been no architectural change with the exception of the seating arrangements. Since that time the desks were removed and they were replaced by the present seats.

The other change was the raising of the floor in order to provide additional space. The installation of the loudspeaking system was started under the leadership of the late Speaker Joe Byrns, and finally installed under the leadership of the late Speaker William Bankhead. The only other change recorded was the changing of the location of the President's gallery. That represented no architectural change.

The Chamber in which you are now located is practically identical to the Chamber in the historic days when the House of Representatives first occupied it on December 16, 1857. That represented the fourth quarters of the House.

Those of you who are interested in the States and Territories should give some serious attention to this attempt to eliminate the valuable American art and history contained in this historic building and this historic Chamber.

You will recall, from year to year an attempt has been made to change the entire front of this Capitol Building by moving the central portion of the building out to conform with the House and Senate wings. This attempt has always been started in another body and the membership of this House has always refused to accede to these changes.

I suggest that you look up and view this historical ceiling with its 51 State and Territorial seals. About 30 of these seals were painted and placed in the ceiling in 1857–58, the year that the House of Representatives first occupied the Chamber. The remainder were added from time to time, as other States joined the Union. It is proposed here to destroy this ceiling with its historic art and historic seals and replace it with something modern and streamlined and endeavor to duplicate or imitate, by painting into the proposed new cement and plaster ceiling, some of these State and Territorial seals.

I feel that it is proper that I tell you something about the history of the House of Representatives in this Capitol Building. The House occupied its first quarters here in 1800. They were in the room directly opposite the old Supreme Court chamber, now the disbursing office of the Senate, and other offices.

The second move of the House of Representatives occurred in 1801, when the House met in the temporary structure which was erected in the south of the rotunda, and later removed to make way for the continuation of the construction work on the Capitol. The temporary structure was known as the oven.

The third move of the House of Representatives occurred in 1804, when the House moved back directly opposite the old Supreme Court chamber while the construction work was going forward in the south wing, which contained their new Chamber, now known as Statuary Hall.

The fourth move was made on October 26, 1807, when the House then occupied the room now known as Statuary Hall.

In these times of war, when our material and all effort is needed so badly for the main objective—victory; in these times when our country needs all the energy of skilled mechanics to prosecute this war, I feel it would be a disgrace to allow this thing to be done.

I hope you will join with me in combating this proposal and help us preserve and protect all of this valuable American history written in this famous Chamber in order that those of the present and future generations can come here and visit and see with the eye of today and tomorrow those things which the American statesmen of today and yesterday saw and felt.

I have discussed this matter with a number of my colleagues who feel as I do about it. Many of them are interested to know how many Speakers have presided in this House since it was first occupied. I have made some research, and for your information I give you here the names of all of our Speakers from the day of Speaker Muhlenberg in 1789 to our present Speaker the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas:

Speakers of the House of Representatives

Name	State	Time
F. A. Muhlenberg	Pennsylvania	1789–91
Jonathon Trumbull	Connecticut	1791–93
F. A. Muhlenburg	Pennsylvania	1793–95
Jonathan Dayton	New Jersey	1795–99
Theo. Sedgwick	Massachusetts	1799–1801
Nathaniel Macon	North Carolina	1801–07
Joseph B. Varnum	Massachusetts	1807–11
Henry Clay	Kentucky	1811–13
Langdon Cheves	South Carolina	1813–15
Henry Clay	Kentucky	1815–20
John W. Taylor	New York	1820–21
Philip P. Barbour	Virginia	1821–23
Henry Clay	Kentucky	1823–25
John W. Taylor	New York	1825–27
Andrew Stephenson	Virginia	1827–34
John Bell	Tennessee	1834–35
James K. Polk	do	1835–39
R. M. T. Hunter	Virginia	1839–41
John White	Kentucky	1841–43
John W. Jones	Virginia	1843–45
John W. Davis	Indiana	1845–47
R. C. Winthrop	Massachusetts	1847–49
Howell Cobb	Georgia	1849–51
Linn Boyd	Kentucky	1851–55
N. P. Banks	Massachusetts	1855–57
James L. Orr	South Carolina	1857–59
William Pennington	New Jersey	1860–61
Galusha A. Grow	Pennsylvania	1861–63
Schuyler Colfax	Indiana	1863–69
Thomas M. Pomeroy	New York	1869
James G. Blaine	Maine	1869–75
Michael C. Kerr [1]	Indiana	1875–76
Samuel S. Randall	Pennsylvania	1876–81
Joseph W. Keifer	Ohio	1881–83
John G. Carlisle	Kentucky	1883–89
Thomas B. Reed	Maine	1889–91
Charles F. Crisp	Georgia	1891–95
Thomas B. Reed	Maryland	1895–99
D. B. Henderson	Iowa	1899–1903
Joseph G. Cannon	Illinois	1903–10
Champ Clark	Missouri	1911–19
Fred K. H. Gillett	Massachusetts	1919–25
Nicholas Longworth	Ohio	1925–31
John N. Garner	Texas	1931–33
Henry T. Rainey [1]	Illinois	1933–34
Joseph W. Byrns [1]	Tennessee	1935–36
William B. Bankhead [1]	Alabama	1936–40
Sam Rayburn	Texas	1941–date

[1] Died in office.

Total, 43 (not counting serving more than once).

SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM OHIO

Joseph W. Keifer, 1881–83.
Nicholas Longworth, 1925–31.

SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WHO DIED IN OFFICE

Michael C. Kerr, 1875–76.
Henry T. Rainey, 1933–34.
Joseph W. Byrns, 1935–36.
William B. Bankhead, 1936–40.

Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1927 Congressional Directory.

Mr. Speaker, the seal of the great State of Nebraska is included among those of other States and Territories in this historic ceiling. The Nebraska seal is the one in the northeast corner of the ceiling. Many great Nebraskans have served here, and for the information of the House I include here a list of these Nebraskans

who have served and those who are now serving in both branches of Congress:

UNITED STATES SENATORS

John M. Thayer, 1867–71.
Thomas W. Tipton, 1867–75.
Phineas W. Hitchcock, 1871–77.
Algernon S. Paddock, 1875–81; 1887–93.
Alvin Saunders, 1877–83.
C. H. Van Wyck, 1881–87.
Charles F. Manderson, 1883–95.
William V. Allen, 1893–99; 1899–1901.[1]
John M. Thurston, 1895–1901.
Monroe L. Hayward. Elected March 8, 1899. Died December 5, 1899. Never qualified.
Joseph H. Millard, 1901–7.
Charles H. Dietrich, 1901–5.
Elmer J. Burkett, 1905–11.
Norris Brown, 1907–13.
Gilbert M. Hitchcock, 1911–23.
George W. Norris, 1913 to date.
Robert B. Howell, 1923—March 11, 1933.
William H. Thompson,[1] 1933–34.
Richard C. Hunter, 1934–35.
Edward R. Burke, 1935–40.
Hugh Butler, 1940 to date.

REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

T. M. Marquett, March 1–4, 1867.
John Taffe, 1867–73.
Lorenzo Crounse, 1873–77.
Frank Welch, 1877. Died 1877.
Thomas J. Majors. Elected in 1878 to fill vacancy.
E. K. Valentine, 1879–83.

First district

A. J. Weaver, 1883–87.
John A. McShane, 1887–89.
W. J. Connell, 1889–91.
W. J. Bryan, 1891–95.
J. B. Strode, 1895–99.
E. J. Burkett, 1899–1905.
E. M. Pollard, 1905–9.
J. A. Maguire, 1909–15.
C. F. Reavis, 1915–22. Resigned.
R. H. Thorpe, 1922–23.
John H. Morehead, 1923–35.
Henry C. Luckey, 1935–39.
George H. Heinke, 1939 to January 2, 1940.
J. Hyde Sweet, April 9, 1940, to January 3, 1941. Elected to fill vacancy.
Oren Copeland, 1941 to date.

Second district

James Laird, 1883 to August 18, 1889.
Filbert L. Laws, 1889–91. Elected to fill vacancy.
W. A. McKeighan, 1891–93.
D. H. Mercer, 1893–1903.
Gilbert M. Hitchcock, 1903–5; 1909–11.
John L. Kennedy, 1905–7.
C. O. Lobeck, 1911–19.
A. W. Jefferis, 1919–23.
Willis G. Sears, 1923–31.
Malcolm Baldridge, 1931–33.
Edward R. Burke, 1933–35.
Charles F. McLaughlin, 1935 to date.

Third District

E. K. Valentine, 1883–85.
G. W. E. Dorsey, 1885–91.
O. M. Kem, 1891–93.
George D. Meiklejohn, 1893–97.
Samuel Maxwell, 1897–99.
John S. Robinson, 1899–1903.
J. J. McCarthy, 1903–7.
J. F. Boyd, 1907–9.
James P. Latta, 1909–11.
Dan V. Stephens, 1911–19.
Robert E. Evans, 1919–23.
Edgar Howard, 1923–35.
Karl Stefan, 1935 to date.

Fourth District

E. J. Hainer, 1893–97.
William L. Stark, 1897–1903.
Edmund H. Hinshaw, 1903–9.
C. H. Sloan, 1911–19; 1929–31.
M. O. McLaughlin, 1919–27.
John N. Norton, 1927–29; 1931–33.
A. C. Shallenberger, 1933–35.
C. G. Binderup, 1935–39.
Carl T. Curtis, 1939 to date.

Fifth District

W. A. McKeighan, 1893–95.
W. E. Andrews, 1895–97; 1917–23.
R. D. Sutherland, 1897–1901.
A. C. Shallenberger, 1901–3; 1015–17; 1923–29; 1931–33.
G. W. Norris, 1903–13.
Silas R. Barton, 1913–15.
Fred G. Johnson, 1929–1931.
Terry Carpenter, 1933–35.
Harry B. Coffee, 1935 to date.

Sixth District

O. M. Kem, 1893–97.
William L. Greene, 1897–1901.
William Neville, 1901–3.
Moses P. Kinkaid, 1903–22.
Robert G. Simmons, 1923–33.
Congressional reapportionment reduced number of Nebraska districts to five in 1933.

[1] Appointed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program of today and following any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the magazine America on April 18, 1942, on the subject of salaries of post office employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Daily News of Washington and a letter which I directed to the editor in answer to that editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests; first, that following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table today and any previous special order, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes and, second, that I may be permitted to address the House now for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, my view regarding civilian defense is contrary to that expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] in the extension which he inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1738. Every American agrees that civilian defense is important, but civilian defense will not win this war. Civilian defense is secondary. The gentleman criticized the War Production Board. He expressed the view that the War Production Board has placed low priority ratings on civilian-defense orders that it will take months before the equipment can be manufactured for complete civilian-defense purposes. He contends we shall have a bottleneck in Washington until our officials recognize that the whole purpose of our armed forces is the protection of civilian America and that "the defense of American cities and homes is the reason for our participation in this war."

Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of our armed forces is to defeat the forces of dictatorship aggression which without provocation attacked us at Pearl Harbor. Dictators are seeking to crush democratic government everywhere and to create a new order in this world and to take the good things of life from our people. The whole purpose of our armed forces must be to beat back and crush dictators of Europe and Japan and do such a thorough job by our offensive might that dictatorship aggression will never again menace our contentment and the peace and security of our children.

I repudiate his statement that the whole purpose of our armed forces is the protection of civilian America. Civilian defense must be subordinated to military and naval offense and defense. The gentleman concluded his extension of remarks with the assertion:

> We must ring our Nation around with a curtain of protective fire that no enemy can penetrate.

The gentleman may, if he chooses, build himself a bomb shelter and hide in it for the duration. I know that my constituents do not want to play into Hitler's hands by diverting our offensive war efforts one iota. Surely we in America are indulging in a mistaken policy and playing the game as the dictators would want us to play it—playing directly into their hands—if we concentrate our energies and financial might in producing and mobilizing now equipment for civilian defense, and "ring our Nation around with a curtain of protective fire that no enemy can penetrate."

Our main job right now is to produce and send airplanes, tanks, and munitions overseas; to thoroughly mechanize our Army; to concentrate on the mechanization and training of the young men in our Army; to concentrate on the building of warships, ships to carry munitions, tanks, and planes; to concentrate upon the strengthening of our outposts in Alaska, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, and elsewhere; and to concentrate upon the safe convoy of our soldiers to Australia and other far-flung battle fronts, and the shuttling back and forth of

equipment, munitions, and food to those fine young men who will win this war. The gentleman from Ohio says he wants every city in this country "surrounded by antiaircraft batteries capable of putting up a withering barrage of protective shells."

Mr. Speaker, the people I represent are not afraid. My constituents live in Cleveland, Toledo, Columbus, Cincinnati, Akron, Dayton, Youngstown, and other Ohio cities and they know those anti-aircraft guns are sorely needed in Australia, in Hawaii, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, and on our merchant vessels. They feel the need is greater and more immediate there than at home. They do not expect the impossible.

It is true that civilian defense is of the utmost importance. Thousands and thousands of energetic and patriotic citizens are daily contributing their talents and efforts in civilian defense work in Cleveland, Washington, and other cities of our country, and in every town and hamlet and they are doing a great work and performing needed public service.

The gentleman complains, "We have no gas masks to speak of." Personally, I feel it is more important that our war plants concentrate on the production of equipment for our armed forces. Fifty million gas masks for civilians will cost our taxpayers a tremendous amount of money. I refuse to believe the need for gas masks for civilians is as great as is the need for munitions and equipment for our armed forces and for our Allies. I voice the view of other civilians when I say we can take a chance, but we do not want our Army and Navy to have to take any risks which might result by giving civilian defense measures precedence over all-out offensive war effort.

He complains that our civilian defense air raid wardens have only "seen a few stirrup pumps on display." Recently I was shocked to learn of a proposed order for 2,500,000 stirrup pumps in connection with civilian defense against incendiary bomb attack. The thought occurred to me that the companies engaged in producing such a tremendous number of stirrup pumps should really be working full time producing equipment sorely needed by our armed forces or by the Russians who are fighting so magnificently.

In regard to civilian morale let me add that our civilian morale is of the highest and no artificial measures are required to strengthen civilian morale. I do not share the gentleman's view that we must have immediately "the equipment necessary for this army of civilian defense exactly as we must have it for our armies in the field." Furthermore, I do not share his expressed view that "gas masks for every member of a family must be produced in tremendous quantities at once." Americans generally, instead of being critical of our war effort and of the War Production Board, are proud of the achievements of recent months. Our immense war production since the time Hitler started his blitzkrieg has astonished the world. We should express pride, instead of criticism, in the outstanding work of the War Production Board. Mr. Speaker, in the entire history of the world no people have done so much in so short a time as have Americans in our all-out war effort.

Without a doubt there is danger that Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, and other American cities will be bombed by Axis planes. I know that my constituents are not frightened nor afraid. If merciless enemies on wings of hate bomb munition plants, shipyards, and homes in Cleveland or other cities or towns in Ohio my constituents will take this in their stride. They are more interested in the fighting effectiveness of our Navy overseas, our air force over Burma and Australia, and our Army in Australia, Iceland, and other battle fronts than in their own personal safety. Possibly if this war is to be prolonged we can in time ring every big city with scores of anti-aircraft guns, equip our civilians with gas masks, and provide an underground bomb shelter for the gentleman and all other civilians. Let that wait. Our job now is to concentrate upon an all-out armed offensive. We must keep intact the life lines to our armed forces overseas. We must above all else give our all—our sons, our entire resources so that our air force, mechanized Army, and far-flung naval forces will win this war. Mr. Speaker, we will not fail but if our armed forces were to lose this war our homes and our institutions would not be saved even though "ringed around with a curtain of protective fire" as a result of regarding civilian defense the "No. 1 job."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address of the President of Colgate University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, future historians will wonder at the slums of present-day Washington. They will write with amazement that a wealthy, intelligent, and humane Nation disgraced its Capital City by permitting thousands of people to live under conditions which violated all the decencies of civilization. They may have to record that these slums were the origin of a widespread epidemic of fatal disease.

These unfortunate people live in surroundings which our home communities would not tolerate. They have no political influence, no votes, no lobbies, nor eloquent spokesmen. They are victims of their own poverty and of the shameful neglect of that great institution, the American Government.

The slums of Washington are a challenge to every decent American. Their continued existence shows that we are either insincere or inefficient. Certainly these mean and squalid hovels are in sharp contrast to the lofty statements of American ideals wich we hear and read so often.

Yet here they are, with all their dirt and disease, ignored by many of us and accepted by others as an inevitable evil, a permanent local institution. The civic societies and the newspapers have done what they could, finding slight interest in certain upper brackets, political and social. Some improvement has taken place, but a disgraceful situation still remains.

There would be much public interest in a list of the owners of these dwellings which threaten the city's health. The owners of the premises, as well as the rental agents, should be held liable for unsanitary conditions. The deliberate maintenance of disease-breeding housing is a serious offense, endangering the entire community, and should involve a jail sentence, not a mere profit-sharing fine.

Washington's long-awaited housing code should be enacted immediately. Its provisions must recognize that a grave situation now exists here, built up by years of neglect and aggravated by the steady influx of war workers. These new regulations for promoting health and sanitation will be a war measure of the highest importance.

Today, when we are fighting a world war, it is supremely essential to keep Washington free from epidemic disease. We are calling in thousands of people to conduct the greatest war enterprise the world has yet known. The organizers of our vast industrial effort are here, and the leaders who plan world-wide military and naval campaigns. Statesmen representing all our allies come here to arrange important policies with the President and his advisers.

The health and lives of every one of them are endangered by the slums of Washington. Disease is no respecter of persons. Typhus, typhoid, bubonic plague, or any other product of filth and overcrowding can start in the slums and be carried rapidly throughout the city by restaurant workers, hotel employees, and household servants. This real threat to our victory, and therefore to our national existence, can and must be ended. We have been repeatedly told of the existing dangers by our medical authorities, civil and military. We must act now, before it is too late.

There was an advance warning when the Japanese planes neared Pearl Harbor. It did not reach the high command and so was disregarded. A serious epidemic here might equal Pearl Harbor as a national disaster. We have had our warnings, many of them. We must act speedily, or we may lose the "battle of Washington."

THE LATE HUBERT H. UTTERBACK

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to

the House the death, on Tuesday last, of Hon. Hubert H. Utterback, who served in this body in the Seventy-fourth Congress from the district I now have the honor to represent. Judge Utterback, as he was familiarly known to all, had a long and distinguished career of public service. He first served as police court judge in Des Moines, and later for many years a judge of the district court, part of which time he was in charge of the juvenile division. Later he served on the Supreme Court of Iowa, after which he was elected to Congress. Following his service in Congress, he was appointed to the State parole board, serving as chairman until about 2 years ago, when illness forced his retirement. He was known in his own community for his love of his fellow man. During the years Judge Utterback was not in public office he was an active and fearless advocate in the practice of the law, and for many years was a faculty member of the law department of Drake University. He was never known to have turned away a client who was worthy, but without funds to pay. He was intensely interested in the welfare of youth, spent much of his time working for their betterment, and for more than a quarter of a century was an active leader in the Boy Scout movement. He was also an active leader in the church, in lodges, and in various civic organizations. From 1937 to 1940 Judge Utterback was national committeeman of the Democratic Party for the State of Iowa. He was respected and admired by Democrats and Republicans alike. His passing is a distinct loss to the Nation, the State, his district, and his county, and particularly to those who knew him for his great heart.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, we of the Judiciary Committee knew Hubert Utterback as a colaborer in that branch of this legislative vineyard. We grew to love him, to depend upon him, to realize his true worth, and it is with saddened hearts that we join the distinguished gentleman who now represents that district which sent Judge Utterback here in deploring his untimely passing. He was a great American, a great lawyer and jurist, a great Member of this body. We can ill afford to lose such men at any time, but particularly in the hour of world crisis through which we are now moving.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARNES Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include an address by our beloved and able majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an article written by a former colleague in this House, the Honorable John Steven McGroarty, entitled "One Day in the Bitter Root," appearing in the Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper items in respect to Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some brief extracts from the Editor and Publisher magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an item from the Presidio Herald of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELEASE OF EARL BROWDER

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks and include therein a letter to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly concerned to read of the release of the Communist secretary, Browder, and to have the reason given that it would promote unity. My understanding is Browder was imprisoned for giving false information and using a forged passport.

I cannot square this out with the action of this Government now threatening 130,000,000 of our people with imprisonment for 10 years and $10,000 fine, if they give false information on sugar cards or cards used for gasoline.

There is the case of Harry Bridges, who signed three documents, and, in answer to the same question, gives three different answers under oath; two of which must be lies. This is a clear case of giving false information, and in my opinion, perjury. Why this favoritism to men whose philosophy would destroy this form of government?

Bridges should be prosecuted for felony and giving false information under oath. Why imprison citizens and let this alien run at large and carry on his work of destruction? Can anybody in this House, or in the United States, square these actions and claim the dealing out of justice in this manner will create unity?

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a letter I have just written to the Attorney General on this subject.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1942.

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Will you please explain to me how it comes about, and how you justify, that 130,000,000 of our citizens can be sent to prison for 10 years and fined $10,000, for giving false information on registration for sugar and gasoline, when Harry Bridges, who has already given false information under oath, which I think is a felony, is not prosecuted?

Can this alien, or other aliens, do this with impunity on such an important thing, when our citizens be imprisoned on registering with reference to sugar and gasoline?

You have, in your possession, three documents signed by Harry Bridges, all answering the same question as to his marriage. These answers are all different, and two, therefore, must be lies.

What is your explanation, and why this protection of aliens and proposed prosecution of citizens?

Sincerely yours,

LELAND M. FORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short article written by Dr. James Bell, president of Southeastern University, entitled "This Is War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a chart.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Antonio Express.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative day, and all other special orders, on Thursday next, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my extension of remarks the speech made by the Governor of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 17, 1942, there was held in the city of New York a celebration which has become a feature of Metropolitan life.

I Am an American Day has become the annual tribute of this country to all of its sons and daughters, both native and adopted, and has become the day for the rededication of American ideals by our community.

On this last occasion it was again my privilege to participate with the millions

of law-abiding citizens in the festivities of the day, and I am particularly happy to note that the Governor of our State, Herbert H. Lehman, graced us on this occasion with his presence. Governor Lehman on this occasion delivered an address, which I am sure will be of interest to the Members of this House, and I, therefore, insert his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks:

On the eve of the Battle of Long Island in 1776, George Washington addressed his troops, in part, as follows:

"Our cruel, unrelenting enemy leaves us only the choice of a brave resistance or the most abject submission. We have, therefore, to resolve to conquer or to die. * * * If we now shamefully fail, we shall become infamous before the whole world."

These words are just as true today as they were when they were spoken 166 years ago.

We are again at war—a war that was not of our own making. Our enemies gave the United States no choice of decision. The evil men who would wipe freedom from the face of the earth decided that this was the time to strike. The Japanese attack on us—inspired by Hitler—was made ruthlessly, without warning, and with consummate treachery.

Today enemies to our way of life and to our liberty are to the east and to the west of us. We fight to preserve a free nation and the liberties which are our heritage.

With our Allies we are participating in a titanic struggle to avert world barbarism and world slavery. The forces that are arrayed against us—more ruthless, more cruel, more ambitious than any that ever before existed on this earth—threaten not only our safety but menace all of the spiritual values that civilization and religion have built up over many centuries.

Our army of freedom today is composed not only of our brave fighting men but of every man and woman in this country. The success of our fighting forces depends on the assistance and encouragement that we civilians give them. They are willing to sacrifice their lives in our struggle for freedom and security—we must see to it that their sacrifice is not in vain.

Make no mistake about this. This war is an all-out fight. The Nazi, the Fascist, the Japanese are irreconcilable enemies of all freedom. They or we must go; they or we will survive; they or we will influence man's destinies for generations to come. If we lose this conflict with barbarism, time will turn back for centuries. It will turn back to the Medieval Ages when man was merely a beast of burden, without rights, without hope, and without dignity. If we lose this fight, freedom will disappear utterly from the face of the earth.

There can be no compromising of the issues. If there are those who are stupid enough or evil enough to believe that they can save their properties or their skins by compromise or appeasement, they ignore or are blind to the history of totalitarian aggression. We must win this war totally or we will lose our freedom totally.

We will not compromise with the forces of evil. But do not let us be under any delusion. It is no easy task to which we have set ourselves. There are grave days ahead. There will be nights of anxiety and agony. Death and suffering are inevitable. No one of us can escape paying a price in life and limb or in tears and suffering. No one of us will avoid—or wish to avoid—bearing the burdens that we must shoulder. All of us must enlist wholeheartedly in the great crusade for freedom and security and peace.

Some of us will fight with a rifle in our hands. Some will fight to preserve the home front. There will be a task for each one of us. No matter how small or unspectacular that task may be, it must be performed faithfully and willingly. Each one of us is a sentinel on duty. Each must be a cog in the great machine that will move slowly but steadily forward to crush barbarism and paganism and to bring lasting peace and security again to a war-torn world.

At our head is the courageous and determined Commander in Chief, the beloved President of the United States. His is the clearest voice for freedom in the world today. His is an unshakable determination that barbarism will be crushed and freedom preserved.

We face the future with calmness and with courage. Thank God, today in this country there is complete unity of purpose and of spirit. The preservation of our country and the freedom of our children and their children are the causes for which we fight.

With the help of God, we shall persevere to the end of the hard road, confident that victory will be ours. And when that happy time comes—as it surely will come—we will again build a world of peace and justice and good will among nations and individuals.

BEN MILLER

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Nation suffers a keen and irreparable loss when a good newspaperman passes on. Ben H. Miller, Sunpapers staff correspondent, was a splendid newspaperman. He respected confidences and reported facts, true to the finest traditions of the decent journalists of our country and the press whose freedom has been made sacred by the organic law of the land. His death occurred on Sunday past while he was carrying out his assignment as a war reporter on the home front.

Sunday morning I read his article on munitions production in United States plants based upon a 2-week first-hand inspection. I was impressed by his grasp of the entire picture and his eminently fair appraisal of the participation by all groups in the war effort. It is regrettable that we will not have the benefit of his talents to complete the work he had begun.

His article is particularly valuable because he has brought home the fact that harmony prevails between labor and management. He has laid the ghost of labor noncooperation in the war effort. Some of his phrases in this regard bear repeating:

"American engineers have blueprinted new and amazing wheels of industry. American labor has put its shoulder to them," Colonel Armstrong (Col. Donald Armstrong, deputy chief of the Chicago ordnance district) forcibly and dramatically told a small group what management in his huge ordnance district had done in the way of planning, conversion from peace to war conditions, parceling out of subcontracts, protection of the economic welfare, health, and safety of its employees, and then no less enthusiastically added:

"There has been the most amazing cooperation between employees and employers in this district. We have had no important shut-down in the production of ordnance from labor stoppages. When we have seen the necessity for pressure on the production of some particular item the men in the plants willingly have worked 75 or 80 hours a week."

Colonel Armstrong's is only a small part of even the limited area of American industry, but his views echo those expressed in other sections. In Philadelphia, in Baltimore, in Newport News, in Knoxville, in Nashville, in Cincinnati, in Dayton, in Indianapolis, in St. Louis, and in Manitowoc, Wis., as well as in Chicago, the same conclusions, with deviations only in degree, have been expressed.

It was also encouraging to learn from this journalist that it has been privately said by a high-ranking war official "the battle of production had been won."

His youth and the keen presentation of an important aspect of the war effort which he had just begun make his passing particularly untimely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of commercial alcohol, and include therewith an editorial from the Sioux City Tribune-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day and any other special orders I may be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday I may address the House for 30 minutes after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem which I have received from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Mr. Hugh Grant, former Minister of Thailand.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by an outstanding columnist, Gould Lincoln, under the caption, "Pursuit of habit of sneering at Congress seen in public cry on X-card allowances."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include a short article in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article written by one of Colorado's outstanding newspaper

correspondents, Mr. Alva Swain, and to include some correspondence from cattle feeders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PLIGHT OF AVERAGE BUSINESS CONCERNS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is vitally interested in what is going to happen to the small business firms of this great Nation. There came to my desk yesterday a little paragraph which I want to read:

The gentlemen of the Congress have been very much upset about the rationing of gasoline. Some harsh things have been said about bureaucrats giving orders to Members of Congress (I don't see why they should be in such a position), but I don't hear a word on the Hill about bureaucrats pronouncing the business death sentence upon thousands of A. B. C.'s (average business concerns) with the execution dates set so close that appeal is almost useless in the face of time. I suggest that before Congressmen go home to campaign for reelection they think up answers for the constituents who have only A cards and for businessmen and their associates who have been dumped upon the economic ash heap and told to lie still, or else. Even the animals are feeling the bureau squeeze. A cow jumping the fence to make a night of it in a neighboring pasture came home with her crankcase drained and a notice that she wasn't to supply any more milk to anyone not on the public pay roll.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein an address by Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black upon the occasion referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an article from the News Bag, by Mrs. Mildred W. Warner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Mr. SHANLEY, may extend his remarks by including an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a talk by Albert Warner, of the Columbia Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Gazette-Telegraph, of Colorado Springs, Colo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JUDGE HUBERT C. UTTERBACK

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Judge Hubert C. Utterback, a former Member of this body, has just been announced. In his passing Iowa has lost one of our truly strong and useful leaders. His career encompassed many fields and he achieved a notable record of "firsts" and "onlys," a few of which I enumerate.

He was—

The first Democrat elected police judge in the city of Des Moines over a long period.

The first member of his party elected district judge in Polk County, Iowa, in half a century.

His election to Congress in 1934 was the first and only time the old Sixth District has elected a Democrat.

He was elected to the Supreme Court bench of Iowa, the first Democrat in 40 years to fill a vacancy, which vacancy the court held later did not exist.

In the course of his career he represented Iowa for 4 years as a member of the Democratic National Committee. Although defeated for nomination to the United States Senate by Senator CLYDE L. HERRING, he was not discredited.

Born in a log cabin in Keokuk County, Iowa, he rose to a place of influence and sought constantly to improve his State and the community in which he lived. I mention a few of the movements and organizations to which he gave his talents and directed his energy without hope of reward or compensation: The De Molays, Boy Scouts, Disciples of Christ Church, American Red Cross, Father and Son Movement, Lions Club, Iowa Humane Society, and perhaps others.

Scores of relatives and close friends in Keokuk County mourn his death, and this list includes his aged father, Hon. A. M. Utterback, a former member of the General Assembly of Iowa and a true pioneer lawmaker of Iowa.

Former colleagues in Congress appreciated the worth of Judge Utterback as a legislator.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of congressional responsibility.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: One that I may be permitted to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered over the National Broadcasting System last Sunday on I Am An American Day; and second that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial appearing in the Green Bay Press Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., under date of May 13, 1942, inspired by the statement of Mr. Michelson, publicity director for the National Democratic Committee. It is entitled "Michelson Better Button Up His Lip." I happen to know the editor of the Green Bay Press Gazette, Mr. Victor Minahan, who is also the editor of the Appleton Post Crescent, both daily newspapers in my district. Mr. Minahan is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and also its law department, and for many years was one of the outstanding members of the bar of the State of Wisconsin. He finally became interested financially in the two newspapers that I have named, was induced to become the editor of these papers, and has developed into one of the best editors of any daily newspaper in the United States. He has always been classified as a liberal and an independent thinker. He has sized up the situation so well with reference to the attempt to smear Congressmen who, prior to December 7, 1941, were opposed to our getting into the war, that I pass this editorial along to you Members of the House and I hope that every Member of Congress will read it because this editorial applies not only to Republicans but to Democrats as well. I ask unanimous consent to insert it and make it a part of my remarks at this point.

The matter referred to follows:

MICHELSON BETTER BUTTON UP HIS LIP

Charles Michelson, director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee and the man who broke the records of Sitting Bull and Tecumseh flinging tomahawks, made an appeal to the country recently calling for a Congress "favorable to the President" and accusing the Republican Party of every crime to be found on the calendar during the last quarter of a century.

Mr. Michelson said the Grand Old Party had weakened the Army and Navy, laid the foundation for the present war by defeating the League of Nations, fostered fascism in Japan, and generally contrived to tear the Republic down. Mr. Michelson's burning tirade is a result of his conviction that enough American blood has already been spilled to cement the country together behind its present leaders, irrespective of how they may have misled it, violated its wishes, or even plunged it into war.

The record fails to sustain Mr. Michelson's violent accusations.

The offense of most of the Republicans in Congress today is that they faithfully attempted to interpret the wishes of the people, some 80 percent of whom were very definitely adverse to becoming involved in the war. But they were not alone in this attitude. Many Democrats joined with them. And some have maintained their criticism of the means employed to hazard attack from Japan and get into the war through Asia's back door. There is, for instance, Congressman SUMNERS, of Texas, voted by newspaper correspondents at Washington a few years ago the ablest Member of the House, who wrote several months after Pearl Harbor:

"This blaming the Pearl Harbor tragedy on the treachery of the Japs is like the fellow

who had been tickling the hind leg of a mule trying to explain his bunged-up condition by blaming the mule with having violated his confidence."

There are others not so kind as Mr. Sumners who say we didn't tickle the hind leg of the mule but ran a pitchfork into it.

Running the figures down and looking over the records that go back 25 years, we find Mr. Michelson both wild and intemperate with his charges.

Even the charge that the Republicans defeated the League of Nations 22 years ago is belied by the Senate record that shows 12 Republicans voting against it while 23 Democrats gave it the ax.

The record at Washington also discloses that the Hoover administration spent approximately the same as the Roosevelt first term for the Navy and even more for the Army.

It is extraordinary for a leader like Mr. Michelson to make a charge of betrayal against the Republicans when the Democrats, for the last 10 years, have had the most overwhelming control of Congress ever held by a political party for so long. And had due account been taken of the Republican criticism of appropriation bills of a few years ago, we would have built fewer battleships and more aircraft carriers, submarines, planes, cruisers, and destroyers, which a Republican bloc in Congress tried unsuccessfully to secure as late as 1940.

Mr. Michelson's arm may be losing its cunning. His former clear and deft tomahawk incisions are now turning into bungling gashes.

He might do better to follow the advice of Senator WILEY, who says that "first things come first," and defines the leading item of the national business as fighting this war. Wisconsin's Senator correctly sizes up the mess in which this country finds itself because, however mistakenly, foolishly, or even wickedly we may have become involved in the war, we certainly are in it. And war is unique in that once having entered under the sign of the skull and crossbones we must fight on vigorously and completely until victory or until the people are satisfied that victory is impossible. That is the curse that accompanies the bloody malady as ashen color goes with cancer.

But Mr. Michelson is like some others at Washington and elsewhere who seem more concerned about their own personal welfare, their jobs or power, their positions, or authority than about the course of battle, and thus gamble upon their ability to bewilder the people with charges shot through with misstatement.

It is a dangerous business but they may get away with it. The Republicans may have to be content with the verdict of history. They actually tried to stay out of the war. They honestly attempted to obey the will of the people. And there were lots of Democrats with them, but such Democrats did not occupy the right jobs for that purpose.

Perhaps Congressman SUMNERS does his chiefs injustice by accusing them of tickling the hind leg of a mule. They may have thought it a Newfoundland puppy. Their sight, and certainly their foresight, could never win them a prize, anyway.

EARL BROWDER

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is true that Earl Browder, who has blasted our form of government, did not go to jail because he was a Communist; but because he was a Communist he was freed from jail; and it happened just before I Am an American Day.

Was it for national unity that Harry Bridges' deportation was deferred?

Last March some miners in Illinois had their fines remitted and their sentences commuted, by the President, too; all they did was to derail some trains.

As one humble American I protest these three acts. I would call their purpose international disunity.

THE LATE HUBERT UTTERBACK

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to tell the House of Representatives of the high esteem in which I held Hon. Hubert Utterback, former Representative of the Sixth Iowa District in the House of Representatives. During the 2 years Mr. Utterback served in Congress, I had occasion to make many trips to Washington on official business for the city of Iowa City, Iowa, and although Mr. Utterback did not represent our congressional district, he was always most courteous and cooperative in extending us his personal help with our problems. All of us who had occasion to come to Washington found him and his office staff always ready and willing to help us wherever and whenever possible.

Further back in history I had occasion to know of Mr. Utterback's great work in the Boy Scout organization and in the juvenile court at Des Moines. He built for himself a record of constructive community service that is second to none and all of us who had the good fortune to know him have reason to be proud of him for his great record of service to his home, his city, his district, our State, and Nation.

SOLDIERS' BASE PAY

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, from every section of the country, from the boys in the service, the ones in the rank and file, from the mothers and fathers of those boys are coming floods of messages urging that we hold the $50 base pay for the boys in the service, provided by my amendment adopted a few days ago. The men in the service say that it has done more to strengthen their morale than anything else that has occurred.

Messages are also pouring in supporting my bill to get rid of the Japs.

I had a letter this morning from a little 10-year-old girl in California. She writes:

> They are asking me to write to my Japanese friends.

She adds:

> I have no Japanese friends. I had a brother at Pearl Harbor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE 12-POINT REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 1942, the Republican National Committee met in Chicago and drew up a 12-point program which, in my considered judgment, is a document of unity and solidarity that well merits the study of this Congress and the country. I believe some of those items will bear restatement and full elaboration. Any discussion of this 12-point program would be a discussion of every problem which has engaged the attention of the Congress in recent months and which is likely to engage the attention of this body in the months to come.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, in the ensuing weeks, to take each one of those 12 points and elaborate on it.

I shall want to take each point in the program and devote 5 or 10 minutes to an interpretation, in the light of the national problems now before us, and the problems which will inevitably arise as the conflict progresses to a victorious conclusion. I shall undertake to keep these remarks from bias in the hope that they will stimulate further discussion in this body and produce some fruit for the common good.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MAJ. PAUL A. LARNED

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2202, to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the gentleman has discussed this matter with the ranking minority member of the committee; and the subject is not controversial.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to transfer to the active list of the United States Army, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Paul A. Larned, now a major, United States Army, retired (now on active

duty): *Provided*, That prior to his restoration to the active list he shall have been found physically qualified for active service in the Regular Army by a board of officers, his name to appear on the active list of the United States Army next below that of the lowest ranking member of the class of 1907, United States Military Academy, now on the active list: *Provided further*, That he shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or, at any time thereafter, be promoted: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT TO ACT TO ESTABLISH A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7066) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to have my distinguished colleague explain the bill to the House.

Mr. CRAVENS. The sole purpose of the bill, and the only thing that it accomplishes, is to extend for a period of 4 years the so-called Bankruptcy Act. There is no change whatever in the substantive law. The former act had a provision that the act would expire on the 30th of June of this year. This merely extends the act without changing it in any respect for an additional period to expire on June 30, 1946.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I recall, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary and there is no change of the provision of the law itself. This is merely an extension for a period of 4 years?

Mr. CRAVENS. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title XI, sec. 404), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 84. Jurisdiction conferred on any court by section 81 shall not be exercised by such court after June 30, 1946, except in respect of any proceeding initiated by filing a petition under section 83 (a) on or prior to June 30, 1946."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE MARINE AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE FUND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, following the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, it may be in order to consider under the rules of the House, House Joint Resolution 314, making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is required in order to raise funds to take care of losses resulting from sinkings, and it comes with the unanimous report of the committee. I do not believe it will be controversial; in fact, I do not think there should be any substantial controversy at all. I can see no objection to letting it come up on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest that the two distinguished gentlemen agree on time, if possible; otherwise there will have to be a unanimous consent request on Thursday. If you do not agree on time, the bill would have to be considered under the regular rules of the House. I do not press that at this time, but if it can be done I think it might be well to do it now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no demands for time, and so far as I know the gentleman from New York has indicated no demands for time. I think it will be disposed of very expeditiously.

Mr. TABER. I think we may limit the general debate to an hour, if the gentleman will incorporate that in his request. That is, a half hour on a side.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent then in that connection that debate on the joint resolution continue for not to exceed 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this opportunity to ask about the program for Thursday. Can the majority leader tell us what he anticipates will be the program for the remainder of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report just filed by the gentleman from Alabama will come up tomorrow. I understand that is noncontroversial. The resolution referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will come up on Thursday. There is nothing else except what might be brought up by unanimous consent, which means, of course, that the majority leadership and the minority must agree.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Is it anticipated that we will probably recess over Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my intention to submit that request. I may say that on Monday, if a rule is reported by the Rules Committee—and I hope the distinguished members of the Rules Committee will report it—the small businessman's bill will come up for consideration. I am happy to give this advanced notice so that Members may be prepared. I will try to give a further statement with reference to the rest of the program next week by Thursday of this week.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—perhaps the majority leader would like to know the status of some of the unfinished bills from the House Military Affairs Committee, as well as the one that will be reported soon. There are two bills, one relating to cadets in West Point and the Army pay bill that are in conference and will remain in conference likely all this week. They should take their place on next week's calendar.

Mr. McCORMACK. We can arrange for that. Of course, I mean the cadet bill. I do not know about any other bill.

Mr. MAY. There is the pay bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a conference report. That can be taken care of.

Mr. MAY. The other bill with reference to allocation of pay will be reported out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, we will give that as quick attention as possible.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the majority leader advise the House what length of time is proposed for discussion of the small business bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that the majority and minority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency will determine that. I am unable to give that information. My friend here naturally feels distressed at my statement, and I apologize to him. Of course, the Rules Committee is the final arbiter in determining that matter, but I assume the Committee on Rules gives profound consideration to the recommendations of the legislative committee. I have no idea as to what time will be allowed for general debate, except that I assume the bill will be disposed of on Monday.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inform the majority leader that the chairman of the Committee on Rules was not distressed but did wish to convey to him that a reasonable time will be granted for debate on that bill. That is all I wish to say in reply to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if he proposes to bring the Small Business bill up for consideration before the Committee on Rules tomorrow morning?

Mr. SABATH. I have stated that to the gentleman already. Two or three other matters will also be taken up by the Committee on Rules tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of pleasure to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] when he asked for unanimous consent for time to address the House on Thursday next to explain the 12-point program as agreed upon by some of the Republican leaders at a recent meeting of the Republican Party in Chicago, which program, I understand, was recommended by Mr. Wendell Willkie and adopted over the protests of the Republican Senator from Illinois. I congratulate the Republican Party, though rather late, in endorsing in the main not only President Roosevelt's foreign policies but also, to a great extent, his domestic policies. I wonder whether the recent Gallup poll, which showed that 80 percent of the American people endorsed the President's policies, had something to do with the action taken at this Republican Party meeting. I have not this 12-point program before me, as agreed to by the Republican leaders, but it is really immaterial because, knowing the Republican leaders as I do, I feel that they have endorsed all the policies and actions taken by President Roosevelt which prove, beyond doubt, that they were in the right direction and in the very best interest of our Nation.

No doubt, they will of necessity point out some errors and will probably dwell on the large expenditures that the administration has not reduced to a greater degree for established Government departments. I am satisfied that they will not point out that these expenditures could not be reduced because nearly all the Republican Members invariably voted against reductions or failed to offer amendments to reduce appropriations. While some of them made speeches against the expenditures, yet the majority of the Republican membership voted for them. However, they cannot be blamed, for they must have something on which to go before the people. In that connection I wish it would be possible to have the Republican record vote on all these appropriations, including their nearly unanimous votes in 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941 on legislation recommended by the President which was defeated because of the nearly solid Republican vote, together with the votes from time to time of some 30 or 40 Democrat appeasers and isolationists. I concede that since the Pearl Harbor Japanese sneak attack they have realized their grave mistakes too late. However, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the extraordinary efforts on the part of my very able colleague, he will not be able to aid his party by his deft explanations of these 12 points, because the American people are satisfied that our President has shown extraordinary foresight, courage, and ability in safeguarding and protecting, as I have stated, the freedom and and liberty of our Nation. I grant that they may criticize him in his desire to protect and aid the wage earners, the farmers, and the small businessmen, but I am satisfied and feel that even the most vicious labor baiters, a few of the commerce association leaders and stock brokers will derive some measure of comfort in attacking his humane efforts in behalf of the underprivileged of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorial speech by Mr. Ben Scott Whaley, one of the distinguished lawyers in Charleston, to the Ladies' Memorial Association at the Confederate Cemetery on May 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Gov. Prentice Cooper, of Tennessee, before the Young Democratic Clubs of America in Louisville last summer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include addresses made by myself and the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING], and in the other to include a letter written by a factory manager in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Haven Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, if my experiences and observations of the past week or two are correct, it certainly goes without saying that gasoline rationing is the current topic of conversation. The headlines feature it; the radio commentators continually remind us of it; we hear it being discussed wherever we go.

A question which is being asked more and more is, "Why should such rationing be restricted to the east coast? If such inconveniences and hardships are required for successful prosecution of all-out war effort, why should not the whole country share in the rationing?" It is a time-worn adage, of course, that misery loves company. But is that in itself a compelling reason for extension of rationing to areas in which gasoline is plentiful and in which rationing cannot be justified upon either practical or economic grounds? When we have droughts in the Midwest do the easterners insist that they be extended to other sections?

NO RATIONING FOR OIL-PRODUCING STATES

There can be no doubt but what the War Production Board is seriously considering rationing of gasoline on a Nation-wide basis. Recently one of the minor Government officials who was discussing the individual's part in the rationing program stated that "the Nation must learn discipline." This is nothing short of bunk. Our people have already demonstrated their willingness to sacrifice in order to win this war. They do, however, object to unnecessary restrictions and regulations.

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is my privilege to represent one of the country's leading oil-producing States. Unlike most of the current discussion of rationing, which seems to be based upon abstract theory, my discussion of the subject here today will be based upon hard, cold facts gathered from my own personal observation and first-hand knowledge of actual operations within the oil industry.

In a State like Kansas, it must be emphasized, local consumption accounts for only a small part of the total production of gasoline. It has accounted for only approximately one-third of the total in recent years, according to the United States Bureau of Mines. This means that production of gasoline could be reduced two-thirds and there still would be no necessity of rationing.

But rationing, we are told, does not arise from any fundamental shortage of crude oil, the basic raw material from which gasoline is derived. Nor does it arise from any lack of refining equipment to transform the crude oil into gasoline. Rather it all stems directly from limitations upon transportation, and one particular form of transportation at that—ocean-going tanker. Only the large consuming areas along the seaboard can be served by such means. The other large consuming areas within the interior always have been supplied by other means. In recent years only one-fourth of all the oil has been carried to refineries in tankers, again according to the United States Bureau of Mines. The remaining three-fourths always has traveled by other means. So far as can be ascertained, even in peacetime none of Kansas' oil ever was carried by tanker. If it were, it was so negligible in volume that the Bureau of Mines failed to report it. By no possible stretch of the imagination, therefore, could rationing of gasoline be justified in Kansas on the same grounds that it is in the East.

BINDING PRECEDENT

To me, the recent action of Federal authorities in relaxing restrictions in certain areas adjacent to sources of oil production in the East is compelling proof of the absence of any need for rationing in Kansas or any other oil producing State. Ninety-three counties in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virgina, and West Virginia had been made subject to previously announced restrictions. But because of their proximity to oil producing areas they now have been relieved of all such restrictions including the necessity of rationing. Such relief for areas located in the East, which because of their geographical location heretofore had been made subject to rigid restrictions, is a most binding precedent why rationing should not be applied to areas closer to the country's most prolific sources of production.

JEOPARDIZE STATE'S REVENUES

There is still another point which seems to be overlooked completely in most of the current discussion. It has been found that fuel oils are indispensable to the war effort. Refiners in Kansas and throughout the country accordingly are being urged continually by Federal authorities to operate their refineries so as to obtain the greatest possible yield of such oils from a given quantity of crude. But the people, those who constantly are harping on country-wide extension of gasoline rationing, overlook the practical implications of such operation. For every barrel of fuel oil which you can obtain in Kansas, for example, you first must produce two barrels of gasoline. In the refining process the lighter fractions, chief of which is gasoline, always come off first. In practice, therefore, you get the gasoline whether you want it or not. What are you to do with it? Isn't it better to let the people use it in their cars than to dump it back into the ground or to burn it, which it is charged has been done recently in Chicago with the sanction of Federal authorities?

Then, too, there is still another consideration. Rationing of gasoline would deprive Kansas and other oil-producing States of the continued productivity of one of their chief sources of revenue—the gasoline tax. In recent years Kansas has been deriving nearly one-third of all its tax revenues from this source. But this tax's productivity already has been reduced by tire rationing, speed limits, and other wartime restrictions. Addition of gasoline rationing, especially when no possible justification for it can be found, certainly would be the final "straw to break the camel's back." It would tend to pauperize the State and place its fiscal system completely at the mercy of the Federal Government.

CONCLUSION

There certainly is no possible justification for rationing of gasoline in oil-producing States. Such rationing would prevent complete fulfillment of the role which producers and refiners have been accorded in the all-out war effort. Finally, such rationing would place the State's finances in jeopardy and at the mercy of the Federal Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true gasoline which is transported from the gentleman's State of Kansas to neighboring States is transported mostly by pipe lines?

Mr. CARLSON. That is generally true. However, some of this gasoline is moved by tank cars. I have noticed these tank cars are out in the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, when they might well be loaded at the end of some of the pipe lines nearer the point of distribution. It would aid materially the present shortage of gasoline at eastern points.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not also true that the product carried by these pipe lines is refined gasoline and not the crude oil that comes from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. That is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And that is particularly true of Kansas and that general vicinity?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent statement on the subject he has just been discussing and I also want to call to his attention the fact that gasoline production in Kansas is off 25 percent, not due to any seasonal decline, but due to the curtailment of the driving of automobiles. There is plenty of gasoline for every purpose and it should not be rationed out there.

I may also state that the refiners, who have their own transportation system in the way of tank cars, are using about 80 percent of their equipment to bring gasoline to the eastern coast and by the middle of June that will probably be increased to 100 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. I may say that my colleague from Kansas is thoroughly familiar with this situation and has done a fine job trying to straighten out the conditions I have referred to. It is a serious problem, and our State is one that produces two-thirds more gasoline than it uses. I am sure it is the gentleman's opinion it would be folly to try to put on any program of rationing in Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Has any responsible Government official proposed that rationing of gasoline should be extended to the Middle West?

Mr. CARLSON. I think that responsible officials in the Government have in mind a Nation-wide rationing program.

Mr. THOM. Who?

Mr. CARLSON. I would rather not mention any names.

Mr. THOM. I would like to have that information if the gentleman has it.

Mr. CARLSON. It is my opinion that time will tell whether or not Government officials plan Nation-wide rationing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an item appearing in the New York Times on April 21, at the time the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning was awarded the first gold medal by the Pi Alpha Sigma, Pan-American fraternity, at St. John's University, Brooklyn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

O. P. A. PAY ROLL

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer headlines: "Williams denies Young look at O. P. A. pay roll" and then states that Birkett L. Williams, administrator of the regional Office of Price Administration in Cleveland denied my request for a copy of the regional pay roll. Williams pulled political wires to have himself selected regional director at $6,500 per annum and it appears that before he had warmed his desk chair his salary was to be increased to $8,000 and other big increases in salaries in this office were to be made. On May 9 his title was changed from regional director to regional administrator and his salary was to be increased from $6,500 to $8,000. Papers for this salary increase were prepared and also for a salary increase of $1,000 for his assistant, Mr. Fiske.

Is it possible that this bureaucrat takes the arbitrary, supercilious, arrogant, and contemptuous attitude that the public is not entitled to know how public money is spent? Congress appropriates money to establish and maintain agencies such as the Office of Price Administration and surely a representative of the people is entitled to know how the people's money is being spent. Constituents constantly write me expressing concern over mounting expenditures in various governmental agencies and as Congressman at Large representing Ohio I have consistently and constantly voted to curtail and reduce nondefense expenditures and I propose to watch defense expenditures as well and prevent waste and extravagance.

A reporter from the Cleveland Press asked Mr. Williams for a copy of his pay roll and the request was refused. This self-important job holder then told the reporter that Stephen M. Young, Congressman at Large, had requested the pay roll and that he had denied the request, on the ground he believed it was prompted by political motives. Possibly someone should tell this puffed-up, gusty, inflated bureaucrat that a public office is a public trust. Is he seeking to hide the facts of his own salary increase by $1,500 per annum but a short time after he secured his appointment? My pay roll as Congressman is open to the public at all times and if anyone inquires how I spend my clerk-hire allowance I will readily state the facts and not claim that the inquirer is prompted by political motives.

Leon Henderson as Price Administrator is, in my judgment, doing a magnifi-

cent job. Criticism, however, has very properly been made by some of my constituents regarding increasing salaries of officials at the regional office. It was but a short time ago that the Price Administrator established a regional office in Cleveland. Birkett L. Williams was designated Regional Director at a $6,500 salary per annum. Mr. Fiske was employed as assistant at $4,600 per annum. Then on May 9 the salary of Regional Administrator Williams was to be upped from $6,500 to $8,000, Mr. Fiske from $4,600 to $5,600, and other general increases in salaries were to be made. These salary boosts, amounting to 20 percent or more in some instances, proposed within just a few weeks following establishment of this regional office, have been a matter of comment among my constituents. This is a time of general sacrifice and pulling in of belts and it does not seem a good idea to pay administrative officials more than they made in private life nor to increase immediately salaries from $6,500 to $8,000, $4,600 to $5,600, and so forth. Furthermore, throughout the country school teachers and other citizens have been volunteering their services to the O. P. A. for sugar rationing, gasoline rationing, and so forth, without thought of compensation.

In order to ascertain the facts I wrote the Director of Personnel, Office of Price Administration, Washington, requesting the names and salaries of certain employees of the regional office in Cleveland. The Director of Personnel, 6 days later, wrote me that the field organization of the Office of Price Administration is highly decentralized and that the information is not available in Washington. He suggested that I write directly to Mr. Birkett L. Williams, regional director. I then wrote to Mr. Williams asking that he have compiled and mailed to me within the next few days a complete list of the personnel under his authority and that this list give the names, official positions, and salaries of all employees and officials as of May 1. It will be noted that in my letter to Mr. Williams I did not ask for the addresses of employees and officials in the regional office. Obviously, I was not interested in compiling a mailing list for myself for political purposes nor in making any check as to the politics of those employed in the regional office. I know that many of the employees do not reside in Cuyahoga County and it would be a tremendous task to ascertain the addresses of these employees and then inquire in the various counties of Ohio and adjoining States regarding their politics. Mr. Williams on May 8 wrote me that he respectfully referred my request to Mr. John E. Hamm, Deputy Administrator. I find that it is advisable for a Congressman to be patient and so on May 13 I wrote to John E. Hamm, Deputy Administrator, asking that he mail me within the next few days a complete list of the personnel in the Cleveland regional office as of May 1, 1942, and in my letter I stated, "I do not want the addresses, as I have no intention of using this as a mailing list. I simply wish the names, official positions, and salaries." To date I have not received any reply to this letter from Mr. Hamm but I'll be patient. My mother taught me "patience is a virtue."

It is my view that the citizens of Ohio wish me to be watchful over defense expenditures and to reduce nondefense expenditures. I will continue to do my duty as I see it and as my constituents desire me to do it, irrespective of whether or not my course may please Mr. Birkett Williams or any other blustery bureaucrat who may take a "public be damned" attitude.

I feel we should not remain silent when an attempt is apparently being made to employ unnecessary officials at high salaries, using dollars paid in by our citizens who have so generously purchased war bonds. Millions of Americans are making sacrifices. It is all wrong to appoint men to high-sounding positions under Federal authority at fancy salaries, then increase salaries and seek to conceal the facts. Why should not men given these appointments make financial sacrifices instead of receiving appointments with salaries higher than their earnings in civil life? Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, and John E. Hamm, Deputy Administrator, should be advised that many Members of Congress have sons in the armed forces serving as privates and seamen, and that we oppose newly created high-salaried administrative positions at a time when Americans are tightening their belts and making great personal and financial sacrifices to preserve this Nation as one spot where people are free. Incidentally, let me add that we Congressmen have reduced our own salaries by imposing heavier income taxes which we have to meet, and our Ways and Means Committee is now proposing to reduce our salaries further. We do not complain.

The other day Dean Walter T. Dunmore, of Western Reserve University Law School, was offered an appointment as Rent Controller by Administrator Leon Henderson. Dean Dunmore is an outstanding citizen of Cleveland, my home city, and I congratulate and commend Administrator Henderson for this fine appointment. It appears unfortunate that this outstanding public-spirited citizen was not designated Regional Administrator instead of Williams.

In presenting my views I want it understood that I have confidence in Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, and believe he will do a fine job in that important position. Furthermore, it is well known that I am a supporter of President Roosevelt's domestic program and foreign policy and support the all-out war effort of this administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. MURRAY, for 10 minutes.

TRADE BARRIERS FOR WHOM?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, brought up the question of trade barriers a few days ago. I called his attention to two in New York City. First, the fact that a farmer has to pay between $8 and $9 in order to get a truck load of his own products to market in his city and, second, in reference to Milk Marketing Order No. 27, which is costing the consumers of that city millions upon millions of dollars. It appears that under this milk marketing order a small group is allowed to erect a high sanitary barrier which results in a fluid milk price too high to the consumer so that these few can lower the price so much on their "surplus milk" that it can be converted into cream for the New York and also the Boston market and undersell the midwestern producers.

The following groups are aware of this injustice:

Cream Shippers Committee, M. G. Van Buskirk, executive-secretary, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Indiana Commission on Interstate Cooperatives, Frank Finney, chairman.

Indiana Milk and Cream Improvement Association, Walter R. Freeman, secretary.

The Indiana State Farm Bureau, Hassil E. Schenck, president.

Indiana Manufacturers of Dairy Products, R. L. Fifer, secretary.

Ohio Dairy Products Association, J. C. Nesbit, secretary.

They make the following comment:

We believe it to be definitely unfair and unjust to so arrange and price the several brackets for cream in such a manner as to effectively close the doors to western cream shippers.

While we have presented specific amendments to Order No. 27 which we feel will tend to bring about the equality which all producers are entitled to enjoy under any milk marketing program under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, we do not insist upon the exact provisions offered. Other proposals submitted also attempt to solve the problem. The manner in which the solution is brought about is of secondary importance. Any plan which may be devised which will restore our competitive position in eastern cream markets will meet with our complete approval.

These groups know that it is a trade barrier. They know that as long as New York City imports foreign dairy products and consumes them—like cheese and butter—without any knowledge of the sanitary conditions under which they were produced or whether the cattle were ever even tested for tuberculosis or Bangs disease. They know the purpose of this barrier against midwestern milk and cream is purely to erect a barrier and to make money for the few. Disease producing bacteria are no more desirable in a pound of butter or a pound of cheese than they are in a pitcher of cream or a bottle of milk.

In regard to these trade barriers and tariffs, it should be kept in mind that though the new dealers castigate the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, they have never repealed it. In fact, the New Deal has added trade barriers and increased domestic as well as foreign tariffs. The following letter is from the Dairy Producers, Inc., of Chicago, Ill.:

DAIRY PRODUCERS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., May 15, 1942.

The Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was a real pleasure to have had another opportunity to visit with you a little while on my recent trip to Washington.

Enclosed find copy of the original brief of Middle Western producers with reference to Milk Marketing Order No. 27. We have not receded in the least from this position and feel that we are on absolutely safe ground.

Following the presentation of this brief an adjustment was made in the arrangement which gave us the relief asked. On April 1

of this year, however, other amendments were made which put us back into practically the same position in which we were in 1940. For instance, the price of milk in Class II-E in New York for April was $1.551. This compares with a price of at least $1.85 which cooperative plants—such as that at Ladysmith, Wis.; Springfield, Mo.; and others scattered throughout the Middle West—pay their producers. Thus in addition to a 30-cent differential in paying price, the Middle Western producer still has a $2 charge for transportation, icing, etc., to put his cream into Boston. The difficulty lies in the fact that New York dealers take what they will when they want it and leave the Middle Western producer to hold the sack at any other time.

As you will note, if you have a few minutes' time to run through the brief, the only thing we are asking is that a comparatively small group in New York be not allowed to set up a high sanitary tariff and Government milk order wall behind which they can wax fat and turn a surplus which would endanger their program over into channels developed by Middle Western producers.

Yours truly,

M. G. VAN BUSKIRK,
Executive Secretary.

THE FILLED-MILK SITUATION

There was one subject brought up at this barrier conference that merits the attention of the dairy farmers of this Nation. It was the cheap attempt of using the war as an excuse to allow filled milk to be universally marketed. This filled milk is made by removing the butterfat from whole milk, condensing the separated milk, and then replacing the butterfat with a vegetable oil. It is largely marketed in sections of our larger cities where there is a large foreign population that cannot read English and who think they are getting real condensed milk. As long as three tall cans of condensed normal Wisconsin milk can still be purchased at retail for 25 cents even here in Washington there is not any sense in lowering the barrier for this inferior product. There are only a few companies making this product—Carolene Products Co., Litchfield, Ill.; Richwhip Corporation, of Newaygo, Mich.; and Indiana Condensed Milk Co., of Indianapolis, Ind. The National Dairy Union, according to their letter of February 26, states as follows:

A Federal statute was adopted on March 4, 1923, known as the Filled Milk Act, which prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce of this product.

At the present time three companies are engaged in the manufacture of filled milk, namely, the Carolene Products Co., of Litchfield, Ill.; the Richwhip Corporation, Newaygo, Mich.; and the Indiana Condensed Milk Co., of Indianapolis, Ind. Of these companies, we are advised that the Carolene Co. and the Richwhip Co. are continuing to ship filled milk in violation of the Federal statute. We are further advised that one or both of these companies have been indicted in various Federal courts for violation of the Federal statute prohibiting the shipment of this product in interstate commerce.

The constitutionality of the Federal law prohibiting the shipment of this product in interstate commerce was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in *United States* v. *Carolene Products Co.*, decided April 25, 1938 (304 U. S. 144, 58 S. Ct. 778).

Notwithstanding the opinion of the Supreme Court and the opinions of various State courts prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or interstate shipment of this spurious product, the companies engaged in its manufacture and sale have continued flagrantly to violate both State and Federal laws.

There are millions of pounds of separated milk wasted annually in our country and this should be dehydrated. This can be cheaply performed. There is no need to incorporate an inferior product in separated milk and put it on the market illegally as is being done in peacetime or wartime with this filled milk.

The New Deal increased by 50 percent the Smoot-Hawley schedule on crabs—to benefit whom? A few people, and a very few, in Maryland, Virginia, and Louisiana. It added a 3-cent-per-pound domestic trade barrier on peanuts and it sanctioned the trade barriers in the milk-marketing orders. In fact, about a year ago I heard Mr. WALLACE on the radio talking to some New York City foreign trade society and relating the evils of tariffs and trade barriers and how the Republicans had sinned when, at the very time, he was getting his pen filled with ink to sign the bill that put a 3-cent-per-pound domestic tariff or trade barrier on peanuts.

The New Deal is not deceiving too many with all their talk about trade barriers as long as they themselves erect more trade barriers and increase the schedules of the Smoot-Hawley Act when it helps their particular section to do so. The New Deal, by continually increasing the cost of doing business, has placed the producers and consumers further and further apart. A few years ago the producer received 55 cents of the consumers dollar and now receives only 42 cents of the consumer's dollar, according to the U. S. D. A.

The recent Washington conference on trade barriers most assuredly did bring out the injustices on motor transportation. It was pleasing to note Wisconsin had already removed this trade barrier even before this meeting.

In conclusion, I wish to state this position:

First. That all trade barriers which in any way hinder the best conduct of the war be repealed or suspended by the States. As stated before, Wisconsin has already done this.

Second. We should not allow a few individuals or a few companies to get rich by removing trade barriers for their own particular benefit and which in no way are retarding our war effort.

Third. I contend that all dairy products—whether milk, cream, butter, cheese, or condensed milk—that will pass Federal inspection are and should be just as eligible to interstate movement as federally inspected meat, potatoes, or any other farm product. They should be acceptable to every market in the United States and should not be continually barred by artificial trade barriers erected in the name of false sanitary requirements.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; gladly.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know the distinguished gentleman has given much time and attention to this study. He mentioned some groups in the State of Indiana which have taken cognizance of these trade barriers. I ask the gentleman if it is not true that these trade barriers apply not only to Indiana, but to all States in the Central and Midwest?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, sir. They apply not only to the Midwest, but to every other State. I presume Minnesota has been the State that has shipped the most cream to the eastern markets. They were barred by this method; the price of fluid milk for bottling is made higher than necessary—so high in fact that the consumers in New York City do not buy milk as abundantly as they should. By placing the price of bottle milk high, they can place a low price on the surplus. They put it down so low that the midwestern dairyman cannot compete with the low price of the surplus milk in the city milkshed.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; gladly, to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Will not the gentleman agree with me that it seems foolish that we are dumping in Wisconsin and other States maybe hundreds of thousands of pounds of skim milk, and still they want us to remove the trade barriers which bars the shipping of filled milk into another State. Most of the people get imitation fat, not genuine butterfat, when they buy this filled milk. They want us to remove the barriers to permit imitation milk to be shipped.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague from Wisconsin. He is conversant with all these injustices, and I know that as far as he is concerned he will do what he can to correct them any time that he is given the opportunity of doing so. He realizes the consumers of New York City are injured by this program and are compelled to pay too much for bottle milk. He also realizes that midwestern dairymen are being denied a market for their product, that they should be entitled to obtain and retain. I repeat, that dairy products are like meat, or potatoes, or any other farm product, and if they pass Federal inspection they should be allowed to be sold in any market in our country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I am pleased to do so.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman would not say that there is equality, so far as trade barriers are concerned, when the condition exists as he explained it in several of his speeches where our farmers are charged eight to ten dollars to bring products into a city like New York. The State of Nebraska laws are such that we are not troubled so much with State barriers. Our Governor was here the other day, and we are cooperating, and we would like to have some cooperation from the other States that are asking us to cooperate in the Middle West. We are now up against the proposition of eliminating trade barriers and bringing into the milk-producing country substitutes whereby we have a trade barrier against our pure natural product in States that are asking us to eliminate these trade barriers. Will the gentleman discuss that?

Mr. MURRAY. The whole question of trade barriers would require a discussion of more than these few minutes that I have. Personally, I have always felt that we should not have any trade barriers between States; that is, where no deception is taking place. I might

present here many arguments about trade barriers. Take Spry and Crisco, for instance, or some of these vegetable substitutes for lard. You do not hear any criticism of them. They advertise their product for what it is. They do not claim it is superior to an animal fat. Where these other companies get into trouble is where they try to make the people believe that their product is superior to the real product which they are making the substitute to replace. I think that is where the oleomargarine interests made their greatest mistake. They say take oleo, fortify it with vitamins to give it some of the properties of butter, and then give it a shower bath in skimmed milk, and make it smell like butter, and put in diacetyl acid to make it taste like butter. Then get the Agriculture Department to go on a national radio hook-up, as they did on July 5, and tell the wonders of modern oleo. If one listens to them and believes them he would think that it is a product that is even superior to butter. This is disturbing to the dairymen of our country, and they ask only a fair and square consideration. These dairymen know the real true value of their product and resent the unfair competition.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LANDIS was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR PROSECUTION OF THE WAR AND FOR DOMESTIC PURPOSES

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from the Federal Register and Public Law 354 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed pleasing to speak to this crowded hall nearly filled with over 400 Congressmen.

I want to address my remarks to Executive Order No. 9112, dated March 28, appearing in the Federal Register.

I am interested in this Executive order from the standpoint of trying to learn how our money is being spent for the prosecution of the war and for the domestic purposes of our Federal Government.

Executive Order No. 9112 interested me because it cites as its authority as follows:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me—

The President—

by the various provisions of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941, by all other acts of Congress and by the Constitution of the United States, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and deeming that such action will facilitate the prosecution of the war, I do hereby order as follows:

He cites his first authority for this Executive order, Public Law No. 354 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 18, 1941. I have analyzed the first two titles of that bill which are pertinent. The second title refers to contracts. It provides as follows:

SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contracts in violation of existing law relating to limitation of profits: *Provided further*, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record under regulations prescribed by the President and when deemed by him not to be incompatible with the public interests.

Now, title II apparently is the particular provision on which the President bases his authority to issue his Executive Order No. 9112. I feel it is our duty as a congressional body and my duty personally, to know what is being done with our money. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I take particular pride as do the other members, in studying the justifications of each department, agency, and independent establishment of the Government to determine the need for the funds that the different agencies and departments ask for. If the committee determines there is no need for funds they turn down the request. Many requests are turned down, curtailed, or limited by the action of the committee. Then it is brought before the House, and many times the conclusions of the committee are overruled and superseded by the House of Representatives. This is the American way of life, and that is the method of financing the Government adopted by the fathers of our Constitution—that Congress should hold the purse strings.

The effect of Executive Order No. 9112 goes further than any expressed authority granted in Public Law 354. It supersedes and short circuits this regular constitutional action of Congress. What does Executive Order 9112 provide? It says first—

The War Department, Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission are hereby respectively authorized, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, (a) to enter into contracts with any Federal Reserve bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or with any other financing institution guaranteeing such Reserve bank, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, other financing institution against loss of principal or interest on loans, discounts, or advances, or on commitments in connection therewith, which may be made by such Reserve bank, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or other financial institution for the purpose of financing any contractor, subcontractor, or others engaged in any business or operation which is deemed by the War Department, Navy Department, or Maritime Commission to be necessary, appropriate, or convenient for the prosecution of the war.

And so forth. What is the effect of that? They can justify funds before the committee, get appropriations allowed, and then tap a limitless source of revenue by guaranteeing loans of the Federal Reserve banks, the R. F. C., and other loaning agencies. The Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission can enter into a contract, in addition to what they have asked Congress for, for an unlimited amount of money, guaranteeing loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Reserve banks, or any other financial institution, in addition to these appropriations. Does that sound like we are holding the purse strings of the Nation? Obviously the R. F. C., the Federal Reserve banks and the other loaning agencies are doing the work of your constitutional body under the authority of this Executive order.

Congress is short-circuited, and any loans that the R. F. C., the Federal Reserve banks, or other financial institutions make are beyond the realm and control of this constitutional body.

I have searched in vain through all the war-power acts, in addition to this particular act I have named; I have searched through the Constitution. I find no authority whatsoever for this Executive order granting the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission power to enter into a contract guaranteeing any loan, either principal or interest, in addition to the appropriations of this Congress. I am going to write today to the Attorney General, who has charge of drafting and approving these Executive orders, and ask him to give me his citation of authorities.

I believe the Executive order is clearly beyond the power and the scope granted, or conceived, or contemplated by this Congress in amplifying the powers of the President to deal with the procurement of necessary materials for the defense of this country and the prosecution of the war. I feel that in the absence of a clear-cut, detailed description of authority in any of the acts cited, and especially in Public Law 354, this Executive order ought to be declared null and void. Congress should assume its full responsibility with reference to providing the funds for carrying on this war and for the domestic needs of the country.

I sincerely hope the Members who are not here today will glance back at the March 28 issue of the Federal Register and see if they do not agree that Congress is being short-circuited. In the last few days there has been considerable talk and many allegations that Congress is not assuming its full responsibility in the conduct of the affairs of the Nation. Certainly this is one of the things that may be laid to our door. Shall we allow anyone else to usurp our authority in regard to the finances and the purse strings of our country? I hope in the name of the integrity of this body, the membership of this House will view with alarm this Excutive Order No. 9112 and will assume the high responsibility the people expect. I hope we will preserve the dignity of our legislative body and live up personally to the traditions of the Congress and to the oath of office we took.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. NOBLE J. JOHNSON, of Indiana, for 35 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. MCINTYRE, for an indefinite period, on account of official business in Wyoming.

To Mr. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, for 30 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 20, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing as per attached press release:

Today Representative CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, announced a hearing to be held next Wednesday, May 20, by the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation.

The purpose of the hearing is to develop three phases due to shortage of supplies of petroleum products and rubber.

The first purpose is to develop the facts as to what is being done to provide petroleum products to sections of the country where there are now shortages.

The second purpose is to bring out the facts as to what is actually being done to meet the Nation's need of rubber and rubber substitutes in view of the shortage of the rubber supply.

The third purpose is to develop the facts as to the dislocations and economic consequences that result from deficient supplies of petroleum and rubber and to consider how the effect of such dislocations can be minimized.

Representatives of Government departments and others will appear as witnesses before the hearing on these questions is completed. The hearing will begin Wednesday and it is expected will be continued in 2 other days within the next 10 days.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m. Wednesday, May 20, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 20 at 2 p. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1646. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $9,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 726); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1647. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal route, Louisiana, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 12, 1938, and January 24, 1939, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1648. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting several documents including a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt; to the Committee on Claims.

1649. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Ohio River and St. Louis, with a view to providing improvements at and in the vicinity of the Ste. Genevieve levee and drainage district, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on February 23, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 727); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1650. A letter from the Chairman of the Textile Foundation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Textile Foundation for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1481. An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 2135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7100. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law, 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 7101. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 7102. A bill to establish an additional United States Military Academy at Claremore, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7103. A bill providing for the withholding of 10 percent of the contract price of naval contracts and subcontracts for the payment of delinquent Federal income or excess-profits taxes of the naval contractor or subcontractor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 7104. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7105. A bill to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 7106. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 7107. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7108. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 7109. A bill relating to the period in which income from shares in domestic building and loan associations may be included in gross income for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect to meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat-food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 7110. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 7111. A bill for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2841. By Mr COLE of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of Corning, N. Y., expressing approval of House bill 6486, which provides for a salary increase for certain postoffice employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2842. By Mr THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the board of directors, Metropolitan Water District Southern California, urging that the existing situation on the Colorado River at Needles, Calif., be investigated and action taken to remedy the flood conditions on that river; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2843. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by R. Cannon and sundry members of the McCabe Baptist Church at Flora, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2844. Also, petition signed by O. D. Rise and 63 other citizens of Harrisburg, Ill., requesting the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2845. Also petition of Mrs. C. L. Swinney and 65 other residents of Eldorado, Ill., requesting the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2846. Also, petition signed by Sarah G. Johnston and sundry other citizens of Albion, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2847. Also, resolution adopted by the membership of the Mill Shoals Baptist Church, of Mill Shoals, Ill., presented by B. B. Dame, clerk of said church, opposing the manufacture and sale of alcohol for beverage purposes for and during the duration of the war, as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2848. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of John W. Keller and 200 other residents of the city of Topeka, Kans., appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and urging the passage of Senate bill 860, the Sheppard bill, at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2849. Also, petition of the Thompsonville Methodist Church, Perry, Kans., and 53 residents of Perry, appealing for legislation to protect our boys and men from insidious forces of vice and intoxication, especially in securing the passage of Senate bill 860, the Sheppard bill, at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2850. Also, petition of Rev. H. P. Basquin and 37 other residents of Williamsburg, Kans., appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men of our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2851. Also, petition of Mrs. Myrtle Bonesteel and 110 other residents of Washington, Kans., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2852. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Moulton, Thayer, Lancaster, New London, Bloomfield, Middle Town, Ogden, and Rippey, Iowa, in the appeal to vote for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and to secure the passage of Senate bill 860, the Sheppard bill, at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2853. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Blanche Rose and 32 other residents of Martinsburg Ohio, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit liquor and prostitution around military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2854. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the State of Arizona, objecting to legislation by Congress for the taxing of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2855. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Musicians' Union, Local No. 6, American Federation of Musicians, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2856. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas Weights and Measures Association, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6784, relative to weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Howard Stone Anderson, D. D., pastor, First Congregational Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father: Again we pause to acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, the Author and Sustainer of life and the Giver of every good and perfect gift. Purify our hearts with Thy love; illumine our minds with Thy wisdom; fire our hearts with celestial flames of faith.

We commend to Thy loving care our sons who have gone forth to serve their country and the cause of freedom on land and sea and in the air. Shield them from danger; keep them strong and steadfast; give them courage and chivalry; inspire them with devotion to the cause to which they are offering their lives, and help them to achieve a just and lasting peace for the whole world. Hold in Thy holy, tender keeping all those dear to them whom they have left behind.

We pray for the President of these United States, the Members of the Congress, and for all in our Government upon whom responsibility rests. We pray for the leaders and people of every nation upon the face of the earth. Open their minds toward Thee, that, at last, Thy will may be done, and Thy peace may come.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 19, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Rosier
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Hughes	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment on page 80, adding at the end of line 25 the following: "*Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senator from Wyoming

and the Senate that I ask the privilege of making a statement at this time about a matter which involves the highest privilege of the Senate and the highest personal privilege of a Member of the Senate.

On May 1, 1942, the New York Post carried a story which grew out of the trial of a case in the State court in the city of Brooklyn where a man by the name of Gustave Herman Beekman was under indictment and under trial for an offense too loathsome to mention in the Senate or in any group of ladies or gentlemen. It involved a house which he operated and conducted in Brooklyn which was known and is described as a house of degradation. He was convicted in the State court presided over by Judge Leibowitz. Following his conviction, before sentence was pronounced, he issued what was alleged to have been an affidavit involving a Member of the United States Senate as a frequent visitor to the house which he operated.

Based upon that affidavit, or alleged affidavit, the New York Post on Friday, May 1, carried a headline which occupied practically the whole front page, which reads:

Links Senator to spy nest.

Then it has some photostatic copies of the signature of Gustave Beekman.

On the third page of this issue of the New York Post the headline is as follows:

Senator linked to spy nest which lured service men.

The article proceeds to describe the place, the name of the street, and the number of the house. The article contains the charge that a Member of the United States Senate had been frequently seen in this place talking to an alien who was suspected of being a spy in behalf of the Nazis, while the article indicated that the conversation which was supposed to have taken place between the Senator and this German was not audible. No one could testify to what was said, or on what subject anything was said.

The article contained a silhouette of the Senator involved in the charge, a white silhouette, blank as a tombstone, which, in all probability, might, in the imagination, fit any one of a dozen or more Members of this body or men outside this body, just a white silhouette of a man's head.

This publication was brought to my attention by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Francis Biddle, and it had been brought to his attention by reason of the intimation in New York, made to agents of the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that there might be a violation of the Espionage Act on the part of those who resorted to this place, which soldiers and sailors now and then frequented. The intimation was that these boys were plied with liquor in order that they might become garrulous and reveal the whereabouts of ships from which they had disembarked or upon which they might reembark for future movements.

The only interest the Department of Justice had in the matter, of course, was to ascertain whether there had been any violation of the law regarding alien activities.

The Attorney General called me up over the telephone and told me of the publication and wanted to talk with me about it. I told him I should be glad for him to do so, especially as it involved a Member of this body. He himself did not come to see me that day, but he sent one of his assistants, Mr. Cox, a very reliable and a very efficient assistant in the Attorney General's office, who told me about the publication and the implications involved.

I told the Attorney General, as well as Mr. Cox, that I should like to confer with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the minority leader, about what was the best course to pursue, inasmuch as this matter involved the integrity of the Senate. Certainly the Senate of the United States was interested in knowing whether any Member of the body was guilty of any violation of the law involving the safety and welfare of his country, whether he was, as intimated in this article, conniving with the enemies of his country, plotting against its security, its safety, and its welfare.

I talked with the Senator from Oregon, and the two of us agreed that the best course to pursue was for the Department of Justice informally, without any action on the part of the Senate, without any official request from the Senate, to make an investigation and reveal the facts, and that the Senate's course thereafter should be determined by what the facts turned out to be. I advised the Attorney General of the result of my conference with the Senator from Oregon, and the Attorney General stated that they would proceed accordingly.

Friday, when this article first appeared, which named no Senator but carried this white silhouette, was the 1st of May. A few days later, early in the following week, I think on Tuesday, although it may have been Monday, Senator WALSH, who had not been named in the article, called me over the telephone and said he wished to see me. He had been told by the New York Post that on that day they were going to publish his name as the Member of the Senate involved in this charge.

Senator WALSH came out to my house, and we had a long conference about the matter. He told me then what appeared later in the paper, that he had told the representative of the New York Post, when he was called up and advised that they were going to name him, that the whole story was a diabolical lie, and that if they published it, that would be what they were publishing. That afternoon they came out in a story and in an editorial naming Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, as the Member of the Senate involved in the charge.

Senator WALSH was visibly agitated, as anyone laboring under such a revolting change would be. I advised him that unless this article appeared in other newspapers than the Post, I doubted the wisdom of his rising in his place in the Senate to make any comment upon it, at least until the Department of Justice had investigated it, and he agreed. That course was pursued.

In the conversation between Senator WALSH and me he stated that he had never in all his life been in this place, or in any similar place, that he had never even been in Brooklyn in his life, except on three occasions, and at those times he went there to deliver public addresses before audiences of the public.

Day before yesterday the Attorney General called me over the telephone and said that their investigation had been completed that it entirely exonerated the Senator from Massachusetts; and that he had in his possession, and wished to submit to me for such use as I might think proper to make of them, statements taken by special agents of the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, showing the facts with reference to the matter.

Yesterday afternoon, following the session of the Senate, the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, and with him one of the special agents, whose name I shall give in a moment, came to see me, and they turned over to me copies of the original documents now in the custody of the Attorney General.

A statement of the facts in the case presents a weird and fantastic story. I do not deem it necessary to go into any details in describing the house, or the charge made, or the practices which were carried on prior to the conviction of Beekman, the man who operated the house. This Gustave Herman Beekman had supposedly made an affidavit, after his conviction, which was supposedly made under some sort of inducement that if he would tell the whole truth and reveal the names of those who were described as some of the topnotchers who frequented his resort, he might receive leniency by way of punishment on the conviction which had just been secured in the State court.

I have here a record of 25 pages, which I shall not insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because it contains disgusting and unprintable things which should not be in the RECORD. Nor shall I give it to the press, because the statements have no more business in the public press than they have in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Besides that there are some confidential matters and names involved which I do not think it would serve any purpose now to publish.

In the statement submitted to the Department of Justice by this man Beekman he states that he did not know what was in the original statement secured from him; that it was not read to him; that it was prepared by his lawyer who had defended him on the trial in the State court; that he did sign it because his lawyer advised him to sign it, but that he did not hold up his hand and swear to it, although the document itself on its face shows that it was sworn to. He states also that he did not make the statement with any knowledge that it was to be made public or that there was to be any publicity whatever about it; that he made it because his lawyer advised him to make it.

In the statements made by not only Mr. Beekman but by others who were frequenters of this resort, they show that there was a man who came to this place about the time, and during the time it was alleged in the original affidavit or statement, whatever it may be called, that the Senator from Massachusetts had been to this place. The Department of Justice has submitted to

me a photograph of the man who actually was there, and I will submit to any Senator or to anyone else who wants to inspect the photograph, that it looks no more like the Senator from Massachusetts than I look like Haile Selassie. The only similarity is that they are both large men, weighing about the same, perhaps within a few years of the same age. I have four of these photographs. I have the name of the man, which I shall not reveal, because I do not think any purpose could be served by revealing his name, but he is not from Massachusetts, he is not from New York; he lives in New England, but not in Massachusetts.

After the statements were made by Beekman, who made the original statement involving the Senator from Massachusetts, and by a man named Zuber, who also made a statement involving the Senator, and by one or two others, they were shown this photograph, and all of them stated that Senator WALSH was not the man to whom they referred. The photograph of Senator WALSH was also submitted to them, and they all stated that he was not the man they had ever seen in this place. While it is not a very good likeness, not a flattering likeness of the Senator from Massachusetts, it certainly is enough like him to indicate that it is a picture of an altogether different man from the one they identified as the man who visited this place.

After these statements were made by Beekman, and by Zuber, and by a man named Fox, and by one or two others, the agents of the Department of Justice visited the man whose picture this is, and they took a statement from him, in which he admitted that he was the man; that he had visited this place time after time for purposes which I do not reveal, at the very times and during the very periods which the original affidavit of Beekman indicated as the dates on which the Senator from Massachusetts was claimed to have been seen there.

Of course, it is all fantastic. It is almost incredible.

The Department of Justice in its investigation has gone into the matter as thoroughly and as completely as possible. They have taken statements from everyone who had been alleged to have made a statement in regard to this whole matter. All of them unanimously and separately—not together, but separately—made the statement that none of them ever saw in or near or around this place, or at the other place from which he had moved, any man corresponding to the photograph of the Senator from Massachusetts.

These things are unpleasant even to have to talk about, but the Senator from Massachusetts, and the United States Senate, and the country, are all entitled to the facts, they are entitled to the statement that I am making based upon the investigation made by the Department of Justice.

I want to congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts upon the calm demeanor which he has exhibited in the face of this contemptuous and contemptible charge. The Senator from Massachusetts and I have disagreed many times on the floor of the Senate about matters of policy, both foreign and domestic. We disagreed—and many of us did—on the foreign policy of the Government of the United States prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7. But I want to say for the Senator from Massachusetts, that regardless of those disagreements as to policy prior to our entry into the war, the Senator from Massachusetts has performed his duties as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and his duties as a United States Senator, in a manner indicating his patriotism, and his loyalty, and his devotion to the interests and the welfare of the United States.

When this charge was made in this publication and was bandied around, handed from hand to hand, and whispered around from mouth to mouth, there was not a Senator in this body who did not know at the very moment that the escutcheon of the Senator from Massachusetts, so far as the performance of his duties here was concerned, so far as any effort on his part to connive or to consort with, or to converse with, or conspire with anybody who is the enemy of the United States, was unsullied.

The Senator from Massachusetts indicated in his first conversation with me that unless this article appeared generally in the newspapers of the United States and was confined to this particular newspaper in New York City, he would not exercise what was obviously his right, to rise to a question of personal privilege and discuss it, at least until the Department of Justice had concluded its investigation.

I wish to say to the credit of the newspapers of America that, so far as I know, no other newspaper in the United States carried this story. It may be that one or two other newspapers somewhere carried an intimation of or a résumé of the story involving in a vague way some Member of the United States Senate, without naming him. I did not see any such publication. I am advised that with the possible exception of one or two newspapers somewhere whose identity I cannot give, the rest of the newspapers of the United States ignored it completely. Of course, I cannot speak for all of them, and I do not know, because I have not seen them all, but that is my information.

This whole situation is unfortunate, but it was not brought here by any of us. It was not initiated by the Department of Justice. It was brought to the attention of the Department because of a trial in the State court in the city of Brooklyn. I am advised by the Attorney General that the Department has completed its work and has in its custody the original documents, of which I have copies.

Unpleasant as this episode has been it is a pleasure to be able to state, as I had anticipated from the beginning I would be able to state, that from beginning to end there was never the slightest foundation or basis for the opinion, charge, or suspicion that the Senator from Massachusetts was the man involved in the descriptions which were given in this publication on May 1. I shall not go into the question of motives. I cannot read the mind of any human in an effort to ascertain his motives. I do not know. Therefore I make no intimation, but I am sure that every Senator and every man in the Government of the United States, including the Department of Justice, felt the same way about it. Their confidence has now been confirmed by the investigation to which I have referred.

Mr. President, that is about all there is to say. It is most regrettable that for any reason or any motive a Member of this body, or any American anywhere, high or low, should be involved in such an unjustified, malicious, degrading charge, or that a Member of one of the legislative bodies of this Nation should be accused of conspiring with alien enemies against the welfare and safety of his country. Nobody who is acquainted with the Senator believed the charge. I hope that as a result of the fair, impartial, and exhaustive investigation made by the Department best equipped to make it, those who have been responsible for it will see to it that justice is done, even in their midst, with respect to this despicable accusation against a Member of this body.

Mr. President, I feel compelled to retain the documents which I have received from the Department and withhold them from the RECORD and from the press. The statements which I have made are borne out by these documents. I am not in a position to say that they will be available if anybody wishes to inspect them at the Department of Justice. I think the Senate will rely upon my statement that these documents amply and overwhelmingly justify the complete and thorough exoneration of the Senator from Massachusetts from any suspicion of ever having been to the place referred to or anywhere near it, or ever having engaged in any activity which could have justified any honest man in making the assertion that he was ever there.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to congratulate the Attorney General of the United States for making the investigation, and I wish to congratulate the F. B. I., under Mr. Hoover, for carrying out the investigation and bringing the truth to the country. If the investigation had been conducted by private individuals, there might be the suspicion that such individuals were biased in favor of one person or another; but I am sure that nobody in this country will say that the Attorney General of the United States, or the F. B. I. under Mr. Hoover, was prejudiced in favor of the Senator from Massachusetts. On the contrary, they have rendered a great public service to the Nation in making this investigation.

I also congratulate the Senator from Kentucky for the statement which he has made in bringing about the exoneration of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Montana. I think it was infinitely better for the Department of Justice, through the Federal Bureau of Investigation, rather than the Senate itself, to have made this investigation. The Senate might have been thought by some persons to be prejudiced in behalf of one of its Members. Nobody can lay any charge of partiality at the door of the Department of Justice.

From the very beginning of this matter, from my first conversation with the Attorney General until my last conversation with him and his representatives, all they have sought to do was to obtain the truth; and they have done so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. First I wish to express the appreciation which every Member of this body feels for the action of the majority leader in bringing this matter out into the open, having a report on the facts, and giving the Senate an opportunity to know the facts.

I think the Attorney General of the United States is entitled to great credit for the manner in which he has conducted this investigation and the manner in which he has apparently uncovered a conspiracy to smear a distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the Senate will have sufficiently done its duty simply by receiving that report. A moment ago the Senator from Kentucky said that he was not able to examine into motives. I think that for the maintenance of its own integrity it is the duty of the United States Senate to examine into the motives behind this filthy conspiracy to smear a Member of this body. Even though the Member has been officially exonerated by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of any suspicion or charge, I do not think we ought to allow the incident to pass without examining into the motives and personalities behind this conspiracy against the Senator from Massachusetts.

In view of the report which the Senator from Kentucky has made, I think the Senate should call to the bar of the Senate the old hussy who runs the New York Post. We should call to the bar of the Senate Walter Winchell, the radio commentator who disgraces the uniform of the Navy of the United States by appearing in his Navy uniform to try to smear Members of Congress.

In a radio address he undertook to smear not only the Senator from Massachusetts but six other Members of the Senate whose names happen to begin with W.

The report of the Senator from Kentucky makes it perfectly obvious that there has been subornation of perjury, to which the trial judge himself, in view of the statement from the trial judge quoted in the New York paper, must have been a party. I think he should be summoned to the bar of the Senate to ascertain whether he was a party to subornation of perjury.

In addition, I think that the great reformer, Morris Ernst, who sat with the trial judge in the trial of the case, and who afterward brought these charges to Washington, as I understand, in an effort to smear the Senator from Massachusetts, should be brought to the bar of the Senate. If there is a conspiracy or an organized effort, as has appeared from time to time, to smear Members of the Senate and the House who do not happen to agree with certain newspapers on public questions, the people should know it.

We all know that a few weeks ago there was a dinner in Washington, promoted by the Communist front and the New Republic magazine. At that dinner, which was called the overseas correspondents' dinner, it is a matter of common notoriety that the statement was made that men who had opposed our entrance into the war before Pearl Harbor must be destroyed. As I understand, the statement was openly made at that time—I was not present, but I have it on very good authority—that they should be "hooked" for subversive activities if possible; if that were impossible, they should be caught on some income-tax frame-up; and if that were impossible, they should be "hooked" on a violation of the Mann Act or anything else anybody could think of.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am trespassing on the time of the Senator from Kentucky.

In view of the F. B. I. report on the matter, it seems to me that the attempt to smear the Senator from Massachusetts is plainly and clearly a conspiracy. It is a matter of which the United States Senate should take cognizance. We ought to find out where Mr. Winchell obtained his information, where the New York Post got the story, and who were the parties to the conspiracy to smear a distinguished and honorable Member of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri. I can very well understand how all Senators must feel with respect to the whole matter. I should not like to give a categorical answer now to the question whether the Senate should take further official action. I think that is a matter which ought to be considered carefully.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with the Senator. I was not trying to obtain a categorical answer from him. I made the suggestion because it seems to me that it is something which every Member of this body ought to take into consideration with a view to protecting the dignity and integrity of the Senate, and protecting this body from baseless, filthy, and dishonorable attacks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

The Senator has mentioned Mr. Morris Ernst, whom I do not know. I know that there is such a lawyer. I was told by a certain person that he had been informed that Ernst sat on the bench with the judge in Brooklyn who tried the case. I asked the Attorney General about it, and he said that that statement was incorrect; that sometime during this episode, when these statements were being made, Mr. Ernst was present as attorney for the New York Post. I am informed that he is the attorney for the New York Post, and that he was supposed to be present in his capacity as attorney, probably to determine whether the statements should be published. I do not know what happened, but that is the information I have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no personal knowledge of the subject, and the Senator from Kentucky may not have any; but, inasmuch as we are discussing Mr. Ernst, I have been informed by a very reputable newspaperman, whose information is usually correct, that Mr. Ernst brought the story to Washington and went to the White House with it, in an attempt to interest the highest authority in Washington in an effort to smear the Senator from Massachusetts. To the credit of the President and his advisers, I am informed that Mr. Ernst's suggestions were entirely rejected. I do not know whether that is true, but I have been informed by reputable newspapermen who are usually accurate that it is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot affirm or deny that, because I do not know. I do not know whether Mr. Ernst brought the charge down here or who brought it. I have never been told, and therefore I would not hazard a guess as to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was the basis of my suggestion. I should like to have Mr. Ernst summoned to the bar of the Senate to respond to questions about how deeply he is involved in the conspiracy.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I rise to add my commendation to the distinguished majority leader for the fine tribute he has paid and the fine remarks he has made about DAVE WALSH. My mind goes back to the days after Pearl Harbor, when I spoke on the floor of the Senate, and when DAVE WALSH replied to my statement. He spoke of the responsibility devolving upon him as chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, and of the talk he had had with the President, and of how he was talking with various persons; and then he said:

> In this trying time in administering the affairs of the Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. President, I must have the confidence of the Senate.

I answered back, and said to him, "You have it," and after I spoke the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] also paid tribute to the confidence the Senate has in DAVE WALSH.

In closing my brief remarks I simply desire to say that DAVE WALSH is and has been my friend of many years standing in my birth State of Massachusetts, and, to me, it is terrible that this thing could have happened to him and to the Senate of the United States, through the calumny and abuse of this vermin group in Brooklyn, N. Y., and in New York City.

To my mind come the words of Edmund Spenser, written many years ago with reference to the fact that in the end justice will make her own cause right:

> It often falls in course of common life
> That right long time is overborne of wrong,
> Through avarice, or power, or guilt, or strife,
> Which weakens that, and makes this power strong.
> But justice, though her doom she do prolong,
> Yet at the last will make her own cause right.

Justice is making her own cause right in the incident before us this morning, and the Senate of the United States, both parties, all groups, and all thoughts will join with the senior Senator from Kentucky in helping justice make her own cause right in the present instance.

More power to the Senator from Kentucky; we join with him in solid phalanx to vindicate the good name of DAVE WALSH and the State of Massachusetts and the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I should state, if I have not already done so, that in all the statements made by these various persons to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the special agents sent to Brooklyn, all of them stated, as will be shown, that they made those statements freely, without coercion and without influence or pressure brought to bear upon them to make such statements. I think that should be stated.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that even after the Federal Bureau of Investigation made the investigation—I was told this yesterday—the New York Post subsequently published a statement to the effect that this same man—Beekman—had retracted the statement which he had made to the F. B. I.; they asserted Beekman said he was forced to make a new statement by the F. B. I. This shows, in my judgment, the viciousness of the New York Post in attempting to continue to smear the Senator even after the F. B. I. made an impartial investigation. I am also informed that when the man Beekman first made the affidavit, it was made at approximately 12 o'clock at night; and I also desire to call the Senate's attention to the fact that the New York Post boasts of its part in this sordid affair—I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Post—in this manner:

> When the notorious Beekman case is prosecuted in Brooklyn County Court next week it will involve one of the highest ranking legislators in the country.

Then the New York Post continues:

> The first mention of the sensational Beekman case in which a United States Senator is linked with a Nazi spy ring, appeared in the Lion's Den, thus registering another scoop for the Post's scintillating columnist.

Then there appears a photostat. The newspaper says:

> The jury was out 50 minutes when the verdict of guilty was announced. Judge Leibowitz said in part—

And then the Post explains that Judge Leibowitz knew that a Senator was involved. Of course, he knew that a Senator was involved. All he had to do was to read the New York Post which had carried this story saying that a Senator was going to be involved. I call attention to the fact that the man to whom the judge spoke had been running a house of degradation, and, therefore, he was one of the lowest types of individuals who could possibly be found on earth.

Mr. TOBEY. The scum of the earth.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; as the Senator suggests, the scum of the earth.

It is reported that Judge Leibowitz said to Beekman, after the latter was convicted:

> The defendant's fate lies in his own hands. If he assists us and tells the truth and makes a clean breast of his activities and those in connection with them, and if he uncovers the whole spy ring with which he was connected, the court will give him extreme leniency. If he fails to tell the truth, I will give him the maximum of 20 years.

In other words, if this man does not make a statement detailing what Judge Leibowitz and the New York Post want, he will be given 20 years.

Some Members of the Senate have been prosecuting attorneys, as I have been. How many Members of the Senate who have prosecuted cases would believe under oath a man who was running a house of degradation—the very scum of the earth? How many decent men or women would take his word if he should attempt to smear a Member of the United State Senate, a man who has been elected by the people of the great State of Massachusetts at least five different times, if my recollection serves me correctly, and who has been Governor of his State and Lieutenant Governor of his State?

Yet this newspaper, the New York Post, publishes the statement of a man such as Beekman all over the country, attempting to give the aura of credibility and honesty to the words of a man whom no honest and decent man would believe under oath, and whom no competent official could believe unless supported by overwhelming evidence.

Some people approve official action to halt publication of some newspapers in the name of unity. I say to the Members of the Senate that this newspaper, the New York Post, and some other newspapers of similar character are doing more to promote disunity in the United States of America and they are doing more to break down the confidence of the people in the Government of the United States than anything that could be done wittingly by anyone. In one breath the New York Post shouts about democracy and the need to fight for it all over the world, and yet at the same time it is doing more to tear down democracy and to stir up racial and religious hatreds in the United States than any individual or group of individuals could possibly do. If a newspaper should be stopped because it spreads disunity or is detrimental to the waging of war, certainly the New York Post, which was aided financially by the Federal Reserve bank, should come under the ban of the Government of the United States.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri that this matter should not stop here. Some persons may say, "Well, it involves only one Senator." No; that is not correct. Let me say that, in my judgment, this is a diabolical attempt on the part of certain individuals in the city of New York to smear every Member of the Senate of the United States who has disagreed with them on matters of foreign policy. I have no apologies to make for the position I took before we got into this war. I know that there is not a Member of the Senate, and I do not think there is a Member of the House of Representatives, who does not want to do everything he possibly can and humanly can do to aid in the winning of this war in the shortest possible time. Yet a number of persons constantly attack Members of the Senate who disagreed with them prior to Pearl Harbor, and then they say they want to bring about unity in this country.

Unity in the country under those circumstances.

I hold in my hand an advertisement which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. The headline reads as follows:

> Will you help stop votes for Hitler?

The advertisement says:

> Join us today—

and is signed by a committee of—

> Citizens for Victory. National headquarters, 8 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

The advertisement contains an appeal for money with which to carry on their campaign. I am not up for election, so it does not affect me; but they are asking money with which to carry on a campaign against candidates, whether Democrat or Republican, who do not agree with the views of this committee. If a candidate does not agree with this organization which is raising money to carry out their purpose, that candidate is to be guillotined; in their judgment that candidate is not an American, that candidate must not hold public office. The effrontery of these people, these people who are the same people who were members of the Fight for Freedom group and similar groups, who also raised money to carry on a program a few months ago before Pearl Harbor to bring this country into war.

I say that, in my judgment, it is not only an attack upon Senator WALSH, but if the Members of the Senate had permitted those responsible to get away with a smear upon Senator WALSH, it would only have been a question of time before they would have tried to smear and frame every Member of the Senate who had the courage to stand up in the Senate and vote his convictions.

This is not a personal matter as to one Senator; it is a question of whether the Members of the Senate shall permit individuals to hold up to ridicule Members of the Senate, to intimate that Members of the Senate are traitors to their country, to assert that they are guilty of the lowest kind of degradation that could be imagined by the human mind.

I agree that to bring the owner of this newspaper and those responsible for this outrage to the bar of this Senate would be far too easy on them. We should not let them off so lightly. Certainly something should be done about this matter. If a Federal judge, for example, were involved, I would say that he should be impeached. I should say that any Federal judge who made such a statement, under the conditions this man made it, should be impeached by the Congress of the United States. I doubt if there is a

man in this body who would not vote for impeachment.

I say that all those who are involved in this conspiracy—for it is a conspiracy—should be prosecuted, and the lawyer, whoever he may be—if the story is true that the lawyer urged Beekman to make the statement—ought to be disbarred.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state that the lawyer referred to, whose name I could not recall a moment ago, was one Mr. Harvey L. Strelzin. He is the man who represented Beekman, and wrote the affidavit which Beekman said he had not read, which was not read to him, and which he does not recall having sworn to.

In regard to the New York newspapers, I think, in fairness, it ought to be said that, so far as I know, the Post is the only New York newspaper that carried this particular story.

Mr. WHEELER. Walter Winchell, who, as has been said, wears a Navy uniform, both wrote in his newspaper column and made a statement over the radio saying that the name of the man involved began with the twenty-third letter of the alphabet. He did not know, apparently, or care, that there are seven Members of the Senate whose names begin with that letter. Here is a man—Winchell—who is just as contemptible as those connected with this affair, in my judgment. He wears a naval uniform as a commander in the Navy, and yet he does not dare to show his face in public in Washington because of the libel suits already pending against him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was speaking of newspapers and not radio commentators, because I do not listen to all of them.

I wish also to state for the record that the agents of the F. B. I. who made this investigation were Mr. R. A. Newby, Mr. H. O. Hawkins, Mr. A. F. Spigner, and other special agents. Mr. Newby came here yesterday with the Attorney General when he called upon me and gave me these papers.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his courtesy in yielding to me in order that I might make this statement. There is nothing further now that I wish to say about it.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, at the time the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was on the floor I sought to interrupt to the end that there might be a clarification of certain language that had been resorted to at a dinner of the so-called overseas writers in Washington. For the purpose of the record, I am sure we should have, as reported, the language that was used by at least one of the speakers at that banquet on that evening. It was reported on March 30 in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., by John O'Donnell in his column entitled "Capital Stuff," and he said:

> The significant point is that such potent Roosevelt advisers as Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter and the paid personnel of the official propaganda agencies applauded lustily such declarations as—

Then comes in quotation marks this statement:

> The American Senate must be taught the facts of life. * * * The important thing is to put an end to criticism of the Roosevelt administration by whatever means may be necessary. Be as ruthless as the enemy. * * * Get him on his income tax or the Mann Act. * * * Hang him, shoot him, or lock him up in a concentration camp.

Let me say a further word. I should like to join with the Senator from Missouri and others in the insistence that we not let this matter drop here. I am sure that reasonable inquiry by the Senate will reveal the existence in this country of a secret society that has been engaged for the last 2 years in an undertaking to gather such information as would permit the smearing of individual Members of the Senate. I have in my possession information that goes directly to the existence of such a society, and I hope, not now—for this is not the time to be doing it, I know—but before we are done with this thing, I hope the Senate will provide for a study of the motives lying back of this experience which has befallen a very respected Member of this body.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, when the Senator from Kentucky, our leader, was speaking he said he knew of no other newspaper in the city of New York, or in the country, which mentioned this article. I think it is true that no other newspaper carried the story, but I should like to call attention to the fact that Marshall Field's PM, in the city of New York, did say that the Senator mentioned in this story, known as Senator X, was Senator WALSH. They did not dare to carry the story, but they did carry in their newspaper the statement that the mysterious Senator X was Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts.

COMPENSATION FOR OVERTIME WORK OF PER ANNUM GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Civil Service Commissioners, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation purposing to provide a greater degree of uniformity and equity in the compensation of the per annum employees of the Government for overtime work, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. AIKEN:

The petition of Rev. Frank W. Grippin, minister of the First Methodist Church, and 60 other citizens, all of Rutland, Vt., praying for the prompt enactment of the so-called Sheppard bill, the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition signed by 158 citizens of Kansas City, Kans., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860. I ask that the body of the petition, without the signatures, be printed in the RECORD and that the petition be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the War Act of 1917 the Congress of the United States included legislation forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and Navy by liquor and commercialized vice, even though liquor was then forbidden in any military unit; and

Whereas in the Selective Service Act the Congress of 1940 called the young men of the present time to train for defense of our Nation, if need be, and there now exists for these young men defenders no defense from the activities of what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," namely, the traffic in alcoholic beverages, and since beer is now sold in the camps by Government authority, and since commercialized prostitution in camp areas threatens health, morals, and efficiency of service: Now therefore

We, the undersigned citizens of Kansas City, State of Kansas, do respectfully petition you to vote for S. 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile; without amendment.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 5636. A bill to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 7008. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; with amendments (Rept. No. 1361).

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. Res. 233. Resolution for an inquiry relative to the training of air pilots for military and naval service (submitted by Mr. BROOKS

on March 31, 1942); with an amendment; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HAROLD SINGER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 242, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 242), submitted by Mr. McNARY on May 1, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Harold Singer, son of Joseph F. Singer, late an employee of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2544. A bill to extend the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. LEE introduced Senate bill 2545, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2546. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal. This bill is in the nature of an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2545) to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2544) to extend the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1360) thereon.

FIRST THINGS FIRST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject First Things First, delivered by him before the Service Club of Wausau, Wis., on May 4, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SYNTHETIC THINKERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Synthetic Thinkers," delivered by him before the Service Club at Marinette, Wis., May 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PLACE OF THE PRESS IN WINNING THE WAR—ADDRESS BY HON. ARCHIBALD MacLEISH

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Archibald MacLeish, Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, at the Associated Press annual luncheon on April 20, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES TO SUGAR PRODUCERS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him with reference to subsidies paid to sugar producers, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BILLION DOLLAR TAX ON BUSINESS OF TOBACCO FARMERS—STATEMENT BY LEWIS C. WILLIAMS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Lewis C. Williams published on May 3, 1942, in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, under the title "A Billion Dollar Tax on Business of Tobacco Farmers," which appears in the Appendix.]

GASOLINE RATIONING—STATEMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Charleston (S. C.) Courier of May 19, 1942, relative to correspondence had by the Governor of South Carolina, Hon. R. M. Jefferies, in relation to the rationing of gasoline, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress and the People," published in the Birmingham (Ala.) News of May 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PLANNING AT HOME AND ABROAD—EDITORIAL FROM MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Post-War Planning, at Home and Abroad," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of May 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2202) to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7066) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7066) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum which has just been sent me by messenger from the Association of the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, together with a copy of a night letter which they sent to their membership.

There being no objection, the memorandum and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF THE SOUTHERN COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
Memphis, Tenn., May 19, 1942.

Memorandum for Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE, United States Senator from the State of Iowa.

(By special messenger)

President Trovatten, of the National Association, Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, wants this writer to hand you copy of his night letter, 18th, to the members of said association—48 States. The background for said night letter was the unanimous action of said association in a special meeting held in Washington May 5, 6, and 7, there being more than 30 States present or duly represented.

President Trovatten, speaking for himself, the commissioner of agriculture from the

State of Minnesota, and for his associate members of said association, hopes you will oppose with all your might proposition to sell wheat for any purposes whatsoever below the standards now fixed by law to protect agriculture; he is confident that the sale of wheat or other farm commodities below the standards now fixed will undermine confidence and demoralize markets. He says with acute labor shortage, high wages, possibility of unfavorable climatic conditions, alone, farmers have enough production handicaps if they are to produce adequately for national defense.

C. C. HANSON, *Acting Secretary.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 18, 1942.*

Serious division threatened among farm Senators because proposed amendment to agricultural appropriation bill to permit selling surplus Government wheat at 85 percent of parity price of corn for feeding purposes. However, most agricultural Senators oppose selling surplus wheat below parity price of corn because they believe it will not only depress price of corn, wheat, and oats but will also depress the prices of hogs, cattle, milk, and cotton. Therefore, if you agree that the surplus wheat should not be sold for feeding purposes below 110 percent of parity price of corn or $1.05 per bushel, it is urgent you telegraph soon as possible on Tuesday to both your Senators; also telegraph Senator WHEELER, Senator SMITH, Senator BANKHEAD, Senator GILLETTE, Senator ELMER THOMAS urging they do all in their power to protect and maintain minimum prices established by Congress on wheat, corn, cotton, hogs, cattle, and all American commodities. Also have many friends send similar telegrams to Senators. This is in accordance with declaration adopted at special meeting, national association, Washington, May 5, 6, and 7. I am sending this telegram to all our members.

R. A. TROVATTEN,
President, National Association, Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to the subject matter which is before the Senate, namely, the amendment which has been brought in by the committee, and modified upon the floor, with respect to the disposal of certain surplus farm commodities, and the substitute amendment which was presented yesterday by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. It is my purpose to express, at least in summary form, the reasons for my belief that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, rather than the committee amendment, should be agreed to.

In general outlines, of course, the story of the committee amendment is perfectly well known to all Members of the Senate. The very lucid and eloquent address delivered yesterday by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] made clear most of the reasons why many Senators feel that the Commodity Credit Corporation should not be given the power to sell wheat in competition with corn.

When this matter was before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the agricultural appropriation bill, I suggested an amendment, which was not adopted by the committee. The amendment provided that wheat should not be sold for feed in competition with corn in such manner or at such price as to depress the market price of corn.

It seemed to me, Mr. President, that there could be no logical disagreement with that principle, that the surplus quantities of wheat gathered by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the course of the long campaign of Government policy to raise the prices of agricultural products from the depressed level should not be used to defeat the very purpose of that policy.

Of course, the question was complicated by considerations of war policy, and, as indicated in the questions which I addressed to the Senator from Iowa yesterday, there was reason to believe, in fact, we all know, that no Member of the Senate would desire to adopt a policy which would in any manner complicate the war effort.

The question therefore arises, Would the unrestricted sale of surplus commodities in any way affect the war effort? The answer to that question seems to me to be clearly and emphatically "No."

The first consideration to demonstrate the correctness of that answer is the fact that it is the considered policy of the Department of Agriculture, and of the Government generally, to increase the production of farm commodities. The Department of Agriculture has asked the corn farmers of the United States to increase their production as a part of the campaign of "food for freedom." It is proposed by the Department of Agriculture that the area devoted to the production of corn be increased from something over 87,000,000 acres to at least 92,000,000, and probably to 95,000,000 acres. I have in my hand a statement which was prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture showing the goals for all these agricultural commodities, and with respect to corn the goal is 108 percent of the 1941 acreage.

It seems to me, Mr. President, to be perfectly logical that if the Department of Agriculture wants the corn farmers of the United States to increase the number of acres devoted to the production of corn by at least 8 percent over 1941, it is only a perfectly reasonable request upon the part of the representatives of the corn farmers that the Government shall not use its surplus supply of wheat to drive down the price of corn.

There is no question that that would be the result. The committee recognized it. The action of the chairman of the subcommittee, in offering to the committee amendment the proviso that wheat shall not be sold for less than 85 percent of corn parity, is in itself an acknowledgment that the result of the proposed campaign would be to depress the price of corn, and the explanation of the proposed amendment is that it is to prevent the decrease going below 85 percent. It is argued that that is a permissible decrease in the price of corn, because, it is said, the producer of corn will be recompensed by parity payments out of the Treasury. In that very argument lies the heart of this whole problem.

The agricultural industry of America has been steadily declining for more than 50 years. In 1880, the rural population of the United States represented almost 75 percent of the total population. Today it represents less than 23 percent of the population. There has been a steady trend away from the farm. It is not a question of the last 10 years or the last 15 or the last 20; the movement has been under way for 50 years or more. Agriculture, the one industry which is still, in its greatest part, carried on by individuals, has been steadily declining. Its proportion of the national income has constantly fallen off, and the condition of individual farmers has steadily become worse.

As I pointed out during the debate on the price-control bill, following the 1940 census, the Census Bureau reported, without any relation whatsoever to this debate or the question before the Senate, that the number of farm families in the United States whose total income, including the farm commodities used on the farm, was $250 a year or less, had more than doubled during the 10-year period between 1930 and 1940. That took place in the face of the program which had been undertaken by the Congress and the Government to lift up the depressed agricultural industry.

Mr. President, when we speak of parity payments, many persons who do not understand the farm problem get the idea that parity payments constitute perfection, and that the farmer ought to be satisfied with perfection. Therefore, it is said that when Senators, such as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and all the other Senators who have constituted the so-called farm bloc—I almost used the word "greedy" in connection with it—are defending the agricultural industry and asking for parity, or 110 percent of parity; they are asking for something more than perfection. We know that that is not the fact. We know, and the records show, that the farmer, the producer, does not receive more than 50 percent of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to see the figures which the Senator from Wyoming has by which he can prove that the farmer receives 50 percent of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said the farmer does not receive more than 50 percent of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never been able to see how the farmer received anywhere near 25 percent. He receives a larger proportion of the consumer's dollar in the case of beef, I think, than in the case of almost any other commodity, but when it comes to such commodities as cotton and wheat the farmer does not get 12 percent of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia is quite correct. There is no question about that. With respect to certain commodities, such as cotton and wheat, the farmer does not get so large a percentage of the consumer's dollar. I

have before me the statistics covering all agricultural products, as prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for all the years from 1913 down to and including 1941. In 1913, according to this statement, the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar for 58 foods was 53 percent. In 1941 it was 48 percent. During all that period of years the highest figure I find is for the year 1917, when the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar was 60 percent. In all other years, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] pointed out so well yesterday when he quoted from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, the principal burden upon the consumer comes from the cost of processing and distributing. Those are factors in the agricultural problem to which we are paying little attention.

Mr. President, it is not only true that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is less than 50 percent, but it is also true that wages on the farm have during this period been constantly increasing, but, though they have been increasing upon the farm, they have not been increasing in anything like the degree in which factory wages have been increasing.

In the preparation of this table the Bureau of Agricultural Economics took the period from 1910 to 1914 as the base period representing 100 for both wages on the farm and factory wages. That is the base period for the computation of parity. Observe what the story is. Farm wage rates in the period 1910–14 stood at 100. In 1941 they stood at 154. Factory wages per employed worker, 1910–14, were 100, and for 1941 were 262.9.

We find the farmer's position to be that he is receiving less than 50 percent of the consumer's dollar, that farm wages, involving the problem of labor, are constantly increasing, but increasing at a disproportionate rate with wages in other industries, and that the farmer does not yet have parity in the market places on the commodities which are under consideration here.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Before the Senator proceeds to another phase of the discussion I wonder if I can supplement the figures to which he has just referred.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the Senator interrupts me to do that I simply wish to point out that on April 15, 1942, wheat was selling at 75 percent of parity, corn was selling at 82 percent of parity, oats were selling at 86 percent of parity, beans at 87 percent of parity, and butter fat at 93 percent of parity. In order to feed chickens it is desired to depress the price of corn, and chickens were selling on that date at 107 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I come from a cattle-growing State, a livestock State, and I am very glad to be able to say that the prices of livestock are now well above parity. Beef is 131 percent of parity, veal calves 120 percent of parity, and lambs 142 percent of parity. Of course, as I have frequently pointed out heretofore, the parity period of 1914 for the livestock industry was a particularly depressed period, but the point I am making is that, with every other element of cost steadily increasing, and the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar below 50 percent, in spite of everything the Government has done to carry out this program, he has not received parity for the commodities with which we are dealing.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I merely wanted to supplement the very illuminating argument the Senator from Wyoming is making by calling attention to the fact that the Federal Trade Commission for a 2-year period conducted a study into the share of the consumer's dollar which the farmer received, and, based on that study, made a report to the Congress in which it is shown that on the basis of 100 commodities the farmer's share was an average of 43 percent, which is well under the 50-percent figure to which the Senator has alluded.

I also wish to refer to a table to which I alluded yesterday showing the percentage of national income which was received by the farming communities over the period of years from 1909 to 1941. It shows a substantial decline in the farmers' percentage of national income. In the period from 1909 to 1918 the farm population's share of the national income ran from 16 to 18 or 19 percent, and from 1920 it has steadily declined, until in 1941 it is less than 6 percent, being 5.8 percent of the national income. There has been a steady decline in the farm population's share of the national income over that period of 25 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's figures, I take it, are based upon the receipts of the farmer, less Government subsidies.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. I will also state that the same table contains the statement by years from 1923 to 1941, with the Government subsidies, the conservation and the parity payments, added, showing that in 1941 the agricultural population received the stupendous share of 6.6 percent of the national income.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator advise me of the date of the figures he has just given of the percentage of parity at which certain farm commodities were selling?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The figures I last gave are as of April 15, 1942.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator have the percentage of parity at which pork products were sold on that date?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Hogs were sold at 123 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I correctly understand the argument of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Iowa it is to the effect that parity prices, as at present fixed, are too low. I may say that I heartily concur in that opinion. When the so-called price-fixing bill was pending before the Senate, the Senator from Wyoming offered an amendment to compel a revision of the method of computing the parity prices. He did not have a more zealous and earnest supporter of that amendment than the Senator from Georgia. If the Senator will recall, when the bill was on its final passage and his provision had been done to death in the conference room, I was one of the 13 or 14 Senators who voted against the bill in its entirety because I thought we were abandoning the one chance we had when we were dealing with the proposition of prices as an overall thing to see that the farmer was done a greater share of justice in the computation of parity. I was one of that small group which went down in the last avalanche of votes which adopted the price-control bill. Certainly I have no quarrel with that part of the Senator's argument. I heartily concur in the belief that the parity prices of practically all farm commodities today are entirely too low when they are considered in the light of the profits which accrue to producers in industry. Unfortunately this is an appropriation bill. We might differ with respect to the manner of arriving at the present parity prices, but if the Senator has any suggestion as to the way in which we can force a higher parity price, or a parity price that will be more nearly adjusted to the theory of parity, a more true parity, certainly I shall be happy to join the Senator in any effort to that end.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator has interrupted me to make that statement. I am ready to acknowledge that the farmer has never had a better or more effective champion on the floor of the Senate or in its committees than the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know of no Senator who understands the problem better than does the Senator from Georgia, or who can more effectively defend the farmer's position. He has always done so.

However, I do not rise today to argue the question of a higher parity price, because I recognize the fact that we are now involved in a very serious war. What I have said thus far has been merely by way of summary for the purposes of the RECORD, so that the argument I am now about to make will be more understandable to those who are not quite so familiar as is the Senator from Georgia with the fundamentals of the farm problem.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to have interrupted the Senator if my interruption provoked the compliment, which I deeply appreciate. However, the question of what is parity for the several commodities undoubtedly does control the proportion of the total income of the United States received by the farmers. Both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wyoming have referred to the pathetically small proportion of the total income which the farmers of the Nation receive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that anybody who has studied the farm question

knows that today the agricultural industry, so far as the producer is concerned, is in a LORE depressed state than is any other single industry in the country. The policy of the Congress to lift agriculture and the agricultural producer out of that depressed state has been wise, but it has not been completely successful. I want it understood, Mr. President, that that is why I referred to the consumer. The share which the producer receives for the commodities which the housewife buys does not exercise any substantial effect upon the cost of living. Rather, the cost of living is affected by the multiplying costs in processing and distribution costs with which, apparently, we are making no effort at this moment effectively to deal.

I wish now to address myself to the issue of subsidy or honest prices. Let not the consumers of the country believe that their costs will be reduced if we do not put agriculture on an honest price basis, because if we do not put it on an honest price basis we must follow the policy of subsidy. When the price-control bill was brought before us, and when those who sponsored the bill refused to adopt the so-called Baruch plan against inflation, the refusal was clearly made on the ground that we should not do anything to reduce agricultural prices. When the bill was presented to the House Banking and Currency Committee it called for price ceilings at 80 percent of parity; and when the House refused to agree to that proposal and the bill came to the Senate, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency was asked to permit price ceilings at 100 percent of parity, and that proposal was rejected. When the bill was reported to the Senate it contained a provision allowing the Price Administrator to subsidize the production of agricultural commodities.

The authors of that bill well understood—otherwise they would not have drafted that provision—that to cut down the prices of agricultural commodities in the market would make it essential to subsidize the production. Such a subsidy can be paid only out of the Treasury of the United States. If the consumer of agricultural products does not pay an honest price in the market, he pays it in the form of an increasing deficit of the Federal Government in the subsidization program.

Let us see what the subsidy has amounted to in the past. I have before me a table showing the payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Soil Conservation Act, and the parity programs by years, from 1933 to 1942.

It shows the payments which have been made under the Soil Conservation Act and the so-called parity payments which have been made under the authority of various appropriation bills. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payments under agricultural adjustment, agricultural conservation, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941 (preliminary)	1942 (estimated)
Cotton:										
Adjustment or conservation	$181,025,000	$115,226,000	$120,451,000	$86,884,000	$68,742,000	$142,595,000	$118,817,000	$102,564,000	$100,003,000	$88,358,000
Parity				39,771,000		123,000,000	96,193,000	95,752,000	88,045,000	
Total	181,025,000	115,226,00	120,451,000	126,655,000	68,742,000	265,595,000	215,012,000	198,316,000	188,048,000	88,358,000
Wheat:										
Adjustment or conservation [1]	93,806,000	105,554,000	114,988,000	43,389,000		50,126,000	83,941,000	47,754,000	49,759,000	62,296,000
Parity							53,614,000	55,884,000	58,061,000	78,827,000
Total	93,806,000	105,554,000	114,988,000	43,389,000		50,126,000	137,555,000	103,638,000	107,820,000	141,123,000
Corn, hogs: Adjustment		311,852,000	176,886,000							
Corn:										
Conservation [1 2]						61,048,000	89,791,000	85,956,000	88,593,000	64,264,000
Parity							60,131,000	43,826,000	47,650,000	118,327,000
Total		311,852,000	176,886,00			61,048,000	149,922,000	129,782,000	136,243,000	182,591,000
Rice:										
Adjustment or conservation			9,642,000	2,593,000	2,763,000	1,966,000	1,539,000	916,000	853,000	700,000
Parity							1,801,000	1,299,000	2,690,000	
Total			9,642,000	2,593,000	2,763,000	1,966,000	3,340,000	2,215,000	3,543,000	700,000
Tobacco:										
Adjustment or conservation	2,059,000	43,930,000	16,020,000	15,380,000	11,471,000	10,622,000	7,476,000	12,573,000	11,234,000	8,493,000
Parity									4,502,000	846,000
Total	2,059,000	43,930,000	16,020,000	15,380,000	11,471,000	10,622,000	7,476,000	12,573,000	15,736,000	9,339,000
Peanuts: Adjustment or conservation			3,713,000	1,251,000	871,000	1,217,000	625,000	464,000	1,159,000	933,000
Rye: Adjustment				203,000						
Sugar: Adjustment or conservation		59,961,000	25,288,000	5,275,000	3,629,000					
Flax: Construction				2,039,000						
Vegetables, commercial: Conservation							1,910,000	2,584,000	2,464,000	(3)
Potatoes, commercial: Conservation						6,095,000	5,632,000	5,491,000	4,692,000	4,865,000
General depleting: Conservation				202,342,000	129,926,000	77,057,000	70,502,000	68,401,000	76,881,000	
Soil building				58,456,000	81,666,000	80,734,000	103,221,000	114,830,000	130,871,000	[4]193,860,000
Range				1,810,000	8,765,000	12,188,000	12,218,000			
Naval stores				466,000	360,000	997,000	1,639,000	1,178,000	1,748,000	
Grand total	276,890,000	636,523,000	466,988,000	459,859,000	308,193,000	567,645,000	709,052,000	639,472,000	669,205,000	621,769,000
Agricultural conservation programs				420,088,000	308,193,000	444,645,000	497,311,000	442,711,000	468,257,000	423,769,000
Parity				39,771,000		123,000,000	211,742,000	196,761,000	200,948,000	198,000,000

[1] Wheat and corn included in general soil-depleting acreage under the 1936 and 1937 agricultural conservation programs.
[2] Commercial corn area only.
[3] Included in soil building.
[4] Includes soil and range building, naval stores, and insular.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps I should point to the difference between soil conservation payments and parity payments. Soil conservation is, in fact, a national program to preserve the fertility of the soil. The parity payments, however, are an out-and-out subsidy, and are made from the Treasury simply because the market prices have not been sufficient to maintain agriculture as a whole, even upon the low basis it occupied from 1910 to 1914.

Without reading all the figures, we began in 1933 with a subsidy to agriculture of $276,890,000. In 1938 the amount had increased to $567,645,000; in 1939 to $709,052,000. In 1941, last year, the subsidy payments totaled $669,205,000.

The amount carried in the bill before us is smaller than the amount provided in the measure which was passed last year, because of a reduction in parity payments which is expected this year. Why? Because the feeling now is that with the slight increase of agricultural prices from 1940–41 to 1942 it will not be necessary to delve as deeply into the Treasury for subsidies as it was in the past. But under present war conditions which prevail those in charge of price administration well know that it will be impossible to produce the agricultural commodities which we need unless the subsidy system is continued. So the issue is between a subsidy out of an empty treasury and honest prices. In such a

condition shall we clothe the Commodity Credit Corporation with the authority to sell wheat in such a manner as to depress the price of corn, when we know that to do so would mean an increase in subsidy payments out of the Treasury of the United States, which would not only increase the national deficit but also would increase the tax burden to be paid by every worker, every farmer, every professional man, and every other person in the United States?

In my opinion, there can be no question as to which of these policies is better—Government subsidies upon the one hand, or, on the other hand, honest market prices, for which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] pleaded so lucidly and effectively yesterday.

This question goes to the very fundamentals of the issue which is now wrecking the world. It is a question of independent free enterprise upon the one hand, or totalitarian government in one form or another upon the other hand. If we are to continue to support the economy of the country by subsidies out of the Federal Treasury, then we must confront the inevitable result of increasing the power of government to regiment and direct the lives of the citizens of this country.

I know that there are Government planners who would be willing to scrap the whole system of private enterprise in order that they might build anew. No one knows better than they that the best way to wreck a government or to change a system is to wreck its financial policy. So, if we place 23 percent of the people of the United States, representing the agricultural industry, permanently on the dole, we undermine the very foundations of the system to defend which we are waging war on all the seven seas.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that, confronted by this issue as we are, we should not surrender the principle which Congress has enunciated over and over and over again—the principle that the agricultural industry should be made self-sustaining. If the farmer were destroyed, such a result would do the consumers in the city no good.

Does anyone think it is idle talk for me to say that danger confronts the Nation or the farmer? In this very bill the committee brought in a provision to increase the appropriation for and to increase the amount of money to be loaned by the Farm Security Administration. What was the theory upon which the provision for that increase was suggested? The theory was that we should encourage the family-sized farm. I supported that proposal. The committee, however, cut down the amount contained in the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee eliminated from the recommended appropriation provision for the appropriation of several million dollars for the establishment of new migratory farm labor camps.

What was the reason for the refusal of the committee to permit the establishment of new migratory farm-labor camps? The reason was that the committee did not want to contribute toward the pauperization of the agricultural labor of the country. It was the opinion of the committee that men should be encouraged to obtain work in self-respecting status, in self-sustaining industry and that they should not be supported by the Government.

Here is the whole issue, Mr. President: What sort of a government do we want? What sort of a country do we want to live in? Are we willing to contribute to the building up in this country of the condition which has brought chaos to Europe—the condition of complete government control of the individual citizen?

So, Mr. President, I say to you that the principle which is involved here is the principle of free enterprise, and I do not believe that the Senate or the Congress should by its vote contribute to the depression of the agricultural industry at a time when we know that to do so is certain to increase the burden of the Federal Government in its payment of subsidies, a program which is the totalitarian program in all its evil.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am naturally very much interested in what the Senator has said with reference to the action of the committee in refusing to recommend a larger appropriation or any appropriation for migratory farm labor camps. The Senator will recall that the record disclosed that these work camps passed out of the category of being camps for migratory workers, and became places of perpetual habitation for the persons who came to them. The record also discloses that not only were they places of perpetual habitation, but they became more and more overstaffed by those who made a place of welcome and a place of continuous living for the persons who came there, rather than to encourage them to obtain permanent employment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator is quite correct. That is exactly the condition which was developed by the committee.

The point clearly brought out by the testimony, and which is clearly involved in this issue, is that with W. P. A. camps and W. P. A. appropriations being cut down, with C. C. C. camps disappearing, the only proposal for the expansion of government activity of this kind had to do with agricultural labor, because it was recognized that agriculture is the industry which is at the very bottom of the pile. The farm has been the foundation of our economy.

As I said, it is the only industry which still remains operated by individual citizens; and if we contribute to the destruction of the self-sustaining character of agriculture, by that very act we shall contribute to the destruction of the free enterprise system in America. I believe that the Senate of the United States should not do that; and for that reason I hope that when the Senate comes to vote, it will vote in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said:

Mr. President, during the hearings on the pending bill one of the witnesses who appeared was Mr. R. B. Corbett, director of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station, located at the University of Maryland. He gave some very illuminating testimony on the costs of distribution. Under his direction studies have been made of modern costs in some of the large cities. He has also made a review of some of the publications issued by the Department of Agriculture dealing with this matter.

I asked him if he would be kind enough to send me a memorandum in which he would gather some of the facts he mentioned before the committee. About a week ago he did send me such a memorandum. It is of great significance in connection with this problem. For example, it shows that, according to the study made by the United States Department of Agriculture, in 3 years while farmers received a total cash income of about $1,000,000,000 from the sale of fruit and vegetables, the consumers paid for those commodities, when delivered to them, more than two and one-half billion dollars. Other illuminating facts are stated in the memorandum. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSTS OF DISTRIBUTION

(Memorandum prepared by R. B. Corbett, Director, Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maryland)

According to a study made by the United States Department of Agriculture entitled "The Wholesale Markets for Fruits and Vegetables in 40 Cities," the farmers' cash income from the sale of fruits and vegetables in 1936 amounted to a little over $1,000,000,000. Consumers are estimated to have paid in the neighborhood of $2,500,000,000 for the fruits and vegetables for which the growers received $1,000,000,000. This means that it cost approximately $1,500,000,000 to market the billion dollars' worth of fruits and vegetables sold by farmers, or that 60 percent of the consumer's dollar spent for fruits and vegetables was used to pay the distribution costs from the farm to the consumer.

THE BALTIMORE MARKET

The value of fruits and vegetables at retail in the Baltimore market in 1938 was $31,620,533. The value of fruits and vegetables to first-hand receivers was $21,013,859. The cost of distributing fruits and vegetables was $10,606,674. The farmers received for fruits and vegetables $13,108,846, or 41 percent of the retail price. The total costs of distribution in the Baltimore market were $18,511,687. In other words, it cost $18,000,000 to distribute fruits and vegetables for which the farmers received $13,000,000.

Bulletin No. 409, of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station, entitled "Baltimore Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Markets," indicates that excessive delivery costs in the Baltimore market for fruits and vegetables amounted to approximately $500,000. These costs include the cartage charges for transferring produce from wholesale markets in Baltimore to the Camden jobbing market; the cost to farmers of delivering their produce sold through commission brokers at Marsh Market to the jobbers and canners in Baltimore; and porterage and other costs incident

to the congestion and inadequate facilities for loading and unloading at the jobbing markets.

A complete modern market in Baltimore can be constructed for a cost of approximately $1,500,000. This includes the value of the land and the cost of constructing the buildings.

THE ST. LOUIS MARKET

A study made by the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the University of Missouri of the wholesale fruit and vegetable market of St. Louis shows that in 1940, 24,000 carloads of fruits and vegetables were sold through the Third Street Market in St. Louis for $19,200,000. The total costs of operation in this market were as follows:

Selling expenses	$1,075,000
General expenses	460,000
Drayage	440,000
Credit	180,000
Special handling	85,000
Preventable spoilage	240,000
Total	2,480,000

The estimated costs of a modern market in St. Louis are as follows:

Cost of market facilities	$1,500,000
Cost of 35 acres of land	500,000
Total	2,000,000

THE NEW YORK MARKET

A study made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture of the wholesale fruit and vegetable markets of New York City indicates that for the year ending April 30, 1939, the total marketing cost of the entire quantity of 201,700 carloads of fruits and vegetables, from the time they were unloaded until they arrived at the retail outlets in New York City, amounted to $209 per carlot. This was 15 percent of the estimated retail sale value of $1,400 per carload and 26 percent of the estimated wholesale value of $800 per carload.

About three-fourths of the total receipts, or 154,367 carloads, were sold through the lower Manhattan market. The city marketing costs were considered to begin when the supplies actually reached the point where they were unloaded from the transportation agency that brought them into the city. A summary of the cost is shown in table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of estimated city wholesale marketing costs on 154,367 carloads of fruits and vegetables sold through lower Manhattan market, May 1938–April 1939*

Item	Carloads	Cost per carload	Amount
Costs at lower Manhattan market:	(*Number*)		(*1,000 dols.*)
Cartage	127,498	$33	4,181
Porterage	134,000	10	1,340
Rent for fruit and vegetable stores and offices	154,367	9	1,400
Rent for fruit and vegetable pier space (paid by railroads)	63,850	8	488
Unloading, sorting labor, and maintenance of piers (paid by railroads)	63,850	19	1,225
Margins, excluding cartage, porterage, and rent	196,046	50	9,894
Waste and deterioration due to inadequate facilities	154,367	12	1,852
Time lost by motortrucks due to inadequate facilities:			
Trucks bringing products to market	43,570	5	218
Trucks of buyers	154,367	7	1,005
Total	[1] 154,367	140	21,603

[1] These are not the totals of the carloads given in items preceding the total.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of estimated city wholesale marketing costs on 154,367 carloads of fruits and vegetables sold through lower Manhattan market, May 1938–April 1939*—Continued

Item	Carloads	Cost per carload	Amount
Costs from lower Manhattan market to metropolitan retail outlets:	(*Number*)		(*1,000 dols.*)
Cartage	136,012	$62	8,393
Margins, excluding cartage	89,347	70	6,243
Total	[1] 136,012	108	14,636
Total costs from unloading point to metropolitan retail outlets or to trucks of out-of-town buyers	[1] 154,367	235	36,239

[1] These are not the totals of the carloads given in items preceding the total.

The total cost of handling that part of the city's supplies which moved through the lower Manhattan market amounted to more than $36,000,000, of which $21,600,000 was incurred at the market. The remainder represented the cost of moving the supplies from the market to metropolitan retailers.

The cost of cartage alone within the lower Manhattan market area amounted to more than $4,000,000 a year. This charge was made for moving the supplies from the many scattered unloading points to the central market area and for other movement from one place to another within the market.

This $4,000,000 bill for intramarket cartage is one of the items on which a very material saving could be made in a modern, well-organized market. It should be observed that porterage costs amounted to $1,340,000. The unloading, sorting, labor, and maintenance of piers amounted to $1,225,000. Waste and deterioration due to inadequate facilities amounted to $1,852,000. The time lost by motortrucks due to inadequate facilities amounted to $1,223,000. Cartage costs from the lower Manhattan market to the metropolitan retail markets amounted to $8,393,000.

A better indication of the savings that would be effected through the reorganization of the lower Manhattan market is illustrated in tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of estimated annual marketing costs for fruits and vegetables sold through present lower Manhattan market, from unloading point to metropolitan retail outlets or to trucks of out-of-town buyers, and estimated costs and savings for modern markets at 3 locations*

Item	Present lower Manhattan market	A modern market in—		
		Lower Manhattan	New Jersey	Long Island
Costs at central market:				
Cartage (trucking)	$4,181,000	$1,553,000	$1,640,000	$1,622,000
Porterage	1,340,000	730,000	730,000	750,000
Unloading and maintenance of piers at present market (paid by railroads); unloading, float bridge operation and switching at modern markets	1,225,000	823,000	747,000	845,000
Waste and deterioration due to inadequate facilities	1,852,000	----------	----------	----------
Time lost by motortrucks due to inadequate facilities:				
Trucks hauling to market	218,000	0	0	0
Trucks of buyers	1,005,000	0	0	0
Total	9,821,000	3,106,000	3,117,000	3,217,000
Savings in modern markets due to proper market lay-out	----------	6,715,000	6,704,000	6,604,000
Rent (includes $488,000 at present market paid by railroads. For modern markets the amounts are the estimated costs of amortization, taxes, and administration)	1,888,000	5,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Increase or decrease in rents in modern markets [1]	----------	+3,112,000	−488,000	−488,000
Margins, excluding cartage, porterage, and rent	9,894,000	10,061,000	10,003,000	10,511,000
Increase in margins in modern markets [2]	----------	167,000	109,000	617,000
Total costs at central markets	21,603,000	18,167,000	14,520,000	15,128,000
Total savings in modern markets	----------	3,436,000	7,083,000	6,475,000
Costs from central market to metropolitan retail outlets:				
Cartage (trucking)	8,393,000	8,212,000	9,160,000	7,573,000
Margins, excluding cartage	6,243,000	5,893,000	6,015,000	4,950,000
Total	14,636,000	14,112,000	15,175,000	12,523,000
Increase or decrease from modern markets to metropolitan retail outlets [1]	----------	−524,000	+539,000	−2,113,000
Total costs from unloading points to metropolitan retail outlets or to trucks of out-of-town buyers	36,239,000	32,279,000	29,695,000	27,651,000
Indicated annual savings for modern markets compared with present market	----------	3,960,000	6,544,000	8,588,000

[1] Plus (+) or minus (−) denotes an increase or decrease over costs in present market.

[2] Margins in a central market at each location are assumed to be at the same rate for the same type of transaction as in the present market, but the totals are increased because greater quantities would be sold direct to retailers. There would then be comparable decreases in margins accruing after the produce has left the central market, because of lesser quantities handled by other dealers outside the market.

The estimated net savings resulting from a modern market in each location, compared with the present lower Manhattan market, are shown in the following tabulation:

Lower Manhattan:	
Savings in lay-out	$6,715,000
Savings from market to retailers	524,000
Total savings	7,239,000
Increase in rents	8,112,000
Increase in margins	167,000
Total increases	3,279,000
Net savings	3,960,000
New Jersey:	
Savings in lay-out	6,704,000
Savings in rent	488,000
Total savings	7,192,000
Increase in margins	109,000

New Jersey—Continued.	
Increase from market to retailers	$539,000
Total increases	648,000
Net savings	6,544,000
Long Island:	
Savings in lay-out	6,604,000
Savings in rent	488,000
Savings from market to retailers	2,113,000
Total savings	9,205,000
Increase in margins	617,000
Net savings	8,588,000

It should be observed that the net savings that would result from a modern market in lower Manhattan are $3,960,000; in the New Jersey market, $6,544,000; and in the Long Island market, $8,588,000.

Approximations of the costs of developing a complete market on reasonably priced land and of the annual expenditures for operation and amortization are as follows:

Cost of market:	
Land	$6,000,000
Buildings and facilities	8,000,000
Total	14,000,000
Annual expenditures:	
Amortization ($14,000,000 in 25 years, at 4 percent)	900,000
Management, maintenance, taxes, etc	500,000
Total	1,400,000

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to present and have printed in the RECORD a letter and certain telegrams which I have received from various States relative to the pending matter. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them, but merely ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams and letters submitted by Mr. SMITH are as follows:

AMERICAN COTTON
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Lake Providence, La., May 18, 1942.

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You may know that there is an organized campaign being made in at least some of the cotton-growing States to sell farmers on the idea that they should not oppose the President's idea of selling surplus farm commodities below parity price levels.

It is reported to me that in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana directors of Extension Service, district agents, and county agents have been instructed to sell cotton farmers the idea that to demand 110 percent of parity, or even parity prices, is unpatriotic and will stimulate inflation—in fact, that it is not in line with the duty of patriotic citizens who want to support the President in his all-out war effort.

My information does not go further than the three States mentioned; however, I am taking for granted that the purpose of this quiet campaign is an attempt to show our friends in the Senate that the cotton farmers are not supporting them in their position regarding cotton prices. They may succeed in having some telegrams and letters sent to you under the pressure that may come from official sources; however, I do not believe much progress will be made along this line. The cotton farmers are standing behind you and our other friends in the Senate who have been making the fight for us.

If any direct or more positive information comes to me, please be assured that it will be furnished you promptly.

Thanking you for your good work in the past, and with personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

N. C. WILLIAMSON,
President.

MAY 20, 1942.

Senator ELLISON SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your fight for the farmers and against proposed sale of wheat has the unqualified endorsement of the farmers of Georgia and of the Nation. The proposal to sell wheat at reduced prices is intended as entering wedge to create dissension among friends of agriculture in the Senate. If successful it would mean lower prices for all agriculture products. Every bushel of wheat not needed for food should be converted into alcohol and byproducts, especially rubber. The farmers of Georgia are in danger of total loss of many crops due to rubber shortage and truck regulations. The effort to authorize sale of wheat at reduced prices is most insidious effort to divide and conquer agriculture in this country. Now is the time for every patriotic American in the Senate to realize that the production of food crops constitutes our greatest war effort. They should realize that the effort to produce food for the Nation cannot be carried on at lower prices than those provided by ceilings fixed in price-fixing belt. The effort to reduce prices on wheat at this time amount to an effort to create still further shortage of vital foods for the Nation in its hour of peril.

This bill is being largely sponsored by a representative of the manufacturers of mixed feed. It is a part of Leon Henderson's plan to bleed the farmers white. The General Maximum Price Regulation Bulletin No. 1, dated April 28 1942, on page 5, section 9, subsection 7, exempts mixed feed for animals. The passage of the measure to sell grain lower would only result in lower prices for farmers to sell grain, demoralize agriculture generally, without any benefit to the public. Subsection 3, section 9, fixes the price on milk sold by dairymen but exempts from the price ceiling order all milk products, including butter, cheese, condensed and evaporated milk. These milk prices are fixed by a representative of Borden Milk Co. and their products are exempted from operation of the rule. It is my understanding and information that the prices on cottonseed oil, peanut oil, and soybean oil were fixed by a representative of Procter & Gamble, working for Henderson at $1 a year, while Procter & Gamble were paying him $27,000 a year. Not only the welfare of the farmer is at stake in this fight but the welfare of the entire Nation. "He who makes his country live, makes all things live, and all things living bless him, but he who lets his country die, lets all things die and all things dying curse him."

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture from Georgia.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
May 20, 1942.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised division is threatened among farm Senators account of proposed amendment to agriculture appropriation bill to permit selling of surplus Government wheat at 85 percent of parity price of corn. In my opinion this would depress the price of corn, wheat, and oats and no doubt very soon lower price of hogs, cattle, milk, and cotton. Owing to the high prices of all commodities used by farmers and the scarcity and high wages being paid farm labor this would be a grave injustice to our agricultural interests. I hope you will do all you can to protect minimum prices established by Congress on all American farm commodities.

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
May 19, 1942.

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I do not think that selling wheat below parity price of corn is fair to wheat growers or below $1.05 per bushel. I have consulted principal agricultural leaders of State and we are in accord on this.

C. C. FLANERY,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

RALEIGH, N. C., *May 19, 1942.*

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope you will vigorously oppose proposed amendment to agricultural appropriation bill to permit selling Government surplus wheat at 85-percent parity price of corn for feeding purposes. We are of opinion such action will depress not only price of corn, wheat, and oats, but also depress prices of hogs, cattle, and cotton. To maintain parity of income for farmers price of surplus wheat should not be sold below 110 percent of parity price of corn.

W. KERR SCOTT,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

AUSTIN, TEX., *May 19, 1942.*

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please oppose with all your might proposal sell surplus wheat for feeding purposes below 110-percent parity. Any amendment to recently passed agricultural legislation will undermine confidence and demoralize markets. With acute labor shortage, high wages, and unfavorable climatic conditions farmers have enough production handicaps. Farmers must have stabilization and not ever-changing legislation if they are to produce adequate crops for national defense.

Regards,

J. E. MCDONALD,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH subsequently said: Mr. President, relative to the telegrams which I sent to the desk and asked to have printed in the RECORD, I desire to call the particular attention of those who may read them to one from the State of Georgia, which adjoins my State. The telegram covers certain details with which every Member of this body should be familiar. I hope that those who read the telegrams will read the one from the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Georgia. It gives certain details, and I think it should be read by everyone who is interested in this problem and who understands something about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment on page 80, proposing to insert after the word "purposes", in line 25, the following: "*Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Rosier
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Hughes	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words before the vote is taken.

Anyone listening to the debate which has proceeded yesterday and today might get the impression that corn and wheat were the principal important crops of this country and that other crops produced are of considerably less value than corn and wheat. As a matter of fact, there are several other branches of farming which produce in value a great deal more than corn and wheat combined, that is, corn and wheat which are sold for cash. Among these other farm-production items are beef, hogs, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables, the value of any one of which amounts during the year to more than the value of the cash sales of corn and wheat combined.

I come from a State which sells for cash very little of the basic crops; in fact, almost none whatever, and our farmers receive practically no parity payments whatsoever. I think there are two erstwhile tobacco growers in the State who still receive some parity payments, but, if I remember correctly, those are the only parity payments made in Vermont.

We produce dairy products; we produce butter, which is selling for less than parity today; we produce eggs, as do all the other Northeastern States. In New England eggs are selling today for less than parity prices. We produce a large amount of fruit and a tremendous amount of fresh vegetables. On all these crops we receive no parity payments whatsoever.

Coming from a State which consumes hundreds of thousands of tons of grain, I suppose that I should be glad to have corn and wheat producers become involved in a controversy which it appears to me, would ultimately reduce the price of both corn and wheat and make it possible for our farmers to buy them for less money; but, as a matter of fact, I do not know of anything that has happened here which has distressed me more than to see the different groups of farm representatives disagreeing so thoroughly, so publicly, and in such a vital manner as they are doing here today.

The situation as I see it is this: The wheat-storage bins are filled to overflowing; there is a question whether the new wheat crop coming on can be adequately taken care of; the Commodity Credit Corporation is taking over wheat day after day. I do not know how much they have now on hand, but probably about 200,000,000 bushels, and, before they get through taking over wheat, the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the branch of the Federal Government that handles this matter, may hold as much as 300,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, may I give the Senator information on that point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Corporation now holds 360,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. That is rather more than I thought; but it is a very large amount which the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding, and it is bound to prove an embarrassment if something cannot be done with at least a part of it.

Then the Commodity Credit Corporation owns about 66,000,000 bushels of corn, and we were told yesterday that, under the law as it is now, the Federal Government can dispose of any of its wheat or any of its corn for any purpose whatsoever at any price it sees fit to charge for it; in fact, I believe the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] told us that some of the grain sold for alcohol netted the Commodity Credit Corporation only about 5 cents a bushel. That, however, we will concede was due to a bad policy of shipping into far-removed sections of the country, in some instances, and using up the value in transportation charges.

The feeding value of corn and wheat is approximately the same; that is, a farmer who is feeding grain can afford to pay about as much for a bushel of corn as he can for a bushel of wheat. The different elements contained vary somewhat, but, bushel for bushel, they are worth just about the same.

The pending bill, as amended by the committee, permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of a limited amount of wheat—125,000,000 bushels, which, I understand, includes about 25,000,000 bushels of substantially deteriorated wheat, at a price which will not be below 85 percent of the parity price for corn.

Yesterday the Senator from Oklahoma offered an amendment which appears to be substantially the same as the provision in the bill, except that it prohibits the sale of wheat at less than the parity price of corn. The present farm price of corn, according to the figures which have been sent to the Members of the Senate by the Farm Bureau Federation, is today 79.7 cents a bushel. The parity price of corn is 96.9 cents a bushel.

If the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from selling any wheat at less than the parity price of corn, it means they must charge for that wheat approximately 17 cents a bushel more than the feeders would have to pay for corn today, and inasmuch as the feeding value of corn and wheat is approximately the same, the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma would be to make it impossible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wheat for feeding purposes, because no feeder wants to pay 17 cents a bushel more for wheat than he does for corn, when the feeding value is approximately the same.

As I have stated, it disturbs me very much to see the wheat and corn growers fail to agree upon the proper wording of the bill, or the amendment. It is my belief that, should the committee amendment be defeated, the result would be a drop in the price not only of corn, but of wheat, and in the prices of other commodities as well.

In yesterday's New York Times, in two columns on the same page, I read items which I should like to read to the Senate at this time. The first is as follows:

> CHICAGO, May 18.—The controversy in the Senate as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be permitted to sell cash wheat and corn below parity prices continues to rage, but reports today that the farm bloc had split on the question resulted in turning the grain markets downward and the close was near the lowest levels of the day.

That applies not only to corn and wheat, but to rye, and I think to oats as well. All grains are today substantially lower than they were a week ago today.

In another column I read the following:

> The fear that the farm bloc rift over selling prices for wheat and corn may lead eventually to the inclusion of cotton in administration designs on agricultural price ceilings at parity was reflected yesterday in a sharp decline in the cotton market.

In other words, this difference of opinion which has arisen on the floor of the Senate has already resulted in generally falling farm prices.

It has been said by some that they prefer to wipe out all amendments if they cannot oblige the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wheat for the parity price of corn, or 17 cents a bushel more than corn is bringing today, but I do not see how that is going to help the grain prices at all, because there would be no control whatsoever over the Commodity Credit Corporation, and they could sell corn, wheat, or any other grain crop for whatever they pleased.

The amendment offered by the committee does put a floor of 85 percent of the parity price of corn, which is approximately what corn is selling for today, under both corn and 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, which the bill would authorize to be sold.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to say that today agriculture in this country is receiving an income which is very definitely not on a parity with that received by other groups. It is very necessary that those who recognize the importance of agriculture to our country shall not divide against themselves in Congress. I am very sorry that we have divided even to the extent we have. As I stated before, I come from a State which

undoubtedly would profit for a time by lower prices for both wheat and corn, but we know perfectly well that, once those who believe in the importance of American agriculture divide against themselves, or once the produce from one part of the country starts on a down grade, all the rest will soon follow, and if wheat prices are depressed too far we know that all the commodities produced in New England, in northeastern United States, will also go below the price levels we are getting in that section.

I think the committee has done the best it could. I think it has brought in a very fair compromise bill. I do not think anyone is getting everything he wants, but it seems to me it is the very best we can do under the circumstances, and I hope the Senate will support the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. What is the use of our compromising and fooling about in this matter when we have already settled the question as to the parity price? Why not leave the responsibility on the Government? The Commodity Credit Corporation could have sold the surplus of the commodity with which I am most familiar, namely, cotton at any price, but I say in all justice to those Government officials that they never sold it at below the market price. Of course, it was there as a menace, and the trade was afraid they would do it, but they never did. Why should we bring in a controversial measure when, so far as the votes of the Senate and the House are concerned, we have already established a parity on wheat and corn and cotton? Why not leave the decision with those who have the responsibility? Why are we asked to authorize them, by legislative enactment, to undo the very thing we worked for 10 years to accomplish? It is asinine. We should say, "All right, we have expressed ourselves, and if you see fit now to go out and break the market, the responsibility is on you."

A great poet has said a truth which applies to the situation now confronting us:

> I'll no say, men are villains a':
> The real, harden'd wicked,
> Wha hae nae check but human law,
> Are to a few restricked;
> But, och! mankind are unco weak
> An' little to be trusted;
> If Self the wavering balance shake,
> It's rarely right adjusted!

We try to adjust the practice as to one kind of grain, which is higher in price and more universally used than corn, but we simply cannot do it, and should not try to do it. We fix a price on wheat, and we fix a price on corn, and then we try to compromise when "self the wavering balance" is shaking. I do not believe in it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have a great deal of respect for his philosophy. I realize that there are many very wrong Federal policies in effect today; but I do not consider that the bill before us is a compromise with the wrong policies of the Government. I think the compromise is between us Members of this body who are so intensely interested in agriculture. What we are dealing with is the Government-owned corn and wheat, and the wheat has to be disposed of.

Mr. SMITH. And what the farmer has must be disposed of. Why say to the Government, "You can dispose of yours, but the farmer must stand to his guns"? What kind of reasoning is that? The Government owns a certain amount. Who is the Government? It is the Senator and I and the whole American people. In times of distress we have asked the Treasury to lend certain amounts, and they have done so. I take it we are the responsible body so far as legislation is concerned. We have said what we think is right for wheat, and what we think is right for cotton, for tobacco, and other things, and then are we to come here, because the Government happens to have a supply of a commodity on hand, and say, "Well, we wil' let you do so and so"? I am not going to join in that.

Mr. AIKEN. I say further to the Senator from South Carolina that during the 16 months I have been a Member of the Senate we have all worked together toward the same end—100-percent parity for all farm products. I shall continue to work toward that end. I should much prefer to have the farmer get 100 percent as the price for his produce, so that he would not be dependent to any extent whatsoever on Federal subsidies; but we are faced with a condition which confronts us at this moment, and I do not believe we can say to the wheat growers in the West who are producing a tremendous crop, and have no storage facilities for it, that they shall not be permitted to have storage for at least 125,000,000 bushels more, so long as that wheat, which has the same feeding value as has corn, will not be sold for less than the price for which corn is selling today.

In spite of my great admiration and respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, I still think the committee amendment is a fair compromise among ourselves. We are not compromising with the Federal Government. The Federal Government has been very wrong in many ways.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because I know he has consistently supported the agricultural program calculated to bring parity prices for all farm products. That has been the Senator's desire. I have listened to his remarks and tried to reconcile that purpose with the committee amendment which now proposes to establish a new standard and set up a new rule so far as 125,000,000 bushels of wheat are concerned. That new standard is not parity price for wheat. It has no connection at all with the parity price for wheat for which we have all been striving for years. The new standard says that at least this much wheat now—and I do not know when that figure might be enlarged—shall be sold for 85 percent of the parity price of corn. It is a brand-new standard, which was never heard of before in connection with any commodity, to fix a price upon one commodity based upon the parity price of some other commodity. That has never been done before. What is the purpose of it? Can the Senator explain it to me?

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose is to dispose of not over 125,000,000 bushels of Government wheat, which is Government owned, which is likely to embarrass the wheat growers as well as the Government if it occupies storage space; and the best way to dispose of it appears to be to sell it for feed; and in order to get rid of it at all for feeding, it has to be sold for the same price as other grains of the same feeding value.

I should be very glad to support the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] in his proposal to dispose of it for the purpose of making automobile tires, by way of producing alcohol from it, and, I believe, by way of the butadiene process. If I am correctly informed, some eighty to one hundred million bushels of wheat could be used for that purpose. I will support any move the Senator from Iowa sees fit to make in that direction, but I think in all fairness we should not prohibit the sale or the disposal of this embarrassing amount of wheat.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. If the purpose is to provide storage space for the oncoming crop, then why fix a limitation of 125,000,000 bushels, because the disposal of 125,000,000 bushels will not even begin to start to solve the problem of storage.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would start to solve it. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico what he would do with that wheat? Would the Senator destroy it?

Mr. HATCH. Not at all. I am trying to find out the purpose behind the amendment, because I cannot see any reason for it whatsoever. It does not solve the question of storage. It would not establish a floor under corn prices, as was so eloquently argued by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. Is it not going around Robin Hood's barn to establish a price based on 85 percent of the price of corn, below which the Department may not be authorized to sell 125,000,000 bushels of wheat?

Mr. AIKEN. I think if we establish this floor of 85 percent of parity, we shall establish a floor considerably higher than that we have now. As a matter of fact, at present there is absolutely no floor at all. If the amendment providing that the Department shall sell the wheat at a price 85 percent of the parity price of corn is not agreed to, the Commodity Credit Corporation can sell this wheat at 80 percent of the parity price of corn. I do not think it would do so, but it has a right to do so today. It seems to me we are making some gain toward our goal of 100 percent of parity by establishing this floor, which is 85 percent of parity.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If we want to establish a floor for corn would it not be more simple and more direct simply to say that corn shall not be sold for less than 85 percent of parity, or whatever percent might be fixed? Would not that establish a floor under corn?

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, today both the wheat growers and the corn growers have a floor of 85 percent of parity, because they can borrow 85 percent of parity on their crops. But the amendment refers to that part of the crop which is not in the hands of the producer. I do not see why the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to interfere in the slightest with the corn or the wheat growers borrowing 85 percent of parity as usual from the Government and in effect selling it at that price if they do not reclaim their grain.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to ask the Senator what he thinks the establishment of the policy of a price for wheat at 85 percent of parity price of corn is going to do to the wheat market? I am thinking now in terms of wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that the average farm price of wheat today is 99.7 cents per bushel. The parity price of corn today is 96.9 cents per bushel. There is not much difference.

Mr. HATCH. Where are those prices figured, at Chicago, or on the farms?

Mr. AIKEN. The figures I gave were given me by the American Farm Bureau Federation, and it says the prices are the farm prices. The price of wheat today on the farm is 99.7 cents, but the United States parity price is 133.5 cents. In other words, the wheat farmer is getting only the loan value of his grain today, and he will continue to get that for this year's crop. But the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to be embarrassed by this great surplus which might be used to produce some of the extra milk which we are asked to produce for our Allies, some of the extra eggs and powdered milk for which the poultry and dairymen of the United States are not receiving parity today.

They simply cannot operate on a 100-percent cost level and sell for 90 percent of the cost and get by. The sale of some of this wheat, however, would enable them to do so, by feeding a little more than otherwise would be fed.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I will say that evidently the Senator was not in the Senate Chamber awhile ago when the comparative prices as of April 15 were put into the record by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. According to those figures the prices of most of the products the Senator has mentioned, and of hogs and cattle, for which this feed is expected to be used, are far above parity, while wheat is far below parity. Yet to boost and preserve those prices it is proposed still further to reduce the price of wheat to feed to livestock which today is selling away above parity. That is the situation. None of it makes much sense to me. I am trying to find out why it is proposed to take the contemplated action.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator just said would seem to indicate that it would be good business for the wheat and corn growers to market more of their produce in the form of livestock, which is selling far above parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that no wheat can be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation at a price below wheat parity except the 125,000,000 bushels proposed to be sold for feeding purposes. Therefore any wheat which is sold for the purpose of making flour or for any purpose would have to be sold at the full wheat parity price.

Mr. HATCH. I understand that is the situation, but the amendment relates only to 125,000,000 bushels of wheat to be used for feeding purposes. The purpose is to sell that grain to feed livestock which is selling away above parity, and forcing down the wheat price, which is already under parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Most of the grain used for feeding purposes is fed to livestock on the farm where the grain is actually produced.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The pending committee amendment will permit the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at 51 cents under parity price for wheat, and at 30.7 cents under 85 percent of parity price of wheat, and at 17 cents under the price of wheat on the farm. In that connection I rose to ask the Senator a question relating to the disastrous effect of a policy of this kind, and it is in line with the question just asked by the Senator from New Mexico. I hold in my hand a letter which was just brought to my desk by a Senator who, for obvious reasons, desires not to have his name mentioned or his State mentioned. He addressed a letter to a judge, a personal friend, in his State, asking him to interview the farmers as to their attitude on this type of legislation, and I wish to read an excerpt from the letter. The letter is dated May 18, 1942. He said he had interviewed a number of farmers. I quote from the letter:

> One condition was mentioned by these men that rather opened my eyes. It is that some of the farmers have been purchasing this wheat already sent in here, much of which I am informed is a good grade, and are placing the same in their bins with no apparent attempt to conceal an intention of mixing the same with the other wheat and later selling the same along with their own product at the market price.

Wheat is being bought at 17 cents under the farm price and mixed with the farmers' own wheat with the intention of reselling it.

I quote further:

> One of the men interviewed told me of a farmer who purchased a quantity of this shipped-in wheat and later sold the same wheat to an elevator at the market. The man I talked to called attention to the fact that if many farmers should be allowed to purchase this wheat at or below parity, the above condition may generally result, with the effect that the commodity will not be used for feed at all, but will be simply resold later for the market price and be a drug on the market.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I really do not believe that many farmers would resort to that sort of practice; but if they should it would be up to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department of Justice, or whoever is in command, to see that such persons are properly penalized for violations of that sort. I understand that when grain is sold for feeding purposes, it is sold with the understanding that it shall be used for feeding purposes.

The amount authorized by the amendment is 125,000,000 bushels. Last February, during the late winter and early spring, while we were discussing and enacting legislation which was supposed to establish a minimum price on wheat and to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling so as to depress the market, it sold something like 200,000,000 bushels while we were discussing the matter That is almost twice as much as it is proposed by the committee amendment to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell. I think the amendment offers definitely more protection to the wheat and corn growers than the legislation, or lack of legislation, which we have today.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a telegram which I have just received from E. K. Dean, president of the Kansas Farmers' Union, who makes a convincing appeal for approval of the pending bill as proposed by the Senate committee. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALINA, KANS., *May 18, 1942.*

Hon. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We now have our grain elevators as full of wheat and grain as though a new crop were just stored. Materials for additional storage space are not available. Yet we have prospects for bountiful crops this year. A tremendous surplus of wheat is now on hand Must we pile wheat on the ground and thus not avail farmers of wheat loans on new crop? Corn surplus is now melted. We face possible meat rationing next year. We can't build new elevator facilities for wheat storage. Is it right to ask farmers to cut their wheat acreage in half for the next year? Must we isolate wheat from the feed market to assure corn producers 110 percent of parity? Must poultry and milk producers be held up for high-cost feed? We should increase wheat production and assure plenty of feed to produce meat and milk, thus give a fair chance to producers of wheat, meat, and milk. We are at war. We must protect the public and our Allies. We want full production and not scarcity to create fancy corn prices. Wheat farmers do not desire and cannot get along on half wheat production at parity prices. They want full production with parity price for wheat processed for bread, and fair feed prices for the remainder of their wheat production. We must face the issue that now confronts the producers of wheat, meat, and milk and the public interest in meeting our requirements of these basic foods for our World War

program. We urge you to support the Appropriation Committees' recommendation to allow the sale of 125,000,000 bushels loan wheat for feed. We urge you give your support to an increase in the appropriation for the stamp plan and the Farm Security Administration.

E. K. DEAN,
President, Kansas Farmers' Union.

GASOLINE RATIONING AND CONSERVATION OF RUBBER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes of the Senate's time. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter the original of which was sent to Secretary Ickes, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Eastman. The four original letters were signed by the five members of the Maine congressional delegation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 19, 1942.

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EASTMAN: The undersigned, Members of the Maine congressional delegation, are gravely concerned by the effects of the recently promulgated gas-rationing regulations upon our State, and especially we are disturbed because of the feeling of our people that they are not receiving that equality of treatment to which in good conscience they are entitled.

We understand that there is no shortage of fuel oil and gas. With respect to these, the problem is one of transportation and distribution and not of supply. We understand further that there is an acute shortage of rubber and of tires and other products of rubber and that the conservation of rubber is of supreme importance in our war effort. We feel that this necessity for conservation of rubber demands that there should be equal efforts and equal sacrifices to this end in all parts of our country. If a restriction upon the use of gas in New England and in Maine limits the demands upon tires and makes contribution to rubber conservation, it must be true that unrestrained use of tires in States where gas may for the time be abundant makes contribution to the wastage of tires and rubber in such areas.

We cannot justify a policy which permits and encourages unlimited wear and tear upon tires in one State and which, through the device of gas regulations, sharply limits the use of the automobile and of tires in another section.

For these reasons, we most respectfully protest against the discrimination and irreparable harm with which existing gas regulations threaten our State, our industries, and our people. We ask that the people of Maine be accorded, with respect to the use of gas, equality of opportunity and of right with the people of every other State.

We are very truly yours.

Mr. WHITE. The letter refers to the gasoline and rubber situation in the State of Maine and in the whole country. It voices the great concern which we feel about the present situation and the dark prospects of the future.

Fuel oil and gasoline are essential to Maine's industrial and domestic life. We have felt that the gravity of our situation was not appreciated by the authorities in Washington, and that the harm already done, and the greater danger impending, were not receiving the consideration they deserve.

We have been limited to 3 gallons of gasoline a week for each motorist engaged in nonessential activities. That is, roughly, equivalent to 45 miles of automobile travel a week.

Mr. President, the largest industry in my State is the tourist business. From it my State and the people thereof derive an annual income of approximately $100,000,000. That income comes to us from tourists, or those engaged in so-called nonessential motoring. The existing regulations destroy this $100,000,000 business of my State.

If this sacrifice is necessary in the war effort, and if equal burdens are borne by other States, Maine will not complain; but, Mr. President, the spirit of unity does not flourish in fields of preference or discrimination; and our people do not find in the existing plan of distribution that equality of consideration and treatment which in good conscience we are entitled to receive. So far as I can see, there is no principle which justifies according to one State a supply of oil or gasoline not accorded to another. There is no justification for excepting from the imposed restrictions the counties in one State and applying the restrictions with full vigor in all the counties of another State.

Mr. President, very practical reasons, as well as regard for principle, demand doing away with discriminations in the use of gasoline. There is no shortage of gasoline. There is a problem of transportation and distribution. There is an acute national need for rubber. Rubber is vital to our war effort. Rubber should be conserved, not alone in Maine, but everywhere throughout the Nation. It is estimated that a quarter of a million pounds of rubber are consumed each day by automobiles. This rubber should be saved in States in which gasoline is available as well as in States in which there is a shortage of gasoline.

We in Maine can find no justification for a policy which permits and encourages unlimited wear and tear upon tires in one State, through free use of automobiles, and which, through the device of gasoline regulation, sharply limits the use of automobiles and tires in another State.

We are encouraged to note that our authorities in the Nation's capital are considering the extension of gasoline regulation to all sections of our country. In such an extension there would be conservation of rubber. There would be equality of right and of burden throughout the country. That is the course which we commend to those having responsibility and charge of this matter.

TEAMWORK ON THE WISCONSIN FRONT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to consume only a few minutes of the Senate's time.

The Navy E for excellence in production has been awarded to the following Wisconsin companies and their employees:

Lakeside Bridge & Steel Co., Milwaukee; the Louis Allis Co., Milwaukee; West Bend Aluminum Co., West Bend; the Falk Corporation, Milwaukee; Harnischfeger Corporation, Milwaukee; Manitowoc Shipbuilding Co., Manitowoc; Nordberg Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee.

I understand that other Wisconsin concerns will receive the same award in the near future.

What is the significance of the award of the Navy E?

In the traditions of the United States Navy, the highest of all honors is the Navy E—coveted emblem of excellence, awarded by the Navy since 1906 for supremacy in gunnery, battle practice, or engineering.

The Navy keeps continuous records of the performance of the crew of every ship and plane in engineering and gunnery. Ships are classified by design, such as battleships, cruisers, and destroyers, and at the end of each year the crew in each class whose ship has the highest rating in engineering is given permission to paint the letter E on one of the funnels. Crews with highest ratings in gunnery paint the E on a mast or bridge. Men in an individual gun turret also can win an E for gunnery, in which case they paint the letter on the turret.

The idea behind the use of this award in the Navy was to provide recognition for excellence, and an incentive for further fine work. This same purpose now applies to the use of the Navy E within industry supplying material for the Navy.

In the words of Secretary of the Navy Knox, when he cited the first E awards,

To show our appreciation of the way American industry has gone to bat in this emergency, the Navy has decided to award the highly coveted E to the management and employees of those plants who are doing an outstanding job in the production of naval material. It's the Navy's way of saying, "Well done."

Mr. President, when the history of the great effort made by America since Pearl Harbor is written it will show how America became unified, how we "played ball" together like men on a football team, forgetting our differences and going forward under the direction of the captain. When the history of America is written much that has been said about the great industrial leaders and the industry of this Nation will have to be retracted. Industry has done a tremendous job. In my State industry and labor have cooperated in a notable way. They have done things which are hardly comprehensible to the average mind.

It was my good fortune the other day to be present at the presentation of the Navy E by Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance of the United States Navy, at the Nordberg Manufacturing Co., in Milwaukee.

Speaking on that occasion, I said:

As this Navy E award—a symbol of production excellence—is conferred upon the Nordberg Manufacturing Co. because of the excellence of management and employees, we are reminded that:

Every bank, factory, ship, farm, store, home, and every individual, is a production center in this war for survival.

Every shovel, wheel, plow; every heart and brain, belongs to the Nation in this emergency.

Hoarded dollars, miser dollars, must heed the call of the Nation. We are all in the ranks now—on the home front or on the battle front.

The price of liberty is dear, but liberty has always been worth the dearest price.

This is no time to prate about the patriotism of the fathers who fought and died and sacrificed for liberty. It is for us to demonstrate that we are not rhinestone counterfeits of a glorious ancestry.

We have been called a melting pot of nations. Under that melting pot, since Pearl Harbor, there has been kindled a sacrificial fire and the white heat of that fire will melt and fuse our American alloys, and if there are any who, by the white heat of that fire, are not fused and made pure Americans, all such must be thrown out as undesirables, as slag and dross.

Nobody knows the road ahead, but we know that God will bless America through the courage, industry, loyalty, sacrifice, and faith of our citizenry such as has been demonstrated by the management and employees of the Nordberg Manufacturing Co.

May its excellence in production in the future exceed its excellence in the past.

America thanks you, gentlemen.

Mr. President, I repeat that sentiment: America should thank all those who have laid aside their differences in order that the great objective may be achieved. That objective is to get so much production and to build such a great amount of armament for our land and sea and air forces that there will be no question about our ultimate victory.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment on page 80, by adding certain words at the end of line 25.

Mr. SMATHERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Smathers
Brooks	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Bunker	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment on page 80, by adding certain words at the end of line 25.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I think the issue should be clarified so that every Member may have an opportunity at least to know exactly the question on which we shall vote.

The amendment now submitted is not a committee amendment. It was not considered by either the committee or the subcommittee, so far as I know.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I try never to infringe on the prerogatives of the committee, but I may say that this amendment was discussed in the subcommittee, that the subcommittee went into this very question of the limitation, and that, more through inadvertence than anything else, the suggested language was left out of the bill. Because two or three members of the subcommittee had not been consulted, I did not state that the amendment was a committee amendment; and I did not discuss it with the entire membership of the Appropriations Committee; but it does bear a very close relation to the committee's action, and the subcommittee discussed the amendment and practically agreed upon it in the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I did not intend to intimate that the amendment was offered as a committee amendment. It was not offered as a committee amendment; it was not considered in the main committee. I say that because I am a member of the main committee, and it was not considered in my presence. I was not a member of the subcommittee, and of course I cannot say just what discussion was had there. I take the word of the Senator from Georgia with regard to that.

Only one matter is involved in the whole proposition, and that is whether the Senate will consent that Government wheat may be sold at 97 cents a bushel or at 82 cents a bushel. The amendment suggested would place the Senate's seal of approval on the sale of an unlimited amount of wheat at 82 cents a bushel; that is 85 percent of the parity price of corn. The parity price of corn is approximately 97 cents per bushel; and 85 percent of corn parity, or 97 cents, is 82 cents, or 51 cents below the present parity price of wheat. I am opposed to having the Senate go on record in favor of selling an unlimited amount of wheat at 51 cents a bushel less than the parity price on wheat; and that is what this amendment, if agreed to, would permit.

However, Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is such that I cannot offer to amend the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia, because that would be an amendment in the third degree. If I could do so, I would offer an amendment striking out the words "85 percent of the parity price of corn," and making it the full parity price of corn, or 97 cents. I would offer such an amendment, but under the rule I cannot do so.

We must pass upon this matter in a parliamentary way, and so, in order that the vote may come, and come speedily, and inasmuch as this matter will come up on an amendment in the nature of a substitute in just a moment, I am willing, so far as I am concerned, to permit the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to be adopted. Then I shall offer my substitute to modify it by eliminating the 85 percent and providing for full parity of corn.

I ask, Mr. President, if that will be in accord with the parliamentary practice of the body?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not making a unanimous-consent request. I am asking if the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is agreed to, as a matter of expediting the business of the Senate, then will it be in order for me to offer a substitute for a number of lines which would eliminate the provision with regard to 85 percent of the parity price for corn and provide the full parity price for corn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator can move to strike out the provision as amended and offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, in order to get the matter to a vote, if the Senator is agreeable, I shall have no objection, for the purposes I have in view, to the adoption of the amendment now before the Senate. Immediately thereafter I shall offer a substitute which, if adopted, will change the provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma will recall that I said that I desired to offer a perfecting amendment, which I think is of vital importance. I think every Member of the Senate wishes to see every bushel of this surplus grain that can possibly be used for the purpose devoted to the production of rubber and alcohol. Under the language of the House provision, grain may be used for alcohol, but it is desired to clarify the provision so that grain may be used for any type of alcohol or for rubber if a process is developed that does not require it to be first transformed into alcohol. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that before his perfecting amendment is in order, a vote should be taken on the committee amendments, namely, one in line 15, striking out the words "provisions of this act" and inserting the words "foregoing proviso"; one in line 19, striking out the word "and" and inserting the word "or"; and the amendment with reference to the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat limitation, as amended, beginning in line 23. They should be acted upon before a substitute would be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia had overlooked the fact that there were other committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now state the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 80, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "alcohol" and insert "ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I favor the amendment, and I do not wish to delay the action of the Senate on it. However, there has been considerable discussion during the debate on the question of the manufacture of alcohol and rubber from grain and other agricultural products. Some criticism has been leveled at the Department of Agriculture on the basis that the Department has not been as diligent in this matter as it might have been.

The record shows that the Department has been alert and diligent. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief excerpt from a letter which Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, wrote to Mr. Francis P. Garvan, president of the Farm Chemurgic Council, Dearborn, Mich., on May 25, 1936.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Virtually all of the specific proposals you mention are already, I am glad to say, among those that are either being actively carried on or else are being studied by this Department. I assure you that the Department will welcome and give the most careful consideration to any additional projects for industrial utilization of agricultural products that you may wish to suggest.

One of your major projects, the manufacture of fuel alcohol from corn and other agricultural products, has been the subject of considerable investigation and thought. We have favored carrying out a practical test of the possibilities on a small commercial scale, but so far the necessary funds have not been made available to the Department. We believe that such a test is the sound approach to the problem.

Mr. HILL. I ask also to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the address which Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, delivered at Peoria, Ill., on October 18, 1939, on the occasion of the opening of the Department's regional laboratory, showing his vision and determination in the matter.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What we need, if we are to get anywhere, is a continuing interest in this subject, not one that comes only when the price of corn is very low. This time we are going at the problem in a systematic way. If the problem can be solved, it will be solved, for we have the will to solve it.

But there are many more complications to the problem than I thought when I first began writing editorials about it. I was especially impressed with that fact in 1933 when Chester Davis, George Peek, Rex Tugwell, and I looked into the possibilities of a governmental project to develop the manufacture of corn alcohol. Some of the "bugs" in corn alcohol production have been worked out, but more of them need to be worked out if the project is to be a success.

The men with chemical background who will operate this laboratory tell me they do not expect to confine their motor fuel research to derivatives of corn but will also try out derivatives of wheat and agricultural byproducts and other things produced on American farms. They will experiment with various liquid fuels, including different types of alcohols and related chemical compounds. They will investigate the possibilities of solid fuels, which may include such material as pulverized corn and wheat, starch, cellulose, lignin, and carbon. The use of solid materials, of course, would necessitate studies dealing with the design of motors suitable for burning them.

There are also interesting possibilities for the economic production by various methods of gaseous motor fuels from farm products and byproducts, particularly from the standpoint of their production and use by the farmer on the farm.

The immense importance of this motor-fuel project to our national life arises from the fact that our petroleum resources are not inexhaustible. In 1928, a Government committee said these resources would run out in 7 years. Now some say they will last only until 1950, while others predict they will last about 25 years. In any event scarcity will be deeply felt long before supplies are exhausted. It seems clear that eventually some form of substitute will be needed if we are to continue as a Nation on wheels and wings, and it is not too early to seek to establish the part that agriculture may play in the supply of such replacements.

So far as the problem relates to agriculture, it is not only technical but economic. If motor fuel is to be made out of corn or other farm products in commercial quantities, then uniform supplies of these products must be available at stable prices which are reasonable to industry and at the same time fair to the producers. No industry can depend on a farm commodity which fluctuates in price from 20 cents to more than a dollar a bushel, as corn has done within the last 7 or 8 years. If the technical phases of the problem can be solved, these economic aspects would not seem to be insurmountable. Through the ever-normal granary machinery already set up, it should be possible for producers with Government aid to impound the necessary supplies of corn or other products and make them available to the motor-fuel industry in uniform amount at a uniform price, year after year.

The economic phases of the problem will be studied concurrently with the technical research. We shall study the possible competition which might result from motor fuels producible from materials other than agricultural products. We shall study also the possible effect of new motor fuels on the existing industry. No one wants to see changes so abrupt that they will be upsetting and do more harm than good. Farmers want to see improvements that will help everyone.

Mr. HILL. I ask also to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement prepared at my request by the Department of Agriculture on the matter of the Department's work in behalf of synthetic rubber production.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 the four well-known regional laboratories of the Department of Agriculture were established and directed to "conduct researches into and to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for farm commodities and products and byproducts hereof." These provisions gave the Department of Agriculture authority and funds for conducting studies relative to the production of rubber from grain if this seemed desirable. Therefore, in 1939 as soon as the first personnel of the laboratories were appointed, an elaborate program of synthetic rubber research for the Northern Laboratory at Peoria, Ill., was drawn up, based on three distinct approaches to the problem: Through grain, through farm residues, and through vegetable oils. Since the doors of this laboratory were opened in 1940 the chemists in Peoria have been carrying out this program. They have developed a new and promising process by which butylene glycol may be produced from grain. This may be in turn converted to butadiene, the basic raw material for synthetic rubber. It is anticipated that the former process will be ready for industrial exploitation within the next few months. It has been known for some time that processes existed in Russia, Poland, Germany, and Italy—countries cut off under war conditions from the sources of natural rubber—for the manufacture from alcohol of a synthetic rubber which was until recently far more expensive than natural rubber and inferior to it. It was within the last few months that the Secretary of Agriculture learned that a plant properly designed and fully engineered was under construction in this country to produce butadiene interchangeably from either synthetic or fermentation alcohol. It is alleged that complete description of this process is in the hands of the Rubber Reserve Company or the War Production Board. The allocation for the plant in question was first for 20,000 tons, and later for a total of 80,000 tons of synthetic rubber production. Only recently, therefore, has it been possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to state as he did before the Gillette committee that, "We should move ahead at once on a program of making synthetic rubber from grain by way of alcohol."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, briefly to summarize, the shortage of starch cannot be blamed on the Department of Agriculture, as good industrial processes for its production have long been known and in commercial production. The shortage of alcohol cannot be blamed on the Department of Agriculture, since the process of producing alcohol from cereal grains has been understood and stimulated for many years by the Department; but heretofore grain has not been used for the production of industrial alcohol because of economic conditions. Work on synthetic rubber was planned in the Northern Regional Research Laboratory in 1939, has been under way since 1940, and the Secretary of Agriculture at the earliest practicable time urged the production of synthetic rubber from grain by way of alcohol and butadiene.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I now offer my substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 80, line 14, after the colon, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 14 and all of lines 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,

23, 24, and 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided further,* That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity to or by the Agricultural Marketing Administration for distribution exclusively for relief purposes, nor to grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of alcohol, or commodities sold to farmers for seed, and sales of cotton required in connection with the present new uses program being carried on by the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes, but at not less than the parity price for corn."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oklahoma makes his statement, I wonder if he will bear with me if I make a suggestion? It occurred to me yesterday that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] made a very constructive suggestion in the way of possible interpretation of this amendment, if adopted, affecting the word "and" and the word "or." I suggest that the word "and" in the eighth line of the Senator's amendment be changed to "or", which will make it conform to the Russell amendment which has just been adopted. It would seem to me, as a friend of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, so far as it will go—it does not go so far as I should like to have it go—it will be very helpful if the Senator would modify his amendment by striking out "and" and inserting "or."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska yesterday of the advisability in his opinion that such a change should be made and upon the suggestion now made by the Senator from Iowa, I will be very glad to modify my offered substitute by changing the word "and" to "or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Now, Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my amendment the exact verbiage added to the provision by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] just a moment ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In other words, the Senator desires to perfect his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire to add the words offered by the Senator from Georgia to my substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to further modify his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Now, Mr. President, the issue is simplified and clarified. The provision as now in the bill authorizes the sale of an unlimited amount of Government wheat at 82 cents per bushel. My amendment would change the 82 cents per bushel to 97 cents per bushel, or to an amount equal to the full parity price of corn.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALGREN], and vote "nay."

Mr. GILLETTE (when Mr. HERRING'S name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TUNNELL (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who I understand if present would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who is absent because of illness, has a pair on this question with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING]. I am advised that if present the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—25

Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hughes	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bulow	Lee	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Willis
George	Murdock	
Gillette	O'Daniel	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Brown	Danaher
Austin	Bunker	Davis
Bailey	Byrd	Doxey
Ball	Caraway	Ellender
Bankhead	Chandler	Gerry
Barkley	Chavez	Glass
Brewster	Clark, Idaho	Green
Guffey	Maybank	Spencer
Gurney	Mead	Tobey
Hayden	Norris	Truman
Hill	Nye	Tydings
Holman	Overton	Vandenberg
Kilgore	Pepper	Wagner
La Follette	Radcliffe	Walsh
Langer	Reynolds	Wheeler
McCarran	Rosier	White
McFarland	Russell	Wiley
McNary	Schwartz	
Maloney	Smathers	

NOT VOTING—16

Barbour	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Lodge	Tunnell
Burton	Murray	Wallgren
Butler	Reed	
Downey	Shipstead	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment as amended was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the committee amendment been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Ohio will permit, there are two legislative amendments which the committee requested me to offer from the floor, and I should like to offer them at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 77, line 2, after the word "payments", it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1942 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this language has been carried in the law for the past 3 or 4 years. There are some few farmers scattered throughout the country who are working upon lands belonging to the Government. An official in one of the departments ruled that they were not entitled to payments which other farmers receive, even though they complied with all the practices followed by other farmers elsewhere in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have another amendment I wish to offer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it a committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is an amendment which the committee instructed me to offer from the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My only purpose in asking is that I think we should have a record vote on the committee amendment as finally perfected. Since we are to have a dissolution of the association of those who have been making efforts in behalf of agriculture, which has existed so long, by the defeat of the substitute of the Senator from Oklahoma, I think we should have a record vote. I am perfectly willing to have any of the perfecting amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia voted on, but I think it should be understood that there will be a final vote on the amendment as perfected.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that the amendments now being offered are amendments to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; these amendments have no relation to the matter which has just been discussed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no desire to interfere with the amendments the Senator from Georgia is now offering, but I do desire to have it understood that there will be a roll-call vote on this dissolution of the concerted farm efforts which have gone on for 10 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair has announced that the committee amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the committee amendment, which we have been discussing all day, been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed to by a vive voce vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. On that motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri requests the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Guffey
Andrews	Caraway	Gurney
Austin	Chandler	Hatch
Bailey	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Barkley	Connally	Hughes
Bilbo	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.
Bone	Davis	Kilgore
Brewster	Doxey	La Follette
Brooks	Ellender	Langer
Brown	George	Lee
Bulow	Gerry	Lucas
Bunker	Gillette	McCarran
Butler	Glass	McFarland
Byrd	Green	McKellar
McNary	Radcliffe	Truman
Maloney	Reynolds	Tunnell
Maybank	Rosier	Tydings
Mead	Russell	Vandenberg
Millikin	Schwartz	Van Nuys
Murdock	Smathers	Wagner
Norris	Smith	Walsh
Nye	Spencer	Wheeler
O'Daniel	Stewart	White
O'Mahoney	Taft	Wiley
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Pepper	Tobey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had supposed, and I do yet suppose, that the vote on the Thomas substitute was a real test of the Senate on this subject, but, in order that there may be a roll call vote on the adoption of the committee amendment, I withdraw my motion to table the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, and that we then have a yea-and-nay vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request of the Senator from Kentucky to withdraw his motion—do I have that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the right to withdraw his motion to table the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I object to it being done, nevertheless.

Mr. BARKLEY. The motion has been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, and that there be a yea-and-nay vote on the committee amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that he couple with the request a provision that we shall vote without further debate, because we have been debating the question for several days.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to do that. I assumed anyway there would not be any further debate.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram to me from M. W. Thatcher, chairman, National Farmers' Union Legislative Committee, and president, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 15, 1942.*

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We now have our grain elevators as full of wheat and grain as though a new crop were just stored. Materials for additional storage space are not available. Yet we have prospects for bountiful crops this year. A tremendous surplus of wheat is now on hand. Must we pile wheat on the ground and thus not avail farmers wheat loans on new crop? Corn surplus is now melted. We face possible meat rationing next year. We can't build new elevator facilities for wheat storage. Can any Senator say to wheat producers, "Cut your acreage in half for the next year"? Must we isolate wheat from the feed market to assure corn producers 110 percent of parity? Must poultry and milk producers be held up for high-cost feed? Must we punish consumers to make a fancy corn price? We should increase wheat production and assure plenty of feed to produce meat and milk and thus give a fair chance to producers of wheat, meat, and milk. We are at war. We must protect the public and our allies. We want full production and not scarcity to create fancy corn prices. Wheat farmers do not desire and cannot get along on half wheat production at parity prices. They want full production with parity price for wheat processed for bread, etc., and fair feed prices for the remainder of their wheat production. The Senate must face the issue of what now confronts the producers of wheat, meat, and milk, and the public interest in meeting our requirements of these basic foods for our World War program. We urge you to support the Appropriations Committee's recommendation to allow the sale of 125,000,000 bushels loan wheat for feed. Any changes should be to give more freedom of action to the President and Secretary of Agriculture. You should increase appropriations for the stamp plan and the Farm Security Administration.

Respectfully,

M. W. THATCHER,
Chairman, National Farmers Union Legislative Committee.
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Mr. STEWART. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Kentucky asked unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to table the motion made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator from Tennessee is mistaken. I have withdrawn my motion to table the motion made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to reconsider, and I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted be reconsidered, and that the Senate proceed to a yea-and-nay vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. STEWART. The inquiry I desire to make is whether the motion of the Senator from Kentucky was voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it was not.

Mr. STEWART. I understood it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I correct in understanding that the unanimous request is for the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted, and that the Senate proceed without further debate to have a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I

desire to place in the RECORD certain telegrams, and when I have obtained consent to do so I shall have no further objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a telegram from Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Georgia; a telegram from J. E. McDonald, Commissioner of Agriculture of Texas; a telegram from C. C. Flanery, commissioner of agriculture, Nashville, Tenn.; and a telegram from Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture, Baton Rouge, La.; likewise a letter from N. C. Williamson, president, American Cotton Cooperative Association, and several other telegrams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter and telegrams are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 19, 1942.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The fight by you and other Senators to defeat effort to throw wheat on the market has the united support of the farmers of Georgia and the Nation. Attempt to depress grain prices is intended as entering wedge to disrupt and disorganize friends of agriculture in Senate and to make it possible to depress prices of all commodities. Most of excess wheat in storage caused by imports. Every bushel of wheat not needed for food should be used for alcohol and byproducts, especially rubber. The farmers of Georgia now threatened with total loss of many crops account of rubber shortage and restrictions on truck movement. Price Administrator's general maximum price regulation, bulletin No. 1, dated April 28, 1942, page 5, section 9, subsection 7, exempts mixed feed from general price ceiling. Lower price of grain now would merely increase margin of profit to feed manufacturers and would not help other farmers or the consuming public.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture,
State of Georgia.

AUSTIN, TEX., *May 19, 1942.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

Please oppose with all your might proposal sell surplus wheat for feeding purposes below 110 percent parity. Any amendment to recently passed agricultural legislation will undermine confidence and demoralize markets. With acute labor shortage, high wages, and unfavorable climatic conditions, farmers have enough production handicaps. Farmers must have stabilization and not ever-changing legislation if they are to produce adequate crops for national defense.

Regards,

J. E. MCDONALD,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
May 19, 1942.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I do not think that selling wheat below parity price of corn is fair to wheat growers or below $1.05 per bushel. I have consulted principal agricultural leaders of State and we are in accord on this.

C. C. FLANERY,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
May 20, 1942.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised division is threatened among farm Senators account of proposed amendment to agriculture appropriation bill to permit selling of surplus Government wheat at 85 percent of parity price of corn. In my opinion this would depress the price of corn, wheat, and oats and no doubt very soon lower price of hogs, cattle, milk, and cotton. Owing to the high prices of all commodities used by farmers and the scarcity and high wages being paid farm labor this would be a grave injustice to our agricultural interests. I hope you will do all you can to protect minimum prices established by the Congress on all American farm commodities.

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

AMERICAN COTTON
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Lake Providence, La., May 18, 1942.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You may know that there is an organized campaign being made in at least some of the cotton-growing States to sell farmers on the idea that they should not oppose the President's idea of selling surplus farm commodities below parity price levels.

It is reported to me that in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana, directors of extension service, district agents, and county agents have been instructed to sell cotton farmers the idea that to demand 110 percent of parity, or even parity prices is unpatriotic and will stimulate inflation, in fact, that it is not in line with the duty of patriotic citizens who want to support the President in his all-out war effort.

My information does not go further than the three States mentioned, however. I am taking for granted that the purpose of this quiet campaign is an attempt to show our friends in the Senate that the cotton farmers are not supporting them in their position regarding cotton prices. They may succeed in having some telegrams and letters sent to you under the pressure that may come from official sources; however, I do not believe much progress will be made along this line. The cotton farmers are standing behind you and our other friends in the Senate who have been making the fight for us.

If any direct or more positive information comes to me please be assured that it will be furnished you promptly.

Thanking you for your good work in the past and with personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

N. C. WILLIAMSON,
President.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *May 20, 1942.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of farmers of North Dakota, urge you to oppose selling of farm commodities for less than 110 percent of parity.

MATH DAHL,
Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *May 20, 1942.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Any amendment permitting the selling of surplus wheat for feed below parity price of corn would, in my opinion, drive a wedge into the gain farm leaders have made and would be an opening which would jeopardize prices of all farm products. I trust that you will oppose this effort to disorganize farm support in Congress which would reduce prices of farm products.

J. ROY JONES,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

RALEIGH, N. C., *May 19, 1942.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

Sincerely hope you will vigorously oppose proposed amendment to agricultural appropriation bill to permit selling Government surplus wheat at 85 percent parity price of corn for feeding purposes. We are of opinion such action will depress not only price of corn, wheat, and oats, but also depress prices of hogs, cattle, and cotton. To maintain parity of income for farmers price of surplus wheat should be not sold below 110 percent of parity price of corn.

W. KERR SCOTT,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. AIKEN, who answered in the affirmative.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. A vote in favor of the committee amendment would be "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. A vote against the committee amendment naturally would be "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. What is meant by "the committee amendment"? There were half a dozen committee amendments combined in one. A number of amendments offered by the committee were finally combined into one amendment. That was approved, and a substitute amendment was offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. Now, what is the amendment of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 80, in line 15, in line 19, and in lines 23, 24, and 25, as amended by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. GEORGE. The committee amendment begins at what line?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In line 15, in line 19, and in lines 23, 24, and 25, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask for a severance of the votes on that amendment, because I do not want to be placed in the position of voting against amendments which I favor. For certain amendments I shall vote, but I do not desire to vote for the composite whole. The original agreement, as I take it, cannot now possibly apply. The original request made by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was to

combine the votes on all these amendments. There may have been separate votes taken upon various amendments, but I now ask for a severance of the vote on these amendments. If it is desired to have a record vote on all these amendments, very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry of the Senator from Georgia, if I may. There were some amendments offered to the committee amendment. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered from the floor an amendment to the committee amendment which was discussed quite at length today, and which had been discussed in the subcommittee, as I understand. That was adopted by vive voce vote. There was no request made for a roll call vote at the time that amendment was added to the committee amendment. The question now is on adopting the committee amendment as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; the recollection of the Senator from Kentucky is not correct. There were a number of amendments offered to the whole text, from line 15 on page 80, to the bottom of that page. There was a perfecting amendment offered by my colleague to include alcohol and rubber.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was a legislative amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, it is all in this section, and I want to know what we are voting on.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I recorded on this roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the roll call has started. I voted on the amendment offered by the committee, as amended, from line 15, down to the bottom of the page.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator wants to make that point, when I was on my feet he is at liberty to do so, but I know my rights here. I was on my feet propounding a parliamentary inquiry, and I demand a separate vote upon each of these amendments. I do not demand a roll call vote upon each of them. I am not concerned about that. But there are several amendments from line 15 to the bottom of page 80 upon all of which we are now called upon to vote either for or against, when some Senators may be opposed only to the last amendment offered to the general section.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Georgia that each of those amendments was voted on separately.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. And what the Senator now wants is a separate vote on each one.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly; because the Senator from Kentucky has asked for a reconsideration of the votes by which they were agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not on all the separate amendments. I asked for a reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, and that the Senate have a yea-and-nay vote upon that amendment. But there was a separate vote on each of the amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in charge of the bill, at the time it was offered; the one relating to alcohol, the one relating to rubber, the one relating to 85 percent of parity price of corn. All of them were voted on separately.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and there are other amendments which were not voted on separately. They were combined.

Mr. BARKLEY. They had to be combined or they could not be in the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator from Kentucky is wrong about it. I have been listening to every word of this debate, and I want a separate vote on each of the amendments if there is to be a reconsideration of the vote by which they were agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think there is any controversy about some of these amendments. I do not think there is any objection whatever to the amendment relating to the production of alcohol and rubber from these commodities. If I understand the situation correctly, the entire controversy revolves around the amendment as amended, which begins in line 23 on page 80.

Mr. GEORGE. I would have no objection, Mr. President, to voting separately on that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Suppose we confine the reconsideration of the vote to that amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I asked the presiding officer what the amendment embraced, and he said beginning in line 15 on page 80, and I do not want to be placed in the position of voting against amendments which I favor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Oklahoma applied only to the amendment which I offered from the floor, and if we were to consider only the committee amendment as amended, commencing in line 23, I think it would embrace the only controversial question to be decided.

Mr. GEORGE. I should be content with that. That is the purpose for which I rose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that the most essential item in this whole amendment representing the committee's action has to do with the proposal in line 19 to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or." It seems to me that the senior Senator from Georgia is certainly completely within his rights, under a specific rule of the Senate, when he says he wishes to have the question divided.

It is true that when the junior Senator from Georgia was offering these amendments yesterday, the Vice President stated that without objection the amendments would be agreed to; but the request of the junior Senator from Georgia is for consideration of the amendments as a whole. Therefore, the specific rule of the Senate applies, that any Senator who so desires may demand a division of the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator desire a division and a record vote on the amendment in line 19?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's colleague demanded a division, and was told he could not have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not responsible for any decision made by any person other than myself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am simply urging the fact that the senior Senator from Georgia is entitled to a division if he wants it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I understood my colleague, he stated that he was not interested in the amendment in line 19. Possibly, in the confusion, I misunderstood him.

Mr. GEORGE. No; my colleague correctly understood me. I am not interested in any amendment except the amendment in lines 23, 24, and 25. Several amendments were made to the body of the text from line 15 on, to which I had no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, if the Senator will yield further, I am not interested in a separate vote. The amendments have been combined in such a way that the only thing any Senator who holds the views I hold can do is to vote against the whole proposal. That is the reason I asked for a record vote, because I think this means the dissolution of the effort which a great many of us have made for 10 years in the interest of agriculture. I should like to have a record vote on the question. I am not interested in dividing the question, but I think the amendment in line 19, to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or" is the most vicious part of the whole committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma had accepted that portion of the amendment. Therefore it was not involved in the last vote to any degree whatever.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that I was not talking about what was involved in the substitute amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I am talking about what is involved in the committee amendment, as combined at the request of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator from Missouri insisting on a record vote on the amendment in line 19?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the combined committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has been insisting, on behalf of my colleague, on a division of the question; yet he is demanding a vote on the combined committee amendment. It seems to me there is some conflict.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I cannot answer as to that. I made the request for a yea-and-nay vote on the combined committee amendment. That has already been ordered by the Senate. The request of the senior Senator from

Georgia for a division of the question is something to which he will have to attend.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us see if we cannot straighten out this matter. As I understand the combined amendment, it is the committee amendment at the bottom of page 80, beginning in line 23, plus the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to that amendment. That is the combined amendment. The amendment in line 19 is entirely separate from the committee amendment as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there is no combined amendment which could be voted on which would include the change of the word "and" to the word "or" in line 19, and at the same time include the language in italics at the bottom of the page, plus the Senator's amendment. What we are now voting on is the combined amendment, as it is called, beginning in line 23, on page 80, and ending in line 25, plus the amendment which the Senator from Georgia offered to that language.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, a unanimous-consent agreement was propounded, a part of which was that this question would be voted on without debate. I think that if the Chair will state what is before the Senate, and if we have no further debate, we shall be in line with the unanimous-consent agreement, unless it is waived. The unanimous-consent agreement provided that there should be no further debate, as I recall.

Mr. GLASS. There has not been any debate. There has been only talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have a vote on this matter?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask for a statement of the amendment before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, line 23, after the word "Agriculture", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes: *Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. TUNNELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HAYDEN. Making the same announcement as before with respect to my pair, general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] is necessarily absent. He has a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has been detained at the Department of Justice on matters pertaining to Government business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] would vote "yea" if present. The Senator from Minnesota is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Kilgore	Spencer
Bunker	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McNary	Vandenberg
Chandler	Maloney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Norris	White
Doxey	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—18

Bilbo	Gillette	Millikin
Brooks	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bulow	Hughes	Smith
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Connally	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
George	McKellar	Willis

NOT VOTING—16

Barbour	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Lucas	Tunnell
Burton	Murray	Wallgren
Downey	Reed	
Herring	Shipstead	

So the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Ohio desires to call up an amendment, but I have an amendment which relates to the subject now before the Senate, and it will take only a few minutes to dispose of it, if the Senator from Ohio will be patient.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator will accept my amendment. I do not see why it should not be considered at this time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well; I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will defer to me, let me say that a few minutes ago I offered from the floor an amendment in which the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], a member of the committee, was very much interested, and which the committee approved, relating to the payment of benefits to farmers who rent lands from the Government. Has the amendment been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia was agreed to, but not the second.

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit another committee amendment, at the direction of the committee, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, in line 18, after the word "Solicitor", it is proposed to insert "including the salary of a Solicitor at $9,200 per annum, and."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment is offered under the instruction of the committee. The former Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture was a Reserve officer, and has been called into service. A new Solicitor, who has been an employee of the Department, has been appointed to take his place.

There are at least two assistant solicitors in the Department of Agriculture, one of whom is in the Rural Electrification Administration and the other in the Farm Credit Administration. Each receives a salary of $9,000 a year. The present Solicitor, being classified under the civil service, as I understand, can be paid only $8,000 a year, due to some ruling or regulation of the Civil Service Commission. The amendment which I offer is for the purpose of enabling him to receive a salary slightly larger than that received by the assistants in his office. That would be the effect of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Am I to understand that the increased salary is to apply to the man who has been called into the service?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not; it is to apply to his successor. The man who has been appointed to succeed the Solicitor, who has gone into the Army, has been under the civil service, and is allowed to draw a salary of only $8,000 a year, which is less than the salaries received by his assistants, and less than the salary which was received by the Solicitor whom he succeeded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What has been the experience of the new Solicitor? Is he classified under the civil service?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia is far from being an expert on questions pertaining to the civil service; but as the matter was presented to the committee, it was explained that because of some regulation of the Civil Service Commission, his classification was such that he could not receive the salary which the former Solicitor drew.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on page 7, in line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 77, in line 15, after the word "payments", it is proposed to insert "for the crop year 1942."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in reading the provision on page 77 authorizing parity payments, it seems to me to be at least capable of the interpretation that the Secretary is being authorized to make commitments or incur obligations to provide for full parity payments for the next 3 years. I understand that was not the purpose of the provision; and so I have suggested that it be limited to the crop year 1942.

I should like to know whether such an amendment is satisfactory to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection, so far as the subcommittee is concerned, because the bill will be in effect only for the fiscal year 1943. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], on page 77, in line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer three perfecting amendments, which I send to the desk. The first amendment is made necessary by the fact that the Senate voted an increase of $1,000,000 in the appropriations for the Forest Service for the maintenance of roads. When the Senate voted the increase of $1,000,000 in excess of the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for the maintenance of roads which have heretofore been constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps, the W. P. A., and the Forest Service, it became necessary to change three words, so that the money may be specifically devoted to that purpose, not to new construction. That is the purpose of the first amendment, and I ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, in line 11, after the word "and", it is proposed to strike out the words "a part" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "parts."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the second amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, in line 11, after the words "of the", it is proposed to strike out the word "amount", and to insert in lieu thereof the word "amounts."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the third amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, in line 12, after the word "fiscal", it is proposed to strike out "year 1942", and insert in lieu thereof "years 1942 and 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer another perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 88, in line 4, after the word "program", it is proposed to insert the following: "except for the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment is offered to apply to a prohibition contained in the language agreed to by the House relating to the purchase of lands by the Government. The amendment proposed would not permit the Department to make any new purchases of lands out of the appropriations for next year, but it would permit it to complete projects which are under way. That is the only effect of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, on page 88, in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 66, in line 17, was agreed to, in order that I may offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. May we be informed of the nature of the proposed amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will state what the amendment proposes. During the consideration of the bill it developed that the committee had failed to restore a provision for services of a cotton classing station at Charleston, S. C. The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is a member of the committee, has been very much interested in that proposal; but unfortunately it was omitted. This amendment is to provide an increase of $6,000 in the appropriation for the purpose of maintaining the station at Charleston, S. C., in which the junior Senator from South Carolina is very much interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 66, in line 17, was agreed to? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered. The clerk will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 66, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out the figures "$486,483", and to insert in lieu thereof "$492,486."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to; and, without objection, the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I now call up the notice previously given to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order that I may offer an amendment; and I ask that the amendment be read in order that the Senate may understand what the motion concerns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 81, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

Disposal of surplus commodities: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of such section 32 and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, $46,949,756, together with the budgetary reserves of the appropriations made for carrying out the provisions of such section during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. The appropriation made by this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any appropriation made by such section or any other appropriation made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such section: *Provided*, That so much of such section as prohibits the devotion to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof of any amount in excess of 25 percent of the funds available under such section shall not be applicable to amounts devoted to a stamp plan for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities from funds made available hereby and by such section and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, not in excess of 25 percent of the funds made available hereby and by such section may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof under plans other than a stamp plan.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Mississippi desired to speak first on the amendment, and that will be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the pending question on agreeing to a motion to suspend the rule, or is it on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply called up the motion to suspend the rule, and asked that the amendment which I intend to offer in case the motion should be adopted, be read for the information of the Senate. The question comes first on the motion to suspend the rule, notice of which I gave several weeks ago for the purpose of offering the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that I am bound by the rule of the committee to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not seeking to offer the amendment. Under the rules, I am simply calling up my motion to suspend the rule, in order that, if the motion shall be agreed to, the amendment may be offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to suspend the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, could not the amendment be offered so as to determine whether it will be subject to a point of order, in which case it would not be necessary to make the motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I grant that the amendment is subject to a point of order, and, therefore, I am proceeding, as provided by the rules, to call up a motion notice of which was previously given, to suspend the rule, in which case, if the rule is suspended, I intend to offer the amendment just read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, after the House of Representatives cut last year's appropriation for the support and maintenance of the Agricultural Marketing Administration with its many and ever-increasing duties and responsibilities to the poor, destitute, and unemployed, to the over 9,000,000 improperly fed and undernourished school children, to the not all too prosperous farmers, and to the "all-out war effort" in production and distribution of food to our own people, to our own soldiers, and to the citizens and soldiers in our Allied Nations in our lend-lease program, from $223,000,000 to $131,000,000, a cut of ninety-two millions, I had prepared an amendment to be offered to the Agricultural appropriation bill restoring to at least the amount appropriated to the Agricultural Marketing Administration in last year's appropriation bill.

I waited patiently and hopefully for the Senate Appropriations Committee to make the restoration without the need of my amendment. I am happy to say that my hopes were partially fulfilled by this committee, which wisely and graciously restored about one-half of the necessary and imperative amount. Since the able and distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has introduced an amendment for the same purpose, I have refrained from presenting my own amendment, and am happy to join in the fight to secure the adoption of his amendment.

In this period of our history, when it is our duty to scrutinize every Government activity in terms of its immediate contribution to the total war effort, I have no hesitancy in urging that this increase in appropriations must be made immediately. We in Congress must not be found wanting in the leadership that the country expects during this period.

I know that millions of people—farmers, public officials, and businessmen—are vitally concerned over the type of leadership we exert in this matter. I make this statement without fear of challenge and wish to lay before you my considered judgment for the immediate necessity of this action.

There is not a country in the world today that does not see the importance of food and fibers for total victory. The Axis is struggling to conquer and loot lands that have wheat, vegetables, and potatoes, livestock products, and other agricultural commodities even more desperately than it has been struggling to gain oil, minerals, and munition plants. We have a farm program—production goals—in which the Department of Agriculture assumes the responsibility for guaranteeing that we in this country shall have abundant food and fiber. This is to meet all requirements for the Military Establishments, lend-lease, exports, and our domestic consumers. We have taken on the job of seeing that our food stocks at all times shall be sufficient to meet the emergency needs both here and abroad, and that increasing production shall keep up with the absolute needs of the war.

The farmers are doing the job of producing. The Department of Agriculture has the job of helping to see that the commodities are produced, processed, shipped, and utilized in a way that will maximize the efficiency necessary for the war effort. The country knows about production goals. It understands the meaning of the term "food for freedom." Every optimistic report on achievement of the goals is hailed with more enthusiasm than a 20-percent rise in the stock market ever could produce. That is a great thing, because it means we are recognizing the real issues in the war.

These production goals are distribution goals at the same time. There is not a single request for increased production that is not worked out in terms of the need for distributing the production. Much must be produced for the United Nations and the Military Establishments, even at the cost of domestic consumption.

Much of it is to meet the expanding requirements of domestic market since the continuous high labor productivity for war can only be maintained with a thoroughly well-fed population. Some of the supplies are for reserves to meet later needs domestically or abroad, or to be prepared for emergencies that cannot be precisely determined at the present. We have a total production and distribution goal that is framed for the total war effort. That is agriculture's contribution.

How is this being achieved? First, we are telling farmers of the Nation, and every farmer in every county of the United States, what we expect him to do; and he is out in the fields every day doing that job. But he knows and we know that production job has to be backed by two things if it is to be continuous and successful. First, the farmer has got to know that he can come out all right on the job, that the price for his product will cover the cost of the job he has been assigned. Second, he has got to know that we are going to take the supplies from him and see that they are distributed. It would be a national catastrophe if, for one moment, farmers were to be left "holding the bag" after they had started the job. It would be a catastrophe to the farmers and a knockout blow for us and our Allies, since we have got to depend on the farmers doing a bigger job every day.

Congress has given the Department of Agriculture and farmers some ammunition for their war job, and it has also given them directions on carrying it out. The most important directive we have given thus far has been in the so-called Steagall bill—Public, 147. That bill provides that when we ask the farmers to do the production job and get us the supplies for distribution, the Department of Agriculture shall use all resources available to see that farmers get at least 85 percent of parity.

In the Department of Agriculture it is the Agricultural Marketing Administration that has to assume the biggest part of the job. We have done a pretty thorough job of providing funds and authority to protect the producers of the basic crops. But there is one thing we have got to remember. Dairy, poultry, and livestock products, fruits and vegetables account for about 70 percent of the total cash income of farmers. None of these is a basic crop. All of them are crops or products for which we are asking increased production and distribution.

The Agricultural Marketing Administration has major responsibility for supervising these commodities. Senators know how well it is doing the job. It is the largest buyer of agricultural products in the United States. It buys these to meet lend-lease food requirements, since practically all of the food for lend-lease is purchased by it. Incidentally, its record is the best of any of the lend-lease agencies so far as meeting the British needs is concerned and providing the major part of all shipments under lend-lease to the United Nations. It is buying and shipping to Hawaii the staples needed to guarantee the civilian population an adequate supply of food to meet any emergency. It does this job by authority of Congress which established a revolving fund for purchases maintained through the sale of commodities to the regular channels of trade in Hawaii. Aside from this, it supports prices and assures outlets through buying and distributing foodstuffs directly to needy school children and unemployed persons, and through normal trade channels under the food-stamp program. It has shipped hundreds of thousands of bales of low-grade cotton to low-income farmers who would never have had decent bedding and who make their own mattresses from the cotton goods made available by the Agricultural Marketing Administration. It is seeing that surplus milk, at least a part of it, that is not used for evaporated milk, cheese, butter, and other products, gets to needy school children for a penny a glass. It is seeing that no fruits or vegetables are allowed to go to waste. In other words, it is doing one of the biggest jobs in the world—the job of helping to bring about the production and increase and definitely assuming responsibility for seeing

that every pound of agricultural products is used to the best possible advantage. That is a big job, but no bigger than what has to be done. We cannot fail in that job.

The record is pretty clear on what is happening to agriculture. Looking at the industry as a whole, and comparing its current position with the miserable state it was in 10 years ago, agriculture is relatively prosperous. That has been the result of rising national incomes and of the strong farm programs. The Agricultural Marketing Administration's buying operations is one of the most important reasons for that strength. In addition to the nonbasic crops, representing 70 percent of agricultural income, the basic crops have been getting major support from the Agricultural Marketing Administration. Through the Agricultural Marketing Administration's mattress program alone, domestic utilization of cotton has been increased by approximately 500,000 bales in a single year. The careful experiments that the Agricultural Marketing Administration developed on the use of cotton for bale covering are now proving a life saver since the supply of burlap is reduced. The peanut industry has been put on a profitable basis, and the program for diverting peanuts to oil is now looming as one of the most hopeful means in meeting the loss of imported fats and oils.

But if the general situation is healthier, and well in line with what Congress has established to be its agricultural policy, we have also got to remember that we have given to the Agricultural Marketing Administration tremendous responsibility, and new problems are developing all the time. Some of them are not immediate but may develop in the next 12 months. Because our problem is one of maintaining an increased production of many commodities, the Agricultural Marketing Administration has to grapple with such longer-time problems. In the canning situation alone, it has to assure us and the Nation of an abundant supply of vegetables and fruits at the very time that the use of tin cans has to be curtailed. That means developing dehydration facilities, economic and sound ways of preserving foods and food values. It has to be sure that reserve stocks will meet any call of the Military Establishments. It has to attack every bottleneck, whether it be in processing or machinery, transportation or warehousing, which threatens or may threaten to prevent most effective utilization of increasing supplies of food and fiber.

In its early history it used to respond to needs as the fire department responds to a fire call. When prices went to low levels, it would rush in and try to salvage crops and farmers. But now it cannot afford, and we cannot afford, to let farmers or any commodity group get into a position where production will fall off.

For most crops, the Agricultural Marketing Administration has to see that the price situation is right when farmers are planting, and when they are planning to plant, as well as when they are harvesting and selling, if we are to be sure of obtaining the supplies which the Nation and the world expect of agriculture. As to other crops, where the production is continuous it has to work now to divert additional quantities to one outlet such as cheese, or at another time to evaporated milk. All the time it must see that increasing supplies of all these products are made available.

The new price-ceiling orders raise new problems. O. P. A.'s first commandment is that there shall be no increase in the cost of living. The Department of Agriculture's first commandment is that we shall have increased supplies of food. The Agricultural Marketing Administration has the job of seeing that the farmer is not caught in the middle, and it has to work out most of the problem of seeing that we get the increased supplies without penalizing the farmer. It can do this job, we know, but we have to give it the sinews of war for the job, namely, more money.

Yes; prices are very favorable for agriculture as a whole—just under parity for all crops, according to the latest official figures. But the Agricultural Marketing Administration has to be prepared to underwrite potato prices, which are currently strong but may be weaker without their action. We cannot be short of a crop like potatoes, from which farmers can divert to other crops fairly easily. Sweetpotatoes are bringing pretty low prices right now, 23 percent below parity, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Butterfat prices have declined recently, and the Agricultural Marketing Administration has to swing into action because the price of butterfat tells the single most important story about the production of fluid milk, evaporated milk, dry milk, butter, and cheese.

Egg prices declined markedly under the influence of greatly increased production, and the Agricultural Marketing Administration waded in and brought them back quickly. Few people think very often of the South as an important commercial egg producer. But our farmers, and mostly our little farmers, are asking hens to work for the war, and they are getting a surprisingly large production. To help, the Agricultural Marketing Administration established for the first time a program which would make it possible for farmers or groups of farmers to get together 10 cases of eggs or more and sell them in the fresh form. It organized an intensive drive for increased sale of eggs for dehydration throughout the South. As a result, the farmers have had a real chance to do a job of production and sale for the United Nations.

Fruits, vegetables, and citrus need help currently, and are getting it. The bean market is being stabilized, and beans are proving to be a fairly good substitute for meat in areas where it is hard to get meat.

Those are some of the real problems that mean the Agricultural Marketing Administration has to have the financial resources to do the job. It is true that it has received hundreds of millions of dollars under lend-lease. Let us not forget that in buying for lend-lease the Agricultural Marketing Administration can supply only the specific commodities which the United Nations need. It cannot give the protection to the other crops and products that are important to farmers and the Nation. Moreover, lend-lease buying is not feeding any hungry people in this country, even though it is a weapon on the front line among the United Nations.

To do its job on the whole agricultural front, it has been suggested by some that the Agricultural Marketing Administration receive $131,000,000. That is 30 percent of the customs revenue for the calendar year 1941, an amount which Congress has each year appropriated for its programs. Actually, that is the largest amount of money received from customs revenue for agricultural use in any year since the fiscal year 1939. But the $131,000,000 is 40 percent less than we saw fit to appropriate for the work last year, and $92,000,000 less than last year's appropriation. It is $105,000,000 less than was appropriated in the fiscal year 1941, and $75,000,000 less than was appropriated in the fiscal year 1940.

It is all right for us to say that we should have economy, but we are not economizing on the war effort. At least we had better not. The Agricultural Marketing Administration has been given a larger part of the responsibility for helping farmers do their war job. Through the Steagall bill we gave them a more definite responsibility than ever before to maintain farm prices. We are asking farmers to make shifts in production and great expansion in specific crops. I submit that job cannot be done with $131,000,000; no one expects that it can, and we must not, through our negligence, permit any failure in the job.

There is another aspect of this matter. Every dollar spent results in getting the best possible use out of food and fibers for the war effort. Lend-lease gets the bulk of it. With the help of our foods Great Britain is giving a free school lunch to about 90 percent of the school children.

I wish Senators would remember that. We have 9,000,000 children who are entitled to this service and only 6,000,000 are enjoying the service. We are furnishing the food with which England is affording free lunches to her school children. She is providing huge restaurants where workers can get good meals at low cost. Great Britain is itself spending approximately $500,000,000 on food subsidies. If we were to spend as much for our population on a per capita basis as Great Britain is spending, we would have to be spending at the rate of $1,300,000,000 a year. Great Britain does not do that spending because of generosity. It is what a nation at war has to do. We are not spending anything like that for people of this country and we do not have to. But we do have to spend more than $131,000,000. The food which does not go to lend-lease and is bought in the price-supporting effort is used for purposes in which everyone of us can have nothing but pride. This very month 6,200,000 school children in 93,000 schools—22 percent of the total enrollment of the United States—are getting food shipped by the Agricultural Marketing Administration

for a free school-lunch program. In my judgment, we ought to reach more school children. To make democracy work a free school lunch can do as much as free textbooks, if not more, and it costs us less than $1 a month per child.

Millions of pounds of food and fiber products are being received by needy unemployed people. I am proud of the fact that we are giving 198,000 people in families in the State of Mississippi extra food to provide them increased strength and to maintain their morale. I am proud of the fact that 324,000 children in my State alone are getting free school lunches. One of the most remarkable things we have ever done has been to see that nearly 8,000,000 people in families everywhere in the United States receive some of that extra food that we are purchasing to help farmers. There is not a State in the Union—in fact, even in the Territories of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Hawaii—which has not benefited through the fact that more than 6,000,000 children get that food and more than 8,000,000 persons in families are thus assisted.

I know many people think that unemployment is gone, and that there are no longer any needy people. But here are some facts. There are in the United States today—May 1942—between nine and ten million people receiving public assistance and about one and five-tenths million who are eligible to receive it but not getting it. Most of these are dependent children, aged, blind, and physically unfit. A number represent people whose efficiency can be brought up or who are temporarily in need of public assistance because of unemployment. Sometimes industries in their regions have not felt the war boom, or there have been severe dislocations in converting industry to war needs. We are all grateful that the number of needy unemployed and their dependents has gone down from a peak of more than 25,000,000 in 1933 to over 10,000,000 now, and we hope for a further decline. But the ugly fact is that we do have nearly 10,000,000 people who are inadequately fed. I regret to say that in my own State there are people trying to get by with food expenditures of less than 2½ cents per person per meal, and I know the same condition exists in many other States of the South. Even in the more prosperous northern cities there are millions who are trying to get by today on 5 cents a person per meal. We can all regret it, but we cannot deny it. And we better not let this situation exist without doing something about it.

The Agricultural Marketing Administration cannot do a job on the human side of seeing that in this war period our people are decently fed if we give them substantially smaller sums of money than last year. These needy people must be rehabilitated. That is part of the job of making democracy work. It is part of the war effort of making people able to perform useful services. These school children have to be sure of having healthy bodies and minds. They have to be in condition to serve their country, and food for growing children is the best medicine that exists.

We gave free school lunches this year to over 6,000,000 undernourished school children of America, but there are over 3,000,000 more who need these lunches. Vote this comparatively small increase, and we will be able to furnish free school lunches to 9,000,000 needy and undernourished children, instead of 6,000,000, and extend the food stamp plan to part of the 1,500 counties in the United States which are now asking for it and cannot get the service.

We have watched many countries fall while we were getting strength. In each good excuses were offered at the time, excuses which they could make to themselves and to others. We know that none of those excuses were good enough. "Too late and too little" was the real trouble every time. That must not happen here, and it will not happen here if we go all the way and do our full duty. Therefore, let me urge the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered, if its consideration be permitted by suspension of the rule, would appropriate for the disposal of surplus commodities and their distribution to needy persons the same sum that was appropriated by Congress for the fiscal year which is now drawing to a close. It is true that the Bureau of the Budget impounded some of the funds which Congress appropriated in the agricultural appropriation bill and in the relief act of last year, so that the reappropriation of such impounded balances for last year and the two preceding fiscal years will provide within about $14,449,756 of what was actually spent by the Surplus Marketing Administration. But the amendment which I have offered would, in addition to the amendment made available by the committee for the reappropriation of the unexpended and impounded balances, provide the same amount of dollar appropriations that were provided by the Congress last year.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the need for this money is more than adequately justified. In the first place, let me point out to my colleagues that defense and war expenditures and the distribution of war contracts have indeed been very spotty; in fact, they have been concentrated, indeed, overly concentrated, in my opinion, with the net result that certain industrial areas have been swamped with war contracts and war work, whereas other areas of the country have received practically no economic stimulus from the distribution of such contracts and work.

Furthermore, I think many of the authorities in Washington are not now aware of the terrific impact which the necessary orders now being issued by the O. P. A. and by the W. P. B., to prevent further utilization of commodities for manufacture for civilian purposes, have already had and will continue to have during the coming fiscal year upon the cities, towns, and villages of the United States. In fact, the impact of the conversion to war effort and of denying manufacturing and business concerns the opportunity to produce and sell the usual civilian commodities is already beginning to have its effect. Stores all over the United States are beginning to find their inventories depleted. The prospective order rationing gasoline all over the United States, if it goes into effect, will close filling station after filling station, and will throw more and more people out of work, for it is a well-known fact that those who are employed in the so-called service industries cannot, without retraining, be made available for actual work in the manufacture and production of war materials.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that despite the fact that this program has perhaps had general and universal support by persons of all points of view and in all walks of life, it has never attained the objective which those who conceived it had in mind. Last year, it is estimated, there were in the United States about 28,000,000 school children. A conservative estimate is that 9,000,000 of those 28,000,000 school children came from families in the very low income groups. Nevertheless, with the funds available last year only four and a half million children received the supplemental school lunch which is provided by the Surplus Marketing Administration. There were about 11,700,000 persons last year eligible for distribution under the stamp plan, and yet only from three and a half million to four million persons were able to take advantage of that program.

During the last year, 1941, a relatively prosperous year as recent years go, more than 10,700,000 persons were living in family units which received less than $500 a year income, and more than 23,500,000 persons were living in family units with incomes of less than $750 per annum. These figures are the recent estimates made by the Office of Price Administration. The expenditures for food in the low-income families, those with incomes under $1,000 a year, were grossly inadequate measured by any proper nutritional standards. Although expenditures for food constitute a larger percentage of income received, the average expenditures for food per family in the income classes under $1,000 was less than one-half of the family expenditures for food in the $2,500-income class, and less than one-fourth the average expenditures in the $10,000-income class. In other words, 2,315,000 families in the United States last year had incomes which permitted them to spend only 5.2 cents per person per meal for food. A large proportion of these, with the help of the Surplus Marketing Administration, were able actually to secure the food equivalent of 7.8 cents per person per meal.

Mr. President, in the light of these startling, and what I contend to be shocking figures, in the face of the ability of this country to produce food, is it any wonder that General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, has pointed out that perhaps one-third of the men who were originally rejected by the Selective Service were rejected because of defects directly or indirectly due to nutritional deficiency? I may remind my colleagues that 40 percent of the flower of the young manhood of this Nation originally called up for selection was rejected because of physical or other deficiencies, and the

man at the head of this Service has stated that more than one-third of the rejections were due either directly or indirectly to malnutrition or to nutritional deficiencies.

Mr. President, the Surgeon General of the United States has stated that the school-lunch program is the most basically helpful step which has been taken by this Nation in improving the health of the people.

I am sure I share with everyone within the sound of my voice the fervent hope that the war in which we are now engaged may be quickly and speedily won, but I think it would be a great mistake, in shaping the policies of this Nation during the war, to proceed upon any other assumption than that it may prove to be a long one. If, by the grace of God, we are permitted to win it quickly, we can soon alter the plans which have been projected for its conduct into the future, but if, perchance, it should prove to be a long war, we will indeed be glad and will bless the day when we predicated the policies of this Nation upon the assumption that it would be a long war.

Mr. President, the young men to whom we will have to look, the classes of 1944, of 1945, and of 1946, perchance, are at the very age when, if we can provide them with additional nutrition, additional food, we can prevent to a considerable degree the cruel and shocking deficiency which has been so completely demonstrated to exist by the selective service experience thus far had.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that from the standpoint of agriculture, despite the fact that we are making huge appropriations and purchases for lend-lease purposes and for the armed forces of the United States, the war needs and Government requests for increased production will have the effect of unbalancing the supply of specific commodities, which will bring about unusual marketing conditions, which, even though but temporary, can be met only by such machinery as that provided by the Surplus Marketing Administration. Unusual marketing conditions will continually arise while agriculture passes through this change of production in order to meet the varying demands of our Nation and of the other United Nations.

Mr. President, everyone who is watching the progress of America's war effort must know that domestic and foreign transportation is the next bottleneck, the next problem to confront the people and the leadership of this Nation. I have information from what I believe to be trustworthy sources that already there is on hand lend-lease food material for which no speedy and rapid transportation is available, and some of it is already deteriorating because of overlong storage. Yet there are not funds available to utilize this material for distribution to people who are living below any decent standard of nutrition, who are living on 5.2 cents per meal per person at this very hour.

Mr. President, I say that, in the light of the astronomical sums which Congress has voted for purposes of war, it would indeed be a mistaken policy and a false economy, it would be swallowing the camel and straining at the gnat, to refuse to provide the means designed to help the underprivileged and to make the young manhood and young womanhood of the Nation better equipped to meet the exigencies of war and of the post-war period.

Mr. President, for no invidious purpose I wish to point out that Congress has appropriated literally billions of dollars for lend-lease purposes, and many hundred million—in fact, several billion dollars—have already been spent for that purpose. I do not object to that policy, but I say that much of it is being utilized today to provide a school lunch for every child in England, regardless of the economic status of the home from which the child comes. That decision, I am sure, is predicated upon a sound policy for the conduct of the war from the standpoint of Great Britain, but, Mr. President, if we can appropriate money for that purpose, then I say that indeed it would be a niggardly Congress which would refuse to provide at least a portion of the children of this country who are underprivileged with a supplemental meal which would bring their dietary standard to such a point that if the Nation needs them it will not have to reject them because of malnutrition and the deficiencies created thereby.

So, Mr. President, not wishing longer to detain the Senate, admitting frankly that the committee has already provided these impounded balances, and that it will provide within $14,449,756 of what was spent last year, I plead with my colleagues in the Senate, in the name of the oncoming generation, in the name of the youth of America upon whom we shall have to depend if this war lasts long, as I fear it will—in their name I plead with my colleagues who have placed the official stamp of approval upon the appropriation of billions upon billions of dollars, to suspend the rule, and to appropriate $46,947,000 for the children and the underprivileged of America.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all of us have been tremendously interested in this item of appropriation for some years. I can readily appreciate the feelings of the Senator from Wisconsin which prompted him to make his very eloquent address advocating an increase of approximately $47,000,000 in this appropriation. We think that the committee has dealt very generously with the item.

As the bill came from the House it contained an appropriation of $131,429,833. The committee went into this item because it did not desire to see the school-lunch program curtailed. To avoid any possibility that anything might be done which would curtail, impair, or slow down the program of providing lunches for school children we reappropriated unexpended balances which had been available in years past, amounting to $44,500,000. Bear in mind that that amount of appropriation is not only above the amount provided by the House, but it is over and above the Budget estimates.

Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin were to prevail, it would increase the total amount of the appropriation by approximately $47,000,000; but, in my judgment, it would not result in the expenditure of any considerable amount of money, because the amount would be almost as much as the Surplus Marketing Administration has spent during the current year. Due to the fact that the Budget impounded thirty-seven and one-half million dollars of the funds appropriated last year, when the Congress exceeded the Budget estimates by $127,000,000 or $128,000,000, the amount which is provided in the committee amendment is within $9,000,000 of the total which will be expended by the Surplus Marketing Administration during the current year.

We are all interested in this program. In the committee report the committee pointed out that—

> In reappropriating these unexpended balances, the committee expects the school-lunch program to be maintained at all events, and hopes that a larger amount of milk will be used.

We were told by the representatives of the Surplus Marketing Administration that if the unexpended balances were approved by the House and made available they would be able to maintain the school-lunch program.

In all fairness, I do not believe that at this time we can justify increasing the appropriations for the so-called stamp plan, or for the distribution of surplus commodities. Today thousands of people who have been beneficiaries of the food-stamp program have employment in war industries and are earning more money than they have ever earned before. Almost any man in the Nation today who is mentally and physically sound can obtain a job of some kind, somewhere—if not in industry or on public works, certainly on the farm.

The amount in the bill will allow for the food-stamp plan within a few million dollars of the amount which is available this year. The only persons who are justified in receiving any considerable number of food stamps are those who are physically or mentally incapacitated from earning their livelihood.

We have all been sympathetic to this program. The committee which reports the bill to the Senate has nursed the program along from year to year and has consistently increased the appropriation above the Budget estimates and above the figures provided in House bills. We have done so this year by increasing the Budget estimate by $44,500,000. Certainly, when we view the condition of the Nation today, we cannot justify appropriating larger amounts under present conditions. We have provided for the school-lunch program in all events; and with the decrease which conditions have brought about in the number of recipients of the benefits of the food-stamp program, ample funds have been provided for the administration of this activity for next year.

I hope the rule will not be suspended.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator makes the statement that the appropriation provided for in the bill is adequate to take care of free school lunches. The Senator does not mean to say, does he, that

provision is made to take care of all the school children who are entitled to free school lunches? This year we had 6,200,000, and the survey shows that between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 children are entitled to this relief.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my information that unless there is undue extravagance in the food-stamp plan and in distributing surplus commodities, we should be able to provide for nearly ten and a half million children in the school-lunch program by means of the funds already provided in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BILBO. That is not my understanding. A sad commentary on the Senator's position is that under the lease-lend program the Agricultural Marketing Administration does the buying of foods for England. We are putting up the money and shipping to England food produced in America. England is providing free lunches for 90 percent of her school children, and the United States is footing the bill, paying its own bills, and taking care of only 22 percent of our children. I do not think that is exactly right. I do not see how the Senator could resist a small increase in this appropriation to guarantee that every child in America who is undernourished shall have an opportunity to obtain free school lunches. If we can let the Agricultural Marketing Administration have the money, we can take care of a greater percentage of our children. We do not hope to reach 90 percent of them, as does England, but we can reach a decent percentage of our underfed children if we have adequate appropriations.

As to the food-stamp plan, it has been my experience that the food-stamp plan is the most popular service of the New Deal. It is not only good for the poor people to whom the surplus commodities are supposed to be distributed, but it is good for the businessman, because the program is conducted through the stores, and there is not the waste which there was under the old system, under which surplus commodities were distributed by an administrative agent of the W. P. A. or of some other Government agency.

There are 3,000 counties in the United States, and because of the inadequacy of the fund only about 1,500 counties have been recognized in the food-stamp program. A thousand counties in the United States are pleading for this service. It cannot be given to them because the Agricultural Marketing Administration has not had adequate funds to give the people of the United States this service, which is the best service the New Deal has furnished so far.

Mr. RUSSELL. That might be a question of opinion.

Mr. BILBO. It is not a question of opinion. It is a statement of fact. The Senator knows how many counties there are in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. There are 3,000. The Senator knows how many we are now serving.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that.

Mr. BILBO. We are now serving 1,500.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are a great many counties in the United States in which I do not feel we would be at all justified in establishing the food-stamp plan at this time.

Mr. BILBO. There are not 1,500 of them. There may be four or five hundred counties which do not need this service and would not have it; but at least a thousand counties have not had an opportunity to obtain the service because we have not provided adequate funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Mississippi knows, because he has studied the question, that it is not exactly a fair picture to break the program down by counties. I am talking about the number of people served. Almost every populous city in the United States now has the food-stamp plan.

Mr. BILBO. What percentage of the population is now served?

Mr. RUSSELL. I forget the exact figures, but approximately 63 percent of the people of the United States are now served by the food-stamp plan.

Mr. BILBO. I am sure that is not a sufficient percentage of the population to constitute a fair and equitable distribution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Where the food-stamp plan is not in operation, surplus commodities are distributed.

Mr. BILBO. The most wasteful way of handling surplus commodities for distribution to the needy people of the country is through the Surplus Commodity Administration. The plan has been a failure in almost every instance in which it has been so handled. The food-stamp plan is popular because there is no waste in it. It does not work an injustice to the small merchants. Under our present regulation of prices, and so forth, the small business men have been catching hell. They have been put out of business; but the food-stamp plan gives them a "break." The direct distribution of commodities has certainly been a great detriment to the small business men of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have been an ardent advocate of the food-stamp plan, but I doubt very seriously whether in this day, with conditions in the country as they are, we can justify increasing this appropriation by $46,000,000 in order to expand the food-stamp plan. The unemployment we have today is due to lack of local work available in the places in which the unemployed persons live rather than to any lack of work of all kinds throughout the Nation. There is work of some kind to be done by any man who is physically and mentally able to perform a job.

I do not think we should suspend the rule and increase the appropriation by $46,000,000. If we should do so, and if the Department were to spend all the appropriation, it would mean that we would increase the funds for 1943 by $37,500,000 in excess of what was expended in 1942. I do not think we can justify the spending of money in that way.

Mr. BILBO. I do not think we should become alarmed——

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, let me say that a short time ago I made a statement regarding the number of children who could be serviced under the school-lunch program. We might as well be realistic about it. I have visited a great number of school houses in my State, and I know the impossibility of segregating children who are able to pay for their lunches from those who are not able to pay for them. As a matter of fact, no real effort is made to do so; and I do not think any should be made. I am perfectly willing to go along with the program and agree that when surplus commodities are available the Government shall furnish them to the State, the State shall furnish them to the schools, and the schools shall supply free lunches to the school children; but we have provided in the Budget for school lunches—which is the item under which the direct distribution of surplus commodities is found—an increase of $19,221,000 over the amount in the original 1942 estimate by reappropriating unexpended balances. The Surplus Marketing Administration can greatly expand the operations of the school-lunch program. There is no question about that. The committee in its report has instructed it to go ahead with the school-lunch program.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I dislike to take issue with my good friend the Senator from Georgia, who has always been fair. I know that he is sincere in his contention, and I appreciate his attitude, even in this matter. He is standing by his committee, and that is quite all right. However, does not the Senator think that if England can provide free lunches for 90 percent of her school children the United States, as wealthy as we say we are, when we are footing the bill and furnishing food for England, can afford to do a little better than provide free lunches for 22 percent of our children?

That is the point I am making. If we were asking for an increased appropriation, there might be some merit in the Senator's contention; but we are not asking for an increased appropriation. We ask only that the same amount which was appropriated last year be provided to the Department, not only for free lunches to be given to children—a program which should be doubled, of course—but also for food stamps. The appropriation should be made sufficiently large so that food stamps may be made available to all communities in the country, some of which have been neglected and discriminated against because some counties have not availed themselves of the program. Some receive the benefits of the program and some do not.

The milk program also should be expanded. That is the program under which we provide milk to school children for a penny a bottle. In addition, we would proceed with the mattress-making program, under which mattresses have been furnished the underprivileged people of the South. Last year 500,000 bales of cotton were consumed in making mattresses for people who had been sleeping on shucks, or sleeping on the floor on pallets. The Senator knows what that means. We should proceed with the program to furnish decent beds to the tenant farmers and poor people of the South.

Here and there throughout the country we have had bumper crops of pears,

apples, cabbage, and so forth, at times when market conditions have not been favorable, and when the market has been glutted. It is the function of this service to rush in and buy up such surpluses in order to protect the producers and the prices for those crops, when the producers cannot realize even the cost of production. Although this agency has done a fine job, if it had more funds, it could double its activities and could double the services furnished the people. The money thus spent would be spent to better advantage than any other money spent by the Government. Why quibble over $44,000,000 when we are going to serve the whole people of the United States, and when we have voted $20,000,000,000 or $30,000,000,000 without blinking an eye?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator does not insist that we can double the activities of the Surplus Marketing Administration by providing the proposed increased appropriation, does he?

Mr. BILBO. I do not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Senator to say that the appropriation he proposes would double its activities.

Mr. BILBO. No; I say that its activities should be doubled, and that this year we should give it more money than we gave it last year. The Bureau of the Budget took part of its money away, and thus crippled its ability to do good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hughes	Rosier
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Brown	La Follette	Schwartz
Bulow	Langer	Smith
Bunker	Lee	Spencer
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Doxey	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Norris	White
Gerry	Nye	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NYE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If the Senator from Maryland were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent attending to public matters.

Mr. HAYDEN. Making the same announcement as to my pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I am advised that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and vote "nay." I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], which I transfer to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who, I am informed, if present and voting would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—20

Aiken	Capper	Ellender
Bilbo	Danaher	Hughes
Bulow	Doxey	La Follette
Langer	Murdock	Tobey
Lee	Norris	Tunnell
McNary	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Mead	Pepper	

NAYS—48

Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reynolds
Ball	Hatch	Rosier
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Kilgore	Spencer
Bunker	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Walsh
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Willis

NOT VOTING—28

Austin	Glass	Shipstead
Barbour	Green	Smathers
Bone	Guffey	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Herring	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Butler	Lodge	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Murray	Wiley
Davis	Nye	
Downey	Reed	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's motion to suspend the rule was not agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, certain proposed reciprocal trade agreements between this country and the Republic of Mexico have been pending before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Some of us who are interested in the American livestock industry have taken steps to express our views to the Committee seeking information on this subject. Some days ago, I submitted my views in writing to the Committee in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of transmittal, together with my statement, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 19, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,
Tariff Commission Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg leave to file with your honorable Committee my views as to pending supplemental trade agreements with Mexico, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

My kind personal regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

[Enclosure.]

SUPPLEMENTAL TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

The people in my State and throughout the Southwest are greatly concerned over the proposal to negotiate a supplemental trade agreement at this time with Mexico. It appears to be designed largely for the benefit of producers in Mexico.

The list of items proposed for consideration is a comprehensive one, including, as it does, live animals, and many other food products and commodities. In most instances it is already known that we have on hand large quantities of the items mentioned, some of which are having a depressing effect on the market prices to our own producers.

Since others appearing here have already or will discuss the many items being considered, I desire to direct my remarks to live cattle and other livestock products, which

constitute one of principal sources of livelihood and income of our people.

Before proceeding I want to say that the stockmen and farmers in my part of the country and I believe everywhere, have proven that they are good neighbors, so we do not need to dwell on that phase of the question. They have and will continue to contribute to the economic welfare of the people of Mexico. As always, they are willing to help work out measures mutually beneficial for establishing and maintaining cordial relations with their neighbors.

The proposal to reduce further the tariff duties on live cattle and the many other commodities greatly disturbs my people. They believe that the time has passed for making further concessions for the benefit of producers in other countries. They believe that if further concessions are made and existing tariff rates reduced still further, it will undoubtedly result in an increased flood of live cattle and other farm commodities which would enter into direct competition with our own producers and supplant consumption of domestic products to the extent of such imports. The effect of bringing in these cheaper products from Mexico would further depress market prices and burden our producers at a time when there is some chance of some degree of recovery from a decade of ruinously low prices. It is also doubtful that our consumers would receive any material benefit from these cheaper products.

My opposition to any further reduction in tariff duties on cattle, sheep, and other farm commodities is largely summarized under the following headings:

1. Mexico needs the beef and most of the other food products produced for the proper nourishment of her own people. Furthermore, we do not need it and do not want it, as much of it is of a class and grade which we have in abundance.

2. The economic position of the American stockmen and farmers is such that they are unable to withstand further sacrifices for the benefit of producers in other countries. To give over the home market to other countries robs our people of their chance to meet the huge financial and other obligations devolving upon them.

3. Our producers want to maintain, if possible, the American standard and the good health of their herds and flocks. Our stockmen are apprehensive for fear of infectious livestock diseases and pests from imports of live animals from other countries.

4. If it is necessary to extend further aid to producers in other countries, some other means of doing so should be employed so that the burden will fall more evenly upon all our people. Stockmen and farmers insist that through lend-lease or some other medium such aid as necessary be extended so that the burden will be borne by all of our citizens.

It should be remembered that our own farmers and stockmen have gone through a most unfavorable economic period for almost two decades. During the last 10 years they have been in a serious economic plight in many sections, huge sums of money having been appropriated in an effort to save them from bankruptcy and ruin.

Unless farmers and stockmen can be assured of the home market for disposing of their livestock and other farm commodities, with reasonable protection for the American standards which they help to maintain, it will not only be impossible for them to supply all of the products we need and the increasing demands of other countries, not because of any unwillingness to do their part but because of their financial inability to carry on under existing conditions.

It must be remembered that it requires years to grow into the cattle business. It requires years to bring cattle to marketable age and finish.

According to the figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, we had on hand January 1, 1942, the numbers of meat animals indicated in the following table, the farm value of the cattle alone being more than $3,000,000,000:

Class of livestock	Average, 1931–40	1940	1941	1942
Cattle	67,575,000	68,197,000	71,461,000	74,607,000
Sheep	52,281,000	52,399,000	54,283,000	55,979,000
Hogs	51,566,000	61,115,000	54,256,000	60,526,000

It will be observed that livestock production in this country is on an upward cycle. Any action taken now which will depreciate the value of livestock on hand and impair the huge investment that is involved would be most unfair to our producers and should not be contemplated.

In the past, it has been argued by some, that a larger market outlet is needed for manufactured commodities. With wartime needs and consequent restrictions for most of them, this argument is hardly applicable at this time.

When the argument for pursuing the announced policy is analyzed, it is apparent that the principal reasons for granting further concessions to Mexico at this time is principally to help Mexican producers. When it is known that the effect will be detrimental to our own producers, certainly great care will be exercised in selecting the items for reduction in tariff duty. In doing this it should be remembered that, on the average, it costs only about 40 percent as much to produce cattle, for example, in Mexico as it does in this country.

Some have put forth the argument that the number of cattle or amount of other commodities to be brought in would be small, and the concession, if granted, would not materially affect stockmen and farmers in this country. It is known, however, that the total concessions which have been granted add up to a total of great proportions. That portion of our market which has thus been given over to neighboring countries often means the difference between profit and loss for our producers. There can be but one answer—bankruptcy and ruin for many of our producers.

The imports, for consumption, of total cattle from Mexico into the United States for the 10-year period of 1931 to 1940, inclusive, were as follows:

Year ended Dec 31—	Number	Year ended Dec 31—	Number
1931	66,745	1936	164,730
1932	90,051	1937	199,460
1933	62,624	1938	286,245
1934	57,090	1939	478,832
1935	251,370	1940	410,843

Given the American market with reasonable protection which is accorded the products of industry, the American stockmen and farmers can and will supply all of our essential needs and more, and at prices which nonfarm consumers can well afford to pay, as the income of the urban people has an income of about four times that of the farmer. On the other hand, if the American market is to be given over to producers of other countries, a little here and a little there, ruination of the American farmer and stockman will be the inevitable result.

It should be remembered that Mexico has no surplus of cattle. If American producers were selfish, they would not only encourage producers to market their cattle in this country, but drain their farms and ranches of breeding cattle as well. As we see the future, Mexico, like our own country, should preserve a strong and healthy livestock industry.

TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH MEXICO AND BOLIVIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Committee for Reciprocity Information has before it the question of reciprocal trade agreements between this Republic and the Republics of Mexico and Bolivia, on the matter of importation of strategic and essential war metals. In order that the expressions of some of us who are interested in the subject from the standpoint of protecting our own industries might be expressed, I transmitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information my views on the subject. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of transmittal, together with the statement attached, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 19, 1942.

Subject: Trade agreement negotiations with Mexico and Bolivia.

The CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,
Tariff Commission Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I respectfully beg leave to file this letter, presented rather late because of the stress of official business here in the Senate.

No one can deny the necessity for unusual quantities of essential metals; and inasmuch as our primary aim and object is to win this war, the sources from whence we may derive these essential metals cannot be too seriously questioned.

However, in permitting foreign countries to bring essential and strategic metals into America, I respectfully urge that your committee look with caution that nothing be done to destroy American initiative in mining and American production of all war essentials.

The American standard of living must not be lost sight of, nor should it be put up against peon and slave labor from other countries.

American investment and American initiative in mining activity should not be discouraged. If the American miner is compelled to compete with foreign conditions, based on an economy entirely out of line with the American way of living, then we can scarcely expect the American enterprise to go forward. If the American investor does not make the investment, then we can scarcely expect American labor to be encouraged. If the prospector cannot develop his mining claim after he has made the discovery, or if after developing his mining claim, he cannot sell his product at a price that would justify his effort, and if this condition is brought about by reason of the importation of slave and peon produced commodities, only one result will follow, namely, mining industry at home will be discouraged and destroyed, and that discouragement will not only prevail during the war but will in all probability extend into the post-war period.

I know no better way of expressing my views to your honorable committee than to subscribe to and endorse the statement filed by the American Mining Congress, a copy of which I attach hereto, endorsing and making it a part hereof.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

[Enclosure.]

THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,
Tariff Commission Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Subject: Trade agreement negotiations with Mexico and Bolivia.

Products: Antimony, paragraph 376; fluorspar, paragraph 207; graphite or plumbago, paragraph 213; lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes, paragraph 391; lead bullion, pigs

and bars, dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial scrap lead, type metal, babbitt metal, solder, alloys and combinations of lead, paragraph 392; molybdenum ore or concentrates, paragraph 302 (b); quicksilver, paragraph 386; tungsten ore or concentrates, paragraph 302 (c); zinc-bearing ores, paragraph 393; zinc in blocks, pigs or slabs, zinc dust, zinc in sheets, old and worn-out zinc, zinc dross, and zinc skimmings, paragraph 394; zinc oxide and leaded zinc oxides, paragraph 77; zinc sulfate, paragraph 93.

DEAR SIR: The American Mining Congress, representing the combined mining industries of the United States, and including in its membership companies which produce approximately 85 percent of the domestic output of the above-named mineral commodities and derivatives, respectfully requests that no reductions be made in the existing duties on these products in the pending trade agreement negotiations with Mexico and Bolivia.

These mineral products are highly important to our industrial system and standards of living in times of peace; they are of critical importance in the present war program. The specific uses of each commodity and the statistics of production, imports, consumption, etc., are readily available to you in reports of the Tariff Commission and Bureau of Mines, as well as in statements filed with respect to individual commodities. We merely wish to emphasize that these materials are basic and indispensable in the manufacture of munitions, and that in most cases vastly larger quantities are required today than ever before in our history. It has been aptly stated that "Metals are the muscles of Mars"; and the entire production program upon which our national safety depends would bog down were the supply of these mineral products to be inadequate.

We assume that your committee's consideration of the pending trade agreements is based primarily on the one supreme objective of winning the war. The mining industry's efforts are being devoted without stint to that end, regardless of margins of profit, exhaustion of ore reserves, and other factors which would ordinarily play an important part. We realize keenly that if there is no victory there is no post-war period for any of us to be concerned about. At the same time, many of the conditions required if the industry is to be maintained in a healthy and vigorous state after the war are equally required if it is to function efficiently during the war years in supplying the metals and minerals so urgently needed.

As to most of the mineral products listed, our country is fortunate in having large resources which have been developed over past years as a result of our national policy in providing reasonable protection against cheap foreign competition. Mines cannot be developed overnight, but require years of effort, prospecting, exploration, development, metallurgical research, and the investment of large sums both in opening up the ore deposits and in providing the physical plant and equipment. The moderate tariff rates established in the 1930 act have been a factor of great importance in making it possible for our country to enter the present world conflict with a reasonable degree of self-sufficiency as to many of these minerals.

We submit that the present is no time to change that policy nor to tamper with the modest rates of protection now enjoyed by the mineral industries.

We distinguish sharply between—

(A) Proposals to reduce or remove tariff duties for the period of the war and as a means of expediting war production (such, for example, as are reported to have been under discussion by the Joint Canadian-American Commission and at the Rio de Janeiro Conference); and

(B) The type of duty reductions which have been made under previous trade agreements and are apparently contemplated in the proposed agreements with Mexico and Bolivia. Such reductions, made usually for a term of 3 years but continuing indefinitely thereafter unless one of the signatories gives 6 months' notice of cancelation, are for all practical purposes permanent in nature.

As to (A) we would not for one moment oppose any action which would help in winning the war. We doubt that reduction or removal of duties is needed for this purpose. We understand that large quantities of ores, metals, and other products are being imported by the Metals Reserve Company for the Navy Department, under a 1914 statute which granted such authority; in fact Mr. Jesse H. Jones testified to that effect before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on September 16, 1941.[1] We also understand that the Government has the necessary authority and is proceeding to make such purchases of foreign ores, minerals, and metallic products at such prices as it deems expedient. This is demonstrated by the announcement of the Secretary of Commerce on April 30 that arrangements had been made with the Mexican Government whereby the Metals Reserve Company will "purchase for the period of the agreement copper, lead, and zinc in metallic form or in ores and concentrates imported into the United States at prices which should give a stimulus to increased (Mexican) production." Even though our Government or its agencies are required to pay import duties on such purchases, it is obvious that this is purely a bookkeeping transaction, whereby the amounts paid as duties are merely transferred from one Government pocket to another.

Notwithstanding all this, if there should be definite benefits to the war program from the reduction—or even the complete elimination—of import duties on products of the mining industry for the period of the war, we would interpose no objection to such action. We do feel strongly, however, that any such curtailment of our protection should be explicitly and positively limited to the period of actual hostilities, and that it should automatically terminate and the present rates of duty should again become effective immediately at the close of the war.

As to (B) above, we are strongly opposed to any change in duties on our products such as are customarily involved in foreign trade agreements. Agreements with Mexico and Bolivia, if drawn up in the usual form, would provide indefinite continuance into the future of any reductions in tariff rates, and would thus seriously threaten domestic producers with low-cost foreign competition in the post-war period. The effect of any such duty reductions on mineral commodities would inevitably be to discourage new and increased production of these minerals within our own borders, through a realization on the part of prospectors, would-be producers, and investors that following the war they could not expect even the moderate protection accorded in years past.

The vital importance of developing our own mineral resources—of securing the maximum production within this country with the least possible dependence on transportation from abroad—is demonstrated by the many measures taken by the war agencies to stimulate domestic output. Premium prices are being paid for new or "over-quota" production of copper, lead, and zinc. A high official of the War Production Board recently told a Senate Committee[2] that some 300 Government engineers and geologists are combing the country to seek out and bring into production new ore bodies; that some 40 major mineral projects are going ahead under Government auspices, and that over $400,000,000 of Government funds are being devoted to mine development and the building of plants to process the needed minerals. In this work, he stated, the dollar sign has virtually been wiped out, and the primary consideration is the obtaining of sufficient materials at the earliest possible date.

But Government effort alone, even on this enormous scale, cannot do it all. The history of the mining industry shows that new discoveries and developments have primarily been the work of a great army of prospectors, explorers, small miners, engineers, scientists, and investors, spurred on by the incentive of creating new wealth and of sharing in the wealth thus created. This applies both to the finding of new ore bodies and to the development of new metallurgical processes to recover the values from low-grade or refractory ores. The efforts of private individuals and groups in this field are more urgently needed today than ever before. The incentive for such efforts should be preserved. It should not be stifled by commitments on the part of our Government, which would let down the bars to low-cost foreign minerals for an indefinite future period, and would thereby tend to destroy any hope of recovering investments or receiving a return in the years to come.

Let us make it plain that there is no lack of all-out effort by the mining industry in providing the sinews of war. Existing mines are being depleted without regard to accepted business principles, and operating companies are undertaking new enterprises where there is little or no hope of any real profit. We cannot expect, however, that those who might venture into the mining field—and particularly those who might seek out and develop the many small mines, which in the aggregate will produce important tonnages and from which must come the large producers of tomorrow—will risk their all in the face of a Government policy which destroys the hope of survival in the post-war period.

The discouraging effect of tariff concessions made to any particular country is multiplied by the "most-favored nation" clause, under which the same concessions must be extended to practically all other nations. In many of these countries the ore bodies are of much higher grade than those in our mines, as is brought out more fully in statements submitted to you dealing with individual mineral commodities. Wage rates and labor costs are generally far lower than in this country, and depreciated currencies afford a further important competitive advantage.

May we refer briefly also to the fact that many of our mining operations are carried on in remote locations. Whole communities and large sections of our population are completely dependent upon continued operation of the mines. Not only the mine workers and their families, but tradesmen, farmers, railroads, local, county, and State governments, and school systems are supported wholly or in part from the proceeds of mining. We urge that you do not add to the difficulties of these many thousands of persons and hundreds of communities in the inevitable period of readjustment which will follow the war.

It might be said that the so-called escape clauses in our foreign-trade agreements could be invoked to avert hardship after the war. To the mining man, this argument, unfortunately, carries no weight. Experience under previous trade agreements, notably that of the zinc industry under the Canadian agreement, has convinced him that no relief may be anticipated under these provisions, even though a conclusive showing of injury to the domestic industry is presented. The escape clauses, we regret to say, are totally inadequate to give mineral producers any confidence in the future. Any reduction of tariff protection which appears to them to be of a permanent nature will discourage exploration and development and to that extent

---

[1] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 7, 1941, p. 7693.

[2] Testimony of W. L. Batt, head of the Materials Division, War Production Board, before the Senate Special Silver Committee, May 6, 1942.

will counteract the strenuous efforts now being made to secure increased production.

We ask that you take no action at this time which would hamper or impede the fullest possible production within this country of the metals and minerals so critically needed in the war program. We wish soberly to warn those charged with the negotiation of these treaties that reductions in the present duties on our mineral products which are not safeguarded by positive and automatic provision for their termination at the close of the war are contrary to the national interest in the present crisis.

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
JULIAN D. CONOVER, *Secretary*.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate for more than a moment.

Senators have recorded their views on the parity question, which was discussed for some hours. I expressed myself as well as I could on the subject yesterday, taking a good deal of the time of the Senate; but at that time I stated that I would make a motion to strike the provision from the pending bill. I therefore ask the clerk to state the amendment, merely to complete the record. I have no intention of asking for a record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, on page 80, beginning with the proviso on line 14 and down to and including line 25.

Mr. GILLETTE. There is just one thing to which I wish to call attention. This morning the Committee on Banking and Currency made a report on a bill, which has been under consideration by the committee, making available to the Commodity Credit Corporation a billion dollars with which to purchase agricultural commodities and to dispose of them in this country. The Committee on Banking and Currency protected the parity concept by prohibiting the utilization of any of the funds so appropriated for selling under the parity price. The Committee on Banking and Currency has protected the concept. It had been the hope of some of us that we could protect the parity concept in the measure now pending, but it is very evident that a majority of the Senate have a different view and a different concept.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to ask what the effect of the amendment proposed would be, because I think the discussion of the Senator has changed the situation somewhat. If I understand the Senator's amendment correctly, it would now prevent the sale of any of these commodities for relief purposes, the sale of grain for the manufacture of alcohol or rubber, or any of the purposes provided for.

Mr. GILLETTE. The motion at the desk was to strike out beginning with the proviso in line 9.

Mr. HATCH. I think the clerk said from line 14. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 80, beginning with the proviso in line 14, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 25 on page 80.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. If the words should be stricken out, am I to understand that the Department of Agriculture would be privileged to proceed to sell what they wanted to sell at whatever price they felt was the right price?

Mr. GILLETTE. As the amendment was first sent to the desk, striking out all from line 9 down, it would have left the Agricultural Surplus Marketing Administration in the position in which they are today. They could have sold the surplus commodities at any figure they saw fit to ask, down to a penny a bushel. But the amendment as I have changed it, at the request of and out of deference to some Senators who were anxious to maintain a record on the parity principle, merely strikes out from line 14 down, which would leave the House prohibition against selling under parity.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I should have voted for the original proposal made by the Senator from Iowa for the simple reason that selling only 125,000,000 bushels of wheat is not going to do the job which the Department of Agriculture and some of the leading farm organizations of the United States contend is necessary to be done. I should have voted for the Senator's original proposal, and would then leave it to the administration to take care of the situation. About 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, I am told, will probably have to be stored in the fields, by reason of the fact that the farmers cannot obtain storage facilities. If that be true, then those 400,000,000 bushels of wheat must be sold on the open market because the producers cannot obtain loans on it. In view of the fact that the Senator has modified his amendment I cannot vote for it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with the Senator from Iowa that the matter has already been settled here today. The whole principle of parity has been killed today by the vote we have already taken. The principle of parity has been done to death in the house of its friends. I agree with the Senator from Iowa that it is not necessary to have another yea-and-nay vote, because that would simply again emphasize the fact that it is the purpose of the Senate to kill the parity principle. The Senator from Iowa does not wish to ask for a yea-and-nay vote; I do not intend to ask for it; but I should simply like to have it a matter of record that when the vote is taken on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to strike out the language in question, I shall vote "yea."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the reason I stated I would not ask for a yea-and-nay vote is that the Senate has gone on record twice today on the substantive proposal of whether we shall protect the parity concept. A heavy majority of the Senate is of the opinion that we should not do so. No good purpose could be served by asking for another yea-and-nay vote. My only purpose is offering the amendment at this time is to complete the record, and to try to make this one last effort to protect the parity principle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. (Putting the question:) The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide, and the Vice President announced that 22 Senators had voted "aye."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us have a yea-and-nay vote on the question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the amendment as it is now offered, would maintain the parity principle, a principle for which I have contended and for which I have voted all day; but it would strike out everything except the House provision, which would put an absolute floor under all commodities. None of the commodities could be sold for less than parity for any purpose whatever. None could be sold for relief, and I think the Department should have that privilege. None of the deteriorated corn could be sold. I think it would be ridiculous to say to the Department, "You cannot sell wheat which is spoiling; you cannot get parity price for it." Some of the important parts of the bill are affected by the Senator's proposal. For that reason I shall be compelled to vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, although I should like to see the parity principle maintained.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GILLETTE. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Do I have the privilege of perfecting or changing my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask unanimous consent to change my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. GILLETTE. My original amendment was to strike out the language on page 80, beginning in the middle of line 9, to the end of the page, because I thought it was a matter of making a record only, but at the request of several Senators, including the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who have the same views with respect to parity which I hold, I modified the amendment to

strike out the language on page 80 beginning in the middle of line 14, to the end of the page. Under the permission which has just been given me by the Senate, I modify my amendment to strike out all after the semicolon in line 9 to the bottom of the page.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that if that language is stricken, the Department can in its discretion sell whatever amount of wheat it feels necessary to sell.

Mr. GILLETTE. Absolutely. It can sell any commodity under its control at any figure it may wish, which has heretofore been its privilege.

Mr. WHEELER. I feel that should be done under the circumstances, because the claim is made that there will be approximately 400,000,000 bushels of wheat produced this year which cannot be stored, and if it is not stored it will be fed into the market at any price the farmer can obtain, which of itself will not only break the parity price on wheat but it will break the parity price on other farm products. So I cannot entirely agree with what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has said, that the selling of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat means the abandonment of the parity principle. What will destroy the parity principle is to permit 400,000,000 bushels of wheat to go onto the market, because of the fact that the producers thereof cannot make loans on it. That wheat will go onto the market in any way, shape, or form it can get there. It will then break not only the parity price of wheat but that of corn and of other farm products. My reason for voting for the Senator's amendment is that if the Government handles that crop it can put it on the market in a much more orderly fashion than if it were thrown or dumped onto the market by the farmers themselves. Therefore I shall vote for the Senator's amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TUNNELL (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am free to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents. I am advised that if present and voting, he woud vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is detained on business in one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is unavoidably detained.

I repeat the announcement heretofore made in regard to the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—20

Ball	Lee	Stewart
Brooks	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Murdock	Wheeler
Gillette	O'Daniel	Willis
Hughes	Smith	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Ellender	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Pepper
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Rosier
Brown	Holman	Russell
Bulow	Kilgore	Schwartz
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Byrd	Langer	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chandler	McNary	Walsh
Chavez	Maloney	White
Danaher	Maybank	
Doxey	Norris	

NOT VOTING—30

Austin	Glass	Reynolds
Barbour	Green	Shipstead
Bone	Guffey	Smathers
Brewster	Herring	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Tydings
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Murray	Wallgren
George	Reed	Wiley

So Mr. GILLETTE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill, on May 15, 1942, I said I had written to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked him for the cost of the publicity activities of his Department.

Now, I find that the committee of which I am chairman—the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures—in making the inquiry of the Secretary of Agriculture, asked for expenditures for publicity and information. I was unaware of this when I made the statement on the floor of the Senate.

I have received a letter from Mr. Grover B. Hill, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, which I shall ask unanimous consent to have made a part of the RECORD. It appears to me that nearly all the expenditures contained in the report which was printed in the RECORD on May 15, are for publicity, but I want to do entire justice to the Department of Agriculture and I therefore ask that the letter from the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Hill, be published in the RECORD, as I would not desire to do the slightest injustice by my remarks on this question in the Senate on May 15.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 18, 1942.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Page 4233 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1942, indicates that you made the following statement: "I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked him for the cost of publicity activities of the Department. I do not mean information. Many of the departments attempt to classify publicity as 'information.' I asked him for the cost of publicity and nothing else."; and later, "It is not claimed to be anything else but publicity."

I have before me a copy of the questionnaire which your committee sent out asking for the information to which you refer. Part D thereof definitely states "Publicity and Information." I must maintain, therefore, that the Department's reply, which is printed in the RECORD, covers information activities. This fact is unmistakably demonstrated on page 4236 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1942, where there are listed the employees who work on the Department's Market News publication.

I am sure that in the interest of accuracy you will wish to rectify the impression which has been created that the Department's reply to your questionnaire dealt only with publicity activities.

Sincerely,

GROVER B. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, on page 89 of the bill will be found an item of

$700,000 for cooperative farm forestry work. I wish to make a brief statement to the end that there may be administrative understanding of the intent of Congress.

Up until last year the so-called shelterbelt work was carried on by means of relief appropriations. Last year the Senate wrote into this item a specification covering $300,000 for the shelter-belt program. This year the Bureau of the Budget estimated a continuation of that work at the same figure. The House and the Senate committee have accepted that figure.

However, some misunderstanding might arise by reason of the report of the House committee on this bill. That report leaves some little question concerning the manner in which the $300,000 shall be expended. There was a rather indirect assertion that the money ought to be distributed among all the States. Let me say, as a member of the Senate committee, that that was not my understanding. If I am not mistaken, the department administering this fund intends this year to appropriate about $40,000 of the $300,000 for the same kind of work in other States, to which I and others interested would have no objection. I simply wish to have it understood that it is the understanding of the Senate committee that it is not intended to distribute this fund—except for the $40,000—for any other purpose than that for which it was appropriated a year ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is not exactly my understanding of the matter. My understanding is that the Senate committee did not undertake to direct the expenditures at all. However, we were told by the Department that it proposed to spend only $41,050 in States not in the shelterbelt; and we imposed no restriction or limitation on the expenditure, nor did we require the Department to spend more. I do not understand that the Senate committee stated that it approved the proposed expenditure, but we understood that that was a requirement of the House provision. We are not interested in that; but we were advised by the Department that it had set up $41,050 for other States. We have not changed the provision, or required the Department to spend any larger amount or any smaller amount.

Mr. NYE. I may have misstated the understanding, but the chairman of the committee correctly states it. I simply wished to have the record clear respecting the understanding of the Senate committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to page 74, line 3, where an item of $450,000,000 appears, under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture." Addressing myself to that item, I move to strike out "$450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000,000."

Mr. President, we have been talking about economy; yet we are spending money which we do not have. We are spending it in wartime. Under that program we are reversing the policy of the past several years. Not only have we made provision in other legislation for a guaranty of parity with respect to crops specified by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the expansion of production of such crops, but we have made guaranties of parity in this measure. Similar guaranties are also proposed in a measure which will shortly come from the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, the saving of $150,000,000 in this item would mean that instead of having to sell 24,000,000 $25 War Savings Bonds we should be required to sell only 16,000,000 $25 bonds. It would mean that instead of being required to sell 12,000,000 $50 bonds we should be required to sell only 8,000,000 $50 bonds.

Translated in another way, Mr. President, the vast sum now stated in the bill would require the sale of 900,000 bonds of $500 denomination each, merely to raise that sum which we do not have.

There is no question in my mind, after an examination of the hearings with reference to the matter, that although the soil conservation measures of past years may have required payments, and at least the Congress has adopted the policy with reference to it which finds reflection in the pending bill, in this particular year the soil can be conserved through the expanded program of the Department of Agriculture, particularly in view of the fact that the Secretary has the power to specify the items he wishes to have produced; and in that way——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I did pause for breath, I will grant you. [Laughter.]

I will also observe that, until the present incumbent of the Chair came in, I had patiently sought recognition at various times during the afternoon, and I thank the Chair for having seen me at this particular time.

I shall not continue very much longer; but I submit that with the program of development of our soil resources and the conservation of soil in this country, in the midst of wartime, demanding, as it does, such extraordinary sacrifices from our people to meet it, at a time when the need for it at least can be reduced by one-third, a plan to make such a reduction seems to me to be a worthy objective and one fairly to be sought.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has given some very apt illustrations in support of his argument. I will put it in another way: Not only would the proposed saving make unnecessary the sale of the bonds mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut but it would be a saving to the taxpayers of $150,000,000; is not that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, obviously, it would save $150,000,000 that we do not even have, and which we should have to borrow.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate agree to the amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate at this time by asking for a yea-and-nay vote on the passage of the bill; but I do wish to record my vote against it. Inasmuch as the bill contains a section of legislation which should have been made subject to a point of order, and was subject to a point of order in the other House, but which has been made very much more iniquitous by the action of the Senate committee and of the Senate, I believe it will be recorded in history as the destruction of the whole parity system for which we fought so long.

Therefore, while I do not wish to ask for a yea-and-nay vote, I simply wish to record in the RECORD my personal vote against the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 6709) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk be authorized to correct the totals in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

WAR HOUSING AND WAR PUBLIC WORKS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has reported favorably House Joint Resolution 308, making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in the city of Washington and its suburbs.

The authorization was $70,000,000. The Budget estimate was $50,000,000, divided into two parts: $30,000,000 was recommended for housing, and $20,000,000 for public works.

As the joint resolution passed the House, $12,000,000 was appropriated for housing, instead of the recommended $30,000,000, and $17,500,000 was appropriated for public works, instead of the Budget estimate of $20,000,000.

In considering the joint resolution the Senate committee left the appropriation for Federal public works just as it was, with an appropriation of $17,500,000. The appropriation lacked just $2,500,000

of what was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Senate committee has recommended the appropriation of $25,500,000 for public housing, instead of the appropriation of $12,000,000 passed by the House. Thereby the joint resolution as approved by the Senate committee provides for 3,000 additional housing units in the city of Washington and its suburbs.

The matter is one of very great importance. The city is overcrowded. It is very necessary that some action be taken at once; and I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 308. I think every Senator in the Chamber is familiar with the situation, and I hope the joint resolution may be passed.

If any Senator wishes to ask any questions regarding the matter, I shall be glad to respond; but first, I ask the Chair to put the motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 308.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, under the heading "National Housing Agency", on page 2, in line 2, to strike out the figures "$12,000,000", and insert "$25,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency", on page 2, in line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "purchase and exchange (not to exceed $5,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 3, in line 4, at the beginning of the line, to strike out the words "United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 3, in line 4, after the word "Army", to insert the words "of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 3, in line 8, after the word "agency", to strike out the semicolon and the following: "and any commissioned officer so detailed shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowances as such officer, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and allowances and the salary of the office of such chief engineer, and the travel and subsistence expenses of any officer so detailed shall be paid from appropriations available to such Administrator on the same basis as authorized by law and by regulations of the War Department for officers of the United States Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be happy to respond.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Bureau of the Budget and the President recommended the appropriation of $50,000,000 for such purposes in the District of Columbia. The House cut the recommended appropriation practically in half, and the Senate committee has restored it to $43,000,000, which is $7,000,000 less than the amount requested by the President.

I shall not offer an amendment to increase the amount to $50,000,000; but I should like to have the assurance of the Senator from Tennessee that if during the progress of the program to provide housing for the war workers who have been brought here by the thousands, it is found necessary to provide a supplemental amount in order to complete the necessary work, the Senator will be sympathetic toward it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the committee would be, if it were shown that there was a necessity for additional appropriations for housing. It is absolutely necessary to take care of those who come here to work, and that is why the committee has raised the amount from $12,000,000 to $25,500,000. We made provision for 3,000 units of the larger type of houses so as to relieve the congestion. It is very necessary that it should be done.

I am glad the Senator does not intend to offer an amendment. I believe that if it is found to be necessary, Congress will appropriate the additional money necessary, and I am sure our committee would approve such an appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, I hope the $43,000,000 will be sufficient, but if it is not, of course we cannot afford to fail to provide for the war workers who come here, and who are now doubling up four or five people in a room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6599, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal judiciary.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. I assume the Senator does not desire to proceed with the consideration of the bill until tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada providing for avoidance of double income taxation, modifications of certain conflicting principles of taxation, reductions of certain rates of taxation, and establishment of exchange of information between the United States and Canada in the field of income taxation, signed at Washington on March 4, 1942; without amendment (Ex. Rept. No. 3).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and Canada signed at Washington on April 29, 1942; without amendment (Ex. Rept. No. 4);

The nominations of Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado, and F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania, now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, also to be consuls;

The nomination of William Langdon Sands, of Florida, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service; and

The nomination of Lincoln MacVeagh, of Connecticut, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The nomination of Capt. Donald B. Beary to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 1, 1941;

The nomination of Capt. Robert H. English to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 8, 1942; and

The nominations of sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Navy.

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The nomination of Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of May 1942 and to continue during his assignment as commander, eastern sea frontier; and

The nomination of Rear Admiral John W. Greenslade to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of May 1942 and to continue during his assignment as commander, western sea frontier.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 15), 1942:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Leslie S. Kofoed, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada, vice Frank L. Middleton, term expired.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Edward Arthur Evans, Coast Artillery Corps (Reserve).

Col. Kenneth Buchanan, Cavalry (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Albert Edward Colburn, Coast Artillery Corps (National Guard of the United States).

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Gen. Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr. (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Charles M. Wesson, Chief of Ordnance, who is retiring, and Maj. Gen. James H. Burns (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, who has declined to accept commission as confirmed by the Senate.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Albert Eger Brown (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Henry Lawrence Cullen Jones (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr. (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Durward Saunders Wilson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Middleton Grimes (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Rapp Brush (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Dorst Patch (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Emmitt Sloan (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Hanson Gill (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harry Lewis Twaddle (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Cadle Mahin (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Homer Ray Oldfield (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harold Roe Bull (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Olds (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Thoburn Kaye Brown (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lucian King Truscott, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Clift Andrus, Field Artillery.

Col. Paul Everton Peabody (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Gilbert Richard Cook, Infantry.

Col. Hayes Adlai Kroner, Infantry.

Col. Leland Stanford Hobbs (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Stonewall Jackson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lloyd Davidson Brown (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Dewees Finley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Alfred Jefferson Lyon (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Lily Spragins (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Horace Logan McBride (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Barnwell Rhett Legge (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Roland Paget Shugg (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. James Francis Brittingham (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Ward Hale Maris (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Guy Ichabod Rowe, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Roderick Random Allen (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. John Matthew Devine (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. George Wesley Griner, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Arthur McKinley Harper (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Warren Thomas Hannum, Corps of Engineers.

Col. John Thomas Kennedy, Field Artillery.

Col. Royden Eugene Beebe, Infantry.

Col. Louis Albert Kunzig, Infantry.

Col. James Arthur Pickering (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Milton Baldridge Halsey (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Washington Barnett (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Randolph Tucker Pendleton, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Idwal Hubert Edwards (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Leland Wilbur Miller (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas James Hanley, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Henry Green (lieutenant colonel), Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Royal Reynolds, Medical Corps.

Col. Omar Heinrich Quade, Medical Corps.

Col Charles Egbert Branshaw (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Bernard Larkin (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Leonard Russell Boyd (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Armstrong, Ordnance Department.

Col. Gordon Marshall Wells (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. John Kay Christmas (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Rosswell Eric Hardy (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Charles A. Lockwood, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

Capt. Marc A. Mitscher to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of December 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 15), 1942.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Chester H. Layton, Thatcher.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Joseph W. Hazeltine, Contoocook.
Dorothy D. Clark, Hancock.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our God and gracious Father, in Thy revealing power show us the virtue of the all-atoning Lamb. Increase in us the manifold gifts of Thy grace, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and true godliness. We pray that we may live more courageously and more bravely, enduring the disillusionments of life. The purest motive is to love Thee, the loftiest rule, Thy will, and the supremest end Thy honor and glory.

Heavenly Father, the world hath its tragedy; its breath is a pestilence and its hate a flame. Oh, cast down the spirit of destroying war; break the iron rod and destroy the destroyer and bring all nations to their intelligence and self-control; be our sun, filling the whole

sphere of life with fruitfulness, vision, and victory. To Thy guidance and unerring counsel we commend our most notable President, our Speaker, and the Congress; oh, may they seek that greatness which sanctifies all desires, all passions, and all labor in the field of toil. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6979. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to remove certain limitations on the cost of construction of Army and Navy living quarters.

MRS. HATTIE DAVIS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 484), as follows:

House Resolution 484

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Hattie Davis, widow of Milton Davis, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Milton Davis.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON], who is temporarily confined to the Doctor's Hospital in this city I ask unanimous consent that he may have leave to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a notable address which he delivered before the Rotary Club of Independence, Mo., on May 11, 1942, relating to subjects of interest to Missouri and Missourians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

SUGAR OR RUM

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been a considerable amount of discussion concerning the rationing of sugar. In view of the shortage of sugar, patriotic citizens are glad to join in this program. I want to call your attention to a situation, however, that I think is most inconsistent.

Mr. Speaker, during last year we imported into this country approximately 2,000,000 gallons of rum from Puerto Rico. We imported about 1,000,000 gallons from the Virgin Islands. That is approximately 250,000 gallons per month. We do not know the figures for this year. It is estimated they will be larger. We are still importing rum. Rum is, of course, made from sugarcane. According to estimates of Virgin Islands officials, the 1942 crop of sugar will amount to 3,500 tons. The Puerto Rico crop will, of course, be a great deal more. Mr. Speaker, there is no logical reason why this sugar should not be used to help take care of the shortage in this country rather than make it into rum. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the irony of the situation is that the United States Government subsidizes the Virgin Islands to the extent of approximately $60,000 per year for the production of sugarcane.

The Government, instead of importing the sugar, permits it to be manufactured into rum and then sold in the United States. We certainly do not need the rum. We do need the sugar.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman knows that those rum plants in the Virgin Islands are owned by all the people of this country?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes. We appropriated $60,000 last year for the Virgin Islands to take care of the shortage to grow sugar that was made into rum.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by Rear Admiral J. W. Greenslade, commandant of the Twelfth Naval District, and a White House text on ships.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF GRAIN-STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, food is important in connection with the winning of this war. Despite this fact, however, recent regulations by the Government have created a great shortage in grain-storage facilities which must be corrected if the United States and the United Nations are to have the necessary food with which to win the war and preserve the peace to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point by inserting a telegram from the Governor of South Dakota on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

PIERRE, S. DAK., *May 19, 1942.*

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Grain storage in South Dakota for the carry-over and the prospective new crop is in a critical condition. In a conference today of all governmental agencies, farm agencies, lumber and transportation groups the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas South Dakota farmers and all citizens wish to participate in the food-for-freedom program to the absolute limit; and

"Whereas during the past few years, on account of drought conditions, farm-storage facilities have deteriorated; and

"Whereas prospects are that South Dakota will have an estimated small-grain crop plus carry-over of about 40,000,000 bushels in excess of total storage facilities in this State: Therefore be it

"Resolved—

"1. That this group recommends that an education program be aimed at encouraging the construction of needed permanent storage facilities by the farmers themselves, so far as practicable, as their first responsibility.

"2. That as an inducement to elevators and public warehouses to increase their emergency storage space we recommend that the Commodity Credit Corporation give such facilities the same assurance as that accorded to farmers in their farm storage program.

"3. That the Government be urged to modify present regulations to the end that required materials may be made available for construction of emergency farm storage facilities, including stocks already frozen.

"4. We especially urge that South Dakota be allocated her fair share of the 100,000,000-bushel program for new contemplated construction of storage to be provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in that connection that a proper allocation of steel bins from other States be made to this State for the emergency."

Will be glad to come personally to assist in pressing this matter if you think advisable.

HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
Governor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some letters from the executive and military officials in reference to the selection of military sites.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

THE CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record entitled "It's Your Congress—Help Guard It Now."

I agree with all of this editorial, including certain points it makes to the effect that some of us have at times by bad judgment given weight to criticism of the Congress. However, I want to read the last part of the editorial. It is addressed to the people and says:

Keep your mind vigilant. Vigilant against any effort to make you lose faith in Congress, and, hence, in democracy.

Just as the British Parliament has been a great source of strength in Britain's war effort, so has our Congress a magnificent record of vigor, initiative, and cooperation.

Finally, remember this: That if there are some weak and incompetent men in Congress, they are there because we, the voters, sent them there.

Congress is not something apart from us. It is us. Our voice. Our strength. Our power. And our hope for future freedom.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a young man whose appointment to West Point I recommended 4 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by me to the president of the Western Union Telegraph Co. and his reply; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by me on Sunday, May 17, 1942, over station WLAW, at Lawrence, Mass., on the subject of I am an American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for today and tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. A conference report was filed yesterday on a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, and its consideration will be in order today. There will be nothing else today.

On tomorrow there will be brought up a joint resolution from the Committee on Appropriations in connection with war-risk insurance. A road bill has also been reported out and a rule providing for its consideration is being reported out today. The bill is H. R. 6908, to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941, and it deals with access roads. I understand it is quite an important bill.

Agreement has already been reached on 1 hour of general debate on the joint resolution from the Committee on Appropriations, and I understand there is not much controversy over it. If we have time after that joint resolution is disposed of, then this road bill will be brought up.

I announced yesterday that on Monday a bill relating to small businessmen would be considered. If a rule is reported out today on that bill, the bill will be brought up Monday.

I shall be in a better position tomorrow to advise the distinguished minority leader as to the probable program for the rest of next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not proposed that the House meet on Friday of this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When can we expect the tax bill to come in?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer the question, but it is impossible for me to say. I could not say anything about it that would be definite or reliable at this time. I wish I could.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the majority leader that I noticed on the Treasury statement of May 16 that we have already gone in the red $16,139,000,000. You will have to hurry and get that tax bill in or we will be wrecked.

[Here the gavel fell.]

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such mortgage shall not in any event exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of off-site public utilities and streets, and organization and legal expenses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18 are technical and clarifying amendments. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 16: These amendments provide that the Administrator may prescribe such procedures as are necessary to secure to war workers occupancy priority with respect to properties not previously occupied and which are covered by mortgages insured under title VI, and with respect to additional living accommodations provided under title I of the National Housing Act. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 15: The House bill provided that to be eligible for insurance under the new section 608 the mortgaged property must be designed for rent for residential use "primarily" to war workers, and it also provided that the additional living accommodations under section 2 (b) should be "suitable for war workers". In view of the occupancy priority provisions of amendments numbered 3 and 16 the language above quoted was omitted by the Senate amendments numbered 7 and 15. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: The House bill provided that to be eligible for insurance under section 608 the principal obligation of a mortgage should not exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the reasonable replacement cost of the completed property or project, including the land and certain other enumerated items. The Senate amendment eliminated certain of the detailed enumerations in the House bill and added a further limitation which was identical to the provision contained in section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, namely, that the mortgage shall not exceed the Administrator's estimate of the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project with certain items excluded. The conference agreement retains the language of the House bill relating to 90

percent of the reasonable replacement cost, and modifies the provision contained in the Senate amendment so that in estimating the cost of the completed physical improvements the Administrator is not to include off-site public utilities and streets, and organization and legal expenses.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by George Rothwell Brown

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Times of this morning expresses the belief that Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, is opposed to a bill which the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House has reported favorably. That bill is a revision of the bill which Mr. Green opposed. It has now been revised to include only interference with interstate commerce by robbery or extortion. Therefore, while I have heard no expression from him, I do not believe Mr. Green will oppose the revised bill, which was reported favorably.

The excellent editorial to which I refer is as follows:

TO CURB LABOR RACKETEERING

It is encouraging that a House judiciary subcommittee has approved the bill sponsored by Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, to make labor unions subject to the provisions of the Federal Antiracketeering Act. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, declares that his organization will oppose the bill, because it is antilabor and there is no necessity for it. Are these contentions true? Let us see.

Less than 3 months ago the Supreme Court handed down a decision declaring that certain union members, though clearly guilty of threats and violence to obtain money, were nevertheless immune from the present Federal Antiracketeering Act. Chief Justice Stone described the facts of the case, as follows:

"They, the members of the teamsters' union, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $8.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the truck, and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid, without rendering or offering to render any service."

The majority of the Court held, however, that these payments obtained by violence or threat of violence were immune under the Federal Antiracketeering Act, because that act exempts "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee." In short, as the so-called Antiracketeering Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court now stands, it grants a clear immunity to, and therefore clear encouragement of, labor racketeering. Teamsters can continue to beat out-of-town truck drivers when they enter New York City at the Holland tunnel; employers of all kinds, in fact, can be forced to "hire" any number of men whom they do not need and who perform no work, and under the existing Federal Antiracketeering Act absolutely nothing can be done about it.

All that the Hobbs bill does is to strengthen the Antiracketeering Act and remove the special immunity to union racketeers, who would henceforth be treated like other hoodlums. It may be seriously questioned whether Mr. Green's opposition to the Hobbs bill helps the cause of honest labor. If union leaders are going to rush to the defense even of hoodlumism, they must inevitably weaken the influence of their opposition to measures that really threaten the interests of the great body of labor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, newspaper and radio accounts state that the Office of Price Administration is hinting very strongly that there will be Nation-wide rationing of gasoline effective July 1. The city of Belle Fourche in my district has a rodeo or a round-up that has been conducted as an annual celebration on the 2d, 3d, and 4th of July for something over 20 years. It has been an important source of revenue to the Federal Treasury. Whether that should be held or not under present conditions I am not now arguing, but if the Office of Price Administration contemplates putting on a Nation-wide rationing of gasoline, I feel that instead of hinting that it may be done by July 1 it ought to be settled whether or not rationing will be put into effect by July 1. All through the country there will be 4th of July celebrations that are being planned now. People are investing money in advertising and in talent for these celebrations. They ought to be told now whether or not there will be rationing of gasoline by July 1 and whether or not these celebrations should be canceled. It might be wise, if Nation-wide rationing is instituted, to consider Monday, July 6, as the effective date rather than July 1, but whatever is to be done, let the decision be made and announced so that people can plan and make commitments intelligently.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJUSTMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service, with a House amendment, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

INCREASE OF NUMBER OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the request. Is it simply for the appointment of conferees?

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Kentucky is to take from the Speaker's table the House bill with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distressing situations that grows

out of this gasoline rationing in the East is this: In the small communities where the dealers are expected to take care of the gasoline for the farmers who are now trying to put in their crops, the dealers are cut down to the same percentage as the dealers in the big cities where a large percentage of the pleasure driving exists. At the present time it is impossible to get gasoline for the purpose of plowing and putting in crops in the country districts. I am receiving a tremendous number of complaints on this, and I hope the Office of Petroleum Coordinator is going to show some appreciation of the necessities that are growing out of the way this proposition is being handled and see that we get immediate relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement on the amount of the farm income and the percentage of the cost of handling it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] for 15 minutes.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, there will come before this House within a few days a conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill. That bill contains the annual appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since time for debate under usual procedure will be limited when the report of the conferees is presented here, I deem it advisable that some discussion of the broad significance of Senate amendment No. 114 be held in advance. Many Members of the House are from sections geographically remote from the Tennessee Valley and there may, at times, be a tendency to consider that agency and its program as matters of local or regional interest.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that House conferees will insist on retaining in the independent offices appropriation bill the language written into that bill by the House, but which was stricken by the adoption of Senate amendment No. 114.

This is not in any sense new language, but is the same language each similar bill has contained since 1935.

By striking that language from the bill now we would eliminate the authorization for the reappropriation of the unexpended balance and we would abolish the fund in the Treasury of the United States designated as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund. As the House well knows, that fund was authorized in 1935, and each year since then has had the approval of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and both bodies of the Congress.

That provision created a convenient accounting device whereby both receipts and expenditures could be handled in one account. Manifestly it has proved not only successful but entirely satisfactory and has contributed in a considerable degree to the orderly administration of the Authority's financial affairs. I have been unable, Mr. Speaker, to find any logical reason for changing the system at this time.

But today, rather than going into a further analysis of the effect of that particular amendment, I wish to discuss the T. V. A. somewhat in its relation to the prosecution of the war.

I will leave a more detailed examination of the amendment for subsequent discussions by myself and others.

The responsibility of the Tennessee Valley Authority in connection with national defense goes much further back than Pearl Harbor or the invasion of Poland.

The act of Congress which created the Authority in 1933 placed upon that agency a very definite responsibility in relation to national defense.

I think it should be a matter of considerable interest to the House to know that at the present at least two-thirds of all the power supplied by T. V. A. is devoted to production of materials absolutely necessary for the prosecution of war. By the end of this year that total will be increased to 80 percent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes. I gladly yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that the act of 1933, which was the original act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, put upon it the obligation of national defense. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that act expressly directed the T. V. A. to utilize the facilities of the Muscle Shoals nitrate plant. So far as I have been able to learn since that time they have done nothing about it. Does the gentleman have assurance that they will develop Muscle Shoals?

Mr. PRIEST. I say to the gentleman that it is my understanding that while the act directed the Authority to utilize it, the Authority awaited word from the War Department as to when they would need it for national defense, and they had plans ready to put it in operation. They were called upon to do so in 1940, and that plant is now in production.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; I gladly yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, I may say in that connection that if anyone cares to go into the records he will find that very soon after these properties were turned over to the Tennessee Valley Authority, a full study was made as to the availability of plant No. 2 for national defense purposes, what it would cost to rehabilitate it, and those estimates were supplied to the War Department. The War Department was in possession of that information at all times, and as a matter of fact I believe the suggestion or request was made by the Tennessee Valley Authority that something like $900,000, to be made available for that rehabilitation. That was not done until about a year or a year and a half ago, and plant No. 2 now has been operating in the ammonia-nitrate plant, and five furnaces are now engaged in the manufacture of calcium carbide, and it is being used to its fullest capacity.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman from Alabama and hope that answers the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

By the end of this year T. V. A. will have an installed capacity of 1,141,000 kilowatts of power. That current is being distributed over 5,150 miles of high-voltage transmission lines to major distribution points. Within the area served by the system there are 252 substations where current is made available for further distribution over a network of secondary transmission lines. During the current year more than 7,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours will be thus distributed.

Within that area, which includes parts of 6 States, there are 115 municipal and cooperative distributors handling electric current for more than 470,000 consumers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while there are thousands of domestic consumers among that number, there are also many large industries that are running day and night to manufacture and process materials vitally necessary to our war program. These include aluminum, phosphorus, ferrosilicon, munitions, coal mining, textiles, and many others.

Power supplied by T. V. A. goes directly into large aluminum plants at Alcoa, Tenn., and Muscle Shoals, Ala. It is used in large quantities by chemical and metallurgical plants in the same area as well as by many smaller plants whose products are just as necessary in supplying the sinews of war.

Let me cite a specific instance of how T. V. A. has met emergencies in assuming and discharging its responsibilities to supply power to manufacture war materials.

When the dogs of war were unleashed across the Polish border in September 1939, and the second World War was under way, the demand for aluminum was vastly increased. At that time the Aluminum Co. of America was the only source of supply, and it could not meet its

requirements under the contract then in effect with T. V. A.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the production of aluminum about 10 kilowatt-hours of current are required to produce 1 pound of that metal so necessary for airplane manufacture.

The company turned to T. V. A. and asked the Authority to supply the additional power needed. The T. V. A. had at that time some steam capacity available and consequently entered into an agreement to furnish the required power. During the remainder of that year the T. V. A. supplied the Aluminum Co. with 288,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. In order to do that it was necessary to expend for fuel and labor to produce the power, a total of $1,300,000. The Authority received in revenue from the sale of that power $1,600,000 for a net profit to the Government on its investment of $300,000.

The point I emphasize here, Mr. Speaker, is that T. V. A. did what was necessary to meet an emergency, and because it was met the Aluminum Co. was able to produce an additional 29,000,000 pounds of aluminum, or enough to manufacture 1,500 bombers weighing 10 tons each.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes. It is a pleasure to yield to my able colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Tennessee on the very fine presentation he is making of this subject matter, and ask him this question. In the event that one proposed Senate amendment had been in the law, limiting the T. V. A. to any specific appropriations it gets here, would it have been possible to have enabled the Aluminum Co. of America to secure the electricity that made the aluminum to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. PRIEST. In my opinion, it would have been utterly impossible with the limitations which would have removed the flexibility which the T. V. A. must have to meet such emergencies as this.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And I believe that additional aluminum was sufficient to build 1,500 bombers.

Mr. PRIEST That is the best estimate that I have been able to get, and I believe it is a correct estimate. I thank my distinguished colleague for bringing that matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Right in line with that same thought would it not have been impossible for the T. V. A. to have entered into the contract with the Reynolds Metals Co., who established another aluminum plant in the Tennessee Valley, in my district, I might say, manufacturing 40,000,000 pounds a year, which output has been increased by 60,000,000 additional, since that time?

Mr. PRIEST. I am quite sure the gentleman from Alabama, who has followed all of this program very closely all the way, is eminently correct in that assumption.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; I yield to my distinguished and able colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman in the beginning of his remarks said something about the fact that some people might regard the Tennessee Valley Authority as a matter of local interest to the people of that section. I assure the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I am very deeply conscious of the fact that the T. V. A., by the benefit it has brought economically to one section of the country, has been of benefit to every section, and more especially in this time of war in which we find ourselves. I am profoundly grateful that we have this great enterprise devoted solely to the public interest, and therefore in no respect fearful of the maximum possible production of its power, which is somewhat in contrast with the attitude of certain other power-generating plants.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California. I will say that he is one Member of this House who sees every issue that comes up in a broad national sense. I appreciate his contribution.

Now, to go a little further along this same theme of how the Tennessee Valley Authority met emergencies in connection with the production of aluminum, you will recall that during the summer and early fall of 1941 a serious power shortage was developing in the southeastern area because of the growing defense load and a rather severe drought. In that period T. V. A. met a very serious threat to aluminum production by keeping the Alcoa plant running at capacity. In order to do so the Authority had to supply the company with 150,000 kilowatts of emergency power over and above the 30,000 kilowatts supplied under a long-term contract. Much of that excess power was generated in the Authority's own plants, and some of it was obtained by purchase and interchange from adjoining utility systems. But here again, the point is that the emergency was met and the aluminum company was enabled to continue full-time operation in the manufacture of aluminum. In both cases the emergency was met because T. V. A. realized its responsibility in connection with the defense of the Nation, and under wise laws enacted by Congress, it was in position to exercise some flexibility in its operations.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that in considering the question of electric power, whether it be furnished by an agency such as T. V. A. or a privately owned utility, that we recognize that any power system must be ready at all times to meet emergencies quickly and to take care of fluctuating demands.

Power is a product which must be used as it is made—or if you prefer it the other way around—made as it is used. Except for small storage batteries we have not yet found a practical method of packing a lot of power in a warehouse to use at some future date.

Let us examine very briefly some of the other services rendered by T. V. A. in the war program.

Ammonium nitrate, as we all know, is an important ingredient of high explosives, and high explosives are going to be necessary in large numbers to blast the Axis in the four corners of the world.

During the 8 years up until October 1940 T. V. A. maintained the large ammonium nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, while at the same time plans were made ready for the modernization of the plant when it became necessary. That time came more than a year ago, and T. V. A. proceeded under prearranged plans to place the plant in production. The output of the ammonium nitrate there is immense. The actual figures are not available for military reasons.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago I looked down on much of the Tennessee River and the valley from an airplane. From such a vantage point that far-flung region from the Appalachian Mountains to the Mississippi River takes on the appearance of a gigantic arsenal for war.

Up and down the river barges move raw materials which are turned into aircraft, munitions, and chemicals that are vitally important today.

Water that starts seaward from mountain slopes churns through turbines at one after another of the giant concrete dams and power surges out across the valley and into motors which run machines that are never idle in making more and more materials to be used in defeating the Axis and crushing the greatest menace in the history of the world.

I referred just now to barges moving up and down the Tennessee River. We are beginning to realize more each day the extent of the heavy burden that the war emergency has placed upon the transportation systems of the Nation. The multipurpose dams built by T. V. A. have created a navigable channel from the Ohio River to Chattanooga, a distance of 464 miles, and before long, when other dams are completed, that channel will be extended another 100 miles to Knoxville.

The annual report of T. V. A. for the year 1941 shows that traffic on the river has grown from 22,000,000 ton-miles in 1933 to about 100,000,000 ton-miles last year. New traffic consists of huge bulk shipments of pig iron from Birmingham that moves to the Middle West, petroleum products, and others necessary for war production.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I stated previously, more detailed analyses of Senate amendment No. 114 will be given to the House between now and time for consideration of the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill.

In the meantime, I hope the House may give some consideration to the extreme importance of the T. V. A. in a national sense at this particular time. I hope, moreover, that when the House comes to final action on that report such action may be based not upon the question of whether Members are for or against public power but solely upon the basis of what course now is best for the maximum utilization of all the resources and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the benefit of the whole Nation in this crucial hour.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REDUCED RATES OF INTEREST ON FEDERAL LAND BANK AND LAND BANK COMMISSIONER LOANS

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on House Resolution 485 (Rept. No. 2138), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous order shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on House Resolution 486 (Rept. No. 2139), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6908) to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

ADJUSTMENT OF PAY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is entitled to recognition for 10 minutes. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield the 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly obliged to the gentleman from Ohio. I simply wanted to remark that in my judgment the request of the rank and file of postal employees of this country for an adjustment in their pay is justified.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include in my remarks an editorial from the Sacramento Bee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

POSTAL EMPLOYEES HAVE RIGHT TO WAGE INCREASE

The employees of the post offices render an invaluable service to the American people.

Day in and day out, in bad weather as well as in good, they keep the mails moving; and it is done so smoothly we have come to take it for granted that when a letter or package is deposited in one place it will reach the person to whom it is addressed in the shortest possible space of time—that is, if we have properly addressed it and put on the proper amount of postage.

Occasionally mistakes are made, but they are so unusual as to be utterly negligible.

The laborer is worthy of his hire, especially when rendering a community and national service so important to everybody.

And it is a fact that not since 1925 have the post-office employees had any adjustment of their pay schedules.

So there has been a growing disparity between what they are paid and that of the employees of other Government services. Moreover, many post offices in the country already are feeling the pinch of conditions which developed in the last war, namely, a lack of personnel because of the more attractive jobs available in other Government departments, in the State services, or in war industries.

A bill providing for modest increases in postal wage schedules has been introduced in Congress by Representative MARTIN SWEENEY, of Ohio, and is being considered by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Its favorable consideration is highly desirable in due justice to the cause it favors.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I also want to add that it seems to me worthy of consideration to try to find some of the money necessary for this purpose by a reasonable reduction in some of the higher salaries of governmental officials—say of all those receiving in excess of $7,500 a year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield and permit me to address the House for a minute?

Mr. YOUNG. Certainly.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Ohio for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I have about 300 citizens living in York, Pa., of Italian parentage. Over the past week end I was invited to attend a meeting of an organization at which time there was presented to me a $1,000 Defense bond payable to the Treasury of the United States, an outright gift to the country they love and of their adoption.

It was a most significant and thrilling experience to meet with these gentlemen, for they know the difference between living in a free land and living under another form of government.

It might be of interest to learn that these were men of low incomes who made contributions so willingly to a land they love in order that we might successfully wage a war to retain our freedom and liberties. In the opening address of the meeting, presided over by Mr. John Lucia, he declared:

This country is going to win the war for everybody—even for the Italian people themselves. The Italian people really love America and when the United States sits down at the peace conference, Italy will go with America again, for the Italians never were against the United States. Today we are all united here for one purpose and you should be proud of yourselves. Our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, dedicated this day as I Am an American Day. But I urge you to be an American not only today, but every day and our posterity a thousand years from now.

This brought forth a tremendous shout of approval that thrilled every one of us. In presenting that $1,000 bond to me to give as a gift to our Government, Mr. Pete Alfano said:

In behalf of the Italian-American community, I present this bond to be used as the Government sees fit, so that we may gain the victory we all desire.

In addition to the gift of $1,000 there was also presented a check in the sum of $100 for the American Red Cross and $173 to the U. S. O. The occasion was an inspiring one and worthy of fine citizenship in a great country.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from the Washington Daily Star and the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, civilian defense and military defense go hand in hand and it has seemed to me all along that civilian defense should be directed by military leaders. Civilian and military defense is so interlocked that in event of emergency, it would be difficult to determine where military defense ended and civilian defense began. Adequate civilian defense is of the utmost importance. Civilian defense would be much more effective if the Army were in charge, but instead Dean James M. Landis was appointed as national director.

In the State I represent, Dan Tyler Moore, Jr., who has never had any military training nor experience to my knowledge, is the head of the civilian defense. Dan Tyler Moore, Jr., has taken the Ohio bar examinations, according to information given me, and may have passed a recent one and may have been admitted to the bar in Ohio as an attorney-at-law, though my information is that he has not as yet done so. Does legal training qualify a man to be national director or regional director of civilian defense? A colonel in the Army receives $4,000 and a small subsistence allowance per annum. Would not a retired colonel or some Army officer incapacitated for active combat service, be better qualified for regional director of civilian defense than Dan Tyler Moore, Jr., whose experience has been holding appointive political office as Chief of Division of Securities for Ohio, and a position under authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission?

My comrades in the Ohio department of the American Legion charged that Moore was "gambling with the public safety" by retaining his position as regional director of the Securities and Exchange Commission and "by doing a part-time job" in civilian defense. I feel his salary of $6,500 is ample even if he were to devote full time to civilian defense and resign from his position in the Securities and Exchange Commission. I do not believe a man should be permitted to hold one appointive position under Federal authority and then enjoy a $6,500 per annum salary from another position. Furthermore, the American Legion objected to his removal of the regional O. C. D. office to Cleveland from Columbus, stating this was done to suit his own convenience as his Securities and Exchange office is in Cleveland. It appears unfortunate that some outstanding member of the American Legion with a background of service and military training, or a retired Army officer is not in charge of civilian defense in Ohio and adjoining States instead of Mr. Moore.

These are desperate times for our Nation, and I am utterly opposed to boondoggling. It is the duty of a representative of the people to curtail nondefense expenditures and to watch carefully over defense expenditures and prevent waste. In Ohio the civilian defense set-up appears likely to be costly to our taxpayers. Mr. Moore's salary is $6,500 per annum as regional director of civilian defense, and it appears he will have a large number of salaried officials and employees under his authority. This seems unfair, unfortunate, and unnecessary when so much of the work of civilian defense is being done by volunteer workers without salary. There are thousands and thousands of splendid citizens in my own State of Ohio who are devoting their talents and untiring energies in civilian defense service without the thought of compensation. It seems to me to be unjust to these splendid, patriotic citizens that at the top, from Washington throughout the States, civilian defense is being loaded down with regional directors, State directors, and assistants at high salaries.

Mrs. Mabel Montgomery, who was actively in charge of the contemptible little group of Communists calling themselves American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House and held so-called peace parades in front of our President's home up to the moment Hitler invaded Russia, has been connected with civilian defense as an assistant in Air Raid Warden Murphy's office, this according to the Washington Daily News.

May I voice the hope that Mrs. Montgomery is not at this time employed in civilian defense as a co-worker with the thousands of splendid, patriotic Americans who are volunteering their services without compensation in this time of our country's peril.

It is our hope that civilian defense will never be put to a real test. It is our hope that no enemy bombs will ever fall on any American cities, but if such catastrophes occur, many thoughtful people believe it will be evident that the Army should have been in charge of civilian defense from the outset.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of other special orders for today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INTERCEPTED COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following report on House Joint Resolution 310, to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2140), which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of the prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous order shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

SMALL BUSINESSMAN'S BILL

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that in the very near future we are to have before the House for action what is known as the small businessman's bill. I desire to say in advance that I am heartily in favor of legislation to help the small business people in the present crisis. There are a great many of them in my district who have been seriously affected by the conversion to the all-out war effort. Already some of them have been forced out of business. No time should be lost by Congress in coming to the aid of the small businessman in order that he may carry on and contribute his part in the common effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

IDLENESS IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to refer to a picture in today's Washington Daily News. This picture shows War Department X Building, in which hundreds of employees recently brought to Washington have nothing to do but loaf. I quote from the Washington Daily News, caption appearing beneath a picture showing girls and boys loafing, holding hands, and gazing from the windows:

(Caption above picture)

HO-HUM COORDINATOR—WAR DEPARTMENT HIRED HANDS LOAF WHILE OFFICE IS REORGANIZED

(Explanation under picture)

For lack of work, many of the employees at X building pass a lot of time at the windows. Left, an unoccupied couple holds hands. Above, with nothing to do, girls look out at the world and smile.

(Article accompanying picture)

(By Gladys Haack)

We went to the temporary X building to track down the knitting stenographers and idle file clerks on the Government pay roll, who, tipsters reported, were sitting on desks swinging their shapely legs and wandering around the halls eating popcicles.

We didn't find the knitters, but otherwise the tipsters were right. Such things may happen, it seems, when a War Department project is trying to get under way. C'est la Guerre.

X building at Seventeenth and East Capitol Streets marks the spot for War Department's new office of superfinance. A block long and nearly that wide, the E-shaped building has 100,000 square feet of office space. It will accommodate 4,000 war workers. Of X building it is prophesied that it will be the largest single disburing agency in the world.

LONG LUNCH PERIOD

B Building makes a good place for a reporter and photographer on investigation to play hide-and-seek. It seemed to be general lunch hour when we arrived at 11 a. m., many rooms empty as employees strolled up and down the long halls. At 1 p. m., two hours

after our arrival, the file clerks seemed still to be on lunch hour. Two of them told us that they had been told to take as long a noon siesta as they liked.

We hit one large office where a supervisor was assigning desks to a group of girls who said they had been sitting around for over a week.

In a little office on the third floor we found a dejected lot, a sulky boy and three girls sitting on a desk and looking out of the window. They were file clerks, and after 10 days on the job, they hadn't seen the letter A.

Explanation for all this came from a man in the office of the Chief of Finance, who didn't want his name used. "This department is in a state of organization and reorganization," he said. "From 400 to 700 persons come in a week, and we move as many as 600 at a time from our former offices in the War Department."

He admitted that people sat around "for as long as a week" before they were put to work, that the building would not be completely furnished for a month, that there were a "few pools" of people waiting in idleness until they would be needed.

In many other Government departments around town there aren't enough stenographers to meet the demand. But: "We have them here so we can get them when we want them," the spokesman said. "Right now we are training people for technical work in finance and allotments. We must be ready before the volume of work hits us."

He promised streamlined production once organization is completed. "There won't be any waste or lost motion in this office," he said.

On our way out we decided to tell the sulky boy about the highly technical training he was receiving. "Have you learned streamlined accounting or filing?" we asked.

"The only thing I have learned," he said very rudely, "is how to twiddle my thumbs backward and forward."

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this deplorable condition I take leave to include the following editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News, Indianapolis, Ind., under date of May 15, 1942:

FEDERAL PAY ROLL

According to a Civil Service Commission report of May 12, there were 238,000 civilians on the Federal pay roll in Washington on March 31. Employees were being added at the rate of about 7,000 a month.

Probably 50,000 of these employees are necessary to the proper operation of the Government's departments and the great bureaus which contribute so much to the increase of national wealth and the health and well-being of the people. These employees are devoted to the public service. Nearly all of them are competent and industrious. They earn more than their pay.

Another 50,000 are manning New Deal bureaus. They were brought in to pay political debts after March 4, 1933. On that date, 66,000 civil employees were on the Federal pay roll in Washington. By 1941, before Pearl Harbor, the number had been increased to 167,000. It is believed that fully half of the 100,000 that were added between 1933 and 1941 are mere pay-roll riders, kept at useless jobs to satisfy the demands of politicians.

The remainder may be charged to the war effort, but it is significant that the number of civilian employees in Washington is now more than double the 117,000 who worked there during the first World War.

Washington has become not only the center of the war effort, but the refuge of thousands of pay-rollers who are a drag on the war effort; a disgrace to an administration that is asking school children for dimes to help MacArthur; and a warning of things to come if the social visionaries are allowed to go on plundering the country's producers.

It will be recalled by the Members of this House that I made a determined effort as far back as last January to prevent the wholesale hiring of thousands of unnecessary employees by Federal agencies.

At that time I advanced a 10-point program, which has been adopted in part and enlarged upon by several Members of Congress, and those parts seemingly have worked very well; but other points of the 10 might alleviate the situations described in these articles. My third point was that preliminary training for defense workers could be done in some nearby city. Possibly training centers could be set up in several large cities over the country, and only when a Government worker was absolutely ready to do a job, and a good one, would he be allowed to come to Washington to work. We must become a district of experts at our jobs, and no one incapable or unwilling to carry his load should be given working space in this crowded city.

Another point which would be worth at least a trial would be the doubling up of shifts, which would save hundreds of dollars in equipment costs and thousands of dollars spent for additional buildings.

Gentlemen, we simply must do something besides appropriate money. Present taxation on the average American worker is far beyond the load he should be asked by his Government to carry, and so far this body has not offered any substitutes for the easiest way out. We were not elected to shovel out the people's money faster than they could work and pay it into the Treasury. We were supposed to be men of ideas and ideals, or we campaigned on such platforms, I am sure; but I, for one, am not very proud of our record for not thinking, but just voting more and more money whenever requested.

Let us get our thinking caps on and our lead-soled shoes off and help to run this country—and I do not mean in "the hole," either.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Indianapolis News and also two reviews or remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLASON Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON Mr. Speaker, it has been difficult, if not impossible for the people of the Eastern States, where gasoline is now rationed, to believe that the situation has been handled with the best judgment. We are told that all gasoline necessary to meet the requirements of the entire Nation is being produced within this country. We are told that the shortage is due solely to lack of transportation facilities. The possibility that this shortage would arise was first brought forcefully to public attention by Secretary Ickes many months ago. Yet the rationing plan for gasoline was developed hurriedly during the past few weeks on what obviously is a temporary basis, to be effective only to July 1, and to be limited to the Eastern States. The plan has proved to be inequitable in operation, as certain parts of the country to which gasoline and fuel oil are transported by rail are not rationed, and therefore are not called upon to shoulder part of the common burden. The plan of rationing has brought peculiar hardships to salesmen and small businessmen, whose weekly income frequently not large, is severely reduced by their inability to secure the gasoline necessary to cover the territory which they normally would visit. Other small businessmen operating restaurants, roadside stands, and other businesses along the highway have actually been forced to close their doors, with almost total loss of their investment and means of livelihood. The rationing system has reduced travel greatly and clearly shows that the people of the Eastern States are cooperating fully with the authorities in reducing the use of gasoline in the affected areas. All of our large industrial plants employ workmen who travel many miles to and from the factories. Frequently the distance of the plant from the home is over 20 miles. No sufficient provision is made for the needs of these persons who are so important to the successful outcome of the war. They are told to double up insofar as possible and are doing so in great numbers.

Under these circumstances, it makes people wonder when they read in the newspapers, as some did a few days ago, that two full tank cars were refused in the large town of Palmer, Mass., because there was no more storage space available and that an official of a major oil company reported that his headquarters had requested him to take more gasoline because there were two tankers at Providence with no place to store their contents. These conditions would indicate that the distribution within the affected area is not being handled efficiently.

I have brought a number of complaints arising in my district to the attention of Government officials because they seem to me to be well-founded. Undoubtedly others have done likewise. Perhaps they have had some effect. At any rate I feel that President Roosevelt was well warranted in his press conference yesterday in stating that he is opposed to the continuance of gasoline restrictions on a purely sectional basis. I agree with him that in the areas where oil is produced and to which it is delivered by pipe-line, restrictions need not be applied. If, however, as the President suggests, the restrictions are applied to all other sections of the country, obviously tank cars and other facilities in much larger numbers will be made available to the east coast on a basis whereby all sections of the

country will receive amounts based upon their needs. The main problem, as I see it, is to assure equal treatment to all affected sections of the country while every effort is made to complete additional facilities, such as tank cars, pipe lines, barges, and trucks, which will end the shortage at the earliest possible date without interfering with the all-important war-production program.

The news item to which I referred is contained in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of May 18, 1942, and is as follows:

STORAGE TANKS FULL, TWO CARS OF GAS ARE REFUSED—OFFICIAL OF ONE CONCERN SAYS TANKERS OF FUEL AT PROVIDENCE UNABLE TO UNLOAD

PALMER, May 18.—Revising the lines to "gasoline, gasoline everywhere, but not many drops to use" may explain the condition here relative to the motor fuel. It was learned today that bulk plants in this vicinity are filled to the fullest extent and could handle the normal needs of motorists for some time.

TANK CARS REFUSED

Two full tank cars have been refused here because there was no more available storage space, and an official of one major company's station here reported that his headquarters requested him to take more gasoline because there had been two tankers of the fuel in Providence with no place to store its contents.

However, regardless of the reported abundance, gasoline-station owners reported today that the week end saw cooperation to the highest degree by the average motorist, and in all but a few exceptions rationing cards were presented upon applications for gasoline. Service-station proprietors reported a definite downward trend in the week-end business, as was expected, since it appeared that motorists on the highway had a definite purpose in being there in most cases while the majority of Sunday motorists had declared a moratorium on travel.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to remove certain limitations on the cost of construction of Army and Navy living quarters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1942.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 21, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 21 at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1651. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $31,717,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year as contained in House Document No. 718 (H. Doc. No. 730); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1652. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and approved by the Acting Governor of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the Municipal Councils in the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1653. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 10, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Holland Harbor and Black Lake (Lake Macatawa) Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 484. Resolution granting a gratuity to Hattie Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2137). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NELSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 485. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6315, a bill to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2138). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 486. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6508, a bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 2139). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 487. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 310, a joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2140). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7112. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 7113. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 7114. A bill to amend the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 7115. A bill to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 7116. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Stella Hertchikoff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 7117. A bill for the relief of A. L. Sauls Planograph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7118. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt Percy K. Morrison; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2857. By Mr. CRAVENS: Petition of Omer R. Cantrell and others of Sebastian and Scott Counties, Ark., concerning Senate bill 860 to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2858. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, urging the Work Projects Administration to give favorable consideration to transferring or alloting an additional quota of 500 to Work Projects Administration in southern California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2859. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Sara Shaw Bible Class of the First Presbyterian Church, Beaver Falls, Pa., urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2860. Also, petition of 49 members and adherents of the Clinton United Presbyterian Church near Saxonburg in Butler County, Pa., urging the prohibition of the sale of all alcoholic beverages in the vicinity of our Army camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2861. Also, petition of Rev. J. L. Hull, minister, and 36 members of the First Church of God, New Brighton, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land, air, and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2862. Also, petition of patrons of Frankfort Springs Grange, No. 1989, Beaver County, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2863. Also, petition of 46 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging enactment of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2864. Also, petition of 105 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2865. Also, petition of 63 members of the East Brook United Presbyterian Church, East Brook, Pa., urging enactment of Senate bill 860, taking liquor from our Army camps, and also legislation prohibiting liquor advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2866. Also, petition of 207 residents of Beaver County, Pa., originated in the First Methodist Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 to provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2867. By Mr. HAINES: Petition unanimously approved by the 89 members of the Armor Bearers Men's Bible Class of St. Paul's United Evangelical Congregational Church of York, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2868. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Roy Adams and 63 others, residents of Harrisburg, Ill., requesting the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2869. Also, petition of I. E. Vanwey and 50 other members of the United Brethren Church of Flora, Ill., appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against vice and intoxicating liquor, and urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2870. Also, petition of Minnie P. Funkhouser and 65 other residents of White County, Ill., urging the adoption of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2871. Also, petition of J. S. Vise and sundry other citizens of Ewing, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2872. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Edith Prichard and 117 residents of Mercer County, Ohio, and members of the Anderson Bethel Church of God, of Mendon, Ohio, in support of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2873. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, urging that the situation existing on the Colorado River at and in the vicinity of the city of Needles, Calif., be immediately investigated and that appropriate action to remedy the flood conditions on the river at that point be taken; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2874. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., commending the action of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold on his efforts to link the oil company and Alcohol Trust; to the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2875. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolutions of the Central Union Label Council of Greater New York, urging increase in salary for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2876. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Frank J. Venning and a number of citizens of Keokuk, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military and naval camps and cantonments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2877. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Watchmaker's Local No. 101, International Jewelry Workers' Union, at San Francisco, Calif., adopted April 24, 1942, relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2878. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the United Automobile Workers of America, Local 85, Racine, Wis., approving the following general principles of taxation: The income tax and estate tax be utilized at maximum efficiency; undivided surplus funds be regarded as taxable income; excess-profits tax—rate of profit to corporation not to exceed rate allowed individuals who lend money to Government—namely, 2½ percent; exempt securities and obligations to be placed on taxable basis; taxation of excessive bonuses paid by corporations; and individual and corporate incomes to be limited to $25,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2879. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Club, No. 2, of Du Bois, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to "pay as you go" for pensions and defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Oscar F. Blackwelder, D. D., pastor, Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father of us all, Lord of the nations, Saviour of mankind, we turn to Thee as the source of our light, the refresher of our spirits, the cleanser of our motives.

We pray for strength of character and of body. We pray for clear minds and singleness of purpose.

In like manner, we pray for our country, for the fathers and mothers of young men in the Nation's service as well as their sons, for leaders and for humble men and women in the ranks of life. Especially we pray for the President of the United States, for the Congress, and for all in posts of responsibility. We pray for an early and lasting peace, if it be Thy will. Above the storm and tragedy of this hour may Thy kingdom come.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 20, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Norris
Andrews	George	Nye
Bailey	Gerry	O'Daniel
Ball	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Glass	Overton
Barkley	Green	Pepper
Bilbo	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bone	Hatch	Reynolds
Brewster	Hayden	Rosier
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Brown	Holman	Schwartz
Bulow	Hughes	Smathers
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Spencer
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lee	Tobey
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the committee attending the funeral of the late Representative BOLAND, of Pennsylvania, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has been called out of the city on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent attending to public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

VERNON VAN ZANDT

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TEXTILE FOUNDATION

A letter from the chairman of the board of directors of the Textile Foundation, submitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foundation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from The Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy, Agriculture (6), and Commerce, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of members of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Great Bend and sundry citizens of Newton, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a group of 72 petitions praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, the so-called Sheppard bill, relating to the prohibition of liquor sales and the suppression of vice around military camps. The petitions contain over 4,000 signatures of citizens in 57 communities located in 30 counties in the State of Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Ohio will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference the petitions of Mrs. M. Evelyn Killen and 22 other citizens of Kent and Sussex Counties; Ethel C. Wheatley and 19 other citizens; Mrs. Willard Everett and 45 other citizens of Felton; Addie L. Heving and 18 other citizens of Kent County; Mrs. George Anderson and 63 other citizens of Cheswold; and Rev. Earl M. Shockley, pastor, and Jessie A. Knott and 131 other members of the Harrison Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilmington, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, the so-called Sheppard bill, relating to the prohibition of liquor sales and the suppression of vice around military camps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and lie on the table.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of the Committee on Claims were submitted:

By Mr. ROSIER:

H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Alfred Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1362);

H. R. 5329. A bill for the relief of J. J. McIntosh; without amendment (Rept. No. 1363);

H. R. 5496. A bill for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1366);

H. R. 5772. A bill for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364); and

H. R. 5847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1365).

By Mr. HUGHES:

S. 2186. A bill for the relief of Viola Dale; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1371);

H. R. 488. A bill for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367);

H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Lillian Last; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368);

H. R. 5454. A bill for the relief of David Caron; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1369); and

H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley; with amendments (Rept. No. 1370).

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of James D. G. Alexander; without amendment (Rept. No. 1372); and

H. R. 5794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1373).

By Mr. SPENCER:

S. 1953. A bill for the relief of James B. Shuler; with amendments (Rept. No. 1374).

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2191. A bill for the relief of Clara Wrobliski; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1379);

S. 2203. A bill for the relief of Bayard M. Atwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378);

H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Lair; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1376);

H. R. 4554. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1377); and

H. R. 5713. A bill for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; without amendment (Rept No. 1375).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2547. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2548. A bill providing for the observance as National Flag Raising Day of the day on which the public schools open each year for the beginning of a new school year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 2549. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in Lexington, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2550. A bill to provide that monthly payments of yearly renewable term or automatic or national service life insurance shall not serve to reduce amounts of compensation or pension payable under existing compensation or pension laws; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $600,000, to be expended under supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, for the gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense), intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, dealing with the question of the gasoline shortage and supply. As I think is recognized, Governor Landon knows a good deal about the production and transportation of oil in the Midwest, which is a matter of great concern to us in the East. It is believed that more effective measures in the use of tank cars might alleviate the shortage to some extent. Copies of this letter have been furnished to the governmental agencies concerned with the production and transportation of oil and gasoline.

I wish to express my own personal view, that gasoline rationing throughout the country is going to be essential in order to conserve rubber. With 125 tons of rubber being used up each day upon our highways, it is disquieting to realize how limited are our present facilities for producing synthetic rubber. During the past week the Truman committee found in Louisiana one of the few synthetic rubber plants in the United States, a plant capable of producing only 14 tons a day at the present time.

If we can save 125 tons of rubber a day, or any portion of it, through conserving gasoline by traveling less mileage, it would seem the country must very seriously consider further curtailment on a Nation-wide basis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, *May 16, 1942.*

Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: It's not a case of bellyaching over gasoline and fuel-oil shortage. It is a question of whether gasoline and fuel-oil rationing in the Eastern States is unnecessarily drastic. It is a question of whether we are wisely handling our present transportation facilities. I don't believe we are.

Fuel-oil and gasoline shortage in the Eastern States could be greatly relieved if all the available tank cars were concentrated on a shuttle service east of Chicago, which is the nearest point of available and ample supplies to the eastern market.

This is not being done. Tank cars are still trying to move crude and refined products on long hauls from remote points of supply. For example, Texas.

The turn-around of these cars is obviously much quicker between Chicago and New York than between Texas and New York, and much can be done to increase the speed of the turn-around of the cars, even on the Chicago and eastern points service, by increasing the unloading facilities.

I am enclosing a statement I made on June 12, 1941. After months of delay, the piping of gasoline from the east coast west to Pennsylvania and Ohio has only been stopped in the last 2 weeks.

There is still much to be done in the way of increased pumps on the present pipe lines, to increase their capacity for delivery. There are still small loops and connections that can be put in that will increase deliveries. There is still much that could be done in the way of grouping and trading oil among the major companies, not only to increase the deliveries of refined products, but to help the small producers in such States as Texas, which is suffering from its location. The efficient organization of present transportation facilities would greatly increase the supply of oil products to eastern States.

Sincerely yours,

ALF M. LANDON.

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of a letter which I sent a day or two ago to the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION,
AND RECLAMATION,
May 19, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,
Tariff Commission Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to protest against the projected negotiation of a trade agreement with Mexico, and particularly against any reduction in the duties or any increase in the quotas on imported cattle.

I realize fully that this protest will be disregarded by you. I have had the experience before of appearing before your committee to present data and express the views of my constituents and of having my representations rejected in toto. I realize that this administration is determined to reduce practically every duty in the tariff act; that your committee is merely an instrument to that end; and that nothing I can say will alter this determination. For that reason I have refrained from appearing before you to deliver in person a protest that was certain to be rejected. This letter, then, is primarily for the purpose of going on record in opposition to that policy, and not with any expectation that it will have the slightest effect on your deliberations.

If it were merely a matter of temporary adjustments to wartime conditions, I think I would be disposed to accept the decisions of administration agencies without argument as a contribution to national unity and in recognition of the sacrifices we must all make in wartime. however much I might disagree with individual actions. But it is evident that your policy is not geared to recognize merely wartime emergencies; but, on the contrary, is designed to establish a permanent low-tariff policy during the postwar period of readjustment, a policy which will permit the goods of all nations to be dumped in our markets without regard to our own welfare. To this policy of permanent benevolence to the rest of the world at the expense of our own producers I must, in justice to the people I have the honor to represent, register my protest.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER.

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER ON DICTATORIAL RULE DURING WAR

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered in New York by Hon. Herbert Hoover, on Wednesday, May 20, 1942, before the National Industrial Conference Board, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY FORMER SENATORS GORE AND OWEN, OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD addresses delivered by former Senators Gore and Owen, of Oklahoma, on the occasion of the unveiling of an oil portrait of ex-Senator Owen at a banquet of the Oklahoma State Society of Washington, D. C., May 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL MOTORS EMPLOYEES' BOND DRIVE FOR VICTORY

[Mr. BRWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to the Secretary of the Treasury by H. W. Anderson, vice president, General Motors Corporation, under date of May 15, 1942, giving the results of the campaign known as the General Motors Employees' Bond Drive for Victory, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope we may have the attention of the Senate to the pending business because it is all-important, being the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal judiciary. As the bill came from the House, it carried appropriations amounting to $221,078,000 for these departments.

The Senate committee held extended hearings. After hearings lasting over 2 weeks, the full committee met and approved the action of the subcommittee. At that time the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Nevada, asked that the bill be returned to the subcommittee for further study of the items of travel pay, travel expenses, and printing and binding. The full committee deemed it advisable to return the bill for such study, and the study was conducted by the subcommittee for several weeks.

Following the action of the full committee, and in the interim, a supplemental estimate was sent from the Bureau of the Budget, with a letter of transmittal from the President of the United States. The supplemental estimate carried an item of $199,750,000 for the Department of Commerce, and specifically for aviation. Aviation, it will be remembered, is now under the Department of Commerce; therefore the item comes under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Before leaving that item will the Senator tell us what the increase of $199,000,000 means to aviation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will come to that item and make an explanation of it at length.

As I have stated, the bill, as passed by the House, carried for the three Departments and for the Federal judiciary the sum of $221,078,100. The Senate has increased appropriations contained in the bill by $204,625,135. That increase reflects the item to which I first drew the attention of the Senate, which came to our committee by way of a supplemental estimate carrying $199,750,000. The amount of the bill as it is now reported to the Senate is $425,703,235.

The amount of appropriations for the three Departments and the Federal judiciary for 1942 was $371,602,115.

The regular and supplemental estimates for 1943, including the amount of $199,750,000, total $411,352,434.

The bill as reported to the Senate exceeds the appropriations for 1942 by $54,101,120, and exceeds the estimates for 1943 by $14,350,801.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator an itemized statement showing where the estimates have been exceeded? Such a statement does not seem to be contained in the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it appears in the report, and will be explained as I proceed.

Mr. BYRD. I note that the bill, as the Senator says, exceeds the Budget estimate.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill exceeds the Budget estimate, because of some increases which were made by the committee, but it would not exceed the Budget estimate if the item of $199,750,000 covered by the supplemental estimate were not included. I shall explain that item later.

Mr. President, the amount in the bill for the State Department is $26,995,140.

The amount in the bill for the Department of Justice is $84,111,600.

The amount for the Department of Commerce is $302,152,845. I again draw to the attention of the Senator from Virginia the item of $199,750,000, because it will partially explain what he is inquiring about.

The amount in the bill for the Judiciary is $12,443,650.

The total amount carried in the bill is $425,703,235.

Mr. President, it will be noted as we go along in considering the bill that the Senate committee, after having made a study of the question of travel expenses and printing and binding, came to the conclusion, as is shown in the report, that in most departments a reduction of 10 percent could be made in the appropriation for travel pay and travel expenses, and such a reduction was made in some cases, although in other instances we did not believe it could be made with propriety or safety. So the Senate will notice that with respect to the Department of Justice, while we imposed a blanket cut of 10 percent for travel expenses, we excepted from the effect of the reduction the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation being a war agency, and now very much used by the War Department and by all other departments engaged in national defense activities, we thought it would perhaps be dangerous or hazardous to make a blanket cut in the travel expenditures of that agency.

Again, with respect to the Department of Commerce, the Senate will notice that the committee made a blanket cut of 10 percent in the appropriation for travel expenses, except with respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The reason for the exception is that the War Department has now practically taken over the Civil Aeronautics Administration, or at least has so imposed upon the Civil Aeronautics Administration, if I may use that word, as to call upon its services almost continuously.

The Senate will notice in the pending bill a supplemental item covering the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Standards, and so forth, all going for improvements and services requested by the War Department.

Mr. President, with that preliminary explanation I now ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator believe that he has covered the aviation item?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not as yet. I thought I would cover it when the item was reached in the bill. Perhaps the explanation could then be more explicit. That was my thought. If it is demanded now——

Mr. McNARY. No; I shall conform to the Senator's desire in that respect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Contingent expenses (departmental)", on page 3, line 1, after the word "Revised", to strike out "Statutes," and insert "Statutes;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding", on page 4, line 10, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$254,000" and insert "$152,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign intercourse—Ambassadors and Ministers", on page 5, after line 14, to insert:

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia, Ecuador, and Paraguay, at $10,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 20, after the name "Australia", to strike out "Bolivia"; in line 22, before the name "El Salvador", to strike out "Ecuador"; and in line 24, after the name "Norway", to strike out "Paraguay."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contributions, quotas, and so forth", on page 20, line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$997,500" and insert "$996,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico", on page 22, line 13, after the word "proper", to strike out "$240,000" and insert "$239,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 8, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$950,000" and insert "$949,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 25, to insert:

Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project: For the construction of the United States portion of the Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project at Douglas, Ariz., as authorized by section 2 of the act approved August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 660), in accordance with an agreement with Mexico effected by an exchange of notes pursuant to a joint report of the International Boundary Commission, $90,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for construction until the governing body of the city of Douglas, Ariz., has given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of State that it will (a) cause to be furnished, without cost to the United States, evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner of the United States section of said Commission that title to all lands or easements in land which may be designated by said Commissioner as necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the United States portion of said project is vested in the city of Douglas, Ariz.; (b) upon notification by the said Commissioner that the United States portion of said project has been completed, take over and operate and maintain the said project; (c) hold the United States harmless on account of damage or claim of damage arising out of or connected with the construction or operation and maintenance of or failure to operate and maintain said project or any part thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 26, to insert:

Fence construction on the international boundary: For construction of fence along the international boundary, as authorized by the act of August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 660), $50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or easements for sites for boundary fences except for procurement of abstracts of certificates of title, payment of recording fees, and examination of titles.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. What is the purpose of the amendment on page 26 for constructing a fence? What kind of a fence is it to be? What is the fence for?

Mr. McCARRAN. That item provides for a fence on the international boundary between the Republic of Mexico and the United States. There are places along the border where it has been necessary and is necessary to install fencing so as to prevent running back and forth across the international line. The work has been progressing in a piecemeal fashion. As a rule, about $50,000 or $25,000 worth of fencing has been erected each year. These fences, as I am advised, and as the record shows, are put in at the most essential places along the border, so as to prevent smuggling and other illicit traffic across the line.

Mr. McNARY. Did the bill last year carry any appropriation for construction of fences?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate approved an item of $50,000 last year for that purpose, but in conference it was cut to $25,000.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. Now the Senator is asking for double the amount appropriated last year, at a time when strategic materials are needed for war purposes. What kind of fence is the one proposed to be put up? Is it a barbed-wire fence?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Barbed-wire fencing is very important to national defense purposes. I do not know why it should be used for the purpose proposed at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, national defense takes in very many angles, and national defense also covers the angle of preventing, insofar as possible, the activities of those who engage in smuggling contraband into this country.

Mr. McNARY. I might ask whether the Senator wants the fencing to fence in or to fence out our good-neighbor policy with Mexico.

Mr. McCARRAN. We want to keep our good-neighbor policy on both sides of the fence.

Mr. McNARY. Then we do not need a fence. [Laughter.] But, seriously, it occurs to me that when everyone is fighting for strategic materials, perhaps it is not the right thing to do to double the appropriation for a barbed-wire fence to be placed on the boundary line between the United States and Mexico. The able Senator from Nevada may have a good reason for it. Doubtless the committee had a good reason for including the item, but I should like to have a more explicit explanation than has been offered by the able Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Evidence presented to the committee showed that the construction of the fence will eventually

result in economy, because we must either patrol the border or else we must fence it.

Mr. McNARY. Is it to be a fence against smugglers or against cattle?

Mr. McCARRAN. Against smuggling principally.

Mr. McNARY. The fence must be of a highly protective character if it is to prevent smugglers from coming into the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that it is.

Mr. McNARY. It should be very formidable.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has served a good purpose wherever it has been constructed. Experience speaks louder than words.

Mr. McNARY. One might apply a good deal of humor to this project. I am not at all convinced that it is necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, we are all looking forward to the action of the conference committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at the top of page 26.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Fisheries Commission", on page 29, line 9, before the words "to be", to strike out "$28,000" and insert "$27,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission", on page 30, line 1, after the name "Secretary of State", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$39,960."

The amendment was agreed to.

THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have sought the floor to discuss a matter which gravely concerns the defense of the United States. I believe it demands the immediate attention of the Senate. I refer to the military highway to Alaska now under construction by the United States Army engineers.

I have been making a study of this highway for some time. When the so-called prairie route connecting North Dakota and Edmonton with Alaska by way of Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, Watson Lake, and Whitehorse was selected by the Canadian-American Joint Defense Board, my first reaction, as a North Dakotan, was favorable.

Since then, I began to have disquieting doubts about the road. I have made it a point to go into the record, and I find I was in error. The interests of the United States at war must be considered before the local interests of North Dakota. The former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Charles Stewart, who is also a resident of Edmonton, courageously opposed the local interests of his constituents when he declared that the prairie route was a blunder which might carry with it the seeds of military disaster. Mr. Stewart, as a member of the Alaska International Highway Commission, and chairman of the Canadian delegation, probably knows as much about the Alaska highway problem as any other man alive.

That is not all. Every single member of the Alaska Highway Commission—Alaska's Delegate to Congress, ANTHONY DIMOND, Alaskans, Canadians, and the American delegation headed by Representative WARREN MAGNUSON, of Seattle—has declared that the selection of the prairie route fails in its military purpose of safeguarding Alaska and the United States, and, in fact, is a colossal engineering blunder.

Those are serious charges and merit serious consideration. I propose to discuss them seriously.

There can be no question that a military highway, constructed in the shortest time, has become a vital and pressing necessity since Pearl Harbor. In spite of the fact that Alaska is part of the North American Continent, it remains an island, due to our short-sightedness in the past. Any place which cannot be reached save by sea and by air is an island. Alaska has no overland communication with the United States.

This is an incredible state of affairs when it is considered that Alaskan Territory more closely approaches Japan than does any other American holding. Alaska was called the most important piece of land in the world from a strategic standpoint by no less an authority than the late Gen. Billy Mitchell, the pioneer advocate of air power, whose theories have unhappily been proven true—by our enemies.

Within the past year the Senate sought to make amends for the treatment Billy Mitchell received by posthumously raising his rank. It was a deserved gesture, but we build a more enduring monument to Mitchell by immediately investigating the Alaska Highway and making sure that the Alaska Mitchell envisioned as the ranking military base in the Northern Hemisphere is properly protected by overland transport.

I have the report of the outstanding civil engineers familiar with road construction in the Northland that the route selected and now under construction cannot be completed in time to be of military value in this war because of various engineering difficulties, among them being the muskeg, the northern swampland, across which the Defense Board proposes to construct a large part of this all-important highway.

There was something decidedly curious about the method of the Joint Defense Board in selecting the right-of-way for this highway. A committee of the House of Representatives was treated in the most cavalier fashion by the Defense Board. On February 4, 1942, the House Committee on Roads and Bridges opened hearings on a House bill introduced by Delegate ANTHONY DIMOND, of Alaska, who has labored long and constantly for it, relative to the location of the proposed Alaska Highway. After having held up consideration of this vital problem for over a year, the Defense Board ignored the House committee, then taking testimony, and in the middle of the hearings announced that the prairie route had been selected and that engineering crews were even then on the ground.

This highly unconventional behavior has never been explained. Indeed, as one goes into the record, it is discovered that the Defense Board not only acted to forestall receiving the benefit of the testimony before the House committee but had previously, not once but several times, evaded proffers of expert engineering reports and technical data in a fashion which was rude and inexplicable.

The Alaska International Highway Commission is an official creation of Congress, appointed by the President. It was first created in 1930 and reappointed by President Roosevelt in 1938. For 12 years this Commission has had experts in the field gathering weather data, studying roadbed foundations, and determining where gravel and rock deposits for economical roadbuilding are located along the proposed routes. They have had for their single purpose the selection of the best route to Alaska.

Theirs was a peacetime function. The outbreak of the war at Pearl Harbor changed everything. It was suddenly discovered that our most strategic northern outpost was totally without overland communications. The Alaska Highway received its final impetus as a war measure. As a war measure it came within the province and authority of the Joint Defense Board.

Mr. Donald McDonald, one of the original members of the Highway Commission, very promptly and properly prepared a digest of the reports of the Highway Commission's engineers and transmitted it, together with an offer of all the Commission's findings, to Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, Chairman of the Defense Board, with jurisdiction over the highway. He never received an acknowledgement of his patriotic gesture, nor would he have known that the data had been delivered if they had not been sent by registered mail. He wrote again, believing in the urgency of the highway as an Alaskan, and again failed to receive the courtesy of an answer.

These were not the only times the Joint Defense Board had flouted other official agencies. In November 1940 Representative MAGNUSON, acting as Chairman of the Highway Commission, finally was able to arrange a conference in Seattle with Mayor LaGuardia, who was then on one of his junkets for the Defense Board. Although he waited more than 4 hours past the time set for the conference, LaGuardia did not put in an appearance or offer any explanation. When the Defense Board selected the prairie highway route, the Highway Commission, with 12 years of study behind it, was totally ignored. The Joint Defense Board, remember, is less than 2 years old. It has had to consider other problems besides the highway. It has made no ground surveys. However, despite its obvious lack of information, it selected the route, in defiance of all expert opinion assembled by the Highway Commission.

This is peculiar enough in itself. It becomes the subject for proper Senate investigation when the charges made by members of the Highway Commission and other officials are considered.

Mr. McDonald is perhaps better qualified than any other man on earth to discuss the Alaska Highway. He was the location engineer and assistant in charge

of the Alaska Railroad from 1914 to 1922. As location engineer, he laid the right-of-way for that railroad, which was an epic of pioneer construction. In 1922 he was appointed commissioner of roads for the Territory of Alaska, and still holds that position. It is as a professional engineer that he criticizes the present Alaska Highway routes as an engineering monstrosity and an economic absurdity.

First, as to engineering difficulties, the route of the prairie road has never been surveyed on foot. It is known that between Fort Nelson and Watson Lake there are vast reaches of swampland which the road must traverse. This muskeg swamp is an engineer's nightmare; and speed in road construction across such footing is manifestly impossible. Yet it is speed that supposedly dominated consideration of the right-of-way.

Second, the prairie route is longer than the direct route favored by the International Highway Commission, which route would have run straight north from Prince George, British Columbia, to Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, and thence to Fairbanks, Alaska, via Tanana Crossing.

Third, there are no intermediate points of access to the line of the highway now under construction. Every bit of heavy construction equipment, all the supplies needed, and the personnel, must move to the construction site from one of the two terminals at Fort St. John or Whitehorse.

It is obvious to all that a road can be constructed faster if we can build intermediate construction camps and build both ways from each one of them. This cannot be done on the prairie route chosen by the Defense Board. It could have been done on the so-called A route favored by the Commission. There are no less than four places from which alternative transportation could have taken supplies to the A route intermediate construction camps. Imagine the saving of time if building could proceed from four intermediate camps, both ways, as well as from the terminals.

Does it not begin to appear that the Defense Board had better have some overpowering reasons for flying in the face of physical facts to choose a road that is longer, cannot be built as fast, is over uncertain footings, and has never even been surveyed?

That is not all, however. Due to climatic conditions and the terrain, the construction season on the prairie route from Edmonton is 2 months shorter than the working season on the A road. In the North every working day counts, and it is obvious how much it counts when a defense highway as important as the Alaska highway is concerned. How can they explain that shortened 2 months' working season?

Consider the fact that between four and five hundred miles of road already exist along the line of the A route which was discarded. The grades are already in. It would require far less work to put these segments of already constructed road in shape for military traffic than it would to build new road. Yet the Defense Board chose the prairie route, where not a mile of road has been constructed, and their unsurveyed line runs through the wildest bush in North America.

I could go on citing Mr. McDonald's engineering critique of the Defense Board's road, but I must go on to other phases of this matter. I think it has been demonstrated that the sponsors of this road should at least justify the choice of a road that is folly in the minds of the Northland's most competent engineers.

There is a matter that first caused me to look at the choice of road sites carefully. During the time of the hearings before the House committee, which were ignored by the Joint Defense Board, a man from my home State of North Dakota appeared before the committee as a volunteer witness. His name is Halvor Halverson. Mr. Halverson said he represented the Prairie Highway Association, composed of Edmonton and North Dakota people interested in seeing the prairie route chosen. I know Mr. Halverson, and feel that the Senate should find out if he was also the attorney for powerful railroad and corporate interests; and I was more than a little curious over his emergence as a military expert qualified to discuss the location of a vital defense highway.

Since then I have learned some interesting things. From the time I was a crossroads attorney, I have found it a fairly wise idea to hunt for the beneficiary in any project. It usually tends to shed a clearer light on motives.

Who will benefit from the location of the Alaska highway on the prairie? Not the people of North Dakota or Edmonton. We have never had commercial relations with Alaska. Their natural supply source has been the Pacific Northwest, the great ports of Seattle and Vancouver. The 50,000 white persons in Alaska constitute no present market for North Dakota products. It is conceivable in the future that North Dakota might benefit from tourists using the road, but that is so far in the future, and so doubtful, inasmuch as this is to be an unpaved military road, that a busy man like Mr. Halverson would not take the time to come to Washington to promote it.

There had to be more immediacy about his sponsorship, some more moving reason than that North Dakota would benefit at some nebulous future date from truck traffic with 50,000 Alaskans scattered over an area one-fifth as large as the United States.

Who would benefit from the location of the road on its present site? Well, for one, the Canadian Pacific Railway would benefit and is benefiting. If Senators are at all familiar with the Canadian Pacific, they know it has been the stormy petrel of Canadian politics for years, and its power is no less than that of our railroads in our boisterous pioneer days.

In the only attempt at justification of the prairie road, the Joint Defense Board rather weakly explained that it would provide ground supply for military airports at Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, and Watson Lake.

It seems incredibly stupid that these airports were located for military use before ground supply was considered. It is not the part of military brilliance to locate airports in the middle of nowhere, before adequate means of supplying them are at hand.

But wait a minute; it is suddenly disclosed that these airports developed for military use are the old airports of the Yukon Southern Airways. By an odd coincidence, the Yukon Southern Airways was recently brought under control by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

To supply the airports of the Yukon Southern, temporarily in war use, and which will presumably revert to Yukon Southern, improved and more valuable after the war, the line of the Alaska highway is distorted, carried far off the route of direct supply to Alaska, and the Alaska highway project is rendered virtually valueless except for ground supply for some isolated airports in the Canadian bush.

These airports could have been supplied from the A route by air transport based on a field at Dease Lake far more quickly, far more cheaply, than at present contemplated, and the whole strategic value of the Alaska highway would not have been destroyed.

Here is something else to consider. The A route is less than 150 miles from the Alaskan coast. The bulk of the population of Alaska lives on the southeast Alaskan coast. It would be possible, and highly likely, that short branch highways would be built from the A route to these most populous Alaskan towns. This would be of extreme value from a military standpoint. It would be impossible to build such short feeder highways, invaluable for the quick transport of troops and supplies, from the route chosen by the Defense Board.

This may or may not have an important bearing; I think it has: By another of the odd coincidences that keep cropping up as you go into this Alaska highway business, it seems that the Canadian Pacific Railway owns a steamship line to Alaska—a line that serves the populous towns in southeast Alaska at perhaps the highest freight rates of any regular line on the seas.

A direct highway to Alaska, with short stub lines from it to these Alaskan cities, would conceivably cut into the revenues of the Canadian Pacific steamship line after the war. The prairie route from Edmonton would be utterly harmless so far as the steamship business of the Canadian Pacific is concerned. It seems to me worthy of more than passing interest that every factor in the choice of the prairie route seems to favor the peacetime profits of the most powerful corporate interest in Canada.

It is already deriving fat revenues from the prairie highway. With a noncompetitive contract, the Yukon Southern Airways is flying gasoline to the base at Watson Lake, and the freight charge is $1.80 a gallon—not $1.80 a barrel but $1.80 a gallon. That is for a 240-mile haul from White Horse.

Mr. McDonald, my authority for conditions in the Northland, says similar air

lines in Alaska are hauling gasoline to remote camps, over comparable distances and terrain, for 60 cents a gallon. I do not have the information, and I should like to have it, whether our Army engineers have contracted with the Yukon Southern to fly in their gasoline at the same exorbitant rates this airway is charging to supply the Canadian airport base. It seems to me shameful that our Canadian ally is being stuck for triple the fair flying rate for gasoline haulage; but if we are paying out good American dollars for a similar hold-up, I, for one, want to see if something cannot be done to remedy the situation.

I could quote authorities by the yard, every one of whom is opposed to the present route of the Alaska Highway. Governor Gruening, the present Governor of Alaska; Tom Riggs, a former Governor of Alaska; Delegate Anthony Dimond; George Black, a member of the Canadian Parliament for the Yukon—all of them condemn the choice of the Defense Board as fantastic and impracticable. Mr. Black, quoted in an article in the Washington Post for April 9, 1942, is quoted as saying that in his opinion it will take years to build a military road from Fort St. John to Fairbanks. Mr. Black lives in the territory, and should be presumed to know these muskeg conditions.

It happens that only today I had further confirmation that the muskeg that underlies the route chosen by the Defense Board is virtually impassable. A former college classmate of mine collected big-game specimens for the United States Biological Survey over the area the present route proposes to traverse. He adds his objection to the route as little more than a quagmire in summer.

Finally, consider the question of air operations. The prairie-road airports are roughly 400 miles or more from the seacoast of Alaska. Interceptor airplanes, the fighters modern tactics call for to beat off bomber attacks, could not fly from the present bases on the prairie road. The average operational range of fighter airplanes is 600 miles. They could not fly to the coast and have any margin for fighting, let alone return to base. There is also the question of time lost in getting to the coast.

Fighter planes based on airports on the A route could quickly respond to an alarm over the Alaska coast, with gas to spare for fighting. They could serve as escorts to the bombers based inland on existing airports.

There is also grave doubt that the airports on the prairie route are located in advantageous sites. Certainly, the Pan American Airways, which flies from Seattle to Alaska, refuses to use the Yukon southern airports. Pilots on the Pan American have nicknamed the terrain between Fort St. John and Watson Lake the "million-dollar graveyard" because of the expensive airplanes that have been cracked up in the area. I am advised that no less than 14 operational accidents have occurred in that sector. On the other hand, Pan American has regularly flown over almost the exact course of the A route for several years with never a crash.

But to garrison these airports of doubtful value they selected a roadway route of less value, and propose to build the road over a bottomless swamp.

I think the American people are entitled to know the reasons behind the choice of this prairie roadway. Certainly, no military information will be divulged. The location of the airports and of the roadway has been broadcast by the Defense Board. The pros and cons of the various roadways have been published repeatedly in official reports. We owe it to the people of Alaska, who right now are up in arms over this choice of highways, to investigate this matter. They are the people most concerned, and rightly so. This war is closest to them, of all the people on the American Continent. They know the fate of Hong Kong and the other outposts Japan attacked. They have a right to an explanation of this highway route, that on the face of it seems contrary to all their most vital interests. The people of the States, if they were as familiar with the road as are Alaskans, would be just as concerned as the people of Alaska. The defense of Alaska is the defense of the United States. In Japanese hands, Alaska would be dreadful to contemplate. You may be sure that the lessons Gen. Billy Mitchell taught about its strategic value were not wasted on the Nipponese.

To sum up briefly: On the one hand, you have a proposed road that satisfies all the military and economic requirements for our closest and most important outpost. It can be built quickly, is open the year around, is shorter, connects with strategic locations and bases on the Alaskan coast, and would be cheaper to build.

On the other hand, you have a proposed road that is deficient in military requirements, is longer, cannot be built within the time limit set, if at all, and benefits no one in peace or in war save powerful transportation interests.

The road that satisfies nobody except the Defense Board and its military satellites and the Canadian Pacific is chosen over the objections of all the expert engineers, the Governors and ex-Governors of Alaska, United States Congressmen, Canadian statesmen, and the people most vitally concerned.

This situation demands an explanation from the standpoint of our safety. I urge upon the Senate, on the basis of the facts presented here today, to authorize an investigation of the location of the highway to Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 253) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Canadian-American Joint Defense Board has ordered construction of an overland highway to Alaska as a vital military measure, and such construction is proceeding; and

Whereas the location of this highway right-of-way has occasioned intense objections from the people of Alaska, its present Governor, its present commissioner of highways, from the Canadian and American members of the Alaska International Highway Commission, from Members of this Congress, and from other interested and qualified engineers; and

Whereas these objectors and the leading construction engineers of the Alaska Territory characterize the route selected as: (1) an engineering monstrosity because of muskeg swamp along a major portion of the route; (2) an economic absurdity because it is hundreds of miles from Alaska's supply bases in the States; (3) militarily insignificant because it fails to fulfill its function as a military route of speedy ground supply for Alaska; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Senate that the present location of the route confers great peacetime commercial benefits on certain Canadian corporate interests, and is in fact enabling these interests to monopolize present and future rail and air transport facilities; and

Whereas it appears that another route to Alaska, approved by the International Highway Commission, has been surveyed, is partially complete, and fills all the military, economic, and engineering requirements, but was ignored by the Joint Defense Board: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That a committee be named from among its Members to inquire into the location of the Alaska highway on the so-called C or prairie route, to determine if there exist real reasons for its location in its present contemplated route, or whether the Joint Defense Board was wittingly or unwittingly victimized into selection of a route of dubious benefit, and to recommend relocation or additional construction to the end that the vital military function of the completed road shall be served.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MRS. CLAUD TUCK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1694) for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Cooperation with the American Republics", on page 30, line 21, before the word "for", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$53,040", and on page 31, line 23, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$1,664,640."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 33, to insert:

Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $123,734, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Office of the Attorney General", on page 33, line 21, after the words "Administrative Division", to strike out "$830,000" and insert "$916,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 21, to strike out:

For the Personnel Division, $85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 25, after the word "Justice", to strike out "$567,000" and insert "$340,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous appropriations", on page 43, line 6, after the words "Antitrust Division", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I inquire at whom the amendment is aimed?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not aimed at anyone. A provision similar to this has been carried in this bill for a number of years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It appeared to be an amendment to the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. The House leaves out the provision and the Senate always restores it. It is simply to enable the Senate to keep its fingers on the power of appointment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a standard practice?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 43, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 21, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "newspaper (not exceeding $2,500), and press clippings" and insert "and newspapers (not exceeding $2,500)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 15, after the word "duties", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more and paid from this appropriation unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "3" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Penal and correctional institutions", on page 56, after line 4, to insert:

Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, with the exception of the amount for traveling expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Attorney General is authorized and directed on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $253,350, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Contingent expenses, Department of Commerce", on page 58, line 20, after the figures "1942", to insert "and for printing Sixteenth Census material", and in line 24, after "(44 U. S. C. 111, 220)", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$330,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$119,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census", on page 60, line 13, before the word "together", to strike out "$3,200,000" and insert "$3,163,992."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 22, after the word "records", to strike out "$556,500" and insert "$554,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 21, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$420,000" and insert "$415,518."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 9, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$1,257,000" and insert "$1,067,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", on page 64, line 7, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$5,640,000" and insert "$9,315,000, of which $2,875,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided,* That this appropriation and the unexpended balances of all appropriations heretofore made under this head for the fiscal year 1942 are hereby consolidated and shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund and remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $800,000 of this amount shall be available for the establishment of landing areas."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 1, after the word "specifications", to strike out "$380,000" and insert "$899,600, of which $519,600 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 10, to insert:

Development of landing areas: For continuation of the program for the construction, improvement, and repair of not to exceed 668 public airports and other public landing areas in the United States and its Territories and possessions, selected by the Administrator, and approved by a Board composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce, as necessary for national defense, including areas essential for safe approaches and including the acquisition of land, $199,740,000, to be immediately available, of which not to exceed $14,716,500 shall be available for administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further,* That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of $199,740,000, as well as any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under this head for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 are hereby consolidated and shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund under the appropriation under this head in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, and may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator explain this item?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment on page 66 of the bill came to the Committee on Appropriations by way of a supplemental estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, with a letter of transmittal from the President. If the Senator will turn to page 490 of the hearings he will note that it is a part of the pilot training and a part of the aviation development, all of which is very specifically called for by letters from the Secretary of War.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did the hearings disclose the point at which the 164 new airports are to be located?

Mr. McCARRAN. The hearings, in a confidential way, did disclose that information, but not definitely, for the reason that the War Department always reserves the right, as it states to the committee, of changing its mind as to the location of landing fields and airports.

Let me, in answer to the Senator's question, and in answer to the request of the Senator from Ohio, say that a great part of this expenditure is to be in the Territory of Alaska. In other words, Weather Bureau stations are to be located in the Territory of Alaska to work in conformity with the program for the

extension of our aviation facilities in that Territory.

Again, we are confronted with the War Department's request that the positions be not disclosed; but suffice it to say that it is all in keeping with the national defense and preparation for national activity in war.

Some of the 166 new fields are to be in Alaska and others in the several States of the Union. The other expenditure is for the improvement and enlargement of fields now in existence.

I may say that the program commences with pilot training and plane production. In other words, the President stated that we must produce in excess of so many thousand planes per annum, and we must train in excess of so many thousand pilots per annum. In order to produce these planes and provide places where they may operate, take off, and land, it becomes essential that we have landing fields and landing places all over the United States.

Let me say further, in explanation, that since the 7th of December orders have gone forth from the War Department that aviation activities, especially those having to do with the training of pilots, shall be removed at least a distance of 150 to 200 miles inland from the west coast. So it has become necessary to increase the number of fields in the interior away from the coast line.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the entire iron ore life line of the Nation as respects the war effort runs through the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and culminates in a bottleneck at the Soo locks, through which practically all the iron ore has to go to its ultimate destination. Anything that happened to the Soo locks, which is a concentrated target, would probably be as conclusive damage as anything possibly could be to the American war effort. Those of us who are intimately related to this exposure naturally perhaps are more concerned about it and more nervous about it than others.

There is no air protection nearer than Selfridge Field, away down on the southern rim of Michigan. There is in reality no air protection for this entire iron ore life line, stretching the entire length of Lake Superior, the harbors, the iron ore docks, the unloading machinery, and other vital places and objects.

For many months we have been seeking to impress upon the authorities the importance of an adequately equipped and manned military airport somewhere near the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, as a protection for this entire hazard. I was hoping the Senator would be able to assure me—and I should not think it would be a military secret, because I think it would be bad news for the enemy if it was true—that this appropriation contemplates protection at that key point in the defense program.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish I could give such assurance, but it seems to me that, within the latitude afforded by this very substantial appropriation, everything should be done by those who are interested in the matter the Senator brings to our attention to see to it that protection by air is afforded to that all-important strategic area. So far as I may have any influence whatever, I certainly should exert it in that direction.

Let me say further, however, that the Army is holding itself without specific commitment as to certain of these fields, with the view, as I understand, of being able to take care of just such positions and conditions as those the Senator brings to our attention. At least I hope the Army will see the light in that direction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I have no complaint to offer against the Army's reservation of freedom of action. I merely express the deep-seated hope that they will use a little of their freedom of action in the direction indicated.

Mr. McCARRAN. I join with the Senator in that hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 66, beginning on line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board", on page 69, line 12, after the word "binding", to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$14,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey", on page 72, line 19, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$449,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce", on page 75, line 18, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$1,140,000" and insert "$1,423,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$310,000" and insert "$397,000", and on page 76, line 8, after the word "thereunder", to strike out "$345,000" and insert "$430,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, under the headline "Patent Office", on page 77, line 23, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "and elsewhere", so as to read:

PATENT OFFICE

Salaries: For the Commissioner of Patents and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $3,893,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office", on page 79, line 2, after the word "indices", to strike out "$791,000" and insert "$632,800"; in line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "$69,000" and insert "$55,200", and in line 4, after the words "in all", to strike out "$860,000" and insert "$688,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards", on page 81, line 4, before the words "of which", to strike out "$377,000" and insert "$406,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 22, after the word "Standards", to strike out "$2,410,500" and insert "$2,440,200", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,132,000" and insert "$2,161,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau", on page 86, line 1, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$7,982,100" and insert "$8,761,135"; in line 11, after the word "Bureau", to strike out "$8,129,900" and insert "$8,908,935"; and in line 13, before the word "may", to strike out "$888,000" and insert "$900,880."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 87, to insert:

Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, with the exception of the amount for traveling expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed, on and before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $64,804, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—Court of Claims", on page 90, after line 24, to insert:

Repairs and improvements: For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, $4,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", on page 98, after line 18, to insert:

Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $30,387, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—General provisions", on page 101, after line 2, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 505. No part of the funds appropriated by titles II and IV for salaries of judges, the Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, Solicitor General, district attorneys, marshals, and clerks of court shall be used for any other purpose whatsoever, but such salaries shall be allotted out of appropriations herein made for such salaries and retained by the Department or the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and paid to such officials severally, as and when such salaries fall due and without delay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada to tell me

whether provision was inserted in the bill for an increase in the mileage rate for those using their own cars.

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the Department of Justice, the mileage was changed from 3 cents a mile to 4 cents a mile for those using their own cars.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his courtesy and cooperation in that particular.

I ask unanimous consent to recur to the item appearing in line 10, page 4, and I ask that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut that the vote by which the amendment on page 4, line 10, was agreed to be reconsidered? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether the particular cut here recommended by the Senate committee contemplates so great a reduction that publication by the Department of State of the volumes entitled "Foreign Relations" will not be possible.

Mr. McCARRAN. The printing and binding can be curtailed in accordance with the desires of those in charge of the department. That which is most essential can be produced and that which is least essential can be curtailed. That is the object of the amendment. The committee was impressed that somewhere, during this period, there must be a curtailment of the wholesale printing and binding which goes on in the various departments, some of which, indeed, much of which, is duplication. With the setting up of the United States Information Center, costing millions of dollars, it seemed to us that we could with propriety curtail some of the items, and one of them was printing and binding. So we provided here a blanket curtailment, which would allow the Secretary of State to issue the publications to which the Senator refers, and curtail in some other direction.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further to me in this connection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand that the last volumes of Foreign Relations which, in fact, have been published, are those for 1926, although they did not appear until last year, and if this particularly valuable series, already so sadly in arrears, were to be allowed to lapse and not be published at all, we might be much worse off even than we would be by saving the amount of 40 percent of the printing appropriations. I am informed by various professors of international law and students of the subject who have communicated with me on this point that they greatly fear that the weekly bulletin, and the peace conference volumes particularly, may be omitted if this reduction shall be retained. They point out to me that at a time when we necessarily must be preparing for peace the very least we should do is to have available the data and research material which would reflect on the last peace conference, but which to date are still in arrears. Because that material, it seems to me, is equally of importance to our present thinking, and at least should be available to students who pursue such matters, I should greatly dislike to see anything happen which would curtail the fund of knowledge at a time when it is most likely to be needed, and I am sure the Senator from Nevada shares my view. I seek the Senator's assurance that the cut can be so administered in the Department that less essential matter than such items as those to which I have referred may be eliminated.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the object of the method by which the Committee on Appropriations made the reduction, so that the head of the department could apply it to less essential publications and publish those which he considered to be vital or essential. I take it that the publication to which the Senator refers is an essential one.

Let me say further, while the matter is before us, that there is not an item in any bill which comes before the Committee on Appropriations which is not justified by the department or the bureau, or the group affected by any proposed cut. In every instance, without a single exception of which I am aware or when I have listened as a member of the committee, those affected have found a justification in national defense or the prosecution of the war which can scarcely be disputed. Some committee had to take a rather arbitrary stand, and the Committee on Appropriations is the one to do it, but in taking an arbitrary stand it has desired to do so with as little resulting harm as possible, at the same time effecting curtailments where possible. That was the object of the blanket cut now being discussed by the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I am reassured by what I know has been the diligent attention of the Senator from Nevada to the subject matter of my inquiry. I shall not pursue the subject further, and I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 4, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 41, line 9, after the word "laws", the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for alterations, improvements, and repairs to premises occupied for detention purposes, without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 278a), when authorized or approved by the Attorney General, and for all necessary expenses incident to the maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such aliens to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General."

Mr. McCARRAN. I think a word of explanation would do no harm, although it is not asked for.

The Immigration Service is handling the concentration camps, and those detained in concentration camps, and this amendment is offered to make provision so that the money may be available notwithstanding the provision of another law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I send forward another amendment, which I wish to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 3, it is proposed to insert the following proviso before the period: *"Provided further,* That $2,000,000 of this appropriation may be restored to the emergency fund for the President, created by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, in reimbursement of a like amount advanced therefrom."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6599) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I understand the calendar is in such condition that we may take up for consideration House bill 7008, to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue certain notes, bonds, and debentures. I may say that I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I should like to have the bill made the pending business, with the understanding that no action will be taken on the measure today, but that it will be taken up either next Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that it is my purpose to move an adjournment until Monday next. A special order has already been arranged for memorial services on Monday in honor of deceased Members of the Senate, and when those services shall have been concluded, I think we should properly adjourn until the following day. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Michigan and to the Senator from Oregon, I should like to have it understood that on Tuesday the Senate shall take up House bill 7008, which has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to make the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill the unfinished business today, because there will be no difficulty in making such a motion Tuesday.

Mr. BROWN. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say that I understand the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency will not take a great deal of time on Tuesday. I hope that, following the disposition of that bill, we may call the calendar for the disposition of unobjected-to bills, beginning with Calendar No. 1353, the point where the Senate left off at the last call of the calendar, on May 7.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS AT THE MILITARY ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase in the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRAINING OF PILOTS FOR THE ARMY AIR FORCE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I offer a page from the publication, Education for Victory, of May 15, 1942, published by the Office of Education, and request that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the matter to which I have just referred consists of three short articles, all of which relate to the subject of training of aviators. These articles emphasize the importance of my suggestion on March 31 that the schools and colleges of the country be utilized in obtaining material for the aviation service.

It is, however, with a view of attracting some additional attention to the program of the various departments for the building of the supply of reserves that I direct attention to this subject. The commanding general of the Army Air Forces announces that a candidate must be 18 to 26 years of age, inclusive, he must have graduated from high school, and must pass a special physical examination and a screening test, both of which will be administered at centrally located colleges and universities.

If accepted he will be placed in training where, as an aviation cadet, he will receive $75 per month, plus $1 a day for subsistence, as well as quarters, medical care, hospitalization, necessary uniforms, clothing, equipment, and a $10,000 Government life insurance policy. Following acceptance he will immediately be known as a member of the Reserves and be subject to call by the Government at any time. Representatives of the Air Corps will be located in various accepted colleges to which applications may be addressed.

The Navy opened its first preflight indoctrination school at the State University of Iowa April 15. Six hundred carefully selected naval aviation cadets began their 3 months' course and next week will commence actual preflight training. Additional groups of 600 each will arrive June 28 and July 28, after which it is anticipated that enrollment will remain stationary.

The Navy also is starting a mass program to train 40,000 enlisted men in radio work and visual signaling through privately operated schools. Contracts have been signed already with 20 schools. There will be 7 schools in elementary electricity and radio material. It is expected that under the Navy contract for the schools 24,000 radio operators will be trained in courses lasting 4 months.

The need for more pilots is responsible for the program prepared by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Army Air Corps asked that organization for 1,000 instructors in elementary and 1,000 in advanced flying to train pilots. Private pilots between 21 and 42 who can pass physical standards for commercial pilot's license and who have a reinstated pilot's license and airman identification cards are eligible to be instructors. The average rate of pay is $300 a month.

This pretentious program indicates the progress in training men for our air forces. It is believed that if properly pursued the colleges and high schools will produce an adequate supply of applicants for the flying service.

I am glad to have this opportunity to commend these agencies for their activity in devising and pursuing this program for the development of our air forces.

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES

THE AIR FORCES ENLISTED RESERVES

To meet the increasing demands for aircrews to man the fighting planes of the growing Army Air Forces and the ground crews to Keep 'em Flying, the War Department has launched a campaign in colleges, universities, and secondary schools throughout the Nation to provide thousands of young men for future requirements of the Army Flying services. Educators throughout the Nation are being asked to assist in this vital effort.

Enlistment on deferred service basis

The plan calls for the procurement of aviation cadets through enlistment in the Air Forces Enlisted Reserves. This is a part of a new enlarged Army Enlisted Reserve Corps program which provides opportunities for enlistment on a deferred service basis so that enrollees may continue their educational careers until actually required for training.

In order to be inducted into the Air Forces Enlisted Reserve, a candidate must be 18 to 26 years of age, inclusive, he must have graduated from high school, and must pass a special physical examination and a screening test, both of which will be administered at centrally located colleges and universities. While every effort will be made to allow students enrolled in the Enlisted Reserve to continue in school as long as possible, they are, nevertheless, subject to being called to active duty by the Secretary of War if the necessities of the emergency so dictate. The plan, however, is to defer them for further scholastic training, provided they maintain a satisfactory scholastic standard. As members of the Air Forces Enlisted Reserves, these students are no longer subject to call into other branches of the Armed Forces under the Selective Service Act.

May compete for commission

Those college students whose courses of study at the schools give them the specialized instruction necessary for such work as meteorology and communications will be given special permission to continue their schooling to enable them to qualify as officers for these posts. The extent to which students will be allowed to continue in college for these special posts will depend largely upon comprehensive examinations to be given to sophomore students enrolled in the Reserves. Students called to active duty from the Reserves become aviation cadets with the opportunity to compete for commissions. While in training as an aviation cadet a man will receive $75 per month plus $1 a day for subsistence, as well as quarters, medical care, hospitalization, necessary uniforms, clothing, equipment, and a $10,000 Government life insurance policy.

Backlog of manpower necessary

The backlog provided by enrollment of the thousands of eligible students in the Air Forces Enlisted Reserves is vital to the war effort. Ability of the Air Forces to draw upon this reservoir of qualified, physically fit young men is expected to insure orderly expansion and training of flying officers and men and the ground personnel necessary to provide air power on the battle fronts of the world.

The campaign, extended into virtually every college and university in the United States and to some senior students in the high schools, is intended, says the War Department, to maintain without delays anywhere along the line the flow of young men for the training which must be continued without interruption until the war is brought to a victorious close. Young men enrolled in the Air Forces Enlisted Reserves and deferred for scholastic reasons will be identified by an emblem similar to the familiar Air Forces wing and propeller insignia.

Central colleges as focal points

The college recruiting campaign was recently announced by Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, in a telegram to centrally located colleges throughout the country. These central colleges are to serve as focal points for organizing campaigns in colleges and secondary schools in their vicinities.

In a letter confirming the telegrams General Arnold said: "The successful prosecution of this war demands the creation of an air

force second to none on earth, and this in turn requires the eventual enlistment as an aviation cadet of every young man who can qualify for service with the United States Army Air Forces.

"This need is imperative—the number of those fitted for this exacting duty so limited—that without hesitation the air forces are asking for the cooperation of every educator in the United States

"An earnest attempt has been made to devise a program that will enable the air forces to obtain the very large number of aviation cadets which must be trained every year until this war is brought to a successful conclusion, and at the same time cause the least possible disruption in the Nation's educational program."

Faculty air forces advisers

General Arnold has requested that colleges and universities and secondary schools appoint a faculty air forces adviser to serve as a definite point of contact between the air forces personnel and the college and high-school students.

"To this representative," General Arnold said, "all future communications will be sent. Also he will be kept fully informed of plans and changes in plans, and with him the Office of the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces will establish a relationship which will facilitate the exchange of information and advice. He will aid the air forces officers to avoid disruption of college activities and will bring to our attention the problems that will arise because of local conditions."

General Arnold explained that the new plan of enlisting Reserves "will benefit the young men concerned and their colleges, and also serve the vital purpose of insuring the Army Air Forces a continuous supply of young men well qualified by education to become officers in all branches of the Army Air Forces."

Manual of instructions

A special manual of instructions was issued by the Army Air Forces. Copies have been sent to the air forces faculty advisers who have been appointed in colleges and universities and secondary schools. It contains complete information concerning the program and should be studied carefully by all those who will serve in administrative and advisory capacities.

UNITED STATES NAVY

PREFLIGHT INDOCTRINATION SCHOOL

The Navy opened its first preflight indoctrination school at the State University of Iowa on April 15.

Six hundred carefully selected naval aviation cadets will begin their 3 months' course of actual preflight training on May 28. Additional groups of 600 each will arrive June 28 and July 28, when it is anticipated enrollment will remain stationary.

The commanding officer of the new training center is Capt. David C. Hanrahan, United States Navy (retired).

A similar 3 months' toughening program will begin in the near future at the Universities of Georgia, North Carolina, and at St. Mary's College in California.

The opening of these institutions to naval aviation cadets represents the beginning of a new naval aviation training program to induct 30,000 student pilots annually. Each institution will provide buildings, grounds, dormitories, dining rooms, and classroom facilities for approximately 2,000 men.

Utilizes private schools

The Navy is starting a mass program to train 40,000 enlisted men annually in radio work and visual signaling through privately operated schools.

Contracts have been signed with 20 schools already and one more contract is pending. All the schools start classes by June 1, 1942. Thirteen of these have already begun their training programs.

Seven schools in elementary electricity and radio material have already started classes. These schools have contracted for quotas of 713 men per month, which means 8,556 men per year. These courses are 12 weeks in length, and graduates will then go to 2 secondary schools, operated by the Navy, for 5-month courses.

Under Navy contract there will be 24,000 radio operators trained, each in courses lasting 4 months.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION TO PRODUCE 2,000 FLIGHT INSTRUCTORS

The Army Air Forces Flying Training Command needs more pilots, according to its announcement. For this purpose there must be more flight instructors. The Army has, therefore, asked the Civil Aeronautics Administration to furnish, by June 15, 1,000 instructors in elementary and 1,000 in advanced flying to train pilots for the Army air forces.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration some time ago practically exhausted its force of experienced pilots in order to produce instructors. After this was done it was necessary to train pilots and then give additional training to make them into instructors.

Now the need is urgent so that the call is for all private pilots between the ages of 21 and 42 who can pass the physical standards for commercial pilot's license, and who have a reinstated pilot's license and airman identification card.

There are, in all probability, many pilots who could be of significant service in this program. These are individuals who do not meet the physical qualifications for combat duties or perhaps those whose positions in life justify deferment from military service.

The average rate of pay is $300 a month. All flight contractors start instructors at a salary of around $200 a month. Those interested should consult the nearest Civil Aeronautics Administration office. If the address of this office is not known it can be obtained at any near airport.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message informed the Senate that Mr. ARENDS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength, vice Mr. SHORT, resigned; and also that Mr. ARENDS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, vice Mr. SHORT, resigned.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry cadets, United States Military Academy, to be graduated May 29, 1942, to be appointed second lieutenants in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law, to rank from May 29, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lincoln MacVeagh, of Connecticut, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Langdon Sands, of Florida, to be Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career and secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adolphus Andrews, to be vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from

May 1, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, eastern sea frontier.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that that nomination go over for the day.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to have the nomination go over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Oregon asks that the nomination of John W. Greenslade also go over?

Mr. McNARY. No; I ask that the nomination of Adolphus Andrews go over. Some Senators have stated they would like to look into the report more completely. The report has not yet been published by the Committee on Naval Affairs. My objection applies only to the nomination of Adolphus Andrews.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will go over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Greenslade to be vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 1, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, western sea frontier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert H. English to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 8, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of Admiral Andrews, I regret that the report concerning the nominee is not yet available. The committee has had the report for 2 or 3 days, but it has been held up so that it is not possible to file it. I think it will be available in the next few days.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator says the report will be available within the next few days.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was understood that it would be. It has not yet been released by the committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Will it be available to us by Monday?

Mr. BREWSTER. I doubt it. I do not understand that this affects the functioning of Admiral Andrews' assignment as commander of the eastern sea frontier, combatting the submarine menace. He is exercising all the authority, but it is believed that giving him the additional rank will enable him to function more efficiently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald B. Beary to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from December 1, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the regular service of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations for promotion in the regular service are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it occurs to me that we may, unconsciously perhaps, be doing a bit of injustice. If I may make a brief explanation as a preface for that conclusion, it may commend itself to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that we recur to the list of promotions in the Navy and defer until Tuesday all nominations above the rank of commander. I make that unanimous-consent request because conceivably Vice Admiral Andrews, at the head of the list at the present time, might be subordinated in the date of his commission if we should consent to the promotion of the other vice admiral and the rear admirals and defer action on the nomination of Admiral Andrews.

Let me say further, Mr. President, speaking for myself, that personally I am fully convinced that Admiral Andrews was in no way responsible for the loss of the *Normandie*. I also think that, for the benefit of all Senators who will be called upon to confirm the nomination of Admiral Andrews, we ought to have the report which the Senate Naval Affairs Committee has compiled, and which is printed, but which has not yet been released to Members of the Senate. If we have the report at hand at the time we act upon his nomination, everyone will know that we are acting in the light of the evidence developed in the investigation and in the light of the conclusions stated in the report.

With that explanation, I submit the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in connection with the request, and in view of what has transpired, I think it should be clear that the nomination of Admiral Andrews was held up for some time in the Committee on Naval Affairs at my request, until the report regarding the investigation in connection with the *Normandie* was available. That was a most exhaustive report. It is now a printed document, but, as a result of some questions which were raised, it has not yet been released by the Naval Affairs Committee. However, as the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, it was sufficient to satisfy me, and I think others, that, whatever may have been the confusion which prevailed in the command at New York at the time of the *Normandie* incident, Admiral Andrews was not the one primarily responsible.

In fact, if Admiral Andrews had intervened in the course of the reconstruction of the *Normandie*, I think it would have been regarded by the Bureau of Ships, which was immediately in charge, as an intrusion, in spite of the fact that Admiral Andrews had receipted for the *Normandie*. It was on that basis that it was felt by some that his responsibility might be fixed.

However, an examination of all the circumstances makes it perfectly clear that he could not, without intruding beyond the sphere of his ordinary activities, have taken charge of that situation. Great confusion prevailed throughout the whole affair. Admiral Andrews finally ordered the firemen to get off the boat and stop pouring water into her, but as a result of the refusal of anybody to recognize the authority of Admiral Andrews, it was necessary to get in touch with the Mayor of New York before the flow of water which was inundating the ship could be stopped. Under those circumstances I felt, from my investigation, that Admiral Andrews was amply cleared.

The other matter which is of concern on the eastern sea frontier is the submarine menace, which is now facing not only our Atlantic seaboard, but also our Gulf coast, where shipping is practically paralyzed. Shipping losses have run to 190 ships. This does not seem to me to be primarily the responsibility of Admiral Andrews, but rather the responsibility of those who have failed to provide the equipment essential to meet the submarine menace with some such measure of success as has been achieved by our British friends. Within 400 miles of the British Isles there has been scarcely a sinking within the past year. If the submarine menace can be met in that fashion over there, I feel confident that it can be met along our seaboard the moment the instrumentalities are provided. Certainly Admiral Andrews could not be held responsible for improvising speed boats, blimps, and other essentials to carry on this warfare.

For these reasons, while I was responsible for deferring consideration of Admiral Andrews' nomination, I am now satisfied that the more promptly it can be confirmed the more advantageous it will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Connecticut whether his request amounts to a request that all the nominations in the Navy down to that of Clarence E. Voegeli, the first commander, shall go over until Tuesday? Does the Senator mean to ask that the nominations of all those who are promoted to rear admiral or vice admiral go over until Tuesday?

Mr. DANAHER. I see the point of the Senator's question. I think the unanimous-consent request properly may be modified to include only those who would otherwise be promoted for temporary service. Thus it would take into account only Adolphus Andrews, John W. Greenslade, Robert H. English, and Donald B. Beary.

Mr. BARKLEY. How about the nomination of James L. Kauffman for promotion to rear admiral?

Mr. DANAHER. Apparently that is a promotion in the regular service.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. So the Senator really requests that only the nominations of those who are promoted to vice admiral and rear admiral, except the nomination of James L. Kauffman, go over until Tuesday; is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection, although I hope that on Tuesday the Senate may confirm the nominations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the majority leader to the fact that two nominations of rear admirals appear on the next page, and that under the circumstances the agreement should be phrased so as not to include them. The Senator will notice that on page 6 of the Executive Calendar appear the nominations of William R. Munroe, as rear admiral, and John F. Shafroth, Jr., as rear admiral. The Senator from Connecticut was pointing out that if the unanimous consent agreement did not apply to those receiving promotion in the regular service it would permit them to receive their promotion in the regular manner.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the question of the Senator from Ohio is answered by the fact that the Senator from Connecticut asked that only the nominations of those who are to be promoted for temporary service go over until Tuesday. All other nominations are to be confirmed. The agreement simply means that the nominations of Adolphus Andrews, John W. Greenslade, Robert H. English, and Donald B. Beary will go over until next Tuesday.

Mr. BURTON. I entirely agree with the Senator. I was merely afraid that the Senator's mention of the nomination of Admiral Kauffman alone might be confusing.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the request does not affect that nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the nominations of John W. Greenslade, to be vice admiral, Robert H. English, to be rear admiral, and Donald B. Beary, to be rear admiral, were confirmed? The Chair hears none; the votes by which the nominations were confirmed are reconsidered, and the nominations are returned to the calendar.

As previously announced, the nomination of Adolphus Andrews, to be vice admiral, will be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF MILITARY ACADEMY GRADUATES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the nominations of the cadets who will graduate at West Point were favorably reported to the Senate earlier in the day. The authorities at the Military Academy are very anxious to have the nominations confirmed as quickly as possible, so that they may know by Tuesday, at the latest, that they have been confirmed, and the necessary steps may be taken to issue commissions as second lieutenants in the Army to the West Point graduates.

The Senate will not be in session tomorrow, and on Monday we do not expect to transact any business. That being the case, unless the Senate should act on the nominations today, they could not be acted upon before Tuesday.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, which has jurisdiction over nominations, has acted on the nominations and has made a favorable report on them. In addition to the members of the subcommittee, three other members of the full committee have also approved the nominations, but the nominations have not been approved by the full committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Does that constitute a majority of the committee?

Mr. HILL. That does not constitute a majority of the full committee.

Mr. McNARY. Has the chairman been consulted?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the chairman has been consulted and has approved the nominations. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is chairman of the subcommittee, which includes also the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The subcommittee has acted favorably on the nominations.

Mr. McNARY. It is largely a matter of routine.

Mr. HILL. It is a matter of routine. The cadets have finished their 4 years' work at the Military Academy and have successfully passed their examinations. Of course they are entitled to their commissions.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that in many instances the Senate has acted by unanimous consent but always after a report of the full committee supporting the recommendation. It is only a technical routine matter. Inasmuch as it is essential that some action be taken between now and Tuesday, personally, I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no question about the confirmation of the nominations. The cadets have all graduated. They have passed their examinations, and the only question is whether we shall act upon the nominations today as a routine matter, or act upon them next Tuesday.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I think an exception should be made; but the practice itself is not to be commended. In any other instance I should object.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is not to be regarded as a precedent.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, these boys have finished their 4-year course and have passed their examinations. They have been recommended by the authorities of the academy, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has acted favorably on the nominations.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 25, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 15), 1942:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John B. Colpoys of the District of Columbia to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia. Mr. Colpoys is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 28, 1942.

M. Frank Hammond, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas. Mr. Hammond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 28, 1942.

JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Ernest K. Kai, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Carrick H. Buck, who has been appointed to the First Circuit Court, Territory of Hawaii.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Vincent Paul O'Reilly, of Lynchburg, Va., to be a senior administrative officer, CAF-12, $4,600 per annum, in the Office of Civilian Defense.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM MAY 29, 1942

Corps of Engineers

1. James Hart Hottenroth.
3. Henry Preston Halsell.
4. Thomas Henry Lauer.
7. George Edward Hesselbacher, Jr.
8. Robert Paul Young.
9. John Moore McMurray.
10. James Bryan Newman 3d.
15. John Earle Kennedy, Jr.
16. William Harold Morgan.
17. Lawrence Willard Vogel.
18. George Chambers Hozier.
20. John Winthrop Barnes.
21. William Ward Watkin, Jr.
22. Leon Joseph Hamerly.
23. Edward Ambrose Martell.
24. John Arnot Hewitt.
26. Francis Paul Koisch.
27. Daniel Arthur Raymond.
28. Jerrold Duster Snow.
29. Joseph John Schmidt, Jr.
30. Eric Castlereigh Orme.
32. Robert Maurice Rawls.
33. Alvin Dumond Wilder, Jr.
34. Philip George Krueger.
36. Miles Lowell Wachendorf.
37. Robert Peyton Tabb, Jr.
39. Fred Edgar Rosell, Jr.
40. John Clement Mattina.
41. Frank Clyde Smiley, Jr.
42. Mahlon Eugene Gates.
43. John Pierce Beeson, Jr.
45. John Emory Gimperling.
47. Richard Louis Hennessy.
49. Thomas Adrian Norwood.
50. Edward McWayne Wright.
51. Roger Alley Barnes.
52. Seymour Rubenstein.
53. Theodore James Michel.
55. Edmond Harrison Leavey, Jr.

Signal Corps

12. Hugh Pat Williams.
14. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr.

25. Yates Michel Hill.
46. Roger Lee Russell, Jr.
48. Charles Emerson Ragland.
57. Eugene Leland Weeks.
60. John Warmington Atwood.
63. Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt, Jr.
69. Thomas Francis Farrell, Jr.
72. Thomas Matthew Rienzi.
74. Louis Polcari.
75. Charles Fred Shutrump 2d.
81. Edwin Felix Pezda.
82. Ben Franklin Hardaway, Jr.
96. Robert Davis Terry.
115. Marshall Waller.
122. Leonard John Pasciak.
124. Joseph Richard Elliott.
129. George Raybourn O'Neal.
145. Edward Allan Munns.
155. Roy William Ballard.
157. Harold Windsor Rice.
187. John Clarence Peck.
188. James Woodrow Bigbee.
197. Jacob Baer Cooperhouse.
207. Ira Welch Thompson.
220. Leon Stann.
241. Walter Franklin Griffin.
249. Pierce Anthony Doyle, Jr.

Cavalry

35. William Tuttle Hamilton, Jr.
54. John Wallis Leonard.
56. Francis Eugene Voegeli.
58. John Preston Sheffey 3d.
66. Charles Marshall Fergusson, Jr.
77. Rollin Thomas Steinmetz, Jr.
78. Carl Helmstetter, Jr.
83. William Russell Kraft, Jr.
88. Arthur Lawrence Lambert.
94. Wilbur Deane Snow.
95. Campbell Palfrey, Jr.
104. Jack Lester Bogusch.
105. John Randle Watson.
106. Roy Orval Smith, Jr.
131. Cyrus Edson Manierre, Jr.
135. Andrew Hudson Weigel.
143. Richard Arthur House.
150. Lowell Stanley Nickodem.
158. Sam Powell Wagner.

Field Artillery

62. Harold Archer Ogden.
65. William Hampton Edwards.
67. Peter Richard Moody.
68. Horace Allan Lawler.
85. Charles Malcom Mizell.
87. John Clinton Cockrill, Jr.
98. Carey Herbert Brown, Jr.
110. John Marion Baker.
112. Philip Shaw Wood, Jr.
113. Philip Henry Riedel, Jr.
116. Dale Eldon Buchanan.
117. George R. Allin, Jr.
118. Lawrence Lahm.
121. Selmer Gustaves.
123. James Francis Clark Hyde, Jr.
125. Thomas Taylor Galloway.
127. Charles Curtis George.
128. John Paul Omans.
130. John Douglas Reid.
141. John Edward Craig.
147. Joel John Dilworth.
149. George Rogers Selp.
159. William Robert Hughes.
165. Wayne George McCarthy.
167. Thomas James Hanley 3d.
168. Severino Martinez, Jr.
170. Jay Jaynes.
171. James Madison Caviness, Jr.
175. John Dennis Sitterson, Jr.
176. James Edwin Wise.
177. Francis Joseph Roberts.
179. William Davis Tatseh.
182. John Aloysius Ryan, Jr.
190. Henry Premyslaus Kozlowski.
191. Leon Bilstin.
195. John Lloyd McKee, Jr.
198. Karl Nelson Retzer.
199. Frank Dwight Waddell.
202. Roy Stanley Geiger, Jr.
211. Philip Alfred Wyman.
219. Howard Lay Burris.
222. Fred Cutting Tucker.
223. Charles Brooks Gracey, Jr.
227. Donald Frank Blaha.
236. William Cloyd Plott.
238. William Henry Crosson, Jr.
239. James Norwood Wood.
244. Harvey Wirt Courtland Shelton.
245. Phillip Marshall Costain.
247. Robert Henry Hinckley, Jr.
251. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr.
252. Donald George Jackson.
254. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr.
256. Albert Edward Hunter.
258. Lawrence Augustus Adams, Jr.
259. Roy Walter Johnson, Jr.
260. Raymond Laurence Miller.
261. Richard Paul Yeilding.
262. Hal Creighton McMaster.
264. William Edgar Gernert.
267. Lee Emir Cage.
269. Frank Wharton Williams 2d.
270. Robert Arnold Berman.
271. Joel Beck Stephens.
272. Edwin Griffin Clapp, Jr.
274. Robert Elmer Winkelmeyer.
276. Radcliffe Spencer Simpson.
277. Thomas Hunter Crary.
281. Frederick Weston Hyde, Jr.
282. John Clayton Adams, Jr.
284. Howard Westley Slaton.
285. Mark John Burke.
287. Richard Robert Clark.
288. Joseph Morgan Cannon, Jr.
291. Thomas Kennedy Trainer.
298. Charles Russell Hill.
326. Edgar Bergman Colladay, Jr.

Coast Artillery Corps

6. Sam Ellsworth Cumpston.
13. Richard Malcolm Horridge.
31. Paul Robert Cerar.
61. John Baker.
71. Rosario Pietro Bonasso.
73. Theodore James McAdam.
84. Richard Eddy Gaspard.
86. Raymond Patrick Murphy.
91. Andrew Stevenson Low, Jr.
100. El Roy Paul Master.
101. Robert Walter Fritz.
102. Stanton Wayne Josephson.
103. William Edward Corley, Jr.
107. Jere Washington Maupin.
108. James Alfred Vivian.
114. Lee Glasier Jones.
119. Paul Berkshire Woodward.
120. Fred Ernest Holdrege, Jr.
132. Matthew John Redlinger, Jr.
133 Donald Eugene Simon.
136. Glen William Russell.
137. John Carter Ford.
138. John Munroe Anderson.
139. Charles Elbridge Howe, Jr.
140. Donald Hilary Connolly, Jr.
144. Robert Clark Kates.
148. Benjamin Ira Hill.
151. Charles Howard Garvin.
161. Frank Clark Scofield, Jr.
166. Jesse Lee Lewis, Jr.
169. John Joseph Short.
174. Cecil Kenneth Charbonneau, Jr.
178. Chester Reed Ladd.
180. Albert Nicholas Thompson.
184. Harry Franklin Boone.
189. Walter Walton Dillon.
204. Byron Arthur Evans.
205. Thomas Peter Iuliucci.
208. Thomas Harvey Tarver.
210. Edward Lawrence Corcoran.
213. VanCleave Parrott Warren.
214. George Thad Buck, Jr.
217. Lawrence Francis McGuire.
221. Galen Person Robbins.
224. Wyley Lovelace Baxter.
225. Archibald Donald Fisken, Jr.
231. Walter Harlen Peirce.
235. Charles Eugene Robbs.
237. Linwood Fogg Jordan.
240. Ulysses Grant Jones, Jr.
242. Claire Alfred Pelton Duffie.

Infantry

2. James Henry Hayes.
5. Elliott Carr Cutler, Jr.
11. John Reiley Finney.
38. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr.
44. Robert Langdon Ferguson.
59. Carter Williamson, Jr.
64. Wayne Leonard Bart.
70. Gerhardt Christopher Clementson.
76. David Rowland.
79. John William Harrell, Jr.
80. Alexander McCarrell Patch, Jr.
89. Garrard Foster.
90. Kenneth Frederick Hanst, Jr.
92. Garth Stevens.
93. Lawrence Lofton Cobb, Jr.
97. Carl William Stapleton.
99. Robert Bryan Short.
109. Philip Edward Horan, Jr.
111. Thurman McCord Brandon.
126. Floyd Irvin Robinson.
134. Albert Oliver Witte.
142. William Burr Clark.
146. Walter Dean Short.
152. Arvol Duane Allen.
153. Edgar Allan Rickman.
154. Samuel Hubbard Hays.
156. Richard Wood Maffry.
160. Robert Horatio Clagett, Jr.
162. James Knox Cockrell, Jr.
163. Henry Compton Benitez.
164. John Ashton Ely.
172. Carl Comer Ulsaker.
173. Robert William Carpenter, Jr.
181. Samuel Alexander Gibson, Jr.
183. Mark Howard Terrel.
185. Frederic Homer Sargent Tate.
186. Carl Columbus Hinkle, Jr.
192. John Russell Deane, Jr.
193. Miles Alderman Gayle.
194. James Edmund Buckley.
196. James Boone Bartholomees.
200. Henry Harmeling, Jr.
201. James Nicholas Studer.
203. Richard Atlee Wise.
206. Robert Henry Ivey.
209. William Charles Warren.
212. Allen Everett Frawley.
215. George Denny Hughes.
216. William Franklin Smith, Jr.
218. Ollie William Reed, Jr.
226. John Ott Sanders Damron.
228. Robert Hilton Offley, Jr.
229. Charles Marmaduke Grimshaw.
230. Samuel William Koster, Jr.
233. Richard David Reinbold.
234. Thomas Patrick Furey.
243. Ralph James White.
246. Charles Berra.
248. Robert Houston Townsend.
250. William Carroll Garland.
253. Alfred Franklin Grieco.
255. Joe Dean Hennessee.
257. Douglas Cunningham Murray.
263. James Richard Pendergrast.
265. Wayne Norbury Bolefahr.
266. Robert Ramsey Evans.
268. Robert William Beers.
273. Arthur Robert King.
275. Howard Martin Fender.
278. August Dorsey Parker, Jr.
279. Forrest Stewart Gatchel.
280. Wallace Biddle Frank.
283. Robert MacDougall Bringham.
286. John Richard Murphy.
289. James Elwood Josendale.
290. Altus Grant Steadman.
292. Robert Morris Blair.
293. Edwin Hall Marks, Jr.
294. Albert Charles Reinert.
295. Frank Butner Clay.
296. Leonard John Blissenbach.
297. Richard Cutler Miles.
299. Claude Cleo Lumpkin, Jr.
300. Sidney Hooper Young, Jr.
301. Charles Kelly Borteil.
302. John Raymond Moran.
303. Walter Alfred Divers.
304. David Darwin May.

305. Peter Talbot Russell.
306. John Fuller Davis, Jr.
307. Jack Willard Pryor.
308. Gene Clifford Smith.
309. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr.
310. David Clark Claggett.
311. John Wilkinson Heard.
312. Vincent Lincoln Coates.
313. Robert Burnett Spilman.
314. John Hurst Westenhoff.
315. Daniel Edward Halpin.
316. James Stanley Woolfolk.
317. John William Guckeyson.
318. John Boursiquot Ross.
319. Earnest Johnson White, Jr.
320. Luis John Flanagan.
321. Clifford Cobb Sherman.
322. Richard Martin Scott.
323. William Francis Loughman, Jr.
324. Henry William Urrutia.
325. Charles Ray Rogers.
327. Keith Grayson Chatfield.
328. Donald Eugene Deffke.
329. William Edgar Shedd 3d.
330. Charles Carroll Fishburne, Jr.
331. Richard Patrick Brice, Jr.
332. Joseph Bell.
333. Joe Virgil Morey.
334. George Lawrence Eckert.
335. Leonard Samuel Marshall.
336. Timothy Asbury Pedley 3d.
337. Jesse Richard Miles, Jr.
338. George Rayens Grant.
339. Frederick Dana Standish 2d.
340. Donnelly Paul Bolton.
341. James Savage Braden.
342. Allan Richard Scullen.
343. Charles Andrew Beaucond, Jr.
344. Lynn DeWitt Sifford, Jr.
345. Charlie Calhoun Coleman.
346. George Williams, Jr.
347. Samuel Withers Howell, Jr.
348. Allen Monroe Otis.
349. William Morris Zimmerman.
350. James Simmons Timothy.
351. Albert Edward Seifert.
352. George Robert Rew.
353. Jerome Pershing Ellis.
354. Thomas Seelye Arms, Jr.
355. Ellwood Tylor Claggett.
356. Boyd Freeze Walker.
357. Kenneth Earl Dyson.
358. Edward Joseph Alleo.
359. Lucius DuBignon Clay, Jr.
360. William Ross Scott, Jr.
361. Frederick Charles Uhler.
362. George Doan Rehkopf.
363. Wilfred Craig Ford.
364. Samuel Hampton Henton, Jr.
365. Thaddeus Francis Dziuban.
366. Albert McConnell Ward.
367. Robert George Brugh, Jr.
368. John Myrddin Davies 3d.
369. Austin Patrick Byrne.
370. Richard Stockton Field, Jr.
371. Alden McLellan, Jr.
372. Charles Campbell Ettlesen.
373. Thomas Hasset Ray, Jr.
374. John Denis Crowley, Jr.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Rear Admiral Walter B. Woodson to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years from the 20th day of June 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 15), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lincoln MacVeagh to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

William Langdon Sands to be Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Frederick E. Farnsworth to be a consul of the United States of America.

P. Ridgway Lineaweaver to be a consul of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Howard W. Wilmoth, Wasilla.

CONNECTICUT

Julius Woodruff Johnson, Georgetown.
Helen K. O'Brien, Glenville.
Joseph M. Halloran, New Britain.
Mary P. Beauregard, Wauregan.

FLORIDA

Anna W. Lewis, Everglades.
Norma F. Hutchenson, Fort Barrancas.
William R. Vosburgh, Lutz.

GEORGIA

Alexander S. Chamlee, Bartow.
Ruth A. Redmond, Chatsworth.
Robert H. Manson, Darien.
William T. Adkins, Edison.
Sara B. Green, Fairburn.
Charles Clements, La Fayette.
Ernest L. Wilson, Leslie.
George W. Cornwell, Monticello.
C. Heard Tolbert, Omega.
Irene S. Walker, Patterson.
Susie M. Lunsford, Smithville.
Mamie G. White, Stone Mountain.
Roy D. Smith, Tennille.
Carleen S. Bell, Trion.
Arthur E. Horn, White Hall.

INDIANA

Marjorie I. Stevens, Cynthiana.
Irven V. Tyler, Georgetown.
Lueldo R. Davis, Marengo.
Clarence R. Nagel, Milan.
Harry S. Glump, New Harmony.
Fred J. Merline, Notre Dame.
Earl M. Miller, Princeton.
Ruth N. Hearn, Whiteland.

IOWA

John J. Herkenrath, Portsmouth.

MICHIGAN

Janet C. White, Essexville.
Glenn O. Donner, Garden City.
Allgot B. Johnson, Ironwood.
Maud B. Perham, Lakeside.
Leo W. Arnestad, Marenisco.
Mary E. Devins, Michigamme.
George D. Mason, Montague.
Peter Trudell, Jr., Negaunee.
Charles P. Sawyer, Newaygo.
Eva A. Wurzburg, Northport.
Victoria Jesionowski, Posen.
Lulu H. O'Rourke, Richmond.
George E. Judd, St. Johns.
Louis J. Braun, South Range.

NEBRASKA

Vernon G. Wager, Arlington.
Louis F. Kreizinger, Bellwood.
Esther A. Carlson, Mead.

NEW MEXICO

Cora A. Hanagarne, Shiprock.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Bonner, Aurora.
T. Coleman Galloway, Brevard.
G. Leslie Hensley, Burnsville.
Clinton E. Bolick, Conover.
Samuel T. Stough, Davidson.
Carroll E. Kramer, Edenton.
Cleveland C. Hines, Hollyridge.
May Calvert, Jackson.
William W. Hampton, Leaksville.
Oscar L. Phillips, Matthews.
Columbus L. Biggerstaff, Rutherfordton.
James H. Howell, Waynesville.

RHODE ISLAND

Thomas F. Burke, Barrington.

WASHINGTON

Orris E. Marine, Colton.
Adrian C. Gehres, Connell.
Mary E. Brown, Sequim.
George P. Fishburne, Tacoma.
Grover C. Houtchens, Waitsburg.
Joshua E. Leander, White Bluffs.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of James Hart Hottenroth et al. to be second lieutenants with rank from May 29, 1942.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations to be second lieutenants in the Regular Army were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings under the caption "Nominations" in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE OF THE NAVY

The nominations of James L. Kauffman et al.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations for promotion in the Navy, regular service, may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 14, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 4211.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend Joseph Singleton Cook, pastor, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Columbus, Ga., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. Our minds are turned toward Thee in this hour because our problems are many and because our need of divine guidance and wisdom is very great. And so may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6709. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS TO PROVIDE WAR HOUSING AND WAR PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 308, making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There being no objection, the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

MOBILIZATION OF PRODUCTION FACILITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 488, Rept. No. 2141), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of the successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE LATE RAYMOND BARTLETT STEVENS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House the death on May 18, in his sixty-eighth year, of the Honorable Raymond Bartlett Stevens, of Landaff, N. H., Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission and a former Representative from the Second New Hampshire District.

For 33 fruitful years Mr. Stevens served the interests of the people and Government of the United States, in his own State, in Washington, and in foreign lands. I stand today in the place he occupied in this House 29 years ago. I only wish that I might be gifted for this brief moment with the eloquence with which Mr. Stevens was so splendidly endowed, to the end that I might present a fitting tribute to his memory. I can only pay my respects in the simplest manner, speaking of him in the homely terms of one who knew him well and valued his friendship.

Raymond Stevens rose up on many occasions as champion of the cause of the common man, and it was not in hollow phrases alone that he expressed his championship. He possessed deep-seated convictions regarding the aims of democratic government, and at every turn he followed those convictions, cost him what it might.

Educated at Harvard College and Harvard Law School, he graduated from the latter in 1899 and was admitted to the New Hampshire bar in the same year. His service to the people of this country began when he was elected to the New Hampshire House of Representatives in 1909. From those simple beginnings grew a career that spanned the years and the globe. It was the career of one who cared little for selfish gain, whose selflessness was rewarded by a grateful Government. It was a career rich in variety as in service. After three sessions in the New Hampshire Legislature, Mr. Stevens was elected to the Sixty-third Congress. He sought election to the Senate in 1914, but was unsuccessful. He became special counsel for the Federal Trade Commission in 1915, and remained in that position until 1917, when he became Vice Chairman of the United States Shipping Board. Until 1920 he held that post and was American representative on the Allied Maritime Transport Council, one of our important war agencies.

Mr. Stevens went abroad in 1926 to become adviser on foreign affairs to the King of Siam. He remained in Siam for 10 years as a friend and counsel to the King, as a member of the Siamese Supreme Court, and as a member of that nation's railroad commission. He was an important figure among the group of men who drew up the Siamese Constitution.

He returned to America in 1935 to become a member of the United States Tariff Commission, of which he has been Chairman since 1937.

In party matters, Ray Stevens was a Democrat, and he served his party well. I often had occasion to seek his opinion on the whole wide scope of governmental affairs. Although our political differences sometimes made it impossible for me to agree with him, he always was ready with his counsel and he generously gave of his fine store of understanding to assist in clarifying the subject under discussion.

New Hampshire has lost an outstanding citizen and the Government has lost a valuable public servant. To his devoted family I extend my deepest sympathy in this hour of bereavement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to the Governor of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by the Honorable Richard Neuberger, appearing in the current issue of the Nation magazine in reference to the Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and T. V. A. Dams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a press release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by David Lawrence appearing in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., entitled "United States Hews Path to Victory."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WADSWORTH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the San Francisco News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Brandt, president of the Land O' Lakes Creameries Association, on the definition of parity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent article by Frank Kent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the reddest paper I know of is the United States Treasury statement. If you look at the statement of May 18 you will find that we have gone in the red $16,357,000,000. I would ask the Treasury Department to print this statement in red ink.

I notice in the paper that the President has requested $8,818,000 increase for the C. C. C. program, the increase being largely needed to run the camps a full year. The trouble is that those who are running the C. C. C. have to coax boys to come into the camps in order to maintain the enrollment. If the President wants to change this Treasury statement, he should cut down the nonessential expenditures of the Government. Neither he nor anyone else will be able to cause this statement to balance unless we do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PAY OF SOLDIERS AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, from the morning press we learn that there is a proposal on foot to pay Government employees time and a half for overtime.

Surely the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, surely our conferees, will not cut down the pay of the enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps below the $50 provided in my amendment adopted by the House of Representatives, if we are going to increase the pay of people on the pay roll who are getting many, many times as much as are the men in the ranks, who are doing the fighting for this country in this emergency.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean to say that he is going to vote for that raise for Federal employees?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; I did not say that. But I am certainly going to demand that we hold to $50 as the minimum base pay for the men in the armed services of the United States at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the majority leader if at this time he can tell us the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to do so.

Monday is District day, and it is expected that four District bills will be considered, which I understand to be noncontroversial. The first is H. R. 6986, to change the name of Conduit Road to MacArthur Boulevard; the second is H. R. 6961, to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans in the District of Columbia; the third is H. R. 6297, to provide for the issuance of a license to practice in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris, who filed too late to be admitted; and the fourth is H. R. 7097, which involves the extension of certain track connections into the Navy Yard. I understand these bills are noncontroversial. It is understood that nothing controversial will be brought up on District day.

On Monday the so-called small businessmen's bill will also be considered.

On Tuesday there will be a joint resolution from the Committee on Appropriations providing $9,500,000 to complete the training program of the department of education for the fiscal year. I understand that will take only a short while. Following that will be the bill, introduced by our able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], extending for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, and following that the wire-tapping bill. If the wire-tapping bill is not disposed of on Tuesday, its consideration will be in order on Wednesday. The business in order on Calendar Wednesday will probably be dispensed with.

Several bills are in conference—the Army pay bill, the cadet bill, the legislative and independent offices appropriation bills, and the bill H. R. 4476, dealing with sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment. Of course, if conference reports come in on any of these bills, they will be considered, inasmuch as they have the right-of-way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the program, practically, for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

I understand that the week after next the Iowa primaries will be held. That is a matter that concerns Members without regard to political affiliation, and it is only proper and fitting that Members be given every consideration possible in connection with the primary election. I am hopeful that this program will be disposed of by Thursday, so that we can adjourn over the week end. It is my hope that everything controversial will be out of the way by Wednesday, so that Members who desire to leave here by Wednesday may do so.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wish to make this observation for the benefit particularly of the floor leader, that in addition to the two bills the House Committee on Military Affairs has in conference, we have reported, as a follow-up of the Army pay bill, the allotment and allowance bill, which proposes to provide allowances from the soldiers and the Government to the dependents of the soldiers, who are left at home. My committee is very anxious to complete the whole program of both raising and allotting the pay of our fighting forces; and, of course, the distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], having served with distinction in the

armed services during the first World War, is entirely in sympathy with the main objective of both these bills, each of which I regard as vital to the morale and welfare of our troops. And, by the way, the minority floor leader [Mr. MARTIN], also being from Massachusetts, in view of his fine record of support of war legislation, I am sure he, too, wishes to cooperate with our committee in the early disposition of these bills. I hope we can take it up the coming week.

We also have a bill involving amendments to the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act that will probably be reported tomorrow. In view of our heavy schedule and the tremendous amount of work that we have to do, I was just wondering if it would be possible for us to reach the Edmiston bill on allotments on Thursday or Friday of next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to make any commitments now.

Mr. MAY. Of course not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will keep that especially in mind, but I hope it will not be taken up on Friday, because of the reasons I have already stated.

Mr. MAY. The Iowa situation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and I can assure my friend from Kentucky that if the primaries in Kentucky were being held a week from Tuesday the gentleman naturally would feel very much concerned.

Mr. MAY. Sure.

Mr. McCORMACK. And would feel that consideration should be given to that fact.

Mr. MAY. I would be more concerned about how my people were thinking about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Naturally.

MARINE AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a previous order of the House, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance funds.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 314, with Mr. ROBINSON of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under order of the House, time for debate on this joint resolution is limited to not exceeding 1 hour, the time to be controlled one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, marine insurance is an indispensable factor in the maintenance of shipping on the high seas. Men refuse to risk cargoes, personnel, or boats unless adequately insured.

This is especially true in time of war. Ordinarily and under peace conditions, most of this burden is carried by private companies, but it is the history of every war, when heavy losses begin, the private companies disappear from the field, and the only source from which insurance can be secured is the Government. Under the act of July 18, 1940, the Congress provided $40,000,000 for marine insurance. This was before the declaration of war and was ample provision under peacetime conditions. But immediately following Pearl Harbor, coincident with the tremendous upswing in loss of shipping, it became immediately apparent that the $40,000,000 was wholly inadequate to meet the needs of wartime insurance.

Transportation, and shipping in particular, is the bottleneck in this war. Our production facilities are far in advance of schedule, but after the material has been fabricated it must be transported across thousands of miles of water to the front in a dozen theaters of war. The loss and the drain on insurance are correspondingly heavy. At the present rate, we are paying out every month $20,000,000 more than we are taking in by way of premiums. As a result, our insurance reserves are being rapidly depleted. We had at the time the Department appeared before the committee, in round numbers, about $63,000,000 of assets, including the $40,000,000 originally provided plus the premiums accumulated to date. Against that we had a rapidly rising debit, amounting at the time to $47,000,000. In other words, we are today only $16,000,000 ahead of the hounds. With a view to meeting the situation, an estimate for $210,000,000 was submitted to augment the original appropriation of $40,000,000. This is expected to carry us along for a period variously estimated at from 8 or 10 months to 1 year.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What are the premiums charged for this insurance in comparison with the rates charged during the last World War?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I cannot give the gentleman the figures on that, but they are as high as the traffic will bear. If we put them any higher, we cannot get shipping out upon the seas.

Mr. RICH. Then I am led to believe that because the sinkings are so much higher now than then, that that is the reason for the fact that we are using up this fund which has already been appropriated?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I regret to say that the gentleman is correct. The Department reports that sinkings up to date, although we have been in the war less than 6 months, exceed the entire loss in the first World War.

Mr. RICH. Then it behooves us to spend more effort to catch these submarines that are close to our shores.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every effort is being made in that direction, and I am glad to say we are meeting with success. The last reports are that the percentage of sinkings is decreasing, although it is still very large.

Mr. RICH. How long does the gentleman figure that this appropriation of $210,000,000 will last?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, that is conjectural. It depends upon the extent to which we are able to control the inroads on our shipping; but it is anticipated that amount, with funds now on hand and current premiums, can be expected to supply requirements for something like 10 months to a year.

Mr. RICH. And the point that we ought to make now is that we ought to give every consideration to the building of the proper kind of boats that will go out and get these submarines along our coast, because we are going to lose if we do not and we can afford to spend money unstintingly for that purpose because it will mean so much to us in every way.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No time is being lost and no effort is being spared to meet the menace. In that connection, it is gratifying to be able to report that the daily launchings now approximate two ships per day, and that before the end of the calendar year they may be expected to reach three ships per day. In other words, we expect, even at the present rate of sinkings, to build them faster than they can sink them.

Mr. RICH. Just one other question of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, a gentleman who is considered to be one of the great parliamentarians of the House. Take the language in line 3 of the bill. This appropriation is to be made out of "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." Will the gentleman explain what that means, when we have an empty Treasury?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The American Treasury is never empty, and it will never be empty. The American taxpayers and investors in war bonds will see to that.

Mr. RICH. The only thing is this, and I say to the gentleman as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and to all other committees, that we have a lot of things that we are operating now in our Government that we should stop, and we should take the ax to them right away, because we are getting into terrible financial trouble, and every one of those is a drain on the Federal Treasury which ought to have the ax, and the quicker the gentleman as chairman and I as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and every Member of the House, realize that, the better it will be for our country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman in that. I am opposed to the appropriation of a single dollar that is not absolutely necessary, and may I express my regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has rendered such invaluable service in that respect, is leaving the House voluntarily at a time when more and more care should be exercised in the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. In connection with the general subject of losses and our ability to rebuild, we have read much in the papers about criticisms of the Maritime Commission and the general lag in the shipbuilding program. I think the country will be gratified to know that as of yesterday, less than the first 3 weeks of this month, we have put into commission—not launched, but actually put into commission on the high seas—35 ships, and by the end of this month that will approximate 60, which means that we are reaching the goal of 2 a day, and that shortly that will be stepped up to 3 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take one-half minute in order to express appreciation of the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. The situation which he outlines is most encouraging. We hope by the passage of this resolution to provide the necessary assets to continue insurance on this additional shipping and thereby contribute to the steadily growing volume of shipments to our Allies and our own expeditionary forces abroad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with the losses that are coming in at the present time, running approximately $20,000,000 a month on the insurance that we are carrying upon the ships, cargoes, and lives of the seamen, there is no question but what it is necessary that we provide the $210,000,000 required in this bill.

It is an enormous sum of money for that purpose. Undoubtedly because of the terrific losses in the Atlantic we are going to have to meet tremendous insurance payments. As I understand it, as Admiral Land told us, there were 36 ships launched in April. They hope to have 50 in May, and after a while they hope to get up to 2 a day, and perhaps a little later in the year—in about 3 months more—to 3 ships a day, so that they may obtain 800 ship launchings in the calendar year of 1942. This is a tremendous undertaking—just as the war itself is a tremendous undertaking.

So that we may have a picture of how large an undertaking the war actually is, I have felt that some estimate should be given of what is in sight and what has been appropriated and what is now pending, or which we have notice of pending.

Down to the 27th of March, when we had the last large supplemental defense bill before us, the total costs in sight, including the authorizations for the two-ocean Navy, follow:

Appropriations and estimates	$153,752,693,237
2-ocean Navy	7,137,021,018
Total	160,889,714,255
Add—Increase in Senate	1,000,000,000
Add—Reconstruction Finance Corporation commitments on account of war program, March 20	11,128,000,000
Increase in Budget estimate for Army (based on announcements) for 1943	$30,000,000,000
Total	203,017,714,255
Deduct—Items other than appropriations	46,000,000,000
Appropriations	157,017,714,255

The total of those items amounts to $203,000,000,000. Of course, $11,000,000,000 of that is Reconstruction Finance Corporation; $35,000,000,000 is estimates for which the money has not yet been appropriated.

The total expenditures to the 15th of May for the war effort, since the 1st of June 1940, are $28,362,000,000. The national debt at this time is $73,434,000,000. We are faced with a tax bill which is estimated to run about $25,000,000,000. We will undoubtedly have other estimates for appropriations. It is estimated, as near as I can figure out the announcements from the Budget, that the war expenditures for the year 1943, from all sources, will run from seventy-three to seventy-five billion dollars.

Now, that presents a situation of the utmost seriousness. The war situation, with the Japanese menacing the Pacific, the German menace in the Atlantic, including the German submarine menace, presents a picture that demands of every American that we go all out for the war effort.

What I cannot understand is the attitude of the President of the United States at this moment. Facing that picture, we have him sending in an increased estimate for the Civilian Conservation Corps of $31,000,000. That outfit cannot get recruits except by the most strenuous type of solicitation. That makes the total estimate for C. C. C. upward of $80,000,000. We have the President sending in an estimate for the National Youth Administration of $50,000,000, in order to operate private boarding schools around the country to send boys and girls away from home. He has sent in increased estimates for the Farm Security Administration, at a time when the demand for money for anything of that kind is absolutely reduced.

The trouble with the President seems to be that he is not able to go full fledged in one direction at a time. He is bound to go in two opposite directions at the same time. So while we have his war program, which is receiving the hearty support of the thinking Americans, we have his antidefense program, sending up these estimates for things we do not need, which do not contribute to the war effort, and which really hamper the war effort in every way.

Now I am asking that the President of the United States go all out for the war effort; that he cut out those things that are not needed, himself; that he leave out those things that he wants to keep going in spite of the fact that they are not needed and do not serve a useful purpose in the war effort. I am asking him that he cut out going in two opposite directions at the same time, and that he go all out for the war effort, and cut out this monkey work. If any of us took the position that we should do things like that, which hamper and impair the war effort, and dissipate and waste American substance at a time like this, we would be blameworthy. Every time we do anything of that kind we are blameworthy.

So I appeal to the President of the United States, and I appeal to him most earnestly and most sincerely, to give up these programs which do not contribute to and do not help the war effort. I think it is time that we devoted ourselves wholeheartedly to getting rid of this sort of thing. Everywhere throughout the United States there is a demand from the people that the President create more unity by doing just that.

There is the feeling amongst many people that by doing that we would get rid of the feeling of complacency that comes to a lot of people in the country because things are being proposed that do not need to be done at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, you know the most brutal things always come in the smallest packages. The report on this bill indicates the brutality and the extreme seriousness of the shipping situation. It was alluded to by Walter Lippmann this morning in a column under the caption "Wake up." He proposed the possibility of some remedy for this tragic situation, but I think we shall do best with it if we understand from this small package how serious it really is.

The testimony will show that since the 31st of December 1941, to May 1, 1942, which is 4 months, insurance coverage increased from $14,000,000 to $883,000,000. This is a considerable expansion in insurance coverage. Before Pearl Harbor you could send a cargo vessel from here to the Dutch West Indies for a rate of one-eighth of 1 percent, and perhaps one-tenth of 1 percent. It was testified in the hearings that the rates today range from 6 percent to 7 percent; so that today because of the impact of war rates are fiftyfold over what they were in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

There is a very pungent paragraph in the report, and I believe it ought to be made a part of the RECORD. I shall therefore read it:

> At the rate losses are occurring the fund is estimated to be liable for a little more than a ship a day, and on the basis of estimated claims payments it will require approximately $20,000,000 average appropriated funds per month over premium receipts to meet the obligations.

The estimate of those who are administering this program in the War Shipping Administration, which is an agency in the Office for Emergency Management, indicates to the committee on the basis of estimates of the loss of one ship per day that the losses to the Treasury will be $20,000,000 per month over and above the premium receipts.

This joint resolution carries $210,000,000. If the sinkings in the Atlantic and elsewhere continue on the basis of this estimate, the money that will be provided by this joint resolution will be sufficient

for about 10 months, and then it will be necessary to come back and ask the Congress for increased funds for reindemnification of the ship and cargo losses.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk for an hour on this subject but I believe it would be no more impressive than to say that on the basis of this report the shipping situation is serious and demands the best attention of the best minds in the country.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I am in full accord with everything the gentleman has said. I am sure there will be no opposition whatever to this additional $210,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure there will not be.

Mr. LEAVY. But I do want to ask the gentleman if there is not a great similarity between this type of insurance and the type of insurance we have been passing in peacetime for the American farmer in the form of crop insurance on wheat, corn, and cotton? Both are of a type that has a high hazard and can never be profitable to the insurer, but have a general welfare feature that is essential.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can see no similarity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are no further requests for time. I ask that the joint resolution be read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $210,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to increase the marine and war-risk insurance fund for the purpose of providing insurance and reinsurance in accordance with the act of June 29, 1940 (Public Act 677, 76th Cong.), as amended by section 3 (b) of the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), the acts of March 6, 1942 (Public Law 482, 77th Cong.), and April 11, 1942 (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), and Executive Order No. 9054 of February 7, 1942. Such fund shall also be available for the employment by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of persons, firms, and corporations for the investigation and settlement of insurance claims, and the payment of obligations incurred by such contracts shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 314, making an additional appropriation for the marine and war risk insurance fund, directed him to report the same back to House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to its passage or rejection.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BEITER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the proceedings had at the awarding of the All Navy E Pennant to the Alcoa Works of the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa, Tenn. This will exceed the usual space allowed, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein very short excerpts from speeches on I Am an American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Dr. F. Rhee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1941

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 486.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6908) to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 486) is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate and making in order consideration of H. R. 6908, which is a bill to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941.

The Defense Highway Act, approved November 19, 1941, authorized an appropriation of $150,000,000—

to provide for the construction and improvement of access roads (including bridges, tubes, and tunnels thereon) to military and naval reservations, to defense industries and defense-industry sites, and to the sources of raw materials when such roads are certified to the Federal Works Administrator as important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for replacing existing highways and highway connections that are shut off from general public use by necessary closures or restrictions at military and naval reservations and defense-industry sites.

The bill (H. R. 6908) which is made in order by this rule amends the Defense Highway Act of 1941 by increasing the authorization for access roads from $150,000,000 to $250,000,000, and also provides that the money, appropriation for which is authorized, may be used for maintenance as well as for construction and improvement of such access roads.

Doubtless the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Roads, will explain further H. R. 6908. May I inquire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] if he has any requests for time on this rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on the part of anybody on this side to attack the rule. We understand the committee reported this unanimously. Is that true?

Mr. LEWIS. So I am informed; yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It also has the approval of the Director of the Budget and the President also recommends it?

Mr. LEWIS. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It does nothing more than provide an addition for the construction and improvement of roads and also provides for the maintenance of roads around Army and Navy posts and around places that are working on defense materials?

Mr. LEWIS. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 6908) to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved

November 19, 1941 (Public Law No. 295), is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$250,000,000".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "$250,000,000", insert "and by inserting a comma and the word 'maintenance' after the word 'construction' in the first sentence of said section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is a short, simple bill which merely changes one figure and adds one word to existing law.

It applies only to necessary access roads to military and naval reservations, war industries, and sources of raw materials.

It was recommended by the Federal Works Administrator, with the concurrence of the Budget Bureau and the President.

It is strongly supported by officials of the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, and the Public Roads Administration.

After full hearings, it was favorably reported unanimously by the Committee on Roads.

There is no opposition to it that I have ever heard of from any source.

Therefore I shall not take long to discuss it.

The bill authorizes appropriation of $100,000,000 to the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency for the construction or improvement of access roads to centers of war activity, in addition to $150,000,000 provided for this purpose in section 6 of the Defense Highway Act, approved November 19, 1941.

Only projects certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as important to our war program are eligible.

Under the original authorization 499 access-road projects were approved to provide new or improved facilities in 271 areas certified by the War or Navy Department. These projects include 2,060 miles of road and 185 bridges. The average length of these access-road projects is a little over 4 miles.

Studies of the access-road needs of certified areas are made by engineers of the Public Roads Administration in cooperation with the State highway departments and local Army and Navy officials. Individual projects considered essential are planned by the Public Roads Administration, with statements showing the necessity for each and estimates of cost. Each project statement is approved by the local commanding officer of the military or naval area.

As of April 14, 1942, projects with an estimated cost of $154,000,000 had been prepared under this procedure, requiring Federal funds in the amount of $148,400,000, which practically exhausted the original authorization of $150,000,000 for access roads.

On the same date project studies had extended to 478 areas in the continental United States and 9 sites outside the continental United States, or a total of 487 centers of war training and production. Of these, the testimony of the Commissioner of Public Roads shows, 263 are Army reservations, 94 are naval reservations, and 121 are industrial sites. Fourteen of the latter are to sources of essential raw materials in 8 different States.

The Public Roads Administration estimates the cost of projects needed to serve these 487 certified sites will be slightly more than the $250,000,000 total which will be authorized to be appropriated for access roads after passage of this bill.

So there is now—and, in fact, has been for several weeks—an urgent need for at least the additional $100,000,000 authorized by this bill.

Your Committee on Roads has unanimously recommended one minor amendment. It simply inserts the word "maintenance" after the word "construction" in the first sentence of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941.

It has developed that some access roads in some areas are not on any public-roads system—they are not State highways and are not on any county-road system—and there is no authority with jurisdiction and funds for maintaining these roads. The committee amendment permits the Commissioner of Public Roads, when necessary, to provide for maintenance, as well as construction or improvement, of access roads. In some cases maintenance of an existing road or trail may be all that is necessary. In others it may amount only to removal of snow from a road to an isolated mine where some strategic material is being obtained, or some minor repair to a road or bridge, necessary to keep it open for traffic. Some access roads are used entirely for military traffic and are not even open to civilian use. In such cases the responsibility for necessary maintenance is clearly on the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is urgently important that this bill be passed and this additional money made available quickly. We are holding up the war.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, justification for the passage of this bill cannot be questioned. I desire to express the hope that when this bill does become a law and the money is made available, that the various Government agencies will act as speedily in carrying out its provisions as the House has in approving the measure today. There are any number of very important projects in the United States today approved by the War Department as essential access roads as well as approved by the Federal Works Agency which cannot be started until this money is available.

I desire to point out a situation in the city of St. Louis. The Government has established a very large ordnance manufacturing plant, known as the St. Louis ordnance plant in North St. Louis. In so doing the Government purchased property on the east and west of what is known as Goodfellow Boulevard. In order to connect the property the Government widened Goodfellow Boulevard, constructed underpasses, but only where it adjoined the ordnance plant. It immediately developed that a mistake had been made in not widening the boulevard 2 blocks north of the plant as well as 2 blocks south of the plant. Failure to do so resulted in a bottleneck, and when I say there will be approximately 25,000 employees at this plant, one can easily understand the traffic situation on this thoroughfare. The War Department is certifying this project to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency for accomplishment under the provisions of Public Law 295, Seventy-seventh Congress, known as the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as soon as additional funds become available for work of this nature. This bill authorizes this money.

It can be seen that if this was not a very important project the Chief of Engineers would not take the action which he has advised me that he is taking.

I have always maintained that where the Government has gone into a locality and disturbed the transportation facilities in order to construct a national defense project it is the duty of the Government to take such steps as are necessary to restore normal transportation conditions.

In a city like St. Louis, under our charter, if the Government does not provide for access roads such as this then it will be necessary for the city to do so, but it would be the individual property owners in the area who would have to pay for the improvements. In other words, under our charter, the city undertakes the necessary improvements and then makes a special tax assessment against those who own property within a certain area. Prior to the time that the Government purchased the property and constructed this defense project the greater part of this area consisted of homes constructed in the main by wage earners, many of whom took advantage of the Federal Housing Act. I do not think any informed person will deny but that the construction of this ordnance plant at this place has caused the property of the individuals in the vicinity to depreciate in value. Aside from this they were placed at many inconveniences during the time the project was being constructed and it would be a grave injustice in my opinion if the Government does not quickly extend the widening of this boulevard two blocks to the north and two blocks to the south of this ordnance plant.

I am pleased to see that there is absolutely no opposition to this authorization and I hope that the appropriation will be available to the Department within the next few days.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will unavoidably be away tomorrow and the next day, and he has been named as a conferee on the current pay bill and the West Point bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that in view of his absence the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] be substituted as a conferee on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is excused from service on the

committee of conference and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is appointed in his stead.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will inform the Senate of the action of the House.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight to file a conference report and statement on the housing bill, and that it be in order to consider that report on Monday next, notwithstanding the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1941

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Roads a question or two about the bill H. R. 6908, which has just been passed.

As I understand the bill, it is for the purpose of increasing by $100,000,000 the appropriation provided in the general roads bill, to construct access roads from main highways to industries or to mines that are producing what is now necessary in connection with our defense program.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. He embodied my answer in his question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Having that in mind, may I say that in my district there is a mileage of 43 miles of road between Columbus and the chrome mines, in Stillwater County, that has already been certified by the War Department as an access road. There is a controversy between the War Department and the Public Roads Administration here in Washington and the highway commission of my State in regard to the construction of a bridge which it is necessary to construct in connection with the building of this access road. I hope, if it becomes necessary, that this money will be used for the purpose of building not only the road but also the bridge, as the road would have no value without the bridge.

In addition, I may say that the construction of the road and the bridge would not be required were it not necessary to use heavy trucks in the transportation of chrome, a much needed metal, from the mines to the railroad. I am wondering if the gentleman will not agree with me that the bridge should be built at the expense of the Federal Government in view of the fact, if it is a fact, that the bridge would be of no avail to the civilian population were it not for the necessity of developing these mines and getting chrome out of them.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The picture, as the gentleman gives it, is exactly what this bill is intended to take care of, so at least we have a good argument for it. However, it must be passed upon by the Public Roads Administration, the State Highway Department, the Army, and the Navy.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is my understanding. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this body acts wisely in passing H. R. 6908. In connection with the subject matter of wartime highway needs I include the following comment which I made over the American Forum of the Air during a radio debate on March 29, 1942:

A tragic lesson in Germany's amazingly successful blitzkrieg of Europe is the importance of an adequate and integrated system of superhighways. From the day he attained power until he struck his first devastating blow, Hitler had the best engineering brains of Germany constructing a network of high-speed motorways on a scale the nation had never seen, coordinating it with the development of rail, water, and air transportation.

It was this system that made possible the gigantic expansion of German armaments in the few short years that followed Hitler's march into the Rhineland. When Poland's hour struck it was the broad, perfectly constructed roads to the border which enabled his swiftly moving mechanized hordes to accomplish what military men considered an utter impossibility.

In Hitler's headlong rush to the French coast it was again the superhighway system that transported his unending stream of tanks and motorized troops. In contrast was the relatively inadequate system of narrow roads used by the French and British. The Allies were slow in their initial advance through Belgium to meet the Germans, and then were bottlenecked without supplies or reinforcements when their narrow roads were choked with fleeing humanity and blasted by Stuka bombers. It was the story of one- and two-lane roads, vulnerable to attack, against a vast system of six- and eight-lane superhighways.

In relation to our industrialization, size and strength, the American highway system today is little better than were those of the conquered countries. Nearly one-third of our 75,000 miles of strategically important highways do not at the present time meet even the minimum requirements of the War Department. Some of its is too crooked, some too steep, some too light in construction to stand military transport. Maneuvers in Texas and Louisiana disclosed that only 25 percent of the roads used were adequate to handle even the comparatively light 10-ton tanks and 155 millimeter howitzers. What would we do if the coming heavy tanks were rushed into these possible invasion sites under conditions of actual warfare?

Industrial mobilization in our stepped-up war effort, plus movement of troops, threatens to overtax our present transportation system. Railroads with equipment depleted by depression years, feel the pressure of transporting men and materials. Waterways have been improved in recent years, but still fall far short of carrying their share of the load. Commercial aviation, with emphasis on passengers and speed, grows in importance daily, but cannot be expected to help materially in the transport of heavy equipment.

The automotive industry, which grew to its present giant stature with the growth of highways, can lend its facilities to speeding defense transport, provided we build the roads to carry the trucks. Our highway network must be strengthened throughout the United States as we have done by the completion of the 160-mile Pennsylvania Turnpike from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg, and by construction now being rushed on a 2,000-mile highway to Alaska and the Pan-American Highway to Mexico.

Twenty years ago the War Department studied our highway needs, which are being modified today to meet the new tempo of modern war. We realize that we must revamp our conception of minimum requirements. Testimony before the House Roads Committee revealed there are some 6,400 miles of highway in the New England States that should be rebuilt, widened, or relocated. This condition is multiplied one-hundredfold throughout our Nation.

Our opponents will contend that these improvements should be treated from a long-range standpoint, that we should approach them with the ease of a peacetime stride. I cannot agree with their sentiments.

I do believe we should eliminate the elements of rush and reckless emotional haste, but I emphasize the need for immediate and thorough action. It is quite obvious that our military experts believe America is closer now to warfare on our own soil than for long years. Wisdom dictates that we take stock of our highway deficiencies and begin a program that will modernize our national road system immediately. We must make it the most effective for war and, at the same time, a highly developed network for the days of peace which will follow our successful prosecution of this terrible conflict.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper pointing out that only the ignorant refer to the Midwest as being uninformed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have permission to sit today and tomorrow during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CONGRESS—ITS PLACE, ITS DUTIES, AND ITS OPPORTUNITY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in every nation that has lost its liberties and fallen under the yoke of dictatorship the first and basic job that has been done by those seeking to bring about these results has been to discredit the National Legislature, to destroy the people's confidence in their Congress, and then to proceed to take from the people's elected representatives their powers and influence in government.

I agree with those of my colleagues in the House who are profoundly and sincerely worried lest this process is already well under way in the United States.

I have been repeatedly grieved and disheartened at the unfair and frequently actually false rumors and reports which have been printed and broadcast regarding the work of Congress.

But I do not believe we are as yet applying the best remedies for the situation.

The only certain answer to criticism is outstandingly constructive performance on our part. The only sure way to protect the position and powers of our National

Legislature is to use that position and those powers so effectively in the national interest in this time of trial and crisis and to offer such unswerving and really unselfish leadership to the Nation that gradually people will begin to question the validity of the attacks made upon the Congress.

I do not believe those attacks will cease. I think they will continue unless every vestige of progressive legislation should be wiped from the statute books and unless Congress should become subservient to the will of a certain few powerful publishers of the country. I hope and pray such a time will never come. I do not believe it will come. Ever since I can remember the Congress has been the butt of criticism, and even ridicule, by the press and columnists of America. And I do not believe that situation will change, at least for a long time. One of the hard jobs for Members of Congress will continue to be to go ahead with their work and at the same time to furnish some sections of the press and radio a convenient and ever-present target for their wit and sarcasm.

I believe that there is ample justification for the deep resentment that exists here against those forces which apparently are bent on nothing less than the reduction to impotence of the American National Legislature and therefore the establishment of totalitarian government in America.

But it is an ill wind that blows no good, and it is, as I see it, our task not to complain but rather to calculate our action on the expectation that the worst light will be thrown on much of what we do. For if we did that, we would join together as no Congress has ever done before to cast aside every inconsequential consideration and to begin to give to this Nation not only acceptable routine legislative work but the dynamic leadership which the people of this great country deserve, which this Congress can give it and which, at such a time as this is, indeed, indispensible to the national morale.

In other words, I believe Congress must realize that only Congress itself can restore Congress to its proper place. And I have faith that there is sufficient sense of fairness in the American people so that it is also true that no one can destroy the position of Congress except Congress itself. I believe that over the long pull the truth will get abroad and prevail.

There are two things that we must do. The first is to give the Nation, faced as it is today with privations and difficulties utterly new to America, an example of unselfish leadership. Now, I agree most heartily that the facts regarding the so-called pensions-for-Congressmen bill have never to this day been truly set forth in the press of the Nation. They never will be, in my opinion. I also think it highly significant that hardly a word of protest has, so far as I am aware, been uttered regarding the full lifetime pensions received by judges and others in the Nation. But for Congress to give any indication whatsoever that Members were considering their own welfare at a time like this was a mistake of serious consequence, regardless of the merits of the measure for times of peace.

Again, it is very discouraging when one has tried to be as conscientious as he knew how about the matter of gasoline rationing to read story after story in the papers giving the unmistakeable impression that all Congressmen received gasoline cards providing for gasoline in excess of their official needs. That simply is not true, and it seems to me it would be no more than fair for someone some place along the line to try to ascertain the facts. Indeed, in my opinion it will help, not hurt, the cause of Congress if the full story is told about this matter. Moreover, here, as in the case of so-called pensions, it is passing strange that hardly a writer has pointed out that other top Government officials, outside Congress, whom they have praised so fulsomely, use Government cars and Government gasoline for their work and their own cars only for their personal matters—sometimes not even then. But Congressmen use their own cars for all the trips they make, including those on official business. And Congressmen do owe many, many duties to the Government and the people whom they represent.

But all this is really beside the point. It is no good our comparing ourselves with other Government officials. Our comparison has got to be with the situation of the men who are really carrying the load for America today—men in the armed forces, on the farms, and in the factories. These are the people that are going to save the Nation. Are we doing all we can in the light of what they are doing? And we must govern ourselves by the answer. The trouble with all these things has been not that Congress has been guilty of wrongdoing but rather that we should have done ever so much better than anyone else.

ENEMIES OF CONGRESS DO US A SERVICE

To a certain extent therefore, the enemies of Congress do us a service. They serve notice, in effect, that everything that happens here will be discussed in a most unfavorable light and that every variation from a standard of perfection will be broadcast to the Nation as further evidence of the alleged venality and unworthiness of this body. In so doing they inevitably set for the Congress a standard impossible of attainment, but which, after all, is inevitably worth striving after for its own sake.

There is, however, another and yet more fundamental answer which we have it within our own power to give to these attacks. That is to do an outstanding legislative job in the days that lie ahead. It is my frank opinion that we have a great deal of most important work to do and that no extended recess in the summer should be contemplated.

There can be, of course, no question that Congress will pass with promptness all bills to supply the armed forces with whatever we are told they need.

But beyond this there is important work to be done by the Congress in the doing of which we would be assuming a vital and proper leadership along with the President in this time of trial for our country. The all-important thing in all these matters is for Congress to act with forthright courage and determination, to disregard all small considerations, and to drive forward with vision and foresight instead of waiting to be forced into action by events.

PREVENT WASTE

First, then we can and must prevent waste. Not that worth-while work has not been done by the Truman Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee, because it has. But more is required. I suggest that the Appropriations Committee be granted sufficient funds to engage a staff of not less than 50 high-grade men to be given the task of following through Government contracts to be certain that they are carried out with absolutely no unnecessary additions to expense, and no waste of material or manpower that is avoidable. I propose also that such additional legislation as may be necessary be passed so as to make certain that whenever profiteering, fraud, extortion, bribery, or racketeering appear in connection with war work they can be dealt with by the Department of Justice. If no additional laws are required, then Congress should by joint resolution memorialize the Department of Justice to proceed with all vigor in such cases. As I have already said a number of times in the House, no patent rights or monopolistic agreements must be permitted to block the full and free use by every qualified manufacturer of the most efficient methods of producing the things we need. If legislation is required to accomplish this, it should be passed at once. Again if there is any equipment, any manpower, any raw material now being used in the manufacture of liquor, in gold or silver mining, or in any other manner which is useless which could be employed in some other manner, then such a requirement should be made. The War Production Board has taken some steps along this line. A directive from Congress about the matter would do no harm. It would be encouraging to many, many people.

SAVE THE NATION FROM UNNECESSARY INTEREST-BEARING DEBT

And there is another sort of waste we could prevent. It is a waste that results from the failure of Congress to assert and utilize the power the Constitution itself gives us to coin money and regulate its value. The sale of War Bonds to the people for money they actually possess is one thing—at the moment a good thing—and the people should receive interest on the money they have given over out of their pockets for the Government's use. But nearly half our present national debt has not come about in this way. It has come about through the sale of interest-bearing bonds of all the people to a very few people—namely, the banks—for a brand-new bank deposit or checkbook money created on their books for the explicit purpose of buying the bonds with it. In such cases the Government and people are paying the banks, including the Federal Reserve banks, interest for the use of their own national credit. This is wrong and should not continue. If any new money is to be created in any form at all, it should be the people and the Nation that derive the benefit from such creation of money, and no interest whatsoever should

be paid upon it. There are a half-dozen ways this objective could be reached. I have spoken of all of them at one time or another in the House; so have some other Members. Just now all I ask is a hearing by the Banking and Currency Committee on the general subject of war financing, for out of such a hearing could come a bill which would, over the years, save the American people perhaps $100,000,000,000 in interest on their national debt. This is a waste which Congress is responsible for, since it is in our power to stop it. We should do so forthwith.

MAKE AMERICA'S AIMS CLEAR

The very outcome of this war may be decided by the degree of confidence which we inspire in people all around the world as to what kind of world we are seeking to build.

In this connection I would like to refer the Members to what I consider to be one of the greatest speeches ever delivered in the annals of American history. It was delivered by the Vice President of the United States at a dinner in New York City a week ago Friday. It appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1675. From that speech I believe people around the world will take great inspiration. I hope every Member will read it.

We have written a good record in Latin America in the past few years. It is standing us in very good stead indeed in the friendship and help those nations are giving us now. But Congress has largely let the good-neighbor policy appear to be a policy of this administration rather than of the American Government as a whole. The time has come for some definite indication to be given that the American National Legislature will stand for the good-neighbor policy toward Latin America through the years whoever may be President and whatever party may be in power.

This is no racial war. Talk of that kind is fodder for the Nazi radio. The Chinese people, the first to feel the iron blow, the bomb, and the destruction—they belong to the yellow race. And they should be told in no uncertain terms that when this war is won there will be no more extraterritorial rights for foreign nations in China, no more international control of her seaports, no more interference with her national life. Something of the same sort must be done with regard to India. The defenders of Bataan Peninsula, probably the majority of General MacArthur's army there, were Filipinos. And why the difference between the way our Filipino soldiers fought on Bataan and the way the natives of Malaya failed to support the British cause? I think the answer lies in America's bona fide offer of independence to the Philippines. Whether they will want it or not—after all this—remains to be seen, but they know they can have self-rule if they do want it. The past experience of Malaya was different.

This war is a conflict of ideas and principles. The lines are drawn between people who desire freedom and those who have been caught under the heel of a military despotism. But it cannot just be freedom for Anglo-Saxons. No. There must be hope for all people everywhere that out of their suffering will come hope of a new world, a world built on true freedom—including freedom from want.

When I say that I mean that one of America's aims in this war is the establishment of a world where full employment of all the people will be taken for granted as the basic underlying principle of our economic life. The one thing we take for granted and from which premise our other calculations and programs take their root must be that there will be jobs for all the willing and able workers of America after we have won this war.

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING WE SHOULD DO NOW TO PREPARE FOR POST-WAR PERIOD

Congress must show the people of America that it can and will deal effectively with such problems as will arise when the war has been won. We can do this in two ways. First by providing now for an outstanding national commission, not only in the ranks of Government, but from the people generally, and the important economic groups of the Nation and giving this commission the task of working out and building support for four or five basic principles to be followed in assuring our people of a continuance of full employment and full production in the post-war period.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's proposal for the setting up of commissions to study post-war problems and I wonder if the gentleman, at this point, will tell us what, if any progress, has been made toward having this done. I think it is most important.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I very much appreciate the gentleman's question. I may say that legislation which I introduced on this subject was considered first by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, of which the very splendid gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] was the chairman. That subcommittee held hearings on the resolution and at the hearings there appeared representatives, I can honestly say, of most of the important organized groups of America, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers' Union, the American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, the C. I. O., the National Catholic Welfare Congress, the Federal Council of Churches, the Association of American Rabbis, the National Association of Manufacturers, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Cooperative League of the United States, and there were other groups that I could mention who came there to testify in favor of the bill. One testimony that I appreciated as much as any was that of Mr. W. L. Batt, who is now the Deputy Director of the War Production Board. Everyone, universally, was in favor of the measure. As a result of the hearings, the committee took the suggestions that had been made and the various suggestions as to amendments are embodied in a measure which I introduced as a clean bill and which is House Joint Resolution 291, which, in turn, has been unanimously reported by the whole Labor Committee and is now in that position. I appreciate the gentleman's interest very much.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope the gentleman is able to secure a rule for its early consideration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I can assure the gentleman that is what I am most anxious to do.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I simply want to say that as a member of the House Committee on Labor we feel that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has rendered a real contribution to the subject of post-war planning, and it was in that spirit that the Committee approved the bill, and I trust the House may have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very grateful to the gentleman for his interest in the matter, and for his very practical help as a member of the Labor Committee.

But Congress could also consistently follow one line of policy right now which would help very greatly indeed to assure our people with regard to that time after the war has been won. That policy is to do now everything possible to build up a reserve of buying power in the hands of the rank and file of the people for that time. There are a number of ways that we could do this.

The first is to provide for discharge pay for men who serve in the armed forces. This would mean that over a period of months corresponding to their period of service, the men would receive a sort of soldiers' bonus in regular installments, thus enabling them to adjust more easily back to civilian life and giving the economy of the Nation a considerable amount of active buying power on which it could depend. Again corporations could be allowed to invest a certain percentage of their earnings in a special type of bond, callable at any time after the war on condition that they agree to spend the money derived from the paying off of the bonds in some manner that would employ labor. Third, and very important, we should provide now the framework of taxes and other machinery required to enable us to begin payment of a general Federal old-age pension at the close of the war. That will be the time of all times in our country's history when a sustained flow of consumer buying power will be needed to make up for the withdrawal of the huge Government expenditures now being made. There is no more orderly way to provide this than by an old-age pension, properly supported on a pay-as-you-go basis by fair taxation. The final way in which this backlog of buying power for the post-war period can be assured I shall discuss later on.

EQUALIZE THE BURDENS

Most important of all the tasks of Congress at the moment is the task of bringing about as nearly as is humanly possible an equality of sacrifice and equalization of the burdens of this war. The President has given us excellent guidance in this matter. But before I come to his program I have two points of my own to make. It is becoming more and more evident that the request for an upward pay adjustment of postal clerks and car-

riers is justified. Supposing that such an increase were granted by act of Congress and at the same time the salaries of higher-paid Federal officials including ourselves were somewhat reduced. The effect of such action upon the people of our country and indeed of the entire world would be tremendous. It would be the kind of thing that would build spirit in every American.

In like manner we should, on the one hand, levy very heavy taxes on luxury consumption, but, especially since no shortage of food or milk exists, we should extend our school-lunch program and the stamp plan until undernourishment has been ended in our country. This would be the best guaranty of health, the best assurance of a strong and vigorous future generation, the best protection against disease.

Our main reliance, of course, in bringing about this equalization of the war burdens must be upon the coming tax bill. Our duty requires of us a courageous, effective, and thoroughgoing program of excess-profits taxation, the plugging of every loophole, an income- and estates-tax schedule that will actually prevent anyone from becoming rich as a result of this time of loss and suffering. The President's recommendations both as to excess-profits taxation and as to a $25,000 limitation on the amount of income anyone shall be allowed to spend upon his own consumption and that of his family should be carried into law. For the accomplishment of these great purposes we have one primary method—the coming tax bill. We simply must not pass an easy substitute for the sort of courageous measure the times demand.

For if we do we shall fail in another duty, and that failure will affect everyone in this whole Nation. I refer to the duty of Congress to prevent a further rise in living costs. When the price-control bill was passed I stated in my speech that I realized price control was probably necessary, but that it must be recognized as a temporary measure and that it was a second best method of controlling inflation. I spoke then of three other measures more fundamental, more sound, more in accord with American tradition which ought to be used in preference to price control so far as possible. The first of those measures is effective control of the supply of money—a thing we do not have today. The second is taxation, the basic and straightforward way to pay for a war and to bring the supply of active buying power into line with the supply of goods. The third measure is increased production of basic consumer necessities wherever this can be done without in any way detracting from the war production.

PRICE CONTROL ALONE INADEQUATE

Our major task as the Congress of the American people, aside from our tasks directly affecting our military forces and their supplying, is the task of preventing a rise in the cost of living. Price control is the easy way to do this, not the basic one. Superficially it appears to be all that is needed. But it is not. Indeed, as I said when the price-control bill was passed, that method alone will, I am afraid, fail unless it is made only a last resort after the other three methods and one other which I shall suggest have been employed to the utmost.

Now the reason I say this is because, on the basis of anticipated tax revenues under the new bill—about $27,000,000,000 a year—on the basis of the expected devotion of at least $55,000,000,000 to war production out of an expected national production of $110,000,000,000, on the basis of present purchases of War Bonds—$7,000,000,000 a year—and on the basis of the present failure to do anything to get small business going in increased output of certain basic civilian necessities—on the basis of all these things Mr. Henderson and his staff will have to combat a situation where probably money in consumers' pockets will exceed by more than $20,000,000,000 the available supply of goods in the coming year. If we spend $70,000,000,000 on the war instead of $55,000,000,000, and there are those who say we will, this difference between the demand for goods and the supply of them will be $35,000,000,000 instead of $20,000,000,000. In the absence of the other measures I shall describe, I am afraid general rationing will have to be resorted to if we are to prevent the pressure of this excess of effective demand over supply from resulting in black markets, hoarding, and evasion of the price ceilings.

The first thing is to prevent the uncontrolled creation of new money by the banking system. Since March 1941 excess reserves have been reduced from $6,300,000,000 to $2,700,000,000. About a billion of this was the result of a Federal Reserve Board order increasing reserve requirements. But the rest was the result of the outright creation by the banking system of some $13,000,000,000 of new money. The banking system is required to have about $1 of reserve for every $5 of deposits. Since excess reserves were reduced by $2,600,000,000—outside the reduction through increasing reserve requirements—the amount of new deposits created during this period would amount roughly to five times $2,600,000,000 or $13,000,000,000. Now the remaining $2,700,000,000 of excess reserves can and will be used by the banks to create another $13,500,000,000 of new money to be loaned into circulation at interest unless something is done to prevent it. The Federal Reserve Board has exhausted its power. It has raised reserve requirements to the maximum allowable under present law. Unless Congress acts to require that this surplus money-creating power of the banks be converted into required reserves, and makes it possible for the banks to meet such reserve requirements, we are in the position of trying to tax away from the people their buying power at the same time that we permit the banking system to go on creating money, much of which it will use to buy interest-bearing obligations of the American people. The injustice of such a situation should require no elaborating on my part. The inflationary effort of this money creation is also entirely obvious. Some day, and before long, if we are to avoid serious problems in connection with the servicing of a huge interest-bearing public debt, we must learn to use the sovereign power of this Congress to provide the supply of money required by the Nation, at all times controlling any excess of such monetary supply by means of taxation. We should be far better protected against inflation and deflation by such a system, and much of an interest-bearing debt would be avoided.

As to taxation, reports of action by the Ways and Means Committee lead me to fear very much that the coming tax bill will fall far short of what it ought to be. According to reports, the coming tax bill may fail to plug a number of the most serious loopholes in our present tax laws. Although we are told that excess-profits tax rates are to be raised to 94 percent, we are also told that the average earning plan of computing the excess-profits tax credit may remain unaltered, which will mean that some of the largest and wealthiest corporations in the country will continue to be able to escape in large measure from the effectiveness of the excess-profits tax law.

Reports also indicate that the bill will contain no provision with regard to changing depletion allowances for oil companies, which at present continue to give very substantial tax reductions to such companies even after the entire cost of drilling operations has been paid.

Apparently the committee has voted to reduce the exemption figure for the individual income tax, but it is exceedingly questionable whether it will adopt rates as high as the needs of the time demand in the middle and upper brackets. What will be done to increase estate and gift tax rates I do not know, but here, if anywhere, is a place where increases should be very substantial.

There is apparently some danger that a general sales tax may be included in the bill in place of increases in taxes on those particular articles which are scarce, definite luxuries or things requiring materials especially needed for the war, and whose consumption, therefore, should be actually discouraged. Excise or sales taxes on such selected items are a very important and appropriate type of tax today. But the general sales tax, if adopted, will be the one tax that will raise the cost of living of every single item, even of the most necessary minimum diet of food, to every single family in America, even the very poorest. Its adoption would be indication that since it is politically less likely to cause resentment, we are taking refuge in an utterly unscientific form of tax in order to avoid a courageous application of sound tax principles in the present situation.

The main point is, however, that if Congress is to gain and retain the position of public confidence it should have, the most important single thing it can do right now is to pass a tax bill which will actually do a large part of the job of assuring economic balance during the war and preventing a rising spiral of living costs. The danger is not, at this time, that the tax bill will be too severe, but that it will not be as effective as the needs of the country demand, and will fail to equalize the burden as between those who have a bare subsistence income and those who really do have more buying power than they need. At the very least the proposal of the President

that no one in these times be allowed to keep or spend on personal consumption more than $25,000 a year should certainly be adopted. In point of revenue it may not be so important. From the standpoint of morale it is all-important.

The principle of equality of sacrifice and the job of preventing spiraling costs of living—these must be our main guides. If they are and if we act with the courage of which Congress undoubtedly is capable the best possible answer will have been given to the attacks on this National Legislature.

The third method of assuring economic balance in the face of the war and the devotion of half of our total production effort to it is by the increase of production of basic consumer needs. I know it is perhaps not prudent to speak of this, for there is danger that one will be misunderstood and regarded as advocating something which is in conflict with the war effort. That is, however, the last thing I would advocate. It is, however, true that a considerable amount of our production capacity has not yet been brought fully into use. Most of this is in the small business and manufacturing establishments. Mr. Floyd Odlum, who, up until recently, was head of the contract distribution section, recommended in his letter to the President that while some small businesses could be and, of course, should be converted to war production the principal answer to the problem of achieving 100-percent use of all our productive power was to be found in mobilizing small business to produce basic civilian needs. I could discuss this matter for a very long time but will only say at this point that I am greatly encouraged to learn that the House will act next Monday on Senate bill 2250, already passed by the Senate. This bill would create, under the War Production Board, the smaller War Plants Corporation specially charged with the task of organizing and assisting small business in becoming as busy as big business in producing for the Nation's needs today. To the extent, of course, that more civilian goods can, without detracting from war production, be turned out, the pressure for inflation will be relieved and the problem of preventing further rises in the cost of living will have been attacked in the most fundamental way possible.

Since already price ceilings have been generally applied, it is impossible to refute the argument that wages and farm prices must be treated likewise. I believe Congress should itself act in both these matters. I do not think we should leave it to someone else. However, I see no reason why, as to wages which are even now below an amount required for health and decency and as to farm prices which are still below a fair return, there cannot be allowances made for fair increases with such price ceiling adjustments as may be required to compensate.

SAVINGS NOW FOR THE PEOPLE'S OWN BENEFIT IN FUTURE

But I come now to what is perhaps the most vital part of my speech. I have pointed out the great importance of Congress making sure that the people are assured that there will not be an economic collapse after this war. I have indicated the importance of providing a backlog of buying power for that time. And especially I have submitted figures to indicate that unless further measures are taken mere attempts at control of the cost of living by price-ceiling decrees will almost certainly fail to do the job.

Theoretically the thing to do is to raise taxes to a point where they will enable us to pay the whole cost of the war now—as we go along—by taking up all the slack between the available supply of goods and the buying power in consumers' hands. But this would mean taxing approximately half the total income of the people away. That just cannot be done and in the case of millions of our people it should not be done. The other possibility would be an increase, to about 3 or 4 times the present rate, of purchases of War Bonds on a voluntary basis. They are now selling at a rate close to $7,000,000,000 a year. They would need to be sold at a rate of at least $20,000,000,000 a year to create an economic balance between goods and demand for goods. Such a figure cannot, I am afraid be reached on a voluntary basis.

I know there will be a great deal of opposition to and resentment against the passage of a law requiring that savings be made by the people now through the purchase of nontransferable Treasury Bonds. But sooner or later I believe we shall have to come to this and I believe the Congress should forsee that necessity and act now.

There are three reasons why I am here today advocating a general savings program for our country during the war period. The first reason is this: The effect of the purchase of War Bonds by the people will be exactly the same as the effect of taxes so far as the anti-inflationary influence is concerned. But if we had compulsory savings we could then substitute this method for at least part of the tax burden which otherwise our people of very modest incomes will be called upon to carry. Second, I want as much of a reserve of savings to be in the hands of our poorer people when this war is over as possible. I do not want all those bonds—together with the economic power they will give—to be concentrated in the hands of a few wealthy people. Such a reserve of buying power in the hands of the people generally would be one of the best guaranties we could have that we can continue full production, a full market for our farm products, and above all full employment of all our people after the war is over. Third, I believe that, although many of the people themselves will protest, it will be a far, far greater kindness to them to require now that they set aside a reasonable percentage of their incomes for their own use and protection after the war than it would be for us to permanently take their buying power away from them by failing to act effectively to prevent a rise in the cost of living now. As I have said, I do not believe price control alone can do the job. Neither, I am afraid, can sound monetary measures and taxation alone do it. But I believe a program of general saving by the people could bring about the economic balance which alone can give certain protection against further increases in living costs of the people.

There must be courageous action by Congress to equalize the burdens of war—to limit to $25,000 the amount of income anyone can have during this war, to close every tax loophole to sharply increase estate and gift tax rates, to tax the individual incomes of all those who have more than they need for a standard of living of health and decency, to recapture for the people all excess profits accruing to anyone as a result of this war, and to require that all who can possibly afford to do so, all who have any real margin at all above their absolute needs shall set aside for their own future protection through purchase of nontransferable War Bonds from their Government a fair and reasonable percentage of their incomes. These things in the field of taxation are our clear duty now, as I see it.

If we do that duty, we will, I imagine, receive scant credit for doing so. Many of us will probably be defeated. But the Congress, as America's one agency of Government which is really close to the people, will have been justified fully and completely. Those who have launched this drive to destroy this representative body will not be deterred from their attempt. But they will inevitably fail in it if we answer them with speedy, forthright, and dynamic action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for 20 minutes.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, we have all followed with interest and with some alarm the recent debate in the Senate regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Senate by a close vote adopted an amendment striking out the House language in the independent offices bill which reappropriated to the T. V. A. its unexpended balances at the end of the current year. The Senate devoted almost a week to consideration of the various amendments affecting the T. V. A. The House will probably have an opportunity of a separate vote on the Senate amendment. Inasmuch as time for debate on the conference report will be limited, I have secured this time to discuss the issue prior to the submission of the conference report.

The lengthy Senate debate reasserted two very important facts about the T. V. A. We knew these facts already, but after a critical examination in the Senate these facts stand out unchallenged. First, the T. V. A. is a great national asset. It has done much for not only the people in the valley but for the Nation as a whole. The second fact is the T. V. A. is contributing more to our war effort than any single production agency. Without it we would be in a desperate plight.

After taking the T. V. A. over the coals for a week, after a most critical scrutiny of its operations, what were the results? Its record was shown to be exceptionally clean; not a dollar has been embezzled or misspent; it has made a remarkable record.

It is difficult to understand why an agency that is doing a great war production job should be attacked at this time. It seems that we might well let the

smooth-functioning agencies alone and concentrate on winning the war.

The language of the House bill reappropriating to T. V. A. its unexpended balances and creating a single fund was originally adopted in 1935 after the most careful study by experts of the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury and painstaking consideration by the members of the Appropriations Committee of this House.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. One of the charges that has been made recently against the Tennessee Valley Authority is that it is selling power to the war-production agencies at a higher rate than they are selling it for at wholesale to the municipalities. On the face of it, without any explanation, that allegation conveys an erroneous impression. The truth is that where these camps, or shell-loading plants, or munition plants, are established, they call on the T. V. A. for power, and the T. V. A. has had to expend large sums of money to build transmission lines, substations, and distribution facilities for temporary use, and that necessarily increases the cost of the power. If the war continues over a long stretch of time, these rates will be reduced, and if they were permanent they would be below the wholesale rates, or at least down to the wholesale rates now charged to the municipalities.

I call attention to these facts because, in my opinion, it is one of the most unjust charges I have heard made against the Tennessee Valley Authority. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee thoroughly, that without the Tennessee Valley Authority our war efforts would be in some respects paralyzed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of thanking the gentleman from Mississippi, who has been a most ardent and vigorous advocate of this great project in the House of Representatives over the course of many years, and along the line of the suggestion he has brought up, I think this should be pointed out. I understand the Tennessee Valley Authority in a written communication to the War Department offered to furnish electricity free, without any charge, but that the Secretary of War, in his wise judgment, felt that the Tennessee Valley Authority should be operated as a business and that some payment should be made. I wish to point out further that the reason that some higher charges have been made for power furnished war installations as compared to cooperatives is that it has been necessary for them to build expensive transmission lines or power stations, which they have not been able to figure on amortizing over a long time, because the War Department was not in a position to sign a long-time contract; but I am sure the gentleman and Members of the House will agree that even those rates charged—and they necessarily had to be somewhat higher—are lower than the rates charged by private utilities in other parts of the country, and I shall be glad if the gentleman from Mississippi, who has information about that, would tell if he has not found this to be true.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I think if you will investigate thoroughly, you will find that the Tennessee Valley Authority is supplying this power to these defense plants, at least 50 percent below the rates the Government is paying private power companies throughout the country. I have gone into this proposition carefully, because I have had this problem up in my own district, and I have discussed it with Mr. Lilienthal. I do not think you will find a single instance where the Tennessee Valley Authority is charging more for this power than the municipalities would have charged if it had been sold through them in the usual way. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has had some experience with this proposition, and I am sure that he will bear me out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I think that at one time the Tennessee Valley Authority was in consultation with the War Department relative to furnishing electricity to some war agencies which were in the vicinity of municipalities which had municipal systems which were prepared to furnish the service. But after full consideration the T. V. A. and War Department agreed that the municipalities or cities that had the power distribution system in that city should service the war industry, provided the rates and other considerations were in line. I think this was a correct decision for the T. V. A. and the War Department to make.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the gentleman makes it absolutely clear. As a matter of fact, the Tennessee Valley Authority left it up to the War Department to say how the service should be rendered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, as I understand it, the Tennessee Valley Authority in effect said, "We will produce the power; we will make it available to the War Department as they may requisition it, and service it in any way that they may see fit." In other words, if it is to the advantage of the War Department to furnish it, they will furnish it. If it is to their advantage for the municipality or the rural cooperatives to furnish it, they left it up to the War Department to say.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. I should have clarified that. The War Department, in those instances where the municipality or the cooperative was in a position to furnish it, had them service the installations rather than secure power direct from the T. V. A.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. But in every single instance the Tennessee Valley Authority is supplying power to these war agencies far below the rates they could purchase at from private power companies throughout the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the gentleman's statement is entirely correct.

I was making a statement of the great care that was taken in writing the House language in the appropriation bill which was stricken out by the Senate amendment.

In contrast, the Senate amendment proposing to strike this language from the bill was adopted by the Senate without testimony on the question and without full consideration of its merits by the Appropriation Committees of either House. Not only was the T. V. A. not called on to discuss the effects of this proposal before the committees, but the views of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Comptroller General were not obtained and each of these offices has a definite interest in the fiscal questions involved.

Moreover, the lengthy debate on the floor of the Senate did not touch upon the merits of this particular amendment when disassociated from the proposed amendment requiring T. V. A. to pay in its receipts every month. That debate was devoted to a consideration of the disastrous results that would have followed from the combined effect of Senate amendment No. 114 when supplemented by the proposed amendment which in effect would have repealed section 26 of the T. V. A. statute by taking away the Authority's revolving fund.

Even in normal times a proposal to disrupt a system that has worked effectively in practice should be approached with the greatest caution. At this particular moment in our history, when the T. V. A. is straining every resource to keep pace with the ever-expanding demand for power for the production of aluminum, munitions, chemicals, and other materials of war any such proposed change should be rejected unless required by some urgent necessity established by the record. No such necessity has been shown.

The T. V. A. is now engaged in the largest construction program in the Nation's history, involving 12 hydroelectric projects and 2 steam plants. This organization has been operating with marked success for 9 years. Its predictions as to the necessity for an expanding power supply in this region have been vindicated by the developments. Its records show that it has never failed to meet its promises as to construction schedules, and that it has never exceeded its estimates as to the cost of a project. Through its efficient organization it has succeeded in reducing its unit cost of operation, and from year to year it has successfully held down its overhead administrative costs even in the face of an expanding program and rising costs, until they now stand at less than 4 percent. This agency has not only been subjected to a continuous audit of its books and records by the General Accounting Office since its beginning, but all of its activities were reviewed by a joint congressional committee charged with the duty of discovering and reporting any irregularities. No agency of the Government has ever been subjected to a more thoroughgoing scrutiny, and yet there is not even a suspicion of dishonesty or corruption against any employee of this organization. In the light of that record, convincing proof of the necessity for this proposed change should be required of the proponents of this Senate amendment before its adoption is agreed to.

Because of the fact that this amendment was never considered on its merits but only as one unit of a broader attack aimed at freezing the receipts of the Authority, there has been great confusion in the press and in the public mind as to what this proposal really accomplishes. In the interest of clarity it is desirable to catalog some of these errors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that as a matter of fact when it was written into the bill in 1935 for the first time it did not constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, but simply carried forward the basic law which was contained in section 26 of the T. V. A. Act?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

It has been stated that under this amendment the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority would for the first time be covered into the Treasury. Almost the exact opposite is the truth. Under the language that has appeared in this bill since 1935 the receipts of the T. V. A. are placed in a fund in the Treasury and are withdrawn by the T. V. A. by means of an accountable warrant signed by the Secretary of the Treasury and countersigned by the Comptroller General. Under Senate amendment No. 114 the receipts would not go into the Treasury at all but would be handled at the discretion of the Board according to the provision of section 26 of the statute.

It has been indicated that the single fund provision was inserted in this bill by amendment offered on the floor of the House. As previously pointed out the fact is that this language was written by the Appropriations Committee of this House upon the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and the officials of the Treasury in 1935. Similar language has been incorporated in every subsequent appropriation bill.

It has been said that under this amendment the Comptroller General would for the first time audit the accounts of the Authority. There is nothing in this Senate amendment that in any way relates to the power of the Comptroller General over the accounts of the T. V. A. This amendment neither adds to nor detracts from those powers.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the fine analysis my colleague is making, and with particular reference to the subject he has just mentioned; that is, the relationship between the T. V. A. and the Comptroller General. I find in discussions that there has been a considerable amount of confusion resulting perhaps from some of the Senate debate on this measure, with reference to that relationship. I am happy that my colleague is bringing that out for the benefit of the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I want to compliment the gentleman upon the very fine and clear way he has presented the cause of the Tennessee Valley Authority during the time he has served in the House.

The question of the relationship between the T. V. A. and the Comptroller General is entirely extraneous to this issue, but, since a substantial portion of the Senate debate was devoted to this question, fairness requires that this matter be examined.

The statement has been made that expenditures made by the T. V. A. are not subject to examination and audit by the General Accounting Office. That statement is contrary to the fact.

Under Section 9 (b) of the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act, enacted in 1933, the Comptroller General was given the broadest possible auditing powers. From the beginning he has had the right to examine every record, every voucher, and every item of income and expenditure. The record shows that the T. V. A. has never denied the right of the Comptroller General to make such an audit and has in fact made its records available to his representatives at all times. This is the finding of the Joint Committee which made a thorough investigation of this subject and there has never been any contention to the contrary—Report of the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, pages 123–125.

Despite categorical statements to the contrary, the truth is that the accounts of the Authority, together with the supporting books and records, have been subject to continuous audit by the representatives of the Comptroller General since the inception of the T. V. A. This audit has been carried on both by field crews working on the original records at the offices of the Authority and by an examination of accounts in Washington.

During the Senate debate an attempt was made to create the impression that the Authority is in some way responsible for the fact that the Comptroller General has failed to make the formal annual audit reports provided for by section 9 (b) of the statute. Whatever may be the cause of delay it certainly cannot be attributed to the Authority.

For the purpose of supplementing the auditing provisions of section 9 (b) of the statute the Congress, after hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs, enacted the act of November 21, 1941, amending section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. This amendment was drafted by the Comptroller General and he personally appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs to advocate its enactment.

The effect of this amendment is to add to the existing audit provisions of the T. V. A. Act the requirement that the Authority submit in the regular forms prescribed by the General Accounting Office all of its accounts and vouchers to that Office for examination and audit. With the full approval of the present Comptroller General, and, in fact, at his suggestion the amendment authorizes the Authority to settle claims and litigation by or against it, and to determine the forms and contents of its own contracts. The amendment also provides that in the event of any difference of opinion between the Comptroller General and the Board of Directors of the Authority as to the legality of any expenditure, the Comptroller General shall not disallow payments that have been approved or ratified by the Board of Directors. He does have the power, however, to examine into every such transaction, to call upon the Board for a full explanation and, if he is not satisfied, to report the same to the President and the Congress under the provisions of section 9 (b) of the T. V. A. Act. In commenting upon these provisions before the House committee the present Comptroller General stated:

> I have stated both in my decision of last December and the communication to the Congress of June 2 that I recognized on account of the peculiar type of the business that they are engaged in that they are entitled to certain latitude that other agencies would not be. That latitude has been given by Congress on numerous occasions to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; the Maritime Commission; the Employees' Compensation Commission; the Federal Housing Administration; the United States Housing Authority; in many respects to the Veterans' Administration; the Soil Conservation; and the World War Adjusted Compensation Act.
>
> This proposed agreement recognizes that latitude but makes definite that they come under the Budget and Accounting Act. It also for the first time will bring their contracts and their vouchers to the General Accounting Office in the seat of the Government for permanent keeping. That in itself will facilitate our future audits, and certainly should give us a certain degree of economy in making these audits that we have not had before. (Hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, on H. R. 4961, p. 115.)

As the Comptroller General states, provisions practically identical with the proviso to section 9 (b) are to be found in the statutes governing the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 12 United States Code, section 1463; the United States Maritime Commission, 46 United States Code, section 1117; the Federal Housing Administration, 12 United States Code, section 1702; the United States Housing Authority, 42 United States Code, section 1406a; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 12 United States Code, section 264; the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, 12 United States Code, section 1020; the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, 12 United States Code, section 1725; Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 15 United States Code, section 604; and Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, 15 United States Code, section 713c. (Hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, on H. R. 4961, pp. 119–120.)

Under the provisions of section 9 (b) of the statute, as amended, the Comptroller General has far greater powers of supervision and control over the accounts and records of the Authority than he exercises over the accounts of other Government corporations engaged in comparable activities. Under the present practice, the Authority renders regular accounts current, together with all vouchers, contracts, and supporting documents, to the General Accounting Office in Washington. This is the regular rendition of accounts as required by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. In addition, however, the Comptroller General has the power at any time, with

personnel of his own selection, to examine the books and records of the Authority at the offices of the Authority. No other Government agency is subjected to any closer scrutiny by the representatives of the General Accounting Office. In addition to the regular audit reports that are contemplated by section 9 (b), the Comptroller General is expressly directed by the statute to report to Congress any irregularities in the financial transactions of the Authority. It seems fair to assume that the fact that no such report has been made over a period of 9 years indicates that no such irregularities exist.

The Comptroller General has expressed himself as completely satisfied with this existing relationship and is advocating no further powers. The Directors of the Authority, while I think they would greatly prefer the original provisions of section 9 (b) contemplating only a continuous field audit of the books and records, are cooperating in the rendition of accounts to the full satisfaction of the Comptroller General. It would seem that both parties should receive credit for having succeeded in arriving at a satisfactory solution to a difficult problem. No justification has been suggested for reviving old quarrels and upsetting a solution that has been reached after years of effort.

It has been stated that the Tennessee Valley Authority is different from all other governmental agencies because it possesses a revolving fund in the form of an annual appropriation of earnings. This statement is completely inaccurate. In fact, Government corporations have always been accorded freedom in the use of their earnings, and the great majority of them possess far more freedom in this respect than does the T. V. A. The Authority has been financed on regular annual appropriations, plus a reappropriation of the unexpended balances in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund. Most Government corporations are provided with initial capital through Government subscriptions to their stock and are empowered both to borrow additional capital and to use their earnings to meet operating needs without the necessity of having them appropriated from year to year. Among the Government corporations which enjoy this type of financial freedom are the following: Commodity Credit Corporation, 15 United States Code, section 713a; Export-Import Bank, 15 United States Code, section 713b; Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 40 Statutes 5, 15 United States Code, section 712c; Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 48 Statutes 128; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 48 Statutes 168; Inland Waterways Corporation, 43 Statutes 360.

Similar freedom in the use of earnings has been granted by Congress in the case of some agencies which are not organized as corporations. An example is the United States Maritime Commission, 49 Statutes 1985, 1987, as amended, 50 Statutes 839. It should also be noted that in the pending bills to establish the permanent organization of the Columbia Power Administration the Bonneville Administration would be given far more freedom in the use of its receipts than the Tennessee Valley Authority now possesses. (See sec. 12 of S. 2430.)

The only result of Senate amendment No. 114 would be to create difficulties, hardships, and confusion for the T. V. A. It certainly would not be helpful in its future operations. This amendment would establish a precedent which would have an ill effect, not only on the T. V. A. but upon the national war effort. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will vote down the Senate amendment, and that the T. V. A. will be allowed to pursue its useful course in helping produce the sinews with which to win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert a statement from the Comptroller General in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to ask the gentleman this question: Whether in his opinion, in pleading the cause of orderly accounting procedure from the standpoint of the T. V. A. and of the T. V. A. itself he does not believe that he is speaking for an overwhelming majority of the people of his section of the country?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman asked that. I am satisfied that the overwhelming majority of the people of the Nation are highly pleased with the great contribution the Tennessee Valley Authority has made to the war effort. I am sure they are pleased with the orderly way in which it has been operated, and I know that the people in the Tennessee Valley, as evidenced by editorials in the press and resolutions of various organizations, do not want the Tennessee Valley Authority tampered with or curtailed.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman has made a very interesting and constructive statement and one that will undoubtedly be of use to the membership of this House in passing upon an issue that will shortly come before us with reference to the amendments that have just been added in the other House. I want to ask the gentleman if at any time the charge has been made and any proof offered that the procedure and practice in handling the finances in the Tennessee Valley Authority has resulted in irregularities that were illegal?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's question, and I do not think the charge has ever been made, and it certainly has never been proven. I want to say at this point that the gentleman from Washington has been one of the most active friends of the Tennessee Valley Authority and other great similar projects. We are sorry that he is leaving us and we are certainly going to miss him and his good influence in connection with this type of legislation when he assumes the district bench.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A PROGRAM FOR THE COMMON GOOD

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the fact that the Republican program adopted in Chicago by the national committee on April 20, 1942, deals with matters of common interest with which we are daily concerned, it occurred to me that a discussion of that program is equivalent to a discussion of current problems before the country and that a restatement and elaboration of the 12 points would be wholesome.

It is a document of general interest for national guidance. It advances a program devoted to unity and solidarity. It recognizes that victory is our primary objective. It pledges post-war cooperation of this Nation to a stricken world. It presents a code of domestic action which is best calculated to enhance the efficacy of the war effort and facilitate readjustment after the conflict ends. It is therefore a program of substance which will well bear discussion and consideration.

The first point in that program reads:

> We demand the prosecution of an offensive war, relentlessly and without reservation, whatever it may cost in wealth, energy, or human life, until the United States and its Allies have won a complete victory over their enemies.

That is more than a victory program. It is a program for bold action and undelayed victory.

In the dialogues of Plato it is written that "We must persuade those who are the principal men of our state to go and learn arithmetic." It is the humblest and most widely used of the sciences and the mother of invention.

Arithmetic dictates the need for bold offensive action and undelayed victory.

Delay means death to more young men. In the last 11 hours of the first World War, 213 Americans were killed and 1,107 wounded. Translate that in terms of a week, a month, a year for a truer appreciation of what delay means in terms of human life.

Delay means debt. Today, the daily expenditure for war is $100,000,000. Later it will be greater. The expenditure of a single day would provide comfortable homes for 20,000 American families or pay the interest on a $4,000,000,000 debt for a year.

Delayed victory means dislocation for labor, for industry, for agriculture and

in our daily living. It means mounting debt and higher taxes. Priorities, price ceilings, and the rationing of available supplies are but a part of the victory effort from which there will be no escape until the need for these devices disappears. That need can disappear only with complete triumph.

Let there then be a bold and vigorous prosecution of an offensive war, relentlessly and without reservation.

This in no wise denotes a reflection upon the capacity of our military leaders, nor is it meant to impel undue and ill-advised haste. It is intended to make plain to our leaders that the Nation is squarely behind them and seeks bold and vigorous action. It is meant to make plain that the Nation, indivisible, is ready for any sacrifice in marshaling every spiritual and material resource in achieving complete, undelayed victory so that the work of world healing and restoration may the sooner begin.

What can be done for this cause? A united will from which flows vigorous action is the very essence of early triumph and we can give unstinted support to the Commander in Chief.

A united will generates that spirit of sacrifice so essential to the grim task in hand. A united will produces an appreciation for the immensity of our task. A united will is a cushion for the truth no matter how it may hurt. A united will produces that physical and spiritual reserve against fatigue and weariness and against the temptations which spring from weariness. A united will generates the faith that will be proof against the despair and bitterness which lurks in the psychosis of war.

A united will must be implemented with the five "M's" of manpower, munitions, money, morals, and morale. In these five "M's" lies every problem with which we must wrestle to develop a coordinated offensive for victory. Not the least of these is the nurturing of that moral sense which makes every American a partner in sacrifice. Let us be the first to vigorously criticize conduct or mistakes which diminish the efficacy of our war effort; let us be the last who by word or deed contribute to the sabotage of unity for victory. By precept and example we can point the way to those who would raise spurious issues which might divert attention from the undramatic business of an undelayed and complete victory. There is a time for everything and a season for every purpose. This is a time for a relentless, undivided prosecution of the war.

V is for victory and not vacillation. Forward, then, with vigor, vigilance, and vision. "Damn the torpedoes," said Farragut; "four bells, Captain Drayton; go ahead. Jouett, full speed."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Wednesday of next week, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes on each of the stated days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Sunday, May 17, was I Am an American Day, proclaimed by the President of the United States and observed throughout the country following the passage of legislation by the Congress of the United States.

In New York City it is said that in Central Park there were almost 1,000,000 persons who participated in appropriate exercises in the greatest populated city of our Republic. Throughout the land there were similar exercises on a smaller scale.

It was my privilege to participate in the observance of I Am an American Day in my own congressional district at Morgantown, W. Va. I shall not tell you of the impressive exercises there that afternoon. I shall place in the Appendix of the RECORD, however, short excerpts from the excellent speeches made on that occasion. I wish to call the attention of the Members to a certain incident which took place as I journeyed to Morgantown for that exercise.

I left LaGuardia Field Sunday morning at 7 a. m., in a driving rain, as a passenger on a Transcontinental and Western Airliner flying on its regular route from New York City to Pittsburgh and on westward to Chicago. It was a rather choppy trip; the weather was bad, at least at the beginning of the journey. I could not help but think of how the approximately 20 individuals in the cabin had entrusted their lives to those who were operating the mechanism of this great airliner. On the door that leads to the pilot's cabin we see the names of the captain, the first officer, who is the copilot, and of the stewardess or hostess as the airline happens to call her in that post of duty. I was struck with the names of these individuals who were in charge of this airliner. The captain of the plane was F. H. Deffendall, spelled D-e-f-f-e-n-d-a-l-l. I inquired as to the ancestry of Captain Deffendall and found that on his father's side he was of German and Irish parentage. On his mother's side were blood strains which went back to Irish and French ancestry. The name of the first officer I shall not try to pronounce but shall spell it for you: C. H. T-s-c-h-i-r-g-i. I asked what the ancestry of this young man was and was told he descended from Swiss and English. The hostess, or stewardess, was named Jane Weiler. I asked this young woman what her ancestry was and she replied cheerfully it was Dutch on both sides.

I tell the story to the Members of the House who are on the floor this afternoon simply to emphasize once again the value of the American ideal. Such an incident caused me to realize that I had given the safety of myself on a several hundred mile trip across the mountains into Pittsburgh, where I alighted 2 hours and 15 minutes later into the hands of three individuals in whose veins were mixed the bloods of foreign countries—Deffendall, Tschirgi, and Weiler—German, French, English, Irish, Swiss, and Dutch ancestries.

I Am an American Day, observed in 1942 throughout the communities of America, is significant for the fact that naturalized as well as native-born citizens can and do contribute to the well-being and the glory of the United States of America. Citizenship is a precious heritage. Let all of us appreciate its opportunities and its subsequent responsibilities in this time of crisis.

INCREASED PRODUCTION OF COTTON

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, after several days' discussion with a group of farmers and businessmen representing the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and at the requests of these groups and the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, I introduced on May 20 H. R. 7115, a bill "To promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal."

As Members, especially from the cotton-growing areas of the country, will recall, the Secretary of Agriculture recently called upon the cotton growers of the country to plant 27,400,000 acres of cotton, about 4,000,000 acres in excess of what was actually planted and grown last year, to make certain that there will be no shortage of cotton or cottonseed oil or cake during the present emergency. It is presumed that the Secretary of Agriculture was sincere, that he meant what he said in his appeal to cotton farmers to plant 27,400,000 acres this year.

This bill is presented as an emergency measure to meet that goal and also for the purpose of giving relief to that area including the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and possibly the State of Arkansas, where green bugs, floods, hail storms, or cyclones have either destroyed the cotton or prevented the planting of same.

For example, the bill if and when passed will release about 500,000 acres in Oklahoma for spring cotton planting and will enable the county A. A. A. committees to "loan" to other farmers unplanted cotton allotments of their neighbors. I am told that it will release and reallocate approximately a million "frozen" cotton acres in the State of Texas in order to make certain that the President's war-program goal for farm production will be carried out.

It is significant that each year for the past several years Oklahoma has had about 500,000 unplanted cotton acres lost from its planting quota of about 2,250,000 acres because of droughts, floods, hail storms, or failure of cotton farmers to plant their full allotments. Under this legislation at least 500,000 unplanted cotton acres in Oklahoma alone will be transferred to other farmers who may need extra cotton to support their families.

In several counties of western and southwestern Oklahoma practically the

entire small grain crop has been destroyed by green bugs and other insects. The same situation is prevalent in several sections of the State of Texas and I am sure several other areas where cotton is grown have also been devastated on a smaller scale.

This week representatives of farm groups of three States called on the Secretary of Agriculture and presented him data giving much detailed information concerning the crucial situation in areas where crops have been lost through no fault of the farmers. The Secretary of Agriculture was very cordial and attentive to their urgent pleas but frankly admitted that he was not a cotton expert. The Secretary's experts advised him, however, in the presence of the group, that the cotton trade was expecting a maximum of 24,000,000 acres to be planted this year, which is still 3,400,000 fewer acres than the Secretary says is essential to reach the President's war-program goal of cotton production. So it was decided to present this legislation and urge that immediate consideration be given same in order to meet the present unusual emergency. If this permission is not granted by Congress to utilize the millions of devastated or flooded acres by planting them into cotton the farmers of the South stand to face destitution because of no crops at all.

Under the provision of this proposed legislation the transfer of these unplanted acres of cotton would be permitted in order to correct this situation and permit the planting of cotton in those sections. It would also permit relief in other hardship cases where the farm cotton allotment is too small to provide a living for the farmer. If Members will examine provision of the proposed bill, a copy of which I am inserting in the RECORD in connection with these remarks it will be found that provision is made permitting the original allottee to keep the parity and soil-conservation payments on the acres he surrenders. It also provides that the farmers receiving the transferred acres will not receive these benefit payments. Another proposed change would suspend the 40-percent limitation on cotton acreage per farm for these acres transferred by the county committee.

I am asking the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House to grant a hearing on this bill this week, if possible, inasmuch as it is a real emergency, in order that those of us who are especially interested in the amendments proposed may have an opportunity to appear before the committee and explain the urgent necessity for the legislation. In my judgment, it would clarify the present law. If this proposed legislation is enacted in the near future it will be a godsend to the cotton farmers of the South and at the same time assist in promoting an all-out war effort.

The bill (H. R. 7115) reads as follows:

A bill to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal

Be it enacted, etc., That section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) After the word "apportionment" in the first proviso add the words "of either original allottee or transferee."

(b) At the end of the first proviso of this subsection, after the word "years", strike out the semicolon, add a comma and the words "and parity and soil conservation payments shall remain with the original allottee in the same manner as though no portion of allotment had been temporarily transferred." At the end of this subsection, as amended, strike out the period, add a colon and the words *"Provided further,* That this maximum of 40 percent of the acreage on such farms shall not apply to such acreage as may be temporarily reallocated to such farm by the county committee, as provided in this subsection."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6927. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 25, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be postponed for approximately 2 weeks.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1654. A letter from the Civil Service Commissioners, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill bringing about a greater degree of uniformity and equity in compensating the per annum employees of the Government for overtime work; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1655. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1656. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to create the title of "flight officers" in the Army Air Forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1657. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement in duplicate of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1658. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Corpus Christi, Tex., with a view to its protection by the construction of breakwaters, sea walls, or jetties, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1659. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 14, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Crisfield Harbor, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941, and a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on March 4, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1660. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 5, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Delaware and Raritan Canal, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 14, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Colville River, Wash., a tributary of the Columbia River, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1662. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 488. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2250, a bill to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances; without amendment (Rept. No. 2142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7097. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize The Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); without amendment (Rept. No. 2143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6986. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of

Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 2145). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6961. A bill to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans as a body corporate of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 162, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national defense program. Special Committee No. 3, on Matériel, Procurement, and Personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6297. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 2147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 7119. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7120. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 7121. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in respect of the system of medical examination of registrants under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNS:

H. Res. 489. Resolution to investigate prices charged in Army canteens; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7122. A bill for the relief of C. J. Boyle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7123. A bill for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 7124. A bill reviving and renewing Patent No. 926,411; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 7125. A bill for the relief of James W. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2880. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Sarah I. Braman, of Providence, R. I., and 69 others, supporting Senate bill 860 and House bills 4000, 3371, and 3746; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2881. Also, resolution of Ruth E. Richardson, of Providence, R. I., and eight others, supporting Senate bill 860 and House bills 4000, 3371, and 3746; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2882. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition signed by Rev. R. H. Ling, pastor and president of the official boards of the West Bridgewater (Pa.) and Concord (Beaver Falls, Pa.) Churches, representing a total of 300 members, urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2883. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Madaline Davis and 16 other members of the Church of God of Flora, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2884. Also, petition of Ransom De Loss Brown and a number of other citizens of Carmi, Ill., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2885. Also, petition of Ella Pearl Threet and 63 other residents of Harrisburg, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2886. Also, petition of Julia E. Berry and 63 others, of Saline County, Ill., urging the adoption of Senate bill 860 as a part of our preparedness program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2887. By Mr. LaCOMPTE: Petition of Rev. Fred E. Miller, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Chariton, Iowa, urging the prohibiting of liquor around Army and naval camps and the discontinuance of the sale of beer in Government commissaries and to create dry zones around military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2888. Also, petition of Rev. E. Hopson, pastor, Newton, Iowa, and members of his congregation, urging the prohibiting of liquor around Army and naval camps and the discontinuance of the sale of beer in Government commissaries, to create dry zones around military and naval establishments, and to set up dry zones around industrial establishments in which airplanes, ships, tanks, arms, and equipment must be produced with the utmost precision and speed for the support of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2889. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by William W. Ellis and 37 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, or legislation similar thereto, in order to safeguard the health and the morals of the men in the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2890. Also, petition signed by Spike Daniels, of Riga, Mich., and 19 other residents, of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2891. Also, petition signed by Eula Marvin, of Ottawa Lake, Mich., and 34 other residents, of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2892. Also, petition signed by Belle C. Wood, of Rives Junction, Mich., and 52 other residents, of Jackson County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 or legislation similar thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2893. Also, petition signed by Rev. J. D. Shorney, of Toledo, Ohio, and 12 other residents, of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2894. Also, petition signed by Mrs. M. Swy, of Temperance, Mich., and 70 other residents, of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2895. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Julius Meier and 14 other members of the boys in uniform committee, Presbyterian Church, Monroe, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2896. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Albert Sparks, of Lambertville, Mich., and 30 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2897. Also, petition signed by Mrs. W. B. Wilson and 30 other members of the Ladies' Guild, First Presbyterian Church, Monroe, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2898. Also, petition transmitted by Mrs. Richard A. Weir, chairman, Woman's Society of Christian Service, Ypsilanti, Mich., and signed by 76 other members of the society, urging legislation restricting the sale of liquor and controlling vice conditions for the protection of the men in the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2899. Also, petition signed by Rev. D. S. Carmichael, of Holloway, Mich., and 44 other residents of Lenawee County, Mich., urging favorable action on Senate bill 860, in order to provide the largest possible protection for the men in the service against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2900. Also, petition signed by Rev. W. Prentice Peck, pastor, First Evangelical Church, and 46 other residents, of Monroe County, Mich., urging that legislation be enacted to protect the men in the service against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2901. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Williamsport, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2902. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the American Legion, Department of California, Marina Post, No. 348, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the creation of a Federal guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2903. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Petalure Townsend Club, A. C. Smith, president; Christina Barry, treasurer; Berenice L. Gardner, secretary; and Mrs. J. E. Aldrich and R. M. Gardner, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a general Federal old-age pension system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.